

THE ETHNIC MINORITIES IN GREECE*

Türkkaya ATAÖV

The events everywhere of the past years show vividly how necessary it is to devote more meticulous attention to questions of human rights in general and to ethnic conflict in particular, in the interests of better coexistence. Daily coverage of events serve to underline that more significance must be attached to the question of relations between ethnic groups if one wishes to build a common home, whether in Europe or elsewhere.

* This paper was prepared as a draft for a seminar on "Human Rights and the Cyprus Question", that took place on 22-23 October 1990 in Lefkoşa (Nicosia). Being a basis for an oral presentation, the text bore no footnotes and no references to material utilized. In any case, I was even obliged to summarize this manuscript within a little over quarter of an hour. Although I intend to publish separate booklets on the minorities of Greece and Bulgaria with references to most of the other works as well, I may, nevertheless, mention here a few printed works that are either of a general nature or are the ones that ought to be underlined on account of their importance. Hugh Poulton's *The Balkans* (London, Minority Rights Publications, 1991) is worthy of special attention because its author, who travelled extensively in the Balkans and wrote other reports (such as *Ethnic Hungarians*), treats that complex area and its conflicts through the problem of minorities. It is, so far, the most reliable and up-to-date description of the situation in Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia. His earlier report, entitled *Minorities in the Balkans* (authored in conjunction with the Minnesota Lawyers International Human Rights Committee), was also an initial (1989) but also an indispensable source on almost all ethnic, religious and linguistic groups in the Balkan Peninsula. *Minority Rights in Europe*, another MGR publication, was a report on the conference (1990) in the Folketinget, Denmark. This report evaluated the policies and practices in Southeast Europe in terms of five main minority issues.

There exist, in addition, various publications on particular Balkan minorities. I don't intend to present here a full bibliography because such a list is not the purpose of this particular paper. Moreover, printed works on the minorities in Greece, including the Turks living there, are not numerous. Those internationally known are the Helsinki Watch report (*Destroying Ethnic Identity*) and the several short manuscripts of Dr. Erik Siesby, Professor at the University of Copenhagen and the Chairman of the Danish Helsinki Committee. Foreign interested circles are much less familiar, nevertheless, with *Western Thracian Turks*, printed in Istanbul, and a detailed monograph (*Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde Batı Trakya Sorunu*, Ankara, Mülkiyeliler Birliği Vakfı, 1986) by Baskın Oran, whose

The world community has come a long way since the French Declaration of 1789 advanced the idea of dual rights - human rights in an abstract sense (*droits de l'homme*) and the rights of the citizen in a particular state (*droits du citoyen*). The origin and the development of the concept of human rights are connected with the theory of the natural law of existence, irrespective of the state, of the inalienable rights of man inherent in all since birth. The state should guarantee everyone the enjoyment of these natural rights.

But in some cases, it doesn't. Moreover, the rights of the citizen, or rather of some citizens, may be constantly violated. Inequality between people has played a great role in history. The Charter of the United Nations was the first multilateral agreement in the history of international relations to lay down a basis for broad cooperation between states in encouraging respect for human rights. The Charter does not make a mere reference to the promotion of respect for human rights; it obliges all states to observe them.

It is well-known that all series of conventions, documents and resolutions were adopted underlining the legal nature of state obligation in this respect. An entire complex of principles and rules concerning human rights has taken shape in contemporary international law.

But the scope and extent of human rights, their actual content and guarantees of implementation are, in the final analysis, defined by the nature of the state in question. John Reddaway who served more than twenty years in Cyprus while it was under British rule, wrote a book entitled *Burdened with Cyprus: the British Connection*, in which he examines how the Greek Cypriot leaders, before and after 1960, pursuing the unrealisable obsession with "Enosis", union with Greece, in total disregard of the rights of the Turkish Cypriots, eventually achieved a result which they least wanted.

This outcome is not surprising in view of Greek expansionism since independence, Greek undermining of the precarious balance provided by the peace Treaty of Lausanne (1923) and the Greek Cypriot conduct towards the Turkish community on the island. Greece kept acquiring territory in 1881, 1913, 1920, 1923 and in 1947 and made an unsuccessful attempt in 1919-1922. Turkey has always been "in the way", geographically speaking.

The basic international document regulating Greek-Turkish relations is the Lausanne Treaty, which is still in force. It sought to create a balance in the three major areas of Western Thrace, the Aegean Sea and Cyprus. The Lausanne Treaty recognized for the Moslem Turks of Western Thrace a set of minority rights. The same balance stipulated the de-militarization of the Aegean Islands which are very close to the Turkish

work I have frequently consulted while writing the short portion on the Turkish minority in Greece. I preferred to rely more on the latter Turkish source, more accurate and detailed compared to others.

Material on the Macedonians of Greece is plentiful, although not easy to find. I have relied on a number of sources emanating, not only from Skopje, but also from the diaspora, which I plan to utilize fully in more extensive publications in the future. Material on the other minorities of Greece are very limited.

coast. The main Turkish complaint regarding Cyprus, ruled by Britain until 1960 when it became an independent republic, was the efforts of Greek terrorism to annihilate the Turkish community there. It should be well-known that after the Zurich and London agreements (1959), which founded an independent and non-aligned republic, the Greek Cypriot and Greek leadership upset the balance by pursuing a policy of annexation. The Greek attacks, aimed at annihilating the Turkish community, continued until 1974, the year of the Turkish intervention.

The primary aim of Greek activities in international fora has been to create the impression that the Cyprus problem started with the Turkish military operation in 1974. The problem had reached a point of crisis already in 1963 when Greek Cypriot leadership, in accordance with the notorious Akritas Plan, set out to destroy, by violent means, the bi-communal nature of the new Republic of Cyprus. Many authors quoted President Makarios and other leading Greek Cypriots in proof of the fact that they had never accepted the partnership with the Turkish Cypriots embodied in the Constitution. Archbishop Makarios had early decided to organize militarily the Greek Cypriots and arm them. Author Reddaway, one of the former top British officials in Cyprus, wrote that when in 1973 Makarios himself faced terrorism from opponents of his policy within the Greek Cypriot community and in Athens, he then denounced the use of violence in terms which he should have done eighteen years ago.

The violent onslaught on the Turkish Cypriot community was the inevitable result of the Greek pursuit of the dream of *Enosis*. The same dream, with accompanying shedding of blood and trampling of rights, destroyed the partnership state. Besides armed attacks and physical extermination, the Greeks displayed one of the most flagrant examples of discrimination based on race, national origin, language and religion.

The plight of the Turkish community in Cyprus mirrored the Greek attitude on all its minorities on the mainland. Georgina Ashworth, formerly Research Director of the Minority Rights Group (London), writes that the desire to Hellenize all its territory has been an influential force in Greek policy from the day of the establishment of an independent kingdom.

Greece incorrectly claims to be a country exclusively inhabited by Greeks. Just before the Balkan Wars, even only in Aegean Macedonia and Western Thrace, there were, not only Greeks, but also Macedonians, Moslem Turks, Moslem Pomaks, Christian Turks (the Gagauz), Moslem Cherkez (or Circassians), Moslem Albanians, Christian Albanians, Vlachs (Aromanis), Moslem Vlachs, Jews, Armenians, the Roma people (Gypsies) and others.

The Greek position contradicts the dominant trends elsewhere. For instance, European minorities are becoming recurrent themes in international meetings. There is hardly any country in Europe without ethnic, religious or other minorities. Although Portugal and Ireland may be considered, depending on the definition, as being monolithic, there are Portuguese and Irish minorities elsewhere.

To give a few examples for Europe, the Basques and the Catalans in Spain, the Walloons in Belgium, the "old" and the "new" minorities in Holland, the question of the two Irelands, the Germans in Denmark, the Austrians in Troy, the Slovenes and the Croats in Austria, the Serbs and Germans in Hungary, the Inuits (Eskimos) in the whole

of northern Scandinavia, the Swedes in the Aaland Islands of Finland, the Hungarians, Germans and Serbs in Rumania's Transylvania, the Tatars and Turks in Kostenje, the Turks, Macedonians, Gagauz, Pomaks and Tatars in Bulgaria, the Greeks and Macedonians in Albania, and various other minorities are becoming frequent topics of discussion. About 200 languages are spoken in the Soviet Union. Yugoslavia, considered for decades as example of fair treatment, is now in ferment. Small minorities raise their heads even in little Vojvodina. Almost everybody belongs to a minority in Switzerland, in terms of language, size of canton and origins in highlands or in low countries. In addition, Europe is full of various refugees, foreign workers and asylum seekers.

The whole continent of Africa is a mosaic of ethnicity. There are aborigines in Australia, Brazil and in various islands of the oceans. The so-called "Red Indians" are the original inhabitants of the "New World", to where waves of Africans were brought as slaves. While the Anglo-Saxons and the French have at times difficulty in sharing Canada, their common home, the Spanish settlers mingled with the original peoples all the way down the Caribbean. There are at least three minorities in Japan, just as the Tuareg constitute the most sizable minority in the whole of the Maghreb from Morocco to Libya. There are Copts in Egypt and the Christian Blacks in southern Sudan.

This explanation is not intended to be an inventory on world minorities. The foregoing examples were cited as contrasts to the official Greek position which considers all those who speak Greek within the boundaries of that country as Greeks.

* *

For instance, the Greek Government has consistently denied the existence of the Macedonian people in northern Greece. "Vardar Macedonia" is in Yugoslavia, constituting there one of the six republics. About a third is within the borders of Bulgaria, where the Macedonians are considered as Bulgarians. The Aegean part of Macedonia, which after World War I, became a part of Greece, covers an area of 35,000 square kilometers. The majority of the people living on it were Macedonians. The Greek Government changed the ethnic composition and Hellenized the population of Aegean Macedonia. It was helped in this process by a convention (1919) between Bulgaria and Greece, which served as a basis for driving out thousands of Macedonians under the garb of exchange of minorities. The 1924 Kalfov-Politis Protocol acknowledged the existence of the Aegean Macedonians as a "Bulgarian Macedonia in Greece". The Macedonians, however, are neither Bulgarians, nor Greeks.

Consequently, a published primer called *Abecedar* (or an ABC reader), printed in Athens in 1925 especially for the Macedonian children, meant a recognition of the Macedonians as a separate people. This was an event of great importance for Macedonian linguistics and historiography. That primer was not in Bulgarian, for that minority, though speaking a Slav language (as noted by Sir J. Erick Drummand, the Secretary General of the League of Nations), was neither Bulgarian, nor Serbian, and definitely not Greek, but Macedonian.

The very fact that official Greek circles then did not see the Macedonians as a Bulgarian minority, but rather as a separate Slav group is of particular importance. The primer, published in the Latin alphabet, was based on the Lerin-Bittola dialect. The Greek governments, however, made no sincere attempts to give the Macedonians their

ethnic rights in Greece. The *Abecedar*, which actually never reached the Macedonian children, is in itself a powerful testimony of the existence of the Macedonians. Since the Kalfov-Politis Protocol was an outcome of a treaty (Sèvres) that Greece had signed (1920) before the League of Nations obliging it to grant certain rights to minorities of non-Greek origin, it was then a League requirement to undertake measures to protect that minority in Greece. By signing the 1920 treaty, Greece had undertaken certain obligations guaranteeing its minorities their life, their freedom, their property as well as civil and political rights. The Greek Government undertook the obligation to provide for a special budget intended for the undisturbed development of schools for the minorities.

The primer entitled *Abecedar*, based on the Macedonian dialect, was intended for use in the schools which were yet to open in Greek Macedonia. It was submitted to the League of Nations as a proof of the fulfilment of one of the obligations undertaken by the Greek Government. The primer was also an unpleasant surprise for the Bulgarian Government, whose representative in Geneva described it as "incomprehensible." What is of particular significance in terms of Greece is that its representative at the League of Nations, Mr. Vasilis Dendramis, defended it on the grounds that the Macedonian Slav language was "neither Bulgarian, nor Serbian, but an independent language." He also produced linguistic maps as additional evidence for the independence of the Macedonian language. However, the *Abecedar* never reached the Macedonian children, and the Greek Government never took essential steps to meet its obligation of granting cultural autonomy to the Macedonians. Moreover, beginning in 1926, the Macedonian names of the inhabited places and the family names of the Macedonian people were changed, ancient Slavic inscriptions in the churches were taken down, religious services in ancient Slavic language were prohibited, and the use of the mother tongue was gradually discouraged.

Consequently, many Macedonians moved out of Greece to go to the United States, Canada, Australia and Yugoslavia. Further, nearly 30,000 of them, a great majority of whom were children, were forced to seek refuge in Yugoslavia and the Eastern European countries during World War II and especially during the Greek Civil War. Taken together with the second generation offsprings, there are sizable Macedonian minorities outside Aegean Macedonia. Since 1956, the majority of the children "returned" to Yugoslav Macedonia while some left for overseas. The Greek Government passed in 1982 a bill calling for the repatriation of all refugees who had left Greece during the civil war, a restoration of their civil rights and the reinstatement of confiscated properties. But this bill applies only to persons of "Greek origin" and is therefore discriminatory. Citizens of Macedonian origin are not granted repatriation. So, the children of two to 14 years of age, born in the Aegean part of Macedonia and forced to leave their fatherland because of the Greek Civil War, now appeal for the support of all Europeans to return to their fathers and grandfathers homes in Greece, where they hope that the rights of the Macedonians as a nationality will be respected in the future.

* * *

Western Thrace is composed of three provinces: Evros (central city Dedeağaç or Alexandrupolis), Rhodope (central city Gümülcine or Komotini) and Ksanthi (central city İskeçe or Ksanthi) and is situated between Aegean Macedonia and the Turkish Thrace. It is a narrow strip of land that borders Turkey. The general name of the region originates with the Thracs, who settled there some 4000 years ago.

Thrace had been a part of the Ottoman State from 1363 until 1878. A Principedom of Bulgaria was created in the north, and Eastern Thrace was to be administered by a European governor appointed by the Turkish sultan but approved by the great powers. Eastern Rumelia was added to Bulgaria in 1885. The Turkish revolt of 16 May 1885 led to the formation of an interim government, soon brought to an end on 20 April 1886. Apart from the portion called Eastern Rumelia, the rest of Thrace remained in Turkish hands until the Balkan Wars. Western Thrace was occupied by Bulgaria in 1913.

It was when the Balkan countries started a war among each other that a "Western Thracian Provisional Government" was formed (31 August 1913). This was the first "Turkish republic" in history. It announced its independence on 2 October 1913, and called 29,170 persons to arms. It also made a defense budget for a total of 61,000 soldiers, issued its own stamps, set up an official Western Thrace (news) Agency and started printing a Turco-French paper called *Indépendant*.

Western Thrace was turned over to Bulgaria on 25 October 1913, and retained sovereignty until 1918. But there had been Turkish resurgence since 1915. Bulgaria, being among the defeated countries of World War I, the southern portions of Western Thrace were occupied by France acting on behalf of the victorious powers. It was also then that a "Western Thracian Committee" was set up by the Turks.

Simultaneous with Greek attack on Anatolia in 1919, the Greek army invaded all three provinces of Western Thrace. The Allies approved this transfer of sovereignty at Sèvres on 10 August 1920. Article 3 of the Turkish National Pact, however, requested a voting by the inhabitants to decide the future of Western Thrace. The pact actually aimed to protect the former Ottoman lands as they existed when the Mudros Treaty was signed in 30 October 1918. And since Western Thrace had been abandoned in 1913, this Thracian land was not within the Turkish boundaries.

Turkey repeated its request for a free vote at the Lausanne meetings as well. The Turkish figures presented to the conference showed 129,120 Turks and 33,910 Greeks. The Turks owned 84 percent of the land, as compared to 5 percent by the Greeks. The figures given by the Greek statesman E. Venizelos on 30 December 1918 were not much different.

The Lausanne Convention left Western Thrace to Greece. But the Turco-Greek Treaty on an exchange of respective minorities, recognized two special groups not to be exchanged, the Greeks (*Rum*) of İstanbul and the Moslems (Turks) of Western Thrace. The fate of the Turks in Thrace was entrusted to Greece under contractual safeguards. Their status, along with that of the Greek Orthodox minority allowed to remain in İstanbul, were guaranteed and regulated by Articles 37-45 of the Lausanne Convention. It is explicitly stated throughout the Treaty that these articles should be recognized as fundamental laws and no law, regulation or any official action should conflict or interfere with these stipulations nor should anything prevail over them.

The Lausanne Convention actually included articles for the protection of the minorities in Turkey. And it was stated in the same document that the same rights were applicable to the Moslems of Western Thrace. But the Turks of Western Thrace needed to

be protected economically as well; such protection was not necessary for the well-to-do Christian and Jewish minorities in Turkey .

Nevertheless, there are a number of specific provisions concerning the protection of the Turks in Greece. The legal texts may be reviewed in three categories: The Protocol of 1830 and the Istanbul Convention of 1881, which are the two minority agreements of the 19th century; the 1913 Agreement, a bilateral treaty between Greece and the Ottoman Empire; and the Sèvres Treaty of 1920 signed with Greece, and the Lausanne Convention (1923), along with the complementary texts of 1923, 1926, 1930 and 1933.

The first two instruments deal with the rights of the Moslems abandoned in Greece. The former refers to the Morean and the Attic Peninsulas and the latter to Thessaly. None, then, apply to Western Thrace. Moreover, the agreement to exchange minorities did away with all the Turks in the Morea, Attic and Thessaly.

The 1913 Athens Agreement is somewhat different. It is true that it applies to Greek-acquired territories from Thessaly to Western Thrace (including the Island of Crete). Since the Moslem Turks of these areas fall within the jurisdiction of the exchange agreement, it does not apply to them; the Turks of Western Thrace are outside of its scope anyway. But, here is an additional provision: Protocol No. 3 makes the agreement applicable, not only to the territories already abandoned to Greece, but also to all Greek territories. Although Greece was not yet in possession of Western Thrace or the Dodecanese at the time of the signature of Protocol No. 3 in 1913, it applies to the future, that is, to all Greek lands gained in course of time. The Lausanne Convention has not eliminated that Protocol, as evidenced by the decision of the International Court of Justice in 1978.

The Sèvres Treaty of 1920 applies to all minorities in all Greek lands, including the territories which may be incorporated into Greece in the future. The Greek Government considers itself bound by the Lausanne Convention, but not with the Sèvres Treaty because the latter recognizes the unilateral-not the reciprocal-responsibilities of Greece and because it is a general kind embracing all and future Greek lands. Greece considers the Lausanne Convention as (1) reciprocal, (2) concerning itself with the Moslem minority and (3) as being restrictive geographically.

By underlining the validity of the Lausanne Convention, the Greeks also create the impression that, one day, they are planning to free themselves from the reciprocal provisions of Lausanne. The Greeks of Istanbul now number a mere 5000 or even less. They now constitute a small minority in that city. Most went to Greece to work and live there. There are a 1.5 million Turkish workers who have gone to West Germany. But the overwhelming Turkish majority in Western Thrace, which had owned 84 percent of the land, has been turned into a minority. In summary, the legally binding treaties that protect the rights of the Moslem Turkish minority in Western Thrace are: (1) Protocol No. 3 of the 1913 Athens Agreement, (2) the 1920 Sèvres Treaty and (3) the 1923 exchange of minorities treaty, as well as the complementary agreements signed in 1926 (Athens), 1930 (Ankara) and 1933 (Ankara) .

In addition, the fundamental rights of the Turks in Greece are under the guarantee of the following international documents to which Greece is a party: Universal Declaration of Human Rights, European Convention of Human Rights, International Convention on

the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Helsinki Final Act and the related documents of the follow up meetings.

How is everyday life like for the Moslem Turks of Western Thrace? Various items of irrefutable evidence indicate that the Greek authorities have violated the country's obligations by persistently following a policy of oppression aimed at uprooting the Moslem Turkish minority from Western Thrace.

This fact is acknowledged not only by Turks, but by several prominent Europeans such as Professor Erik Siesby (who submitted a paper along these lines to the Minority Rights Conference in Copenhagen, March-April 1990) or the spokesmen (including Yuri Orlov, the founder of the Moscow Helsinki Group) for the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights.

Greece cannot camouflage an elaborate governmental and administrative system of racial discrimination and harassment against the Turks living in that country. The Greek authorities deny even the existence of a Turkish minority. The Greeks deny the existence of the Turks there-despite the well-known historical background, ethnic origin, mother tongue and other cultural affiliations.

Likewise, the longstanding use of the adjective "Turkish" in titles and on signboards are prohibited. The Greek courts have ordered the closure of the Turkish Teachers' Association, the Komotini Turkish Youth Association and the Ksanti Turkish Association on grounds that there are *no Turks* in Western Thrace. Such community associations had been active until 1984. But they were first told to remove the word "Turkish" on their buildings and on their official papers and then eventually closed down. This is also the final verdict (4 November 1987) of the Greek High Court.

The Greek minority in Turkey, however, uses the word "Greek" in all official business. There are in Turkey the Greek Hospital, the Greek Girls' Lycée Alumni Association, the Principo Islands Greek Benevolent Society, the Greek Medical Foundation, the Principo Greek Orphanage Foundation, the Zapion Greek Girls' Lycée Foundation, the Yovakimion Greek Girls' Lycée Foundation, and the Fener Greek Men's Lycée Foundation.

The Greek authorities try to base their choice of terminology, i. e., "Moslem" (instead of "Turkish") on the Lausanne Convention. It is not difficult to understand why the Lausanne Convention employed the term "Moslem". This is in conformity with Ottoman history, law and tradition. The Ottoman society, based on Islamic law, recognized separate religious communities. It is in keeping with this old practice that the Turks of Western Thrace were referred to as "Moslems". But the later Agreement on the Exchange of Minorities uses the term "Turks", which demonstrates what is actually meant by the previous reference to "Moslems." Moreover, the Greek Government has, several times, used the word "Turk" exchangeably with "Moslem". A recent (September 1981) Greek official communiqué states: "The Turkish Embassy in Athens may be assured that all concrete observations that the Turkish Government may wish to bring to the attention of the Greek Government through diplomatic means, will always be studied attentively, within the confines of the Constitution and domestic laws as well as the international obligations of Greece." This communication, addressed to the Turkish

diplomatic mission, has validity only if the subject matter of the communiqué happens to be Turks.

The fact that the Greek Government also mentions the existence of a few thousand non-Turkish Moslems does not change the essential reality that there lives in Western Thrace a much bigger Turkish minority. The "Pomaks" are also a Moslem people, whom all the three nations (Bulgarians, Turks and Greeks) consider as part of themselves.

How was the Moslem Turkish minority to be organized, in accordance with the agreements between Greece and Turkey? Communal institutions such as the office of the "Müftü" (the supreme religious leader of the minority) and the "vakıflar" (pious foundations) are of fundamental importance to the existence of the Turks in Western Thrace.

Under Ottoman sovereignty the Turks were administered through those "Moslem communities." Article 13 of Protocol No. 3 of the 1913 Agreement recognized the juridical personality of these organizations. Article 8 of the 1920 Treaty of Sèvres and Article 40 of the Lausanne Convention stated that the Moslem minority in Greece may set up and run benevolent societies for social, religious and educational purposes. Greece made the provisions of the 1913 Athens Treaty matter of domestic law with Act No. 2345(1920). The Turkish minority was thus to be organized and administered by the community boards, led by the head *müftü* and the subordinate *müftüs*. Although Article 12/1 of Act No. 2345 (1920) allows for the formation of the interim boards, this article was put into operation only through two Royal Decrees that came as late as 1949. The boards of Gümülcine and İskeçe were to have 12 members and those of Dimotoka and Dedeağaç were to have 7. However, the councils of the first two were made up of 7 persons and those of the last two were nonexistent. The military junta tried to eliminate the Jewish boards as well, but was unsuccessful on account of outside pressure. There is no doubt that these institutions have become a target for discriminatory and arbitrary acts by the Greek authorities. Such perpetual acts aim to erode the autonomy of the Turkish institutions which form the backbone of the community there. In 1980 the Greek Parliament passed Law No. 1091, virtually taking over the administration of the *vakıflar* and other charitable trusts. They have ceased to be self-supporting religious and cultural entities. Moreover, Law No. 2345 requires that the Moslem *müftü* be elected by the Turkish minority. This law was not put into practice. The Greek authorities are attempting to appoint the *müftüs* irrespective of the will of the Turkish minority, as state officials. Although the Orthodox Church has full authority in similar matters in Greece, the Moslem Turkish minority will have no say in electing its religious leaders.

Some Greeks and the authorities arbitrarily demolish Islamic historical monuments. For instance, they frequently destroy convents, monuments and cemeteries. Such destruction, which reflects an attitude against the Moslem Turkish cultural heritage, is a violation of the Lausanne Convention as well as the Greek Constitution, which guarantees the protection of historical monuments. For those who may try to justify this demolition of the an Islamic convent by asserting that its roof was about to fall, one can easily cite other examples of devastation. Repair, not obliteration, is the answer for the maintenance of buildings created hundreds of years ago. Western Thrace is full of Islamic memorials that need restoration, not official or mob destruction. The Greek Government, on the other hand, is building new churches in remote villages as a complementary step toward Hellenizing the region. Part of such resources might well be channelled to the

repair of the Turkish monuments - subject to the written approval of the Orthodox Archbishop of the region.

A coordinated Greek policy of discrimination against the Turkish minority may be seen in the régime governing property rights. This is a crucial aspect of a general approach to crush the minority economically. Consequently, the Turkish ownership of land in the region has been reduced from 84 percent in 1923 to about 35 percent at present.

The 1933 Agreement, which came as a consequence of the forcible invasion of Turkish homes in Western Thrace, stated that such take-overs would not occur in the future. But the Turks kept losing land and property through a variety of methods. Especially since the Metaxas era (1936), the permission to purchase real estate in Western Thrace has been granted to all citizens, with the notable exception of the Moslem Turks.

Despite the explicit guarantee in Article 17 of the Greek Constitution, which states that the right to own property is under state protection and that no one shall be deprived of this right, the Turks are restricted in buying fixed assets and selling them to each other. But when the Turks sell the same to a Greek citizen of Hellenic origin, the Greek Government awards the latter long-term credits.

An agreement (1966) between the Greek Central Bank and the Greek Agricultural Bank assists Christian Hellenic citizens in purchasing both land and agriculturally useful buildings of Thracian Moslems. According to that agreement, the Hellenes receive the total of the money they are required to pay for the purchase (and the tax involved) of the lands belonging to a Moslem Turk. The credit extended is paid back in twenty years, starting two years after purchase. The credit is withdrawn only if used for purposes other than provided for. Not only can ethnic Turks not buy land and sell it to other Turks, but they cannot build or repair houses. The standard of living among the Turks, judged from their houses, is much lower than that of the Hellenes.

The Turks feel that the Greek Act No. 2185 (1952) concerning nationalization is applied especially to rich and productive lands owned by the Moslems. Moreover, nationalization encompasses much over and above the limit set by the law, and the compensation paid is far too little. The expropriation of valuable and fertile land hits the Thracian Turks severely because they are mostly a farming community. This policy seems to be a coordinated effort on the part of the Greek authorities to force the Turks to emigrate.

Much productive land, on the outskirts of Komotini, was expropriated for the construction of Dimokritos University campus, a military air strip and an industrial site. In each case, many acres more than actually necessary have been nationalized. The University of Salonica is built on 640 acres. Five times as much have been ostensibly allocated for Dimokritos University. The expropriations for the base and the industrial site are even larger. Only one-fourth of the last-mentioned has been converted into an industrial area, the rest being rented to villagers. In other words, the people whose lands have been forcibly taken are now allowed to rent the same fields.

Act No. 821 (1948) is also applied in a discriminatory manner. It concerns the unification of land, but it is applied in such a manner that rich land is taken away from the Turks, who are compensated with poor land. The Greek authorities frequently fail to recognize the old Ottoman land acquisition documents or interpret them wrongly.

The Turks of Western Thrace fear that the Greek Government is planning to take one more step to deprive the minority there of more land. The tendency to resettle the Pontic Greeks from the Soviet Union will further change the population ratio in the whole of Western Thrace. One consequence will be the election returns. The Greek authorities have already imposed on the Turks to cut down their legitimate voting strength. For instance, during the June and November 1989 elections, they shut the Turkish border so that some 6,000 voters working or studying in Turkey would not be able to come and vote for their own candidates. In contrast, personnel in the Greek army were given the right to vote anywhere they liked and were conveniently moved to Western Thrace in all the buses and trucks that could be rented for this purpose to upset the electoral balance there.

There are also so-called "restricted areas" in Western Thrace, where the situation is worse. There are no comparable prohibited zones in Europe. This Greek policy imposes a severe restriction on the freedom of movement of a substantial section of the Turkish minority, which requires passes to travel within and outside these zones.

The right of the Turkish minority in Western Thrace to education in its own language was initially recognized in the 1913 Agreement (Article 15 of Protocol No. 3). This article accepted the existence of private Moslem schools and the fact that the means of instruction in them would be in the Turkish language.

The Treaty of Sèvres (Articles 8-9) and the Lausanne Convention (Articles 40-41) concede wider rights to the Turkish minority. They provide not only the right to open, administer and control such schools, but also refer to appropriate allocations from the general Greek budget for this purpose.

When one compares the contractual obligations of Greece with the actual state of affairs, one feels that the Greek government has violated its legal responsibilities by subjecting the education of Turks to the will of the Greek authorities. Greek legislation invested the latter with the power to take unilateral decisions on important educational issues, such as the appointment of administrators and teachers and the selection of educational material.

There are about 250 primary schools, in which close to 12,000 Turkish students are enrolled. There are two high schools, one in Gümülçine and the other in İskeçe. The former is the official Celâl Bayar Lycée, set up in 1952, in harmony with the spirit of friendship between Greece and Turkey in the early 1950s. It was in this atmosphere that a Cultural Agreement (1951) was signed, foreseeing scholarships, the correction of mistakes in school books and setting up of permanent mixed commissions. Both sides had agreed on the exchange of teachers for minority schools. The "Marechal Papagos Law" (1954) even referred to these educational institutions as "Turkish primary schools". But the word "Turkish" was later deleted. The 1972 law dropped the word "Turkish" altogether from the titles of schools. It did away with the rights of school boards to

suggest candidates for appointment as teachers. The suggestions are now made by Greek inspectors.

The appointed teachers are required to pass examination in the Greek language. Their appointment is now for a period of one to three years, instead of three years previously stipulated. The Greek authorities make selections and appointments. Hundreds of Turks, graduates of schools in Turkey and therefore eligible for teaching positions in Western Thrace (and also qualified to offer traditional ethnic culture to students) have either been dismissed or have not been given teaching posts at all by the Greek authorities.

These steps were part of a drive to control the education of the ethnic Turks through using the graduates of the "Salonica Special Pedagogical Academy", created in 1966 by the Greek Government to discourage Turks from aspiring to teach at their own schools after graduation from teachers' colleges in Turkey. The Salonica Academy is for the Pomaks of the "restricted area", who are poor in Turkish (and in general education), having had only five years of religious training after elementary school. In the Salonica Academy, they are taught only by Greek instructors and learn Greek rather than Turkish. This procedure aims at culturally obliterating the Turkish minority within a matter of a decade. The graduates of the Salonica Academy are not the most suitable teachers to educate the ethnic Turks in Western Thrace.

Those much more fitting are the Western Thracian Turkish graduates of teachers' schools in Turkey. They are the ones educated for that particular job, for which they are paid by Turkish school boards. But the Greek authorities make use of that reason to prevent them from carrying out their duties.

Another group of teachers is composed of professionals sent from Turkey, in accordance with the Turco-Greek Cultural Agreement (1951) and the Mixed Cultural Protocol (1968). They generally number about 35, the same figure of Greeks being allowed to teach in the Greek schools in Turkey. These Turkish teachers are paid by the Turkish Government, but their offers of service are frequently turned down by Greece for a variety of reasons.

Despite the existence of about 12,000 Turkish students in Western Thrace, the number of those who graduated from the two high schools during the curricular year of 1988-89 is reported to be only three. This numerical imbalance is ample proof of the gravity of the educational problems of the Turkish minority there. For thousands of Turkish children, education ends with the first six years. An entrance examination has been introduced to the secondary schools, allowing only a limited number of Turkish students to pursue further studies. The Greek authorities require a special examination in the Greek language for subjects studied in Turkish in the minority schools. The Turkish children lack proper textbooks. No Turkish school books may be imported from Turkey. Even an innocent reference to the "Turkish lira" in a Turkish textbook is a sufficient reason for a ban. The books which had been previously allowed are so worn out that they cannot be profitably utilized by the other students. Consequently, only one student graduated from the Gümülcine High School in 1985. It is no wonder that 60 percent of the Western Thracian Turks are illiterate. Under the circumstances described, the Turks try to further their education in Turkey. The Greek authorities, however, do not recognize the validity of diplomas earned there. The young Western Thracians, then, are left with

no alternative but to stay in Turkey, and consequently, the Turks back in Western Thrace are deprived of the leadership of their own educated élite.

The cultural progress of the Turks is hindered in many other ways. Turkish television stations are now jammed. Turkish newspapers, usually confiscated at customs, are not permitted. The Turkish minority press is under heavy pressure. The editor of *Gerçek* (Truth) has been heavily fined. The co-editor of *Güven* (Trust) has been sentenced to 18 months imprisonment. Turkish literature is unobtainable in Greece. To quote Professor Erik Siesby, the head of the Danish Helsinki Committee: "The Greeks are prejudiced against everything Turkish".

It is generally accepted, perhaps at times without further question, that there has been a democratic régime in Greece since the 1974 downfall of the fascist junta. However, does the disappearance of military fascism automatically eliminate all vestiges of prejudice, intolerance and even undemocratic legislation? In the recent Copenhagen meetings, that is, in the parallel activities of the non-governmental organizations, there were complaints and criticisms that revealed the existence of racial discrimination against minorities in Greece.

Two Greek speakers reacted to such fault-finding reviews of human rights in Greece by saying that we all had gathered in Copenhagen "to be constructive". This falls short of the overall intention of making suggestions for the correction and improvement of rights all over Europe. In a continent-wide NGO conference on the human dimension, Greece cannot, as if it were by nature uncensurable, stay outside the scope of a general analysis.

Moreover, there is most serious ground for urgent criticism both on account of the treatment of the Turks of Western Thrace and of the Aegean Macedonians. Much of that criticism points at the sober reality of racial discrimination. For instance, Article 19 of the Greek Law of Citizenship is a clear violation of human rights because it discriminates on the basis of ethnic origin. It says: "A person of non-Greek ethnic origin leaving Greece without the intention of returning may be declared as having lost Greek nationality. This also applies to a person of non-Greek ethnic origin born and domiciled abroad. His minor children living abroad may be declared as having lost Greek nationality if both parents or the surviving parent have lost the same. The Minister of the Interior decides in these matters with the concurring opinion of the National Council".

Contrary to the explicit provisions of the Greek Constitution, many ethnic Turks have lost their nationality under the pretext that they have stayed abroad too long and "without the intention of returning." This is done without their knowledge; they come to know of it when they are denied entry to Greece. Many ethnic Turks have been forbidden to enter the country.

The person so deprived of citizenship also loses right to property. And the Greek Government is empowered to liquidate it when so "left behind". Article 19 unquestionably divides Greek citizenry into two categories and establishes a racial element of being ethnically Greek or not.

In contrast with the fact that the Turks of Western Thrace frequently lose their citizenship, the Hellenes of Greece and the Greeks of Turkey, who go abroad for the same reasons, don't lose the citizenship of their respective countries.

When I suggested at the Copenhagen NGO conference that this discriminatory article in the Greek Law of Citizenship should be amended or repealed, my suggestion was constructive and certainly in keeping with human rights.

Prior to the parliamentary elections of 1989, the Greek customs authorities began to seize passports of Turks living in Western Thrace. No explanations have been offered for the seizures and no receipt has been given to detail why, where and when these passports have been confiscated without court authority. This is probably a way of punishing the ethnic Turks for voting in favour of the non-party list of independent candidates. Recently, the passport of Professor Erik Siesby's guide and interpreter (barrister Adem Bekiroğlu) was arbitrarily withdrawn by the police. The professor was visiting Western Thrace on behalf the Danish Helsinki Committee. As Professor Siesby outlines in his report (submitted to the Conference in Christiansborg, Copenhagen, 30 March to 1 April 1990), all these measures are part of the official Greek policy to intimidate the Turkish minority.

Dr. Sadık Ahmet, the foremost spokesman of the Turks of Western Thrace, accepted an invitation to speak about that minority at the Christiansborg conference. After having sent his report, Ahmet was tried in court for "spreading false information" (Article 163 of the Greek Penal Code) and for "dividing the population and disrupting public peace" (Article 192). He was acquitted on the first charge, but sentenced (to 18 months of imprisonment and deprivation of civil rights for three years) on the second. Siesby went to Western Thrace to make his own observations. He wrote that Ahmet was charged and convicted for having referred to his people as "Turkish". He visited the Turkish shops and Moslem mosques attacked during the anti-Turkish riots of 29 January 1990. He took photographs depicting the destruction. He also mentioned in his report that Ahmet's wife and a German lawyer were beaten during the demonstrations, and that television teams from Turkey, Germany and the Netherlands were also attacked. The shops owned by Christians were marked by Greek flags and therefore avoided attacks. He concluded that such assaults were planned. He added that the Greek police did not prevent the attacks. He noted that the Turks of Western Thrace cannot buy land, cannot sell it to other ethnic Turks and cannot build or repair houses. They have difficulties even obtaining licenses to drive tractors. Land belonging to Turks is being expropriated without sufficient reason. They are frequently fined, and fined very heavily. The Greek authorities confiscate even the hunting rifles of Turks. Restriction on land and licenses are all the more significant when one remembers that 85 percent of the Turks in Western Thrace rely on agriculture for survival.

The Western Thracian Turks, in contrast, claim nothing more than fundamental rights as human beings and as citizens of the Greek Republic.

* * *

The Moslem Pomaks of Greece are one of the minorities. Their origin is obscure. Bulgarians, Greeks and Turks interpret their origins differently. Some Turks claim that

the Pomaks are originally Turks. They find relationship between the Pomaks and the Turkish Avar, Kuman and Pechenek tribes which came to Europe before the Ottomans. According to this view, the Pomaks are not only Moslems, but also the oldest original Turks in Europe. The Greeks, on the other hand, have attempted, with the help of blood-group testing of the Pomaks, to "prove" that they were not related to the Turks.

In contrast, the Bulgarians assert that they are Slavs who converted to Islam. They consider the Pomak language as the Rhodope dialect of the original Bulgarians. But the linguistic peculiarities of the Pomak language are different from Bulgarian, and it has many Turkish words. It is generally assumed that the Pomaks do not understand Bulgarian, but they understand Turkish. They prefer to align themselves with the Ottoman past. They feel closer to the Moslem Turks than any other people in Greece. In any case, Greek is a foreign language to them.

The villages near the Bulgarian border in all three provinces of Western Thrace are predominantly Pomak with the exception of some that have a mixed population or others with Moslem Gypsy inhabitants. Many Pomaks also live in other centers in Western Thrace.

The "Pomak territory" lies in the military zone. Places such as Echinós, Kotili, Meliwiá, Oraion, Pachni and Thermai are forbidden areas. Much of Western Thrace is a restricted area, where the lands of Turks and Pomaks were expropriated and where their freedom of movement is restricted. The old (1938) Decree No. 1366, which prohibits foreigners to buy land near the border areas, is applied to the ethnic Turks and Pomaks although both of these minority peoples are Greek citizens.

There are growing complaints by all Moslems that they, in contrast to Greek Orthodox Christians, cannot buy real estate-except for a handful of people in very good terms with the officials. Neither Turks, nor Pomaks may build or restore mosques. The doors of state bureaucracy are closed to them. They are hindered in business. The Greek authorities disperse them by sending the unemployed Pomaks and Turks to other regions and later barring them from returning. They are pressured with the threat of dismissal to change their names to Greek ones.

The Greek authorities want to assimilate all the Moslem population, including the Pomaks. There is no school that teaches the Pomak language. Although there are very few Greeks in the Rhodope mountain ridge, the classes in that whole area are held in Greek. The Greeks count on the younger generation of Pomaks to leave their territory and surrender in time to assimilation. Many poor peasants have left their villages. They either moved south or migrated to Turkey or to the Federal Republic of Germany as "guestworkers". They fear that they have no future in Greece. It may be that this is exactly what the Greek officials want. After all they cannot acquire land; they cannot even repair homes; they can hardly get driving licenses for tractors although as peasants they depend so much on the land.

No Pomak thinks of himself as an "ethnic Greek". They don't want to be called Bulgarians either. They are closer to the Moslem Turks than any other people.

The official Greek position, on the other hand, considers all those who speak Greek as Greeks. This policy is especially repressive on smaller minorities such as the Vlachs, Albanians and Gypsies.

The Vlachs, also known as Aromani or Koutsoiahs (in Greece) and Karachani (in Bulgaria) are Latin - speaking people living south of the Danube, mainly in Greece (and also in Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia). They live primarily in Greece. Large numbers of Vlachs emigrated during this century. There is little information on this ethnic group. They are one of the oldest peoples of southeastern Europe.

Unfortunately, they are not recognized as a distinct ethnic group. They antedate the more modern arrivals to the Balkan Peninsula. Enjoying an existence of centuries, they have their own tongue and their own culture, and they are the only Latin community south of the Danube.

Perhaps because they are a historically old people, they are not concentrated in a particular area. They have, nevertheless, founded kingdoms in the past, the best known of which were in Thessaly and Epirus. In accordance with the Islamic law that recognized religious communities, they enjoyed administrative autonomy during the reign of the Ottoman Empire. In Ottoman times, the Vlachs controlled overland trade in the Greek provinces. Further, not only did Article 23 of the Berlin Peace Treaty (1878) mention them, but the Sultan's Decree, dated 10 May 1905, gave them the same rights accorded to other ethnic groups within the Ottoman state.

With the Second Constitutional government of the "YoungTurks" (1908) they sent their own representatives to the Ottoman Parliament (*Meclis-i Mebusan*) in Istanbul, the capital. Just as in the case of the Macedonians, they too were united for about five centuries during the Ottoman Empire. The Vlachs (Aromani and Karachani) were divided and partitioned among the four Balkan states after the Bucharest Peace Treaty (1913). The Balkan states had promised then to guarantee the rights of the Vlachs, that is, their right to their own language to be used in their own schools and religious services. They were not, however, permitted to utilize their mother tongue.

For instance, in Greece where they constituted, according to the Vlach sources, 7 percent of the total population, they were menaced by mass media when they used their own language. First of all, although the percentage cited above may be exaggerated, the Greek census of 1935 and 1951, which recorded 19,703 and 39,855 Vlach respectively, seem to be terrible minimizations. If the yardstick to define a Greek had then been those who speak Greek in daily use, then most members of the Vlach minority were probably classified as Greeks, especially if some happen to have been assimilated and became Eastern Orthodox (Greek) Christians. In any case, the Federal Union of European Nationalities lists the Vlach figure in Greece to be around 300,000.

The Vlach attempts to use their own language in education and prayer has been discouraged by successive Greek governments and Orthodox hierarchy. Since the Vlachs may be said to speak a form of Romanian, it was the Romanian state that helped Vlach children learn their own language, Aromanian.

The armed struggles of several rival Balkan peoples, following the withdrawal of the Turks from these areas, hit the Vlachs the hardest, possibly because they were least

prepared to defend themselves. The Greek chauvinists burned down Vlach schools and churches. After the First Balkan War (1912 -1913) Greek Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos had to sign an agreement with Romania allowing the latter to assist the Vlach schools and churches on Greek soil.

This Romanian support of financing Vlach education and worship was discontinued after 1945. The autonomous "Principality of the Pindus" with its "capital" in Aminciu (Metsovon) and led by Prince Aloibiades Diamandi, during the Second World War, was only an initiative supported by Romanian, Vlach and Italian fascism.

Whatever their political tendencies on account of changing circumstances in the Balkans, the Vlachs generally felt that they were distinct from the Greeks. Consequently, some of them emigrated, carrying their thoughts and feelings abroad and reflecting a much freer expression of their identity. In Greece, on the other hand, there was always governmental and public repression which reached peaks especially under the military dictatorship (1967-1974).

The situation somewhat improved only in the late 1980s since the Greek governments apparently feel that the Vlachs, unlike the Turkish and the Macedonian minorities, do not constitute a "potential threat". Nevertheless, the Greeks, long accustomed to referring to their country as inhabited by the Hellenes, find it difficult to accept the existence of minorities and even suggest that the Vlachs too are actually Greeks who converse in an unusual dialect.

Under these circumstances, it is only natural that large numbers of Vlachs, like West Thracian Moslem Turks and Slavic Macedonians, migrated from Greece and established Vlach associations in Germany, France, the United States and elsewhere.

They have held several congresses in Germany, where the Vlach activists contacted the Bureau of Lesser Known Languages of the European Community (EC), resulting in the EC's questioning Greece about the situation of the Vlachs. There was a strong reaction in Greece, including that of Evangelos Averoff, a former foreign minister who is himself a Vlach.

Few expressed diverging views, one being Zoitsa Papazisi-Papatheodorou, a leader of the Panhellenic Vlach Cultural Society, who testified before the European Community and was severely vilified for that in the Greek press.

The Vlachs desire and have a right to request to have schools and religious services, to print newspapers and reviews in their own language and to establish their own cultural associations.

There is little information about the Albanian minority which remained in Greece following the creation of the Albanian state (1912). Formerly a territory of the Ottoman Empire, the Albanian national awakening occurred in the second half of the 19th century. About 70 percent of the Albanian population is Moslem. But most of the Albanians in Greece were Christian Orthodox by religion. There were also Moslem Albanians of Cam in northern Greece.

The Orthodox Albanians, like many other Orthodox minorities in Greece, were Hellenized due to the Greek control over education. At the beginning of this century, there were sizable Albanian-speaking peoples in Attica, Boetica, Evvoia and Hydra, as well as the Plaka district of Athens (near the Acropolis) where the Albanians had their own law courts using their local language. The shared religious sect, totally under Greek control, and the national educational system greatly facilitated the assimilation and the "disappearance" of the Christian Albanian minority of Greece.

But there was also a Moslem Albanian minority. The "unity of religion" does not apply to them but the policy of educational control does. However, another phenomenon affected their future. According to the Patriotic Political Association of Camaria, they were forcefully expelled from their native lands, and they now live in Albania. The Albanian association, whose headquarters is in the United States and whose representatives also attended the Moscow meetings on human rights(1991), claim very high figures, not only for the Cam Albanians but also for the whole Albanian minority in Greece. Some of that is accepted by the Federal Union of European Nationalities, based in Austria.

No matter what the correct figure is, the decision of the Ambassadors' Conference of London (1913) had left the Albanian province of Cameria to the Greek state. It is the contention of the Albanians that the people there never enjoyed minority rights. They also assert that they were sometimes very brutally treated, including the destruction of their property, burning of houses and attacks that caused deaths. There are even references to wholesale killings. Moreover, the Moslem section of the Cam population was apparently forced to leave sometime between 1944 and 1945.

The representatives of these people have expressed their grievances in front of several international fora, including the United Nations organs. Eyewitnesses of this tragedy visited several governmental representatives and explained the ordeal of the expelled Albanians and also complained about the assimilation policy of the Greek Government, which at times resorted to changing the names of the Moslem Albanians who became Iorgos or Dimitrios while they were previously "Muhammed" or "Osman". Their spokesmen at the Moscow meeting urged all participants to request due justice for the Albanians of Greece.

The plight of the Gypsies in Greece is even more serious. Some are Orthodox and some are Muslims. Their number is probably a little less than 150,000. The Muslim Gypsies lack citizenship and therefore basic rights. They are accepted as Greek citizens only after baptism for the Greek Orthodox Church. Although there is a lack of proper statistical information in their case as well, there is no doubt that the Gypsies are at the bottom of the social ladder.

The Jewish minority also disappeared in Greece. They were settled mainly in the port-city of Salonica during the Ottoman administration and in reaction to the notorious inquisitions in Europe. The Ottomans had recognized them legally as a separate "*millet*" with rights to practice their own religion, and to speak their own language, to help themselves, hold public offices and engage in business. The occupation of Macedonia by Nazi Germany, fascist Italy and Bulgaria changed the fortunes of the Jews drastically. Although the opposition of the Bulgarian King and some leading figures in that country saved the Jews from Bulgaria from death, the Jews of Macedonia and Western Thrace

were deported, destined to physical extermination. While they were over 63,000 in 1928, an official Greek statistics (1951) quoted their number as 6,325.

* * *

The record of the Greek treatment of its own minorities in mainland Greece as well as the Turkish Cypriots is as black as the pre-1974 "Black Colonels". The Greeks were terribly unfair towards the Macedonians, the Turks of Western Thrace and several other minorities. Likewise, the Greek Cypriots never reconciled to accept the unequal political status of the Turkish Cypriot Community, legally binding in accordance with international instruments. The Turkish Cypriot actions were only reactions to the prior discriminatory conduct of the Greeks that included various forms of violence. The present Greek drive to isolate the Turkish Cypriots from the rest of the world is a continuation of the same denial of an identity.

The third parties may have been taught since childhood to appreciate the milestones of ancient Greek civilization, be it the beautiful Doric columns of the Parthenon, the pioneering thought of Thales, the philosophical conversations of Socrates, the logic of Aristotle or the dramatic powers of an Aristophanes. The third parties may have been educated with Homeric verses or the images of rich Greek mythology. They probably appreciate the Greek view that they have now a democratic régime in the mainland.

With all due respect to the achievements of the ancient Greeks, the fact persists that presently the Greek Cypriot assertion to represent the whole of the island violates the individual and collective rights of the Turkish Cypriots. A return to democracy is a positive step, but not enough, in view of the very poor Greek treatment of the non-Greeks in the mainland and in Cyprus. Had there been a unitary or an integrated form of government in Cyprus, the fate of the Cypriot Turks would have been worse than the ordeal that they have experienced. The Turkish Cypriots have a distinct identity with equal status to the Greek Cypriots and are entitled to equal say in determining the future of Cyprus.