



University of Macedonia
Department of International & European Studies
Department of Balkan, Slavic & Oriental Studies

MA in Human Rights & Migration Studies

“The Muslim Minority in Thrace respecting the period 1923-1949”

Prof. Dr. Konstantinos Tsitselikis



Olga Diakidou
Thessaloniki, 2021

Consent form

The views and opinions expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Macedonia. The approval of this thesis from the University of Macedonia does not imply the adoption of the views of the author.

This dissertation is submitted by its author as part of the requirements of the postgraduate program in Human Rights and Migration Studies of the University of Macedonia. It is responsibly stated that this dissertation has been written by the signatory and has not been submitted or evaluated in the context of another postgraduate or undergraduate degree, in Greece or abroad.

Abstract

This thesis inspects the evolution of the Muslim Turkish minority in Western Thrace the period of 1923-1949. It is constituted by three parts, the first one in respect of the legal texts regarding the minority, the second one in reference to the factors that contributed to the evolution of its identity and the last one with a presentation of a comparison of the minority with the Muslim minority in Bulgaria. Each chapter analyzes a different aspect of the minority's history with the aim to enlighten some crucial points in order to understand its evolution. The dissertation is oriented to prove that the minority constituted a population that crystallized its structure by interacting into a dynamic environment where national, international, social and historical circumstances impacted its path to history.

Key Words: History, Muslim Minority, Minority Rights, Minority Protection, Status of Minorities, Interstate Relations.

Acronyms and abbreviations

EAM	Elliniko Apeleutherotiko Metopo [Greek Army for Liberation]
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
EES	Ellinikos Erithros Stavros [Greek National Army]
ELAS	Ellinikos Laikos Apeleutherotikos Stratos [Greek Democratic Army for Liberation]
FEK	Fyllo tis Efimeridos tis Kyverniseos [Official Gazette of Greece]
LoN	League of Nations
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PCIJ	Permanent Court of International Justice
StE	Symvoulío tis Epikrateias [Council of State]
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
KEMO	Kentro Erevnas Meionotikon Omadon [Center of Research for Minority Groups]
MAY	Monades Asfalías Ypaithrou [Security army for the Countryside]

Commonly used terms (As perceived in the Greek context)

<i>établis</i>	Greek populations established in Constantinople
<i>fesi</i>	type of headgear which was widespread in the Muslim world
<i>ierodikeio</i>	religious court
<i>imam</i>	the leader, the head of the Muslim community
<i>Kurban Bayram</i>	an old custom that is preserved today in Turkish culture. It consists of the ritual slaughter and cooking of a lamb, beef, bull or cow
<i>medrese</i>	religious school
<i>metadimoteusi</i>	change of municipality
<i>Mixed Committee</i>	a council constituted in 1923 based on art.11 of the Treaty of Lausanne with main purpose the regulations of the properties of the exchanged populations and the minority protection
<i>Moufti</i>	religious leader, interpreter of Islamic law, judge
<i>neoteristes</i>	modernists Muslims
<i>omogenis</i>	a person of Greek descent
<i>Palaiomousoulmanoi</i>	Old-Muslims
<i>Protodikeio</i>	first Instance Court
<i>Seker Bayram</i>	It refers to the restoration of one's best human composition and is the three day celebration following the end of the thirty days of fasting during Ramadan
<i>sharia</i>	Islamic law
<i>temenos</i>	a sacred enclosure
<i>vafks</i>	Muslim assets

Contents

Introduction - Historical context	7
1. Part One: Legal Framework in Greece	
1.1. Domestic framework and minorities- The status of minorities	14
1.2. The Treaty of Lausanne	19
1.3. The role of the Mixed Committee - The Greek-Turkish agreement of 1930.....	21
2. Part Two: The Muslim Minority & its evolution	
2.1. The educational status of the Minority.....	28
2.2. The religious status of the Minority	32
2.3. The parliamentary representation of the minority	36
3. Part Three: The Muslim minority in Bulgaria & the Muslim minority of Western Thrace. A comparative approach	39
Conclusions	43
Annex	46
Bibliography	53
Pictures.....	56

Introduction

Historical context

This thesis aims to launch and make a wider research on the issue of the Turkish minority in Greece during the period between the years 1923-1949. On the one hand, an overview of the developments regarding the issue of minorities during the period 1923-1949 is carried out. On the other hand, a survey is being reviewed on the way the Turkish minority in Western Thrace evolved and established its identity. Following the history by investigating the Muslim minority through the kaleidoscope of the minority's interaction with the local community as well as the international context, there are approached issues as the education, the religious status, the administrative structure, the political decisions and last but not least, the governmental strategies of the states. These issues are depicted and documented in order to be explicated and lead to the definition and the analysis of the causes that evolved them. The aim is to be proved that the minority has been a receiver of the historical, legal and ethno-social developments of the era.

By examining the path in the history it becomes more clear the way Muslim minorities are connected to stereotypes as 'the enemy inside the state' (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013) or that the Muslim minority in Western Thrace is completely and only Turkish. The Muslim minority in Greece consists also of Pomaks and Muslim Roma people. It is essential to be perspicuous that the thesis focuses on the evolution of the Turkish Muslim minority, although the sources relative to this chronological period indicate that were co-existing several identities inside the classes of the Muslim minority. The main deal posed is pertaining to the question whether some generally accepted beliefs in Greece relative to minorities can be challenged and lead to an alternative reading of the history where the minorities in Western Thrace do not relate to a problematic, taboo affair (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

Apropos to the research of the evolution of the Muslim minority in Greece, its path consists of controversial issues relative to its history, its value into Greek-Turkish relations, its social structure as well as the local circumstances of co-existing and reacting in Thrace. The evolution of the Muslim minority is a junction where politics, sociology, interstate relations, human rights of minority groups encounter with literacy of nationalities, and identity issues into an international context (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

First and foremost, it is placed an overview of what took place during the period 1923-1949. To begin with, the area of Western Thrace had been from the beginning of the 20th century a key issue for both Greece and Bulgaria. As the Greek-Turkish relations

evolved the appellation of the Muslim minority in Thrace turned to be a competitive and considerable issue. Both Turkey and Greece focused on the religious character of the minority and disregarded the fact that the nation and not the religion defined the identity of the minority (Douma, 2013, p.6).

In the outbreak of the Balkan wars both Greece and Bulgaria claimed for the annexation of Western Thrace in their state borders. With the Treaty of Bucharest and the end of Balkan wars a new chapter was launched regarding the area of the Western Thrace. At first Greek populations welcomed the Bulgarians that wanted to annex the area as they saw them as liberators from the Ottomans. Afterwards however strong conflicts broke out that led to the Treaty of Constantinople in the end of the Second Balkan War (1913). In the Paris Peace Conference E. Venizelos, the prime minister of Greece, required the annexation of the areas of North Epirus, Western Thrace, Western Asia Minor, the islands Imvros, Tenedos, Kastelorizo, the Dodecanese islands and Cyprus. In the end of the First World War Bulgaria with regard to the Treaty of Neuilly (1919) receded for her claims in areas as the Western and Eastern Thrace. In 1920 Eastern Thrace was officially and constitutionally annexed to Greek borders.

To such an extent, it is significant to observe the role of the Greek state from that period when the Western Thrace was liberated. The Greek state was mainly propagandistic and diplomatic as the Greek forces both to the diplomatic and the military front paid close attention to the Turkish triggers that were actualised in Western Thrace (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). To continue with, in 1920 with the Treaty of Sevres Western Thrace was completely annexed to Greece. The Treaty of Sevres included legacies for minority protection and minority legal status although the Turkish and Bulgars partisans during the period 1921-1922 provoked plenty of conflicts in the area.

In 1923 the territory was formally transferred to Greece – a key moment in the region's history that holds on shaping the experiences of its large minority to this day. The negotiations through the Treaty of Lausanne were formed, were plenty, hard and took place in a totally diplomatic context. The mandatory exchange of populations has been judged as an inhuman act opposite to human rights legacies and international law. Moreover, until nowadays it does not seem to be clear whose responsibility was to enact that proposal.

When the Treaty of Lausanne was accorded the population of Western Thrace was predominantly Muslim. In the 1920 population exchanges some 60,000 Greek-speaking refugees from Asia Minor were resettled in Western Thrace. At the same time, subjected to economic, social and political pressures, many Turks and Pomaks emigrated, mainly to

Turkey but also to other areas of Greece and to Germany. The Treaty of Lausanne gave the Muslim minority the right to religious freedom and to education in their own language which in practice meant Turkish. Since the 1920s according to the terms of the Treaty of Sevres (1920) and Treaty of Lausanne (1923) the Muslim minority have been subject to Sharia law in matters such as inheritance, divorce and other family matters (Minority Rights Group, 2021).

After the rise of E. Venizelos to power the climate in Greek-Turkish relations began to change. Turkey abandoned its campaign to promote the minority issue in Western Thrace internationally focusing on expanding and consolidating the influence of nationalist ideology on the Muslim minority. The government of Venizelos had, as it appears from the archival research, the most organized minority policy of all the other governments of the interwar period, nevertheless, it did not avoid mistakes in the general treatment of the minority. It seems that in practice it treated the minority as Turkish, not taking into account the peculiarities the last presented (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).



Picture 1.

The facts about the Muslim minority seem to have changed during the Metaxas dictatorship. Despite the fact that Metaxas continued the line of friendship with Turkey the climate of terrorism and police measures that prevailed in the rest of Greece, prevailed in Western Thrace as a result of which the act of the minority and the Turkish propaganda were limited.

In combination with the measures for the fortification of the borders, the measures for the surveillance of the border populations, as well as the measures for the restriction of the rights were increased. There was a ban on newspapers while the existing framework for

education became restrictive. The possibility of establishing private schools was also limited. Two inspectors were appointed to supervise Muslim schools, while the circulation of textbooks intended for use in Muslim schools without the permission of the Ministry of Education was prohibited. Also, the teaching of the Greek language became mandatory. In 1938-1939 the state undertook the publication of textbooks and the import and use of other books was not allowed. It is noted that the existence of propagandistic texts as well as the existence of an anti-Bulgarian dimension was observed in primary school textbooks. Still, the question of the revolution of 1821 was not stressed in an appropriate way for students of Muslim schools (Tsioumis, 1994).

Also, in 1938 the unfavorable treatment of religious minorities in relation to the construction of temples was introduced. I. Metaxas seems to have favored the Reformers. It is noted that Metaxas' positive attitude towards the Modernists is due to two reasons, the intention to join a significant portion of Muslims and the need to maintain good relations with Turkey (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). "Metaxas noted that he continued the relations of friendship and cooperation with Turkey but not in the climate of parity while the lack of negotiating power of the dictatorship has been documented" (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

In regard to the decade of 1940s, it is underlined that the rules which characterized the survival tactic of Muslims during the occupation of Germans determined their following position during the civil war. Apropos of the international background of this period, after the end of the second World War until the outbreak of the civil war the British demands dominated and the Bulgarian interests in the area of Thrace retreated (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

The outbreak of the civil war found the people of Thrace struggling in a conflict atmosphere that was evoked by the two abolitionist sides that conquered the area. As the rest of the Greek people the Muslim minority similarly owed to choose in which side would stand with. It is discerned that ideological reasons did not permit to the Democratic Army of Greece (ΔΣΕ) to charm the minority as their secular values did not coordinate with the Muslim traditions and ethics. Muslims lined conveniently with the Greek National Army (ΕΕΣ) however they seem to support more the Monades Asfaleias Ipaithrou (MAY) that protected their villages and their families from the conflicts (Respecting Thrace, 2010-2016, p. 311). Despite the fact that the Muslims were amenable in engaging with the national groups, in the Greek authorities rooted the belief that the loyalty of the minority to the Greek state was doubtful. As the Greek governments moved towards a more national legacy, the Muslim minority attached more to the Turkish consulate with the smooth arising of a new

united Muslim community with common ground the sense of the ‘Turkish identity’ (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

In respect of the Greek civil war, literacy aligns that the presence of the EAM/ELAS army was pale and did not manage to engage the Muslims of Thrace in the struggle for resistance. The army of EAM/ELAS focused mainly on the Slavs of Macedonia rather than the Muslims. Moreover, the fact that the Muslims themselves did not declare any interest in being involved in the struggle for resistance is probably connected to the fact that their conservative Islamic tradition was contrary to the left atheistic ideology of the insurgents (Respecting Thrace, 2010-2016, p. 308).

In addition to this, Muslims in their majority did not cooperate with the occupational powers (except in some cases) yet mostly concentrated on their survival struggle (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). Moreover, the influence of the Turkish consulate of Komotene was augmented especially in the Turkish communities. The Turkish consulate was considered to be an agent of the Kemalist ideology which popularity was expanding in the gulfs of the Muslim minority. In the period of the EAM control until the late 1945s the relations of EAM with the Muslim minority was recorded as positive while they are considered to empower the community with the spread and support of the modernist Kemalist movement. To continue with, the placement of the Greek authorities in Thrace provoked fear and nurtured the national mistrust towards the minority that was perceived to be a threat for national security. It is observed that the presence of the Muslim minority in the parliamentary elections with the outcome of elected Muslim deputies in combination with the lack of trust of Greek governments towards the minority placed Ankara in the political field relative to the issue of Western Thrace (Respecting Thrace, Xanthe 2010-2016, p. 310).

. In the end of the civil war the cooperation of the Greek government with the Muslims operated in a line that served both sides’ interests (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). “The minority sought out for protection as the dramatic effects of the civil war created living circumstances that were characterized by ideological dualism, fear and insecurity” (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

In reference to the policy of Turkey from 1923 and after, the Turkish legacies were depending on the state’s internal affairs, the bilateral relations with Greece, the external threats and the diplomatic goals Turkey appointed in the diplomatic field. In the decades of 1920s and 1930s, Turkey concentrated on the internal cases and on the effort to create alliances through a constantly altering European environment. Consequently, the interest declared towards the minority was pale. With the outbreak of the Second World War, Turkey

abandoned the ties with Greece and maintained a state of political neutrality. This choice did not permit the adoption of a line for the minority during the period of Occupation and only after the end of the War it introduced some requests to Athens regarding the minority and its struggles. During the civil war, Turkey's apprehension was oriented to a scenario of Bulgarian and Communist expansion to Thrace and the autarchy of the Greek governments was discounted (Respecting Thrace, Xanthe 2010-2016, p. 314).

Legal framework in Greece

Domestic framework and minorities

The status of minorities

As a newly established nation in 1830 Greece assumed its first obligation toward its minorities by virtue of the 1st Protocol of London of 1830¹ which established Greece's birth as a new nation as well as secured the religious, civil, and political equality of all inhabitants without any discrimination. The Treaty of London of 1864² provided for the protection of religious freedom of Catholics in the Ionian Islands and for political and civil equality of people of different religions and denominations. Article 8 of the Agreement of Constantinople on Greek-Turkish borders³ which was concluded in 1881 guaranteed religious freedom and civil rights to Muslim inhabitants of the Epirus and Thessalia areas of Greece. Religious protection was extended to Muslim inhabitants of the new lands pursuant to the Athens Agreements of 1913 between Greece and Turkey⁴ (Tsitselikis, 2012).

Since the institutional formation of the Greek State (1830–31) Greek Orthodoxy has been the predominant religion of the country. Hence, Catholics, Jews, and Muslims became minorities under legal protection (Tsitselikis, 2012). The security of Muslims' persons and property was set as an obligation for Greece under the framework of the negotiations that gave birth to the Greek Kingdom in 1830. Following the annexation of Thessalia (1881), Crete and the New Lands (1913) and Thrace (1920), Islam gradually became the most important minority religion in Greece until the exchange of population between Greece and Turkey (1923) (Tsitselikis, 2012, p.48). To continue with, the Convention of Constantinople was signed in 1881 and inaugurated for Greece a period of coherent and detailed international obligations regarding her Muslim communities. "The Treaty declared that Muslims along with all other 'Greek citizens by birth' (ek genetis Ellines polites) shall enjoy equal civil and political rights (article 3)" (Tsitselikis, 2012, p. 57).

Demographically Greece is a largely homogeneous country. This homogeneity is attributed to two population exchanges following several wars and a domestic policy whose objective was to create a nation-state and assimilate all non-ethnic Greek citizens into the overwhelmingly Greek Orthodox society (Tsitselikis, 2012). The notion of a national and a religious consciousness has been deeply ingrained in the Greek Constitution, governmental

¹ Available at: http://www.mfa.gr/images/docs/diethneis_symvaseis/1830_london_protocol.doc (in French).

² Available at: http://www.mfa.gr/images/docs/diethneis_symvaseis/1864_london_treaty.doc.

³ Available at: http://www.mfa.gr/images/docs/diethneis_symvaseis/1881_constantinople_convention.doc (in French).

⁴ Available at: http://www.mfa.gr/images/docs/diethneis_symvaseis/1913_athens_convention.doc (in French)

policy measures, and court decisions. It is pronounced that one of the objectives of education is the development of the notion of national and religious (presumably Greek Orthodox) consciousness (Tsitselikis, 2012). The distinction between omogenis (foreign citizen of Greek descent) and allogenis (a non-ethnic Greek), which has been enforced since at least 1955, resulted in discriminatory practices and specifically the collective denaturalization of members of the Muslim minority (Minority Rights Groups, 2021).

Based on the principles enunciated by the Permanent Court of International Justice (PCIJ) and the constituent elements of the definition of a minority which require that a state must employ a set of objective and subjective criteria to reach a conclusion as to whether a particular minority exists within its territory one can argue that minorities exist in Greece, even though their precise number is not easily ascertained in the absence of specific demographic data due to statutory restrictions on the collection of data based on race, ethnicity, or religion. In identifying whether a particular group is a minority, the starting point is the self-identification of the group. In addition, minorities have made their presence known either collectively or individually by instituting legal proceedings before domestic courts and the ECHR after exhausting all domestic remedies by the use of the media and by bringing their claims to human rights organizations, including the OSCE.

The Treaty of Sèvres on Minorities, was agreed to by the victorious allied powers (Greece, the British Empire, Italy, Japan, and France), and the Ottoman Empire. The Peace Treaty was later renounced by Turkey and was superseded by the Treaty of Lausanne. It established a legal framework for the protection of minorities in Greece under the League of Nations. The object of the Treaty of Sèvres on Minorities was to guarantee protection of all minorities living in Greece at that time including the population of the newly annexed Western Thrace. On the basis of the Treaty Greece granted citizenship without any formality to Bulgarians, Turks, and Albanians who were living in the territories transferred to Greece. Article 8 of the Treaty which ensured religious freedom and granted equal rights to all inhabitants has superior status because it was recognized as “fundamental law”.

“Minorities exist as a matter of fact and not of law, a principle that was first established in 1930 by the PCIJ” (Papademetriou, 2012).⁵ To begin with, the origins of the Muslim minority in Western Thrace is the outcome of history and law. In Greece as in many other countries, the question of minorities has been deeply entwined with history, politics,

⁵ Minority community is defined as “a group of persons living in a given country or locality having a race, religion, language and tradition in a sentiment of solidarity, with a view to preserving their traditions, maintaining their form of worship, ensuring the instruction and upbringing of their children in accordance with the spirit and tradition of their race and mutually assisting one another”.

and foreign policy considerations. Greece's longstanding and categorical official position is that there is no other minority except the Muslim minority that lives in Western Thrace. Greece also contends that the Muslim minority which amounts to approximately 100,000 people, is composed of three distinct groups: those of Turkish ethnic origin, the Pomaks, and the Roma (Papademetriou, 2012).



Picture 2.

A 1930 report by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs grouped minorities into three categories depending on the degree of threat posed to Greece's national interests. These were: Muslims of Western Thrace (whose status was already recognized by the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923), Slavophones in Macedonia, Chams of Albanian origin in Thesprotia, Koutsovlahi, Armenians, Jews and the minority populations of Mount Athos, which included Russians, Bulgarians, and Romanian Monks (Papademetriou, 2012).

Moreover, the 1951 census which is the last census that used data based on ethnic and religious origin indicated that at that time the following religious groups existed in Greece: Muslims, Catholics, Protestants and Jews. In terms of linguistic minorities, there were Turcophones, Slavophones, Vlachs, Albanians, Pomaks and Roma. The legal literature identifies two main groups of minorities in Greece—religious and linguistic (Papademetriou, 2012). Among the religious groups are a small number of Jews whose religion is indeed officially recognized, Catholics, Protestants, Old Calendarists and Jehovah's Witnesses while the Slavo-Macedonians have been described as both a linguistic and an ethnic group. Greek governments have not recognized the Roma as a minority with the exception of those who live in Western Thrace. Legislation and policy instruments consider them to be a "vulnerable social group," along with migrants. In Greece the Roma who are mostly Muslims are referred

to as Horahane Roma, they speak the Romani dialect and live mainly in the prefecture of Evros in southern Greece and in Komotini. This group of Roma is part of the Muslim minority pursuant to the Treaty of Lausanne. A number of Muslim Roma identify themselves with Turkey and stay connected with the Turkish Consulate General in Komotini, whereas others are loyal to Greece (Papademetriou, 2012).

Its legal status is governed by the Convention on the Compulsory Exchange of Population signed in Lausanne in January 1923 and the Treaty of Lausanne of July 1923 (Tsitselikis, 2020). Greece assumed the obligation to grant the same rights to its Muslim minority with no specific geographic limitation as well as the Greek Constitution grants to everyone within the Greek territory the right to life, honor, and freedom without discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, race, language, or religious or political convictions. Moreover, Greece is bound by EU treaties, secondary legislation and ratified legal instruments starting with the Treaty of Lausanne, post-Lausanne agreements, and case law, primarily that of the ECHR. In addition to this, the Supreme Court of Greece (Areios Pagos) has held that the Treaty of Lausanne applies to the entire territory of Greece, except the area of the Dodecanese Islands, which falls under the Peace Treaty of Paris of 1947. Nevertheless, the official position of Greece is that the territorial scope of the provisions of the 1923 Lausanne Treaty is limited to the Muslim minority that resides in Western Thrace. For example, under article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), Greece may be obliged to take positive measures to ensure that minorities enjoy their fundamental human rights, including their culture, language, and religion, and are protected against acts of Greek authorities, be they judicial, administrative, or legislative, and also against acts of other persons (Naskou-Perraki, 2000).

However in practice the Muslim minority is subject to Sharia law as there is no consensus in the legal literature or the courts as to whether the Muslim minority has the option to choose between Sharia law and civil jurisdiction. The application of the Sharia law could be found to violate Greek public order and morals, and is incompatible with EU and Council of Europe rules and standards (Tsitselikis, 2004).

Nowadays, individuals of Turkish ethnic background argue before the ECHR for the right of self-identification as a “Turkish” minority. Greece has responded to this demand by claiming that the Treaty of Lausanne recognizes only a Muslim minority and not a Turkish one. Consequently, associations wishing to register as “Turkish” (art. 11 of ECHR) are denied registration by Greek courts or are ordered to close down on the grounds of public security and public order (case with Tourkiki Enosi Xanthis). In the aftermath of these cases, and

during the period of 2008–2010, thirty-two out of thirty-three applications for registration with the word “minority” have been accepted (Turks and Pomaks, 2018).

Finally, one could argue that a number of international and regional human rights bodies under the United Nations and the Council of Europe have issued reports on the situation of minorities in Greece and have called on Greece to cease its restrictive interpretation of the Treaty of Lausanne and to align its policy with contemporary international and regional human rights treaties.

The Treaty of Lausanne

The legal status of the Muslim minority is determined on the basis of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey signed at Lausanne in 1923. With this Treaty, Greece pointed her land borders until the river of Evros and secured her predominance in the Aegean islands. The compulsory exchange of population that was carried out on the basis of religion was designed to create homogeneous nation-states and reduce to some extent the presence of minorities in both states (Tsitselikis, 2004).

Picture 3.



The Treaty of Lausanne had strong differences from other treaties. It was not supposed to be a united treaty yet its text was fixed and completed by other secondary protocols, declarations and contracts (Tsioumis, 1994, p. 58). One of the key objectives of the Lausanne Treaty was to protect the rights of the Greek Orthodox minority in Turkey and the rights of the Turkish minority in Western Thrace. These populations were exempted from the exchange as provided in article 2 of the Convention on the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations and were put into the minority protection system under the League of Nations. While the Treaty of Lausanne was signed, the protocol of the Treaty of Sevres on the protection of minorities was also ratified in 1924 (Tsioumis, 1994).

In the Convention concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, there were set the obligations of Turkey towards the non-Muslim populations as well as it was proposed the creation of a “Mixed Committee” that would regulate the properties of the

exchanged people. The Lausanne Treaty applies to Muslims everywhere in Greece except those living in the Dodecanese Islands, and the Treaty Peace of Paris (1919) which governs the rights of Muslims who live in the Dodecanese Islands especially in Rhodos and Cos.

Afterwards, legal literature and particularly article 29 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969) will provide that a treaty is binding upon each party in respect of the entire territory unless a different intention appears from the treaty or is otherwise established (Tsioumis, 1994).

Furthermore, since the Treaty of Lausanne came into effect, the term “reciprocity” has been used by both Greece and Turkey for political expediency and to justify retaliatory and other measures taken against their respective minorities who are also their own citizens. From the legal perspective it is claimed that the term “reciprocity” is based on article 45 of the Treaty of Lausanne where is used the word “similarly” which in its ordinary meaning signifies that the same rights granted to the non-Muslim minorities of Turkey will also be accorded to the Muslim minority by Greece. Specifically, article 28, paragraph 1.2 of the Greek Constitution subjects the application of international law to aliens always on the condition of the reciprocity principle. However, in the field of human rights, obligations assumed by states are their application cannot be subject to reciprocity. It is accepted that states cannot invoke the principle of reciprocity to escape from their human rights obligations. The unstable period of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s in Greece and Turkey’s history had an adverse impact on minorities. Reciprocity was often invoked for reasons related to education, religious rights and religious foundations (vakfs).

Since the Lausanne Treaty was concluded in 1923 international law on minorities has evolved noticeably from the principle of nondiscrimination to requiring positive measures by states to promote and protect distinct rights of minorities related to their own language, religion, and culture. In the meantime, Greece has gained a deeper understanding of the issues involved as reflected in its new policy adopted in the early 1990s urging equality in law and equal citizenship for its Muslim minority.

The role of Mixed Committee -the Greek-Turkish agreement of 1930

The Mixed Committee constituted a legal instrument that was composed in 1923 in order to supervise and regulate the application of the Convention concerning the exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations and likewise to estimate the value of the estates and real estates of the exchanged people. The Mixed Committee was responsible for guaranteeing that the rights of the exchanged populations would be secured. These rights concern their free transportation, the enjoyment of their fundamental rights and the access to the right of property. The Mixed Committee adopted the thesis that minority protection was part of its responsibilities. As soon as it was composed it received a large amount of complaints from both the Turkish and Greek government (Tsioumis, 1994).

The Turkish government refused to let the Epitropi regulate the issue of properties that belonged to Greek people who had temporarily left Constantinople. The Turkish government declared infringement of the article 16 of the Convention referring to the exploitation of the Muslim properties in Thrace that had been distributed to the refugees that had been displaced from East to Western Thrace (Treaty of the Moudans). On the other hand, Greece complained about the treatment of the Greek population in Constantinople. It seems that the Turkish government did not permit to Greek people that had left Constantinople to come back, refused the involvement of the Mixed Committee to this issue and declared that the conquest of Greek properties in Constantinople constituted retaliation for the treatment of the Muslim properties in Thrace. Greece made the commitment to transfer refugees from the Thrace, pay compensations for the requisitions of Muslim movable and immovable properties and adopt legacies in order to restore the small agricultural properties and expropriate the large agricultural areas (Tsioumis, 1994).



Picture 4.

Greece's main issue was the one of the *établis*. *Établis* which are the Greek people that were settled in Constantinople were exempted from the exchange (article 2 of the Convention). The Turkish government accepted as *établis* only the people that had been officially registered as citizens of Constantinople with the Ottoman law of 1914 regarding the settlement although this was unable to happen as the Turkish state did not allow the *metadimoteusi* (change of municipality) (Tsioumis, 1994).

In that period Turkey arrested 4452 Greek people in order to deportate them to Greece considering them to belong to the exchanged population. This provoked a great agitation to the Greeks of Constantinople as well as to the Greek government and led to the recourse to the League of Nations. "Greece is strongly worried about the plans of Turkey on the Greek Orthodox of Constantinople and Turkey seems to be hardly annoyed by the treatment of the Muslim properties in Thrace." (Tsioumis, 1994) The League of Nations was requested to extrapolate a solution to this prolonged intensity between the two states. Nevertheless, the council of the LoN was reluctant to get involved and counseled the two states to address their request to the International Court of Hague. The disputed issue of the *établis* was transferred to the Convocation of 1925. A committee was constituted with the main purpose to refer a report on the current situation of the two minorities in reference to the article 16 of the Convention. This report developed some basic parameters: The right of residence in the country, the right to return to the country, the right to transport (from the areas that were exempted from the exchange), the right to property and the right of withdrawal from Greece and Turkey. The indications of this report marked that the Muslims in Greece enjoyed all their rights except the one referred to their properties that were expropriated and distributed perforce. Greeks in Constantinople had only the right of residence and the right of withdrawal secured by the Turkish government (Tsioumis, 1994). Turkey wanted to create a nation based on the idea of European national states. She proposed the exchange of the Muslim minority in Western Thrace with the Greek minority in Constantinople. Alternatively, Turkey propounded that the Greeks acquire Greek citizenship and the Muslims a Turkish one (Tsioumis, 1994).

"It is recorded that the Mixed Committee could not easily apply decisions and frequently was disoriented from the deviations of the states" (Tsioumis, 1994). Greece and Turkey responded to each other with negotiations outside of the effect of the council. In 1924 Turkey renounced retaliation and refused to restore the Greek properties in Asia Minor. Simultaneously, the Greeks of Constantinople forced pressure on the Greek government apropos of the application of article 16 of the Convention and the restoration of their

properties. In relation to the bilateral negotiations Greece scheduled proposals referring to the fixation of the compensations of the occupied properties that processed the Greek-Turkish relationship as well as the general protection of the minorities. “The Greek governments of this period in reference to their unfavorable position in the international diplomacy system did not succeed to promote a forceable solution concerning these negotiations” (Tsioumis, 1994). In 1925 with the Agreement of Ankara the negotiations were completed. This Agreement was divided into two parts. The first one alluded to the Greek properties in Turkey and the second to the Turkish properties in Greece. The transportation of the refugees from the Muslim properties was left out as Greece was considered to be incapable to carry out this mission. Milestone of the Agreement was that Greece should consent to the prohibition of Greek people that did not owe Turkish passports to return back to Constantinople. The solution that was featured however accepted as *établis* the Greeks established in Constantinople before 1918 and without examining their intention for permanent residence. In the interim, in Greece dictatorship erupted and T. Pagalos refused to sign the Agreement. Turkey, in reaction to Greece’s refusal put into force the law regarding retaliation against the Hellenism of Constantinople. Conclusively, the negotiations were concluded in 1926 with the Agreement of Athens (Tsioumis, 1994).

The Agreement of Athens, accorded in 1927 had great differences from the one that was agreed in Ankara. In this pact Greece made large retreats contrary to the ones of Turkey. Originally, it was debated the affair of the properties that belonged to Greek and Turkish citizens whose citizenship was not alienated due to the Exchange of Populations. These properties shall pass to the ownership of the two states in order to be given to their owners. Following their evaluation there would also be estimations for the purpose of balancing a reciprocal toll of the amounts. “Greece agreed to pay the amount of 500000 pounds, an act that provoked the strong disapproval of the Greek refugees who wanted to receive compensation for their lost properties in Asia Minor as well as to evolve in the estimation of their abandoned fortunes”. Furthermore, it was being examined the matter of the *établis* besides the application of the article 16 of the Convention. It was agreed that as *établis* would be considered all the Greek people that resided in Constantinople before 1918. Notwithstanding, Turkey took as an alibi the fact that many Greeks could not justify their purpose for permanent residency and denounced that it would deport 20000 Greek people. Regarding the Muslim properties in Western Thrace the Greek government committed to evacuate and return the properties to their owners as well as to constitute a catalogue of the properties that would pass to the greek state. Until 1927 the process of the evacuation had not

been completed, despite this, it was marked a noteworthy progress. Concurrently, Turkey had presented no effort to process the compensations for the properties of the minority population on Constantinople taking advantage of the alibi that Greece had not fulfilled her obligations arising from the Agreement of Athens (Tsioumis, 1994)..

Until 1928 the estimation of the properties evolved in very slow rhythms and Turkey in a diplomatic context remarked an effort to claim new requests in order to gain a more lucrative toll. Turkey substituted the question of the *établis* and denounced her intention to deport 20000 Greek people. These evolutions destabilized the regulation of the Agreement and led to the recourse of the opinion of the International Court (Tsioumis, 1994, p. 48-88).

In December 1927, the work of the Mixed Committee had quitted due to the non-settlement of the issue of Muslim property in Greece. Bilateral negotiations between Greece and Turkey did not yield any results while Turkey's attitude towards the Hellenism of Constantinople deteriorated. The confiscation of property did not stop and interventions in community and educational affairs placed the minority of Istanbul in a unfavored position. In February 1930 three solutions to the property issue emerged. Disagreements and negotiations intensified the delay of the signatures. The delay endangered the whole agreement, led to the deterioration of Greece's position and exposed the country internationally and the minority of Istanbul to oppressive measures (Tsioumis, 1994).

It is noted that Turkey was not willing to give in to important issues or to accept any arbitration. On the contrary, the position of the minority in Constantinople was deteriorating strongly. In the face of Turkish intransigence the Greek government chose concessions which led to the settlement of disputes. The agreement was finally signed in June 1930 and regulated matters that had arisen from the Treaty of Lausanne and its subsequent drafting, decisions and declarations. The pact consisted of twelve chapters and thirty-four articles. Each chapter dealt with a specific affair such as the property of exchangeables, the property of Greek nationals in Turkey and Turkish nationals in Greece, compensation and so on. By this contract the assets of the exchangeables would pass into the hands of Greece and Turkey respectively and each country would undertake to compensate its own refugees. The issue of *etablis* was being resolved. Turkey recognized all Greek Orthodox Turkish nationals. With this pact the refugees lost their property rights permanently, a fact that contributed to the contract being characterized as glaringly unfair to Greece and giving rise to the development of severe criticism. Turkey was the winner of this agreement as it has been noted that the property of the Greek refugees was covered fully with the compensation for the restoration of the refugees. There was a strong reaction among the refugee deputies who strongly opposed

the agreement, creating at the same time an independent parliamentary group (Tsioumis, 1994).

It seems that during this period the reformist wing was particularly favored and with the support of Turkey and the Greek political leadership managed to impose the Kemalist reforms and to upgrade its presence. There is spread of the Latin alphabet, increase in Kemalist organizations, election of deputies by the leaders of the nationalist wing and a significant increase in the newspapers of the reformist direction. Moreover, after the pact of 1930, most of the property affairs met their solution. In the period 1934-1935, in Western Thrace there were operating 300 schools. All school documents were in Turkish except for the graduation paper. Most of the teaching was done in Turkish and the Greek language was taught in only 60 schools. The schools were run by the communities which also shaped the curriculum. At the same time, despite the Greek-Turkish approach, Turkey applied pressure on the educational, religious and charitable institutions of the Greek minority. In 1934 a law was passed to abolish the priestly attire of clergy outside of religious ceremonies. "This measure caused great problems in the Patriarchate and in the minority of Constantinople, tensions that were alleviated when it was clarified that the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Armenian Metropolitan were excluded, an exception that was left to the discretion of the Turkish government" (Tsioumis, 1994). Moreover, there is a remarkable flowering of the minority type, which is characterized by publications adorned with quality data. This flourishing is attributed to the growing influence of the reformist nationalist wing.

The situation of the Muslim minority in the 1930s is characterized by the strengthening of the reformist wing, the wing of the Kemalist reforms. There is a spread of the Latin alphabet, an increase of pro-Kemal organizations while during this period significant progress is made in solving property problems. Regarding the attitude of Turkey at this time towards the Muslim minority, it seems that it has not abandoned its aspirations for Western Thrace. It is noted that an essential stage of Turkish politics was the integration of the Muslim minority in the Turkish national body. It is reported that Ankara's intentions aimed at subordinating the minority to state control and converting the Muslim minority from a religious to a Turkish national minority. It is also documented the attempt to impose the principles of Kemalism in the area of Western Thrace and the annexation of as large a part of the minority as possible is evident. Moreover, the Turkish government on the occasion of the difficulties faced by the Greek government in resolving the refugee issue in Western Thrace protested against the treatment of the Muslim minority. The Turkish propaganda in the area of Western Thrace is presented intensively and organized with many publications in the media

fighting for the introduction of Kemalism and securing support in the political arena and state services (Tsioumis, 1994).

The main centers of propaganda were Xanthi, Komotini and Didymoteicho. However, despite the given intentions the internal developments and the reforms in the interior of Turkey did not allow them to deal enough with the minority of Western Thrace while the effort to achieve national homogeneity was postponed for later (Tsioumis, 1994).

The Muslim Minority & its evolution

The educational status of the Minority

Afterwards the concordance of the Treaty of the Sevres, in Thrace there were operating almost 86 religious Muslim schools (medrese), where the Korani was instructed. In accordance with article 40 of the Treaty of Lausanne there were presented provisions for the freedom of the minority to constitute and establish any kind of entities and associations and be responsible as well as be free to deploy their own language and practice their religion. In obedience to article 41 of the Treaty, the Greek government was concerned about the indispensable benefits to assure the teaching of the minority's language in the areas where the percentage of Muslims was significant.

Greece, harmonizing with its obligations deriving from the above articles of the Treaty, furnished the possibility to the minority to function schools by nurturing them financially. Law 1981/1922 concerning the reinforcement of Ottoman and Israeli schools had been issued since 1922 and law 1979/1924 regarding the schools of Thrace was passed in 1924. The first one respecting the state's obligation to financially corroborate the Muslim schools whereas the second special one configured questions concerning the Muslim schools of each area. The outline of the intentions of the Greek government was delivered in 1925 and can be comprehended in the ensuing salient points: Initially, each minority could establish private schools in compliance with the laws of the state. In the large villages there would be primary schools in which the language of instruction would be the minority's, as well as teaching Greek would be compulsory. The preservation of the schools would be assumed by the minority with the approval of the state. The instruction in the schools would follow the current curriculum with the proviso on the part of the state to condone the content of the books for the purpose of not being subject to public order and good manners (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). Administratively, the minority schools operated under the supervision of the Ministry of Education with the cooperation of the Ministry of External Affairs which was responsible for the supervision of the appliance of the Treaty of Lausanne. Additionally, in order to monitor the better functioning of Muslim education, the institution of the inspector of Muslim schools was established. "The role of the inspector as arranged by the Greek government was particularly meaningful as further to being accountable for the operation of Muslim schools, it was a body of Greek culture, a liaison between the Greek administration and the countryside" (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). The legal operation context for these schools was completed in 1920. The teachers of the courses delivered in the Turkish language were defined from minority communities who were responsible for their

compensations as well. The appointments of those teachers were meticulously investigated from the Inspector apropos to their required qualifications and to their accordance with the values of the Greek educational system. The teachers for the Greek courses that were delivered in the Greek language were appointed and compensated from the Ministry of Education (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013, pp. 467-485).



Picture 5. “Echinos, a village of Pomaks in the municipality of Xanthé”

Pursuant to a report by the General Administration, during the school year 1923-1924 128 schools functioned. Furthermore, it is stated that the population's interest in education seemed to be diminished. “There were no noteworthy investments to educational services nor from the state or the community. The school served as a shelter for very young children who were incapable to assist their parents with their working liabilities whereas the older children who could work, attended school occasionally, intermittently and for only a few months” (Tsioumis, 1994). Until 1952 there was no secondary education for the minority in Western Thrace. Notwithstanding, in accordance with the report, dozens of schools were closed.

Moreover, there were some further questions that raised a wealth of matters. In those decisions it was entailed the compulsory education of Muslim children in Greek schools in the areas where no Muslim schools functioned, a measure that was rejected on account of reactions. Additionally, the determination to appoint some fugitives as teachers, aroused a storm of counters in the Muslim minority who confronted them as suspects and settlers of the Greek administration. Supplementary to this, funds that were allocated from the state to

Muslim education frequently were not adequately absorbed whereas the state of the schools in terms of infrastructure was inadequate. The schools were mostly cited in mosque annexes, inappropriate for classrooms. The Muslim schools did not follow an official curriculum. In fact the curriculum was determined by the principals and teachers without observing the necessary formalities (Tsioumis, 1994).

The textbooks were initially imported without any control from Constantinople. After their unsuitability was ascertained they were confiscated although at the same time the General Administration applied a precautionary check and ensured that a special committee would issue the textbooks of the primary schools. Nevertheless, these textbooks were considered inadequate by the Muslim school inspector and were discarded. Eventually school textbooks proceed to derive from Turkey. To continue with, the General Administration of Thrace from one point onwards did not take any measures to disseminate the Greek language for the purpose of making it purposive, serviceable and respected as the language of the state, a damage that redounded to the isolation and the creation of a gap between the two elements and caused difficulties in administrative matters. In 1930 it was denounced the introduction of the Greek language in all Muslim schools. In addition to this, in the period of Metaxas dictatorship (1936-1940) the Greek authorities posed many restrictions both to the content as well as to the administration of the minority. The introduction of school books from Turkey was prohibited and a stricter control was imposed on the content of the Turkish curriculum. Apropos to the period of the Greek civil war, it was political profitable the provision of a separate minority education for the Muslim populations that were under the control of the Democratic Army (ΔΣΕ). The application of the plans that Democratic Army had scheduled for the education of minority confronted serious obstacles as its modern and secular character was contrary to the values and the conservative nature of the Muslim ethics. Moreover, the obligatory character was something new for the Muslims and generally the minority was sceptical towards the aspirations of the Democratic Army (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

Inferentially, the Greek state moved within the framework of the Lausanne Treaty pursuant to the issue of minority education. It provided full autonomy to Muslim education contrary to what was occurring in Constantinople, Imbros and Tenedos, where restrictions on the education of Greeks were represented as suffocating. In spite of the existence of Article 40 of the Treaty of Lausanne which enabled the establishment of all kinds of educational institutions, the Greek minority was prohibited to have commercial and technical schools. By 1927 orphanages in Prigipo and Chalki had been closed. The Greek administration made considerable mistakes, nevertheless it has been observed that in no case can these be

comparable to the restrictions coerced by Turkey to the Greek minority. Criticism could be afforded to the Greek governments for not formulating a commonly accepted curriculum, for not providing books compatible for the minority and for the detachment towards the case of teaching the Greek language (Tsioumis, 1994).

The religious status of the minority

The Muslim minority of Thrace was an afterresult of the geopolitical transformations that provoked the Treaty of Lausanne that quitted the Greek - Turkish war of 1919-1922. The Treaty of Lausanne followed the Agreement of the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations. Both the Treaty and the Agreement consist of contradictory lectures, as they identify the religion with the national identity of the minority in a specific regional environment where the circumstances are highly complex to allow such simplistic definitions. In addition to this, the beforementioned Treaties did not utilize regularly a specific term to define the Muslim population of Thrace yet they alternate between the terms of ‘Muslim’ and ‘Turkish’ (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013, p.92-93). The focus provided from the Treaty of Lausanne on the religious identity and freedom had previous basis on international agreements that Greece accorded such as the Protocol of London (1830) with regard to the Romeo Catholics and the Treaty of Constantinople (1881) in respect of the Muslims of Epirus and Thessaly (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013, p. 96).

The Muslim minority of Thrace is a minority rootly religious. Considering this, the substance of the minority’s social organisation is its religious organisation and constitution. When the Western Thrace got attached to Greece the status of religious organisation maintained as the previous one. The Minority was divided administratively to three Mouftia, the one of Xanthe, one in Komotini and one in Alexandroupoli. In the mid-war period in Western Thrace were operating 300 temeni with 378 imams and 5 *medrese*.



Picture 6.

The religious rights and the freedom of worship for Muslims was already secured in 1881 by the Treaty of Constantinople between Greece and the Ottoman empire. It ensured the maintenance of Muftis as religious leaders and the religious courts for the trials of cases with strictly religious content. The expression of religious faith and religious freedom were completely free and the religious celebrations constituted the core of the social life of the Minority. *Kurban Bayram* and *Seker Bayram* were major social and cultural events as well as any events related to religious ceremonies and celebrations such as weddings and festivals.

Moreover, the law 2345/1920 recognised to Muftis in addition to their religious obligations the right to supervise the religious and educational workers of the Muslim communities as well as supervise the management of vakfs. With decision of the General Administration of Thrace there were constituted commissions regarding the management of the vakfs⁶ that were completed by five Muslims that were proposed by Mufti. These commissions were responsible for the verification of the estates that belonged to the vakufia and with their management yet their act was not satisfying. The vakfs as well as the temens the schools and the charitable constitutions were also managed from the Muslim communities that firstly were elected from the citizens without a legal substance and this is why there were not approved by the General Administration of Thrace. Regarding the estates that belonged to vakfs and had been occupied in order to serve the refugee issue, they had already been attributed since 1925. The General Administration of Thrace recognised the Muftis as religious leaders of their region and granted them some additional educational and political rights. Although the law 2345/1920 provided that the election of the Mufti would be generated from the Muslim community this provision was never applied. Greece had no reason to apply these provisions as nothing similar was valid for the Greeks in Constantinople (Tsioumis, 1994). Muftis after the Treaty of Lausanne were appointed after suggestion of the Muslim Communities. The legal status of Muftis as religious leaders and judges in the family and inheritance law of Muslim minorities was first established by the Treaty of Peace concluded in 1913 at the end of the Balkan Wars. Muftis were supposed to be elected directly by the Muslim communities yet in practice elections of Muftis never occurred while the

⁶ Pursuant to Ottoman law, each vakf was a legal entity whose property was managed by an administrator or an administrative committee depending on its nature. The Treaty of Lausanne (art. 40 & 42) govern the legal status of vakfs of the Muslim minority in Greece and the Greek Orthodox minority in Turkey. Based on Law No. 2345/1920, which was drafted for purposes of the Muslim communities in Greece prior to the Treaty of Lausanne, the administration of vakfs was given to the Muslim minority under the supervision of the local Mufti.

person chosen by the community was appointed by the government as occurred in the case of a Mufti in Rodopi in 1920 and another one in 1935.

In Thrace there were operating three religious courts (*ierodikeia*), one in the headquarter of each Mufti. These courts adjudicated the cases of jurisdiction of Mufti and had the right to compile their documents in the Turkish language. It is documented a pleiada of problems regarding the non-stamping of decisions, non-payment of court fees, and mainly non-presentation of decisions for ratification to the President of the Court of First Instance, fact that created the non-valid and consequently the non-legal character of these decisions (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

In the religious context severe problems had occurred due to the chasma created between the Old-Muslims (*Palaiomousoulmanoi*) and the Modernists (*neoteristes*). The Old Muslims considered the Modernists to be heretics as the first one required the abolition of the arabic alphabet as well as the abolition of the *fesi* which was considered to be a symbol of the Muslim culture.

In accordance with Law 1920/1991 Muftis exercise religious duties pursuant to Sharia law and judicial duties related to marriages, divorces, alimony, guardianship, wills and intestate succession and additionally, issue legal opinions pertaining to questions involving Sharia law. The decisions of Muftis are not enforceable nor do they have *res judicata* effect unless the appropriate district court declares them enforceable. Districts courts must examine whether a Mufti acted within the limits of his authority and whether the decision is compatible with constitutional norms. Decisions of the district court which are written in Greek are subject to appeal.

Furthermore, Muslim Greek citizens are subject to Sharia law while currently there are three Sharia courts in Thrace recognized by Law No. 1920/1990. Sharia courts must decide issues in accordance with constitutional guarantees and the rights and freedoms enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights.

The application of Sharia law in Greece where it was introduced in 1914 has generated a great deal of controversy and debate in legal theory and practice concerning its territorial application and whether Muslim Greek citizens have the right to choose between Sharia law and the Greek Civil Code. Under Sharia law women's status is inferior to men and Muslim women are subject to discrimination with regard to inheritance or divorce. Consequently, the application of Sharia raises serious constitutional law questions because of its conflict with the principle of equality of the sexes and other human rights provisions enshrined in international conventions ratified by Greece. Muslims living in other parts of

Greece except of Western Thrace including those in the Dodecanese, are subject to the provisions of the Civil Code in force since 1946.

The parliamentary representation of the minority

In response to article 39 of the Lausanne Treaty Greece recognized full civil and political rights of the minority. Nevertheless, from 1923 onwards Muslim deputies were elected in Western Thrace. With regard to the political orientation of the minority in the decade of 1930s literacy supports that Turkey as a considerable exterior agent as well as a benchmark for the identity of the minority influenced meaningfully its political evolution. In Turkey the stabilization of the Kemalist movement provoked a stormy wave in the traditional community of Western Thrace, that was attached to the Islamic values and ethics. The Kemalist movement was supported by the Turkish consulate of Komotene, and Greece on a diplomatic level was imposed by Turkey to expel Old Muslims and enemies of Kemalists (Tsioumis, 1994).

Apropos to the parliamentary behavior of the Minority the decade of 1930s, it is essential to mention that “in the Greek political scene the conflict between the Venizelos supporters and enemies conquers” (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). The parliamentary representation of the national minorities’ did not stay unaffected from the polarity characterizing this period. However, the most important observation regards the disinterested relations between the minority’s deputies and the Greek political scene on a national level. The minority’s ballot papers were using the names of the national parties as ‘Liberal’ or ‘Democratic’, nevertheless, the connection between the representatives of the minority and the deputies of the national parties did not exist at all. Proof of this distance, consists of the fact that the Muslims of Western Thrace adversely from the Jews of Thessaloniki did not react to the political decision of separating the parliamentary associations yet they expressed their discontentment when they were abolished (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

The Muslim minority of Western Thrace adopted the stance of abstention from the Greek national political scene. The parliamentary behavior of the Muslims was affected by the local circumstances as the conflict between the Old Muslims and the Kemalists was a major factor. Moreover, the existing insecurity oriented Muslims to support the authority front. “In this era it is problematic to accredit an ideological identity to the deputies of the minority” (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). Furthermore, a considerable dimension were the ethnic and geographical factors as for instance in Komotene there were deeply rooted powerful families that conquered power and control. The meaning of the deputies can be interpreted as arbitration and intermediation between the Greek authorities and the needs of the minority’s peoples. In accordance with the way the Muslim deputies were governed it has been recorded

that they were all inclined in all the affairs of the minority. The concern was reflected in matters of general consequence such as education, military service and property questions as well as more distinct local affairs such as the question of substituting a mufti confronting allegations of corruption or the precise matters of some communities whose solution was asserted by the authorities and the government. With regard to the great number of the illiterate peoples, their role as intermediators was highly significant. In addition to this, as in the wider Greek political culture same in the Muslim minority, noteworthy was the role of the personal network of patronizing. The unstable international, regional and local environment contributed to the flourishing of such patronizing networks in the gulfs of the Muslim minority (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).



Picture 7. “ Pomaks in the decade of 1960s”

In recapitulating, the observation of the political orientation of the minority in the decade of 1930s poses an auxiliary context for understanding and interpreting the evolution of the minority. The ascendance of the Kemalist movement in Turkey and its reverberations in Western Thrace shook effectively the traditional way of living for Muslims. The conflict between Kemalist and Old Muslims introduced a new disjunctive line with parliamentary and social dimensions beyond the already existing dimensions of ethnological and geographical character. “The field of antagonism could be ideological (Old Muslims - Kemalist), ethnological (Turkish - Pomaks), political (Liberals - Democrats), geographical (Komotene - Xanthe) or even a combination of some of these factors” (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). This conflict between Kemalists and Old Muslims crossed with the polarized Greek political scene

of Venizelos supporters and enemies. In this context, the Muslim minority supported the stance of not assuming act. The decision of separating the parliamentary associations created the opportunity for the Muslims to elect their deputies and through them to affect the Greek authorities. However, this decision reflects the general suspicion towards the minority and the fact that the Muslims accepted this decision is proof of their marginalization and their distance from the central political scene. The existence of the political fermentation in the gulfs of the Muslim minority operated as a pressure valve for the frustrations and dissatisfaction. This example is contrary to the example of the minority of Slavs in Macedonia who were not recognized by the Greek state and consequently did not have the right to participate in political processes, essential particularity for the subsequent evolution of the minorities (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013, pp. 100-118).

**The Muslim minority in Bulgaria & the Muslim minority of Western Thrace. A
comparative approach**

A case similar to that of the Muslim minority in Western Thrace was the Muslim minority in Bulgaria. This minority, like the minority in Western Thrace, is made up of Turks, Pomaks and Gypsies. The Muslim-Turkish minority in Bulgaria was from the beginning more populous than the corresponding one in Western Thrace. The rights of the Muslims of Bulgaria began to be protected by the Treaty of Berlin in 1878 which in article 5 provided for the protection of religious minorities and in particular the unimpeded exercise of religious duties and the organization of their religious ceremonies. The Turkish-Bulgarian treaty of 1913 which recognized the independence of Bulgaria contained corresponding provisions. This protection regime was maintained until the end of the First World War. The Neuilly Peace Treaty (1919) also contained provisions guaranteeing the rights of religious and ethnic minorities. In particular, article 54 of the Treaty provided for the granting of equal rights to members of minorities and their right to establish religious, charitable, educational and other institutions. Article 55 provided for the obligation of the Bulgarian government to provide facilitation to the citizens of a country whose language was not Bulgarian to be educated accordingly in specific places. Of particular importance to the Muslim minority in Bulgaria was the 1925 protocol which was part of the treaty of friendship signed between Turkey and Bulgaria in 1925. According to this protocol the two sides agreed to apply the provisions for the protection of the minority of the Treaty of Neuilly to the Muslim minority of Bulgaria and the provisions of the Treaty of Lausanne to the Bulgarian minority of Turkey. With this protocol Bulgaria formally recognized the existence of a Muslim minority on its territory and undertook to protect it (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

The official administrative organization of the Muslim minority in Bulgaria corresponded to that of the Muslim minority in Western Thrace while the institution of the mufti was defined as the religious leadership of the minority. The power of the muftis extended to religious and legal issues but also to the guidance of the Muslim youth while it is reported that the majority of the muftis were Turks. Moreover, the body that corresponded to the committees for the management of Muslim and vafks property that existed in Greece was the "Council of the Religious Muslim Minority" which had taken over the management of the community property of the vafks. In addition, the religious courts that have operated since 1935 were 22 and had jurisdiction in matters of family, inheritance law and personal status. Continuing, the education of the Muslim minority in Bulgaria was better organized than that of the minority in Western Thrace. The Muslim minority in Bulgaria had different types of schools: Koranic schools, primary and secondary schools, Turkish schools, teacher training schools, pedagogical schools, private schools, theological schools and lyceums. To continue

with, the intervention potential of the nationalists and Turkey in matters of education was much greater in Bulgaria than in Greece. In the area of Bulgaria where the influence of the traditional wing was not as great as in Western Thrace, a large number of Turkish schools developed rapidly despite the strict control of the Bulgarian authorities. The education was done in Turkish language, the books came from Turkey and the curriculums followed the corresponding ones in Turkey. In addition, the Turkish schools were private. It was the communities that founded and supported them financially under the control of the Bulgarian authorities (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

Given the fact that the relations of the Muslim minority of Bulgaria with Turkey were closer than those of Western Thrace, the type developed more than in Western Thrace. In the period 1908-1941 a total of 67 newspapers and 13 magazines were published that had mainly a religious character while many newspapers had a purely Turkish character. As far as their economic life is concerned, the majority of the Muslims of Bulgaria like the Muslims of Thrace were farmers. Their properties were small and contributed to a kind of household economy. In general, the economical status of the Muslim minority in Bulgaria has not been very prosperous (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

Turkish policies easily found ground in Bulgaria mainly through education, press and other social activities as occurred in Western Thrace. Forums were created, which promoted nationalist pro-Kemalist positions. Significant differences between Greece and Bulgaria existed in the attitude of governments and state authorities. “Contrary to the Greek one, the Bulgarian policy towards the Muslim minority was characterized as restrictive and intrusive and even hostile while Bulgaria through its political orientations aimed at greater national homogeneity” (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). Moreover, due to these policies part of the population emigrated to Turkey. Mass migrations took place in 1927, 1933 and 1935. Most of them returned when they found that the situation in Turkey was no better (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

It is reported that after Stambulisky time laws were issued which allowed the exercise of pressure. Inspectors were able to close minority schools, there were closing of newspapers while the Bulgarian government intervened in community affairs and other minority institutions that were to be under the control of the authorities. The situation for the Muslim minority in Bulgaria became difficult when the fascist government came to power in 1934 where a policy of harsh pressure was launched. It seems that a policy was generally pursued that aimed at the deprivation of the minority from the institutions of its cultural expression, its subjugation or its assimilation. Measures to restrict the rights of the Muslim minority were

also taken in Greece by the dictatorship of Metaxas yet it seems that they did not have the extent and intensity of the measures of the Bulgarian government (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

Despite the restrictive climate, Bulgaria's Muslim minority grew more significantly than the minority in Thrace. It developed institutions and democratic processes and also Turkey's intervention in the modernization of Bulgaria's minority seemed to be crucial. Bulgaria's policies were aimed at guarding its national security and circumventing minority rights. In contrast to the Bulgarian stance, the Greek governments exercised minority rights with some exceptions. "The ethnogenetic process in both countries went through the same mechanisms: education, culture, type and processes of collective organization. In both countries Turkish propaganda has moved to advance its goals" (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). While Greece had the most friendly attitude it was the one that had the harshest treatment from the part of Turkey and faced a multitude of accusations. Mild tones were observed towards Bulgaria. This attitude of Turkey seems to be connected with its general foreign policy and the needs of its propaganda in the two countries. It should be noted that the same policy of associating Turkish-speaking or semi-Turkish-speaking minorities was applied consistently and methodically throughout the Balkans where such minorities existed. The attempt to attract them to the Turkish nationalist ideology was the constant goal to achieve which used the propaganda, the type, the education and the provision of various privileges and possibilities. The securing of their rights by actions of Turkey led to its supervision and control and to their transformation into minorities with Turkish national characteristics (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

Conclusions

This thesis inspected the historical, social and political circumstances that configured the reality in Western Thrace in the period of 1923-1949. It is presented the mosaic of factors, the international interference, the national strategies and the local determinatives that elaborated the rise and the maturity of the Muslim Turkish identities in Western Thrace. The aims are oriented to enlighten aspects of the research for the Muslim minority that shall interpret the attitude of the minority during the investigated period by presenting its evolution into a geopolitical context.

The Treaty of Lausanne contributed to the placement of the minority as a minority to protect for Turkey and a minority towards the majority for Greece. It is also presented a comparative approach of the Muslim minority in Bulgaria which dissects the status of minority through the equal core of placing a minority towards the majority. Furthermore, the study aligns the importance of the existence of minorities in the gulfs of international relations. In this case, it is examined the role of Turkey towards the Muslim minority in Western Thrace, the passive reactions of the minority during the decade of 1940s and the evolution of the issue of the Turkish identity. Moreover, it is scoped the Greek policy and the line that the Greek governments followed towards the minority affair.

With the peace Treaty of Lausanne a final dimension was given to the solution of the question of Western Thrace, a question that as a matter of territorial sovereignty had been a point of friction between Greece, Turkey and Bulgaria. This issue was particularly acute during the Balkan Wars and the First World War. During this period the specific countries developed intense diplomatic, propagandistic and military mobility for the final integration of Western Thrace in their territory. Furthermore, this matter was involved in the processes of international diplomacy and the fermentation of the peace conferences of the period 1919-1923.

Summarizing, it is clear that the question of the Muslim minority was not actually negotiable for Turkey during the Lausanne conference. Turkey achieved without any objection the exclusion of the Muslim minority from the exchange as well as the securing of its rights. The issues of the two minorities were closely linked. Greece in the course of time linked its policy towards the Muslim minority with the question of Hellenism in Turkey and made concessions. Turkey launched its plans aimed at the national homogenization of the Muslim minority in Western Thrace.

The period after the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne was a period of great liquidity. The intensity of the refugee problem led to problems in the area of Western Thrace. The squatting and confiscation of Muslim property and the co-location of Christian refugees with Muslims created unrest. The relations between Greece and Turkey were largely determined by the developments at the level of the negotiations on the economic matters that had arisen from the Treaty of Lausanne and from the developments in relation to the Hellenism of Constantinople.

The Greek governments of this period proceeded to legislate the rights of Muslims. “The lack of government stability, the military interventions, the intensity of the problem of refugee rehabilitation and the economic problems of the country did not create the appropriate conditions for the pursuit of a consistent minority policy. On the contrary, there has been an instability in the diplomatic handling of the question of the Muslim minority while Greece is presented as vulnerable to the demands of Turkish diplomacy” (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

The lack of planning for a specific educational policy framework that would protect and upgrade Muslim education was evident during this period as well as throughout the interwar period. It is noted that this relaxation was theoretically intended not to complicate the functioning of Muslim education but in practice exacerbated the isolation of the minority and turned to the detriment of the Greek administration while leading to favoring the Turkish nationalist propaganda effort. Still, the fact that there has been no clear treatment of the issue of the administrative organization of the minority resulted in additional frictions. Finally, the treatment of the Muslim minority as a marginal group of the Greek political system did not contribute to the process of its social integration.

In addition, the attempt to create a positive climate in relation to minorities only paid off in the short term for the Hellenism of Turkey, and not to the desired level. The Greek governments due to the circumstances and the lack of planning failed to implement a substantial policy of guarding the Greek minorities in Turkey and the Muslim minority in Western Thrace. The Greek-Turkish friendship of the period 1930-1938 did not yield any practical results. “The main guide of the actions of the Greek political leadership during the interwar period was the attempt not to guard the rights of the Greek Orthodox minority in Constantinople but to save it” (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013). Turkey has consistently pursued a repressive policy towards the minority of Constantinople even during the period of Greek-Turkish friendship.

“The policy pursued by Turkey towards the Greek Orthodox minority of Constantinople and the islands of Imbros and Tenedos is noted to have been implemented consistently. In the face of this reality the Greek governments had two choices. To pursue a similar policy by retaliating and endangering the fate of minorities in Turkey or to implement a policy of securing the rights of the Muslim minority trying to protect as much as possible the Greek Orthodox minority in Constantinople” (Tsioumis, 1994). Literacy aligns that the choice to defend the rights of the Muslim minority was not combined with the formulation of a hierarchical minority policy. “This fact led Greece to follow the developments and not to intervene in them. The Greek governments limited themselves to protests over what was happening in Constantinople without making specific demands and without asking for specific guarantees for the Hellenism of Constantinople” (Featherstone *et al.*, 2013).

The research showed that whenever Greece took into serious consideration the question of the Muslim minority by establishing institutions or by creating services to monitor the course of the relevant policy these issues had a more positive development. But this practice has not been consistent. The non-systematic engagement with the economic, social, cultural and educational upgrading of the Muslim minority cultivated a climate of isolationism and rivalry that it characterized as dangerous.

Annex I

Agreement of Ankara, 1930

The Ankara Agreement is signed between Greece and Turkey and generally provides the cancellation and final liquidation of the financial obligations between the two countries. Both Greek properties in Turkey and Muslim properties in Greece are owned by the Turkish and Greek State respectively. The issues of "refugees" and "settlers" of Istanbul as well as the Muslims of Western Thrace are regulated.

Constitution of Greece, Article 3

Relations of church and state

The prevailing religion in Greece is that of the Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ. The Orthodox Church of Greece, acknowledging our Lord Jesus Christ as its head, is inseparably united in doctrine with the Great Church of Christ in Constantinople and with every other Church of Christ of the same doctrine, observing unwaveringly, as they do, the holy apostolic and syn-odal canons and sacred traditions. It is autocephalous and is administered by the Holy Synod of serving Bishops and the Permanent Holy Synod originating thereof and assembled as specified by the Statutory Charter of the Church in compliance with the provisions of the Patriarchal Tome of June 29, 1850 and the Synodal Act of September 4, 1928.

Constitution of Greece, Article 5,2

All persons living within the Greek territory shall enjoy full protection of their life, honour and liberty irrespective of nationality, race or language and of religious or political beliefs. Exceptions shall be permitted only in cases provided by international law.

Constitution of Greece, Article 13.1

Freedom of religious conscience is inviolable. The enjoyment of civil rights and liberties does not depend on the individual's religious beliefs.

Constitution of Greece, Article 28

The generally recognised rules of international law, as well as international conventions as of the time they are sanctioned by statute and become operative according to their respective

conditions, shall be an integral part of domestic Greek law and shall prevail over any contrary provision of the law. The rules of international law and of international conventions shall be applicable to aliens only under the condition of reciprocity. Authorities provided by the Constitution may by treaty or agreement be vested in agencies of international organizations, when this serves an important national interest and promotes cooperation with other States. A majority of three-fifths of the total number of Members of Parliament shall be necessary to vote on the law anctioning the treaty or agreement. Greece shall freely proceed by law passed by an absolute majority of the total number of Members of Parliament to limit the exercise of national sovereignty, insofar as this is dictated by an important national interest, does not infringe upon the rights of man and the foundations of democratic government and is effected on the basis of the principles of equality and under the condition of reciprocity.

Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, Article 1

As from the 1st May, 1923, there shall take place a compulsory exchange of Turkish nationals of the Greek Orthodox religion established in Turkish territory, and of Greek nationals of the Moslem religion established in Greek territory. These persons shall not return to live in Turkey or Greece respectively without the authorisation of the Turkish Government or of the Greek Government respectively.

Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, Article 2

The following persons shall not be included in the exchange provided for in Article 1: (a) The Greek inhabitants of Constantinople and (b) The Moslem inhabitants of Western Thrace. All Greeks who were already established before the 30th October, 1918, within the areas under the Prefecture of the City of Constantinople, as defined by the law of 1912, shall be considered as Greek inhabitants of Constantinople. All Moslems established in the region to the east of the frontier line laid down in 1913 by the Treaty of Bucharest shall be considered as Moslem inhabitants of Western Thrace.

Convention of Ankara, 1925

In the Convention of Ankara Greece relinquishes the right of return of the "fugitives" of Constantinople, while at the same time the issue of "settlers" (établis) in Istanbul is regulated. The issue of Muslim estates that are not exchangeable in Greece is being settled, as well as the issue of Western Thrace.

Convention of Athens, 1926

The Athens Convention is signed between Greece and Turkey and provides the acquisition of non-exchangeable estates and real estate by both countries.

Treaty of Sèvres, Article 8

Greek nationals who belong to racial, religious or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as the other Greek nationals. In particular, they shall have an equal right to establish, manage and control, at their own expense, charitable, religious, and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their religion therein.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 2

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 18

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 16

Turkey hereby renounces all rights and title whatsoever over or respecting the territories situated outside the frontiers laid down in the present Treaty and the islands other than those over which her sovereignty is recognised by the said Treaty, the future of these territories and islands being settled or to be settled by the parties concerned. The provisions of the present Article do not prejudice any special arrangements arising from neighbourly relations which have been or may be concluded between Turkey and any limitrophe countries.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 37

Turkey undertakes that the stipulations contained in Articles 38 to 44 shall be recognised as fundamental laws, and that no law, no regulation, nor official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation, nor official action prevail over them.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 38.

The Turkish Government undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Turkey without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion. All inhabitants of Turkey shall be entitled to free exercise, whether in public or private, of any creed, religion or belief, the observance of which shall not be incompatible with public order and good morals. Non-Moslem minorities will enjoy full freedom of movement and of emigration, subject to the measures applied, on the whole or on part of the territory, to all Turkish nationals, and which may be taken by the Turkish Government for national defence, or for the maintenance of public order.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 39

Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities will enjoy the same civil and political rights as Moslems. All the inhabitants of Turkey, without distinction of religion, shall be equal before the law.

Differences of religion, creed or confession shall not prejudice any Turkish national in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as, for instance, admission to public employment, functions and honours, or the exercise of professions and industries. No restrictions shall be imposed on the free use by any Turkish national of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, religion, in the press, or in publications of any kind or at public meetings. Notwithstanding the existence of the official language, adequate facilities shall be given to Turkish nationals of non-Turkish speech for the oral use of their own language before the Courts.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 40

Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as other Turkish nationals. In particular, they shall have an equal

right to establish, manage and control at their own expense, any charitable, religious and social institutions, any schools and other establishments for instruction and education, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their own religion freely therein.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 41

As regards public instruction, the Turkish Government will grant in those towns and districts, where a considerable proportion of non-Moslem nationals are resident, adequate facilities for ensuring that in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such Turkish nationals through the medium of their own language. This provision will not prevent the Turkish Government from making the teaching of the Turkish language obligatory in the said schools. In towns and districts where there is a considerable proportion of Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities, these minorities shall be assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of the sums which may be provided out of public funds under the State, municipal or other budgets for educational, religious, or charitable purposes. The sums in question shall be paid to the qualified representatives of the establishments and institutions concerned.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 42

The Turkish Government undertakes to take, as regards non-Moslem minorities, in so far as concerns their family law or personal status, measures permitting the settlement of these questions in accordance with the customs of those minorities. These measures will be elaborated by special Commissions composed of representatives of the Turkish Government and of representatives of each of the minorities concerned in equal number. In case of divergence, the Turkish Government and the Council of the League of Nations will appoint in agreement an umpire chosen from amongst European lawyers. The Turkish Government undertakes to grant full protection to the churches, synagogues, cemeteries, and other religious establishments of the above-mentioned minorities. All facilities and authorisation will be granted to the pious foundations, and to the religious and charitable institutions of the said minorities at present existing in Turkey, and the Turkish Government will not refuse, for the formation of new religious and charitable institutions, any of the necessary facilities which are guaranteed to other private institutions of that nature.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 45

The rights conferred by the provisions of the present Section on the non-Moslem minorities of Turkey will be similarly conferred by Greece on the Moslem minority in her territory.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 65

Property, rights and interests which still exist and can be identified in territories remaining Turkish at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, and which belong to persons who on the 29th October, 1914, were Allied nationals, shall be immediately restored to the owners in their existing state. Reciprocally, property, rights and interests which still exist and can be identified in territories subject to the sovereignty or protectorate of the Allied Powers on the 29th October, 1914, or in territories detached from the Ottoman Empire after the Balkan wars and subject to-day to the sovereignty of any such Power, and which belong to Turkish nationals, shall be immediately restored to the owners in their existing state. The same provision shall apply to property, rights and interests which belong to Turkish nationals in territories detached from the Ottoman Empire under the present Treaty, and which may have been subjected to liquidation or any other exceptional measure whatever on the part of the authorities of the Allied Powers. All property, rights and interests situated in territory detached from the Ottoman Empire under the present Treaty, which, after having been subjected by the Ottoman Government to an exceptional war measure, are now in the hands of the Contracting Power exercising authority over the said territory, and which can be identified, shall be restored to their legitimate owners, in their existing state. The same provision shall apply to immovable property which may have been liquidated by the Contracting Power exercising authority over the said territory. All other claims between individuals shall be submitted to the competent local courts. All disputes relating to the identity or the restitution of property to which a claim is made shall be submitted to the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal provided for in Section V of this Part.

The Treaty of Lausanne, Article 66

In order to give effect to the provisions of the first and second paragraphs of Article 65 the High Contracting Parties will, by the most rapid procedure, restore the owners to the possession of their property, rights and interests free from any burdens or encumbrances with which such property, rights and interests may have been charged without the consent of the

said owners. It will be the duty of the Government of the Power effecting the restitution to provide for the compensation of third parties who may have acquired the property directly or indirectly from the said Government and who may be injured by this restitution. Disputes which may arise in connection with such compensation shall be dealt with by the ordinary courts. In all other cases it will be open to any third parties who may be injured to take action against whoever is responsible, in order to obtain compensation. In order to give effect to these provisions all acts of transfer or other exceptional war measures, which the High Contracting Parties may have carried out in respect of enemy property, rights and interests, shall be immediately cancelled and stayed when liquidation has not yet been completed. Owners who make claims shall be satisfied by the immediate restitution of their property, rights and interests as soon as these shall have been identified. When at the date of the signature of the present Treaty the property, rights and interests, the restitution of which is provided for in Article 65. have been liquidated by the authorities of one of the High Contracting Parties, that Party shall be discharged from the obligation to restore the said property, rights and interests by payment of the proceeds of the liquidation to the owner. If, on application being made by the owner, the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal provided for by Section V finds that the liquidation was not effected in such conditions as to ensure the realisation of a fair price, it will have the power, in default of agreement between the parties, to order the addition to the proceeds of the liquidation of such amount as it shall consider equitable. The said property, rights and interests shall be restored if the payment is not made within two months from the agreement with the owner or from the decision of the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal mentioned above.

The Treaty of Moudania, 1922

The Treaty of Moudania is an agreement signed between the victorious forces of WWI which defined the borders between Turkey and Greece. The consequences were the withdrawal of the Greek army from Eastern Thrace and the forced displacement of about 250,000 Christian inhabitants of Greek origin.

Bibliography

A. Greek bibliography

Articles - Press

Δούμα, Α. (2013). *Τα δικαιώματα των μειονοτήτων με έμφαση στη μουσουλμανική μειονότητα της δυτικής Θράκης και υπό το πρίσμα της απόφασης “Τουρκική Ένωση Ξάνθης και Λοιποί κατά Ελλάδα του Ευρωπαϊκού δικαστηρίου των δικαιωμάτων του ανθρώπου”*. Έδρα UNESCO Πανεπιστήμιο Μακεδονίας, σελ.6-8.

Ηρακλείδης, Α. (1997). *Ελληνική μειονοτική πολιτική: Η αναχρονιστική στάση και τα αίτια της*. Περιοδικό *Σύγχρονα θέματα*, τεύχος 63.

Κτιστάκης, Γ. (2008). Ομιλία σε ημερίδα με θέμα «Πρόσφυγες και μειονότητες: δυσχέρειες ενσωμάτωσης». Κέντρο ερευνών μειονοτικών ομάδων. Διαθέσιμο στο:

<https://www.kemo.gr/index.php?sec=show&item=109>

Προφίλη, Ο. (1997). *Η στήριξη των περιφερειακών και μειονοτικών γλωσσών από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση*. Περιοδικό *Σύγχρονα θέματα*, τεύχος 63.

Σωτηρίου, Κ. (2006). *Η εκπαίδευση της μουσουλμανικής μειονότητας της Θράκης: Τα προβλήματα του θεσμικού πλαισίου και οι πρόσφατες διοικητικές παρεμβάσεις*. Αθήνα.

Τάκης, Α.(2018). *Να ξανασκεφτούμε τι εννοούμε ως μειονότητες και γιατί μας απασχολούνε τόσο*. Κέντρο ερευνών μειονοτικών ομάδων. Διαθέσιμο στο:

<https://www.kemo.gr/index.php?sec=show&item=186>

Τσιτσελίκης, Κ.(1997). *Τα δικαιώματα των μειονοτήτων. Από την νομική κατοχύρωση στην εφαρμογή*. Περιοδικό *Σύγχρονα θέματα*, τεύχος 63.

Τσιτσελίκης, Κ.(2008). *Για το όνομα των μειονοτικών συλλόγων της Θράκης*. Κέντρο ερευνών μειονοτικών ομάδων. Διαθέσιμο στο:

<https://www.kemo.gr/index.php?sec=show&item=121>

Τσιούμης, Κ. (1994). *Η Μουσουλμανική μειονότητα της Δυτικής Θράκης και οι ελληνοτουρκικές σχέσεις (1923-1940)*. Διδακτορική διατριβή [online]. Θεσσαλονίκη:

Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης. Διαθέσιμο στο:

<https://thesis.ekt.gr/thesisBookReader/id/3738#page/1/mode/2up>

Χριστόπουλος, Δ. (1997). *Ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και μειονοτικός λόγος στην Ελλάδα*. Περιοδικό *Σύγχρονα θέματα*, τεύχος 63.

Books

Featherstone, K., Παπαδημητρίου, Δ., Μαμαρέλης, Α. & Νιάρχος, Γ. (2013). *Οι τελευταίοι Οθωμανοί. Η μουσουλμανική μειονότητα της δυτικής Θράκης 1940-1949*. Αλεξάνδρεια: Αθήνα.

Websites

Γεωργιάδης, Θ., Δράκος, Α., *Αρχείο Περιουσιών των Ελλήνων της Ανατολής σε συνεργασία με τα Γενικά Αρχεία του Κράτους*. [online] Available at: <<http://conpolis.eu/uploadedNews/ARXEIO%20PERIOUSIWN.pdf>> [Accessed 04/08/2021]

B. Foreign bibliography

Articles

Kurban D., Tsitselikis K., (2010). *A Tale of Reciprocity: Minority Foundations In Greece and Turkey*. Research Centre for Minority Groups, Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV).

Naskou-Perraki, P., (2000). *The legal framework of religious freedom in Greece*. Ant.N.Sakkoulas: Athens - Komotini.

Tsitselikis, K., (2004). *The legal status of Islam in Greece*, Brill, available at: *The Legal Status of Islam in Greece on JSTOR*.

Tsitselikis, K., “*Reciprocity as a regulatory pattern for the treatment of the Turkish/Muslim minority of Greece*”. S. Akgönül (ed.), *Reciprocity. Greek and Turkish Minorities: Law, Religion and Politics*. Bilgi University Press. Istanbul 2007, pp. 163-189.

Tsitselikis. K., (2008). *The minority protection system in Greece and Turkey based on the Treaty of Lausanne (1923): A legal overview*, 7th International Student Conference. Borjan Tanevski Memorial Fund, ACT/Anatolia College, 14.05.2010.

Tsitselikis, K., (2013). “*A Surviving Treaty: The Lausanne Minority Protection in Greece And Turkey*”, Kristin Henrard (ed.), *The Interrelation between the Right to Identity of Minorities and their Socio-economic Participation*. Martinus Nijhoff: Leiden/Boston 2013, pp. 287-313.

Hekimoglou, E., “*Some Notes on the Muslim vakfs in Ottoman Thessaloniki (Selânik)*”, KAFADAR, Y., TEKİN, G. (ed.). *DEFTEROLOGY FESTSCHRIFT IN HONOR OF HEATH LOWRY*. Published at the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations. Harvard University 2013, pp.151-169.

Books

Papadimitriou, T., (2012). *Greece: Status of Minorities*, The Law Library of Congress. Global Legal Research Center.

Tsitselikis, K., (2012). *Old and New Islam in Greece. From Historical Minorities to Immigrant Newcomers*. Leiden - Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Websites

World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples, 2021. *Turks and Pomaks*. [online] Available at: <<https://minorityrights.org/minorities/turks-and-pomaks/>> [Accessed 02 August 2021]

World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples, 2021. *The Turkish Minority in Western Thrace*. [online] Available at: <<https://stories.minorityrights.org/western-thrace/>> [Accessed 02 August 2021]

The law library of Congress (2012), *Greece: Status of Minorities*, Global Legal Research Center, p. 1-3.

Pictures

Cover Photo asserted from:

<https://kokkini.org/2020/05/16/%CE%B7-%CE%BC%CE%B5%CE%B9%CE%BF%CE%BD%CE%BF%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%84%CE%B1-%CF%83%CF%84%CE%B7-%CE%B8%CF%81%CE%B1%CE%BA%CE%B7-%CE%B5%CE%B9%CE%BD%CE%B1%CE%B9-%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%85%CF%81%CE%BA%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%B7/>

Picture 1 asserted from:

https://www.istorikathemata.com/2013/09/h_23.html

Picture 2 asserted from:

https://www.istorikathemata.com/2013/09/h_23.html

Picture 3 asserted from:

<https://www.mixanitouxronou.gr/i-synthiki-tis-lozanis-to-plires-keimeno-kai-i-oli-symfonia-peri-antallagis-ellinikon-kai-tourkikon-plithysmon/>

Picture 4 asserted from:

<https://www.iefimerida.gr/news/90616/%CE%B5%CE%BA%CE%B4%CE%B7%CE%BB%CF%8E%CF%83%CE%B5%CE%B9%CF%82-%CF%83%CF%84%CE%B7%CE%BD-%CE%BE%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B8%CE%B7-%CE%BC%CE%B5-%CE%B1%CF%86%CE%BF%CF%81%CE%BC%CE%AE-%CF%84%CE%B1-90-%CF%87%CF%81%CF%8C%CE%BD%CE%B9%CE%B1-%CE%B1%CF%80%CF%8C-%CF%84%CE%B7%CE%BD-%CF%85%CF%80%CE%BF%CE%B3%CF%81%CE%B1%CF%86%CE%AE-%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-%CF%83%CF%85%CE%BD%CE%B8%CE%AE%CE%BA%CE%B7%CF%82-%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-%CE%BB%CF%89%CE%B6%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82>

Picture 5 “Echinos, a village of Pomaks in the municipality of Xanthe” asserted from:

https://sitalkisking.blogspot.com/2015/03/blog-post_9.html

Picture 6 asserted from:

<https://gr.pinterest.com/pin/737323770221502066/>

Picture 7 “ Pomaks in the decade of 1960s” asserted from:

https://sitalkisking.blogspot.com/2015/03/blog-post_9.html