

LEGALIZED RACISM:
FORCED DEPRIVATION OF CITIZENSHIP ON THE BASES OF
ARTICLE 19 OF THE GREEK CITIZENSHIP
LAW AND PROBLEMS OF VICTIMS

by
Cem ŞENTÜRK

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES 3



ABTTF



Federation of Western Thracian Turks in Europe

NGO in Special Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
Member of the Federal Union of European Nationalities (FUEN)



ABTTF
Wemerstr. 2
58454 Witten
Germany



Tel.: +49 2302 91 3291
Fax: +49 2302 91 3293
E-Mail: info@abttf.org
Web.: www.abttf.org

Content

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction..... | 5 |
| 1. Article 19’s Judicial and Implementation Analyses..... | 7 |
| 1.1. Judicial Analysis..... | 8 |
| 1.1.1. Racist Dimension – Discrimination between the Citizens..... | 8 |
| 1.1.2. The Reason of Denaturalization and Administrative Appraisals..... | 8 |
| 1.1.3. Constitutional Position and Abolishment Exercise..... | 8 |
| 1.2. Implementation Analysis..... | 9 |
| 1.2.1. Decision Making Procedure..... | 9 |
| 1.2.2. Notification..... | 10 |
| 1.2.3. Targeting the Minority Activists..... | 10 |
| 2. Victims of the “Article 19”..... | 11 |
| 3. Present Situation after the Abolishment of the Article 19..... | 17 |
| 4. Instead of Result: A Problem of Europe..... | 19 |

Introduction

After the Second World War, West Europe purified herself of the pre – war memories and with great emphasis on the “contender and militant” feature of democratic systems; the established democracies were formed against widespread racism.

Militant democracy concept refers to the preventive measures, at least in practice, to restrict people who would openly contest and challenge democratic institutions and fundamental preconditions of democracy.

The very rapid institutionalizing militant democracy watched over the constitution protection organizations and the destructive ideologies that can enter the system under different names and with tools of democracy but specially the racist ideologies were under observation. One of the founding characteristics of Europe in post – war period was the strict resistance against “racial – chauvinist” ideologies and it became evident one more time in the middle of 1990’s at “Haider Case”.

Austria was threatened by international insulation in case the racist party did not withdraw from the parliament. This was a good example that shows the high degree of the sensibility against racist components that can somehow take place in the political system. There are some points that this sensibility loses its validity. Europe is so sensible against the racist components that have extrinsic features that are generated out of the system but can not respond to the racism and over nationalism that is performed in the system. During the cold war period, the anti - democratic implementations were somehow managed by the diplomacy that was a byproduct of the cold war era and by the new world order beginning with 11 September, there happen some weak points that may allow the new “excesses” by new methods .¹

Greece, lying in the southeast Europe, fits well in the framework of “the over nationalism generated in the system” especially with the applications towards minority members.

Victims of the xenophobia generated in the system are the national, religious, linguistic minorities in Greece.

¹ Over nationalism and racism were the losers of the Second World War but it should not be forgotten that the regimes of Franco and Salazar were able to survive among the democratic European regimes for a long period.

This study aims to analyze the past and still continuing effects of Article 19², of the Greek Citizenship Law issued as a result of xenophobic and racist policies on the minorities but especially on the Western Thrace Turkish minority living in the northeast of the country.

First, the related law article is going to be evaluated in the framework of judicial and implementation criterias and then the effects on the selected minority members are to be discussed.

² In the study the related law article is briefly defined as Article 19.

1. Article 19's Judicial and Implementation Analyses

The Article 19 of the Greek Citizenship Law, whose issuance number is 3370, was made in 1955 and its content is exactly like below;

“A citizen who is not from Greek race may be deprived of citizenship in case he/she leaves the country without the intention to come back. Deprivation of citizenship may be applied the ones that are not from Greek race, born abroad and still live out of the borders of Greece. The underage children whose parents or the alive parent have been deprived of citizenship may be denaturalized as well. Ministry of Interior Affairs decides with the ratification of Citizenship Council of Greece. ”

The Article 19 of the Greek Citizenship Law that was reformulated in 1955 has the continuation character of another law that was made in 1927.³ It was the instrument that was used to exile the “foreign” communities that were mostly the Macedonians in Northern Greece and the “communists” during Greek Civil War.

Between 1927 and 1955, we do not observe any evidence that sign the damnification of Western Thrace Turkish minority. With the reformulation of the law, the Western Thrace Turkish minority became the main target group.

According to the Greek Parliamentary's reply to the notice of question given by Ilhan Ahmet in May 2005, MP for Rodopis in the Hellenic Parliament, 46.638 Turkish (muslim) in Western Thrace and the Island of Rhodes (Twelve Islands) were deprived of citizenship through the related article of the Greek Citizenship Law until 1998. The former Minister of Interior Affairs, Alekos Papadopoulos, announced that the victims of the law sum up to 60 thousand until the announcement date, 23.01.1998.⁴ The critical point is that these numbers give the sum of the “direct” victims but when we consider the “indirect” victims, their number sum up to nearly 20-30 thousand in these 33 years of time. We concept the “indirect” victims as the children of these people, who were denaturalized.

When we analyze the related Greek Citizenship Law in judicial framework;

³ We could not reach the text of the related law that takes place in various reference sources.

⁴ International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, Parallel Report on Greece Compliance, March 2000, s. 9.

1.1. Judicial Analysis

1.1.1. Racist Dimension – Discrimination between the Citizens

The Article 19 of Greek Citizenship Law is a specific statute that encloses a special part of the public. The citizens are classified on the criteria of being from “Greek Race” or not. The law discriminating the citizens on the criteria of being from “Greek Race” or not is against the 38th, 39th and 40th Articles of the Treaty of Lausanne that is accepted as being superior to the Greek interior law.

The 38th Article of the Treaty of Lausanne that guarantees the rights of Turkish Muslim minority in Greece obligates Greece to protect the lives and human rights of everyone living in Greece without any discrimination on the base of nationality, language, race and religion.

The 39th Article affirms that the members of the minority have the same civil and political rights as the Christians. The 40th Article ensures that the Muslim Greek citizens benefit the legal assurances as the other citizens.

The law that is great contrary to the Treaty of Lausanne is also in conflict with international documents like United Nations Charter and the international treaties of Europe that prohibit racial discrimination among citizens.

1.1.2. The Reason of Denaturalization and Administrative Appraisals

The reason to denaturalize the citizens that were not from Greek race was stemmed from the opinion of the Greek authorities that these people left the country without the intention to come back again. The decision to denaturalize these people was taken by the administrative authorities not by the legal authorities. The arbitrary application of the Greek Citizenship Law by the administrative authorities resulted in tragicomic stories.

1.1.3. Constitutional Position and Abolishment Exercise

According to the first paragraph of 4th Article of the Greek Constitution of 1975 “all the citizens are equal before the law” and the third paragraph of the same article talks about the denaturalization possibility in case of taking another country’s citizenship or displaying activities against national

interests abroad. In this context, the racial feature of the Article 19 is against Article 4/1 and the underlying reasons to denaturalize the Western Thrace Turkish minority are against 4/3.

In spite of all democratic features of the constitution, 111/6 paragraph of the constitution brings all the legal decisions of the Greek Citizenship Law under constitutional protection and due to this formulation, it is impossible to put forward the constitutional challenge⁵ The law was abolished in June 1998 but since it was not implemented retroactively, the injustices of the law were not cured.

1.2. Implementation Analysis

1.2.1. Decision Making Procedure

As emphasized above, the implementation of the Article 19 is an administrative procedure. The first step of the procedure is the information gathering process of the police. The police go to home of the citizen that is believed to leave the country without any intention to come back and gathers information about the person from his/her neighbours. This information was the unique reference point and evaluated to be enough to start the denaturalization process. The practical denaturalization application took place as the citizen learned the loss of the citizenship in case of application to an abroad Greece representative office.

Another application of 1980's was the giving of "only exit" passports to illiterate minority members and sketching out the "return paragraph" of the passports. Since they travelled to abroad with the passports that did not let them return back to Greece, they were deprived of citizenship.

The falsity of the denaturalization process caused a lot of tragicomic events like; the ones who were doing the military service were deprived of citizenships⁶ during their military service in Greek army.

⁵ The 111/6. paragraph of the constitution provides such a constitutional protection for the Article 19 but on the other hand the 5. subparagraph of the same paragraph gives the right to the ones who were deprived of citizenship before the constitution was in force to be renaturalized by the decision of a special committee. This new formulation was for the ones that were deprived of citizenship during the civil war or military junta and it aimed to build up peace in the system. But the following paragraph was announcing the new enemy: "the ones not from Greek race"

⁶ Helsinki Watch [Louis Whitman], **Vernichtung der ethnischen Identität: Die Türken in Griechenland**, ABD, 1990, page. 12.

1.2.2. Notification

Another feature of the Article 19's implementation that makes its unfairness more evident was that the victims were not notified by the process and its result that they were denaturalized.

Most of the victims learned that they had been denaturalized when they had either an administrative problem in consulates or during ingress – egress at borders. When they faced the reality, the deadline (60 days to commence a suit) was already over and because of this they could not run any counter – process against Greek unfair treatment.

1.2.3. Targeting the Minority Activists

Article 19 was the tool of the systematic immigration policy until the end of 1990's. It covers a great spectrum of people from the illiterate migration members to elites who were fighting for minority rights but it was specially used to assimilate, suppress and exile the activists to abroad. The most known event of this act is the grievance of journalist Selahattin Galip. He learned that he was denaturalized after one of his Turkey visits.

He won the suit and he regained his Greek citizenship but after some time, he was redeprived of citizenship depending on the justification of the 20th Article of Greek citizenship law on the ground that he acted against the interests of Greece abroad.⁷

After explaining the implementation of the article in the framework of the main features, we can analyse some of the grievances that still continue.

⁷ His contacts with Association of Western Thrace Turks, whose center was in Istanbul, were used as evident. Helsinki Watch, **Vernichtung...**, s.13.

2. Victims of the “Article 19”

According to the formal announcement of Greek authorities, the Article 19 of the Greek Citizenship Law caused the direct grievance of 46.638 Turkish minority members during 43 years of implementation period between the years 1955 – 1998.

Important number of these victims is still in Greece and in Turkey. Other victims were the minority members who were in Germany and Australia as migrant workers.

The increasing psychological press on the Turkish minority members as a result of Cyprus conflict forced them to escape to Turkey by the fear to lose their lives and the ones that crossed the border secretly were deprived of citizenship.

Another implementation was either in the form of either not letting the ones that were abroad for educational or professional purposes enter the country or not letting them to continue their professional life in Greece and forcing them to leave the country. When forcing succeeded, Article 19 was put in action sometimes before sometimes after and it was ensured that the gone ones would not be able to come back. By this, Article 19 was used as the complementary tool of the systematic immigration policy of Greece.

Beside its complementary feature, Article 19 constituted a barrier to travel freedom. The ones living in Greece were afraid to go abroad every time and also the ones living abroad had the fear to lose their passports when they entered the country and as a result they could not visit the country in which they were born and brought up.

The first chairman of Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe (the name was Federation of Greece Western Thrace Turk Associations in Germany at that time), Cafer Alioğlu, could not go to Western Thrace for 22 years due to the fear to be deprived of the citizenship.⁸

The victims living in Greece are convicted to live at the worst social conditions. An important part of them have never been to abroad. They can not get their pensions (although they had paid all the premiums), they can not get benefit from social services and also they can not engage in any economic activity as a result of their condition.

⁸ Cafer Alioğlu. **Dünden Bugüne Batı Trakya**, Publication of Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, Ed: Mehmet Koca, Bursa, 2005, page.16.

Another part of the victims that live in Greece are heimatlos ever since they settled in the country. Citizenship rights are not given to the minority members whose ancestors came from Bulgaria and settled in the region. We can name this group of the minority as “innate heimatlos”. They struggled for their rights for long years and the Greek authorities demanded them to prove that they did not have Bulgarian citizenship although they had never been abroad (!). After the person got the proof certificate after a lot of difficulty, the application for citizenship did not succeed any result.⁹

We begin to evaluate the grievances of the Article 19 victims with the help of Federation’s databank;¹⁰

Case of Cihan Doğan

Cihan Doğan worked on international transport ships for 12 years like many other minority youngsters. He applied to vote at 1993 elections but his application was rejected on the ground that he was deprived of citizenship. Doğan did not return his passport and went to Turkey then to Germany. He moved to a big city in Germany and hired two Greek lawyers to solve the problem legally. In spite of the high costs, the lawyers protracted the problem and advised him to get German citizenship. He married a Turk of Greek origin and the children had Greek citizenship. He passed through a mental distress period with the fear that Greek authorities would not extend the validity of his passport and actually they did not extend. Due to his continuing mental distress, he was not able to work. His mental distress problems are still present and he is not able to work anymore. He lives on the money that is provided by German Work Office (Arbeitsamt).

Case Analysis

Case of Cihan Doğan gives us a lot of clues about the problems of other victims. His working on international transport ships with other Greek citizens and being away from Greece was accepted as he left the country without intention to come back. He was deprived of citizenship on the ground that he was from another ethnic origin although his permanent residence was in Greece. The grievance as a result of being from another ethnic origin resulted in loss of one of the main citizenship rights, the right to elect and be elected. The efforts of the victim to lose the problem legally brought about the second grievance. For long years, the Greek authorities did not recognize Turkish university diplomas and as a result, members of the Turkish minority had to go to Greek lawyers to get information and legal advice. It is so commonly complained that these Greek lawyers do not show the necessary

⁹ International Helsinki Federation, **Parallel Report**, s. 10.

¹⁰ Some modifications were made on the dates and the names of the victims to protect their rights. The informations are provided to our data bank by the victims to be used in international initiatives. (CŞ)

interest in the suits and always advise mandators to get other citizenships. It is not known whether the person has tangible losses. International law has a weakness to measure or remove intangible losses as it is mentioned in the further sections.

Case of Hamit Necdet

Hamit Necdet went to one of the big cities in Turkey to visit some of his relatives in the middle of 1990's. The burglar that broke into the house stole his passport with other valuable things and it was the beginning of all troubles. He applied a Greek representative authority for a new passport or a permit to go to Greece but his application was rejected. In spite of his long lasting efforts, he could not get any result. He learned in August 1998 that he had been deprived of the citizenship as of April 1997. He can not reach his tangibles in Greece since 1993 while he is living in Turkey as heimatlos. Since 1993, Hamit Necdet has a tangible loss of 15.000€ per year, according to his statements, as he can not harvest his plantations.

Case Analysis

The case of Hamit Necdet reflects the behaviour of Greek authorities in the implementation of the article. A small unluck resulted in a tragedy and the person was exiled although he did not have any guilt in the case. 5 years later after his application for passport or a permit to enter his country, he was informed that he had been deprived of citizenship although his application was rejected. If he had been informed about the deprivation earlier, he would have been able to commence a suit but he was made to wait until the deadline to commence a suit was over. Hamit Necdet can not use any of his legal rights to object "tangible violation situation" in the framework of Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights Article 1 since the Greek interior law procedures are not used.

Another victim, Cemil Emin, lives in Turkey as heimatlos and also has problems about his properties. As he was in Turkey as student, he was deprived of citizenship in 1984. He declared that his properties in Greece were under the ownership of other people.

Case of Ali Tarık

Ali Tarık completed his university education in one of the big universities in Turkey. After the graduation, he began to work in a hospital to get his specilization training. Since the hospital was not a university hospital, it was not possible to postpone the military service. Tarık became deserter to be able to complete his education. After he graduated, he went to a Greek representative authority and declared his request to return to Greece and to extend his passport which was not extended during his

study. He was informed by the Greek representative authority that he had been deprived of citizenship. He became heimatlos. He was requested to prove his situation to be able to get work and stay permit but the Greek Consulate rejected to give him the documents. They accepted to give the necessary documents if Tarık signed a paper that notified that he renounced the citizenship “voluntarily”. He was forced to sign the paper of “voluntary renouncement of citizenship”. His wife, children and the rest of his family were living in Greece when he was deprived of citizenship. He was not able to go to his own country between 1983 and 2001. In 2001, he got the visa for Greece but at Ipsala border he was met with a refusal on the ground that he was “dismissible person”. The victim has Turkish citizenship now and his wife, children are Greek citizens.

Case Analysis

Case of Ali Tarık is a good example for the systematic expatriation policy especially implemented for the minority members that have higher education. Their passports were not extended and they were deprived of citizenship during their higher education. They had to sign papers that declared that they renounced their citizenships voluntarily. They were forced to sign these papers to get the necessary documents to be able to survive in the “exile” countries. As emphasized by Prof. Dr. Baskın Oran, Greece representative authorities were so careful not to mention Article 19 in the expatriation applications.¹¹ The reason for this carefulness should be the try to protect Greece of the possible future conflicts. Greece delegation made an announcement that the Turkish minority voluntarily renounced the citizenship after the representatives of the Turkish minority attended the meetings of United Nations Minority Working Group to express the problems of the Turkish minority..¹² The example event informs us about the form of “voluntary renouncement of citizenship”.

The implementation of the Article 19 targets mostly the minority members who have higher education but for the ones who have less education, the article has other deterrent strategies like forcing them to immigrate to other countries and get other citizenships to be able to lead a normal life. 1980’s and 1990’s are the years when Turkish minority members could not get the permit neither to repair the roof of the home nor to get tractor driving license. Minority members chose to escape to Turkey from barbarous practices in Greece. Turkey embraced Western Thrace Turkish minority members and carried a secret parliamentary resolution that was about easing the naturalization procedure for the ones that were announced as heimatlos in 1970’s¹³ in Greece.

¹¹ Greece Consulate in Frankfurt talked about the Article 19 in one of the documents. This is a very rare situation. Refer to Baskın Oran, **Türk – Yunan İlişkilerinde Batı Trakya Sorunu**, Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara, 1991.

¹² <http://www.abttf.org/html/index.php?link=detay&id=776&grup=2&arsiv=1>

¹³ Baskın Oran, **Türk – Yunan...**, s. 217.

After some time, this secret resolution was somehow heard by the public in Western Thrace and some of the desperate members of the Turkish minority would like to enjoy the eased procedure and chose to become heimatlos. The exact number of such people is not known but it is not logical to think that these people, who were obligated to leave their own country by systematic immigration and expatriation policies, committed this act voluntarily while their country's mandatory immigration policy is already approved by various human rights reports¹⁴.

In the case of Ali Tarık, wife and the children of the victim were in Greece in the course of expatriation and this reality shows that the law was not applied on clear criterias. It is not possible to claim that Ali Tarık left the country “without any intention to come back” when his whole family were in Greece.

In this case there existed 4 years between the expatriation and the notification of the act. The elapsed time makes demand of any legal solution in Greek interior law impossible.

Case of Şakir Tefikoğlu

Şakir Tefikoğlu went to Turkey for higher education after he completed his secondary education in Greece like Tarık Ali. After he graduated and became teacher, his diplom was approved by a Greece representative authority. Although his diplom was approved by Greek Consulate, Greek authorities did not recognize his diplom and did not give him work permit. He struggled for one year to make his diplom recognized by the Greek authorities and during this time he opened art exhibitions. He attracted great attention as being the first Greek artist of Turkish origin that opened an art exhibition. After some time, he returned to Turkey to earn money by his profession. Until 1999, he did not know that he was deprived of citizenship and he learned the situation when he applied for some legal documents at a Greek authority. The victim had to sell his properties for very low prices since he was not allowed to live in the country, in which he was born and brought up. He incurred great financial losses from this unfair situation as he declared.

Case

Case of Tefikoğlu and case of Ali Tarık are clear evidents of the Greek policy to avert the formation of an elite class with higher education among the minority members. In case of Ali Tarık, the victim was out of the country and in case of Tefikoğlu, the victim was not deprived of citizenship at the first step but was forced to immigrate by not granting him the right to execute his profession in Greece.

¹⁴ Refer to “Helsinki Watch” as the unique international report that analyzes this policy with all dimensions , **Vernichtung der ethnischen Identität**, USA, 1990.

The booming number of people with higher education in the region after the abolishment of the related law article shows the success of this policy (!)¹⁵.

Case Şerif Ali

Şerif Ali at a small age migrated to Australia with his family in the beginning of 1970's. He never lost his links in Greece and was always in contact. He married a Greek of Turkish minority and made his military service. He lived in Australia but spent his 4 months lasting holidays in Greece. The victim, as an active minority member, worked at various associations in Australia. He was in charge at Western Thrace School's Family Association for 12 years. In 2004, he wanted to get a citizenship certificate but he was informed that he had not been a Greek citizen for 11 years.

He consulted the Greek representative authority in his residence area but they said that they could not do anything about this problem while it was an interior problem and advised him to solve it in Greece. He can go to his country without any problem with his Australian passport but he worries about the possibility not to be able to enter the country when he wants since he is "foreigner". He declares t his intangible losses resulting from the facts that even if he made his basic duty, military service, for his country Greece he feels sorry about the unfair treatment of his own country's.

Case Analysis

Case of Şerif Ali is a good example to show the problems that the activists living abroad often had. The Article 19 was used to passivise the minority activists. It caused problems also to activists living in Germany and Turkey. The members of Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe and Solidarity Association of Western Thrace Turks often live the same problem mentioned above.

The second important dimension of the case is that the victim was informed 10 years after the expatriation, in some cases even after the abolishment of the law article. Although the victim entered the country in 1999 after he was deprived of citizenship in 1993, he was not informed about this situation. If it does not contain intent to avert him to commence a suit, the state seriousness is to be examined in this case due to the gross negligence. Undiscipline of the case creates question marks about the true date of the expatriation.

¹⁵ Member number of "Western Thrace Minority University Graduates Association" was about 28 at the year of establishment, 1982 and today it is about 800. Refer Cem Şentürk, **Yunanistan'da Azınlık Eğitiminin Sorunları**, ABTTF Yayını, Batı Trakya'nın Sorunları Dizisi, Rapor No: 1, Witten, 2005.

3. Present Situation after the Abolishment of the Article 19

As mentioned before, there has not been any further expatriation after the abolishment of the law article but there has not been any improvement in the situations of the victims of the last 45 years time. After the abolishment of the law article, international press yielded some satisfactory results and Greece renaturalized 100 victims.¹⁶ On the other hand, some of the victims were renaturalized on an irregular pattern. Still at least 1000 victims (at best guessed) living in Greece are guessed not to have been renaturalized. There are some serious troubles also in the renaturalization process. At first, the renaturalization process is not in the form “renaturalization” but instead the procedure that is applied to third citizens is applied to the minority members. They must go through various steps and are renaturalized after oath – taking ceremony. Although they did not have any mistake in all these unfair implementations, such a treatment clearly offends their honours.¹⁷ Another interesting point is that Turkish minority members are to pay the citizenship fee of 1500€ like the other third country citizens but this amount is not demanded from the ones from Russia on the ground of “being from the same race”.

The victims can not engage in economic activities since they are heimatlos, they can not get their pensions although they paid all the premiums, and they can not benefit from social security opportunities. They do not have the basic citizenship rights and this leads a dependent life and also creates alinated people that live at the worst life conditions. They can not commence suits due to financial difficulties and as a result they can not find legal solutions for their problems.

The victims living out of Greece are not in better conditions if they do not have another citizenship. The long distances make it impossible to use legal ways and struggle for their rights. Some of them gave warrant of attorney to their relatives to commence suit but there has been no result up until now.

As Greek Interior Law is not able to formulate solution for the problems created by constitutionally protected law article, it is not possible to find an individualistic solution by even applying European Court of Human Rights.

¹⁶ International Helsinki Federation, **Parallel Report**, s. 9.

¹⁷ According to the press releases of minority member and Rhodopis MP, Ilhan Ahmet, recently if the victims give application to be renaturalized, they do not pass through these various steps but there has not been a feedback about the implementation of this new formulation.

On the ground that, the expatriation notification was always learned randomly but specially after the legal time of 60 days to commence a suit, the tools of interior law can not be used and the one of the prerequisites to apply European Court of Human Rights can not be satisfied.

On the other hand, there is not a direct article that protects the “citizenship rights”, and the condition to be able to apply European Court of Human Rights, there should be other violations of the rights mentioned in the treaty. First article of the first additional protocol that formulates “property right” and the articles of the fourth additional article that formulate “travel freedom” offer strong points to the minority members. But all the difficulties and the financial cost of this long process push the victims to wait for a political solution. The Western Thrace Turkish minority expect the European Organizations specially Council of Europe and European Parliament to take the initiative.¹⁸

¹⁸Among the other minority associations, Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe concentrates on the main decision taking bodies of Europe for a solution. For the ideas of the Federation refer: http://www.gundemgazetesi.com/2004/arsiv_index.php?haber_sayi=0430,
<http://www.abttf.org/html/index.php?link=detay&id=834&grup=2&arsiv=1>,
<http://www.abttf.org/html/index.php?link=detay&id=812&grup=2&arsiv=1>

4. Instead of Result: A Problem of Europe

According to official declarations of Greek Interior Ministry, Article 19 of the Greek Citizenship Law caused fraud on more than 60 thousand minority members (46.638 of them are Turkish minority members) during 45 years of time and between the years 1981-1998 denaturalization applications even accelerated. During the 17 years period 7.182¹⁹ people were not only deprived of Greek citizenship but also European Union citizenship and on this ground European Union has a direct responsibility over these victims. After the Second World War, Europe clearly stated her aim to become the human rights and democracy castle of the newly established world. Europe is succeeding in her aim and carrying a great responsibility to cure the ever bleeding wound in the middle of Europe.

The denaturalized Western Thrace Turkish minority have embarked on demanding their citizenship rights back with the leadership of Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europa.

Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europa has the following requests for a solution;

- Renaturalizing of all direct and indirect victims, that were deprived of citizenship although they did not commit any illegal act, by one common legal decree,
- Compensating the tangible losses and refundment of the properties to the real owners,
- Naturalizing the innate heimatlos people immediately,
- Granting the right to the denaturalized victims to keep their second citizenship (if they have another citizenship) and providing the special right to enter the country without visa for the ones that do not want to get the Greek citizenship back.

¹⁹ Nazif Mandacı, Birsen Erdoğan, **Balkanlarda Azınlık Sorunu**, SAEMK Yayını, Ankara, 2001, page.9.