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Abstract - In contemporary times, the European Union gives the advance to its integration process by the including the political structure alongside of its economical structure and it become most important supranational organization with the principle that it adopted as the human rights, rule of law, freedom of speech, freedom of expression, etc. This paper aims to explain the process of “Europeanization” by using the minority issue and cultural rights concept and analyze how the states integrate themselves to the “Europeanization” process by a comparison of Greece.
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1. The Council of Europe and Minority Protection

The Framework Convention for the Protection of the Council of Europe can be regarded as a belated result of the changes after 1989 in Europe. As Gal asserts, the Framework Convention is a milestone in converting the political declarations and intents into legal terms, thus becoming the first legally binding international instrument generally devoted to minority protection which shall be elaborated infra.

However, for concerning to understand the urgent need to overcome divisions and conflicts in Europe, the Council of Europe indeed has a longer history dating back to its early days of establishment after World War II. Though seen in the context of human rights at the time, the Council’s mission was perceived primarily as “(...) to achieve a greater unity between its member states, (...) on the basis of a specific political project: the commitment of the member states and their peoples to the principles of a pluralist democracy, human rights and rule of law.”

The main objective of the Council of Europe is seen in the “European Convention on Human Rights” of 1950, wherein the rights of minorities were also secured essentially by employing the term “everyone” and not expressions such as “people, public, citizen” and the like, particularly observed in Article 9, 10, 11 Additional Protocol, Article 2. Against this background, the European Commission for Democracy through law know as the “Venice Commission”, a unit consisting of eminent jurist and constitutional experts set up in 1989 under the aegis of the Council of Europe took the initiative to examine the proposal for a draft European Convention for the Protection of Minorities. Nevertheless, after lengthy discussions and deliberations, the Council, in October 1993, in Vienna, agreed to call for a new framework convention in order to assure the protection of minorities, which would also be open for signature by non-member states.
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On the other hand, an idea for protection of regional or minority languages was proposed by the Standing Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, which drew the draft of the Charter of European Regional or Minority Languages which was subsequently adopted in June 1992 by the Committee of ministers.

As Henrard asserts, in examining the characteristics of the Charter, it is remarkable that “(…) the Charter does not grant any rights to speakers of certain (minority) languages or to certain linguistic groups but is focused on the languages themselves, and thus on a recognition, protection and promotion of multilingualism.”

Secondly, the Charter envisages that the Contracting states can within a certain frameworks choose their obligations a la carte, thus leaving so much choice to member-states. As this naturally denotes each member-states can determine itself which languages are minority language in their territory. The contribution of the Charter to minority protection seems to be modulated and balanced in view of its flexibility as regards state’s choosing its options. In general, the Charter offers guidelines to member-states on the fashion to deal with the issues of accommodation of linguistic diversity and it confirms the importance of multicultural including multilingualism.

Turning to the Framework Convention for the Protection of Minorities, through close analysis, it can be seen that several articles of the Framework Convention take up human rights articles of the European Charter of Human Rights while introducing at times extra requirements for securing minority rights.

On the other hand, the Framework Convention does not define the subject in its text. As such, certain states as Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Switzerland and Macedonia added their interpretations of the term, which consequently resulted in addition of declarations to the ratification of the Framework Convention and also the Convention stipulates that every signatory report on its implementations every five years.

In general, there exist both positive and negative evaluations regarding the contribution of the Framework Convention is the most impact but detailed European arrangement to date inter alias designated.

The council of Europe continues to be active in the field; in 1997 an Advisory Committee was designated to assist the Council of Ministers monitor agreements, and in 1998; an intergovernmental Committee of Experts was established to deal with minority related issues.

By way of conclusion, in contrast to arguments stating that the Council at best facilities the work of those states which aim at ameliorating the treatment of minorities, it may be seen that the Framework Convention represents a step forward in internalizing the European minority policies. Besides, it may be argued that nor the documents itself, but the negative stances of full member as that of Greece by means of not ratifying the Convention complicates and heralds the achievement of a unified approach in Europe.
2. Protection of National Minorities in Greece

Greece signed the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in Strasbourg on 22 September 1997, yet not ratified it. As per the article 28.1 of the Greek Constitution, ratified international instruments take precedence over Greek Domestic Law: The generally recognized rules of the 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.

However, just as the case, if international instruments are not ratified, the sole of provision in the Greek Constitution that operates concerning the right of minorities is Article 5.2: All persons living within the Greek territory shall enjoy full protection of their life, honor and liberty irrespective of nationality, race or language and religious or political beliefs. Exceptions shall be permitted only in cases provided by International Law.

Though the Greek Constitution does in no form or shape define “minority”, it acknowledges the existence of only one among the all, in religious character, which are the Muslims of Thrace whose right have been guaranteed the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. However, Greek laws use the term “omogenis” and “allogenis” when the differentiating between ethnicity. It has been noted in the 1999 Report of Greek Helsinki Monitor and Minority Rights Group-Greece that such “allogenis” Greek citizens have been stripped of their citizenship if they settled abroad for future with respect to Article 19 of the Greek Citizenship Code, which eventually came to be abolished in 1998:

A person of non-Greek origin leaving Greece without the intention of returning may be declared as having lost Greek nationality. This also applies to a person of non-Greek ethnic origin born and domiciled abroad. His minor children living abroad may be declared as having lost Greek nationality is both their parent and the surviving parents have lost the same. The Minister of the Interior decides in these matters with concurring opinion of the National Council.

The same report writes that while the bulk of 60,000 people who lost their citizenship under Article 19 between 1955 and 1998; omogenis people of Greek origin who were citizens of other countries could swiftly acquire Greek citizenship. These constitute but two example of the Greek official attitudes and practices among many observed to date. Yet, official voices of pro-integration in the Greek Parliament are also known to have raised questions regarding the ratification of the Convention on minority issues. In 1999 when MP Maria Damanaki of the Progressive Left Coalition requested that the Parliament discusses and ratifies the Convention, the Minister of Foreign Affairs in his written answer declared that “The ratification of the Framework Convention of Council of Europe is a matter time”. However, the ratification of the Convention still remains to be seen while many reports make reference to the necessity of the implementation of the related international instruments by Greece.
3. Turkish Minority in Greece

The settlement and subsequent presence of the Turks in Western Thrace is reflected as dating to the 2nd century B.C; while some related accounts note the first Turkish traces in the region as 12th century. In line with the latter, which is sounder, Oran in his comprehensive writings marks the history of the Turks of Western Thrace as beginning with the Ottoman conquest of the region in the 12th century; more neatly illustrated as the 1363 conquest of Eastern Thrace and the subsequent 1364 conquest of Western Thrace. In geographic terms, Western Thrace is a narrow portion of land of 8,578 square kilometers, stretching horizontally across the northern coast of the Aegean, surrounded by Bulgaria, Turkey and the Aegean Sea. Statistics reflect the overall population of Turks in the region in 1922-23 as 129,120; yet the current figure is 110,000. 80% of the minority is traced to be localized in rural areas displaying a high birth rate of 3%, which on the other hand was not reflected as an increase in the number of population due to emigration to Turkey amounting to 250,000. Nevertheless, the figure for those Western Thrace Turks residing in Turkey announced by the Minister of Internal Affairs of Turkey is 2874 as January 2002; consisting of those “heimatlos” or “iskat”.

In general terms, the Turks of Western Thrace criticize and accuse the Greek state on the grounds that it follows a discriminative policy denying the rights granted by multilateral and bilateral agreements; and those granted by Greek citizenship. The reaction by the Greek state against these allegations has been observed as objection to the accusations, stressing that the Greek laws have not been and are not exercised, the Greek official stance is known to have manifest a tendency to substantiate the issue on a counter-argument as an answer: the argument that the Greek Orthodox population in Istanbul decreased from 90,000 to 5,000 and that the Turkish government was responsible for this.

Through legal instruments and arrangements, it is seen that the first international agreement on minority protection in Greece was the 1830 London Protocol which declared Greece independent, with Great Britain, France and Russia acting as the brokers of Greek political and international affairs. It guarantees the protection of the Muslims in the territories of Greece. The second international agreement similar to the London Protocol is the Istanbul Convention signed on the one hand by France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Britain, Italy, Russia; and the other hand by the Ottoman Empire, again guaranteeing the rights of Muslim minorities in the territories given to Greece. The third is the known as the 1913 Athens Agreement which was signed between Ottoman State and Greece and the fourth is the Greek Sevres signed on 10 August 1920. This last agreement is larger in scope in that it undertakes to protect the right of not only the Muslims but also all other minorities. The fifth and the last international agreement is the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, specifically Article 45 and preceding Article 37-44 that it makes reference to. As Oran argues, also the Convention Concerning to Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, signed concurrently in Lausanne, the 1926 Athens
Agreement, 1930 and 1933 Ankara Agreements relate to rights of Turkish minority in Western Thrace.

Poulton argues that given the cited legal arrangements, Turkey has seen itself as having the rights to say over the issues relating to Turkish community more, for example, than the similar case of Bulgaria where a solid amount of Turkish population also exits, yet; where no much specific treaties do; and but less than the case in Cyprus for instance, where Turkey displays more power as one of the guarantor states. Poulton, further notes that the consistent features of the way the Greek government handles issues pertaining to Western Thrace since 1960s has been reciprocation, one which implies tit-for-tat arguments as aforementioned.

Viewed in retrospect, the history of Western Thrace Turks reflects attempts of independence movements, the first of which took place after the 1878 San Stefano Agreement. This agreement gave Western Thrace to Bulgaria, causing the Turks in the region to revolt which resulted in the establishment of an interim government named “Rhodope Government”. Yet, owing the revision of the agreement in the Congress of Berlin, this government was annulled after eight years in 20 April 1886. The second attempt is seen during the 1913 Balkan War when Enver Bey ordered Commander Kuşçubaşı Eşref and his 116 soldiers to reach the region where they had been notified the Turks were being annihilated by Bulgarian gangs. The Turkish battalion quelled the riot and “Western Thrace Government” was set up on 31 August 1913 which would last only fifty-eight days. The third Western Thrace Turkish Administration was set up by Fuat (Balkan) on 30 July 1915, which power until 27 September 1817. This government also proved to be short-lived due to the negative international and regional conjuncture of the time. The fourth and the longest attempt of independence movement was the “Western Thrace National Government” which annulled itself as a consequence of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. The last phase in the chain of attempts is the ideological struggle which soon turned to the disapproved by the Turkish community, as it was aimed at starting a new independence movement; however is the time under Stalinist principles. The Turkish community came to realize that was not a national struggle and it did not take long before it dissolved in its time.

Through these phases, Turkish community came to be labeled as a Muslim minority by Greece, which in due course manifests uneasiness in several aspects of life. To start with, as regards Article 19, Turks are known to have lost citizenship, the mostly heard of examples being students who went abroad to study in Turkey or Germany and found that they had lost citizenship when they tried to return to Greece and were not permitted to come back. Before the laws are abrogated in 1998, it was acknowledged by lawyers representing the Turkish minority that if an ethnic Turk was out of the country, the police would ask his/her neighbors if she/he would return to Greece. If they received “no” as an answer, the police would send a notice to the Ministry of the Interior to deal with the matter, which mostly was followed by a decision of stripping citizenship. The decision would be printed in the official gazette, yet the person would not be notified thereof. Among all, it is notable that Semahat Haliloglou and Arap Haliloglou lost their citizenship when they were doing their military service in the Greek Army. It has also been reported
that despite encouraging Turks to go to different regions in Greece to find job, the Greek authorities later stipulated that the Turks stayed where they settled and threatened them on the grounds that they would be expelled from their job unless they took Greek names.

Secondly, education stands another field in which certain friction has been traced particularly since 1950s. As per a culture agreement concluded on the basis of reciprocity (1951), Turkey send teacher to Greece and young people of Western Thrace come to Turkey to take teachers’ training with the aim of going back to Western Thrace and to teach there. In the 1950s, the official Greek changed and Greece chose to use the term “Muslim” for schools, peoples, etc...

When the Junta administration took power in 1967, the education of the Turkish minority embarked in its most uneasy phase whereby the Greek government began to appoint the administrative boards of Turkish schools, which until then were chosen by Turkish parents. Transfer of schoolbooks from Turkey was stopped by 1951 and the uses of Turkish names were banned. Ethnic Turkish children have been reported to be taught with out-dated Turkish schoolbooks and it is also acknowledged that Turkish languages teachers are trained in a special academy in Thessaloniki; they do not speak Turkish well due to a backward curriculum they receive, with little contact with developments in Turkey. A Greek law dated May 1984 that stipulated that the entrance examinations to the two secondary Turkish minority schools in Kotomini and Xanthi, as well as graduation examinations had to be in Greek led to remarkable decline in the number of pupils from 227 in Xanthi and 305 in Kotomini in 1983-83, to 85 and 42 respectively 1986-8755. As reported by Helsinki Watch, according to the former Turkish Consul to Komotini, Mr. Önder Alpmen, fewer than 10% of the students who graduate from Turkish elementary schools continue attend secondary school.

As regards the out-dated content of the books, the Greek government sources, as reported in Dateline, 19 May 1990, claim that the schoolbook issue was the fault of Turkey and not Greece. The former Greek Prime Minister Constantine Mitsotakis is known to have stated that schoolbooks were supposed to be specifically adopted for use by Greek nationals who are members of Muslims minority, under the terms of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. Mitsotakis claimed that he had requested changes to be made by the Turkish educational authorities which he claimed were never done. In line with this, Greek authorities objected to those schoolbooks as, they said, these were intended to educate citizens of Turkey.

The Greek government was also reported to inhibit Turks’ freedom of movement through passport seizures, which by the Turkish community was said to be “many” in 1989. In some cases, people returning to Greece were told that their passports were no longer valid, while in some cases the passport were returned after two to eight months, yet with no explanation. The number of such of people amounted to 40-50 in 1989.

Regarding to denial of ethnic identity, it is notable that the Greek policy changed over the years whereby for instance 1) a geography book of 1933 written in Turkey was described as “a Turkish book”
by Greece 2) a Turkish school in Komotini about forty years ago, in which a sign of identified the school as “Turkish elementary school”, on which the name was written in Turkish and Greek 3) protocols of curricula in Turkish elementary schools for the educational year 1957-58; wherein the schools were referred to as “Turkish schools”, 4) an elementary school diploma dated 10 June 1957, written in Greek and Turkish, in which 13- years-old Hati ce İmam was identified as a “Turk” and 5) two emergency orders dated 1954 and 1955 in which the chief administrator of Thrace ordered relevant municipalities to change all signs from “Muslim minority” to “Turkish minority”.

The two figures that stood out as the negative recipients of these policies were Dr. Sadık Ahmet and İsmail Şerif, against which cases were brought as of January 1990 during an election campaign on the grounds that they distributed campaign literature referring by name to “Turkish minority”; pursuant to which they received subpoenas on charges with:

- Slander and misinformation in Komotini during the last ten days of October 1989, in violation of Articles 245, 320 and 321 of the Criminal Procedure Law, by saying that candidates of New Democracy, Left Coalition and PASOK parties had created an atmosphere of terror and anarchy; and;

- Violating Article 192 of the Penal Code by “openly or indirectly inciting citizens to violence or creating rifts among the population at the expense of social peace” by the use of the word “Turkish”.

Dr. Ahmet and Mr. Şerif were found “not guilty” of slander and misinformation; but “guilty” of disturbing public order as per Article 192 of the Greek Penal Code. They spent 64 days in prison in Thessaloniki; yet the Court o Appeals released them on the condition that they paid their fines $1875, respectively; in place of the remainder of their prison terms; Dr. Ahmet was soon elected an independent MP on 8 April 1990.

On the other hand, Turks of Western Thrace are known to have complained that their religious freedom had been violated through refusal of permission to repair and/or to build old mosques, denial of the rights to choose muftis and through efforts to control the minority’s waqfs. To cite but a couple of examples, it is known that on 4 February 1989, the Nomark of Komotini wrote that permission from the Greek Archbishop was required in order to build a mosque and in the village of Diomilia in the outskirts of Xanthi, exists an old mosque among many others, which has been waiting for permission of repair for 25 years.

Restrictions in political and social life such as those noticed in degrading treatment by the security forces, freedom of expression, license acquisition and restraints in business and professional life are reported to be the components of the suffering of the Turkish minority. Greek security forces frequently call in Turks for interrogation, who assist outside observers; magazines and newspapers form Turkey would not be permitted entry until recently, air and land traffic was heralded during 1989 elections and Turkish-Greek border crossing were closed shortly prior to the elections to keep Turks from returning to vote, Turks are rarely allowed to obtain driving licenses; there are reportedly no Turkish-owned factories, gas stations or pharmacies, no Turkish high-ranking civil servants. Turks can not take credit from Greek banks, either.
Apart from those reported, it is also documented that the Greek government’s expropriation of land and cemeteries in Western Thrace incited complaints on the minority’s end, in that for instance, the government confiscated 3000 to 4000 acres to build the University of Thrace on the outskirts of Komotini. Related with the issue, the Greek Information Office Director Nikos Papaconstantinou stated that “for the establishment of the University, in Komotini 85% of the (...) land belonged to Muslims, (...) in Xanthi, 82% of the appropriated land belonged to Christians. The allegations regarding a discriminatory Greek land against the Thracian Muslims have no scientific base whatsoever.

4. Macedonian Minority in Greece

In geographic terms, the heart of Greek Macedonia is the littoral plain of Thessaloniki, stretching inward, starting from Thermaic Gulf, across which flow the river of Haliakmon, Loudas and Gallikos. Poulton writes that Macedonia, in general terms, is the area surrounded in the north by the Skopsa Crna Gora and Shar Planina Mountains; In the East by the Rila and Rhodope Mountains; in the south by the Aegean Coast around Thessaloniki, Mount Olympus and Pindus mountains; and in the west by Ohrid and Prespa lakes. The area is a geographic unit located around the Vardar, the Struma and the Mesta river valleys, which is referred to as “geographic Macedonia”, comprising of 67,000 square kilometers, divided between the Macedonia, Greece and Bulgaria.

Viewed in historical perspective, it has been argued that the mindset which was traced as an influential on the official Greek practices and policies in the aftermath of the proclamation of the Greek state, more specifically later in 1880s, has been exemplified by the words of Kharilaos Trikoupis, the former Greek Prime Minister: “When the Great war breaks out, Macedonia will become Greek or Bulgarian, according to who wins (...) and if we take it, we will make them all Greeks”. Atrocity in the region by Greeks in parallel terms with this policy in the 19th and 20th centuries has been documented officially as well as scholarly. The chronological history of Macedonia as of 725 B.C. the year when the Kingdom of Macedon was established, up until the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest, by which the Ottoman Empire lost the territory, reflects Hun, Slav, Bulgarian, Byzantine and Serbian encounters.

As Hill points out, estimates regarding Macedonians in Greek Macedonia vary between 10,000 and 300,000 citing the U.S Department of State accounts’ related reference as “under 10,000 to 50,000 or more” and also the Encyclopedia Britannica Books of the Year 1987 and 1992 as 180,000 and 150,000, respectively, together with Poulton’s estimate of 200,000. Historical statistics regarding Macedonian population estimated by Greece is noted with lower figures or even as non-existing as in the Greek census of 1940, wherein Greeks, Turks, Slavs, Vlahos and Jews were observed as constituents of population of Greek Macedonia, but Macedonians. This practice in fact, through not precisely similar, appears to have a precedent in 1919, when with Article 56 of the Treaty of Neuilly it was stipulated that a “voluntary exchange of population be made” between Greece
and Bulgaria. According to the agreement, ethnic Bulgarians of Greece (Macedonians) would be exchanged for ethnic Greek of Bulgaria; however, this voluntary exchange in short term was transformed into a compulsory one by Greece as regards Macedonians, which forced them to immigrate to Bulgaria. Relevant literature labels new settlements in Greek Macedonia as “a great success” in term of Hellenizing the region by those coming from Anatolia after the 1922 Turkish-Greek War. Pursuant to WW I, the Greek practices persisted more or less the same; this time Macedonians were named as “Slavo-Macedonians” and towards the mid-1920s, all Macedonian named were change with Greek ones. Yet, worse proved to be a dictatorship of General Metaxas who took power in 1936 with coup d’état which lasted five years, a period followed by an even worse one: World War II. Metaxas regime viewed the minority as a danger to Greece’s security and many Macedonians were interned from the border regions with Yugoslavia; furthermore night schools were opened to teach adults Slavs Greek.

The repression was stepped up during the Greco-Italian War in 1940, despite many Macedonians fighting loyally in Greece army against Italians. The ensuing Civil War saw the exodus of many Slavs together with Greek Communist Party members fleeing to Yugoslavia. In aftermath of the Civil War, Greek state took such steps as to remove “undesirable aliens” from border regions with Yugoslavia through Decree numbered 2536, dated 1953, and enacted to colonize these northern territories “with new colonists having healthy national consciousness”. By 1954, Papagos government resolved to remove all Macedonians from official posts in Greek Macedonia and in bordering regions peasants were not permitted to move from their villages; moreover, inhabitants of villages near Lerin, Kostur and Kajlari were asked to publicly confirm before officials that they did not speak Macedonian; which to finally led to emigration to Australia or Canada.

Regardless of type of government in power, whether democratic or military dictatorship of 1967-74, the official practices with respect the Macedonian minority is observed almost constant which led to the evolution of a Macedonian nationalism stronger among emigrants from Greece, than nationals in Macedonia proper. It is also acknowledged that the property of those Macedonians who emigrated was confiscated by Greek government by Decree 2536/1953, with Article 19 of the Citizenship Code depriving them of their citizenship, as well. Through another law enacted thereafter, the Greek state decided that the property would be returned to refugees who were “Greek by birth” which required a change in their names. This practice was also observed when Lafter Lajovski, one of the participants of over 100 former refugees, wished to visit Greek Macedonia along with other refugees; but was turned back at the border by Greek officials stating he should change his name to a Greek one if he wanted to enter Greece; his Canadian citizenship apparently did not make any change.

As of 1981, when PASOK came to the power with Andreas Papandreu at its head, actions against Macedonians escalated and Papandreu is known to have explicitly denied the existence of a Macedonian minority stating he would not accept any dialogue on the matter. The Greek conservative party, Nea
Demokratia, on the other hand also continued its hostility to Macedonia and in 1986 set up a monitoring center in Florina to monitor broadcast from Skopje.

Today it is known that teaching of Macedonian is banned and a Macedonian baby cannot be given a Macedonian name, since the Greek priests who approve birth certificates accept only Greek names. It is also reported that priests refuse to marry Macedonian couples unless assured no Macedonian dances shall take place, as this displays Macedonians feelings. Stating this “feeling” is also known to have caused two minority activists Christos Sideropoulos and Tasos Boulis to be sentenced to five months imprisonment and a fine of 100,000 drachmas; as these gentlemen stated that they felt “Macedonian”. Also, in 1990 when 54 Macedonians decided to establish a Macedonian Cultural Association in Florina, Greek Courts refused the application as the applicants, they said, presumed there was a Macedonian minority in Greece. Forwarding the case to the European Court of Human Rights the minority received an answer that the Court considered the aims of the minority clear and legitimate; and convicted Greece. The Macedonian churches in Greece are also reported closed as the Greek Orthodox Church claims the Macedonian church in Ohrid is legitimate. In line with this, a Macedonian monk name Nikodimos Tsarknias, who opposed the Greek Church was dismissed from ecclesiastical post due to his identification as a Macedonian.

After Papandreou’s fall from power in 1990, a mass demonstration in Skopje protesting the lack of minority rights for Macedonia was organized. The escalation was even deteriorated with the break-up of Yugoslavia and the proclamation of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia followed suit. The use of the certain country symbols such as the star of Vergina on the Macedonia flag, harnessing nationalism in Greece led to vetoing this new state with name “Macedonia”. Greece saw this provocative, as it is a symbol used by the ancient Macedonian royal dynasty in Greek Macedonia which was found in King Philip’s tomb in Greece. Greece also received Skopje’s adaptation of the image of the Whiter Tower, the symbol of Thessaloniki in Greek Macedonia, on its commemorative currency as “threatening”, multiplied by the use of name “Macedonia” itself, which caused Greeks to think that the new state coveted the relevant Greek territory. It has been argued that the Macedonian issue was widely articulated by nationalistic Greek media in its length, projecting the issue on public through a bulk of headlines, distribution of articles, news reports and editorials; most significantly in newspaper of To, Eleftheros Typos, Kathimerini and Macedonia.

Finally to speak about the attitudes of the society in Greece, it would not be erroneuous to suggest that they vary depending on political affiliation or personal perceptions. Just as extreme “Greek chauvinists are known to have called for the liquidation of all Macedonians, whether in Greece or elsewhere”, some left-wing and a portion of Greek population sympathize with Macedonians which might entail there exists amicable relations between Greeks and Macedonians in Greece, despite cases reported.
5. Conclusion

Especially the development of minority rights centered approaches in the post-Cold War era has driven nation states to re-examine their own minority policies. At the present, the process is developing within the framework of recognizing the minorities and efforts to guarantee the minority rights while trying to protect the basic values of nation-states. Greece, which reflects all characteristics of a nation-state, constitutes a very good sample with its minorities and minority issues as well as negative/positive changes in the attitudes towards the minorities. It’s seen that, however there are some positive developments on current minority issues of Greece when compared with the pre-1990 era, these developments are still on a slow and limited scale.
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