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Abstract

In the aftermath of the Greek Civil War, the right-wing elements of Greece’s government felt that they needed to join NATO to protect Greek interests from the perceived threat posed by Communism and their Balkan neighbors. Throughout this period of time, the Greek state implemented several drastic and often undemocratic motions that led to measures against minority groups, suppressing left-wing politicians, and applying old nationalistic rhetoric such as the “Menace from the North” to the situation with the Communist regimes in their neighboring countries. During this time, Greek interests often were pushed aside in order to appease the United States and other members of NATO while at other points, Greece nearly went to war with their NATO ally Turkey over the future of Cyprus. Meanwhile, Greece’s new-found alliance with NATO led to an improvement of their military capabilities to the point where the highly nationalistic, anti-Communist army would seize control of the government in 1967 and form a Military Junta. During the seven years of military control, NATO continued to work with the Military Junta which in turn would have drastic consequences when Greece nearly went to war with Turkey over Cyprus. With the collapse of the Junta, Greece has slowly taken steps to begin distancing their decision-making towards Greek interests.
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Introduction

1952: with the memories of the Civil War still fresh in their minds, the Greek government saw their place in a new alliance take hold. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) had approved their membership and the effects of being a part of such a multi-state organization, with the United States at its head, started taking hold. After the first seven years of post-World War Two in which Greece had several confrontations with Communist entities including a bloody Civil War and the spread of Communism throughout the Balkans, joining NATO seemed to be a beneficial deal that would “save” the Greek state from this perceived threat. The period was the Cold War, a time of conflict between the United States and Soviet Union in a battle of ideologies which ended up having drastic consequences for Greece. Upon falling under US influence, the Greek state began implementing measures that were highly undemocratic but were seen as being crucial in preventing a Communist victory. With the alliance in NATO secured, the right-wing elements of the Greek government began enacting undemocratic measures with dire consequences for their political rivals and any dissenter which in turn would be made possible by toleration from the Western powers.
Chapter 1: The Factors contributing to a need to join NATO

In order to begin to understand the Greek aspiration to join NATO, it might be appropriate to examine the root of this desire. Why did Greece decide that they needed to become a part of NATO? The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was founded in 1949 with the goal of protecting the freedom and security of its member-states through military and political means.\(^1\) At its inception, the means of protecting the freedom and security of NATO’s member-states was directed towards combatting Communism.\(^2\) These ideas would be a key point towards Greece feeling a need to join this organization. For the Greek government, especially the more reactionary right-wing elements, there were several major factors that were involved in the decision to join. By examining these events, one can begin to form an image of how the Greek right-wing political establishment wished for the alliance with NATO.

A major factor contributing to the Greek desire to join NATO was the Civil War which lasted from 1944 until 1949. This conflict had long-standing implications that could be traced back to events leading up to World War Two. In the inter-war years, the Greek government had always been concerned with the perceived popular support of the Communist factions amongst the working classes, particularly the Communist party,


\(^{2}\)“What is NATO?”
Kommounistikó Kómma Elládas (KKE).³ These fears were addressed in several policies throughout the 1920s by the Eleftherios Venizelos-led government through imprisonment of leading Communists and trade union members.⁴ The persecution of the left-leaning aspects of society would continue until the eve of World War Two, under the Metaxas regime which even went as far to call these elements as traitorous and anti-Christian.⁵ Under these two governments, the total number of Communist membership was estimated at only two thousand five hundred but the Greek police managed to extract fifty thousand confessions, often under dubious methods such as torture.⁶

By arresting and torturing so many people, the Greek government contributed to the growth of Communism which they had feared in the first place. Due to the process of arresting suspected Communists and their sympathizers, those who were affected were often ostracized and usually the only entity willing to embrace them was the Communist party.⁷ Also the government-controlled newspaper contributed highly to this situation by printing thousands of names of innocent bystanders whose lives were compromised due to being suspected of harboring Communist sentiments.⁸ Through this process of ostracizing, the growth of the Communist party would begin to take hold but it would be the events of the Second World War which saw a growth of membership and lead to the eventual fear of a possible Communist takeover.

³Mark Mazower. Inside Hitler’s Greece. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 324
⁵Gerolymatos, 5
⁶Gerolymatos, 5
⁷Gerolymatos, 5
⁸Gerolymatos, 5
The strong desire to join NATO could be seen in the events that occurred during the 1940s. Throughout the Second World War and then in the aftermath, the Communists would end up gaining massive support, even possibly numbering almost two million members at the time of liberation from the Germans.\textsuperscript{9} The factors that contributed highly to the government suspicion of Communism in this period, however, would be the Civil War. The KKE-led National Liberation Movement (ELAS), the most organized of the Greek resistance movements against the German occupation, and the British-backed National Republican League (EDES) had already long come to fighting each other in the closing stages of the German presence in Greece.\textsuperscript{10}

The in-fighting between the resistance movements and British meddling would soon contribute to the Civil War. As it became apparent that the allies would win the Second World War, Churchill and Stalin held a meeting to determine the fate of the Balkans. In this meeting, it was decided that British influence in Greece would be ninety percent in comparison to only ten percent that the Soviets would hold thus allowing for the anti-Communist, post-war situation to take hold.\textsuperscript{11} This was particularly evident in the message exhibited by the British in that they wished to return Europe to a pre-war status quo.\textsuperscript{12} At the Potsdam conference, they formally announced their position in which there was a call for maintaining the Greek monarchy and that elections would be held under Allied supervision.\textsuperscript{13} Then in 1946, under this plan, there was a special election in which

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{10}Gerolymatos, 85
\textsuperscript{11}Glenny, 522
\textsuperscript{12}Gerolymatos, 82
\end{flushleft}
the Monarchy was reinstated.\textsuperscript{14} By trying to bring back a pre-war status quo, the British would assure that the conservative and right-wing elements of Greek politics would manage to regain control and thus allow for a pathway to NATO.

However, as all of this was occurring, the Greek countryside had devolved back into one of fighting between the two sides. Due to the goal of reinstating a pre-war status quo, the British showed absolutely no qualms about working with Greeks who had collaborated with the German occupiers and supplied them with weaponry to use against the Communists and other non-Monarchist forces.\textsuperscript{15} The British goals towards bringing Europe back to a prewar status quo could also be seen in how Greece was slowly becoming an obsession for Churchill. For instance, at the height of the first phase of the Civil War in December 1944, Churchill decided to fly out to Athens to hold a meeting with the newly appointed regent Archbishop Damaskinos in order to build trust between the Greek government and the British.\textsuperscript{16} By showing their willingness to support the Greek government, the British began a policy of assistance that would eventually be overtaken by the United States.

During this time, the American interference would also begin to take hold. As Britain’s own situations worsened, the United States began taking over as the most influential force in financing the Greek government in their struggle against the Communist insurgency.\textsuperscript{17} This first foray of American interference into Greek issues

\textsuperscript{16}Richard Clogg. \textit{A Concise History of Greece}. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 136-137
\textsuperscript{17}Judt, 91
would also be influential during Greece’s eventual ambitions to join NATO. Beginning in March 1947, President Truman stressed the importance of supporting the Greeks through emergency aid as part of funding the “free peoples” of Europe, which would be part of his larger Truman Doctrine, especially through the Marshall Plan.  

The main goal was to create an ally that would eventually be self-sufficient through economic and military means. By supplying the Greek state with six hundred forty nine million dollars, the United States would assure themselves of being an important player in the fate of Greece during this period of uncertainty. The key reason that led to American interference in the first place was a fear of Soviet interference that could be triggered by Greek instability in the region. This would be particularly evident once the Soviet Union began to support claims from Communist governments on Greek territory.

Meanwhile the threat posed by Communism was still very apparent. There was one very important way in which this could be felt: the Communist treatment of villages in their zones of control. The fears that would eventually convince Greece to join NATO included the “Red Terror” instigated by the KKE. Although both sides were equally guilty of such atrocities, the violent tactics used by the Communists such as destroying whole villages, would become synonymous with the radical left for many on the right-wing. By emphasizing these occurrences and ignoring their own involvement in similar policies of razing suspected Communist strongholds, the Greek right-wing political
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18 Clogg, 137  
20 Judt, 96  
21 Tomai, 21  
22 Tomai, 24  
23 Judt, 504-505
machine could easily convince the people that Communism meant repression and atrocities.\textsuperscript{24} Also another way in which the right-wing could attack the Communists was through the law. In 1947, Law 509 effectively banned the KKE and made membership illegal.\textsuperscript{25}

Policies enacted by the KKE also didn’t help their image. They began a program of forced conscription within their zone of control in which both men and women would be required to fight in their army.\textsuperscript{26} Meanwhile, when it became apparent that the Communists were going to lose, they began implementing policies of “evacuating” children to Eastern Europe.\textsuperscript{27} These policies directed at children, gave the right-wing political ammunition. The claim being made by the Communists was that the program of “evacuating” children was meant for their own protection; however, the right-wing stated that this was clearly a new instigation of the Ottoman policies of snatching children with the goal of creating a new Janissary corps which could then be used to destroy Greece.\textsuperscript{28}

At the same time, the KKE and their overt support of the non-Greek minorities did not help their cause either. Although it was denied, there was suspicion that the KKE had been funding the Slavo-Macedonian Liberation Front (SNOF) in Northern Greece who was seeking an autonomous Slavic speaking Macedonia.\textsuperscript{29} By having this possible connection with the SNOF, the KKE would provide another point in which the Greek

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Judt, 504}
\footnote{Clogg, 139}
\footnote{Loring M. Danforth and Riki Van Boeschoten. \textit{Children of the Greek Civil War.} (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2012), 4-5}
\footnote{Clogg, 139}
\footnote{Tomai, 22}
\end{footnotes}
government, particularly the more reactionary elements, could use rhetoric to attack the Communists’ position.\textsuperscript{30} The argument being presented in this case was that if allowed to spread, the Communist message would eventually call for the recognition of non-Greek minorities such as Slavs and Albanians which in turn would lead to calls for an autonomous Macedonia, free from Greek influence, and thus undermine the sovereign territory of Greece.\textsuperscript{31} By using a rhetoric deeply rooted in nationalism, the government could continue making these claims against Communism while also building a basis of support for an alliance that would protect them from the perceived threats from their neighbors.

By playing on these fears, the Greek politicians were also allowed a free hand in determining the fate of many of these minorities. During an eleven year period, spanning from 1940 to 1951, the state began a process of deporting over eighty thousand minorities who spoke Romanian, Albanian, or Macedonian Slav by often claiming falsely, that these groups portrayed a strong threat against Greek sovereignty.\textsuperscript{32} Due to the persecution suffered at the hands of the Greek government, many of the minorities especially Slavs were part of the Communist groups due to their stance on an autonomous Macedonia.\textsuperscript{33} By the end of the Civil War in 1949, almost forty percent of the Communist guerillas were Slavs, which made it rather easy for the Greek government to attack the Communist

\textsuperscript{30}Judt, 505
\textsuperscript{31}Judt, 505
\textsuperscript{33}Close, 36
stance as being anti-Greek and trying to give away territory that had been gained through hard-fought Greek victories in the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913.34

However these policies were not entirely new. In the buildup to World War Two, the Greek state had been implementing policies of “Hellenization” which saw a repression of any non-Greek languages, culture, and names were converted to be more Greek-sounding by changing them from Albanian or Slavic to Greek.35 However, these policies weren’t new. The Greek government had already begun implementing some of these laws with the advent of the 1920s Asia Minor Catastrophe by settling Greeks from Asia Minor into areas that previously had been inhabited by non-Greek people.36 By enacting these policies, the Greek government hoped to create a structure that would be more sympathetic to their claims over the region. However, the effects of these policies would have a drastic consequence during World War Two. During the German occupation, many of these minority people greeted the new occupiers as “liberators” and even worked closely in combatting Greek resistance.37 With these claims in place, the Greek state could begin implementing new rhetoric.

For years, the Greek government had been emphasizing a “Menace from the North,” which consisted of Greece’s Balkan neighbors and their ambitions of possibly undermining the integrity of the state by laying claim on areas with sizeable minority groups.38 With the rise of Communism, these same politicians that had been using this

34Clogg, 139
35Danforth and Van Boeschoten, 35
37Danforth and Van Boeschoten, 35
nationalist message could now intertwine it with new rhetoric that emphasized on that this “Menace from the North,” also consisted of a “Red Peril.”39 An instance of this could be seen in how the Communists were portrayed as “Bulgaro-Communist” in that they were thought to be in league with Greece’s Slavic enemies.40 Arguments such as these also would lead to a desire to join an organization such as NATO which claimed that it would protect their member-states’ freedom and security from outside threats.

By using these arguments, the Greek government could make a very compelling case for the threat that they felt was posed by these minority groups and the supposed influence that outside forces might have had on them. The usage of the “Menace from the North,” entailed a perceived threat that was seen in the form of all of Greece’s Slavic neighbors. The deputy minister for Foreign Affairs even went as far as to call it “Slavic Imperialism.”41 This could also be seen in 1948, when the Central Committee on Hellenic Rights addressed the UN General Assembly by making the claim that Greece was currently locked in a struggle for its life against their Slavic neighbors.42

However, not everyone was convinced of the claims that all of Greece’s neighbors were pressing claims upon sovereign Greek territory. The diplomat Alexis Kyrou, who had earned a reputation of a riot-inciter in his native Cyprus and would later be a government official of several 1950s right-wing governments, was convinced that the largest threat posed by outside forces on Greece was not pan-Slavism as the “Menace from the North,” seemed to be imply but rather in the form of one instigator: Bulgarian

39 Hatzivassilou, 5
40 Close, 37
42 Stefanidis, 27
nationalism. He also pointed out that Communism wasn’t the main reason that Bulgaria was a threat to Greece but rather its historical aggressiveness posed the threat. The historical basis that Kyrou was emphasizing could be seen in regards to issues that occurred in the direct aftermath of World War Two.

The threat posed by Bulgaria against Greek sovereignty was real. The roots of this threat could be traced back to numerous issues that also could be traced back to the “Menace from the North” theory that politicians sprouted off in their speeches. When Bulgaria repeatedly made claims on Western Thrace throughout the inter-war period as well as in the aftermath of the Second World War, the Greeks feared that their territory was being threatened. This was evident in that the Bulgarians were particularly reluctant to even remove their occupying forces in the aftermath of World War Two despite having suffered regime change. Only after repeated demands did Greece get any headway on this issue from the United States and Great Britain. The resolution was that in case of an attack from the North, there would be allied support to Greece but any territorial questions were to be directed to the United Nations.

Meanwhile the Bulgarian forces were finally removed from Western Thrace, after the Greeks with British backing were able to pressure the new regime in Sofia to comply with Greek sovereignty. However this would not be the last time that Greece would feel threatened by Bulgaria. Once the Communists were defeated in Greece, those
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43 Hatzivassilou, 21
44 Hatzivassilou, 21
45 Tomai, 23
46 Hatzivassilou, 7-8
47 Tomai, 23
48 Hatzivassilou, 7-8
who fled to Bulgaria would occasionally venture forth back into Greek territories to conduct raids and attacks.\textsuperscript{49} The feeling in regards to this could be applied to the idea that by joining NATO would provide a deterrent to a possible Bulgarian invasion.

While Greece was countering Bulgarian threats, they also faced threats from Yugoslavia. Marshall Tito, who was the Yugoslav dictator, made it quite clear that the Yugoslav ambition was to “reunite” Ancient Macedonia and thus made an irredentist claim on the Greek Macedonia.\textsuperscript{50} In order to distract the Greeks even more, the Yugoslav government decided to back the Bulgarian claim on Thrace, which led to an ever increasing threat against the sovereignty of Greece.\textsuperscript{51} Also during the Civil War, the Yugoslav government had funded the Greek Communist guerillas thus assuring to Greece that the “Menace from the North,” was quite real in the form of Tito.\textsuperscript{52} Yugoslavia would continue to be seen as a threat in the undermining of the Greek state when numerous children who had been “evacuated” by the Communists were moved there.\textsuperscript{53}

These issues, however, would be played down once the rift between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia deepened which meant that Tito began looking for aid from the United States so he began loosening his stances on several issues pertaining to Greece including the support for the Communists.\textsuperscript{54} By 1949, the two sides had normalized relations and within a year had even exchanged ambassadors.\textsuperscript{55} This would culminate

\textsuperscript{49}Close, 39  
\textsuperscript{50}Hatzivassilou, 8  
\textsuperscript{51}Hatzivassilou, 8  
\textsuperscript{52}Close, 31  
\textsuperscript{53}Danforth and Van Boeschoten, 44-45  
\textsuperscript{54}Close, 38  
\textsuperscript{55}Close, 126
with Greece and Yugoslavia making a defensive pact in the early 1950s.\textsuperscript{56} Once Yugoslavia began shifting towards the Soviet Union again during the mid-1950s in the aftermath of the death of Stalin, this pact would be cancelled and Greece once again felt uneasy about their Yugoslav neighbors.\textsuperscript{57} Greece could, however, play on their relations with Yugoslavia to try and portray themselves as an important regional entity for when the West attempted to reach Tito regime.

At the same time that this was occurring, Greece’s other Communist neighbor, Albania began making their own demands. The situation between the two sides was particularly tense in that they were in a state of war since 1940 and still hadn’t resolved this issue.\textsuperscript{58} Due to a major dispute over the border, this state of war would continue with the Northern Epirus question which focused on the claim that Albania was occupying territory which was rightfully Greek.\textsuperscript{59} Just like Yugoslavia, the Albanian government had supported the Greek Communists who upon being defeated, fled into Albania.\textsuperscript{60} As was the case with Yugoslavia, the Albanian government was seen as a threat due to their allowance of the Greek Communist “evacuation” of children into their country.\textsuperscript{61} Also upon the defeat of the KKE, those who had fled into Albania would continue to harass the Greek frontier by using their new protector as a staging ground.\textsuperscript{62} At the same time, the relationship between the two countries was continually tense in that Britain and the United States had been using Greece in their attempts to undermine the Albanian regime.

\textsuperscript{56}Close, 126  
\textsuperscript{57}Close, 126  
\textsuperscript{58}Judt, 505  
\textsuperscript{59}Stefanidis, 70  
\textsuperscript{60}Danforth and Van Boeschoten, 31  
\textsuperscript{61}Danforth and Van Boeschoten, 52-53  
\textsuperscript{62}Close, 39
of Enver Hoxha.\textsuperscript{63} The willingness of the Western powers to use Greece as a Balkan base against the Communist regimes throughout the region would partially lay a framework for Greece’s eventual entry into NATO.

By having these fears, the case to join NATO was strong. A long history of having Great Power interference within the region especially Britain already provided a structure for gaining an alliance with the West. Also a bloody Civil War that the right-wing claimed to have been instigated by the Communists would also have a major effect on the situation. As late as 2009, when asked about the outcome of the Civil War, a poll conducted by the Greek newspaper \textit{H Kathemerini} (The Daily Paper) found that a majority of those who participated in their survey felt that the victory of the government over the Communists had been the most beneficial for the outcome of Greece.\textsuperscript{64}

Also the fears of a “Menace from the North” were particularly instrumental in asking for membership into NATO. By emphasizing this extremely nationalistic message and applying anti-Communist rhetoric to it, the Greek politicians could easily begin asking for NATO to grant them membership. The cause for Greece to yearn to be a part of NATO was extremely powerful and would determine numerous aspects of Greek policy during the Cold War era. The course towards this membership was a key point of the right-wing who would use their status within NATO and their relationship with the United States to their advantage in determining the outcome of elections for the better

\textsuperscript{63}Close, 126
part of the 1950s and early 1960s.\textsuperscript{65} When it became apparent that their membership was approved, these policies could be seen in numerous aspects including implementing new tactics to modernize the military, a continued political basis, and also as an economic partnership.

\textsuperscript{65}Close, 86
Chapter 2: Consequences of Joining NATO

In 1952, Greece was finally granted membership into NATO. After years of uncertainty faced with threats from the “Menace from the North,” this new alliance was seen as a particularly beneficial one for the Greeks in that they felt that they were now in a safer position. By being allowed entry into NATO, the politicians felt that they had achieved something that had never been done by a Greek government prior to this period. However, in what ways did Greece benefit from this new relationship?

The decision to join NATO was monumental for the Greek government. It gave the state something that they didn’t have in either World War One or World War Two: an alliance with the Great powers.66 The feeling was that by being a part of this alliance, the Western superpowers such as the United States and Great Britain would help provide a deterrent towards any perceived threat from Greece’s Balkan neighbors and the Soviet Union as a whole.67 Afterwards, politicians would use this alliance to further their own political ambitions as could be seen in several instances during the 1950s and 1960s.68 The right-wing would heavily emphasize this role and thus through these means they managed to run the government for most of this period.69 At the same time, the Greek monarchy used the alliance with NATO to try and guarantee to the West that they were

66Hatzivassilou, 2
67Hatzivassilou, 2
68Close, 86
69Close, 83
the most stable force within the region and thus the government should be allowed to work as the “middlemen” between the West and Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{70} Also due to the strategic location within the Eastern Mediterranean, NATO could use Greece as a base against any perceived threats within Southeastern Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa.\textsuperscript{71}

The biggest benefactor of the alliance with NATO was the Greek military. In particular, this entity would prove to have numerous benefits bestowed upon them in the coming years. Some of the policies enacted by the alliance with NATO however were just continuations of previous political ambitions felt within the army. In the context of the Civil War, the Greek military had already gained autonomy from the government thus allowing for them to form political ambitions of their own.\textsuperscript{72}

The armed forces had emerged from the chaos of the previous decade as a strong anti-Communist and heavily nationalist player in the Greek political arena.\textsuperscript{73} This could be seen in several ways. American and British influence into military conspiracies such as the Sacred Bond of Hellenic Officers (IDEA) would assure that the armed forces would continue to remain royalist and in later years even shape Greece’s Cold War history with an eventual coup.\textsuperscript{74} The United States interference into the Greek military during this period could also be felt in the decision-making process. The United States National Security Council (NSC) issued a document in regards to this titled NSC-103 in which Greece was mentioned as being an important Western ally due to its location as a

\textsuperscript{70}Judt, 505  
\textsuperscript{72}Hatzivassilou, 24  
\textsuperscript{73}Judt, 505  
\textsuperscript{74}Close, 84
crossroads between East and West. However this document also seemed to display a certain bias against the Greek military. It stressed that in the event of a Soviet invasion through Bulgaria, the Greek army could only be used as a delaying measure until proper forces could be mustered by the other members of NATO.

Also the American influence could be seen in regards to the role played by numerous Greek officers in the aftermath of the Civil War. Alexander Papagos, who had been the Commander-in-Chief of the Greek Army during the Greco-Italian War and then during the Civil War, played a heavy role in Greek politics upon resigning from the army. He was widely respected throughout Greece for his accomplishments but due to dissatisfaction with the interference of the Greek Monarchy, particularly Queen Fredericka, he ended up resigning his commission. Upon his resignation from the military, Papagos formed his own political party, the Greek Rally and eventually succeeded in becoming Prime Minister of Greece. However the road to becoming the Prime Minister would be marked by several hindrances. In the first election which his new party would partake in, the result was so inconclusive that the American ambassador threatened to cut off aid to Greece if the system wasn’t changed to a majority system rather than a proportional one. The reasoning behind this was that the American government felt that Papagos and his control over the Greek military would provide a stable role in an unstable region.
The Papagos years were very instrumental in the forming image of Greece within NATO. It would be under his tutelage that Greek policy began to focus more on military issues particularly the strengthening of the army. Due to the fears of an invasion from their Balkan neighbors, the ability to field a strong army was extremely important. In fact while speaking to American officers about the situation, the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs, Evangelos Averoff stressed that Greece was barely holding back the threat posed by their neighbors. The army numbered only one hundred forty three thousand and most of their equipment was outdated and would be no match if the perceived invasion were to take place. This was particularly worrisome in that Greece’s neighbors seemed to have significantly stronger armies. The estimates of their neighboring foes included Bulgaria with two hundred thirty five thousand, future NATO member Turkey with three hundred fifty thousand, and Yugoslavia with four hundred fifty thousand. Meanwhile the lightest threat seemed to be Albania due to only being able to field forty five thousand and also the Greek-Albanian border proving to be a very defensible area.

The ambition to join NATO could be seen as being instrumental in providing for a modernization of the Greek military. Alongside of gaining a joint US-British agreement to intervene in case of an invasion from Soviet forces through Bulgaria, the new alliance would provide a basis for the modernization of the military. Within months of joining NATO, this was witnessed in terms of military equipment. Although they began to receive newer equipment, it was made apparent that the Greek forces would still receive
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inferior products to Turkey, who was seen as a more stable and stronger NATO ally. But the equipment that the Greek army did receive was extremely beneficial for modernizing the armed forces. By 1953, most of the outdated artillery had been replaced with modern American-made pieces and by 1954 the Greek air force began receiving F-86 jets to replace their outdated Spitfires while F-84 bombers would take the place of the Helldiver light bombers that were still being fielded. These changes in air power could already be seen in the previous aid that was provided to the Greek military. As early as the Civil War, the Greek air force started to be equipped with modern technology such as napalm in order to combat the Communist insurgency. By continuing policies such as these, the goal was to completely change the outlook of all aspects of the Greek military in order to make them stronger and more capable of fighting off another Communist attack.

At the same time, there seemed to be little progress in the tank corps. As was noted by Greek Minister of Defense, Panagiotis Kanellopoulos in a speech to parliament, the Greek tanks were still relatively light in comparison to their neighbors which seemed to pose the biggest disadvantage in regards to defending against an invasion. Meanwhile, the navy would be the least affected of all branches of the Greek military in that the focus was more on rebuilding the Greek land defenses. The only real change to be seen during this period was an increase of purchasing US-made Liberty ships.

---

87 Close, 130  
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91 Hatzivassilou, 31  
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At the same time, these new developments seemed to be beneficial towards the goals set forth by the United States within the NATO context. The feeling was by providing a modernized military for Greece could lead towards restraining irredentist claims within the Greek political structure. The feeling was that the Greek tendency to stride towards irredentist claims on their neighbors provided a sharp weakness that could undermine the NATO alliance. In order to combat the threat of irredentism, the United States felt that the best way to deal with the situation would be to focus on claiming to be the shield against Soviet ambitions so as to curb the Greek claims on neighbors such as Cyprus and Turkey. Several of these factors would contribute to the growing trend towards “weaning” Greece off of economic aid.

Meanwhile by joining NATO, the Greek economy could begin to feel the effect as it began improving. Prior to joining the alliance, defense expenditure had been steadily increasing but upon joining the organization, it began to see a reduction and at the same time, the United States seemed to be the most likely candidate in funding the Greek land forces. US officials were even reporting that the improvement of the Greek economy should be a sign to begin cutting aid. A National Security Council review on policy in the mid-1950s even concluded that providing continued economic aid to Greece might be detrimental in the shaping of the relationship between Greece and the United States. However, the Greek government felt differently. When US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles visited Greece in 1953, the Greek government stressed the importance of
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receiving more aid in order to achieve a larger army. The claim being made by the Greeks in this context being that by having a large army, they could in turn be an influential ally within NATO.

This could be seen as a continuation of other policies in regards to receiving military aid to strengthen the Greek military. By claiming that if they did not receive enough economic aid, Papagos threatened to cut the Greek military to seventy thousand troops in order to emphasize the importance of being able to field a strong military. When the Eisenhower administration contemplated cutting economic aid to Greece, Papagos tried to counter it by offering to send more Greek troops to Korea in exchange for the opening of US military bases on sovereign Greek territory however the American government stated that this did not qualify for an increase of economic aid. So the Greek government began using a different tactic.

The new tactic that was used in order to stress the importance of aid was the usage of the Marshall plan. The Greek government repeatedly claimed that due to the Civil War, the Marshall plan’s advantages had not been fully realized due to the funds being used to combat the Communists. The claim was that if Greece were unable to continue fielding a strong army which heavily depended on economic assistance, then Greece would surely be overrun. Finally an agreement was reached. After much
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encouragement, the government in Athens finally agreed to allow the opening of US
military bases on sovereign Greek soil.  

The Greek government during this period faced a major issue in regards to
transition. After a long period of illness, Papagos would die in 1955 to be replaced by
Kostantinos Karamanlis. Just like numerous politicians before him, Karamanlis would
play on the alliance with the United States in order to provide his basis of power. One
such instance could be seen during the 1960s when the Greek stance on the Cuba
blockade was completely out of tune with the rest of the West in that it fully supported it
despite putting numerous Greek sailors from the merchant marine out of work. By
enacting pro-Western policies, Karamanlis would soon face issues that would eventually
lead to his first downfall.

However, not everyone was pleased with this new alliance. The more nationalistic
elements of society felt that this was a betrayal of Greece’s unique path in history which
had emphasized heavily on the concept of “Hellenism.” These elements of society
tended to be supporters of the concept of the Megali Idea (Big Idea) which had
emphasized that Greece needed to retake territories that were ancestrally Greek. By
joining NATO, the argument was that the Greek government would cave-in to the
demands from Western powers and in turn ignore the duty of the state to regain all parts
of Ancient Greek territory. In an article published in a 1958 journal from the Greek
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Educational Society, these elements of society began lamenting that the *Megali Idea* was betrayed by this new development.\textsuperscript{110} This mindset would continue to have support from the more nationalistic elements of society and would have dire consequences in the relationship with several of Greece’s NATO allies during this period.

Meanwhile, another very important issue that joining NATO entailed was Greece’s interesting and often hostile relationship with its largest neighbor, Turkey. Despite the two state’s often hostile history, ironically enough, Greece’s ascension into NATO had depended on whether or not the Turkish request for membership would have been accepted.\textsuperscript{111} This was largely due to the image of Turkey having taken massive strides towards forming a parliamentary government while Greece was still seen as being somewhat politically unstable.\textsuperscript{112} However both would gain admittance into NATO for several reasons including their regional status.

Due to regional interests, both countries had been accepted into NATO in 1952 and both had seen Soviet interference into the Mediterranean as being extremely worrisome thus why the two had begun to petition to be allowed into NATO beginning in 1948.\textsuperscript{113} Although neither state could be seen as “North Atlantic,” they were both admitted due to their strategic location.\textsuperscript{114} Both sides even sent troops to Korea in 1950 prior to becoming members of NATO in 1952.\textsuperscript{115} By sending troops to Korea, the two states tried to show the West that they were committed to fighting the spread of
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Although the two sides expressed governmental friendliness to one another, the shared history of Turkey and Greece was still seen with hostility by the citizens of both countries. This would particularly become evident in the years to come.

A large catalyst that would allow for the rupture of stabilizing relations between Turkey and Greece would be seen during this time period in the form of Cyprus. For years, Cyprus would cause a deepening rift between the two states as each sought different methods of how to appropriately deal with this issue. As it became apparent that British control was slowly easing on Cyprus, the Greek majority present in this territory called for Enosis (Union) with Greece. In 1954, Greece even went to the United Nations to plead their case in regards to the Cypriot question. Each incoming government in Athens would pledge support to Enosis much to the chagrin of the Turkish government. The only options that Turkey was willing to even consider was Takism (partition) or if that failed, independence for Cyprus. After returning from a visit to Turkey in 1956, Vice President Richard Nixon mentioned that Turkey was willing to go to war over Cyprus against their NATO ally Greece if the idea of Enosis were to become a reality.

The fear of a devolving relationship within NATO between the two allies over the issue of Cyprus was completely plausible. As it became apparent that Britain was losing
control over the situation, they continued claiming that their presence on the island was preventing a Civil War from occurring which would have drawn in both Greece and Turkey.\textsuperscript{122} Since both sides began fueling ethnic tensions by providing support to their respective communities, the idea of a war breaking out on Cyprus wasn’t far-fetched.\textsuperscript{123} The United States noted as early as 1951 that the brewing hostility within Cyprus was a dire threat to NATO and its interests within the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{124} These thoughts continued throughout the 1950s as the situation worsened when Secretary of State Dulles complained that the Cyprus situation was distracting NATO from the actual threat of Soviet Imperialism and that a compromise needed to be made.\textsuperscript{125}

In order to ease tensions, a compromise was reached. After much reluctance on the part of the Greek government, it was finally agreed on that Cyprus as an independent state was the best option.\textsuperscript{126} Although a deal was made in regards to Cyprus, the United States continued working on creating a better situation for NATO in regards to the final decision over the island. For the most part, the US officials were convinced that despite having made a compromise over Cyprus, Greece and the Greek Cypriots would continue to desire \textit{Enosis}.\textsuperscript{127} In order to sway Turkey towards the idea that that \textit{Enosis} would occur they tried to use the argument over the benefits of NATO. By allowing Greece to gain control over Cyprus, the argument was that this would allow for NATO basing rights which in turn would be instrumental in the struggle against Soviet interests within the
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Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{128} Despite the US warnings, Turkey would not budge on the issue and the compromise of independence took hold. Not everyone was satisfied with this outcome.

The effect of the Greek compromise on the issue of \textit{Enosis} was immediate. In the aftermath of this decision, the main opposition party in Athens began attacking the Karamanlis government for “betraying Hellenism” in favor of the interests of NATO and American factors.\textsuperscript{129} Rather than staying true to the ideals of the Greek state in promoting “Hellenism” the opposition felt that Karamanlis had strayed away from a major issue of Greek foreign policy which had been the incorporation of Cyprus into the Greek state. The argument presented against Karamanlis included that he had abandoned Greece’s one hundred fifty year struggle of national unification.\textsuperscript{130} By shifting away from \textit{Enosis}, Karamanlis began to lose support amongst the military as well.

Another major factor that was extremely dissatisfied with the decision to abandon \textit{Enosis} was General Georgios Grivas. This Cypriot-born Greek army officer already had gained a nasty reputation during the German occupation and the aftermath by leading the extreme right-wing, anti-Communist organization \textit{X} (Chi).\textsuperscript{131} After the Communists had been defeated, he even tried to set up his organization as a political party but failed due to most Greek politicians, including the staunch anti-Communists, viewing him as a pariah.\textsuperscript{132} So he returned to Cyprus to form \textit{EOKA} (National Organization of Cypriot Fighters) with the sole goal of achieving \textit{Enosis} with Greece.\textsuperscript{133} In particular, some of his
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tactics would be responsible for Turkey to take an even greater interest in protecting the Turkish Cypriot minority.\textsuperscript{134} When the agreement to form an Independent Cyprus was concluded, Grivas felt betrayed as he felt that his actions had been instrumental in the struggle to achieve \textit{Enosis}.\textsuperscript{135} At the same time as Grivas was conducting his campaign of terror in Cyprus, another monumental incident occurred that would be instrumental in creating a deeper rift between Greece and Turkey in their formative years with NATO.

The Greek-Turkish relationship within NATO would worsen with new events. As a conference was underway on the Cyprus issue, a bomb went off in Thessaloniki next to the house in which the founder of Modern Turkey, Ataturk had been born.\textsuperscript{136} Although the bomb was seen as the work of Turkish radicals, the effects of this offense would soon be felt through extreme measures.\textsuperscript{137} Throughout Turkey, this was seen as an outrage caused by the Greek nation and Turkish mobs reacted rather violently by instigating pogroms of the Greek populace in Istanbul and other major cities.\textsuperscript{138} The actions of the Turkish mobs and those of \textit{EOKA} would provide more political ammunition for both sides to use against one another in the years to come and make their working relationship within NATO more strained.

The worsening relationship with Turkey would also lead to the downfall of Karamanlis. Since 1955, when he had taken over after Papagos’ death, Karamanlis had received widespread support but upon making the decision to compromise on the issue of \textit{Enosis} he began losing support from two important institutions within Greek society: the

\textsuperscript{134}Glenny, 617-618
\textsuperscript{135}Clogg, 149
\textsuperscript{136}Glenny, 618
\textsuperscript{137}Glenny, 618
\textsuperscript{138}Clogg, 148
military and the Monarchy. The Monarchy was a particular troublemaker in that there were instances of this institution interfering into the political arena. In particular, Queen Fredericka had already proven to be a nuisance when her tactics had led to Papagos resigning his position of Commander-in-Chief of the Greek armed forces in the 1950s. Now King Constantine began a similar approach which eventually led to Karamanlis resigning as Prime Minister. Alongside of her son, Queen Fredericka would again prove to be an instrumental force in the eventual resignation. Meanwhile the military elements that had supported Enosis began questioning Karamanlis’ commitment on furthering the position of the Greek state as they began to note that he seemed to spend more time trying to gain support for elections rather than actually governing the state.

Another factor contributing to Karamanlis falling out of favor was in regards to allegations of election fraud. The opposition parties claimed that Karamanlis had allowed the army to use the NATO plan “Pericles”, which was meant to suppress internal security threats, and had applied it to the elections in order to prevent his party from losing their position of power. Although originally denied, these allegations would have some effect on events that were rapidly approaching. In fact, it would later be acknowledged by Colonel Georgios Papadopoulos that the military had been quite
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instrumental in achieving the election results to be beneficial towards the right-wing establishment.\textsuperscript{146}

At the same time as Karamanlis’ hold began to unfold, a new fear began to arise within the Greek political arena which would in turn undermine Greece’s relationship with NATO. The old fears of the left-wing began to reappear yet again during this period and would eventually lead to a massive historical event in the form of a military coup. The 1960s saw several events that threatened to upheave the right-wing control of the government. The first such instance occurred in regards to Dr. Grigoris Lambrakis. While speaking at a peace rally in Thessaloniki in May 1963, he was assaulted and would later die of his injuries.\textsuperscript{147} Due to the government seemingly approaching the investigation half-heartedly, suspicions began to arise that there had been some government complacency with the murder of Lambrakis.\textsuperscript{148} After a longer period of investigation the assassination of Lambrakis was found to have connections with several key figures in the police and the far-right underworld often referred to as the “parastate.”\textsuperscript{149} The investigation and the aftermath of this incident provided another reason for Karamanlis to resign and eventually leave Greece for self-imposed exile.\textsuperscript{150}

With these factors causing controversy for Karamanlis, it soon became apparent that a new change was coming in the political arena. This would be seen in the form of Georgios Papandreou. The fear surrounding these new developments would be that Georgios Papandreou, due to the influence that his leftist son Andreas had on him, could
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have undermined the relationship between NATO, the United States, and Greece which
the right-wing had been so boastful of during their eleven years of controlling the
government.\textsuperscript{151} Starting in 1961, he began exploiting the self-doubt of the right-wing to
his benefit by gaining support for his center-left party, the Center Union.\textsuperscript{152} Due to his
brilliant usage of exposing these weaknesses of right-wing self-doubt over the fallout
with Karamanlis, Papandreou even slowly began receiving favor from the United States,
who felt that a slight reformist approach might be beneficial to the country.\textsuperscript{153} By
becoming more self-reliant it was felt that Greece would be more self-confident of their
abilities and thus become a more stable ally.\textsuperscript{154} In fact, the United States had already
elaborated over the course of the late-1950s and early 1960s that they felt that it would be
beneficial for Greece to be a self-reliant ally within the NATO context.\textsuperscript{155} The feeling
was that Greece and NATO should not have to depend solely on one person or party thus
the United States was willing to allow these moderate reforms to occur.\textsuperscript{156}

However not everyone was pleased. The right-wing establishment felt particularly
threatened by this turn of events and even began pressuring King Constantine to
intervene.\textsuperscript{157} They didn’t need to convince the King too much, as Constantine was
extremely adamant about refusing to work with Papandreou in that he claimed that the

\textsuperscript{151}Close, 83
\textsuperscript{152}Clogg, 153
\textsuperscript{153}Clogg, 153
\textsuperscript{154}Miller, 69
\textsuperscript{155}Miller, 69
\textsuperscript{156}Miller, 67
\textsuperscript{157}Judt, 506
Center Union was too dependent on gaining support from the far left.\textsuperscript{158} Alongside of the King, the military felt extremely threatened by the rise of Papandreou.

As usual the military was up to its usual plotting. With fears growing over a left-wing victory in the upcoming elections, the first stages of the April 21, 1967 coup began to unfold. The origins of the eventual coup could be found with IDEA who had a long tradition of being involved with plotting.\textsuperscript{159} The roots of this organization could be traced back to World War Two, when their planning assured that the Greek military would remain the strongest backer of the Monarchy.\textsuperscript{160} Due to a strong alliance with NATO, the officers of the Greek army saw themselves as being the guardians of the state and were willing to commit whatever plan was required to assure that this would continue.\textsuperscript{161}

Finally a new threat presented itself in the rise of popularity of Georgios Papandreou who after his electoral victory in 1963 was a challenge to the established right-wing political culture.\textsuperscript{162} The right-wing and the army, feeling threatened by this turn in events, pressured King Constantine to force Georgios Papandreou into resignation.\textsuperscript{163} The Greek relationship with NATO was also threatened causing deep concern. This threat came in the form of Georgios Papandreou’s son, Andreas who might have worked behind the scenes to influence his father into possibly making a decision to leave NATO.\textsuperscript{164} Despite this perceived threat, Georgios Papandreou had publically stated
that Greece would continue to be a member of NATO and that the relationship with the United States would continue as well. However these promises would not be enough as King Constantine had Papandreou resign.

After Papandreou resigned, the government was headed by numerous interim Prime Ministers, each one failing to maintain control for more than a few months until 1967 when a new round of elections were to be held. In the weeks leading up to the elections, IDEA began to implement more measures of their plan that would eventually lead to the coup on April 21. They began to planting false flag operations in which they claimed that there was a left-wing conspiracy that consisted of the Communists and supporters of the slain Grigoris Lambrakis who were working together to undermine the Greek state. Finally the stage was set for the coup to take place.

With the elections five weeks away, the traditional right-wing fears began spreading about an imminent leftist victory that would destroy the basis of Greek society. With the anticipated victory of Papandreou looming, the military felt that something needed to be done to prevent this from happening. In particular, the future dictator, Colonel Georgios Papadopoulos saw the biggest threat in the form of Georgios Papandreou gaining victory yet again and the threat posed by the influence of Papandreou’s left-leaning son, Andreas. The US government seemed to feel the same way about Andreas. In his memoirs about his time as a counselor at the US embassy, future Ambassador to Greece Robert V. Keeley, mentioned that the CIA was extremely
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worried about the younger Papandreou and his supposed influence over his father to the point that they kept a large dossier of files on any activities that Andreas may possibly have been involved in.\textsuperscript{170} Part of the worries involving Andreas Papandreou was that he had harbored anti-NATO as well as anti-American views which had a strong appeal within the left-wing.\textsuperscript{171} By exhibiting these views, the CIA worried that Andreas might possibly undermine the relationship between Greece and the West.

Some of these fears were not entirely unfounded as a conspiracy had just been unearthed between leftist elements in the army and Andreas Papandreou which had led to a court-martial of twenty one officers.\textsuperscript{172} However, the fears of Communism in this regard seemed to be unfounded in that the officers who had been court-martialed expressed traditional liberal ideas.\textsuperscript{173} The gears of the military coup would set into motion another chapter of Greece’s relationship with NATO.
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Chapter 3: The Military Junta and NATO

On the morning of April 21, 1967, the world awoke to the news that a military coup had occurred within Greece. Due to the traditional fears of the “Red Peril,” the new Junta under Papadopoulos seemed to garner a lot of attention from the West. In particular, rather than actually condemn the Junta publically, NATO and other Western institutions continued working with it which would have disastrous consequences in several aspects including the Cyprus issue, continued human rights violations, and a disintegration of relations between Greece and Turkey. By draping themselves in the mantle of NATO, the Junta effectively tried to promote their government as being a key player within the organization.

The ability for the military to seize control of the Greek government was made possible by several means. In the weeks leading up to the coup, there were attempts on both sides to implement plans that were originally created by NATO. Several leading officers of the Greek military even approached the King to ask for permission to activate an old NATO plan which specified the ramifications necessary for the armed forces seizing control of the government, however Constantine stalled them which allowed word of the attempt to reach other parts of the army who began implementing their own coup.174 Meanwhile the eventual April 21 coup leaders began using an old NATO plan as
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well which was codenamed “Prometheus” which was originally drawn up as a countermeasure in the event of a Communist invasion from the North.\textsuperscript{175}

Due to distinct plans set out by \textit{IDEA}, which included shifting attention away from them, the secrecy which surrounded the eventual coup would remain in place until the instigators wanted it to be openly acknowledged. Since there was a distinct fear that the upcoming elections would lead to a left-wing government, those planning the coup had a motive which they could use in order to justify their necessity of gaining control over the establishment. These fears were not unfounded since there was a popular feeling amongst the Greek people that their government, with the Monarchy in particular, was playing a partisan role in determining the future of their country rather than focusing on the wishes of the people.\textsuperscript{176} Once the coup had succeeded, the new regime used the time-honored tradition of claiming that they were purely acting in order to protect the people from the imminent Communist victory.\textsuperscript{177}

For instance, when Papandreou had gained control a few years earlier, the military had derided him as being a “Trojan Horse” for Communist influence and thus considered that any victory for the left-wing would allow Greece to fall under the dangers of radical left-wing politics.\textsuperscript{178} By seizing control of the government before this could happen, the military officers behind \textit{IDEA}, could claim that they were in fact protecting the country from this influence. The swiftness of the coup surprised many. The implementation of the coup began in the early morning of April 21, with the mobilization of the Greek armed
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forces. At first, witnesses believed that it was just a strange maneuver being used by the army to test their capabilities but it soon became apparent that was a coup when tanks began pouring into the streets of Athens and surrounded the government buildings.

Within hours of this happening, several key politicians of the center and left had been rounded up and arrested. Even the interim Prime Minister, Panagiotis Kanellopoulos who headed the right-wing aspects of the government was taken by surprise and arrested by soldiers who claimed to do so for his “own protection.” Meanwhile the army’s favorite scapegoat, Papandreou tried to resist but when the soldiers took his son hostage and threatened to kill him, Papandreou surrendered. By imprisoning any suspected opposition to their coup, the military could begin implementing measures that would strengthen their grip on power.

The first months of control under the Junta saw several reactionary measures that were meant to change the outlook of the country into the vision of the military. Within this period, Papadopoulos went about and dismissed nearly one thousand civil servants while also imprisoning and exiling any politician that was seen as being too sympathetic to the left-wing. Meanwhile, the Junta began a process of removing dissent from the armed forces by removing over one third of the army’s officers who were seen as not being in line with the Junta’s values.
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Although the Communist party had long been outlawed, the Junta still claimed that it was an ever present threat. The leading members of the coup even went as far as to claim that they were forced into this position by the “virus of Communism.” As a part of the reaction against Communism, they continued the traditional right-wing fear mongering in regards to the “Menace from the North,” when it came to describing the threat that they felt would come from their Balkan neighbors.

In the months following their seizure of power, the Junta began interacting with NATO in a continued program of modernizing the Greek military to NATO standards. Although several members, particularly US secretary of defense McNamara, voiced their displeasure at the “rape of democracy,” they continued to work with the Junta in supplying the Greek military with weapons and other forms of assistance that were supposed to act as hindrances to any possible Communist threat. However, the member-states of NATO decided to wait for the United States to make the ultimate decision on whether to continue working with Greece under the Junta. The future US Ambassador to Greece, Robert Keeley pointed out in his memoirs, the coup divided the sentiments of the American embassy and eventually two possible options were explored: work with the status quo or intervene through military force. By January 1968, the United States chose to work with the status quo and recognize the Junta as the legitimate government of Greece.
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The reasoning behind a continued relationship with the Junta was to prevent a collapse of the defenses of Greece which in turn could lead to greater Soviet influence within the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{192} Although there were options available that would have toppled the Junta and allow for a return of democracy, the United States, and NATO as well, decided to begin work with the Junta.\textsuperscript{193} Rather than try to liberate Greece, which may have been beneficial for improving Greek relations with the United States, the feeling was that it would be better to work with the new government rather than risking a potential conflict.\textsuperscript{194} The feeling being that any attempts to oust the Junta would lead to a crisis within NATO which might have caused dire consequences.\textsuperscript{195}

Meanwhile the reaction of the Monarchy seemed to be extremely half-hearted. Due to having earlier been involved in the removal of Karamanlis, King Constantine had already suffered a decline of support amongst the military but his new actions would also lose him the support of the people.\textsuperscript{196} Rather than condemning the coup, Constantine legitimized it by swearing the coup leaders into positions of power.\textsuperscript{197} In particular, the “legitimacy” of Papadopoulos was established through this policy.\textsuperscript{198} However at the same time, the King was planning a counter-coup. As it would turn out to be, the coup itself was extremely weak and seemed to be only a half-hearted attempt after which King
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Constantine fled Greece with his family. The place of the Junta as Greece’s governing body was set.

The Junta tried to exhibit a style of rule that was similar to a previous dictatorship: that of Ioannis Metaxas. Since twelve of the fifteen leaders of the coup had undergone their officer training during the Metaxas regime, they tried to exalt similar positions although with fewer positive results. They began instigating changes throughout all fabrics of society in an attempt to provide a “moral compass” for Greek society. The Junta seemed to portray a sense of backwardness that could only be seen as being anti-Modern.

The Junta managed to gain and keep control through several channels. An important backer of their regime was the American CIA who had worked with Papadopoulos while he was a member of the Greek Central Intelligence Service, KYP. By supporting Papadopoulos and his regime, the CIA felt that they were continuing the tradition of working with trusted assets. After the United States lost several key military bases in Libya, they found that the Junta was more than willing to allow a larger US presence within Greece and allowed for more bases to be opened for the usage of the American military. In exchange for these bases, the American government continued supplying the Greek armed forces with weaponry. At the same time, Papadopoulos showed NATO that he was key ally by allowing an increase of military exercises to be
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conducted in Greek territory.\textsuperscript{206} In return, NATO refused to condemn the actions of the Junta towards its own people.\textsuperscript{207}

Meanwhile in terms of support within Greece, the Junta had several outlets as well. Due to the coup leaders’ positions prior to launching their plan, they had the full support of distinct aspects of military agencies as well as several important institutions of the Greek government including the Ministry of Public Security which would see an increase of over forty percent spending in the first two years of Junta rule.\textsuperscript{208} Also the middle-ranks of the officer corps throughout the armed forces proved to be a viable base of support since they were the most likely to receive promotion under the Junta due to the roots of most of the coup leaders.\textsuperscript{209}

At the same time another key institution provided support for the Junta and its values: the Orthodox Church. Under him, thirty-three bishops were removed due to their suspect allegiances and also replaced with militant anti-Communists.\textsuperscript{210} The support that the Orthodox Church exhibited during this period would still have consequences further down the line as they attempted to reestablish themselves after the fall of the Junta.\textsuperscript{211} In exchange for the support of the Orthodox Church, the Junta began implementing an official stance of “Helleno-Christianity.”\textsuperscript{212} By exhibiting this doctrine which stressed heavily on the role of Greek Orthodoxy within the state, the Junta could continue
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implementing measures against perceived Communist threats that were seen as being un-Hellenic and traitorous as the Junta’s role model Ioannis Metaxas had labeled them.

However, there would be several massive events that would undermine the Junta and its rule. One was the domestic issue presented by anti-government protests and the other was the foreign policy issues presented with the Cyprus situation. The Cyprus situation, in particular, would have a massive impact within NATO. In both instances, the Junta reacted in a way which led to their downfall.

The anti-government protests presented an interesting outlet against the Junta. They often came to be associated with funerals of several key anti-Junta figures. The first such incident occurred during the funeral of Georgios Papandreou in November 1968, when several thousand people showed up and called for a return to democracy.213 Even so early on in the Papadopoulos regime, there were cracks beginning to form in the fabrics of the society that they were attempting to set up. The next incident of this kind occurred at the funeral of Georgios Seferis in 1971. Seferis had been a vocal opponent of the Junta in the final years of his life and when he died, tens of thousands of people showed up at his funeral and began singing the banned Theodorakis rendition of Seferis’ poem “Denial.”214 Meanwhile several prominent and established politicians such as Kanellopoulos, who was the leader of the conservative element of the country, even began criticizing the Junta which meant that the regime was losing support from the right-wing who traditionally had been an ally.215 Although these protests were occurring, the Junta’s relationship with NATO continued to be strong. Due to the Junta being so
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willing to allow NATO to use Greek territory for training exercises, the organization turned a blind eye towards the violations occurring against the Greek people.\textsuperscript{216}

As all of this was occurring the Junta tried to make some reforms in the system to try and appease these people. In 1973, the possibility of returning to parliamentary rule began to be examined as Papadopoulos appointed Spyros Markenzis as the new Prime Minister.\textsuperscript{217} Part of this set of reforms included the abolishment of the Monarchy and the establishment of a Republic.\textsuperscript{218} For instance, due to still lacking real legitimacy, there were attempts to the constitution which would also provide some liberalization of public gatherings and other forms of protest.\textsuperscript{219} A lift on the ban of some of Mikis Theodorakis’ music also began to take place during this period; however it would not be enough.\textsuperscript{220}

Meanwhile new developments began to take hold within the domestic arena. On November 14, 1973, students occupied the Athens Polytechnic demanding change.\textsuperscript{221} Although some politicians were extremely sympathetic to the students such as Kanellopoulos, the Junta was in no mood to cooperate.\textsuperscript{222} After several days of standoff, the Junta sent out armored vehicles against the university on November 17 and claimed that the students were armed with rifles and bombs.\textsuperscript{223} In this context, the Greek military began using weaponry that had been supplied to them by NATO. To signal the end of this uprising, a tank, supplied to Greece from NATO, crushed the university gates and in the
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ensuing chaos anywhere between forty-three and eighty people was killed, while almost seven thousand people were arrested and hundreds wounded.\footnote{Close, 122} In the aftermath of the Polytechnic uprising, Papadopoulos was ousted in a countercoup by hardline Junta member Brigadier Dimitris Ioannidis.\footnote{Clogg, 163} Under Ioannidis, the situation with Greece’s NATO ally Turkey would almost lead to a full-scale war.

A foreign policy decision would mark the unraveling of the final strings of military rule in Greece. Cyprus had been an ever lingering presence within the psyche of Greek politicians since the flare-ups of violence in the 1950s against British control. Now the Junta tried to exert their position in this issue with a different yet extremely disastrous approach. As if relations with Turkey weren’t already at an all-time low due to a clash over the rights to oil discovered off the coast of the Greek island of Thasos, the Junta decided to provoke their neighbors with an even worse decision.\footnote{Clogg, 163}

In July 1974, President Makarios of Cyprus declared that almost all of the mainland Greek officers who were a part of the Cypriot National Guard needed to be removed after Ioannidis had been continually harassing him into accepting Athens as the “natural center of Hellenism.”\footnote{Clogg, 163} The Junta reacted by plotting a coup to overthrow Makarios.\footnote{Clogg, 163} By using Grivas and his organization EOKA, Ioannidis hoped to bring about the \textit{Enosis} between Greece and Cyprus.\footnote{Clogg, 163} Grivas was extremely pleased to comply as he

\begin{flushleft}
\footnote{Close, 122}
\footnote{Clogg, 163}
\footnote{Clogg, 163}
\footnote{Clogg, 163}
\footnote{Clogg, 163}
\footnote{Glenny, 621}
\end{flushleft}
had felt betrayed when earlier attempts had been shelved.\textsuperscript{230} Despite warnings from NATO members the coup took place on July 15, as \textit{EOKA} began implementing measures to overthrow Makarios by attacking the presidential palace and installing a puppet ruler who would then okay the objective of \textit{Enosis}.\textsuperscript{231} These decisions would soon have a major impact in the inner workings of NATO. In particular, the decision to instigate a coup against Makarios would draw one of Greece’s larger neighbors into the conflict and damage Greece’s already fragile relationship with Turkey.

These plans would have massive consequences since Turkey did not stand by idly as had been hoped. Although several NATO members, including the United States, would later claim that they had warned Greece against intervening in Cyprus, the coup which ousted Makarios want about as planned and for a few days it seemed that everything was going Greece’s way. But there were plans being put into motion on the Turkish side. Within five days of the Greek coup, Turkish forces invaded Cyprus from the north on July 20 and had seized almost two-fifths of the island by the end of the week.\textsuperscript{232} The reaction of the Junta spelled its doom as Ioannidis issued several different orders each of which was completely different from the previous one.\textsuperscript{233} Within days of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, the Junta’s grip on power had crumbled allowing for a gradual pathway back to democracy. The consequences surrounding the Junta’s decision
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to intervene into Cyprus would also affect the military’s role within politics and lead to an eventual return to democracy within Greece.\textsuperscript{234}

\textsuperscript{234}There are numerous sources relating to the Junta’s relationship with NATO that were unfortunately left unexamined due to time constraints.
Chapter 4: Democracy and NATO: Post-Junta Greece and a Changing Relationship

As the disaster of the decision to try and achieve Enosis with Cyprus became apparent, the Greek people demanded change. The bumbling of the Junta assured that the military would no longer be seen as a credible source of political power either.\textsuperscript{235} So finally within days of the Turkish invasion of Northern Cyprus, the Junta relented on July 23, 1974 and allowed for a transition of power back to a more democratic style of rule.\textsuperscript{236} With the collapse of the Junta, many of the exiled politicians began to return as well. Several of these politicians would even have a very important role to play in the coming years as Greece shifted away from Junta rule to democracy.

Karamanlis, who had been in self-imposed exile since 1963, would eventually return during this period and would eventually lead the first post-Junta government.\textsuperscript{237} Alongside of eight other prominent politicians, Karamanlis was invited back at the request of the Junta who had relented to the idea of a democratic state.\textsuperscript{238} At the same time as the government in Greece was undergoing this transformation, the question of Cyprus still loomed heavily over the incoming Karamanlis. He was faced with three
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options, each of which would have dire consequences. The three options that he faced included: war, ceasefire, or rearm the country for defensive purposes in case of Turkish irredentism. Within days, Karamanlis decided to go with a ceasefire in Cyprus and by July 30, the agreement was signed by him and his Turkish counterpart. Upon signing the ceasefire, Karamanlis could begin implementing changes pertaining to defensive measures against any possible future Turkish attacks. Meanwhile in protest to the complicity of NATO in this situation, Greece left the alliance in 1974 in order to protest the Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus and would continue to have consequences in regards to Greece’s future with NATO. Due to the perceived complicity, Greece felt that it would be prudent to avoid being a part of the military wing of NATO until the situation with Turkey had been properly solved. For a period of six years, Greece would remain outside of NATO to protest the actions that had occurred. During this period, Greece focused on domestic policies that were aimed at fixing the mistakes of previous governments.

At the same time, Karamanlis was faced with the dilemma of what to do with the members of the Junta while also preparing the country for elections. Rather than giving the prominent members of the Junta amnesty, a program was set up in which those who were involved with the coup and had played important roles in the violent repression
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policies would be charged and taken to court.\textsuperscript{245} Often these cases would be televised.\textsuperscript{246} After much deliberation, one hundred four people would be charged with crimes related to the Junta and its policies including being part of the coup, the torture of dissidents, and their roles in the Polytechnic massacre and its aftermath.\textsuperscript{247} The main officers behind the plots and the Junta, Ioannidis, Papadopoulos, Markenzis, and Pattakos all received numerous life sentences in regards to their role during this period.\textsuperscript{248} Meanwhile the officers who harbored pro-Junta views were retired from active duty while civilian appointees from the Junta period were also thoroughly investigated leading to one thousand people losing their jobs.\textsuperscript{249} The question on what to do in regards to the jailed Junta members would continue to come up throughout this period including a plan to pardon those imprisoned but before the plan was to go into motion, it was cancelled.\textsuperscript{250}

Alongside of these changes in all aspects of life that had been associated with the Junta, Karamanlis was also charged with assisting in the formation of a new government and the elections that would lead to the new government. One policy that was undertaken during this time was the legalization of the Communist party.\textsuperscript{251} This was a very different approach from Karamanlis’ first tenure as Prime Minister in which he had stressed that “International Communism” would bring about the downfall of democratic principles.\textsuperscript{252} By changing his tone on the issue of Communism, Karamanlis displayed a change in
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attitude from previous Greek governments who had been using NATO’s framework as a means of outlawing the KKE. In particular, it was a change from Karamanlis’ first tenure as Prime Minister when he had allowed the military to use NATO plan “Pericles” to disperse dissenters.

Meanwhile December 1974, saw a plebiscite in regards to the Monarchy which led to its abolishment. By abolishing such a prominent supporter of NATO, the Greek state began a real shift away from previous policies which were enacted to please the United States and other members of NATO. Once the elections took place, Karamanlis swept to power with his new party, New Democracy and began ascension talks with the European Economic Community (EEC) which had been frozen during the reign of the Junta. A new opposition party also appeared during this time in the form of PASOK (The Pan-Hellenic Socialist Movement) with Andreas Papandreou heading it. For almost the next forty years, New Democracy and PASOK would alternate in controlling the government through different points of post-Junta Greece’s history.

However, there were a few major issues in foreign policy affecting several key relationships. Greece’s relationship with Turkey, already strained due to the Cyprus crisis and its aftermath, continued to get worse. Due to several statements that seemed to be threatening Greek sovereignty in Western Thrace and the Aegean, Greek politicians seemed almost united in their stance against Turkey and seeing them as a threat. In particular, starting in 1975 the Turkish stance on the Aegean could be summed up in one
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phrase: “half of the Aegean belongs to Turkey.” By making irredentist statements in regards to Greek territory, the relationship between Greece and Turkey continued plummeting which in turn would have dire consequences in regards to Greece’s feelings towards continued membership within NATO.

During this period, Turkey began a series of provocations that can still be felt today. One way was to see how far Turkish military aircraft could get into Greek airspace before the Greek air force responded. These actions, alone, increased the threat of another conflict breaking out between the two sides. Also in violation of the 1952 International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) resolution, Turkey refused to notify Greece in regards to air traffic. The situation revolving around these two neighbors was quite tense during this period. In response to Turkish failure to adhere to the 1952 ICAO resolution, Greece cut off all flights to Turkey from 1974 until 1980 in a move similar to their decision to leave NATO. Meanwhile 1976 saw another crisis in the form of a Turkish surveillance vessel strafing into Greek territorial waters. Several Greek politicians, with Papandreou at the forefront, called for it to be sunk but Karamanlis decided that rather than risk another war, he would confer with the UN Security Council and the International Court of Justice on this issue. Had Karamanlis chosen to listen to his opponents, Greece may have risked yet another possible war with Turkey.
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Alongside of the continued issue on what to do in regards to relations with Turkey, the Karamanlis government was faced with another major foreign policy decision: what to do with the United States. Due to the long history of cooperation with these two entities, it would have been difficult to cut off all contact with the United States so the focus evolved around building a different relationship than previous governments.

The United States had been complacent in the organization of the Junta and was very instrumental in continuing assistance, so many Greeks were extremely resentful towards the US for having been so adamant in supporting Papadopoulos. The reasoning that was given on the part of the United States towards this situation was that they felt that the Junta presented the best alternative to another power struggle between the left and right that may possibly have devolved into another Civil War. However the new government wasn’t buying this excuse. In a similar move to the decision to move away from NATO, Karamanlis began a process of distancing Greece away from the United States. In fact, it was a major step away from the traditional role of Greece’s right-wing politics who had always boasted of their special relationship with the United States. The final straw was when rather than actually trying to resolve the situation in Cyprus; the United States seemed to hold back from condemning Turkey who was seen as an important ally in the region. By using this logic, it seemed as if the United States was implying that Greece’s contributions to NATO were not as important as those made
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by Turkey. Due to these perceptions, Karamanlis quickly began calling into question the future of American military bases within Greece.\textsuperscript{270}

Meanwhile Karamanlis was faced with several key decisions on the domestic front as well. One major point was to open up the examination of the recent past in regards to the Civil War. During Karamanlis’ tenure, there were numerous policies enacted that were beneficial towards those who had been involved in the Civil War on the losing side. Many of these decisions were quite the shift away from previous decisions enacted by the Greek right-wing political establishment. Along with legalizing the Communist party, several parts of the Greek legal system that had been designed to suppress the left-wing began to disappear including some of those that had been enacted in the 1920s by Venizelos.\textsuperscript{271} In particular, laws that had empowered the police to arrest people based on the suspicion of being subversive were removed, often in their entirety.\textsuperscript{272} This was a complete shift from the Greek governments of the past which had refused to acknowledge the contributions of the left-wing during the German occupation and its aftermath.

Some of these decisions would have consequences in the future elections as the ultra-right-wing aspect of New Democracy ended up defecting to the extreme far-right party, The National Camp.\textsuperscript{273} This defection ended up eventually costing New Democracy the election to PASOK under Papandreou.\textsuperscript{274} The next few years would see a continued policy of trying to solve issues from its Cold War past. By starting a larger
focus on domestic issues, the Greek state began to implement measures that focused on aspects that had been unsolved by Greece’s position within NATO.

With Andreas Papandreou’s rise to power in the 1980s there was a continuation of the process of rehabilitating the left-wing from the post-Civil War period. Upon gaining control of the Greek government in 1981, Papandreou began a process of removing legal restrictions for political exiles that were ethnically Greek but had chosen the wrong side in the Civil War. Although the right-wing opposed these ideas, the effects were almost immediately seen. In the period following 1981, nearly forty-five thousand political exiles and their families began to return alongside of two hundred eighty thousand resistance veterans finally receiving pensions. It was a drastic step away from old policies enacted by the right-wing in their attempts to suppress the left-wing.

Alongside of these new policies, the new government under Andreas Papandreou saw through changes in other aspects of life that had been previously ignored by their predecessors who had been too attached into pleasing their allies in NATO. In particular, part of Andreas Papandreou’s rise to power came through the emphasis he put on NATO’s complicity in allowing the Junta to rule Greece for seven years. He played deeply on the humiliation of the Junta period by playing on the strong nationalist sentiment that had always been exhibited within Greek society. Although he played on the nationalist and anti-Junta sentiment, Andreas Papandreou had some differences from his predecessors.
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Rather than just focusing on military issues, the government began a process of enacting new laws that would focus on the family and empowering women.\textsuperscript{279} This was a major shift away from previous governments such as those under Papagos who had focused mostly on strengthening the military. However \textit{PASOK} still showed some of the mentality of their counterparts in the right-wing. For instance, when Karamanlis pulled Greece out of NATO in the aftermath of the Cyprus debacle, it was \textit{PASOK} which had voiced the opposition to this idea.\textsuperscript{280} Even though Papandreou was thought to harbor anti-NATO viewpoints, he expressed the complete opposite in this context. The argument that he presented was more of that he felt that NATO needed to be two-sided in that they would follow Greece’s interests in reciprocation of Greece supporting NATO’s interests.\textsuperscript{281} However under Papandreou’s tenure, the relationship with NATO remained rather rocky.

During the first few months of his tenure, Papandreou asked NATO for a guarantee of Greece’s sovereignty against Turkish ambitions which were met with silence.\textsuperscript{282} Due to these slights, the Greek government responded with refusing to partake in official NATO exercises in the Eastern Mediterranean as a sign of protest against the continued Turkish harassments.\textsuperscript{283} It was also during this period that the Greek government began drastic steps that were away from the NATO norm. One such incident involved Greece’s understanding with the Jaruzelski’s regime in Poland. Rather than condemn the Jaruzelski regime for human rights abuses, the Papandreou government
began implementing several policies in which they would work together.\textsuperscript{284} Rather than join the rest of the West in isolating Poland, Papandreou would be the first leader from the Western European states to visit.\textsuperscript{285} Another similar occurrence happened in regards to the Soviet Union. When the Soviets shot down a Korean airlines flight, the Greek government refused to condemn the USSR and would continue a similar approach in regards to the Soviet abuses of human rights.\textsuperscript{286} Policies such as these also showed a distinct break from the traditional subservience to NATO and the West.

However there were policies in which Greece took a more progressive stance than their previous governing parties had allowed for. One such way was in the normalization of relations with their Balkan neighbors. In particular, Greece began a process of normalcy with Bulgaria and Albania which had not been undertaken by previous governments. In regards to Bulgaria, Greece had always been extremely mistrustful and worried about the potential of a Bulgarian invasion of Northern Greece due to historical basis. Now however in the 1980s, the two states began a process of improving their relations beginning in 1986 when the two sides agreed to cooperate in assessing potential security threats to their respective countries.\textsuperscript{287} Also the restrictions in regards to traveling across the Greek-Bulgarian border began to ease a bit and traffic between the two countries increased.\textsuperscript{288} This was a dramatic shift away from the fears that Greece always portrayed in regards to their neighbors. By normalizing relations with Bulgaria,
the Greek government began to transition away from the “Menace from the North” fears which had led to Greece joining NATO in the first place.

A similar situation began to develop in regards to Albania. Since 1940, the two sides had technically been in a state of war that had never been resolved but in 1985 both countries finally agreed to sign a treaty officially ending the hostile situation.\footnote{Judt, 505} Similar policies began being implemented in regards to internal situations. Greece finally agreed to put an end to funding Greek separatists in Albania and also an agreement was reached on the finalization of the borders between the two states after Greece agreed to abandon the idea of Northern Epirus.\footnote{Close, 275-277} For the first time in years, both sides began a process of normalizing their relations.

Meanwhile Greece also began internal measures in regards to the previous treatments of their non-Greek minorities. The 1990s began a process of removing some of the restrictions that had been placed on Slavic languages and culture while also allowing for exiles to return and visit their families.\footnote{Close, 128} Similar policies were enacted in regards to the people who had been forcibly deported from Greece for not speaking Greek. During this time, the people who had been deported for speaking non-Greek languages were finally allowed to return to their native villages after such a long period of exile.\footnote{Close, 87} As was the case with so many decisions in post-Junta Greece, this was quite a drastic shift from the previous governments who had made so many attempts to suppress
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the non-Greek cultures in order to prevent any support in case of an attack from any of the “Menace from the North” states.

Meanwhile Greece’s relationship with Yugoslavia changed drastically in this period as well. Since the late 1940s, Greece had presented itself as the “middleman” for the West and Yugoslavia but new developments would soon make this guarantee obsolete. Beginning in the early 1990s, Yugoslavia began disintegrating into violent conflict between different ethnic groups. It was during this point that Greece decided to side with the Serbs in their conflicts against the Croats, Bosnians, and Kosovars. Rather than condemning Serbia for its actions, Greeks from all walks of life seemed to portray major support for their Orthodox brethren.\textsuperscript{293} This was a particular shift away from the official NATO stance which focused on condemning Serbia for their actions. In this case, the Orthodox Church came back to the forefront. Since the collapse of the Junta, the Orthodox Church had suffered some setbacks in regards to their official support of the Papadopoulos regime but now with this new conflict occurring within a neighboring country, there was a feeling that they would be able to regain their place as a dominant political factor.\textsuperscript{294}

Even the Ecumenical Patriarch stressed the importance of Orthodox Christianity in this struggle between the former Yugoslavia and stressed that it was a necessary duty to support Serbia.\textsuperscript{295} Alongside of the religious factor though was the notion that Serbia had always been Greece’s ally in such an unstable environment such as the Balkans.\textsuperscript{296}
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The support of Serbia never went further than rhetoric and in a few cases volunteers, mostly from the extreme right-wing. When Serbia’s leader Milosevic offered Greece a secret deal in which the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia would be partitioned between the two, it was rejected. By rejecting this proposal, Greece could assure their NATO allies that they were merely passively opposed to NATO’s mission within the Yugoslav conflict.

Meanwhile relations with Turkey started to become tense yet again. Since the 1974 Cyprus issue, Greek-Turkish relations had been on an extremely rocky road with each Greek government making it clear that the biggest threat to Greece was in the form of Turkey. In the aftermath of the debacle in Cyprus, Greece had pushed NATO for setting up an intra-NATO dispute settlement mechanism which would focus on solving such issues in a peaceful solution rather than through violence. The dispute settlement would not be implemented which would nearly lead Greece and Turkey towards the brink of war over two key issues: Imia and Cyprus.

Cyprus was still a rather hot and tense issue in the 1990s but another issue caught Greece’s attention in their standoff with Turkey. Beginning in December 1995, both sides began arguing over who owned the rights to a small, uninhabited island known as Imia (Kardak in Turkish). A Turkish ship crashed on Imia and when Greece offered assistance, Turkey refused claiming that it was Turkish territory. Greece responded by
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sending a party over to the island and placing a Greek flag on it, and the Turkish response was to send a group of journalists over to tear down the Greek flag and replace it with the flag of Turkey.\textsuperscript{303} This process would continue for several months until both sides began gearing up for another war upon which the United States intervened and tried to defuse the situation.\textsuperscript{304} Another factor that contributed to the brink of war was a Greek helicopter crashing on the island.\textsuperscript{305} The situation between the two NATO allies was on the brink of war.

However, it would be Cyprus yet again which would bring the two sides closest to war. Since 1974, this issue in particular had caused Greece the most grief in regards to their relationship with other NATO members particularly Turkey and the United States. As it became apparent that the European Union was exploring the possibility of allowing Cyprus in, Turkey made it clear that the northern half of the island which had been under Turkish occupation since 1974 would become a permanent part of Turkey if allowed to happen.\textsuperscript{306} In 1996, several clashes along the ceasefire line led to the deaths of five people (four Greek-Cypriots and one Turkish-Cypriot) including the highly televised deaths of two Greek-Cypriot cousins.\textsuperscript{307} These deaths caught the attention of the world and were still massive hotbeds of controversy after it later became apparent that Turkey had shipped in far-right extremists to agitate the protestors.\textsuperscript{308} The reaction of the Turkish Prime Minister, in response to this incident caused more agitation in that the statement
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made it quite clear that they did not care that these deaths occurred since they happened because the Greek-Cypriots were insulting the Turkish flag.\footnote{309}{“Turks Kill 2, Injure 50 in Protest Against Continuing Occupation.”}

A few years after these events, the relations between Turkey and Greece improved again after the new Prime Minister of Greece, Kostas Simitis, made it clear that the Greek position on blocking Turkey from the EU would no longer be the case.\footnote{310}{Close, 273} This promise, though, asked for Turkey to cede all claims on the Aegean islands and also assist in forming an agreement on the Cyprus issue that both sides could agree to.\footnote{311}{Couloumbis, Kariotis, and Bellou, 36} This was a drastic change from the previous decades in which the two NATO allies were nearly at war over several issues.

Meanwhile there were several other important developments that had been occurring in the Balkans during this period. In the years leading up to the continued hostility between Turkey and Greece, Communism had collapsed throughout the Balkans and the “Menace from the North” factor could now be used in a different context: immigration. As examined in the film, \textit{Ulysses’ Gaze} by Angelopoulos, the Greek response to the increase of immigration would often lead to deportation.\footnote{312}{Vangelis Calotychos. \textit{Balkan Prospect: Identity, Culture and Politics in Greece since 1989}. (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 1} The feelings of the “Menace from the North,” although no longer an issue in regards to Greek ambitions within NATO, were now being directed towards the more traditional, nationalist idea in this context.
Meanwhile Greece did change some of their stances in regards to their neighbors’ attempts at gaining membership into prestigious alliances during this point. After agreeing to finally follow through on their alliance with NATO, Greece began sending peacekeeping forces into Kosovo.\(^\text{313}\) The main goal was to promote a stable region.\(^\text{314}\) However, not everyone was pleased by this decision and the government faced criticism that claimed that the Greek government was continuing a policy of bowing down to the wishes of the Great Powers rather than doing what was best in the interests of Greece and other Orthodox countries.\(^\text{315}\) However the Greek government ignored this criticism and continued policies that were seen as promoting a more stable region. When the successor to Milosevic in Serbia was assassinated, the Greek Foreign Minister Georgios Papandreou (the grandson of Prime Minister Georgios Papandreou and son of Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou) issued a statement in which he urged efforts to be undertaken in which Greece’s Balkan neighbors would be accepted into organizations such as NATO and the European Union.\(^\text{316}\) This was a particular shift away from the previous “Menace from the North” dismissal of Greece’s neighboring countries.

There are still numerous issues facing Greece today in regards to the setup of the post-Junta years and policies enacted during this period. In particular, it appears as if there have been steps taken to change the dynamic of Greece being the West’s tool in spying on the Balkans. Since 1974, Greece made decisions that they felt would be more beneficial for their situation rather than toeing the official NATO line as they had been.
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prone to do in the years following the defeat of Communism in the Civil War. During their process of democratization and away from military rule, there were several effective changes that were undertaken which slowly shifted Greece away from NATO and more in line with their co-religionists. In fact, with the collapse of Communism throughout Eastern Europe, Greece took steps to have stronger relations with Serbia, and Russia. Now in the midst of an economic crisis, Greece has begun implementing new measures that might lead to a drastic change of its position within both NATO and the European Union.
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Conclusion

Throughout its relationship with NATO, Greece has been in different positions. For the most part, NATO treated Greece as a second-class member for most of the sixty years that Greece has been a member of this alliance. Whether it was in regards to refusing to work with democratically elected leaders due to the potential of them being left-leaning or the willingness to work with the Papadopoulos regime despite its extreme repression against its own people, NATO has caused quite a few grievances within Greek society which have led to a major unraveling between the two sides. The next few years might bring about major changes in this dynamic due to Greece’s internal factors.

2015 saw the election of Syriza a left-wing political party in the midst of Greece’s economic crisis. Part of this economic crisis can be traced back to the defense expenditure that Greece invested in during the Cold War period during their six decades long relationship with NATO and the West. A potential exit of NATO has also been called for by the new party in charge which would be a drastic change from over six decades of Greece being within this organization.\(^{318}\) Despite assurances from previous governmental officials that a Greek exit from NATO would never occur, there are rumblings from Syriza that appear to have the potential of throwing Greece’s membership within NATO into jeopardy. Alongside of its membership within the European Union

being in potential jeopardy, Greece is potentially sliding towards its position at the outset of World War Two, where they weren’t entangled within alliances with the larger states. Only time will be able to judge what pathway Greece will choose in these upcoming years.
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Appendix: Important Dates

1912-1913: The Balkan Wars leads to Greece expanding its territory. Many Slavic people would now find themselves under a government that saw them as a potential threat.

1919-1922: Greece invades the Ottoman Empire, leading to the collapse of the Empire and the rise of the Modern Turkish state. Under Ataturk, the Turks manage to repulse the Greek army. During this period, many Greeks were forced to flee their ancestral homes.

1923: The Treaty of Lausanne leads to a population exchange between Turkey and Greece. Christians are sent to Greece and Muslims are sent to Turkey.

1920s: Greek fears over Communism, leads Eleftherios Venizelos to begin enacting legislature designed to target the growth of Communism. Numerous Trade Union members and suspected Communists are jailed.

4 August 1936: Ioannis Metaxas seizes control of the Greek government and begins targeting suspected Communists. Due to being ostracized, many people who were arrested have nowhere to turn to but the Communist party.

1940-1951: Over a period of eleven years, about eighty thousand non-Greeks are deported from their villages and not allowed to return until much later.

28 October 1940: The Italians offer an ultimatum to Ioannis Metaxas who rejects it leading to Greece entering World War Two. Italy invades Greece through Albania and Greek forces successfully repulse the Italian invasion leading to eventual German
intervention. A state of war would remain between Greece and Albania for nearly four decades after this event.

6 April 1941: Germany invades Greece and overruns the country within six weeks. For the next three years, Greece faces German occupation and several resistance movements including the National Liberation Movement (ELAS) and the National Republican League (EDES) are formed.

October 1944: Greece is liberated from German occupation and the two rival resistance groups, the Communist-led National Liberation Movement (ELAS) and the British-backed National Republican League (EDES) begin fighting each other. The beginning motions of the Greek Civil War are set into motion.

3 December 1944: Communist protestors are fired upon by Greek policemen in Syntagma (Constitution) Square in Athens. The British begin supplying known collaborators with weaponry to defeat the Communists.

September 1946: In a heavily criticized plebiscite, the Monarchy is reinstated. Britain achieves one of its goals of trying to implement a prewar status quo.

March 1947: At the urging of President Harry Truman, Greece is included in his Truman Doctrine. The Marshall Plan is also implemented and Economic aid from the United States begins flowing into Greece as the Government tries to defeat the Communist insurgency.

1947: The Greek Government implements Law 509 which outlaws the Communist party and would remain in effect until it is repealed almost thirty years later.
4 April 1949: The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is formed.

16 October 1949: The last Communist insurgents are defeated and stream across the borders into neighboring countries such as Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria. For the next few months, the Greek Communists would occasionally conduct raids into Northern Greece.

1950: Alongside of Turkey, Greece begins sending troops to Korea as part of the NATO mission. Despite not being members of this organization, Greek and Turkish willingness to send troops to combat Communism is noted with interest by NATO.

1952: Alexander Papagos, the hero of the Greco-Italian War and the Civil War, is elected Prime Minister. During his tenure, there are numerous steps taken to strengthen Greece’s military over fears of a potential invasion from any of their neighboring countries. During this period, the United States would begin opening military bases in Greece.

February 1952: Greece’s membership into NATO is ratified. The effect is nearly immediate as the Greek military begins receiving newer equipment to replace their outdated technology.

1953-1964: Greece is ruled by a series of right-wing governments who are extremely boastful of their relationship with the United States, NATO and the West.

1955: Papagos dies after a long period of illness and is succeeded by Kostantinos Karamanlis. Growing tensions over Cyprus leads to Pogroms and deportations of almost the entire population of Greeks throughout major cities in Turkey, leading to growing mistrust.
1 April 1955: Far-right nationalist Georgios Grivas founds the National Organization of Cypriot Fighters (EOKA). Many of his actions would contribute to Turkey becoming agitated and taking a deeper interest against the possible Enosis (Union) between Greece and Cyprus.

19 February 1959: A compromise is reached over Cyprus, leading to independence. Karamanlis is verbally attacked as having compromised on the issue of Enosis leading to the beginning of his downfall.

1960: During the elections, the Greek military implements NATO plan “Pericles” to disperse dissenters. Although originally denied, it would be confirmed by Colonel Georgios Papadopoulos in the future.

16 August 1960: Cyprus’ independence is proclaimed much to the chagrin of several key figures within Greek society including Georgios Grivas who feels dissatisfied with the result.

22 May 1963: Dr. Grigoris Lambrakis, a prominent left-wing politician, is brutally attacked at a peace rally and dies five days later (27 May). After an investigation, the assassins are found to have ties with the Greek police as well as the far-right “parastate.” Karamanlis downfall continues.

1963: Georgios Papandreou is able to exploit the self-doubt within the right-wing and becomes Prime Minister of Greece. King Constantine, alongside of the more reactionary elements of the right-wing, refuses to work with him claiming that Papandreou relies on support from the far-left. After pressure from the military and other elements of the right-wing, King Constantine forces Papandreou to resign.
1963-1967: Greece is ruled by numerous interim Prime Ministers until it is eventually decided that elections are to be held in May 1967.

21 April 1967: With the elections a month away, the Sacred Bond of Hellenic Officers (IDEA) instigates a coup that overthrows the government and replaces it with a military dictatorship. King Constantine “legitimizes” the government and for the next seven years Greece is ruled by a Junta. The most prominent member of the Junta is Georgios Papadopoulos.

1967-1968: The member-states of NATO are at odds over whether to continue working with the Junta and wait on the actions of the United States before making their final decision. In January 1968, the United States recognizes the Junta is Greece’s legitimate government and NATO continues working with Greece.

1 November 1968: Georgios Papandreou dies and thousands show up at his funeral to protest the Junta. It is the first of many anti-Junta protests to occur.

20 September 1971: The poet Georgios Seferis, a prominent anti-Junta activist, dies. His funeral becomes a massive anti-Junta rally in which the poem “Denial” is sung.

1973: Georgios Papadopoulos abolishes the Monarchy and begins a process of liberalization. During this period several extreme measures implemented by the state are removed.

14-17 November 1973: the Athens Polytechnic University is occupied by students demanding change. The students become symbolic by including radio transmissions that they broadcast to the world. On the evening of 17 November 1973, the final radio
transmission is cut short by the sounds of a Greek tank breaking down the gate of the university. In the ensuing chaos, between forty-three and eighty people are killed and thousands arrested. Papadopoulos is overthrown by Junta hardliner Dimitris Ioannidis.

15 July 1974: After Makarios voices displeasure over the Junta and the Greek military presence in Cyprus, EOKA is employed to overthrow the President and replace him in order to finally achieve Enosis.

20 July 1974: Turkey reacts by invading Northern Cyprus. Within days, almost forty percent of the island is in Turkish hands.

24 July 1974: The Junta finally relents and caves in to democracy. Several key Greek politicians such as Kostantinos Karamanlis begin to return paving way for the transition towards a Democratic society.

30 July 1974: A peace treaty is signed over the issue of Cyprus. However, rather than withdraw their troops, Turkey begins an occupation of the Northern half of the island that is still in place to the present day. Greece withdraws from NATO in protest over this situation.

1974: Law 509 is repealed and the Communist party is legalized. Afterwards during the election, Karamanlis wins in a landslide. His main opponent would be Andreas Papandreou.

1974-1980: Greece remains outside of the NATO framework. During this period, Turkey begins a series of provocations including ignoring international laws over aviation,
sovereign waters and infringing into Greek air space. Some of these provocations occur to the present day. These provocations would lead to an increased defense spending.

1981: Andreas Papandreou becomes Prime Minister based on claims blaming the United States for the implementation of the hated Military Junta. For the next eight years, Papandreou would be Prime Minister. During his tenure, resistance veterans from World War Two are finally honored. NATO ignores Greece’s request for a territorial guarantee against Turkey.

1984: Greece and Bulgaria begin a process of normalization. Traffic between the two countries begins and they begin cooperating on regional security.

1985: Greece and Albania finally resolve their state of war that had been in effect since 1940. A period of normalization begins between the two neighbors.

1989: Cracks begin appearing throughout the Warsaw Pact countries and Communist regimes begin falling throughout Eastern Europe.

1990: The Communist regime in Bulgaria falls. Almost immediately immigration from Bulgaria begins. Greek restrictions on Slavic languages and cultures begin to ease.

1991-1999: Yugoslavia begins a process of breaking apart. During this period, ethnic cleansing begins. Rather than condemning Serbia like the rest of NATO, Greece stands firm on their commitment of supporting the Serbs through rhetoric and ignoring the embargo.

1992: The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) declares independence from Yugoslavia. Almost immediately Greece begins arguing over whether they have the
right to use an Ancient Greek name. Meanwhile, the Communist regime in Albania collapses and immigration from Albania begins almost immediately.

1995: NATO begins intervening into the Bosnian Conflict. Greece refuses to participate and condemns NATO’s actions.

1996: Kostas Simitis takes office as Prime Minister. Under him, the Greek government begins a process of fulfilling their obligations to NATO. Situations between Turkey and Greece escalate over two issues: Cyprus and the islet of Imia. In August, several Greek-Cypriots and one Turkish-Cypriot are killed in violent confrontations, leading to Greece and Turkey nearly being on the brink of war.

1999: The Kosovo conflict breaks out. NATO begins sending in peace keepers that would eventually include one thousand five hundred Greek soldiers due to the Greek government’s desire to promote regional peace.

2000: Kostas Simitis lifts the Greek protests over Turkish attempts at joining the European Union. It is made clear, however, that Greece would only support Turkey joining the EU if a solution were found for Cyprus that would work for both sides.

2003: Slobodan Milosevic’s successor in Serbia is assassinated. Greece’s Foreign Minister, Georgios Papandreou (the grandson of the former Prime Minister Georgios Papandreou and son of former Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou) asks NATO and the European Union to accelerate the process of allowing the other Balkan countries into these alliances in the interests of regional security.
2009-present: Greece’s economy tanks leading to a serious financial crisis that has put the country into heavy debt. After nearly six years of austerity programs, the Greek financial situation has still not improved.

29 January 2015: Anti-European Union, Anti-NATO party Syriza wins the Greek election. There are several comments being made from Syriza which have put Greece’s position within both the European Union and NATO into jeopardy.