

**The 2nd LSE PhD Symposium on Modern Greece: Current Social Science Research on Greece**

**Name:** Anna- Elisabeth Tsakona, 3<sup>rd</sup> year PhD student, Faculty of History, Peterhouse, University of Cambridge, UK

**e-mail:** aet27@cam.ac.uk

**Title** : Anti-Americanism in Greece: the case of Kosovo, 1999

## Introduction

After the wars in Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia, the Kosovo war and the air campaign launched by NATO in the former Yugoslavia (March-June 1999) was the culmination of a long crisis<sup>1</sup>. In Greece, according to a number of opinion polls conducted for various Greek media outlet, over 95 percent of the population was against the war. Other opinion polls showed that 91 percent of Greeks declared themselves ‘not at all satisfied’ with the attitude of the European Union and 94.4 percent had a negative opinion about President Bill Clinton.<sup>2</sup> At the height of the NATO bombing campaign against Serbia, the US embassy in Athens was besieged by daily demonstrations in support of the Serbs and against the war. Anti-American demonstrations were also held almost every day not only in the Greek capital but around the country. Politician Andreas Andrianopoulos recalled that ‘the leaders of the western powers and President Bill Clinton in particular, were branded as cold-blooded executioners selfishly devoted to the destruction of a virtuous nation (Serbia). Therefore, it can be hardly surprising that Greek public opinion condemned NATO/US policy in Kosovo.’<sup>3</sup> Indeed, in the words of Alexis Papachelas, a Greek journalist in the leading daily *Vima*, ‘the Greek reaction to the Kosovo crisis was the result of 80 percent of the Greek anti-American feelings and only 20 percent of the Greek solidarity towards the Serbian people’.<sup>4</sup>

In this paper the focus will be on the reaction of Greek political figures to the crisis and the degree to which this reaction could be related to anti-American sentiments. A detailed analysis is pursued on the views and comments of members of the major political

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a great amount of literature regarding the breake up of Yugoslavia. See Bennett, C., 1995, “Yugoslavia’s Bloody Collapse: Causes, Course and Consequences”, London: Hurst

Glenny, M., 1999, “The Balkans, 1894-1999”, London: Granta Books.

Gow, J., 1997, “Triumph of the Lack of Will: International Diplomacy and the Yugoslav War”. London: Hurst, 1997,

Judah, T., 1997, “The Serbs: History, Myth, and the Destruction of Yugoslavia”, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

<sup>2</sup> Source, V-Project Research Consulting: [www.balkanunity.org/yugoslav/english/greek.htm](http://www.balkanunity.org/yugoslav/english/greek.htm).

<sup>3</sup> Personal interview with Mr. Andrianopoulos, Athens, 08/05/2002

<sup>4</sup> Personal interview with Mr. Papachelas, Athens, 24/04/2002.

formations represented in the Greek parliament. This paper is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the way the war in Kosovo was perceived by Greek political leaders and the stance towards the crisis held by the government. The second part focuses on the causes of the war and the way Greek politicians viewed NATO and its new role in the international environment.

## 1. This war is wrong

All politicians of all political persuasions were unanimous in condemning the air campaign. Both the government and the opposition used the same arguments to denounce NATO's decision to strike Serbia. The only variation was the language used. They all proclaimed that air strikes in Kosovo was an incorrect decision for three reasons. The first one was that the allied bombing threatened to alter the status quo and this would cause a great number of refugees to flee the former Yugoslavia. The second reason was that the war could spill into other regions and could cause the whole area to destabilize. The third reason was that it was an illegal war since there was no UN Resolution authorising military action against Serbia.

Regarding the first issue, a general doctrine that all Greek foreign ministers followed was the 'preservation of the status quo', based on the perception that Milosevic was actually a stabilising factor and that Serbia did not threaten the status quo. Yugoslavia was a strong military and economic force in the Balkans and for successive Greek governments it was a guarantee of stability in the region. The majority of Greek politicians held the view that a change in the status quo would lead to a huge number of refugees fleeing the former Yugoslavia and seeking shelter in neighbouring countries such as Greece. One of the challenges the Greek government was facing was the need to protect the Greek Community in Southern Albania. There was a distinct possibility that if Muslims refugees settled in the southern part of Albania and in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia they would outnumber the Orthodox population. In addition, there was fear over the possibility that refugees would take over Greek properties that were temporarily abandoned by Greeks who had moved back to Greece out of fear of the consequences of the war.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The minister of Foreign Affairs arranged a special meeting with his Albanian counterpart to talk about this issue and to come to an agreement. The Greek foreign minister seemed to be satisfied with the Albanian Minister's reassurances that the properties of the Greek minority would remain intact. Cited in Papadioxou. K.P., 'Minima pros Tirana gia ti mionotita', *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999, p. 5. See also the comments made by the government representative Dimirtis Reppas cited in Kalliri, F., 'Sinoliki Europaiki politiki kai katamerismo ton prosfigon se oli tin Europi ziti I Ellada', *Kathimerini*, 6/4/1999, p.5

Also the president of the Greek Conservative Party, K. Karamanlis, pointed out that ‘abolition of the existing borders inevitably means the emergence of a great wave of refugees who will seek shelter in neighbouring and more prosperous countries such as Greece.’<sup>6</sup> In fact all members of the Greek Conservative Party focused on the issue of refugees and urged the government to take special precautions.<sup>7</sup>

Andreas Andrianopoulos, also a member of the Greek conservative party, and one of the few politicians who openly supported the war in Kosovo, held a different view regarding the issue of refugees. Unlike his colleges who presented the large wave of refugees as a consequence of the allied bombing, Andrianopoulos tried to stress the fact that people were fleeing their home towns long before the allied operations in order to avoid ethnic cleansing:

Since 1992, I have repeatedly stressed the wider consequences of ethnic cleansing committed in Yugoslavia, namely the possibility of a great number of refugees fleeing their country and heading south. This would cause the persecution of Orthodox Greeks who live in southern Albania and it would urge Greece to intervene for their protection. This in turn might urge Albania to ask for Turkey’s support and so on and so forth. It makes me sad to see that my fears are becoming reality.<sup>8</sup>

Giorgos Karatzaferis, member of the Greek Conservative Party with extreme right and nationalistic views, who was later expelled from the Party, formed his own political formation and also became member of the European Parliament, also focused on the issue of refugees. In his own interpretation of the events:

The Albanian government is determined to use NATO air strikes in Yugoslavia in order to achieve its goal of exterminating the Greek minority in Albania. According to testimonies by Greeks living in the area, the government is systematically encouraging Bosnian Muslims, Turks and Egyptians to settle in villages occupied by Orthodox population who has temporarily moved to Greece. There have also been cases where Albanian courts have allowed Albanian citizens to claim arable lands as well as areas belonging to Orthodox monasteries. At the same time Albanians have given the right to Turkey to install four bases on Albanian soil.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> See the comments made by Konstantinos Mitsotakis, Miltiades Evert, Ioannis Varvitsiotis and Dora Bakogianni in: ‘Omofonia Karamanli-Mitsotaki sti ND’, editorial, *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999, p.9

<sup>8</sup> Andrianopoulos, A., ‘Tis Apopsis mou tha tis dikeosi o xronos’, *Eleftheros Typos*, 18/4/1999, p. 31

<sup>9</sup> Karatzaferis, N., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Session PIB’, 26/4/1999, p. 6122

The second reason why the majority of Greek politicians, regardless of political persuasion, were against this war was their inner fear of a spill over of the war and of the destabilization of the whole region. Even recently, the former foreign minister of the Greek socialist party PASOK and currently President of the Greek Republic, Karolos Papoulias, expressed his concern over the situation in the Balkans after the disintegration of Yugoslavia: ‘the Greek government at the time was one hundred percent right when it supported the preservation of the status quo in the region. We have all witnessed the consequences of the destabilisation in the region and my view is that this destabilisation will last for years with unexpected consequences.’<sup>10</sup>

This destabilization was likely to have caused even Greece to become directly involved in the operations. On April 21<sup>st</sup>, 1999, the President of the Parliament, Apostolos Kaklamanis, talking on behalf of the whole parliament expressed his strong opposition to the bombings: ‘we all denounce NATO’s bombardment of Kosovo because we all know what the real motives behind this action are, namely the destabilisation of the entire South East Europe.’<sup>11</sup> The Prime Minister in his speech to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, vividly described the anxiety felt by the Greek people: ‘The Americans have to seriously consider the consequences of this war; especially the possibility of causing permanent instability in the whole Balkan Peninsula. Perhaps for the United States this is not a major issue, because Americans are thousands of miles away from the conflict. How would they feel if this war was taking place in their own continent? How would people in Washington react if New York was being bombed? Greece is closer to Kosovo than Washington to New York; Americans have to bear this in mind in order to understand Greece’s fears and concerns.’<sup>12</sup>

Nikos Konstantopoulos, the president of the Greek left wing party Coalition of the Left and Progress, focused on the issue of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia that would re-emerge if Yugoslavia disintegrated. In his words:

---

<sup>10</sup> Personal interview with Karolos Papoulias, emphasis added, Athens, 29/04/2002

<sup>11</sup> Kaklamanis, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Session PΘ’, vol. H’, 21/4/1999, p., 5995

<sup>12</sup> Site in Dimas, D.P., ‘Simitis : stamatiste, diafonoun ta Balkania’, *Eleftherotypia*, 23/4/1999, p. 4-5. See also the comments made by the Defense Minister Athanasios Tsoxatzopoulos, ‘Adianoiti kathe prospathia allagis sinoron’, *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999,p.8

Greece's vital interests are at odds with those of the United States. The Americans are aiming at weakening Yugoslavia, if not destroying it completely. They are after fluidity in the borders between Yugoslavia, Albania and FYROM. All this and especially the destabilisation of FYROM is extremely dangerous for Greece and is likely to undermine Greece's political and economic role in the Balkans.<sup>13</sup>

The third issue that made Greek politicians consider military operations in Kosovo the wrong choice, was the fact that there was no UN Resolution authorising such strikes and that war in general should not be a means of solving problems. Their claim was that military operations in Kosovo would have the opposite result to what the allies expected in terms of protecting the Albanian community. The President of the Parliament, Apostolos Kaklamanis, stated: 'we do not believe that military intervention could in any way solve the problem, and we have repeatedly said so in every occasion. We firmly believe in using peaceful and diplomatic means. As a government, we have explicitly stated our disagreement with anything that leads to disaster, pain and human suffering'.<sup>14</sup>

Also former foreign minister Theodoros Pangalos expressed his disappointment over the way the international community, and the United States in particular, chose to impose law and order in the world: 'it was ridiculous for the world's largest military, economic and political power to fight with all its power an illegal war against a small nation for three whole months.'<sup>15</sup> On the same subject, Karolos Papoulias stated: 'war should not in any case be a tool of solving any problems, it only creates more.'<sup>16</sup>

The Opposition leaders did not differentiate themselves from members of the government. To the president of the Greek Conservative Party K. Karamanlis 'this war was a mistake...everyone in this room, regardless of political persuasion, has realized

---

<sup>13</sup> Konstantopoulos, N., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH'20.4.1999-PKΓ'11.5.1999, vol. H', 3/5/1999, p.6435-6436

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 6419

<sup>15</sup> Personal interview with Theodoros Pangalos, Athens, 30/04/2002.

<sup>16</sup> Personal interview with Karolos Papoulias, Athens, 29/04/2002. See also the comments by P. Paraskevopoulos, member of the PASOK government in Paraskevopoulos, P., 'Allilegii xoris sinora', *Eleftherotypia*, 4/4/1999, p. 87. See also the speech Georgios Papandreou, the foreign minister gave at the time: Papandreou, G., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH'20.4.1999-PKΓ'11.5.1999, vol. H', 3.5.1999, p. 6446

that. The results of this air campaign are completely the opposite from those expected.<sup>17</sup> He continued that: ‘in order to deal with a crisis one needs to build bridges and not to cause deeper divisions like the allies have done in the case of former Yugoslavia.’<sup>18</sup>

Prokopis Pavlopoulos, also a member of *New Democracy* Party, attempted a comparison between the Gulf war in 1991 and the Kosovo war in 1999 in order to demonstrate that NATO air strikes in Serbia were not only illegal but also completely wrong. Pavlopoulos started his analysis by describing the features of the new century:

Although the possibility of a new world war is virtually non-existent, it is very likely that small local conflicts of religious and nationalistic origins will erupt and will threaten peace and stability in the world. This new reality will challenge America’s role in the world. If America manages to escape isolation and bring peace and stability by acting as a global fireman and peace-maker it will deserve the title of global coordinator. Most importantly the Americans should always act in accordance with international rules and regulations. Otherwise the world would result into chaos; every country that feels strong enough would invade other countries according to will. Finally, Americans should invest in building alliances and should always keep in mind that respect for the allies is not a sign of weakness but a sign of political realism.<sup>19</sup>

In the case of the Gulf War, P. Pavlopoulos pointed out that ‘the Americans managed to persuade the majority of world opinion to back the war because their intervention was based on a very legitimate claim, namely the freedom of Kuwait and most importantly their venture was endorsed by the United Nations.’<sup>20</sup> Pavlopoulos did not fail to mention however that even in the case of the operation to liberate Kuwait, the Americans ‘could be accused of having double standards in enforcing international law. The case of Cyprus was indicative of the way the world’s superpower uses international law selectively in line with its own national interests.’<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Karamanlis, K., *Records of the Greek Parliament, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKI’/11.5.1999*, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p.6427. The same argument was expressed by another prominent member of New Democracy Party Stefanos Manos in Manos, S., ‘Ime mathimenos stis sigrousis’, *Eleftheros Typos*, 25/4/1999, p. 20-1

<sup>18</sup> Karamanlis, K., ‘O proedros tis ND episimeni tous kindinous’, *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999, p. 9. See also Mitsotakis, K., ‘I simerini igetes pezoun me ton polemo giati den exoun polemisi’, *Eleftheros Typos*, 1/4/99, p. 4. Mitsotakis, K., ‘Dramatiki parembasi gia eksodo apo tin krisi’, *Eleftheros Typos*, 4/4/1999, p.22. Sarantakos, G., ‘I 10 megales alithies Mitsotaki’, *Eleftheros Typos*, 2/4/1999, p. 8

<sup>19</sup> Pavlopoulos, P., ‘Isxis ke dikeo mias iperdinamis’, *Kathimerini*, 11/4/1999, p.7

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

In the case of Serbia, Pavlopoulos was convinced that there was no excuse for American intervention:

to the irrationality of Milosevic brutal regime, the Americans answered with an equally irrational war and disregarded international law. Both in the case of Hussein and Milosevic, the international community had to confront totalitarian and brutal regimes that were guilty of violating human rights and of lacking tolerance towards minority groups. What made Americans and NATO reprehensible in the case of Serbia was that there was no UN Resolution justifying any kind of intervention. In addition, NATO made no provision for this kind of war.<sup>22</sup>

Nikos Kostantopoulos, president of the Greek left wing party Coalition of the Left and Progress (Sinaspismos), also denounced the war as illegal:

What is happening in neighbouring Yugoslavia is not a military “intervention”, it is not an “operation”; it is a brutal, deadly and savage war with no meaning, no legal, historical or political basis; it is a war without morality. In other words it is a crime against humanity. This war is responsible for the loss of life, for the demolition of the whole country, of the nature, of the monuments, of the infrastructure but mostly this war has caused the extermination of people of the present and the future generations.<sup>23</sup>

The point that there was no necessity to wage war on Serbia was made by Dimitris Tsovolas, president of the left wing party DIKKI:

according to article 5 of NATO’s Constitution, NATO is obliged to defend a member state if it is being attacked by another member-state. There is no provision for intervention for humanitarian reasons or for the defence of human rights or even more for bringing democracy in a country that lacks democratic institutions. And of course there is no obligation of any country to support NATO in its decision to invade a sovereign state. In other words, armed intervention in Kosovo is unconstitutional and illegal and does not obligate any member state to support it.<sup>24</sup>

Only Andreas Andrianopoulos, member of the Greek conservative party, *New Democracy*, expressed his conviction that the government was not only right in aligning itself with the West but should have held an even stronger pro war stance. ‘Its not the first time that I don’t follow the norm’, he stated, ‘but it will also not be the first time that my views will be vindicated in the future’. He maintained that by saying yes to the war in

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Konstantopoulos, N., *Records of the Greek Parliament, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKΓ’/11.5.1999*, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p. 6434. See also the comments of the General Secretary of the Greek Communist Party, Alexandra Papariga in Papariga, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKΓ’/11.5.1999*, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p.6422

<sup>24</sup> Tsovolas, D., *Records of the Greek Parliament, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKΓ’/11.5.1999*, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p.6442

Kosovo, Greece was taking a decision to belong to the Western World were its natural position is:

Maybe I'm wrong to consider Greece part of the developed Western World and not part of the marginal and underdeveloped East. Greece should make clear who it supports and where it belongs; we cannot receive assistance from the West and at the same time refuse to support their unanimous decisions. It's time to free ourselves from the underdog syndrome and realise that our interests lie with the developed Western world. How can we expect our western allies to support us in our disputes with Turkey when we oppose to their decisions?<sup>25</sup>

Andrianopoulos insisted that, apart from its obligations towards its allies, Greece would in fact benefit from the destruction of Serbia. In a recent interview he insisted that 'contrary to what the majority of Greek politicians believed at the time, a strong Serbia would in fact pose a threat Greece due to its constant ambition to find an exodus to the Aegean Sea through the city of Thessaloniki.'<sup>26</sup>

The paradox of the Greek reactions to the Kosovo crisis was that although all Greek politicians were unanimous in condemning the war in Yugoslavia, they held different views on the issue of Greece's official stance towards the crisis. The government as well as the Greek conservative party supported the view that Greece was right not to veto the allied decision to strike Serbia. The main concern of the government was to promote Greek interests and the only way to do that was to support every unanimous decision made by its allies. The government's slogan at the time was that 'Greece comes first'. The government felt that people should not be sentimental regarding the war and instead should be judging things more in terms of what is good for Greece and less in terms of what is ethical.

On May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1999, the Greek Prime Minister Kostas Simitis in his speech to the Greek Parliament summarised the official stance of the government and analysed the reasons for this stance. He explained that Greece was in a very awkward position being a member of the European Union and also of NATO. Furthermore, Greece was a Balkan country and therefore had a great deal at stake if things went wrong in Kosovo. Nevertheless, the

---

<sup>25</sup> Andrianopoulos, A., 'Tis apopseis mou that is dikeosi o xronos, *Eleftheros Typos*, 18/4/1999, p.31

<sup>26</sup> Personal interview with Andreas Andrianopoulos, former Trade and Industry Minister of the Greek Conservative Party, *New Democracy*, Athens, 08/05/2002

Prime Minister stressed the fact that despite complications and restrictions Greece had managed to form its own foreign policy and to distance itself as much as it could from the unanimous decision of its allies to go to war:

We refused to participate militarily in this war because we are a country adjacent to the area of conflict and therefore it is essential for us to maintain a safe distance from the operations. In addition, we do not believe that military intervention can be the solution to any problem and we have repeatedly said so in every opportunity. To us Greece's national interest is and should be the number one priority. Greece comes first and therefore the government's goal is for Greece to remain trustworthy and strong in the international arena.<sup>27</sup>

Members of the Greek government pointed out that there was very little room for manoeuvre when the rest of the western world was unanimous in its decision to strike at Serbia. Dimitris Apostolakis, the deputy Defence Minister, said:

Our government's strategy is to promote a political solution to the problem and to establish a policy of security and cooperation in the region. These goals cannot be accomplished if we distance ourselves from what is happening close to our borders. Our position is clear; we do not take part in any military undertaking but on the other hand we have to realize that as members of NATO we have some obligations that we need to fulfil...Although it's a wrong war according to our opinion we should some times pursue our own interests and release ourselves from the underdog syndrome; we have stood by the Palestinians, the Kurds, the Libyans, the Iraqis, but sometimes we have to look for our own benefit.<sup>28</sup>

Similarly, in a recent interview the foreign minister at the time, Theodoros Pangalos, insisted that the Greek government was right not to veto the war in Kosovo. This was not because Milosevic was a criminal and the international community was right to try to stop him in every possible way, but because 'Greece had more important issues to think of for the sake of its own national interests, namely the problem of Cyprus. A country

---

<sup>27</sup>Simitis, K., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH'20.4.1999-PKΓ'11.5.1999, vol. H, 3 May 1999, p.6414. The same point was made by the minister of defense, Athanasios Tsochatzopoulos: 'The Greek government has made clear to its European counterparts that the only way to resolve the Kosovo crisis would be through peaceful means and with the cooperation of both America and Russia. Greece, as a Balkan country and as a stabilising factor in the region has the moral obligation through International Organisations to help in keeping the peace...our goal is through NATO to achieve peace and stability. If Greece fails to convince NATO to follow peaceful means it will abstain from any military operation.', Athanasios Tsochatzopoulos, *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions OE'8.2.1999-ΠΘ'3.3.1999, p.4787. See also the speech of the Foreign Minister George Papandreou in the Parliament: George Papandreou, *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PKΔ'12/5/1999-ΠΑΣΤ'28.5.1999, Meeting ΠΛΕ', 27 May 1999, p.6446-6447

<sup>28</sup> Apostolakis Dimitrios, *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PKΔ'12/5/1999-ΠΑΣΤ'28.5.1999, Meeting ΠΛΕ', 27 May 1999, p. 7598. See also Paraskeyopoulos, P., 'Alilegii xoris sinora', *Eleftherotypia*, 4/4/1999, p.87

cannot pose two vetoes at the same time. It would have been like trying to carry two water melons under the same arm'.<sup>29</sup>

Apart from the government, members of the Greek conservative party maintained that the Greek stance was by and large the correct one but that the way the government presented itself in the international arena lacked decisiveness. Greece gave the impression to its allies that it has no policies of its own and therefore its role is restricted to confirming what the allies have already decided. Furthermore the members of *New Democracy* suggested that Greece should have pressed more for an immediate ceasefire. The president of the party, Konstantinos Karamanlis, when asked to comment on the government's line stated that 'the government is by and large handling the crisis in the right way but its policy is characterized by timidity'<sup>30</sup>. He never stopped arguing that Greece should have had a stronger voice in the international arena and should not give the impression that its policies are dictated by its allies:

We were honestly surprised Mr. President by your strong pro-western and pro-NATO stance; for years and years we were trying to convince your party that Greece belongs to the West, but this time you overdid it! Your speech on Greece's position to the war was a road map for subjugation to the West; it was a description of the policy of 'yes man'<sup>31</sup>.

Contrary to the government and the Greek conservative party, the rest of the political formations completely rejected the government's stance of not vetoing the war and they accused the Prime Minister and his Cabinet of lying to the Greek people. The central argument was that Greece was fully participating in the war and that it had become a puppet of Western, and in particular, American demands. In addition it was suggested that Greece's national interests did not dictate alliance with the Americans in this war. On the contrary, Greece would benefit more if Serbia actually won this war. Dimitris Tsovolas, president of the *Democratic Social Movement* (DIKKI), for example argued

---

<sup>29</sup> Personal interview with Theodoros Pangalos, Athens, 30/4/2002

<sup>30</sup> 'O proedros tis ND episimeni tous kindinous, *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999, p.9

<sup>31</sup> Konstantinos Karamanlis, *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Session PIZ', 3 May 1999, p. 6426. See also Barbitsiotis, I., 'Minima sto NATO i Symfwnia Milosevic-Rougova', *Eleftheros Typos*, 4/4/1999, p.16 and Manos, S., 'Eimai mathimenos stis sigrousis, *Eleftheros Typos*, 25/4/1999, p. 20-1. Similar views were heard by the honorary president of the party Konsantinos Mitsotakis and his daughter Dora Bakogianni in Sarantakos, G., 'Protasi irinis apo ton psilo', *Eleftheros Typos*, 5/4/1999, p.4 and Bakogianni, D., 'Ta Valkania xriazonte mia politiki arxon', *Eleftheros Typos*, 11/4/1999, p. 10-11

that if America won in this conflict then they would stay in the Balkans because it would be easy for them to control the area and use its natural resources. In order to control the area America would have to depend on Turkey and therefore Greece's national interests would have to be sacrificed. If America failed in this war it would most probably abandon the idea of controlling the Balkans and it would turn to other regions rich in natural resources, such as the Persian Gulf. In that case, Turkey would find itself in a bad position and therefore Greece would be able to take advantage of this opportunity.<sup>32</sup>

Nikos Konstantopoulos, the president of the Greek left wing party Coalition of the Left and Progress (*Synaspismos*) condemned the government for fully participating in the allied operations in Kosovo. He urged the Prime Minister to stop facilitating NATO bombings and bring to an end the lies he was telling the Greek public: 'we all know what is going on in northern Greece; it's a shame and it has to end now!'<sup>33</sup> His view was that Greece should support an immediate cease fire and promote a political solution that respected existing borders. To him it was also essential to grant autonomy to Kosovo and secure protection of minorities within the territory of Yugoslavia using UN inspections. To him, Slobodan Milosevic 'did not have bad intentions. He was simply interested in defending the independence of his country and in securing a political solution to the crisis that would provide political autonomy for Kosovo'. Therefore Greece 'should have supported the actions of this man'.<sup>34</sup>

Alexandra Papariga, General Secretary of the Greek Communist Party (KKE) also targeted her criticism at the fact that the Greek government participated in the war in many ways. Both were convinced that the government was lying to the Greek public and both accused Greece of subjugation to American demands.<sup>35</sup> In Tsovolas' words, 'the

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p.6444

<sup>33</sup> Ibid,p.6434

<sup>34</sup> Katsavos, N., 'Na stamatisoun tora oi vomvardismi', *Eleftheros Typos*, 7/4/1999, p. 9

<sup>35</sup> Likewise, Alexandra Papariga, the General Secretary of the Greek Communist Party, denounced the government for having no voice of its own and for following American orders. In her opinion, Greece's 'non participation' in words was an American plan and not a Greek decision. America and NATO needed Greece to look as if it abstained from any operation so that they had an allied country able to negotiate with the enemy after the war was over: 'a country to finish up their dirty work in Yugoslavia; after the end of this bloody war. The allies would need to use Greece as an angel force, as an overseer and a guarantor for

Greek government has become a watchdog for America's interests in the region...Greece is guilty of complicity to the crime committed in Kosovo. The government signed NATO's resolution to go to war last June and it also provided all the necessary means for this war to proceed. The government of Mr. Simitis disregarded the Greek constitution that prohibits foreign troops to pass through Greek territory under any circumstances.'<sup>36</sup>

To summarise, regarding the position that Greece should have held in the case of Kosovo the government and the Greek conservative party maintained the view that Greece was right not to veto the allied decision. On the other hand, members of left wing parties completely denounced the Greek stance as irresponsible. What was striking in the views held about the war in Kosovo was that neither the government nor members of the opposition, such as Andrianopoulos who openly supported the war, focused on the fact that Milosevic was a criminal and that war could be the last resort to stop the ethnic cleansing. They justified Greece's decision not to veto the war only with reference to the fact that Greece's interests dictated alignment with the West.

Another paradox of the way the war in Kosovo was interpreted in Greece was that regardless of the different opinions on Greece's obligation to support its allies, all politicians, including the Prime Minister and members of his government, denounced the war and expressed their disapproval of any use of force. Their disagreements were mostly about their pacifism and their fear of the consequences the crisis could have for Greece, a neighbouring country. The argument supported by the majority of Greek politicians against the war was the need to preserve the status quo in the region because otherwise Greece, more than any other country, would have to deal with the huge wave of refugees. Apart from that there was always the possibility a spill-over of the war that would rekindle disputes with countries such as the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Furthermore this war was denounced as illegal since it had no UN authorisation. War should always be the last resort and should not be considered as a means of solving problems. As it has been demonstrated in the case of Kosovo, the war had the opposite

---

any so called "agreement" such as Dayton.' Alexandra Papariga, *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Session PIZ', 3 May 1999,p. 6422

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p.6441

effect to that which was expected and had only exacerbated ethnic cleansing along with additional problems it created. In other words, the break up of Yugoslavia introduced a completely new political picture, which the Greek politicians could not work out at the time.

## 2. The first war of globalisation and the role of NATO

In Greece, public discussion on a New World Order and the role of NATO was another opportunity to accuse the US for imperialism and for attempting to rule the world. The idea of a New World Order was related in the minds of the Greek political leaders to the real motives of the war. The majority of the Greek political community held the United States responsible for the war in Kosovo and saw the allied bombing of Serbia as another opportunity for America to throw its weight around the global arena. The general idea was that in their effort to 'conquer' the world, Americans are using NATO, which they have transformed from a purely defensive alliance into an invader. Members of the government and the Greek conservative party were hesitant in openly expressing their views. Only in private interviews did they reveal their true feelings about the events. It has to be noted that some of the politicians did acknowledge the fact that Milosevic was partly responsible for the crisis and that he was indeed a criminal, but he alone was not to blame. He was used by the United States in order to promote their own interests. There were also some isolated members of the Greek political community who refused to blame the United States for the situation in the Balkans and claimed that only Milosevic was responsible for the criminal acts that led to the bombing of Serbia.

The starting point in the debate on the real motives behind the allied decision to bomb Serbia was American double standards in imposing law and order in the world. This was a very common theme among Greek politicians, which was often mentioned even by the people who held Milosevic entirely responsible for the fate of his country. To all Greek political figures the open wound of Northern Cyprus, that had been under Turkish occupation for more than 25 years despite numerous UN Resolutions that condemned it, was enough proof for American double standards in foreign policy.

The President of the Greek Parliament, Apostolos Kaklamanis, was the first one to touch on the matter of Cyprus in relation to Kosovo. The key argument was that, although there

had been numerous resolutions on Cyprus condemning Turkish aggression, neither the Americans nor any of their Allies decided to take any action:

The drama of the Cypriot people has been going on for 25 years now and although the allies and in particular the Americans are partly responsible for it they have done nothing to stop it. It is the same people, the Americans, who now pretend to feel for the refugees in Kosovo. At the same time they seem to be completely indifferent towards the 200.000 Cypriot refugees, the continuous occupation of Cyprus and the destruction of churches and archaeological sites by the Turks. All Greeks have the duty to condemn the bombing of Serbia because they all know the hypocrisy behind the whole operation.<sup>37</sup>

Dora Bakogianni, a prominent member of the Greek Conservative party expressed her scepticism towards the American stance on Kosovo: ‘it is hard to understand why NATO decided now to act in Kosovo and not elsewhere in the world where equal or even worse violations of human rights are taking place. The United States of America and NATO failed to show the same interest for other cases whereas in Kosovo they even sacrificed the United Nations to help the Albanians...Unfortunately the Americans feel that some people deserve to be rescued more than others’.<sup>38</sup> Similarly, Theodoros Pangalos when asked in an interview to state his view on US policy in Kosovo burst out:

what about Cyprus? What about the Kurds? The violation of human rights in Turkey over the years certainly equal what Milosevic is accused of. The number of Kurds alone that were ethnically cleansed by Turkey more than equals the killing of Albanians in Kosovo. It appears that nobody can draw attention on Turkey or on Turkey’s criminal actions. The right of Kosovo Albanians to return to their homes is regarded as vital by Washington; yet the Palestinians appear to have no such right. Why this sudden concern over the Kosovo Albanians now?<sup>39</sup>

The majority of Greek politicians were astonished by the American haste to go to war and by what they interpreted as American unwillingness to negotiate. According to Theodoros Pangalos, the Greek foreign minister at the time, ‘Greece fully supported further negotiations with the Serbian leader and for that reason I had personally travelled several times to Belgrade to help towards a peaceful solution but the United States did

---

<sup>37</sup> Kaklamanis, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions OE’/8.2.1999-ΠΘ’/3.3.1999, vol. ΣΤ’, p. 5995. See also the speech of the representative of PASOK government, Kosmas Sfiriou, who expressed the same views. Sfiriou, K., in *ibid.*, p. 5996

<sup>38</sup> Bakogianni, D., ‘Ta Balkania xriazonte mia politiki arxon’, *Eleftheros Typos*, 11/4/1999, p. 10-11

<sup>39</sup> Personal interview with Theodoros Pangalos, Athens, 30/04/2002. Similar views were expressed by Karolos Papoulias in his interview, Athens 29/04/2002 and by Konstantinos Karamanlis in his speech in the Greek Parliament, *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKΓ’/11.5.1999, vol. Η’, 3/5/1999, p.6428

not want to negotiate. They would turn down every suggestion that could lead to an agreement; it was clear that the Americans would only be satisfied if they destroyed Milosevic.’<sup>40</sup> The same point was made by Nikos Konstantopoulos, president of the leftist party Synaspismos. He accused the United States of aiming for the complete destruction of Yugoslavia: ‘the Americans undermined any attempt to find a peaceful solution. Their only goal was to humiliate Milosevic and the Serbian nation, to create turbulence in the Balkans and to eventually alter existing borders to their own benefit.’<sup>41</sup>

Greek political leaders gave two reasons why Americans initiated the war in Kosovo. The first one was due to American arrogance and imperialistic policies. According to this interpretation, NATO was in danger of being used as a global policeman and as a guarantor of American imperialism. The Prime Minister was the first one to comment on the new role of NATO and of its relation to American policies. He acknowledged NATO’s role as a guarantor of European Security but at the same time he pointed out that he would not like to see NATO extending its influence beyond Europe and becoming a global policeman. The Prime Minister warned the United States that disregarding International Law could be very dangerous. It could create a precedence which other countries might choose to follow: ‘there should be some kind of legitimacy for every action NATO decides to take. No one should be allowed to surpass the International Law formulated by the United Nations, not even NATO.’<sup>42</sup>

The leader of the Greek Conservative Party, Konstantinos Karamanlis, although still considering NATO a useful international organisation and favouring Greece’s participation in the alliance, was more critical of the new role of NATO. In his opinion, NATO would from now on feel free to invade any country in any part of the world, in the name of protecting human rights. In his view national sovereignty should be the number one priority because human rights can only be protected within a strong and independent nation state:

---

<sup>40</sup> Personal interview with Theodoros Pangalos, Athens, 30/04/2002

<sup>41</sup> Konstantopoulos, N., ‘I kivernisi stirizete stous vomvardismous’, *Eleftheros Typos*, 18/04/1999, p. 12

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6416. The same point was made by the foreign minister, see Papandreou, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKΓ’/11.5.1999, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p.6445

what should make us all worry about the new global situation is that one country or an alliance of countries has reached an arbitrary decision that protection of human rights is more important than national sovereignty...human rights are of course important, but how can one decide that NATO should intervene in one country and not in another? With what criteria will the International Community decide which minority needs to be protected or which violation of human rights is more severe than another? Has the International Community decided to impose democracy in the world at any cost, even by using non-democratic means?<sup>43</sup>

Karamanlis also pointed out the major change NATO had gone through: ‘It is clear that the alliance has acquired a completely different character and form. From being a purely defensive alliance it has now turned into an alliance with broader responsibilities, so broad that not even its members know where to set the limits. NATO seems to be ready to even ignore the United Nations that used to be the only legitimate organisation in the world.’<sup>44</sup> M. Giannakou, member of the Greek Conservative Party *New Democracy* and currently Minister of Education, expressed the view that: ‘The United States of America has one and only goal; to use NATO to create new puppet regimes in the area, namely countries that could be used as protectorates and would be easy to influence just like Turkey’.<sup>45</sup> Also Nikos Kouris, a former defence minister for the socialist government of Andreas Papandreou government, expressed his conviction that the Americans ‘are actually seeking the opportunity through NATO to build a military establishment in the middle of the Balkans. It is a matter of great importance to them because the Balkans is Europe’s weak spot and because it is a strategic geopolitical position leading the way to the oil and gas supplies of Caucasus.’<sup>46</sup>

Unlike the members of the government and of the Greek Conservative Party, members of left wing political formations were more critical of American motives in the case of Kosovo and on the way the Americans used NATO. As Nikos Konstantopoulos put it ‘the war in Yugoslavia was the first war of globalization’.<sup>47</sup> Americans desired to control

---

<sup>43</sup> Karamanlis, K., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKT’/11.5.1999, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p.6428

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Cited in Sarantakou, G., ‘Omofonia gia to Kosovo sti ND’, *Eleftheros Typos*, 1/4/1999, p.4

<sup>46</sup> Cited in ‘Anikse o kiklos enimerosis politikon arxigon’, *Kathimerini*, 7/4/1999, p. 5

<sup>47</sup> Konstantopoulos, N., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKT’/11.5.1999, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p. 6435-6438

the region, which is strategically important for the oil and gas supplies of Caucasus. He accused America of using NATO to pursue its policies around the world while disregarding international law and order. His whole speech in Parliament targeted American vicious policies that threatened not only Europe but the whole world:

The United States are aiming at destroying the old world and at creating a New World Order where Americans will be uncontested leaders; this New World Order that places the whole world under the tutelage of the United States is not going to be based on peace. It will be the new international barbarism where America will invade countries, divide people, kill political leaders, and destroy whole societies in order to secure its own interests.<sup>48</sup>

Dimitris Tsovolas, president of the Democratic Social Movement (DIKKI) also accused the United States of

barbarism, imperialism, arrogant behaviour, and disregard for human rights. In order to achieve its goal of controlling the universe, America has practically hijacked NATO and has transformed it from a pure defensive organisation to an aggressive invader. NATO has been transformed into an international terrorist and at the same time into a global policeman that stands above any international law.<sup>49</sup>

To him the war in Kosovo was nothing more than a testing ground for the American plan to conquer the world: ‘the success of this overbearing and inhumane plan is being tested in Yugoslavia. It is the first time NATO is testing its new role as a global terrorist. If America wins the battle in Kosovo the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be an American century.’<sup>50</sup>

Likewise Mikis Theodorakis, a famous music composer who supported the left wing party *Synaspismos*, denounced America’s desire to control the whole world. Theodorakis was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2000. In an interview with the Greek daily *Eleftherotipia* he used scornful words to characterise the United States and American foreign policy in particular:

all Greeks should condemn this cowardly behaviour of the assassins who spread pain, sorrow and death, who are responsible for the ill fate of innocent children and women, who act as directors of evil; they first take pictures of innocent people suffering and then

---

<sup>48</sup> Konstantopoulos, N., Records of the Greek Parliament, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKΓ’/11.5.1999, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p. 6435-6438

<sup>49</sup> Tsovolas, D., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKΓ’/11.5.1999, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p. 6440

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6443. See also the views of the general Secretary of the Greek Communist Party in Papariga, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH’/20.4.1999-PKΓ’/11.5.1999, vol. H’, 3/5/1999, p. 6423

they force this people to flee their country...Clinton is using Kosovo as a testing ground, to teach the rest of the world that America is the world's super power and that it can impose its will anywhere. In the case of Yugoslavia, Clinton's final goal is to completely destroy the country, to exterminate the Serbian leadership and to transform the Serbian people into slaves that will obey the Americans. Under the disguise of the nation-saviour there is a nation-invader who disregards all International Rules and Regulations. Yugoslavia is the first example of a series of others that will follow. A new era has began in which American Law has replaced International Law just like Hitler in the past wanted to replace global regulations with his own.<sup>51</sup>

Also the far right wing politician, Antonis Samaras, who served as a Foreign Minister in the *New Democracy* government during 1989-1992, and later founded the Political Spring Party, expressed similar views to those voiced by representatives of the extreme left. In an interview carried out by the Greek conservative newspaper *Eleftheros Typos* he stated: 'NATO has been transformed into the military arm of the United States and Europe has suffered a severe loss of political credibility. It has officially become America's lackey.'<sup>52</sup>

The second reason, according to Greek politicians, that made the Americans so keen to launch this war was the opportunity to undermine an ascending European Union that was likely to pose a threat to American global dominance. This argument was not as popular as the first one and was mostly used to support the first view that America's sole aim is to impose its will to the rest of the world and to eliminating any potential enemy. Karolos Papoulias openly accused the United States of undermining European integration: 'behind the rhetoric of the US for the protection of human rights, lay the inner desire to weaken the strength and stability of an ascending European Union, which with a single currency, an ascending economy and a strong voice in foreign affairs is likely to threaten the American empire in a few years time'.<sup>53</sup> In that sense, the United States by interfering

---

<sup>51</sup> Theodorakis, M., 'Mia simaxia na stamatisi tous neous eksousiastes', *Eleftherotypia*, 13/4/1999, p. 6. See also the comments made by Leonidas Kyrkos, a prominent figure of the Greek Communist Party in 'Konstantopoulos: oratos o efialtis ton xerseon', editorial, *Eleftherotypia*, 19/4/1999, p. 6

<sup>52</sup> Samaras, A., 'Geliopiisi tou OHE', *Eleftheros Typos*, 1/4/1999, p. 9

<sup>53</sup> Personal interview with Karolos Papoulias, Athens, 30/04/2002. See also Leonidas Kyrkos, in 'Konstantopoulos: oratos o efialtis ton xerseon', editorial, *Eleftherotypia*, 19/04/1999, p. 6. See also Konstantopoulos, N., *Records of the Greek Parliament, Sessions PH'/20.4.1999-PKG'/11.5.1999*, vol. H', 3/5/1999, p. 6435-6438. See also the statement made by the former Prime Minister of the Conservative Party Tzanis Tsannetakis cited in Sarantakos, G., 'Omofonia gia to Kosovo sti ND', *Eleftheros Typos*, 1/4/1999, p. 4

in the Balkans aimed at creating sources of instability in the heart of Europe, which were likely to impose a heavy burden on the European Union. In addition, Washington wanted to make clear to European leaders that Europe, lacking a well organised and ready to act army, would always need the support of the United States at critical moments.

There was also a group of politicians that refused to blame the United States for starting the war in Kosovo and put the blame on Milosevic for the situation in the Balkans. The most prominent supporter of this view was the Minister of Defence, Athanasios Tsochatzopoulos. He did not hesitate to condemn Milosevic for his policies and to justify the fact that the International Community finally decided to do something to stop the massacre:

the policy of ethnic cleansing is not the result of NATO bombings; it had started way before the International Community decided to take some action. No one can exclude the possibility of Milosevic himself planning the alteration of existing borders. Milosevic aimed of taking all Balkan countries as hostages. Everyone should feel aversion for the means this man used to achieve his goals. We, as Greeks, have endured ethnic cleansing at least three times in recent history; in Pont Sea, in Asia Minor and in Cyprus. NATO is crystal clear about the reasons of these air strikes; it's up to Milosevic to prevent his own country from falling into pieces.<sup>54</sup>

Tsochatzopoulos was the only Greek politician who used such harsh language to denounce Milosevic and his policies. Most politicians who shared similar views were much milder in expressing their opinions. For example, the president of the Greek Conservative Party, Konstantinos Karamanlis, in his speech in the Greek Parliament on May 3<sup>rd</sup> 1999, admitted that the main responsibility for the crisis in Kosovo lay with the authorities in Belgrade who altered the constitution in 1989 and took the arbitrary decision to give autonomy to Kosovo. He nevertheless avoided mentioning Milosevic's policy of ethnic cleansing. Instead he referred to 'methods of expulsion of the Albanian speaking population that are not acceptable by the international community'<sup>55</sup>. Regarding the allied decision to bomb Serbia he stated:

I was never in favour of conspiracy theories; therefore I accept the formal excuse for going to war, namely the protection of human rights. I do not see any other reason for the

---

<sup>54</sup> Cited in Liarelis, S., 'Rouketa ke apo ton Aki', *Eleftherotypia*, 4/4/1999, p. 4. See also Fafoutis, K., 'Tsoxatzopoulos: Epithesi kata Milosevic', *Kathimerini*, 4/4/1999, p. 4

<sup>55</sup> Karamanlis, K., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH'20.4.1999-PKΓ'/11.5.1999, vol. H', 3/5/1999, p.6427

Americans to engage in this war or what were they expecting to gain from it. On the contrary the Balkan countries seem to favour wide American involvement in their domestic affairs. Nevertheless, I am less concerned with the reasons for going to war rather than the results and consequences of it. The whole world is currently facing a major crisis, millions of people are suffering and the whole region is in turmoil.<sup>56</sup>

As demonstrated in the above analysis, the key questions in the minds of all politicians were related to the causes of the war. Why did the Allies decide to bomb Serbia now and not earlier? Why did they decide to take action in that part of the world and not in another where worse violations of human rights take place? In providing answers to the above questions, the majority of Greek political leaders held America mainly responsible for this war and not Milosevic. It needs to be noted that although both government members and members of the New Democracy party were extremely careful in accusing Washington for the break up of Yugoslavia, it seemed to be a common secret view that the Americans had much to do with the whole crisis. In their public speeches the most prominent members avoided taking sides or making open statements against the United States. Nevertheless, all political figures regardless of political affiliations seemed to be critical of the idea of a new NATO used by the Americans as an international policeman that would intervene in every part of the world to protect violations of human rights. The main fear was that as demonstrated in the case of Kosovo, NATO could from now on be used by America to impose a New World Order to fit its interests.

---

<sup>56</sup> Cited in Sarantakos, G., 'Lathos polemos gia lathos logous', *Eleftheros Typos*, 25/4/1999, p. 8-9. See also the comments made by Prokopis Pavlopoulos in Pavlopoulos, P., 'Isxis k Dikeo mias Iperdinamis', *Kathimerini*, 11/4/1999. p. 7

## **Concluding Summary**

95% of the Greek public responded negatively to the allied bombing of Kosovo. Equally, opinion makers in Greece condemned the bombings and explored the purpose and the results of this war. This paper focused on the interpretation of anti-Americanism in Greece. The focal point was the relation between reactions to NATO's air campaign in Kosovo and anti-Americanism. More specifically, the questions addressed in this paper dealt with the type of anti-Americanism which the bombing of Kosovo gave rise to, the people who were most likely to express anti-American views and the way in which these people justified their accusations against the United States. In an effort to establish whether anti-Americanism has played a role in the Greek politicians' interpretation of the events the analysis was divided into two broad themes.

The first theme explored was way Greek political figures viewed the war. It is interesting to note that the massacre committed by the Serbs and the moral obligation of every human being to prevent it from happening was not discussed. There were two basic reasons why the majority of Greek politicians condemned the air campaign. The first one was that it was against the dogma of preserving the status quo in the region. Any alteration of the existing borders was likely to create a large number of refugees as well as a spill over of the war that would destabilise the whole region and would encourage territorial claims by neighbouring countries such as the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Another reason Greek politicians condemned the war was the wide perception that war cannot solve any problems, it can only create more. Especially since this war was an illegal one with no United Nations Resolution to authorise it and could well have become a precedent for similar actions in the future.

Apart from focusing on the negative results of this war, Greek politicians sought the 'real reasons' why the allies launched a war against Serbia in 1999. This was the second theme explored. The majority of the Greek politicians held America more responsible for the war than Milosevic. Politicians associated with both *PASOK* and *New Democracy* held a

somewhat ambiguous stance towards the allied motives for this war. On the one hand they refused to succumb to conspiracy theories whilst on the other they did express their astonishment at American/NATO indifference towards violations of human rights in other parts of the world that have been going on for much longer than those in Kosovo. Politicians that belonged to minor political formations were less restrained and therefore they openly accused the United States for launching this war in order to destroy Serbia and to be able to control the region more easily. As well as they accused America of trying to demonstrate their power to the rest of the world and trying to undermine European integration. Also the idea of NATO changing in character and responsibilities initiated a great deal of criticism. America was the target of most of this criticism because in Greece more often than not NATO was equated with America. All statesmen of all political persuasions showed little enthusiasm for the prospect of NATO disregarding the United Nations and invading sovereign states to protect minority rights. The focal point of the discussions about NATO was whether NATO had a reason to exist after the collapse of the Iron Curtain or not. For members of the government and of the Greek conservative party, NATO was still useful provided that it did not transform itself into a global policeman and that it would not be used by the United States to promote their interests in the world. To members of the Greek left, NATO was useless and should have been abolished, otherwise it was likely to be used by world's only superpower in an arbitrary way just as in the case of Kosovo.

To summarise, the above analysis demonstrated that anti-Americanism exists in Greece and that it becomes evident mostly in periods of crisis, either international or domestic. It needs to be stressed that the NATO bombing of Serbia caused considerable anxiety to the Greeks. All Greek politicians, whether members of the governing party or not, were extremely confused and concerned that with the war in Kosovo, there might have been a renegotiation of the borders. They were mostly concerned because they could not get a clear picture of how the situation would evolve and therefore they did not know how to react. It could be argued that anti-Americanism had served two goals. The first one was that it helped in keeping the Greek public united. The last thing the Greek politicians needed when their own country was facing a crisis was a divided population that would

cause domestic instability. There was a fire burning on Greece's borders and the Greeks felt that they had to be united and prepared for all eventualities. Anti-Americanism could very well, and as it turned out it did work as a uniting factor.

Secondly, anti-Americanism in the case of Kosovo played another important role, namely to justify to the allies the ambivalent position of the Greek government. In that sense it could be said that America was the scapegoat for the government's inability to deal decisively with the situation in Kosovo. On the one hand Greece was a full member of NATO and the European Union, on the other it was so adjacent to the crisis that the threat of a spill over was imminent. Therefore Greece wanted to avoid actively participating in the bombings instead trying to act as a mediator between the conflicting parties. How could the Greek government disregard the fact that almost one hundred percent of Greek public opinion condemned the air campaign and accused the United States for the situation in the former Yugoslavia?

Having said that, it is necessary to stress the fact that the government did not initiate or in any way support the anti-American sentiment that was growing in Greece. However, it could be said that the Greek government realised this kind of sentiment might prove beneficial if used in the right way. The majority of Greek politicians tried to restrict themselves into arguing vaguely about the negative consequences of the war, about what is right and what is wrong, and to logically proving that war is not the solution to any problem. However they did contribute to anti-Americanism by highlighting the negative consequences of this war that was launched by NATO, and which was directed linked in the minds of the Greek public to America. By criticising the war, Greek politicians were, in the eyes of the public, criticising the United States.

In other words Greek political figures contributed to anti-Americanism by expressing concerns over the destabilisation in the region, the possible territorial claims and the changes in the borders. They also touched on the issue of Greek minorities in Albania that, if hurt, could draw Greece into the conflict as well as the new political affiliations and alliances that could emerge including a possible upgrade of Turkey's status.

Although the majority of Greek political figures, with the exception of representatives of the extreme left and right, did not criticise the American government directly, they argued extensively the significant dangers to national sovereignty and security. There were extensive discussions by politicians on American Foreign Policy, whether the US was aware of the dangers in the region, on the new World Order pursued by the US government, on the changes in the character of NATO and the future implications of setting as a priority the protection of minorities in various parts of the world.

It is also worth noting that criticism voiced against America by the major political parties was more cohesive compared to past references. Political figures from the two basic political formations, namely *PASOK* and *New Democracy* held more or less the same views about American policies and were equally careful in the way they expressed them. It is also evident that since 1999 a new type of anti-Americanism has appeared which is not connected with the old left wing reactions to American led globalization and the capitalist markets. It is an anti-American sentiment that runs through Greek society regardless of class or political persuasion. This type of anti-Americanism is mostly political and the criticism is directed towards American foreign policy and its relationship with other countries. America is often presented as the world's bully who has hijacked NATO in order to pursue its policies around the world. Even the most lenient critics of American policies have accused the United States of treating the rest of the world in an arrogant way that is more suitable to an empire rather than a democratic country.

Another interesting observation was that in 1999 anti-Americanism in Greece appeared to be based less on domestic factors and more on international issues. In other words the sentiment did not derive from bitterness about the way the Americans treated Greek people in the past but originated in the concern about the dangerous path American foreign policy was on. Yet, one could still perceive traces of anti-Americanism based on past American policies toward Greece; for example there were several cases where politicians expressed their disappointment at American double standards; they pointed out that although in the case of Kosovo the whole International Community under the leadership of America rushed to save the Albanians, in the case of Cyprus the same

countries showed complete indifference and disregarded several UN Resolutions that condemned Turkish aggression.

All the above issues contributed to the sentiment of anti-Americanism in Greece. One could conclude that with the war in Kosovo, the flood gates burst open and the Greek people felt free and justified to grieve openly about the war, to voice their pain and anger against the American government, and to resurrect old issues such as Cyprus that caused them considerable doubt about American motives and declarations.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 1. Primary sources

#### Interviews

Andrianopoulos Andreas: Former Trade and Industry Minister, member of the Greek conservative party New Democracy (ND), Athens, 08/05/2002.

Pangalos Theodoros: Former Foreign Minister, member of the Greek Socialist Party, Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK), Athens, 30/04/2002.

Papachelas Alexis: Journalist in the Greek daily *Vima*, Athens, 24/04/2002.

Papaconstantinou Michalis: Former Foreign Minister, member of the Greek Conservative Party ND, Athens, 16/04/2002.

Papoulias Karolos: President of the Greek Republic, Former Foreign Minister and chairman of the foreign affairs committee of the Greek parliament, Athens, 29/04/2002.

#### Systematic Research in Newspaper Archives:

Eleftheros Typos (from 25/03/1999 till 25/04/1999)

Eleftherotypia (from 25/03/1999 till 25/04/1999)

Kathimerini (from 25/03/1999 till 25/04/1999)

Rizospastis (from 25/03/1999 till 25/04/1999)

#### Other Newspaper articles

Andrianopoulos, A., 'Tis apopsis mou tha tis dikeosi o xronos', *Eleftheros Typos*, 18/4/1999

Barbitsiotis, I., 'Mininima sto NATO i Symfwnia Milosevic-Rugova', *Eleftheros Typos*, 4/4/1999

Bakogianni, D., 'Ta Valkania xriazonte mia politiki arxon', *Eleftheros Typos*, 11/4/1999

Barbitsiotis, I., 'Minima sto NATO i Symfwnia Milosevic-Rougova', *Eleftheros Typos*, 4/4/1999

Charvalias, G., 'O Berns diapseudi tin Amerikaniki presvia', *Eleftheros Typos*, 3/4/1999

Dimas, D.P., 'Simitis:stamatiste, diafonoun taBalkania', *Eleftherotypia*, 23/4/1999

- Fafoutis, K., 'Tsoxatzopoulos: Epithesi kata Milosevic', *Kathimerini*, 4/4/1999
- Konstantopoulos, N., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, sessions PH',20/4/1999-RKΓ',11.5.1999,vol.H',3/5/1999
- Karamanlis, K., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Session PIZ', 3/5/1999
- Karamanlis, K., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH'/20.4.1999-PKΓ'/11.5.1999, vol. H', 3/5/1999
- Katsavos, N., 'Na stamatisoun tora oi vomvardismi', *Eleftheros Typos*, 7/4/1999
- Kalliri, F., 'Sinoliki Europaiki kai kataremismo ton profigon se oli tin Europi ziti I Ellada', *Kathimerini*, 6/4/1999
- Karatzafelis, N., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, session PIB',26/4/1999
- Kaklamanis, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, session PΘ',vol.H',21/4/1999
- Katsavos, N., 'Na stamatisoun tora oi vomvardismi', *Eleftheros Typos*, 7/4/1999
- Kaklamanis, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions OE'/8.2.1999-ΠΘ'/3.3.1999, vol. ΣΤ'
- Konstantopoulos, N., 'I kavernisi stirizete stous vomvardismous', *Eleftheros Typos*, 18/04/1999
- Konstantopoulos, N., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH'/20.4.1999-PKΓ'/11.5.1999, vol. H', 3/5/1999
- Liarelis, S., 'Rouketa ke apo ton Aki', *Eleftherotypia*, 4/4/1999
- Manos,S.,'Ime mathimenos stis sigrousis', *Eleftheros Typos*, 25/4/1999
- Mitsotatis, K., 'I simerini igetes pezoun me ton polemo giati den exoun polemisi', *Eleftheros Typos*, 1/4/1999
- Mitsotakis, K., 'Dramatiki parembasi gia eksodo apo tin krisi', *Eleftheros Typos*, 4/4/1999
- Manos, S., 'Eimai mathimenos stis sigrousis, *Eleftheros Typos*, 25/4/1999
- Papandreou, G., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PKΔ'/12.5.1999-ΠΑΣΤ'/28.5.1999,Meeting ΠΑΕ',27 May 1999
- Paraskevopoulos, P., 'Alilegii xoris sinora', *Eleftherotypia*, 4/4/1999

- Papariga, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Session PIZ', 3 May 1999
- Papadiouxou, K.P., 'Minima pros Tirana gia ti mionotita', *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999
- Papandreou, G., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, sessions PH', 20/4/1999-  
RKG', 11/5/1999, vol.H', 3/5/1999
- Papariga, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Session PIZ', 3 May 1999
- Papariga, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH'/20.4.1999-PKG'/11.5.1999,  
vol. H', 3/5/1999
- Pavlopoulos, P., 'Isxis k Dikeo mias Iperdinamis', *Kathimerini*, 11/4/1999
- Simitis, K., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH'/20.4.1999-  
PKG'/11.5.1999, vol.H, 3 May.1999
- Sarantakos, G., 'Protasi irinis apo ton psilo', *Eleftheros Typos*, 5/4/1999
- Sarantakos, G., 'I 10 megales alilthies Mitsotaki', *Eleftheros Typos*, 2/4/1999
- Sarantakos, G., 'Omofonia gia to Kosovo sti ND', *Eleftheros Typos*, 1/4/1999
- 'Omofonia Karamanli-Mitsotaki sti ND', editorial, *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999
- Simitis, K., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions PH', 20/4/1999  
PKG', 11/5/1999, vol.H' 3/5/1999
- 'O proedros tis ND episimeni tous kindinous' *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999
- 'Anikse o kiklos enimerosis politikon arxigon', *Kathimerini*, 7/4/1999
- 'Konstantopoulos: oratos o efialtis ton xerseon', editorial, *Eleftherotypia*, 19/4/1999
- Samaras, A., 'Geliopiisi tou OHE', *Eleftheros Typos*, 1/4/1999
- Sarantakos, G., 'Omofonia gia to Kosovo sti ND', *Eleftheros Typos*, 1/4/1999
- Sarantakos, G., 'Lathos polemos gia lathos logous', *Eleftheros Typos*, 25/4/1999
- Tsochatzopoulos, A., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions OE'/8.2.1999-  
ΠΘ'/3.3.1999
- Tsochatzopoulos, A., 'Adianoiti kathe prospathia allagi sinoron', *Kathimerini*, 1/4/1999

Tsovolas, D., *Records of the Greek Parliament*, Sessions ΠΗ'/20.4.1999-ΠΚΓ'/11.5.1999, vol. Η', 3/5/1999

Theodorakis, M., 'Μια simaxia na stamatisi tous neous eksousiastes', *Eleftherotypia*, 13/4/1999

## **2. Secondary Sources**

Glenny, M., 1999, *The Balkans, 1894-1999*, London: Granta Books

Gow, J., 1997, *Triumph of the Lack of Will: International Diplomacy and the Yugoslav War*, London: Hurst

Judah, T., 1997, *The Serbs: History, Myth, and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press

Malcolm, N., 1994, *Bosnia: A Short History*, London: Macmillan

Malcolm, N., 1998, *Kosovo: A Short History*, London: Macmillan

Mazower, M., 2000, *The Balkans*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson

Simms, B., 2001, *Unfinest Hour, Britain and the Destruction of Bosnia*, The Penguin Press

Silber, L., and A. Little, 1996, *Yugoslavia: Death of a Nation*, London: Penguin.