The Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy
A Conceptual Framework and an Empirical Application in Greek-Turkish Relations

Apostolos Agnantopoulos

PhD candidate
European Research Institute
Department of Political Science and international Studies
University of Birmingham

Tel: +44 (0) 121 4542497
Fax: +44 (0) 121 4143496

Paper submitted at the 2nd LSE Symposium on Modern Greece, June 10, 2005

1. Introduction

This paper is part of my ongoing PhD thesis which investigates the effects of EU membership on Greek foreign policy. The central question is: To what extent has Greek foreign policy been Europeanised by operating for so many years within an EU institutional environment?

In Greece as elsewhere, the term Europeanisation is a source of conceptual confusion. In the field of foreign policy we can distinguish at least four different ways in which the term has been employed. First, Europeanisation is used to describe a process through which Greece has been transformed from an awkward partner that consistently deviated from EU consensus on foreign policy issues to an "orthodox" member-state and champion of European integration[1]. From this perspective the Europeanisation is a process of convergence to a European mainstream. Second Europeanisation is understood in terms of "diplomatic lever"[2]. In this context particular emphasis has been given to the "bargaining power and negotiating effectiveness" entailed by Greece's participation in EU policy-making and its ability to use EU instruments in the pursuit of national goals[3]. Third Europeanisation is used to depict the influence of EU membership on what is commonly called the "domestic sources" of foreign policy. From this perspective the Europeanisation of Greek foreign policy is considered to be part of a wider trend of modernisation of the Greek economy, society and politics, which is triggered and/or upheld by EU membership[4]. Finally Europeanisation is seen as a process of adaptation of Greek foreign policy structures and processes to EU standards. In this respect the focus is on the influence of EU membership on the constitutional and administrative structures, the thematic agenda and the policy styles[5].

---

[1] Axt, H-J. (1997): "National Interests on Top of the Agenda – Greece's Role in Common Foreign and Security Policy", in Axt, H-J. (ed.) *Greece and the EU – Stranger Among Partners*?, (Baden, Baden); Valinakis, Y. (1993): "Greece in European Political Co-operation: The First Ten Years"; in Tsoukalis, L. (ed.) *Greece in the European Community: The Challenge of Adjustment* ; (Athens, EKEM/Papazisis)

[2] Couloumbis, T. (1994): "Introduction: The Impact of EC (EU) Membership on Greece's foreign policy profile; in Kazakos, P. & Ioakimidis, P. (1994) *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*, (London, Pinter), p. 191

[3] Ioakimidis, P. (1993): "Greece in the EC: Policies, Experiences and Prospects" in Psomiades, H. & Thomadakis, s. (eds.) *Greece in the New Europe* (New York, Pella), p. 415

[4] Tsoukalis, L. (2003): "The Future of Greece in the European Union"; in Couloumbis, T. ,Kariotis, T. & Bellou, F. (2003): *Greece in the Twentieth Century* (London, Frank Cass)

[5] Ioakimidis, P.(2000): "The Europeanisation of Greece's Foreign Policy: Progress and Problems", in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot)

From the above discussion it emerges that whereas the influence of EU membership on Greek foreign policy has been widely studied, little effort has been made to advance a coherent theoretical framework that is able to grasp the different aspects of EU impact. In this paper I attempt to fill this gap by introducing a theoretical model which is based on three pillars.

The first is a discursive/constructivist understanding of foreign policy, which portrays to take hold of the fact that national interests, and the resulting foreign policy objectives and means, are not given but socially constructed. For this purpose I introduce the concept of *foreign policy discourse* which is understood as a set of statements that provide the rationale for foreign policy action by establishing a particular understanding of national interests and identifying connection between means and objectives in order to achieve those interests. Accordingly, foreign policy change is understood in terms of *adjustment*, *transformation* or *replacement* of the dominant foreign policy discourse.

The second pillar is the identification of four "pathways"[6] of Europeanisation. More precisely I argue that at the substantive level (i.e. content of foreign policy discourse) Europeanisation may occur either through the setting up of policies which force member states to adapt (pathway 1) or through the spread of policy paradigms and norms of appropriate foreign policy behaviour which provide member states with a different understanding of their interests (pathway 2). At the procedural level (i.e. policy-making structures and processes) Europeanisation may entail the adjustment of domestic institutions to the requirements of EU membership (pathway 3) or the socialistaion of national officials to the procedural norms which guide policy making within the EU (pathway 4). This procedural Europeanisation may of course affect indirectly the substance of foreign policy.

The third building block is the specification of five mediating conditions of EU impact: the salience of the issue area; the institutional capacity for reform, which depends on the autonomy of the executive leadership, the presence of veto points and the institutional/bureaucratic culture; the active engagement of change agents at the

[6] On the notion of pathway see euborderconf.bham.ac.uk. My model has been inspired from the conceptual framework used in the context of this project, which studies the European Unon's impact on the transformation of border conflicts. However, the pathways and mediating conditions I identify are different.

domestic level; the timing of the European input; and finally the parallel evolutions in world politics including the target area.

The utility of this model is illustrated through an examination of Greek-Turkish relations during a 20 years period which spans from the restoration of democracy till the present. Based on an extensive review of secondary literature and primary sources I will show that Greek foreign policy towards Turkey has undergone a substantial change since the second half of the 1990s, which however falls short of challenging the basic understandings upon which it has been built. I will therefore argue that this shift can best be described in terms of a transformation of the dominant foreign policy discourse. I will also advance some tentative arguments concerning the extent to which this transformation can be attributed to EU membership as well as the conditions that have facilitated or hampered this process of Europeanisation.

In the next section I elaborate my conceptual framework. In the third section I present a historical overview which seeks to identify patterns of continuity and change in Greek foreign policy. The third section deals with the pathways and conditions of Europeanisation. The concluding sections summarises the findings

2. Conceptual framework

2.1. Foreign policy discourse

The study of foreign policy, like the study of international relations more generally has been marked by a vigorous debate between the rationalist and reflectivist traditions.

According to the former, foreign policy should be seen as a purposeful activity which involves the formulation of a set of objectives to be achieved and the employment of the necessary means/capabilities for achieving them from the part of an independent international actor (most notably governments representing a state), which is directed towards the external environment in this actor operates[7]. From this perspective foreign policy change involves a redefinition of objectives and means and

[7] See Hill, C. (2003): *The Changing Politics of Foreign* Policy; (Basingstoke, Palgrave), p. 3; Carlsnaes, W. (2002): "Foreign Policy"; in Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T. & Simmons, B. *Handbook of International Relations*, (Thousand Oaks, Sage), p. 335

it can be represented as a continuum at the one end of which we have limited adjustment in means and at the other a reorientation in the international role and activities of the state[8]. It follows that the role of the foreign policy analyst is to discover the reasons that prompt states to redirect their foreign policies. These might include material factors that lie in the states' external and internal environment, such as the distribution of capabilities or the constellation of interests of domestic constituencies or alternatively change might be related with factors which are found within the decision making-process, with particular emphasis being given to the perceptions of individual policy-makers and the bureaucratic processes of decision making[9].

The reflectivist tradition sees foreign policy as a discursive activity that constructs the self and the other[10]. Reflectivists portray that the world does not exist independently of the meaning we make of it and that this meaning is constituted through discourse. Discourse is understood in post-structuralist terms as inherently "ambiguous, incomplete and contingent systems of meaning"[11], which produce identities, in the sense that "they operationalise a regime of truth while excluding other possible modes of identity"[12]. From this perspective the analysis of foreign policy should be concerned not with the way policy-makers decide on a mixture of objectives and means but with the way national identities are constituted through and represented in foreign policies[13].

The central problem which rationalist approaches face is that they do not take into account the role of ideational factors in the shaping of national interests. National

[8] Holsti, O. (1982): *Why Nations Realign: foreign Policy Restructuring in the Post-war World*; (London, George Allen & Unwin); Hermann, C. (1990): Hermann, C. (1990): "Changing Course: When Governments Choose to Redirect Foreign Policy"; in *International Studies Quarterly*, 34: p. 5

[9] See Holsti, O. (1982): *Why Nations Realign: foreign Policy Restructuring in the Post-war World*; (London, George Allen & Unwin) ; Hermann, C. (1990): "Changing Course: When Governments Choose to Redirect Foreign Policy"; in *International Studies Quarterly*, 34: pp. 3-21; Gustavsson, J. (1999): "How Should We Study Foreign Policy Change?"; in *Cooperation and Conflict,* Vol. 34. No. 1, pp. 73-95; See also the collective volume of Rosati, J., Hagan, J. & Sampson, M. (1994): *Foreign policy Restructuring: How Governments Respond to Global Change*, (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press)

[10] Pace, M. (2004): 'The Euro-Mediterranean "Partnership" and the "Common" Mediterranean Strategy? European Union policy from a discursive perspective', *Geopolitics*, Vol 9 No. 2, pp. 292-309

[11] Howarth, D. (2000): *Discourse*; (Buckingham, Open University Press), p. 4

[12] Milliken, J. (1999): "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5, No 2

[13] See Campbell, D. (1992): *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*; (Minneapolis, University of Minessota Press); Weldes, J. (1996): "Constructing National Interests"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 275-318; for an overview see Milliken, J. (1999): op. cit.

interests are usually posited on the basis of brave assumptions about the rationality of policy-makers and their ability to respond to external and internal stimuli. Even those scholars who attempted to investigate the influence of decision makers beliefs in foreign policy outcomes subscribe to an individualistic understanding of ideas which underestimates the social structure within which these beliefs are embedded[14]. Another problem with rationalism is that it often ends up with a materialist/idealist dichotomy following which foreign policy change may occur either from material interests or from ideological factors[15]. On the other hand, reflectivists by virtue of their focus on social constitution are well positioned to account for the "sources" of ideas however their neglect of causal theorising prevents them from studying the impact of those ideas on foreign policy outcomes[16].

My approach seeks to integrate the reflectivist and rationalist tradition under a discursive constructivist understanding of foreign policy. More precisely, together with reflectivists I argue that interests cannot be given apart from socially constituted ideas, and together with rationalists I argue that this focus on social constitution should not prevent us from studying the causal effect ideas have on foreign policy. The intellectual background for the bridging of the two traditions is provided by a school of thought, which is commonly known as Social Constructivism. Social constructivists are united in their conviction that the environment in which states operate is social as well as material and that this setting can provide them with an understanding of their interests[17] but they differ as to the social content of our world. Some refer to systemic culture[18] others to international norms[19], others to national identities[20].

---

[14] Larsen, H. (1997): *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe*, (London, Routledge), p. 4

[15] For a very interesting discussion see Laffey, M. & Weldes, J (1996): "Beyond Beliefs: Ideas as Symbolic Technologies in the Study of International Relations"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 193-237

[16] Yee, A. (1996): "The Causal Effects of Ideas on Policies"; in *International Organisation*, Vol. 50, No 1, pp. 69-108

[17] Checkel, J. (1998): "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory"; in *World Politics*, 50, p.325

[18] Wendt, A. (1999): *Theory of International Politics*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)

[19] Finnemore, M. & Sikkink, K. (1998): "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change", in *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 887-917; Herman, R. (1996): "Identity, Norms and National Security: The Soviet Foreign Policy Revolution and the End of the Cold War"; in Katzenstein, P. (ed.) *The Culture of National Security*, (New York, Columbia University Press)

[20] Barnett, M. (1999): "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 5-36

In an attempt to integrate these different elements I introduce the concept of *foreign policy discourse* which I define as *a set of statements that provide the rationale for foreign policy action by establishing a particular understanding of national interests and identifying connections between means and objectives in order to achieve those interests*. A foreign policy discourse does not come out of thin air. It is based on a particular representation of the world which reflects dominant perceptions of the self and the other. The concept of policy discourse so defined comes close to what Hall calls a policy paradigm that is "a framework of ideas and standards that specifies not only the goal of policy and the kind of instruments that can be used to attain them, but also the very nature of the problems they are meant to be addressing"[21]. However the use of the term discourse has the advantage of directing our attention away from an abstract mental construction (i.e. ideas) towards something that can be directly observed (i.e.statements)[22]. This methodological issue is a reflection of a more substantive difference between the two concepts. By focusing on shared ideas, the concept of policy paradigm still conceives of meaning in individualistic terms. Within the discursive/constructivist perspective that I propose meaning is intersubjective and in part linguistic[23]. This transition from ideas to discourse allows us to transcend the conventional understanding of the policy-making process as an arena where different actors, holding different beliefs interpret options and compete to influence the final decision, towards an understanding of the policy-making process as a discursive space where different discourses compete for adherents[24].

At a specific point in time a particular policy discourse will acquire dominance and will therefore provide the framework of foreign policy action[25]. The possibility of change in this model resides in the capacity of alternative policy discourses to challenge the dominant discourse. More precisely I argue that it is possible to identify three levels of change:

---

[21] Hall, P. (1993): "Policy Paradigm, Social Learning and the State: The Case of Economic Policy Making in Britain"; in *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 25, No. 3, p. 279

[22] Wæver, O. (1998): "Explaining Europe by Decoding Discourses"; in Wivel, A. *Explaining European Integration*, (Copenhagen, Copenhagen Political Studies Press), p. 107

[23] Weldes, J. & Saco, D. (1996): "Making State Action Possible: The United States and the Discursive construction of the Cuban Missile Crisis"; in *Millenium*, Vol. 25. No. 2

[24] Shapiro, M., Bonham, M. & Heradstveit, D. (1988): "A Discursive Practice Approach to Collective Decision Making"; in *International Studies Quarterly,* 32, p. 399

[25] On the concept of dominant discourse see Wæver, O. (1998): op. cit.

- Adjustment, which involves a limited change in the means used, but which leaves the dominant policy discourse intact.
- Transformation, which involves a substantial change in the means used (including the introduction of new means and strategies)
- Replacement, which involves the abandonment of the dominant policy discourse in favour of a new policy discourse (including the identification of new objectives)

2.2. Pathways and conditions of Europeanisation

The concept of Europeanisation has taken various meanings throughout modern history ranging from an anthropological debate on the emergence of a European culture to a sociological enquiry into the diffusion of cultural norms and patterns of behaviour[26]. For the purpose of this study Europeanisation is understood as a process through which European integration influences the foreign policies of member states. Thus Europeanisation is strictly speaking EU-sation.

According to Diez et al.[27] it is possible to identify four understandings of Europeanisation: Policy Europeanisation, which studies the influence of European integration on member-states' public policies, including policy actors, policy problems, policy instruments and policy styles[28]. Political Europeanisation, which examines the influence of European integration on political actors such as executives, public administrations, political parties, parliaments, interest groups and subnational governments[29]. Societal Europeanisation which operates at a rather more fundamental level that the other two and can be defined as a process of change in the construction of intersubjective meanings and common understandings within the context of European integration[30]. Discursive Europeanisation, which focus on public discourses

[26] For an overview see Featherstone, K. (2003): "In the Name of Europe"; in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), pp. 5-12
[27] See Diez, T., Agnantopoulos, A. & Kaliber, A. (2005): "Turkey, Europeanisation and Civil Society"; in *South European Society and Politics*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 1-15
[28] Radaelli, C. (2003): "The Europeanisation of Public Policy" in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), p. 35
[29] See the collective Hix, S. & Goetz, K. (2000): *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political systems*, (London, Frank Cass)
[30] Risse, T. (2001): "A Europan Identity? Europeanisation and the Evolution of National Identities"; in Cowles, M-G. et al. *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change,* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press), p. 201

and analyses the extend to which references to the EU are made in public claims and how this has changed over time[31].

Research on Europeanisation has initially adopted a top-down approach following which European integration triggers a process of change, the outcome of which will depend on a number of mediating factors to be found in the domestic environment of states. In the field of public policy for instance it has been argued that Europeanisation emanates from an adaptational pressure, the magnitude of which depends on the degree of compatibility (goodness of fit) between domestic and EU arrangements[32]. The problem with these to-down approaches is that they do not take into account that domestic change may not involve an adaptational pressure, but instead emerge from the fact that EU decisions challenge domestic equilibriua and therefore may alter the opportunity structures of domestic actors[33], or from the fact domestic reformers may use the "need of adaptation" to EU requirements as an excuse to promote change[34]. Accordingly recent research has adopted a bottom up approach which starts from a domestic system of interaction and examines how the EU provides a change in any of the components of the domestic system of interaction[35].

The Europeanisation of national foreign policies is strictly speaking falling to the category of policy Europeanisation. However in the constructivist understanding that this study employs it is difficult to isolate the policy and the societal dimension, since both of them are interrelated. In order to depict the different facets of EU impact on foreign policies it is therefore necessary to develop a genuine model.

My model is based on the identification four pathways which can be categorised along two dimensions. The first dimension distinguishes between the sources of EU impact, in particular whether it emanates from the setting up of a particular policy or

---

[31] Diez, T., Agnantopoulos, A. & Kaliber, A. (2005): op. cit.
[32] Risse, T., Cowles, M-G, Caporaso, J. (2001): "Europenisation and Domestic Change: Introduction"; in Cowles, M-G. et al. *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change,* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press)
[33] Heritier, A. et al. (2001): *Differential Europe: The European Union's Impact on National Policy Making* ; (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield); Haverland, M. (2000): "National Adaptation to European Integration: The Importance of Institutional Veto Points"; in *Journal of Public Policy*; Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 83-103
[34] Kallestrup, M. (2002): "Europeanisation as Discourse: Domestic Policy Legitimisation Through the Articulation of the Need for Adaptation"; in *Public Policy and Administration*, Vol. 17, No 2, pp. 110-124
[35] Radaelli, C. (2004): "Europeanisation: Solution or Problem?"in European Integration on-line Papers;Vol. 8, No. 16, http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004-016a.htm

institutional arrangement, or whether it involves the development and diffusion of ideas of appropriate policies and diplomatic practices[36]. The second dimension concerns the level of EU impact, in particular whether it touches upon the substance of foreign policy (i.e. foreign policy discourse) or the foreign policy-making process. The latter is related to the former, since a change in the process through which foreign policy is formulated is likely to affect its substance, but the link here is indirect. More precisely:

The first pathway which I shall call substantive/regulative emerges when the EU prescribes (or intends to prescribe) a specific policy for member states to follow. In this case change is the result of an adaptational pressure (real or anticipated) provoked by the incompatibility between domestic and European arrangements. The dynamics of change will therefore involve coercion, and compliance with EU requirements will depend on an instrumental calculation of costs and benefits. The adaptational pressure will be stronger in those policy areas where member-states have relinquished a great amount of competencies to supranational institutions (i..e EC external relations) because on the one hand they will have less power to influence decisions and on the other hand commitments will be legally binding. However, the literature reveals that even in areas of intergovernmental co-operation the lack of legally binding agreements did not always entail a lack of enforcement[37]. In any event change should normally be absorbed within the existing policy discourse.

The second pathway which I shall call substantive/constitutive is activated when policy philosophies and norms of appropriate foreign policy behaviour which are first established at the EU level are diffused to member states. Following Manners[38] it is possible to identify five basic norms: peace, liberty, democracy, rule of law and human rights. In contrast with the previous pathway change is not triggered by an adaptational pressure and does not involve coercion. It comes through persuasion[39] and it is likely to involve a transformation of the dominant discourse. Ultimately this

[36] For a similar attempt to differentiate between positive, negative and framing integration see Knill, C. & Lehmkuhl, D. (1999): "How Europe Matters: Different Mechanisms of europeanisation"; in European Integration on-line Papers, Vol. 3, No. 7, http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/1999-007.htm

[37] Jorgensen, K.E. (1997): ""PoCo: The diplomatic Republic of Europe"; in Jorgensen, K.E. (ed.) *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, (London, MacMillan)

[38] Manners, I. (2002): "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?"; in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 234-258

[39] Sedelmeier, U. (2004): "Collective Identity"; in Carlsnaes, W., Sjursen, H., White, B. (eds.) *Contemporary European Foreign Policy*, (Thousand Oaks, Sage)

pathway may lead to a substantial change in national identities which in turn may bring a replacement of the dominant discourse from an alternative discourse[40].

The third pathway which I shall call procedural/regulative emerges when participation in the EU requires an institutional restructuring in member states. This will normally involve an expansion in size and finances of foreign ministries and diplomatic services as well as an increase in the number of missions and accreditations both in the EU and third countries, in order to deal with a growing workload and an expanded agenda[41]. Some empirical studies have also identified that foreign ministries have been able to exercise central strategic political control because they have been entrusted with the work of co-ordinating EU affairs[42]. At the same time the nature of EU policy-making has allowed other ministries to develop their own external relations and conduct their own foreign policies, thus challenging the role of foreign ministries as gatekeepers[43]. On the whole this pathway involves a change in the opportunity structures of domestic actors. As a result of this alteration in opportunity structures, previously marginalised discourses might be strengthened.

The fourth pathway which I shall call procedural/constitutive focuses on the socialisation of national policy-makers to the formal and informal procedural norms that guide interaction among member-states. Within the CFSP/EPC framework these procedural norms include the habit of regular consultation, the responsibility to keep shared information confidential, a commitment to engage in genuine efforts for compromise rather than seeking loopholes to block unpleasant decisions and the right to keep issues considered essential for national security outside the scope of the EU[44]. The existence of these norms is said to have influenced the way member-states conduct foreign policy within the EU towards a more co-operative style which enabled them to overcome power politics and reach common position that transcended the lowest common denominator[45]. Co-operation may also be facilitated

---

[40] For an argument along these lines on the case of Spain see Torreblanca, J. (2001): "Ideas, Preferences and Institutions: Explaining the Europeanisation of Spanish Foreign Policy"; *Arena Working Papers, 26*

[41] Smith, M. (2000): ""Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Co-operation"; *Journal of European Public Policy,* Vol. 7, No 4, p. 620

[42] Smith, M. (2000): op. cit. p. 621

[43] Manners, I. & Whitman, R. (2000): "Conclusion"; in Manners, I. & Whitman, R. *The Foreign Policies of the European Union Member* States, (Manchester, Manchester University Press), p. 260

[44] Smith, M. (2000): op. cit.

[45] Tonra, B. (1997): "The Impact of Political Co-operation"; in Jorgensen, K.E. (ed.) *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, (London, MacMillan); Glarbo, K. (1999): Wide-awake

by the frequency of interactions which can influences the self perceptions of national officials and create a sense of we-feeling[46].

It is important to note that the distinction between sources of EU impact is an analytical not an ontological one. By this I mean that what matters is not so much the way EU is involved (direct policy, norms of appropriate behaviour) but how EU involvement is seen at the domestic level. The internalisation of informal norms might involve rhetorical action and coercion[47]. In the same vain, as the second generation of Europeanisation has shown, compliance with EU policies might be used as an argument in the domestic political debate by actors who favour change. Moreover at a specific point in time different perceptions of the EU might coexist. It is therefore possible that the same EU action will be interpreted differently from different actors, and that the regulative and constitutive pathways are simultaneously at work[48].

The empirical research has revealed that responses to Europeanisation have been highly idiosyncratic and that the likelihood of adjustment depends on a number of mediating factors. Based on the existing literature I have identified five such factors. The first is the institutional capacity for reform, which is a function of the existence or not of veto players who oppose change in the domestic arena, the capacity of the executive leadership and the institutional/bureaucratic culture. The hypothesis is that EU membership is likely to make a difference in conditions of intermediate capacity because in cases of low capacity change will be resisted and in cases of high capacity change is likely to be promoted irrespectively from the EU[49]. The second facilitating condition is the mobilisation at the domestic and international arena of change agents who are able to persuade others[50]. The third factor is the timing of the European input, in particular whether it precedes, follows or coincides

---

Diplomacy: Restructuring the Common Foreign and security Policy of the European Union; in *Journal of European Public Policy (Special Issue: The Social construction of Europe),* Vol. 6, No. 4

[46] Hayes-Renshaw, F. (1990): p. 304; Aggestam, L. (2004): "Role Identity and the Europeanisation of Foreign Policy"; in Tonra, B. & Christiansen, T. (eds.) *Rethinking European Foreign Policy*; (Manchester, Manchester University Press)

[47] Schimmelfennig, F. (2000): "International Socialisation in the New Europe: Rational Action in an International Environment"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 109-139

[48] Methodologically this means that in order to have constitutive effects the EU must be seen as part of the self in the foreign policy discourse. On the contrary when the EU is seen as an external actor the regulative pathway is at work.

[49] Radaelli, C. (2003): "The Europeanisation of Public Policy" in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), p. 47

[50] Borzel, T. & Risse, T. (20030: "Conceptualising the Domestic Impact of Europe"; in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), p. 47

with domestic processes of transformation[51]. The fourth factor is the salience of the policy area. The expectation here is that when an issue is considered of high priority adaptation will be more difficult. Finally one has to take into account parallel evolutions in the external environment of the state. In this respect it is important to examine systemic changes, the role of other actors as well as changes in the target area[52].

3. The evolution of Greek foreign policy towards Turkey

3.1. A "threat from the east"

For much of the Cold War Greece and Turkey have maintained reasonably good relations and, notwithstanding the escalation of bi-communal conflict in Cyprus and the diplomatic tension created over the situation of the Greek minority in Turkey during the 1960s, a Greek-Turkish war was "unconceivable"[53]. This period of relative stability came to an end in 1974, when Turkey invaded Cyprus and occupied 37% of its northern territory in response to the overthrown of the islands' elected government by a Greek-Cypriot nationalist group whose declared objective was to achieve the unification *(enosis)* of Cyprus with Greece. Although these events did not lead to an outright war they nevertheless resulted to the deepening of existing divisions through the forced displacement of 160,000 Greek Cypriots and 40,000 Turkish Cypriots to and from the southern part of the island and the creation of two ethnically homogeneous zones. This in turn had a negative impact on the bilateral relations of their respective homeland. In parallel with the deterioration of the situation in Cyprus, Greek-Turkish relations since 1974 have been marked by the gradual emergence of bilateral differences over the control of the Aegean, including the responsibility for air traffic control in the Athens FIR, the extent of the Greek territorial waters and national airspace and the delimitation of the continental self of the Greek islands,

[51] Radaelli, C. (2003): "The Europeanisation of Public Policy" in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), p. 47.
[52] Vaquer i Fanes, J. (2001): "Europeanisation and Foreign Policy"; *Working Paper No 21, Observatori de Politica Exterior*, IUEE, UAB, Barcelona
[53] Botsiou, K. (2001): "Greek Turkish Relations: A Historical Overview (1974-2000)"; in Kazakos, P. et al.: *Greece and Turkey's European Future*; (Sideris, Athens), p. 141

which brought the two countries to the brink of war in 1976, when Turkey dispatched the survey ship Sismik in contested waters[54]. Relations between Greece and Turkey soured further by allegations over the mistreatment of the Turkish speaking Muslim minority in Western Thrace[55].

The Turkish invasion in Cyprus and the proliferation of differences in the Aegean has generated a consensus among Greek foreign policy-makers and public opinion that Turkey pursues a revisionist foreign policy which aims to alter the status quo[56] and therefore it represents a threat for Greece's national security. After the end of the Cold War this threat perception has been exacerbated by the belief that Turkey could profit from the collapse of the Soviet Union and become a regional hegemon through the creation of an Islamic Arc extending from Central Asia to the Balkans[57].

The idea of Turkish threat flourished because it resonated well with dominant societal perceptions of Greekness. More precisely Greek national identity has been founded on the postulation that the Greek nation has a unified history which starts from the Ancient Greece (Classical and Hellenistic era) and, passing through Byzantium and the Ottoman era, gets to the establishment of the modern Greek state which is the homeland for all the linguistic groups and peoples that had been incorporated into the Greek nation throughout the centuries[58]. The idea that the

[54] For a historical overview of the emergence of these bilateral differences see Clogg, R. (1991):"Greek - Turkish Relations in the Post-1974 Period"; in Constas, D. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan),

[55] The Muslim minority of Thrace is composed of three constituencies (according to their self-designation): Pomaks, Roms and Turks. However the Greek state has find it difficult to accept the self-designation of parts of this minority as Turks. See Tsitselikis, (2004): "How Far Have EU Policies Affected Minority Issues in Greece and Turkey?"; Paper presented at the EUBorderConf conference in Istanbul, November 2004

[56] As led down by the Treaties of Lausanne (1923), Montreux (1936) and Paris (1947); see Coufoudakis, V. (1985): "Greek-Turkish Relations, 1973-1983: the View form Athens"; in *Security Dialogue*, (Spring), pp. 201-204

[57] See Yallouridis, C. (1999): "The External Orientation and Political Culture of Turkey" ; in Yallouridis, C. & Tsakonas, P. (eds.) *Greece and Turkey After the End of the Cold War*; (Athens, Sideris),– in Geek, p. 106

[58] This storyline was elaborated by the Greek historians Constantinos Paparigopoulos, and Spiridon Zabelios and became the official ideology of the newly established state. This perception of Greekness prevailed because it amalgamated successfully the two main competing ideologies of the pre-Revolutionary era. The first, which was represented by the Bourgeoisie and some intellectuals perceived the inhabitants as "descendants" of ancient Greeks, identified positively with the West, subscribed to the principles of enlightenment and advocated the establishment of a independent modern nation/state. The second, which was represented by ecclesiastical circles and the aristocracy, linked Greekness with the Byzantium and Orthodoxy and perceived the creation of westernised Greek state as alien to Greece's eastern tradition. Instead it supported the establishment of a Christian Empire, with the Greeks as the ruling class. See Veremis, T. & Koliopoulos, J. (2003): "The Evolving Content of the Greek Nation"; in Couloumbis, T. ,Kariotis, T. & Bellou, F. (2003): *Greece in the Twentieth Century* (London, Frank Cass)

Greeks are inheritors of the Ancient Greek and Byzantine civilisations renders the Ottoman Empire and its successor Turkey as apparent and unfriendly "Other". In contrast with Greeks, who are the founders of democracy and who led the ground of modern civilisation, the Turks are portrayed as inherently aggressive, barbaric, totalitarian and as envying Greece's glorious past. Turkey's irredentism since 1974 is therefore not accidental but a constant feature because it is deeply embedded in the nature of the Turkish people[59].

Beyond this dominant nationalist discourse it is possible to identify three other interrelated streams of thought which further fuel threat perceptions vis-à-vis Turkey: The first is based on the idea of an irreconcilable rift between the Greek-Orthodox and Western civilisations. According to the proponents of this discourse the problem is not the nature of Turkish people per se, but the fact that catholic and protestant Western countries, which constantly conspire to destroy the Greece nation, prompt and support Turkish irredentism[60]. The second has its roots in classical "geopolitical" thinking and portrays that Turkey, driven by rapid population growth and industrialisation, is in search of "vital space", and that the ageing and shrinking Greece is the obvious available slot[61]. The third is influenced by the "Realist" approach to international relations and sees Turkey's expansionary policies as a reflection of the struggle for power which is the driving force in international politics[62].

In short, since 1974 the Greek foreign policy discourse has been dominated by the perception of an imminent and existential threat from the east. This threat perception has demonstrated a remarkable stability. Turkey's revisionism has never been doubted. What has been debated however was the way Greece should respond to this threat is. It is to this issue that I turn in the next section.

3.2. The Greek strategy

Greece's response to the Turkish threat was based on three pillars: the maintenance of an adequate military balance with Turkey, in order to dissuade it from attacking Greek

[59] For a critical presentation of this thought see Heraclides, A. (2001): *Greece and the Threat from the East*; (Athens, Polis)
[60] See Heraclides, A. (2001): op. cit., pp. 81-123
[61] See Heraclides, A. (2001): op. cit., pp. 127-156
[62] See Heraclides, A. (2001): op. cit., pp. 162-189

territory (internal balancing), the rallying of international support in order to enhance Greece's diplomatic leverage (external balancing), and the evocation of international law as the basis for a viable settlement of outstanding issues. This strategy was initiated by Karamanlis, in the aftermath of the Turkish invasion in Cyprus and provided the general framework within which Greece's foreign policy towards Turkey has evolved. I shall examine each of the three pillars in turn.

Internal balancing

At the time of the Turkish invasion in Cyprus, it was widely believed that Greece's deterrence ability had been compromised by its adherence to NATO's strategic plans. When NATO rebuffed the Greek government's requests to intervene politically and militarily to force Turkey to retreat its army from Cyprus, a consensus emerged that Greece should develop an autonomous security policy, drawing upon its own resources and focusing on the protection of the long Greek coastline[63]. In this context Greece adopted a series of intensive armament programmes, with particular emphasis on the Aegean islands, which were heavily militarised. It is indicative that since 1974 and throughout the 1980s, Greece's defence expenditure represented consistently more that 6% of its GDP[64].

The credibility of the Greek deterrence strategy was also considered of primary importance. In this context it was argued that Greece should not only possess adequate military capabilities but that it should also demonstrate the will and intention to use those capabilities if necessary[65]. In this context Greece tried to delimit red lines, the transgression of which could provoke a war between the two countries. The following statement from Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou is indicative:

> "In order to avoid misunderstanding, it should be known to friends and foes alike that in case of an attack or invasion against the Greek-Cypriot positions, Greece will not stay out. I have warned that this is a *casus belli*"[66].

[63] See Platias, A. (1991): "Greece's Strategic Doctrine: In Search of Autonomy and Deterrence" in Constas, D. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan), p. 99
[64] Dokos, T. (2003): "Greek National Security Policy: The Link Between Defence Policy and Foreign Policy"; in Tsakonas, P. (2003): *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, (Athens, Papazisis)
[65] Platias, A. (1991): op. cit. p. 100
[66] See *Journal of Parliamentary Debates* (23 January, 1987) p. 2915

Greece's efforts to increase the credibility of its deterrence did not remain at the level of declarations but also entailed a dynamic reaction in cases where national sovereignty was "doubted". For instance when Sismik was sent for the second time for exploration within the contested continental self in 1987, Greece initially responded with a massive mobilisation of its army which led to the escalation of the crisis. In addition since 1974 Greek military aircrafts has engaged regularly in "virtual" battles with Turkish ones in response to the alleged violation of Greek national airspace by the latter.

In 1993, Greece announced the adoption of an Integrated Defence Doctrine, which seemed to elevate the military component of its policy towards Turkey to a higher plateau. This new doctrine provided that in the event of a Turkish attack in Cyprus, Greece would come to its defence, if necessary by launching an all-out war against Turkey[67]. According to its proponents the extension of the Greek deterrence strategy to Cyprus and, most importantly, the possibility of an asymmetrical response (which would involve the shifting of location or nature of reaction into terrain better suited to the application of Greece's strengths) would redress the imbalance created by Cyprus' geographical location[68]. The publication of the Common Defence Doctrine generated enthusiasm in the Greek public opinion and media. The perception was that after years of passive reactions Greece was at least regaining the initiative. Critics, who noted that the publication of the doctrine added little to the existing "secret" contingency planning, and who resented the inherent contradiction between Greece's claims of defending the status quo and the pursuing of "aggressive" policies were silenced[69].

Since the mid-1990s we observe a growing concern over the "deteriorating military balance" between Greece and Turkey. Several strategic analysts were pointing out that Greece's qualitative supremacy, which had until then

[67] As part of the implementation of the Common Defence Doctrine Greece and Cyprus undertook some common armament programmes and engaged in several joint military exercises. The most significant incident was the purchase of Russiasn anti-aircraft missiles (S-300), which generated tension between Turkey and Greece.

[68] On the Common Defence Doctrine see Ifestos, P. & Platias, A. (1992): *Greek Deterrence Strategy*, (Athens, Papazisis)

[69] For a critical view on the Common Defence Doctrine see Kazamias, A. (1997): "The Quest for Modernisation in Greek Foreign Policy and its Limitations"; in *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 71-94; Dokos, T. (2003): "Greek National Security Policy: The Link Between Defence Policy and Foreign Policy"; in Tsakonas, P. (2003): *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, (Athens, Papazisis)

counterbalanced the quantitative and geographical advantages of Turkey, was challenged by the rapid modernisation of the Turkish army[70]. Moreover, it was argued that Greece would be unable to redress this balance without a substantial increase in its public expenditure, which would undermine the economic stabilisation programme which was under way as part of the country's effort to be admitted to the EMU[71]. In this context some analysts argued that it was necessary for Greece to redirect its efforts towards the mutual reduction of tension through the establishment of a "limited security regime"[72]. In contrast with the "inflexible" strategies of the 1980s and early 1990s, which focused on the credibility of deterrence through intensive armaments, red-lines and asymmetrical escalation this doctrine suggested the adoption of moderate stance during period of crisis and the establishment of Confident Building Measures in order to avoid an accidental war. This new thinking was put to a test in 1996 when the countries came close to to war over the sovereignty of two Islets in the Eastern Aegean. Although Greece initially pursued the path of escalation, it quickly turned to diplomacy by engaging in intensive negotiations in order to prevent an all out war. After several days the crisis was diffused with US mediation, amid widespread criticism from the opposition parties and public opinion.

Greece's response to the Imia crisis is of course not a sufficient condition to infer a change in Greece's defence doctrine. After all, "prudence" had also prevailed in the past. However whereas the justification then was that Turkey had pulled back because of Greece's "firm-but flexible" [73] response, the main argument in this case was that through its moderate stance Greece had avoided a trap set by Turkey:

> "Greece managed to deter the Turkish plans. The deterioration of the Imia incident to an all out conflict, which was Turkey's intention, would harm Greek

[70] Dokos, T. (1999): "The Balancing of the Turkish Threat: The Military Dimension"; in Yallouridis, C. & Tsakonas, P. *Greece and Turkey After the End of the Cold War*; (Athens, Sideris) – in Geek, p. 202

[71] Moschonas, G. (2001): "The Path of Modernisation: PASOK and European Integration"; *Joirnal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 3, 11-24; see also Tsakonas, P. (2003): "Communautarising the Enemy: The Greek Balancing Strategy towards Turkey and Greek Turkish Relations"; in Tsakonas, P. (ed.) *contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*; (Athens, sideris), p. 63

[72] Tsakonas, P. (1999): "Security Regimes and Regional Stability: the Case of Greek-Turkish Arm Race"; in Yallouridis, C. & Tsakonas P. *Greece and Turkey After the End of the Cold War*; (Athens, Sideris) – in Geek

[73] Platias, A. (1991): op. cit. p. 104

interests… Turkey's attempt to engage Greece in a widespread conflict and a general discussion failed. Turkey is now in the defensive"[74].

The existence of a new strategic thinking can also be inferred by the fact that issues that could have easily escalated into serious crises in the past, such as the outbreak of airspace violations in July 2003, were relatively easily contained by elites as "disagreements"[75]. It is important to note, that although this new thinking envisages a mutual reduction of armaments in the long run it does not imply an immediate reduction of defence spending. Even the devoted advocates of the new doctrine argue that maintaining adequate military capabilities in the short term is necessary:

"It is imperative that during the first stages of rapprochement the maintenance of an adequate balance of power should remain the ultimate axiom… this will elevate the costs of armed conflict at very high levels and will reinforce the seeking for peaceful solutions[76]".

This explains the fact that a few months after the Imia crisis Greece announced a very ambitious re-armament program and that calls for substantial cuts on military expenditure have been met with suspicion[77].

External balancing

The external balancing of Turkey had two dimensions. First Greece sought to establish closer relations with the Balkan countries, which had until then been considered as the primary threat to Greece's security in order to reduce the possibility of multi-front conflicts. Second Greece sought support for its positions in the context of the international organisations to which it participated in order to create favourable conditions for a peaceful resolution of the disputes in the Aegean and Cyprus.

[74] Speech of Costas Simitis (Prime Minister – Leader of PASOK); in in *Journal of Parliamentary Debates*, (6 May 1996), p. 6963
[75] Rumelili, B. (2004): "The European Union's Impact on the Greek Turkish Conflict"; *EUBorderConf Working Paper Series*, No. 6: p. 5
[76] Couloumbis, T. & Ifandis, P. (2003): "Transforming the Security Dilemma in the Aegean: Greek Strategic Choices and Structural Constraints – a Realist Approach"; in Tsakonas, P. (ed.) *contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*; (Athens, sideris) – in Greec, p. 103
[77] An analysis of Parliamentary Debates reveals that the only political party which has consistently called for a reduction in defense expenditure is the Coalition of Progressive Left (liberal left-wing).

With respect to the first dimension, Greece signed with Bulgaria a Declaration of Good Neighbourliness, Friendship and Co-operation and renounced the state of war with Albania, which had persisted for more than 40 years. At the multilateral level Greece made some timid attempts to promote co-operation, especially in "low politics" issues. The end of the Cold War and the breakout of Yugoslavia interrupted these "positive" developments. Amid widespread fear concerning the emergence of an Islamic Arc, Greece sided openly with Orthodox Serbia thus generating hostility from virtually all the countries in the region. However, since 1995 Greece has renewed its attempt to restore its relations with its northern neighbours by adopting a more equidistant approach and actively promoting regional co-operation.

With respect to the second dimension, the apparent unwillingness of NATO to intervene in favour of Greece generated the need to look for an alternative "security provider". In this context the conservative government of New Democracy applied for membership to the EC. Although the EC fell short from being a military alliance it was perceived as a system of political solidarity, which would make Turkey think twice before attacking Greek territory[78]. After accession Greek policy makers became aware that the EC could also serve as a diplomatic lever against Turkey. In this context, Greece adopted a policy of conditionality, which consisted in linking any progress in EU-Turkish relations with a modification of the Turkish stance in Aegean and Cyprus[79]. As part of this policy Greece blocked the provision of financial aid under the fourth financial protocol, which was part of the EU-Turkey Association Agreement and when Turkey was granted a special 10 million ECU assistance it protested by resorting to the European Court of Justice[80]. In addition Greece has succeeded on many occasions to include references to the Cyprus problem in joint statements and declarations issued by the Council and the European Parliament. Finally, when Turkey filled an application to become member of the EU, Greece expressed its outright objection to such a prospect.

During the 1990s we observe a gradual relaxation of Greece's conditionality policy. More precisely in 1992, Greece lifted the veto over the activation of the Fourth

[78] Valinakis, Y. (1994): Valinakis, Y. (1994): "Security Policy"; in Kazakos, K. & Ioakimidis, P. *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*, (London, Pinter)
[79] Yannas, P. (1994): "The Greek Factor in EC-Turkey Relations"; in Kazakos, P. & Ioakimidis, P. (1994) *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*, (London, Pinter), p. 216
[80] Georgiades, H. (2000): "Greece and the EU-Turkish Relationship"; in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot),p . 424

Financial Protocol, in return for EU support over the Macedonian issue. In 1995 it allowed the establishment of a customs union between the EU and Turkey in exchange of a commitment that Cyprus would start accession negotiations. A more significant change occurred in 1997 when Greece expressed for the first time its support for Turkey's eventual membership in the EU, provided that Turkey would fulfil certain criteria. This shift was consolidated two years later, during the European Council of Helsinki, when Greece gave its consent to the elevation of Turkey to the status of a candidate country, and secured an acknowledgment that a resolution of the Cyprus issue would not be a prerequisite for the accession of the country to the EU. Since then Greece has consistently hold a position in favour of Turkey's European perspective, often outmanoeuvring other more reluctant EU member states[81].

The shift in Greece's conditionality policy coincided with a growing concern, over its effectiveness. As Yannas notes this policy was based on an understanding that by using all means available as an EU member (in particular the power of veto) Greece could increase the costs of Turkey's policies and therefore lend it to rethink its position[82]. From this perspective EU memberships constituted a "comparative advantage" that Greece should handle very carefully and exchange it only with firm commitments from the Turkish side. Ultimately the permanent exclusion of Turkey was considered beneficial to the extent that Greece would be able to maintain this comparative advantage[83]. However, it soon became apparent that this policy had not prevented Turkey from establishing closer relations with the EU and that it had instead lead to increased disaffection towards Greece[84]. In this context several analysts argued that Greece should redirect its focus from the imposition of conditional sanctions (i.e. threatening to block EU-Turkish relations unless Turkey conceded fully to Greek demands) to the offering of conditional rewards (i.e. agreeing to a piecemeal improvement in EU-Turkish relations provided that Turkey

[81] It is characteristic in this respect that Greece was among those states who supported Turkey's unsuccessful attempt to start accession negotiations during the European Council in Copenhagen in December 2002.
[82] Yannas, P. (1994): "The Greek Factor in EC-Turkey Relations"; in Kazakos, P. & Ioakimidis, P. (1994) *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*, (London, Pinter), p. 216
[83] Coufoudakis, V. (1991): "Greek Political Party Attitudes Towards Turkey: 1974-89"; in Constas, D. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan)
[84] See Stephanou, C. & Tsardanides, C. (1991): "The EC Factor in the Greece-Turkey-Cyprus Triangle; in Constas, D. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan), p. 213; Georgiades, H. (2000): "Greece and the EU-Turkish Relationship"; in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot), p. 425

demonstrates a more accommodating stance)[85]. According to this strategy Greece's objective should not be to exclude Turkey but on the contrary to engage it in a long term process of economic and political reform, which would eventually lead to the adoption of EU principles and the abandonment of its revisionist behaviour. From this perspective the resolution of Greek Turkish disputes was not a prerequisite but part of the wider process of Europeanisation of Turkey which would start once a realistic prospect of EU membership was established. According to its proponents the potential losses in terms of diplomatic leverage entailed by the renunciation of veto would be compensated by the fact that Turkey's conformity and co-operation would become subject not only to Greek supervision but to an institutionalised EU monitoring mechanism[86]. This thinking was reflected in the speeches of Prime Minsiter Costas Simitis and the Foreign Minister George Papandreou at the Greek Parliament in the immediate aftermath of the Helsinki European Council:

> "We did not want a virtual Turkish candidacy. We wanted a real and substantive candidacy. A candidacy which entails rights and duties emanating from the criteria that apply for any other country… The rules of the game are clear and identical for every country. There is only one way for those who have differences: peaceful resolution and recourse to the International Court of Justice… The accession process will gradually construct links that transgress existing borders… it will lead to an extended relationship… it will consolidate peaceful coexistence and it will diminish or even abolish aggressive policies… references to co-operation and friendship are nor merely wishful thinking, they have been made possible"[87].

> "From the moment that candidacy status is accorded there will be a framework for the monitoring of Turkey, just like for any other country… this is a European system… we do not refer to Greece, France, Germany and the special relationship

[85] The terms conditional sanctions and conditional rewards have been initiated by Theodorsw Couloumbis. See Couloumbis, T. & Ifandis, P. (2003): "Transforming the Security Dilemma in the Aegean: Greek Strategic Choices and Structural Constraints – a Realist Approach"; in Tsakonas, P. (ed.) *contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*; (Athens, sideris) – in Greec, p. 103

[86] See for example Tsakonas, P. (2003): "Communautarising the Enemy: Greek Balance Strategy and Greek Turkish Relations"; in Tsakonas, P. *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, (Athens, Sideris)

[87] Speech of Costas Simitis (Prime Minister – Leader of PASOK); in in *Journal of Parliamentary Debates*, (15 December, 1999), pp. 2362-2364,

that these might have with Turkey… It is a European system, committed to the decisions of the European Council… it will not be Greece that will ask for controls… our partners will be even more demanding that we are"[88].

Bilateral diplomacy

Since 1974 the official Greek position has been that the only difference between the two countries concerned the delimitation of the continental self, for which the only acceptable solution was a referral to the International Court of Justice. However in the late 1970s the conservative government of New Democracy made a timid attempt to reach a peaceful settlement of the dispute over the continental self through the institutionalisation of a dialogue that comprised some political elements[89]. After the coming into government of PASOK, however, Greece hardened its position by refusing to engage in any kind of negotiations with Turkey and insisting on the legal nature of the disputes. The absence of any substantial dialogue was maintained until 1988, when the Prime Ministers of Turkey and Greece met in Davos and agreed to set up two comities in order to discuss the bilateral differences between the two countries. The so called "Davos process" established the principle of "no war" and also led to the signing of a memorandum from the foreign ministers of the two countries, by which they agreed to elaborate a number of Confidence Building Measures in the Aegean concerning the conduct of military exercises. However, this process of rapprochement was short lived and an initiative to revive it in the early 1990s remained at the level of declarations and failed to produce any substantial results[90]

The rationale behind Greece's legalistic and uncompromising stance was that Greece did not demand anything from Turkey and therefore should not engage in negotiations over unilateral Turkish demands, because by definition it would be a net looser. In this context even effort to engage in informal dialogue with Turkey was ruled out as "appeasement" that would further fuel Turkey's expansionism.

---

[88] Speech of George Papandreou (Minister of Foreign Affairs –PASOK); in in *Journal of Parliamentary Debates*, (15 December, 1999), p. 2396

[89] In this context the Greece and Turkey signed the Berne declaration in 1976, by which they agreed to refrain from unilateral actions regarding the Aegean continental self. This was followed by meetings of the Prime Ministers of the two countries in Washington and Montreaux were the possibility of a non-aggression pact was discussed. See Clogg, R. (1991):"Greek - Turkish Relations in the Post-1974 Period"; in Constas, D. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan),

[90] Botsiou, K. (2001): op. cit. p. 177

The legalistic/uncompromising approach has been reinforced by the fact that Greek diplomacy was dominated by the perception for the existence of national rights which were not subject to negotiation[91]. In the Greek foreign policy discourse national rights were used as a substitute for what is commonly called vital national interests but with the additional qualification that they were considered as part of Greece's heritage, not the outcome of rational calculations, and therefore they should be protected at all costs and irrespectively of the possible repercussions this may had in other areas.

Greece's reluctance to compromise seems also to have been nurtured by the absence of stable policy making structures. By this I do not mean that formal policy making structures do not exist. As Ioakimidis notes the problem is not so much the lack of formal structures but the culture of "proceduralism" entrenched within the foreign policy establishment, which induce diplomats to faithfully implement the decisions taken by the political leadership and prevent them from contributing to the formulation of foreign policy goals[92]. The absence of a functioning institutional framework leaded to the dominance of personalities in the policy-making process which in turn is said to contribute to the adoption of maximalistic and irrational foreign policy goals, because the criterion is the maximisation of the electoral appeal of the personality concerned[93].

Over recent years Greece has adopted a relatively more relaxed attitude towards bilateral negotiations. This is particularly evident in low politics issues, where numerous agreements have been signed between the two countries since 1999. In high politics issues we can observe a vigorous attempt to establish Confidence Building Measures. In 1997 the Prime Minister Simitis met his Turkish counterpart at the margins of a NATO conference in Madrid and agreed to issue a joint declaration where they committed their countries to certain principles of good neighbourhood that could, if implemented, create the conditions for peaceful coexistence until a final resolution of bilateral disputes has been reached[94]. Greece has also agreed to the

[91] Keridis, D. (2001): ""Domestic Developments and Foreign Policy"; in Keridis, D. & Triantaphylou, D. (eds.) *Greek Turkish Conflict in the Era of Globalisation*, (Everett MA, Brasey's), p. 12
[92] Ioakimidis, P. (1999): "The Model of Foreign Policy-Making in Greece: personalities Versus Institutions"; in Stavridis, S., Couloumbis, T., Veremis, T. & Waites, N. (eds.) *The Foreign Policies of the European Union's Mediterranean States and Applicant Counries in the 1990s*, (Basingstoke, MacMillan), pp. 144-147
[93] ibid.
[94] Moustakis, F. (2003): *The Greek Turkish Relationship and* NATO, (London, Frank Cass), p. 51

appointment of a committee of experts to discuss the substantive issues that separate the two countries. The appointment of this committee as well as the fact that the Simitis government has accepted that the International Court of Justice has jurisdiction on issues other than the continental self is an indication that Greece has moved slightly from its previous position. On the whole however, very limited progress has been made towards the reaching of final settlement solution.

3.3. Continuity or change?

On the basis of the above discussion I argue that it is possible to identify four sub-periods. The first starts from the return of democratic rule and finishes with the coming into government of PASOK in 1981. The second spans from 1981 to 1989 and covers the two consecutives periods of PASOK government. The third extends from 1989 until the end of 1995 (replacement of Papandreou from Costas Simitis). The fourth refers to the Simitis era. The irredentist tensions of Turkey and the imperative to respond to the existential Turkish threat are not questioned in any of the sub-periods. What has evolved however is the mixture of military, diplomatic and legal means Greece used in order to respond to this threat. The changes during the first three sub-periods have been reduced to limited adjustment in the means used: adequate and credible military deterrence through heavy armaments, use of the EU as a diplomatic leverage and exclusion of Turkey, denial of bilateral dialogue (apart from short lived attempts). During the last sub-period however we observe a more substantial change: a relaxation of Greece's conditionality policy and a more positive attitude towards Turkey's European perspective, a more open approach to bilateral dialogue (especially in low politics issues) and an effort to diminish the tensions in the Aegean through the establishment of confidence building measures.

Whether these elements point to a radical change in the Greek foreign discourse is subject to debate. For some these changes signify the replacement of the traditional logic of geo-politics with a geo-economic logic[95]. Others however see these moves as a clever diplomatic trick intended to move Greece away from isolation. Knowing that

[95] Kavakas, D. (2001): *Greece and Spain in European Foreign Policy*, (Ashgate, Aldershot)

other EU member states were very reluctant towards Turkey's accession, Greece had no reason to serve as a scapegoat and provide a convenient excuse[96].

The evidence I have gathered so far provide support for both explanations. On the one hand references to Turkey's Europeanisation suggest that Turkey is not the monolithic and barbaric state depicted in the nationalist discourses, but a complex society and therefore an improvement in Greek-Turkish relations is possible. In the same vain the fact that the possibility of finding mutually beneficial solutions is envisaged indicates that Greek policy-makers might have "moved away from the traditional way of thinking in zero sum games"[97]. One the other hand it is difficult to defy the fact that Greek perceptions with respect to Turkey's responsibility for the existing imbroglio have remained relatively unchanged. According to most Greeks – even those who support the current rapprochement it is Turkey (not Greece) that has to modify its behaviour. From this perspective one might agree with Oguzlu that Greece continues to view EU-Turkish relations from an instrumental rather than ideational perspective[98].

Caution is also heralded by the fact that the new policy has generated widespread criticism. This is particularly evident with respect to the Helsinki decision, when the leader of the official opposition accused the government for ceding too much in order to achieve too little:

> "Accession to the EC has been the greater achievement of our country after WWII… the capabilities which have been offered to us must be protected…the relinquishment of veto diminishes considerably the capacity of Greece to use EU membership in order to exercise pressure on Turkey to follow the principles of peaceful coexistence"[99].

[96] The idea that Greece was not the real obstacle in EU-Turkish relations is widespread in the literature. See for example Georgiades, H. (2000): "Greece and the EU-Turkish Relationship"; in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot); Grigoriadis, I. (2003): "The Changing Role of the EU Factor in Geek-Turkish Relations"; Paper presented at the 1st PhD Symposium on Modern Greece (London, 21 June)

[97] Papandreou, G. (2000): "Revision of Greek Foreign Policy"; *Western Policy Centre*

[98] Oguzlu, T. (2004): "How Encouraging is the Latest Turkish-Greek Reconciliation Process?"; in *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 94

[99] Speech of Costas Caramanlis (Leader of New Democracy); in *Journal of Parliamentary Debates*, (15 December, 1999), p. 2379

In the same vain when Mr Simitis defended his "cautious" approach at the Imia crisis, he received a furious answer from most opposition parties:

> "It is a myth that we have to chose between retreat and conflict… it is a myth that accommodation generates international support… it is a myth that Greece is not powerful enough… the policy we advocate does not necessarily entail the use of military means… however it is important that the right messages are sent… whenever we are provoked our reaction must be quick, integral and comprehensive"[100].

> "Determination from our part, clear delimitation of our nonnegotiable position is the best guarantee that Turkey will not be tempted… that it will not get the wrong message that next time we will retreat again… we should not give the impression that everything is subject to negotiation… we don't close any issue with Turkey… because the existing balance of power does not permit a favourable solution for us[101].

On the whole the evidence suggests that there is a substantial change in Greek foreign policy which however falls short to be indicative of a replacement of the dominant foreign policy discourse. I believe that the shift epitomised by the Helsinki decision can be depicted as a transformational change because it entails new strategies (i.e. prudence rather than escalation in time of crises, engagement rather than exclusion with respect to Turley's EU membership, negotiation in terms of national interests not national rights) but does not challenge the overall objectives of Greek foreign policy. At the very least one could argue that a "dual logic" of overcoming Greece's isolationism and transforming the nature of the Greek-Turkish conflict might be at work[102].

[100] Speech of Costas Caramanlis (Leader of New Democracy); in *Journal of Parliamentary Debates*, (6 November 1997), p. 1250
[101] Speech of Dimitris Tsovolas (Leader of Democratic and Social Movement); in *Journal of Parliamentary Debates*, (6 November 1997), p. 1255
[102] Botsiou, K. (2001): "Greek Turkish Relations: A Historical Overview (1974-2000)"; in Kazakos, P. et al.: *Greece and Turkey's European Future*; (Sideris, Athens) – in Greek, p. 137

4. The pathways and conditions of Europeanisation

4.1. The substantive dimension

Pathway 1

As pointed out in the second section the substantive/regulative effects of EU membership emerge from the existence of an incompatibility between domestic and EU policies which obliges member states to adapt or incur the costs of non-compliance. In the case of Greece the existence of such an incompatibility can easily be established especially after the return of civilian rule in Turkey in 1983. Whereas Greece demanded from the EU to put pressure on Turkey to modify it behaviour, if necessary by freezing EU-Turkish relations, the EU considered the establishment of close contacts with Turkey as a priority and resented the possibility of a stalemate because of the Greek-Turkish dispute. The question is to what extend Greece has been constrained by EU requirements.

Whereas the rule of unanimity allowed Greece to maintain its position during the 1980s, the gradual relaxation of conditionality policy in the 1990s reveals the limits of Greece's capacity to defy EU consensus. More precisely Greece's conditionality policy seems to have been restricted by its limited bargaining power inside the Community which necessitated the concentration of diplomatic efforts on one issue at a time[103]. Initially Greece had to release the Fourth Financial Protocol in exchange of EU support over the Macedonian issue. Afterwards the willingness to achieve progress in Cyprus' membership prospects led to a step by step improvement in EU-Turkish relations in the 1990s[104].

There is little doubt that cost benefit calculations have been paramount in the Greek foreign policy discourse during the 1990s. However, it would be misleading to infer that EU membership has simply restrained Greece. More precisely, it is doubtful that the Helsinki decision could have been justified to the Greek public only on the

[103] Yannas, P. (1994): "The Greek Factor in EC-Turkey Relations"; in Kazakos, P. & Ioakimidis, P. (1994) *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*, (London, Pinter), p. 220

[104] Suvarierol, S. (2003): "The Cyprus Obstacle in Turkey's Road to the European Union"; in Ali Carkoglu & Barry Rubin (eds.) *Turkey and the European Union*, (London, Frank Cass), pp. 62-66; quoted in Grigoriadis, I. (2003): "The Changing Role of the EU Factor in Geek-Turkish Relations"; Paper presented at the 1st PhD Symposium on Modern Greece (London, 21 June)

basis of the disassociation of Cyprus' accession from a final settlement of the conflict, not least because of the vagueness of the relevant clause in the Presidency Conclusions which allowed for many interpretations. As noted above the shift from conditional sanctions to conditional rewards was also based on an understanding that the conditionality policy was leading to the isolation of Greece within the EU. This is clearly a utilitarian argument, but it includes a substantial change in the way cost and benefits are perceived, since isolation was not thought as a cost in the 1980s.

Interestingly the EU is also thought to have restrained Greece's foreign policy during the pre-accession period. According to Couloumbis and Yannas Greece refrained from retaliating the Cyprus invasion partly because of the awareness that the perception of protracted Greek-Turkish conflict could jeopardise Greece's membership prospects[105]. A similar argument has been advanced by Arvanitopoulos with respect to the 1976 crisis on the continental self and the decision of Karamanlis to play down the military solution and refer the issue to the International Court of Justice[106]. In the same vain Pridham perceives the relatively open stance of Greece towards bilateral dialogue during the late 1970s as a tactical move to persuade reluctant EC member states over Greece's intentions[107].

These arguments merit further investigation. For the EU to have an influence it is important to establish that an incompatibility existed and that Greece would have behaved differently in the absence of EU pressure. Therefore one should established that the EU wanted to avoid a military confrontation between Greece and Turkey; that Greece was indeed thinking to engage in armed confrontation with Turkey; and finally that Greece was prevented from doing so because of the prospect of EU membership. None of the three propositions (apart perhaps from the first) can be substantiated by reasonably solid documentary evidence at this stage of my research.

---

[105] Couloumbis, T. & Yannas, P. (1994): "Greek Foreign Policy Priorities for the 1990s"; in Featherstone, K. & Ifandis, K. (eds.) *Greece in a Changing Europe: Between European Integration and Balkan Disitnegration?"*; (Manchester, Manchester University Press)

[106] Arvanitopoulos, C. (1994): "The Belief System of Constantine Caramanlis"; in *Mediterranean Quarterly*, pp. 61-86; See also Tsakaloyannis, P. (1980): "The European Community and the Greek-Turkish Dispute"; in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol 29, No. , pp. 35-54

[107] Pridham, G. (1991): "Linkage Politics Theory and the Greek-Turkish Rapprochement"; in Constas, D. (ed.) *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan), p. 79

Pathway 2

In contrast with the previous pathway, the substantive/constitutive pathway of EU membership does not involve coercion but a voluntary adoption of policy philosophies and norms of appropriate behaviour and ultimately a transformation of national identities. In the case of Greece the review of the literature reveals several ideational effects.

For instance it has been argued that the promotion of bilateral co-operation in low politics, which is an essential element of the current Greek-Turkish rapprochement, builds largely on the EU model of functional integration as a means of conflict resolution. According to Marias the implicit assumption behind this approach is that co-operation in low politics issues and the resulting growth in interdependence between the two countries will upgrade their common interests and will gradually lead to greater understanding in high politics issues[108]. Along similar lines Heraclides[109] posits that the increased level of co-operation in low politics will make it more difficult for political leaders to adopt intransigent approaches towards the settlement of political differences.

The argument that the EU acted as a paradigm for Greek policy-makers is appealing. But there are certain qualifiers which diminish its plausibility. In the first place the slow progress towards the settlement of political difference reinstates the longstanding scepticism over the possibility of spill-over from low politics to high politics[110]. Moreover whereas it is true that functional integration helped France and Germany to achieve stable peace it would be mistaken to make direct analogies with the Greece Turkish conflict. Unlike Greece and Turkey, France and Germany had just emerged from a catastrophic war and they were facing a common threat from the Soviet Union which obliged them to put their differences aside. From a more general perspective it could be argued that economic co-operation and increased societal transactions can consolidate peace but taken alone they cannot lead to conflict resolution. This is possible only through a political settlement which will create the

[108] Marias, N. (2001): "Negotiating Peace: The Helsinki Decision in the Light of Integration Theory"; in Kazakos et al. (eds.) *Greece and Turkey's European Future*; (Sideris, Athens), p. 86
[109] Heraclides, A. (2002): "Greek-Turkish Relations from Discord to Détente: a Preliminary Evaluation"; in *The Review of International Affairs* Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 19
[110] See Rosamond, B. (2000): *Theories of European Integration,* (Basingstoke, Palgrave), pp. 75-81

conditions of minimum trust that allow co-operation to flourish[111]. Indeed, it appears that the Prime Minister Costas Simitis agreed with this judgement:

> "We want a step by step bilateral rapprochement which should include a renunciation of the threat of war, respect of international law and acknowledgment of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice from Turkey as step 1, mutual referral of the continental self issue to the International Court of Justice as step 2, and *the promotion of co-operation in areas of mutual, interests as step 3*[112].

A more convincing argument is that EU membership has familiarised Greek policy-makers with modern forms of conflict prevention, which until recently found little positive response in Greece[113]. This might explain the turn to confidence building and restraint inherent in the new defence doctrine.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the substantive/constitutive dimension of Europeanisation has to do with the long term impact of EU membership on Greek national identity and political culture. It is generally agreed that one of the building blocks of Greek identity is an ambivalent relations towards the West. From this perspective it could be argued that EU membership provided an answer to the perennial question of where Greece belongs[114]. This in turn could be said to have important implications for Greece's policy towards Turkey. According to Rumelili the liminal position in which Greec had been found during the 1980s and for much of the 1990s prompted it to pursue exclusionary policies in order to underscore its differences with Turkey (and concomitantly the differences between Turkey and Europe) in order to reaffirm its Europeaness[115]. In other words the fact that Greece was depicted as an awkward European in the community-building discourse of the EU, generated the need for Greece to present Turkey as a non-European as a way to

---

[111] See Adler, E. & Barnett, M. (1998): *Security Communities*; (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
[112] Speech of Costas Simitis, (Prime Minister – Leader of PASOK); in in *Journal of Parliamentary Debates*, (6November, 1997)
[113] Axt, H-J (1997): op. cit.
[114] Ioakimidis, P. (2000): "The Europeanisation of Greece's Foreign Policy: Progress and Problems", in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot)
[115] Rumelili, B. (2003): "Liminality and Perpetuation of conflicts: Turkish-Greek Relations in the Context of Community-Building by the EU"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 213-248

validate its Europeaness. The policy of engagement which depicts Turkey as "possible but inadequate European" could thus be seen as a reflection of Greece's more secure position in the late 1990s[116].

It is important to note that the focus on EU's ideational influence does not preclude that material incentives such as the need to ensure progress in Cyprus' accession, have also been at work. As pointed out in the theoretical section regulative and constitutive effects might be simultaneously at work.

4.2. The procedural dimension

Pathway 3

Participation in the EU has led to several administrative and institutional reforms. At the inter-ministerial level it has affected the hierarchy between ministries. More precisely the responsibility to co-ordinate EU affairs fell with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) which therefore acquired power and prestige at the expense of the Ministry of Co-ordination (later to become Ministry of National Economy), which had traditionally dominated the administration[117]. The role of co-ordinator has enabled the MFA to act like a gate keeper, but at the same time the nature of EU policy-making has enabled domestic ministries and civil society actors to acquire some autonomy and develop their own direct contacts in Brussels[118]. Finally it is noteworthy that no role was provided for the Greek Parliament, which has been virtually excluded from EU affairs[119].

What does this amount with respect to Greece's foreign policy towards Turkey is not clear. Given the highly political and conflictual nature of Greek-Turkish relations the direct involvement of domestic ministries and civil society actors has been relatively low. It therefore appears that EU's influence in the opportunity structures of domestic actors is mostly related with the long term promotion of

[116] Rumelili, B. (2003): "Liminality and Perpetuation of conflicts: Turkish-Greek Relations in the Context of Community-Building by the EU"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 213-248
[117] See Ioakimidis, P. (1993): "The Greek Administration and the Formulation of European Policy"; in Tsoukalis, L. (ed.) *Greece in the European Community: The Challenge of Adjustment*, (Athens, EKEM/Papazisis)
[118] ibid.
[119] ibid.

democratisation and civil society in Greece as a result of EU membership. The recent insurgence of contacts between the civil societies of Greece and Turkey could be seen as a result of this indirect influence of EU membership[120]

The MFA has also undergone a substantial internal reform as a result of EU membership. Under the current structure which was established in 1998 the DGC, which is headed by the General Secretary for European Affairs is responsible for issues falling within pillars 1 (EC) and 3 (JHA), whereas DGA, which is headed by the General Secretary for Political Affairs is responsible for issues falling within pillar 2 (CFSP). According to Kavakas this division of labour has created several problems of co-ordination in cases where issues of the second pillar are discussed within the other two pillars[121].

With respect to Greek-Turkish relations one should expect these problems to be even more acute because of the distinction accorded to "national issues" (relations with Cyprus, Turkey, Balkans), which are dealt with by three autonomous units headed by a Deputy Secretary supervised directly by the Deputy Minister whereas all other directorates are under the control of the Alternate Minister. For instance when EU-Turkish economic relations are at stake it is possible to have three units (DGC 1: European External Relations, DG A11: CFSP and DG A4: Greece-Turkey) under three different Deputy Secretaries, two General Secretaries and two Ministers claiming competence. The usual practice is that national issues are dealt by the personnel of DG A4. However this seems to create a further complication because these officials might not be very familiar with EU processes and this in turn may lead to a lack of comprehension of the Greek argument by other member-states[122].

Finally it could be argued that certain of the new bodies created within the MFA have been inspired by the EU. For instance the newly established Centre of Analysis and Planning can be said to imitate the Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit established by the Treaty of Amsterdam[123]. As noted above however the formal institutional arrangements in Greece do not always provide an accurate picture of

[120] Rumelili, B. (2004): "The European Union's Impact on the Greek Turkish Conflict"; *EUBorderConf Working Paper Series*, No. 6, p. 17
[121] See Kavakas, D. (2001): *Greece and Spain in European Foreign Policy*, (Ashgate, Aldershot)
[122] Kavakas, D. (2001): *Greece and Spain in European Foreign Policy*, (Ashgate, Aldershot)
[123] Ioakimidis, P. (2000): "The Europeanisation of Greece's Foreign Policy: Progress and Problems", in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot), p. 367

reality. Accordingly it is unclear what the implications of the creation of this unit for Greek-Turkish relations are.

Pathway 4

The socialising effects from Greece's participation in the EU policy-making process are very important. As shown above during the 1980s Greece adopted a very suspicious stance towards bilateral dialogue with Turkey. This inflexibility was also manifested within the EU, where Greece consistently appealed to community solidarity in order to convince other member-states to support its position, while refusing to change its policies in order to accommodate the interests of its partners. As Kouveliotis notes, "the perception was that Greece used the EPC/CFSP and the EC frameworks mainly for satisfying its national interests, or when that was not possible, for stopping unpleasant developments imposed by its partners instead of using them as stages and platforms for adapting its foreign policy to the integration and the Europeanisation logic"[124].

By taking part in the EU policy-making process Greek officials and politicians have been familiarised with the EU's procedural norms. This in turn had an important influence in the way they pursued national interests. Apart from the habit of informing other member-states before adopting a position two other areas appear to be of primary importance with respect to Greek-Turkish relations. First, as the relaxation of the conditionality policy demonstrates Greece has since the beginning of the 1990s been more wiling to engage in package deals. It may be that Greece was giving its consent under intense EU pressure, but one cannot fail to notice that such trade offs would probably been considered unacceptable from most of those who had been in charge of Greece's foreign policy in the early 1980s. Second, Greece has made a great effort to overcome its isolation by seeking coalitions and presenting its positions in terms of European interests. Thus in the Luxemburg European Council Greece carefully avoided to object openly to Turkish European perspective, but insisted on the establishment of a set of standard criteria, which Turkey had to fulfil in order to open accession negotiations. In so doing it found support among other member-states for its sensible behaviour and avoided the accusation that the road the normalisation

[124] Kouveliotis, K. (2001): *The Impact of European Integration on the Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy*; Occasional Papers - Institute of International Economic Relations - Athens, p. 44

of EU-Turkish relations passed through Athens[125]. In Helsinki Greece went a step further by avoiding any special reference to the Greek-Turkish conflict and inserting a general clause on border disputes, which was referring to all applicant states.

In addition it appears that the EU's procedural norms have been disseminated in Greece's bilateral relations. For instance when the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs Ismael Cem sent a letter to his Greek counterpart George Papandreou in the wake of the Ocalan debacle requesting that the two countries reach an understanding on international terrorism, the latter suggested to widen the agenda of dialogue and carefully placed the issue of dialogue in the framework of EU's co-operation in Justice and Home Affairs. The Greek strategy of widening the agenda and multilaterising the issue could be said to have been inspired by the style of co-operation existing within the EU[126]. At a more abstract level it could be argued that to the extend that Greece seems more willing to negotiate with Turkey, this might be related with the legitimisation of the notion of compromise resulting from participation in the EU policy-making.

4.3. The conditions of EU impact

In the second section I have argued that the likelihood of successful Europeanisation will depend on five mediating factors: the salience of the issue area, the institutional capacity for reform, the active engagement of change agents at the domestic level, the timing of the European input and evolutions in world politics including the target area. With respect to the first of these factors one would need to compare different issue area in which different priority is accorded in order to reach a conclusion. A tentative argument which emerges intuitively but also appears in the literature is that the high priority given to relations with Turkey has made the process of Europeanisation difficult[127].

With respect to the second factor, it should be noted that foreign policy objectives have rarely been endorsed by an entire government and that foreign policy

[125] Georgiades, H. (2000): "Greece and the EU-Turkish Relationship"; in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot), p. 425
[126] Papadopoulos, C. (2004): "Greece and the EU at Helsinki – A Historical New Departure in Greek-Turkish Relations?"; paper presented in EUBorderConf Conference, Istanbul, November 2004.
[127] Stavridis, S. (2003): "The Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy: A Literature Review", Discussion *Paper No 10*, the Hellenic Observatory, LSE, September 2003

constitutes a constant source of disagreement in all political parties[128]. However, in most cases the executive leadership has been strong enough in order to bring dissidents in line with governmental policies.

Mess and Costas Karamanlis and Andreas Papandreou, who ruled the country from 1974 until 1989, were charismatic personalities and enjoyed large parliamentary majorities. Consequently their political authority was undisputed. This enabled Karamanlis to push forward his policy of containment towards Turkey and ignore those who wanted an immediate response to the Cyprus invasion. In the same vain, Papandreou could swing with relative ease from the hard-line policy of non-dialogue in the early 1980s to the Davos rapprochement in 1987, before his deteriorating health and his alleged implication in financial scandals striped him of much of his power[129].

Costas Mistotakis became prime minister after a period of political instability which had brought three consecutive elections, and two coalition governments in one year. Although he was a senior political figure Mitsotakis did not originate from the rank and file of the conservative party. Most importantly, although he had won a landslide victory in terms of votes, he enjoyed a parliamentary majority of only two seats because of the highly proportional electoral law. This gave to virtually every parliamentarian the possibility to veto the government's policy. In 1993 Mitsotakis was compelled to call a general election, when his ex-foreign minister Antonis Samaras, who had defected and formed his own party because of his disagreement over the Macedonian issue, urged the New Democracy MPs who were under his influence to withdraw their support for the government. Eventually, Mitsotakis, who had attempted according to certain observes[130] to insert some seeds of pragmatism in Greece's foreign policy during his term in office lost the election and was replaced in New Democracy's leadership from the hard-liner Miltiadis Evert. Although Mitsotakis did not loose power because of his policy towards Turkey, his political weakness may partly explain the failure to revive the Davos process.

---

[128] Ioakimidis, P. (1999): "The Model of Foreign Policy-Making in Greece: personalities Versus Institutions"; in Stavridis, S., Couloumbis, T., Veremis, T. & Waites, N. (eds.) *The Foreign Policies of the European Union's Mediterranean States and Applicant Counries in the 1990s*, (Basingstoke, MacMillan), p 157

[129] It has been argued that this deterioration of Papandreous political authority was one of the primary reasons for the collapse of the Davos process. See for example Pridham, G. (1991): "Linkage Politics Theory and the Greek-Turkish Rapprochement"; in Constas, D. (ed.) *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan), p. 83

[130] See for example Botsiou, K. (2001): "Greek Turkish Relations: A Historical Overview (1974-2000)"; in Kazakos, P. et al.: *Greece and Turkey's European Future*; (Sideris, Athens)

During his third term in office (October 1993 to December 1995) Papandreou was less powerful than in the past but still the undisputed leader of PASOK, until he was replaced by Mr. Simitis for health reasons. Mr Simitis was not as charismatic as his predecessor, but his large parliamentary majority gave him the possibility to resist pressures from hardliners and pursue a relatively moderate foreign policy towards Turkey. It should be noted however that his ability to impose changes has somehow been restricted by his low appeal to the traditionalist fraction of PASOK which despised his modernising agenda. This induced him to some tactical compromises especially during the early years of his government[131].

The capacity of the executive leadership to push forward reforms has been constrained by the church and the media. Although none of these institutions has an institutionalised role in foreign policy-making they were able to act as quasi-veto points on certain issues, because of the influence they exercise in Greek public opinion. The role of the media has been very prominent after the liberalisation of private broadcasting in the early 1990s, which marked their emancipation from the political leadership and transformed them from mere transmitters of the governmental line to active agents of foreign policy[132]. In the field of Greek Turkish relations this has been particularly evident in times of increased tension. For instance it has been argued that the Simitis government initially tried to downgrade the crisis at Imia, but was pushed to escalation under intense pressure from the press which treated the issue as matter of national prestige[133]. With respect to the Church, the coming into leadership of Archbishop Christodoulos in 1998, signified a shift to a Greek Orthodox fundamentalist and anti-Western rhetoric, which appeals to the public[134]. The Archbishop successfully mobilised popular support twice on domestic politics issues[135] and although until this time he has avoided a direct confrontation with the government in foreign policy issues his potential and readiness to do so cannot be underestimated.

---

[131] Kazamias, A. (1997): "The Quest for Modernisation in Greek Foreign Policy and its Limitations"; in *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 71-94

[132] Mitropoulos, D. (2003): "Greek Foreign Policy and Mass Media: Subordination, Emancipation, Indifference", in Tsakonas, P. *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, (Athens, Sideris)

[133] ibid.

[134] Kavakas, D. (2001): *Greece and Spain in European Foreign Policy*, (Ashgate, Aldershot)

[135] Once over a governmental decision to scrap religion from the elements included in identity cards, and the second over the nomination of a liberal/leftist candidate from the conservative party. In the first case he did not manage to reverse the governmental decision but in the second case he is said to have influenced the outcome, since the conservative party lost, even though it was the net favourite.

On the whole the evidence suggests that when during periods of intermediate institutional capacity for reform (1993 until today) Europeanisation has been more evident than during periods of very strong (1974-1989) or very weak (1989-1993) executive leadership. This finding conforms with the expectation set out in the theoretical section.

The recent Greek-Turkish rapprochement is said to have been facilitated by the emergence since the early 1990s of a small constituency of academics, journalists and political activists which have been very influential in shaping governmental policy during the second half of the 1990s and in legitimising these policies to the wider public.[136]. This constituency is not homogeneous. It includes enthusiastic liberals who portray that democratisation, economic development, increased interdependence and (first and foremost) European integration can change the nature of the Greek Turkish relations as well as moderate realists, who recent the extensive focus on military balancing which deprives Greece from using its soft power more effectively, but at the same time are rather pessimistic over Turkey's transformative potential. The members of this constituency are united in their belief that Greece has been hampered by the existence of an "underdog culture"[137] which is parochial, clientelist, statist and advocate the need for modernisation of the Greek economy, society and politics along the liberal ideas of enlightenment. In the field of foreign policy the "modernisers" advocate the replacement of the outdated "Hellenocentric" approach, which emphasise national interest with a "Eurocentric" approach[138].

Moreover, it appears that the timing has also been an important facilitating factor for the Europeanisation of Greek foreign policy. At the macro level, one cannot fail to notice that the shift in Greece's policy towards Turkey coincided with the quest for EMU membership and the consolidation of a consensus over Greece's international orientation. Although these can be said to results of EU membership they also set the structural condition within which Europeanisation occurs. This reminds us of the fact that Europeanisation studies are not easily amenable to the

[136] Keridis, D. (2001): ""Domestic Developments and Foreign Policy"; in Keridis, D. & Triantaphylou, D. (eds.) *Greek Turkish Conflict in the Era of Globalisation*, (Everett MA, Brasey's), p. 16

[137] Diamandouros, N.(1994): "Cultural Dualism and Political Change in Post-Authoritarian Greece"; *Estudio/Working Paper,* 50

[138] Couloumbis, T. & Dalis, S. (1997): *Greek Foreign Policy in the Eve of the 21st Century: Ethnocentricism or Eurocentricism?*; (Athens, Papazisis); Costandinidis, S. (2003): "Greek Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice"; in Tsakkonas, P. (ed.) *contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*; (Athens, Papazisis)

dependent/independent variable analysis as Featherstone has rightfully pointed out[139]. One could also argue that the coming into power of Costas Simitis signified a generational change[140]. At the micro level, there is little doubt that the earthquakes that hit Istanbul and Athens in the August and September 1999 created an unprecedented climate of solidarity on which domestic reformers sized upon to promote their agenda.

Finally with respect to the external dimension, there is a consensus in the literature that notwithstanding the early speculation concerning Turkey's expanding role, the end of the Cold War had only a minor impact on Greek Turkish relations, which seem to have developed their own independent logic since 1974[141]. In the same vain the role of the US has been confined mainly to the diffusion of tension during periods of crisis. Interestingly it appears that the recent shift in Greece's foreign policy has been facilitated mainly by evolutions in European politics, such as the coming of a Social Democratic government in Germany, which created a positive prospect for Turkey's accession[142].

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have attempted to provide a theoretically informed account on the impact of EU membership on Greece's foreign policy towards Turkey. My analysis has been based on a discursive understanding of foreign policy which depicts foreign policy change in terms of adjustment, transformation or replacement of a dominant foreign policy discourse which provides the rationale for foreign policy action, and the identification of four pathways and five mediating conditions of EU impact.

I have demonstrated that the Greek foreign policy discourse has been dominated by a perception that Turkey represents an imminent existential threat for Greece's national security. This threat perception has been nurtured by four interrelated streams

[139] See Featherstone, K. (2003): "In the Name of Europe"; in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press)
[140] Bertrand, G. (2003): "The European Dimension of the Greek Turkish Rapprochement"; *ECPR Workshops*, Edinburgh, March 29-April 2, p. 8
[141] Botsiou, K. (2001): "Greek Turkish Relations: A Historical Overview (1974-2000)"; in Kazakos, P. et al.: *Greece and Turkey's European Future*; (Sideris, Athens) – in Greek, p. 140
[142] Tsakonas, P. (2003): "Communautarising the Enemy: Greek Balance Strategy and Greek Turkish Relations"; in Tsakonas, P. *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, (Athens, Sideris)

of thought, which are well ingrained in Greek national identity. Greece's response to this threat has been based on a mixture of military, diplomatic and legal instruments. The evidence suggest that the threat perception and the overall strategy have not changed, during the period studied. However, the mixture of instruments has evolved over time. I have identified four sub-period and concluded that during the first three periods we observe only limited adjustment in the mixture of means used but not in the way these means are connected with the declared objectives. By contrast the last period signals a more important change in the use of means, which however does not challenge the overall foreign policy discourse. One could therefore speak of a transformational change.

With respect to the substantive dimension of Europeanisation, Greece has been constantly under pressure to change its stance with respect to Turkey's European perspective. The pressure has intensified in the 1990s and this, together with the fact that Greece's attention was diverted to other issues (FYROM, accession on Cyprus, EMU) might partly explain the gradual relaxation of Greece's conditionality policy during that period. However, the existence of adaptational pressure alone does not suffice to explain the important shift in Greece's policy, exemplified by the Helsinki decision to give candidacy status to Turkey without previous resolution of the Greek-Turkish disputes. In order to account for this change one can evoke two arguments which point to Europeanisation through the second pathway. First, that the EU model of functional integration has been disseminated to Greek foreign policy-makers who expected that co-peration in low politics issues would eventually transform the nature of the Greek Turkish conflict and lead to the creation of a community of stable peace in the region. Second, that EU membership has solved Greece's identity problem by providing an answer to the perennial question of where Greece belongs, and in so doing it has facilitated the adoption of a policy of inclusion towards Turkey because it is not necessary for Greece to differentiate itself from the non-Euroepan Turkey in order to re-affirm its Europeaness. I have argued that the first argument is appealing but highlighted certain qualifiers which diminish its plausibility. With respect to the second argument, there is evidence that a transformation of Greece's national identity is taking place. It is important to note however, that the evocation of the regulative and constitutive effects of EU membership refers to an analytical and not an ontological distinction, since the same EU input might be interpreted by different people in different ways.

With respect to the procedural dimension there has been a considerable administrative restructuring as a result of EU membership. At the inter-ministerial level the findings conform to studies undertaken in other countries: centrifugal and centripetal forces coexist and whereas the foreign ministry as co-ordinator is able to exercise some central control it has also lost its monopoly on representing the state. Moreover, subnational actors had more opportunities to be involved in foreign policy. What this had amounted to in practice however is unclear. I have also noted a partial Europeanisation of the internal structure of the MFA, which however excludes the so-called national issues, and this is said to create co-ordination problems. Arguably the most significant procedural effects of EU membership concern the socialisation of national officials to the EU procedural norms. Greece is now trying to behave like any other EU member-state. It consults with its partners, seeks coalitions and evokes national interests only when this is necessary. The days where the Greek Prime Minister was ready to block EU decisions by overriding the consent given a few hours earlier by his Foreign Minister seem to be definitely gone.

The Europeanisation of Greek foreign policy towards Turkey in the second half of the 1990s seems to have been facilitated by the fact that the executive leadership has enjoyed relative (but not absolute) autonomy. The contribution of intellectuals, activists and other change agents in the formulation and legitimation of the new policies carried forward by Costas Simitis was also central. However, the Europeanisation process has been compromised by the awkward role of two powerful constituencies, the media and the Church. Finally, the process of Europeanisation of Greek foreign policy coincided with a wider process of modernisation of the Greek economy, society and politics as well as with systemic changes, especially at the EU level.

Bibliography

Adler, E. & Barnett, M. (1998): *Security Communities*; (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)

Aggestam, L. (2004): "Role Identity and the Europeanisation of Foreign Policy"; in Tonra, B. & Christiansen, T. (eds.) *Rethinking European Foreign Policy*; (Manchester, Manchester University Press)

Arvanitopoulos, C. (1994): "The Belief System of Constantine Caramanlis"; in *Mediterranean Quarterly*, pp. 61-86

Barnett, M. (1999): "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 5-36

Bertrand, G. (2003): "The European Dimension of the Greek Turkish Rapprochement"; *ECPR Workshops*, Edinburgh, March 29-April 2

Borzel, T. & Risse, T. (20030: "Conceptualising the Domestic Impact of Europe"; in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press)

Botsiou, K. (2001): "Greek Turkish Relations: A Historical Overview (1974-2000)"; in Kazakos, P. et al.: *Greece and Turkey's European Future*; (Sideris, Athens) – in Greek

Checkel, J. (1998): "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory"; in *world* Politics, 50, pp. 324-348

Clogg, R. (1991):"Greek - Turkish Relations in the Post-1974 Period"; in Constas, D. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan)

Costandinidis, S. (2003): "Greek Foreign Policy: Theory and Practice"; in Tsakkonas, P. (ed.) *contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*; (Athens, Papazisis)

Coufoudakis, V. (1985): "Greek-Turkish Relations, 1973-1983: the View form Athens"; in *Security Dialogue*, (Spring), pp. 201-204

Coufoudakis, V. (1991): “Greek Political Party Attitudes Towards Turkey: 1974-89”; in Constas, D. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan)

Couloumbis, T. & Ifandis, P. (2003): “Transforming the Security Dilemma in the Aegean: Greek Strategic Choices and Structural Constraints – a Realist Approach”; in Tsakonas, P. (ed.) *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*; (Athens, sideris) – in Greek

Couloumbis, T. & Yannas, P. (1994): “Greek Foreign Policy Priorities for the 1990s”; in Featherstone, K. & Ifandis, K. (eds.) *Greece in a Changing Europe: Between European Integration and Balkan Disitnegration?*; (Manchester, Manchester University Press)

Couloumbis, T. (1994): “Introduction: The Impact of EC (EU) Membership on Greece’s foreign policy profile; in Kazakos, P. & Ioakimidis, P. (1994) *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*, (London, Pinter)

Couloumbis, T. & Dalis, S. (1997): *Greek Foreign Policy in the Eve of the 21st Century: Ethnocentricism or Eurocentricism?*; (Athens, Papazisis)

Cowles, M.G. et al.: *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change,* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press)

Cowles, M-G, Caoraso, J. & Risse, T. (2001): *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change,* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press)

Diamandouros, N.(1994): “Cultural Dualism and Political Change in Post-Authoritarian Greece”; *Estudio/Working Paper,* 50

Dokos, T. (1999): “The Balancing of the Turkish Threat: The Military Dimension”; in Yallouridis, C. & Tsakonas, P. *Greece and Turkey After the End of the Cold War*; (Athens, Sideris) – in Geek

Dokos, T. (2003): “Greek National Security Policy: The Link Between Defence Policy and Foreign Policy”; in Tsakonas, P. (2003): *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, (Athens, Papazisis)

Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (2003): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press)

Featherstone, K. (2003): “In the Name of Europe”; in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press)

Finnemore, M. & Sikkink, K. (1998): “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change”, in *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 887-917

Georgiades, H. (2000): “Greece and the EU-Turkish Relationship”; in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot),

Glarbo, K. (1999): “Wide-awake Diplomacy: Reconstructing the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU”; in *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No 4, pp. 528-44

Grigoriadis, I. (2003): “The Changing Role of the EU Factor in Geek-Turkish Relations”; Paper presented at the 1st PhD Symposium on Modern Greece (London, 21 June)

Gustavsson, J. (1999): “How Should We Study Foreign Policy Change?”; in *Cooperation and Conflict,* Vol. 34. No. 1, pp. 73-95

Hall, P. (1993): “Policy Paradigm, Social Learning and the State: The Case of Economic Policy Making in Britain”; in *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 275-296

Haverland, M. (2000): “National Adaptation to European Integration: The Importance of Institutional Veto Points”; in *Journal of Public Policy*; Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 83-103

Heraclides, A. (2001): *Greece and the Threat from the East*; (Athens, Polis)

Heraclides, A. (2002): “Greek-Turkish Relations from Discord to Détente: a Preliminary Evaluation”; in *The Review of International Affairs* Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 17-32

Heritier, A. et al. (2001): *Differential Europe: The European Union’s Impact on National Policy Making* ; (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield)

Herman, R. (1996): “Identity, Norms and National Security: The Soviet Foreign Policy Revolution and the End of the Cold War”; in Katzenstein, P. (ed.) *The Culture of National Security*, (New York, Columbia University Press)

Hermann, C. (1990): “Changing Course: When Governments Choose to Redirect Foreign Policy”; in *International Studies Quarterly*, 34: pp. 3-21

Hill, C. (2003): *The Changing Politics of Foreign* Policy; (Basingstoke, Palgrave)

Hix, S. & Goetz, K. (2000): *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political systems,* (London, Frank Cass)

Holsti, O. (1982): *Why Nations Realign: foreign Policy Restructuring in the Post-war World*; (London, George Allen & Unwin)

Howarth, D. (2000): *Discourse*; (Buckingham, Open University Press)

Ifestos, P. & Platias, A. (1992): *Greek Deterrence Strategy*, (Athens, Papazisis)

Ioakimidis, P. (1993): "Greece in the EC: Policies, Experiences and Prospects" in Psomiades, H. & Thomadakis, s. (eds.) *Greece in the New Europe* (New York, Pella)

Ioakimidis, P. (1993): "The Greek Administration and the Formulation of European Policy"; in Tsoukalis, L. (ed.) *Greece in the European Community: The Challenge of Adjustment*, (Athens, EKEM/Papazisis)

Ioakimidis, P. (1999): "The Model of Foreign Policy-Making in Greece: personalities Versus Institutions"; in Stavridis, S., Couloumbis, T., Veremis, T. & Waites, N. (eds.) *The Foreign Policies of the European Union's Mediterranean States and Applicant Counries in the 1990s*, (Basingstoke, MacMillan)

Ioakimidis, P. (2000): "The Europeanisation of Greece's Foreign Policy: Progress and Problems", in Mitsos, A. & Mossialos, E. (eds) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, (Ashgate, Aldershot)

Jorgensen, K.E. (1997): "PoCo: The diplomatic Republic of Europe"; in Jorgensen, K.E. (ed.) *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, (London, MacMillan)

Kallestrup, M. (2002): "Europeanisation as Discourse: Domestic Policy Legitimisation Through the Articulation of the Need for Adaptation"; in *Public Policy and Administration*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 110-124

Kavakas, D. (2001): *Greece and Spain in European Foreign Policy*, (Ashgate, Aldershot)

Kazamias, A. (1997): "The Quest for Modernisation in Greek Foreign Policy and its Limitations"; in *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 71-94

Keridis, D. (2001): "Domestic Developments and Foreign Policy"; in Keridis, D. & Triantaphylou, D. (eds.) *Greek Turkish Conflict in the Era of Globalisation*, (Everett MA, Brasey's)

Kouveliotis, K. (2001): *The Impact of European Integration on the Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy*; Occasional Papers - Institute of International Economic Relations - Athens

Laffey, M & Weldes, J. (1996): "Beyond Beliefs: Ideas as Symbolic Technologies in the Study of International Relations"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 193-237

Larsen, H. (1997): *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe*, (London, Routledge)

Manners, I. (2002): "Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?"; in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 234-258

Marias, N. (2001): "Negotiating Peace: The Helsinki Decision in the Light of Integration Theory"; in Kazakos et al. (eds.) *Greece and Turkey's European Future*; (Sideris, Athens)

Milliken, J. (199): "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5, No 2, pp. 225-254

Mitropoulos, D. (2003): "Greek Foreign Policy and Mass Media: Subordination, Emancipation, Indifference", in Tsakonas, P. *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, (Athens, Sideris)

Moschonas, G. (2001): "The Path of Modernisation: PASOK and European Integration"; *Joirnal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 3, 11-24

Moustakis, F. (2003): *The Greek Turkish Relationship and* NATO, (London, Frank Cass), p. 51

Papadopoulos, C. (2004): "Greece and the EU at Helsinki – A Historical New Departure in Greek-Turkish Relations?"; paper presented in EUBorderConf Conference, Istanbul, November 2004.

Papandreou, G. (2000): *Revision of Greek Foreign Policy*; Western Policy Centre

Platias, A. (1991): "Greece's Strategic Doctrine: In Search of Autonomy and Deterrence" in Constas, D. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan)

Pridham, G. (1991): "Linkage Politics Theory and the Greek-Turkish Rapprochement"; in Constas, D. (ed.) *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s: Domestic and External Influences*, (London, MacMillan)

Radaelli, C. (2003): "The Europeanisation of Public Policy" in Featherstone, K. & Radaelli, C. (eds): *The Politics of Europeanisation,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press), p. 35

Radaelli, C. (2004): "Europeanisation: Solution or Problem?"in European Integration on-line Papers;Vol. 8, No. 16, http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004-016a.htm

Risse, T. (2001): "A Europan Identity? Europeanisation and the Evolution of National Identities"; in Cowles, M-G. et al. *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change,* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press)

Risse, T., Cowles, M-G, Caporaso, J. (2001): "Europenisation and Domestic Change: Introduction"; in Cowles, M-G. et al. *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change,* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press)

Rosamond, B. (2000): *Theories of European Integration,* (Basingstoke, Palgrave)

Rosati, J., Hagan, J. & Sampson, M. (1994): *Foreign policy Restructuring: How Governments Respond to Global Change*, (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press)

Rumelili, B. (2003): "Liminality and Perpetuation of conflicts: Turkish-Greek Relations in the Context of Community-Building by the EU"; in *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 213-248

Rumelili, B. (2004): "The European Union's Impact on the Greek Turkish Conflict"; *EUBorderConf Working Paper Series*, No. 6

Rumelili, B. (2004): "The Talkers and the Silent Ones: The EU and change in Greek-Turkish Relations"; *EUBorderConf Working Paper Series*, No 10

Sedelmeier, U. (2004): "Collective Identity"; in Carlsnaes, W., Sjursen, H., White, B. (eds.) *Contemporary European Foreign Policy*, (Thousand Oaks, Sage)

Shapiro, M., Bonham, M. & Heradstveit, D. (1988): "A Discursive Practice Approach to Collective Decision Making"; in *International Studies Quarterly,* 32, pp. 397-419

Smith, M. (2000): "Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Co-operation"; *Journal of European Public Policy,* Vol. 7, No 4, pp. 613-31

Stavridis, S. (2003): "The Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy: A Literature Review", Discussion *Paper No 10*, the Hellenic Observatory, LSE, September 2003

Tonra, B. (1997): "The Impact of Political Co-operation"; in Jorgensen, K.E. (ed.) *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, (London, MacMillan);

Torreblanca, J. (2001): "Ideas, Preferences and Institutions: Explaining the Europeanisation of Spanish Foreign Policy"; *Arena Working Papers, 26*

Tsakaloyannis, P. (1980): "The European Community and the Greek-Turkish Dispute"; in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol 29, No. , pp. 35-54

Tsakonas, P. (2003): "Communautarising the Enemy: Greek Balance Strategy and Greek Turkish Relations"; in Tsakonas, P. *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, (Athens, Sideris)

Tsitselikis, K. (2004): "How Far Have EU Policies Affected Minority Issues in Greece and Turkey?"; Paper presented at the EUBorderConf conference in Istanbul, November 2004.

Tsoukalis, L. (2003): "The Future of Greece in the European Union"; in Couloumbis, T. ,Kariotis, T. & Bellou, F. (2003): *Greece in the Twentieth Century* (London, Frank Cass)

Valinakis, Y. (1993): "Greece in European Political Co-operation: The First Ten Years"; in Tsoukalis, L. (ed.) *Greece in the European Community: The Challenge of Adjustment* ; (Athens, EKEM/Papazisis)

Valinakis, Y. (1994): "Security Policy"; in Kazakos, K. & Ioakimidis, P. *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*, (London, Pinter)

Valinakis, Y. (199x), Greek Security Policy in the Perspective of the CFSP; in Axt, H.J. (ed) *Greece and the European Union: Stranger Among Partners?* (Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden)

Vaquer i Fanes, J. (2001): "Europeanisation and Foreign Policy"; *Working Paper No 21, Observatori de Politica Exterior*, IUEE, UAB, Barcelona

Veremis, T. & Koliopoulos, J. (2003): "The Evolving Content of the Greek Nation"; in Couloumbis, T. ,Kariotis, T. & Bellou, F. (2003): *Greece in the Twentieth Century* (London, Frank Cass)

Wæver, O. (1998): "Explaining Europe by Decoding Discourses"; in Wivel, A. *Explaining European Integration*, (Copenhagen, Copenhagen Political Studies Press)

Yallouridis, C. (1999): "The External Orientation and Political Culture of Turkey" ; in Yallouridis, C. & Tsakonas, P. (eds.) *Greece and Turkey After the End of the Cold War*; (Athens, Sideris),– in Geek

Yannas, P. (1994): "The Greek Factor in EC-Turkey Relations"; in Kazakos, P. & Ioakimidis, P. (1994) *Greece and EU Membership Evaluated*, (London, Pinter),

Yee, A. (1996): "The Causal Effects of Ideas on Policies"; in *International Organisation*, Vol. 50, No 1, pp. 69-108

Official documents

Journal of Parliamentary Debates (23 January, 1987)

Journal of Parliamentary Debates (6 May 1996)

Journal of Parliamentary Debates, (15 December, 1999)

Journal of Parliamentary Debates, (6 November 1997)

‘EUROPEANISATION’ AND GREECE

THE IMPACT OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION ON THE DIPLOMATIC AND STRATEGIC DOMAINS OF GREECE

Dr. Kyriakos Kouveliotis

Executive Director – Global Education Consulting

Galinou 18

11741 Athens

Greece

kkouvel@hol.gr

+306977227035

Contents

Abstract

This paper endeavours to present a rigorous examination of the impact of the Europeanisation process on the foreign and security policy of Greece. It attempts to access this impact on the state's diplomatic and security domains by highlighting and analysing the following key issues: the behavioural patterns of Greece and European integration; the distinctive elements of Greece's role, contribution and attitude in the European Political Co-operation framework; the institutional impact of the Maastricht Treaty as a vehicle for the Europeanisation of Greece's foreign policy; and Greece's foreign policy in the nineties.

In order to measure the impact of Europeanisation on the country's high politics the paper also examines distinctive structural and procedural developments, policy initiatives and the institutional framework.

Europeanisation and high politics: the case of Greece

EU membership is now widely recognised as an important factor in shaping a nation's political scene. It tends to blur the distinction between domestic politics and external foreign policy and to create new patterns of political behaviour. It encourages new institutional and administrative structures and interactions by redistributing power and competencies and reorienting political objectives. Membership has redefined territorial political relations, produced new governmental networks, given rise to new demands and pressures and has provoked new ideological tensions and conflicts. All these tendencies are encapsulated in the term 'Europeanisation'. According to the writer, R. Ladrech: *Europeanisation is an incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EU political and economic dynamics become part of the organisational logic of national politics and policy-making.*[1]

The ideological acceptance of the objectives of European integration undoubtedly constitutes a vital precondition for the Europeanisation process to take hold. It would, of course, be wrong to assume that rhetorical advocacy of European integration automatically denotes the internalisation of all EU logic, discipline and behaviour.

The process has effects on every field of a member state's economic, political, social and cultural structures, however, the purpose of this paper is to evaluate the impact of 'Europeanisation' on the area of high politics having Greece as a case study.

It attempts to access this impact on the diplomatic and security domains of Greece by highlighting and analysing the following key issues:

- The behavioural patterns of Greece and European integration;
- Greece in the European Political Co-operation framework;

- The Maastricht Treaty as a vehicle for the Europeanisation of Greece's foreign policy; and
- Greece's foreign policy in the nineties.

The Greek case suggests that a discrepancy might well exist between the rhetorical adherence to the integration logic and the actual behaviour in terms of defining objectives and carrying out policies.

Greece offers a good case study to analyse attempts to Europeanise a country's foreign policy, to resolve the post-Cold War foreign policy and security dilemmas, and to participate actively in all West European security organisations (NATO, WEU, EU/CFSP). Its proximity to three former Communist countries (Albania, former Yugoslavia, Bulgaria), that in the 1990s experienced a period of instability and economic restructuring, its uneasy relationship with fellow NATO member Turkey, its exposed geographic location in the Balkans as well as the fact that it is not connected by land to any of the other European Union countries make this case unique. Apart from that, the country's imbroglio on the issue of the recognition of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), the dilemmas this issue presented to Greece and its allies in the Union or NATO and the fact that it is a weak state that has historically been involved in great power games, but which has everything to lose from new instabilities and confrontations in its neighbourhood, constituted major challenges for the Europeanisation of Greek foreign policy in the 1990s.

Greece tried to respond to these challenges by participating in the European Political Co-operation. However, its EPC participation, produced a double dilemma. Firstly, the New Democracy government which had paved Greece's way to the European Community lost the elections of October 1981 and was replaced by an administration

of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK), which was 'anti-European' at that time. What followed was a critical process of adaptation and a 'Europeanisation' of the new political elite which led to considerable friction with the country's European partners.

Secondly, at the end of the 1980s, the very pro-European government of Constantine Mlitsotakis got its chance to improve relations with the EC partners and the USA. Then, however, came the end of the Cold-War, bringing chances, but also dislocations and disputes which destabilised the Balkans and once again separated Greece from its European partners. As far as its vital interests in the Balkans, and vis-à-vis Turkey were concerned, Greece followed a policy which its partners found hard to understand and to accept.

The transformation of EPC to CFSP presented new challenges for the country and found Greece to be more involved in EU's political co-operation process with a 'pro-European' attitude and coherence in its foreign policy formulation. However, in order to evaluate Greece's attempts to 'Europeanise' its foreign policy it is necessary to clarify first that for Greece there was never what we call 'formulation of foreign policy'. There was what the Greeks called a bloc of 'national issues'[2] that considered of the utmost importance: the Greek-Turkish relations, the Cyprus issue, and relations with the Balkan countries. Although circumstances and political parties in government were different, it seems that there were some common characteristics in both cases. All governments in Greece follow a rather unified policy when so-call 'national interests' are at stake. This holds true with respect to Turkey and Cyprus, but also to the Balkans.

Behavioural patterns of Greece and European integration

Greece signed the first Association Agreement with the European Community (EC) in 1961, aiming at the acquisition of full membership status within 22 years. But at the Commission's initiative, the 'accession process' was partly frozen for seven years (1967-74), as a reaction to the military regime. Immediately after its collapse, however, the Karamanlis administration crowned its novel political project ‘bourgeois modernisation’ which included the country's entry into the Community.

The post-1974 situation in the neighbourhood of the country necessitated additional structures of support in its external affairs, all converging to the idea of a close European 'partnership' to counterweight successive military threats by Turkey. The EC was seen as an additional platform for the newly re-established parliamentary regime to consolidate its strength. It was also perceived as the most appropriate context to facilitate national economic development. Karamanlis’ strategy implied that Greece should adjust to its more competitive European environment.

However, EC membership became the object of political rivalries in Greece. Being for or against Europe was an instrument in the internal competition among Greek parties. The Conservatives had been pro-European since 1974, whereas the then rapidly growing Socialists (PASOK) presented themselves as anti-European. In terms of rhetoric, the Community was a welcome scapegoat for the leftists or populists among the Socialists for nearly the whole decade.

The antipathy of the major parties of the broad left to the question of membership was manifested during the discussion on the ratification of the Accession Treaty in 1979.

But Karamanlis' consummate statesmanship was decisive and instrumental in the success of the Greek application in 1981.

Accession to the EC undoubtedly constitutes the greatest post-war achievement in Greek international relations. At the beginning, it was a catalyst and engine for modernisation.[3] Under the leadership of Karamanlis, Greece capitalised on a particularly favourable international climate and became, as mentioned above, the tenth member of the EC. The accession was not only a net benefit in economic terms and an added assurance for the country's democratic institutions, but above all, it also enhanced Greece's feeling of security and independence. It has been referred to as *the greatest achievement of Greek foreign policy since independence, as important as independence itself*[4].

However, as soon as Greece became member of the EC, the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK) won the national elections. This irony of history brought into power a party that was elected on a ticket to withdraw from the EC. It did not take very long for Greece to become the 'odd man out' of the Community under the new political leadership or 'a limited ally'.[5] As a result, the country entered a stage of 'diplomatic isolation' from its European partners.

PASOK's years in government (1981-1988) went through a number of phases. Initially, the leadership of the party was caught in a north-south paradigm that almost naturally resulted to the rejection of the 'Community solution' to national economic problems. The pillars of PASOK's electoral manifesto were three-fold: national independence, popular sovereignty and social engulfment. The EC was seen as conflicting with at least the first. Electoral considerations aside, the dogma of national independence has acted as a major obstacle to changing PASOK's European policy. Somehow, the national feeling of a people being eternally persecuted and patronised

was translated into unconditional support for Papandreou, facilitating his re-election in 1985.

The second phase was marked with the memorandum of March 1982 on the special problems facing the Greek economy after the accession. This document was a clear sign that the Greek government was contemplating the idea of staying in the EC on the terms of the Accession Treaty, rather than seeking alternative routes of action. It also projected the framework of future Greek-EC relations by requesting temporary deviations from the rules of both the Rome Treaty and the Accession Treaty. Finally, it called for a redistribution of costs and benefits resulting from the Common Market.

The third phase came with the government's support of the Single European Act (SEA) in 1985. The ‘trade off’ took the form of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes which were under consideration by the Commission at the time. What seemed to encapsulate the mood of this phase was that the central question asked by party members was no more whether Greece should stay in the EC, but how to improve the conditions of membership. The inclusion in the SEA of the social and economic cohesion provisions was regarded by many 'moderate socialists' as an important European social conquest - the first ever to be reported as such in the EC. Whether a 'breakthrough' or not, for those that were largely to bear the burden of this policy, these provisions became the 'carrot' for PASOK’s acceptable European behaviour. Essentially, they had been in favour of the European Community just as much as the Conservatives since the middle of the 1980s. The 'stick', however, took the form of various threats on the part of the Commission about the management of European financial resources by Greek governmental authorities. The Greek attitude towards the EU, was characterised by a lack of confidence, whereas, the source of all

problems seemed to be deeply rooted misconceptions and ignorance of the real character of the EU.[6]

These inadequacies, in certain cases continued to shape the quality of Greek-EU relations. As Fatouros argues, the issue of the country's entry to the EC was entangled in the cleavage between 'westernisers' and 'traditionalists'[7]. This assumption results from the period before the independence of the Greek state in 1831. It refers to the age-old question of whether Greece belongs to the 'east' or to the 'west'. The 'westernisers' have been historically identified, *grosso modo,* with the rational inquiry and the political liberalism of the continent whereas the easterners' have adamantly advocated the defence of the *status quo*[8]. These reflections suggest that the Greek case in the EC in the first years after accession was a problematic one, not least due to the fact that the country joined the Community on political, rather than economic grounds.

An evaluation of Greece's EPC participation

It is beyond doubt that membership in EC / EU institutions and participation in the European Political Co-operation (EPC) process for co-ordinating the foreign policy of the member states on international issues considerably broadened weak members' foreign policy objectives and 'area concerns'. According to Featherstone, Portugal, Ireland and Greece are the three countries that the EPC/CFSP institutional development had the most significant impact upon[9] since participation in its framework involved the articulation and presentation of well-defined, concrete positions, and perhaps taking sides in diplomatic conflicts. Ireland, Portugal and Greece were no longer able to confine their foreign policy and activities solely to issues of immediate national interest. They had to deal with all issues arising in the international system and formulate views and present positions on all of them.

As far as Greece is concerned it has extended the geographical and thematic substance of its foreign policy. Before EC membership and before participation in the EPC mechanisms, Greek 'foreign policy makers' used rhetoric as statements and nationalist declarations as their diplomatic tools in order to have success on 'national issues'. In consequence, there was no significant effect. What EPC did was to force Greece to 'acquire a foreign policy'[10] of some kind and give up its past spasmodic actions.

As a member of the EPC process, Greece had been called upon or had been forced to deal with a wide range of international issues far beyond its traditional, immediate, 'foreign policy concerns'. Included among those issues were major items on the international agenda such as East-West relations, the Middle East crisis, the Iran/Iraq

conflict, trans-Atlantic relations, the OSCE, the Afghanistan crisis, the Falklands crisis, and combating terrorism; other issues were geographically remote from what was traditionally perceived to be of 'Greek interest', such as, for instance, the situation in Philippines and in Latin and Central America, the conflicts in Ethiopia, the Horn of Africa, and the Sudan, to name but a few.

In addition to markedly extending the scope of foreign policy, participation in the EPC had the related effect of fundamentally changing the content of that policy. It was not only that the agenda of foreign policy became more extensive, it was also the nature and content of the subjects brought onto the agenda that added a new dimension to foreign policy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs had been vested with the overall responsibility for co-ordinating Community policy, formulating positions, forwarding them to Brussels, and communicating with Community institutions. This should not necessarily be interpreted as reflecting a perception that 'Community policy' is part of the foreign policy. It rather follows the pattern of other member states in organising their Community affairs. As a result of this process, the Greek foreign policy-making process changed in a number of respects:

- *Structures*. There had been a significant reordering of departments in the internal hierarchy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The department of European Community Affairs and the European Political Co-operation Department (EPC) had acquired predominance in policy-making. In practice, the European Political Co-operation department exercised control over all other departments dealing with political affairs, either on a bilateral or multilateral level. The same, though in a rather informal way, happened with the department of European Community Affairs in relation to other economic departments of the Ministry.

- *Nature /Style*. Foreign policy-making had become more of a collective exercise involving a wider number of actors (diplomats, technocrats, experts, officials) drawn either from inside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or from other specialised ministries. It had also become more open and transparent merely by involving a larger number of actors. In short, as a result of EPC participation, the process of foreign policy-making became more institutionalised and less personally dominated.

Apart from that, the common commercial policy and the external economic relations of the Community embodied in a vast network of agreements (trade, association, co-operation, etc.) all instilled a strong economic element into Greece's foreign policy. Consequently, Greek foreign policy was forced, for the first time, to address economic policy issues and global economic questions. This marked a change in Greece's foreign policy which had previously been centred on relations with Turkey and the Cyprus problem. EPC participation forced Greek leaders to change that attitude.

The Maastricht Treaty as a vehicle for the 'Europeanisation' of Greece's foreign policy

The institutional developments and Greece's attitudes

The Maastricht Treaty pledged the Union and its Member States to put into effect the Common Foreign and Security Policy. This was to be pursued by establishing systematic co-operation between Member States, gradually implementing joint action. The Member States were required to inform and consult each other within the Council of Ministers on matters of foreign and security policy, and the Council would adopt common positions where necessary. Member States were to ensure that their national policies conform to the common positions, and were to co-ordinate their action within international organisations. The European Council was to define general guidelines for joint action and the Council would decide, by unanimity, whether an area or issue should be the subject of joint action. The detailed arrangements for the implementation of joint action would be decided by qualified majority.

Greece's contribution with respect to the Maastricht Treaty can best be described by two consecutive memorandums in 1990 and 1991. The first supported the idea of European Union and the need for cohesion, whereas the second concentrated on security aspects. During the IGC on the Political Union, it was made clear from the outset that Greece placed a special emphasis on defence; no real progress was thought possible in the IGCs on both the EMU and Political Union without parallel progress in

defence.[11] To the Greek government, defence meant above all that the country's borders would be 'guaranteed' against air external attack. Greece expected its participation in a politically united Europe to act as a deterrent against expansionist neighbours and as a platform for the 'Europeanisation' of its security problems; moreover, if deterrence failed, the EU 'would certainly help' through political and military support (provision of equipment, for example), economic sanctions against the aggressor, and perhaps even through the dispatch of a future EU/WEU Rapid Reaction Force. The inclusion of the security/defence dimension into European integration was seen necessary as the most logical step towards European Union, and the membership composition of the EC rendered it politically more attractive to Greece in comparison with other security institutions. It was believed that an EC common security policy would guarantee Greece's territorial integrity.

In the Greek eyes, enlarging the scope of European integration to incorporate a security and/or defence dimension appeared to be an eminently rational development. The existence of a community of nations sharing the same values and interests and integrating their various policies into collective ones provided the best and most promising environment: the comprehensive net of interdependence created during years of progressive integration was expected to culminate in the co-ordination and step-by-step orchestration of the security policies of the Twelve. [12]

The foundation of Greece's EC strategy in relation to security affairs had traditionally rested on perceived advantages involving a European framework with regard to external challenges and most particularly in relation to the perceived Turkish threat. The prevailing argumentation in favour of a Europeanised security system went mostly along the following lines: if a common defence policy was created within the EPU, it would by definition protect all twelve members against external threats.

Given that Turkey posed a serious threat to Greece, the latter would be able to count on the support of a collective deterrence mechanism that would discourage a potential Turkish incursion. Because of the slow progress of security consultations within the EC, even after the SEA, accession to the WEU was increasingly perceived as the true key to Greece's future security needs. PASOK's anti-nuclear policy during the 1980s had unfortunately excluded Greece from this increasingly important forum and was thus threatening to marginalise this country in the debate on the future of European security.

The New Democracy administration, therefore, pursued the goal of WEU accession as a top priority. It adroitly put forward its credentials as an EC member (as a basis for a differentiated treatment vis-à-vis Turkey), and it demonstrated its eagerness to join the security component of EC integration. For the Mitsotakis government, it *a conditio sine qua non* that any treaty on European Union was only to be accepted if it included Greece's accession to the WEU. As became evident later, Greece was ready to veto the whole outcome of the IGC on Political Union if these conditions were not met.[13]

'Security first, economy second', - that was the strategy of Karamanlis when he led Greece into the 1970s. That was also the primary option of the Mitsotakis Government when negotiations concentrated on Political Union, especially in 1991.[14] The difference was, however, that 'security' in the 1970s was not only external, such as the Turkish threat, but also internal and concerned the stabilisation of the democratic system revitalised in 1974. For Greece, internal security challenges ceased to exist in the late 1970s, whereas the external ones had two dimensions in the early 1990s: the traditional one concerning Turkey and a new one with respect to the northern neighbours.

When an invitation to EC member states still outside to join the WEU was expressed it was received with joy. Greece was an associate member of the WEU and this declaration was an open invitation for membership which was conceived as a great benefit. Accession to the WEU was for the New Democracy government a 'victory for Greece'.

However, WEU Member States were not at all willing to let Greece use the WEU as a shield against Turkey in order to decrease its 'security risk'. The United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Portugal had been in the forefront trying to prevent a bilateral Greek-Turkish conflict from becoming a matter for the WEU.[15] Even Germany, which was in favour of the Greek entry to the WEU, was not willing to let the WEU become an instrument for dealing with bilateral regional problems. In addition, taking into account the Anglo-Italian Initiative on Foreign, Security, and Defence Policy of 5 October 1991, it was clear that Greek expectations of forming a WEU alliance for the benefit of Greece against Turkey were totally unfounded. Greek government's expectations that Maastricht would be a guarantee of Greek borders were frustrated.

What could be anticipated from the Maastricht Treaty was confirmed by the Petersberg Declaration on 19 June 1992. The nine partners were not willing to take sides in Greek-Turkish differences. As was anticipated, such a position could only weaken the Western Alliance in a strategically important region. Article V of the modified Brussels Treaty was interpreted and altered so as not to be applicable to any form of Greek-Turkish conflict. As Greek observers have noted, even an unprovoked attack by Turkey on Greece would not be a case for WEU assistance. The WEU Treaty was modified in the sense that obligations to assist a partner were seen as mutual and equal regardless of whether they originated from the NATO or the WEU Treaty.

The explanation for Greece's reaction to the Petersberg Declaration can best be understood by the over-optimistic perception of the benefits of the TEU. The Greek side had interpreted the Maastricht Treaty and the attitudes of EC member states as a panacea in its security problems. The disappointment that followed the Petersberg Declaration was perceived in Greece as 'a slap in its face'. When Greece signed the accession treaty to WEU in November 1992, the Greek authorities were obviously disappointed that Turkey had become an associated member of the WEU and that Article V had been modified. Nevertheless, despite its frustration regarding security, the Greek government, as mentioned before, did not realise its threat to veto ratification of the Maastricht Treaty.

The end of 'Europhoria'

By 1993 Europhoria - the striking attribute of the early period of the Mitsotakis government – was a phenomenon of the past. Two aspects were primarily responsible for the change of behaviour in Greece.

Firstly, Greece had enormous aspirations as to what European Union could imply for the country. As negotiations proceeded, it became obvious that essential parts of these hopes were not fulfilled. What frustrated the Greeks most was the fact that the partners were not willing to develop Greek membership in the WEU into an automatic security guarantee of Greek borders, especially against Turkey. Having realised that, Greece's interest in the European Union decreased substantially.

Secondly, as the Inter-Governmental Conferences progressed, the Yugoslav crisis turned into war, and Greece was included in the conflict because of the 'Macedonian question'. While discussing the target of a 'common' foreign security and defence

policy, Greece's expectations were extremely high that the partners would understand the obligation of 'solidarity' in the same way as the Greeks did: more or less as unilateral support for the Greek demands against the newly established state, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.[16] Although the Community showed itself extremely compliant to the Greek position, this was not enough for the Greek government. Greece expected too much of the Community, with the result that frustration spread within the country when hopes were not fulfilled. As a backlash, nationalism grew and Europeanism declined. Furthermore, during 1991-1996 the handling of the Macedonian question and continuing Greek support for the Serbs dissociated Greece from the rest of the Community.

The Greek Prime Minister declared that his government was of the opinion that the Maastricht Treaty 'was more than incomplete' and aimed at a 'Europe simply concerned with the monetary system,' and therefore the Greek government favoured the revision of the Maastricht Treaty planned for 1996.[17] The fact that Papandreou stressed at the same time that 'Europe needs to be strengthened in its weakest regions,' accusing the European Union of being 'responsible for the current tragedy in former Yugoslavia,' and stating that Greece did not feel European solidarity or support in the case of Skopie, was an indication of two trends coming from the past and even determining the future. First, that the Greek government regarded the Community after the Maastricht Treaty primarily as a lever for the development of the backward regions and countries, and second, that Greek politicians believe that solidarity in the Community should favour their country.

Greece's Foreign Policy in the Nineties

General observations - old problems - new prospects

It is an irony of history that during the Cold War, Greece was separated geographically from the rest of the European Community by non-western States (Warsaw Pact countries and also Yugoslavia and Albania). After the end of East-West antagonism, Greece was isolated once again - this time by an arc of conflicts and crises which started in Albania, included the former Yugoslavia and reached to the former Soviet Union. Greece obviously has not yet found a way to deal with this difficult situation and adopt the EU logic and rationale on its foreign and security policy. In addition, Greece's geo-strategic location, as NATO's 'shield' in south-east Europe, lost its significance after the end of the Cold War, whereas Turkey's was strengthened, since strategic interests moved to the Gulf area and Caucasus.[18]

Summarising Greece's situation in the period from 1990 to 1996 with regard to what extent its foreign and security policy followed a 'Europe-oriented' pattern, the following aspects constitute the most important structures and developments.

Greece's Policy centred on Turkey, whereas, the post-Communist era is perceived as an encirclement by the eastern neighbour.

As other countries and regions, Greece is reverting to history. Differences and disputes from the past which seemed to be settled somehow reappeared. What had not been an object of major concern during the Cold War had become so in the

nineties. This is true with respect to the 'Macedonian question' and to 'Northern Epirus', as the Greeks call the southern part of contemporary Albania.

Greece's security seemed to have been challenged more than ever during the last forty years and on nearly all 'fronts.' Differences with Turkey relating to the complex conflict in the Aegean, the Cyprus question, and the minorities were still unsolved. The problem of refugees and the treatment of the Greek minority divided Greece and Albania. Because of a disputed name and anticipated expansionist tendencies there was no *détente* with the FYROM. Relations with Bulgaria no longer had a privileged status, and it was feared in Greece that some day even territorial claims could arise, as happened in the past during the two Balkan Wars in the first two decades of the twentieth century.

The fact that the Balkans as well as Turkey were and still are areas of unsettled disputes overstrained the capacity of the multidimensional foreign policy traditionally followed by Greece. Greece had not been able to develop a clear strategy for managing disputes on nearly all fronts. After 1993 Greece tried to 'Europeanise' the Cyprus issue[19] and at the same time in the Council of Ministers and at the European Councils also tried to convince its partners that the Greek-Turkish dispute is not a bilateral but a European one, based on the assumption that when a member state is under constant threat there is an effect on the Union itself [20].

Albania and the FYROM did not constitute significant security threats for Greece in the nineties. Furthermore, in contrast to all other northern Balkan neighbours, Greece was a member of NATO and WEU which created a favourable security status. Security guarantees provided by these organisations were valid against any threat from the north, but not, of course, against Turkey.

What Greece feared most was that the northern neighbours might form alliances with Turkey. Until 1996 such a constellation was not in sight. However, perceptions in Greece were different. Turkey was seen to be collecting allies all around Greece. The 'worst case scenario' seemed to exert an influence on domestic politics, too. To some extent, this explains harsh reactions in Greece towards the Balkan states and the feeling of being 'threatened' by neighbours. The result was a disparity of perception between Greece and the rest of the EU. Western partners did not regard the behaviour of Greece's northern neighbours as threatening, as the Greeks did. In the language of International Relations, what others saw as 'capability' or 'probability,' the Greek government might regard as 'intention.'

These differing perceptions had substantial consequences. Where Western partners favoured some form of 'institutional' arrangements and integration vis-à-vis Balkan states, Greece did not see the usefulness and legitimacy of such steps and, instead, in many cases opposed such strategies. Thus economic and financial co-operation with Balkan states, which was understood as a core element of this strategy, was blocked by Greece as far as the FYROM or Albania were concerned. Apart from that, Greece's attitude was still national centred. In the nineties, issues such as: relations with Turkey, the Cyprus issue and the Macedonian question, monopolised the Greek press; whereas, at the same time the European press mainly referred to the situations in Iraq and Ireland.[21] In other words, there was no Europeanisation effect since there was no interest in Greece for important European or global events but only for developments related to the Greek so-called 'national issues': Turkey, Cyprus and the Balkans.

However, it is very important to show that the patterns which had been evident in Greece's attitudes to EPC in the 1980s were confirmed with regard to Common

Foreign and Security Policy in the 1990s for issues that Greece was indifferent towards them: the country followed its partners in nearly every declaration and action. In this respect there was no difference between the Mitsotakis government which was in office from 1990 to 1993 and the PASOK administration which came to power again in 1993. This can be demonstrated by the following selection of statements:

- supporting US policy vis-à-vis Haiti;[22]
- demanding the withdrawal of troops from the frontier with Kuwait addressed to Iraq;[23]
- welcoming of the development in South Africa;[24]
- condemning all acts of violence in the Israel-Palestine area;[25]
- assisting CFSP proposals on disarmament;[26]
- demanding the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltic countries;[27]
- expressing concern over the aggravation of the human rights situation in Turkey.[28]

Whenever its vital interests were concerned, Greece found it difficult, more than any other member state, to follow its partners in CFSP. Greece hampered the development of the EU's relations with Turkey. As in the past, Athens blocked the Fourth Financial Protocol. [29] Greece was prepared to compromise when Turkish troops withdraw from Cyprus and a solution was found for the island. In September 1994, the Greek Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs made it clear that tripartite talks within the EU/CFSP troika to study relations with Turkey could only take place if there was a reference to the problem of Cyprus. [30] Another conflict concerned the project of the Customs Union to be finalised with Turkey in 1996. Greece opposed these plans[31] and tried to convince its partners in the Council of Foreign Ministers to

issue declarations on Turkey's unsuccessful application for membership in order to put pressure on the neighbouring state.

In contrast to the early 1980s, not even minimal criticism of US policy towards Third World countries was expressed, even over Haiti. Concerning Iraq, with which PASOK had had connections in the past, Greece took a firm stand on the Western camp. South Africa and even the Middle East also did not cause any friction. Greece had toned down its pro-Palestine position. Disarmament was no longer a matter of dispute. The same held true with regard to Russia. Having made progress in the 1980s, the adaptation of Greece's policy to the EU mainstream was speeded up after the end of the Cold War.

Papandreou's return to power and the recognition of FYROM in December 1993 by half the twelve EU member states, including the four most important states, marked a new phase in Greece's relations with the EU. Its three main features were a strengthening of relations with the US, which viewed in Athens as a stabilising element in the Balkans; a corresponding scaling down of expectations of the EU, a rejection of the 'Europeanisation' logic particularly as regards foreign policy and security; and a re-examination of Greece's position towards FYROM where PASOK had tacitly accepted the diplomatic *fait accompli*.

The Hellenic Presidency of 2003

The most important challenge that Greek foreign policy has faced after the millennium was the Presidency of the European Union in 2003.

The Hellenic Presidency of 2003 set five priorities as its main objective as there were highlighted in the official documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

- Enlargement: the Accession Treaty and the day after
- The Lisbon Process: competitiveness, cohesion and sustainability
- Immigration/Asylum: joint responsibility, comprehensive immigration policy
- The Future of Europe; The Outcome of the Convention
- **External relations: the new Europe as an international motor for peace and Cooperation**

According to the official document published by the Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs [32] a main aim for the Greek Presidency was to promote the EU's relations with the Balkan countries and to consolidate peace, stability and cooperation in Europe. Other parameters included the effective development and deepening of relations with Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova the Caucasus region and the strengthening of the EU's cooperation with Mediterranean countries.

The Presidency aimed to promote political dialogue with all groups of countries and to give special emphasis to the respect of human rights and the rule of law and promised closer cooperation between the Union and the US in the fight against inequality, the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons, armaments control and

conflict prevention. The Presidency also aimed at a more active participation of the EU in the international community's fight against terrorism, promoting the development of capabilities and policies and supporting multilateral cooperation with third countries and international organizations, with the aim of eradicating this scourge, which has developed into a major international problem following September 11, 2001.

At the same time, they were proposals for stronger policies for combating poverty, protecting the environment, preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, resolving regional conflicts and facing the problem of drug trafficking.

The Greek Presidency's immediate priorities also included the strengthening of relations with the US and cooperation at all levels, so as to form a joint response to international challenges.

The Greek Presidency aimed to strengthen the EU's capacity for effective political intervention in conflict areas, by improving and further developing existing institutional instruments (common strategies and joint actions). At a time in the EU's efforts to build new capabilities in the field of Security and Defence Cooperation, the Greek Presidency, in order to reinforce the institutional framework of the CFSP, responded by proposing the area of "Freedom, Security and Justice".

The Results of the Hellenic Presidency in the Foreign Policy Domain [33]

Dossier	Achievement	Policy objective	Comments
CFSP/ESDP	Significant progress was made towards better defined common policies on security, defence and foreign affairs,	The Security Strategy identifies three key objectives for the EU: Extending the zone of security around Europe; Strengthening	The Iraq crisis, as well as popular demand for a stronger EU voice on the international scene, have led the

Dossier	Achievement	Policy objective	Comments
WMD / Terrorism	through the further development of military and crisis management capabilities and the launching of the European Security Strategy. A Joint Action Plan on Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction was adopted at the June 16 GAERC in Luxembourg An EU External Action in the fight against terrorism (including CFSP/ESDP) has been adopted at the June 16 GAERC.	the international order; Countering the new threats. The development of the first EU Security Strategy responds in a timely and structured way to the need for the EU to address major global security challenges, including terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, failed states and organized crime. A clear Security Strategy will enable the EU to consider these new threats to international peace and security in a strategic manner, which in turn will facilitate a rapid, effective response to crises. In an era of globalisation, European security is increasingly effected by violent conflicts, failed states, and organised crime beyond the Union's borders. An effective policy to deal with these challenges is therefore an urgent priority.	EU to introduce a more strategic, coherent, capable and dynamic focus to the development of the common foreign and security policy and European security and defence policy. At the Gymnich meeting in Katellorizo in May, Foreign Ministers mandated SG/HR Javier Solana to produce the first draft of an EU Security Strategy, for consideration at the Thessaloniki European Council. At Kastellorizo, at the invitation of the Greek Presidency, ministers also began to discuss their respective national foreign policy objectives, with a view to reconciling differences and capitalising on convergences as far as possible, in the interests of building a more effective CFSP.

Dossier	Achievement	Policy objective	Comments
Operational Capabilities	The Union declared at GAERC on 19 May, its operational capability across the full range of Petersburg tasks. During the Greek Presidency, the first three crisis management operations have been launched and are underway: EU Police Mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina; CONCORDIA in FYROM; and ARTEMIS in Bunia, Democratic Republic of Congo.	This development marked an important step in the progressive creation of a common European Security and Defence Policy. The effort to develop effective European influence over international security issues is now matched by an ability to take rapid, effective action. Complementary action alongside NATO and other international partners will continue to produce mutual benefits and a fairer sharing of responsibility for dealing with security challenges.	Further development of the emerging common European security and defence policy has been one of the key priorities of the Greek Presidency. The deployment of EU forces in three crisis management operations will provide valuable lessons and experience for future missions, should they prove necessary.
European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP)	Rapid and systematic progress in implementing the ECAP, within the set timeframe of the end of 2003. The way ahead was defined by the establishment, among others, of the ECAP Project Groups.	The aim of the Action Plan was to identify and remedy capabilities shortfalls that would allow the full operationality of the EU's 60,000-strong crisis management force, through the creation of expert panels and working groups.	The Greek Presidency promoted the work of the ECAP panels alongside SG/HR Javier Solana, on behalf of the Council, and has mapped out the way ahead by the establishment of the ECAP Project Groups. The next crucial step will be to address outstanding financing and resourcing issues.
	The so-called	To enhance the	The conclusion and

Dossier	Achievement	Policy objective	Comments
	'permanent arrangements' between the EU and NATO have been concluded, providing the framework for a strategic partnership in crisis management.	operational capability of the Union, and provide the framework of an effective partnership to meet global challenges.	implementation of EU-NATO permanent arrangements will also contribute to effective multilateral cooperation, which is the interests of the international community.

Conclusions

Participation in EPC, EPU and CFSP presented new challenges and found Greece to be more involved in EU's political co-operation process with a 'pro-European' attitude and a more 'Europe-oriented' approach and coherence in its foreign policy formulation. However, again 'national issues': the Greek-Turkish relations, the Cyprus issue, and relations with the Balkan countries, played a crucial role and made adaptation to the new situation complex. Also the disillusionment regarding expectations from the TEU in the field of security made 'European-oriented' structures, from 1994 and onwards, to look much less attractive than they did in 1992. This also applies to the WEU, which was seen as the ultimate prize for Greece during the 1992 IGC. This stemmed from a dual realisation, first that the WEU was largely a defence organisation without a nervous system and, therefore, incapable of addressing problems like those in the Balkans. Second, even if the WEU did possess real muscle, it was far from certain whether it would have rushed to Greece's side. It will be, therefore, an illusion to assume that the EU/CFSP would provide security for Greece against Turkey. Greece learnt the lesson at the latest in 1992 when the Petersberg agreement made it clear that membership in the Western European Union (WEU) does not imply any assistance for Greece in case of a military conflict with NATO member Turkey. After the TEU however, expectations from the WEU had been scaled down to a more realistic level. Although the Maastricht Treaty defines defence policy as a long-term responsibility of the EU, it seems not very likely that the EU will take over these responsibilities in the future.

However, even though the European Union did not go as far as to integrate the defence policies of the member states, the Community framework and even more so the EPU process entailed a series of important assets for Greek security, above all the web of interdependence and solidarity among the fifteen partners. Participation in the CFSP decision-making structure also guaranteed an increased and timely flow of information critical for foreign policy decision-making. It contributed simultaneously to the modernisation of Greece's foreign policy mechanism and bureaucratic structures (educational effects through intensive consultation, etc.).

As a member of the EU, Greece could have enjoyed, up to certain extent, the support of the other member states even though this support was not automatic and was subject to a certain code of conduct based on shared values. It is very important to emphasise that with regard to Common Foreign and Security Policy in the 1990s, what was said about EPC in the late 1980s had to be confirmed: Greece followed its partners in nearly every declaration and action that did not conflict with its interests.

However, although Greece had demonstrated such a 'pro-European' attitude after 1990, instead of 'Europeanising' its foreign policy, it tried to 'Europeanise' its foreign policy goals and as a result, suddenly found itself isolated from its EU/CFSP partners. This became obvious in two cases in Greece's foreign policy in the Balkans. First, in the 'Macedonian question' where Athens for two years had gone through the agony of fighting a diplomatic battle against recognition which it had no realistic prospects of winning. The only thing in which it succeeded was to seriously impair its place in the Union. Second, in the case of the former Yugoslavia, Greece also disassociated itself from its partners by adopting a pro-Serbian attitude and continuously sabotaged UN sanctions purely for national interest reasons.

Greece's policy in both cases was catastrophic. The Greek government conducted its EU's policy vis-à-vis FYROM and Serbia, frequently making use of vetoes and of the requirement of consensus in CFSP. The result was that the EU could no longer play the role of mediator and that efforts failed to stabilise the situation in this part of the Balkans through intensified economic and political co-operation. Apart from that, Greece hampered the development of the EU's relations with Turkey and as a result, it found it difficult to follow its partners in CFSP.

We can conclude that mere participation in the EU/CFSP provided Greece with many opportunities, that still need to be explored, for advancing, directly or indirectly, its political and security interests. However, as far as foreign policy is concerned Greece used the EPC/CFSP and EPU frameworks mainly for satisfying its national interests, or when that was not possible, for stopping unpleasant developments imposed by its partners instead of using them as stages and platforms for adapting its foreign policy to the integration and Europeanisation logic.

One should observe though that the shift in the Greek foreign policy towards its relations with Turkey and the way that the EU Presidency of 2003 was administered changed the perceptions of Greece to its European partners to a great extent. Greece is not anymore politically isolated and more important it has convinced the other EU member states that it can provide excellent liaison services to the southeast European countries as an emerging regional power. In this framework, there are still lessons to be learned and a lot of perspectives to be explored.

References

[1] R. Ladrech, *Europeanisation of Domestic Politics and Institutions: the Case of France*, Journal of Common Market Studies, vol. 32, no. 1, March 1994.

[2] Meeting with Prof. P. Ioakimidis, University of Athens, [conducted in London, 6/3/1998].

[3] Interview with Prof. Loukas Tsoukalis, London School of Economics, [conducted in London 5/3/98].

[4] P.M. Kitromilides, The Vision of Freedom in Greek Society, Athens, 1992, p. 60 (in Greek).

[5] Interview with Dr. Ben Tonra, University of Wales – Aberystwyth, [conducted in Aberystwyth, 6/5/1998].

[6] Interview with Dr. Erik Goldstein, University of Birmingham, [conducted in Birmingham, 16/5/1997].

[7] A. Fatouros, *Political and Institutional Facets of Greece's Integration in the European Community*, in J. H. Psomiades and B. Thomadakis (eds.), Greece, the New Europe and the Changing International Order (New York: Pelia, 1993), pp.23-42,

[8] *Ibid*., p. 24.

[9] Interview with Prof. Kevin Featherstone, University of Bradford, [conducted in Bradford, 14/7/1998].

[10] *Ibid*.

[11] See the Greek proposals in the Southeast European Yearbook 1990, in ELIAMEP 1991, pp. 345-352.

[12] This position was very clear in the Commission's ideas. See Political Union, European Commission's Opinion about the IGC, in *Europe Documents*, 31 October 1990, 1659, p. 2.

[13] 'Greece demands accession to the WEU as condition for its acceptance of Political Union' in *Macedonia*, 13 November 1991.

[14] See article of Panayiotis Ioakimidis in *Oikonomikos Tachydromos*, 27 June 1991, pp. 21-22.

[15] Sir Geoffrey Finsberg, Rapporteur on the enlargement of the WEU for the WEU's Parliamentary Assembly, had pleaded, for instance, in favour of the simultaneous membership of Greece and Turkey. See *Agence Europe*, 4 December 1991, p. 6.

[16] Some Greek newspapers warned that the prevailing opinion in Greece is that the partners have to follow the path set by the Athens government. If this is not done, the Greeks are quick to accuse the Community of 'betraying' Greece. See anonymous author in *Oikonomikos Tachydromos*, 30 January 1991, p. 20.

[17] See *Agence Europe*, 6/7 June 1994, p. 4.

[18] Meeting with Prof. N. Christodoulakis, Minister of Finance, [conducted in London, 7/3/1998].

[19] Discussion with Dr. P. Tsakaloyannis, Athens University of Economics and Business, [conducted in London, 6/3/1998].

[20] Interview with Dr. Spyros Economides, London School of Economics, [conducted in London, 26/2/1998].

[21] Meeting with Mr. O. Miles, former British Ambassador to Greece [conducted in London, 6/3/1998].

[22] *Presse-und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung* Bulletin, 26 October 1994, p. 923.

[23] *Ibid.*,19 October 1994, p. 906.

[24] *Ibid.*, 16 June 1994, p. 556.

[25] *Agence Europe*, 9 April 1994, p. 4.

[26] *Ibid.*, 26 August 1994, p. 4.

[27] *Ibid.*, 21-22 March 1994, p. 6.

[28] *Ibid.*, 1 April 1994, p. 13.

[29] This was confirmed in July 1992. Reservations were dropped by Greece only with respect to some finances in the context of the Mediterranean policy. See *Agence Europe*, 27 July 1991, p. 3. The question was on the agenda of the Foreign Affairs Council whether Greece was willing to drop its veto. As is known Greece was not ready to do so.

[30] *Agence Europe*, 28 September 1994, p. 3.

[31] *Agence Europe*, 3 November 1994, p. 6.

[32] Our Europe – The Priorities of the Hellenic Presidency, MFA December 2002, pp. 10-11.

[33] Official Cite of the Hellenic Presidency, http://www.eu2003.gr/en/articles/2003/6/25/3158/

Paper for
2nd LSE PhD Symposium on Modern Greece

Dr. Nikos Panagiotou

MA in Conflict Analysis

Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki

Department of Mass Media and Journalism

TITLE

"The role of Mass Media in Foreign Policy: The case of Greek press."

The paper will introduce an outline for mass media impact-influence on foreign policy which takes its role as a twofold input and output environment. The sources of the paper come from the combination of theories regarding the construction of the public sphere with the relevant communication theories. Our approach incorporates mass media as an important factor in the foreign policy. . The mass media are not only restricted to the reporting and coverage of foreign policy issues but equally preserve an autonomous role, by determining and "constructing" the context in which the issues are discussed. To support my argument I will develop an approach that best describes the various roles undertaken by the Greek mass media in foreign policy. The functions suggested and illustrated by incidents are be three: 1) The protagonist function 2) The 'cooperative' function 3) The commercialise function

Political scientists and media specialists accept the commonplace assumption thatt mass media have a profound and direct impact on virtually every aspect of the political process. Their development in modern societies influenced to a great extent the ways in which we acquire knowledge, interpret information and transform it into a meaningful and coherent whole. Mass media affect the way that we participate in the political sphere, through becoming an important source of our knowledge. William Gamson suggests that media discourse is but one of three resources that people use to make sense of politics. Personal experience and popular wisdom are often combined with media discourse in ways that lessen the influence of media converge on people's opinions and frames of reference (Gamson 1996:123-125,Doulkeri 2001). This element, the absence of personal experience by the public in foreign policy issues, is critical regarding mass media influence in relation with the domestic issues. *`Foreign policy issues are clearly more complex than domestic policy issues and are more difficult with which to identify (*Malek, Wiegand 1996:11). Paletz and Entman, in addition, agree in that domestic issues are better understood by the public than foreign issues (Paletz and Entman, 1981).

Media is an important component which '*foreign policy decision-makers take into considerations as they develop they develop their policies ' (*Naveh 2002:2) since it both constrains leaders and officials yet provides them with opportunities to advance their goals (Gilboa2002). In the realm of foreign policy political pressure on the media is greater than on domestic issues *(*Graber 1989:336).

Methodology

Our analysis aims to examine questions concerning mass media and more specifically Greek press and the ideological conditions of production of the dominant discourse in foreign policy issues. Greece will be used as a case study, in order to uncover the competing demands perceptions expectations and roles of mass media in public communication environment of foreign policy. Our approach is founded on the premise that mass media role in Greek foreign policy is important. In order though to examine successfully the validity of our hypothesis and keep the length of the study within reasonable limits, we assume that media can have a direct effect on government and on public opinion.

The selection of the newspapers is based upon the following criteria: 1) representation of the whole political spectrum 2) circulation figures 3) Their influence upon the members of the political spectrum that they belong. The newspapers that we examined are: 1) Vima 2) Eleftherotypia 3) Eleftheros Typos 4) Kathimerini 5) Rizospastis.

Articles of newspapers during various incidents were compared and examined in a three-step process. First a micro level analysis was conducted for the analysis of news agendas. Secondly in a macro level an analysis of the reactions of the government discourse was conducted. Micro as well as macro analysis results were co-related in order to assess media function. Our choice to examine the press instead of the television is based to the following:

1) As Anthony Sampson suggests the role of political journalism in "providing the chief context for information and understanding for the public" is being undermined by "the media's ability to confuse news with entertainment" (Sampson 1996:42-51).

This 'ability' creates a technique of presentation that is known as infotainment, which is widely used in the television across the world. In contrast, the absence of the use of this technique in press coverage enables to have a clearer examination on the way that it reports the facts.

2) Television addresses usually a more general audience concerning its political preferences. In contrary the choice of a newspaper by a reader is clearly based on more clear-cut political criteria. This choice results not only from reader's point of view but contents a form of political expectation (Curran, Seaton 1998). Bearing this in mind we suggest that the study of the press reflects the narrative of the ideological spectrum that 'represents'.

Our analysis although that examines the press, we suggest that it can equally be applied to television since '*that new private television channel licenses and frequencies were primarily reserved for press publishers has contributed to the existence of similarities between the print and broadcast media in terms of editorial priorities and work ethic'* (Tsagkarousianou 1999:179)

The unit of our analysis will be the headlines, the editorials. Our choice to examine the headlines as well as the editorials is based, on the following assumptions: 1) they are a decisive among other factors, in a reader's decision to buy a newspaper. This assumption lies in the fact that the Greek press has a small number of subscribers, while the most of its circulation is made through kiosks. 2) Headlines 'express' the stance of the newspaper. They are the reflection of the articles published inside while it clearly represents the ideological stance of the newspaper.

With regards to the influence of the press, on the public and the decisions-makers, I adopt the agenda-setting model as has been modified by Rogers and Dearing. (Rogers & Dearing1983:550-60). I use critical discourse analysis and the

agenda-setting model, in order to evaluate how the Greek press constructs the public and policy agenda. My premise is that the Greek press sets the public and policy agenda. It both prioritises themes for public debate and determines the terms in which the themes are discussed. The combination of agenda-setting model and discourse analysis will contribute to our understanding of the role of the press in the construction of the public sphere. It will further explore meaning and the social implications of such meaning (Katrivesis, 2003). In addition an agenda-setting analysis demonstrates a strong connection between the salience of foreign affairs in the media and the salience of foreign affairs for the public. In general, we argue that agenda setting in foreign policy is a transaction process in which elites the media and the public converge to a common set of salient issues that define a campaign.

Regarding our arguments the existence of policy certainty or uncertainty is a critical element, which determines whether their coverage and in turn the extended of their influence will be critical, supportive, or neutral of the government's policies (Robinson 2002). Our approach though takes into consideration other factors as well, (economical, organizational etc) which additionally influence their intervention in foreign policy. In order to make our theoretical distinction clear we will use a number of recent relevant cases for each role.

For our the analysis the following hypothesis will be tested:

Hypothesis 1: Greek press influence-coverage depends upon the existence of policy certainty or uncertainty.

Hypothesis 2: In the case of absence of a clear-cut line by the government, the role and the views of the press dominate the public sphere, and as a result influenced a great extent the reactions of the public opinion.

Hypothesis 3: In the case of political certainty especially in major issues of foreign policy press discourse is line or follows their 'definition' of the situation.

Hypothesis 4: In the case that commercial necessities prevail over the others (political ideological etc), press operates in terms of attracting attention, by dramatizing and sensationalizing the events.

Foreign policy and the Press

The end of Cold war as well as the globalization of communications has changed the way that mass media influence foreign policy process. These developments displaced old diplomacy's methods '*increasing the diplomatic influence of non-traditional actors such as journalists"* (Ammon 2001: pp.48-61,Fragkonikolopoulos Kannelopoulos 1995). Debate over which the mass media serves elite interests or alternatively, plays a powerful role in shaping political outcomes has been dogged, by dichotomous and one-sided claims. Some attribute enormous power to the news media (the so-called CNN effect) while others claim the media 'manufactures consent' for elite policy preferences. As Chanan suggests `m*edia is involved in all stages of foreign policy formulation and that political leaders take the media into consideration in its national and international aspects. (*Chanan 2001:1)

Regarding mass media role, in foreign policy there are several analytical approaches. The first (structuralist) considers press as an important factor in the formation of foreign policy. More specifically its role is considered important in the process of opinion formation and of policy formulation. For some scholars media play a highly active role in influencing decisions made in foreign policy *viewing the media as a watchdog, an independent observer, an active participant, or a catalyst (*Cohen 1963). Chang (1993:7) enthralls "*the notion of an al- powerful, authoritative media".* It examines the larger organizational limits impinging on press actions and decisions

that may lead journalists to support government policies. Cohen suggests that organizational practices shape press coverage of foreign policy. Journalists often work within the governmental instituted boundaries of foreign policy coverage, and consequently are inclined to support the stated policy objectives. (Cohen 1963) Inspired by this study scholars have looked at either the organisational practices of the press or the government's imposed organizational constraints that influence international news products. Peter Drier suggests that newspapers became integrated into what he calls the *"web of affiliations that form the national power structure, remaining a very important factor in foreign policy*" (Drier1989:301) Although all of these studies place emphasis upon the structural conditions, which influence media content, they share a belief about the central role of the press in foreign policy. The press is thought to shape and determine, to a great extent, public opinion reactions, and through that policy itself. As is suggested press and the media in general, are functioning as independent controlling actor. Critiques of this model focused upon the underestimation of the capacity of the audiences to retain some degree of autonomy from the mass media. In addition they criticised the "*assumed neutrality of media message by structural-functionalist approach, and its inability to account for the role of the press in the political and cultural struggle for the construction of consensus"(*McNair 1995:65)

The second approach informed mainly by Marxist theory emphasizes the centrality of the mass media in the reproduction of ideology and of asymmetrical relations of power in society. According to Hallin (1987), (Gittlin 1980) mass media tend *'to support the elite class and already existing political initiatives, whilst validating the government's decisions by deferring to authority*` (Malek, Wiegand 1996:5-6) Representative of this approach is the work of Herman and Chomsky

(Herman & Chomsky, 1988).The 'instrumentalist' approach concentrates on the actual controls exercised on press operators by the power holders in the capitalist economy, as well as the dependence of ideology on the economic processes. Ownership and control are considered to be determining factors in media activities, which directly influence ideological production, and the content of media messages. "*With a majority of the news outlets being owned by large conglomerates, the press as an institution is essentially viewed as belonging to the broader economic system, with very close ties to the governing political system*."(Luther C 2001:36). Access to the media is determined by political elites, while room for challenges to the political and economic systems is limited. *"The press is considered as "lapdog" of the state and the corporate powers; it panders to the interests of those in power. The information that it disseminates to the public, therefore, simply reflects its role as mouthpiece for the governing power elites. Thus news coverage of foreign affairs would reflect the interests of both multi-national corporations and the government."* (Luther C 2001:37). Media coverage is considered as biased in favour of the status quo whilst suppressing the challenging ideas.

The 'instrumentalist' approach constitutes an important contribution, as it focus on the important implications of ownership, market pressure and other economic and political considerations to the ideological production that has been neglected by approaches focusing exclusively on the content of media messages. It fails though, as McNair suggests, *"to account adequately for the complexity of mediated political debate, and the many cases where 'primary definers', like the ruling elites, have failed to impose their primary definitions on the public debate as a whole. Political shifts like Nixon administration withdrawal from Vietnam War, Thatcher's retreat from poll tax and her removal highlighted the weakness of any theoretical framework*

*which asserts the existence of a deep structural bias on the part of the media towards the 'powerful' the 'establishment' or the 'ruling class' "(*McNair 1995:59)

According to McQuail the emphasis placed by the this approach on the economic process does not explain cases where the mass media are under public ownership and not operate on the logic of profitability, or ownership by powerful corporations. (McQuail, Windahl 1993:64) Even in the case of privately owned media other priorities could be detected, since it might serve the owners plan for political influence or control.

The third approach 'liberal-pluralism', deals with `*the media as course*` *(*Gitlin 1980:7). According to this approach `*no single frame predominate to the exclusion of the others*` *(*Hackett1996: 144). Society is seen and dealt as an open to various competitions sphere. Mass media and more specifically journalists role is dealt as that of an objective observer. As a result '*of the virtue of ownership in a market economy a range of opinions will emerge…in this model the consuming public is not a passive body which absorbs (media) content, but is a heterogeneous group of consumers who use the media in the way that suits their needs "*(Watts 1997:18)

The fourth approach, the dynamic paradigm-approach as we call it, sees foreign policy as the outcome of continuous negotiation, where press role is important in shaping the public and political agendas. "'*Political reality' is not neutral it is rather a product of representation, of processes of definition, or signification. In this context the press product is not mere reflection of 'reality', but rather specific interpretation of it."* (Tsagkarousianou 1993:114). Press account is the outcome of processes of selective introduction and exclusion of issues from the universe of discourse. The central role of the press in the public sphere could be defined as "*assisting the equitable negotiation or arbitration of competing interests through democratic*

*processes." (*Curran 1977:114) According though to this approach that we adopt mass media though are not only restricted to the reporting and coverage of crises, but they equally preserve an autonomous role, by determining and 'constructing' the context in which foreign policy is decided.

Press is considered to constitute a domain of action, negotiation of increasing importance in contemporary societies. Tsagkarousianou suggests that the press is a gatekeeper: "*It is through the press that our understanding of the political is mediated: the definitions of the political which determine which issues will enter the sphere of public awareness, discussion and collective action; the terms in which these issues are discussed; the criteria for legitimate participation in the public debate; and the parameters of the ensuing debates and discussions*" (Tsagkarousianou 1993:117) The press has a critical role in making more explicit the links between events in foreign policy and their repercussions for the average citizen. Its role as information provider is not entirely neutral. In its decision on what or what not to cover, various political, economic, ideological and cultural factors, along with organizational constrains or interests are employed and determine the outcome. As McNair states: "*there is no single 'primary definition' of an event or an issue circulating in the public sphere at any given time, but a multiplicity of definitions, reflecting the interests of various collectivities, within and outside the 'establishment'; while one definition may be dominant at a particular time, challenges will continually be mounted, as opposition groups seek to advance their alternative definition. That structures of access to the media through which the struggle for definitional primarily takes place, are not rigid but flexible, and capable of accommodating, even under certain circumstances welcoming challenges to the establishment; and that such*

flexibility is, indeed, an integral legitimating feature of the media in a liberal democracy." (*McNair 1995:140)*

Economic though and other factors, in contrast with the pluralism paradigm, in the dynamic approach are considered important, influencing mass media discourse. According to O' Herffernan's, the policy makers are particularly informed by the mass media during the early stages of policy development rather than during the latter stages, after policy adoption. "*Policy makers-the Insiders- have a definite model of the media's relationship to the foreign policy process. They see the media as dual actors, affecti1ng the policy both inside as a player or a tool of the inside players, and outside as part of the environment shaping policy, both overtly and covertly*". O' Heffernan 1991: 152)

Informed by the dynamic approach we believe that media are `*active players in the policy process and that the government also played a significant role in media coverage by use of the media to publicize its policy intentions* (O`Heffernan 1991:13). According to our approach mass media are active participants in the construction of foreign policy issues discourse. Economic interests play an important role in influencing mass media content, without though being the dominant actor. The importance of this model, according to our view lies upon its hypothesis that there is an interconnection between the public, policy and media agenda, but their 'autonomy' is being reserved without their importance equalized.

Our approach presents a taxonomy where mass media and especially the press is viewed as an actor in the policy process with corresponding attributes of type, activity, context and concept. Four are the fundamental areas that influence on press: *1) Political Context 2) Economic conditions 3) Quality of journalism 4) Public attitudes* (Relji:2005). A critical element of press influence on the overall system of

foreign policy, we consider the existence of policy certainty or uncertainty. From this result three functions of the Greek press concerning its role in various incidents:

The Co-operative Function

According to our approach press discourse in the co-operative function is in accordance with the government and political elites 'definition' of the events. That was the case, regarding Greek press stance during the 1987 crisis between Greece and Turkey.

This crisis hinged on proposed oil explorations in disputed waters and likewise involved the survey ship Sismik. The Greek government tabled a bill to take control of Canadian-owned North Aegean Petroleum Company (NAPC) that exploited the Prinos oilfield off the Greek island of Thasos. Turkey accused Greece of having violated the Berne Protocol of November 1976. As a result Turkish government granted further exploration and exploitation licenses to the state-owned Turkish Petroleum Corporation in international waters near the Greek island Samothrace.

On 28 March 1987, when the Turkish survey ship Sismik under naval escort set sail for the Aegean sea, Greek and Turkish forces were placed on alert and Papandreou declared that all necessary measures would be taken to safeguard Greece's sovereign rights (Keridis, Triantafyllou 2001). Holding NATO and, in particular, the United States responsible for the crisis, Papandreou ordered the suspension of communication facilities at the American base at Nea Makri. It also promptly dispatched his foreign minister to Sofia to brief the Bulgarian leader Tudor Jivkov. In a calculated snub, the ambassadors of Warsaw Pact countries in Athens were briefed on the crisis in advance of their NATO counterparts (Clogg 1991:15).

The threat of outright hostilities was averted only when Ozal declared that Sismik would operate only in Turkish territorial seas, while Greece likewise declared that no drilling would take place in disputed waters. After the crisis of 1987 a secret dialogue was established between Ozal and Papandreou that lead to a breakthrough that materialized in Davos in February 1988.

The Greek press during this period supported what is perceived as a decisive stance of the government towards the Turkish 'provocations' *(Decisive stance against Turkey Kath 25/02, Don't play with the fire. Turkey is dropping the glove (Eleyft.22-23/03).* This especially the case for the newspapers in favor of the government but is traced to the oppositional newspaper to a great or less extent. *The crisis is under control. Kath.24/03)*. The word 'decisive' that appears in most of the headlines justifies the use of military means, as appropriate towards Turkish 'provocations'. It also serves as an approval from the press of this policy that is 'decisive' in contrast with other policies (like rapprochement) that from before are set to be non-decisive or to constitute signs of retreat. (Panagiotou 2003:9). During the crisis the headlines become dramatic in their tone *(Zero Hour Eleft.28/03).* The 'dramatization' of the events aimed at evoking feelings of insecurity, extreme danger and threat. Thus the use of relevant metaphors mobilized these feelings and prompted a unified stance by the public towards the danger. What is reflected in the headlines of the newspapers examined, especially during the peak of the crisis is 'rally behind the flag phenomenon', in the face of Turkish 'threat'. As a result there is an ideological consensus in the press headlines, aiming to invoke feelings of national unity in the public opinion. During the escalation of the crisis all the newspapers examined, but especially the ones that are in favor of the socialist government, followed the arguments and the terms of the discourse that has been set by the government. *(Zero*

Hour Eleft.28/03) This ideological consensus, effects that complex causes to be reduced to a simple picture of an irrational and threatening Other. Turkish 'aggressive' and 'expansionist', policy as well as the 'neutral' stance of third parties (USA, E.U. NATO) are being projected as the causes of the crisis.

This co-operative stance is clear both in the escalation of the crisis as well as for the ways of its proposed resolution. According to the headlines, the Greek side is looking at ways to resolve the conflict through addressing to the International Court of Justice. As in the government rhetoric, in the newspapers examined Greece stance is praised as in accordance with international law while Turkey's proposals are presented as residing outside of lawful solutions. The antithetical scheme employed in this case is Greece's rightful claims as against claims that are based on threats, which are sought to be justified through bargaining. *(End at bargaining (Eleft 05/04)*, *Turkey is looking forwards to the division of the Aegean. Turkey reacts in the suggestion from the European Parliament (to commit the dispute in Hague) adhering to the bilateral talks (Kath 06/04).*

Protagonist function

In cases of political uncertainty or in the absences of a clear stance news media discourse and their influence prevails the public sphere. In this case the dominant element that results in the protagonist role of medias discourse, is the uncertainty from public elites. This function is highlighted by the Greek press stance in Imia/Kardak crisis on 1996.

In 1996 Papandreou, the founder of PASOK and Prime Minister of the time, resigned and in his position K.Simitis was elected. His administration got off to a bad start with the Imia/Kardak crisis, which almost cost him the premiership. In late

December 1995, a Turkish merchant vessel ran aground on the coast of the rocky islet Imia/Kardak in the Aegean Sea. This incident was followed by a small but silent exchange of diplomatic papers between the Greek and Turkish authorities as to who was to rescue the ship. The Turkish government in a verbal note argued that Imia/Kardak belonged to Turkish territory, which was disputed by Athens. "*The incident that took place on an islet of a size that was appropriate only for keeping goats but hardly of any other use, would have gone unnoticed had the Greek TV station ANT1 not aired the exchange of diplomatic notes nearly four weeks after the incident occurred. On 25 of January, the mayor of Kalymnos (an island situated next to Imia in the Aegean) took action and put the Greek flag on the rocky soil of the island. This was the spark that inspired the Turkish newspaper "Hürriyet" to fly a helicopter with a team of journalists and photographers to the tiny islet, to remove the Greek flag and hoist the Turkish one. The action took place and "Hürriyet" published the photograph of the journalists removing the Greek flag, on its front page the very next day*` (Keridis, Triantafyllou 2001) Things took a more serious turn from that moment on. The Greek navy changed the flag within 24 hours and by January 30/31-1996 Greek and Turkish naval forces stood opposite each other in Aegean. The crisis escalated further when Turkish Special Forces landed and occupied one of the isles that was not been guarded by the Greek army. (Giallouridis 1996). A Greek helicopter on a reconnaissance mission in order to verify whether or not the islet was being occupied, was crashed causing the death of its pilots. This prompted speculations in Greece that it had been hit by Turkish fire. The intervention of USA and especially a phone call by the President of the United States in person to the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey averted further escalation of the already dangerous situation. A

deal under the auspices of the United States was achieved and the two countries withdrew their armies from the area.

From the early beginning of the crisis, the newspapers examined, reported Greek-Turkish relations as a zero-sum game. Their stance is aggressive towards what is seen as Turkish provocation whilst demanding a dynamic response against Turkish `provocations`. *(Greece is being left ungoverned while the Turks are cruising Subtitle: They placed the Turkish flag in Imia. E.T 29/01. Turkey is pushing to the limits E.T.13/02, We do not retreat Kath. 24/01. Turkey is threatening to use brutal force Kath10/02. A long-ago planned crisis. Andreas has predicted it Eleyth. 27/01)*

Following the events especially in the 'war of the flags' press speech is war mongering (*Lets stand up at Thermopylae, The Turkish flag has been posted on Imia islet E.T.02/02. A Turkish invasion Eleyth. 27/02).* The newly elected government, as well that of the opposition parties responses were in accordance with the war mongering speech of the media. As Dimitras suggests "*The conflict was in fact triggered and then aggravated by the media of the countries"* (Dimitras 1998:65). In that context there as increased appeal for "*aggressive if not heroic acts"* (Dimitras 1998:67)

Mass media protagonist function in this crisis is reflected in the fact that the outcome of the crisis has being projected and categorised since then as a Greek loss, in spite of the governments arguments, that it was a win to win situation for both countries since war has being avoided. *To the Death squad Simitis and Pagkalos. Simitis is letting Tsiler and attacking Andreas. E.T. 03/02. Shame on us, we have been humiliated by the Turks E.T.02/02 Waterloo for Greece E.T. 04/02.Humiliation and submission to American imperialism Rizo 17/02).*

The perpetuation of the conflict is reflected in headlines, which in accordance with the war mongering speech before the crisis, are calling to 'reorganize our capabilities'. *(It's time to rally to reorganize our capabilities (Kath 04/02).* There is a call to the nation to be prepared for a second round in the near future. The enmity in the relations between the two nations is presented as something normal. War preparations are to be considered 'normal', and the right reaction to be followed by the political leadership.

The prospect of a dialogue between the two countries and in general policies to diffuse the conflict are pushed out from the dominant discourse as not the appropriate approach towards 'an unreliable', 'expansionist, 'brutal' Other. Implicit is the message that only military preparations, and even the will to use military force will provide Greece with the necessary security, and will not allow the repetition of the Cyprus tragedy. *Tsiler is threatening with another war, Eleyth. 05/02)*

The Commercialised function

According to our approach when commercial necessities prevail over the others (political ideological etc), press operates in terms of attracting attention, by dramatizing and sensationalizing the events. In this case their discourse is characterised by the infotainment model.

During the second half of 1999, Greek-Turkish relations entered a phase of détente. An important factor has been the establishment of a working relationship between G. Papandreou and Ismail Gem, the Greek and Turkish foreign ministers respectively. The ongoing rapprochement has been further prompted by the solidarity exhibited by the Greek and Turkish people in the face of the humanitarian disaster caused by

devastating earthquakes in both countries in August and September 1999. In Istanbul the earthquake of Mw7.4 resulted in the death of 17.000 people while it had a tremendous social and economical impact, since it hit an area that produced 35% of Turkish GDP. Greek government rushed to provide humanitarian help from the early beginning. The impact of this move has been enormous in the Turkish public opinion, as images of Greek and Turkish rescue teams working together were aired through the media.

In September of the same year Athens was hit by an earthquake of 5,9 Mw leaving 10.000 homeless while 70 people were killed. It was the Turkey's turn to render the help given by Greece. The impact that these developments had upon the Greek public opinion is reflected to a poll conducted by Metron Analysis (Nea 14/12/1999). According to this opinion poll 57,5% of the Greek had a more positive stance for the Turks, while for 41,6% the earthquakes didn't affect its stance. 51,1% percent believed in a positive change in Greek-Turkish relations, while 44,2% percent of the persons asked believed that nothing would change.

During the period examined these incidents were covered extensively by the Greek press, especially during and after the earthquake in Istanbul. The newspapers covered Greek-Turkish relations with a special emphasis being placed upon the manifestation of friendship between the two nations. (*Greeks and Turks are turning the page Kath. 11/09.* Press antagonism with the television affected the way that it covered the incidents, resulting that the headlines to be characterized by the dramatization and sensationalizing of the events. (*Thank you Greek 'brothers' E.T. 17/08 The Greek cries like a friend Eleyth 21/08.Our hearts came closer Eleyth25/08, Thank you neighbor Vima 17/08 The earthquake is becoming a bridge of friendship Vima 20/08, Romeiko Filotimo (Greek generous feelings) Vima 20/08)* This stance

though in the majority of the cases did not affect the way the Other, or in general the Greek-Turkish relations were projected. The absences of a change in the images of the Other, underlines that commercial necessities of the press prevailed over the others (political ideological etc), impelling press to operate in terms of attracting attention

In spite of the extent coverage of the events and a change in the stance of some newspapers, especially Kathimerini and Eleytherotypia, there are still in use prejudices and stereotypes of the Other. *George you shouldn't help Attila E.T. 21/08 The earthquake has proven that Turkey was the great patient of the Balkans E.T.23/08. Earthquakes is seen as a chance for the' yielders'to promote their sell off policy Rizos 14-15/08* Even in the newspapers that differentiate their stance there is a suspiciousness that runs the headlines that concern Turkey (*Yilmaz thanks but still claims: There is no land that cannot be split Kath. 19/08*

Greek-Turkish relations, despite the sensational headlines, are still viewed as a zero-sum game. This results by the fact that destructions caused in Turkey by the earthquake are in some cases seen as a positive for Greece (*Turkey lacks anymore the economic, social and military strength for a win full war against Greece E.T. 23/08*). In a numerous cases there are calls for Greece to take into advantage this situation in order to pursue its targets *(The earthquake lives no excuse for the yielders E.T. 22/08)*

The newspapers stance during this period was heavily influence by its commercial necessities, since and despite the coverage of the earthquakes, the overall image of the Other remains the same. There is still the aggressive, arrogant, and non-democratic image implicitly running the headlines *(Turkish oligarchy Rizo 22/08),* that suggests that other were the necessities, that influenced the coverage of the Turkish-relations this period

Conclusions

As our analysis has come to reveal mass media is an important variable of the foreign policy system. Its role though and its influence differentiates from time to time while it is in close relation with other factors that influence foreign policy as well as the way the context in which press operates. *The media use of political symbols offers a serious potential to affect responses to foreign policy issues and could have serious policy impact (Chang 1993:103).* Our work informed, by the dynamic approach sees foreign policy as the outcome of continuous negotiation between the poles that constitute foreign policy system. In this hierarchical 'system' press role is important in shaping the public and political agendas.

In the beginning of our paper we have made some hypothesis. Our fist hypothesis proves to be valid since Greek press coverage depends upon the existence of policy certainty or uncertainty. More specifically, as it proves from the analysis of 1987 crisis in the case of political certainty especially in major issues of foreign policy press discourse is in line or follows governments 'definition' of the situation. When governments '*adopt a clear diplomatic strategy, they can successfully harness the growing power of mass media to achieve their goals'* (Gilboa 2002:744)The co-operative stance of the press is informed and influenced by government's choices, whilst it is characterised by the "Rally behind the flag phenomenon". In times of serious crisis (war etc) the alignment with government's decision is being justified as a patriotic duty. Co-operative stance, although that it might be argued justified in times that constitute a threat to nations existence, it carries the danger that policy mistakes will go unchecked by the public opinion.

Our third hypothesis proves to be valid as well, as is been show by the Imia/Kardak coverage of 1996.In the absence of a clear-cut line by the government, the views of the press dominate the public sphere, and as a result influences to a great extent the reactions of the public opinion. That was the case in Imia/Kardak crisis were the war mongering speech by the media, has dominated the Greek public sphere during the crisis and the period after. The protagonist function of the press and the media in general in the Imia/ Kardak crisis almost triggered a war between the two states. In this case mass media pressure was intense and demanding towards the political elites. These included shortening of the time available for policy making and demanding immediate response to crisis and events, excluding experts and diplomats, facilitating diplomatic manipulations, creating high expectations, broadcasting deficient reports (like the one regarding the landing of Turkish special forces in Imia/Kardak islet), and making instant judgments. As a result an incident that first was considered as unworthy of public attention, medias intervention converted it to one of the major crisis between Greece and Turkey during the 1990s. As Dimitras underlines "*It took a few days of media activity for the two governments to find themselves in a position which they could hardly back away from as the two publics were expecting their respective governments to 'save their nation's pride'*" (Dimitras 1998:66).

According to our fourth hypothesis in the case that commercial necessities prevail over the others (political ideological etc), press operates in terms of attracting attention, by dramatizing and sensationalizing the events. This hypothesis is valid as shown by the examination of the Greek press coverage of the earthquakes between the two countries on 1999. Despite the extent coverage of the reactions of the Greek and Turkish public opinion when faced with the catastrophes of the earthquakes both in

Istanbul and Athens, this does not result by change in the way the Other is projected. Rather is a result of commercial-economic necessities of the press in order to exploit the sentiments and stances created to Greek public opinion by the earthquake in Istanbul. This way of coverage fostered expectations, that long-term animosity can be extinguished in a short-term period, while it has created expectations that are difficult to meet. This usually has negative effects on public opinions' support for rapprochement policies, as shown from the Palestian-Israeli peace talks after the Oslo agreement.

In our analysis we have taken into consideration that press instrumentalization by private interests *'with political alliances and ambitions'* (Hallin, Papathanassopoulos 2002:177) affects their role in all three functions. In addition the stance of the Greek newspapers in all cases examined, was informed by their political preferences, although common elements between them could be found.

As this study shows mass media role in foreign policy has become central. This places a heavier responsibility both on media, politicians as well as public opinion. As a result there is a clear need to further investigate on this issue in order to further our knowledge on the role and the impact of mass media in foreign policy.

References

1. Altshull H 1984: *Agents of power: The role of the news media in human affairs.* New York: Longman Press
2. Ammon J. R 2001: *Global Television and the shaping of World Politics: CNN and Telediplomacy, and Foreign Policy* London: McFarland&Co.Inc.
3. Cohen, B.C. 1963: *The press and Foreign Policy* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
4. Chanan N 2002: The role of the Media in Foreign Policy Decision- Making: A theoretical Framework *Conflict &Communication online Vol 1 No2 2002*
5. Curran J., Seaton J. 1988: *Power without Responsibility. The press and Broadcasting in Britain.* London Routledge
6. Curran James "Mass Media and Democracy: A reappraisal" In J. Curran et al.(ed): *Mass Communications and Society* London: Edward Arnold/ Open University Press 1977
7. Chang, T. 1993: *The press and China policy: The illusion of Sino-American relations 1950-1984.* Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex
8. Richard Clogg 1991: Greek-Turkish relations in the post 1974 period, In Dimitris Constas (edit): *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the 1990s:Domestic and External influences* Macmillan London 1991
9. Dimitras P 1998: The apotheosis of hate speech: the near success of (Greek and Turkish) media in launching a war In Lenkona M (ed): *"Hate speech" in the Balkans* International Helsinki Federations for Human Rights: 65-68
10. Drier P. 1989: 'The position of the Press in the US Power Structure' *Social Problems*, vol 49, no.3 1989 pp.298-310

11. Graber D.A. 1989: *Mass media and American politics* Washington D.C.: CO Press

12. Gowing D. 1994: *Coverage of Armed Conflicts and Diplomatic Crises: Does it Pressure or Distort Foreign Policy.* Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy

13. Gilboa E 2002: Global Communication and Foreign Policy" *Journal of Communication* December 2002

14. Gitlin T 1980: *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left.* Berkley,CA: University of California Press

15. Gamson W. 1996: 'Political communication effects' In Ann N. Crigler (ed):*The Psychology of Political Communication* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press: .123-125

16. Hallin D. 1987: 'The American news media from Vietnam to El Salvador' In D.Paletz (ed), *Political communication Research.*Norwood, NJ: Ablex

17. Hallinn D& Papathanassopoulos 2002: ' Political clientelism and the media: Southern Europe and Latin America in comparative perspective' *Media Culture & Society* Vol.24 Number 2 March 2002.

18. Hacket R 1996: The press in foreign policy dissent: The case of the gulf war In Malek A (eds): *News Media and foreign relations: a multifaceted perspective* Ablex Publishing Corporation, New Jersey.: 141-161

19. Herman&Chomsky 1988: *Manufacturing consent* New York Pantheon Books

20. Keridis D., Triantafyllou (eds) 2001: *Greek-Turkish Relations in the Era of Globalization.* Dulles, VA,Brassey´s

21. Luther C 2001: *Press Images, National Identity and Foreign Policy: A case study of US-Japan Relations from 1955-1995* Routledge

22. Malek A., Wiegand K 1996 : News media and foreign policy :an integrated review In Malek A (eds): *News Media and foreign relations: a multifaceted perspective* Ablex Publishing Corporation, New Jersey: 3-29

23. McNair B (1995): *An introduction to Political Communication* Routledge 1995

24. McQuail D., Windahl S. 1993: *Communication Models,* Longman: Singapore

25. O` Heffernan (1991): *Mass media and American foreign policy: Insider perspectives on global journalism and the foreign policy process* Norwood, NJ: Ablex

26. Paletz, D.L.&Entman, R.M. 1981: *Media, power, politics* New York: The Free Press

27. Panagiotou N 2003:The role of the press in a 'conflict': The Greek press coverage of the Greek-Turkish relations Paper presented at 1st LSE PhD Symposium on Modern Greece

28. Rogers&Dearing 1988: Agenda Setting Research. Where has it been where it is going in J.Anderson: *Communication Yearbook* 11, Newburry Park: Sage Publications

29. Robinson P. 2002: *The CNN effect: The myth of News, Foreign Policy and Intervention.* London and New York: Routledge

30. Reljic D 2005: *The News Media and the Trasformation of Ethnopolitical Conflicts,* Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management

31. Tsagkarousianou R 1993: *Mass Communications and political culture: Authoritarianism and press representations of political deviance in Greece*. Ph.D Thesis University of Kent (UKC) Sociology.

32. Tsagkarousianou R. (1999): Nationalism, Ethnic Antagonism and Mass Communication in Greece In Allen T., Seaton J. (ed): *The Media of Conflict: War Reporting and Representations of Ethnic Violence,* Zed Books, NY:175-191.

1. Tuchman G. 1974: *The TV establishment: Programming for power.* Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.
2. Watts D 1997: *Political communication today* Manchester University Press, Manchester

In Greek

1. Fragkonikolopoulos Ch, Kannelopoulos A 1995: *The present and the future of Greek Foreign Policy.* Sideris Publications
2. Giallouridis Chr. 1996: *The Greek-Turkish Conflict .From Cyprus to Imia* Sideris Publications Athens.
3. Irakleidis A.2001: *Greece and the «danger from the east»* Polis Publications
4. Doulkeri T 2001: *Mass Media and Communicational Procedure* Papazisis Publications.
5. Katrivesis N. 2003: Modern Sociological Theories. Guttenberg Publications
6. Panagiotou N. 2005: The role of the press in Foreign Policy: A critical discourse analysis of the Greek. *Press coverage of the Greek-Turkish relations* PhD Thesis Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication

Title:	***Exploring the Sources of Greek Foreign Policy Towards the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia***
Name:	*Spyridon* ***KOTSOVILIS***
E-address:	*spyridon.kotsovilis@mail.mcgill.ca*
University Affiliation:	*Doctoral Candidate,* *Department of Political Science,* ***McGILL UNIVERSITY****.* *855 Sherbrooke St W, Montreal, Quebec,H3A 2T7 Canada.*
Conference:	*2nd PhD Symposium on Modern Greece, June 10, 2005.* *The Hellenic Observatory,* *London School of Economics and Political Science.*

Exploring the Sources of Greek Foreign Policy Towards the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

By
Spyridon Kotsovilis*
spyridon.kotsovilis@mail.mcgill.ca

This paper seeks to investigate and analyze the external and domestic sources of Greek Foreign Policy towards the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), especially the period between 1991 and 1995. It argues that a solely Realist approach is inadequate to fully explain the Greek decision-making calculus in withholding formal recognition of the young state under the name 'Republic of Macedonia'. It views this Realist balance of power explanation as complementary, and it proposes, instead a composite Liberal theory of International Relations perspective that considers domestic preference formation and variation, the social-psychological dynamics behind them, and their impact on foreign policy formulation between states. After an initial brief historical review of the modern history of Balkan nationalisms in the 'Macedonian Question', the paper focuses on the post-1991 case of the dispute between Greece and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia over its official name and state symbols. Then, a general theoretical section briefly discusses Realist, Constructivist and Liberal theories of foreign policy and applies these main theoretical propositions to the facts of the period examined, with emphasis on the ideational domestic sources influencing decision-making both for the Greek and FYROM governments. The paper argues that regardless of external factors, no Greek government could have possibly adopted an accommodating initial stance towards FYROM (and vice versa) without risking both immediate and long-term dire domestic political consequences. Finally, to explain why the overwhelming percentage of the Greek population held such an uncompromising position-and its variation-the study employs a social psychology theory that emphasizes the importance of group status. This approach strives to illuminate the nature and persistence of domestic public opinion in Greece, as well as its impact on Greek foreign policy towards FYROM, in support of a multi-causal, primarily Liberal theory of Foreign Policy.

The highly publicized recent diplomatic efforts to deal with the outstanding issue of the name dispute between Greece and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have brought this seemingly esoteric-to-outsiders matter back into the spotlight. After a long campaign of denying any use of the term 'Macedonia' to avoid confusion with its northern prefecture with the same name, the Greek government is showing signs of compromise. During this current round of negotiations (Spring 2005), the FYR of Macedonia remains insistent on using the formal name 'Republic of Macedonia' while, amidst mixed poll results, Greece has declared its willingness to accept UN special negotiator Mathew Nimetz's proposed term 'Republika Makedonija-Skopje.' This latest barrage of diplomatic activity focuses one's attention to the issue of the external and domestic sources of foreign policy determinants in both countries, especially Greece.

* I would like to thank (alphabetically) Thomas Homer-Dixon, Neophytos Loizides, Brian Rathbun, Steve Saideman, Blema Steinberg, Donald Taylor and Suranjan Weeraratne for helpful comments and suggestions throughout this project; I remain solely responsible for any deficiencies of this paper. Also, I would like to express my appreciation to the Hellenic Observatory of the London School of Economics for providing me with a travel grant, and to Ms. Maria Kantirou for her patience and valuable administrative assistance.

Specifically, one of the re-emerging questions involves the reasons that may have prevented past Greek governments from accepting solutions to the dispute deemed better than the ones currently on the table. Stemming from this puzzle, this paper looks at international relations' theories, to investigate the external and domestic sources of foreign policy, and expands on the social-psychological dynamics of the domestic politics involved to explain one dimension of them.

The study unfolds in five parts. Part I offers a brief historical review of the 'Macedonian Question', while Part II provides a detailed account of the dispute between Greece and the FYR of Macedonia, with emphasis on the 1991-5 period. Part III briefly discusses and evaluates International Relation theories and Part IV applies these theoretical approaches to the Greek-FYROM case, arguing for the explanatory prowess of a composite Liberal theory of Foreign Policy. Part V offers an explanation of the nature and variation of ideational public preferences. It employs literature from Social Psychology (Tajfel and Turner's theories of Social Categorization and Social Identity) and ethnic conflict (Horowitz) to provide an explanation for the dynamics behind group-level political preferences and action both for Greeks and FYR Macedonians, regarding the conflict over the disputed state symbols and name. This approach emphasizes the importance of social-psychological motives and relative group status in the Liberal-Ideational theory of domestic preference formation and its impact on the making of foreign policy. Finally, the paper concludes with a synopsis of the external and domestic factors affecting Greek foreign policy towards FYROM and a brief discussion on the application of the theoretical model to the recent developments in the dispute.

PART I: A Short History of the 'Macedonian Question'.

As a geographical area covering 25000 sq. km in the heart of the Balkan peninsula, Macedonia is a region spread between northern Greece (51%-Aegean), South-Western Bulgaria (10% Pirin) and what used to be the People's Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Vardar).[1] During Antiquity, Macedonia was part of the Hellenic world, and foundation of Alexander the Great's vast empire. Later it passed on to Roman possession and subsequently transferred to the Eastern part of the Empire (Byzantium).[2] Slavs settled in the

Balkans and into Macedonia around the 6th c. AD.[3] Between the 9th and 12th century, Macedonia was dominated by the Bulgarians, who still claim that modern day Slavic-speaking inhabitants of Macedonia are of Bulgarian ethnic descent and speak a Bulgarian dialect.[4] From the 12th to the 14th century, Macedonia became the centre for the medieval kingdom of Serbia. The Middle Ages witnessed the Byzantines, Bulgarians and Serbs clashing intermittently over its territories, until all three were crushed by the advance of the Ottoman Turks. Macedonia fell in 1371 and remained under Turkish rule for more than five hundred years.[5]

The disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the rise of nationalism in the 19th century made the fate of Macedonia a matter of controversy, both for the nationalist projects of expanding neighbouring states and for the competing and overlapping ethnic affinities of the local population.[6] In 1878, as a result of a Russo-Turkish war, the whole of Macedonia was awarded to Bulgaria. This transfer of ownership was immediately revoked by the Great Powers which restored the territory back to an ailing Ottoman Empire, but has since been seen by historians as one of the prime Bulgarian geo-political goals. [7] The ethnically mixed resident population endured the competing and often violent intentions of the outside claimants, as well as the destructive practices of its own nationalists. In 1893 the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation (VMRO) was founded, opposing the partition of Macedonia and advocating the idea of autonomy.[8] Soon a rival sentiment in favour of incorporation into Bulgaria gave rise in 1895 to an external Macedonian Revolutionary Organization, based in Sofia.[9] Both groups clashed with Greek and Serb irregular bands and the Ottoman army, during the violent period known as the 'Macedonian Struggle' (1897-1908) which provoked the deployment of the first modern International Police Force.[10] Despite their differences, Greeks, Serbs, Bulgarians and even Albanians joined forces to expel the Ottomans from the region during the Balkan wars of 1912-13. As a result, Macedonia was partitioned, mainly between Greece and Serbia, the smaller Pirin region going to Bulgaria.[11] After a period of occupation by Bulgaria during World War I, the Serb part (Vardar) became part of the new Yugoslav kingdom in 1918, and Serbian was made the official language.[12] As a reaction to harsh centralizing practices of Belgrade-which administered Vardar as South Serbia-Slavic Macedonian autonomists turned to Bolshevik Communist ideology, the only proponent of a unitary, nationally distinct Macedonia.[13] In

1934 Stalin was the first to proclaim Macedonians as a distinct nation. During World War II, Yugoslav Communists under Tito pledged to create a united Macedonia (Egei, Vardar and Pirin) as part of a future Communist Federation of Balkan People.* Allying itself with the Axis powers, Bulgaria again occupied Greek and Yugoslav Macedonia, but after defeat in 1945 it reluctantly complied with Yugoslav Communist grand plans for the Balkans.[15] Both Yugoslav and Bulgarian communists interfered in the Greek civil war (1944-49) on the Greek communist side, which eventually found itself fighting for a united Communist Macedonia.[16] The defeat of Greek Communists and the deterioration of Yugoslav-Bulgarian relations after the Tito-Stalin rift in 1948 (which nullified the secret agreement between the two for Pirin's eventual incorporation into Yugoslavia) left the project for a distinct and unitary Macedonian nation solely on Yugoslav hands.[17] Tito's regime began to consolidate a distinct Macedonian identity, partly as a counter to pro-Bulgarian sentiments. An official national language was introduced, a history tracing Yugoslav Macedonian roots all the way back to Alexander was written[18] and, official Yugoslav state atheism notwithstanding, the republic was even vested with its own national church (1967).[19] Despite this vast project of national identity-building, a large Albanian minority and a smaller Turkish and Gypsy ones maintained their own identities, languages and cultural traditions. At the same time, Cold War politics and the delicate balances surrounding non-aligned Yugoslavia ensured that the construction of a Yugoslav-Macedonian national identity went on uninterrupted, despite the somewhat muted Bulgarian and Greek protests.[20] The Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia grew strong enough to survive even its nation-building architect's death (Tito-1980) and the gradual demise of its political incubator (Yugoslavia) during the 80's.[21]

PART II: The dispute between FYR of Macedonia and Greece from 1991 onwards.

With the withering away of the old political structure in late 1990, the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia held its first multiparty elections.† Within a year (September 1991) it became an

---

* The "People's Republic of Macedonia" was established by Tito in 1944 as a constituent part of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The goal of Macedonian unification was clearly stated in the manifesto of the Macedonian Partizan Organization (ASNOM): *"In view of the centuries-old ideals of the people of Macedonia, the first Macedonian national council proclaims to the entire world its just and resolute aspiration for the unification of the whole Macedonian people on the principle based on the right to self-determination. This would put an end to the oppression of the people of Macedonia in all its parts and would provide conditions for genuine solidarity and peace among the Balkan peoples".* [14]

†The electoral results confirmed a fragile political balance. The main nationalist party, calling itself VMRO (Democratic Party for National Unity) gained a plurality; ex-communists came second, but managed to form a coalition government supported by two new

independent state, inheriting the Republic's borders and an ethnically diverse population body of 2 million (65% Slavs, 21% Albanians, 4.8% Turks, 2.7% Gypsies and 2.2% Serbs).[23] It was the only former republic to be spared of blood and violence during separation, but profound and immediate domestic and international dangers threatened to make its future extremely precarious.

Domestically, it faced the problem of a territorially concentrated ethnic Albanian minority, and its demands for formal recognition as a nationality with extensive autonomy rights. It also faced a dire economic situation as a result of a naturally poor economy, almost non-existent infrastructure and the flaring war in Yugoslavia.[*] Internationally, in the eyes of many regional players, the collapse of the Yugoslav federation turned the Balkan clock at least back to 1945 (if not 1912-13) putting the issue high on their agenda. Besides a politically unstable Albania with an unpredictable foreign policy towards its ethnic minorities abroad (its national assembly had already recognized Albanian Kosovo as a sovereign and independent state) adjacent to the ethnically Albanian western part of the country, the new state bordered the unfriendly rump Yugoslavia (which withheld recognition until 2001, prompting the deployment of UNPROFOR peacekeepers in 1992 along the border with Kosovo), and an unreliable Bulgaria (among the first to recognize the new state but only as a people-not a nation-claiming it belonged to the Bulgarian cultural space). A final neighbour was Greece, which, despite widely believed not to have any real claims (e.g. territory, or national minorities) raised grave obstacles in the early years of the young state's existence.

The following section chronicles the dispute between Greece and FYR of Macedonia over the latter's official name and state symbols, with emphasis on the 1991-5 phase. For a conceptually clearer narrative of this period it adopts the nomenclature of the stages of a foreign policy crisis.[†]

Onset

Soon after independence (September 8, 1991), the government of formerly Yugoslav Macedonia drafted a constitution and actively sought international recognition, critical for its admission the international organizations (UN, IMF, OSCE, etc.) that could substitute for

---

ethnic Albanian parties. The presidency remained in the skillful hands of veteran Yugoslav politician Kiro Gligorov. [22]

[*] By the end of the year foreign trade was down by 60%, a third of the workforce was unemployed and the inflation figure was at 86% per month-a mind-blowing annual (1992) consumer price percentage change of 1,691%. (Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit, Annual report/FYR of Macedonia).

[†] See Brecher, M., Wilkenfeld, J. *A Study of Crisis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.

the old Yugoslav protective umbrella and provide security, legitimacy and economic assistance. The conditions under which the new state sought this acceptance were deemed unacceptable for Greece, which actively tried to prevent any such international recognition.

More specifically, the very name 'Republic of Macedonia' could be seen as suggestive of territorial pretensions against Greek Aegean Macedonia.[24] The Macedonian Struggle, the Balkan wars, the bitter civil war with its territorial implications, the post-war Macedonian nation-building with what was seen as the falsification of ancient Greek history, were all considered serious issues for many Greeks. The nationalist platform of unification of all parts, under which many parties had run during the 1990 former Yugoslav-Macedonian elections (including the VMRO, whose name was reminiscent of a sinister past) was cause for further alarm. During that campaign, maps showing a unified Macedonia with the Aegean part incorporated into *Republika Makedonska* circulated widely, and politicians, especially from the VMRO toyed with irredentist ideas.[*] More cause for Greek suspicion came from the constitution (some parts of which alluded to territorial re-unification[†]), and later by the adoption of the same gold "*Vergina*" star –the ancient emblem of Alexander's Macedonian dynasty found on Greek soil and widely regarded as a significant part of Greek cultural and historical heritage-on the new state's flag.

The conservative *Nea Democratia* party in power enjoyed a razor-thin 152 seat-majority in the 300-seat Greek parliament and found itself possessing minimal political capital for flexibility towards such a sensitive and publicly followed issue.[27] It also found itself internally divided, a rift showcased by the difference of style and substance between the

---

[*] During a 1991 interview, its leader, Ljupce Georgijevski stated that "Some 250,000 Macedonians live in Greece, and 51% of Macedonia's territory lies there. A United Macedonia has long been the dream of Macedonians. It was the goal of our struggle in World War II. We want to achieve this unity peacefully, within the unification process in Europe, when borders become insignificant." [25]

[†] The opening paragraph of the Constitution of Macedonia read: *"Taking as the points of departure the historical, cultural, spiritual and statehood heritage of the Macedonian people and their struggle over centuries for national and social freedom as well as the creation of their own state, and particularly the traditions of statehood and legacy of the Krushevo Republic and the historic decisions of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the People's Liberation of Macedonia* [ASNOM]*, together with the constitutional and legal continuity of the Macedonian state as a sovereign republic within Federal Yugoslavia* [...] *the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia adopts..."*

Particularly disturbing for Greece was the reference to the ASNOM decisions [see ASNOM Manifesto footnote] that specifically proclaimed the aspiration for Macedonian unification and liberation from oppression. Moreover, there were two more alarming points, in Articles 3 and 49, respectively.

Article 3 stated: *"The territory of the Republic of Macedonia is indivisible and inviolable. The existing borders of the Republic of Macedonia are inviolable. The borders of the Republic of Macedonia may be changed only in accordance with the constitution."*

Article 49 stated: *"The Republic cares for the status and rights of those persons belonging to the Macedonian people in neighboring parties, as well as the Macedonian expatriates, assists their cultural development and promotes links with them. The Republic cares for the cultural, economic and social rights of the citizens of the Republic abroad."*

Of the above paragraphs, the third clause of Article 3 (territorial changes allowable in tandem with constitution) and the first of Article 49 (care and assistance of Macedonians of neighboring countries) appeared particularly inflammatory for their irredentist overtones.[26]

popular hard-line foreign minister, Antonis Samaras, and the more moderate and pragmatic Prime Minister Constantine Mitsotakis. The former's dismissal from his post in April 1992 for displaying a nationalist hard line deepened that division which a little over a year later would bring down the latter's government. But for the time being, the conservative Greek government moved to deny recognition to its new neighbour under such official name and national symbols.* One measure adopted was the temporary month-long apparent ban of petrol imports from the Greek port of Salonica. Overall, this tactic produced moderate results in inducing the new state only to make some amendments in its constitution.† However, during EU summits throughout 1992, Greece succeeded in the passing of unanimous EU decisions not to proceed with recognition under any name bearing the term 'Macedonia.'[29] By the end of the year, only Turkey, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Croatia, Russia, the Philippines and Lithuania did so.[30] Even when the Greek government displayed some flexibility and consented to the United Nations admitting the new state in the spring of 1993, it was under the peculiar name "Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (FYROM) and without a flag.[31] Despite these initial diplomatic 'successes', time was not on Greece's side, as any prolonged dispute over FYROM's status risked further destabilizing the region and, in light of the greater picture in the Balkans, Greek intransigence was not tolerated by NATO and EU allies for long.

The Greek government also faced internal pressure for the quick and favourable resolution of the dispute. It would not be an exaggeration to state that during that period, the Greek public went on a state of mass nationalist hysteria over the Macedonian issue.‡ The Greek "*Vergina Star*" emblem began appearing everywhere from coins and stamps to airport logos. Salonica's '*Mikra*' airport was renamed 'Makedonia' and unprecedented million

---

* The stance had been agreed during the Ministers' council in late 1992 and the extraordinary council of parliamentary political leaders in April 1992.

† The following amendments to the Constitution of 'Republica Makedonska' came into force on the day they were promulgated, on Jan. 6, 1992: Amendment I: *1. The Republic of Macedonia has no territorial pretensions towards any neighboring state. 2. The borders of the Republic of Macedonia can only be changed with the constitution and on the principle of free will, as well as in accordance with generally accepted international norms.3. Clause 1. of this Amendment is an Addendum to Article 3 of the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia. Clause 2. replaces paragraph 2 of the same article.*
Amendment II: *1. In the exercise of this concern the republic will not interfere in the sovereign rights of other states on in their internal affairs. 2. This Amendment is an Addendum to Paragraph 1 or Article 49 of the Constitution of Macedonia.* [28]
These amendments did not completely remove Greek fears. Suspicion and doubt remained in what was meant by territorial change in accordance with Constitution, free will and "generally accepted international norms." Also, if not interfering in other states' affairs, how would FYROM exercise its concern over brethren (a controversial issue for Greece and Bulgaria) abroad?

‡ Nicolaidis, quoting Woodward in the introduction of The Greek Paradox, Allison, G. T. and Nicolaidis, K. (eds.)

people-strong rallies took place in both Athens and Salonica to protest, the theft of names, symbols and history of Greece.[32]

Given domestic sentiments, any attempts from the Greek government to compromise could be perceived as national treason. Similarly, any compromise from the FYR Macedonian side could constitute national suicide, since the symbols of the new state were used to promote a sense of a distinct, positive, unifying national identity or at least preserve a fragile ethnic balance; their abolition could help precipitate the opposite effects. The name dispute was monitored closely by the ethnic Albanian minority that would prefer a neutral geographical term in its quest to achieve national and linguistic parity with the Slav majority.[33] At the other end of the political spectrum, hard-line Slav-Macedonian nationalists dismissed even minor government concessions in the constitution. In April 1993, the ruling coalition narrowly escaped a VMRO no-confidence motion, gaining 62 out of 120 votes.[34] Thus, domestic political considerations forced a maximalist posture for FYROM's government.

Greek diplomacy suffered a similar hard-line turn when disagreement within the Conservative Party on how to deal with the deteriorating course of events brought down the government. Samaras and close to a dozen conservative MPs resigned the party's parliamentary ranks to protest the handling of the Macedonian issue and the privatization of the telecommunications sector, formed a new party, *Politiki Anoexi* (POLAN), and brought down the government. The subsequent October 10, 1993 elections gave the Socialist party PASOK 47% and 170 seats, *Nea Democratia* 39% and 111 seats, and POLAN 5% and 10 seats. Acting on an election promise, the once and again premier Andreas Papandreou threatened FYROM with closure of their common border and soon after withdrew from bilateral talks. The small state remained defiant, especially in the light of recognition by EU members (like France, Germany, Italy, the UK) breaking from common policy (December '93) and the prospects of a *fait accompli* against Greece.

Escalation

The final blow to Greek diplomacy came with FYROM's recognition by the United States on February 3, 1994, [35] followed by Australia and the news that IMF and the World Bank were extending it stabilizing credits (weakening the Greek negotiating position).[36] While not unanimous within PASOK government's ranks, its response was swift and resolute. On February 16, 1994 Greece imposed a total economic embargo against FYROM.[37] Specifically

the government in Athens denied access to the port of Salonica for any commercial activity, except for humanitarian supplies, closed its consulate in Skopje, prohibited the import of FYR Macedonian goods and, under huge domestic pressure, extended the blockade to all customs points.[38] Already in a bad shape, FYROM's economy was sent into a nosedive, while domestic social and inter-ethnic tensions increased.*

International reaction was not favourable to Greek actions. The EU Commission threatened and eventually took legal action against Greece at the European Court of Justice† and individual countries expressed their concern. Meanwhile, while both adversaries declared they welcome dialogue to end the dispute-UN mediator Cyrus Vance initiated diplomatic efforts to resolve the situation-domestic political considerations ensured that a resolution would not be forthcoming quickly.[69] Both Greece and FYROM had scheduled municipal and general elections respectively, for the fall of 1994 and none of the governments wanted to appear backing down or giving in to the other side.

Especially in FYR Macedonia, domestic politics prevented President Gligorov's coalition government from conciliatory action for fear of losing support to nationalist opposition. Moreover, the Constitution required two-thirds majority vote in parliament for any change to it or the flag, and the moderate forces did not possess it.[41] At the same time, the embargo kept eroding the economy at a cost of U$70 million per month, increasing manifold transportation costs for rerouted trade and forcing the closing of most heavy industries.[42] By official estimates, unemployment reached 40% and inflation skyrocketed to 70%, where it was stabilized only by a range of severe monetary and fiscal policies with potentially explosive implications for rising social and ethnic discontent.[43] These were trying times for FYROM but some diplomatic and financial support kept trickling down to enable its government to refuse to move on the dispute. The EU provided small scale funding, the US continued to signal its support, and the IMF prepared a stand-by loan. As the stalemate continued, a diplomatic phoney war of sorts ensued.

During the fall of 1994, political developments in both countries pushed towards a resolution of the crisis. The results of a long-promised census during the summer tallied

* Assessment by Michel Noel, World Bank division chief.[39]

† Greece was accused of violating common EU trade policy laws, and invoked political reasons in its defense. In mid-1994, the EU Court rejected the request for an interim injunction to force Greece to lift the embargo; the case was dropped altogether after the 1995 interim accord.[40]

ethnic Albanians at 22.9%, just short of the required 25% for qualifying as a 'constituent nation' status-a disappointing result disputed by many Albanians that promised to accelerate the radicalization of FYROM domestic politics.[44] The general elections, boycotted in the second round by the ultra-nationalist VMRO, gave a sweeping victory to the ruling coalition, and enough seats to enact changes to the constitution and national symbols. President Gligorov was re-elected president with 77%, and acquired fresh political capital.[45] In Greece, opposition gains were partially interpreted as the voters' disapproval for the hard-line stance of the government, and hinted at some public fatigue after a period of intense display of patriotic sentiments.[46]

Developments in the international scene also pressed for a settlement. The situation in Bosnia and Eastern Slavonia was deteriorating rapidly, and NATO-the executive hand most poised to actively intervene-welcome one less regional trouble spot. The US intensified its efforts in 1995 through carrot-and-stick diplomacy, rigorously pushing for some resolution. All these factors led to the resumption of unofficial negotiations in New York over the flag, constitution and name disputes. The escalation of the crisis in Krajna and Bosnia may have also provided an accelerant for the two sides themselves to seek some resolution in their dispute.

De-escalation

On September 13, 1995 in New York the two states concluded an interim accord that settled the matters of the flag and the constitution.[47] FYR Macedonia agreed to cease to use in any way the symbol in all its forms displayed on its national flag, and replaced the 16-point gold Vergina star with an 8-point yellow sun. It also pledged to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Greece. Finally, it made clarifying statements as to the peaceful and international law-abiding nature of its constitution.[48] In turn Greece recognized FYROM's independence under the provisional name. It lifted the 19-month economic embargo, ended its veto on its neighbour's applications to join international organizations, and pledged peaceful regional co-operation and friendship.[49] The more thorny issue of the name was left to be dealt with in the future, and since it was invested with so much importance for FYROM and Greece, both sides appeared aware of the fact that it could take quite some time to resolve.

Impact[*]

The newly established friendly relation between the two states allowed for economic and military cooperation and enough bilateral peace of mind to turn their focus to more substantial problems. But, times after the interim accord proved more trying for FYR Macedonia than Greece.

Greece's general gradual policy re-orientation (personified by the PASOK government's new Prime Minister Costas Simitis, who succeeded the deceased Papandreou) ended its diplomatic isolation, and allowed for its political rehabilitation in the EU and a smoother course-and treatment in the negotiations-for joining the European Monetary Union. More importantly, Greece gradually reclaimed its role as a factor of stability in the Balkans, and directed its diplomatic attention to outstanding issues with Turkey that promised significant fluctuation in intensity in the years that followed (e.g. see the Aegean Seabed Imia/Kardak islet crisis in early 1996, the Cyprus SS-300 missiles deployment crisis, 1998, the Ocalan arrest in 1999, the withdrawal of objections to Turkish EU membership (Helsinki, 2001), and the road to Greek-Cypriot EU ascension in 2004). The name dispute lingered on, and time seems to have worked against Greece. Common referral to FYROM as 'Macedonia' by many countries and international news organizations has lead to a de facto acceptance of its legitimacy, and numerous countries (more recently, the United States, to help prop up FYROM government's chances of defeating a potentially destabilizing ethnic referendum) have officially recognized it as the 'Republic of Macedonia'. Domestic critics point that Greece's current willingness to accept negotiating terms worse than the proposals put forth to it in 1992, and FYROM government's intractability on the issue amount to a significant diplomatic failure.

Indeed, the current FYROM government estimates it can prevail on the name issue. Despite registering initial dissatisfaction about the reached compromise[†] the interim agreement was eventually recognized as very beneficial for FYROM's economy, international legitimacy and sense of security.[50] FYR Macedonia purchased valuable time in the name dispute towards de facto international acceptance, and had more freedom to concentrate on brewing domestic ethnic unrest. In early 2001 it came perilously close to ethnic civil war between the

[*] Synopsis of recent political history compiled from BBC on line, Economist Intelligence Unit-Country Profiles, Macedonian (Greek) News Agency. Also, selected International Crisis Group reports (2004-5) on Kosovo and FYR Macedonia: ICG Europe Reports No 155, 161 (Kosovo), Europe Briefing/Skopje/Brussels, 3 August 2004, Europe Briefing No 37/25 February 2005 (Macedonia).

[†] This was one of the theories explaining the assassination attempt against Gligorov in October 1995.

government and ethnic Albanian irregulars, following the spill-over effects of the nearby war in Kosovo.* The war-averting Ohrid peace agreement stipulated the surrender of Albanian weapons in return for greater recognition and autonomy, while NATO soldiers deployed to police the accord. Later that year, in an effort to forestall ethnic Albanian alienation and radicalization, constitutional changes gave the Albanian minority more rights, as did a census in the following years that certified their status as a national minority. In late 2004 another crisis was averted when a hard-line Slav-Macedonian opposition-driven referendum failed to reverse new municipal restructuring laws creating municipalities with Albanian majorities in local affairs.

The persistent tense ethnic situation between Slav and ethnic Albanian Macedonians further complicates the name dispute. Ethnic Albanians continue to proclaim their nationalism and fly Albanian flags over some municipalities and universities and the leader of one of the two ethnic Albanian parties recently stated that "the name of FYROM must reflect the post-Ochrid character of the state."[51] At the same time, the state's economic performance remains poor, with high unemployment rates and rampant corruption. These signs, together with domestic political fragility—like the resignation (late 2004) of Prime Minister Kostof, after citing obstruction in the government's work by the Albanian ally of the government, and accusing it of promoting its own Albanian agenda--hint that FYR Macedonia's future may still not be entirely secure. More so, given the yet unknown fate of the great catalyst for the domestic ethnic stability of the country and the region—Kosovo's final status. Under such volatile domestic and near abroad conditions, the current leadership of FYROM appears adamant in its unwillingness to negotiate the name issue with Greece.[52]

PART III: International Relations Theories and Foreign Policy-Making

On a theoretical level, how do International Relations approaches to foreign policy formation account for the intensity and duration of the dispute between Greece and FYR of Macedonia—especially Greece's strategically costly intransigence? The usual suspects

* With demands ranging from requests for greater rights to outright independence, some in the 25% strong ethnic Albanian minority took up arms, and only active EU and NATO mediation together with rigorous government overtures (that invited the two ethnic Albanian parties to participate in the government) halted the descend into war.

are Realism and its variants (to which I would include Institutionalism), Constructivist strands and Liberalism. Before applying them to the specific case study, this section presents a synopsis of these schools of thought, and their ontological and epistemological strengths and weaknesses in explaining foreign policy behavior of states in general.

Realism(s)

For 'structural' Realism (Waltz, 1979), the distribution of capabilities (power) within a system is the key variable in explaining state behavior. States are considered the most important actors in IR, and they are seen as rational, unitary actors trying to maximize their power ('offensive' Realism-Mearsheimer, 2001), or security ('defensive' Realism-Posen, Walt, 1987) in order to protect their interests amidst an anarchic international system. More recent strands ('neo-classical' Realism-Zakaria, 1998, Snyder, Chistensen) posit that states (their governments) seek instead to maximize utility and that systemic variables are filtered through domestic variables. The notion of balance of power (Waltz), threats (Walt) or interests (Schweller, 1998) to avoid the dominance of the system by a single state is a central tenet of Realist theory.[53] It is associated with another basic tenet of Realism-the security dilemma (state A's defensive preparations increase insecurity in state B and threaten to disrupt the balance of power or threat, which induces B to increase its own security for fear of being dominated, which, in turn, may trigger a downward spiral of action-reaction).

The variants of Realist school of thought (power vs. interests, or unitary state vs. government, relative vs. absolute gains) have exposed it to a series of academic debates and to accusations it is a degenerative scientific research program (Vasquez, 1997) pointing that it is unable without serious mutations of its basic principles to explain political change and complexity, especially of the post-Cold War era. The most serious critique leveled against Realism(s) is that it continues to treat the state mostly as a black box, [and when it does not-e.g. Zakaria-then it is not Realism, as Legro and Moravcsik (1999) argue] and, that its pure unit-level explanations cannot account for different behavior of similar states or, for different behavior of the same state over time.

Institutionalism (Krasner, 1983; Keohane, 1984; Haggard and Simmons, 1987) also accepts most of Realism's core assumptions (states as primary actors, rationalist and self-interest). Hence, while it introduces the variable of institutions as affecting power,

interest and knowledge and as a means to reduce transaction costs and improve the information environment, making regime formation and cooperation possible, it suffers from the same class of criticism directed against Realism-the state as a unitary actor.

Constructuvism

One effort to unlock the black box of the state is by the latest theoretical framework in the field of International Relations. Constructivism's 'neo-classical' (Hass, 1990; Finnemore, 1996) and 'naturalistic' (Wendt, 1992, 1999) strands [as opposed to the post-positivist, deconstructionist 'post-modern'/'critical' one (Walker, 1993) that lies outside the realm of duplicable scientific research] move away from materialist theories into an ideational ontology.* They assert that human interaction is shaped not simply by material, but also by ideational factors, the most important of which are widely shared inter-subjective beliefs not reducible to individuals, which result in the construction of interests and identities of the actors (2001 Katzenstein, 1996; Finnemore and Sikkink). Social context (ideas and norms) gives meaning to material structure (Checkel, 1998) and there exists a process of mutual interaction and construction (a difficult concept to operationalize) between agents and structures, thus, attempting to open up the black box of identity formation and interests.† Wendt's systemic Constructivism emphasizes the impact of the international environment, whereas scholars like Katzenstein and Risse-Kappen focus on local/domestic influences, and on identity as a domestic attribute arising from national ideologies of collective distinctiveness which, in turn, shape state policy.‡ This strand of Costructivism closely approximates a Liberalism of the impact of domestic preferences, but is not yet fully developed, especially in explaining their variation between, or origins within states. Overall, Costructivism offers a framework of operation of social interactions during which agents and structure are mutually constituted, but not

* Classification by Ruggie (1995).

† One note of distinction here between IR and Comparative Politics Constructivists, pointed out by Finnemore (1996): IR theorists argue that identity is a matter of construction and not of individual choice, whereas Comparativists argue that actors have a choice in shaping their identities even as they appear natural to them]. Still, the concept of identity is [insufficiently] not [clarified] enough [by Constructivists.}

‡ A recent article offers more promise in exploring domestic Constructivism, in the context of institutional change in the EU: "…Members of the political elite make choices on European political integration on the basis of their identities […] and political elites engaged in political competition adjust their stance […] to what they perceive are the preferences of their potential voters. […] 'political elites try to promote ideas (including identity constructions) with an eye on gaining power or remaining in government.'[…] Political elites are constrained by public opinion, but the latter is malleable to the discourses propagated by the former…"[54]

a theory to explain how or why groups and agents' preferences and nature of structures arise and vary.*

Descending the level of analysis ladder, two further candidates for explaining foreign policy behavior on a group, or individual level are bureaucratic politics and the political psychology of leaders. The bureaucratic politics' approach may have opened up a new avenue of understanding foreign policy decision-making on a sub-state level (Allison, 1971/1999; Rhodes, 1994) but suffers from the disadvantage of being too static (e.g. it cannot account for dramatic change) and from the same constrains of organizational theory from which it derives its main premises. Political Psychology's focus on perceptions and misperception (Jervis, 1976/1985), groupthink (Janis, 1972) and cognitive biases (Vertzberger, 1990) has also provided new insights on the decision-making process of leaders and elites, but fails to account for the interests of groups larger than the immediate circle of leadership.

Liberalism

For the most comprehensive, encompassing and nuanced theory of a state's foreign policy behavior, this study argues one must turn to Liberalism. The core assumptions of Liberal theory [meticulously articulated by Moravcsik (1997)] are (i) the primacy of social actors (individuals as well as private groups), (ii) the nature of states not as actors but as political institutions representing subsets of domestic society and defining state preferences based on societal interests (the 'functional differentiation' of states), and (iii) the configuration of independent state preferences as the determinant of state behavior. Liberalism comes in three variants, depending on the impact of domestic factors on state behavior: 'Republican' (the Democratic Peace thesis of the impact of domestic representation-e.g. Russett, 1993; Maoz and Russett, 1993; Doyle, 1997), 'Commercial' (the impact of individuals' transactional gains or losses-e.g. Keohane and Milner, 1996), and Ideational (the impact of collective social values). The ideational variant of Liberalism which is of interest in this study views the configuration of domestic social identities and values as a basic determinant of state preferences.† Among the types of social identities are the nature of legitimate socio-economic regulation and redistribution

* In the critiques against Constructivism one can add in its disproportional causal emphasis on structure as opposed to agency, and rejection of methodological individualism.

† The degree of importance for social/national identities and values is illustrated by the massive expense of political capital by successive Greek governments expend so much political capital on such a symbolic issue.

(the economy), the commitment of individuals or groups to particular political institutions (the regime), and the scope of the nation (the polity). This premise (endogeneity of ideational preferences) is similar to liberal Constructivism, but in addition, Liberalism adds a dynamic element by proposing the degree of cooperation or conflict between the two states is variable according to the degree of compatibility on national preferences between these societal forces. Critics have accused Liberalism of reductionism, or conversely of being too broad. Still, a broad liberal theory of varied preferences understanding state foreign policy as a function of societal context, and introducing domestic conflict as a determinant of sub-optimal policy outcomes allows for greater explanatory power. Liberal theorists best unpack the black box of the hitherto unitary state actor, and convincingly argue that definition of preferences and their variability precedes any fight (Realism), bargain (Institutionalism) or debate (Constructivism).

PART IV: IR Theory Application to Foreign Policies over the Macedonian name dispute

Realist theories would explain Greece's hostile foreign policy towards FYR of Macedonia in terms of a threat to material resources (potential irredentism and threat against Aegean Macedonian territory). Nevertheless, despite some obvious signs of irredentist propaganda early in the political life of FYROM (especially by the VMRO party), the overwhelming military disparity between EU and NATO member Greece and the extremely poor, ill-equipped neighbor to its North West quickly dispels such arguments, even if such ultra-nationalist tendencies prevailed politically in FYROM. Turned on its head, the fact of FYR Macedonia's structural, military and political weakness could classify it as a weak or failing state, from which irregular and/or criminal forces could pour into Greece, posing a different kind of security threat. More plausible as an argument, still, such an assessment would call for Greece's concerted efforts to stabilize the new state (going beyond its guarantees, bulwark against repeated proposals by Milosevic to carve FYROM up, and economic assistance to allow for and support its admission to international security and financial organizations on a permanent basis). Another argument in support of a Realist diagnosis and prescription of foreign policy is the question of a changing regional balance of power. While FYROM by itself could not

pose a threat, it was perceived as contributing another piece to the mosaic of the changing configuration of unfriendly neighbours. Turkey was among the first two states recognizing 'Macedonia' in early 1992, and prominent politicians like Samaras (his plans for an Orthodox alliance against a perceived Islamic threat in the Balkans) and Papandreou ("…*Greece must not betray Serbia* […] *its defeat would deprive Greece of a natural ally upgrading the role of Turkey and the West in the Balkans*") voiced such beliefs, widely publicized and occasionally sensationalized in the Greek Press at the time.[55] Still, this argument also poses the question of whether befriending instead of alienating the new state (and forcing it into the arms of Greek regional adversaries) wouldn't serve Greece's geo-strategic balance of power objectives better, given the largely-shared affinity of the orthodox religion between the two states, and the utility of FYROM as a buffer against a potential Southward spread of the Yugoslav wars. Moreover, such a perspective is problematic, given the negative impact of Greek foreign policy on a greater balance of power level-that of the European Union, where Greece found itself isolated because of its increasingly intransigent policy (especially after the 1994 embargo and the Commission's legal case against it).

Realism is successful in offering a plausible explanation for the external involvement of the US as a mediator, and its exerted pressure aimed at stabilizing one flank of the Balkan war theater. Also, some merit is deserved for a *Realpolitik* calculation of Greece's settling the FYROM dispute to concentrate on more pressing issues. But these reasons do not explain why the Greek government accepted only an Interim Accord that excluded settlement over the name.[*] Equally important, Realist approaches fall short of fully explaining Greece's foreign policy (and FYROM's, for that matter) because they fail to account for the non-monolithic character of the state and the impact of internal economic, political and social changes in public preferences and elite policies.[†]

Institutionalism offers a less convincing explanation of Greece's foreign policy towards FYROM. Initially Greece sought and received the support of the EU for its foreign policy

[*] Equally, Realism fails to explain why in the early 1990's, despite facing what by all accounts was a uniquely desperate situation (internal ethnic turbulence, economic stagnation, unfriendly neighbors and the contagious threat of a neighboring war), FYROM steadfastly refused to deal away to Greece its name claim. It also fails to adequately explain why FYROM refuses to accept a compromise over the name to this day.

[†] For example, witness the diversity of preferences *within* FYROM that only Liberalism can account for. During a 2002 opinion poll, 51% of the Slavs surveyed cited a resolution over the name dispute as apriority for peace and stability (ranked 9th in a total of 24 items to select from), while only 25% of Albanians selected it (ranked 22nd out of 24).[56]

positions, but a year into the dispute individual members deviated from a common course agreed during the summer 1992 Portugal EU summit, and as the diplomatic tide turned against Greece it found itself in opposition (eventually litigious) with other EU members and the European Commission. Institutional norms, rules and rising costs in the form of penalties did not prohibit or deter Greece from pursuing its own policy regarding the name dispute.

On the subject of international norms and culture, as far as interstate interactions are concerned, Systemic Constructivist explanations suffer from the above type of criticism, as well as from the lack of a theory of agency to explain systemic social construction of foreign policy. While it could address the deficit of Realism in accounting for the disproportional sense of security threat that FYROM posed to Greece (with emphasis in the social rather than material relationships between them) Far more promising in its explanatory power is the domestic (or Liberal) Constructivist premise of Greek government policy towards FYROM as one influenced by domestic social groups' identities and values. Attention to the impact of domestic preferences is important, and in that respect domestic Constructivism is almost interchangeable with Ideational Liberalism's emphasis on the social 'embeddedness' (to use Ruggie's term) of regimes, and on the prominent role of elements of social identity in preference formation. As Moravscik notes, ideational Liberalism is agnostic to the origins of social identities and whether they reflect material or ideational factors, or both. The difference between them is that the Constructivist approach does not go as far enough as to offer a theory that could explain the variation and intensity of the Greek public's collective preferences, or their emergence in the first place. In contrast, Liberalism proposes a theory-- the foreign policies in the relations between two states are determined by the degree of compatibility or lack thereof in social preferences over fundamentally collective goods, like the FYROM state symbols and names.

Bureaucratic politics and the study of leaders offer an insight into the dynamics of individual decision-making in the Greek-FYROM dispute, but do not account for dynamics beyond the individual or small group level of analysis. Another deficit in a leadership psychological explanation is the case fact that, while the styles and personalities Mitsotakis and Simitis were indeed more pragmatic and moderate (therefore

more prone to accommodation) than Andreas Papandreou's more ideologically-driven leadership, still the interim agreement with FYROM was signed by the latter's government before Simitis came to power.*

On the whole, this study finds the republican (domestic power politics) and ideational (domestic preferences for national values and their political impact) variants of Liberal theory of IR most convincing in explaining Greek and FYR Macedonian foreign policies. Republican Liberalism accounts for the ways in which domestic institutions translate social and economic preferences into official policies, and examines the strategies which political groups, administrators, bureaucrats and societal groups employ to win office in liberal democracies. Whereas it is mostly associated with the normative and institutional strains of the 'Democratic Peace' thesis, the general argument can be employed to explain suboptimal policy outcomes by way of domestic conflict related to democratic governance power politics. In other words, domestic political constrains, like electoral considerations or parliamentary majorities and balances can constrain governments' policy options. This is amply evident in the case of the name dispute, both with Greece and FYROM, where Domestic political considerations (parliamentary majorities, electoral calculations and public opinion) played a major part in the foreign policy calculus. Mitsotakis' marginal parliamentary majority proscribed much maneuverability in negotiations regarding the name-as not all of his MP's, especially those from the prefecture of Macedonia would accept it-and eventually led to the demise of his government. A similarly precarious balance of power in the FYR Macedonian parliament prevented-or, as some may argue, shielded-Gligorov from any generous overture to Greece at least until the 1994 elections.†

While domestic power politics arguably played a significant part in shaping the parameters of Mitsotakis government's foreign policy and precipitated its fall, its electoral defeat in the subsequent elections indicates the role and influence of the public preferences (in favor of a more hard line political platform). After a 47% of the popular vote in 1990 (versus 39% of PASOK), these percentages were virtually reversed in the

* Papandreou's leadership style could offer at least a commentary on his uncompromising stance and embargo (or his ailing health and the resulting circumscribed investment in his personal foreign diplomacy). For a discussion on Prime Ministerial leadership styles and personality see forthcoming article by Steinberg, B. in Political Psychology 26 (4), October 2005.

† However, a comfortable majority margin alone does not explain Papandreou government's continuing and even hardening an already uncompromising stance, given its 170 MP's in the 1993 parliament.

results of 1993 (with the 5% received by POL.AN overwhelmingly due to support by disaffected *Nea Democratia* voters).[57] Adding up the numbers, both in parliament and among the public, points to bipartisan, widespread support for a harder line in Greek foreign policy against FYROM. It derived from a mobilized, overzealous Greek public, persistently unyielding over Macedonia-related aspects of its values (like the name 'Macedonia' and symbols like the Vergina star). Scholars and politicians alike agree that strong public sentiments over symbolic issues of national identity played a constraining role in the negotiating positions available between the decision-makers of the two sides. For example, Couloumbis points that "*unfortunately the leaders* [of both countries] *were oversensitive to domestic considerations and rejected compromises put forward by Pinheiro, Vance and others.*"[58] During a recent interview, current FYROM Prime Minister Crvenkovski's insists that "*this matter* [of the name] *is important for the national identity of my country* […] *some in my country might take a pro-Greek position, but I would like to know who-regardless of their rank-could announce something like that to the people.*"[59] Zachariadis argues that

> *"…any hint by the Greek government that it could accept a designation including the term 'Macedonia' was bound to be viewed domestically as a capitulation", "…Greek public opinion served as a constrain limiting the PM's room for diplomatic maneuvering" and that "while Mitsotakis fired Samaras, perhaps out of deference to public opinion he maintained Samaras' uncompromising position*."[60]

At the same time it must also be noted that such domestic preferences were themselves prone to exploitation and inflammation, especially by populist political elites and their opportunistic or nationalist demagoguery (like Samaras in 1992 and Papandreou in 1993), and a sensationalist press and mass media (certainly the case with many Greek newspapers in early 1990's).[*] National policies and official propaganda (like the Mitsotakis government campaign to promote a political message of the 'Greekness' of Macedonian heritage, under the guise of tourist posters and National Organization of Tourism brochures) also served to fuel (or further solidify) such preferences. Thus, domestic preferences in Greece over national symbols provided a fertile ground for the formulation of respectively uncompromising foreign policy positions, by constraining or

[*] During a recent interview with two seasoned members of the Greek diplomatic service, an unfavorable view of the Greek press's continuing role in sensationalizing the issue, keeping the public roused and obstructing the chances of a compromise was strongly expressed to the author. Consequently, there was a prevailing sense of pessimism in their assessment of Greece's current (2005) chances for a 'successful' resolution.

empowering political actors. The same can be said for the domestic sources of FYROM's foreign policy positions, with the resulting foreign policies in the two countries yielding a configuration of opposite views, diplomatic intransigence and protracted conflict.

To recapitalize, the composite argument for a republican-ideational Liberal theory explaining the foreign policy of Greece and FYR of Macedonia is as follows:

1. Domestic power politics and societal preferences (reflected in public opinion) are important in influencing and constraining foreign policy.

2. Social preferences can be ideational as well as material, pertaining to national values, symbols and identity.

3. The degree of compatibility between comparative domestic preferences (reflected in respective foreign policies) determines the relationship (and its variability) between states. Greece and FYROM domestic preferences on symbolic values of national identity had been diametrically opposed for most of the dispute's duration.

PART V: Social-Psychological Group Dynamics

The above argument raises the question of foundations, intensity and duration for such social preferences. Why do agents and groups' interests and ideational preferences form and how do they change?[*] While public opinions can certainly be malleable to produce spikes in poll results, political demagoguery or a sensationalist press rarely cater to thin air; instead they tap on existing beliefs. A fundamental core of beliefs within the Greek public that favored the support of an uncompromising stance (as well as a worldwide Greek Diaspora which displayed patriotic fervor and intensive lobbying efforts in support of Greek positions) was evident since the early stages of the dispute.[†]

The final part of this study argues that an explanation on the origin, nature, intensity and variability of ideational domestic preferences can be sought in Social-Psychological theories of group status and self-worth. Indeed, descriptions of public mood and related domestic preferences frequently employ or allude to psychological explanations. Gavrilis quotes Rizopoulos in support of the claim that,

[*] Checkel has suggested in passim that this may be possible through learning, symbolic interactions theories, or self-categorization, but have not pursued an investigation of any of these mechanisms. Due to space constraints, the present study addresses only the social-psychological dimension. For a theory on the micro-foundations of self-categorization involving cognitive mechanisms and parallels between knowledge storage and processing in the human brain and data classification in Artificial Intelligence, see Kotsovilis, S. 'National Identity and Ethnic Strife: Social-Psychological and Cognitive Dimensions in the Macedonian Conflict' (MA Thesis, Department of Political Science, McGill University, 2000).

[†] For a liberal discussion of the effect of ethnic ties abroad on domestic policies relating to ethnic conflict, see Saideman (2001).

> "…PASOK's [1993] *rhetoric arguably served a domestic purpose: Papandreou's confrontational diplomacy had a certain therapeutic effect on the national psyche, as the general public came to believe that Greece's sovereignty was being restored after 150 years of Great Power bullying…*"[61]

Writing on Greek-Turkish relations, Keridis also presents a psychological angle. Consider the complex interplay between Greek identity self-perception and group status in the following quote:

> *"Occasionally, the country appears to suffer from a certain siege mentality epitomized best in what former President of the Republic Christos Sartzetakis called the 'brotherless friendless Greek nation'. This siege mentality makes Greeks defensive and oversensitive. This over-sensitivity is significant to the degree that it fuels the potential top exaggerate risks and turn them into threats. The resolute face-off of such threats becomes a national interest and priority. Official policy loses the initiative and the necessary perspective to evaluate risks calmly. It becomes reactive and is driven by impulses, volatile public opinion and demagoguery. Populist politicians and a polemical media in pursuit of sensationalist stories are ready to assume the worse and pick up insignificant 'provocations' to reinforce Greek's reactionary defensiveness. Many Greeks exhibit an arrogance based on a perceived 'historical superiority' that bestows a status-bearing classical heritage and all its cultural capital on contemporary Greeks and often demonizes neighboring Turks as 'uncivilized Asians. This arrogance is strangely coupled with a victimization mentality that often leads to historical nihilism in which Greeks are no longer the subjects but only the mere objects of history."*[62]

This superiority, he notes further, conflates contemporary interests with 'historical' rights and makes a flexible foreign policy less appealing to the public. As far as the display of group status elements of superiority and insecurity constraining foreign policy, Keridis might as well have been writing about Greece and the FYROM dispute.

A theory that addresses aspects of group status is Social Identity Theory (SIT) (Tajfel and Turner 1979; 1986).[63] It assumes that "individuals are motivated to achieve a positive social identity, defined as that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from the knowledge of their membership in a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to this membership." [64] Such a desire induces individuals to engage in social comparisons between in-groups and out-groups, with the ultimate aim to achieve both a positive and distinct position.[65] In SIT, the knowledge that one belongs to certain groups and the value attached to group membership in positive and negative terms, represents the individual's social identity.[66] The two essential features of this theory are that group membership is viewed from the subjective perception of the individual

(categorization), and that the value-laden nature of group membership is highlighted and given importance.

This approach extends to the inter-group level, proposing that individuals are motivated to belong to positively evaluated groups. Tajfel believes that social identity can be understood as 'an intervening causal mechanism in situations of change, whether this change is observed, anticipated, feared or aspired.' [67] His identification of such situations involves three categories:

> *(I) the badly defined or marginal situation of a group which presents the individuals involved with difficulties of defining themselves in a social system;*
> *(II) the groups, socially defined and conceptually accepted as 'superior' in some important respects at a time, when their position is threatened either by occurring/impeding change or by a conflict of values inherent in their superiority;*
> *(III) the groups socially defined and conceptually accepted as inferior in some important respects at a time, when - for whatever reasons - either (a) members of the group have engaged in a shared 'prise de conscience' of the illegitimacy of their inferior status or (b) they have become aware of the feasibility of working towards alternatives to the existing situation, or (c) a combinations of both (a) and (b).*[68]

His definition of groups as 'superior' or 'inferior' is based in terms of psychological correlates of a number of interacting dimensions of social differentiation, such as discrepancies between groups in social status, power, domination, etc.[69]

Tajfel stresses that superior groups (II) may feel insecure about their identity, since 'the dynamic state of the social environment is such that makes a secure social identity an empirical impossibility, even for groups with unquestioned 'superiority'.[70] The group can utilize social identity to gain and preserve a kind of (at least) psychological distinctiveness, that is inexorably linked to its superior status. 'This can be only if the social conditions of distinctiveness are carefully perpetuated together with the signs and symbols of distinctive status, without which the attitudes of complete consensus about 'superior' distinctiveness are in danger of disintegrating. When the group is threatened, therefore, it can proceed with the intensification of existing distinctions, together with the creation and use of new conditions that will enable it to preserve and enhance its psychological distinctiveness.'[71] According to Tajfel, such an example is the creation [or protection] of a variety of distinctive symbols.[72] Greece fits this category extremely well, when the distinctiveness of the highly valued Macedonian aspects of it national identity were threatened by FYROM.

That is because FYROM fits the descriptive diagnosis both for groups that have difficulty in defining themselves (I) and 'inferior' ones (III). The unpleasant social situations in which such groups may find themselves can prompt action either towards leaving (social mobility) or staying in the group and always involve group identity as a tool. Conditions that favor remaining in one's group include (a) any form of caste system, (b) any other differentiation system which for whatever reasons makes moving difficult, (c) a strong conflict of values (inherent in leaving one's group), like loyalty versus personal advantages or gains, and (d) fear of powerful sanctions for moving to another group.[73]
Given these different conditions, the social identity of the inferior group can express themselves in social behaviour'.[74] For Tajfel, these ways of social behavior involve:

> *(a) becoming, through action and reinterpretation of group characteristics more like the superior group*
> *(b) reinterpreting existing inferior characteristics of the group, so that they do not appear as inferior but acquire a positive valued distinctiveness from the superior group*
> *(c) creating, through social action and/or diffusion of 'new ideologies', new group characteristics which have a positive valued distinctiveness from the superior group.*[75]

Solution (a) is a blueprint for the group's cultural and psychological assimilation.[76] The group will strive to become more like a superior group and may eventually be absorbed on incorporated to it. Tajfel indicates that groups may try this approach first. Solutions (b) and (c) however, imply that the group will pursue *differentiation* and create a distinct, positively valued identity. These solutions are structurally similar, involving creation and recreation of in-group characteristics and vesting them with a positively valued distinctiveness.[77] With respect to solutions (b) and (c), it is obvious that they prescribe the creation and recreation of old and new group characteristics which can, when compared with out-group ones, give a positive value of self-esteem, pride and distinctiveness that achieve an adequate form of social identity for the inferior group.*
The newly created characteristics need to be positively evaluated by the inter-group members (absolute value), and the in-group evaluation has to be accepted by out-groups (these characteristics must acquire a *relative* positive value).[79]

---

* Tajfel cites the nationalisms of nineteenth century European states as an example of solution (c). Discussing this phenomenon in 'Nationalism, Liberalism and Progress: The Rise and Decline of Nationalism', Ernst Haas echoes such a view: '…a nation is a socially mobilized body of individuals who believe themselves united by some set of characteristics that differentiate them from outsiders and who strive to maintain and create their own state."[78]

These two stages are very important, as Tajfel points out, for they present more complications for both in-group (the inferior) and out-group(s) (superior(s). The new characteristics may consist of 'attributes that are already highly valued by both, or, more groups, and which the inferior group was previously deemed not to posses.'[80] What ensues is social competition, and the debate focuses on whether others 'will acknowledge the new image, separate but equal or superior.'[81] Or, the new characteristics may not be consensually valued at all. In this case, the question becomes whether others 'acknowledge the new image different but equal or superior.'[82] The problem, thus, consists of either the re-evaluation of a group on attributes commonly valued, or the acknowledgment by others through re-evaluation of the attributes.

The battle for acceptance by others of new forms of inter-group comparisons is a battle for legitimacy and vice versa. As long as these forms are not accepted, new characteristics (or old re-evaluated ones) cannot be fully adequate in their function of building a new social identity.[83] At the same time, Tajfel writes, 'there can be many instances where the superior group, for the sake of its own distinct identity cannot accept any of the forms of change discussed earlier'.[84]

To this observation one can insert the additional difficulty that arises from negotiating or contesting elements of identity, which are by nature intractable or non-negotiable (e.g. group emblems). The only conclusion that can be made at this point of conflict between cooperative social identities and their legitimacy is that a marked discrimination in inter-group behaviour.[85]

Donald Horowitz's psycho-cultural approach to ethnic conflict (1985) demonstrates the application of social identity theory to an ethnic level.[86] Horowitz identifies situations that induce groups to turn to their identities for solutions. More specifically:

> *"...an ethnic group fragmented into subgroups that threaten to overtake the larger group identity might react by reinforcing elements of common culture and common ancestry, suppressing for example differences in dialect or stressing a descent from a single ancestor."*[42] On the other hand, *"a group that found itself losing its distinctive identity by absorption into another ethnic group might respond by emphasizing it cultural uniqueness, selectively recalling ancient glories, resuscitating all that distinguishes group members from others destroying all that links them to others."*[87]

As in Tajfel's described situations, threat is associated with change. Horowitz's focus however is directed at how the group under 'danger' survives, by staying together. Social

mobility of the ethnic type is usually not a convenient option. Horowitz points towards the clear demarcation of ethnic boundaries, which the ethnic groups can achieve by striving towards group differentiation through manipulation of the group's identity and the positive value that this distinctiveness brings to the group. In general, such cultural tools involving history, myth, symbols, past glories, language and religion can infuse the group identity with a new or revived cultural content that can serve as to more clearly demarcate the lines between groups.[88] These tools, as Horowitz points, must also help allocate prestige which will help the ethnic group boost its self-esteem. Horowitz states that 'insecure, declining or rising groups frequently lay claim to a favorable distribution of prestige, that can help their self-esteem and increase the forces that bind them together.'[89] It is the stage where the group has to approve of the new characteristics shaped by the 'tools' and feel good about claiming them. The invocation of symbols is an example of a claim of a favorable distribution of prestige.[90]

The value of an identity, and furthermore the allocation of prestige, are interconnected with social recognition. Groups have to differentiate themselves to acquire a unique identity but need to attach to it a positive value that can be obtained only through interaction and comparison with other groups. Indeed, a brief look at the nature of ethnicity reveals its interactive, transactional character. Creation and maintenance of an ethnic identity consists of two stages: Internally, members define themselves and then signal this self-definition to out-groups. Although conceptualized initially as internal, this stage is 'necessarily transactional and social because it presupposes an audience and an externally derived framework of meaning'. In external definition, members are defined by others; it is an 'other-directed' process. 'At its most consensual level, there is the validation of others' internal definitions of themselves; at its most antagonistic, there may be the imposition by a set of members upon another of a putative name and characterization which can affect in significant ways the social experience of the categorized.'[91] These transactions can cause serious conflict.

Hence, in simple terms, SIT posits that the positive self-value of individuals is connected to group membership. Membership in a prestigious, 'superior' group enhances this positive value, whereas belonging to a marginalized, 'inferior' one decreases it. A distinct or differentiated group status is central to this premise.

Therefore, marginalization or inferiority can be a result of social turmoil or flux. If social mobility is available during such periods, individuals may try to escape disadvantaged groups and join (assimilate into) privileged ones. If not, they may try to increase the value of their membership by improving and distinguishing the status of the group they belong to. A status of a group can be improved by reinventing old characteristics, or adopting new 'positive' ones that are associated with social prestige. This theory also applies to Ethnic identity and ethnic prestige. Positively-valued ideational elements of ethnic identity (e.g. the history of a glorious past, or distinctive symbols) enhance the value of self-esteem for its members. Groups that possess such prestigious traits emphasize and safeguard their exclusivity (differentiation) to maintain its positive value. This is so, especially against attempts for their appropriation by other groups, which, during periods of ethnic turmoil, may seek to enhance their own group status to avoid disintegration, fragmentation, assimilation.

Social Identity Theory, FYR Macedonian state-building and the dispute with Greece

1945 marked the birth of Macedonia (the ASNOM manifesto serving as the birth certificate) within Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. After Pirin and Egei parts escaped his reach, Tito's political project for Vardar became the *differentiation* of Macedonian identity which unfolded with its nation-building process. In post-world war II Yugoslav Macedonia's case, characteristics of language, religion, history, symbols etc. were either created or reinvented precisely to promote this distinctiveness.

Horowitz's commentary on--among other tools--the manipulation of language as a basis for group identity presents a very similar theoretical description of the events that took place in Yugoslav Macedonia after 1948. Another significant action taken by Tito himself was the creation of an independent Macedonian church to vest the nation with its own religious institution. Horowitz writes '…for many groups, religion is not a matter of faith, but a given, an integral part of their identity, and for some an inextricable component of their sense of peoplehood.'[92] Further example was the rewriting and retelling of history of the land associated with glorious characters. Horowitz describes such incidents as the allocation of prestige by the invocation of symbols. Indeed,

Yugoslav-championed Yugoslav Macedonia was vested with many tools to construct a national identity loaded with prestige and positive value.

The next stop in this nation-building process was positive in-group evaluation and out-group acceptance for the new reconstructed identity to acquire some social value. Vestige with positive national characteristics and a non-pluralistic regime where dissent was not tolerable meant Macedonian identity was accepted easily inside the republic and the Yugoslav confederation. Further, international recognition and legitimacy awarded to Yugoslavia, implied the tacit acceptance of its Macedonian Yugoslav Republic as part of the whole package.

As soon as the two elements responsible for the cohesion of ex-Yugoslavia --Tito and the communist ideology-- eclipsed, Yugoslav Macedonians saw the system that had provided them with legitimacy and security disappear, its place taken by anarchy and disorder created by the virulent ethnic nationalism that filled the ideological vacuum. Amidst this state of flux, Yugoslav Macedonia found itself in an increasingly difficult position. Yugoslavia's collapse removed the structure upon which its legitimacy and protection rested. The young nation had in developed its identity for only fifty years and mostly through Yugoslavia's means of reference, patronage and active help that controlled, contained and compromised threats to it. The now Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was left alone and its status was challenged both domestically and internationally. The conditions specified by Horowitz directly apply to FYR Macedonia's situation in the early l990's, for the new state was threatened both by fragmentation into subgroups (Albanians, Serbs, pro-Bulgarians) and by absorption into another group (Bulgaria, rump Yugoslavia, and partially Albania). Under such conditions, the only potential solution for enhancing FYR Macedonian chance for survival was the re-establishment and re-assertion of a distinct, positively-valued identity its inhabitants would be proud to bear. As in the recent Yugoslav past, FYR Macedonia turned to the familiar pattern of differentiation. The national identity of FYR Macedonians was infused with characteristics enhancing its positive value, and certifying its distinctiveness and legitimacy. Specifically, a clearly distinct identity with positive valued characteristics

would challenge any foreign claims and increase internal cohesion (make in-group membership more attractive).*

The process–or pattern--of creation and recreation of identity characteristics encompassed action is described by Horowitz: Reinforcement of elements of common culture and ancestry, suppressing differences and stressing commonalities was promoted, with added emphasis on a unique cultural and historical character, and was aimed to create and aspired identity to bring in-group members closer, while designed, at the same time, to distance them from out-groups.

Newly created ones included the state symbols--the official name ('Republic of Macedonia'), the flag (red with a sixteen point star), and the liberal constitution. Old characteristics, like the uniqueness of 'Macedonian' language or the glorious Macedonian history were kept, but stressed to enhance the positive value of their identity. Sometimes, interaction between the new and old was also meant to have the same effect. For example, justification for the adoption of the sixteen-point star on the flag could be found in that it was an emblem of Alexander the Great, and therefore, symbolized the ancient Macedonian glory --allocation of prestige to the group, thus an increase of its positive view of the self.

Again, these categorization changes had to be positively evaluated by in-groups and accepted by out-groups, so that their value and legitimacy could be further established. Designed to downplay the intra-group differences and to stress similarities (as described by Horowitz) the new identity was welcomed by most (except Albanians, whose ethnic self-categorization remained different). However, out-group acceptance proved difficult. The demise of Yugoslavia revived its neighbors old fears mixed with new objections; consequently many aspects of Macedonian self-aspired identity were denied.

In the case of Greece, although it did not deny the FYR Macedonians right to nationhood *per se*, it raised serious objections regarding the ownership of symbols. Greece maintained its exclusive rights over the emblem of the Vergina star (by virtue of their Hellenic Macedonian history dating back to Alexander) and over the actual name Macedonia, (the official name of the Aegean part)—Greek national identity traits

* Observing a Slavic Macedonian Diaspora rally in Toronto, in 1993, the author was intrigued by the centerpiece of the procession: a large 2x2 meters painted map incorporating the three parts of Macedonia under a single entity, with the inscription 'ГОРД СУМ ШТО СУМ МАКЕДОНЕЦ' ('*Proud* [emphasis added] to be Macedonian').

challenged by FYROM claims. These claims raised fears of irredentist aspirations against Greek-Macedonian territory. Moreover, their attempted appropriation was perceived as cultural property theft, infringing on the positive value derived for Greek identity by the prestige and exclusivity of national traits, like symbols, history, etc. Given this set of cultural and strategic fears, and the chimera of a 'secure identity', the Greek public's reaction to FYROM fit that of a 'superior' group's to threat and change. As Tajfel's model predicts, the Greek public was alarmed and reacted acutely to the name and symbols issue with displays of intensification of existing identity distinctions that served to simultaneously deny them to the competitor and maintain their exclusivity. Hence, the public's preference for intransigence over the name and symbols, and its reflection in the constraints faced by Greek governments in negotiating the dispute.

CONCLUSION

This paper explored the nature and sources of Greek foreign policy towards the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in the post-1991 era. Foreign Policy formation required multi-causal explanations. Realism offers a partial explanation (Realpolitik calculations and external-3rd party intervention) but the primary explanation is the effect of domestic factors, supported by a composite Liberal theory (domestic power politics and group social/ideational preferences). The ideational component of this theory virtually overlaps with Liberal (or 'soft') Constructivist approaches of endogenous social construction, save for the dynamic element of their temporal and spatial (inter-group comparison) variation.* Domestic preference variance remains in the domain of Liberal Theory.

A mechanism explaining the persistence of domestic preferences for prestigious symbols and an uncompromising stance with respect to their negotiation for both Greece and FYR Macedonia is offered by a modified Social/Ethnic Identity Theory. The argument proposes that the threat or the prospect of change induce social or ethnic groups-of either superior or inferior status-to act in conjunction with their social/ethnic identities. At times of social flux or ethnic turmoil, superior groups' members attempt to safeguard and fortify their superior 'feel-good' status by making their distinctiveness more clear;

* Only recently, constructivists have pursued this domestic aspect of Katzenstein's 1996 edited volume further (see Koenig-Archibugi article referred to earlier in the paper). But a mechanism of how agents' interests vary is largely absent.

members of an inferior one may either try to leave their group, or stay and try to increase the worth of their identity. This can be achieved either by trying to become more like a superior group, or by trying to differentiate and create a distinct social identity by recreating and creating group characteristics that have positive value. For the individuals in such a group to gain a positive self-esteem, these characteristics have to be accepted both by in-groups and out-groups. Out-group acceptance of these new attributes (validation of this new ethnic identity) may lead to competition over them, ethnic tensions and inter-group hostility. The reflection of such uncompromising public preferences when it comes to prestigious, positively-valued ethnic symbols in the foreign policies of both Greece and FYR Macedonia provide a good application of this model.

A final word about IR theories and their explanatory power vis a vis the variability of foreign policy and endurance of public preferences over time. Can this multi-causal mixture of foreign policy formation-and the Social Identity Theory-account for the recent diplomatic overture by the Greek government to accept a possible compromise over the name? Again, external considerations offer a partial response: they can explain the urgency with which powers like the EU and the US would like to see and press for a settlement before the Pandora Box of the Kosovo final status discussions opens later this year; Greece and FYROM possibly engage in similar calculations for security reasons.[*] Another involves a more secure regional environment after the recent Greco-Turkish rapprochement that has quelled Greek fears of strategic isolation and encirclement. But then, why insist on a composite, instead of giving it up completely? Finally, there is third Realist consideration: the possibility of the recent Greek overture being a merely tactical one, to gain a diplomatic and negotiating advantage.

Do domestic considerations' explanations fare better? Having come to power in the 2004 elections, the *Nea Democratia* government enjoys a 165-seat majority over the 117 seats of the official opposition, PASOK (their total vote share was 45.4 and 4.5 % respectively).[†] While not a debilitating, compromise-prohibitive one (like l990-3), the government's majority is still slightly smaller than that of intransigent PASOK in 1993. If

[*] However, the potential of regional ethnic instability involving neighbouring ethnic Albanians could conversely present a deterrent for FYROM against negotiating away a distinct and distinctive supra-ethnic official state name (despite the increasingly de facto ethnic identification of only the Slavic population of FYROM as 'Macedonians').

[†] By that time, POL.AN had disappeared from the political scene, many of its members reabsorbed back into *Nea Democratia*'s ranks. Gavrilis credits its failure to Samaras' lack of charisma, and its competing against highly institutionalized parties with more coherent electoral platforms.

similar comfort margins can yield diametrically opposed policies, then parliamentary majority power play may be a necessary but not sufficient condition for determining foreign policy. On the other hand, changes in public opinion may shed more light over this recent foreign policy variation. Despite spikes related to events like the U.S.'s recognition in the fall of 2004 of FYROM under the 'Republic of Macedonia' name, more recent polls in Greece (late 2004, early 2005) register an overall change in the public mood. While there still is more opposition (56%) to a compromise solution of a compound name than for (41%), it has decreased from 1993's 72% high. Moreover, only 30% of respondents favour mass protest rallies (with 68% against)—a far cry from a decade's ago million people-strong rallies.[*]

These results bring us to final question of how foreign policies change and the part played by public preference variation. In the case of FYR Macedonia, the national character and unity of the state (as far as the accommodation between ethnic Albanians and Slavs is concerned) is still unresolved, and the lingering uncertainty over the status of nearby Kosovo indicates the persistent importance of prestigious, inclusive state symbols, especially for the Slav part of the population and the government. This persistence is reflected in the continued uncompromising foreign policy stance of the current FYROM government towards Greece (especially, following a cascade of international recognitions under the name 'Republic of Macedonia').

In the case of Greece, polls indicate that Greek public opinion has softened and that domestic preferences have changed. This is reflected by the fewer constraints in the government's foreign policy course in the dispute. What accounts for this shift in public preferences over FYROM? One answer is the combination of the public's fatigue (to a long, ongoing dispute), over-saturation and shortened attention span (vis a vis more dramatic Balkan developments and Greek foreign policy priorities) as well as resignation (to the widespread international de facto recognition of FYROM as 'Republic of Macedonia'). Another reason is the lessened sense of danger, or flux in the region's affairs that has diminished a sense of insecurity and threat mentality. While still volatile,

[*] Poll conducted by 'Opinion' (MPA, 10/11/04). It is interesting to note a Greek diplomat's hypothesis during a recent interview with the author, that, while still registering lower opposition than in the '90's, if some of these Greece-wide poll results were disaggregated by location, the net change would be somewhat smaller for inhabitants of the prefecture of Macedonia. While such data must certainly exist, lack of space in this paper and time to receive formal responses from poll companies in Greece has prevented the pursuit of this avenue. If true, and depending on the variation, this could mean deeper domestic variation of preferences, with Realist concerns about territorial integrity continuing to play a greater part in Northern Greek component of Greek public opinion.

the current situation in the former Yugoslav region is incomparable to the multiple points of war, instability and tragedy of ten years ago, and some rapprochement with Turkey has helped in this assessment.

Finally, the softening of public stance may have to do with the emergence of other sources or events enhancing Greek national prestige, sense of distinction of feeling good and more secure. The firmly entrenched European Union course has poured in billions of euros in subsidies enhancing overall quality of life and resolutely answering the once pressing existentialist public question of where Greece belonged culturally.[*] Further, the successful staging of the 2004 Olympics and even the (seemingly trivial as far as foreign policy formulation is concerned) improbable Greek national soccer squad win of the European national championship earlier that same year have brought world wide positive publicity for Greece, bolstering the prestige of Greek group identity.[†] Developments like these may have enhanced Greek feelings of self-esteem enough for it not to be singularly dependent on the outcome of the diplomatic dispute with FYROM. A fitting epilogue to this thesis is provided by a recent Washington Post article on Greece:

> *"Angst swirls unobstructed through most of the global village. Yet a modern Diogenes would not need to go far if he were to set out to find a happy man. […] the Greek prime minister has the nerve to be cheerful, optimistic and even soothing about Turkey, the Balkans, Greek-American relations and other subjects that have provoked verbal thunderbolts and mass marches in Athens in the past. On a checklist of difficult topics, Karamanlis provides an implicit description of the one thing a political leader must know above all: the mood of his people toward the world and toward themselves. His message is more powerful for not being put in so many words: Greeks feel pretty good about themselves these days, especially in comparison with their Balkan neighbors, European countries to their north and west, and Muslim nations to their east and south."*

[*] E.U. budgetary support over a decade helped them nearly double their gross domestic product and raise per capita GDP (about $20,000 last year). The E.U. subsidies helped finance the successful 2004 Olympics, which also lifted national morale. Hoagland, J. The Washington Post, May 26, 2005.

[†] In terms of the Olympic Games, while material calculations for boosting tourism and building infrastructure are important, one cannot overlook the group psychological dimension of prestige in the repeated bidding to host an extravagantly expensive world event like the Summer Olympic Games (the two-week fete came at an estimated cost of US $10 billion).

REFERENCES

1 Zametica, J. *The Yugoslav Conflict* (Adelphi paper No. 270: International Institute of Strategic Studies, 1992), p. 34.
2 Schevill, F. *A History of the Balkans.* (New York: Dorset Press, 1991), pp. 27-28, 38.
3 Ibid, p.41.
4 Fine, Jr., J.V.A. *The Late Medieval Balkans* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), pp. 606-608.
5 Ibid., p. 611.
6 Okey, R. *Eastern Europe, 1740-1985: Feudalism to Communism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), pp. 21-24.
7 Jelavic, B. *History of the Balkans: XVII and XIX c., vol. I.* Cambridge University Press, 1983.
8 Jelavic, B. *History of the Balkans: XX c., vol. 2* (Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 95.
9 Palmer, A. 'The Balkan Wars' in Roberts, J.M. (ed.) *Europe in the XXth c*., (London: MacDonald Press, 1970), p. 238.
10 Kofos, E. *National Heritage and National Identity in XIX and XX c. Macedonia* (Athens: Hellenic Foundation for Defense and Foreign Policy, 1991), p. 9.
11 Curtis, G.E. (ed). *Bulgaria: A Country Study*. (Washington: Library of Congress, Federal Research Division, 1992), p. 35.
12 Kofos, E. *The Macedonian Question: The Politics of Mutation*. (Thessaloniki: Institute of Balkan Studies,1987), p. 54.
13 Ibid.
14 Text obtained from *Documents on the Struggle of the Macedonian People for Independence and a Nation-State, vol. 2* (Skopje: University of Civil and Methodius Faculty of Philosophy and History Editions, 1985), p. 36.
15 Kofos, E. *The Impact of the Macedonian Question on Civil Conflict in Greece, 1943-49*, (Athens: Hellenic Foundation for Defense and Foreign Policy, occasional papers no. 3, 1989), pp. 28-29, 32.
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
18 Kofos, *The Macedonian Question: The Politics of Mutation*, p. 70.
19 Curtis, G.E. (ed.) *Yugoslavia: A Country Study* (Washington: Library of Congress, Federal Research Division, 1992) p. 87.
20 Jelavic, *History of the Balkans, XX c., vol.2*, p. 329.
21 Zametica, p. 36.
22 Woodward, S.L. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War* (Washington: The Brookings Institute, 1995), p. 122.
23 Crnobrnja, M. *The Yugoslav Drama* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), p. 27.
24 Ibid, p. 244.
25 Zametica, p. 55.
26 'The Constitution of Macedonia' (1991), obtained by the 'Canadian Macedonian Human Rights Commission', Toronto, ON, Canada.
27 ANA (Athens News Agency), MAK/MIK (FYROM News Agencies) May 1992); IU (1st Quarter 1993) pp. 23-26.
28 Zametica, p. 55, EIU (2nd Quarter 1993), p. 31.
29 Woodward, p. 344, ANA (June 1992)
30 EIU-The Economist Intelligence Unit-1st Quarter 1993, p. 4.
31 ANA, MAK, MIC (April 1993), EIU (1st Quarter 1993), p. 30, Woodward, p. 331.
32 ANA (Sept.- Oct. 1993).
33 EIU (2nd Quarter 1993), p. 33.
34 MAK, MIC (April 1993), EIU (2nd Quarter 1993), pp. 31-32.
35 ANA, MAK, MIC (Feb. 1994-extensive coverage), EIU (1st Quarter 1994), pp. 27-28.
36-38 Ibid.
39 EIU (2nd Quarter 1994), pp. 27-28.
40 ANA (June 1994, Dec. 1994, June 1995), EIU (2nd Quarter 1994), pp. 26-27.
41 EIU (1st Quarter 1994), p. 28.
42 Ibid, p. 27. Also, Glenny, M. "The Macedonian Question" in Dancher, A.and Halverson T. *International Perspectives of the Yugoslav Conflict*, (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1996), pp. 122-123.
43 EIU (2nd Quarter 1994), pp. 27-28.
44 EIU (4th Quarter 1994), p. 30.
45 MAK, MIC (June-Nov.1994), EIU (4th Quarter 1994), pp. 28-29.
46 ANA (Oct, 1994), EIU (4th Quarter 1994), pp. 28-29.
47 ANA, MAK, MIC (Sept. 1995-extensive coverage), EIU (4th Quarter 1995), p. 22.
48 For the text of the Interim Accord Text, see Valinakis, G. and Dalis, S. (eds.) *The Skopje Question: Attempts Towards Recognition and the Greek Position, Official Texts 1990-1996, 2nd ed*. Athens: Sideris/ELIAMEP, 1996; also, visit http://www.hri.org/docs/fyrom/95-27866.htm

49 Interim Accord Text; also EIU (4th Quarter 1995), p. 24.
50 EIU (4th Quarter 1995), p. 29.
51 DPA's leader, Xhaferi (quoted in MPA, 19/04/05).
52 FYROM Prime Minister, B. Crvenkovski interview, cited in Macedonian (Greek) Press Agency, 19/4/05. This is also the assessment of Nicholas Whyte, an ICG director during an interview with BBC Skopje service (18/4/05).
53 For a comprehensive discussion on Balancing and Balance of Power, see Paul, T.V., Wirtz, J. and Fortmann, M. (eds.) *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
54 Koenig-Archibugi, M. "Government Preferences for Institutional Change in European Foreign and Security Policy". *International Organization*, 58, Winter 2004 (137-74).
55 Cited in Gavrilis, G. "Reluctant Europeans: Negotiating Greek Identity During the Macedonia Crisis". *Replika*, online at http://www.c3.hu/scripta/scripta0/replika/honlap/english/02/03gavri.htm. Talk of a Muslim Arc intensified with news that FYROM, Turkey, Bulgaria and Albania were to hold discussions over constructing a highway connecting Durres to Istanbul (EIU report 1/1993). Interestingly, the 'specter' of a perceived Islamic threat is still part of the discourse in parts of the Balkans (see Tudoroiu, T. *Dimensiunea Balcanică a Securităţii Europene*. Bucharest: Editura Lucretius, 1999).
56 Irwin, C. "Peace, Stability and Elections: An Opinion Poll and its Implications". *Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, 2, 1, September 2002 (62-74).
57 Caramani, D. *The Societies of Europe: Elections in Western Europe since 1815, Electoral Results by Constituents*. New York: Grove's Dictionaries Inc., 2000), pp. 510-13.
58 Couloumbis, T. "A Tale with a Name". *Kathimerini*, 4/03/01.
59 Macedonian (Greek) Press Agency, 19/4/05.
60 Zachariadis, N. 'Greek Policy Toward the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 1991-95' *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, (14, 2, 1996), pp. 310-315.
61 Rizopoulos (1993:21) quoted in Gavrilis.
62 Keridis, D. *Political Culture and Foreign Policy: Greek-Turkish Relations in an Era of European Integration and Globalization*. (NATO Fellowship final report. Cambridge, June 1999), pp.43-4.
63 See Tajfel, H. (ed.) *Differentiation Between Social Groups: Studies in Social Psychology of Inter-group Relations* (1978); Also, Tajfel, H. (ed.) *Social Identity and Inter-group Relations* (1982).
64 Tajfel, H. The Achievement of Group Differentiation, in H. Tajfel (ed), *Differentiation Between Social Groups; Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, (London: Academic Press, 1978), p. 63.
65 Taylor, D. and Moghaddam, F. M. (eds.) *Theories of Intergroup Relations: Social Psychological Perspectives*. London: Praager, 1994, p.61
66 Ibid, p.78.
67-85 Tajfel (1978), pp. 86-96
86 Horowitz, D. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
87 Ibid, p. 70.
88 Ibid, p.72.
89 Ibid, p.216
90 Ibid, p.217
91 Jenkins, R. "Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power". *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 17, 2, April 1994, (189-199). Also, see Tajfel's "Social Categorization, Social Identity and Social Comparison", in Tajfel (1978), p. 65.
92 Horowitz, p. 50.
93 Hoagland, J. "It's More Than Us They Hate". *The Washington Post*, May 26, 2005.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allison, G. T. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

Allison, G. T. and Nicolaidis, K. (eds.) *The Greek Paradox: Promise vs. Performance*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997.

Brecher, M., Wilkenfeld, J. *A Study of Crisis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Caramani, D. The *Societies of Europe: Elections in Western Europe since 1815, Electoral Results by Constituents*. New York: Grove's Dictionaries Inc., 2000.

Checkel, J. T. "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory." *World Politics* 50, 2, January 1998, (324-348).

Christensen, T. J. Useful *Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Christensen, T. J. and Snyder, J. "Progressive Research on Degenerate Alliances." *American Political Science Review*, 91, 4, December 1997, (919-922).

Couloumbis, T. "A Tale with a Name." *Kathimerini*, 4/03/01.

Crnobrnja, M. *The Yugoslav Drama*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.

Curtis, G.E. (ed.) *Bulgaria: A Country Study.* Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Federal Research Division, 1992.

_____(ed.) *Yugoslavia: A Country Study.* Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Federal Research Division, 1992.

Dancher, A., Halverson T. *International Perspectives of the Yugoslav Conflict*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1996.

Doyle, M.W. "Liberalism and World Politics." *American Political Science Review*, 80, 4, December 1986, (1151-1169).

Elman, C. and Elman, M. F. "Lakatos and Neorealism: A Reply to Vasquez." *American Political Science Review*, 91, 4, December 1997, (923-926).

Feaver, P. D., Hellman, G., Schweller, R. L., Taliaferro, J. W., Wohlforth, W. C., Legro, J. W. and Moravcsik, A. "Correspondence: Brother Can You Spare a Paradigm? (Or Was Anybody Ever a Realist?)" *International Security*, 25,1 Summer 2000, (165-193).

Fine, Jr., J.V.A. *The Late Medieval Balkans*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Finnemore, M. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Finnemore, M. and Sikkink, K. "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2001. 4:391-416.

Gavrilis, G. 'Reluctant Europeans: Negotiating Greek Identity during the Macedonia Crisis.' *Replika*, online at http://www.c3.hu/scripta/scripta0/replika/honlap/english/02/03gavri.htm.

Haas E. B. *Nationalism, Liberalism, and Progress: The Rise and Decline of Nationalism.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Haggard, S. and Simmons, B. A. "Theories of International Regimes." *International Organization*, 41, 3, Summer 1987, (491-517).

Hoagland, J. "It's More Than Us They Hate." *The Washington Post*, May 26, 2005.

Horowitz, D. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985

Irwin, C. "Peace, Stability and Elections: An Opinion Poll and its Implications." *Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, 2, 1, September 2002, (62-74).

Janis, I. L. *Victims of Groupthink; a Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1972.

Jelavic, B. *History of the Balkans: XVII and XIX c., vol. I.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

_____*History of the Balkans: XX c., vol. 2* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Jenkins, R. "Rethinking Ethnicity: Identity, Categorization and Power." *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 17, 2, April 1994.

Jervis, R. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

_____ "Realism in the Study of World Politics." *International Organization*, 52, 4 Autumn 1998, (971-991).

Jervis, R., Ned Lebow, R. and Stein, J. G. *Psychology and Deterrence.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Joseph, E. P. "Back to the Balkans." *Foreign Affairs* 84,1, January/February 2005, (111-122).

Kapstein, E. B. "Is Realism Dead? The Domestic Sources of International Politics." *International Organization*, 49, 4 Autumn 1995 (751-774).

Katzenstein, P. (ed.) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Keohane, R O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984/2005.

Keohane, R. O. and Milner, H. V. (eds.) *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Keridis, D. *Political Culture and Foreign Policy: Greek-Turkish Relations in an Era of European Integration and Globalization*. NATO Fellowship Final Report. Cambridge, June 1999.

Koenig-Archibugi, M. "Government Preferences for Institutional Change in European Foreign and Security Policy." *International Organization*, 58, Winter 2004, (137-74).

Kofos, E. *The Macedonian Question: The Politics of Mutation*. Thessaloniki: Institute of Balkan Studies, 1987.

_____ *The Impact of the Macedonian Question on Civil Conflict in Greece, 1943-49*. Athens: Hellenic Foundation for Defence and Foreign Policy, occasional papers no. 3, 1989.

_____*National Heritage and National Identity in XIX and XX c. Macedonia*. Athens: Hellenic Foundation for Defense and Foreign Policy, 1991.

Kotsovilis, S. *National Identity and Ethnic Strife: Social-Psychological and Cognitive Dimensions in the Macedonian Conflict.* Montreal: McGill University, Dept. of Political Science-MA Thesis, 2000.

Legro, J. W. and Moravcsik, A. "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security*, 24, 2 Fall 1999, (5-55).

Maoz, Z. and Russett B. M. "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986." *American Political Science Review*, 87, 3, 1993, (624-638).

Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton, 2001.

Moravcsik, A. "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organization*, 51, 4 Autumn 1997 (513-553).

Okey, R. Eastern Europe, 1740-1985: Feudalism to Communism. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

Paul, T.V., Wirtz, J. and Fortmann, M. (eds.) *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

Rhodes, E. "Do Bureaucratic Politics Matter? Some Disconfirming Findings from the Case of the U.S. Navy." *World Politics* 47, October 1994, (1-41).

Roberts, J.M. (ed.) *Europe in the XXth c.* London: MacDonald Press, 1970.

Ruggie, G. J. "The False Premise of Realism." *International Security* 20, 1, Summer 1995, (62-70).

Russett, B. M. *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Schweller, R. L. "A Tale of Two Realisms: Expanding the Institutions Debate." *Mershon International Studies Review*, 41, 1, May 1997, (1-32).

_____"New Realist Research on Alliances: Refining, Not Refuting, Waltz's Balancing Proposition." *American Political Science Review*, 91, 4, December 1997, (927-930).

Schevill, F. *A History of the Balkans*. New York: Dorset Press, 1991.

Sterling-Folker J. "Realism and the Constructivist Challenge: Rejecting, Reconstructing, or Rereading." *International Studies Review* 4, 1, Spring 2002, (73-97) .

Tajfel, H. (ed.) *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in Social Psychology of Inter-group Relations*. London: Academic Press, in cooperation with the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, 1978.

Tajfel, H. (ed.) *Social Identity and Inter-group Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Taylor, D. and Moghaddam, F. M. (eds.) *Theories of Intergroup Relations: Social Psychological Perspectives*. London: Praager, 1994

Tudoroiu, T. *Dimensiunea Balcanică a Securităţii Europene*. Bucharest: Editura Lucretius, 1999.

Valinakis, G. and Dalis, S. (eds.) *The Skopje Question: Attempts Towards Recognition and the Greek Position, Official Texts 1990-1996* (2nd Ed.). Athens: Sideris/ELIAMEP, 1996.

Vertzberger, Y. Y. I. *The World in Their Minds: Information Processing, Cognition, and Perception in Foreign Policy Decision-making*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Walker, R.B.J. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Walt, S. M. *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

_____"The progressive Power of Realism." *American Political Science Review*, 91, 4, December 1997, (931-935).

_____"International Relations: One World, Many Theories." *Foreign Policy* Spring 1998 (29-46).

Waltz, K. N. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1979.

_____ "Evaluating Theories." *American Political Science Review*, 91, 4, December 1997 (913-917).

Wendt, A. "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization*, 46, 2, Spring 1992, (391-425).

_____"Constructing International Politics." *International Security*, 20,1 Summer 1995, (71-81)

Woodward, S.L. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute, 1995.

Vasquez, J. A. "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition." *American Political Science Review*, 91, 4, December 1997, (899-912).

Zachariadis, N. 'Greek Policy Toward the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 1991-95' *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 14, 2, 1996, (303-327).

Zakaria, F. *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Zametica, J. *The Yugoslav Conflict*. Adelphi paper No. 270: International Institute of Strategic Studies, 1992.

News Agencies and Reports:

ANA (Athens News Agency); MAK/MIK (FYROM News Agencies); MPA [Macedonian (Greek) News Agency], BBC on line.

The Economist: Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU)-Country Reports and Country Profiles.

International Crisis Group reports (2004-5) on Kosovo and FYR Macedonia: ICG Europe Reports No 155, 161, Europe Briefing/Skopje/Brussels, 3 August 2004, Europe Briefing No 37/25 February 2005.