

Political Culture and Foreign Policy:

***Greek-Turkish Relations in the Era of
European Integration and Globalization***

A NATO Fellowship Final Report

Dr. Dimitris Keridis

Director of the Kokkalis Program on Southeastern and East-Central Europe at
The John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Cambridge, June 1999

Abstract

Greek-Turkish rivalry continues to produce instability in war-torn Southeastern Europe, threatening the very cohesion of NATO. Recently however, there have been some promising signs of a breakthrough, following three devastating earthquakes in Greece and Turkey. The causes for this progress should be explored in relation to an international environment that is increasingly conducive to such progress. In addition, more importantly, they are located in the significant domestic changes—cultural and institutional—that both Greece and Turkey are experiencing. These changes involve the liberalization of their polity and economy and are directly linked to the effects of and responses to globalization. For Greece and Turkey, the driving force of modernization and globalization has been the demands of European integration. Participating in European structures has meant democratic and market reforms and the spread of West European liberal values.

Contrary to traditional security studies of Greek-Turkish relations, the present research is inter-disciplinary and aims at integrating comparative politics, historical sociology and other fields of social sciences to the study of international relations. The research's underlying assumption is that both Greece and Turkey are experiencing radical rethinking of traditional configurations of the nation-state and dramatic redefinition of its role in today's world. National interest, to the degree that it is not limited to the existential survival of the state, is not pre-

determined and static but rather, it is constantly negotiated among political actors with different views and preferences.

Although Greece participates fully in the E.U. and enjoys a stable democracy while Turkey does not, some parallels can be drawn in the domestic politics of both countries which center around the emergence of reformist agendas in each. In Turkey this agenda involves a break with conservative Kemalism and the search for a liberal and democratic post-Kemalist consensus. Having left the “phantom of Sevres” behind, reform-minded Turkey feels confident about its position in the region, measures power in economic rather than military terms and, in place of confrontation, seeks regional cooperation and European integration. In Greece, reformism means a post-nationalist reading of international and domestic politics and a policy of engaging rather than isolating Turkey in support of the latter’s Europeanization. The desire for domestic modernization has raised awareness among reformers on both sides of the Aegean that resolution of the Greek-Turkish dispute is necessary. In this very important respect, they share a common interest. Faced with this difficult challenge, Greek-Turkish reformers have come to realize that Europe, with the support of the United States, can provide the best framework for a settlement.

This report is based on the findings of several research projects I helped organize in the period between 1995 and 1999:

- A 2-day conference entitled, “The Greek Paradox: Promise vs. Performance,” John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, October 1995;

- A 2-day conference entitled, “Security in Southeastern Europe and the U.S.-Greek Relationship,” Washington, D.C., May 1996, jointly organized by the Karamanlis Foundation and the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis;
- A 1-day workshop entitled, “Greek-Turkish Relations and in the Post-Cold War Era: Crisis or Détente?,” Center for European Studies, Harvard University, November, 1997;
- A 2-day workshop on Greek-Turkish Relations and the Cyprus Conflict, Rhodes, Greece, June 1998, jointly organized by the Kokkalis Program, the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP);
- A 2-day conference entitled, “The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy,” John F. Kennedy School, Harvard University, October 1998;
- A 2-day Transatlantic Conference on “NATO and Southeastern Europe: Security Issues for the Early 21st Century,” Washington DC, April 1999, jointly organized by the Kokkalis Foundation and the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis.

For more information on these projects please visit the relevant web sites at www.ksg.harvard.edu/kokkalis and www.ifpa.org. Most of these meetings published their proceedings under the same titles, in what should be considered ground-breaking works for understanding contemporary Greek and Turkish realities. These projects were inter-disciplinary in their scope and reformist in their agenda. Many of the findings of this research derive directly from the debates these meetings elicited.

Curriculum Vitae

Dimitris Keridis studied Law at the University of Thessaloniki and International Relations at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, where he recently completed his doctoral dissertation entitled “The Foreign Policy of Nationalism: The Case of Serbia (1986-1995) and Greece (1991-1995).” In the past, Dr. Keridis worked as a research associate at the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis and the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. He has edited collective volumes and published papers and book reviews on international security, nationalism and democracy. Dr. Keridis has been awarded numerous fellowships from the Greek government, the Council of Europe, the Fletcher School and various foundations in Europe and the United States.

1. Introduction: Towards a Greek-Turkish Entente?

During the second half of 1999, Greek-Turkish relations entered a phase of détente. This was 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. Although the recent rapprochement remains tenuous, it has already yielded some positive results in decreasing tensions in the Aegean, promoting low politics cooperation, opening the way to Turkey's candidacy to the European Union, and initiating proximity talks between the leaders of the Greek and Turkish-Cypriot community in Cyprus. These promising developments are the result of the new geostrategic environment, but more importantly, they stem from institutional and cultural changes in the polity of both countries.

NATO's intervention in Kosovo and the continuous instability in much of Southeastern Europe highlight the need for an end to antagonism between the two pivotal states of the region, Greece and Turkey. By far the strongest nations in Southeastern Europe, war between Greece

According to the Economist Intelligence Unit's 1999 country profiles, Turkey has a GDP of 200 billion dollars and Greece of 130 billion dollars. In comparison, Romania's GDP is 40 billion, Croatia and Slovenia's 20 billion each, Yugoslavia's 13 billion, Bulgaria's 11 billion, FYROMacedonia's 3 billion and Albania's only 1.5 billion. Thus, whereas the combined Greek and Turkish GDP is approximately 330 billion dollars and growing, the rest of the Balkans have

and Turkey would devastate the region as no other and jeopardize the very existence of NATO due to the two countries' membership in the alliance. As Washington and other Western capitals find themselves deeply involved in Balkan politics 10 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, they realize that their efforts to "Europeanize" this corner of Europe can better succeed through Greek-Turkish and Euro-Turkish cooperation.

However, despite the importance of positive external influence in resolving disputes, the major factors that facilitate or impede this rapprochement should be traced in domestic developments and related with the modernization of the Greek and Turkish polities and the way the two states negotiate their responses to globalization. Both nations have experienced significant changes during the past twenty years. The end of protectionism, import-substitution and nationalization has given rise to the emergence of vibrant market economies and powerful business interests. The abolition of state monopolies in broadcasting and education has caused a media explosion and led to the establishment of independent informational and educational networks. Finally, the demands of European integration, the growth of middle classes in each country, the expansion of mobile, urban, and consumerist society, the arrival of economic immigrants, and the eruption of ethnic conflicts in the vicinity have all stimulated a debate over

a national product of less than one third of that and decreasing. Similar differences are exhibited in export performance, investment and military spending. Actually, Greece and Turkey are the only countries in the region with a Western-trained and equipped military with modern air and naval capabilities.

Both Greece and Turkey, the latter with few exceptions, participate in the liberal common market regime of the European Union. Privatization has accelerated pace in the last two years with proceedings exceeding one billion dollars a year for each country. According to EUI statistics, Turkey has grown on average by 4% a year since 1980, whereas Greece by 2%, but since 1997 growth in Greece has picked up speed to 3.5%, exceeding the EU average.

identity that challenges traditional conceptions of the nation-state and demands an institutional and cultural national redefinition.

Contrary to the situation in the past, today's foreign policy-makers operate within the context of an aspiring civil society, a vibrant media and private economic interests, and a tightening nexus of international regimes. This creates constraints and a political fragmentation that can cause a certain policy paralysis. In the short run, it often exacerbates the populace's nationalist reflexes and adventurism but, in the long run, it could facilitate the transition to more liberal, open, diverse and tolerant societies.

2. Theory: Domestic Developments-External Behavior and the new Europe

Since the publication of Kenneth N. Waltz's classic *Man, the State and War* in 1959, the debate over levels of analysis has dominated international-relations theory. Waltz located the causes of war on three levels: human nature, the nature of states and the nature of the international system. The "level of analysis problem" is about how to identify and treat different levels of explanation for observed phenomena.

The issue emerged within the broader behavioral movement and general systems theory of the 1950s, when social scientists tried to introduce the methodology and rigor of the natural sciences into the study of social phenomena. Waltz's isolation of the international system itself as a location of explanation in its own right also served to increase the distinctiveness of international relations as a field—an appealing collateral for international relations scholars.

The debate over levels of analysis is informed by the broader epistemological debate between the two primary approaches to understanding social events: atomistic, i.e. the fragmentation of a subject into its component parts, and holistic, i.e. the study of the whole which is assumed to be more than the sum of its parts.

Since then, the debate has focused on identifying various levels of analysis (individual-bureaucracy-state-region-international system) and how they relate to each other. A major shift in thinking occurred with Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* in 1979—a seminal work

For more on neorealism see James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., Contending Theories of International Relations, (New York: Longman, 1997), pp. 80-89.

Barry Buzan, "The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations Reconsidered," in International Relations Theory Today, ed. Ken Booth and Steve Smith, (Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), pp. 212-213.

on the system and its structure at the international level. He focused on system level theory in order to explain why different units behave similarly, relegating all other explanations to what he coined "reductionism." He was quickly criticized on the basis that, since he had defined structure in highly restrictive terms, he could not avoid pushing a vast array of causes and effects down to the unit level. As Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye argued "making the unit level the dumping ground for all unexplained variance is an impediment to the development of theory." The debate has enriched the study of international relations and is far from over. What is the primary unit-of-analysis/actor and how it relates to various levels remains at the very center of any international relations study.

Classical *realist theory* holds that the key international actors are nation-states, that states have equal legal sovereignty but gradations of capability, that states are unitary actors, that domestic politics can be separated from foreign policy, and that states are rational actors that serve as a vehicle for maximizing the national interest. According to Hans J. Morgenthau political leaders "think and act in terms of interest defined as power." In his view, international politics is a process in which national interests are accommodated or resolved on the basis of diplomacy or war. Where nations interact strategically with one another in an essentially anarchic, high-risk environment, differences among countries do not matter much. Kenneth Waltz's *structural realism* elevates the structure of the international system, defined as the

The response is powerfully articulated in Robert Keohane, ed., Neorealism and Its Critics (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987).

"Structure includes only what is required to show how the units of the system are positioned or arranged. Everything else is omitted," Kenneth Waltz, Theory of International Politics (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1979), p. 82.

Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, Power and Interdependence (Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1989), p. 17.

Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, Contending Theories of International Relations, p. 58.

Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations, 5th ed., rev., (New York: Knopf, 1978), p. 4.

Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, Contending Theories of International Relations, p. 71.

distribution of capabilities among the units, as the independent variable. He defines states as "unitary actors."

Critics have long questioned the nature of national interest, power, capabilities and the unitary character of states. Thirty years ago, Raymond Aron offered a devastating attack against the vagueness of the term "national interest" and argued that to invoke it *post facto* bestows no power in predicting behavior: "...whatever the diplomacy of a state may be, nothing prevents one saying after the fact that it was dictated by considerations of 'national interest', as long as 'national interest' has not been strictly defined. Indeed, the so-called theory of 'national interest' either suggests something as undeniable as it is vague -- that each actor thinks first of itself -- or else tries to oppose itself to other pseudo-theories, for example that the foreign policy of states is dictated by political ideology or moral principles. Each of these pseudo-theories means something only in connection with the other. To say that the Soviet Union conducts its foreign affairs on the basis of its 'national interest' means that it is not guided exclusively by its ambition to spread Communism. Such a proposition is undeniable, but to conclude from it that the rulers of a non-Communist Russia would have had the same diplomatic policy...is simply absurd. The purpose of the empirical study of international relations consists precisely in determining the historical perceptions that control the behaviour of collective actors and the decisions of the rulers of these actors." More broadly, as it is argued in the following pages, 'interest' is culturally constructed, and no social action takes place outside the context or structures of meaning. Thus, the determination of what constitutes the 'national interest' of each particular state at each particular time is not a given but the very product of political processes and the interplay of political values at the domestic level.

An equally important criticism is that "an analysis of preferences is analytically prior to variation in environmental constraints. The reason for the priority of preferences is simple:

Waltz, Theory of International Politics, pp. 93-101.

Raymond Aron, "What Is a Theory of International Relations," Journal of International Affairs, 21 (1967): p. 192.

preferences dictate which systemic theories are appropriate to explain interstate strategic interaction. A simple ‘Dahlian’ example from the study of a core realist concept, power, makes this clear: we cannot know whether ‘A influenced B to do something’ (power) unless we know ‘what B would otherwise do’ (preferences).” It is at this point of preference-analysis that the study of nationalism as a powerful political ideology in the present international system of nation-states becomes important for international relations. An analysis of the preferences and, ultimately, the interests of international actors inevitably leads us to examine domestic developments and thus, to attempt to explain international affairs, at least partially, through the study of comparative politics.

It is not only realists who reject comparative politics. Institutionalism, often viewed as a polar opposite of realism in paradigmatic debates, is also “systemic.” Both realism and institutionalism assume unitary rational states with fixed preferences and both attribute the patterns of outcome to variations in the political structure of the international system. Realists focus on the structure of capabilities while institutionalists concentrate on the structure of information. However, the importance of different preferences that states bring to strategic interaction implies that comparative politics -- variation in those preferences -- does matter.

The most celebrated preference-based theory in contemporary international relations is *republican liberalism* and *democratic peace theory*, which Bruce Russett terms “the closest thing we have to a law in international relations.” Republican liberalism points to domestic regimes to explain foreign behavior by linking democracy to peace. Such an emphasis on domestic regimes and state preferences is also to be found in studies of decision-making starting

Andrew Moravcsik, “From the Outside In: International Relations and the ‘Obsolescence’ of Comparative Politics,” American Political Science Association-Comparative Politics Newsletter 7:2 (Summer 1996): p. 9.

For an excellent account on both see David A. Baldwin, ed., Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

For a good review of the democratic peace theory see Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, eds., Debating the Democratic Peace (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1996).

with Graham Allison's treatise on the Cuban Missile Crisis, Jack Snyder's work on imperialism, and Helen Milner's study on tariff policy. Lisa Martin has explored the role of executives and legislatures in foreign policy-making using theories drawn from the study of the U.S. Congress. James Fearon has shown that deterrence must be understood as a selection process that separates governments with varying preferences; an analysis of those preferences is thus a precondition for understanding the outbreak of war. Studies of the conduct of war and the design of foreign aid programs by Jeffrey Legro and David Lumsdaine illustrate the importance of domestic ideas and values. Peter Haas, Robert Keohane and Marc Levy have reconceived international institutions as mechanisms for the muster of domestic political support. All these scholars criticize Morgenthau, who believed a concern for the motives of statesmen to be a fallacious way to understand foreign policy.

The analysis that follows rests upon the following theoretical assumptions. States are the primary but not the only international actors; they possess legal equality but different capabilities as well as different preferences; the definition of national interests is not pre-established but mutable and negotiable among various domestic constituencies within a certain political culture; states might appear unitary on an official level but they are not black boxes; their policy responses to outside stimuli are only the product of the balance of competing domestic interests and external pressures; and domestic and international politics are increasingly inter-penetrable and their strict separation has become problematic.

Peter Gourevitch, "On the Interaction of Comparative and International Politics," APSA-CP Newsletter 7:2 (Summer 1996): p. 16.

Moravcsik, "From the Outside In: International Relations and the 'Obsolescence' of Comparative Politics," p. 18.

David A. Baldwin, "Neoliberalism, Neorealism, and World Politics," in Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate, ed. David A. Baldwin, p. 7.

The end of the Cold War, the collapse of communism and growing economic globalization have further advanced the ‘domestication’ of foreign policy. Increased popular participation at home and economic competition abroad have made ruling elites and governments more vulnerable to both internal and external pressures. At the same time and in certain, not always welcoming, ways, the autonomy of individual governments has increased with the de-linking of local problems from the Cold War, East-West competition, and the strategic retreat of Russia and the resurgence of isolationism in the US. In such an environment, “low politics” are becoming the true high politics of the day.

The process of European integration embodies and best exemplifies this process. European integration provides the linkage between domestic and foreign policy. It is the most powerful agent for the “domestication” of foreign policy and for the softening and broadening of national security towards low politics and economics. It demands the re-conceptualization of the nation-state and the pooling and sharing of national sovereignty. It accelerates economic globalization by breaking down economic barriers and establishing a single market. It forces the modernization of backward polities and economies by promoting competition. Most importantly, by adopting the traditionally high democratic standards of Europe’s Northwest as the basis for a future political union, it has helped the democratization of the rest of the continent. European integration has focused policy-makers’ attention and has provided useful roadmaps, linkages and trade-offs for painful institutional reforms. Ultimately, it has initiated a learning process spreading values, mentalities and behaviors from Europe’s northwestern core to its periphery.

Most of the domestic changes described in the following pages are directly or indirectly linked to the demands and benefits of European integration. In the case of Greece, an EU member since 1981, changes preceded accession, continued with significant delays during the first decade after that and have picked up speed in the 1990s. In the case of Turkey, the desire for European integration has informed the Kemalist vision and program from its very inception. Although Turkey is not an EU member and will remain outside the union for the foreseeable future, the EU and Turkey have come closer together politically and institutionally over the years , and have embarked on a “structured” dialogue that provides the roadmap for what needs to be done in order to achieve Turkey’s candidacy and eventual membership.

If Cypriot candidacy and fast-track accession to the Union are added to this picture, it becomes clear that Greek-Turkish relations have become part of and could be resolved through the broader European agenda. This report aims at exploring these linkages and highlight the most effective policies for the stabilization of the Greek-Turkish frontier from Thrace to the Aegean to Cyprus and ultimately, for rendering it irrelevant.

It seems that in Europe today, from nationalist Britain to Euro-federalist Germany, there exist two types of politics: traditional power politics that emphasize security issues, military might and state sovereignty on the one hand, and the “post-modern” politics of political and economic

The EU is by far Turkey’s most important trading partner, accounting for half of its external trade and most of its foreign investment. The two have signed numerous agreements. Turkey is not only an associate member of the EU but also of the WEU and a full member of NATO and the Council of Europe, all three important European institutions whose agenda is EU-related and whose membership mostly overlaps with that of the EU.

integration, which downplay the need for a powerful military, stress socio-economic development and “soft power” in Joseph Nye’s words , and do not recognize “internal matters,” on the other. The former are best understood through a realist reading of the international environment and a preference for relative gains. The latter reflect greater liberalism and absolute gains; they acknowledge the supremacy of the state in international affairs, but they recognize that in an era of rapid globalization, identities, loyalties and sovereignties are increasingly overlapping and shared. As Susan Woodward argues, “political alignments in most if not all countries are largely between defense and geostrategic-oriented interests within the economy (but also in perceptions of national identity), versus those who orient themselves toward trade and greater international openness.” The process of European integration informs the choice between the two. Being part of a supra-national Europe, ultimately involves a certain supra-national understanding of politics and international relations.

A similar choice confronts present EU candidates and future members including Turkey. A useful yardstick for gauging Turkey’s entry into the EU, is the acceptance of the International Court of Justice as a mechanism for the settlement of disputes with neighboring countries, including Greece. Acceptance of ICJ’s jurisdiction will signal that Turkey is becoming a good

Repeated European Councils (Lisbon 1992, Luxembourg 1997) have stated that the resolution of Greek-Turkish differences is a precondition for progress in Euro-Turkish cooperation.

See Joseph S. Nye, “Greece and the Balkans: A Moment of Opportunity,” in The Greek Paradox: Promise vs. Performance, ed. Graham T. Allison and Kalypso Nicolaidis (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp.145-149.

Susan L. Woodward, “The Security Environment,” in Security in Southeastern Europe and the U.S.-Greek Relationship, ed. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr. and Dimitris Keridis (New York: Brassey’s, 1997), p. 28.

“European citizen” by submitting its foreign policy to the authority, scrutiny and constraints of international institutions. It would signify a fundamental change in Turkey’s perception of the world and, inevitably, the world’s perception of Turkey.

3. Turkey after the Cold War: the Road to Europe and to a post-Kemalist

Consensus

Since the end of the Cold War, Turkey has emerged from the periphery to the very center of Eurasian security. This is due to Turkey's geography and demography. With a land mass and a population larger than that of France, Turkey is clearly an important Eurasian power, controlling the land route between Europe and the Middle East and the sea lanes between the Black and the Mediterranean Seas. Beyond its geostrategic endowments, Turkey's contemporary emergence as a power is the result of the success of economic reforms initiated in January 1980 and the significant, if erratic and unequal, economic expansion that followed. In a region of chronic economic mismanagement and backwardness, Turkey stands out as a powerhouse. With a GDP of 200 billion dollars, the Turkish economy, despite rather than because of Ankara, is three times the size of Egypt's and as large as the economies of all Balkan countries combined.

The combination of natural and human resources has placed Turkey in a unique position. No longer concerned with its own survival as was the case for many centuries until the end of the Cold War, Turkey (like Greece) can, for the first time in its modern history, project its influence beyond its borders and transform itself into a regional leader. Since 1989 the Turkish foreign policy agenda has expanded dramatically. Today, Turkey has interests in the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean. The collapse of the Soviet empire to the north has opened a vast region for the projection of Turkish influence— from the Adriatic to China and from the Black Sea to the Persian Gulf, and thus, offers great economic and political opportunities.

In this process, Turkey is supported and impeded by past legacies and present realities. Since 1989, Turks have rediscovered their ethnic kinsmen in the Balkans, the Caucasus and Central Asia. This has been accompanied by a similar re-discovery of the Ottoman legacy. Whereas ethnic and cultural affinity has been helpful in promoting relations, old historical antagonisms, such as those with Armenians and Greeks, have impeded them.

The most troubling thing is a certain imperialist, hegemonic, and neo-Ottoman discourse that, despite its usefulness for domestic political consumption, can lead to serious policy blunders. Since 1989 the Turkish public has been fed, to the horror of its neighbors, a constant diet of grandiose projects with dubious returns: from the great Egnatia highway linking Albania to Istanbul to the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline. Turkey entered the Balkans in 1991 with bravado, projecting itself as the guarantor of Balkan Muslims and states such as Albania, Bosnia and FYROMacedonia, only to withdraw in 1995. This happened as Albania and FYROMacedonia drew closer to Greece, Bulgaria and Romania focused on their accession to NATO and the EU, and Yugoslavia/Bosnia fell apart. By far, Turkey's greatest disappointment has been its adventure in the Caucasus and Central Asia. Heralded as Turkey's backyard or "near abroad," it soon became apparent that Turkey did not have the resources to play the leadership role it envisioned. The overthrow of the pro-Turkish Azeri president in 1993 was a turning point and had a sobering effect on Turkish policy and forced a scale-down of its expectations. It appears that this experience has sobered Turkish politicians infusing more flexibility and a sense of proportion into their regional policy.

The vast majority of Turks take great pride in the legacy of the founder of the modern Turkish republic, Kemal Ataturk. However, twice in the past they abandoned his cherished

foreign policy principals. After the Second World War, Turkey moved away from its inter-war neutrality and its special understanding with the Soviet Union to actively link itself to the West. It became a member of NATO and leased military bases to the United States. After 1989, Turkey abandoned Kemalist inwardness to take an active interest in the well-being of Turkic and Muslim populations in its “near abroad.” This was a process that had started with its entanglement in Cyprus in the 1950s but intensified with the end of the Cold War.

However, for all its regional distractions, Europe has become Turkey’s first foreign policy priority. The acceleration of European integration since the second half of the 1980s, the prospect of a European political union, the political and economic benefits associated with EU membership as exhibited by the growing line of applicants to join, and finally, the lack of any credible alternative to European membership easily explain Turkish priorities.

Turkey’s regional and European aspirations cannot be understood without an appreciation of the dramatic internal changes that the country has experienced over the last fifty years. What used to be a conservative, religious, patriarchal, peasant, immobile and illiterate society has been transformed into a fairly urban, industrialized, highly mobile and fairly educated nation that is increasingly open and cosmopolitan. The arrival of “modernity” was bound to create tensions and cause enormous dislocations. As a result, three, if not four times, the

Greece, like so many other developing nations, experienced similar changes and dislocations with serious political ramifications. However, the number of people involved was much smaller and the period of time much longer so that the whole process was more gradual and was already completed by the late 1970s.

democratic political process was trampled by the intervention of the army. However, the rapidly decreasing population growth rate signifies that the process is, at last, entering maturation.

Since the end of ANAP's hegemony of Turkish politics in the early 1990s, Turkey and the Kemalist establishment have been challenged from two sides: the Islamists and the Kurdish nationalists. Both challenges and the policy responses they generate have serious implications for the image and position of contemporary Turkey in the world. Both have their roots in Kemalism's exclusionary vision and intolerance towards religion and ethnic diversity. As an inter-war elite-driven, top-down, authoritarian movement, Kemalism allowed little room for social pluralism and strove to build a modern, homogeneous and secular society.

The present incarnations of the Islamic and Kurdish challenges are the result of both the successes as well as the incomplete and dysfunctional nature of Kemalist modernization. Success can be measured in the social pluralization and the emergence of a vibrant, diversified, complicated and sophisticated civil society outside the reach of the official state; these are inevitable byproducts of modernization. The fact that political Islam and Kurdish nationalism have found fertile ground in the least modern and most traditional sectors of Turkish society, i.e. among recent peasant immigrants in the urban peripheries and in the Southeast, demonstrates the incompleteness of Kemalist modernization. The failure of Kemalism is apparent in the Islamists' success in capturing the protest vote of the populous lower social strata that feels

On the importance of demographic change for Turkey's prospects for modernization and social stability see TUSIAD's former president Muharrem Kayhan's intervention in the conference proceedings on The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy, ed. Dimitris Keridis and Lenore Martin (Cambridge: MIT Press, forthcoming).

inadequately represented by the official Kemalist political establishment. To put it more succinctly, such movements have filled the vacuum created by the collapse of the Turkish Left.

This brings us back to the 1980 coup and the actions taken by the military to, as the military viewed it, restore social order and balance in Turkish politics. Much of Turkey's present-day Islamic and Kurdish problems have their roots in these policies. First, in their effort to reduce the Left's influence, the generals, and later Ozal, supported “law-abiding, conservative Islam” and thereby allowed the opening of thousands of the religious schools that the military is currently in the process of closing down. Second, by imprisoning any moderate Kurdish nationalist, the military provided fertile ground for the rise of the most maverick, ruthless and uncompromising of all challenges—the PKK—whose leadership had already escaped safely to Syria on the eve of the coup.

As Turkey moves closer to Europe and aspires to obtain full membership in the European Union, it is not surprising that its domestic politics are coming under increased international scrutiny. The stability and quality of Turkish democracy, the condition of human and minority rights, the level of economic development and income, and regional inequalities have become, especially after 1989, issues of European concern.

Euro-Turkish relations carry their own historical baggage. At the height of Ottoman power in the 16th century, Turkey was an important European power participating and

See Halil Berkay's commentary in Greece, Turkey and the Cyprus Conflict, ed. Dimitris Keridis and Dimitris Triantafyllou (Brassey's: New York, forthcoming).

See Kemal Kirisci's paper on Turkey's Kurdish Problem in The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy.

maintaining the balance of power of the time by allying itself to France against the Habsburgs. European-inspired reforms did not start with Kemal but were more than a century old by the time he came to power. After the Second World War, Turkey fully oriented itself towards the West, abandoned its immediate neighborhood in the troubled Middle East, and strove to integrate politically into the Euro-Atlantic alliance. This new orientation was attempted through its entry to NATO in 1952 and its signing an association agreement with the European Communities in 1963. However, the end of the Cold War and the emergence of Central Europe suddenly put Turkey further behind in the line for accession, while renewed interest in the strict observance of democratic preconditions for membership further complicated Turkey's efforts.

Turks object to Europe's reluctance to admit them on two grounds: they suspect Brussels of neo-colonialism and racism. Modern Turkey cannot but carry the traumas of the Ottoman Empire and the memories of the repeated, quasi-colonial interventions of Europe's great Christian powers in its internal affairs under the pretext of protecting minority rights. After all, such intervention culminated in the nightmare of the Sevres treaty of 1920 and the dismemberment of not just the empire but the Turks' very homeland in Anatolia. Thus, Turks,

Cemal Kafadar, "The Ottomans and Europe," in Handbook of European History 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation. 2 Vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994- 1995. Vol 1: Structures and Assertions.

Bernard Lewis, The Emergence of Modern Turkey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 75-128.

See Feroz Ahmad, "Retrospective on Turkish Foreign Policy on the 75th Anniversary of the Republic, in The Future of Turkish Foreign Policy.

especially of the most nationalist ilk, are especially sensitive to the dictates of foreigners. But the very nature of membership in the European Union involves, at a minimum, the voluntary surrender of parts of state sovereignty to a supranational organization, if not the complete rethinking of the state's role and the limits of its sovereignty in today's world. Europe does not and cannot draw a line at "internal affairs." It is in Turkey's interest to build an open, tolerant and democratic society that will take its rightful place in Europe.

Many inside Turkey and abroad are all too ready to talk of Kemalism's crisis. The "crisis" discourse is neither new nor unique to Turkey. Since its inception, Kemalism seems to be in perpetual crisis. Wasn't it in crisis when the Democrats ousted the Republicans from power with the landslide of 1950? Wasn't it in crisis in the late 1970s when radical leftists and rightists killed each other in university campuses? Those who point to the success of the PKK in plunging the Southeast into anarchy, should not overlook the fact that the majority of Turkey's Kurds are well integrated into Turkish society, taking advantage of whatever political and economic opportunities are open to them. Those who panicked with Refah's success in capturing more than one-quarter of the vote in 1995 should not forget that various mainstream rightist and leftist Kemalists captured the other three-quarters. The thousands of Turks who periodically demonstrate in defense of secularism, women's rights, and other liberal values are a testimony to Kemalism's transformation from an elitist modernizing movement of officers, bureaucrats, and intellectuals to a popular ideology that commands the support of the Turkish masses and the middle classes in particular. Kemalism's ability to adapt to changing conditions is a sign of vitality: Turkey went from the state-led corporatist autarky of the inter-war period and

Berktaş, in Greece, Turkey and the Cyprus Conflict.

the import-substitution industrialization of the 1960's and 1970's to the liberalization of the 1980's and the privatization of the 1990's. Moreover, it went from the one-party authoritarianism of the inter-war years to the political opening in the post-war period. A similar adaptation, if not complete transformation, is required today in order to democratize the Turkish constitution by reducing the role of the military in politics and liberalize socio-cultural institutions in order to accommodate diversity and respect minority rights.

Ultimately the challenge ahead requires nothing short of overcoming the fundamental internal contradiction of Kemalism and its top-down modernization program for Turkish society. The question is how Turkey can turn from a republic to a democracy? That is, how can it move away from being a regime that actively promotes and suppresses certain values and behaviors to one that recognizes independent public spaces and leaves room for ethnic, cultural and political diversity?

4. Turkish Polity and Culture: Jacobins Vs. Reformers and Greek-Turkish Relations

Traditional left-right political distinctions in the conventional European sense carry little meaning in Turkey. The Kemalist body politic (some 75% of the total) is roughly divided among two main poles: Jacobines and reformers. The former, ridiculed as stone-age Kemalists, adhere to a strict interpretation of Kemalism and reject any deviation from secularism and uniculturalism. Advocates of such a program are to be found mostly in the center-left, the military and in the top levels of bureaucracy. For this group, secularism does not mean simply the separation of church and state, but the suppression of religion from the public sphere and its complete, if possible, privatization. In similar logic, minority rights are suspect tools of foreign agents who want the belittling of modern Turkey in the same way as 19th century European concern for Ottoman Christians led to the dismemberment of the empire and the treaty of Sevres. All too ready to amplify risks abroad into foreign threats, they are hard-line nationalists who define Turkey's national interest in narrow security terms and feel uncomfortable with the rapid economic liberalization of the last two decades.

On the contrary, present-day reformers, products of policies implemented by the late-president Ozal, understand the limits of Kemalism and the need for reaching a new post-Kemalist consensus—one which is better suited to a society that has developed dramatically and pluralized radically during the last half century. Kemalism served its modernizing purpose well, but in this new phase it is a “straightjacket” Turkish society can ill afford, inhibiting the full consolidation of an open, liberal and democratic polity. Reformers, most numerous among the center right, the Left and among cosmopolitan business elites of Istanbul, would like to see recent economic opening be translated into a similar political opening up. Reform-minded Turks envision constitutional reform that would bring the army back to the barracks, consolidate the

party system into two or three poles, and move it away from today's personality-based, patriarchal and clientelistic formations. Such changes would lead to the rise of mechanisms for effective and consensual governance and guarantee the rights—including cultural rights—of all citizens against an intrusive, secretive, authoritarian state. The reformers recognize Turkey's multi-cultural and multi-ethnic background, but taking pride in the country's recent successes, remain confident that Turkey has nothing to fear and much to gain from a more open, relaxed, and cooperative policy abroad. For them, national interest is not just military strength and security. They want Turkey rich in not only “hard,” “pushing” power but in “soft,” “pulling” power as well.

Turkish reality has often been conceptualized in dualities. For example, developed Western Turkey is viewed in contradistinction to backward Eastern Turkey and modernizing Kemalist Turkey is seen as the polar opposite of traditionalist Islamist Turkey. More recently, a very important antithetical relationship is being drawn between Ankara and Istanbul—that is between the state and society. This shows in the fracturing of the Kemalist body politic as described above. Outside observers—often too ready to talk of one, static and monolithic Turkey and to ignore the plurality and internal fragmentation among competing interests with different policy preferences—must take these dichotomies into account. Ankara representatives make a conservative, nationalist, and often defensive reading of Turkish foreign policy. Istanbulites, however, project the vision and assertiveness of a new Turkey that wants to be fully integrated into Europe, build economic, cultural and political bridges with all its neighbors, and project its influence across its region from the Middle East to Central Asia and the Balkans.

For this to be possible, Istanbulites need to successfully answer the question confronting all reformers: how can change be managed safely? In other words, how can they ensure that political opening will not bring a fundamentalist regime to power and while simultaneously ensuring the recognition of Kurdish rights without leading to their secession. First, reformers should have confidence in the successes of modern Turkey. They should know better than many foreigners who are all too ready to confuse Iran with Turkey and Turkey's mostly mild Islamists with religious fanatics elsewhere. They should understand that in the transitory period, it is only natural that the emancipation of civil society and the emergence of independent social agents will increase fragmentation and give rise to every kind of populism, including religious, economic and nationalist. Strong institutions should be able to withstand the populist assaults. The safest framework within which Turkey could navigate through change is Europe. The success of the structural transformation of Southern Europe in the 1970s and Central Europe in the 1990s show that Europe can provide the necessary anchor for the transition from a closed, monolithic system towards an open and pluralist one.

Many could rightly claim that it is often the army that has put a break on the nationalist adventures of populist politicians. None of the numerous Greek-Turkish crises of the last forty years occurred while Turkey was under military rule. In fact, Turkey allowed Greece to re-enter NATO's military wing only after general Evren took over power in 1980. Senior army commanders have made some of the most promising statements for the need to put an end to Greek-Turkish enmity. On the other hand, most Greeks and many foreigners believe that Turkey is aggressive because it is run militarily and the military, by its very nature, is favorable to confrontation, expansion and war.

The heavy-handedness of the Turkish military is detrimental to Greek-Turkish relations. This is not because the military itself is expansionist but because it prevents the maturation of Turkish politics. Turkish political leaders can safely defer to populist and nationalist politics (witness the Ciller premiership) without having to bear the costs of their actions since they know the military will come to their rescue. Unless political leadership emancipates itself from military guidance, it will remain prone to populism and Turkish foreign policy will continue to be hostage to nationalism.

The incompetence and confusion of the official Turkish state, the public administration and the military, in the face of the earthquake disaster of August 17, 1999, as contrasted to the comprehensive humanitarian relief provided by NGOs and foreign countries, re-ignited the state's legitimacy crisis and forcefully put into question its paternalistic authoritarianism, the so-called "baba devleti." The Greek mobilization at the state and society level to provide aid to neighboring Turkey challenged nationalist stereotypes of the Greek "enemy" that have kept the debate on Greek-Turkish relations for years hostage. Liberated from the confrontational discourse of the past, it is up to political leaders to seize the opportunity and provide for a comprehensive settlement of the Greek-Turkish dispute.

In this, the role of Europe is crucial. However, this role is not to be played in throwing its weight in favor of its member-state Greece, as many Greeks hope and Turks fear. Rather Europe should participate in securing domestic change in both countries and the victory of reformers in both sides of the Aegean.

Ultimately, Euro-Turkish relations depend on Greek-Turkish relations, as successive European Councils and President Clinton, during his November 1999 visit to Ankara and

Athens, confirmed. This, to the degree that Turkey remains interested in Europe and the need for this interest is fully appreciated by Athens, should provide the framework for a solution.

Turkish interest in Europe is not a given. It is not only the Islamists who, at times, have opposed Europe. Conservative members of the Kemalist establishment find Europe too intrusive and threatening to Turkey. They are reluctant to give up the state's mechanisms of social control and the army's prerogatives in favor of an elusive and distant European future. Their understanding of international relations as balance of power remains deeply realist and suspicious of supra-nationalist experiments.

In the mid-1990s, advocates of this position took the initiative and concluded an agreement with Israel for a comprehensive bilateral military cooperation. This agreement provoked the fierce reaction of the Arab world which saw this as a means of increasing pressure on Syria by both parties. Conservative Kemalists continue to think that a "special relationship" with the United States and Israel is a good alternative to Euro-membership. They received a boost by the EU's refusal—at Luxembourg in December 1997—to grant Turkey candidacy status. The rebuff hurt Turkish national pride and undermined the position of reformers inside Turkey. In the April 1999 elections, the nationalist left and the far right came first.

The whole episode was a good lesson for both sides: Turkey should not exaggerate its expectations for membership prior to implementing far-reaching domestic reforms and the EU should realize that it has no interest in isolating Turkey in a category of its own. In the second half of 1999, Euro-Turkish relations entered a more promising phase and Turkey and the EU

should be able to outline a roadmap for Turkey's accession in the next summit of the European Council in Helsinki in December 1999.

4. Greece: The Great Realignment-The End of Historical Polarizations and Clientelism and the Rise of “Modern” Politics

Following the Balkan debacles of the early 1990s, Greek foreign policy is currently exhibiting a growing realism and flexibility as a result of the broader modernization of the Greek political system and culture. However, despite the recent progress, much still depends on the outcome of a confrontation “between the conservative populist forces on the one hand, which represent clientelistic politics, populism, and introversion [and nationalism in foreign policy], and modernizing European forces on the other.”

Often, Greek analysts underestimate the importance of Greek domestic politics for Greek-Turkish relations. Some use international-relations theory to claim that domestic developments have no relevance to the external behavior of states. Others, while all too ready to blame every crisis on Turkish domestic politics (i.e. the political autonomy of the Turkish military and the attempt of a disintegrating Ciller administration in January 1996 to gain popularity through a hot incident in the Aegean), nevertheless refuse to look to the Greek side for factors of equal importance in improving or hampering Greek-Turkish relations.

Most of these analysts take refuge in the belief that Greece is in favor of the status quo and think that any further analysis on the Greek side is redundant. However, while the definition of the status quo remains partially undetermined (i.e. is the expansion of the territorial waters in the Aegean to 12 miles considered part of the status quo? Is the current division of Cyprus part of the status quo or not?) strategies for dealing with the Turkish threat and the broader strategy

of Greece vis-à-vis its large neighbor also remain unresolved (i.e. yes or no to Greek-Turkish dialogue, isolating or engaging Turkey etc).

This part of the report focuses on the recent political realignment in Greece and the rise of new political agendas polarized around the question of the state's role in the economy and society and the affect this development has had on Greece's relations with Turkey. The following part explores the preferences and strategies of various constituencies within Greece, including the political, business and media elites of the country, and the specific factors that facilitate or impede a Greek-Turkish rapprochement on the Greek side.

Up to the middle of the 1980s, the political identity of Greeks was the product, to a large extent, of the two great cleavages of the first half of the twentieth century and of a continuously increasing system of clientelist relations with an expanding state. The breaking of cooperation between Prime Minister Venizelos and King Constantine in 1915 divided Greeks between Venizelists and royalists and determined Greek political developments for the following thirty years. The civil war of 1946-1949 between communists and loyalists further introduced an additional polarizing factor. These conflicts produced memories, grand historical narratives and collective identities, that were repeatedly recycled and politicized younger generations. As a consequence the quality and style of Greek politics was held hostage by these divisions, especially in the countryside, up to 1989.

Loukas Tsoukalis, "Greece's Role in the Emerging European Environment," in Security in Southeastern Europe and the U.S.-Greek Relationship, ed. Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr. and Dimitris Keridis (New York: Brassey's, 1997), p. 28.

Stathis Kalyvas. "Polarization in Greek Politics: PASOK's First Four Years, 1981-1985." Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora 23: 1 (1997), 98.

The two great cleavages of the 1910s and the 1940s were the result of Greece's effort to move away from a closed, oligarchic parliamentarianism of the nineteenth century to a much more open, participatory and pluralistic political system. The integration of the rising middle classes first and the lower-middle and working classes (including the incoming refugees) later into the Greek body politic delegitimized old values, destabilized established practices, and gave rise to tensions that led to civil conflict twice in thirty years. The right (royalists first and national-minded *ethnikofrones* later) emerged as the temporary victor, preserving its control over the state apparatus in the period between 1935 and 1981 with few brief breaks in between, thanks to the division of the rival anti-right camp into liberal Venizelists and communists.

Up to the middle of the 1980s, Greek political parties (including the Communist Party) were less the expression of class struggles and interests and more the products and the carrying agents of the two great historical conflicts of 1915 and 1946-1949. Greece is a country with a weak industrial base and a small working class. The social majority is mainly composed of civil servants and the self-employed (in farming in particular). According to a recent electoral study, social class does not determine the electoral behavior of Greeks. Indeed, Greece came

The story of the rise of the communist left and the division of the Venizelist camp between liberals and socialists is brilliantly narrated by George Mavrogordatos in his masterful Stillborn Republic: Social Coalitions and Party Strategies in Greece, 1922-1936 (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1983).

Konstantinos Tsoukalas, Kratos, Koinonia, Ergasia sti Metapolemiki Ellada [State, Society, Labor in Post-War Greece], Athens: Themelio, 1987.

Spyros Takis Pappas, The Making of Party Democracy in Greece, Ph.D. Thesis, Yale University, 1995.

last in a study of sixteen countries in regard to the class determination of voting behavior. The old Popular Party was supported by both the poor and the rich. Until 1985 the same was the case for its successors— the Greek Rally, ERE (National Radical Union) and New Democracy— and their opponents—the Liberal Party of Venizelos, the Center Union and PASOK. In the 1981 elections, PASOK was voted in urban districts and the countryside, in the wealthy first district of Athens and the popular neighborhoods of Western Attica. According to George Mavrogordatos, in 1981 PASOK drew popular support equally from all social strata.

The astonishing electoral rise of PASOK in the late 1970s was based, to a great extent, on the successful unification of the two political traditions that were left out of power for fifty years—the old Venizelists and EAM's (NLF-National Liberation Front) leftists. From the moment the Communist Party refused its de-stalinization in 1968, a vacuum was created in the center-left that was easily filled by PASOK. The rejection of the center-left, euro-communist transformation of the CP within the framework of a strong post-junta EDA (Greek Democratic Left), sealed CP's electoral fate and kept its appeal to 10% of the votes. The sacrifice of electoral success for ideological purity, allowed PASOK which had no such 'ideological restraints'—to successfully appropriate the left's tradition and siphon away its votes. Already, in the 1958 elections, this constituency had given EDA an astonishing 25% of the vote.

S. Ersson, K. Janda and J.E. Lane, "Ecology of Party Strength in Western Europe: A Regional Analysis." Comparative Political Studies 18:2 (1984), 170-205.

George Mavrogordatos, "Rise of the Green Sun: The Greek Election of 1981." Occasional Paper No. 1. London: Centre of Contemporary Greek Studies, King's College, 1983.

PASOK, in other words, was the most original and successful product of the Greek political system as it was defined in the 1910s and the 1940s. Its strategy was based on a number of factors. These included ideological eclecticism, a ‘catch-all’ electoral appeal, the long tradition of populism and nationalism in Greek politics since the time of Theodore Deligiannis in the nineteenth century, and after 1981, the use and expansion of the state apparatus in the service of clientelism and favoritism on a grand national scale. Moreover, the construction of Greek collective political identities was informed by historical conflicts and cleavages and the desire of politically marginalized Greeks to see the destruction of the rightist state.

Whenever attempted, the unification of the fragmented anti-right achieved great electoral results. George Papandreou, having approached the left through a relentlessly uncompromising anti-ERE struggle in the early 1960s (the so-called *anendotos*), received 54% of the votes in 1964. In 1981 Andreas Papandreou, helped by the lack of leadership in the centrist EDIK, the internal crisis of New Democracy, the ideological isolationism of KKE and the wider radicalization of Greek society following the fall of the junta, was handsomely rewarded with 48% of the votes for the formation of an anti-right front of “democratic forces.” He was never tired of trying to further solidify this front until the end of the 1980s, through polarizing rhetoric and practice. This was done in order to weaken the left and keeping the centrist voters hostage to the PASOK camp.

The first real break with this historical tradition of ‘classless,’ ideologically eclectic, historically constructed political struggles came with the election of Constantine Mitsotakis to the leadership of New Democracy in September of 1984. Mitsotakis ‘ideologized’ New Democracy clarifying its ideological profile and ‘de-historicized’ the Greek conservatives, stepping up efforts—already initiated by Constantine Karamanlis in 1974—to turn New Democracy from the heir of royalists and national-minded anti-communists into a modern liberal European party. New Democracy could no longer electorally afford the separation of Greeks into ‘democrats’ and ‘right-wingers.’ Mitsotakis himself, a nephew of Venizelos and a former anti-right leader in the early 1960s, was never part of the right’s historical tradition. In addition,

PASOK's mismanagement of the Greek economy in the 1980s, added impetus to the demand for economic reforms that was successfully voiced by the new leadership of New Democracy.

It is very instructive to notice that PASOK reacted to the election and strategy of Mitsotakis by trying to revive old dividing lines and polarizations and strengthen the historicity of Greeks' political identities. The 1985 elections stand out as the apogee and conclusion of this attempt. Greeks were told to vote not for petty things such as the price of tomatoes and related economic issues but for the greater question of protecting the Greek-PASOK republic from the "German collaborator" and the "traitor of the 1965 defection." Andreas Papandreou used the painful memories of July 1965 to their maximum electoral potential and warned left-wingers not to repeat the mistake of 1952, when they refused to vote for liberal Plastiras and allowed conservative Papagos to win the elections. Karamanlis' election to the Presidency was sacrificed in favor of a candidate whose only "qualification" was his revivification in the clearest way possible of the old divisions among Greeks. Clientelism was coupled with historical divisions while the economy greatly suffered through generous pre-electoral hand-outs and appointments of PASOK-loyalists to the civil service.

PASOK's strategy was temporarily successful in 1985, but quickly reached its limits when New Democracy won the municipal elections of 1986 (the first elections the party had won since 1977). This was achieved through a campaign for "national reconciliation" and through KKE's abstention from the second round of voting. This abstention, moreover, proved for the first time that communist support of PASOK should not be taken for granted. During the following three years, New Democracy made "national reconciliation" the central theme of its political rhetoric. In addition, it cultivated its relations with the communist left (surrendering, for

In July 1965 Mitsotakis led the defection of one third of the Center Union deputies that brought the centrist-reformist government of George Papandreou down and opened a cycle of crises that eventually led to the 1967 collapse of Greek parliamentarism and the military's open intervention in politics.

The PASOK candidate and eventual President, Christos Sartzetakis, was a senior jurist who in the 1960s had led the investigation for the murder of Lambrakis, a deputy of EDA, against the efforts at concealment of an all encroaching rightist state.

example, the management of the newly established radio station of the City of Athens to well-known left-wing journalists) in its efforts to ‘de-historicize’ Greek political life. Mitsotakis’ strategy was completed with the unprecedented formation of the Tzanetakis coalition government (between ND and KKE) in the summer of 1989, which ended the national divisions established during the civil war and de-linked Greek political life once and for all from the traumas and prejudices of the past. The Tzanetakis government and its ecumenical successor (with the participation of PASOK) mark the end of *metapoliteysi* and the historical circle that was initiated with the 1915 cleavage. Since then, the rules of the political game have changed, and political life has been normalized, europeanized and liberated from artificial and obsolete divisions that had cast their shadows over and constrained it for decades.

Today Greek politics are dominated by the ideologically charged and class dependent, central question of the state’s role in the economy and society. Contemporary Greek politics are polarized not around the old historical divisions between a “conservative” right and a “progressive” left. Rather, they position themselves vis a vis political forces which in turn, are formulated in relation to the great economic and political changes necessitated by economic globalization, the rise of information society and the need—as George Papandreou claims of “at a deeper level, redefining [Greek] identity in the multicultural settings of Europe, the Balkans, and the Mediterranean.”

Nationalism goes hand in hand with economic protectionism and state corporatism. Greece is no exception. Having orchestrated the fall of the Mitsotakis government in September 1993, Antonis Samaras justified his action as necessary in order to prevent the imminent signing of a compromising agreement on the Macedonian issue and the privatization of the state monopoly over the telephone system. Both, he argued, threatened to surrender Greek national identity and the economy to foreigners.

George Papandreou, “Greek Politics in the 1990s,” in Pfaltzgraff and Keridis, 39.

It is important to note that the true political conflict in contemporary Greece occurs between those who insist on a large state, corporatism, economic protectionism, the narrow ethno-centric definition of Greeks' identity and the isolation of Turkey by all means and at all costs, and those who support reformist demands for the reduction and reconceptualization of the role of the state in the economy and society, the full integration of Greece into the international distribution of labor and European structures, the redefinition of Greek identity within the framework of an open, multi-cultural European society, and the supplementing of the existing policy of a strong deterrence of the Turkish threat with a new policy of engagement that would promote the European orientation of Turkey.

These two poles (which define the political confrontation in *fin-de-siecle* Greece), are not to be found among but rather within political parties. This gives rise to tensions and defections and fuels discussion around the reformulation of the Greek political party system so that it better represents the post-*metapoliteysi* reality. During the last five years both New Democracy and PASOK witnessed the defection and creation of competitive parties by former members (the Political Spring in 1993 and the Democratic Social Movement in 1996). Through such efforts, these politicians gave voice to the dissatisfaction of traditional voters towards the painful economic and social changes that New Democracy and PASOK had adopted, in response to the pressure of accelerating European integration and economic globalization. Similar protest movements should not be ruled out in the future. Even the two main parties themselves are not immune to historical regressions, as it was shown with the Evert Interregnum in New Democracy between 1993 and 1996. During this time, the party reverted to an old-fashioned statism, populism and nationalism. Often the clear cut distinction between 'modernizers' and 'nationalists' is very difficult as Theodore Pangalos' policy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs showed and which, while firmly Euro-oriented, was not free of nationalist outbursts for populist domestic consumption.

The 'ideologization' of New Democracy within the framework of European liberalism changed its electoral appeal and profile. In the period between 1985-1990, New Democracy

attracted the votes of the urban milieu, the youth and all those with a fairly high income and education level. In other words, New Democracy was voted by the most dynamic strata of Greek society who were not afraid of but demanded change. On the contrary PASOK was abandoned by the modernizing forces that had helped to bring it to power in 1981. Although its electoral appeal was reduced only slightly (to around 40%), its political appeal was limited to the least dynamic, most state-dependent social groups (i.e. farmers, civil servants, pensioners), who were the most threatened by and resistant to change. These groups continue to overwhelmingly dominate PASOK's rank and file, representing around 90% of the delegates in the last two party congresses (in June 1996 and March 1999).

However, between 1990 and 1996, PASOK succeeded fairly well in adapting to new political and economic realities, further promoting the modernization of the Greek political system. PASOK became member of the Socialist International, clarified its ideological profile, made peace with economic rationality and the Euro-Atlantic structures, and modernized its political message from the historical embodiment of political polarizations to the representative of European social-democracy in Greece. The election of Costas Simitis to succeed Andreas Papandreou in January 1996 initiated a series of developments that had been underway long before. Simitis symbolizes European normalcy as opposed to Greek exceptionalism. The 'modernization' of PASOK's political profile did not go unnoticed by voters and had significant consequences for its electoral composition. The result was the strengthening of its appeal in large urban centers and among entrepreneurial elites while diminishing its popularity among low-middle and working-class districts and in the countryside.

6. New Politics and Greek Foreign Policy: Agendas and Actors

Greek foreign policy has suffered from features that have been detrimental to Greek-Turkish relations to the degree that they make engagement and compromise difficult if not impossible. These include a general state of misinformation about Turkey, the existence of a nationalist-oriented education and public discourse, a siege mentality that exaggerates threats

but overlooks opportunities for cooperation, the conflation of minority issues with territorial claims, a superiority-inferiority syndrome, the crisis of the professional foreign service, and an overemphasis on rights rather than interests. These traits are described below with the understanding that Turkish foreign policy has suffered from similar pathologies and that, recently, Greece, under Prime Minister Simitis, has exhibited an encouraging determination to overcome them and to change the public discourse on and understanding of Turkey as a prelude to a Greek-Turkish rapprochement.

Greek policy-making elites, in their urge to integrate into the European mainstream, have often neglected their immediate region. Despite Turkey's size and importance for Greek foreign policy, Greek political, media and business elites suffer from a profound Turkish illiteracy and the reduction of a complex reality into few stereotypes (i.e. on the Turkish military, Kemalism and the role of Islam) that eventually find their way into official Greek policy.

Greece missed, for example, an opportunity between 1983 and 1988 to respond constructively to Ozal's leadership in Turkey. By the time Ozal's demonization eased and a breakthrough materialized in Davos in February 1988, both Papandreou's and Ozal's leadership was in serious trouble. At present, besides a small number of under-financed programs in Ottoman studies, there is no academic department in Greece devoted to the study of Turkey. Establishing educational projects, training new experts in Turkish affairs and shifting some of the little research conducted on Western Europe towards Turkey could help enhance Greece's knowledge of its neighbor.

Greeks are brought up within a closed, over-centralized, Helleno-centric educational system that, in its emphasis on the glory of classical Greece, neglects and often distorts the

country's recent Ottoman and post-Ottoman past. Greeks are educated to ignore the multi-ethnic background of their country and to believe in a white-washed "national history." Four centuries of Ottoman rule and political and cultural coexistence with the Turkish people are reduced to the stereotype of the "Ottoman yoke."

Often, minority issues, are not thought of as questions of human rights but are factored into geo-strategic considerations. Despite their long-standing participation in the European human rights structures (i.e. the Council of Europe), much of official Greece seems unaware of the significant evolution that occurred between 1945 and 1989 in the perception and expected treatment of minorities. This explains the ease with which Greeks, like so many other people in Southeastern Europe, conflate minority issues with issues of sovereignty and borders and quickly equate accusations of minority mistreatment with territorial claims. This conflation, historically attributed to the fluidity of Balkan borders, helps explain the traditional difficulty of Athens in accepting the mere existence of ethnic minorities in Greece and the self-designation of parts of the Muslim minority of Western Thrace as "Turkish."

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 to 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 worst and pick up insignificant “provocations” to reinforce Greeks’ 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.

The Greek state which was already overextended, overstaffed and badly mismanaged in 1974, suffered greatly by the implementation of “democratization” policies since then. Such policies have often led to the abolition of hierarchy, control and accountability of state employees and the state’s submission to a powerful ruling party-trade union alliance. Today, the Greek foreign, military and intelligence services stand unprepared to successfully fend off crises as they arise, as the Ocalan debacle in February 1999 clearly illustrates.

Finally, political discourse in Greece emphasizes Greek rights, which are thought to extend back to ancient times, rather than Greek interests, which require an appreciation of current realities and a defense using arguments and intelligent diplomacy. Viewing Greece’s relations with Turkey as a matter of justice and the repeated references to rights rather than interests, make negotiations and a bilateral give-and-take with Ankara almost impossible and, certainly, more difficult to sell to the wider public. This difficulty is evident in Greece’s reluctance to subscribe to CBMs in the Aegean out of fear of compromising its legal sovereignty. The discourse on “rights” is the product of a certain populist political culture that refuses to bear the political cost of articulating bilateral differences in terms of diverging interests and of identifying

common positions and potential convergences. Having separated declarations, demands, and historical rights from underlying interests, a compromise between the two nations in the Aegean is possible and can accommodate many of Turkey's concerns (i.e. freedom of navigation), without encompassing Greek territories in Turkish functional jurisdiction.

Political choices at home are intricately linked with choices abroad. The forces that support fiscal consolidation, the reduction of the role of the state, the opening of Greek society to its multi-cultural origins, and the internationalization of the economy are those who support the idea that Greece's credible deterrence of Turkey is important but not sufficient and should be supplemented with a new dynamic and proactive policy that claims that:

Turkey is not a monolith but a complicated and rapidly changing reality with a variety of constituencies. Some of them think of the Greek-Turkish antagonism as a missed opportunity for the cooperation of the two most powerful Balkan states to the benefit of the whole region and are willing to engage in an honest dialogue with the Greek side to this end. Turkey is experiencing a phase of rapid social, political and economic pluralization, with the opening of its economy, the proliferation of private media outlets, the further urbanization of great number of former peasants etc. During this process of seeking and achieving a new post-Kemalist equilibrium, there is a risk of destabilization and tensions may grow, but great opportunities are also being created for growing cooperation with Greece through Turkey's emerging non-state

Dimitris Keridis, "Conclusion," in Security in Southeastern Europe and the U.S.-Greek Relationship, 201. For a compromise scenario see Theodore Couloumbis and Louis Klarevas, "Prospects for Greek-Turkish Reconciliation in a Changing International Setting," in Security in Southeastern Europe and the U.S.-Greek Relationship, pp. 129-146.

economic and social agents (the market and civil society), above and beyond official government channels.

Greece has no interest in isolating its great neighbor and in excluding it from the European structures. On the contrary, Greece has only to gain from the Europeanization of Turkish society and the dissemination and further strengthening of European civic values inside Turkey. A stable, democratic and peaceful Turkey with a market double the size than of all the other Balkan countries combined and with strong cultural links with Greece (in folk culture, music, cuisine, language, mentality etc) offers the best partner for the joint construction of the new European Balkan and Near Eastern order. Within this framework, there is an urgent need for the adjustment of the Greek educational system and the broader public discourse on Turkey that would aim at identifying common spaces and similarities between the two countries rather than their differences.

Ultimately, the normalization of Greek-Turkish relations will help, if it is not the precondition, for the modernization of Greek and, to large extent, of Turkish society as well. As long as the Turkish threat, real or perceived, exists and grows, Turkophobe and nationalist supporters of introversion gain legitimacy. Furthermore, Greek defensiveness, siege mentality, and intransigence are bound to increase thus thwarting all attempts at overcoming the political culture of populism-nationalism and promoting a new Greece. The new Greece does not underestimate its failures. Having overcome its victimization syndrome, it does not undervalue its great historical success as the only successor-state of the Ottoman Empire that is a full member of the European Union that enjoys stable democratic institutions, an affluent economy, and a,

more or less, settled national question. This is in stark contrast with all of its other Balkan neighbors.

Currently, Prime Minister Costas Simitis firmly shares this strategic vision and sincerely believes in a Greek-Turkish accommodation. However, he faces two main impediments. First, he is far more reform-oriented than the mainstream of his party (and of Greek society as a whole, which seems unprepared for what such an accommodation might involve). The vast majority of PASOK's rank and file and most of the cabinet members are far more traditional in their foreign policy outlook. This, of course, does not include the hard-line nationalists of "patriotic" PASOK, who feel nostalgia for Papandreou's nationalist coronas of the 1970s and early 1980s and fiercely oppose any conciliatory move on the part of Greece vis-à-vis Turkey .

Second, Simitis is well-known for his inexperience in and fear of foreign policy issues. His administration got off to a bad start with the Imia crisis of January 1996 which almost cost him the premiership. The trauma of Imia and Simitis's inexperience generally make him reluctant to undertake a major policy initiative towards Turkey or even, to respond constructively to a Turkish initiative to end the current stalemate. Simitis has focused most of his attention and spent most of his political capital on the economy and Greece's participation in the European Monetary Union by the year 2001.

While PASOK is divided among its modernizing, patriotic and moderate wings, New Democracy, the main opposition party and the only credible governing alternative at this time, suffers from its own divisions. Since it was ousted from power in 1993, New Democracy has suffered a prolonged identity crisis, torn apart by three different trends: a modernizing Euro-

liberal minority associated with former Prime Minister Mitsotakis, a conservative “Gaullist” mainstream of cautious and reluctant reformers associated with the current Karamanlis leadership and a small but colorful and vocal populist-nationalist extreme of monarchy sympathizers. This tripartite division of New Democracy confuses its message, weakens its electoral appeal and perpetuates an internal crisis the recent victims of which were two prominent former ministers, Stephanos Manos and George Souflias, and four other deputies. The crisis of New Democracy that, unlike that of PASOK, cannot be papered over through government hand-outs, is a testimony to the shallowness of its “modernization” in the 1980s that affected parts of the top echelons but did not penetrate deep into its rank and file.

All other parties, with the exception of the newly founded Liberals of Stephanos Manos, are, to different degrees, nationalist. The Greek left in particular, comprised by the stalinist Communists (CP), the Euro-communist Coalition and the populist DIKKI, conflate “Turkish aggression” with “Turkish militarism” and “American imperialism.”

Beyond the parties, there lies the market and civil society. Since the mid-1980s a new dynamic, export-oriented private sector has emerged that has seized the “Balkan challenge” successfully and has established Greece as a prime trader and investor throughout Southeastern Europe. However, Greek-Turkish economic ties remain absurdly weak despite the proximity, size and complementary nature of the two economies. There is a promising space for cooperation in tourism, shipping, banking, energy, telecommunications, light manufacturing and steel products, but the promise remains to be fulfilled. Greek business understands the potential benefits of cooperation but, it often seems captive to its own nationalist stereotypes and reluctant to alienate the Greek public and leadership.

Developments in Greek civil society are dominated by the media explosion of the past 10 years with the end of the state monopoly in broadcasting and the proliferation of private media outlets and, TV and radio stations. The new private electronic media play a very influential role in contemporary Greek politics, setting the agenda and often recycling a distorted, nationalist discourse in pursuit of sensational stories in order to attract attention. There are few journalists who are both trained in international politics and capable of a more critical analysis of Greek-Turkish relations and they themselves are often constrained by editors and owners who are only interested in high ratings and political influence.

The one promising development in Greek civil society has been the emergence—out of the Macedonian debacle of the early 1990s—of a small constituency of scholars, journalists and political activists who, having realized the danger of nationalist mythologizing, are producing an alternative discourse on Turkey. This group, which strongly supports Prime Minister Simitis, is small but influential enough to undertake a variety of projects from critically reviewing Greek primary and secondary schooling aiming at a more open and friendly approach to neighbors (see the work of Thalia Dragona and Anna Fragoudaki) to a number of conferences, publications and articles (see the work of Nikiforos Diamandouros, Nikos Mouzelis, Loukas Tsoukalis, Stephanos Pematzoglou, Richardos Someritis and others) that aim at a Greek-Turkish understanding and eventual rapprochement.

Their discourse—emphasizing the enhanced importance of human rights in post-Cold War Europe and demanding the de-ethnicization of the Greek identity—is evident in a series of

proposed constitutional amendments for the complete separation of church and state and the full protection of minority rights. Recently their efforts bore fruit, when Athens repealed the infamous article 19 of the Citizenship Law that was used in the past to deprive members of ethnically alien minorities of their Greek citizenship and established a fairly liberal immigration policy legalizing thousands of mostly Albanian immigrants in Greece.

Overall, the obstacles to a Greek-Turkish rapprochement on the Greek side can be summarized by the following points: the continuous strength of Greek nationalist schooling, the painful memories of the destruction of the Greek community of Constantinople and the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, the hostile, populist and sensationalist media, the limited and weak economic links between Greece and Turkey that make a deterioration in relations cost-free for Greek business interests, the lack of strong political leadership with a vision larger than EMU integration, the limited political capital of the Simitis administration given the demands of domestic structural reforms, the weakening of party discipline that makes life easier for maverick backbenchers, and an overall absence of a serious, critical discourse on Turkey. What might facilitate the rapprochement is the emergence of a small anti-nationalist elite in academia, journalism, business and politics, the unsustainability of Greek-Turkish antagonism in the long-run, the demands of globalization for fiscal consolidation at home, and for a better understanding of neighbors abroad.

Greek policy towards Turkey has often been accused of being reactive rather than proactive. However, it has not been made clear, to the degree necessary, that the “defensive”

and “static” nature of Greek foreign policy is the product, to a large extent, of the Greek political system and culture. The prerequisites for the successful conception and implementation of a political strategy are long-term planning and the willingness to take risks and withstand the political cost involved in decision-making. Greek political leadership, always prone to populism, has proved many times in the past (i.e. in Cyprus or Macedonia) that it is unable to take up the responsibility to produce and implement a coherent, long-term policy. Instead it has found refuge in heroic declarations and legal formalisms with little connection to reality. A good example of this is the mishandling of the Macedonian question. Until today, the threat of the accusation of abandoning the “ancient inalienable rights of Hellenism”, has inhibited politicians from working for its resolution, although everyone recognizes that the continuing stalemate is harmful to the Greek national interest.

Today’s Greece of Maastricht realizes the cost of the Greek-Turkish antagonism for its economic convergence with Europe, for its role in the Balkans and the Mediterranean, and for the settlement of the Cyprus issue. Political will is crucial if recent progress is to yield long-lasting positive results rather than yet another episode in the Greek-Turkish feud. However, Turkey in the 1990s is a primarily military-guided democracy with unstable coalition governments that are left to use Greek-Turkish tensions for domestic consumption. In Greece, for years now, there has been an impression that Turkish aggression should be exclusively handled through military deterrence and the legalization of differences.

The Greek political elite, with few exceptions, has proved its inability to produce and implement a policy, any policy. In the 1980s, Greece refused to conduct a dialogue with

Turkey, preferring to disengage from internal Turkish developments. Greece can no longer afford such luxury. Greece should be present and try to positively influence, to the degree it can, the great changes and realignments that Turkey is presently experiencing.

International law is the safest guide for a settlement of the Greek-Turkish dispute. However, the Greek leaders should stop taking refuge in legalisms and displacing all responsibility for a settlement to third parties, be it the International Court of Justice, Europe or the United States. Both the multiple political facets of the Greek-Turkish relationship as well as the political use of international law make the existing Greek strategy insufficient.

Greek political leaders have some (perhaps more than they think) room for maneuver if they decide to take advantage of it. The modernization of the Greek political system and its democratic culture means first and foremost the ability to produce and effectively implement policies. In this sense, Turkey remains Greece's great challenge.

7. Conclusion

During the last years an international consensus has emerged according to which Greek-Turkish rivalry is detrimental to the stability of Southeastern Europe and the cohesion of NATO. In the absence of an all-encompassing Soviet threat to dampen intra-alliance tensions and in the presence of proliferating regional sources of conflict, the settlement of Greek-Turkish differences has become a priority. This settlement is supported by the modernization of the Greek and Turkish polities as they struggle to adjust to globalization, increased economic competition and the devolution of state sovereignty to new supra and sub-national agents.

For Turkey the challenge is summarized in the question of how to democratize the republic. This means civilian control of the military, respect for human and minority rights, and the peaceful resolution of bilateral disputes. For Greece the challenge is to consolidate recent progress and move further towards a tolerant, civic-minded and prosperous society fully integrated into Europe.

In this process, the European Union can be the catalyst. Despite the weakness of its Common Foreign and Security Policy, Europe is helping the structural transformation of Greece and Turkey through expanding trade, political, social and educational networks. It is in Europe's interest to remain engaged and invest the necessary resources for Greek-Turkish detente.

Turkey is a pivotal state in Europe's periphery. Its Europeanization is a Western strategic interest. The US and the EU agree on this although they often appear to disagree on how to bring this about. The US is more interested in the strategic value of the country and has developed close relations with the Turkish military through NATO. The EU is more concerned with Turkey's domestic situation, since it will be the one to suffer the consequences of a possible premature accession of Turkey to the EU. Having agreed on the broader strategic goal, the US and the EU should be able to coordinate their efforts and use their considerable resources efficiently to achieve this.

The time may come when Greek-Turkish détente is turned into an entente and the two countries take full advantage of all potential synergies in economic, political and cultural cooperation for their own benefit and for the benefit of the whole region.