
Article:
Karamouzi, E. and Chourchoulis, D. (2019) Troublemaker or Peacemaker? Andreas Papandreou, the Euromissile Crisis and the policy of peace, 1981-1986. Cold War History, 19 (1). pp. 39-61. ISSN: 1468-2745

https://doi.org/10.1080/14682745.2018.1497014

Troublemaker or Peacemaker? Andreas Papandreou, the Euromissile Crisis and the policy of peace, 1981-1986

Introduction

'On the balcony, the primary soapbox of the Greek politician, his manner and his speech are transformed. He plants his feet in the stance of a prizefighter and slices the air with his hands, his heavy eyebrows drawing together, his voice mocking and indignant in turn. His rhetoric loses the careful moderation of his private conversation and crystallizes into slogans that touch Greek passions and are scrawled on walls all over the country: "Greece for Greeks, Out of NATO, Change"'.[1] Commenting on Andreas Papandreou and his party's (PASOK) 'short march to power' in October 1981, the British drew attention to the appeal of his theatrical tone and the mercurial sentimentality that seemed to beset his rhetoric.

Preoccupation with the tone and substance of his declarations was not restricted to foreign observers but also Greek contemporaries and scholars of all political hues who struggled to decipher his words and respond to the lingering question of what *really* drove his policies and what these policies actually were in practice.[2] In particular, Andreas Papandreou as a figure in Greek foreign policy has received wide coverage, and along with it, a variety of interpretative frameworks. In popular imagination, he is remembered as a maverick, but scholars have struggled to understand how genuine or effective was this policy of dissent, or notoriously dubbed 'troublemaking'.[3] In assessing Papandreou's foreign policy, Theodore Couloumbis had suggested to differentiate between core and peripheral issues to bridge the gap in the literature that debates whether Papandreou's

---

[1] Wilson (FCO) to Sutherland (Athens), 5 February 1982, The National Archives (hereafter: TNA), Foreign and Commonwealth Office (hereafter: FCO) 9/3516.
[2] Michalis Spourdalakis, *The Rise of the Greek Socialist Party* (London & New York: Routledge, 1988).
[3] Richard Clogg (ed.), *Greece, 1981-89: The Populist Decade* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993).

foreign policy marked a radical rupture from the past or was in fact the continuation of past practices.[4]

However, this article's empirical research shifts the focus from such divisions and classifications and instead proposes that Andreas Papandreou attempted to combine and consciously fuse together different foreign policy fronts into what he dubbed the 'policy of peace'. Papandreou's rise to power coincided with heightened Cold War tensions of the 1980s and the unfolding of the Euromissile crises that saw deep controversy across Europe over the proposed deployment of a new generation of delivery nuclear systems in both East and West.[5] Against this background, peace politics either at elite or public opinion level tended to refer to nuclear and anti-nuclear politics, but it also became a shorthand for 'communicative and symbolic debates and contestations about the shape, form and order of the political'.[6] Peace mobilisation transformed political participation and aided in the emergence of both a national and transnational civil society.[7] Across Europe, the fear of nuclear annihilation and the question of nuclear weapons was 'imagined' and interpreted in different ways by politicians and activists.[8]

In Greece, Papandreou tapped into these diverse peace discourses and framed the policy of peace in ardent nationalist terms while subscribing an international cause. The scope of the policy of peace was not solely restricted to discussion of nuclear armaments but involved the renegotiation of the American

---

[4] Theodore A. Couloumbis, 'PASOK's Foreign Policies, 1981-89: Continuity or Change?', in Clogg, Richard (ed.), *Greece 1981-89: The Populist Decade*, 120; Van Coufoudakis, 'Greek Foreign Policy Since 1974: Quest for Independence', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 6:1 (1988), 61-62 [55-78].

[5] Leopoldo Nuti, Frederic Bozo, Marie-Pierre Rey and Bernd Rother (eds.), *The Euromissile Crisis and the End of the Cold War* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Centre Press; California, Stanford University Press, 2015).

[6] Holger Nehring and Helge Pharo, 'Introduction: A Peaceful Europe? Negotiating Peace in the Twentieth Century', *Contemporary European History*, 17:3 (2008), 278

[7] Kathrin Fahlenbrach, Martin Klimke & Joachim Scharloth (eds.), Protest Cultures: A Companion (New York: Berghahn books, 2016)

[8] Matthew Grant and Benjamin Ziemann (eds.), *Understanding the imaginary war. Culture, thought and nuclear conflict* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

bases on Greek soil, relations with NATO, Balkan regional schemes for nuclear weapons free zones and international initiatives with the Third World.[9] But mostly it was framed as the struggle against the *perceived* and *real* Turkish threat and the alleged American favouritism towards the latter. As a NATO document noted, '[Greek] people are made to believe that the struggle for peace and disarmament is at the same time a national struggle for Greece and vice versa'.[10] It also had a relevant domestic angle with the active involvement of Papandreou himself in the often neglected, albeit dynamic, Greek peace movement. Actually, Greece was an interesting case of peace mobilisation where 'antinuclear attitudes were widespread in Greece from the grassroots to the highest levels of power'.[11]

To understand therefore the idiosyncrasies and complexities of the Greek policy of peace it is vital to demonstrate the multifaceted interaction between various dimensions of the governmental policy-making, long-term developments in political culture and its relation to the national peace movement activism. Recognising the perils of subscribing to a great man theory framework, the article will nonetheless concentrate on Andreas Papandreou as our archival research and the consensus in the literature point to the centrality of PASOK's leader in masterminding, implementing and legitimising the country's major foreign policy decisions.[12] The analysis will be situated against the unfolding drama of the Euromissile crisis, as well as the specific historical and cultural peculiarities that dictated foreign policy priorities, ranging from the Turkish threat to the recognition of the peripheral status of a junior actor such as Greece.

---

[9] The relationship with EEC and NATO has received the lion's share of scholarly attention but a very important aspect has been neglected, that of nuclear politics.
[10] Note by the Secretary General, Brussels, 29 January 1982, NATO Archives, C-M(82)4.
[11] Lawrence S. Wittner, *The Struggle Against the Bomb. Towards Nuclear Abolition. A History of the World Nuclear Disarmament Movement. 1971 to Present* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 163.
[12] Kevin Featherstone and Dimitris Papadimitriou, *Prime Ministers in Greece. The Paradox of Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 79, 83; John O. Iatrides, 'Beneath the Sound and the Fury: US Relations with the PASOK Government', in Richard Clogg (ed.), *Greece, 1981-89: The Populist Decade* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993), 154-166; Lykourgos Kourkouvelas, 'Monitoring the rise of a radical force: the British Embassy in Athens and the Ascent of the Greek Panhellenic Socialist Movement, 1974-1981', *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 17:3 (2017), 485-503.

Original material from the FCO, Reagan Library, the CIA, Mitterrand and NATO archives as well as the international and domestic press illustrate the international and national developments that influenced Greece's peace policy. The analysis compensates for the scarcity of Greek official governmental records during this period by using the Karamanlis archives, selected files from the Amalia Fleming archive as well as national newspapers and the Greek parliament debates to shed light on the semantic context of the policy, as it developed, within the Greek society.

The piece will enrich the understanding of Greek foreign policy with fresh archival research that illuminates some of its neglected dimensions while paying due attention to the reaction of Greece's major allies. Moreover, the globalised interpretation will offer new ways of thinking of possible margins of manoeuvres available to small states operating within Cold War dynamics. The recent declassification of archival material pertaining to the Euromissiles crisis and the ensuing (re)surge of peace mobilisation and peace policies have attracted the attention of historians with a particular focus on the western European countries that planned to install 'the Euromissiles'.[13] In contrast, Greece and Southern Europe, in general, is still terra incognita.[14] Examining Greece's policy of peace will add an important piece to the complicated puzzle of the Euromissile crisis as well as the country's turbulent 1980s.

The Advent of PASOK and its relation to NATO during the Euromissile years

[13] The most recent examples: Special issue on German Politics & Society 33:4 (2015); Holger Nehring & Benjamin Ziemann, 'Do All Paths Leads to Moscow? The NATO dual track decision and the peace movements- a critique', *Cold War History* 12:1 (2012), 1-24; Eckart Conze, Martin Klimke, Jeremy Varon (eds.), *Nuclear Threats, Nuclear Fear and the Cold War of the 1980s* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

[14] An exception is Leopoldo Nuti, "Me too, please': Italy and the politics of nuclear weapons, 1945–1975", *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 4:1 (1993), 114-148;

The possible introduction of the neutron bomb and the 1979 NATO's 'dual track' decision not only aggravated the fear of 'limited nuclear war' in Europe, but, significantly, along with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, dealt the *coup de grâce* to the spirit of superpower détente.[15] NATO's 'dual-track' decision of 12 December 1979 provided for the deployment of advanced, new generation long-range theatre nuclear Forces (LRTNF): 108 US Pershing II launchers and 464 US Gryphon ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCM). In addition, the alliance made an offer to Kremlin on negotiations on the scale of NATO's LRTNF, if the USSR reduced its recently deployed and still expanding new generation INF (Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces), the SS-20s. The decision was a product of very long and complex intra-allied negotiation process, where West European political and military policymakers and officials initially took the lead to persuade the United States to respond firmly to Soviet nuclear initiatives.[16]

As NATO adopted the 'dual track' decision in December 1979, the conservative Karamanlis government that led the country's smooth democratization process following the fall of the junta in the summer of 1974 and had successfully concluded negotiations to enter the EEC as a full member in May 1979,[17] was preoccupied with negotiating Greece's full return to the alliance's integrated command structure.[18] In August 1974, rapidly growing anti-Americanism and the humiliating consequences of the recent double Turkish

---

[15] Lawrence Freedman, 'Note of the month: The neutron bomb returns", *World Today* 37/3 (1981), 81-87. A variety of factors explain the fall of détente during the late 1970s. See for more, Raymond Garthoff, *Detente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1985); Jussi M. Hanhimäki, *The Rise and Fall of Détente: American Foreign Policy and the Transformation of the Cold War* (Washington, DC: Potomac Books 2013); also, Olav Njølstad, 'The Collapse of Superpower Détente, 1975-1980', in Leffler, Melvyn and Westad, Arne (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War* (vol. 3) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 135-55.

[16] Kristina Spohr Readman, 'Conflict and Cooperation in Intra-Alliance Nuclear Politics: Western Europe, the United States, and the Genesis of NATO's Dual Track Decision, 1977-1979', *Journal of Cold War Studies* 13/2 (2011), pp. 41-3.

[17] Eirini Karamouzi, *Greece, the EEC and the Cold War: The Second Enlargement* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

[18] Dionysios Chourchoulis and Lykourgos Kourkouvelas, 'Greek perceptions of NATO during the Cold War', *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 12:4 (2012), 507.

invasion in Cyprus pressured the newly installed government in Athens to act.[19] Greek Defence Minister Evangelos Averoff, the military leadership, and, eventually, Prime Minister Konstantinos Karamanlis, all concluded that war against Turkey would be a highly dangerous option, as the seven years of the *junta* had left the Greek armed forces in a fragile state.[20] Instead of war, on 14 August 1974 Karamanlis announced the country's withdrawal from NATO's integrated military structure and requested renegotiations on the future of US bases on Greek soil.[21]

However, Greece did not withdraw from NATO's Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) and the Americans did not remove the nuclear warheads deployed there.[22] Within NPG, therefore, the Karamanlis government supported NATO's 'dual track' decision, partly because it genuinely believed that the nuclear balance in Europe had been shaken due to the deployment of the SS-20, but also because no Cruise or Pershing II missiles – or in fact any additional nuclear warheads and delivery systems – were about to be deployed on Greek territory. However, it is clear that Karamanlis also believed that the West should seek to alleviate excessive Soviet fears, reduce tensions and distrust, and seek a stable equilibrium regarding both nuclear and conventional forces of the two blocs. [23]

At the same time, PASOK, under the leadership of Andreas Papandreou, had become the main opposition party following the elections of November 1977.

---

[19] Ivan-Andre Slengesol, 'A Bad Show? The United States and the 1974 Cyprus Crisis', *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 22: 2 (2000), 96-129; Konstantina Botsiou, 'Anti-Americanism in Greece', in *Anti-Americanism: History, Causes and Themes*, ed. Brendon O'Connor, vol. 3 (Oxford, Westport, CT, 2007), 213-345.

[20] Estimate of Turkish military capabilities on Cyprus, 13 August 1974, CIA Records Search Tool (CREST), CIA-RDP79B01737A00210008000-1; Constantinos Svolopoulos (ed.), *Constantinos Karamanlis: Archives, Event and Texts* [in Greek], vol.8 (Athens, 1997) (hereafter *Karamanlis*), 84-88.

[21] John Iatrides, 'Challenging the Limitations of the Atlantic Community. Konstantinos Karamanlis and NATO', in Svolopoulos, Konstantinos et al (eds.), *Konstantinos Karamanlis in the Twentieth Century* (vol. 2) (Athens: Karamanlis Foundation: 2008), 17- 36.

[22] MoD draft reply to Lord Jenkins question, 10-15 December 1981, TNA/FCO 46/2761. Also, Leslie Gelb, 'U.S.S Weighs Status of Nuclear Warheads in Greece', *The New York Times*, 11 September 1974, and Claudia Wright, 'The U.S., Greece and A-Arms', *The New York Times*, 27 February 1981.

[23] Karamanlis' response to Brezhnev, 29 November 1979, Konstantinos Karamanlis Foundation (hereafter: KKF), Konstantinos Karamanlis Archives (hereafter: KKA), File 57B; Note on conversation between Karamanlis and Italian Prime Minister Francesco Cossiga, 25 October 1979, KKF/KKA, File 52B.

PASOK's electoral rise had caused much apprehension to US analysts and officials, some of them even fearing that 'by the time the first Carter Administration completes its term, Greece could be a disaster area again'.[24] In foreign policy, PASOK had stood at first for non-alignment based on hostility to Turkey, distrust of the USA, rejection of Greece's identification with the West, support for Mediterranean socialist grouping and for closer links with the Arab world and with Greece's northern neighbours in the Balkans.[25] Since 1977 Papandreou had started, however, to moderate his rhetoric on his foreign policy goals.[26] He had understood that his party would have to shift its foreign policy declarations to attract as much of the rapidly increasing lower-middle-class voters while also reassuring the Greek establishment – including the military.[27] But even in 1981, during the long election campaign, he was still promising to pull Greece out of NATO (which Greece had finally rejoined NATO as a full member in October 1980)[28], to close the US bases in the country (although this would require US-Greek negotiations and an unspecified amount of time), to remove US nuclear warheads from Greek territory and to hold a referendum regarding Greece's membership of the EEC.[29]

Papandreou exploited deeply held popular frustration at what had been seen as Greece's subservience to the West, and particularly the United States, as well as Karamanlis' conservative party's (New Democracy) perceived failure to curb

---

[24] Memo by Henze to Brzezinski on Greek Election Outcome, 21 November 1977, Declassified Documents Reference System (DDRS), doc. CK3100483060.
[25] See, for instance, PASOK's Founding Declaration of 3rd September 1974; Andreas Papandreou, *Greece to the Greeks* [in Greek] (Athens: Karanassis, 1976). For the rise of Andreas Papandreou on the political scene, read the seminal work of Stan Draenos, *Andreas Papandreou. The Making of a Greek Democrat and Political Maverick* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2012); and Takis Pappas, *The charismatic party: PASOK, Papandreou, Power* [in Greek] (Athens: Patakis, 2009), 63-184.
[26] Stearns (Athens) to State Department, 14 January 1982, Ronald Reagan Presidential Library (RRPL), Staff Member and Office File collections (hereafter: SMOF), Executive Secretariat, NSC, Box 15.
[27] Couloumbis, 'PASOK's Foreign Policies', 117-118.
[28] Stefan Maximilian Brenner, *Die NATO im griechisch-türkischen Konflikt 1954 bis 1989* (Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter, 2017), 258-264.
[29] PASOK Publications, *Socialist Party Manifesto – Contract with the People* [in Greek], (Athens, 1981), pp. 31-37.

foreign influence and make Greece's voice heard properly on the world stage.[30] Diverse cultural, political and ideological factors determined anti-Americanism during the post-war years, but what was different in the post-junta period was that the phenomenon ceased to be solely the playing field of the Left.[31] To some extent, the Right also distanced itself from its post-civil war attitudes 'as an element of patriotism' in the political climate of the 'post-junta period', which discredited the American influence. Anti-Americanism therefore, to a degree transformed into a factor of national unity that superseded the Cold War consensus of the pre-junta years and offered a fertile ground for Andreas Papandreou's ideas and policies.[32]

When PASOK eventually won the general election on 18 October 1981, even US policymakers and intelligence officials appeared rather relieved that the Greek Socialists had secured a clear mandate to govern, thus hopefully assuring governmental stability and encouraging moderation. They assessed that the Greek prime minister would 'try to strike a more independent pose in foreign affairs', but that he would move cautiously in his relations with NATO and the United States. The removal of US nuclear weapons seemed probable, and, according to the Americans, Papandreou was likely to 'follow the earliest Gaullist practice of limiting military cooperation in NATO and stressing NATO's political role'.[33] However, American and West European officials acknowledged that the future course of Greek foreign policy under Papandreou was a bit of a mystery.[34] Even the Reagan administration (especially the State Department), which was extremely concerned about Papandreou's medium-term intentions, was 'ready to do business

---

[30] Rhodes (Athens) to Synnott (FCO), 18 December 1984, TNA/FCO 9/4657. Also, Kostas Simitis, *Courses of Life* [in Greek] (Athens: Polis, 2015), 286.

[31] Quoted in Konstantina E. Botsiou, 'The Interface Between Politics and Culture in Greece', in Stephan, Alexandre (ed.), *The Americanization of Europe. Culture, Diplomacy and Anti-Americanism after 1945* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2006), 280.

[32] Zinovia Lialiouti, 'Greek Cold War anti-Americanism in Perspective, 1947-1989', *Journal of Transatlantic studies*, 13:1 (2015), 47.

[33] Memorandum on Monthly Warning Assessment: Western Europe, 23 October 1981, CREST, CIA-RDP83B01027R00050024-7.

[34] Preparation for Papandreou's visit to France on 25 November 1981, "Dejeuner a l'Elysée"; Note Pour Le President De La Republique" from Hubert Vendrine, Mitterrand Archives, AG/5(4)/CD/270, Dossier 5

with the new government in Athens, to respond to reasonable requests and to see Greece remain in the alliance', while it did not expect to be confronted with abrupt Greek demands.[35]

Those estimates proved accurate. In the aftermath of PASOK's landslide victory, the new prime minister and his government were stuck between a rock and a hard place. The post-1974 populist and nationalist rhetoric had significantly nurtured anti-American sentiment which had already permeated the majority of the Greek people.[36] Papandreou and his associates genuinely wished to break free from Greece's Cold War commitments and during the 1980s remained highly critical of the policies and Cold War rhetoric of the Reagan administration. The Greeks were also annoyed at the professed insensitiveness of Washington to the pride and particular needs of its smallest allies, such as Greece.[37] Furthermore, during his stay in the United States, Papandreou himself had been a Left Liberal who resented 'neo-conservative' US-style capitalism and Washington's policies around the world.[38] However, Greek security interests required that the relationship between Greece and the United States (and NATO) not be fundamentally altered in the short to medium term. Papandreou and his ministers, like their conservative predecessors, became painfully aware that Greece could not afford either to withdraw from NATO or to break its relations with the US for one overriding factor: Turkey. The Turkish threat not only dictated the country's foreign policy direction and considerable resources to defence; it also loomed large in the Greek public imagination.[39] According to Mitterrand's advisor Jean-Michel Gaillard: 'more than ever, the actions of neighbour Turkey in the region determines the foreign policy of Greece. Devoting 6.7% of its GDP to its defence, it cannot go

---

[35] Henderson (Washington) to FCO, 26 November 1981, FCO 46/2761.
[36] Mavrogordatos, G. et al. (1991) 'The Political Culture of Southern Europe: A Four Nation Study', *GESIS Data Archive, Cologne*.
[37] Iatrides, 'Beneath the Sound and the Fury', 155-158.
[38] Georgios Papoulias, *Essays on Diplomacy and Politics* [in Greek] (Athens: Benaki Museum, 2012), 138.
[39] For a very accurate analysis and prediction of PASOK's foreign and defence policy, see CREST, Special analysis by K. Hochstein on: Papandreou's Foreign Policy, 13 January 1982, CIA-RDP84T00301R0001000100-39-4.

further or face north and east simultaneously'.[40] In fact, Papandreou had repeatedly made clear that Turkey, and not the USSR or the Soviet bloc, was viewed as the main foe: 'We really have a unique problem in Greece, which really you do not meet in any other country, member of the alliance. We sense a threat from an ally on our east, Turkey'. He pointed out that NATO was offering a guarantee against a Soviet bloc attack from the north, even if 'there is no visible threat', but what Greece needed and wanted was 'a guarantee on our eastern frontiers'.[41]

When Andreas Papandreou presented his Government Program to the Parliament on 22 November 1981, he implied that Greece might again withdraw from NATO's integrated command structure, as long as the alliance did not guarantee Greece's eastern borders. However, no explicit threat or implicit hint to pull out of NATO altogether was aired. In fact, he went on to carefully admit that 'the course of Change will be a long process' and that, with regard to the readjustment of Greek national security and foreign policy, 'the government will move on gradually, step by step, always taking into consideration all facts, in order to secure the necessary military preparedness and might'.[42]

Thus, the PASOK government's short term foreign policy remained vague.[43] So how would that 'Change' happen gradually? The answer was given to a reply to President Reagan's letter of congratulations where Papandreou stressed that one of Greece's 'first duties' would be the 'strengthening of these [US-Greek] ties in the interests of democracy, progress, and peace'.[44] Such strengthening entailed ways to fortify Greece's defences against the Turkish threat but not to the extent that it threatened notions of peace and independence. In a rather

---

[40] Briefing Note for Mitterrand from Jean-Michel Gaillard, Paris, 22 November 1983, AG/5(4)/CD/270, Dossier 7.
[41] Bernard Gwertzman, 'Greece's leader Eases His Stand on U.S. Bases', *The New York Times*, 26 October 1981.
[42] Hellenic Parliament Library (hereafter: HPL), *Parliament Debates*, Third Period, First Session, 22 November 1981, 15-16; also, Marvine Howe, 'Greeks Are Told Timetable Is Due to Oust U.S. Bases', *The New York Times*, 23 November 1981.
[43] 'Mr Papambiguous', *The Economist*, 28 November 1981.
[44] 'Papandreou softens Washington anxiety', *The Guardian*, 21 October 1981.

contradictory manner, Papandreou was rejecting the Cold War straitjacket as it was imposed by the Americans whilst at the same time he was willing to recruit their help in pursuit of the ultimate national interest, namely protection from Turkey. For him, both heightened Cold War tensions and Turkish aggressiveness posed a threat to peace. Echoing this sentiment, in mid-January 1982 Papandreou held a private meeting with the US ambassador in Athens, Monteagle Stearns, where he stated that Greece wanted to remain in the Western alliance and that 'the form of Greece's association with NATO was to be negotiated but not the fact'. When Stearns responded that this position was different from that of the PASOK programme, Papandreou denied this, saying that 'the PASOK program tried to define ultimate objectives rather than objectives that could be realized in short terms' [sic].[45] When pressured by journalist David Tonge in *The Times* for his first interview after his election, he framed his 'coming to terms with reality' with the following statement: 'As a socialist movement we believe genuinely in détente and disarmament and we are not prepared to accept as permanent arrangements the existence of the two blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact. But the fundamental question for us is Greek national interest. It is this and current practical politics- not ultimate goals, targets and visions - which we put before the Atlantic Alliance'.[46]

No wonder therefore that in their first NATO's Defence Planning Committee (DPC) on 9 December 1981, the Greek socialists blocked NATO's defence ministers from issuing a communique on their two-day meeting, highlighting the lack of a satisfactory statement guaranteeing Greek integrity against Turkish aggression.[47] NATO officials evaluated this action as the product of Greek domestic politics rather than an increased threat to the country's

---

[45] Stearns (Athens) to State Department, Athens, 14 January 82, RRPL, SMOF, Executive Secretariat, NSC, Box 15.
[46] David Tonge, 'Idealist Papandreou comes to terms with reality', *The Times,* 24 February 1982.
[47] Ioannis Charalampopoulos, *Critical Years: Fights for Democracy (1936-1996)* [in Greek] (Athens: Proskinio, 2000),

continued participation in the organization's military command structure. They also acknowledged that the Greek action was a 'sorry step' that hurt NATO's public image more than it harmed its actual functioning.[48] The following day Papandreou announced that Greece was proceeding to limit its military commitments within NATO (supposedly beginning to disengage from Atlantic alliance commitments) and that the Hellenic Armed Forces would be used only in accordance with the national interests to face a possible Turkish threat, rather than an aggression from Warsaw Pact members. He nevertheless made it clear that he was not aiming to pull Greece out of the alliance; instead, he was embarking on an effort to obtain more advantageous terms within it.[49]

Papandreou's tough strategy at the DPC paid dividends domestically, as he and PASOK won considerable support in Greece. The Greek public felt that the country had a leader who was standing up for Greek national interests.[50] Papandreou himself declared, while addressing PASOK MPs on 11 February 1982, that 'over the last three and a half months Greece had made her presence felt in Europe and the Mediterranean'.[51] Indeed, by that time the PASOK government had also distanced itself from its allies by withholding full support for NATO's declaration on Poland, thus initiating the practice of "footnoting" official NATO documents as a means to express its disagreement with various aspects of allied policy (most notably those pertaining nuclear strategy).[52] According to Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs, Carolos Papoulias, the Greek government was trying to follow 'a policy independent of the two superpowers and would not

---

[48] John Vinocur, 'Greece Obstructs a NATO Communique', *The New York Times*, 10 December 1981.
[49] 'Greece Limits Its NATO Role', *The New York Times*, 11 December 1981.
[50] George Coats, "Papandreou's strategy wins support at home", *The Guardian*, 11 December 1981. See also the editorial comment of the leftist (non-communist) periodical *Anti*, vol.194, 11 December 1981.
[51] Athens Embassy to FCO, Letter on PASOK's First Four Months, 16 February 1982, FCO 9/3516.
[52] Effie Pedaliu, '"Footnotes" as an Expression of Distrust? The United States and the NATO "Flanks" in the Last Two Decades of the Cold War', in Martin Klimke et al. (eds.), Trust, but Verify: The Politics of Uncertainty and the Transformation of the Cold War Order, 1969-1991, (Washington D.C. & Stanford, CA, Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Stanford University Press, 2016), 237-258

participate in a campaign led by the United States'.[53] Papandreou himself argued that his government wished to ease the increasing Cold War tension between East and West. Moreover, Greece was a small European country which could not risk taking part in sanctions that might bring upon it unbearable countermeasures from the Soviet bloc.[54] After all, it had been the US administration which had imposed unilaterally economic sanctions against Poland and the Soviet Union after the imposition of martial law in Poland while pressing its West European allies to follow suit.[55]

Soon Athens voiced doubts about important principles of NATO's negotiating position, such as the Alliance's global approach to limiting INF and the exclusion of French and UK nuclear forces from the negotiations with the USSR. For example, on 18 March 1982 Papandreou differentiated from a recent NATO decision and publicly endorsed a Soviet proposal put forward by Leonid Brezhnev to cancel (or at least postpone) the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles west of the Ural Mountains; most importantly, he adopted the Soviet view which called for the inclusion of UK and French nuclear forces in any future East-West negotiations on nuclear disarmament.[56] This was a tactless act which infuriated the UK and French governments, who considered it highly inappropriate for the Greek leader to raise the issue of their nuclear capacity.[57] Soon, the Greek government also 'reserved its position', that the preparation for the deployment of the Pershing II and Cruise should *not* proceed as scheduled, when the NATO DPC

---

[53] *I Kathimerini*, 13 January 1982.
[54] Greece Is Said to Tie Stand On Poland to Other Issues', *The New York Times*, 13 January 1982.
[55] Andrea Chiampan, "Those European Chicken Littles': Reagan, NATO, and the Polish Crisis, 1981–2', *The International History Review* 37/4 (2015), 682-699.
[56] Gozney (Mod) to FCO, 17 August 1983, FCO 9/4080; also, *Ta Nea*, 19 March 1982. The Greek Communists considered the acceptance of Brezhnev's proposal as "positive": see *Ta Nea*, 29 March 1982.
[57] 'Britain and France Protest Greek Missile View', *The New York Times*, 4 April 1982. Nikos Katapodis, *Scattered papers of my diplomatic life* [in Greek] (Athens: Potamos 2004), 106. In December 1981 NATO had decided that the British and the French nuclear forces were independent and were constituting a strategic deterrent; hence they could not be included in any disarmament talks between the United States and the Soviet Union or in the negotiations regarding the future of the medium-range missiles in Europe.

issued its final press communique on 7 May 1982 which stated that '[…] the schedule for this deployment has to be maintained'.[58]

During his policy of dissent, however, the Papandreou government quietly dropped the issue of the unilateral removal of US nuclear warheads from Greece. Such an initiative would have indeed constituted a direct challenge to US and NATO strategy and prestige and might have some adverse consequences on the balance of forces in the Balkans. On the contrary, Papandreou favoured and toyed with the idea of regional denuclearization, which, as analyzed later on, was a remote prospect. Thus, no matter how much irritating his initiatives might appear to the West, he was able to project himself and his country as sincere advocates of peace and as independent actors, without essentially risking an actual confrontation with his NATO allies.

The US Bases and the Greek peace movements

Since 1953, Greece hosted four US bases and several other facilities. While no intermediate-range ballistic missiles (IRBMs) were installed there in the aftermath of Sputnik (largely because of the strong reaction of the pacifist movement and the sobering effects of the Cyprus dispute), in 1957 the Karamanlis government decided to accept the deployment of *Honest John* short-range rockets as well as other tactical nuclear weapons.[59] In the following year, an agreement with the USA was signed for the storage of tactical nuclear warheads under the dual-key system that presupposed the consent of both parties for the use of nuclear weapons.[60] After the fall of the Greek junta and despite the crisis in US-Greek relations and

[58] NATO/M-DPC-1(82)11, Final Communique, 7 May 1982.
[59] Evanthis Hatzivassiliou, *Greece and the Cold War. Frontline state, 1952-1967* (London and New York, Routledge: 2006), 94; Dionysios Chourchoulis, *The Southern Flank of NATO 1951-1959: Military Strategy or Political Stabilization* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2014), 209-213.
[60] Ioannis Stefanidis, *Unequal partners: Greece and the United States in the Cold War* [in Greek] (Athens: Patakis, 2002), 184-188.

Greece's withdrawal from NATO's integrated military command, the US bases and nuclear warheads were not removed from Greek territory.

Since then, the debate over the presence of these bases and control of nuclear weapons in Greece made headlines from time to time. In February 1975, despite opposition from the Ford administration, the US Congress imposed an arms embargo on Turkey, mainly as a means to press the latter to make concessions for a settlement in Cyprus. This angered Turkey, which suspended the operation of several US facilities and demanded the repeal of the arms embargo. In March 1976, the US and Turkish governments reached a four-year agreement to improve bilateral military cooperation. According to the new Defence Cooperation Agreement (DCA), the United States would provide 1 billion in military aid to Turkey divided in annual instalments, a significant step for repeal of the Congress-imposed embargo. As a response, Greece demanded that any future US-Greek base agreement should entail similar provisions and that US military aid to Greece should be adequate enough to enable the latter preserve the balance of power in the Aegean.[61]

On 15 April 1976, the then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Greece's Foreign Minister, Dimitris Bitsios, signed an agreement committing both sides to Greek sovereignty and military command of the four US bases: Souda Bay naval base on Crete that could anchor the whole Sixth Fleet; the Hellenicon Air Base; Nea Marki and Heraklion Communication installation base. Operation by US forces were allowed 'to serve only the purposes' authorized by Greece. This agreement was part of a package deal for a new defence cooperation agreement with the USA (DCA)- which, however, was never ratified by the conservative ND governments.[62] By 1977, the main tenets of the US-Greek agreement were

---

[61] Theodore Couloumbis, *The United States, Greece and Turkey: The Troubled Triangle* (New York: Praeger, 1983), 142-144; Sotiris Rizas, 'Managing a conflict between allies: United States policy towards Greece and Turkey in relation to the Aegean dispute, 1974–76', Cold War History 9/3 (2009), 367-387

[62] Kyriakos Mitsotakis, *The Clashing Rocks of foreign policy. Internal and international pressures on Greek-American negotiation on the bases, 1974-1985* [in Greek] (Athens: Patakis, 2006), pp. 88-89.

established, according to which Greece would be entitled to 700 million dollars in military aid spread over four years (that is, 70 per cent of the amount appropriated for Turkey). This signified, at least *de facto*, the establishment of a 7:10 ratio which determined in subsequent years the level of US military aid for Greece with relation to Turkey.[63] Then, the new ND government under Georgios Rallis sought to use the status of the US bases as a bargaining chip to achieve acceptable conditions for Greece's re-integration in NATO's military command structure.[64] Finally, while Greece re-entered NATO's military structure in late October 1980, the Rallis government announced on 16 June 1980 the suspension of US-Greek talks on the future of the bases until after the October 1981 Greek election.[65]

When Andreas Papandreou came to power, and despite electoral pledges for removal of bases, he started negotiating the modification of the 1977 DCA agreement covering US military activities and bases in Greece as well as US military assistance to Greece. Papandreou wanted a formal commitment to a 7:10 ratio, and a formal reaffirmation of the 1976 Kissinger security guarantee. Deputy Foreign Minister Giannis Kapsis was put in charge to negotiate a mutually acceptable Defense and Economic Cooperation Agreement (DECA) with US Special Advisor, Reginald Bartholomew, which would ensure both quantitatively and qualitatively the balance of power in the region.[66] During the negotiations with Greece, the USA had decided to double its assistance to Turkey, thus upsetting the Aegean balance and threatening vital Greek interests. Papandreou wrote to Reagan to express concerns about the proposed increases bringing a disparity to the 7:10 aid ratio that was established in 1976-77.[67] Echoing Papandreou's words, Konstantinos Karamanlis, then the President of the Republic and an authoritative

---

63 Rizas, 'Managing a conflict', 375-378.
64 'Crying wolf?', *The Economist*, 27 September 1980.
65 *I Kathimerini*, 19 June 1981.
66 Athens Embassy to State Department, 24 January 1983, RRPL, SMOF, Executive Secretariat, NSC, Box 15
67 Papandreou's letter to President Reagan, 4 February 1983, CREST, CIA-RDP85M00363R000701640003-5

voice on foreign affairs. At dinner with Stearns mentioned 'you may not believe that we face the danger of Turkish attack. You may not even believe that we face the danger of expanding Turkish influence at our expense in the Aegean. All Greeks do believe these things, however, and because we believe them, you must take them into account'.[68]

By the spring of 1982, both the US administration and the PASOK government were trying to embark on negotiations on outstanding problems between the two countries. In mid-May 1982 Secretary of State Alexander Haig arrived in Athens for talks, while a few days earlier Papandreou had acknowledged that despite past and current grievances, 'we must bear in mind the strategic facts which prevail in conjunction with our national problems and the demands of our national defence. This also applies to the US military bases in Greece'. Haig, however, found a chilly atmosphere in Athens. More than 20,000 demonstrators, waving red flags and banners reading 'Out with Americans' and 'Haig go home' gathered near Parliament to protest at the visit.[69]

This was just one of the many peace protests that occurred in Athens and other Greek cities in this period. Since – in contrast to other West European states – Greece was not facing a direct prospect of missiles being installed, the Greek peace movement directed its struggles mostly against the existence of the American military bases, and the country's association with any kind of military organisation. Greece had a history of involvement in international peace mobilisation since the early post-war years, and the first organised peace movement was created bearing the name Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace (EEDYE), which became part of the Communist-led World Peace Council (WPC).[70] Despite declaration of non-partisanship, the movement

---

[68] Stearns (Athens) to State Department, Athens, 20 February 1983, RRPL, SMOF, Executive Secretariat, NSC, box 15.

[69] George Coats, 'Haig visit puts Papandreou to the test on bases', *The Guardian*, 15 May 1982.

[70] For more information on the genesis of the Greek peace movement, Evi Gkotzaridis, "Who will Help me to Get Rid of this Man?": Grigoris Lambrakis and the Non-Aligned Peace Movement Post-Civil War

was led by the Greek Communists, who had remained loyal to the Soviet Union. As a consequence, EEDYE clearly placed the blame on the USA for the escalation of the nuclear arms race. In the summer of 1981, some of its members, with the prominent nuclear scientist and a future PASOK MEP, Christos Markopoulos, at its helm who had close ties to PASOK, decided to leave EEDYE and form a new pacifist movement: the Movement for Peace, Human Rights and National Independence (KEADEA). The founders of KEADEA had felt that EEDYE's peace mobilisation had been essentially Soviet-friendly. Such affiliation had proved a weakness for three reasons. Firstly, it falsified the true character of the movement, discouraging many people from mobilising who were against nuclear weapons per se and refused to subscribe to a purely pro-American or pro-Soviet point of view.[71] Secondly, the superpower rivalry had led to an escalation of armaments which reinforced society's sense of urgency, unease and fear. Society demanded that the peace effort be directed towards *both* superpowers.[72] Thirdly and barely discussed in public, PASOK's decision to establish a separate peace movement constituted an attempt to create an anti-nuclear movement, free from the control of the Communist Party (KKE). The aim was to create a PASOK-led Panhellenic peace movement, with centres in all major cities, which would overturn Communist dominance of the Greek peace movement.[73]

Papandreou, who at the time was still the leader of the opposition, embraced and actively supported the creation of KEADEA in the summer of 1981 saying 'for the Greek people, the issue of peace acquires a special meaning. We are hosting American military bases as well as nuclear weapons, with the acquiescence of the Right. At the same time, we are facing "Attila" in Cyprus and the

---

Greece: 1951-1964', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 30:2 (2012), 299-338; Lykourgos Kourkouvelas, *Greece and the issue of nuclear weapons* [in Greek] (Athens: Patakis, 2011), 146-150.

[71] Christos Markopoulos, *With Andreas Papandreou and the World Peace Movement* [in Greek] (Athens: Kastaniotis, 2005), p. 157.

[72] *Anti*, vol. 194, 11 December 1981.

[73] Thedoros Pagkalos, *With Andreas in Europe* [in Greek] (Athens: Patakis, 2011), 24.

expansionary policies of Turkey in the Aegean'.[74] In its founding declaration, KEADEA emphasized the need for Greek independence, the demand for removal of all bases and the full liberation of Greece from any foreign intervention in any aspect of political, economic and socio-cultural life. So, from early on, Papandreou and KEADEA were negotiating the terms of peace along nationalist purposes, an attack on Right and highlighting the major enemy which was not on the other side of the Iron Curtain but on the other side of the Aegean, namely Turkey.

How did Papandreou's anti-nuclear initiatives fit in his broader foreign and domestic policy goals of 'peace'? First and foremost, Papandreou genuinely seemed to believe that the major victims of heightened Cold War tensions were smaller states, and such peace initiatives were set to overcome Cold War divisions, and thus protect the country's national interests. In 1980, he had stated that nuclear weapons 'contributed exactly zero to our national defence. Exactly zero'.[75] Yet, there were other parameters at play. Andreas Papandreou's simultaneous active support of the anti-nuclear movement both in Greece and abroad was – among other things – a means to satisfy the anti-American appetite of the Greek public in a way that would not undermine the country's web of western allies and hence put in peril the delicate Greek-Turkish regional balance. Papandreou's peace initiatives and his government's heavy involvement in the peace mobilisation was linked to his desire to bolster the country's independent stance without posing a danger to its security whilst adding the country's voice to international calls for disarmament and relaxations of tensions.[76] His aim was to put Greece on the map internationally by playing the troublemaker or for what he thought of himself 'the peacemaker'.[77]

---

[74] *Ta NEA*, 16 June 1981.
[75] Quoted in Wittner, *The Struggle Against the Bomb.*, 163.
[76] John Iatrides, 'Papandreou Foreign Policy', in Theodore C. Kariotis, *The Greek Socialist Experiment. Papandreou's Greece 1981-1989* (New York: Pella Publishing, 1992), 139.
[77] Diplomatic Report by Sutherland (Athens) to FCO, 1 April 1982, TNA/FCO 9/3516. Also, Papoulias, *Essays on Diplomacy and Politics*, 138.

This policy also served a key domestic policy goal: he could mollify the KKE in opposing US 'aggressiveness'. While PASOK had firmly established itself as the hegemonic party of the Left, there were concerns about KKE's growing influence in the aftermath of the October 1982 municipal elections. As the British embassy was reporting from Athens, 'the disappointment at PASOK's lack of progress in implementing change and at time going off with pre-electoral commitments' had caused PASOK's relative poor performance.[78] Moreover, the radical party cadres and supporters were expressing grassroots impatience at the slow pace of centrally directed 'Change'.[79] However, PASOK had attracted not only radical forces but others with 'bourgeois' - centrist, reformist or technocratic tendencies. It was these non-radicals who had subsequently laid down the basic lines of government policy. Although rejecting the tenets of social democracy (at least in theory), the party had progressively adopted a reformist attitude.[80] Thus, Papandreou had to steer a careful balance between the left and centre.

By the end of 1982, KKE was pressing the government to live up to its programme of radical change and, in particular, to adopt a more neutralist foreign policy. When KKE published the political resolutions of its 11th Congress in late December 1982, its criticism was harsher and was concentrated on the government's failure to resolve the economic crisis and to carry out election pledges to pull out of NATO and the EEC. The text amounted to a denunciation of Papandreou's policy or what they called 'reformism' and an appeal to the rank and file of PASOK for united action with the Communists to bring about 'genuine change'.[81]

---

[78] Llewellyn-Smith (Athens) to Wilson (FCO), 28 January 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4039; Political Brief on Greece, 5 November 1983, FCO 9/4041. In October 1982 PASOK lost considerable ground to the Communists (PASOK won about 36 per cent while the KKE about 23 per cent).
[79] Hunt (FCO) to Llewellyn-Smith (Athens), 10 December 1982, TNA/FCO 9/3516.
[80] Llewellyn-Smith (Athens) to Wilson(FCO), 28 January 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4039.
[81] Marvine Howe, 'Communists Press Greece to Toe Radical Line', *The New York Times*, 16 January 1983; *Ta Nea*, 14 and 30 December 1982.

Therefore, outburst of anti-American ultra-nationalism, dominant in the peace discourse, mobilized public opinion, silenced left-wing critics within his party and appeased KKE.[82] This new type of mass public mobilisation allowed for further influence of the masses through one more PASOK-led organization (KEADEA). PASOK was able to maintain its radical message of anti-imperialism, anti-establishment and anti-Americanism while 'beating the stigma of communism' and thus attract and mobilise large segments of the population.[83] The high levels of peace mobilisation and his government's endorsement boosted Papandreou's credibility in his attempts to launch diverse international and transnational initiatives for peace.[84] But most importantly, the mass peace movement added legitimacy to the claims of an independent Greek voice in foreign affairs, transcending Cold War barriers and escaping American dominance even when Papandreou was negotiating and concluding an agreement on the US bases. The domestic parliamentary and public discussion that ensued on this burning foreign policy issue was interestingly framed as a discourse on peace.

In mid-July 1983, the US and Greek governments reached a five-year agreement on defence and economic cooperation. Signed on 8 September 1983, the agreement saw the continuation of the four existing American bases in Greece and the payment of $500 million in US military aid to Greece. The terms of the agreement provided that it would be terminable after five years upon written notice by either party, to be given five months in advance. Each party could interpret the term 'terminable' differently, thus both Washington and Athens were satisfied. Talking to reporters, the Greek Prime Minister beamed with pride since 'the

---

[82] Paul Anastasi, 'Feint, Thrust And Parry Is Papandreou's Style So Far', *The New York Times*, 24 January 1982.

[83] Christos Lyritzis, 'Political Parties in post-junta Greece: A case of 'bureaucratic clientelism?'', *West European Politics*, 7:2 (1984), 111; Stathis Kalyvas, 'Polarization in Greek Politics: PASOK's first Four Years, 1981-1985', *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora,* 23:1 (1997), 82, 90; Theodore Kariotis 'The Rise and Fall of the Greek Sun', in Theodore Kariotis (ed.), *The Greek Socialist Experiment. Papandreou's Greece 1981-1989* (New York: Pella Publishing Company, 1992), 11-35.

[84] Jan Van Deth & Martin Elff, 'Politicisation, economic development and political interest in Europe', *European Journal of Political Research* 43 (2004), 481-2.

defence agreement with the United States recognizes for the first time our country on equal footing and reflects to a large degree our hard-won national independence'. Papandreou dubbed the agreement as one of a kind, representing a *Stunde Null* moment and 'a break from Greece's dark and dependent past as echoed in the agreement of 1953'.[85] The Greek government, therefore, presented it as a timetable for the removal of the bases.[86] Most of the peace movement activists wholeheartedly embraced the logic and Athens was plastered with slogans declaring 'at last and end of the dependence … the struggle is being vindicated'.[87] Meanwhile, *Exormisi*, the party weekly newspaper, trumpeted that the bases 'would close in five years'.[88]

During a parliamentary debate, on 31 October 1983, it is extraordinary how the majority of parliamentarians from almost all parties alluded repeatedly to the US-Greek defence agreement as part of the development of the Euromissiles crisis and the intense pan – European peace mobilisation as well as Greece's role in the policy of peace. Indeed, the PASOK MPs reverted again and again to the buzzwords of national independence, but significantly underlined the defensive character of the bases that guaranteed the peaceful policy of Greece towards the Middle East, as they supposedly could not be used against any military campaigns in the region. The Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Giannis Kapsis, who negotiated the defence agreement, noted how: 'previous agreements resembled a prenuptial agreement for a happy marriage with the Americans [...] In contrast, our agreement bares the characteristics of a negotiated settlement following the filing of divorce proceedings'.[89] Along the same lines, Ioannis Charalampopoulos, Minister of Foreign Affairs, underlined the completely different nature of the

---

[85] *The Prime Ministers Speeches*: *Andreas Papandreou* (Athens, 1983), 107.
[86] Mitsotakis, *The Clashing Rocks*, 174, 179-181; Peter Pappas, 'The 18th October of Andreas Papandreou. Some thoughts on a democratic cult of personality', in Kariotis, *The Greek Socialist Experiment*, 60.
[87] Richard Clogg, 'PASOK in power: rendezvous with history or with reality? *The World Today* 39:11 (1983), 439.
[88] *Exormisi*, 16/17 July 1983.
[89] HPL, Parliament Debates, Third Period, Third Session, 31 October 1983, Athens, 827.

agreement. He declared that, in contrast to past practices of striking deals behind closed doors and secret protocols, the new defence agreements were openly negotiated and presented to the Greek people. 'This was a victory for democracy'.[90] All parties of the opposition conceded that the current agreement did not bind the Greek Parliament in 1988 to remove the bases, hence lamented PASOK for 'negating its electoral promises and transposing the heavy load of the decision to the next government'.[91] PASOK claimed otherwise, pointing out that the new agreement signalled a new era in US-Greek relations and Greek foreign policy and meant the 'end of Greece's subjugation to the United States' and the termination of any US control on the formulation of Greek security policy.[92] Most importantly, it provided peace in the short and distant future: in the short term, it strengthened Greece's defence capabilities against possible Turkish aggression, while in the long term, it guaranteed the country's removal as a possible site of Cold War confrontation.

Papandreou's international initiatives

While Greece was negotiating the existence of the US bases on its soil and its part in NATO, it became the first *NATO* country to propose a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Balkans (NWFZ). The Bulgarian government had been seeking to revive the 1957 Romanian proposal for the denuclearization of the region, but with little success.[93] Then, on 22 November 1981, Papandreou gave his first major policy address and pointed out that 'the government is proposing a denuclearized zone in the Balkans. Greece, after the necessary deliberations, will first apply, in a short period of time, by this principle by removing nuclear weapons from its

[90] Ibid, 836.
[91] Ibid, 819.
[92] Note of PASOK's Enlightenment Committee on the Bases Agreement, 27 July 1983, ELIA (Hellenic Literary & Historical Archive), Athens, Greece, Amalia Fleming Archive (hereafter: AFA), File 24/10.
[93] Longworth (Sofia) to FCO, 5 April 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4079. Just prior to PASOK' electoral victory, the Bulgarian leader Theodor Zhivkov had been seeking to revive the old Romanian idea for a Balkan NWFZ .

territory'.[94] Of course, the significance of such a proposal was from the beginning psychological rather than practical: in case of an East-West war in Europe, a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans would not have spared the region from a nuclear exchange.[95]

Yet, Papandreou and the Romanian leader Ceausescu took up the initiative several months later. During Papandreou's visit to Romania in early November 1982, the two leaders agreed that their governments should call a summit conference of Balkan leaders to discuss turning the region into a zone free of nuclear weapons within 18 months. The objective would be to put pressure on the rest of Europe to 'denuclearize'; there were already no nuclear arms in Scandinavia, so the addition of such a zone in the Balkans would 'no doubt ha[ve] its effect in influencing similar developments in the rest of Europe'. For the Greek Prime Minister, his interest stemmed from his opposition to the existence of the two military blocs and reiterated that his government *ultimately* wanted to expel American bases from Greece and withdraw from NATO's integrated military command structure.[96]

Then, during the visit of Soviet Premier Nikolai Tikhonov to Greece in February 1983, the Greek and the Soviet governments agreed that nuclear weapons free zones were an important aspect of the disarmament process and called for the limitation of both conventional and nuclear arms to 'the lowest possible level' on the basis of equal security.[97] 'Greece, as the maverick of the western alliance, has in Soviet eyes the potential to play a role analogous to that of Romania in the Warsaw pact.' [98] More than a year later (in May 1984), in a press

---

[94] Marvine Howe, 'Greeks Are Told Timetable Is Due to Oust U.S. Bases', *The New York Times*, 23 November 1981.
[95] Note on the conclusion of a meeting of Greek officials on the possible consequences of a Balkan NWFZ, 1 April 1982, KKF/KKA, FILE 38B.
[96] 'Greece and Rumania Urge Talks to Rid Balkans of Nuclear Arms', *The New York Times*, 6 November 1982.
[97] Marvine Howe, 'Greece Joins Soviet in Urging Deep Arms Cuts', *The New York Times*, 25 February 1983.
[98] Note by Sutherland (Moscow) to FCO, 4 March 1983, FCO 46/3599.

conference about the Initiative of the Six (see below), Papandreou added that the nuclear warheads in Greece were a provocation and a threat against peace: 'We did not take any specific measures to remove these weapons', he said 'not because we have changed our view, but because we want to do it – if possible- within the framework of Balkan disarmament'. [99]

The initiative to discuss the possibility of a Balkan NWFZ was part of a continuing Greek effort to establish an institutionalized framework for multilateral Balkan cooperation.[100] However, the Balkan governments had conflicting views and attitudes regarding the establishment of a regional zone, while some were insisting on a broader agenda and others had been uninterested not only to the specific idea but also to any Balkan negotiating forum. The Greek government, therefore, understood that a multilateral high-level summit could not be held in the foreseeable future. Thus, Athens opted for proposing an experts' meeting that would help pave the way for a future summit. On 18 May 1983, Papandreou sent confidential letters to the leaders of Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Albania and Turkey, inviting them to send 'qualified experts' to a conference to be held in Athens in the near future to discuss the NWFZ proposal. This did not have any conclusive and tangible results, as Turkey essentially objected the separation of Balkans from the rest of Europe regarding arms control and/or disarmament.[101] The main Greek opposition party, the conservative New Democracy and particularly its leader, Evangelos Averoff, repeatedly opposed the idea. The latter claimed that the initiative was causing additional friction between Greece and its NATO and EEC allies; furthermore, if such a zone were established, the West

[99] Press Release 'General and complete Disarmament is Greece's objective for peace', New York, 23 May 1984, TNA/FCO 46/4172.
[100] Similar attempts for Balkan cooperation were made in the previous decade. See Eirini Karamouzi, 'Managing the "Helsinki Spirit" in the Balkans: Greece's Initiative for Balkan Cooperation, 1975-1976', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 24:4 (2013), 597-618.
[101] Donna Klick, 'A Balkan Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone: Viability of the Regime and Implications for Crisis Management', *Journal of Peace Research* 24/2 (1987), 111-124.

would unilaterally have made concessions to the Warsaw Pact.[102] Throughout the Cold War era, NATO remained steadfast in its position that any reduction in its theatre nuclear forces was conditional on a considerable reduction of both Soviet/Warsaw Pact tactical nuclear weapons *and* conventional weapons, as a means to offset the Soviet bloc's conventional superiority in Europe.

In fact, Papandreou's widely publicized initiative was proposed to Warsaw Pact members without even informing – let alone consulting – Greece's NATO allies in advance, provoking outrage in several NATO capitals. The Greek proposal was clearly at odds with the approved NATO strategy and had serious implications for the alliance as a whole, and not just on its South-eastern region. For instance, the UK delegation to NATO insisted that 'this is a case where we should bring home to the Greeks that such clear disregard for the views of their allies on major security issues is unacceptable'; and that until the Greek proposal would have fully and in detail discussed in the alliance, no discussion with Warsaw pact governments should take place.[103]

However, other policymakers, who were better informed of Papandreou's idiosyncrasy and motives, such the British Consul General in Athens, Michael Llewellyn Smith, were far less alarmed. The latter explained to the FCO that one should always keep in the 'background and context of Papandreou's proposal'; this had to be viewed 'more as a move in a diplomatic game designed to give his supporters the impression of activity than a serious initiative aimed at achieving denuclearization'. As Papandreou had been also championing – in words, but not in deeds – the removal of US nuclear weapons from Greece, a well-publicized gesture on the issue of a Balkan NWFZ aimed to satisfy PASOK's (and Leftist) supporters – especially at a time when US-Greek negotiations on the future of US bases in Greece were about to enter the decisive final stage.[104] It is important to

---

[102] Athens Embassy to FCO, 17 May 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4079; also, *TA NEA*, 8 February 1984.
[103] UK Delegation in NATO to FCO, 20 May 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4079.
[104] Llewellyn Smith (Athens) to FCO, 23 May 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4079.

note that the US intelligence community also reached the same conclusion: while the Americans estimated that the NWFZ concept did have deep roots in Socialist and Papandreou's thinking, it was nevertheless most probable that the Greek prime minister was seeking to use the issue to 'fend off attacks from the Greek Communists. Advocacy of a zone allows Papandreou to demonstrate that he is 'struggling for peace' and deflects criticism he receives for having signed an agreement allowing US bases to remain in Greece'.[105]

Nevertheless, it can be argued that the Greek initiative should be seen in a broader context of Greece's détente policy towards the Soviet bloc and particularly the Balkan Warsaw Pact members – neighbouring Bulgaria as well as Romania – at a time when Cold War tensions had been heightened both globally and across Europe. Indeed, some Greek officials hinted this to their NATO colleagues.[106] Andreas Papandreou and the Greek diplomats were fully aware of Turkey's flat opposition to any regional NWFZ initiative, Yugoslavia's relative disinterest in the idea and Albania's disinclination to participate in any form of Balkan co-operation as long as most Balkan states remained member of the military blocs.[107] So, while Papandreou aimed to keep the Balkan NWFZ idea alive as a means to facilitate Romania's and especially Bulgaria's interest in a broad dialogue on Balkan co-operation on other issues, he did not expect his denuclearization initiative to go too far.[108]

As early as February 1982, Greek career diplomats had been assessing the implications of discussing a Balkan NWFZ and had been fully aware that the 1981 Bulgarian proposal was endorsed by the Kremlin, mainly because Moscow and

---

[105] Report on Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zones, Proposals and Prospects, January 1984, CREST, CIA-RDP84S00895R000200070004-8.
[106] Llewellyn Smith (Athens) to FCO, 31 May 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4079.
[107] Madden (Athens) to FCO, 15 June 1983, TNA/FCO 46/3603; Figgis (Belgrade) to FCO, 17 June 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4079.
[108] Adriana Ierodiaconou, 'Balkan nations postpone talks on regional nuclear-free zone', *Financial Times*, 17 January 1984; Mario Modiano, 'Nuclear ban in Balkans recedes into future', *The Times*, 14 February 1984.

Sofia wished to capitalize on this idea as a piece of anti-NATO propaganda. However, during 1982-1983 they were arguing that, under certain conditions, Greece should not avail itself of the opportunity to embrace the idea: the country would probably get some extra leverage vis-à-vis the United States during the upcoming negotiations for the future of the US bases; Turkey might find itself relatively isolated in the Balkans; Greece's position would be enhanced both within the socialist bloc and the Third World; promotion of Greece at an international level as a genuinely peaceful country championing denuclearization. Of course, possible disadvantages also existed, especially with regard to a reaction by Greece's powerful allies which strongly opposed such ideas (mainly the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy).[109]

Even before Papandreou's initiative to revive the concept of a Balkan NWFZ, PASOK's government had also favoured, in principle, the declaration of the Mediterranean as a 'zone of peace' and de-nuclearized area. According to Papandreou's statement of 22 November 1981, 'the Mediterranean must belong to its peoples without the presence of superpower fleets and without military exercises'.[110] This proposal had been already elaborated by the USSR and Brezhnev himself on 9 June 1981. It had been put forward by the Non-Aligned Movement and the UN General Assembly, but NATO authorities flatly rejected such a prospect and concept.[111] The proposal to 'turn the Mediterranean Sea into a zone of peace and collaboration', along with the denuclearization of the Balkans and other regions in Europe was reiterated by the Warsaw Pact on 7 January 1983.[112] It

---

[109] Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Note on the Balkan NWFZ, KKF/KKA, File 38B, 8 November 1982.
[110] Marvine Howe, 'Greeks Are Told Timetable Is Due to Oust U.S. Bases', *The New York Times*, 23 November 1981.
[111] Summary Record of NAC Ministerial Session, 14 June 1982, NATO Archives, C-R(82)27; NAC Memorandum, Report on the Situation in the Mediterranean November 1981-March 1982, 10 May 1982, NATO Archives, C-M(82)21(Final).
[112] *Ta Nea*, 7 January 1983. For the Warsaw Pact arms control proposals, see, for instance Malcolm Byrne, "The Warsaw Pact and the Euromissile Crisis, 1977-1983", in Leopoldo Nuti et al., *The Euromissile Crisis and the End of the Cold War* (Washington D.C. and Stanford, CA: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Stanford University Press, 2015), 104-120.

had been one of many Soviet and/or Warsaw Pact calls to the West to engage in arms control talks. Papandreou rushed into welcoming this 'courageous offer' to NATO with great enthusiasm.[113]

Meanwhile, East-West tension was further rising as the year 1983 had already featured many gloomy developments and moments, such as Reagan's 'Evil Empire' speech and his announcement of the SDI, plus the pending deployment of the high-tech and highly accurate Pershing II and Cruise missiles.[114] Then, in August 1983, and while the signature of the DECA between Athens and Washington was imminent, Papandreou felt that the time was ripe to undertake another well-publicized gesture. Once again, he took Greece's Western allies by surprise, as the Greek government, which had recently assumed the presidency of the EEC for the first time, requested that the latter should discuss the issue of the INF arms race and proposed a six-month postponement of the deployment of the Pershing II and Cruise missiles as it would hopefully 'give the Geneva negotiations the breathing space they certainly need'.[115]

Greece's allies flatly rejected that proposal.[116] They considered that sufficient time had been already provided to the Soviet leadership to acknowledge the necessity of reaching an agreement about the INF since December 1979 and NATO's dual-track decision. If NATO was about to have any success at the ongoing negotiations, it should continue the deployment program as scheduled; the alliance would be willing to 'stop, amend or reverse' the deployment program 'should success at the negotiating table warrant it'. Furthermore, Greece's NATO and EEC partners considered that this initiative had been 'the worst example to-date of the Greeks dissociating themselves from the agreed alliance position on

---

[113] *Ta Nea*, 8 January 1983.
[114] Stephen J. Cimbala, "Year of Maximum Danger? The 1983 'War Scare' and US-Soviet Deterrence", *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 13/2 (2000), 1-24; Nate Jones (ed.), *Able Archer 83. The Secret History of the NATO Exercise That Almost Triggered Nuclear War* (New York: The New Press, 2016), 5-24.
[115] U.S. Secretary of State Shultz to all NATO capitals, 22 August 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4080.
[116] Katapodis, *Scattered papers of my diplomatic life*, 112-113.

INF'. They were greatly disturbed by the proposal of discussing such a sensitive NATO issue, that is the alliance's nuclear strategy, at the EEC and that Athens was seeking 'to use the Presidency to further their maverick views'. Other fora existed for this purpose, while certainly, the EEC had nothing to do with military matters, NATO's strategy and defence planning.[117]

In addition, although it was clear that Greece could not be brought round to support NATO's INF policy, the United States, Britain, the FRG and other countries (such as Italy, the Netherlands and Belgium) responded firmly by publicly rejecting that proposal. The Americans, in particular, became furious. So did the Germans, who were firmly in the lead in expressing that Papandreou 'has overstepped the mark of what his allies will tolerate'.[118] At the same time, another Cold War incident increased tension between Greece and its major allies. On 1 September 1983, Korean Air Lines flight 007, which had drifted off its correct flight path and had passed over prohibited Soviet air-space, was shot down by Soviet fighters. The 269 passengers and crew died, sparking international outrage and triggering the imposition of sanctions by the United States and other Western countries on the Soviet Union.[119] The Greek government did not follow suit though; on the contrary, it blocked a Community's joint public condemnation of the Soviet Union.[120]

Still, the Western partners, while worried about the growing isolation of Greece from the line of the western institutions, downplayed the possible impact of such action. The troublemaking may have been gratifying to the Soviets but the maverick behaviour of Greece as a non-basing country was not posing a serious threat to Western security.[121] The Greek government was aware that the initiative

---

[117] Gozney (MoD) to FCO on INF: Greek Foreign Minister's Proposal to Delay NATO Deployments, 17 August 1983, FCO 9/4080; Draft FCO Note on the Greek proposal to Postpone Deployment on INF Missiles, 22 August 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4080.
[118] Telegram by Daunt, Bucharest, 9 January 1984, TNA/FCO 46/3618.
[119] Paul Richardson, '1983: The Scariest Year', *Russian Life* (March/April 2013), 39-47.
[120] John Wyles, 'Greece angers EEC partners over airliner', *Financial Times*, 13 September 1983.
[121] Telegram by Sutherland to FCO, Athens, 26 August 1983, TNA/FCO 9/4080.

would get nowhere, but still wanted to be able to say that it had raised it and engaged with public opinion, regardless of the result, in order to restore the image of a radical government and promote the cause of peace, since according to Papandreou, at the end of the day 'Greece's initiative contained an appeal to both superpowers'.[122]

'Six-Nation Initiative' for Peace and Disarmament

Papandreou's policy of peace, despite its strong domestic angle and deep nationalistic tone, was endorsed by several prominent leaders from around the globe and peace activists across Europe that shared his views.[123] Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Palme had publicly endorsed Greece's initiative for a Balkan NWFZ and the two prime ministers complimented each other in speeches on 22 August 1983, when the latter visited Athens. Palme and Papandreou, who had developed strong personal ties, were in full agreement on the urgent need 'to intervene since the two superpowers already have a nuclear arsenal, capable of destroying one another more than fifty times'.[124] The two countries were on the same page on several issues.

It comes as no surprise, therefore that on 22 May 1984, Andreas Papandreou joined five other heads of state and government – including India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi (succeeded by Rajiv Gandhi), Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, Mexico's President Miguel de la Madrid, Argentina's President Raul Alfonsin and President of Tanzania Julius Nyerere – to launch the 'Six-Nation Initiative' or 'Five Continent Initiative' for Peace and Disarmament.[125]

---

[122] Llewellyn Smith (Athens) to FCO, 25 August 1983, TNA/FCO 46/3599.
[123] Wittner, *The Struggle Against the Bomb,* 163.
[124] Blanc (Stockholm) to Quai d'Orsay (Paris), 26 October 1984, Archives du Ministère des Affaires étrangères [hereafter: AMAE] 5257.
[125] *Exormisi*, 26/27 May 1984.

Explaining Greece's role in such a global initiative, Papandreou noted 'I believe that the prevention of nuclear war is not an issue that concerns only superpowers. It is of direct concern to all of us since it threatens our lives. Therefore, any attempt aiming at achieving a positive solution cannot be left exclusively to the superpowers'.[126] The idea was originally promoted in mid-1983 by the international network of politicians working together on disarmament - the Parliamentarians for World Order (PWO) - and its President, Mr D Roche, a Canadian PM.[127] Leaders such as Indira Gandhi understood that 'peace is too important to be left to the White House and the Kremlin.'[128]

The declaration of May 1984 was handed to UN secretary-general Javier Perez De Cuellar, who had a positive reaction, and to UN missions in the Soviet Union, USA, China, Britain and France. The declaration called on states with nuclear weapons to halt what the document calls 'a rush towards global suicide' and to facilitate an agreement on nuclear arms control. The statement attracted unexpectedly broad attention in media and parliaments. Even Pope John Paul II offered his encouragement for this initiative in May 1984 and it was endorsed by a large number of peace organizations.[129] Prime Minister Gonzalez of Spain, Trudeau of Canada and Sorsa of Finland added their support.[130]

The Six national leaders issued several joint declarations to advance their goals and focused on prevention of an arms race in outer space and the need for a nuclear test ban. In May 1984, they called on the five nuclear powers 'to stop testing, production, and deployment of weapons of mass destruction and to undertake substantial reductions in nuclear forces'. It concluded that 'progress in disarmament can only be achieved with an informed public applying strong

---

126 The Four Continent Peace Initiative, 22 May 1984, European Nuclear Disarmament, LSE archives (henceforth END) END/19/16.
127 The Four Continent Peace Initiative by PWO, New York, 22 May 1984, TNA/FCO 46/4172.
128 Olafur Grimsson & Nicholas Dunlop, 'Indira Gandhi and the Five Continent Initiative', *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, 45/1 (January 1985), 46.
129 Letter by Pope John Paull II, 22 May 1984, TNA/FCO 46/4172; also, *Exormisi*, 2/3 June 1984.
130 Report on Parliamentarians for World Order, New York, January 1984, END/20/6.

pressure on governments'.[131] The Americans and French were dismissive of the appeal and the British showed clear lack of enthusiasm.[132] The Soviets published a statement pointing that the declaration was in the same direction as Soviet proposals for a nuclear freeze. Greece was the only NATO country to sign the declaration, and Papandreou justified that by stating that 'NATO is a democracy and we have the right to disagree with some of the over-all initiatives'.[133]

In October 1984, Papandreou paid an official visit to Sweden and had many contacts with members of the Swedish Social Democracy Party. They discussed the Five Continent declaration and its follow up. Papandreou launched an attack on the US, claiming that it was 'Reagan's emotional desire to regain the military superiority which American had possessed before détente which lay behind the current arms spiral […] while in the Soviet Union there was a deep-rooted fear of a holocaust'.[134] After his mother's assassination, Rajiv Gandhi continued to promote the initiative and made his debut as an international statesman by hosting a further meeting of representatives of the six countries in January 1985 in India. The conference issued a communique – the Delhi Declaration – which called for an immediate ban on testing nuclear weapons and a halt to their development, especially of space weapons.[135] Papandreou was particularly worried about the increase of speed and accuracy of modern nuclear weapons and delivery systems, 'which makes reason impossible to prevail. Everyone should fear a nuclear holocaust because the nuclear winter would probably affect every human being'.[136]

Following the New Delhi meeting, three of the leaders – Alfonsin, Nyerere and Palme – flew to Athens to attend a meeting, hosted by Papandreou with some

---

131 Sergio Duarte, 'Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons', *Centre for Strategic and International Studies*, Delhi, 9 June 2008, 4.
132 Gozney (MoD) to FCO, 11 June 1984, TNA/FCO 46/4172.
133 Andriana Ierodiaconou, 'Papandreou and Zhivkov condemn space weapons', Financial Times, 25 July 1985.
134 Williams (Stockholm) to FCO, 25 October 1984, TNA/FCO 46/4172.
135 John Elliott, 'Gandhi Hosts Six-nation Nuclear Arms Talks / India', *Financial Times*, 29 January 1985.
136 Initiative of the Six, Joint Communique of the 'Six' in New Delhi, 28 January 1985, ELIA/AFA, File 24/18.

50 leaders of non-governmental organizations as well as prominent legislators and personalities (anti-nuclear campaigners and intellectuals) supporting the Five Continent initiative. Prominent former prime ministers and other politicians, such as Edgar Faure, Pierre Trudeau, Joop den Uyl, Bruno Kreisky, and Egon Bahr, were also present, while Willy Brandt gave his full support. The Athens meeting urged the nuclear states to 'assume their responsibility towards civilization and the universal right of life' and transfer resources to economic development, while Papandreou observed 'the battle of the streets has become the battle of the governments'.[137] The six leaders pledged to convey the Initiative's message to the two superpowers and the other three nuclear powers (the UK, France and China) and soon Papandreou had the opportunity to put forward the cause of nuclear disarmament during his subsequent talks with the Soviet and Chinese leadership.[138] Moreover, during an official visit in Sofia in July 1985, the Greek prime minister declared that 'small non-nuclear states have not only a right but a duty to participate in the struggle to promote détente and to prevent the militarization of space'.[139]

During 1986, the Six-nation/Five Continent Initiative continued to call for the halt to all nuclear testing and the development of new nuclear weapons in 1986. Such a plea to the US and Soviet governments had been already signed by Olof Palme only hours before his assassination on 28 February 1986. The leaders of the six countries offered to undertake the task of verifying such a test ban, in an effort to remove doubts about compliance and possible violations.[140] The Group of Six held its second meeting in Ixtapa, Mexico, on 6 August 1986 and reiterated its plea for a ban on nuclear testing and the abolishment of the SDI/Star Wars

---

[137] Christopher Paine, 'The "other nations" speak up', *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, 45/2 (March 1985), 6-7; Mario Modiano, 'Delhi peace initiative endorsed in Athens', *The Times*, 1 February 1985.
[138] Initiative of the Six, Papandreou's statements after the Delhi meeting, 29 January 1985, ELIA, AFA, File 24/18.
[139] Andriana Ierodiaconou, 'Papandreou and Zhivkov condemn space weapons', *Financial Times*, 25 July 1985.
[140] Kevin Done, 'N-Test Ban Urged at Palme Memorial Service', *Financial Times*, 17 March 1986.

space defense project, to be followed by the conclusion of a US-Soviet arms reduction treaty and its readiness to offer their good services to verify compliance, should a US-Soviet test ban treaty was eventually signed.[141] In any case, by that time the two superpowers had already initiated a policy of rapprochement, while, despite the setbacks suffered, their negotiations focused on nuclear arms control/reduction.[142] Thus, not only the Initiative of the Six, but not even the allies of the United States and the Soviet Union were in a position to influence significantly the course of US-Soviet talks. Papandreou however capitalized on the Initiative to wield personal influence as a regional or even global peacemaker and mediator, and enhance Greece's prestige - especially in the Third World.

Conclusions

Greece, still sober from the experiences of its brutal dictatorship and the double Turkish invasion of Cyprus became less convinced by the incessant gesturing towards the ubiquitous shadow of an endless crisis that the Cold War fostered, and highlighted the need to reduce overdependence on the United States. Most significantly, the political establishment and mass political opinion saw in Turkey, not across the Iron Curtain, the preeminent threat to the country's security. The fall of superpower détente, the exacerbation of tensions surrounding the Euromissile crisis and the consequent rise of nuclear fear contributed to the further delegitimization of the Cold War division in the Greek public scene and strengthened the constant quest for national independence and pride.

It was against this background that Andreas Papandreou rose to power and formulated the country's foreign policy. He was a product of his time but at the same time he heavily framed a version of Greek reality that struck an emotional cord and became a rallying point for the majority of Greeks. This version beset

---

[141] 'Six nations urge ban on nuclear weapons tests', *The Times*, 8 August 1986.
[142] Saki Ruth Dockrill, *The end of the Cold War era: The transformation of the global security order* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), 109-113.

with an ardently nationalistic rhetoric that required foreign scapegoats was made believable because the 'conditions of possibility' that had produced Greeks' burning quest for independence had reached unprecedented heights by the 1980s. In the name of Greek nationalism, Andreas Papandreou had promised his voters 'change' in many facets of societal life, but also the country's foreign policy orientation.

The Turkish threat however meant that pragmatically he could not deviate from his predecessors' policy of utilising western fora to guarantee a delicate balance with Greece's Aegean neighbour. Despite his condemnation of Cold War dilemmas and American 'imperialism', peace for his country meant continuing relations with both NATO and the USA. Even when he was occasionally overdoing it by decrying the United States and Western institutions such as NATO, Papandreou was aware that extreme courses in foreign policy would prove counterproductive and dangerous. The Greek government's actions and reservations arguably did little – if actually any – practical damage to the West, and arguably, to Greece itself.

These restraints, however did not deter Andreas from delivering his anti-American and anti-establishment message and giving the Greeks the strong independent voice they had been yearning for. For him, such a policy was not contradictory but part and parcel of fighting for peace. Subscribing to an international anti-nuclear cause offered to camouflage the dropping of – indeed carefully articulated – election pledges to leave NATO, and perhaps the EEC, and to remove the US bases from Greece whilst asserting his left-wing credentials and protecting the country's core security needs. Peace projects such as the Initiative of the Six and the Balkan NWFZ had not only been a central feature in Papandreou's both pre-election and government programme but a global appeal that crucially infused a sense of pride in a small and historically dependent country. It did not matter if it yielded any concrete objective benefits for the country, as the fervent rhetoric that accompanied these moves offered its own texture of reality

reconstituted verbally in protest language and nationalistic tone. Ultimately, Papandreou was guaranteeing peace for his country in strictly nationalistic terms but at the same time promoting an international peace cause that elevated Greece's status. He was neither a troublemaker as his opponents claimed or a stirmaker as his allies would suggest, but his own brand of a peacemaker.