

DeMunn
15-6-74

ADDRESS BY
MR. JOHN G. ZIGHDIS
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
MAY 20, 1974

I wish to thank you sincerely for your kind invitation to speak to you about the situation in Greece today and the role of the U.S. The reputation of your Center is internationally established. Some of America's great intellectual leaders are associated with this Center, as are some who have handled and still handle the foreign policy of this great democracy. It is also true that many of the world's political and intellectual leaders have studied at this institution. I feel a heavy burden of responsibility as well as an honour and challenge in addressing such an audience.

I. Tyranny, unfortunately, is not a rare phenomenon in the history of mankind. Our own epoch has experienced tyranny in all its forms and all its variant degrees of brutality. Inevitably the sensitivity of public opinion has become dulled to the appearance of every new instance of tyranny.

The Greek dictatorship however, although established in April 1967, continues to concern public opinion and governments throughout the world. This is the result of many factors; (1) Greece has been the birthplace of democracy,

(2) Greece represents the first reappearance of post-World War II authoritarianism in Western Europe, (3) the abolition of Greek democracy took place under the NATO Alliance whose proclaimed purpose is to safeguard the collective defense of democratically-governed Western countries, (4) last but not least, the resistance of the Greek people has never been subdued.

There is only one category of people who are not disturbed by the Greek dictatorship; the cynics of realpolitik. These men try to explain it away as a typical symptom of a congenital disease characterizing unstable developing countries or as a necessary sacrifice of the liberty and dignity of a small people in the interests of strategic needs of the Western system of nations.

II. One can analyze the Greek dictatorship from a number of angles. But regardless of analytic focus - one quickly concludes that it is not a kind of Fascist or Communist totalitarianism. The regime lacks both charismatic leadership and formalized ideological doctrine which could act as magnets involving or mobilizing the population to the centrally defined objectives of the state apparatus. Nor is it a form of the traditional pre-World War II military dictatorships of Europe.

It is rather the first transplantation in Europe of some contemporary Latin American prototypes of a military-managerial junta. Let me be more specific. The military-

managerial junta is the characteristic product of authoritarianism in the technological era. Life these days - even in transitional societies such as Greece and Brazil - is based on a technological infrastructure. This infrastructure involves complex telecommunications, mass media, energy production, transportation and other technological networks, which are controlled by a small number of centers of command.

If a small group of determined men manage to take control of these centers - this group or junta - can impose its tyrannical will over an entire nation indefinitely. These small groups usually are recruited from the Armed Forces, which, given the advanced state of technology, are in turn, effectively controlled from a few centers of command. Thus we have a concurrent two-phased process:

- a. The seizing of control of the Armed Forces, and
- b. The takeover, through the Armed Forces, of the technological nerve centers of a given nation.

Once control is secured, then crude and well-worn justifications of the coup are advanced including claims that: the entire "Armed Forces" moved to save the nation from chaos, communism, corruption, factionalism and political instability; and that the foundations for social and economic development are being set, i.e., real and healthy democracy.

The mass media are systematically used to brainwash public opinion and to deprive the people of any possibility of free expression. Immediately thereafter a regime of terror and intimidation is instituted, which is made even more effective by the use of advanced technology.

III. The execution of the April 21 coup in Greece followed the blueprint just sketched. A small group, mainly of Army Intelligence Officers, first occupied the nerve center of the Armed Forces - the Greek Pentagon. Simultaneously, they occupied the control centers of radio, telephone and telegraph and, using tanks, they paralyzed land and air traffic in the capital. Thus they cut communications between the King and the Government, (who were promptly arrested) with the rest of the Armed Forces and with the Greek people. Simultaneously, by mass arrests, they deprived the people of its leadership. They beamed false information through the radio and stopped the publication of newspapers. Their biggest frauds were: presenting the King as having participated in the takeover of power and claiming that they represent the will of the entire Armed Forces. In the first 12 critical hours by thus creating general confusion, they were able to consolidate their power.

IV. After the junta took power through deft manipulation of telephone, telegraph, and postal surveillance techniques, a regime was imposed which can almost completely detect the

thoughts, attitudes and intentions of practically every Greek citizen. Through advanced technological devices, the junta keeps control over the flow of persons, vehicles, vessels and airplanes in and out of the Greek territorial complex.

Bugging and modern photographic techniques have also been used to destroy privacy in one's own abode as well as to monitor public gathering places. Thus the impression of an Orwellian omniscient and omnipresent "Big Brother" has become a haunting reality for the Greek people.

To illustrate this let me cite an example. The regime had tried to engender paranoid fear in the public during the 1967 "plebiscite" by spreading the rumor that they were going to use fingerprint detection and hidden cameras in voting booths. Thus a University Professor put thick glue all over his finger tips, fearing that the regime will detect his identity from his "No" ballot.

Let me relate to you at this time my own daily experiences during the past seven years - at those times when I happened to be neither in jail nor in exile. My telephone is tapped and therefore all my conversations are recorded by the police. My correspondence is opened. Outside my office there is parked a black Fiat-124 containing two or three plainclothes policemen who watch those entering and leaving my office. When I am outdoors walking, a policeman follows me, also on foot, who

informs his colleagues in the car of my movements by means of a walkie-talkie. If I use my car the Fiat follows me bumper to bumper, wherever I go. If I visit a small town, or an island, such as Rhodes - my home district - the police, on foot, in cars or motorcycles, follow me everywhere. When I go swimming they keep their watchful eyes on me. People who happen to exchange greetings with me in the street are subsequently stopped and questioned about these "conversations." Even when in the privacy of my own home I am discussing confidential family matters, I have to play the radio loudly in order to counteract possible bugging. There is not one single moment in my life when I am confident that I am enjoying personal privacy.

This I am afraid is the lot of most other members of the democratic political leadership of my country. This also is approximately the situation with most leading personalities in all walks of life.

I will not dwell on the techniques used to deprive the Greek people of the right to be informed and to express their opinion. Neither will I detail the methods of oppression and terror which are employed when there is evidence of intent or an act of opposition. Both subjects will require treatises of their own, and both have been given enough coverage in the news media, the Commission of Human Rights of the Council of Europe, etc.

V. Some observers accuse the Greek people of having passively acquiesced to the dictatorship. Others point out that the fact that there has been no general uprising against the junta "proves" that the regime enjoys the support of the people. These observers are either superficial, irresponsible or accomplices of the dictatorship.

In a country where most citizens do not possess weapons or ammunition and where none of the border nations is willing to offer military supplies or privileged sanctuary, it becomes exceedingly difficult to develop effective armed resistance. Radar and other devices are used by the junta authorities to monitor the movement of ships and airplanes. Thus weapons cannot easily be smuggled from other countries. Even small quantities of hand guns and explosives are hard to smuggle into Greece given the improvements in anti-hijacking detection devices.

Under current circumstances mountain-based guerrilla warfare is practically impossible. The countryside - including mountains - is criss-crossed with roads which are patrolled by military forces. A combination of jeeps and helicopters makes the undetected development of guerrilla groups unfeasible.

In the sector of urban guerrilla warfare, police surveillance techniques against all citizens have managed to identify, monitor and apprehend hundreds of resistance groups that have formed in Greece despite the impossible odds. Very few of these groups have managed to carry out substantive

resistance work for any extended period of time.

It is not psychologically easy to decide upon and to implement serious sabotage activities that might result in innocent deaths or cause great hardships on the population. This happens primarily in countries experiencing civil war, such as in Ulster. In Greece, the tyrants comprise an infinitesimally small number of people who keep practically the entire Greek population in chains.

Nor is it easy to organize mass strikes or demonstrations that require planning and preparations. Before a group has a chance to move into the operational phase, secret services have penetrated the planning and neutralize the organizers by arresting them.

Spontaneous mass uprising of an unarmed people against tanks is not a simple affair and cannot be carried out without tragic consequences. Proof of this, is the cold blooded execution of the Polytechnic students by tanks. And those were the very tanks which, within NATO's framework, were designed to safeguard freedom.

A general uprising against the tyranny will be the last resort of a people who have no alternative and have lost all hope.

Notwithstanding these odds, the Greek political and dynamic resistance has thousands of victims - men, women and children who have sacrificed their well-being, their careers,

their family ties, their health and even their lives to keep burning the torch of liberty. All the Greek people, united in their disdain and hatred for the regime, engage in thousands of forms of passive resistance. Given this record, the Greek people are worthy of admiration rather than criticism.

From seven years of resistance experience, from failures and successes, the Greek people, undaunted, are endeavoring to develop the appropriate techniques for overthrowing the regime. This experience and these techniques will be invaluable in the struggle against military-technological juntas, wherever they appear in the future.

VI. The time has come to add to the picture the role of the American factor. The special position of the United States in Greece since the Truman Doctrine is well known and needs no elaboration here.

There were many indications prior to the 1967 coup that the U.S. Government, always watchful of political developments in the country, became quite alarmed at the perspectives presented by the free functioning of the parliamentary system. American officials were indeed seized with the obsession that Greece, under parliamentary rule, would eventually be pushed out of NATO, and that, in consequences, the American military presence there would be jeopardized. And this in a period when international

developments rendered Greece strategically very important to the United States.

These suspicions and fears, in the opinion of the Greek political leadership, were a gigantic error of judgment. But it was these misguided fears which led the U.S. Government to acquiesce to the idea of imposing a dictatorship in Greece -- in a country which was a NATO ally and a member of the Western system of democratic nations. The first clear indications that the American Government was adopting such an orientation were given long before the 1967 coup, by the doctrine advanced by American diplomats in Athens and elsewhere that Greece, in order to overcome its political problems, needed a "guided", a "controlled" democracy.

Naturally, a heavy burden of responsibility for the destruction of the democratic system lies on the shoulders of the Greek people and its leadership; and of this they are fully cognizant. The colonels' coup was carried out in the context of acute political crisis, resulting from the events of July 1965. In this connection, it is true that the Greek conservative establishment toyed with the idea -- even made plans -- for a "temporary" suspension of parliamentary processes in order to prevent the transfer of political power to the democratic forces. The democratic leadership, on the other hand, was responsible for serious tactical mistakes in their effort to achieve social and

political reform. But this is not the place for a detailed analysis of this subject.

Fear of the consequences of an extra-constitutional solution, however, stayed the hand of the establishment. And then the Colonels struck. Democracy came to an abrupt end; and the intended elections were put off indefinitely on the eve of the opening of the electoral campaign. Thus, the danger of Greece having governments based on the people but "unfriendly" to the Alliance was averted...

As it soon became clear, the objectives of the putschists were quite different from those of the conservative establishment, whose fervent servants they had pretended to be up to the coup. They aimed not at the preservation of political power in the hands of the Right, but at usurping it for themselves indefinitely. Concurrently, under cover of a strident anti-Communism, they sought to guarantee the "undisturbed" attachment of Greece to her military alliances.

In the confusion which reigned for a short period after the coup, a section of the conservatives -- and more particularly those impressed with the slogans of "law and order" -- adopted a rather favorable attitude towards the regime. But this gave way to shock, disbelief and consternation as the junta proceeded to systematically undermine all institutions and taboos to which the Right was traditionally attached: to-wit, the monarchy, the church,

the armed forces, the judiciary, etc. Even domestic big business, which enjoyed the generous favors of the Colonels, took at first an attitude of tolerance towards them, but eventually became, with few exceptions, seriously concerned about the economic and social consequences of the regime. Naturally, the democratic forces and the mass of the people were, right from the beginning, unremittingly opposed to the dictatorship.

The Colonels, therefore, have never enjoyed the support of any section of the population. Their regime was not and could not have been the outcome of a confrontation between opposing social forces. It was an artificial implant in the Greek body politic. It was indeed the first application in Europe of a Latin American type of military-managerial junta.

Such a regime, in its aims and structure, could not have been engineered and maintained without foreign collusion, in the interest of forces external to Greek politics. To put it another way, the small junta of unknowns could not have been organized, installed and maintained in power without the guidance and support of American Government agencies. The Greek putschists alone did not possess sufficient wisdom -- to say the least on the matter.

The details of American complicity will, of course, become known when the related American and Greek documents are published. But this complicity was self-evident from the first moments of the coup.

On American responsibility for the maintenance of the dictatorship we possess already a series of undisputed data. Indeed, without American moral and material assistance the dictatorship could not have lasted for seven years. The junta may be in a position to control "internal order" through technology and oppression but it is in no position to face grave political, economic and foreign policy problems without advice and support from the U.S. Government.

Let me give some illustrations. The European members of NATO, under pressure from their own public opinion, have sought to use NATO as a lever to press for the restoration of democracy in Greece. Even this past December, at the NATO Council meeting in Copenhagen, U.S. officials managed to prevent those efforts from materializing. The U.S. Government over and over again has sought to impede every multilateral effort, in the Council of Europe, the Common Market, etc., against the Greek regime. It has also intervened even in bilateral relations between European countries and Greece.

The U. S. Government supplied the junta with military and economic assistance - directly and indirectly - using as a pretext the requirements of the NATO Alliance. Huge loans, designed to cover increasing deficits in the balance of payments were generously extended by American banks apparently not without the blessing of the State Department.

The European Governments - seeking to demonstrate their displeasure with the dictatorship - did not indulge in State visits, with one or two minor exceptions. The American Government, on the contrary, tried to lend prestige to the junta by sending to Athens former Vice President Agnew and cabinet members such as Messrs. Laird, Rogers, Stans, etc. as well as an uninterrupted array of Admirals and Generals from NATO and the 6th Fleet. These military and civilian visitors competed among themselves in heaping praise upon the "achievements" of the regime.

There have been few instances where the U.S. Government appeared to be assuming a critical stance against the Colonels. But these proved to be sheer rhetoric, unsubstantiated by appropriate actions. For example, the embargo imposed in 1967 on the delivery of heavy military equipment to Greece was never effectively implemented. It was ended in 1970. Government statements in favor of a return to democracy in Greece were systematically nullified by visiting personalities, mostly military, telling the junta that these expressions were designed to pacify American public opinion and the Congress.

Never has the U. S. Government clearly shown appropriate indignation at the oppressive measures employed by its protegee in Greece. Let me mention a characteristic example. Five days after the massacre of the Polytechnic students, the American Admiral Colbert visited Athens. All the Athenians newspapers

published a picture of him with a smile and admiringly clasping the hands of the dictator - a hand which was still wet with the blood of innocent Greek students.

The systematic effort of the American military establishment to come to the aid of the military regime has been most recently illustrated by the Supreme Commander of NATO, General Goodpaster. In an interview, which was published with banner headlines in the junta-controlled press on April 19th, he extolled the virtues of the Greek defense organization. This came only days after my own testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe where I cautioned about the dangers of the disintegration of the Greek defense establishment, as a result of junta policies.

The American authorities have never ceased advising, even pressuring, the Greek democratic leadership to come to some form of collaboration with the junta so as to allegedly assist in the gradual restoration of democracy. Even to the most naive, this appears as a transparent attempt to hide the ugliness of the dictatorship behind a democratic facade.

After all of this, it is only natural for the overwhelming majority of Greeks to believe that the junta is American-made and maintained. And they also believe, that if real difficulties are encountered, the U.S. Government would not hesitate to come to the junta's assistance by military force. It is frightening but this is what the Greek people believe.

VII. Greece entered NATO in 1952 under the auspices of a parliamentary government. The bilateral strategic agreements between Greece and the U.S. have also been contracted by parliamentary governments. No one has ever accused those governments of not respecting or applying those agreements faithfully. The same cooperative trend would have been continued if democracy had not been overthrown in Greece. Safeguarding important strategic and legitimate American interests in Greece therefore, cannot be considered as the reason for U.S. support of the dictatorship. Dictatorship was apparently thought necessary to satisfy U.S. demands which are not compatible with the dignity or interests of the Greek people. Homeporting facilities in the area of Athens is a case in point.

Thanks to the dictatorship, the U.S. has secured the trouble-free utilization of the Greek geographic space. At the same time, Greece has been transformed into real estate that can be used at will.

Given the Middle East strategic developments of the last few years, American policymakers have toyed with the idea of seeing Greece out of NATO and of establishing Spanish-style bilateral relations with the Greek junta. The so-called advantages of this approach have also been highlighted on various occasions by Greek supporters of "realpolitik." This scheme has never been seriously considered, however, even by the dictatorship.

The U.S. Government also apparently believed that the dictatorship would have guaranteed the unimpeded use of Greek territory for its strategic needs in the Middle East. President Nixon's statement is characteristic. Challenged by his presidential opponents in the 1972 campaign regarding his support for the Greek dictatorship, Mr. Nixon asserted that there can be no viable defense policy for Israel without Greece. Despite this, during the October War (1973), the American air-bridge to Israel could not make use of Greek territory. Not even the dictatorship could ignore the basic interests of Greece in the Arab countries (e.g., Greek minorities in Arab nations and dependence on Arab oil).

Such were, in short, the dubious advantages of the U.S. support of the dictatorship in Greece.

All this is outweighed by the negative effect which support of the junta has had on the Greek people's attitude towards the U.S. The old friendship has eroded and an anti-Americanism has developed, an anti-Americanism that threatens to assume explosive proportions.

The Greek people are also quite concerned about the diversion of the Armed Forces away from external defense considerations toward internal regime-support activities. This contributes to a feeling of national insecurity for which they also hold the U.S. responsible.

There is yet one other thing. Young officers who belong to the junta, had expected strong military support from the U.S. which helped them come to power. In their narrow-focused nationalistic mentality they feel that the U.S. has defaulted in its responsibilities toward them in their country. Thus, being deeply disappointed, they have come to think that the Quaddafi model of neutralism would best serve Greek interests. As a non-aligned country, the argument goes, Greece would enjoy the support of both the U.S. and the USSR who would compete for its favors.

Thus, from the very bosom of the American backed dictatorship have sprung forces directly opposing the military presence of America in Greece.

And to conclude on this section, the position of the U.S. vis a vis the Greek dictatorship, has shaken the strong feelings of friendship towards America which had existed ever since Greek independence. The old friendship has been replaced by a continually intensifying anti-Americanism. Even regarding Greece's international position which prior to the coup was set, for most Greeks, it is now being seriously questioned.

Thus neutrality appears to offer the best orientation for the country. Neutrality of course is also a respectable cover for that sector of public opinion that was always anti-western. Many tendencies therefore, are coming together on this issue. And, so long as there is no change in the causes which

have brought this about, neutralism will continuously increase in strength with the passage of time.

VIII. To complete the story, let us proceed to a brief analysis of the consequences of the Greek dictatorship in the international setting.

The weakening of Greece as a result of the dictatorship, can be quite dangerous for the unity of the NATO Alliance. The unfounded demands of Turkey regarding the continental shelf of Greece, Turkish minorities in Thrace and Macedonia and the Cyprus issue (demands for federalization, i.e., partition) are resounding proof of the existence of these dangers.

A confrontation between Greece and Turkey would disrupt the alliance. On the other hand, if the Turkish demands were allowed to be satisfied at the expense of Greece, the alliance would be transformed from an instrument of protection, to a mechanism for the destruction of Greece. The former would be absurd, and the latter would be criminal.

The inconsistencies of the dictatorship's policies toward President Makarios have added further difficulties to a Cyprus settlement. Furthermore, they have contributed to the USSR repeatedly appearing as the protector of hellenism in Cyprus and as the guarantor of peace in the area.

Political developments generally in Southeast Europe necessitate a strong and effective Greek government based on

the will of the people. Tito's succession is a case in point.

On the other hand, Todor Zhivkov of Bulgaria has recently stated that his country is looking forward to political union with the USSR and that his government is working with all its power to attain this goal. Such a development will have significant repercussions for the maintenance of peace and security in the area. Such fundamental developments cannot be treated adequately by a government which does not enjoy the support of the people.

IX. The Papadopoulos regime fell as a result of incompetence, corruption and deceit. The word 'deceit' here refers to Papadopoulos' behavior toward his American protectors. The Papadopoulos regime fell, but the dictatorship remains. There has only been a change of guard among the jailers of the Greek people. The only member of the original junta who has survived in the 'New Guard' is Brigadier General Demetrios Ioannides, the dreaded chief of the Military Police and the head of the "Organization for the Security (control) of the Armed Forces." All other members of the new junta are new faces.

The new guard, however, is not homogeneous. It consists of three factions with distinctly different ideologies and objectives. There will soon be a confrontation among those factions as today's unstable equilibrium cannot be maintained for long.

Today the regime is a dictatorship without a dictator and a tyranny without a tyrant. The new junta, in order to survive, must manage to become homogeneous and find an undisputed leader. Further, Papadopoulos has bequeathed this new regime with acute problems such as a serious economic crisis, student unrest, church disruption and the need to punish those responsible for corruption in the previous phase of the dictatorship.

In order to cope with these problems the new regime will have to rely on further increasing oppression and violence. The Greek people, however, have reached the limit of their patience and may soon explode in revolt.

Among the factions in the new junta one is the so-called "Quaddafists" or neutralists. If in the next confrontation they manage to secure decisive control of the junta, then the U.S. military presence in Greece will come to an end.

If, on the other hand, the Quaddafists do not prevail - and in one or another fashion the dictatorship survives - the mounting popular frustration with increasing repression, will surely lead to a popular uprising. If, as a result democracy is restored, despite American support for the dictatorship, then the American presence in Greece will be also terminated.

Thus, the tide of events will lead one way or the other to punishment for the crime of U.S. support for the dictatorship in Greece.

This is why it is necessary to proceed immediately with a drastic revision of American policies toward Greece.

Specifically, the U.S. Government should disassociate itself from the dictatorship - in words and deeds - and should declare its firm support for the restoration of democracy.

If and when this happens, forces within Greece will bring a painless end to the tyrannical regime. The political and resistance leadership of the country will then form a government of national unity which will carry out within a stated period of time free and fair elections.

It is quite certain that in the new parliament a solid majority will emerge in support of democratic governments which will vindicate Greece's position as an equal partner in the family of Western nations. The great majority of the Greek people knows that its real interests are vitally associated with those of the Western World.

If the U.S. sincerely helps in this process, the Greek people will forgive, if not forget, past wrongs committed against them. The Greek people are not rancorous. The traditional Greek-American friendship will surely be rekindled.

X. But it is time to conclude. I have briefly presented to you an analysis of an extremely complex and evolving situation in Greece.

Secondly, I have tried to evaluate the results of the application of "realpolitik" in Greek-American relations.

The outcome of my analysis above is a warning of a rapidly approaching crisis in Greece and its surrounding area with significant repercussions on America's position. The art of governing is the art of foreseeing and acting accordingly in time.

But there is even a more important point that should be made here. The Greek dictatorship is the first application of technological authoritarianism in post-War Europe. What has happened in Greece can also happen in other Western countries, not necessarily European.

The Greek tragedy highlights the basic problems for democracy in the future - whether technology will be its servant or the instrument of its destruction. And this is the most important warning coming from Greece.

END