Nationalism and Small State Foreign Policy:
The Greek Response to the Macedonian Issue

by Nikolaos Zahariadis, University of Alabama at Birmingham

Few statesmen could have foreseen the complications posed by the resurgence of nationalism and inter-ethnic tensions in the wake of the dissolution of communism in the former Eastern bloc. Although a great deal has been written about how nationalist aspirations and ethnic divisions affect a state's external relations,[1] little attention has been paid to nationalism as an external source of foreign policy. We are warned, for example, that the emerging nationalism in lands of former Eastern Europe is an issue of great concern, but we are not given a theoretical map as to how it may affect the Western response.[2]

In this paper, I am concerned with the effects of nationalism as an external stimulus on foreign policy: that is, how nationalism in one state or region affects another state's foreign policy. The main argument is that structure, which has global and regional components, mediates the adverse effects of unifying nationalism (also known as irredentism). The findings extend structural theories, enhance the theoretical understanding of a small state's foreign policy behavior, and emphasize the importance of symbols and ideas as sources of interstate disputes in addition to territoriality.

The case study from which I will draw empirical material involves the Greek response to Yugoslav Macedonian nationalism[3] since World War II. Why did the issue gain prominence in the post-Cold War era after being dormant for over 40 years? Particular emphasis will be placed upon explaining Greek efforts to prevent the international recognition of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM). Oddly, Greek politicians have made it abundantly clear on several occasions that FYROM is not a contested territory and that Greece makes no territorial claims on that entity.[4] Why is Greece then so steadfastly opposed to its recognition?

---

[1] See, for example, James G. Kellas, The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity (New York: St. Martin's, 1991) and James Mayall, Nationalism and International Society (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

[2] Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Post-Communist Nationalism," Foreign Affairs (Winter 1989-90): 1-25.

[3] For a contemporary exegesis of the "Macedonian Question" and the competing perspectives, see Symeon Giannakos, "The Macedonian Question Reexamined: Implications for Balkan Security," Mediterranean Quarterly (Summer 1992): 26-47; Katerina Manolopoulou-Varvitsioti, "The Macedonian Question: The Independence of the 'Socialist Republic of Macedonia' and its Implications," Athena, March 1992, 69-71.

[4] Kerin Hope and Judy Dempsey, "Balkan Pledge on Macedonia: Greece Seeks to Allay International Concern about its Intentions," Financial Times, 13 November 1992, 3. In the aftermath of the Balkan wars of 1912-13 and World War I Greece legally possessed nearly all the land inhabited by Greeks in Macedonia and thus hoped to liberate the remaining "unredeemed" Greeks in eastern Thrace and Asia Minor. The disastrous Greek-Turkish war of 1922 smothered all aspirations for a "Greater Greece", and subsequent Greek governments have been extremely reluctant to even appear to covet neighboring territory, including that of FYROM.

Although the analysis does not question the merit of studies that seek answers in domestic politics, Greek foreign policy can be explained largely by examining the effects of external factors. In this sense, the study follows a stream of research that views the state as a unitary actor.[5] Several reasons impelled this choice. First, external factors are likely to have the most influence on small states.[6] There is general agreement in the international relations literature that because small powers lack the capacity to greatly influence their environment, they are more likely to adapt their policies to its dictates.[7] Consequently, the foreign policy of a small state, such as Greece, should illuminate these effects most clearly. Second, I am interested in increasing the theoretical understanding of a small power's foreign policy, which is an area that contains mostly "theories not substantiated with empirical evidence."[8] Third, the case sheds light on the general issue of nationalism in the former Eastern Europe and the problems of the Western response. Without a doubt, the disintegration of Yugoslavia illustrates most vividly the type of challenge to world peace that has emerged in the post-Cold War era. Finally, in its contemporary form this particular issue has not received adequate scholarly attention.

Nationalism, Structure and Foreign Policy: A Framework

Despite its role as a powerful force that shaped world history in the last two centuries, nationalism is one of the most ambiguous concepts in social science.[9] Indicative of this confusion is the fact that despite the plethora of studies on the subject, there is no widely agreed upon definition. Some authors view nationalism as a political doctrine, others as a political movement, and yet others as both.[10] The latter seems more appropriate because there is more to nationalism than mere ideology; the term can also take various organizational forms that may prove to be critical to its success (or failure). In practical terms, this means that nationalism should be examined both in terms of content and in terms of organization. Accordingly, nationalism is taken here to refer to "an ideological movement for the attainment and maintenance of self-government and independence on behalf of a group, some of whose members conceive it to constitute an actual or potential "nation" like others."[11] Central to this definition is the nation which is a group of people who share a collective

---

[5] Graham Allison, The Essence of Decision (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971).

[6] Throughout this paper, the terms small and weak are used interchangeably. Although scholars disagree as to what constitutes a small state, small here refers to size and power relative other states in the international system.

[7] See, for example, Michael Handel, Weak States in the International System (London: Frank Cass, 1981); Robert O. Keohane, "Lilliputians' Dilemmas: Small States in International Politics," International Organization 23 (1969): 291-310; Raimo Vayrynen, "Small States in Different Theoretical Traditions of International Relations Research," in Otmar Holl, ed., Small States in Europe and Dependence (Wien: Braumuller, 1983). For evidence challenging this conclusion, see Maurice A. East, "Size and Foreign Policy: A Test of Two Models," World Politics (July 1973): 557?

[8] Maria Papadakis and Harvey Starr, "Opportunity, Willingness, and Small States: The Relationship Between Environment and Foreign Policy," in Charles F. Hermann, Charles W. Kegley, Jr., and James N. Rosenau, eds., New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987), 428.

[9] Peter Alter, Nationalism (London: Edward Arnold, 1989), 4.

[10] For critical reviews of various definitions, see ibid., 4-9 and Anthony D. Smith, Theories of Nationalism (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1983), chap. 7.

[11] Smith, Theories of Nationalism, 171.

sentiment that features ties of history, culture, and common ancestry.[12]

Although there exist many typologies, nationalism can generally be divided into two types: Risorgimento and integral.[13] Risorgimento nationalism, which is the focus of interest in this paper, refers to liberation from political and social oppression and seeks to place the nation as an equal member of a family of nations. In broad terms, it can have one of two aims: separate or unify.[14] These aims have a differential impact on foreign policy. Separatist nationalism, that is, secession from a larger unit, may be viewed with caution, but it is unlikely to produce a hostile reaction by state A. This is particularly true when borders are clearly demarcated, the size of the state to be created (state B) is relatively small, and B's creation does not violate A's vital national interests—such as blocking vital commercial routes, weakening A's ability to defend herself, or undermining A's political authority. Unifying nationalism, however, that is, one that aims to liberate people who are members of state A, is likely to be met with hostility and even aggression. This is because such nationalism effectively undermines the sovereignty of state A, and by extension the concept of the nation-state itself. Any legitimacy accorded to state B will perpetuate demands and may eventually result in the break up of state A.

Naturally, both aims can also be two points along the same national historical trajectory. It is possible that separatist nationalism evolve into unifying nationalism once state B has solidified control over her territory. This scenario is not at all infrequent, and Greece is no stranger to it.[15] Indeed, Greece's borders have continually shifted since her independence in 1830. Greek Macedonia was liberated from the Ottoman yoke in 1913 after years of armed struggle between opposing bands from Bulgaria and Greece, and to a lesser degree Serbia, and two Balkan Wars that involved all the states in the peninsula.[16] Consequently, nationalism with latent or explicit unifying tendencies is likely to provoke a strong reaction by neighboring states. Of course unifying nationalism need not be destructive. Rather it can have the beneficial effect of bringing together disparate groups of people. The attractiveness of such ideology is the obsessive search for a sense of community; the group becomes "a refuge against a hostile and uncaring world."[17] More relevant to the present situation in the former Eastern Europe, nationalism can be considered as "a substitute for factors of integration in a disintegrating society."[18] So long as this ideology refers to people within a given state, tension between states is likely to be low.

---

[12] Kellas, The Politics of Nationalism, 2.

[13] The typology belongs to Alter, Nationalism.

[14] Breuilly, Nationalism, 11-12. Nationalism can also have a third aim, that of reform. This aim, however, is excluded from here because it is irrelevant to our case. In contrast to the other two aims which seek to establish a state, reform nationalism emerges in an existing one, e.g., Turkey and Japan, and makes no additional territorial demands.

[15] An elaboration of Greek unifying nationalism, the so-called *Megali Idea*, is included in John Cambell and Philip Sherrard, Modern Greece (New York: Praeger, 1968) and Douglas Dakin, The Unification of Greece, 1770-1923 (London: Benn, 1972).

[16] For an incisive account of the Greek struggle in Macedonia, see Douglas Dakin, The Greek Struggle in Macedonia, 1897-1913 (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies and Museum of the Macedonian Struggle, 1993).

[17]Manning Nash, The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp. 128-29.

[18] Hroch quoted in E.J. Hobsbawm, Nations and Nationalism since 1780 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 173.

Apart from content, the organizational apparatus by which nationalism manifests itself is also significant. It makes a difference whether nationalist ideology is espoused by a sovereign versus a non-sovereign entity. Sovereign entities command exclusive territorial ownership and demand undivided political loyalty. Conversely, nations as opposed to states derive their vitality and viability largely from cultural bonds.[19] In this way, the normative identity of nations "rests not in space, but in time."[20] Moreover, stateless nations do not have clearly demarcated boundaries; in fact they may extend across several states. The consequences of this differentiation suggest that the impact of nationalist ideology differs along the organizational dimension. State nationalism, to employ Lapid's terminology,[21] is likely to have more deleterious effects on other states than the ideology of stateless nations. This is because sovereignty elevates the legitimacy of nationalist ideology; after all sovereign states are viewed as equally legitimate, but not equally powerful, units in the world system. Hostility in the form of ideas and symbols materializes into the state apparatus for the latter provides the human and material resources necessary to pursue nationalist dreams.

Structure acts as a filter refracting or absorbing the potentially negative effects of nationalism. In this sense structure becomes an intervening variable that conditions the impact of nationalism in one country on another country's foreign policy. It follows that certain types of structure are more capable of refracting and cushioning the negative effects of unifying nationalism.

It has long been recognized that the structure of the international system helps to shape the political patterns of interaction among its members. Structure here refers to the way the parts of a system are arranged. According to realists and neorealists, who are the most forceful advocates of the centrality of structure in international affairs, states must rely on their own capabilities and external alliances to ensure survival and enhance security.[22] As a result, a global balance of power will emerge.

Since World War II the global system of military bipolarity has had a profound impact on state behavior.[23] States clustered around two hegemons by forming alliances, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and by formulating or redefining their interests and objectives to better suit alliance goals. This is particularly true of small states. Because they lack extensive coercive powers, small states are dependent on the security umbrella offered by superpowers. Consequently, the former pursue policies that avoid direct confrontation with the latter or at least cast their actions and goals in ways that suggest that their defense is also

---

[19] Ernest Gellner, Nations and Nationalism (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983).

[20] C.J. Berry, "Nations and Norms," The Review of Politics 43 (1981): 75-87.

[21] Yosef Lapid, "Theorizing the "National" in International Relations Theory: Reflections on Nationalism and Neorealism," in eds., Friedrich Kratochwill and Edward D. Mansfield International Organization: A Reader (New York: Harper Collins, 1994).

[22] This thesis has been vigorously advocated by realists. For further elaboration, see Henry A. Kissinger, "System Structures and American Foreign Policy," in Charles W. Kegley , Jr. and Eugene Wittkopf, eds., Perspectives on American Foreign Policy (New York: St. Martin's, 1983); Kenneth M. Waltz, Theory of International Politics (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979); and Robert Gilpin, War and Change in World Politics (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981). For additional insight and criticism consult Robert Keohane, ed., Neorealism and its Critics (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

[23] One could of course argue that the global system became tripolar in the 1970s and 1980s with the addition of China. More recently, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, one analyst envisions a unipolycentric system which also includes regional hegemons, such as Japan or Germany. For further elaboration of the concept of unipolycentrism, see John Spanier, Games Nations Play 8th edition (Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1993).

in the interest of their senior partners.[24] The foreign policy of Greece illustrates this pattern of behavior well. Historical disputes with Bulgaria and Yugoslavia concerning claims over territories of northern Greece, which Greeks refer to as Macedonia and Thrace, were for the most part brushed aside. Relations with these countries were then reformulated on a Cold War basis, that is pursuing warmer relations with non-aligned Yugoslavia while assuming a more bellicose posture vis-a-vis communist Bulgaria.[25]

Global structure, however, is not the only structural variable affecting a small country's foreign policy. Small states also have a narrow geographic range of concerns.[26] Because they lack the resources for extensive international interaction, they tend to concentrate on regional issues of immediate security. Consequently, a regional component should be added to our framework: the regional balance of power. Although it is affected by the global system, it also has its own internal dynamics that influence a state's foreign policy.

To a large extent, the global system affects the regional balance of power. Independence was won by most Balkan states in the 19th century partially because of support from foreign powers such as Britain, France, and Russia. Traditionally considered to be weak powers, Balkan states, including Greece, have also sought continued protection by allying themselves with stronger patrons. Diplomacy has been conducted in consultation with their protectors and the intensity of pursuit of their goals has been tempered by signals from foreign governments.

Once fluid, the structure of the Balkan balance of power has been relatively stable with the advent of global bipolarity. Being Soviet allies, Romania and Bulgaria stood on one side. Greece and Turkey, two reluctant NATO allies, stood on the other. Leaning more toward the West although pursuing a middle, "non-aligned" policy was Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, in their pursuit of national interests Greek policy makers occasionally sought to shift the balance. In periods of intense antagonism with Turkey, for example, Greece sought warmer relations with Bulgaria to counterbalance any relative power disadvantage vis-a-vis her Eastern neighbor. To put it in classical realist terms, when faced with external threats small states will seek to improve their position by seeking marginal changes in the regional distribution of power.

This situation yielded some unexpected benefits to Greece. National sovereignty and legitimacy granted by international recognition as well as the gradual integration of states into an international community of equals resulted in attempts to solidify the political map.[27] So long as the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia remained in tact, Greece's northern borders remained fixed and internationally recognized in their post-1913 form. It appears therefore that it is beneficial for Greece to support Yugoslavia in her post-World War II territorial form for changes in the status quo may lead to disputes over borders or, worse yet, an upset in the regional balance of power, should smaller Yugoslav republics seek alliances with more powerful neighbors. Consequently, opposition to the creation of a state is likely to be stronger when another state perceives that such an action will result in a negative tilt in the regional balance of power.

In this study, I am concerned with the impact of external factors on a small state's foreign policy. I have proposed a framework arguing that foreign policy is affected by

---

[24] David Vital, The Inequality of States (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).

[25] For geopolitical reasons, the Greek socialist government initiated security talks with Bulgaria in the early 1980s.

[26] Maurice A. East, "Size and Foreign Policy Behavior: A Test of Two Models," World Politics (July 1973): 557- 55?; Papadakis and Starr, "Opportunity, Willingness, and Small States".

[27] Mayall, Nationalism, 35.

nationalism whose effects are in turn mediated by global and regional structure. In the next section I use the framework to explain Greek foreign policy in response to Yugoslav Macedonian nationalism.

Greek Foreign Policy vis-a-vis Yugoslavia since World War II

To comprehend Greece's policy in regards to Yugoslav Macedonian nationalism, the content of FYROM's unifying nationalism must first be examined.[28] In the aftermath of World War II, Yugoslavia pushed aside defeated Bulgaria and took the initiative to raise the national consciousness of the Slavic inhabitants of Macedonia. To eradicate the pro-Bulgarian sentiments of a large segment of the population of Yugoslav Macedonia, Tito and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia laid out the groundwork for a remarkable transformation process, turning the indigenous Slavs into ethnic Macedonians by "mutation".[29] FYROM's version of Risorgimento nationalism has contributed significantly to the republic's push for national self-determination and international recognition. However, it is based on an interpretation of Macedonia's long history designed to suit the political needs of Yugoslavia's communist party. The mutation process required the invention of the essential elements of a new, albeit artificial nationality: a distinct language and church affiliation; an easily identifiable name; and a splendid history.[30]

The formation of the Republic of Macedonia as an equal partner among the six republics of federal Yugoslavia was a crucial first step, for it deterred secessionist tendencies and annexationist ambitions. From then on, the cultivation of Macedonian culture played a decisive role in propagating Macedonian nationalism.[31] To sever the Bulgarian linguistic ties that the local dialect had, a commission of Yugoslav linguists produced a "new" literary language based on the Prilep dialect but also enriched by Serbian, Russian and Polish contributions.[32]In marked contrast with marxist practice elsewhere, the newly formed communist regime in Skopje established by government degree the autocephalous Macedonian Orthodox Church over the objections of the Serbian Orthodox Patriarchate. Though the Church violated the canons of the Eastern Orthodox Church, and thus did not receive official recognition, it suited well the Balkan tradition of church affiliation as a determinant of nationality. Severing the spiritual ties that connected Yugoslav Macedonians

---

[28] The discussion on the content of FYROM's nationalism borrows from Nikolaos Zahariadis, "Is the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia a Security Threat to Greece?" Mediterranean Quarterly (Winter 1994): 84-105.

[29] Evangelos Kofos, The Macedonian Question: The Politics of Mutation (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1987).

[30] A representative sample of national 'Macedonian' historiography appears in Stoyan Pribichevich, Macedonia: Its People and History (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1982), 37-155. In a critique of historical legacies in the region, Kofos suggests that 'Macedonian' historiography has three primary goals: first, to advance that 'Macedonian' history is distinctively different from Bulgarian, Greek, and Serb history; second, to establish that 'Macedonians' are direct descendants of the early Slavic tribes which settled in Macedonia thirteen centuries ago; and third, to monopolize the Macedonian name for the Slavs of Macedonia. Kofos, "National Heritage and National Identity": 246-47.

[31] Palmer & King, Yugoslav Communism and the Macedonian Question, 154.

[32] The idiom spoken by Macedonian Slavs—in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and several villages near the border in northern Greece—was known as a Western Bulgarian dialect that had noticeable but not significant Turkish and Greek influence. Because the idiom lacked an alphabet, and consequently a written component, it tended to vary in pronunciation and vocabulary depending on the proximity to a major national group. The Prilep dialect has a close affinity to Bulgarian but is influenced by Servo-Croatian.

with other Balkan Slavs was a compelling way to reaffirm their separate existence and raise Macedonian consciousness.[33]

The nation-builders in Skopje found the idea of unifying the three Macedonian regions in a single state impossible to resist. As a result, they intensified efforts to raise the national identity and cultural distinctiveness of Macedonian minorities across the borders. Macedonian literature and historical treatises as well as Greek-language broadcasts from Radio Skopje, for example, portrayed Greek Macedonia as the cradle that nurtured the Macedonian national ideology and minimized Greek contributions to the region's liberation.[34] Similar efforts were aimed at eradicating the Bulgarian origins of Slavs in 'Pirin' Macedonia. From Greece's standpoint, these efforts aimed at strengthening cultural ties with Skopje and weakening links with Athens or Sofia until international conditions were ripe for more dramatic political action.

Still, the most visible way that Yugoslav policy makers sought to establish the historical and political legitimacy of the newly formed state was to adopt the term 'Macedonia' as her denomination. The term Macedonia has historically acquired several meanings[35] but never before has it symbolized the national character of a separate Slavic people. During the second half of the 19th-century, when the revolt against the Ottoman yoke was growing, the region had a multiethnic and multilingual population. In addition to Greeks and Bulgarians, smaller ethnic groups such as Vlachs, Jews, Serbs and Gypsies made up the remainder of Macedonia's non-Turkish population. Significantly, however, the term Macedonian was not used to describe a separate nationality.[36]

The term Macedonian first became attached to a non-Greek political movement in 1893. That year a secret organization, the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO), was founded by Bulgarian revolutionaries born in Macedonia. While some IMRO leaders advocated unification with Bulgaria, others championed the political autonomy of the region. During the inter-war period the term acquired for the first time a strictly Slavonic interpretation. In the upheaval that followed the Balkan wars and the population exchanges,[37] Macedonia became a prime ground for revolutionary activities by communists who saw an opportunity to subvert the bourgeois Balkan governments. Under the prodding of several IMRO leaders and Bulgarian communists, the Fifth Comintern Congress in 1924 called on the Balkan communist parties to cooperate for the establishment of a united and independent Macedonian state within the framework of a Balkan communist federation.

---

[33] On the subject of the Macedonian Church and nationalism, see Stephen E. Palmer, Jr. and Robert R. King, Yugoslav Communism and the Macedonian Question (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971), 165-73.

[34] Kofos, "National Heritage and National Identity": 256.

[35] Nicholas P. Andriotis, "History of the Name Macedonia," in Macedonia: Past and Present, no ed., Thessaloniki: Institute of Balkan Studies, 1991).

[36] Duncan M. Perry, The Politics of Terror: The Macedonian Liberation Movements 1893-1903 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1988), 19-20. Barker, Macedonia, 16-17; Kofos, "National Heritage and National Identity": 238-39. "Even as late as 1945," confirms Fromkin, "Slavic Macedonia had no national identity of its own." David Fromkin, "Demetrios Returns: Macedonia and the Balkan Question in the Shadow of History," World Policy Journal (Summer 1993): 71.

[37] The 1919 Treaty of Neuilly provided for Greek-Bulgarian voluntary exchanges of population. About 52,000 Bulgarians of eastern Macedonia and Thrace left Greece, and 25,000 Greeks left Bulgaria. In the Greek census of 1928, 81,984 persons registered as Slav-speaking, living mostly in western Macedonia. The 1923 Lausanne Agreement provided for Greek-Turkish compulsory population exchanges. 348,000 Turks left Greek Macedonia and 638,000 Greeks from Asia Minor settled in Greek Macedonia. According to the 1928 census 88.1% of the population in Greek Macedonia was Greek. Barker, Macedonia, 46-48.

Tito employed the Macedonian label in 1945 to activate the mutation process. The application of this designation to the republic and its people offered several significant advantages. As a regional and geographic designation the label was well known to the population and very suitable for speedy adoption. It sharply contrasted with Bulgarian, Serbian or Greek names and could consequently sever ties that Slav speakers had maintained with these three countries. But more importantly for political purposes, this name availed Skopje the opportunity, "through the interplay of its regional and national meanings,"[38] to breed massive confusion and obscure historical events. The confusion had very destructive and far-reaching implications for it could create the erroneous perception among policy makers and the general public that everything associated with the region of Macedonia and its people can be legitimately claimed by the nation of Yugoslavia's Macedonia. The name enabled the Yugoslav Macedonian authorities to manipulatively diminish the presence and contribution of other ethnic groups (Greek, Bulgarian, Albanian, Turkish, Vlach, Jewish) in Macedonia's recent history and refute a significant aspect of these peoples' heritage. The consolidation of Yugoslav Macedonian nationalism, however, antagonized her Balkan neighbors because the copious mixture of ethnic, historical, religious, cultural, and linguistic legends employed to found this nation overlap with Greek and Bulgarian national traditions.

Nationalism has not conditioned Greek foreign policy directly. Rather, its effects have been filtered through external structural impediments. The latter kept nationalism in the region alive but dormant for thirty years. Further, these impediments narrowed decidedly the policy options available to the Greek government. In a nutshell, the Greek reaction was the by-product of the psychology of fear induced by anti-communist sentiments domestically and reinforced by perceived external security threats originating at the global as well as the regional levels. However, structural changes in the 1980s unmasked the raw and potentially destabilizing effects of nationalism.

Having formed a constituent republic within a sovereign federation achieved *de facto* international recognition of her people as a separate nationality. In line with unifying nationalism, claims for respecting Macedonian minority rights elsewhere could now be used as levers of pressure in geopolitical calculations. Neighboring states acquiesced to the formation of Macedonia in the hope of resolving Yugoslavia's complex problem of nationalities. Greece realized early on that Belgrade's willingness to counterbalance the powerful centrifugal forces active in Yugoslavia could not always prevent occasional bellicose demonstrations of Macedonian nationalism. As a result, Greece vehemently denied the existence of a Macedonian minority on her territory and intensified efforts to secure a close relationship with the federal government and Serbian authorities in the hope that these two institutions would contain Yugoslav Macedonian irredentism. This was an effective strategy as long as Tito sought to maintain Yugoslavia's international significance both as buffer state between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and as leader of the non-aligned movement. But Yugoslavia's strategic importance as an anti-Soviet communist regime may have handicapped Greece's ability to withhold the prospect of improved relations until a more favorable solution of the 'Macedonian' issue was reached. The intense Anglo-American interest on Tito's survival after the 1948 Cominform expulsion provided the impetus for closer relations among Yugoslavia and her non-communist Balkan neighbors.[39]

Internally weakened by years of civil strife, Greece could not furnish the power required to grapple with the Macedonian initiatives of Tito's Yugoslavia, and relied on Western influence to entice and pressure Tito to abandon any expansionist desires towards Greece. The Americans and the British had by 1949 decided that Tito's presence as an independent and potentially disruptive influence in the communist movement had vital and strategic implications in the East-West confrontation and wished to see a quick normalization

---

[38] Kofos, "National Heritage and National Identity": 249.

[39] For an incisive account of the Western concern about Tito's survival, see Beatrice Heuser, <u>Western 'Containment' Policies in the Cold War: The Yugoslav Case, 1948-53</u> (London: Routledge, 1989).

of Greek-Yugoslav relations. As a result, they pressured Tito to terminate the military assistance of Greek guerrillas and urged both governments to resolve their differences in the conclusion of the Greek civil war. The rapprochement incurred several setbacks over claims that the rights of Slav-speaking Greeks were violated. Western intermediaries persuaded the Greek government that Tito could not risk censuring the nationalistic outbursts of Macedonians because this was likely to allow the dissemination of pro-Bulgarian propaganda and raise discontent among Macedonian communists.[40] Following some groundbreaking diplomacy, the two states finally reestablished formal diplomatic relations in mid-1951.

The consolidation of the military pacts in Europe and the ensuing Cold War shaped the geopolitical character of the Balkans and checked the proliferation of historic and ethnic rivalries that were the primary destabilizing element in the region. The Korean War and the perception that a Soviet-satellite attack on Yugoslavia was imminent created the conditions for Yugoslavia's integration into the Western defense strategy.[41] At the regional level, the signing of the Tripartite Balkan Pact of 1954 by Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey indirectly placed Yugoslavia in a position to reap the benefit of NATO's security, and illustrated the shared interests of these three states in the defense of their frontiers against Bulgaria. Though the Pact quickly collapsed due to the deteriorating state of Greek-Turkish affairs over Cyprus by 1955, it diminished significantly the perceived threat from the north by securing a friendly Yugoslavia and permitted Greek military planners to reorient the nation's defense towards her eastern neighbor. Since then, the steady deterioration of Greek-Turkish relations has remained a key factor influencing the regional balance of power. Economic cooperation and high-level military consultations between Yugoslavia and Greece were consequently perceived as part of a tactical move aimed at bolstering Greece's bargaining position vis-a-vis Turkey, though it was never anticipated that Yugoslavia would interfere militarily into a squabble between the two NATO allies.

These considerations required frequent Greek silence on Macedonia in the interest of defusing crises that could intensify internal disputes and undermine the cohesion and stability of the Yugoslav Federation. In contrast, the upsurge of Macedonian nationalism guided "Belgrade's hand in the dispute with Greece"[42] in several instances. Following Bulgaria's decision to retract the recognition of Macedonian minorities in 1958—which is Bulgaria's official policy even today despite recognition of FYROM's statehood—Skopje expressed an increased concern for the Slavs of 'Aegean' Macedonia, pushing the Yugoslav government to support a cultural campaign designed to raise their ethnic consciousness. This effort revived old feuds and forced the Greek government to unilaterally suspend the joint border agreement in March 1962.

Tito's death in 1980 and the ensuing disruption of government continuity in Belgrade facilitated the eruption of nationalistic, and even secessionist, indulgences by the republics. This ethnic polarization had considerable consequences beyond the Yugoslav borders, because, in order to placate the republics, the federal authorities agreed to raise the subject of minority rights in bilateral meetings with neighboring states. Proclaiming minority rights as a principal component of Yugoslavia's foreign policy disturbed Greece and Bulgaria since they were not prepared to accept that Yugoslav minorities existed in their territories.[43] This often reached crisis proportions because Yugoslavia was unwilling to cooperate on other issues

---

[40] On the Western mediation efforts between Greece and Yugoslavia, see Heuser, Western 'Containment' Policies in the Cold War, 88-97.

[41] The Yugoslavs had announced their intention to defend the Julian Alps in northern Yugoslavia and block the Soviet assault on Italy and the Adriatic. Ibid, 155-58.

[42] Palmer & King, Yugoslav Communism, 195.

[43] Yugoslavia raised the subject of Serbian and Croatian minorities in Romania during the 1980s as well.

unless problems with Yugoslav minorities in foreign lands were resolved.[44] As a result, the state of Greek-Yugoslav relations during the 1980s alternated between strained and improved, depending on Belgrade's varying willingness or capacity to adopt the ethnic minority planks issued by Skopje.

The heightened sensitivities about the plight of ethnic minorities in the Balkans opened the way for Turkey to attempt to restructure the regional balance of power and further strain Greek-Yugoslav relations. Turkey, which for many years complained internationally about the alleged mistreatment of muslim populations in Bulgaria and Greece, found in the minority issue a point of convergence with Yugoslavia and later with Skopje, that could be exploited to ferment regional opposition to Greece. On her part, Yugoslavia was irritated by Greece's "heretic" policy towards the NATO alliance and the continuing disputes over the demarcation of operational responsibility in the Aegean. In addition, the Greek government under socialist rule had pursued a policy of close cooperation with Bulgaria concerning Balkan security that sharply deviated from her traditional policy. Thus the advancement of demands for Macedonian minority rights as means of pressuring the Greek government served for different reasons both Turkish and Yugoslav interests.

The transition in Balkan politics during the 1980s parallels the radical transformation in East-West relations which altered Yugoslavia's geostrategic significance. The emergence of Solidarity in Poland and the Human Rights movement in then Czechoslovakia manifested the vulnerabilities of the marxist system and, in conjunction with IMF agreements, reduced tensions amongst the two alliances and undercut the rationale for western support of a unified and independent Yugoslav federation. Then in the late 1980s, the dramatic changes in Eastern Europe which ended the East-West ideological divide created new dynamics, leading inexorably to the dismemberment of Yugoslavia and the formation of completely new geopolitical realities in the region.

Alarmed by the impending loss of the final structural impediment to a recrudescence of Yugoslav Macedonian nationalism, the Greek government sought to prolong the regional status quo until an agreeable alternative was formulated. Greece initially opposed the break-up of the Yugoslavian federation and recognition of its constituent republics as independent states, but after failed negotiations to end the hostilities, she joined other EC members and the US in recognizing Croatia, Slovenia, and later Bosnia-Herzegovina. Greece, however, remained adamantly opposed to the recognition of FYROM and secured EC commitment in 1992 that the former republic would not be recognized until it relinquishes the term Macedonia because that designation raises suspicions of territorial ambitions.[45]

After independence, FYROM's government escalated its propaganda efforts by adopting provocative nationalistic symbols, for example the star of Vergina on its flag. This was the symbol used by the ancient Macedonian royal dynasty and was found in King Philip's tomb in Greece. Skopje also adopted the image of the White Tower (the symbol of the city of Thessaloniki in Greek Macedonia) on its commemorative currency, changed the names of many streets and other public places with Slavic appellations of Greek cities, and distributed pamphlets denouncing "the illegal Greek occupation of parts of Macedonia since

---

[44] In bilateral diplomatic meetings Yugoslav officials would typically complain of "open or unresolved problems in the relationship" that prevented closer cooperation.

[45] EIU, Greece: Country Report, 9. Greece obtained two additional conditions from the EC specifying that the former republic must provide constitutional and political guarantees that first, it harbors no territorial claims over Greece and second, it does not intend to conduct hostile propaganda activities against Greece. These conditions were necessary because the new constitution of 'Macedonia' included sections which stated that FYROM's parliament reserved the right to authorize annexation of territory and to protect the minority status and rights of so-called ethnic Macedonians in neighboring states. The Arbitration Committee of the EC issued a report, known as the Babinder Report, confirming that the offending sections, but not the preamble, were subsequently amended from FYROM's constitution.

1913." In addition, maps were distributed depicting the region of Greek Macedonia in chains. The Greek government interpreted these measures as acts with hostile intentions. This helps explain why Athens has refused to accept Skopje's offer to conclude a treaty on the inviolability of borders as sufficient evidence of good neighborly relations and insists on the additional removal of some of these symbols, namely the symbol on the flag.

Since the inception of hostilities in Yugoslavia, Greece has attempted to forestall the recognition of Macedonia by seeking to reconcile her regional policy objectives with those of the international community which favor the principle of self-determination. This is an inherently risky strategy, for it creates the negative impression that Greece is closely aligned with Serbia,[46] the party in the conflict universally condemned as the aggressor. Nevertheless, it is also indicative of the urgency to redirect the Greek foreign policy in the region, particularly in light of the deteriorating state of Greek-Bulgarian affairs.[47] The Greek government indicated her preference for a truncated Yugoslav federation which would unite Montenegro, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and FYROM under Serbian hegemony and her eagerness to function as a broker between Serbia and the West. This position contrasted sharply with the hardening attitudes projected by the Western leadership which, accepting the fact that Yugoslavia was irrevocably partitioned, pressed for the imposition of tough UN and EC sanctions against Serbia to force the cessation of hostilities. To deflect EC criticism that her position disrupted the first exercise in common foreign policy after Maastricht and to secure a more favorable resolution of the nomenclature issue, Greece agreed to impose an EC trade ban on the republics of Montenegro and Serbia.[48] Yet the frequent diplomatic consultations among Greek and Serbian officials throughout the civil war in Yugoslavia raised suspicions that the two sides collaborated on a joint platform to preserve the stabilizing presence of Serbia in the Balkans, albeit in a restructured fashion.[49]

To influence the consensus over FYROM's recognition, Greece has lobbied its EC colleagues and the US by reviving the almost forgotten historical antecedents of the "Macedonian Question" and by stressing the potential of further destabilization in the region.[50] Greeks do "not dispute the existence of a nation, a language or a republic after 1944, but she refutes the legitimacy of the appropriation of the Macedonian name for defining a Slavic population in the Balkans."[51] Furthermore, they argue that diplomatic recognition of the former republic under the term 'Macedonia' perpetuates the residual designs by the Skopje regime on the adjoining Greek province by the same name. Greece worries that the confusion created by the denomination is designed to install gradual legitimacy to FYROM's

---

[46] Greece and Serbia have had a longstanding relationship based on economic interdependence, common Orthodox heritage and historical enmity against the Turks.

[47] Problems between Bulgaria and Greece preceded Bulgaria's recognition of 'Macedonia' and were due to the pro-Turkish bent of Bulgaria's first post-communist government. Following the recognition of 'Macedonia' Greece suspended a $50 million line of credit to Bulgaria.

[48] Greece reluctantly also agreed to UN sanctions imposed at the end of May of 1992. She contributed a destroyer to the NATO flotilla patrolling the Adriatic which monitors the naval embargo.

[49] Press reports that the Serbian president, Slobodan Milosevic, proposed the division of the 'Republic of Macedonia' between Greece and Serbia were confirmed by the Greek foreign ministry. Greece rejected the offer and reported it to the EC.

[50] Greece fears that the heterogeneous populace and extreme economic weakness of 'Macedonia' make the former republic vulnerable to protracted periods of political instability, at best, or to partition along ethnic lines, at worst. On the subject of 'Macedonia's' economic survival and her dependency on adjoining states for economic support, see James Pettifer, "The New Macedonian Question," International Affairs (Fall 1992): 479-80.

[51] Evangelos Kofos, "The Macedonian Question: The Politics of Mutation," Balkan Studies, 27 (1986): 170.

claims over "unredeemed" lands belonging to 'Aegean' and 'Pirin' Macedonia.[52] Greece's concerns are not allayed by the obvious disparity in military capabilities and attachment to collective security organizations that currently exists between the two states, because Athens fears the risk of a protracted low-intensity warfare and because it foresees that the auspicious convergence of interests among FYROM and Turkey in the near future would present a formidable challenge to Greek vital and strategic interests in the region.[53] Despite amending some of the offending constitutional sections, the usurpation of the term encroaches a significant part of Greek history and sustains the high level of mistrust prevalent in recurrent dealings with Skopje over the last four decades.[54]

Following FYROM's unsuccessful bid for recognition from the European Community, the issue came before the UN's Security Council. Greece conceded FYROM's entry to the UN under the temporary designation "Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and agreed to negotiate a resolution to the dispute with FYROM under UN auspices. Despite reported progress on issues of economic cooperation, negotiations reached an impasse on the appellation issue and the symbols. Following Andreas Papandreou's advent to office in October 1993, Greece changed tactics. Having failed to reach a satisfactory conclusion, Papandreou raised the stakes by pulling out of the negotiations. Though he requested that three conditions be met before reestablishing dialogue with FYROM, namely Skopje should remove the symbol on its flag, amend its constitution, and cease the propaganda by signing a treaty with Greece guaranteeing the inviolability of borders, he asked that the nomenclature issue be resolved by negotiation. Given FYROM's dependence on Greece for two-thirds of its oil needs and as export route, its unwillingness to show more flexibility is surprising. To understand Greece's frustration and subsequent Greek strategy, one needs to examine one more change in the regional balance of power.

The protracted conflict in Bosnia-Hercegovina has prompted the deployment of several thousand troops from the United States and the rest of Europe in the region. Some 700 hundred UN troops from Scandinavian countries were deployed in FYROM in February 1993 and 300 additional military personnel from the US joined them in May. Though their purpose was to prevent a spillover of hostilities to the south, the US presence also upset the regional balance of power by strengthening FYROM's hand in the negotiations because it gave the appearance that the US was on its side. President Clinton's decision to station forces in FYROM was all the more surprising given the absence of such a request by FYROM's government.

Unfortunately, the Greek position has been misconstrued as indicative of future plans to resolve the Macedonian issue quietly in concert with Serbia. This is of course another deleterious consequence created by the confusion over the name, because Greece has consistently renounced any claims over FYROM, but it also emanates from the fundamental weakness of Greece's contemporary approach to the subject. Greece failed to maintain the proper distance between her policy on FYROM and her reaction to Yugoslavia's dismemberment. Driven by now irrelevant geopolitical considerations Greece sought to short-circuit the intense revival of Macedonian nationalism by maneuvering to preserve or recreate most of the structural status quo in Yugoslavia. Though she has legitimate concerns

---

[52] On the linkage between international recognition and territorial expansion, see Giannakos, "The Macedonian Question Reexamined": 45-46.

[53] Convergence is likely for two reasons. First, there is a shared interest in raising sensitivity over the plight of minorities in the Balkans. Second, 'Macedonia' is expected to welcome Turkey's role as a regional benefactor and protector, given Skopje's internal political and economic weakness and historical rivalries with other regional powers. For a detailed analysis of Greek security concerns, see Zahariadis, "Is the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia a Security Threat to Greece?"

[54] Interestingly, soon after the EC decision to adopt the Greek position, Skopje announced the inclusion of the sixteen rayed star, a well-known emblem of the ancient Macedonian Dynasty, as a symbol in their national flag.

over the break-up of Yugoslavia,[55] the protracted and visible display of reluctance to come to terms with the new reality placed her dangerously close to Serbia and thus damaged considerably her credibility over the Macedonian issue in the eyes of her allies.[56] In this regard, Greece seriously underestimated the potency of nationalism, fabricated or not, to elicit favorable reactions in an era when the forces of democracy and self-determination constitute the principal parameters in international affairs.

Conclusion

This paper has explored the effects of nationalism as an external stimulus of foreign policy. The proposed framework argued that the effects of nationalism are mediated by global and regional structure. The argument enhances the theoretical understanding of a small state's foreign policy.

Despite being limited to external factors, the framework has shown considerable explanatory power. It has confirmed conventional wisdom that the policies of small states are strongly conditioned by their external environment. This argument is likely to acquire more relevance in the case of Greece since the adoption of a common foreign policy within the European Union framework. Nevertheless, the findings also reveal the limits of such cooperation. Formulating a common foreign policy was originally conceived as Europe's way of acquiring collective leverage in world affairs. Such benefits were particularly welcomed by small states, such as Greece, because that would reduce their vulnerability to the external environment. Traditional balance of power considerations, however, have made this exercise quite difficult. Actions by several of Greece's European and NATO allies helped upset the regional balance of power prompting a swift Greek reaction that did not appear to be in congruence with the CFSP principle of prior consultation. Despite the emergence of supranational authorities in Europe, states still act (or react) in national terms.

At a time when structural approaches are losing their appeal in the discipline, the argument made here shows that structural insights have considerable explanatory potential. Still, it goes beyond structural theories of international relations. Conceptualizing structure as a mediating variable has added yet another source of interstate disputes in addition to territoriality. Ideas and symbols can also have a negative impact on another state's foreign policy, but the effects are likely to be strongest under certain structural conditions. This means that nationalism throughout the Cold War period was not so much suppressed as it refracted through the structural impediments that kept it at bay but also helped nourish it. As structure changed the negative impact of nationalistic dreams could no longer be restrained, thereby increasing regional instability and insecurity. In contrast to conventional structural approaches that view insecurity solely as being rooted in the structural distribution of power, the argument here suggests that ideas and symbols associated with unifying nationalism can also serve as causes for concern.

Finally, the end of the Cold War has affected states differently. Vulnerability to a rapidly changing environment is likely to increase uncertainty and by consequence a small state's insecurity. The presence of unifying nationalism in neighboring lands further accentuates fear. At best, the creation of a new state will upset, at least temporarily, the

---

[55] For a recent exposition of the disputes that threaten to shatter the fragile coalition between 'Macedonians' and ethnic Albanians, see Laura Filber, "Macedonia's Albanians Fearful of Ethnic Bloodbath," <u>Financial Times</u>, 17 November 1992, 2.

[56] Greece feared that the dissolution of the federation could lead to a Christian-Muslim Balkan confrontation between the alignment of Bosnian muslims, the recalcitrant ethnic Albanian population in Kosovo, the Albanians from western 'Macedonia', Albania, and possibly Turkey under her self-proclaimed role as "protector of brother Muslims," and the Eastern Orthodox nations of Serbia, Greece, and possibly Bulgaria.

regional balance of power. At worst, it will legitimize claims on the small state and effectively undermine its territorial integrity. The irony is that despite promises of stability in the new world order small states are likely to encounter more instability.

The emergence of unifying nationalism in neighboring territories further accentuates a small state's assertiveness and insecurity with destabilizing consequences. At best, the creation of a new state will, at least temporarily, disturb the regional balance of power. At worst, it will revive border disputes and, in the long-term, undermine the small state's territorial integrity. The irony is that despite promises of stability in the new world order small countries are likely to encounter more instability.

The 'Socialist Republic of Macedonia', the southern-most republic of former Yugoslavia, signaled her intention to secure sovereign status after Slav voters overwhelmingly approved a plebiscite in September of 1991.[57] Yugoslav 'Macedonia's' ethnic Albanians, approximately one fifth of the republic's population, boycotted the 1991 referendum because their minority status was not officially recognized. The republic's population of almost 2 million consists of the following ethnic groups: 67% 'Macedonians'; 19.8% Albanians; 4.5% Turks; 2.3% Serbs; 6.4% others. July Dempsey, "Specter of Falling Balkan Dominoes Haunts Europe," Financial Times, 17 June 1992, 2. Unlike the other breakaway republics of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, the United States and European Community have so far withheld diplomatic recognition from 'Macedonia'. In the Balkans, however, Bulgaria and Turkey have extended recognition and other political and economic support to it. Greece objects the usurpation of a title—that describes a historically Greek territory—by a Slavic entity and has pressured the international community to postpone recognition of the former Yugoslav republic until it chooses a designation that does not include the term Macedonia. As a result, Greece's response is criticized as incomprehensible, trivial, overly emotional, or even irrational and absurd.[58] Yet Greece steadfastly refuses to give ground on the nomenclature question. Why? What's in a name? Further confounding the issue is the fact that 'Macedonia' does not represent a credible security threat to Greece, given her small size and poorly equipped militia. Why then is Macedonia emerging once again as the "apple of discord"[59] forty three years since hostilities ended in the region?

---

[57] In this paper the term 'Macedonia' and derivatives—in inverted commas—are used to distinguish the Slavic national content attached to a traditionally geographical expression. It should not be confused with the regional—that is as a label indicating a certain region—or ancient use of the term, which applies to a land of ill-defined boundaries and varied ethnography. Macedonia was divided in 1913 into three regions. Slav speakers identify these three regions as 'Vardar' (Yugoslavia), 'Pirin' (Bulgaria), and 'Aegean' (Greek) Macedonia.

[58] "Greece: Balkanized," The Economist, 18 April 1992, 47-48; The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), Greece: Country Report, 3, 1992, 4-9.

[59] For an incisive account of the "Macedonian Question" during the early years of the Greek civil war (1944-1947), see C.M. Woodhouse, Apple of Discord (London: Hutchison, 1948).