



University of Piraeus

School of Economics, Business and International Studies

Department of International and European Studies

MSc in American Studies: Politics, Strategy and Economics

Thesis:

The United States of America & Greece:

Shaping the American - Greek Relations' Future through Strategic Foresight

Student: Panagiota Fasouli

Student ID: MAS 21020

Supervisor: Professor Athanasios G. Platias

Piraeus, July 2023

Statement

Το έργο που εκπονήθηκε και παρουσιάζεται στην υποβαλλόμενη διπλωματική εργασία είναι αποκλειστικά ατομικό δικό μου. Όποιες πληροφορίες και υλικό που περιέχονται έχουν αντληθεί από άλλες πηγές, έχουν καταλλήλως αναφερθεί στην παρούσα διπλωματική εργασία. Επιπλέον τελώ εν γνώσει ότι σε περίπτωση διαπίστωσης ότι δεν συντρέχουν όσα βεβαιώνονται από μέρους μου, μου αφαιρείται ανά πάσα στιγμή αμέσως ο τίτλος.

The intellectual work fulfilled and submitted based on the delivered master thesis is exclusive property of mine personally. Appropriate credit has been given in this diploma thesis regarding any information and material included in it that have been derived from other sources. I am also fully aware that any misrepresentation in connection with this declaration may at any time result in immediate revocation of the degree title.

Παναγιώτα Φασούλη Panagiota Fasouli

Athens, July 2023

Acknowledgments

I express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Athanasios G. Platias, for his invaluable guidance and unwavering support throughout my Master's Program and in particular, during the process of completing my thesis. This work would not have been possible without his expertise, experience and, most of all, encouragement.

I would also like to convey my appreciation to the Director of this MSc Program, Professor Aristotle Tziambiris, the initiator of the Program and an inspiring tutor. He is also worth my gratitude for his valuable contributions to this exceptional Master's Program and for providing us, as participants, with this unique opportunity.

In this regard, I would like to specifically highlight the two main pillars of the Program, the U.S. Embassy in Greece and the American State. Through their generous financial support by scholarship provision, they opened a new, upgraded path of knowledge for me. In a successful constructive collaboration with the University of Piraeus they promote a new field of academic expertise in our country

All Professors of the University of Piraeus, New York University and other Institutions have truly embodied the role of educators for us as students, and for that, I extend my sincere gratitude to each of them.

Finally, I thank all of my co-participants in the course for sharing their knowledge and experiences throughout this journey.

Last but not least, I express my gratefulness to my family and friends for their love, support and understanding during this process.

Page intentionally left blank

“The best we can do is study, think, and choose as best we can in the spirit of building toward the future. Then hope for a little luck.”¹

¹ James Fallows quoted in Dan Gardner’s book *“Future Babble Why Expert Predictions Fail - and Why We Believe Them Anyway”* (2010)

Executive summary

In an increasingly demanding world where traditional and new challenges constantly arise uncertainty is definitely not desirable. The majority of people and entities try to find ways to moderate doubtfulness and unpredictability. By doing so, not only does planning for the future become easier, but by implementing plans in conditions of low uncertainty the chance of success increases. If there is a field where uncertainty reigns that is definitely the international realm. Hundreds of states, thousands of stakeholders, and millions of interactions are taking place daily. Interdependencies and contrasting interests create a complex network of international relations. Although cooperation among states has increased through institutions like the United Nations, the European Union, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as well as various bilateral and multilateral engagements, the international system still fuels states' competitive instincts. Social, political, economic, environmental, and geopolitical factors influence the behavior of states and intensify antagonism. Hence, national security issues are at the top of the agenda. Defense of territorial integrity and national sovereignty as well as the protection of citizens are of primary concern for all states guided by rational decision-making criteria.

Within this context the question that this paper attempts to address is whether international and especially the bilateral relations of the United States of America and Greece can be shaped through the use of strategic foresight. To reach a relatively certain conclusion, taking a step back was necessary to explore first how the states shape their international relations. Organizations and entities have been using strategic analysis, strategic planning, and strategic management for many decades. All these tools are also used by states and governments during public policy, including foreign policy, structuring. In particular, the process of strategic planning is future oriented and intricately linked to the organization's vision. Thus, for the purpose of this paper an analogy is sought between strategic planning and grand strategy. Despite the fact that the two notions do not exactly coincide, they contribute to comprehending the complex procedures of international relations and foreign policy.

It is true that future predicting methods and tools have been developed and used in an attempt to reduce ambiguity. Academics, specialists, and researchers occasionally offered organizations means of future forecasting. Among them there are scholars convinced of the successful development of predicting methods. There are others less certain but equally optimistic about the capabilities of their models. Nevertheless, it is commonly acknowledged that there is no such thing as the perfect prediction tool. The majority of scholars conclude that there are tools and methods which decision makers can use to analyze trends and conclude better decisions, but not predict. One of this is strategic foresight which offers

numerous benefits for organizations and the administration. It helps explore contrasting events, directs policy and structures strategies.

Undoubtedly United States of America and Greece are not only distant in terms of geography they indeed have more contrasts than similarities, like the size, demography, economy, and power. However, the two states share a long-lasting relationship dating back to the nineteenth century. Stronger relations between the two countries developed after the Second World War and over time experienced both positive and negative moments. It is commonly accepted that today American – Greek relations are at their best moment. The two countries experience mutual understanding and a very productive cooperation in various fields.

The ambition of this paper is to direct the reader's gaze to methods and tools that can provide valuable help to decision-makers in matters of high politics. Strategic foresight can be applied to international and bilateral relations and offer a range of benefits for the states and other stakeholders. In this complex and constantly modifying world where technological advancements reign, governments that do not or do poorly use this tool should integrate it in the policy – making procedure. Certainly, strategic foresight is no panacea. But as Jennifer Gidley puts it “learning different ways of thinking our future offers more choices and it may also offer us the strength to create alternative futures from the numerous possibilities in the world” (Gidley, 2022, p. 42).

Key words: International relations, policy making, geopolitics, United States of America, Greece, foreign policy, decision-making process, security, Eastern Mediterranean, strategic planning, grand strategy, strategic foresight, multiple futures, future studies

Contents

Executive summary	6
Outline	10
Part One Theoretical Framework of International Relations and the Evolution of American – Greek Relations over time	11
Chapter One: International Relations, International System and Foreign Policy.....	11
1.1 Preliminary remarks.....	11
1.2 Theory Remarks	11
1.2.1 International Relations.....	11
1.2.2 Foreign Policy	13
1.2.3 Geopolitics	14
1.3 Summary	14
1.4 Conclusive notes	15
Chapter Two: American and Greek relations and foreign policy - A brief historical overview	16
2.1 Preliminary remarks.....	16
2.2 The early years	16
2.2.1 The United States of America	16
2.2.2 Greece	19
2.2.3 Conclusive notes	21
2.3 The years until World War II.....	21
2.3.1 The United States of America	22
2.3.2 Greece	24
2.3.3 Conclusive notes	27
Chapter Three: Deepening the ties.....	28
3.1 Preliminary remarks.....	28
3.2 The years after World War II	28
3.2.1 Introduction	28
3.2.2 The years from 1945 to 1989	29
3.2.3 The years from 1990 to today	31
3.3 Conclusive notes	33
Chapter Four: The Eastern Mediterranean Region – Enemies and Allies	34
4.1 Preliminary remarks.....	34

4.2 Geography and Geopolitics	34
4.3 Friends and Foes	35
4.4 Recent developments in the region	36
4.5 Conclusive notes	37
Part 2. Strategic Foresight and International Relations	38
Chapter Five: Strategic Planning and Foreign Policy	38
5.1 Preliminary remarks	38
5.2 Strategic planning	38
5.3 Grand Strategy	40
5.4 Foreign Policy and Grand Strategy	42
Chapter Six: Forecasting, Foresight, Future Studies.....	43
6.1 Preliminary remarks.....	43
6.2 Prediction: Possible or not?	43
6.3 Key takeaways	45
6.4 Foresight and Future Studies	46
6.5 Strategic Foresight.....	47
6.6 Foresight and Future Studies	48
Chapter Seven: American – Greek relations and Strategic Foresight	50
7.1 Preliminary remarks.....	50
7.2 American – Greek Relations in the future.....	50
7.3 American – Greek Relations through Strategic Foresight	51
Conclusions	53
References.....	56
Books.....	56
Articles in journals.....	59
Websites.....	59
Web pages.....	60

Outline

This paper does not aspire to present any novel insights in regard to the evolution of Greek - American relations until today. The first part of this paper entails an overview of basic concepts of the academic field of International Relations, so that the concepts used along the way are clear. The historical retrospection of the American – Greek relations is done with the purpose of offering an insight regarding the facts and circumstances that determined the choices and decisions. The same applies to the analysis of the Eastern Mediterranean region. Despite the debate over geography's importance in international relations, past and recent events have proven that the geopolitical factor remains a strong determinant of global affairs.

The second part of the paper is concentrating on strategic foresight and how it can be used in American – Greek relations. The background of the academic field of strategic foresight dates back to ancient history where people developed predicting methods in an attempt to cover the need of knowing the future. The failures that accompanied predictions as well as the scientific advancements suggested that new methods and tools were indispensable in order to eliminate uncertainty. The methods that organizations use today to coordinate and facilitate their operations are advanced and projected to the state level helping in understanding state functions and enhance readiness for future developments.

Part One Theoretical Framework of International Relations and the Evolution of American – Greek Relations over time

Chapter One: International Relations, International System and Foreign Policy

1.1 Preliminary remarks

In this introductory chapter an attempt is made to provide a brief yet comprehensive aspect of the basic concepts of International Relations. International relations theories, the international system, foreign policy, diplomacy, and geopolitics are succinctly described. The purpose of this overview is to outline the fundamental concepts of the theoretical framework within which American - Greek relations have been developed and established. In other words, to help the reader better comprehend states' behaviors and policy patterns.

1.2 Theory Remarks

1.2.1 International Relations

Despite the fact that the history of international relations is as old as the practice of people to create groups and organize in the framework of distinct collectivities (Ifestos, 1999, p. 33) International Relations is considered a relatively recent field of study. As an independent discipline emerged in the United States the years that followed the First World War and thrived after 1945 (Dalis, 2015, pp. 17-18). Yet the term “international relations” had already been used by the British philosopher Jeremy Bentham in 1789, to describe the establishing of relations among the political units who formed a clearer national character additionally to their territorial-based character (Heywood, 2011, pp. 3-4). International relations emerged after the First World War as the discipline that analyzed the phenomena of war and peace (Hill, 2018 ; Botsiou, 2020). Its primary scope was how peace could be achieved so that the world could become more stable and safer. The events of the Great War had created the need to identify transnational phenomena as well as to collectively encounter conflicts and create the appropriate conditions for world peace. Nevertheless, that resulted in an idealistic approach regarding international relations, which was mostly making suggestions concerning what should have been done, rather than analyzing the causal link between stakeholders' behavior and acts and their effects. This initial approach was abandoned, since the events of the Second World War obliged scholars' to turn their gaze mostly to security matters and power competition (Varvarousis, 2004, p. 30).

The demanding task of world politics and international analysis explanation has been undertaken by the different theoretical approaches of international relations. As Cox describes, the theories help us, like maps, navigate through the complicated reality of international relations (Cox, 2016, p. 85). The two dominant theoretical schools of International Relations are realism and liberalism. Realism emerged after World War II and its main concepts are the national interest, power, and rationalism. For political realists anarchy prevails in the international system due to the lack of a central government that could impose order. Consequently, the international system becomes a field of constant antagonism, in both the political-military and the economic field (Platias, *Out of borders*, 1997, p. 23). Moreover, peace is attained through a system of balance of powers and thus every state's objective is to protect and maximize its national security, sovereignty, and independence. Realism as well as the set of international relations realist theories are determinedly state-centric, meaning that for them the states are the prime actors of the international system. Despite the fact that realists do not reject the role that other stakeholders have; however, they insist that those other stakeholders are linked to central actors, e.g., the states (Platias, *The New International System - Realistic Approach of International Relations*, 1995, p. 30). Power balancing in the anarchic international system is each state's single-handed task. A state bears the responsibility for its national security (self-help system) and must manage the counterbalance of its opponents. This can be achieved either by investing in the defense mechanism, for example new weapons (internal balancing) or by seeking alliances (external balancing) (Platias, *The New International System - Realistic Approach of International Relations*, 1995, p. 31). To cope with the fulfillment of these goals, the states seek to accumulate power and wealth which inevitably results in constant competition among them.

On the other hand, although liberalism does not reject the existence of international anarchy, supports the idea that anarchy itself does not play the decisive role for a states' behavior. Contrary to realism, liberals and mainly neoliberals consider that state competition has been displaced by international cooperation and interdependence. The interdependence is so strong that "the international actors rely on each other for the provision of goods and services, ranging from security to food to investment" (Cox, 2016, p. 97). For liberalism, the correlation and partnership among states can be the answer to security matters. The development of close economic relations that lead to wealth increase and growth along with the spread of democracy will replace national security concerns. Additionally, (neo)liberals are confident that collective security can be accomplished through the construction of international organizations and agencies within which state collaboration evolves (Platias, *The New International System - Realistic Approach of International Relations*, 1995, pp. 29-44). Between the two theories, realism predominates

since, over time, it managed to effectively answer the basic questions of international relations (Platias, Introduction, Kenneth N. Waltz and the Political Realism, 2011)².

1.2.2 Foreign Policy

The distinction between international relations and foreign policy is definitely delicate. The implementation of foreign policy is the answer to the question of how international actors manage their international relations. International relations theories provide policy makers, e.g., politicians and diplomats the tools to shape their decisions regarding foreign policy (Cox, 2016, p. 111). The interaction between the state and the external environment, the associated political choices and political decisions that this interaction entails is the key element of foreign policy (Hill, *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century*, 2nd edition [in Greek], 2018, pp. 29-30). For Christopher Hill “*Foreign policy is the sum of external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state although not exclusively) in international relations*” (Hill, *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century*, 2nd edition [in Greek], 2018, p. 31). For Andrew Heywood “*Foreign policy refers, broadly, to attempts by governments to influence or manage events outside the state’s borders, usually, but not exclusively, through their relations with foreign governments*” (Heywood, 2011, p. 129). Another approach that focuses on foreign policy’s objectives is that “*foreign policy is the policy that every sovereign state practices, in order to satisfy its requests and ensure its interests in relation to other actors*” (Varvarousis, 2004, p. 183).

Some foreign policy definitions are state-centric, while others are not, some are focused on processes while others are oriented more on the operational dimension of the policy. Regardless of the definition that better meets the needs of a scholar’s analysis it is understandable that the decision-making process is an integral part of foreign policy. As Heywood points out “*foreign policy underlines the crucial significance of a sphere of decision, choice and intentionality within global politics*” (Heywood, 2011, p. 128). Foreign policy is influenced by multiple internal and external determinants, like geography, demography, culture, natural resources, economy, system of governance, public opinion, global power dynamics, international organizations and international norms (Varvarousis, 2004). If indeed the primary goal of foreign policy is securing the national interests by maximizing gains and minimizing costs, then this can only be accomplished through careful strategic planning, competent policy tools and effective implementation methods. Policy makers normally use a combination of tools from the foreign policy

² There are certainly other theories of international relations such as, without the list being exhaustive, behavioralism, Marxism, neoliberalism, positivism, and post-positivism, the analysis of which is beyond the purposes of this paper.

toolbox, such as diplomacy (e.g., public, energy, and preventive diplomacy), military force, economic relations and trade, economic sanctions, foreign aid, intelligence capabilities, deterrence or strategies of soft power. In other words, the process of foreign policy making is not divided by the state's functions since foreign policy problems normally lead to a series of decisions that include several subdivisions of a state's foreign policy machinery (Hermann, 2001, p. 54).

1.2.3 Geopolitics

Geopolitics holds special significance within the realm of foreign policy. Geopolitics examines the "links and the causal relationships between political power and geographic space, including a state's location and resources" (Cox, 2016, pp. 211-213). Although geopolitical analysis has received significant criticism regarding the deterministic approach that a state's fate is intertwined with geography (Heywood, 2011, p. 407), the economic power shift towards of Asia, mainly China (Cox, 2016, p. 258), seems to justify the idea that geoeconomic competition is the opposite side of geopolitical competition (Platias, Introduction, Kenneth N. Waltz and the Political Realism, 2011). Geopolitics is often strongly associated with the realist perspective in international relations. Realism emphasizes the role of power, national interests, and the competitive nature of international politics. Geopolitics, on the other hand, examines the influence of geography, resources, and strategic considerations on international relations. Geopolitical factors, such as territorial control, access to resources, and military capabilities, are often central to realist analyses of international power dynamics. Both realism and geopolitics share a focus on understanding and explaining the behavior of states in the international system.

1.3 Summary

Foreign policy is influenced by many factors that are closely interrelated to the way the international system is organized and the position that each state has or is regarded as having. Some of these factors are the state's size, the power and relative position within the international system, geographical location and natural resources, historical developments, the state's national identity and interests, the political regime, social aspects, demographic characteristics, political culture, the decision-making process as well as the political and nonpolitical actors that influence this process, domestic politics that impact the international and transnational relations, religion, culture, the economy, the technological advances, the security environment, the level of intelligence, international trends, the organizations and agencies in which the state holds membership and the treaties and international agreements that is committed to, and certainly its allies, competitors and enemies. It becomes readily apparent that a

significant portion of the factors shaping foreign policy do not experience immediate formatting. Some are mostly the result of a non-linear, time-consuming process that involves interaction, reconsideration and change both inside the state and in the international realm. However, others, like geography, are nearly impossible to alter. In the following chapters the portrayal of the relations between the United States of America and Greece, is taking into consideration the previously described perspective. The portrayal is based on the examination of the different foreign policy determinants' role.

1.4 Conclusive notes

As mentioned above, international relations theories function as explanatory tools of world politics. Some theories may have common points, some may share similar concerns, and some may have contrasts. Some theories were necessarily revised since reality has overtaken them, others have experienced decline and others became relevant once again. One thing can be considered as certain, that all theories have limitations. That suggests that each theory focuses on distinct aspects of international relations and therefore is capable of addressing different questions that arise within the framework of the international system (Cox, 2016 ; Heywood, 2011). Until World War II for example, the focal point of the International Relations field was the relations between the states, despite the fact that the conventional understanding of those relations has historically centered on diplomatic, military, and strategic dimensions (Heywood, 2011, p. 4). However, the debates between the international relations theories that were developed overtime changed the discipline's paradigm notably (Heywood, 2011, p. 4). Undeniably the state-centric theories have experienced certain decline mainly due to globalization. Yet recent developments, such as terrorist attacks or the global economic crisis have reestablished the role of the state as a key player of the global arena (Heywood, 2011, pp. 121-122).

Chapter Two: American and Greek relations and foreign policy - A brief historical overview

2.1 Preliminary remarks

This chapter is dedicated in a brief historical overview of the American – Greek relations until World War II. The main focus is both the facts and the state leaders that contributed to the shaping of their foreign policies. The chapter is divided into two distinctive periods for each state. The first part “Early years” explores foreign policy from the formation of each state until the middle of the nineteenth century and the second part explores the period until the Second World War. The description of the circumstances under which the two states crossed paths is considered beneficial in order to comprehend how the relationship was built and evolved. Furthermore, it may also be useful regarding future trends.

2.2 The early years

2.2.1 The United States of America

The history of the United States began with the inhabitation of the American continent thousand years before the arrival of the first European migrants, mainly of British and Dutch origin, who settled in the country in the early seventeenth century. These first colonies were gradually transformed into the thirteen states that declared their independence from Great Britain in 1776. The formation of the new state that was founded on the principles of democracy, freedom and individual liberty was the result of the American Revolution that took place from 1775 to 1783.

The nineteenth century has been for the U.S. a period of great transformation and growth. Domestic challenges as well as the evolving international landscape resulted in substantial social and economic changes in the country. Within that time limit, the U.S. managed to greatly expand its territory, attain substantial economic expansion, and gradually deepen the nation’s collective consciousness. The acquisition of the Louisiana territory from France in 1803, known as the Louisiana Purchase, doubled the country’s size and offered expansive land mass for inhabitation and access to new resources. The acquisition of Florida from Spain in 1819, offered access to the strategically positioned Gulf of Mexico. One of the main pursuits of the new-born state was economic growth. During the first part of the century that growth was achieved mainly through trade and commerce and subsequently through the industrialization of the economy and the exploitation of domestic resources (Arvanitopoulos & Ifestos, Euroatlantic Relations [in Greek], 2003, p. 21). Advancements that contributed to the progressive social and cultural development of the population and the creation of the nation’s self-confidence.

Given that the sea realm was regarded as the field of creative competition that had the potential to lead to the state’s empowerment, soon after their independence, the U.S. actively expressed their

interest to access the seas (Litsas, *The Theoretical Foundations of U.S. Foreign Policy*, 2020, p. 4). By the eighteenth-century American merchant ships had already started the maritime expansion across the world seas, including the Mediterranean and Eastern Mediterranean Sea that attracted the interest of the U.S. because of its position in the geographical triangle of Asia, Middle East and Europe. The American expansion towards the European continent and the Mediterranean Sea served at least two purposes. From one hand the U.S. limited the space for Great Britain's reestablishment in the old colonies and on the other hand provided the new state with indispensable economic resources. Those assets were the means for the dissemination of the new state's ideals linked to the notion of American exceptionalism and eventually to the acquisition of the status of a Great Power (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020, p. 44). By establishing its presence in the region this guaranteed access to new trade opportunities and conveyed to all parts the message that the U.S. would fulfill its moral commitment on the international stage (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020, p. 45).

Following the conclusion of the War of Independence the American trade ships had already established the country's access to major ports of the Mediterranean, spanning from Spain to Turkey. This new condition inevitably created the need for the development of a series of diplomatic actions in the region (Litsas, 2020, pp. 1-6). In 1786 the signing of the American – Moroccan Treaty offered American vessels a safe passageway through the waters of the North African kingdom. In 1793 the consulate in Livorno, which by the eighteenth century had become the main port for British trade in the Mediterranean (Papakonstantinou, 2011, p. 290), was established in order to promote American trade rights (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020, p. 43). Realizing the importance of safeguarding the American interests, in 1801 the U.S. Squadron was dispatched in order to counterpart the piracy by the Barbary States of North Africa that was intercepting free trade (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020, pp. 44-45) and by 1815 the Mediterranean Squadron had established a permanent presence in the region (Mead, 2022, p. 26). A few years later in 1824, and since the U.S. had already developed a strong trade relation with the Ottoman Empire, the Consulate in Smyrna was established.

The U.S. was gradually proving itself as a strong stakeholder in this section of the world whilst the Ottoman Empire, which until that moment had been the primary regional actor, was experiencing decline. Nevertheless, the emergence of a new power in the area did not evolve into a rivalry between the two states. The already reputable strong commercial ties led to a flourishing relationship that was officially established and validated in 1830 with the Ottoman – American Treaty of Trade and Navigation that

offered the US free presence in the area, but most importantly free passage from the Straits. It is significant to point out that by 1820 the value of trade between the two countries had reached an annual value of one million dollars (Karvounarakis, 2022, p. 3). The Americans, through their presence in the Mediterranean, primarily fulfilled their desire for economic prosperity, and secondarily, they effectively ensured their existence in the region.

The years subsequent to the Declaration of Independence was the time that the American nation was defining its identity both domestically and internationally. Within the framework of a highly competitive global environment, where old and new stakeholders were antagonizing over the pieces of the pie, the U.S. was making its first steps outside the country's borders where much of the action was taking place. Still, the U.S. interest in economic expansion was not linked to a colonial perception like that of the European Great powers. The evolving American foreign policy was based primarily on the notions of the Monroe Doctrine, that would complement the country's foreign policy for nearly a century³, which on the one hand considered any attempts of colonization in the American Continent and any acts of intervention by Europeans in the western states' internal affairs as acts of aggression and acts of intervention, respectively, while on the other hand stated that the U.S. would remain neutral regarding European colonies and their internal affairs. The Monroe Doctrine It was a response and adaptation to the distribution of power in both regional and worldwide political dynamics (Tziampiris, *The Monroe Doctrine and the Greek Revolution*, 2023, p. 74).

In the competitive environment of the Mediterranean, the United States has approached its international relations policy by carefully considering the region's conditions and dynamics. Economic cooperation and trade, bilateral agreements and alliance building enabled the U.S. to establish itself as a privileged partner in the area. Nevertheless, maintaining the benefits that the country was obtaining in a region thousands of miles away from home within an environment of Great Power competition, would not be possible without eventually using the entire foreign policy toolbox. The protection and defense of its rights and privileges imposed a wider involvement. The U.S. did not avoid the use of military force, like in the Barbary wars, in order to safeguard its presence in the area. The Founding Fathers' legacy of neutrality and non-intervention, that later was described in the detailed framework of the Monroe Doctrine, formed the new state's foreign policy and inevitably structured its character as an international player. "Neutrality was integral to the aim of creating a new republic of commerce that could trade globally,

³ During his annual address to Congress in December 1822 President James Monroe made a statement regarding U.S. policy in the new political order that eventually became a long-lasting tenet of the American Foreign Policy. "*The three main concepts of the doctrine were separate spheres of influence for the Americas and Europe, non-colonization, and non-intervention*". <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1801-1829/monroe>

eschewing the constraints and preferences of the British Empire” (Tziampiris, *The Monroe Doctrine and the Greek Revolution*, 2023, p. 5). However, this framework did not suggest that the U.S. remained unaffected and detached from the events unfolding in the international arena.

2.2.2 Greece

As the American State was methodically setting the foundations of its rise as a Great Power, at the eastern corner of the Mediterranean the Greek people, after almost four hundred years under the fetters of the Ottoman Empire, were at the beginning of their War of Independence. It was a time of struggle and pain for the Greek nation which apart from tangible support and material help in order to respond to the requirements of the battle, was also in desperate need of moral encouragement and inspiration. Before the official outbreak of the Greek Revolution in 1821, the preparatory period of the liberating struggle was in progress by Greek intellectuals that had studied and lived in European countries. For those intellectuals the American Revolution has served as an example and inspiration and the admiration of American democracy was for them an important point of reference (Diogos, 2022, p. 3) when they were guiding and consulting the liberation leaders in Greece. Hence, the “various Greek political organizations and revolutionary leaders sought to establish contact with the U.S. Government” (Diogos, 2022, p. 3). Nonetheless, the Americans were not only renowned for their values and ideals. The United States' distinguished naval power and its continuous presence in the Mediterranean have played a significant role regarding its reputation in the region.

It was well established in the minds and consciousness of the Greek leaders of the time that by developing a relationship with the U.S. Government would be for the benefit of Greece. The very idea of a bond with the U.S. led to a series of actions from the Greek side, like for example Petrobey Mavromichalis⁴ letter of appeal to the American people, in 1821, through which he was requesting their assistance (Diogos, 2022, p. 3). In Greek people's mind the notion of a possible American help sometimes took mythical dimensions. High expectations have been created, like for example the unrealistic idea of obtaining a loan from the United States in order to cover the constantly increasing needs of the struggle against the occupier (Diogos, 2022, p. 6). The importance that the Greek people had given to a possible American intervention was the solid proof that “in the Greek mind, the United States had already been registered as a global superpower with the ability of military intervention in the region” (Diogos, 2022, p.

⁴ Petros Mavromichalis (known as Petrobey) was a Greek, of Peloponnesian origin, politician and General of the Greek troops, which during the years of the Greek Revolution and after served as a member of the Greek Senate and as a President of the Provisional Administration of Greece.

6). Even though the American state did not fulfill any of the Greek expectations, the American people turned their gaze to the small country of the Mediterranean and a philhellenic wave was created rapidly. The American press, affected by this wave of fondness, already by 1822 was requesting the government to act. Under these circumstances President Monroe was forced to satisfy the common awareness. During his annual speech at the Congress in 1822, recognized the Greek Struggle for Independence and wished the struggle to have a positive outcome for the Greek people⁵. “By January 1824, a New York newspaper claimed that “Greek fever” occupied more the American public’s mind than the forthcoming presidential elections” (Karvounarakis, 2022, p. 1).

Regardless of the voices, including those inside the government, in favor of the Greek request for diplomatic recognition from the American state, the Secretary of State John Quincy Adams was unbending regarding American interference in a conflict that involved Turkey. Taking into consideration the neutrality commitment, appeared more than skeptical over the matter (Karvounarakis, 2022, p. 2) and the petition was denied. Obviously, the American posture towards Greece was highly shaped by the Jeffersonian school of thought which acknowledged that the avoidance of war was at the core of foreign policy (Mead, 2022, p. 185) and the framework of the Monroe Doctrine which defined that the United States would abstain from Europe’s foreign affairs. The Monroe Doctrine derived from the need to “balance the stand against European interference in Latin America with a disclaimer of America interference in European affairs” (Kaplan L. S., 1993, p. 13). Even though the American state did not consider that the Greek state met the requirements to be recognized (Karvounarakis, 2022, p. 2) the popularity of the Greek Revolution continued. During the years 1827 to 1828 humanitarian aid, by private initiative, arrived in Greece and the Governor I. Kapodistrias expressed his thankfulness to the representatives of the Philhellenic Committee of New York expressing in parallel the Greek peoples’ gratitude⁶.

In 1830 with the London Protocol, which was signed by the three Great powers, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Kingdom of France and the Russian Empire, Greece was officially recognized as a sovereign and independent state. Nearly four hundred years after 1453 when the Ottoman Turks had conquered Constantinople and progressively the rest of Greece, and nine years after the outbreak of the Greek Revolution in 1821 against the Ottoman Empire, Greece “shall enjoy all the rights political, administrative and commercial attached to complete independence”⁷. It was not until November 1837, that the American government recognized Greece as a sovereign state, after a period of tension that

⁵ “Greece Liberated, Recognition and Establishment of Diplomatic and Consular Relations” - United States of America, President Monroe’s Declaration on Greece, 1822. <https://200years.mfa.gr/diplomatic-consular-relations/usa/>

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ <https://www.mfa.gr/en/the-ministry/international-conventions/major-international-treaties-concerning-greece.html>

had been created with the Great powers because of the so far denial by the United States' government to officially recognize King Otto of Greece. The same year the first Consul of the United States was appointed to Greece and diplomatic relations began in 1868⁸.

2.2.3 Conclusive notes

After the War of Independence, the United States initially recognized the necessity of structuring itself as a modern nation-state, which led to the implementation of a new political and bureaucratic framework that aligned with the core ideological and moral principles of the Declaration of Independence (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020, pp. 42-44). Furthermore, as a newly independent entity in the late eighteenth-century international system, the United States faced the imperative of establishing itself on the global stage. Among its initial priorities, emerged as a crucial objective the construction of a sustainable mechanism for wealth creation. Equally significant was the task of "showing the flag", a deliberate and rational political act aimed at promoting the nation's prestige and asserting its existence beyond the boundaries of the American continent. It was not an act of early narcissism, but rather a strategic move to solidify the nation's position and gain recognition internationally (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020, pp. 42-44). The inclusion of the Mediterranean Sea in the American strategy was the verification of "the geostrategic dictum that in order for a state to impose its naval presence in the Atlantic Ocean it has to be strong in the Mediterranean Sea and vice versa" (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020, p. 4).

Contrarily, Greece's main objective was to achieve independence and establish a sustainable and autonomous nation. However, faced with a non-existent economy and intense competition among the Great Powers, Greece met significant challenges in the pursuit of economic growth and true independence in the years that followed.

2.3 The years until World War II

In the subsequent section of this concise historical examination, the timeframe under analysis spans from the latter half of the nineteenth century up until the beginning of the Second World War. As previously mentioned, the American neutrality that had been articulated by the Monroe Doctrine did not mean that the U.S. was holding the role of a global affairs' passive observer. Actually, the realization of achieving hegemonic power in the region in the long-term undoubtedly required strategic and cautious

⁸ <https://gr.usembassy.gov/el/our-relationship-el/policy-history-el/us-country-relations-el/>

diplomatic maneuvers (Tziampiris, *The Monroe Doctrine and the Greek Revolution*, 2023, p. 52). The following paragraphs provide a brief reference on some of the milestones of the American and Greek foreign policy during the nineteenth century and onwards until World War II.

2.3.1 The United States of America

There is no denying that U.S. foreign policy in the nineteenth century was driven by the state's own interests and objectives. The United States pursued its goals through various means, including bilateral agreements, international treaties, and, in some cases, even warfare. The fact that the state was economically growing inevitably created the need for broader expansion in the international realm. The series of treaties between Western states, including the United States, European powers, and China resulted in the establishment of rights and benefits primarily related to trade and business. The relationship with China prompted the United States to recognize the importance of a stronger presence in the region. As part of its pursuit, the U.S. successfully expanded its influence on the Pacific Ocean through various means, including the acquisition of the Philippines after the Spanish-American war and the initiation of trade and diplomatic relations with Japan⁹.

Indeed, the Civil War that occurred from 1861 to 1865, primarily seen as a domestic conflict, had significant implications for the United States' international standing. While the war was principally fought over internal issues, its outcome had repercussions beyond the nation's borders. The war events gained international publicity since both conflicting sides, the Union, and the Confederacy, appealed to the international community. The Confederacy requested international recognition and support while the Union (pro-slavery supporters) tried, and finally accomplished, to prevent it from happening. The Union victory resulted in the strengthening of the U.S. government and confirmed the country's foreign power¹⁰.

Both territorial expansions that occurred in the nineteenth century played indeed a significant role in the United States' journey toward becoming a superpower. First the Annexation of Texas in 1845 which served the "manifest destiny" claim, e.g., the conviction that Americans were the guardians of the Western Hemisphere security (Brzezinski, 1997, p. 3). Second, the Alaska Purchase which impeded Russia from the west coast of North America and facilitated the country's expansion to Asia and the Pacific. In the second half of the nineteenth century the rapid industrialization combined with the inventions in transportation

⁹ Department of State, Office of the Historian, *Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations, 1830-1860*. <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1830-1860/pacific-expansion>

¹⁰ Department of State, Office of the Historian, *Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations, 1861-1865*. <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1861-1865>

resulted in the immense increase of economic power that supported the U.S. geopolitical ambitions. The twentieth century found America with a robust economy, and it is calculated that by the outbreak of World War I its gross national product could have accounted for about one third of the global national product (Brzezinski, 1997, p. 3).

The U.S. entered World War I in 1917 three years after it commenced. The attacks against American ships by German submarines and the strong indications that Germany was attempting an alliance with Mexico made President Wilson to declare war on Germany. For Brzezinski the Great War was an opportunity for America to project its massive military power into Europe (Brzezinski, 1997, p. 3). For Mead the defeat of Germany nineteen months after the decisive American engagement left the U.S. with at least three important legacies. First the U.S. had become the largest economic power (Mead, 2022, p. 9). The purchases from the European countries for the Great War as well as the mobilization of the economy to support USA's participation in the battlefield resulted in a positive economic outcome. Second, the balance of power shift, since Britain and France were no longer in a position to counter USA's dominance, established the country in the collective consciousness as the world superpower. Lastly, the creation of the League of Nations, which was based on the vision of the Wilsonian school of foreign policy (Mead, 2022). President Wilson, who had incorporated the notion of ideals and morality in the foreign policy, considered it as the country's moral duty to spread the democratic and social values of America and that would conclude to international peace. In this framework active involvement would be chosen when it was absolutely necessary in order to protect security, freedom, and human rights (Mead, 2022). Despite the fact that eventually the U.S. never joined the League, the first international organization that supported intergovernmental cooperation with the goal to secure global peace had become reality.

The economic uncertainty and the Great Depression during the interwar years caused the U.S. to withdraw from global affairs, retreating to isolationism and protectionism. This posture was articulated in the three "Neutrality Acts" passed by the Congress between 1935 and 1937. The purpose was to prevent the United States from entering the war by enacting legislation that prohibited Americans from selling or transporting arms, as well as other war materials, to nations engaged in conflicts. Although the rise of fascism raised concerns, the American foreign policy remained distant from Europe and neutral from the Second World War during the first two years. However, in 1939 with the final "Neutrality Act" that President Franklin D. Roosevelt passed through the Congress the American attitude changed. The Act allowed belligerent nations to acquire war materials on the condition that they made cash payments and transported the goods aboard their own vessels ("cash and carry" basis). The rise of Germany and the weakness of Great Britain to sustain the balance of powers in Europe (Papasotiriou, 2018, p. 44) led the

U.S. to enter the war on the occasion of the 1941 attack on the U.S. Naval Basis of Pearl Harbor by the Japanese.

The ultimate need to defeat the Axis powers forced the U.S. to unite and closely cooperate with the Soviet Union. Bearing in mind that the British were experiencing a decline the victory of the allies would not have been possible without the Soviet Union's participation in the war and its army's struggling battles mainly in the Eastern front (Papasotiriou, 2018, p. 51). For Britain and the Soviet Union, the postwar balance shift due to the power vacuum after the German defeat had become apparent very early. Hence, since 1941 the postwar agenda drafting had started. The U.S. President F.D. Roosevelt who comprehended the situation in terms of geopolitics, believed that a new period of isolationism was not a choice. Yet this perception lacked public consent by the American people. The notion of "American exceptionalism" that intertwined with liberalism, obliged Roosevelt to use an idealistic narrative for the American strategy (Papasotiriou, 2018, pp. 43-51) in order to overcome the lack of public consent.

During the War a series of agreements among the allied nations would shape Europe and the rest of the world after 1945. The collaboration between the three allies, the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union was inaugurated with the Atlantic Charter. The statement signed by Roosevelt and Churchill in 1941 before the U.S. entered the war, declared certain aims based on liberal principles for the post-war international system, like self – determination, economic freedom and disarmament. The three allies in the Conference of Casablanca in 1943 agreed upon the unconditional surrender of the Axis powers, while the same year in Tehran organized the future strategy regarding the war. In the Yalta Conference in 1945 the main agreement was related to the Pacific front and in the final Conference of Potsdam the division of Germany and the fate of Eastern Europe was determined.

2.3.2 Greece

After the recognition of Greece as a sovereign state for I. Kaposistrias, the country's first Governor, the primary national goal was the liberation of the Greek nation and territories where Greeks lived, known as the "Great Idea" (Tsirigotis, 2013, pp. 61-93). For Tsirigotis, Kapodistrias had formed the notion of a Greek grand strategy and tried to implement it by setting short and long-term goals through the use of both domestic and foreign policy tools. However, the Governors' aspirations did not gain popular legitimacy and encountered opposition from the Great powers (Tsirigotis, 2013, p. 90). After Kapodistrias' murder the three Great powers, which had supported Greece's liberation, to avoid a hotbed of tension in the region of Eastern Mediterranean decided to appoint King Otto as the head of the state. The Greek people were no longer under the reign of the Ottoman Empire but, unlike the Americans, the nation did

not yet enjoy national sovereignty. The years that followed were politically unstable and economically strenuous.

Despite the fact that both during the regentship (since King Otto was minor when he was appointed) and the King's administration numerous domestic reforms were implemented in order for the state to obtain a modern governance, Greek people were highly skeptical regarding these reforms. Hence the style of governance was not publicly acceptable. Additionally, although the Greek territory was still fragmented in regions under the occupation of other countries and a large number of Greeks were living in territories of the Ottoman Empire the territorial completion was not in the agenda, since the monarchy was completely dependent from the great powers and lacked freedom of movement in matters of high politics. The main characteristics of that period's foreign policy were international control, economic difficulties, and domestic instability (Svolopoulos, 2022, p. 49). This situation created internal and external frictions and paved the way for political manipulation both on the inside and from the outside. In the years that followed until approximately the First World War, Greek governments did not manage to establish and pursue a national grand strategy. Confined among the absence of sovereignty, the status of political and economic control by the European powers, mainly by Britain, the geostrategic importance and the international developments like the pending Eastern Question¹¹, Greece did not succeed in developing a national foreign policy nor a significant international presence (Tsirigotis, 2013).

The complex territorial situation in Greece and the rest of the Balkans after their independence from the Ottoman Empire as well as the omnipresent interference of the European Powers in the region in order to safeguard their interests, led to the two consecutive Balkan Wars, which took place right before World War I. The Treaty of Bucharest that was agreed in 1913 and put an end to the Second Balkan War meant significant gains for Greece. The country doubled its territory and also nearly doubled its population, strengthened its coastal zone and safeguarded its presence and command in strategic points like the port of Thessaloniki and the Aegean Sea. Consequently, Greece improved significantly its international position (Svolopoulos, 2022, pp. 131-133). The country was at the time under the administration of Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos who is considered one of the architects of the contemporary Greek state's foreign policy and diplomacy. His main goals were the settlement of the Greek

¹¹ The Eastern Question was a European political problem that emerged during the 17th century when the decline of the Ottoman Empire started and ended in 1923 with the establishment of the new Turkish state. It can briefly be described as the competition of the European powers over the territorial division of the Ottoman Empire. One of the main chapters of the Eastern Question was the Greek Revolution. For Tsirigotis the question *"manifests the alternative political and strategic actions of each time European great powers to control the geopolitical area of Eastern Mediterranean and Near East, through the use of political, diplomatic, economic and military resources, in an effort to shape power-interest balances with the Ottoman Empire"* (Tsirigotis, 2013, p. 33).

territorial issues, the containment of the revisionist powers in the country's north and ultimately the implementation of the "Great Idea", e.g., the liberation of all Greek people that lived in regions of the Ottoman Empire and the repossession of all the former Greek territories that were now under the Ottoman Empire. Venizelos developed a strategy based on the balance of domestic and foreign policy. The socioeconomic reconstruction and the international legalization of Greece's national objectives were at the core of his leadership (Tsirigotis, 2013, pp. 354-356).

Prime Minister Venizelos who governed Greece during World War I, as a representative of liberal ideas, had confidence in self-determination and freedom of people. Regarding the Great War he was in favor of the country's neutrality however allied with the powers of Entente. In contrast to the King's will he was convinced that only within this framework the national interest would be served better. Greece eventually did enter the war and fight on the side of the Entente Alliance. This decision not only included Greece in the victors of the war, but also allowed the preservation of the territorial gains from the Balkan Wars. Nevertheless, this difference of concept regarding national interest between the government and the monarchy as well as the gradual shift of the European powers from the Greek side to the redistribution of power and interest, left the country divided (Svolopoulos, 2022 ; Tsirigotis, 2013).

The political instability and the change in regional dynamics caused Greece's retreat in the international realm. The defeat of Greece in the Greek – Turkish War (1919-1922) created a new reality not only for the country and the people but for the broader area of Eastern Mediterranean (Svolopoulos, 2022, p. 174). The aftermath of this defeat was settled by the Treaty of Lausanne, which recognized the independence of the Republic of Turkey, giving back its sovereignty in a series of regions. Greece after a series of diplomatic accomplishments during the previous years experienced territorial shrinkage, was left socially and economically damaged and cornered by traditional allies. During the interwar and after the Asia Minor catastrophe the country remained isolated and busy with the task of strengthening the economy and regaining its international status. Yet, Greece's main concern was ensuring its national security (Svolopoulos, 2022, p. 175).

Until World War II Greek foreign policy was contracted in a highly competitive and rather unfriendly external environment where the European powers were trying to reorder balance of powers in the broader region. At the same time, the internal political situation was equally challenging. The political puzzle in Greece during the first quarter of the twentieth century consisted of external intervention and dependence, fragile governments, internal political disputes that led to national division, and the undimmed desire for the territorial integration which has been worrying the nation since the Greek Revolution. Despite the constraints and the failures of the Greek foreign policy, Greece managed in this

geopolitical intriguing environment to attain accomplishments and perennially sincerely accept the status of international treaties and the rules of international law (Svolopoulos, 2022, p. 175).

The Greek government's refusal to allow Italian troops free passage from the Greek territory resulted in the Greek-Italian war. The war lasted until the spring of 1941 and signaled Greece's involvement in World War II. The geostrategic position of the Balkans was vital for the Axis expansion towards the south (Egypt). Moreover, the British presence in the region and its engagement with the Greek administration had raised Hitler's concerns. Germany, at the conclusion of the Greek-Italian war, invaded and finally occupied Greece in the April of 1941. The Greeks stood against the Axis and on the side of the Allies until the war ended. The British involvement in the Greek affairs, derived from the necessity to serve its grand strategy in the region, continued throughout and after the war (Tsirigotis, 2013, p. 437).

2.3.3 Conclusive notes

The American and the Greek wars of independence did not coincide but were not that distant in time either. After concluding their battles for freedom, the two nations inevitably pursued different paths. The determining factors of each state course were truly diverse. That applies for the formation process of each state, the development of the social, political, and economic institutions, size, geographic position, resources, the allies, and enemies as well as and the real degree of independence. In fact, drawing any kind of comparison would be pointless. Following its independence from the Ottoman Empire Greece made efforts to establish itself as a sovereign state and resolve pending issues like its economic recovery. However, these processes proved to be insufficient for the completion of the state's independence. The country, condemned by geography, remained an object of claim among the European powers. At the same time, the U.S. was vigorously progressing into establishing itself as a preeminent global power

In contrast to the American model, Greece's lack of national sovereignty and economic independence had a significant impact on its governance style. While the U.S. successfully constructed and implemented a comprehensive strategic approach within the complex and dynamic international landscape of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Greece was making efforts to address pending issues and free itself from dependencies. Despite the determination of Greek political leaders to establish a comprehensive national grand strategy, they lacked the necessary capabilities. The supervision by the European powers, which entailed economic dependency along with hostile neighboring environment, severely constrained the development of political initiatives.

Chapter Three: Deepening the ties

3.1 Preliminary remarks

Despite the fact that the two states were known to each other from the eighteenth century, and they were members of the same alliances in both World Wars, their bilateral relations were limited. The post war landscape in Europe created the conditions for the American and the Greek states to develop a relationship that lasts until today. The American state after World War II found itself in the position to take care of the delicate balance of power in Europe and globally. Despite the fact that the Axis front was definitively closed, the challenges that had emerged after the war and the rise of the Soviet Union as a strong player in global affairs required bold and immediate decisions.

3.2 The years after World War II

3.2.1 Introduction

The events of the twentieth century forced the U.S. to abandon the policy of isolationism and enter international affairs, leaving forever behind the security status that the country enjoyed during the past century. The danger of a dominant Germany recommended for the European countries and the U.S. an existential threat. The decision of the American leadership to enter the war, even though it had to overcome the barrier of the limited national consensus, was pivotal for the U.S. The extensive groundwork undertaken by the country in its journey towards becoming a superpower had aligned with the necessary circumstances. The defeat of the Axis powers with the decisive contribution of the U.S., created a new reality for Europe and the rest of the world. In the aftermath of World War II, a second superpower had emerged. The Soviet Union, through its contribution to the war, had gained a reputation but most importantly had increased its spheres of influence in many countries of Eastern Europe. After the war, the country's economy was growing and by 1949 the Soviet Union had successfully tested its first nuclear weapons, which automatically equated militarily with the U.S. In this framework, the U.S. had to tackle the danger of the Soviet expansion beyond the agreed spheres of influence, the Mediterranean included. The incidents that were developed the years shortly after World War II cultivated even more the anti-Soviet beliefs of the U.S. foreign policy and created the need for dynamic interference in the region. The American interest for Greece was inextricably linked to the postwar context of safeguarding the West's vital interests in the Eastern Mediterranean.

3.2.2 The years from 1945 to 1989

The West was confronted with two major issues in the region of the Eastern Mediterranean after the conclusion of the war. First the Greek civil war that had started between the national side and the communist side. And second the ongoing tug-of-war regarding the status of the Straits (Dardanelles and Bosphorus), known as the Turkish issue. In the light of these developments and after Great Britain's withdrawal from the region, both from Greece and Turkey, which was interpreted as the abandonment of the Middle East (Papasotiriou, 2018, p. 75) the U.S. decided to step in. Taking into consideration the support the communist danger the U.S. actively supported two countries to keep them away from the Soviet orbit. One of the fundamental principles of maintaining dominant spheres declares that the hegemonic power is obliged to distribute benefits, to the societies that reigns (Papasotiriou, 2018, p. 91), like prosperity and security in order for the alignment to be ensured (Katsoulas, 2023, p. 21). In May 1947 President Truman promoted the Greek and Turkish Assistant Act, an initiative of the foreign policy action known as the Truman Doctrine¹², asking the Congress for the amount of four hundred million as economic and military aid to both countries. The Truman Doctrine was part of the broader post-war and Cold War American foreign policy, which also included the containment policy and the Marshall Plan. During the Cold War the U.S. realists promoted the containment policy, which became the core of Truman's foreign policy, through which the U.S. supported and reinforced anticommunist states (Cox, 2016, p. 106). Other components of the containment policy were the Marshall Plan¹³ which targeted civilian relief from the war and the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

The orientation of Greece to the West resulted in the country joining NATO. Despite initial objections and impediments by the Alliance's members a series of events led to the acceptance of the Greek petition. The Soviet fear, the Eastern European communist states rearmament by Moscow as well as the tension in the Middle East influenced the decision of the member states. Additionally, the NSC 103/1 a statement of policy proposed by the National Security Council in 1951 titled "The Position of the United States with Respect to Greece" was suggesting that:

¹² The Truman Doctrine was articulated in a speech of President Truman in 1947 "*that the United States would provide political, military and economic assistance to all democratic nations under threat from external or internal authoritarian forces*". In this framework Truman asked the Congress to approve aid (through the dispatch of political and military personnel) to the Greek Government against the Communists. Furthermore, the American President asked aid for Turkey who was until then also relying on Britain. Department of State, Office of the Historian, Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations, 1945-1952, The Truman Doctrine, 1947 <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine>

¹³ The Marshall Plan, named after the Secretary of State, was a program that aimed at reconstructing Europe. The total funding exceeded twelve billion dollars. Department of State, Office of the Historian, Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations, 1945-1952, The Marshall Plan, 1948 <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/marshall-plan>

“It continues to be in the security interest of the United States that Greece does not fall under communist domination. Greece occupies an important strategic position which, in the hands of an enemy, would be a threat to the Eastern Mediterranean, the Suez, Turkey and the Turkish Straits ... Press now for the inclusion of Greece as a full member of NATO, this being the most desirable form of reciprocal security arrangement.”¹⁴

The bilateral relations of the U.S. and Greece after World War II were largely influenced by the Greek - Turkish relation which after a brief period of cooperation and agreement between the two World Wars (Bahcheli, Couloumbis, & Carley, 1997, p. 1) deteriorated suddenly when Turkey raised the issue regarding the militarized Eastern Aegean islands (Katsoulas, 2023, pp. 123-124) culminating in hostility. The years that followed were particularly challenging for the Greek – American relations. A series of incidents provoked mainly by the Cyprus question and the Aegean dispute with Turkey were testing the relation in various ways. On multiple occasions during the Cold War, Greece and Turkey came dangerously close to engaging in an armed conflict. The Turkish pogrom of 1955 against the Greek population in Constantinople lead to the deterioration of Greek - American relations because contrary to the Greek expectations the U.S. chose not to take sides leaving the Greeks disappointed and with a feeling of abandonment. During the 60's the turbulent situation in Cyprus, regarding the two crises of 1963 and 1967, did not make things easier. The American intervention prevented a war conflict however, the Cyprus problem remained unsolved continuing to be a source of instability in the region (Katsoulas, 2023).

In 1967, the Greek junta aggravated the political and social instability in the country. The non-intervention policy of the U.S. was interpreted as a support to the junta, which uplifted anti-Americanism among the Greek society. In 1974, when Turkey invaded and occupied the northern part of Cyprus the American foreign policy was once again in front of another dilemma. The U.S. decision of double appeasement left both the Greek and the Turkish side upset and the U.S. charged with the Sisyphus task of restoring relations with both states. The American policy towards the two neighboring countries was not exclusively motivated by the country's interests in the region and the military bases that were held both in Greece and Turkey. The restoration of the Greek – Turkish relations was of utmost importance since the security of NATO's southern flank was at stake. Greece however escalated the matter and as a means of reaction decided in 1974 to leave the military scale of NATO (Katsoulas, 2023).

During the seventies and while the Cyprus question remained unsolved keeping the tension high, the new emerging challenge was the Greek – Turkish dispute over the Aegean Sea. The oil discovery in the Aegean, led Turkey to raise the issue over the continental shelf, causing new frictions that nearly led to

¹⁴ <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1951v05/d212>

war. After the dispatch of a Turkish research vessel, the Greek government in an attempt to internationalize the matter decided to appeal to the United Nations Security Council and the International Court of Justice. The American administration that was taking the possibility of a military incident in the region very seriously, initiated a close collaboration with both countries in order to resolve the issue. During the negotiations both countries, Greece and Turkey, played the card of the Soviet factor. Both implied to the West that the Soviet Union would be willing to support each one of the two countries if left abandoned by the Western allies. In the end, tensions soothed with relative gains for all parts. Turkey achieved the arms embargo lifting that had been imposed both to Turkey and Cyprus by the U.S. in 1974 after the warfare in Cyprus. Greece, on the other hand and after realizing that staying outside NATO was not the smartest move, returned to the military scale of the alliance (Katsoulas, 2023, pp. 301-347). A similar scenario, over the Aegean, repeated in 1987 with the U.S. intervening to ease the tensions.

3.2.3 The years from 1990 to today

After the Cold War ended, the U.S. was experiencing its unipolar moment with no Great Power competition and the events that followed turned Washington's attention in many different corners of the world. At the dawn of the nineties the G.H.W. Bush administration had to manage the rapid evolution of the international system. As the U.S - Soviet conflict had ceased and the Soviet Union had fallen into decline, the focus turned towards the turbulent Middle East due to the Gulf War. The Clinton administration on the other hand, at least during the first tenure, had to cope with domestic policy issues and mainly the recovery of the American economy. Regarding the foreign policy, President Clinton chose to engage the country mostly in humanitarian interventions, like in Haiti, Somalia, and the Balkans when the conflict of the former Yugoslavia's republics, Bosnia and Kosovo took place.

During the Clinton Presidency, the Imia/Kardak Crisis between Greece and Turkey erupted. The crisis involved a dispute over the sovereign status of two islets in the Aegean Sea. Once again, the U.S. employed crisis management resolution strategies to deescalate the situation, since *"such a conflict would have been catastrophic for the two countries and devastating for NATO, whose new role includes peace implementation and peacekeeping, in addition to its more traditional role of collective defense"* (Bahcheli, Couloumbis, & Carley, 1997, p. 7). The U.S. chose a balanced attitude toward the two countries through the implementation of equal distance policy. The dispute was resolved with no military implications, although Greece experienced human casualties (due to an accident involving a military helicopter) and lost sovereignty over the two islets. Three years later, the U.S. Government asserts Turkey's impressive momentum regarding the improvements in the human rights sector and President Clinton welcomes the

European Union candidate member status for Turkey expressing the certainty that country's shift towards the western values and ideals will ensure peace and stability in the region.

The rise of the twentieth century found the G.W Bush administration confronted the terrorist's attack of September 11th and the subsequent War on Terror. The interest of the U.S. foreign policy for the years to come shifts towards the Middle East. During Bush's second tenure the new approach of the American foreign policy prioritized diplomatic efforts and international collaboration, even when dealing with matters like global security (Papasotiriou, 2018, p. 577).

The Obama administration apart from the ongoing War on Terror had to deal with crucial domestic issues caused mainly by the fiscal crisis of the period 2007-2008 and the economic recession that followed. Additionally, the war in Afghanistan and the Arab Spring in 2010 caused further instability in an already fragile region. At the same time China was experiencing a continuous rise in the global arena, pushing President B. Obama to implement the "Pivot to Asia" policy, shifting the country's interest from Europe, Middle East, and the Mediterranean region towards East Asian countries. During that time, due to the economic and debt crisis Greece was experiencing its most turbulent period after 1974. Following a period of critical negotiations with the European Union member states, President Obama, without intervening in European affairs, strongly supported the opinion that Greece should remain a Eurozone member.

President D. Trump, contrary to one would think, proved a continuator of the basic pillars of American foreign policy, given that this approach better served the long-term national interests of the U.S. (Papasotiriou, 2018, pp. 652-653). In October 2019, the U.S. signed with Greece a revised defense pact that responds to the critical security challenges of the region. The pact provides increased joint activity for the military forces of the U.S., Greece, and NATO member states as well as an expansion for the U.S. in the Souda Bay American base in Crete. As regards to the American – Turkish relations although turbulent in some case¹⁵ remained incessant.

President J. Biden during his political career, as proponent of practical realism, has consistently viewed U.S. security as the primary foundation of foreign policy and has been open to reevaluating the means to promote American interests considering evolving circumstances and persistent challenges (Shifrinson & Wertheim, 2021). During his Administration two Acts were passed regarding the Eastern Mediterranean. The National Defense Authorization Act which requires the Department of Defense to provide "an assessment of the value, cost, and feasibility" of an increased US military presence in the

¹⁵ Events like the custody of the U.S. citizen pastor A. Brunson and the negotiations that followed for his release, the Turkish purchase of the S-400 Missile System from Russia that led to sanctions by the U.S., as well as the crisis over northeastern Syria, led the relationship between the two countries to its extremes.

Eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea regions and also the East Med Act which, among others, introduces Energy Diplomacy as a powerful tool to replace tension and conflict in the Eastern Mediterranean with mutually beneficial cooperation, which aims to strengthen energy partnerships between Greece, Cyprus and Israel. Additionally, the U.S.-Greece mutual defense cooperation agreement (MDCA), which was amended in 2021 is set to remain in force indefinitely after formerly being year-to-year reflects both countries' strong interest in further promoting and enhancing their cooperation. The Greek Parliament ratified the agreement in 2022 and it will permit the U.S. military to use bases in Greece's central province of Volos, Litochoro, training ground, locations such as the Larissa Air Base and army bases in the northeastern port city of Alexandroupoli apart from the naval base in Souda Bay in Crete.

3.3 Conclusive notes

Foreign policy stands as one of the utmost essential endeavors in which a political entity, especially a democratic one, actively participates. It is a public policy that often exhibits a greater degree of continuity. This can be attributed to either the restrictive dynamics of power politics, as realists argue, or the limitations imposed by interdependence, as perceived by liberals (Hill, *What is to be done? Foreign Policy as a Site for Political Action*, 2003). Undoubtedly foreign policy is greatly influenced by the personality of a state's leader that justifies the change of foreign policy paradigm within administrations. Additionally, non-state actors also wield noteworthy influence over events, and perhaps even more than the underlying structures that shape these events (Hill, *What is to be done? Foreign Policy as a Site for Political Action*, 2003). Nevertheless, as presented in the second part of this paper, most states form and maintain a core strategy regarding their international relations which they serve through foreign policy.

It is without doubt that the Mediterranean remains a region of high interest for the U.S. administrations. The presence of the U.S. in the Mediterranean and the Eastern Mediterranean has been continuous from the era of Thomas Jefferson economically, diplomatically, and politically. Despite the critic that over time has been articulated, the American foreign policy dogma for the region throughout the years remained unchanged. The strategy that has been drawn regarding protection of security and the state interests in the region has been the roadmap for all administrations. Within this framework, the relations between Greece and Turkey, long American allies, have always been a significant priority for U.S. foreign policy" (Bahcheli, Couloumbis, & Carley, 1997, p. 1). The relationship with Greece, although challenging at times, survives through the years. The renewed role of the U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean (and Eurasia since Putin's detachment) after the recent events in Ukraine is yet to be determined and Greece has proven itself a loyal friend and reliable ally.

Chapter Four: The Eastern Mediterranean Region – Enemies and Allies

4.1 Preliminary remarks

In this paper there is often mention of the Eastern Mediterranean Region. The following chapters contain a brief description of the geography along with the sociopolitical characteristics of the region's countries. Moreover, an overview of Greece's relations in the region is provided to help better understand the dynamics in the region. International relations cannot be studied and understood.

4.2 Geography and Geopolitics

The Mediterranean Sea is a closed sea and the crossroad of three continents Europe, Asia and Africa and includes all countries that have coasts on the Sea where different nations, cultures, languages, religions, and mindsets meet, blend, and interact. It is connected with the Black Sea on the North through the Straits, with the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean through the Suez Canal on the south and with the Atlantic Ocean through Gibraltar on the west. Spotted in the very heart of Spykman's Rimland, over the course of history, the Mediterranean was a place of geostrategic and geopolitical interest. Hence, experienced over time, crises, conflicts, maritime disputes, great power competition, tenuous governments, failed states and socio-economic inequalities. In the contemporary era, although the Mediterranean's competitiveness in the world economy is not fairly significant, it is undeniable that it has other competitive advantages like the naval routes and the natural resources, i.e., carbohydrates (Babanasis, 2019, p. 13). Eastern Mediterranean in particular, includes the states of Cyprus, Egypt, Greece, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Syria and Turkey and to these one would also add the pseudo-Caliphate of the "Islamic State", the self-declared "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" and Gaza (Tziampiris, 2021 ; Platias, Geopolitical challenges in the Eastern Mediterranean, 2019).

As mentioned in the first chapter geopolitics examines the influence of geography, resources, and strategic considerations on international relations. In the most simplistic way, geopolitics is the study of how international relations and politics in general are being affected by the geographic structure of the world. In international relations, apart from the states, other stakeholders that engage in world affairs such as businesses, individuals, organizations, social movements or even revisionist groups and terrorists must be included. As Robert Kaplan put it in "Revenge of Geography", geopolitics is the influence of geography upon human divisions (Kaplan R. D., 2012). The Eastern Mediterranean, due to its strategic location that allows it to operate as a nexus mainly through the Suez Canal and the Dardanelles, has always been a place of interest and conflict. The recent discoveries regarding its rich undersea resources added a new enhancing factor to the region's attractiveness.

4.3 Friends and Foes

The outcomes generated by the relation with Turkey influences greatly Greece's foreign policy and international relations. The Eastern Mediterranean geopolitical mixture is extremely demanding for foreign policy makers. The primary objective remains to maintain the balance through alliance building and preventing conflicts. Greece in the region of Eastern Mediterranean has both friends and foes. The brief overview, excluding Cyprus and Turkey for obvious reasons, of these relations contributes to the understanding of Greece's role in the region.

Greece and Egypt have enjoyed long-standing bilateral relations in the fields of politics, economy, defense, and culture and collaborate within the framework of international organizations. In 2013 the trilateral cooperation of Greece, Egypt and Cyprus was inaugurated and has been enriched through memorandums of understanding in many different fields of bilateral cooperation¹⁶. In 2020 the two countries signed the memorandum regarding the exclusive economic zones with the scope to counterbalance the Turkish – Libyan maritime deal. For many decades Greece's relations with Lebanon remain very friendly since the two countries share common values and ideals. Additionally, there is still a significant Greek community in Lebanon and Greece within the framework of the European Union is promoting collaboration with the country in various fields. Moreover, the trilateral cooperation among Greece, Lebanon, and Cyprus in sectors of common interest is in force¹⁷. Regarding Syria, Greece finds herself on the side of the international community on the aim of achieving a solution to the internal conflict¹⁸. Although Greece had traditionally friendly relations with Libya, the illegal memorandum, for the exclusive economic zone establishment that Libya signed with Turkey in 2019 resulted in estrangement. After the establishment of the transitional government in 2021, Greece in alignment with the international community supports the efforts at strengthening stability and security in the country¹⁹.

During the last decade Greek – Israeli relations are at their moment of flourish. After the breach of Israel's relations with Turkey, the two countries have started a multiple and deep cooperation in various fields, like military, security, politics, economy and tourism (Tziampiris, Greek Foreign Policy in the New Eastern Mediterranean, 2021, pp. 11-13). In December 2021, this mutual effort to tighten the relationship resulted in the Trilateral Agreement of Greece, Israel and Cyprus. In their joint declaration²⁰ the three countries proclaim their strong intention to cooperate in different sectors including energy and defense

¹⁶ <https://www.mfa.gr/en/blog/greece-bilateral-relations/egypt/>

¹⁷ <https://www.mfa.gr/en/blog/greece-bilateral-relations/lebanon/>

¹⁸ <https://www.mfa.gr/en/blog/greece-bilateral-relations/syria/>

¹⁹ <https://www.mfa.gr/en/blog/greece-bilateral-relations/libya/>

²⁰ <https://www.primeminister.gr/en/2021/12/07/28153>

coordination. The most interesting, at least in the framework of this paper, is the reference articulated in the relevant declaration on the inclusion of the U.S. in this cooperative.

“The “3+1” cooperation framework with the US indicates the importance we attach to the US role in the Eastern Mediterranean. We look forward to intensifying our cooperation with the United States with the view of planning the participation of the US, at the appropriate political level, at one of our next meetings in line with the letter and spirit of the strong support that the US displays to our partnership”²¹.

The U.S. Department of State with an announcement affirmed the commitment to the “3+1” format of cooperation in the region²², highlighting the importance of collaboration in the field of energy and focusing on the correlation between energy independence and national security.

4.4 Recent developments in the region

It is definitely difficult, at least in the framework of this paper” to conclude that “*the Eastern Mediterranean should be “viewed” as a new region* (Tziampiris, Greek Foreign Policy in the New Eastern Mediterranean, 2021, p. 2)”. Undeniably, however, the recent developments in the area crafted for decision-makers and peoples a highly challenging environment, where threats and opportunities intertwine. The devastating civil war in Syria, the instability in Libya after Gaddafi’s regime collapse, the rise and decline of the Islamic State as well as the Arab Spring that affected regional states certainly do not inspire feelings of security, balance and stability (Tziampiris, Greek Foreign Policy in the New Eastern Mediterranean, 2021, p. 2). The politics and dynamics in the region have also been affected by the natural gas discoveries in Cyprus, Egypt (Tziampiris, Greek Foreign Policy in the New Eastern Mediterranean, 2021, p. 3) and Israel making policymakers consult academic essays on energy politics.

At the same time three players are active in the region and challenging the American position (Litsas, The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations, 2020, p. 181). Turkey, the regional player, Russia, the traditional one and China, the new player. China’s involvement in the region is linked to its economic expansionist agenda. The prominent vehicle of this agenda is the renowned Belt and Road Initiative and specifically its segment known as the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road Initiative, which aims to establish a sea-based economic connectivity between China and Europe (Litsas, The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations, 2020, p. 188). Russia on the other hand, since is unable to maintain the constant global antagonism with the U.S., favors regional antagonism. Russia tries to put its foot on the ground of the Eastern Mediterranean region either through questionable

²¹ Ibid.

²² <https://www.state.gov/joint-statement-on-the-31-republic-of-cyprus-greece-israel-united-states-foreign-ministerial/>

alliances or military interventions, with its most remarkable achievement in recent years being the presence in Syria (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020, pp. 195-199). As regards to Turkey, the policy of neo-revisionism, the approach with Russia and the questionable interventions in neighboring countries (Litsas, *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*, 2020) can be recorded as factors instability in the regions.

4.5 Conclusive notes

The bilateral relations of Greece with the countries of the Eastern Mediterranean designate the often-attributed descriptions to the country as “pillar of stability”²³ and “reliable ally.” It is a fact that Greece as a democratic state, operates within international and transnational organizations, respects rule of law, international laws and abstains from irredentist claims and disputes. The U.S. remains present in the Eastern Mediterranean exerting the greatest influence in the region (Tziampiris, *Greek Foreign Policy in the New Eastern Mediterranean*, 2021, p. 5). The United States, driven by a range of factors, as previously discussed, has maintained a continuous presence in the Mediterranean region since its foundation. Although there were occurrences of temporary withdrawal from the international stage, that did not indicate a complete absence or disengagement from global developments. In the Eastern Mediterranean specifically, the United States has consistently acted as a hegemonic power, asserting its influence and displaying its strength. Since its early emergence as a formidable and strategic trade partner, the United States has played a pivotal role in the region during major world crises. The significance of the region, driven by a combination of different and sometimes overlapping reasons, has steadily gained the attention of the United States. Motivations have ranged from the concept of “manifest destiny,” economic considerations such as promoting free trade and open seas, to safeguarding national security interests. All of these factors have contributed to the enduring U.S. engagement in the region.

²³ The former U.S. Secretary of State M. Pompeo in a letter sent to his Greek counterpart N. Dendias in 2020, used the same term.

Part 2. Strategic Foresight and International Relations

Chapter Five: Strategic Planning and Foreign Policy

5.1 Preliminary remarks

Even in the case when an organization has all the data and resources to plan for the future, unpredictable factors will always play a role and can interrupt even well-designed strategies. These factors may come both from the internal and the external environments. Internal factors normally are within the control of the organization and can be managed effectively by the stakeholders. External factors, however, are more difficult to foresee and therefore more demanding in terms of management. Strategic planning and political risk analyses are the organization's "roadmap". When practicing international relations and their foreign policy the states usually employ strategic planning. Nevertheless, strategic planning alone may not be satisfactory in the competitive, constantly changing and unpredictable international realm. Scholars often proclaim that combat against national interest's threats requires an elevated form of strategic planning by states, especially nowadays that the political risk is no longer limited to actions derived only from the actions of governments (Rice & Zegart, 2018). Grand strategy planning is an inclusive approach which through the mobilization of the appropriate resources is managing the state's long-term action and policies.

5.2 Strategic planning

A simplified way to understand state and government operation is to address them as an organization, e.g., as a collection of people that pursue collective goals by combining their efforts. Organizations are systems that interact with their external environment and have management structure characterized by hierarchical relationships. Each organization to accomplish goals and fulfill its mission needs a "roadmap." A chart that leadership and management will use to conduct their competences. Usually, what serves as the organization's roadmap is the strategic plan. John Bryson in his book "Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations" defines strategic planning "as a deliberative, disciplined approach to producing fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization (or other entity) is, what it does, and why. Strategic planning should be considered as a "way of knowing" that helps leaders and managers discern what to do, how, and why" (Bryson, 2011, pp. 7-8). For Bryson, through strategic planning leaders and managers can deal with matters and overcome challenges that cannot be easily addressed with technical solutions. The author considers an organization as a rational player that through data gathering and analysis is led to decision making and action. This process for

Bryson not only creates a legacy of organizational learning, but most importantly creates a public value (Bryson, 2011, p. 8). Towards a better understanding of the strategic planning process, he uses a simple diagram. The diagram consists of three linked basic points. The first point is where the entity is, e.g., its present position. The second point is where the entity wants to be and the third point is described as the way, e.g., “how,” through the organization can reach its goal. In this third point is the exact point of where the strategic plan stands. The demanding part of strategic planning is to comprehend the connections between the three points. In order to get from the first to the second point, decision makers must clarify the goals and visions. Evidently, during the process the organization needs to formulate and implement a strategy. The whole function is not an automated process. Both leadership and deliberating play a fundamental role in strategic planning (Bryson, 2011, pp. 10-11).

The identification of both the internal and external conditions is essential to be identified in order for the organization to have a clear view of its resources as well as its objectives. The value of strategic planning is not limited to its basic function, e.g., the recognition of the environment and goal setting. Entities have much to gain from the wide range of strategic planning benefits. Strategic planning promotes strategic thinking, acting, and learning among key stakeholders. Its emphasis on future consequences eventually advances the organization’s adaptation to change and improves the decision-making process. Ultimately, enhances the organization’s effectiveness, adaptiveness, and sustainability. One of the most substantial benefits of strategic planning is the “enhanced organizational legitimacy” (Bryson, 2011, p. 16). As the author explains when an organization meets the criteria that are set by its own stakeholders, that creates public value and it liberates it from the constant need to give good reasoning for the use of resources (Bryson, 2011, pp. 15-18). Although Bryson’s theory is oriented to public or nonprofit organizations, it is undeniable that it can also be applicable to the state’s operation. It should not be overlooked that a state in general operates as a grand public organization. For strategic planning to be effective and useful, it is critical to assume that all parties involved retain the skills, the resources and the commitment. Foremost, any decided plan should be implemented and not remain another new year’s goal. Nevertheless, for Bryson strategic planning is not a panacea. Leadership and a strategic team are of absolute need. Patience is also needed since is not a one-off process. A number of strategic planning cycles are required in order to benefit from strategic planning (Bryson, 2011, p. 18).

In conclusion, to put an optimal strategic plan into action, thorough and efficient data gathering analysis and integration process is needed. Part of the strategic plan is clarifying the mission, the goals to be pursued, and the issues to be addressed. Strategic planning entails developing, evaluating, and selecting alternatives, while bearing in mind how present choices may affect the future. By advancing

interest and values, it can promote communication, participation, and reasoning. It improves decision-making through intelligence and sound research. Productive implementation and accountability, as well as continuous learning are all results of the strategic planning process. For Bryson, at its best, strategic planning can motivate organizations to develop the kind of imagination and commitment that are necessary to deal with people's life dilemmas (Bryson, 2011, p. 10).

5.3 Grand Strategy

Undoubtedly, it is impossible to manage an organization without forming a distinct strategy or without having a specific action plan. As aforementioned, organizations use the tools of strategic planning and strategic management to achieve organizational accomplishments. Respectively, states develop and implement their strategies in all areas of state operation. In the framework of the international system and international relations many scholars underline the importance of structuring a grand strategy. The need for this eminent kind of strategy derives mainly from the challenging international environment.

There are several different definitions of what the grand strategy is. For Posen is "that collection of military, economic, and political means and ends with which a state attempts to achieve security. It is a political, military, means-ends chain, a state's theory about how it can best cause security for itself." (Kirss, et al., 2018). For Paul Kennedy "the crux of grand strategy lies in policy, that is, in the capacity of the nation's leaders to bring together all of the elements, both military and nonmilitary, for the preservation and enhancement of the nation's long-term (that is, in wartime and peacetime) best interests". And for Hal Brand "a grand strategy represents an integrated scheme of interests, threats, resources, and policies. It is the conceptual framework that helps nations determine where they want to go and how they ought to get there; it is the theory, or logic, that guides leaders seeking security in a complex and insecure world" (Lissner, 2018). Main concepts of all these grand strategy definitions are resources, processes, timeline, goal setting and protection of national interests and security. Concepts that can be found in the analysis of strategic planning. However, a strategy is not identical to strategic planning. As Bryson explains strategic planning helps to develop and implement strategies (Bryson, 2011, pp. 20-21).

A definition that links strategic planning and grand strategy with greater precision is that of Athanasios Platias stating that "as grand strategy may be understood a state's answer in specific (even potential) threats against its security. The grand strategy detects imminent threats against its security and defines the appropriate diplomatic, economic, military, and other means in order to deal with them. From this perspective, grand strategy constitutes the state's compass in peace and war" (Platias & Hadjiemmanuil, *Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras*, 2022, pp. 24-25). In this definition the author's viewpoint

is that grand strategy develops, orchestrates and coordinates power resources in order to effectively self-defend in a competitive environment full of threats (Platias & Hadjiemmanuil, *Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras*, 2022, p. 25). Platias believes that grand strategy has a long-term perspective, which in times may be developed to an extent of decades. Some of its elements may stay the same and others may change regarding the geopolitical circumstances (Platias & Hadjiemmanuil, *Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras*, 2022, p. 25).

Grand strategy planning is regarded as the most challenging test for political leadership. For Platias grand strategy planning ideally should be based on four pillars. First on the analysis of the opportunities and threats of the international and regional system, second on the concretization and prioritization of the state's political objectives of the state and the mobilization of all means of power at its disposal to deal with the threats or exploit the opportunities as defined before, third on the development of power tools and choosing the ideal combination of those tools (policy mix) according to the anticipated political objective and fourth on the development of the country's positive image and its strategy within the international community (external legitimacy) (Platias & Hadjiemmanuil, *Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras*, 2022, pp. 26-27). The author suggests that when leaders set political goals ought to consider the prevailing power balance. Because power balance sets the limits within which a state can realistically establish and pursue its objectives. Another fundamental issue is finding the appropriate combination of goals and available resources (Platias & Hadjiemmanuil, *Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras*, 2022, σσ. 27-28). What the state takes care of is a combination of hard power and soft power. This combination has been characterized by Joseph Nye as smart power. Returning to the strategic planning of Bryson and its benefits is the legitimization that offers when the stakeholder's expectations meet.

For Platias the political leaders should have the acceptance and support of the people to construct a successful grand strategy (Platias & Hadjiemmanuil, *Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras*, 2022, p. 30). Intentionally or unintentionally, Platias considers the designing of grand strategy as an exercise that resembles strategic planning and a SWOT analysis²⁴. As strategic planning is essential for an organization, grand strategy is essential for the states. All states must articulate their grand strategy, making sure that is clearly stated. Because an explicitly expressed grand strategy that is obvious to the opponents helps decision makers manage everyday matters, successfully prioritize, and achieve better governmental

²⁴ SWOT acronym stands for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. A SWOT analysis is a strategic planning technique that assesses internal and external factors, as well as current and future potential, in order to be used from an organization or an entity in the decision-making stages.

coordination and resources allocation. Most importantly an explicitly communicated grand strategy offers the political leaders the legitimization that is needed during the implementation (Platias & Hadjiemmanuil, *Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras*, 2022). The latter is undoubtedly corresponding to the “enhanced organizational legitimacy” of Bryson. A state’s grand strategy does not function in vitro. It is dependent on the grand strategy of the opponent or opponents and that requires constant adaptation through forecasting in multiple fields. How easy forecasting is in regard to international relations is examined in the next paragraphs.

5.4 Foreign Policy and Grand Strategy

The study and importance of foreign policy has experienced a period of doubt and decline for scholars. The neorealist approach suggests that since the power balances shaped the international system and systemic factors had such a profound impact, no room was left for foreign policy. Additionally, the globalization processes and the spreading of interconnection also played a role, along with the emergence of non-state actors (Heywood, 2011, p. 128). Foreign policy and international relations are two concepts attached and interconnected. They are intricately linked and mutually dependent on each other. As Christopher Hill points out since the international cooperation is not an automatic procedure policy and diplomacy still have a vital role (Hill, *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century*, 2nd edition [in Greek], 2018, p. 62). For Heywood “*Foreign policy underlines the crucial significance of a sphere of decision, choice and intentionality within global politics*” (Heywood, 2011, p. 128). Hill’s foreign policy definition is giving an encouraging boost to international relations scholars to focus on matters of political decisions and political choices and to better understand the interaction between the state and its external environment (Hill, *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century*, 2nd edition [in Greek], 2018, pp. 29-30). Foreign policy emphasizes the fundamental importance of a realm within global politics where decisions, choices, and intentions hold great significance (Heywood, 2011, p. 128). The policy-making process is connected with the decision-making process; however, it is not easy to set the limits on the methods and the reasons of the decision-making process. Several theories have been proposed to explain how foreign policy decisions are made. These theories include rational actor models, incremental models, bureaucratic organization models, and cognitive processes and belief-system models. While these theories can coexist, they do not necessarily contradict each other (Heywood, 2011, pp. 129-135).

Foreign policy is the means through which a country interrelates with the international community, advances its goals, and protects its interests. The significance of foreign policy and diplomacy is undisputable since they serve as the bridge between the international realm and the country. As a

subset of the functions performed by the state and as a subset of the notion of soft power (as Joseph Nye described it) foreign policy ought to be an essential part of the grand strategy.

Chapter Six: Forecasting, Foresight, Future Studies

6.1 Preliminary remarks

Forecasting aids all systems in upgrading their ability to adapt to new data. When future events, circumstances or trends are known, organizations, governments, and individuals can organize themselves better, eliminating the possibilities of mishandling or failure. The key question however is what forecasting is and to what areas can be applied. It is significant not to confuse forecasting with future prediction. As identified in Chapter One foreign policy is influenced by multiple internal and external determinants, like geography, demography, culture, natural resources, economy, system of governance, public opinion, global power dynamics, international organizations, and international norms. It may appear to be an unachievable goal that foreign policy decision - makers should forecast in advance, as accurately as possible, all these determinants. And in reality it may be unachievable. However, that is not an option. The responsibility of policy makers is to use all available tools and methods to prepare for upcoming events. This responsibility reaches its utmost level in cases of high politics, where national and international concerns are at stake.

6.2 Prediction: Possible or not?

The desire of people to know the future is as old as humankind. It is beyond doubt that almost no one enjoys uncertainty and the methods that people have used over time to predict the future include scientific and non-scientific tools. In the book "Seeing into the Future, a Short History of Prediction" Martin van Creveld makes a thorough historical review of the variety of forecasting methods. From the shamans' counseling to the ambiguous yet anticipated predictions of prophets, from the emergence of legendary figures like Pythia and Sibyl in the ancient Greece to the interpretation of oracles and dreams, various forecasting methods affected people's hearts and minds throughout the enigmatic life journey. Gradually, people developed methods based on detailed observations and formulated rules that are able to draw conclusions concerning the future. Scientists and specialists have replaced shamans, Pythias, and mediums. Arts and crafts like astrology and numerology, which fascinate people as reliable methods of predicting, use rules and mathematical calculations and link to sciences like cartography and navigation to gain the proper weight (Creveld, 2020). For Creveld, the turning point in the history of forecasting coincides with the scientific revolution of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, when prediction appeared as

credible and possible. Over time statistics, polls, algorithms, and war games were used for prediction. He identifies models and algorithms as powerful tools of forecasting, although he also recognizes the limits and disadvantages of these methods. Undeniably the use of computers during the years after the Second World War made the massive use of these models possible, with Creveld expressing the certainty that their use will continue to increase. Creveld, loyal to his expertise as military historian and theorist, refers to the effectiveness of war games. From Chess, that Creveld considers useless regarding foresight, to war games played on maps during the first half of the twentieth century and finally to computer war games, experience has showed that the quality of strategic thinking is much needed when it comes to predicting the future. The author points out that although war games are a useful tool of forecasting regarding business organizations the same does not apply to politics or micro- and macroeconomics, which proves that no panacea has been found yet.

Creveld examines the significance of the past in forecasting. He assumes that history repeats itself and identifies the repetition of patterns and cycles. The author provides evidence that the events of the past offer considerable knowledge that facilitates the decision-making process. The author is convinced that the difficult part, when it comes to forecasting, is which method one should choose, or which combination of methods should be used. For Creveld three factors control the degree of difficulty in predicting the future. First the greater the role of psychological and social factors as opposed to physical ones the harder the forecasting, second it is more possible to have an unsuccessful prediction if it is detailed and third an accurate forecast is inversely proportional to the period of time that intercedes between the prediction and the event. Additionally, impediments in predicting come from the difficulties that all methods have. For Creveld, a prediction should be either right or wrong in absolute degree and he considers anything between just an evasive attempts. However, he admits that the vast majority of predictions are of that kind, e.g., "anything between". The author wonders what would finally happen if mankind could predict accurately the future. Would it be possible to act in a way that a change could be made possible, or the only choice would be to continue as before? It is clear that even if there was a particular answer to this question it would not be applicable to all cases. There are inevitable events even if they are predictable and there are cases where prediction means prevention. He argues that today humankind finds itself in a better position than our ancestors regarding prediction in some fields, like medicine for example. However, in other fields our forecasting competence fails. The author reckons that the science of the future is as far away as it has ever been.

On the other hand, game theorist Bruce Bueno De Mesquita in his book "The Predictioneer's Game Using the Logic of Brazen Self-Interest to See and Shape the Future" analyzes his success in utilizing

game theory to forecast the outcomes of significant foreign policy matters (Mesquita B. B., 2009). The author is certain that prediction is possible through game theory, provided that decision - making cannot happen without first thinking and assessing how other stakeholders will react. For B.B. De Mesquita it is important to reflect on how others think about their problems in order to make good prognoses. Selfishness is a primary idea in game theory, and it is explained by the defense of self-interest by individuals. Genuine altruism is believed to be an unusual behavior. This notion of self-interest forms the foundation for constructing mathematical games that uncover probable outcomes in various scenarios. When predicting the outcome of an issue, for De Mesquita it is crucial to analyze the motives of the stakeholders with high interests involved. By calculating the level of interest, the reaction of the stakeholders is easily predictable. Therefore, for the author accurate predictions about future behavior are possible.

Reality has shown that in certain cases prediction is possible, however the level of accuracy that De Mesquita is suggesting is rarely attained, especially in complicated fields like the international relations where the level of interest is impacted by multiple and constantly changing determinants. But why do predictions fail? And why do people believe predictions anyway? For Dan Gardner, the answer is simple. The world is too complicated to be predicted and the human brain has a certain capacity building. People's desire to eliminate uncertainty is stronger than rational thinking. The uncertainty leads people to explore meanings and patterns as signs of the future (Gardner, 2010, p. 31). Gardner doubts that experts have any successes in prediction. He argues that prediction scholars manipulate the audience with approaches like the "almost right" prediction, the "wait and see" prediction or by eventually twisting their statements (Gardner, 2010, pp. 33-36). The author's argument is that predictions work well when they follow a linear model. Examples of such systems include planetary motion and the occurrence of tides, which can be accurately estimated using linear models. However, the author indicates that predicting events like demographic, political, and social events is challenging because these systems are non-linear, and the feedback is dependent. Furthermore, slight changes to the input data in non-linear systems can lead to significant model uncertainty. This means that even slight alterations in the original environment or the data used to make predictions can result in extremely different outcomes.

6.3 Key takeaways

Scholars' opinions differ regarding whether the future can be predicted and to what extent. Thus, it is also not possible to conclude if science can predict the future in international relations. However, browsing various perspectives offers a lot of useful information. It broadens understanding and provides

valuable insight. Undoubtedly, the process of evaluating, accepting, or rejecting a theory involves thorough consideration, critical thinking, and an exhaustive analysis of evidence. However, it is of high importance and interest that scholars have eventually included foreign policy in their predicting models. State leaders, governments and public policies decision-makers should shift their gaze on methods and tools that may not predict the future, but they definitely support the optimization of the preparedness. This would prove advantageous not only for international relations matters but also for all fields of public policies.

6.4 Foresight and Future Studies

While strategic foresight and future studies may not be as universally recognized as some other disciplines, they are important fields of study that focus on understanding and anticipating future developments. In many countries strategic foresight methods have been incorporated in the government agencies and the public administration. In 2018 the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) established the Center for Strategic Foresight. “GAO’s Office of Strategic Planning and External Liaison is playing the important role of analyzing trends that will affect federal agencies and programs now and in the future”²⁵. Its role is to help GAO to fulfill the responsibility as the federal government’s supporter towards effectiveness and effectiveness. NATO’s Strategic Warfare Development Command, the Allied Command Transformation, through its Strategic Foresight branch is conducting strategic foresight analysis in order to “develop and promote long-term understanding and awareness of the future security environment that informs military decision-makers on the abilities that NATO may require”²⁶. The Branch organizes workshops and webinars on Strategic Foresight and publishes reports and papers. In 2018 started conducting strategic foresight analysis of specific regions of importance to the Alliance In order to “contribute to a better visualization and understanding of the future security environment in regions relevant to NATO and Euro-Atlantic security and inform the development of the next versions of the Strategic Foresight Analysis”²⁷. In Greece, the Special Secretariat of Foresight was established in 2020. The fact that the Secretariat stands under the Presidency of the Government signifies the government’s will to entail it to the very core of the state’s executive branch. Additionally, the UNESCO Chair on Futures Research among other initiatives regarding the future, has initiated the “Imagining the Futures of Greece” project that concerns futures research and capacity development in anticipation and futures thinking. The

²⁵ Government Accountability Office Center for Strategic Foresight – Overview <https://www.gao.gov/about/what-gao-does/audit-role/csf>

²⁶ NATO's Strategic Warfare Development Command - Allied Command Transformation – Planning – Strategic Foresight <https://www.act.nato.int/activities/allied-command-transformation-strategic-foresight-work/>

²⁷ Ibid.

project includes a range of activities varying from awareness raising to capacity building. To enhance Futures Literacy in Greece UNESCO is introducing tools for anticipation and futures thinking targeting policy makers, professionals, academics, and students²⁸.

In an increasingly unpredictable global environment, it is indispensable that such organizations, public agencies and initiatives have access to all available resources necessary for the accomplishment of their commitment, which should be the support for governments, people and stakeholders toward effectiveness and efficacy. Additionally, the ever-increasing interest in strategic foresight should raise awareness to all governments in order to integrate strategic foresight tools in all public policies. The following paragraphs aim to provide readers and those interested in the matter with an understanding of the function and importance of foresight.

6.5 Strategic Foresight

For Futurologist Richard A. Slaughter “Strategic foresight is the ability to create and maintain a high-quality, coherent, and functional forward view and to use the insights arising in organizationally useful ways; for example: to detect adverse conditions, guide policy, shape strategy; to explore new markets, products, and services. It represents a fusion of futures methods with those of strategic management.” Strategic foresight is an elaborated tool that not only supports organizations to tackle future dangers but also supports them to discover prospects and opportunities.

The European Union, considering challenges like climate change, geopolitics as well as the rapid and relentless evolution of digital technologies, has embedded strategic foresight into its work²⁹. The definition of foresight given by the European Commission reads: “Foresight is the discipline of exploring, anticipating, and shaping the future to help building and using collective intelligence in a structured, and systemic way to anticipate developments. Strategic foresight is a branch of foresight is a method that seeks to embed foresight into policy-making processes in order to build on collective intelligence in a structured and systematic way to help better develop possible transition pathways, prepare the EU to withstand shocks and shape the future we want”³⁰. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in its website dedicated to the discipline explains that “foresight can support government policymaking through better anticipation, policy innovation and future-proofing”³¹. The

²⁸ UNESCO Chair on Futures Research – Objectives <https://www.futures.gr/en/unesco-chair/objectives/>

²⁹ European Commission: Strategy and Policy – Strategic Planning – Strategic Foresight https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/strategic-planning/strategic-foresight_en

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ OECD Strategic Foresight <https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/>

Organization considers that responsible governance requires the use of tools like foresight and thus its Strategic Foresight Unit collaborates with many governments and organizations confronting numerous different strategic challenges. The Unit's work involves supporting governments, enhancing OECD work, and preparing the OECD for the future³². For OECD foresight is required in situations where the degree of uncertainty is extremely high, and its function entails five fundamental sections. First, horizon scanning deals with searching for and examining indicators of change in the present and their potential future impacts. Second, the identification of change drivers which is the identification process of the probable changes that could be the most unexpected and influential. Third, developing scenarios meaning the development of multiple representations of how the future could be. Fourth, exploring opportunities & challenges meaning the investigation of those determinants whose change may result in more achievable or more difficult accomplishment of the policy goals. And finally, the fifth section is formulating perspectives for action that attribute to policymaking³³.

Strategic Foresight does not aspire to give definitive answers regarding the future. Foresight is definitely not forecasting. Foresight comprehends the future as an inevitability, only partly perceptible. That means that no one can be certain for future facts and that the available data are incomplete³⁴. "The objective is not to 'get the future right,' but to expand and reframe the range of plausible developments that need to be taken into consideration"³⁵. Furthermore, strategic foresight through the process of "considering multiple alternative futures" is complementary to strategic planning by supporting it without replacing or supplanting it³⁶.

6.6 Foresight and Future Studies

Although the term and the field of foresight and future studies are not broadly known, the first academic approach in studying the future was made after World War II by the German Professor of History and Political Science Ossip Kurt Flechtheim who invented the term "Futurology" ("Futurologie" in German) (Gidley, 2022, p. 26). Jennifer M. Gidley in her book "The Future: A Very Short Introduction" explains the history of the human conception of the future. For Gidley, as for other scholars, the possibility of accurately defining the future is not possible and the next best alternative is to plan for the future in order to protect

³² Ibid.

³³ OECD Strategic Foresight "How does Foresight work?" <https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/whatisforesight/>

³⁴ OECD Strategic Foresight "Foresight Vs Forecasting" <https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/whatisforesight/>

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ OECD Strategic Foresight "Strategic Foresight Vs Strategic Planning" <https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/whatisforesight/>

ourselves from the consequences (Gidley, 2022, p. 80). Gidley gives emphasis on the notion of “multiple futures.” The idea of multiple (possible) futures was developed in the 1960’s influenced by pluralistic approach of social sciences (Gidley, 2022, p. 75). Multiple futures contrast the restrictive perspective of one possible future and offer a variety of prospects.

The challenges with which humankind will be confronted in the near- and long-term futures are complex and systemic interconnected. Upcoming social, cultural, geopolitical, and environmental crises have been characterized by scholars as crisis of the crises. The end of cheap oil, the environmental challenges, and world economic and financial crises, are for some scholars the evidence that the waiting is over (Gidley, 2022, p. 173). All organizations that expert on foresight use megatrends, e.g., “long-term driving forces that are observable now and will most likely have significant influence on the future”³⁷ to help possible and desirable futures to be identified. The World Economic Forum publishes every year an Outlook on the “Global Agenda Report” which includes twelve trends expected to have the greatest impact in the world in the near future (in twelve to eighteenth months’ time). There are multiple agencies worldwide that expert on foresight and future studies. The World Future Society that was established in 1966 first spoke about the methods of forecasting for purposes other than the military (Gidley, 2022, p. 83). Several universities worldwide offer programs in the interdisciplinary field of Future Studies that are related to strategic foresight, strategic planning, strategic leadership, scenario planning etc. For Gidley the definition of Future Studies is that “are the art and science of responsibility assuming for the long-term consequences of our decisions and acts in the present” (Gidley, 2022, p. 202). Considering the rapid evolution of technology and its implications, future studies need to gain more interest both from governments and scholars.

³⁷ European Commission – Competence Centre on Foresight – The Megatrends Hub
https://knowledge4policy.ec.europa.eu/foresight/tool/megatrends-hub_en

Chapter Seven: American – Greek relations and Strategic Foresight

7.1 Preliminary remarks

What the previous chapters have demonstrated is that international relations can be viewed as an equation in which it functions as the dependent variable influenced by many independent variables and unknowns. The rule that the future cannot be predicted also applies in international relations. The fascinating and intriguing element for those that shape international relations, study the field, practice foreign policy, make decisions regarding global affairs is that they are already in the future. Because the present of the international realm is by default uncertain and complex as the future. Practicing foreign policy may on the other hand involve managing the current situation and addressing present challenges. However, the focal point is not the present but the future. The irony stands in the decisions and policies of the present that may impact the future in unpredictable ways. Considering these factors, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that international relations and foreign policy are the fields of glory for strategic foresight.

7.2 American – Greek Relations in the future

As mentioned in previous chapters, American – Greek relations today are at a thriving moment. The two countries are in close cooperation, experience mutual understanding and demonstrate effective collaboration. The fluctuation of American – Greek relations were assessed in the first part of this paper. Can this overview serve as a guide for the future? The examination of the historical background of the American – Greek relations proves that a series of determinants remain unchanged over time. First, the geopolitical mosaic of the Eastern Mediterranean. The region of the Eastern Mediterranean is the place where the relation started, developed and flourished. Second, Greece's intriguing relation with Turkey, that, as demonstrated, it affected multiple times the American – Greek relations. The disputes over Cyprus and the Aegean Sea remain unsolved and the lurking situation seems like is ready to erupt any minute. It is undeniable that the position of Eastern Mediterranean as passage and boundary, as well as its rich resources are factors that increase the level of competition in the region. The third determinant is Greece's consistent over time, orientation. As a democratic state with respect for the rule of law and the international law, Greece remains oriented towards the West. Member of the NATO, the EU, the UN and other agencies, Greece fosters the ideals of stability, security and mutual respect with its neighboring countries and allies. Another factor that remains unchanged is Turkey's tendency to provoke frictions in the region. Although being is a NATO ally Turkey at the same time seeks and builds alliances with non-democratic countries. It has the ambition to join the European Union but does not prioritize the fulfillment

of the requirements. The fifth unchanged determinant is the interest of the U.S. for preserving the stability and peace in the region. The U.S. may have at times retired temporarily from the region (as for example during Donald Trump's Presidency), however it has never abandoned it. As we have examined, the U.S. has intervened numerous times, as security guarantor, in the region to ease moments of tension.

In Chapter Three, where the American - Greek rapport was examined over the years, it was made clear that the two state's bilateral relations were greatly influenced by these fundamental and unchanged determinants as well as by current events and by the two countries' leaders personalities. Nevertheless, it remains unclear what the American Government's response will be in the event of a potential conflict between Greece and Turkey. And despite the fact that the security of NATO's southern flank is of great importance for the alliance and the U.S. the only certain is that uncertainty surrounds the American reaction during the specific moment of tension (Platias & Koliopoulos, Question 12 What will the US do in a probable Greek-Turkish war?, 2023, pp. 128-132).

The U.S. foreign policy is at a pivotal moment where focus is on inter-state strategic competition. This holds significant consequences for diverse regions, particularly when the global dynamics of the twenty-first century are increasingly adopting a regional character (Tziampiris, The Monroe Doctrine and the Greek Revolution, 2023, p. 94). Nevertheless, it is undeniable that the patterns that were identified in the American - Greek relations can serve as guide for the future. That particularly applies to determining factors like geography that are unlikely to undergo any changes. The exploration of the American - Greek relations' future, in the greater context of the international relations' future, should take into consideration the patterns of the past while applying the tools of strategic foresight.

7.3 American - Greek Relations through Strategic Foresight

Richard A. Slaughter grouped in four categories different methodologies of foresight. Input, analytic, paradigmatic, and lastly iterative and exploratory methods. Input methods gather information that is required for organizations to understand the environments in which they operate. Analytical methods categorize the information that has been gathered during the input stage. The most well-known analytical method is trend analysis. Paradigmatic methods are based on empirical analysis. Iterative and exploratory methods are those focused on the investigation of future conditions, future alternatives or future strategies. The most well-known method of this group is scenario planning. For Slaughter scenario is the most successful foresight method because it can create a series of convincing future realms. The scholar is persuaded that "to make good scenarios a great deal of preparation and analysis is needed" (Slaughter, 2002). That implies that the measure of successful scenario planning lies not in its ability to

precisely predict the future but in its capacity to shift managers' perspectives, encouraging them to break free from their existing mental frameworks (Rice & Zegart, 2018, p. 171).

The strategic foresight methodologies analyzed by Slaughter can most likely be applied to all public policies. The Geneva Center for Security Policy in the research project “Strategic Foresight in Ministries of Foreign Affairs” declares that “strategic foresight can be applied to and can be used as a tool for a broad variety of issues, including peace and security-related topics. In order to better anticipate emerging issues and geopolitical developments, ministries of foreign affairs are building institutional capacities in this area. This can relate specifically to strategic foresight or more generally to political contingency planning or horizon scanning activities”³⁸.

For Greece, the further development of strategic foresight would be for the benefit of the decision-making process and the country’s strategies in all areas. Especially in areas of national security and foreign policy, taking into consideration the challenges of the regional environment. In particular, strategic foresight units should be established in all branches of the administration that have an executive role. The interdisciplinary character of strategic foresight requires intelligence and collaboration from various state stakeholders. Public policies in the field of international relations should be enriched with strategic foresight tools. Particularly, in matters of peace and national security in the region the use of strategic foresight methodology will contribute to the advancement of the American – Greek relations. By employing scenario planning and considering multiple potential outcomes leads to enhanced preparedness for the future, resulting to the further advancement and deepening of the two countries’ relations.

Responding to challenges and crisis requires “develop mechanisms for continuous learning that balance the creative search for new ideas (exploration) and the systematic implementation of proven best practices (exploitation)” (Rice & Zegart, 2018, p. 244). In this framework, Greece should pursue the cooperation with the U.S. by developing strategic foresight methodologies for the region of the Eastern Mediterranean and internationally. The enhancement of bilateral relations has the ultimate potential to enhance Greece's security and prosperity, especially amid heightened Turkish aggression and regional instability (Tziampiris, *The Monroe Doctrine and the Greek Revolution*, 2023, p. 99). American and Greek expertise, intelligence, knowledge, and experience are all ingredients that guarantee the development of strategic foresight methodologies for the benefit of American – Greek bilateral relations and beyond.

³⁸ Geneva Center for Security Policy - GCSP Research Project – Strategic Foresight in Ministries of Foreign Affairs
<https://www.gcsp.ch/Strategic-Foresight-in-Ministries-of-Foreign-Affairs>

Conclusions

The relationship between the United States of America and Greece predates both nations' establishment. The connection existed during the time when the Founding Fathers drew inspiration from the democratic ideals and political culture of Ancient Greece. This inspiration resulted in fascinating interactions, as the leaders of the Greek Revolution regarded the American War of Independence as a model and a source of inspiration. Despite the notable differences in size of the countries, the origin, and the mentality of their people, the two nations have managed to establish and maintain a long-lasting relationship. Since its official establishment, this relationship has remained uninterrupted until the present day. Undoubtedly, there have been moments of tension, occasions of mutual disappointment, and periods of significant challenges throughout the course of this relationship.

The evolution of the American - Greek relations has been significantly influenced by the international developments. Naturally, the United States' interest in the Eastern Mediterranean region encompassed Greece. As history has shown, the region has always been and continues to be demanding in terms of geostrategic and geopolitical considerations. Within this challenging and occasionally turbulent context, Greece has opted to safeguard its national interests by building alliances with other democratic states that uphold principles such as the rule of law, human rights, freedom, and respect for international law. Both the U.S. and Greece share the same democratic views and have common values and the history of their relations has a lot to teach us in terms of the expectations for the future.

Indeed, predicting the future is a challenging task. This applies not only to the future of a single country but also to bilateral relationships or international relationships in general. The complexities and uncertainties inherent in political, social, and economic dynamics make it difficult to accurately foresee what lies ahead. A range of elements, such as changing priorities, unexpected occurrences, and evolving geopolitical landscapes, possess the capacity to profoundly influence the trajectory of these relationships. Consequently, it is wise to approach the future with an acknowledgment of its inherent unpredictability. However, the crucial understanding of future studies and strategic foresight is that the future is not singular and predetermined. Policy makers should move away from a deterministic perspective of having only one option for the future and instead establish networks at national and international levels. These networks will enable them to explore the multiple and different aspects of possible futures, empowering them to effectively tackle the challenges that lie ahead.

The ultimate conclusive note regarding the future of international relations is encapsulated in the following sentence. Study, consider as many as multiple futures as you can, carefully plan, try, and use all

available scientific tools, prepare for different possibilities and hope that your enemies will stay distant, and your allies and friends will remain close.

Page intentionally left blank

References

Books

- Arvanitopoulos, C. (2003). *The American Foreign Policy after the Cold War, Ideological Movements*. Athens, Greece: Piotita.
- Arvanitopoulos, C. (2009). *The Institutional Framework of American Foreign Policy Decision-Making [in Greek]*. Athens, Greece: Piotita.
- Arvanitopoulos, C., & Ifestos, P. (2003). *Euroatlantic Relations [in Greek]*. Athens: Piotita.
- Babanasis, S. (2019). Key findings and conclusions of the Conference: Geostrategic Changes in the Mediterranean and their Consequences. In U. o.-M. Institution, & A. P. Stergios Babanasis (Ed.), *Geostrategic Changes in the Mediterranean and their Consequences [in Greek]* (pp. 9-48). Athens, Greece: Papazisi.
- Bahcheli, T., Couloumbis, T. A., & Carley, P. (1997). Greek - Turkish Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy Cyprus, the Aegean, and Regional Stability. *Peaceworks(No 17)*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace. Retrieved from <http://usip.forumone.com/files/resources/pwks17.pdf>
- Botsiou, K. (2020). International Relations and International Relations' History: Theory and Methodology. In Gofas A, E. L. G., & K. M. (Ed.), *A Century of International Relations 1919-2019* (pp. 126-135). Athens, Greece: Pedio.
- Bryson, J. M. (2011). *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement* (Fourth Edition ed.). San Fransisco, United States of America: Jossey-Bass .
- Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The grand chessboard: American primacy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cox, M. (2016). *Introduction to international relations*. London: Univeristy of London.
- Creveld, M. v. (2020). *Seeing into the Future A Short History of Prediction*. London, United Kingdom: Reaktion Books Ltd.
- Dalis, S. (2015). *From International Relations to International Politics [in Greek]*. Athens , Greece: Papazisi.
- Diogos, K. (2022, April). The Greek Vision of America during the Greek War of Independence (1821-1830). *European journal of American Studies, The Greek War of Independence and the United States: Narratives of Myth and Reality(17-1)*, 1-16. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.17740>
- Gardner, D. (2010). *Future Babble Why Expert Predictions Fail - and Why We Believe Them Anyway*. Toronto, Canada: McClelland & Stewart.
- Gidley, J. M. (2022). *The Future: A Very Short Introduction*. Athens: Crete University Press.
- Hermann, M. G. (2001). How Decision Units Shape Foreign Policy: A Theoretical Framework. *International Studies Review*, 3(2), 47-81. doi:<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3186565>
- Heywood, A. (2011). *Global Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hill, C. (2003, March 21). What is to be done? Foreign Policy as a Site for Political Action. *International Affairs*, 79(2), 233–255. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.00306>
- Hill, C. (2018). *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century, 2nd edition [in Greek]*. Heraklion, Crete, Greece: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης.
- Ifestos, P. (1999). First Chapter. General Introduction: The History of International Relations, The History of the Theory of International Relations and the Discussion on the edge of Theoretical Concern on the doorstep of the 21st century. In P. Ifestos, *History, Theory, Politics and Philosophy of International Relations* (pp. 21-84). Athens: Piotita.
- Kaplan, L. S. (1993). The Monroe Doctrine and the Truman Doctrine: The Case of Greece. *Journal of the Early Republic*(13(1)), 1-21. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2307/3124186>
- Kaplan, R. D. (2012). *The Revenge of Geography What the map tells us about coming conflicts and the battle against fate*. New York: Random House.
- Karvounarakis, T. (2022, April 3). The United States Government and the Greek War of Independence. *European journal of American Studies*, 17-1(The Greek War of Independence and the United States: Narratives of Myth and Reality), 1-6. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.17764>
- Katsoulas, S. (2023). *Dilemmas in the Triangle U.S. and Greek-Turkish Relations [in Greek]*. Athens: Dioptra.
- Kirss, A., Gaddis, J. L., Popescu, I., Reich, S., Dombrowski, P., & Pedersen, S. (2018). Does Grand Strategy Matter? [Review of On Grand Strategy; Emergent Strategy and Grand Strategy; The End of Grand Strategy; The Guardians]. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 12(4), 116–132. doi:<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26533618>
- Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Lissner, R. F. (2018, November). What Is Grand Strategy? Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield. *Texas International Security Review*, 2(1), 52-73. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.26153/tsw/868>
- Litsas, S. N. (2020). The Theoretical Foundations of U.S. Foreign Policy. In S. N. Litsas, *US Foreign Policy in the Eastern Mediterranean. Power Politics and Ideology Under the Sun* (pp. 1-39). Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36895-1>
- Litsas, S. N. (2020). *The U.S. in the Eastern Mediterranean: Historical and Political Considerations*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36895-1>
- Mead, W. R. (2022). *Special Providence American Foreign Policy and how it changed the world*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Mesquita, B. B. (2009). *The Predictioneer's Game Using the Logic of Brazen Self-Interest to See and Shape the Future*. Athens: Piotita.
- Mesquita, B. B. (2009). *The Predictioneer's Game Using the Logic of Brazen Self-Interest to See and Shape the Future*. New York: Random House.

- Papakonstantinou, K. (2011). The Port of Messolonghi: Spatial Allocation and Maritime Expansion in the Eighteenth Century. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*(7), 277–297.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.265>
- Papasotiriou, C. (2018). *U.S. Foreign Policy From Franklin Roosevelt to Donald Trump*. Athens: Piotita.
- Platias, A. G. (1995). *The New International System - Realistic Approach of International Relations*. Athens, Greece: Papazisi Publishing.
- Platias, A. G. (1997). *Out of borders*. Athens: Papazisi Publishing.
- Platias, A. G. (2011). Introduction, Kenneth N. Waltz and the Political Realism. In K. N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics [in Greek]* (pp. 9-31). Athens, Greece: Piotita.
- Platias, A. G. (2019). Geopolitical challenges in the Eastern Mediterranean. In U. o.-M. Institution, *Geostrategic Changes in the Mediterranean and their Consequences [in Greek]* (pp. 69-83).
- Platias, A. G. (2020). *International Relations and Strategic in Thucydides* (8th ed.). Athens: Hestia.
- Platias, A. G. (2022). The Logic of Grand Strategy. In A. G. Platias, & C. Hadjiemmanuil (Eds.), *Elliniki ypsili stratigiki Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras**Greek Grand Strategy Dialogues with the country's Leadership* (pp. 23-39). Athens, Greece: Eurasia Publications.
- Platias, A. G., & Hadjiemmanuil, C. (2022). *Dialogoi me tin igesia tis choras*. Athens: Eurasia Publications.
- Platias, A. G., & Koliopoulos, C. (2023). Question 12 What will the US do in a probable Greek-Turkish war? In A. G. Platias, & C. Koliopoulos, *50 Strategy Rules in Greek Turkish Relations ans Answers to 20 Crucial Questions* (pp. 128-132). Athens: Diavlos Books.
- Preston, A. (2019). *American Foreign Relations: A Very Short Introduction*. Gosport, Hants: Oxford Unoveristy Press.
- Rice, C., & Zegart, A. (2018). *Political risk: how businesses and organizations can anticipate global insecurity*. New York: Twelve Hachette Book Group.
- Shifrinson, J., & Wertheim, S. (2021). Biden the Realist The President's Foreign Policy Doctrine Has Been Hiding in Plain Sight. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-09-09/biden-realist>
- Slaughter, R. A. (2002). *The Public Employment Service (PES) research network of the PES Austria, Dep. for Labour Market Research and Vocational Information / Publications*. Retrieved 2023, from The Public Employment Service (PES) research network of the PES Austria, Dep. for Labour Market Research and Vocational Information: https://www.ams-forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/2002slaughter_Strategic_Foresight.pdf
- Svolopoulos, C. (2022). *Greek Foreign Policy 1830-1981*. Athens: Estia.
- Tsirigotis, D. (2013). *New and Contemporary Greek History - International Relations and Diplomacy*. Athens: Piotita.

Tziampiris, A. (2021). Greek Foreign Policy in the New Eastern Mediterranean. In Collective, *The New Eastern Mediterranean Transformed Emerging Issues and New Actors* (pp. 1-30). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Tziampiris, A. (2023). *The Monroe Doctrine and the Greek Revolution*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan Springer Nature. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-29704-5>

Varvarousis, P. (2004). *International Relations and Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*. Athens, Greece: Papazisis.

Articles in journals

Bahcheli, T., Couloumbis, T. A., & Carley, P. (1997). Greek - Turkish Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy Cyprus, the Aegean, and Regional Stability. *Peaceworks(No 17)*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace. Retrieved from <http://usip.forumone.com/files/resources/pwks17.pdf>

Diogos, K. (2022, April). The Greek Vision of America during the Greek War of Independence (1821-1830). *European journal of American Studies, The Greek War of Independence and the United States: Narratives of Myth and Reality(17-1)*, 1-16. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.17740>

Hermann, M. G. (2001). How Decision Units Shape Foreign Policy: A Theoretical Framework. *International Studies Review*, 3(2), 47-81. doi:<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3186565>

Hill, C. (2003, March 21). What is to be done? Foreign Policy as a Site for Political Action. *International Affairs*, 79(2), 233–255. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.00306>

Kaplan, L. S. (1993). The Monroe Doctrine and the Truman Doctrine: The Case of Greece. *Journal of the Early Republic(13(1))*, 1-21. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2307/3124186>

Karvounarakis, T. (2022, April 3). The United States Government and the Greek War of Independence. *European journal of American Studies, 17-1 (The Greek War of Independence and the United States: Narratives of Myth and Reality)*, 1-6. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.17764>

Kirss, A., Gaddis, J. L., Popescu, I., Reich, S., Dombrowski, P., & Pedersen, S. (2018). Does Grand Strategy Matter? [Review of On Grand Strategy; Emergent Strategy and Grand Strategy; The End of Grand Strategy; The Guardians]. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 12(4), 116–132. doi:<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26533618>

Papakonstantinou, K. (2011). The Port of Messolonghi: Spatial Allocation and Maritime Expansion in the Eighteenth Century. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique(7)*, 277–297. doi:<https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.265>

Shifrinson, J., & Wertheim, S. (2021). Biden the Realist The President's Foreign Policy Doctrine Has Been Hiding in Plain Sight. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-09-09/biden-realist>

Websites

U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian <https://history.state.gov/>

U.S. Department of State U.S. Embassy & Consulate in Greece <https://gr.usembassy.gov/>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic <https://www.mfa.gr/en/index.html>

NATO's Strategic Warfare Development Command - Allied Command Transformation – Planning – Strategic Foresight <https://www.act.nato.int/activities/allied-command-transformation-strategic-foresight-work/>

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development OECD <https://www.oecd.org/>

The European Commission https://commission.europa.eu/index_en

Web pages

<https://journals.openedition.org/ejas/17764>

<https://www.kathimerini.gr/opinion/707453/ellinoamerikanikes-scheseis-arches-20oy-ai-1974/>

<https://ojs.lib.uom.gr/index.php/BalkanStudies/article/view/74>

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1801-1829/monroe>

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1830-1860/pacific-expansion>

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1861-1865>

<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/marshall-plan>

<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1951v05/d212>

<https://www.state.gov/joint-statement-on-the-31-republic-of-cyprus-greece-israel-united-states-foreign-ministerial/>

<https://gr.usembassy.gov/el/our-relationship-el/policy-history-el/us-country-relations-el/>

<https://www.mfa.gr/en/the-ministry/international-conventions/major-international-treaties-concerning-greece.html>

<https://200years.mfa.gr/diplomatic-consular-relations/usa/>

<https://www.mfa.gr/en/blog/greece-bilateral-relations/egypt/>

<https://www.mfa.gr/en/blog/greece-bilateral-relations/libya/>

<https://www.mfa.gr/en/blog/greece-bilateral-relations/lebanon/>

<https://www.mfa.gr/en/blog/greece-bilateral-relations/syria/>

<https://www.primeminister.gr/en/2021/12/07/28153>

<https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/>

<https://www.oecd.org/strategic-foresight/whatisforesight/>

https://knowledge4policy.ec.europa.eu/foresight/tool/megatrends-hub_en

https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/strategic-planning/strategic-foresight_en

<https://www.gcsp.ch/Strategic-Foresight-in-Ministries-of-Foreign-Affairs>