



# ΤΟ ΕΛΛΗΝΟ-ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΟ ΠΡΟΒΛΗΜΑ

Του Καθηγητού κ. Θ. ΚΟΥΛΟΥΜΠΗ

2

Ο «Εθνικός Κέντρος» δημοσιεύει ειδικά την εύχαριστική συνεργασία διακεκριμένων επιστημόνων χωρίς και ανάγκη, να αναφερθεί ποτέ με το περιεχόμενό του. Υπό το πνεύμα αυτό καταχωρείται ήδη καλύτερο έργο του Καθηγητού κ. Θ. Κουλούμπη, ASSOCIATE DEAN, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Η σύγχρονη πολιτική κατάσταση της Ελλάδας επιβάλλει την εξέταση του ρόλου που πρέπει να παίξουν οι «Ελληνοαμερικανικοί» σχετικά με την τύχη και το μέλλον της χώρας των προγόνων τους. Είναι γεγονός αναμφισβήτητο ότι δεν υπάρχει σήμερα Δημοκρατία στην Ελλάδα. Σ' αυτό συμφωνούν όλοι οι παρατηρητές ανεξίτητος πολιτικού προσανατολισμού.

Οι φίλοι της σημερινής Κυβερνήσεως την αποκαλούν «Εθνική επανάσταση» και διαβεβαιώνουν ότι αποτελεί μια προσωρινή επίθεση του Στρατού στην διοίκηση και προοδεύει να δημιουργηθούν τα έσοδα μιας αληθινής και προοδευτικής Δημοκρατίας. Φροντίζουν ακόμη ότι η στρατιωτική επίθεση ήταν επιβεβλημένη, τα γένοια και την γραμμοκρίση που την είχαν οδηγήσει οι πολιτικοί της.

Οι φίλοι της Κυβερνήσεως από την άλλη πλευρά την αποκαλούν «γόνιμα» και «επανάσταση» ή μια κλίμα συναισθημάτων δημοκρατικών που επέδειξε την εξουσία, καταπάτησε όλους τους προστατευτικούς νόμους των ατομικών ελευθεριών και για 212 γόνια τώρα εμπνέει τους Έλληνες και οικιακούς αποσπασμένη την επαναστατική συνταγματική διαταγή από άρρητο και συνεχώς αναβαλλόμενο μέλλον.

Λογικά με την ιδεολογική τοποθέτηση ενός παρατηρητού υπάρχουν όρισμα καταφανή και αδιαμφισβήτητα γεγονότα τα οποία χαρακτηρίζουν τον ρυθμό της σημερινής «Ελληνικής ζωής».

Ας θυμηθούμε από τα πιο χαρακτηριστικά: 1) Κατευθυνόμενος (ή λογοκρινόμενος) Τύπος καθώς και τα άλλα μέσα της μαζικής επικοινωνίας (ραδιοφωνία, τηλεόραση, θέατρο και αόσια, τα ποδοσφαίρα, λογοτεχνία και τέχνη). Αλλά τα μέτρα δίδονται γι' αυτό που είναι η πολιτική που ακολουθείται στην Ελλάδα και η τεχνική μορφή που είναι πάντα το αποτέλεσμα μιας στενής και αυθαίρετης παιδείας ή μεθόδου εκπαίδευσης και επικοινωνίας.

2) Η Εκπαίδευση του στρατιωτικού νόμου με όλες τις ψυχολογικές συνέπειες που επιφέρει αυτό το έκτακτο ή πολύχρονο σύστημα. Είναι «κατάσταση ανάγκης» καθώς δεν μπορεί να αλληλοεπιδράσει ή και σκεπαστεί άρρηκτα. Ξέρει ότι από στιγμή σε στιγμή μπορεί να πιάσει όμοιο κακού ζηλοτυφίου, κρατικού λάθους, αδιανόητης ή υπερβολικού ζή-

(Συνέχεια εις την 8ην Σελίδα)







the US has since that time quietly supported the military junta of Greece in the interest of maintaining (or not withdrawing) US strategic interests: namely American bases and personnel in Greece as well as access rights to airports, overflights and other such matters to American military aircraft, and welcome and useful environment for the sea-worthy crews of the 6th Fleet operating in the Mediterranean sea.

If we accept for a moment the premise that US military considerations outweigh all other factors in the determination of our policy in Greece, let us look into the substance of our foreign policies toward Greece with respect to this country. At its essential heart our policy toward Greece can be described as one of painful dilemma. On one side we deplore the "temporary" (nothing is temporary until it is ended) suspension of democratic freedoms and civil rights in Greece and urge sincerely that democracy should be restored in the not too distant future. On the other hand, we point up the vital strategic importance of the Greek real estate and the fact that the military government has been fulfilling its NATO obligations with religious exactness.

These obligations presumably involving a welcome stance vis-a-vis US military presence in the Greek territorial complex, a willingness to devote a large part of the governmental budget to defense spending, the possibility that large portions of the defense expenditures will be used for internal control rather than external deterrence must be taken into consideration here, and correct attitudes of silence if not even approval with respect to the much-besieged U.S. policies in Indochina. Last but not least, the unstated but very thankful approval of the U.S. govt to the Papadopoulos government for its prudent and definitely political stance vis-a-vis the potentially explosive Cyprus issue which could engulf Greece and Turkey in war (over control of Cyprus) thus settling the matter and ending the NATO as well as the great grin of the Russian bear which is comfortably affirming itself to swimming in the warm waters of the Mediterranean sea.

The military spokesman of our foreign policy vis-a-vis Greece, however, go a step further than stating the two horns of this dilemma. They unwittingly at times and consciously at other times perform the role of public relations go-to-go-makers for the Greek regime in the United States. A classic example of this role-on-the-unwitting side—is the constant sowings and sowing of minor and major lies on the U.S.-NATO establishment within Greece, inspecting sites, kissing babies, and invariably posing in smiling, cordial and warm attitudes to the ever-growing Greek military press installments. These pictures are prominently displayed by the pro-government newspapers in Greece, transmitting with a pleasure rather than a thousand words a single sentence to the ears of the Greek public: UNCLE SAM LINES UP (Alfred Friendly in a recent column published by the Washington Post claims that Ambassador Thoma has put a virtual stop to this practice).

On the more serious and formal side, one discerns the Pentagon's position on the Greek regime following statements made by Defense officials before the various committees and subcommittees as well as necessary sessions of the two houses of Congress. A classic example of this attitude is exemplified by the Defense document presented in evidence by Senator Strom Thurmond before the U.S. Senate in 1967. The document's amendment that would have suspended military aid to Greece pending the restoration of democracy there. The document

eloquently identifies the essence of the American dilemma, but goes considerably further than that. It accuses the good faith of the Greek regime with respect of its oft-announced intentions of restoring Democracy in Greece and an attitude of ambivalence which has been implicitly set by the Greek government (towards the end of 1959) as a reasonable time-limit for the restoration of the civil constitution and provisions for the empowerment of elections which would be the most unequivocal sign of the return of democracy in Greece.

What is remarkable about the narrative of the Greek regime in the present and its subsequent trust with which the intentions of the Papadopoulos government are accepted without reservation.

If we examine briefly the record of the Papadopoulos regime in its over three years of governance he will quickly come to the conclusion that the Pentagon's acceptance with respect to the intentions of the Greek regime is not only unwarranted but also a trusting that seldom speak truer than words has been discredited by the personal failures who have started to emphasize only the negative. Let us look at the record. The regime came to power in 1967, after the insistent behavior of communists and the rampant corruption of the parliamentary regime. Neither of these charges being proven, the regime has dropped the mask and has adopted new, flexible, abstract and theoretical justifications for its stay in power. For instance the objectives of the regime include such long-range goals as the reshaping of the Greek economy and the education of the Greek public so as to introduce civic maturity among them, the transition of Greece from the status of developing to that of a developed country, etc. The regime has in fact an "army" of a hundred year projects. The regime has spoken with many and forced targets regarding how these grandiose objectives will be brought to reality. The regime will, it is said, at least, be more pragmatic in Greek history.

The most authoritative spokesman of the regime, P. M. Papadopoulos, has spoken unequivocally about return to democracy on a flexible foundation. The decline of his government, however, since its inception appear aspect at best. After three years have elapsed since the April 27 takeover, the country is still under the shadow of stifling law and strict military control of the governmental apparatus. Even if certain industries have been entrusted to various civilian personalities, it is a common secret in Greece that the military apparatus is the real backbone of the revolutionary workings in the governmental apparatus. These latter are invariably related military affairs that enjoy the strictest confidence in the revolution. If they are not military, they are under revolutionary control. The latter quality places on matters of highest policy for the Greek nation.

Papadopoulos announced with great fanfare the return of Greece to constitutional democracy very early in the game. A new constitution was drafted, and considerably elaborated on, after the unceremonial ousting of King Constantine in December of 1967. This constitution, which included a power of the King, weakened the authority of parliament and reinforced the power of the executive, was put to the vote of the Greek people in late September of 1968. The main reason that the vote took place under strict conditions of martial law and that an embarrassing majority of over 95% of the Greek people not only voted for the constitution but also voted for a new government which would keep their own civil rights and free-freedom in the drawer until the Revolution deemed it safe or proper to permit a show.

It was unabashedly claimed by some proponents of the Revolution that the Greeks had voted freely for their own political extinction and for the perpetuation of martial law. Although the new constitution has been put into effect, the Greek people are still subject to the highest or revolutionary law of the land which simply rotated heads: Nothing is successful if it endorses the "military" revolution. The majority of the government proved that when it ignored the decisions of Greece's highest administrative court and forced its chief justice, Stasinopoulos, to resign. Nothing illustrates this hybrid and unbecoming situation more than the fashion with which the matter of freedom of the press has been handled. Early in 1970 preventive censorship was lifted and the new law defining the rights and duties of the Greek press went into effect. For many years to be emancipated publishers, the new law proved more than pure and simple military censorship. The philosophy of the new law was the imposition of a form of "constructive self-restraint." As long as the press did not publish anything that could be construed as "weakening aid political freedom, or reporting on questions dealing with national defense and security, or reporting on suicides, or presenting news in a fashion promoting a "defeatist, anti-nationalist" spirit, they were free to write and publish anything they wanted. Even the voice of the conscience, if they broke the elaborate and flexibly interpretable law.

The examples of half-measures, empty gestures, structurally defective laws that would not be applied are too numerous to mention in this short article. Suffice it to say that the new "progressive" legislation being carved out of the revolutionary committee has not only failed to improve the quality of the educational system under which strict military scrutiny, has abolished all local representation from mayor to council and has reported elected local councils which control the municipal government, but has effectively blocked the right of labor strikes, the continuation and maintenance of political and social movements, and has provoked most extraordinary internal opposition. A regime which has repeatedly and continuously urged modernization and development has also seen fit to decrease the years of obligatory free and public education from nine to six. A summation of the picture just painted indicates that there is a tremendous gap between rhetoric and action.

The Pentagon, by choosing consciously to ignore the double standard if not doubletalk of the Greek government is rapidly becoming identified as an accomplice among the proponents of the Greek Revolution. It is, naturally the public. An accomplice, that is, which is responsible for the perpetuation of unnecessary dictatorial conditions in their country. The Greek Revolution, in its present attitude is clearly apparent. The United States is losing the natural support of the Greek preponderance of the Greek political spectrum. This will mean that if and when a popular regime is established in Greece, the favorable position that the US has enjoyed in Greece since 1947 may be seriously jeopardized. This then creates a thankless situation where the US will be required to support a dictatorial government against the preferences of the Greek people as well as international public opinion in order to maintain its strategic interests on the Greek real estate. The alternative is to recognize that it is because which the United States can avoid because Greece today provides the US with a credible, popular, pro-western alternative to the currently governing Greek junta.

What is this alternative and how can it be brought about? The alternative is the transition from the present impasse to a

\* The measure was narrowly defeated 58 to 42. It is indeed unique that 43 US senators voted against aid to the Greek nation since the days of the Truman Doctrine in 1947.

situation where the electoral process will permit the Greek people to elect a sensitive and legitimate government. How can this transition be brought about and what leverage, if any, does the US possess in the situation? Our foreign policy makers will agree to the contrary. However, I will consider leverage in Greece. The early part of this paper emphasized the strained relationship and the ambivalence between the military and the civilian government. Strong, clear-cut statements backed with appropriate action (such as increments of aid, and support in international relations) are adequate to establish the disposition government to deliver the goods that it has solemnly promised from the beginning of its takeover. Failure of Parliament to comply would raise serious and divisive questions within the revolutionary council. Regardless of the exact nature of the 1968 constitution (much depends with respect to constitutions on how said by whom they are interpreted), the present government must be persuaded to apply it without further procrastination. The Pentagon appears to have adopted this attitude by announcing that December 1970 is a reasonable deadline for the complete adoption of the constitution. This means in effect the lifting of martial law, the cessation of political parties to restructure themselves, and most importantly, the announcement of elections within 1971.

Now, many critics of the regime may question the legitimacy of the elections to be held under possible conditions of intimidation and fraud. This must be avoided at all costs if the Greek situation is to find an evolutionary way out of its present impasse. Once the constitution is applied and elections announced, the present regime must give way to an interim or transitional government. The government made up of representative personalities from the spectrum of the Greek political world (which in an overwhelming preponderance is pro-Western) will govern a period which should not stay in power more than six months but administer fair and impartial elections. The members of this government will therefore be excluded—par excellence—from running in the elections of 1971. The members and the supporters of the present regime will be free to form their own political party (if they desire) and seek for the first time an honest mandate from the Greek people. Naturally prior to the elections, martial law will have been lifted, political prisoners will have been freed, the press will have been unshackled and campaigning will be thorough by means of broad movements from any source. Materially order and justice will once more revert to civil and civilian authorities, and the armed forces will not be intervening in the political process. They will revert to their traditional role of defense, and interference from external rather than internal sources of power will be ended.

There are serious indications that the great preponderance of the Greek politicians are ready to support such a compromise solution. The solution is indeed a compromise. The present regime and its supporters, who came to power by illegal means, will be allowed not only to go unpunished but to form a political party of their own and seek the vote of the Greek people. Naturally there are many hot-heads who would like to see the Junta members prosecuted and perhaps executed, but this is the kind of attitude that leads the country inexorably toward confrontation and civil war rather than gen-

<sup>2</sup> There are those having fears that certain provisions of the 1968 Constitution would provide for restrictive conditions to obtain an affidavit. The compromise would require the first post-Junta elected Parliament exercise its power to review and revise the Constitution.

erate compromise and return of the responsibility for the Junta to the most legitimate arbiter: The Greek People!

The pressure of the US must be substantive and selective. The Greek government must positively understand to do no more than it has managed to do in its previous moments. The US has the leverage among the Greek military establishment, the solution has the support of the overwhelming preponderance of the Greek political world, whether at home or in exile, and the military will be once more given a chance to decide for themselves without the bloody and costly intervention of a revolutionary, repressive movement against the Junta.

Greece does not need to become another Vietnam to be coerced to democracy. There are many, and alternative ways to avert violence in a war-torn country, and to divert the positive goals of economic and social development, and possible, democratic politics in short a Greek policy. The task is complex and complex. There must be a target to be addressed by means of the leverage. After all has enjoyed a continuous high economic development rate in its post-war years under parliamentary systems.

The present constitution outlined above will have the support of the Greek government-makers from many backbones which are currently existing there with respect to Greece. Our domestic liberal opposition that points to Greece as an example of appalling dictatorship to provide dubious aid, but military interests will be pacified if not satisfied. Our NATO allies which have all but extracted Greece from their political forums, will stop pressuring the US with regard to Greece, the perpetration and growth of a dictatorial system. Plans that a Vietnam scenario will develop in Greece will be put to rest. West-European strategic interests will be equally satisfied. The US will be able to continue as it has been demonstrated aptly from 1947 to 1967. Finally some of the latent fears that the Greek regime will become progressively more authoritarian, "pro-Soviet" and will start drifting with Moscow in order to secure its normal political survival from external Western pressure will be permanently laid to rest.

The fundamental conclusion of this paper is that the US by paying greater attention to political factors in the determination of our foreign policy toward Greece, will proceed even better our short as well as long range strategic objectives in the most vitally located area of the Mediterranean Sea. By abandoning sterile, short-sighted, tactical objectives on the Greek situation the United States will win a strategic victory in political, economic as well as the strategic dimension.

The time is ripe today for the US to generally try to pressure us as to suppress the present government that is causing serious clashes with the voters of its own people.

Theodore A. Conouche, Ph. D., Associate Professor, School of International Service, American University.

Nikolai N. Stavros, Ph. D., Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Howard University.

#### POLLING WOMEN ON HER ROLE

MR. IRVIN, Mr. President, the Washington Post for August 24, 1970, contains an article entitled "Polling Women on Her Role" by George Gallup, Jr. Mr. Gallup's poll indicates that the overwhelming majority of American women would prefer my proposed amendment—Senate Joint Resolution 231—over the House-passed Equal Rights amendment—House Joint Resolution 204.

It is not surprising that this should be so.

The House-passed amendment is designed by its proponents to abolish all legal distinctions between men and women, no matter how necessary or reasonable such distinctions may be, and to compel Congress and the 50 States to make all future laws applicable to men and women in exactly the same way, no matter how irrational such action may be.

My amendment will abolish all unfair legal distinctions made between men and women without subjecting women to compulsory military service and without depriving women of the protection given them by laws which are reasonably designed to promote their health, safety, privacy, education, or economic welfare, or to enable them to perform their duties as homemakers or mothers.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Gallup's article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### POLLING WOMEN ON HER ROLE (By George Gallup)

Freeborn, N.J.—"Like all mothers, I get fed up with being cooped up in the house. I'd probably even enjoy a part-time job, but I wouldn't change roles with my husband for one minute."

A Hartford, Pa., mother of three small children talks that role in life.

"You hear a lot of talk these days about equality for women," she added. "While girls may find some discrimination in the business world, but I'll bet most women are fairly satisfied with what they are doing now."

She would probably wish her bet, according to the results of a special Gallup survey just completed which focused on the attitudes of American women toward their role in life, interest in working and job satisfaction.

Two-thirds of American women, mothers included, believe they get a good or a break in the world today as much as men. From among those who have attended college, from whose ranks the women's liberation movement has drawn much of its support, far fewer (53 per cent) believe they get as good a break as men.

Moreover, the survey finds that a majority of women feel that members of their sex have it somewhat more difficult when it comes to reaching the upper echelons in business.

Women are now expanding in city after city—publishing handbills, taking out full-page newspaper ads, picketing and threatening court suits. On Wednesday, the National Organization for Women (NOW) will hold a nationwide demonstration for equality with men.

The feminists are protesting what they regard as "intolerable discrimination" against them in industry, government and the professions.

Here are some of the other highlights of the Gallup survey.

Among the two-thirds of American women (67 per cent) who are presently not working in jobs outside the home, the weight of preference is not to work. Among those women who do crave outside employment, 127 per cent, most would choose a part-time job over a full-time position.

Reasons cited by women not now working who want outside employment divide mainly between those who "need the money" and those who admit to being bored at home.

Although 63 per cent of U.S. women believe they get as good a break in life as men,