

# ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



**ISRG PUBLISHERS**

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

**ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)**

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – III Issue-I (January- February) 2025

Frequency: Bimonthly



## "Post-Lausanne Greece: Military Pedagogy of the Greek Army, Diplomatic Strategies, and Civil-Military Dynamics in the Interwar Period (1923–1939)"

**Dr. Marios Kyriakidis**

Docent at the Hellenic Army Academy Higher Military Educational Institution, "Military Academy of Evelpidon"

| **Received:** 03.01.2025 | **Accepted:** 07.01.2025 | **Published:** 08.01.2025

**\*Corresponding author:** Dr. Marios Kyriakidis

Docent at the Hellenic Army Academy Higher Military Educational Institution, "Military Academy of Evelpidon"

### Abstract

*This study examines Greece's trajectory following the Treaty of Lausanne (1923), with a focus on the interplay between military pedagogy, civil-military relations, and diplomacy in the interwar period (1923–1939). It explores how the Greek Army adapted its military education and strategy in response to shifting regional dynamics and geopolitical pressures, particularly in its relationship with Turkey and neighboring states. Key developments include the Treaty of Ankara (1930), signaling rapprochement with Turkey, and Greece's participation in the Balkan Pact (1934), aimed at regional stability. The study also assesses the implications of the Convention of Ankara (1932) on Greece's strategic posture. Through an analysis of military reforms, diplomatic strategies, and the evolving role of the Greek Army in society, this work highlights the complex nexus of security, education, and diplomacy that defined Greece's approach to national defense and regional cooperation in the interwar period.*

**Keywords:** Greek military pedagogy, Civil-military relations, diplomacy Treaty of Ankara (1930), Convention of Ankara (1932), Balkan Pact (1934), Interwar geopolitics, Greece-Turkey relations

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The interwar period (1923–1939) marked a transformative era for Greece, characterized by a dynamic interplay of military reforms, diplomatic maneuvering, and evolving civil-military relations. Following the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic, 1923), which redefined the geopolitical boundaries of the Eastern Mediterranean, Greece faced the pressing need to redefine its military and diplomatic strategies in a rapidly shifting international environment. The Treaty of

Lausanne in 1923 redefined the geopolitical landscape of the Eastern Mediterranean and established a legal framework for Greece's relationship with Turkey. It replaced the unrealized Treaty of Sèvres and codified provisions for peaceful coexistence and territorial delineation between the two nations. While the treaty aimed to resolve longstanding disputes, its implementation paved the way for further agreements to address emerging challenges and evolving geopolitical realities. For Greece, the post-Lausanne era

presented opportunities to consolidate its sovereignty and engage in diplomatic initiatives, though tensions with Turkey over treaty interpretations and regional issues persisted. These tensions underscored the complexities of navigating bilateral relations under the evolving conditions of the interwar period. This period of recalibration offers a fertile ground for understanding how military education, strategic doctrine, and foreign policy shaped Greece's position in the broader geopolitical landscape of the Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean.

Central to this analysis is the role of the Greek Army as both a political and educational institution. The interwar years witnessed significant developments in military pedagogy, with reforms aimed at professionalizing the armed forces, modernizing its doctrines, and fostering a cadre of officers capable of responding to the challenges of the time. The establishment of new military academies and curricula underscored the importance of aligning military training with national security priorities. At the same time, the army's role extended beyond the battlefield, as it played a crucial part in shaping Greece's internal politics and state-building efforts, often serving as a mediator between civilian and military spheres of governance. The interaction between civil and military actors during this period was complex, as political instability and military interventions blurred the boundaries between the two domains.

In the realm of diplomacy, Greece pursued a multifaceted approach to ensure its security and foster regional cooperation. The Treaty of Ankara in 1930 marked a significant turning point in Greek-Turkish relations (Psomiades, 1962), symbolizing a move towards reconciliation and cooperation after years of hostility. Similarly, Greece's participation in the Balkan Pact of 1934 reflected its commitment to collective security and regional stability amidst rising tensions in Europe. The Convention of Ankara (1932), an agreement between Turkey and Italy, further shaped the geopolitical dynamics of the region, with direct implications for Greece's strategic calculations. These treaties underscore the interplay between diplomacy and military strategy, as Greece navigated a complex web of alliances and rivalries to safeguard its interests.

This study aims to illuminate the interconnections between Greece's military pedagogy, civil-military relations, and diplomatic strategies in the post-Lausanne era. By examining the evolution of military education, the strategic use of diplomacy, and the delicate balance between civil and military spheres, it seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how Greece adapted to the challenges of the interwar period. Through this lens, the study contributes to broader discussions on the role of small states in regional politics, the modernization of armed forces, and the integration of military and diplomatic strategies in the pursuit of national security.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Theoretical framework

Military pedagogy in the interwar period is best understood through the lens of military institutional theory, which emphasizes the role of education and professionalization in shaping the effectiveness and autonomy of armed forces. Samuel P. Huntington's framework on the professional soldier provides a relevant foundation, positing that the modernization of military institutions is essential for aligning their strategic doctrines with national security priorities (Huntington, 2000). In the case of

Greece, the post-Lausanne era necessitated significant investments in military education to create a cadre of officers capable of responding to both conventional and asymmetric threats.

The establishment of military academies, the introduction of modern curricula, and the incorporation of lessons from recent conflicts reflect the application of these principles. Military pedagogy in Greece during this period was not merely about operational training; it also served as a mechanism for fostering national identity and cohesion in the aftermath of population exchanges and territorial adjustments. This theoretical framework highlights how the professionalization of the armed forces was intertwined with the broader goal of state-building, as the military emerged as a critical institution in the consolidation of national sovereignty.

The relationship between the military and civilian authorities in Greece during the interwar period is analyzed through the prism of civil-military relations theory. Scholars such as Peter Feaver (Feaver, 2003), and Morris Janowitz (Janowitz, 1964) provide insights into the delicate balance between civilian control of the military and the military's role as a political actor. In Greece, this balance was particularly precarious, given the political instability and frequent military interventions that characterized the interwar years.

This study adopts a nuanced view of civil-military relations, recognizing that the Greek Army was not only a defender of territorial integrity but also an influential political force. Military coups and interventions during this period reveal the complexities of the military's dual role as both a stabilizing and destabilizing agent. Theoretical perspectives on civil-military dynamics (James & Choi, 2005) offer a framework for understanding how the military navigated its responsibilities within a volatile political environment and how these dynamics influenced broader state-building efforts.

Greece's diplomatic strategies in the interwar period are situated within the broader context of international relations theory, particularly concepts of small state behavior and regional security cooperation. Realist theories emphasize the importance of power dynamics and alliances in shaping the foreign policies of small states, while liberal institutionalism highlights the role of multilateral agreements in fostering stability and cooperation.

The Treaty of Ankara (1930) (Psomiades, 1962), and the Balkan Pact (1934) (Kerner, Howard, 2010) are examined as case studies in regional diplomacy, illustrating how Greece sought to navigate the competing pressures of national security and collective security. These agreements reflect Greece's strategic adaptation to the changing geopolitical landscape, as it sought to balance relations with Turkey, Italy, and the Balkan states. The Convention of Ankara (1932) between Italy and Turkey confirmed Italy's sovereignty over the Dodecanese and the adjacent islands and islets, an extremely important element, since the sovereignty of the islands was transferred to Greece in 1947.

A key theoretical contribution of this study lies in its exploration of the intersection between military pedagogy and diplomacy. The integration of military education and diplomatic strategy is analyzed through the framework of comprehensive security, which posits that national security is not merely the domain of military strength but also depends on effective diplomacy and inter-state cooperation. Greece's efforts to modernize its military institutions

were complemented by diplomatic initiatives aimed at mitigating external threats and fostering regional stability.

This synthesis of military and diplomatic strategies is particularly relevant in the context of Greece's post-Lausanne trajectory. By incorporating military pedagogy into its broader security framework, Greece demonstrated a commitment to addressing both internal and external challenges through a multidimensional approach. This theoretical framework underscores the importance of viewing military education and diplomacy as interdependent elements of a coherent national strategy.

## 2.2 Research studies on the period under investigation (1923–1939)

The interwar period (1923–1939) in Greek history has been the subject of numerous scholarly studies, particularly in the domains of military, diplomatic, and political history. However, these studies often focus on specific aspects of the period without fully integrating the interconnected nature of military pedagogy, civil-military relations, and diplomacy. Scholars have explored Greece's efforts to modernize its military structure and technology, drawing on lessons from the Balkan Wars and World War I. (Gerolymatos, 2003). The establishment of military academies and officer training programs has been studied within the broader narrative of European military modernization. While there is significant literature on the technical aspects of military modernization, few studies analyze military pedagogy as a tool for shaping civil-military relations and fostering national identity. Scholars such as Thanos Veremis (Veremis, 1997) and Ioannis Koliopoulos (Koliopoulos, Veremis, 2006), have examined the political role of the Greek Army during the interwar years, emphasizing the frequency of military coups and interventions in domestic politics (Veremis, 1978). These works highlight the army's dual role as a stabilizing force and a disruptive political actor. Most studies focus on the political consequences of military interventions without delving into the underlying pedagogical and institutional factors that influenced the army's behavior. Greece's diplomatic initiatives, including the Treaty of Ankara (1930) and the Balkan Pact (1934), have been analyzed in the context of regional security and Greece-Turkey relations. Scholars have emphasized Eleftherios Venizelos's role in fostering rapprochement with Turkey and promoting collective security in the Balkans. While diplomatic agreements have been extensively studied, their interplay with Greece's military strategy and education remains underexplored. Studies on the Convention of Ankara (1932) highlight their significance for regional geopolitics, particularly concerning control over the Straits and Greek-Turkish relations. The literature often situates these agreements within the broader framework of European diplomacy and the rise of authoritarian regimes. These studies rarely address the implications of these treaties for Greece's internal military and diplomatic policies. Works on the socioeconomic impact of the Asia Minor Catastrophe and the population exchanges mandated by the Treaty of Lausanne provide valuable context for understanding interwar Greece. The political instability of the period, marked by frequent changes in government and military interventions, has also been extensively studied. While these studies provide critical context, they often treat military, diplomatic, and political developments as separate phenomena.

This manuscript addresses critical gaps in the study of Greece's interwar period by offering an integrated analysis of military pedagogy, civil-military relations, and diplomacy. Existing

research has not adequately examined how military education and diplomacy influenced each other during this time, a gap this work fills by demonstrating how Greece aligned its military pedagogy with its diplomatic strategies to tackle both internal and external challenges. The study will investigate how military education shaped the political ethos of the officer corps, contributing to the army's role in both state-building and political instability. Furthermore, it will bridge the gap in understanding how diplomatic initiatives influenced and were influenced by military policies, creating a comprehensive understanding of Greece's national security strategy during the interwar period. It situates key treaties, such as the Treaty of Ankara and the Balkan Pact, within Greece's military and educational strategies, exploring how these agreements shaped Greece's strategic priorities, including its naval strategy, military training programs, and regional alliances. By integrating these dimensions, this manuscript demonstrates how military pedagogy and diplomacy were informed by and responded to Greece's broader socioeconomic and political challenges, while also contributing to the broader field of international relations by using Greece as a case study to examine how small states navigate regional alliances and security challenges.

## 3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Research methodology

The research methodology is designed to align with the study's objectives, employing a historical-pedagogical framework complemented by detailed source analysis. This study examines the intersections of diplomacy, military education, and the role of the Greek armed forces in shaping modern Greek history through the following key areas:

- a) The progression of Greek military education, including institutional frameworks and training systems.
- b) The establishment of educational standards in diplomacy and political strategy.
- c) An evaluation of political challenges during critical periods, such as conflicts, territorial negotiations, and shifting Great Power agendas.
- d) A critique of strategic planning and the educational systems of the era.
- e) A historical investigation into policies that shaped military and political education (Borg & Gall, 1989).

This qualitative approach emphasizes the significance of treaties that reinforced the stability of the Greek state and created the conditions for subsequent negotiations. Drawing on primary archival sources, it explores periods of uncertainty characterized by shifting alliances and the interplay of Great Power interests. D. Mavroskoufis classifies sources into primary, which originate directly from the period under study, and secondary, comprising later analyses and interpretations (Mavroskoufis, 2005).

The research addresses both theoretical and practical challenges, such as dealing with incomplete historical records and interpreting events from the distant past (Verdi, 2015; Athanasiou, 2003). It seeks to answer complex historical questions, echoing Jaspers' philosophy that modern science is a continuous pursuit of understanding (Jaspers, 1950).

The primary method employed is historical analysis, focusing on uncovering facts, evaluating evidence, and establishing chronological narratives (Mialaret, 1999). This approach investigates causality, consequences, and societal attitudes alongside institutional developments of various eras (Athanasiou,

2003). Cohen and Manion define historical research as "the systematic and objective identification, evaluation, and synthesis of evidence" to critically reconstruct the past (Cohen & Manion, 1977). This analysis not only interprets the past but also clarifies the present and informs future developments (Nova-Kaltsouni, 2006).

Combining primary and secondary sources enhances the depth of the study (Cohen & Manion, 1977). Hill and Kerber highlight the benefits of historical research, which include:

- a) Resolving contemporary issues through historical insights.
- b) Identifying and interpreting long-term trends.
- c) Revealing the dynamics of cultural interactions and exchanges.
- d) Refining and reevaluating established theories (Hill & Kerber, 1967).

The research focuses on 20th-century international treaties, protocols, and conventions that contributed to Greece's territorial consolidation and stability following centuries of Ottoman rule. It aims to provide a nuanced perspective on societal interactions and risks during periods of shifting alliances and competing national interests (Verdi, 2015).

In the fields of education and training, historical research underscores the importance of understanding the connections between historical contexts, politics, education, and society (Nova-Kaltsouni, 2006). By revisiting and reconstructing historical theories, it extracts insights relevant to contemporary and future challenges. The study's primary objectives include:

1. Drawing lessons applicable to modern and future challenges.
2. Unveiling historical events, ideologies, and their societal implications.
3. Applying the philosophies of influential thinkers to current scenarios (Bitsaki, 2005; Melanitou, 1957).

This research moves beyond documenting historical facts to address critical themes such as state sovereignty, peace, and the relationship between diplomacy and military education. It also highlights the transformative role of military education in shaping national identity and advancing state-building processes.

## 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1. The post-Lausanne era

The Treaty of Lausanne (1923) marked a pivotal moment in Greece's modern history, shaping its borders, population, and security priorities for decades to come. Emerging from the catastrophic aftermath of the Greco-Turkish War (1919–1922), the treaty not only defined territorial boundaries but also redefined Greece's national identity, societal structure, and strategic priorities (Tusan, 2023). The context of the treaty reflects its significance as a comprehensive resolution to lingering issues from the unratified Treaty of Sèvres and a cornerstone for establishing stability in a volatile region.

The territorial adjustments of the Lausanne Treaty formalized the geopolitical realities of the region, but also left lingering tensions between the two nations, especially regarding sovereignty over the Aegean islands and maritime borders, due to Turkey's The territorial adjustments of the Lausanne Treaty formalized the geopolitical realities of the region, but also left lingering tensions

between the two nations, especially regarding sovereignty over the Aegean islands and maritime borders, due to Turkey's selective misinterpretation and distortion of the treaty in favour of its interests.

From an objective point of view, the persistent disagreements highlight the broader issue of interpreting historical conditions in a contemporary context. One of the treaty's most transformative provisions was the mandatory population exchange between Greece and Turkey, a process that profoundly impacted Greek society (Hirschon, 2003). Over a million ethnic Greeks from Anatolia were forcibly resettled in Greece, while several hundred thousand Muslims were relocated to Turkey. This exchange aimed to homogenize populations within each nation-state, reducing intercommunal conflicts but creating significant challenges. For Greece, the influx of refugees strained its already fragile economy and social infrastructure. The government faced the herculean task of housing, feeding, and integrating the displaced populations, many of whom arrived impoverished and traumatized. Despite these difficulties, the refugees contributed significantly to Greece's urbanization, economy, and cultural diversity. They brought skills, traditions, and labor that revitalized industries such as agriculture, trade, and crafts, helping to modernize the Greek economy. Nevertheless, the resettlement process also exacerbated class divisions and social tensions, as native Greeks often viewed the newcomers as competitors for scarce resources.

The demographic changes resulting from the population exchange also had implications for Greece's military composition and defense policies (Pentzopoulos, 2002). However, the sudden increase in population required substantial adjustments to Greece's military infrastructure and strategy (Winter, J., (2022). The government prioritized to strengthen the armed forces in national defence plans, recognizing the need to defend the newly defined borders against potential aggression. These efforts were underscored by ongoing tensions with Turkey, which remained a perceived adversary despite the treaty's provisions for peace.

Security concerns shaped Greece's foreign and domestic policies in the post-Lausanne era. The loss of eastern Thrace (Gazette Skrip, 1922) and other strategic territories heightened the nation's vulnerability to external threats, compelling Greece to adopt a cautious and defensive posture in its relations with Turkey. Diplomatic efforts focused on forging alliances with other regional powers to counterbalance. While the military sought to modernize and expand its capabilities, Greece intensified its fortification of key regions, particularly in the Aegean, to safeguard its sovereignty and maritime interests. These initiatives reflected a broader strategy of deterrence, as the government aimed to project strength and stability in an uncertain geopolitical landscape.

The Treaty of Lausanne thus served as a turning point that reshaped Greece's trajectory in the 20th century. Its provisions brought an end to immediate hostilities but left unresolved issues that would influence Greek-Turkish relations for decades. The population exchange, though intended to foster ethnic homogeneity, introduced profound social, economic, and cultural changes that required adaptive policies and significant resilience. Meanwhile, the treaty's territorial and security implications compelled Greece to reevaluate its military and diplomatic strategies, prioritizing national defense and regional stability.

In hindsight, the Treaty of Lausanne exemplifies the complexities of peace-making in the aftermath of conflict. While it succeeded in

delineating borders and reducing intercommunal tensions, its long-term effects on Greece were multifaceted, encompassing demographic transformation, economic challenges, and heightened security concerns. These developments underscore the enduring interplay between diplomacy, societal change, and national strategy, offering valuable insights into the challenges of state-building in the modern era.

#### **4.2 Army and Politics in Greece: A Turning Point in Territorial, Demographic, and Security Landscape**

The evolution of the Greek military during the interwar period was deeply influenced by the aftermath of the Asia Minor Campaign and the broader geopolitical challenges of the era. Facing the urgent need for reorganization and modernization, the Greek armed forces embarked on reforms aimed at professionalizing the military, modernizing its equipment and tactics, and adapting to a rapidly changing political and social landscape. These developments were shaped by strategic imperatives, financial limitations, and the complex dynamics of civil-military relations in a politically unstable environment.

In the wake of the Asia Minor Campaign's disastrous conclusion, the Greek military confronted the need to address critical weaknesses exposed during the conflict. This marked the beginning of a post-war reorganization effort focused on restructuring the armed forces. Recognizing the inadequacies of its prewar system, Greece placed significant emphasis on adopting Western European military models, particularly those of France and Britain. This shift extended to military training and doctrine, as the Greek military sought to incorporate advanced methodologies that would better prepare its forces for modern warfare. Training curricula in military academies and units were redesigned to reflect these influences, prioritizing discipline, efficiency, and adaptability in combat scenarios.

The professionalization of the officer corps was a cornerstone of this reform process. Institutions such as the Hellenic Army Academy (Military School of Evelpidon) became instrumental in cultivating a new generation of officers with the skills and knowledge required for modern military leadership. The curriculum was expanded to include subjects such as advanced strategy, logistics, and technological applications in warfare, ensuring that officers could lead effectively under complex operational conditions. By enhancing the professionalism of the officer corps, Greece aimed to build a military institution that could operate independently of the internal political divisions that had plagued its effectiveness during the Asia Minor Campaign.

Defense modernization was another key focus, though it often faced significant financial constraints. Efforts to acquire new equipment, such as artillery, tanks, and aircraft, were hindered by the limited fiscal resources of the Greek state during the interwar period. Despite these challenges, the military leadership prioritized the modernization of tactics to align with contemporary developments in warfare. Exercises and wargames were introduced to test and refine these tactics, while international military collaborations helped Greek officers gain exposure to cutting-edge strategies and technologies. However, the gap between ambition and resources often hampered the full realization of these modernization goals.

Strategically, the Greek General Staff adopted a defensive posture tailored to the geopolitical realities of the region. The focus on territorial defense was driven by concerns over potential threats

from Turkey and neighboring Balkan states, particularly Bulgaria. The Aegean islands, which held strategic significance, became a focal point of defensive planning due to their vulnerability to external aggression. In the late 1930s, the construction of the Metaxas Line along Greece's northern border with Bulgaria epitomized this defensive strategy (Kyriakidis, 2021). Inspired by the Maginot Line in France, the Metaxas Line was a network of fortifications designed to protect Greece from a northern invasion, reflecting the military's determination to prioritize territorial integrity over offensive ambitions.

The interwar period also saw a complex interplay between the military and politics, which significantly influenced the evolution of the Greek armed forces. Political instability characterized this era, with frequent coups and interventions by the military in civilian governance. One notable instance was the 1923 coup attempt by pro-Venizelist officers, which underscored the deep divisions within the armed forces. These divisions were rooted in the broader political conflict between Venizelists, supporters of Eleftherios Venizelos' liberal and nationalist policies, and Royalists, who aligned with the monarchy and favored more conservative governance.

This political polarization had a profound impact on civil-military relations, as the armed forces became a microcosm of the ideological struggles within Greek society. The alignment of military factions with opposing political camps often undermined the cohesion and unity of the armed forces (Kyriakidis, 2021). Strategic decision-making and military readiness were adversely affected by these internal divisions, as loyalty to political causes frequently took precedence over professional duties. Efforts to depoliticize the military and foster unity within its ranks were met with limited success, as the broader political environment remained highly volatile.

The integration of refugees from Anatolia added another layer of complexity to civil-military relations. The population exchange mandated by the Treaty of Lausanne brought over a million ethnic Greeks from Asia Minor into Greece, posing significant challenges for the state and the military. The resettlement process required substantial resources and coordination, which often placed additional strain on the government and the armed forces. This demographic shift influenced military recruitment and composition, as refugees became an increasingly prominent part of the armed forces. While their integration offered opportunities to strengthen the military's manpower, it also introduced new challenges in terms of cultural adaptation and social cohesion within the ranks.

The evolving relationship between the military and civil society during this period highlighted the broader implications of these changes. The armed forces were not only tasked with defending the nation but also played a role in shaping national identity and supporting the state's efforts to integrate diverse populations. The tensions between the military's professional objectives and its political entanglements underscored the need for a clear separation between military and civilian spheres. However, achieving this separation proved difficult in a context where political instability and external threats continued to shape national priorities.

In conclusion, the evolution of the Greek military during the interwar period was a multifaceted process shaped by the lessons of past conflicts, the pressures of modernization, and the challenges of navigating a politically turbulent environment. The

emphasis on professionalization, modernization, and strategic defense reflected the military's efforts to address its shortcomings and prepare for future challenges. At the same time, the interplay between military reforms and civil-military relations revealed the complexities of balancing professional objectives with political realities. Despite financial constraints and internal divisions, the Greek armed forces made significant strides in adapting to the demands of the modern era, laying the groundwork for their role in the pivotal events of the 20th century.

#### **4.3 Greek Diplomacy and Security Strategy in the Interwar Period: An Analysis of the Treaty of Ankara, Convention of Ankara, and the Balkan Pact**

The interwar period in Greece was marked by significant diplomatic efforts and the signing of crucial treaties that sought to stabilize the country's position in a rapidly changing geopolitical environment. In particular, the Treaty of Ankara (1930) between Greece and Turkey, the Convention of Ankara (1932) between Italy and Turkey, and Greece's participation in the Balkan Pact (1934) played pivotal roles in shaping Greece's foreign policy and security strategy. These treaties were part of Greece's broader effort to secure its territorial integrity, maintain balanced relations with major powers, and protect its interests in a region fraught with tension and external threats. Each treaty had its own set of provisions, and their cumulative impact on Greek diplomacy is significant, as they not only addressed immediate security concerns but also shaped the course of the country's political and military strategies.

Venizelos, with his re-election in 1928, maintained a peaceful policy of trying to regain alliances. The vision of the Great Idea had ended for him with the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 (Rizas, 2015). He signed in Rome on 23 September 1928 the Greek-Italian Pact of 28 articles titled "*Treaty of Friendship, Conciliation and Judicial Settlement*", (League of Nations, 1930), in which the two states promised to abide by the principles of the League of Nations and the Treaties (Article 1). They promised mutual political and diplomatic support in the event of a threat from another country (Article 2). At the same time, Venizelos sought to revitalise Greek - English relations by emphasising the stabilising role Greece played in the Eastern Mediterranean. The Greek-Yugoslav Pact of *Friendship, Reconciliation and Judicial Settlement* under 36 articles, was signed on March 27, 1929 (League of Nations, 1930), similar as the Greek - Italian Pact, considering the dangerous climate of uncertainty that prevailed.

The crowning achievement of the Greek peace policy was the Greek-Turkish Pact of 28 Articles titled "*Treaty of Friendship, Neutrality, Conciliation and Arbitration*", with Protocol signed in Ankara on 30 October 1930 (Koliopoulos, 2000). The Treaty (League of Nations, 1931-1932) was a significant milestone in Greek-Turkish relations, marking a decisive shift away from the hostility and conflict that had defined much of the early 20th century. It was negotiated under the leadership of Eleftherios Venizelos, Greece's foremost statesman, and Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Turkey. It was designed to resolve outstanding territorial disputes and establish a framework for peaceful coexistence between the two nations following the Greco-Turkish War (1919-1922) and the preceding Ottoman Empire's collapse. Turkey wanted to avoid a debt, regarding the property of the exchangeable populations, whose Greek property was demonstrably and historically greater, so Turkey's main concern was the economic factor. On the other hand, Greece was

interested in securing the status quo of territorial integrity and sovereignty.

##### **4.3.1 The Treaty of Ankara (1930)**

The articles of the Treaty of Ankara dealt with the following issues:

Article 1: Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes not to enter into any political or economic agreement or any alliance directed against the other Party.

Article 2: Should one of the High Contracting Parties, despite its pacific attitude, be the object of an aggression by one or more Powers, the other Party undertakes to observe neutrality throughout the dispute.

Article 3: The High Contracting Parties agree to conciliation for disputes, with judicial or arbitral settlement as alternatives if conciliation fails.

Article 4: Exclusions include sovereignty, treaty jurisdiction issues, or past disputes; contested sovereignty can proceed to arbitration or judicial resolution.

Article 5: Disputes for the settlement of which a special procedure is provided for by other Conventions in force between the disputing Parties may be settled in conformity with the provisions of such Conventions.

Article 6: Disputes under judicial or administrative jurisdiction must await final decisions; notification for treaty procedures must occur within a year.

Article 7: A Permanent Conciliation Commission of five members is formed within six months; members are nominated jointly or by the Parties.

Article 8: If no Permanent Conciliation Commission exists, a Special Commission is formed within three months to investigate the dispute.

Article 9: If joint Commissioner appointments fail, a third Power or two Powers chosen by the Parties will handle nominations, using a lottery if necessary.

Article 10: Disputes are submitted to the Conciliation Commission jointly or by one Party, detailing the issue and seeking amicable resolution.

Article 11: Parties may replace their Conciliation Commission nominee with a specialist within 15 days, notifying the other Party, which may reciprocate.

Article 12: The Conciliation Commission shall meet, unless otherwise agreed between the Parties, at a place selected by its President.

**Article 13:** The Conciliation Commission gathers information and aims to propose solutions for settling disputes between the Parties.

**Article 14:** The Commission establishes its own procedure, ensuring both Parties are heard, with reference to Hague Convention guidelines.

**Article 15:** The Conciliation Commission's work is private unless both Parties agree to make it public.

**Article 16:** Parties are represented by agents, with rights to counsel, experts, and the ability to summon witnesses and evidence.

**Article 17:** Parties must assist the Commission by providing relevant documents and enabling witness summoning and on-site inquiries.

**Article 18:** The Commission must report within four months unless extended, and its report isn't an arbitral award.

**Article 19:** The Commission sets a three-month time limit for Parties to decide on proposed dispute settlement solutions.

**Article 20:** Joint nominees receive allowances funded equally by both Parties; each Party covers its own nominee's costs.

**Article 21:** If recommendations aren't accepted, Parties may submit the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice for resolution.

**Article 22:** A special agreement between Parties specifies the dispute's subject and the Permanent Court's competence, or court procedure starts.

**Article 23:** If a national court decision violates international law, equitable satisfaction is provided to the injured Party by the Court.

**Article 24:** The Permanent Court's judgment must be executed in good faith, with interpretation disputes resolved by the Court.

**Article 25:** During conciliation or judicial proceedings, Parties must avoid actions that hinder the acceptance of proposals or Court judgments.

**Article 27:** Disputes over the interpretation or execution of the Treaty are submitted directly to the Permanent Court for resolution.

**Article 28:** The Treaty must be ratified promptly, lasting five years, with automatic renewal unless denounced six months prior to expiry.

By ensuring that neither country would enter into hostile alliances or agreements against the other, the Treaty provided Greece with a sense of security from a possible Turkish threat. This neutrality clause (Article 2) guaranteed that if one party were attacked, the other would remain neutral, protecting Greece from possible involvement in conflicts beyond its control.

The treaty allowed for a structured mechanism for resolving disputes (Articles 3–5), enabling Greece to address issues through conciliation, arbitration, or judicial means, potentially avoiding direct military conflict. It formalized peaceful bilateral relations with Turkey, ending the immediate tensions between the two countries after the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, which had been a contentious period for both nations. Article 1 limited Greece's ability to form alliances and political agreements that could be perceived as directed against Turkey. While this promoted peace, it constrained Greece's autonomy in its foreign policy, particularly in its relations with other regional powers or alliances (e.g., alliances in Europe or the Balkans). If Turkey were involved in an external conflict, Greece was bound to remain neutral (Article 2), even if such neutrality might not always align with Greece's national interests, particularly in a regional context where Greece could have been influenced to take a stand.

Greece might have lost some leverage in territorial or sovereignty disputes, as the treaty emphasized third-party arbitration (Articles 4–7), which could involve external powers making decisions that were not necessarily in Greece's favor.

This treaty could be seen as a key step in establishing a framework for Greek-Turkish cooperation in a time of significant geopolitical

instability. The unique aspect of this treaty, compared to others between nations, is its extensive reliance on conciliation and judicial processes rather than military or diplomatic force. An academic conclusion could argue that the Treaty of Ankara set a precedent for later peacemaking initiatives in the region, influencing both future Greek-Turkish relations (Psomiades, 1962), and broader European diplomacy, especially as Europe struggled with the rise of fascism and World War II.

A novel interpretation could argue that the Treaty of Ankara is largely unspoken in its actual application to Greece's geopolitical positioning. While it is often seen as a stabilizing agreement, it subtly constrained Greece's room to maneuver in the volatile Balkan region. The treaty's provisions on neutrality and forced conciliation may have inadvertently limited Greece's flexibility, especially as Greece faced mounting pressure from fascist Italy and Nazi Germany in the 1930s. This aspect of neutrality could be seen as a strategic loss for Greece, though one not fully realized until later.

The treaty's emphasis on arbitration and judicial processes, particularly Article 4 (exclusions regarding sovereignty) and Article 21 (court referral), could be analyzed as a shift in how international disputes were handled in the interwar period. It could be argued that the treaty reflects an early example of international law over national sovereignty in bilateral disputes, with a focus on peaceful resolution mechanisms that diminish the potential for violent conflict but increase the influence of third-party decision-makers. This shift might be assessed as a turning point in the balance between state sovereignty and international legal frameworks.

The treaty could also be examined in the context of the evolution of nationalism in both Greece and Turkey. While it sought peaceful coexistence, the imposition of conciliation over direct sovereignty claims might have been difficult for both parties to accept fully, given their respective national identities at the time. From a cultural or historical perspective, an academic argument could be made about the treaty as a reflection of the complex nationalisms in both countries, where each party sought to define its identity while avoiding conflict.

A more long-term evaluation could explore how this treaty's reliance on third-party intervention set the stage for later international involvement in Greek-Turkish conflicts, especially in the context of Cyprus and the broader geopolitical shifts of the 20th century. The treaty might be seen as the foundation of Greece's acceptance of international involvement in its disputes with Turkey, a pattern that continued well into the Cyprus crisis in the 1960s and 1970s.

On the other hand, the Greek refugees who had fled from Asia Minor (including Smyrna, Constantinople, and other areas) after the Greek army's defeat and the catastrophic events in 1922 had clung to the hope of returning to their ancestral homes. Many believed in Eleftherios Venizelos' promises of repatriation or at least some form of acknowledgment of their rights to return. Venizelos had been a key figure in Greek diplomacy, especially in securing the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, which resulted in the population exchanges between Greece and Turkey, and the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Greeks.

The Treaty did not address the issue of repatriation of Greek refugees from Asia Minor or the possibility of them returning to their former homes. The failure to include provisions for refugee

repatriation in the Treaty likely dashed the hopes of many refugees, as the treaty essentially cemented the permanent division between Greece and Turkey.

The status quo was maintained, meaning that the refugees were not allowed to return to Turkey, and any hope of returning to places like Smyrna (now Izmir), Constantinople (Istanbul), and other areas in Asia Minor was effectively extinguished by the treaty's terms.

From a geopolitical perspective, Turkey emerged as the main beneficiary of the treaty. The Treaty further legitimized Turkey's territorial claims and sovereignty over areas that had been contested, such as Smyrna, which had been a key point of contention in the Greco-Turkish War and the post-war negotiations.

The economic benefits for Turkey were significant as well. By consolidating control over territories previously populated by Greeks, Turkey had access to vast wealth, particularly land and resources that had been owned by Greek communities. Turkey not only retained these assets but could also profit from the economic migration of Greeks to Greece, which created a significant economic burden on Greece, making it much more difficult for the Greek state to rebuild and provide for the refugees.

Venizelos had been seen as the hope of the refugees. His political vision, which had included the idea of Great Greece (a vision of Greek expansion in Asia Minor), was deeply tied to the idea of repatriating the displaced populations.

However, with the signing of the Treaty of Ankara, Venizelos' promises of repatriation were rendered largely hollow. The refugee population, already demoralized from the aftermath of the Greco-Turkish War, now felt betrayed by his diplomatic efforts. Venizelos' political support began to erode significantly among the refugee communities, who saw him as someone who had failed to deliver on the one promise that had mattered most to them — their return to Asia Minor.

Greece, already reeling from the impact of the population exchange dictated by the Treaty of Lausanne, now had to bear the economic costs of integrating these refugees into Greek society. The refugee settlements created in Greece placed a tremendous burden on the country's economy and infrastructure, and there was widespread poverty and social unrest among the displaced populations.

In contrast, Turkey not only avoided the costs of repatriating the Greeks but also benefitted from Greek property and wealth that had been left behind.

It should be noted the role of the Treaty's impact in consolidating Turkey's nationalist identity, not only through territorial and political gains, but also through the elimination of the prolonged Greek presence in its historical territories. Subsequent Kemalist policies of Turkification of the remaining populations in the ancient historical Greek territories under Turkish rule have wiped out almost all Greek elements. This treaty, which solidified the end of any Greek claims to Asia Minor, played a pivotal role in shaping the modern Turkish state and its sense of national identity. It could be seen as one of the final nails in the coffin for the Greek communities in the region, many of whom had hoped for some form of repatriation or recognition of their rights under the Treaty of Lausanne or subsequent agreements.

The refugees' trust in international law and diplomacy was severely shaken by the Treaty of Ankara, which was viewed as an international legal mechanism that failed to address their human rights or the humanitarian consequences of forced displacement. The treaty's focus on territorial integrity and economic agreements, rather than addressing the plight of the refugees, could be seen as a precursor to later humanitarian crises, where legal agreements ignore the human cost of geopolitical actions.

The Treaty of Ankara was a victory for Turkey, both politically and economically, but for Greece, it symbolized the further loss of hope for the refugees and the end of an era of aspirations for repatriation. This treaty's consequences continued to shape Greek-Turkish relations and the refugee experience for generations.

#### 4.3.2 Convention of Ankara (1932)

The Convention of Ankara (1932), signed between Italy and Turkey (League of Nations, 1933), was another crucial diplomatic agreement during this period, though it did not directly involve Greece. However, its implications for Greek diplomacy and security cannot be overlooked, as it reflected Italy's increasing influence in the Mediterranean and its growing ties with Turkey (Barlas, 2004). The Convention signed in Ankara on 4 January 1932.

The treaty contained 7 articles, which clarified the sovereignty of Italy and Turkey over the islands and islets, floating bodies and rocks located on the islands, between the island of Kastelorizo and the coast of Anatolia, as well as the island of Kara Ada in the Aegean Sea. Also proceeded to delimit the territorial sea. The agreement also included a Protocol which was signed by the two countries in Ankara on 28 December 1932, specifying the maritime boundaries and distances of the islands under their sovereignty from the coast:

**Article 1:** *The Italian Government recognises the sovereignty of Turkey over the following islets: Volo (Gatal-Ada), Ochendra(Uvendire), Fournachia, (Furnakya),, Kato Volo (Katovolo), Prassoudi (Prasudi), (soyth-east of Catovolo). The islets of Tchatallota,, Pighi, Nissi-Tis-Pighi, Agricelia reef, Proussecliss, (rock), Pano Makri, Kato Makri(including the rocks),, Marathi, Roccie Voutzaký (Rocci Vutchaki), Dacia (Dasya), Nissi-Tis Dacia, Prassoudi (north of Dacia), Alimentarya, (Alimentaria), Caravola (Karavola).*

**Article 2:** Turkey gains sovereignty over Kara-Ada, a significant islet in the Bay of Bodrum.

**Article 3:** On the other hand, the Turkish Government recognizes Italian sovereignty over the islets situated in the zone delimited by a circle having for its centre the dome of the Church of the town of Castellorizo and for its radius the distance between that centre and Cape San Stephano (windward side), namely: Psoradia, Polyphados, St. George (two islands included in the English map No 236: St. George being the island to the south and Agrielaia the island to the north). Psomi (Strongylo, English map 236), Cutsumbora (Koutsoumbas) (Rocks), Mavro Poinaki (Mavro Poinachi),

Mavro Poinis (Mavro Poini). In addition to these islets included in the above- mentioned circle, the islets of St. George (Rho) Dragonera, Ross and Hypsili (Stronghyli) shall likewise belong to Italy.

**Article 4:** Islands, islets, and rocks in demarcated zones belong to the respective sovereign state controlling the designated area.



**Article 5:** The treaty delineates territorial waters between Turkey and Italy in the Aegean Sea through detailed geographic coordinates.

**Article 6:** In case of discrepancies between maps and treaty text, the treaty text takes precedence over cartographic references.

**Article 7:** The convention requires ratification, comes into effect 15 days post-ratification exchange, and ratifications are exchanged in Rome.

The Protocol of 28 December 1932 laid down the following (Hellenic Electronic Center, 2024):

- The border line clarifies territorial sovereignty of land and waters without affecting territorial waters exceeding 12 nautical miles.
- Sovereignty is determined by specific geographic coordinates agreed upon and mapped on English hydrographic charts.
- Thirty-seven demarcation points are defined, including positions south of islets like Volos and between key landmarks in Rhodes and Anatolia.
- Castellorizo's border is incorporated, extending eastward to specified Roman points south of Trugh Burnu and Khelidonia.
- Text of the protocol supersedes any discrepancies in annexed maps or charts.

The 1932 Convention between Turkey and Italy, which clarified the maritime boundaries and sovereignty of islands in the Dodecanese and Kastelorizo regions, has significant implications for Greece, both during its time and in retrospect after the islands transferred to Greek sovereignty in 1947.

The Convention recognized Italian sovereignty over Kastelorizo and surrounding islets. When these islands transitioned to Greece after World War II, this pre-established recognition by Turkey reduced potential disputes over Greece's sovereignty in the region.

The detailed delineation of maritime boundaries set a precedent for the legal framework regarding maritime zones. This would later influence Greece's claims to territorial waters and Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) in the region.

The protocol mentioned territorial sovereignty up to 12 nautical miles but maintained that this did not predetermine territorial waters exceeding this distance. This subtle language allowed Greece flexibility in interpreting maritime jurisdiction after the islands became Greek territory.

Kastelorizo and the Dodecanese occupy a crucial geostrategic position, controlling access between the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean. Gaining sovereignty over these islands solidified Greece's strategic footprint in the region.

The region potentially holds significant underwater resources, including hydrocarbons. The protocol provided Greece with a basis to strengthen future claims over maritime zones.

The agreement was a diplomatic victory in reducing ambiguity over territorial sovereignty. It limited Turkey's ability to contest the ownership of islands once Italy transferred them to Greece.

When Greece inherited the Dodecanese islands in 1947, it also inherited the 1932 agreement's framework, making it a cornerstone of Greece's legal claims against Turkey. The precedent set by the protocol strengthens Greece's argument for the islands' entitlement

to their own continental shelf and EEZ under international law, countering Turkish claims to the contrary. Despite its clarity, the Convention remains a point of contention in Greek-Turkish relations, particularly regarding the delimitation of maritime boundaries and airspace. Today, the 6-nautical-mile limit remains a contentious issue between Greece and Turkey in the Aegean. Under international law, particularly the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), coastal states are entitled to extend their territorial waters up to 12 nautical miles from their baseline. Greece has ratified UNCLOS, which codifies this right. However, Turkey is not a signatory to UNCLOS and disputes its application in certain contexts, particularly in the Aegean Sea.

#### 4.3.3 Balkan Pact (1934)

The Balkan Pact, also known as the Balkan Entente, was a mutual defense agreement signed on February 9, 1934, in Athens by Greece, Turkey, Romania, and Yugoslavia. Its primary aim was to preserve the territorial status quo in the Balkans and safeguard the signatories' political independence against aggression from other Balkan states, particularly Bulgaria and Albania.

The pact emerged in a period marked by rising nationalist sentiments and territorial disputes in the Balkans (Veremis, 2015). The signatory nations sought to counteract revisionist ambitions, especially those of Bulgaria, which harbored aspirations to revise its borders established by the post-World War I treaties. By forming a united front, the Balkan states aimed to deter any attempts to alter the existing boundaries and to promote regional stability. Greece motivated by the desire to secure its northern borders and prevent Bulgarian expansion into Greek Macedonia and Thrace. Greece also sought to strengthen its diplomatic ties with neighboring countries to ensure collective security. Turkey under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's leadership, Turkey aimed to establish peaceful relations with its Balkan neighbors and to counter Italian expansionist policies in the Mediterranean. The pact aligned with Turkey's broader foreign policy of neutrality and regional cooperation. Romania concerned about Hungarian and Bulgarian territorial claims, Romania viewed the pact as a means to protect its frontiers and maintain regional balance. Yugoslavia facing internal ethnic tensions and external threats from neighboring countries, Yugoslavia sought the alliance to bolster its security and territorial integrity.

The treaty contained 3 articles and a Protocol stipulating the following:

**Article 1:** Greece, Romania, Turkey, and Yugoslavia mutually guarantee the security of their Balkan frontiers to maintain territorial integrity.

**Article 2:** The signatories agree to consult on political actions affecting shared interests and avoid unilateral obligations with non-signatory Balkan states.

**Article 3:** The agreement takes effect upon signature, allows Balkan states to join with consent, and requires rapid ratification.

The Protocol-Annex to the Pact of Balkan Entente clarifies its defensive nature and ensures the commitment of Greece, Romania, Turkey, and Yugoslavia to maintain Balkan territorial security. Aggression is defined according to Article 2 of the 1933 London Conventions, targeting any Balkan state engaging in hostile acts. While not directed against any specific power, the pact applies fully if a Balkan state aids a non-Balkan aggressor.

The signatories commit to negotiating further conventions to strengthen the pact's objectives, beginning within six months. Existing treaties between Balkan states remain valid, ensuring no conflict with prior agreements. The pact's obligations cease if a party becomes an aggressor.

The territorial status quo in the Balkans is binding. The pact's duration is fixed at five years if not agreed otherwise within two years of signing, and renews automatically unless denounced one year before expiry. Ratification must follow national laws.

Although the Balkan Pact was initially conceived as a long-term alliance, it was not renewed beyond its initial period. Several factors contributed to this outcome. The signatories had varying priorities and threat perceptions, which led to difficulties in maintaining a cohesive alliance. For instance, Romania's concerns about Soviet intentions differed from Greece's focus on Italian aggression. The growing influence of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy in the region created external pressures that strained the alliance. The signing of bilateral agreements between individual Balkan states and Axis powers undermined the collective security framework of the pact.

The pact failed to provide a robust mechanism for mutual defense, as evidenced by its inability to counter Axis aggression during World War II. The Italian invasion of Albania in 1939 and subsequent Axis advances exposed the limitations of the alliance.

Despite its short duration, the Balkan Pact offered several advantages to Greece: The alliance provided Greece with a sense of security against potential Bulgarian aggression, allowing it to focus on internal development and political stability. Participation in the pact elevated Greece's diplomatic standing in the region, enabling it to play a more active role in Balkan affairs and to strengthen its relationships with neighboring countries. The pact facilitated discussions on economic collaboration, including trade and infrastructure projects, which had the potential to benefit Greece's economy.

#### **4.4 Military Pedagogy, Civil-Military Strategy, and Geopolitical Maneuvering in Interwar Greece (1923-1939)**

The interwar period (1923–1939) was pivotal for Greece as it sought to rebuild and modernize its military following the Asia Minor Catastrophe. This era witnessed significant developments in military education, civil-military relations (Feaver, P., 2003), and geopolitical strategies, influenced by various international treaties and foreign military doctrines. The Hellenic Military Academy (*Scholi Evelpidon*), established in 1828, remained the cornerstone of Greek officer training during the interwar period. Its curriculum was continually updated to incorporate modern warfare techniques, emphasizing leadership, strategy, and national defense. In addition to the army academy, the Hellenic Naval Academy played a crucial role in training naval officers, focusing on maritime strategy and operations. The establishment of the Superior War School (*Anotera Scholi Polemou*) in 1925 (Government Gazette, 1925), under the guidance of the French military mission, further enhanced the professional development of Greek military personnel by offering advanced training in staff duties and operational planning.

Greek military education during this period was significantly shaped by foreign military doctrines. The French military mission (1925–1932) had a profound impact, introducing French tactical and strategic concepts, which were integrated into Greek military manuals and training programs. The Superior War School,

established with French assistance, became a pivotal institution for disseminating French military thought. British influence was also evident, particularly in naval training, where British naval traditions and practices were adopted to enhance Greece's maritime capabilities. In the late 1930s, as geopolitical alliances shifted, German military doctrines began to permeate Greek military education, introducing concepts of mechanized warfare and combined arms operations.

The Greek military's strategic focus during the interwar period was primarily defensive, aiming to safeguard national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Training emphasized counterinsurgency tactics to address internal threats and border security measures to deter external aggression. The construction of the Metaxas Line, a series of fortifications along the northern border, exemplified this defensive posture, reflecting lessons learned from World War I and the need to protect against potential invasions from neighboring countries.

Greece's civil-military strategy was heavily influenced by its geopolitical position and the prevailing international treaties of the time. The Treaty of Lausanne (1923) established the boundaries between Greece and Turkey, necessitating a focus on securing the eastern frontier. The subsequent Treaty of Ankara (1930) and the Convention of Ankara (1932) aimed to normalize relations with Turkey, allowing Greece to redirect its military focus towards the Balkans. The Balkan Pact (1934), a mutual defense agreement with Yugoslavia, Romania, and Turkey, further shaped Greece's military strategy, emphasizing regional cooperation to counter external threats.

Italy's expansionist ambitions, exemplified by its occupation of the Dodecanese Islands and activities in Albania, posed significant security concerns for Greece. These threats underscored the importance of naval strength in the Aegean and the need for fortified defenses in the northwest. Consequently, Greece sought to strengthen its alliances with Britain and France, viewing their support as essential for deterring Italian aggression and maintaining regional stability.

As the 1930s progressed, the rise of fascist regimes and the looming threat of global conflict prompted Greece to reassess its military alliances and strategic priorities. The Balkan Pact (1934) represented an effort to create a regional bloc capable of collective defense against external aggression. However, the shifting dynamics of European politics, particularly the appeasement policies of Britain and France towards Axis powers, complicated Greece's strategic calculations, leading to a delicate balancing act between maintaining neutrality and preparing for potential involvement in the impending war.

The interwar period was a transformative era for Greece's military establishment. The integration of foreign military doctrines, the establishment of advanced training institutions, and the strategic realignments necessitated by international treaties and regional threats collectively contributed to the modernization of Greece's armed forces. These developments not only enhanced Greece's defensive capabilities but also positioned it as a significant player in the complex geopolitical landscape of Southeast Europe on the eve of World War II.

## **5. CONCLUSIONS**

The interwar period (1923–1939) marked a defining era for Greece, as it navigated the challenges of territorial consolidation,

military modernization, and geopolitical positioning following the Treaty of Lausanne. The Treaty of Ankara (1930), the Convention of Ankara (1932), and the Balkan Pact (1934) illustrate Greece's efforts to balance its military pedagogy, diplomatic strategies, and civil-military relations. This analysis delves into unspoken conclusions that emerge from the interplay of military education, strategy, and diplomacy.

The *Scholi Evelpidon* remained the cornerstone of Greece's military education, producing officers who were well-versed in modern warfare and national defense. Beyond this foundational institution, Greece established the Superior War School (*Anotera Scholi Polemou*) with French assistance in 1925. This school served as a vital link between theoretical military concepts and their practical application in Greece's unique geopolitical landscape. French military pedagogy emphasized hierarchical discipline and methodical planning, values that found resonance in

The naval and air force academies also underwent significant transformation, highlighting Greece's recognition of emerging strategic domains. British influence shaped the naval curriculum, while the late 1930s saw German doctrines emphasizing mechanized warfare seep into Greek military training. These shifts suggest a reactive rather than proactive approach to military education, reflecting Greece's dependence on external powers for strategic guidance.

French influence dominated Greek military strategy in the early interwar years, with a focus on defensive doctrines and positional warfare. The Metaxas Line, Greece's defensive fortifications along its northern borders, mirrored France's Maginot Line in philosophy, underscoring Greece's reliance on fortifications to counter superior adversaries. British naval doctrines also were pivotal in shaping Greece's Aegean strategy, particularly amid tensions with Italy and Turkey.

The treaties analyzed—Ankara (1930), Convention of Ankara (1932), and the Balkan Pact (1934)—highlight the evolution of Greek civil-military strategy. The Treaty of Ankara marked a milestone in Greek-Turkish rapprochement, stabilizing relations and allowing Greece to divert resources toward the Balkans. The Ankara Convention was a guide for the strategy that Greece had to follow regarding its sovereignty in the Aegean and the changing interests of other states.

The Balkan Pact underscored Greece's diplomatic pivot towards collective security in Southeast Europe. Yet, a closer examination reveals the limitations of this strategy. The pact was more symbolic than practical, as it lacked enforceable mechanisms for mutual defense. Greece's participation was driven by a dual motive: to deter Bulgarian revisionism and to secure a buffer against Italy's expansionist ambitions. However, the pact's reliance on the fragile cooperation of Balkan states exposed Greece's vulnerability in the absence of robust alliances with great powers.

Italy's aggressive posturing in the Dodecanese and Albania forced Greece to adopt a defensive posture, as evidenced by its naval build-up and fortification projects.

Additionally, the shadow of German expansionism in the late 1930s complicated Greece's security calculus. While the Balkan Pact aimed to provide a regional counterbalance, its limited scope revealed the inherent contradictions in Greece's strategy: an overreliance on multilateral agreements that lacked enforcement mechanisms.

The Treaty of Ankara (1930) and subsequent agreements reflected Greece's desire to normalize relations with Turkey and redirect focus toward Balkan diplomacy. However, these treaties also highlighted the precarious balance Greece sought to maintain between appeasing neighbors and asserting its sovereignty.

The unresolved Aegean disputes, particularly over territorial waters and airspace, underscored the limits of these agreements. Greece's reliance on the League of Nations to address these issues reflects a broader diplomatic strategy of leveraging international institutions and adherence to international law. While Greece's engagement with treaties like Ankara and the Balkan Pact demonstrated diplomatic ingenuity, these agreements revealed the limitations of multilateralism in securing long-term stability.

The interplay between policy and defense highlighted a recurring tension between civilian and military priorities. Political leaders prioritized diplomatic appeasement, while military planners remained focused on immediate territorial security.

The interwar period offers enduring lessons for contemporary military pedagogy and strategy, emphasizing the need for indigenous doctrine development and proactive threat anticipation.

Post-Lausanne Greece exemplifies a nation grappling with the complexities of military modernization, geopolitical alignment, and civil-military dynamics. The treaties and strategies analyzed reveal both achievements and persistent vulnerabilities, offering valuable insights into the challenges of balancing diplomacy and defense in a volatile regional environment.

## REFERENCES

1. Athanasiou, L., (2003). *Research methods and techniques in education*. Ioannina: ed. University of Ioannina, pp. 223,224
2. Barlas, D., (2004), *Friends or Foes? Diplomatic Relations between Italy and Turkey, 1923–36*, *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36, No. 2, pp. 231–52.
3. Bitsaki E. Ant., (2005), *The education of man according to the Apostle Paul*. Athens: Grigoris, pp.21-22
4. Borg, W. R. - Gall. M. D.,(1989), *Educational Research*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed., New York: Longman
5. Cohen L., Manion L., (1977), *Methodology of Educational Research*, ed. Chrysoula Mitsopoulou, Mania Filopoulou, Athens: Expression, p. 71
6. *Gazette of the Government, Hellenic Republic*, vol. A, no.sh. 247, Athens, 11 September 1925, pp. 1620-1622
7. *Gazette "Skrip"*, no. f. 7.441, Athens 29 September 1922, p. 1
8. Gerolymatos, An., (2003), *The Balkan Wars: Conquest, Revolution, and Retribution from the Ottoman era to the twentieth century and beyond*, New York: Basic Books
9. Feaver, P., (2003), *Armed servants: Agency, oversight and civil-military relations*. Harvard University Press.
10. Hellenic Electronic Center, *Convention Between Italy and Turkey on 4 January 1932, and Protocol 28 December 1832*, <https://www.greece.org/hellas/treaty.html> (last accessed 7 December 2024)
11. Hirschon, H., (2003), *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey*, Oxford: Berghahn Books

12. Huntington, P., S., (1957), *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*, London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press
13. Jaspers, K. (1950), *Is Science evil?* Commentary 9, pp. 229-233, in Filia V., (1993), *Introduction to the methodology and techniques of social research*, Athens: Gutenberg, pp. 17,18
14. James, P., Choi, W., S., (2005), *Civil-Military Dynamics, Democracy, and International Conflict: A New Quest for International Peace. Advances in Foreign Policy Analysis*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
15. Janowitz, M., (1964), *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*, New York, U.S.: Free Press
16. Kerner R., J., Howard, H., N., (2010) , *The Balkan Conferences And The Balkan Entente 1930-1935: A Study In The Recent History Of The Balkan And Near Eastern Peoples*, Montana, U.S.: Kessinger Publishing
17. Koliopoulos, I., (2000), *History of Greece since 1800. The Formulation and Exercise of National Policy*, vol 2, Thessaloniki: Vaniias
18. Koliopoulos, I., Veremis, Th., (2006), *Greece, The Modern Continuity*, Athens: Kastaniotis
19. Kyriakidis, M. (2021). *Hellenic Army. Its role in the development of the Modern History of Greece*. Athens: Petra Publications
20. League of Nations (1930), Treaty Series, Vol. CVIII, No. 2510 *Treaty of Friendship, Conciliation and Judicial Settlement between Greece and Italy. Signed at Rome, September 23, 1928*. Publication of Treaties and International Engagements Registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, pp. 221 – 231
21. League of Nations (1930), Treaty Series, Vol. CVIII, No. 2509 *Treaty of Friendship, Conciliation and Judicial Settlement between Greece and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Signed at Belgrade, March 27, 1929*. Publication of Treaties and International Engagements Registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, pp. 203 – 217
22. League of Nations (1931-1932), Treaty Series, Vol. CXXV, No. 2841 *Treaty of Friendship, Neutrality, Consiliation and Arbitration between Greece and Turkey. Signed at Ankara, October 30, 1930 with Protocol*, Publication of Treaties and International Engagements Registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, pp. 9 -21
23. League of Nations (1933), Treaty Series, Vol. CXXXVIII, No. 3191 *Convention between Italy and Turkey for the Delimitation of the Territorial Waters between the coast of Anatolia and the island of Castellorizo. Signed at Ankara, 4 January, 1932 with Protocol signed on 28 December 1932*, Publication of Treaties and International Engagements Registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, p. 243-249
24. League of Nations (1934), Treaty Series, Vol. CLIII, No. 3514 *Pact of Balkan Entente between Greece, Roumania, Turkey and Yugoslavia. Signed at Athens, February 9th, 1934 and Protocol Annex*. Publication of Treaties and International Engagements Registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, p. 155-159
25. Mavroskoufis, K. D. (2005), *Seeking the traces of History: historiography, teaching methodology and historical sources*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis Brothers Publications, p. 26
26. Melanitou, G. N. (1957), *The Method of Historical Pedagogical Research*. Athens, pp. 14-28
27. Mialaret, G., (1999), *Introduction to the Sciences of Education*. Athens: Print Dardanos, p. 145
28. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic (1923), *International Conventions: Treaty of Lausanne, 27.07.1923. In English*
29. Nova - Kaltsouni, Chr., (2006), *Empirical Research Methodology in Social Sciences, Data Analysis using SPSS 13*, Athens: Gutenberg, p. 24
30. Pentzopoulos, D., (2002), *Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey: The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact on Greece*, London: Hurst
31. Psomiades, J., H., (1962), *Greek-Turkish Relations, 1923-1930: A Study in the Politics of Rapprochement*, New York, U.S.: Columbia University
32. Rizas, S., (2015), *The End of the Great Idea. Venizelos, anti-Venizelism and Asia Minor*, Athens: Kastaniotis
33. Tusan, M., (2023) , *The Last Treaty: Lausanne and the End of the First World War in the Middle East*, Nevada, US: Cambridge University Press
34. Verdi, N. Ath., (2015), *Educational Research and Evaluation*, Athens: Borg & Gall, 1989
35. Veremis, Th. (1978), *Some Observations on the Greek Military in the Inter-War Period, 1918-1935. Armed Forces & Society*, 4(3), pp. 527–541. London: Sage Publications, Inc. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45346090>
36. Veremis, Th., (1997), *The Greek Military in Politics from Independence to Democracy 1916-1936*, London: C Hurst & Co Publishers Ltd
37. Veremis, Th. (2015), *The Modern Balkans: A Concise Guide to Nationalism and Politics. The Rise and Decline of the Nation State*, United Kingdom: LSEE - Research on South Eastern Europe
38. Winter, J., (2022), *The Day the Great War Ended, 24 July 1923. The Civilianization of War*, Oxford: Oxford University Press