

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



"Sovereignty and Geopolitical Strategy in the Modern History of Greece: The Role of the Greek Army, Military Diplomacy, and Pedagogy through the Montreux Convention (1936) and Paris Peace Treaties (1947)"

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 the pivotal role of the Greek army, military diplomacy, and pedagogy in shaping Greece's sovereignty and geopolitical strategy through the lens of three key international treaties: the Montreux Convention (1936), and the Paris Peace Treaties (1947). Positioned at a critical geopolitical crossroads, Greece leveraged its military and diplomatic capabilities to navigate complex international landscapes during the interwar period, World War II, and the Cold War. The Montreux Convention redefined maritime control, with Greece asserting strategic interests in the Eastern Mediterranean. The Paris Peace Treaties solidified Greece's territorial integrity post-WWII, showcasing the Greek army's contributions to the Allied cause. By analyzing these treaties, this paper underscores how Greece's military engagements and diplomatic strategies informed its sovereignty and international standing. Additionally, it explores the development of military pedagogy, reflecting on how historical experiences have influenced Greek military doctrine and education. This interdisciplinary approach integrates history, international law, and military studies to offer insights into Greece's modern geopolitical identity.

Keywords: Greek Army, Military Diplomacy/ Pedagogy, Sovereignty, Geopolitical Strategy, Montreux Convention (1936), Paris Peace Treaties (1947)

1. INTRODUCTION

Greece's modern history is defined by its struggle for sovereignty and strategic positioning at the crossroads of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Following its independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1830, Greece faced continuous challenges in consolidating its

territorial integrity, navigating internal political turbulence, and responding to external threats. Its geography, encompassing pivotal maritime routes and proximity to volatile regions like the Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean, rendered it a focal point for global

powers. This strategic location often subjected Greece to the influence of external actors while offering opportunities for geopolitical maneuvering.

During the interwar years, Greece sought stability amidst a fragile international order shaped by World War I's aftermath. The Montreux Convention (1936) emerged as a milestone in revising earlier arrangements concerning the control of the Turkish Straits, a critical maritime chokepoint for Greece's security and economic interests. In the post-World War II era, Greece's participation in the Paris Peace Treaties (1947) was pivotal in reclaiming territories such as the Dodecanese Islands and reaffirming its sovereignty after enduring Axis occupation. These treaties encapsulate Greece's use of military and diplomatic strategies to navigate shifting global dynamics.

The importance of sovereignty and military diplomacy has been central to Greece's survival and growth. Sovereignty, both territorial and political, has historically been under threat due to external aggression, as seen during the Greco-Turkish conflicts, and internal divisions, such as the Greek Civil War. The Greek army has played a dual role in defending national borders and serving as a diplomatic tool to assert Greece's position on the global stage (Kyriakidis, 2021). Military diplomacy, characterized by alliances, treaties, and participation in international organizations, has allowed Greece to reinforce its geopolitical significance and ensure its interests are protected amidst competing power blocs.

The primary aim of this manuscript is to analyze the Montreux Convention, and the Paris Peace Treaties to highlight the role of the Greek army and military diplomacy in securing Greece's sovereignty. These treaties reveal the interplay between military strategy, international law, and diplomacy in shaping Greece's geopolitical trajectory. Furthermore, the analysis explores how these historical experiences influenced Greek military pedagogy, contributing to the development of strategic doctrines and training programs that resonate in contemporary military practice.

Central to this study are several key questions: *How did Greece assert its sovereignty through these treaties?* Each treaty reflects Greece's tactical approaches to safeguarding its territorial integrity and leveraging its strategic location. For instance, in the Montreux Convention, Greece aligned with international powers to ensure maritime access and security in the Aegean. Similarly, the Paris Peace Treaties saw Greece leverage its contributions during World War II to reclaim territories and secure international recognition of its post-war borders. Another essential question is *What role did the Greek army and diplomacy play in these treaties?* The Greek army's involvement extended beyond combat; its strategic posture and readiness often served as leverage in diplomatic negotiations. For instance, Greece's military resilience during World War II earned it a seat at the post-war negotiation table, strengthening its claims in the Paris Peace Treaties. What makes this approach stand out is its comprehensive exploration of the **Greek army's role not just in defense but as a tool of diplomacy**. It positions Greece as an active participant in shaping its geopolitical destiny, rather than merely reacting to external pressures. Moreover, the integration of **military pedagogy (Florian, 2002)** as a key theme connects the past with the present, offering valuable lessons for contemporary military education and strategy.

The third aspect examined is *What lessons can be drawn for military pedagogy?* Greece's historical reliance on the military as a

cornerstone of national policy underscores the need for continuous development in military education and strategy. The treaties provide case studies on the integration of military and diplomatic efforts, demonstrating the importance of adaptability, alliance-building, and strategic foresight. These lessons have informed Greece's contemporary military training programs, emphasizing the interplay between historical experience and modern doctrine.

In sum, this contextual background sets the stage for a detailed exploration of how Greece, through its army and diplomacy, has navigated challenges to sovereignty. By analyzing these treaties, this study seeks to illuminate Greece's strategic decisions and their enduring influence on military pedagogy, international relations, and the nation's modern history.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework for analyzing Greece's sovereignty, geopolitical strategy, and military pedagogy through the Montreux Convention (1936), and the Paris Peace Treaties (1947) integrates perspectives from international relations theory, military studies, and historical institutionalism. This interdisciplinary approach provides a structured lens to explore the interconnected roles of the Greek army, diplomacy, and the broader implications of international law in shaping Greece's modern history. The study draws on two key paradigms: Realism and Constructivism.

Realism emphasizes the anarchic nature of the international system, where states act to maximize their power and security. Greece's geopolitical strategies, as reflected in its participation in the Montreux Convention and the Paris Peace Treaties, align with realist principles. These treaties were vital in ensuring Greece's survival amidst shifting power dynamics, demonstrating its pursuit of strategic alliances and military preparedness to counter threats. Realism provides insight into Greece's reliance on its military as both a defensive tool and a means of diplomatic leverage in a competitive international environment.

Constructivism complements realism by focusing on the role of ideas, norms, and identities in shaping state behavior. For Greece, its identity as a Western, democratic state with deep historical ties to Europe influenced its strategic choices. The Paris Peace Treaties, for example, reflect Greece's alignment with Allied powers, driven not only by realist interests but also by shared ideological values. Constructivism helps to illuminate how Greece's historical experiences, cultural identity, and diplomatic narratives influenced its actions on the international stage.

Military diplomacy, defined as the use of military resources and relationships to achieve political objectives, forms a cornerstone of the analysis. The Greek army, beyond its role as a defensive force, was integral to Greece's diplomatic endeavors during the period under study. The Montreux Convention highlights Greece's reliance on maritime strategy and its use of the Greek Navy to secure a role in regional security discussions. By engaging in multilateral negotiations, Greece reinforced its sovereignty and safeguarded its maritime interests, showcasing military diplomacy in action. In the Paris Peace Treaties, the Greek army's contributions during World War II, particularly its resistance against Axis forces, provided Greece with moral and strategic capital to secure territorial gains such as the Dodecanese Islands. By linking military diplomacy with sovereignty, the theoretical framework

underscores the interplay between hard power and soft power in Greece's approach to international relations.

Historical institutionalism provides a lens to examine how Greece's participation in these treaties was shaped by long-term historical patterns and institutional legacies. This approach is particularly relevant in analyzing the evolution of Greece's military and diplomatic practices over time. The Montreux Convention can be viewed as a continuation of Greece's maritime strategy, rooted in its historical reliance on sea power dating back to its classical past. The Paris Peace Treaties reflect Greece's institutional efforts to rebuild its sovereignty after World War II, leveraging its historical alignment with Western powers. International law plays a dual role in this framework: as a constraint on state actions and as an instrument for achieving sovereignty. Each treaty analyzed illustrates how Greece navigated legal frameworks to assert its territorial and political sovereignty. By situating Greece within the broader legal frameworks established by these treaties, the analysis highlights how international law both shaped and was shaped by Greece's actions.

The framework incorporates military pedagogy (Florian, 2002), focusing on how historical experiences inform the development of military doctrines, training programs, and strategic thinking. The treaties analyzed serve as case studies for integrating diplomacy and military strategy into training curricula. The Montreux Convention offers lessons in maritime security and multilateral negotiation. The Paris Peace Treaties highlight the importance of leveraging military contributions for political gains. This focus on military pedagogy bridges the gap between historical analysis and practical application, demonstrating how lessons from Greece's past have informed its contemporary military and diplomatic strategies.

The theoretical framework supports the research objectives by providing tools to explore key questions:

- How did Greece assert its sovereignty through these treaties?
- What role did the Greek army and military diplomacy play?
- What pedagogical insights can be drawn for military education?

By combining realism, constructivism, historical institutionalism, and military pedagogy, the framework allows for a comprehensive analysis of Greece's strategies during a transformative period in modern history. It integrates theoretical depth with practical insights, offering a prototype for interdisciplinary research on military diplomacy and sovereignty.

2.2 Research studies on the period under investigation (1936–1947)

The period from 1936 to 1947 in Greek history has been extensively studied, focusing on various aspects such as military engagements, diplomatic relations, and political developments. Greek Military and Political Dynamics analyses of the Greek military's role during the interwar period and World War II, including its political influence and involvement in conflicts (Sadkovich, 1993). Examinations of guerrilla activities in Greece during World War II, provide insights into resistance movements and their impact on German military operations. (Tompkins, Richardson, 1962). Studies research on the 1934 Balkan Pact (League of Nations, 1934), highlighting its role as a precursor to

Southeast European cooperation and its implications for regional security (Kerner, Howard, 2010). Investigations into Greece's territorial claims and diplomatic efforts during the Paris Peace Conference, shed light on post-war negotiations (Kondis, 1991). Other studies examine the geopolitics of the Straits regime (Montreux Convention of 1936), which governs the Turkish straits connecting the Black Sea to the Mediterranean Sea (Segell, 2023).

While these studies provide valuable insights into specific aspects of Greek history during this period, certain gaps remain unaddressed. This manuscript aims to fill these gaps by integrating military diplomacy and pedagogy. Existing literature often treats military actions and diplomatic efforts separately. This study examines the interplay between the Greek army's military engagements and diplomatic strategies, highlighting how they collectively influenced Greece's sovereignty and geopolitical standing. While individual treaties like the Montreux Convention, and Paris Peace Treaties have been studied, their combined impact on Greece's military and diplomatic evolution remains underexplored. This manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of these treaties, demonstrating their collective significance in shaping modern Greek history. The development of military education and doctrine in Greece, influenced by historical treaties and international relations, lacks thorough examination. This study delves into how experiences from these treaties informed Greek military pedagogy, contributing to contemporary military practices and strategic thinking.

By addressing these gaps, the manuscript offers a holistic understanding of Greece's approach to sovereignty and geopolitical strategy during a transformative period, emphasizing the interconnectedness of military actions, diplomatic negotiations, and educational developments.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Methodology

The research methodology aligns with the study's objectives, employing a historical-pedagogical framework enhanced by detailed source analysis. This approach is designed to explore the intersections of sovereignty, geopolitical strategy, military education, and diplomacy, as exemplified in Greece's modern history through the Montreux Convention (1936), and Paris Peace Treaties (1947). The study focuses on the following key areas:

- a) The progression of Greek military education, particularly its role in shaping strategic doctrines and institutional frameworks.
- b) The establishment of educational standards in diplomacy and political strategy as tools for maintaining state sovereignty.
- c) An evaluation of political challenges during critical periods, including conflicts, territorial negotiations, and the influence of shifting Great Power agendas on Greece's geopolitical strategy.
- d) A critique of strategic planning and the educational systems that influenced Greece's ability to navigate international treaties.
- e) A historical investigation into policies that shaped both military and political education, highlighting the role of treaties in reinforcing Greece's sovereignty (Borg & Gall, 1989).

This qualitative approach emphasizes the significance of international treaties in stabilizing the Greek state while setting the

groundwork for subsequent negotiations and alliances. Drawing on primary archival sources, it examines periods of uncertainty characterized by shifting alliances and the interplay of Great Power interests. D. Mavroskoufis' classification of sources into primary (originating from the study period) and secondary (later analyses) serves as a guiding framework (Mavroskoufis, 2005).

The research confronts theoretical and practical challenges, including interpreting incomplete historical records and reconstructing events from the distant past (Verdi, 2015; Athanasiou, 2003). These challenges are addressed through a historical lens, reflecting Jaspers' philosophy that modern science represents a continuous pursuit of understanding (Jaspers, 1950).

The primary method employed is historical analysis, focusing on uncovering facts, evaluating evidence, and establishing chronological narratives within the context of Greece's evolving sovereignty and geopolitical strategy. This method investigates causality, consequences, and societal attitudes while tracing institutional developments across key 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 and inform future developments (Cohen & Manion, 1977). This analytical approach is vital for understanding how Greece used its military and diplomatic tools to navigate critical moments, such as the Montreux Convention's emphasis on maritime sovereignty, and the territorial negotiations of the Paris Peace Treaties. The combination of primary and secondary sources enhances the depth of this study, offering multiple perspectives on Greece's military diplomacy and its implications for national sovereignty (Cohen & Manion, 1977).

- a) Hill and Kerber underscore the benefits of historical research, which include: Resolving contemporary issues by drawing insights from Greece's historical negotiations.
- b) Identifying long-term trends in geopolitical strategy and military education.
- c) Revealing the dynamics of cultural and political exchanges during treaty negotiations.
- d) Refining and reevaluating established theories in light of Greece's role in international relations (Hill & Kerber, 1967).

The study concentrates on 20th-century treaties, protocols, and conventions that shaped Greece's territorial consolidation and geopolitical stability following centuries of Ottoman rule. By analyzing the Montreux Convention and Paris Peace Treaties, the research provides a nuanced perspective on Greece's efforts to assert sovereignty amidst shifting alliances and competing national interests (Verdi, 2015).

Relevance to Education and Training

In the fields of education and military training, historical research reveals the importance of connecting geopolitical contexts, political strategy, and pedagogy. By revisiting historical theories, the study extracts insights relevant to contemporary challenges, such as balancing diplomacy and military preparedness. The analysis of treaties demonstrates how military pedagogy evolved to address these demands, emphasizing lessons applicable to current and future military education.

The primary objectives include:

1. Drawing lessons from historical treaties to address modern challenges in sovereignty and strategy.
2. Unveiling historical events and ideologies that shaped the role of military diplomacy in Greece's development.
3. Applying the philosophies of influential thinkers to contemporary geopolitical and educational contexts (Bitsaki, 2005; Melanitou, 1957).

This research moves beyond documenting historical facts to address critical themes, including:

- The relationship between state sovereignty and military diplomacy as reflected in treaty negotiations.
- The transformative role of military education in shaping national identity and state-building processes.
- The development of strategic alliances and their pedagogical implications for military training and political strategy.

By integrating historical, pedagogical, and geopolitical perspectives, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of Greece's modern history, emphasizing the interconnected roles of the Greek army, diplomacy, and military education in achieving and maintaining sovereignty.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Historical Context of the Treaties

The period between 1936 and 1954 was marked by significant geopolitical shifts that redefined the global and regional order. The interwar years (1919–1939) witnessed the fragile peace established by the Treaty of Versailles unraveling under the pressures of economic instability, the rise of fascism, and the aggressive expansionism of totalitarian regimes. World War II (1939–1945) further destabilized the international system, while the post-war period (1945–1954) ushered in the Cold War, creating new alliances and tensions. Greece, situated at the crossroads of Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, found itself at the epicenter of these global transformations, leveraging its strategic location in the Balkans and Eastern Mediterranean to navigate this turbulent era.

The interwar period posed unique challenges for Greece. Having endured a series of military defeats, including the Greco-Turkish War (1919–1922), and the Great Depression, Greece faced internal political instability. The authoritarian regime of Ioannis Metaxas, established in 1936, sought to strengthen Greece's position domestically and internationally. The Metaxas dictatorship was characterized by a focus on militarization, evident in the enhancement of the Greek army and the fortification of key strategic areas, including the Aegean islands. This period coincided with the signing of the Montreux Convention (1936), which revised the Treaty of Lausanne and restored Turkey's sovereignty over the Straits, critical waterways linking the Aegean and Black Seas. For Greece, the Montreux Convention was a pivotal moment, as it underscored the importance of maritime control in the Eastern Mediterranean for securing its sovereignty and economic interests.

World War II further highlighted Greece's strategic importance. The country's valiant resistance against the Axis Powers during the Greco-Italian War (1940–1941) delayed the German advance in the Balkans, earning Greece international recognition for its military efforts. However, the subsequent Axis occupation devastated the nation, leading to economic collapse, widespread famine, and the rise of resistance movements. Greece's sacrifices during the war

played a crucial role in its claims during the Paris Peace Treaties (1947), where the country successfully secured the Dodecanese Islands from Italy, a long-standing territorial aspiration.

The post-war period, dominated by Cold War rivalries, saw Greece grappling with both internal and external challenges. Internally, the Greek Civil War (1946–1949) pitted communist forces against the government, with significant foreign intervention. Externally, Greece became a critical ally for the Western bloc, given its proximity to the Soviet Union and its influence in the Balkans.

Geographically, Greece has always occupied a pivotal position in the Balkans and Eastern Mediterranean. Its location made it a gateway between East and West, with its ports facilitating trade and its islands serving as critical military outposts. During the 1936–1954 period, this geographic significance became even more pronounced due to the geopolitical stakes of the time.

In the Balkans, Greece had to navigate a complex web of alliances and rivalries. The interwar years saw the formation of the Balkan Entente, a regional alliance aimed at countering aggression from revisionist powers like Bulgaria. While Greece played a leading role in this alliance, its impact diminished with the outbreak of World War II. After the war, the emergence of communist regimes in neighboring countries like Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia heightened Greece's security concerns, leading it to align closely with Western powers.

In the Eastern Mediterranean, Greece's maritime control and island territories became strategic assets. The Montreux Convention, while primarily addressing Turkish sovereignty over the Straits, had implications for Greece's maritime interests, as it ensured the continued free passage of Greek shipping. During the Cold War, the Eastern Mediterranean became a hotspot for superpower rivalry, with Greece acting as a bulwark against Soviet expansion into the region. The treaties analyzed in this study - Montreux Convention (1936), and Paris Peace Treaties (1947) - demonstrate Greece's ability to navigate complex geopolitical landscapes to safeguard its sovereignty. The Montreux Convention reinforced Greece's maritime strategy, emphasizing the importance of controlling key waterways. In addition, it paved the way for the legal rearmament of the Greek islands of Lemnos and Samothrace. The Paris Peace Treaties rewarded Greece's wartime sacrifices with territorial gains, bolstering its sovereignty in the Dodecanese.

4.2 Military and Political Challenges for Greece. Internal and External Threats to Sovereignty and the Role of the Greek Army

The period from 1936 to 1954 presented Greece with significant military and political challenges, both internal and external, that threatened its sovereignty. Internally, Greece faced political instability, economic hardships, and the repercussions of the Greek Civil War, while externally, it had to navigate shifting alliances, territorial disputes, and the growing influence of global powers. In addressing these challenges, the Greek army emerged as a key institution in safeguarding national defense and asserting Greece's role in international diplomacy.

Internally, Greece grappled with persistent political instability, compounded by the authoritarian regime of Ioannis Metaxas (1936–1941) and the devastation of World War II. The Axis occupation (1941–1944) caused widespread economic collapse, famine, and resistance movements, which intensified divisions within Greek society. Following liberation, the country descended into the Greek Civil War (1946–1949), where communist forces

sought to overthrow the government. This civil conflict not only tested Greece's sovereignty but also invited significant foreign intervention, with the United States implementing the Truman Doctrine (1947) to prevent Greece from falling into the Soviet sphere of influence.

The Greek army played a pivotal role in preserving sovereignty during the Civil War, acting as a primary force against communist insurgents. Supported by Western aid, the army's victory reinforced Greece's alignment with the Western bloc, a critical step in its integration into NATO in 1952. The military's ability to quell internal dissent was instrumental in stabilizing the nation, albeit at great social and political cost.

Externally, Greece faced significant challenges from its neighbors and the geopolitical consequences of global conflicts. In the Balkans, Greece's territorial integrity was threatened by revisionist claims from Bulgaria and Albania, both of which were aligned with the Soviet bloc during the Cold War. Additionally, tensions with Turkey over territorial disputes in the Aegean Sea and Cyprus complicated bilateral relations.

The Greek army's strategic importance extended beyond defense, as it served as a tool for diplomacy (Kyriakidis, 2021). During the Montreux Convention (1936), Greece actively supported Turkey's sovereignty over the Straits, recognizing the mutual importance of maritime security in the region. Similarly, the Greek army's role in World War II, particularly in resisting Axis forces during the Greco-Italian War (1940–1941), enhanced Greece's international standing and provided leverage during the Paris Peace Treaties (1947), enabling territorial gains like the Dodecanese Islands.

The Greek army was not only a defensive institution but also a diplomatic asset. The army's participation in these alliances demonstrated Greece's commitment to regional stability and underscored the symbiotic relationship between military strength and diplomatic strategy.

The Greek army's dual role in defense and diplomacy during this period was critical to safeguarding the nation's sovereignty. By addressing internal divisions and countering external threats, the army ensured Greece's territorial integrity and positioned it as a key player in regional and international politics. These challenges and responses exemplify the interdependence of military strategy and political diplomacy in modern Greek history.

5. The Montreux Convention (1936):

The Montreux Convention (1936) was a critical turning point in the geopolitical landscape of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea. It marked the culmination of a series of negotiations that redefined the control and regulation of the Turkish Straits—comprising the Bosphorus and Dardanelles—crucial waterways connecting the Aegean Sea to the Black Sea. This agreement replaced the Lausanne Treaty of 1923, which had imposed stringent limitations on Turkey's sovereignty over the Straits.

Under the Lausanne Treaty (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic, 1923), the Straits were demilitarized, and their management was entrusted to an international commission, severely restricting Turkey's ability to defend this critical chokepoint. However, the rise of fascist powers in Europe and increasing tensions in the 1930s exposed the vulnerabilities of this arrangement. As Turkey sought to reclaim its sovereignty over the Straits, the broader implications for maritime security, trade, and

military strategy drew the attention of neighboring countries, including Greece.

For Greece, the Straits were of immense strategic importance. They represented a key maritime route for trade and military movement, connecting the Aegean and Black Seas, and indirectly influencing Greece's economic and strategic interests. The Eastern Mediterranean's geopolitical balance depended on the Straits' regulation, making Greece's participation in the Montreux negotiations critical.

The Montreux Convention allowed Turkey to remilitarize the Straits and granted it the authority to regulate passage during peacetime and wartime. For Greece, this new framework underscored the need to ensure secure and unrestricted access to these waterways while recognizing Turkey's enhanced role as a regional actor. The agreement also reflected the interdependence of the countries in the region, emphasizing the need for collaborative diplomacy to address shared security concerns.

Greece's diplomatic role in the Montreux negotiations was significant, reflecting its broader strategy of fostering regional stability and safeguarding its maritime interests. Greece supported Turkey's efforts to revise the Lausanne framework, understanding that a stronger and sovereign Turkey at the Straits would enhance regional security and counter the rising threat of Axis powers in Europe. This stance was consistent with Greece's historical maritime orientation and its recognition of the interconnectedness of Mediterranean security.

Greek diplomacy during the negotiations was characterized by pragmatism and foresight. Greece sought to ensure that the Convention's provisions did not jeopardize its maritime trade routes or its naval operations. The focus was on maintaining the principle of free passage for commercial and military vessels during peacetime, a critical factor for Greece's economic lifelines and strategic naval mobility.

The Greek army and navy also played an indirect but vital role in shaping Greece's strategic outlook during this period. The army's assessment of potential threats highlighted the importance of secure maritime routes for both national defense and economic survival. Greek naval strategists advocated for policies that would minimize the risk of conflict in the Straits, reinforcing Greece's alignment with Turkey's position. This military perspective informed Greece's diplomatic approach, enabling it to balance national interests with broader regional concerns effectively.

In addition to bilateral cooperation with Turkey, Greece's role in the Montreux negotiations reflected its alignment with the League of Nations' principles of collective security and peaceful resolution of disputes. By advocating for a solution that respected Turkey's sovereignty while ensuring international maritime access, Greece demonstrated its commitment to a multilateral approach to regional stability.

The Montreux Convention adopted in Montreux, Switzerland on 20 July 1936 and signed by Bulgaria, France, Great Britain, Greece, Japan, Rumania, Turkey, Yugoslavia and the USSR. It contained 29 articles, 4 annexes and a protocol, which stipulated the following:

Article 1: The High Contracting Parties affirm freedom of transit and navigation through the Straits. This freedom is governed by the provisions outlined in this Convention.

Article 2: Merchant vessels enjoy unrestricted transit through the Straits in peacetime, without undue formalities or excessive charges, as specified in Annex I. Communication of basic vessel details is required.

Article 3: Ships entering the Straits must undergo sanitary inspections as per Turkish law. Quick processing applies unless infectious diseases are present, in which case additional measures are implemented.

Article 4: In wartime, when Turkey is neutral, merchant vessels maintain transit freedom, adhering to peacetime provisions (Articles 2 and 3). Pilotage and towage remain optional.

Article 5: If Turkey is at war, merchant vessels from non-enemy countries retain transit rights, provided they do not aid the enemy. Transit occurs by day along routes specified by Turkey.

Article 6: In a situation of imminent war danger, transit continues under Article 2, but daytime passage is mandatory, with routes and obligatory pilotage determined by Turkish authorities.

Article 7: "Merchant vessels" refers to all ships not classified under Section II of this Convention.

Article 8: Definitions of war vessels, their specifications, and tonnage calculation are provided in Annex II of the Convention.

Article 9: Naval auxiliary vessels transporting fuel are exempt from certain tonnage limits but must pass through the Straits singly and have limited armament to qualify for this status.

Article 10: In peacetime, light surface vessels and auxiliary warships of all powers enjoy free daytime transit through the Straits, subject to specific conditions.

Article 11: Black Sea Powers can transit capital ships exceeding standard tonnage limits, provided they travel singly with no more than two destroyers escorting them.

Article 12: Black Sea Powers may transit submarines built or repaired outside the Black Sea, provided advance notice is given to Turkey. Transit must occur by day, on the surface, and singly.

Article 13: Warship transit requires advance notification to Turkey (eight days for Black Sea Powers, fifteen for non-Black Sea Powers), including details like type, destination, and transit dates.

Article 14: The maximum tonnage for foreign naval forces in transit is 15,000 tons, with no more than nine vessels, except under specific exceptions outlined in Article 11 and Annex III.

Article 15: Warships in transit through the Straits cannot use onboard aircraft under any circumstances.

Article 16: Warships must transit the Straits promptly and cannot remain longer than necessary, except in cases of damage or maritime peril.

Article 17: Naval forces of any size can make courtesy visits to ports in the Straits at Turkey's invitation but must exit via the same route unless fulfilling transit requirements.

Article 18: Non-Black Sea Powers are limited to 30,000 tons of naval forces in the Black Sea, expandable to 45,000 tons under specific conditions. Ships may stay a maximum of 21 days.

Article 19: During wartime, if Turkey is neutral, warships of belligerent states cannot transit the Straits unless assisting a treaty ally or returning to their base, and no hostile acts are permitted.

Article 20: If Turkey is at war, it has full discretion over warship passage through the Straits, overriding the Convention's peacetime provisions.

Article 21: In imminent war danger, Turkey can implement wartime passage restrictions. Turkey's actions are subject to review by the League of Nations and signatory states.

Article 22: Warships carrying infectious diseases must transit the Straits under quarantine, implementing onboard measures to prevent the spread of infections.

Article 23: Turkey will designate air routes for civil aircraft between the Mediterranean and Black Sea, requiring advance notification and ensuring safety despite potential remilitarization of the Straits.

Article 24: The Turkish Government assumes responsibilities of the International Commission, managing vessel passage and reporting on movements and commerce through the Straits annually to stakeholders.

Article 25: This Convention does not affect the rights or obligations of Turkey or other parties arising from the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Article 26: The Convention requires ratification by six parties, including Turkey, to take effect. Notifications and documents will be managed through the French Government.

Article 27: The Convention allows accession by parties to the Treaty of Lausanne, with notifications managed by France, effective upon receipt.

Article 28: The Convention is valid for 20 years, with freedom of transit continuing indefinitely. Parties may extend or revise it with advance notice before expiration.

Article 29: Revisions can be proposed every five years, requiring support from additional parties. Unanimous or qualified majority votes are needed to adopt amendments.

Annex I: This annex outlines taxes and charges for services like sanitation, lighthouses, and life-saving stations in the Straits. Charges vary by tonnage and voyage type, ensuring no flag-based discrimination. Additional fees apply for optional services like pilotage and towage. Tariffs are regulated to cover service costs, with updates published periodically.

Annex II: This annex defines naval vessel categories and their standard displacements, detailing classifications for capital ships, aircraft carriers, light surface vessels, submarines, minor war vessels, and auxiliary vessels. It also specifies criteria for obsolescence based on vessel age. The definitions align with the 1936 London Naval Treaty, ensuring consistent naval categorization standards.

Annex III: This annex allows two of Japan's over-age training ships - **Asama**, **Yakumo**, and **Iwate** - to simultaneously visit ports in the Straits. Their combined tonnage is capped at 15,000 tons, ensuring compliance with naval tonnage limits while detailing each ship's displacement and armaments.

Annex IV: This annex defines vessel categories for calculating total tonnage under Article 18, using standard displacement and excluding over-age ships. Notifications must specify the tonnage of all eligible vessels, ensuring transparency in naval capabilities among Black Sea powers.

Protocol: The protocol permits Turkey to remilitarize the Straits zone immediately, provisionally apply the Convention's regime starting August 15, 1936, and enforces its terms upon signing, establishing transitional governance for the Straits.

The Montreux Convention offers valuable lessons for military strategy and pedagogy, particularly in the context of maritime security and regional diplomacy. Greece's involvement in the negotiations highlighted several key themes that continue to inform military education and doctrine. The Convention underscored the critical importance of maritime geography in national defense. For Greece, the Straits were not merely transit routes but strategic assets that could influence the balance of power in the Eastern Mediterranean. This recognition has informed Greek military training programs, emphasizing the need for naval dominance and the protection of key maritime chokepoints.

Greece's participation in the Montreux negotiations illustrated the necessity of integrating military assessments with diplomatic initiatives. The Greek military's evaluation of the Straits' significance informed its diplomatic priorities, creating a cohesive strategy that balanced security concerns with international cooperation. This integration remains a cornerstone of modern military pedagogy (Florian, 2002), emphasizing the role of military institutions in shaping foreign policy.

The revision of the Lausanne framework to the Montreux Convention demonstrated the importance of adaptability in responding to shifting geopolitical realities. Greece's ability to align with Turkey while safeguarding its interests reflected a pragmatic approach to diplomacy and strategy. Modern military education draws on such examples to teach flexibility and responsiveness in planning and decision-making. Greece's support for Turkey during the Montreux negotiations reinforced the value of alliance building in addressing shared security challenges. This lesson has been integrated into Greek military doctrine, which emphasizes the importance of regional partnerships in enhancing national and collective security.

The Convention's historical significance continues to inform Greek military pedagogy, which incorporates case studies from key treaties to teach the interplay of diplomacy and strategy.

6. Paris Peace Treaties (1947)

The Paris Peace Treaties of 1947 (League of Nations, 1950), marked a pivotal moment in post-WWII Europe, redefining national boundaries, sovereignty, and diplomatic relationships. Greece, as a participant in the negotiations, achieved significant territorial and strategic gains, underscoring the importance of its wartime contributions and geopolitical significance (Gazette of the Government of the Kingdom of Greece, 1947).

Greece played a critical role during WWII, resisting Axis powers and enduring severe consequences under occupation. The Greek resistance, notably during the Italian invasion and subsequent German occupation, disrupted Axis plans and delayed their operations in Eastern Europe. These efforts earned Greece international recognition during post-war negotiations, particularly in the Paris Peace Conference.

One significant outcome was the resolution of territorial disputes, particularly the status of the Dodecanese Islands, a chain of islands in the Aegean Sea. Historically under Italian control following the Italo-Turkish War (1912), the islands were strategically important for controlling maritime routes. During the conference, Greece

leveraged its wartime sacrifices and alignment with the Allies to argue for their annexation. The Allies, especially Britain and the Soviet Union, acknowledged Greece's legitimate claim, leading to the formal transfer of the islands from Italy to Greece under the Treaty of Peace with Italy. This outcome was a diplomatic triumph, bolstering Greek territorial integrity and regional influence.

The Paris Peace Treaties (1947) were signed on 10 February 1947 following the end of World War II in 1945. They signed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, China, France, Australia, Belgium, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Greece, India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of South Africa, and the People's Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, hereinafter referred to as "the Allied and Associated Powers", of the one part, and Italy, of the other part. They consisted of 11 parts with 90 articles, 17 annexes, of which Annex 6 contained 38 articles, Annex 7, 11 articles and Annex 8, 26 articles. Briefly, the treaty stipulated the following:

PART I TERRITORIAL CLAUSES SECTION I- FRONTIERS.

Article 1: Italy's borders are based on the boundaries as of January 1, 1938, with modifications detailed in later articles and accompanying maps.

Article 2: The Italy-France frontier is adjusted, with specific changes near Little St. Bernard Pass, Mont Cenis Plateau, Mont Tabor, and the Upper Valleys, as outlined in Annex II.

Article 3: Italy's border with Yugoslavia is redefined, starting from the Austrian-Italian-Yugoslav junction, with adjustments in various towns and rivers, based on administrative boundaries.

Article 4: The Italy-Free Territory of Trieste boundary is described, covering land and maritime boundaries and aiming for equidistant points in the Gulf of Panzano.

Article 5: Boundary Commissions will finalize new borders on-site within six months, with disputes referred to ambassadors of major Allied powers for resolution.

SECTION II-FRANCE (Special Clauses). Article 6: Italy cedes territory on the French side of the Franco-Italian frontier to France, as defined in Article 2.

Article 7: Italy must return to France historical and administrative archives from before 1860 concerning ceded territories under earlier treaties.

Article 8: Italy and France will cooperate on establishing a customs-free railway connection between Briançon and Modane through Italian territory, ensuring efficient transit.

Article 9: France guarantees Italy continued access to hydroelectric and water resources from Mont Cenis Lake and Tenda-Briga, under bilateral agreements detailed in Annex III.

SECTION III-Austria (Special Clauses). Article 10: Italy will maintain arrangements with Austria to ensure free movement of passenger and freight traffic between North and East Tyrol.

SECTION IV-PEOPLE'S FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA (Special Clauses) **Article 11:** Italy cedes territory to Yugoslavia, including Zara, Pelagosa, and nearby islands, with provisions for demilitarization and fishing rights.

Article 12: Italy must return cultural, historical, and administrative objects removed during its occupation of Yugoslav territories (1918–1924) or provide equivalent replacements if restitution is impossible.

Article 13: The water supply for Gorizia and its vicinity shall be regulated in accordance with provisions in Annex V.

SECTION V-GREECE (Special Clause). Article 14 (as it is): *Italy hereby cedes to Greece in full sovereignty the Dodecanese Islands indicated hereafter, namely Stampalia (Astropalia), Rhodes (Rhodos), Calki (Kharki), Scarpanto, Casos (Casso), Piscopis (Tilos), Misiros (Nisyros), Calimnos (Kalymnos), Leros, Patmos, Lipsos (Lipso), Simi (Sym), Cos (Kos) and Castellorizo, as well as the adjacent islets. These islands shall be and shall remain demilitarized. The procedure and the technical conditions governing the transfer of these islands to Greece will be determined by agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and Greece and arrangements shall be made for the withdrawal of foreign troops not later than 90 days from the coming into force of the present Treaty.*

PART II POLITICAL CLAUSES SECTION I-GENERAL CLAUSES.

Article 15: Italy guarantees human rights and freedoms to all under its jurisdiction, including equality regardless of race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 16: Italy agrees not to prosecute or harass its nationals for supporting the Allied cause during WWII.

Article 17: Italy commits to preventing the resurgence of Fascist organizations, ensuring they do not threaten democratic rights.

Article 18: Italy recognizes the peace treaties and agreements made with Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland, Austria, Germany, and Japan.

SECTION II - NATIONALITY. CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS. Article 19: Citizens in transferred territories automatically acquire the new state's citizenship unless they opt for Italian citizenship under specified conditions.

Article 20: Italian citizens with Yugoslav ethnic ties can opt for Yugoslav citizenship, provided they meet linguistic and domicile criteria.

SECTION III-FREE TERRITORY OF TRIESTE. Article 21: The Free Territory of Trieste is established, governed by a provisional UN-approved regime until a permanent statute is enforced.

Article 22: Defines the boundary between Yugoslavia and the Free Territory of Trieste, including adjustments in key locations.

SECTION IV--ITALIAN COLONIES. Article 23: Italy renounces claims to its African colonies (Libya, Eritrea, and Italian Somaliland) pending final disposal by Allied powers.

SECTION V-SPECIAL INTERESTS OF CHINA. Article 24: Italy renounces privileges under the 1901 Beijing Protocol, ceding benefits and claims in China.

Article 25: Italy agrees to cancel the lease for its concession in Tianjin, transferring property and archives to China.

Article 26: Italy relinquishes rights in the International Settlements of Shanghai and Amoy, restoring control to China.

SECTION VI-ALBANIA. Article 27: Italy recognizes Albania's sovereignty and independence.

Article 28: Italy recognizes Saseno Island as part of Albanian territory and renounces all claims to it.

Article 29: Italy renounces property, rights, and claims in Albania acquired through aggression or pre-1939 agreements.

Article 30: Italian nationals in Albania will have the same status as other foreign nationals; Albania can annul Italian concessions.

Article 31: Italy acknowledges all agreements with Italian-installed Albanian authorities (1939–1943) are null and void.

Article 32: Albania may take measures necessary to confirm provisions invalidating Italian claims and agreements.

SECTION VII- ETHIOPIA. Article 33: Italy recognizes and respects Ethiopia's sovereignty and independence.

Article 34: Italy renounces all property, rights, and interests in Ethiopia, including those of para-statal entities, and disclaims special influence in Ethiopia.

Article 35: Italy accepts the legality of Ethiopian measures nullifying Italian-imposed laws and actions since October 3, 1935.

Article 36: Italian nationals in Ethiopia will have the same legal status as other foreigners. Ethiopia may annul or modify Italian concessions within one year of the treaty's enforcement.

Article 37: Italy will return Ethiopian cultural, religious, and historical objects removed since October 3, 1935, within 18 months of the treaty's enforcement.

Article 38: October 3, 1935, is recognized as the starting date for determining Italy's responsibilities toward Ethiopia under the treaty.

SECTION VIII – INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Article 39: Italy agrees to arrangements concerning the liquidation of the League of Nations, the Permanent Court of International Justice, and the International Financial Commission in Greece.

Article 40: Italy renounces all claims and rights related to the mandate system and mandated territories.

Article 41: Italy recognizes agreements on the Statute of Tangier and supports measures for implementing these provisions.

Article 42: Italy agrees to any Allied modifications of the Congo Basin Treaties to align them with the UN Charter.

Article 43: Italy renounces any rights or interests derived from Article 16 of the Treaty of Lausanne (1923).

SECTION IX – BILATERAL TREATIES. Article 44: Allied powers must notify Italy within six months of the treaties they wish to keep or revive, subject to conformity with this treaty.

PART III – WAR CRIMINALS. Article 45: Italy must apprehend and surrender individuals accused of war crimes or treason, and disagreements will be resolved by Allied ambassadors in Rome.

PART IV – NAVAL, MILITARY, AND AIR CLAUSES. Article 46: Military clauses remain in force until modified by Allied agreements or UN Security Council decisions after Italy joins the UN.

Article 47: Italy must dismantle military fortifications along the Franco-Italian frontier and is prohibited from constructing certain installations within specified zones.

Article 48: Similar to Article 47, Italy must dismantle fortifications along the Italo-Yugoslav frontier and adhere to coastal demilitarization requirements.

Article 49: Pantelleria, the Pelagian Islands, and Pianosa must remain demilitarized, with compliance required within one year.

Article 50: In Sardinia and Sicily, permanent installations for torpedoes, sea mines, and bombs must be dismantled, and no new military bases may be built.

Article 51: Italy is prohibited from possessing or developing atomic weapons, guided missiles, long-range guns, non-contact sea mines, or manned torpedoes.

Article 52: Italy cannot acquire or produce war material of German or Japanese origin or design.

Article 53: Italy is restricted to manufacturing and possessing only war materials necessary for its permitted forces.

Article 54: The Italian armed forces are limited to a total of 200 heavy and medium tanks.

Article 55: Former officers of the Fascist Militia or Republican Army are barred from serving in Italy's military, except those exonerated by Italian law.

SECTION III – LIMITATION OF THE ITALIAN NAVY. Article 56: The Italian Fleet is reduced to specified units in Annex XII, with additional minesweeping vessels to be disarmed or converted post-clearance.

Article 57: Italy will transfer specified naval units to Allied powers, ensuring they are operational and fully equipped, under the supervision of a Four-Power Commission.

Article 58: Italy must destroy or dismantle excess naval vessels, submarines, and non-operational ships within specified timeframes, salvaging useful parts for civilian use.

Article 59: Italy is prohibited from constructing or acquiring battleships, submarines, or aircraft carriers. Total naval tonnage is limited to 67,500 tons.

Article 60: The Italian Navy is limited to 25,000 personnel, with an additional 2,500 temporarily allowed for minesweeping operations. Excess personnel must be reduced within specific timelines.

SECTION IV – LIMITATION OF THE ITALIAN ARMY. Article 61: The Italian Army is capped at 185,000 personnel, with 65,000 Carabinieri. Forces are limited to internal defense, frontier security, and anti-aircraft tasks.

Article 62: Italy must disband excess military personnel within six months of the treaty's enforcement.

Article 63: Non-Army personnel are prohibited from receiving any form of military training as defined in Annex XIII B.

SECTION V – LIMITATION OF THE ITALIAN AIR FORCE

Article 64: The Italian Air Force is limited to 200 fighter/reconnaissance aircraft and 150 unarmed support planes, designed solely for defense and internal use.

Article 65: The Italian Air Force personnel is capped at 25,000, with training restrictions on non-Air Force personnel.

Article 66: Excess Air Force personnel must be disbanded within six months of the treaty's enforcement.

SECTION VI – DISPOSAL OF WAR MATERIAL

Article 67: Italy must surrender all excess war material, Allied war material, and German or Japanese designs to specified Allied powers within one year.

SECTION VII – PREVENTION OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE REARMAMENT

Article 68: Italy agrees to cooperate with Allied powers to prevent German and Japanese rearmament.

Article 69: Italy prohibits training or employing German or Japanese technicians, including military or aviation personnel.

Article 70: Italy is barred from acquiring or producing aircraft of German or Japanese design or using their assemblies.

SECTION VIII – PRISONERS OF WAR. Article 71: Italian prisoners of war will be repatriated promptly, with Italy covering transportation costs from assembly points to entry into Italian territory.

SECTION IX – MINE CLEARANCE. Article 72: Italy will join the International Mine Clearance Organization for the Mediterranean Zone and maintain minesweeping forces until the post-war clearance period ends.

PART V – WITHDRAWAL OF ALLIED FORCES. Article 73: All Allied forces must withdraw from Italy within 90 days of the treaty's enforcement, returning Italian goods and compensating for unpaid items.

PART VI – CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF THE WAR. SECTION I – REPARATION. Article 74: Italy will pay \$100 million to the USSR and \$260 million collectively to Albania, Ethiopia, Greece (\$105M), and Yugoslavia over seven years, sourced from surplus war materials and production. Compensation agreements aim to avoid economic disruption in Italy.

SECTION II – RESTITUTION BY ITALY. Article 75: Italy must return identifiable property removed by Axis powers from Allied territories, cover related costs, and compensate for cultural heritage losses when restitution is impossible.

SECTION III – RENUNCIATION OF CLAIMS BY ITALY. Article 76: Italy waives all claims against Allied powers for wartime actions and assumes responsibility for compensation, including military currency and damages in Italy.

Article 77: Italy's property in Germany will no longer be treated as enemy property, with restitution for identifiable property removed after September 3, 1943. Italy waives most claims against Germany, except pre-1939 contracts.

PART VII – PROPERTY, RIGHTS, AND INTERESTS. SECTION I – UNITED NATIONS PROPERTY IN ITALY. Article 78: Italy must restore property, rights, and interests of the United Nations and their nationals, nullify war-related encumbrances, and compensate for unreturned or damaged property.

SECTION II – ITALIAN PROPERTY IN TERRITORIES OF ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS. Article 79: Allied and

Associated Powers may seize or liquidate Italian property in their territories to settle claims. Compensation for seized property must be provided to Italian nationals.

SECTION III – DECLARATION OF ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS ON CLAIMS. Article 80: The rights granted under Articles 74 and 79 fully settle all claims of Allied and Associated Powers arising from Italy's wartime actions.

SECTION IV – DEBTS. Article 81: The state of war does not affect pre-war financial obligations. Debtor-creditor relationships from pre-war contracts remain intact unless the treaty specifies otherwise.

PART VIII – GENERAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS. Article 82: Pending new agreements, Italy will grant most-favored-nation treatment to United Nations members reciprocating similar terms for trade, taxation, and business operations.

PART IX – SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES. Article 83: Disputes under Articles 75, 78, and specific annexes are resolved by a Conciliation Commission, with a third member appointed if needed. Decisions are binding.

PART X – MISCELLANEOUS ECONOMIC PROVISIONS. Article 84: Certain articles and annexes on property and economic rights apply to all Allied and Associated Powers, Albania, and Norway.

Article 85: Annexes VIII, X, XIV, XV, XVI, and XVII are integral parts of the treaty and hold full legal effect.

PART XI – FINAL CLAUSES. Article 86: For 18 months post-enforcement, the ambassadors of the USSR, UK, USA, and France will oversee Italy's compliance with the treaty, providing guidance and clarification.

Article 87: NDIsputes unresolved through diplomacy will be referred to the Four Ambassadors or an appointed commission, with binding majority decisions.

Article 88: Non-signatory United Nations members at war with Italy and Albania may accede to the treaty upon depositing their instruments of accession.

Article 89: Treaty rights and benefits apply only to nations that have ratified the treaty.

Article 90: The treaty is ratified in French, English, and Russian. It takes effect immediately upon ratification by the USSR, UK, USA, and France, with subsequent ratifications applying upon deposit.

The Annexes listed cover various post-World War II agreements. They address modifications to the Franco-Italian frontier, including Mont Cenis and the Tenda-Briga district, and agreements between Austria and Italy from September 5, 1946. Several annexes focus on the governance, legal framework, and economic provisions of the Free Territory of Trieste. Other annexes include a joint declaration on Italy's former African territories, lists of naval units to be retained or handed over, and definitions regarding military and war materials. Additionally, there are economic provisions concerning ceded territories, specific property types, contracts, and legal matters related to prize courts and judgments.

The Greek Army's resilience in WWII was instrumental in Greece's diplomatic success (Kyriakidis, 2021). Despite limited resources and internal political instability, Greek forces effectively resisted the Axis invasion in 1940 during the Greco-Italian War, marking

the first Allied victory against Axis forces. This defense delayed Axis advances, forcing Germany to divert resources to the Balkans and postponing the launch of Operation Barbarossa, the invasion of the Soviet Union.

The Greek Army's contributions did not end with territorial defense. Greek forces continued to fight alongside the Allies in North Africa and Italy, demonstrating their commitment to the Allied cause. These efforts strengthened Greece's bargaining power at the Paris Peace Conference, as its contributions were seen as critical to the larger Allied strategy. Greece was able to position itself not just as a victim of Axis aggression but as an active and effective participant in the war effort.

The Paris Peace Treaties reaffirmed Greece's sovereignty, particularly through the recognition of its territorial claims and the consolidation of its post-war borders. This sovereignty was not merely symbolic but had profound implications for military and strategic planning. By acquiring the Dodecanese Islands, Greece strengthened its control over the Aegean Sea, a region of historical and strategic significance.

This territorial expansion necessitated a reassessment of Greek military doctrine, which evolved to address the defense of extended maritime borders. The integration of the Dodecanese Islands into Greek territory required enhanced naval capabilities and a shift in focus toward maritime security. Additionally, the treaties emphasized non-aggression and international cooperation, influencing Greece's military pedagogy to prioritize defense and align its strategies with broader NATO frameworks after joining the organization in 1952.

7. Conclusions

This research highlights the pivotal role of military diplomacy and pedagogy in Greece's strategic posture through two major treaties: The Montreux Convention (1936) and the Paris Peace Treaties (1947). The synthesis drawn from these documents provides crucial insights into the development of Greece's military identity, its evolving sovereignty, and its pedagogical transformations within the armed forces. Both treaties offer foundational lessons for Greece's military and diplomatic approaches, which have been woven into its military pedagogy. The Montreux Convention illuminated the importance of maritime sovereignty, emphasizing the necessity for Greece to assert control over strategic sea routes in the Eastern Mediterranean. Greek participation in negotiations sharpened its military and diplomatic faculties, particularly in securing favorable terms regarding the Bosphorus and Dardanelles Straits. The involvement of Greek military officers in diplomatic missions reinforced the link between military strategy and foreign policy, providing valuable experience in blending defense strategies with diplomatic negotiations.

In parallel, the Paris Peace Treaties of 1947, which concluded the reshaping of Greece's territorial integrity after WWII, underscored the military's integral role in diplomatic bargaining. Through their service in WWII, the Greek armed forces demonstrated a capacity for strategic insight, which directly influenced Greece's negotiating leverage over disputed territories like the Dodecanese Islands. These treaties solidified Greece's sovereignty while highlighting the growing intersection of military strength and political strategy. Military pedagogy, in this context, thus expanded beyond conventional tactics to include diplomacy as a key component of military education.

The influence of these treaties on contemporary Greek military strategy is clear. Both the Montreux and Paris Treaties have left a lasting imprint on military training programs, particularly in the integration of diplomatic negotiation skills within military curricula. Greece's military academies have increasingly emphasized the dual role of officers as military strategists and diplomats, recognizing the importance of military diplomacy as an extension of defense policy. The lessons drawn from these treaties, particularly concerning territorial disputes and maritime control, continue to inform the strategic doctrines of Greece's modern armed forces. This blending of military and diplomatic skills prepares future officers to navigate complex international relations, a necessity in today's geopolitically volatile landscape.

This study demonstrates that Greece's military and diplomatic strategies were intricately intertwined in asserting its sovereignty, as evidenced by its involvement in the Montreux and Paris treaties. Through these treaties, Greece not only reinforced its territorial integrity but also adapted its military pedagogy to incorporate lessons of diplomacy, sovereignty, and military strategy. The Greek model exemplifies how small states with significant geopolitical challenges can use military diplomacy to safeguard their interests. The integration of military pedagogy into foreign policy underscores the importance of cross-disciplinary education for military professionals. Greece's approach to sovereignty and defense, characterized by strategic diplomacy and military preparedness, holds broader implications for international relations, particularly for nations in similar geopolitical predicaments.

Further research could explore additional treaties and their impact on Greece's military history, examining how the country adapted its defense strategies during critical moments in the Cold War or in response to regional threats. Moreover, comparative studies of military pedagogy in other post-war states could provide broader insights into the intersection of military education, diplomacy, and national sovereignty.

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*. 5th ed., New York: Longman
5. Cohen L., Manion L., (1977), *Methodology of Educational Research*, ed. Chrysoula Mitsopoulou, Mania Filopoulou, Athens: Expression, p. 71
6. Florian, H., (2002), *Military Pedagogy – An International Survey. Studies for Military Pedagogy, Military Science & Security Policy*, Germany: Peter Lang GmbH – Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften
7. *Gazette of the Government of the Kingdom of Greece*, vol. A, no.sh. 226, Legislative Decree No 423 Athens, 22 October 1947, pp. 1141-1181
8. 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

9. 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
10. Kondis, B., (1991), *Greek national claims at the Paris Peace Conference of 1946*, in *Balkan Studies*, vol. 32 No. 2, Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies
11. Kyriakidis, M. (2021). *Hellenic Army. Its role in the development of the Modern History of Greece*. Athens: Petra Publications
12. League of Nations (1950), Treaty Series, Vol. 49, No. 747, *Treaty of Peace with Italy. Signed at Paris, on 10 February 1947*, Publication of Treaties and International Engagements Registered with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, in French pp. 1 – 127, in English pp. 128- 235, in Russian pp. 236- 372 and in Italian pp. 373-496
13. 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
14. Mavroskoufis, K. D. (2005), *Seeking the traces of History: historiography, teaching methodology and historical sources*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis Brothers Publications, p. 26
15. Melanitou, G. N. (1957), *The Method of Historical Pedagogical Research*. Athens, pp. 14-28
16. Mialaret, G., (1999), *Introduction to the Sciences of Education*. Athens: Print Dardanos, p. 145
17. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hellenic Republic (1923), *International Conventions: Treaty of Lausanne, 27.07.1923. In English*
18. Nova - Kaltsouni, Chr., (2006), *Empirical Research Methodology in Social Sciences, Data Analysis using SPSS 13*, Athens: Gutenberg, p. 24
19. Sadkovich, J., J., (1993), *The Italo-Greek War in Context: Italian Priorities and Axis Diplomacy*, in *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 28, No. 3, Washington DC: Sage publications ltd, pp. 439-464
20. Segell, G., (2023), *The Montreux Convention (1936) as a Geopolitical Lens Since the Russia-Ukraine Conflict 2022-*, in *The Russia-Ukraine War and Its Consequences on the Geopolitics of the World*, United Kingdom: The University of Cambridge
21. Tompkins, J., P., Richardson, M. E., (1961), *Assessing Revolutionary and Insurgent Strategies: Case Study in Guerrilla War: Greece during World War II*, Aris series, North Carolina: United States Army Special Operations Command
22. Verdi, N. Ath., (2015), *Educational Research and Evaluation*, Athens: Borg & Gall, 1989