



Working Paper

Author: J. Karkazis

February 2023

**THE GRECO-TURKISH RELATIONS
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORSENING CONFRONTATION BETWEEN THE
ASSERTIVE POWERS AND THE ANGLO-SAXONS BLOC
(Summary)**

During the last two centuries the great imperialistic powers tried methodically, and some times through military coups and deception strategies, to impose on the Region (especially on Greece, Turkey and Iran) a suffocating economic, political and military control.

Recently Europe and the Middle East accommodate a dangerously growing (but still behind the curtains of mass publicity) proxy conflict between the Anglo-Saxons Bloc (ASB: U.S, U.K.) and the emerging Assertive Powers Bloc (APB: Israel, Turkey, Germany and Russia) with Greece being in the periphery of it, trying to balance its relations with the two blocs.

ASB is characterized by a well-structured composition with a historic depth supported by a defense and security alliance in the context of NATO and other international organizations. The weak member of this geopolitical dipole is U.K. and specifically the recently arising issues regarding monarchy and independence of Scotland. The related strategic threat regards the destabilization and disintegration of U.K. on the basis of the above two aspects that will lead to the dangerous weakening of ASB. It is our strong belief that the prospect of the collapse of the British Monarchical Order emerges as a highly threatening eventuality that is expected to destabilize Europe for many generations to come.

APB has a loose structure based on the varying defense, security, economic and geopolitical bonds that characterize the pairs of this bloc. The strength of these bonds follow an increasing trend during the recent decades. The weak aspects of this bloc are: the corruption, the intense socio-political divisions and the authoritarianism of Turkey and Russia, the assertiveness of Germany that is not supported by the appropriate military power and the rising religious fundamentalism and apartheid policies that keep active for too many years the Palestinian time bomb. On the other hand, the weak aspects of Greece, which is dangerously equilibrating between the two blocs, are the weak economy and corruption.

The APB is increasingly defying the interests of the ASB in the Middle East and Europe. In the long term this conflict appears to be more dangerous as compared to Israel-Iran conflict or the Greek-Turkish diplomatic conflict. Due to the existence of behind the curtain regular communications between high ranking Greek and Turkish officials and also as a result of recent (again behind the curtain) mediating efforts of Israel and Germany, this diplomatic conflict has few chances to develop into a military conflict.

There exist a plethora of powerful geopolitical, social and economic factors that bring together the members of the APB: economic, social and geo-political factors for the Greek-German and the Turkish-German dipoles, economic, geopolitical and defense factors for the Israeli-German (eg Dolphin submarines) and Israeli-Turkish dipoles, economic, geopolitical and defense factors for the Turkish-Russian (eg Libya and S300) dipole and geopolitical and economic factors for the German-Russian dipole.

The historical dynamics that have created powerful bonds between Ottomans/Turks and Jews are still alive and strong: during the 15th century the Ottomans offered a safe refuge to tens of thousands of Jews persecuted by the Spain's Christians, in 1910s Turkey offered a safe refuge in Istanbul to thousands of Donmeh from Thessaloniki and Ataturk, in the 1930s, offered a safe refuge in Turkey to hundreds of Germans of Jewish origin to prosper socially and academically there.

On the other hand the frictions between the members of the APB and ASB are growing continuously: the ambassador Hotovoly case, the dangerously growing disagreements between the US (Obama and Biden) and Netanyahu administrations (past and present) over the construction of Israeli settlements in the areas of Palestine Authority and East Jerusalem and the Iranian Problem, the refusal of Biden Administration to agree to an Israeli request to sell Arrow 3 Anti-Ballistic Missiles System to Germany, the rejection by the Biden administration of the diplomatic efforts of ex Prime Minister Naftali Bennet to secure a peace agreement between Russia and Ukraine and several other disagreements.

The above dangerous evolution of events could lead to an all-out confrontation (initially as a proxy one behind curtains) that will open the Pandora's Box for WWIII. As we expect, the first and most affected countries in such a confrontation will be Greece and Turkey, not to mention Ukraine that, according to our judgement, is methodically led by the ASB to a dismemberment aiming to appease Russia (dragging it away from APB) and satisfy the forcefully pro-American Poland by offering the western part of Ukraine to it. According to this scenario Eastern Galikia will increase the geopolitical power of Warsaw and its ability to balance the power and ambitions of Germany to the benefit of course of the ASB.

In the context of the above conflicting interests in the fluid geopolitical environment Greece and Turkey face almost existential threats. Either they both win or they both lose. The only way to survive during the forthcoming Armageddon is to quickly establish strong communications and a geopolitical understanding on defense and foreign policy issues. They do not have the luxury to exploit circumstances in order to maximize gains since such a strategy is characterized by high risks. Rather they should try to minimize losses. It is better to employ low profile tactics and exhibit restraint during this highly unstable period and deal with the main core of the problems and differences that divide them at a time when the geopolitical environment will be more stable. After all, during this period their armour plates (defense, security and socio-economic) have a lot of cracks that can be exploited by external forces for their own benefits.

During this highly unstable period, besides the restraint, the governing and political elites of Greece and Turkey should pay the highest attention to develop internally a cross-party dialogue that will lead to common policies on key issues, cementing in this way their internal political front from exploitation by external forces. With reference to efforts of the two neighboring countries to achieve a balancing equilibrium between the two confrontational blocs we note that such efforts are highly risky, requiring three main prerequisites: (a) a strong economy that offers a high degree of autonomy in the defense and security sector, (b) lack of serious cracks in their armour plates and (c) a strong intelligence apparatus supported by an efficient satellites' information gathering system that will offer an extremely valuable early warning for critical events that may lead to a major military confrontation in the Region. Turkey satisfies to a considerable degree prerequisites (a) and (c) that justify somehow its risky geopolitical tactics. On the other hand Greece, satisfies no one of the above prerequisites and justifiably follows defensive low risk policies.

At this point we underline the existence of high risks in the geopolitically balancing policies and the pursuit for an armed neutrality. For example, the Inonu government promoted since 1938 armed neutrality policies. It is possible that during his visit to Ankara in 1937 the Greek prime minister Metaxas had discussed this critical issue with his Turkish counterpart. If Metaxas had in mind to join Turkey in the pursuit of an armed neutrality during WWII his sudden death in the beginning of 1941 (due to poisoning according to several sources) cancelled such a possibility. On the other hand, the original Inonu's pursuit of an armed neutrality was derailed as a result of misleading information disseminated by the German

Ambassador von Papen that led Turkey to pursue a Turco-German (mainly military) collaboration regarding the Turkish regions of Soviet Union in Caucasus and Central Asia. The Nazis at the beginning were positively assessing the Turkish initiative but as soon as they had defeated the Soviet army and proceeded deep inside Ukraine and Crimea they stopped any discussion on it. Inonou-Saratsoglou diplomacy infuriated the great northern neighbor of Turkey and as a result, with the end of WWII, Moscow demanded the control over the Marmara straits and Istanbul. The fact that the Americans succeeded in constructing before the Soviets the atom bomb, in combination with the phobic syndromes of Stalin (regarding the decisiveness of U.S. to use it against the Russia), saved Turkey from a lethal strike that would deprive it from its European territories.

Last but not least, we recall the extremely worrying comments of Chief Rabbi Safed Shmuel Eliyahu, a prominent figure in Israel's national religious movement represented in the Netanyahu government, that the devastating earthquake that struck Turkey and Syria earlier this week, killing tens of thousands, was "divine justice". We expect that the Israeli government, through the appropriate diplomatic channels, has already strongly condemned these comments. According to our judgement, any response characterizing this argument an isolated incident requiring no further attention is completely unacceptable. The above Chief Rabbi's comments should be carefully and in depth analyzed by all sides (countries, religious groups etc) that, according to the above fundamentalistic religious doctrine, have hurted the Jews in the past (Greeks not excluded) and accordingly should be punished by the "divine justice".