

# STUDY GUIDE



ISTANBUL OKAN UNIVERSITY  
MODEL UNITED NATIONS

UNDER-SECRETARY-GENERAL  
ALI DEMİR BUDAK





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Letter From the Secretary General
2. Letter From the Under-Secretary-General
3. Introduction to the Committee
4. Historical Background
  - 4.1. Second World War & Axis Occupation
  - 4.2. Greek Government in Exile & Resistance Groups
  - 4.3. Dekemvriana
  - 4.4. White Terror
5. Kingdom of Greece
  - 5.1. Political Structure and Postwar Leadership
  - 5.2. The Greek National Army & Royalist Groups
  - 5.3. Relations with Outside Parties
6. Provisional Democratic Government Ideology and Formation
  - 6.1. Democratic Army of Greece
  - 6.2. Relations with Outside Parties
7. Foreign Involvement
  - 7.1. Truman Doctrine
  - 7.2. Percentages Agreement
  - 7.3. Involved Countries
8. References



## 1. Letter from the Secretary-General

### Dear Participants,

I'm delighted to point out that it is my utmost pleasure and honor to serve as the Secretary-General of OKANMUN'25. Throughout the three days of our precious conference, different matters on different committees shall be discussed and very important decisions shall be taken on various past and present events that have already or will have a major impact on our lives. From political controversies to social and daily life problems, we will be creating an active atmosphere for our participants to enjoy and remember every moment they will have during the conference and find efficient as well as prudent solutions by having heated and accurate debates.

Heated and accurate debates require a well-executed and ideally placed preparation process. Therefore, our talented academic team has prepared study guides for their committees so that our participants will have a proper document to get prepared for our conference and perform accordingly.

I believe OKANMUN'25 will be a conference where many first timers will discover their inner diplomats and politicians, who had to hold back and keep it hidden for several reasons that no one knows. Hope to see you dear participants to shape the United Nations and Model United Nations to a better and lasting effulgence. It is thanks to our ancestors who guided us to who we are today. Trust in yourselves and stand out for a better world for everyone. Therefore, I would like to remind everyone of a saying from our Great Leader Mustafa Kemal Atatürk,

“If one day you are helpless, don't wait for a savior. Be the savior, yourself!”

**EZGİ AKPINAR**

**Secretary-General of OKANMUN'25**

## 2. Letter from the Under-Secretary-General

### Honorable Delegates,

It is my pleasure to welcome you all to OKANMUN 2025 and this study guide. In our committee, you will be experiencing high-stress environments, quick decision-making, and—most likely—my tantrums (as a joke, of course). Our agenda will revolve around the Greek Civil War of 1946–1949. The end date shouldn't confuse you, because it's up to you, the delegates, to change and redefine this intriguing topic and potentially shape the course of this event however you see fit.

I hope that over these three days, you create unforgettable memories, build strong bonds, and enjoy a truly engaging academic experience. While researching this topic, I came across a number of fascinating and overlooked events that unfolded during the period. As a fellow World War II history enthusiast, I found that postwar conflicts like this one are rarely talked about today despite how significant they were in shaping the Cold War world.

This committee is not just about debating facts, it's about stepping into the shoes of decision-makers, navigating through chaos, ideology, diplomacy, and betrayal. Whether you aim to preserve the monarchy, fight for a new republic, or pursue something entirely unexpected, remember that this is your stage to leave a mark.

I look forward to seeing how each of you transforms history with creativity, strategy, and a bit of madness. Also as a final note if you have any doubts or questions, maybe if you require further reading material, feel free to contact me in any way you can. You can also access my E-mail down below.

**Warm regards,**

**Ali Demir Budak-Under Secretary General**

**[alidemirbudak@ogr.iu.edu.tr](mailto:alidemirbudak@ogr.iu.edu.tr)**



### 3. Introduction to the Committee

The Greek Civil War was one of the first major conflicts to unfold in Europe after the end of the Second World War (Close, 1995; Gerolymatos, 2004). While its roots lay in Greece's internal divisions, stretching back even to the Great War and further intensified by the country's occupation between April 1941 and October 1944, the war soon became entangled in the rising tensions among the victorious powers of the global conflict (Mazower, 1993). The collapse of wartime cooperation, the rise of rival resistance movements, and the failure of political settlements such as the Varkiza Agreement all contributed to the post-war societal environment (Clogg, 2002).

What began as a domestic struggle between opposing political ideals —monarchist conservatism and revolutionary socialism— soon drew in foreign powers, and as a result, the war became the first of many proxy confrontations that would define the Cold War (Siani-Davies, 1997; Iatrides & Waronoff, 1998). Beyond its regional impact, the civil war left deep wounds on Greek society. Entire regions were devastated, political divisions intensified, and the consequences of the war, both social and institutional, would shape Greece's political landscape for decades to come (Kalyvas, 2006; Van Boeschoten, 2000).

### 4. Historical Background

#### 4.1. Second World War & Axis Occupation

Greece's path to misfortune began with the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. Greece, despite not being involved in the first stages of the war, was under pressure from the Kingdom of Italy, which invaded the bordering Kingdom of Albania earlier in April that year (Richter, 1998). The Greek government, following the events in Albania, started preparing for the eventual invasion of their homeland. Through most of 1940, the Balkans were mostly uneventful while Western Europe fell to the German war machine. Italian and Greek relations were mostly neutral but sometimes highly tense due to Italian aggression and provocation throughout the Balkans and the Mediterranean (Rodogno, 2006).

The Greek Government in 1940, led by the dictator Ioannis Metaxas, had an Anglophile approach to the country's foreign relations (Clogg, 2002). Despite the obvious Allies' leaning, the government also wanted cordial relations with the Italians and Germans, hoping to stay neutral and weather out the storm that was sweeping through Europe. These dreams were short-lived when Italy joined the Second World War against Britain and France in May 1940. Since the Albanian occupation, the Greek Armed Forces prepared for the inevitable—the defence of their homeland—anticipating the eventual invasion from the Italian Dictator Mussolini's speech earlier in 1939, designating the Greek State as the "enemy of Italy" (Richter, 1998). The inevitable invasion and declaration of war came in October 1940, and much to the world's surprise, the Greeks were resilient in their defence and even pushed the Italians back into Albania in the following months (Playfair et al., 2004).

Following a Greek counteroffensive into Albania in the early days of 1941, the German Reich, after observing the Italian situation, intervened in the war in April and invaded Yugoslavia to establish a land route to Greece (Stockings & Hancock, 2013). The Yugoslav army collapsed almost immediately from the unstoppable German war machine, and with the Bulgarian entry into the Axis Powers, the Greek front line collapsed. The Greeks held on until May but ultimately lost their homeland and retreated to Crete, which also fell after a German Airborne operation in June (Richter, 1998). Greece was divided between three occupation zones: Italian, German, and Bulgarian. Following the collapse of Greece, many former armed forces members and radical groups began forming underground resistance movements and started resisting Axis hegemony over their homeland (Mazower, 1993).



## 4.2. Greek Government in Exile and Resistance Groups

After the collapse of the Metaxas Regime in June 1941 and the dictator's death in January, two parallel authorities emerged: the royalist Greek government-in-exile and the disorganised but growing domestic resistance movements. The Greek government in exile, composed of former members of the Metaxas Regime and headed by King George II, struggled with legitimacy domestically and infighting due to its physical absence and its association with the authoritarian Metaxas regime since 1936 (Clogg, 2002; Mazower, 1993). Internally, the government was divided between monarchists and moderate liberals who battled for influence over the government. External pressure from the British government often resolved the squabbles of the exile government and determined the cabinet composition (Gerolymatos, 2004). Despite these problems, the government maintained diplomatic recognition from the Allied Powers, particularly the United Kingdom, which was the primary supporter of the government (Siani-Davies, 1997). The Government in exile was heavily reliant on the British for military and political support, including their claim to the leadership of "Free Greece," the official name given to the domestic resistance efforts (Close, 1995). In occupied Greece, several resistance groups emerged after the start of Axis occupation; the most significant and prominent groups are the following:

**EAM (National Liberation Front):** The EAM is a broad coalition of leftist groups mainly dominated by the Communist Party of Greece, the KKE (Clogg, 2002; Gerolymatos, 2004). It established administrative structures in liberated areas, forming a de-facto parallel government which bolstered its post-occupation legitimacy and gave way to becoming a serious contender against the Government-in-exile (Mazower, 1993). This parallel governance included people's courts, welfare distribution systems, and local councils, often with grassroots democratic elements (Van Boeschoten, 2000). Its success in organizing liberated regions during the occupation period gave EAM unprecedented popular support, particularly among the peasantry and working-class urban populations (Siani-Davies, 1997). However, its growing influence also raised alarm among royalists and Western powers, who feared a post-war communist-dominated Greece (Gerolymatos, 2004).

**ELAS (Greek People's Liberation Army):** ELAS was the military wing of EAM; it became the most powerful resistance force in Greece, having tens of thousands by 1944 (Mazower, 1993; Siani-Davies, 1997). Its influence was evident across rural Greece. ELAS was particularly successful in mountainous regions and in harassing Axis forces through guerrilla warfare, sabotage, and control of key supply routes (Rodogno, 2006; Van Boeschoten, 2000). It also engaged in skirmishes and outright battles with rival resistance groups, leading to a fractured resistance landscape by 1943–44 (Close, 1995). Many of its commanders were ideologically aligned with the KKE, and as the liberation approached, ELAS began transitioning from a resistance force to a political-military actor with national ambitions, triggering fears of a power grab (Gerolymatos, 2004).

**EDES (National Republican Greek League):** A right-wing republican group led by Colonel Napoleon Zervas. Despite being mainly an anti-fascist group, EDES was also strongly anti-communist and frequently received British support (Siani-Davies, 1997). The group, with its leader, joined up with the government-in-exile and fought against the Democratic Army (Close, 1995). EDES operated mainly in Epirus and maintained a cooperative stance with British Special Operations Executive (SOE) agents (Mazower, 1993). Its anti-communist posture earned it long-term favor with Western allies, and during the latter stages of the occupation, EDES was considered a reliable force against not only Axis remnants but also the increasingly dominant ELAS (Gerolymatos, 2004). By 1944, direct clashes between EDES and ELAS had become common, paving the way for the fragmentation of the resistance movement (Close, 1995).



**EKKA (National and Social Liberation):** Smaller than the other resistance groups, EKKA was a centrist republican group that opposed the EAM-ELAS forces (Close, 1995). They were hunted down and crushed by ELAS in early 1944 (Siani-Davies, 1997). EKKA's military unit, the 5/42 Evzone Regiment, led by Colonel Dimitrios Psarros, was one of the few moderate alternatives in the increasingly polarized Greek resistance (Mazower, 1993). Its destruction by ELAS was a turning point in the breakdown of anti-Axis unity, and Psarros's death became a rallying point for anti-communist factions (Close, 1995). The event also damaged EAM-ELAS's image among centrist and liberal circles, reinforcing fears that it sought absolute post-war dominance (Gerolymatos, 2004).

Nevertheless, these groups, despite being fractured and disorganised, were the creators of a "Free Greece" and their main goal was the liberation of their homeland from Axis forces and the puppet collaboration government (Mazower, 1993). The Axis occupation came to an end on 12th October 1944 with German withdrawal due to Soviet advances made into Romania, and two days later British troops under General Scobie entered Athens and liberated the city (Playfair et al., 2004). Four days later, the government-in-exile arrived in the newly liberated capital (Clogg, 2002). For a moment, things looked hopeful; peace was thought to arrive in Greece when a few days later, conflict between the monarchist right and the republican-communist Left erupted on 3rd of December 1944 (Gerolymatos, 2004; Close, 1995).

### 4.3. Dekemvriana

On December 1st 1944, the Government of National Unity decreed that all guerrilla groups were to be disarmed. On the 2nd, six EAM ministers from the government resigned in protest, followed by the resignation of the Prime Minister. An unsanctioned peaceful protest by the EAM escalated into a gunfight which were followed by clashes in Athens for the next few days. The Commander of British forces in Athens, General Scobie ordered all ELAS forces out of Athens and began to secure the city. The clashes concluded by January 5th 1945 and ELAS forces began a general retreat out of the capital. Then negotiations began with the Greek government and EAM which was finalised on January 12th with the signing of the Treaty of Varkiza, this treaty provided a fragile peace so that the nation may start rebuilding as the country was in ruins following the occupation. Due to the events in December the country was left shattered politically and was unstable. This societal climate soon gave way to the eventual continuation of hostilities between government and government aligned forces and the KKE led leftist forces and later as the Provisional Democratic Republic (Clogg, 2002; Gerolymatos, 2004; Siani-Davies, 1997).

### 4.4. White Terror

After the Varkiza Agreement, ELAS disarmed and retreated out of Athens. With this development, many far-right and centrist loyalist groups began to arrest or murder the leftist veterans and EAM sympathizers. Thousands were arrested and murdered by these vigilante groups and shattered the already fragile peace that was achieved with Varkiza. The White Terror, rather created more problems than solving them, leading to the last phase of the civil unrest and conflict by creating more sympathizers and driving former partisans back into armed opposition. In many towns and villages, leftist fighters who had once been celebrated for resisting the Axis now found themselves hunted, beaten, or killed. Sometimes by neighbors they had once fought to protect. Local authorities often looked the other way, or even helped the attackers. The state, instead of stepping in to stop the violence, remained largely silent. For many, it felt like betrayal. The promises of peace and unity made at Varkiza quickly rang hollow. As fear and resentment spread, former ELAS members who had hoped for a peaceful life saw no option but to return to the mountains — not as heroes, but as hunted men and women ready once again to take up arms. By 1946, their growing frustration gave birth to the Democratic Army of Greece, setting the stage for the civil war's most brutal chapter (Clogg, 2002; Gerolymatos, 2004; Siani-Davies, 1997; Kalyvas, 2006).



## 5. Kingdom of Greece

### 5.1. Political Structure and Postwar Leadership

The Kingdom of Greece, or the Government side in our committee, was the King-led former Government-in-Exile based in Cairo, as previously mentioned. The King's government returned to the mainland in late 1944 after the withdrawal of the Wehrmacht and the liberation of Athens (Clogg, 2002; Mazower, 1993). The King was mostly unpopular on the mainland due to years of authoritarian rule stemming from the Metaxas Regime since 1936 (Gerolymatos, 2004). The King's government began to reorganize the country with the support of the British forces stationed there. With British and American influence and material support, the nation started rebuilding and began holding democratic elections in 1946 (Siani-Davies, 1997). The political structure of Greece was fragile; the highly popular Communist Party of Greece (KKE) had been banned since 1936 and boycotted the 1946 elections due to the immense suppression of EAM and KKE supporters during the White Terror (Close, 1995; Kalyvas, 2006).

The cabinet structure of the King's Government are former members of the Metaxas Cabinet and the government-in-exile and former right-wing guerilla fighters such as Napoleon Zervas or Iomenes Usliotis. The Greek State was consisted of twelve ministries; the Prime Ministry, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of National Economy, Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Transport and Public Works, Ministry of Health and Hygiene and lastly Ministry of Press and Information (Clogg, 2002; Rodogno, 2006).

### 5.2. The Greek National Army & Loyalist Groups

After the liberation of Greece in late 1944 and 1945, the King's Government attempted to integrate former guerrilla groups like EAM-ELAS into a standing, united national force. These attempts saw some success with far-right leaning groups, and as a result, the Greek National Army (GNA) emerged as a core military institution of the royalist government. The GNA played a primary role during post-World War II reconstruction efforts and also helped restore state control across the country. Officially created in 1946, the GNA drew on remnants of prewar royalists, former collaborators with Axis forces, and right-wing guerilla groups. It was heavily supplied and restructured by British military advisors present from 1944 until 1947. After 1947, the United States assumed this role, seeing strategic interest in empowering an anti-communist military force in Greece to counter the spread of communism in Europe (Clogg, 2002; Rodogno, 2006; Siani-Davies, 1997).

The officer corps was dominated by monarchists and conservatives, many former military members loyal to the monarchy during and after the occupation. Significant numbers of recruits came from rural areas opposing communist ideas, particularly Central Greece and the Peloponnese. These developments deepened the divide between the state and left-leaning citizens (Kalyvas, 2006; Close, 1995).

The structure and doctrine of the GNA were influenced by its foreign advisors, particularly in counterinsurgency and internal security operations. Military campaigns during the civil war often involved scorched-earth tactics, village evacuations, and “controlled zones” to isolate guerrilla forces. While tactically effective in some regions, these strategies caused widespread displacement and resentment, especially among civilians suspected of supporting the Democratic Army of Greece (DSE) (Kalyvas, 2006; Close, 1995).

The growing strength of the GNA allowed the royalist government to establish firmer control over contested territories, with its legitimacy reinforced by international support, especially under the Truman Doctrine. However, the militarization of state power and ideological purges deepened societal polarization. ELAS veterans were largely excluded from service, and purges within civil and security services ensured loyalty to the monarchy and anti-communist agenda (Gerolymatos, 2004; Kalyvas, 2006).

By the late 1940s, the GNA had evolved from a military institution into a political tool central to the royalist state’s efforts to consolidate power, suppress opposition, and align Greece firmly with the Western bloc during the early Cold War (Clogg, 2002; Gerolymatos, 2004).



### 5.3. Relations with Outside Parties

Foreign Relations of the King's Government was mostly with the Allied Powers, with the British and the Americans. Since the admittance of the government-in-exile in Cairo in 1941, Britain was the main supporter of the King's rule and made great efforts to support and bolster their legitimacy throughout mainland Greece (Mazower, 1993; Gerolymatos, 2004). The British were frequently in contact with rebel groups via their vast intelligence networks in occupied Europe and constantly acted as the middle ground between guerrillas and the government-in-exile (Clogg, 2002). The British ultimately liberated Athens from the Wehrmacht and Stationed a garrison until 1947 (Siani-Davies, 1997).

The Americans, after the announcement of the Truman Doctrine in 1947 took over the British as the main supporter of the GNA and the Government. The United States sent considerable amounts of foreign aid under the Marshall Program and many more (Jones, 1989). The United States also sent military advisors to train veteran guerrillas and new recruits into a professional army (Dimitrakis, 2010). The U.S saw Greece as one of the first dominos against communism, should Greece fall to communism, the Truman Doctrine would fail and stop right on its tracks (Kalyvas, 2006).

The Soviet Union on the other hand, had other plans for Greece along with other Southern European Nations. The Soviet Union was against a far-right leaning government and Army but supported a self-determined Greek State. The Soviet Union before and during the Civil War was supportive of the Rebel forces, but after the Tito-Stalin split in 1948 the Soviets started cutting their losses and began looking to other targets for influence (Danforth & Van Coufoudakis, 1999).

The French Republic also had key interests in the King's Government, while being more of a minor actor in the conflict due to their position in Metropolitan France and abroad were much more concerning to de Gaulle's government. Nevertheless the French gave limited economic aid and diplomatic support to the King's Government (Clogg, 2002).

Despite being former rivals, the Republic of Turkey saw a strategic interest in securing the position of the King's Government. Fearing the "Domino Effect" if Greece fell to the communists, Turkey's position would be vulnerable to future Soviet aggression which were already present during the 1946 Straits Crisis (Harris, 1972). So, the Turks aligned with the King's Government and gave limited support and shared U.S aid that was provided through the Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine (Athanasopoulou, 1999).

## 6. Provisional Democratic Government (PDG)

### 6.1. Ideology and Formation

The PDG was declared in 1947 with Markos Vafiadis as its first Prime Minister. It positioned itself as the legitimate government of Greece, claiming that the Athens government was controlled by foreign powers and was a “foreign imposed monarchy” against the Greek people. The ideological principles of the PDG came from the Marxist-Leninist ideals of the KKE, the communist party of Greece. The Provisional Democratic Government was formed as an underground resistance through popular local councils located in Thessaly, Western Macedonia, and Epirus. The PDG is also the spiritual successor of the EAM, which dissolved earlier in 1946 after the Varkia Agreement was signed. Its members were active members of the KKE and EAM who started to organise after the government supported atrocities committed by far right militias across the country. The PDG as we said earlier wasn’t created until December 1947. This delay in creating a separate government was due to the reluctance of creating another government and escalating the civil war even further. Its military wing, the Democratic Army of Greece was created before a central government was established and already operated from the mountains of Greece. The army also established bases outside Greek borders, mainly in Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The structure of the PDG was a “collective leadership” mainly composed of senior and high ranking members of the KKE.

The provisional government operated its own ministries and underground press and had dedicated welfare programs throughout their controlled territories. The ministries of the PDG are, the Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Education and Culture, Ministry of Agriculture and lastly the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.



## 6.2. Democratic Army of Greece

The Democratic Army of Greece (DSE) was created on the 31st of March 1946, after the dissolution and persecution of the National Liberation Front (EAM-ELAS) throughout 1945. What started as a scattered partisan movement made up of former resistance fighters, quickly turned into the armed response of the Greek left against the monarchy-backed government in Athens. During the first year of the war, the DSE functioned as a loosely organised guerrilla force, relying on sabotage, hit-and-run tactics, and ambushes—buying time until a central authority could be established to unify the scattered leftist opposition across the country.

The DSE drew its strength from the veterans of the EAM-ELAS resistance, fighters already trained in irregular warfare. But it also included thousands of peasants, workers, and a remarkable number of women who played active roles in combat, logistics, and command. In a country still deeply traditional, the sight of armed women on the front lines was as revolutionary as the movement itself.

Most of the DSE's operations were concentrated in Northern Greece, especially in the rugged mountain ranges of Grammos and Vitsi. Isolated from industrial centers and surrounded by hostile territory, the DSE constantly faced shortages of food, ammunition, and medical supplies. Unlike the Greek National Army (GNA), which was well-equipped and steadily supplied by the United Kingdom and the United States, the DSE had to rely on whatever it could carry, capture, or smuggle through sympathetic borders.

Support from abroad was limited. The Soviet Union remained distant, avoiding direct involvement. Some material support and safe havens were provided by neighboring Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria—but not enough to match the overwhelming aid funneled into Greece by the West after the Truman Doctrine came into effect in 1947.

Still, the DSE managed to hold its ground. By 1947, it had transformed from a loose partisan network into a more structured military force with command zones, medical units, and training camps. It fought major campaigns in the mountains and pushed back against a far more powerful army for years. In the end, however, it was a war of attrition, and the DSE lacked the resources to sustain it.

What made the DSE stand out was not just its resilience, but what it represented: a people's army born out of the ruins of occupation, carrying the hopes of a different Greece. One that included workers and peasants, and where women carried rifles alongside men. Even in defeat, its legacy would leave a lasting mark on the country's political and social memory.

### 6.3. Relations with Outside Parties

From the moment it was established, the Provisional Democratic Government found itself in a difficult position on the international stage. Despite being formed by leaders of the wartime resistance and claiming to represent the will of the people, it never managed to gain recognition from any foreign power, not even from the Soviet Union. In a world already being split between East and West, Greece had been informally placed within the Western sphere, and this reality heavily shaped the international response.

Still, the PDG did not stand entirely alone. It received its strongest support from the neighboring communist countries of the Balkans, most notably Yugoslavia under Tito. Throughout 1947 and into early 1948, Yugoslavia was crucial to the Democratic Army's survival, providing arms, medical supplies, and most importantly, open access across the northern border. This allowed fighters to retreat and regroup, helping sustain their campaign in the mountainous regions of northern Greece. Albania and Bulgaria also offered limited but useful assistance, particularly in terms of safe havens and logistical support.

However, this support would prove to be fragile. In mid-1948, the relationship between Tito and Stalin collapsed in what became known as the Tito-Stalin split. The Greek communists, led by Zachariadis and closely aligned with Moscow, chose to side with Stalin and publicly turned against Tito. This was a devastating blow. Yugoslavia, until then the main external backer of the DSE, closed its borders and cut off all support. What had been a vital lifeline was suddenly gone, and at a moment when the Greek National Army, now backed by the United States, was gaining strength and pushing harder into guerrilla-held areas.

Despite the ideological alignment with the Soviet Union, direct Soviet assistance never arrived. This was largely due to the 1944 Percentages Agreement between Churchill and Stalin, where both sides agreed to limit interference in each other's spheres of influence. Greece, falling into the British camp, was one of the places Stalin chose not to challenge the West. As a result, the Soviet Union's support for the Greek communists remained mostly symbolic — a few statements of solidarity, some press coverage, but no real aid on the ground.

This left the Provisional Democratic Government and the Democratic Army increasingly isolated. Without foreign recognition, without resupply routes, and with dwindling morale, they found themselves fighting an uphill battle — one that grew harder with each passing month. By 1949, the combined pressure of military defeats, internal strain, and international abandonment left the movement with nowhere to turn. The war came to an end not with a negotiated peace, but with exhaustion and collapse.



## 7. Foreign Involvement

### 7.1. Truman Doctrine

The Truman Doctrine, proclaimed formally in March of 1947, was a watershed moment for American foreign policy and the history of the Greek Civil War. Following the overall strategy of containment, the doctrine declared the United States' desire to support free peoples in resisting subordination by armed minorities or by external pressure—language that deliberately appealed to the situation in Greece, where the royalist government was engaged in a bloody struggle with communist-led guerrillas (Iatrides & Waronoff, 1998). Following Britain's withdrawal from its post-war commitment to defend the Greek monarchy due to post-war economic exhaustion, America moved in to occupy the power vacuum (Clogg, 2002). President Truman framed Greece's internal conflict as a miniature of the larger ideological struggle between communism and democracy. Intervention was motivated by humanitarian as well as geopolitical concerns. The downfall of Greece into communism was viewed as a likely precursor to instability in the Middle East and eastern Mediterranean (Gerolymatos, 2004).

The application of the doctrine in Greece entailed substantial military and economic aid. From 1947 through 1949, the United States spent over \$300 million in aid and deployed hundreds of military and civilian advisers to manage reconstruction and anti-insurgency operations (Kalyvas, 2006). The assistance was instrumental in transforming the Greek National Army (GNA) into a more cohesive and professional force that could carry out contemporary counterinsurgency warfare. The loyalist forces were retrained by American advisors, their logistical systems simplified, and internal coordination encouraged, thereby reversing the tide of the war in favor of the royalist government (Iatrides & Waronoff, 1998). But the Truman Doctrine had profound political implications. It hardened a dualist system that pushed neutral or third-way political options in Greece to the margins or outside of legitimacy. Leftist forces and former resistance members who were part of EAM-ELAS were also excluded or harassed under the anti-communist measures implemented in tandem with U.S. aid (Gerolymatos, 2004). This contributed to the social and political polarization of the late 1940s and shaped Greek politics for several decades to follow. The success of the Truman Doctrine in Greece reassured American policymakers that containment could be achieved and set a precedent for intervention in Turkey, Korea, and ultimately Vietnam. Greece was therefore a proving ground for the Cold War ideological and military conflicts. So, the Truman Doctrine did not merely impact the Greek Civil War—it was the international embodiment of the Cold War order (Siani-Davies, 1997).

## **7.2. Percentages Agreement**

It was October 1944 that British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin signed a clandestine agreement, known as the Percentages Agreement, during a summit in Moscow. The unofficial agreement would establish spheres of influence in Eastern Europe while World War II was coming to an end. According to the agreement, Greece would be 90% British influence and 10% Soviet influence, and Romania would be 90% Soviet influence and 10% British influence. Hungary and Yugoslavia were to be divided equally, and Bulgaria was to be 75% Soviet influence and 25% British influence (International Churchill Society).

The agreement significantly affected Greece. With British supremacy, the UK was at the center of Greek matters, particularly the Greek Civil War. British support for the Greek monarchy and opposition to communist forces were determining factors in setting the nation's post-war path. But the treaty was also a reflection of the realpolitik of the era, where superpowers unilaterally determined the fate of smaller countries, sowing seeds of resentment and setting the stage for the explosion of the Cold War (International Churchill Society).

## **7.3. Involved Countries**

The Greek Civil War (1946–1949) was heavily shaped by foreign intervention, with regional and global powers pursuing their own strategic interests in Greece. The war rapidly became an internal ideological conflict turned into a proxy of the Cold War, with each side receiving material or diplomatic support from foreign powers.



The most pervasive foreign power initially involved was the United Kingdom. Having been closely tied throughout Axis occupation to the Greek monarchy and government-in-exile, Britain resumed participation in Greek political and military affairs at liberation in 1944. British troops played a prominent role in capturing Athens in fighting against ELAS forces (Clogg, 2002). The UK acted as the mediator of initial negotiations between the royal government and the communist partisans. But financial pressure and war reconstruction forced Britain to reduce its aid, turning the burden to the United States in 1947.

The Truman Doctrine was a watershed for American involvement. Asserting the containment of communism was a vital American interest, the U.S. provided massive military and economic aid to Greece under both the Truman Doctrine and later the Marshall Plan (Gerolymatos, 2004). American advisers helped to restructure the Greek National Army (GNA), and trained loyalist soldiers in counterinsurgency. This aid actually tipped the balance in favor of the government, particularly as communist forces were beginning to lose foreign patronage.

Within the communists, Yugoslavia, under Josip Broz Tito, was the most ardent patron of the Democratic Army of Greece (DSE). Yugoslavia provided weapons, training, and refuge along its borders, particularly prior to the Tito–Stalin split in 1948 (Kalyvas, 2006). Albania and Bulgaria followed Yugoslavia's example by providing logistical support and safe shelters for DSE troops (Iatrides & Waronoff, 1998). Such cross-frontier networks allowed the DSE to exert pressure on the Greek military forces, but they did give rise to diplomatic tensions in the Balkans.

The Soviet Union, however, did its share in a more subdued manner. In spite of ideological affinity, Stalin honored the 1944 Percentages Agreement with Churchill, whereby Greece was left in the British sphere of influence (Richter, 1998). As a result, the Soviets provided little direct assistance to the Greek communists. After the Tito–Stalin rift, things worsened for the DSE, with Stalin demanding that Yugoslavia cease its aid, leaving the supply lifeline of Greek communists snapped.

At the same time, Turkey quietly supported the Greek royalist cause. Direct concern about its own war with the Soviet Union, particularly the 1946 Straits Crisis, led Turkey to see communist Greece as an immediate threat. Therefore, it aligned itself with the Western powers and gained U.S. support under the Truman Doctrine as well as Greece (Siani-Davies, 1997). Turkish support was small but diplomatically significant, adding another regional aspect of opposition to Soviet hegemony.



## 8. References

- Athanassopoulou, E. (1999). Turkey–Greece relations: The security dilemma in the Aegean. Routledge.
- Clogg, R. (2002). A concise history of Greece (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Close, D. H. (1995). The Greek Civil War, 1943–1950: Studies of polarization. Routledge.
- Danforth, L. M., & Van Coufoudakis, V. (1999). The Macedonian conflict: Ethnic nationalism in a transnational world. Princeton University Press.
- Dimitrakis, P. (2010). Military intelligence in Cyprus and the Greek Civil War, 1943–1949. Routledge.
- Gerolymatos, A. (2004). Red Acropolis, Black Terror: The Greek Civil War and the origins of Soviet–American rivalry, 1943–1949. Basic Books.
- Harris, G. S. (1972). Troubled alliance: Turkish–American problems in historical perspective, 1945–1971. American Enterprise Institute.
- Iatrides, J. O., & Waronoff, L. (Eds.). (1998). Greece at the crossroads: The civil war and its legacy. Penn State University Press.
- Jones, H. (1989). The United States and Greece during the Cold War: American policy and the Greek left. Columbia University Press.



Kalyvas, S. N. (2006). *The logic of violence in civil war*. Cambridge University Press.

Mazower, M. (1993). *Inside Hitler's Greece: The experience of occupation, 1941–44*. Yale University Press.

Playfair, I. S. O., Molony, C. J. C., Flynn, F. C., & Toomer, H. L. (2004). *The Mediterranean and Middle East: The Germans come to the help of their ally (1941)*. Naval & Military Press.

Richter, H. A. (1998). *Greece in World War II* (K. Sarropoulos, Trans.). Govostis.

Rodogno, D. (2006). *Fascism's European empire: Italian occupation during the Second World War*. Cambridge University Press.

Siani-Davies, P. (1997). *The Greek Civil War 1944–1949*. Edinburgh University Press.

Stockings, C., & Hancock, E. (2013). *Swastika over the Acropolis: Re-interpreting the Nazi invasion of Greece in World War II*. BRILL.

Van Boeschoten, R. (2000). *From armatoloi to partisans: Power and resistance in Greek Macedonia, 1941–1949*. Columbia University Press.