

MULTINATIONAL OPERATIONS, ALLIANCES, AND INTERNATIONAL MILITARY COOPERATION

PAST AND FUTURE

Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop of the Partnership for
Peace Consortium's Military History Working Group

Edited by
Robert S. Rush
and
William W. Epley



**PfP Consortium of Defense Academies
and Security Studies Institutes**

**MULTINATIONAL OPERATIONS,
ALLIANCES, AND INTERNATIONAL
MILITARY COOPERATION**

PAST AND FUTURE

Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop of the
Partnership for Peace Consortium's
Military History Working Group
Vienna, Austria
4–8 April 2005

Edited by Robert S. Rush and William W. Epley

CENTER OF MILITARY HISTORY
UNITED STATES ARMY
WASHINGTON, D.C., 2006

CMH Pub 70-101-1

First Printing

Publisher's Foreword

The U.S. Army Center of Military History (CMH) is pleased to publish the proceedings from the fifth annual international workshop held in Vienna, Austria, by the Partnership for Peace Consortium's Military History Working Group (MHWG), 4–8 April 2005. The workshop was titled "Multinational Operations, Alliances, and International Military Cooperation: Past and Future," and its papers represent the official military history scholarship from eleven countries.

Military cooperation and alliances have always been an important aspect of the study of military history, and the MHWG seminars reflect the strong scholarly cooperation among the group's members. Annually for the past five years, representatives of the most prominent military history offices have gathered in these seminars to examine and discuss some particularly significant aspects of military history. In 2005 the participants focused on alliances and military cooperation, a topic of vital importance in an increasingly complex international environment. Examining historical antecedents in a cooperative forum, such as that offered by the MHWG seminars, will lead to a better understanding of these challenges.

Particular recognition and thanks go to workshop host General Raimund Schittenhelm, commandant of the Austrian National Defense Academy; and cochairs Erwin A. Schmidl, Austrian National Defense Academy, and Ronald G. Haycock, Royal Military College of Canada.

As a participant in this seminar and a long-time supporter of the working group, CMH was extraordinarily pleased both with the intellectual depth and diversity of the papers presented and with the teamwork and camaraderie that emerged within the seminar over the several days of its duration. We truly hope that this example will be an inspiration for many productive historical enterprises in the future. Mutual understanding is the first step toward friendship among our many partners around the globe.

Jeffrey J. Clarke
Chief of Military History
United States Army
June 2006

Workshop Host's Foreword

It is with particular pleasure that I am able to present this compendium of papers presented in the course of the fifth workshop organized by the Partnership for Peace Consortium's Military History Working Group.

In 1995 Austria joined both the European Union and the NATO Partnership for Peace program, and has been active in both fields. The National Defense Academy has participated in many forums in the Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes because, in the "globalized" environment of today, international cooperation more than ever is key to success. And what better form of international academic cooperation can we think of than to have scholars, officers, and historians of countries that were enemies not so long ago come together jointly to examine our common past?

The topic of this conference holds particular importance today. Unfortunately, the end of the Cold War in 1989–1991 failed to bring universal peace. On the contrary, crises and conflicts have erupted all over the globe, and the international community has had to assist many times to end wars, to stabilize countries, and to implement conditions that could serve as a basis for peace in the future.

In our fast-moving times, past experience and lessons are quickly forgotten, and there are tendencies to reinvent the wheel. Examining the outcome of earlier operations, therefore, is not just of interest for armchair strategists or for historians; it also provides many vital tools for planning and executing future missions.

It is my pleasure and privilege to invite you to read this volume of papers presented at the workshop in Vienna.

General Raimund Schittenhelm
Commandant, Austrian National Defense Academy
Vienna
March 2006

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Summary of Proceedings	3
<i>Part One—From the Seventeenth Century to the Great War</i>	
The Carpathian-Danubian Principalities' Military Alliances in the Seventeenth Century, <i>Sergiu Iosipescu</i>	13
A Study of Sovereign States in Coalition Warfare: The Confederate States of America—A Lesson in Principle over Practicality, <i>Robert S. Rush</i>	21
The Relations Between the German Imperial Navy and the K.u.K. Austro-Hungarian Navy, 1871–1914, <i>Rüdiger Schiel</i>	29
The Alliance Proving Grounds: Canada in the Anglo-Boer War and the Great War, <i>Ronald G. Haycock</i>	39
The Dual Alliance and Austria-Hungary's Balkan Policy, <i>Ferenc Pollmann</i>	47
The International Expedition in China, 1900–1901: The Concept of a Sole Command, <i>Emmanuelle Braud</i>	53
<i>Part Two—The Inter-War Years, World War II, and the Cold War</i>	
In the Shadow of the Great Allies: Romanian-Italian Relations, 1919– 1927, <i>Petre Otu</i>	61
Munich 1938: A Failure To Honor Treaty Obligations, <i>Thomas S. C. Garrett</i>	69
Bulgaria's Preordained Choice in 1941 and 1944, <i>Anatoliy Prokopiev</i>	77

	<i>Page</i>
From Isolation to Intervention: Anglo-Canadian Defense Relations from the Canadian Perspective, 1935–1939, <i>B. J. C. McKercher</i>	85
Soviet Impact on the Czechoslovak Armed Forces, <i>Mikhail Stefanski</i>	93
From Commands to Coordination: Defense Industry Cooperation within the Member-States of the Warsaw Pact, 1956–1965, <i>Pál Germuska</i>	101
The German-Japanese Naval Alliance in World War II: Genesis and Extent of a Challenge to Anglo-Saxon Predominance at Sea, <i>Johannes Berthold Sander-Nagashima</i>	109
 <i>Part Three—The Cold War</i> 	
Hungary’s Role at the Birth of the Warsaw Pact, <i>Tamás Nagy</i>	119
The Contribution of the Hellenic Navy to NATO’s Geostrategy, <i>Andreas Toussas</i>	125
The Fourth Republic and the Korean War: A French Contribution to the Cold War, 1950–1954, <i>Olivier Lahaie</i>	131
Cooperation Beyond the Iron Curtain: The Relations Between Romania and the United States During the 1960s and 1970s, <i>Carmen Rijnoveanu</i>	139
Security Through Flexibility? The Federal Republic of Germany and the Change of NATO Strategy in the 1960s, <i>Dieter Krüger</i>	147
Canadian NATO Mutual Aid and the Reinvigoration of the Hyde Park Agreement: A Multilateral Program in the Interest of Bilateral De- fense Trade, <i>Michael A. Hennessy</i>	157
Austria as a Theater of Operations in the Strategic Plans of the Warsaw Pact, <i>János Jakus</i>	167

Part Four—International Cooperation in Peace Operations

Military Partnership of Russia with CIS Member-Countries, 1991–2004, <i>Oleg Belosludtsev</i>	181
Participation of the Russian Military Contingent in the Peacekeeping Operation in Kosovo: Experience Gained and Lessons Learned, <i>Mikhail Georgievich Lyoshin</i>	187
Boots on the Ground: Thoughts on the Future of the Canadian Forces, <i>Andrew Leslie</i>	195
Reorganization of the Gendarmerie in Macedonia: An Example of European Military Cooperation, 1904–1914, <i>Yann Galera</i>	209
Glossary	215
Selected Bibliography	217
Contributors	219

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Summary of Proceedings

International cooperation, whether based on fixed alliances or on ad hoc coalitions, obviously is now and will be in the future a main feature of practically all military operations. It therefore seemed fitting to look more closely into this topic in the course of the papers presented at the Military History Working Group's (MHWG's) 2005 workshop. More than forty scholars and officers from sixteen countries examined different aspects of military cooperation and, in frank and spirited discussions, contributed to a better understanding of many of the problems involved in the endeavor. The conference was organized jointly by Austria and Canada, represented respectively by the National Defense Academy (Vienna) and the Royal Military College of Canada (Kingston, Ont.). Erwin A. Schmidl (Austria) and Ronald G. Haycock (Canada) acted as cochairs, with the local organization handled by Felix Schneider, Johann Bartl, and Ernst M. Felberbauer. Support from the Partnership for Peace Consortium (PfPC) was channeled through Vernon Hodges from the George C. Marshall Center at Garmisch-Partenkirchen. Special credit for their untiring support is due to Brig. Gen. John S. Brown, William W. Epley, and Robert S. Rush from the U.S. Army Center of Military History. Indeed, over the years the continued successes of MHWG conferences owe a great deal to Rush's personal organizational enthusiasm.

The papers presented at the conference dealt with a variety of topics under the umbrella theme *alliances and multinational cooperation*. Taken together, the papers covered several different national experiences during four centuries of history.

In opening remarks, Erwin A. Schmidl presented an overview of some of the issues associated with the general topic. Whereas political-military cooperation is nearly as old as humankind, formal alliances are closely linked to the system of territorial states—a system usually associated with the 1648 Peace of Westphalia—and currently are undergoing dramatic changes that also will reflect on the very concept of alliances. In any case, numerous experiences from earlier operations reveal general characteristics that are still valid today, and one of the MHWG's aims was to deal with issues currently relevant at a time when international associations and other alliance structures, such as the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), are undergoing a period of strain and transformation. In this way the MHWG is able to contribute usefully to the overall success of the Partnership for Peace Consortium.

The broad time span covered by this conference was clearly illustrated in the first lecture (delivered by Sergiu Iosipescu of Romania), which dealt with the military alliances of the Carpathian-Danubian principalities in the seventeenth century. Caught between the big powers—the Habsburgs in the west, the Poles in the north, the Russians in the northeast, and the Ottoman Empire in the south—the principalities in what is now Romania tried to maintain their autonomy by making various alliances and agreements among themselves or with the powers in the regions. Typical of the time, these rarely were written or longer-lasting formal alliances, but rather were ad hoc arrangements. This actually remained the standard diplomatic format until the nineteenth century.

Robert S. Rush (United States) illustrates the problems of balancing the individual interests of the partners of an alliance with the common interest of the whole group in his presentation concerning the Confederate States during the American Civil War (also called the War between the States). In a fashion similar to some of the tensions experienced by the present-day EU, Confederate state governments more often than not sacrificed the Confederacy's common interests in favor of what appeared to be each state's particular interests.

Similar problems half a century later were discussed in the lecture by Rüdiger Schiel (Germany) on the naval cooperation between Austria-Hungary and Germany before the First World War. The two Central Powers were linked by the Dual Alliance, but often had conflicting political aims that strained military cooperation. Schiel also showed that examples of excellent cooperation—such as in the context of international naval operations off the coast of Montenegro (1880), on Crete (1897), in China (1900), or in Albania (1912–1913)—did not necessarily mean that harmony existed on all levels.

Two more lectures later in the conference dealt with similar topics. Ferenc Pollmann (Hungary) illustrated the strains put on the Dual Alliance by Austria-Hungary's Balkan policy often conflicting with German interests in the region. Yann Galera (France) spoke on the cooperation between the European powers in reorganizing the Macedonian gendarmerie in 1904–1914—one of the early cases of what would now be called peacekeeping or peacebuilding operations. Following reports of Turkish atrocities against the Bulgarian uprising of 1903, Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria-Hungary and Czar Nicholas of Russia agreed on reform measures for Macedonia, including the establishment of an international gendarmerie led by an Italian general. This force proved so successful that it was eventually called to assist in reestablishing order in Constantinople following an attempted coup in 1909.

Such were also the early examples of humanitarian assistance so typical in today's settings. Even then there were pitfalls in these early international operations. Examples were well illustrated by Emmanuelle Braud (France) in her account of the international expeditionary force sent to China in the wake of the Boxer Rebellion of 1900–1901. At first, this international force of twenty thousand was directed by a council comprising the commanders of the eight contingents. However, there was no unity of command. In 1901,

German Count Alfred von Waldersee was appointed supreme commander, but his utter lack of diplomacy hampered rather than advanced the common goals of the intervening powers. Their rivalries eventually frustrated the attempts to achieve a lasting peace agreement at a time when coordination of effort was at least as necessary as the military operations themselves.

Ronald G. Haycock (Canada) well illustrated the problems faced by partners of different strengths in the same alliance. He assessed Canada's role in the Second Anglo-Boer War of 1899–1902 and in World War I. Canada's participation in both wars contributed significant forces to the British war effort, but the political implications of Canadian involvement perhaps were even more important because they showed the united stance of the British Empire. But the same participation also pointed out how individual domestic issues can clash with the goals of the major partner(s). Moreover, cooperation did let loose dangerous internal political and cultural divisions within Canada and these quickly emerged, irrespective of the overall success of the alliance. Nevertheless, the same international activities of Canadian (and of Australian or New Zealand) contingents spawned a remarkable sense of nationalism as these junior allies discovered their own national identities and pride coming out of alliance adversity.

Petre Otu (Romania) spoke on military relations between Romania and Italy between 1919 and 1927, explaining that cooperation between these countries after the First World War was based not so much on a formal alliance as on common interests in relation to other powers in the region.

The problems of treaty obligations conflicting with practical difficulties in honoring them, and with *realpolitik* dictating a different course, were addressed by Command Sgt. Maj. Thomas S. C. Garrett (United States) in his paper on the Munich Crisis of 1938 when the Western European powers abandoned their Czechoslovak ally in the interest of achieving a lasting stabilization of a potential crisis spot—or so they thought at the time. Brian McKercher (Canada) spoke on relations between Canada and the United Kingdom in these years (1935–1939) and on the conflicting interests of isolationists and interventionists in both countries. Liberals such as Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie King at first were opposed to “fighting another of Britain's wars.” Although Canada did declare war in September 1939, it was only in 1944 that the country introduced overseas conscription. To that point, conscription had been limited to domestic service. Canadian reluctance to impose any form of compulsion in the Second World War had its bitter roots in the caustic domestic divisions experienced by imposing conscription in 1917 during the First World War. All of this experience proved again that the interests of all alliance members do not necessarily spring from the same well or take the same course.

One presentation illustrated the problems faced by junior partners in alliances: their freedom of choice and their influence in decision making can be limited. Anatoliy Prokopiev (presenting a paper jointly prepared with Ignat Krivorov, both from Bulgaria) gave an example of Bulgaria, which in 1941

sided with the Third Reich and in 1945 had to join the Soviet Union—in this case following the national interest but also strongly limited in the actual possibilities of choosing a different course of action.

Mikhail Stefanski (Slovakia) addressed the Soviet influence in Czechoslovakia in the decade before the 1955 creation of the Warsaw Pact. Although communist ruler Klement Gottwald occasionally called for Soviet military support, the communist takeover in 1948 and the gradual “sovietization” of the country succeeded without an actual presence of Soviet troops. In Hungary after 1945, as discussed in Tamás Nagy’s paper on Hungary’s role at the birth of the Warsaw Pact, Soviet troops were stationed officially only to guard the lines of communication with the Soviet forces of occupation in Eastern Austria. In 1954, Moscow asked the government in Budapest about future cooperation after the occupation of Austria ended—and on the day before the signing of the Austrian State Treaty (which occurred on 14 May 1955), a new agreement was signed in Warsaw. That agreement would become the basis for the stationing of Soviet troops and for increased cooperation among the participating countries after that date.

Particularly after the Berlin Crisis of 1961, military cooperation between the Eastern and Central European countries intensified, as Pál Germuska (Hungary) described in his presentation on the defense industry cooperation among the member-states of the Warsaw Pact between 1956 and 1965. The increasing cooperation in the fields of arms and materiel procurement led to the various Warsaw Pact countries specializing in different military-industrial products, most of which were of the mandatory Soviet pattern. In the discussion period that followed the panel’s presentations, another aspect of procurement inside alliances became evident: the major partner often forces uniformity of materiel and weapons on the junior allies, ostensibly all in the name of standardization and good logistics. Sometimes such a course stifles national creativity over a wider area of military science and production. After 1989, at the end of the Cold War, practically all of these Cold War alliance-inspired munitions industries of the old Warsaw Pact countries collapsed.

Integration in NATO also had its problems. Olivier Lahaie (France) spoke about the French contribution to the Korean War (an infantry battalion and a frigate), which occurred at the time of a major Viet Minh offensive in Indochina and which received a mixed reaction from the French public, partly because U.S. support for the French in Indochina had been rather reluctant in the late 1940s. In his presentation at the conference, Dieter Krüger (Germany) showed that during the late 1950s and early 1960s inclusion of the Federal Republic of Germany in NATO added a crucial element to the alliance, with the Bundeswehr then contributing much-needed manpower that allowed the transfer from the concept of massive nuclear retaliation to the “flexible response” of conventional forces aimed at halting any Warsaw Pact attack. However, the lopsided nature of conventional forces favoring the Warsaw Pact in Europe made NATO’s early resort to nuclear weapons predictable—and

many targets for attack actually would have been on German soil. Despite Germany's desire to participate in the target selection decision process, the United States denied Germany's request. Eventually Germany found itself subscribing to a strategy that actually contradicted its own interests.

In his paper on the role of the Hellenic Navy in NATO, Andreas Toussas (Greece) gave an overview of his country's participation in the organization, and discussed the alliance's role in shaping and combining the interests of the participating countries. In the nature of alliance cooperation, one clearly sees how allies can contribute strategic territory in the form of military bases when other contributions may not be possible. Equally, when the alliance's strategic interests shift, so might the importance of those bases.

Carmen Rijnoveanu (Romania) illustrated that, even during the Cold War, alliances were not impenetrable by members of the countervailing alliance. In her paper, Rijnoveanu described the relationship between the United States and Romania from 1969 to 1978. To a certain extent, Romania was able to be a "mediator" and offer "good offices" (such as during negotiations to end the Vietnam War)—as long as this effort did not conflict with the interests of the Soviet Union. This posture was similar to the roles that Canada and Austria have played over the years in relation to international cooperation and alliance bodies.

Oleg Belosludtsev (Russia) addressed the military cooperation among the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) from 1991 to 2004. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, many successor states were left with no or insufficient security forces; new forces and new structures had to be created from scratch. The Russian Federation was the only country that could build on existing structures, but even these had to be modified to fit the new circumstances. The CIS countries concluded Collective Security Treaties, and the military-technical cooperation and joint exercises are expected to ensure joint reaction against threats facing all countries involved. In 1995, agreement was reached on a joint air defense system. CIS military contingents also cooperated in several peace operations, such as in Transnistria (the eastern part of Moldova), Ossetia, Georgia, and Abkhazia. In Tajikistan a CIS military presence assisted in the process of national reconciliation.

Mikhail Lyoshin (Russia) spoke of Russian participation in another peace operation: the Russian contingent to the NATO-led Kosovo Force from 1999 to 2003. Although the Russians had wanted their contingent to serve in a separate sector (in the Serbian parts of Kosovo where the Russians could have been most useful because of the language and their acceptance by the local population), for political reasons the contingent eventually was deployed mainly in Albanian areas.

Two Canadian papers that were presented dealt with the difficulties of international military operations. Michael Hennessy's paper (Hennessy had assisted General Roméo Dallaire in writing his memoir) examines the relationship between the origins of Canada's North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

mutual aid program and the bilateral, Canadian-U.S. exchange of notes that reinvigorated the Hyde Park defense production-sharing agreement. Little known outside North America, the Hyde Park Agreement (1941) was the cornerstone accord reached during the Second World War that helped harmonize North American defense production. It is one of the pillars of what Canadians like to consider their “special relationship” with the United States.

Maj. Gen. Andrew Leslie also has experienced the reality of multinational operations (in Bosnia and Afghanistan). In his presentation on Canadian forces in recent operations, he examined some of the problems encountered. Political aims and military realities do not always match, and sometimes organizations are ill suited for the tasks at hand: “Hope,” said Leslie, “is not a recommended planning method.” The United Nations, although perfectly suited to organize the more traditional peacekeeping missions, was not made to lead more forceful military intervention—an endeavor that requires a clear chain of command. Also, NATO in its present form was not ready to handle emergency situations. More often than not, the soldiers in the mission pay the price for faulty planning, ambiguous mandates, and lack of resources. Leslie said that if the soldiers can’t do the job for which they are sent overseas, they shouldn’t be sent in the first place. Improved cooperation between military and civilian, humanitarian, and police components is needed in many missions.

Janus Jakus describes Austria’s unique position between two very powerful military alliances, NATO and the Warsaw Pact. He describes Austria as a potential “theater of operations,” based on his review of the war plans of the two military alliances. Indeed, both alliances were poised to ignore Austrian neutrality. What is important here is with the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, historians can now discover what exactly the war plans of both sides were.

Johannes Berthold Sander-Nagashima on the other hand, describes a narrow, almost technical “alliance,” really cooperation, between the navies of Japan and Germany during the inter-war years through World War II, 1920–1945. He explains that at the basis of German-Japanese naval cooperation lay the common wish to revise the Anglo-Saxon-dominated world order of the 1920s and 1930s, especially its naval dimension. He concludes that in the final analysis, from the early 1920s until the end of World War II, the Imperial Japanese Navy and the German Navy generally saw each other as means to and as objects of domination, instead of as real partners.

Before and during the meetings there were three major social occasions. The opening reception was held at the Austrian Army Museum in Vienna, with a welcoming speech by Brig. Gen. René Ségur-Cabanac, the National Defense Academy’s chief of staff, and music was provided by the Austrian Army’s Guards String Quartet. The event at the Army Museum was organized by Marion Unlaub and her staff, with a guided tour of the World War I exhibit led by M. Christian Ortner. The guests greatly enjoyed the fine chamber music, the beautiful museum setting, and the excellent historical tour, all

topped off by a marvelous buffet dinner. The staff ride on Wednesday led to the military training grounds at Bruckneudorf where it was possible to visit one of the Austrian defense bunkers built after 1956, and then to neighboring Götzensdorf where the Austrian International Operations Command's training facilities are located. On this particular day, force integration training took place for the new Austrian-German-Swiss contingent to the Kosovo Force, so the conference participants were able to experience some real-life aspects of present multinational cooperation in peace operations. On Wednesday evening, a special commemoration took place at the headquarters of the Vienna Military Command to remember the battle for Vienna that had taken place exactly sixty years before.

At the Executive Meeting (comprising the 2005 cochairs, the 2006 cochairs, and the MHWG coordinator) following the conference, this year's executive committee decided that next year's workshop will be cohosted by Slovakia and France and will be held in Bratislava, likely toward the end of March or early April. The theme will be "Exiting War: Postconflict Military Operations." This theme will explore such subsets as occupation, reconstruction, depoliticization, war crimes, and the like.

It also was decided that as PfPC reorganization continues, the MHWG needs to adopt at least a two-year planning cycle with a budget projection every year. This will help in estimating costs and in keeping up our profile as an efficient group.

Robert Rush underscored the need to encourage those countries that could help to do so financially. The fact that so many of the nonfunded members were no longer receiving PfPC money once they joined the EU has potentially serious implications for the viability of all PfPC working groups, not only the MHWG.

The publication record of the MHWG is very good. For instance, last year's conference held in Budapest had sixteen papers deemed suitable for publication, and they have recently appeared in a special edition of the prestigious journal of the International Commission on Military History, *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Militaire*. We have secured from the Marshall Center a two-year commitment to publish in English and Russian (because of cost, now the only two official languages of the Consortium) selected MHWG papers in the PfPC journal, *Connections: A Quarterly Journal*.

In conclusion, the 2005 proceedings of the Military History Working Group held in Vienna was a great success.

PART ONE
FROM THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY
TO THE GREAT WAR

The Carpathian-Danubian Principalities' Military Alliances in the Seventeenth Century

Sergiu Iosipescu

The focus of my paper is on the foreign military politics of Moldavia, Transylvania, and Wallachia in the period between two essential changes of their geopolitical landscape: the collapse of the medieval kingdom of Hungary (1526–1541)¹ and the peace of Carlowitz (1699). But first it is important to note that the international status of Wallachia and Moldavia resulted from the Ottoman domination of the Lower Danube and the Black Sea basin, achieved especially under Mehmed II.² By the closing of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles Straits (1452–1453), the conquest of the Christian Crimean, and the subordination of the Tartar Khanate (1475), the Ottoman Empire obliged Moldavia and Wallachia to enter into the “House of Peace.” This was the result of an enormous strategic Turkish-Mongolian pincers (that is, a pincer strategy) that cut through the steppe corridor east of Moldavia and Wallachia (1484),³ despite Moldavia’s long resistance under Stephen the Great (1457–1504), sporadically assisted by Catholic Christendom (especially Hungary and Venice). The principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia lost their maritime frontage (at Dobroudja in 1420 and Pontic Moldavia in 1484–1486) and were obliged to pay tribute to the Ottoman court.

Beginning in the mid-fifteenth century, the great commercial roads stretching from Central Europe and the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea—one through Moldavia and the other across the southern Carpathian Mountains through Wallachia—were governed by the agreement of Poland and the Ottoman Empire and by treaties between the Ottoman court and Hungary.⁴ The relationship between the Romanian principalities and the Ottoman court was shaped by *sulhname* or *ahidname* (diplomatic terms meaning capitulation, oath paper, or protection treaty).⁵ From a geopolitical point of view, these capitulations could be accommodated with an asymmetrical alliance through their particular stipulations and especially through the Ottoman formula “friend of the friends and enemy of the enemies.” The symmetry of the alliance varied with the partners’ balance of forces and general strategic situation. To complete the geopolitical analysis, it is necessary to underline that the theater of war was divided by the southeastern Carpathians—extending from Upper Hungary to the Morava-Timoc corner—and the Balkans.

The catastrophic defeat of Hungary in 1526 was followed by the 1538 expedition of Suleyman the Magnificent in Moldavia. The southeast portion

of Moldavia with Tighina/Bender was annexed to the Ottoman Empire, thus making it easier to communicate around the Black Sea and improved the Ottoman-Mongolian relations. Simultaneously, the Ottomans annexed and fortified Braila (1538) and closed Black Sea navigation under the occidental flag (1540 Venetian Capitulations).

After the fall of the Hungarian medieval kingdom (1541), the Ottoman pashalik of Buda and the Habsburg kingdom of Hungary (Upper Hungary) created a new geopolitical landscape. The first consequence was that Transylvania entered the Ottoman House of Peace, becoming a tributary state like Moldavia and Wallachia.⁶ Its position was improved, however, by the rise of Stefan Bátorý, prince of Transylvania, to the throne of Poland (1575–1586).

In the new Oriental Europe, the three Carpathian-Danubian principalities appeared like a remote Christian peninsula in an Ottoman sea. In the second half of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman decline affected them, but their leaders were interested in every military initiative against the Great Turk that might change the principalities' international status.

The formation of the anti-Turkish Saint League and its thirteen-year war with the Ottomans (1593–1606) were important events. The Saint League, proclaimed by Pope Clemens VIII and the court war council of Rudolph II, made exaggerated depictions of the Ottoman decline. Pope Clemens wrote to the Romanian princes of Moldavia and Wallachia, using one of his most powerful arguments—the Romanians' Latin-Roman origin—to encourage them to join the league.⁷ Well informed on the Oriental European situation by his embassy in Poland, the pope addressed his letters also to the Polish Cossacks⁸ to avoid the predicable Tartar intervention. The Transylvanian prince Sigismund Báthory was convinced to join the league by the Jesuit propaganda. The Holy See diplomacy also included a subtle confessional proselytism. The prince of Transylvania soon gave his agreement for the anti-Ottoman action (February 1594). On 16 August of that year, in the town of Jassy, Moldavia's Prince Aron, also signed a treaty⁹ by which his principality not only joined the league, but also entered the German Confederation. After difficult negotiations, the emperor Rudolph II accepted Prince Sigismund Báthory's pretensions to be recognized prince of the Holy Roman–German Empire and to be tacitly recognized as a regional leader, according to the Saint Stephen's Crown ideology and to the Renaissance reminiscences of the antique Dacia (Prague Treaty, 28 January 1594).¹⁰ Michael the Brave, prince of Wallachia (1593–1600), and his councilors were obliged to accept Báthory as overlord (Alba Julia Treaty, 20 May 1595), and in compensation they obtained the religious unification of the Romanians from Transylvania and Wallachia, under Wallachia's archbishop.¹¹

Wallachia was a real bastion of the Saint League against the Ottomans, and Michael the Brave and his army proved a great value. In the winter of 1594–1595, the Tartar forces were destroyed in Wallachia, and on 23 August 1595 even the great vizier army was seriously damaged. Consequently, by the

common efforts of the three principalities' forces and of some Italian soldiers, the Ottoman army was completely defeated (October 1595). The principalities' success was compromised, however, by the Polish-Turkish coalition. In Moldavia, a new prince, introduced by the Polish army, was accepted by the Ottoman court. The pope was forced to sanction the partition of influence zones between the Holy Roman-German Empire and Poland. After an Ottoman victory at Keresztes on 26 October 1596, Prince Báthory resigned and retired in Silesia. Under these conditions, the war could be continued on the Lower Danube only by Wallachians. The great alliance treaty between Emperor Rudolph II and Michael the Brave (*Dealu-Targoviste*, 9 June 1598) recognized the hereditary monarchy in Wallachia, confederated with the Holy Roman-German Empire. The emperor agreed to send a contingent of five thousand to ten thousand soldiers, guns, powder, and war machines for the entire conflict. After the treaty, Transylvania, Wallachia, and the Hungarian region called Partium made up the Romanian theater of war.¹²

In August–November 1598 Michael the Brave's forces destroyed the Ottoman power on the Lower Danube and even in the Vidin region from the Danube to the Balkans. Unfortunately, the election of Cardinal Andrew Báthory as Transylvanian prince, which was supported by Poland and the Ottoman court, isolated Wallachia (March 1599). Against these unfavorable auspices, but favored by the temporary Ottoman defeat, Prince Michael and his councilors conceived a military plan for unifying the three principalities. A lack of the logistic conditions caused the Romanian offensive against the pro-Ottoman princes to be fulfilled in two stages (October 1599 and May 1600), which meant the union of Moldavia, Transylvania, and Wallachia under Michael the Brave. He established his residence in Alba Julia.¹³

This dynastic union was accepted by Rudolph II, at least for Transylvania and Wallachia (September 1600), after tortuous negotiations. But the rise of a new regional power, a great Romanian principality of approximately three hundred thousand square kilometers, changed drastically the southeastern European balance of forces. It caused the Poles first to support an uprising of Hungarian noblemen in Transylvania and then to mount a strong military intervention in Moldavia and Wallachia—an intervention accepted by the Ottoman court and the Tartars.

Michael the Brave's fall dismantled the Danubian front of the Saint League, but the front's restoration was begun by the emperor's reinvestiture of Michael and, after his death in August 1601, by the new prince of Wallachia, Radu Serban (1602–1611), accepting the treaty with the Holy Roman-German Empire. The Romanians reestablished the Lower Danubian front, reintegrated Transylvania in the Saint League (1603), and obtained the neutrality of the Tartars by a treaty (30 June 1604).¹⁴

Unfortunately, all of this was too late. Exasperated by the imperial army and administration and by its intolerance, the Hungarian nobility from Upper Hungary and Transylvania revolted under Stephen Bocskai, supported by the

Ottomans (1604). The Hungarians argued strongly for the restoration of a Hungarian Protestant kingdom, even if vassal to the sultan. Step by step, the imperial court in Prague was obliged to abandon the Romanians (1604), to accept Stephen Bocskai as prince in Transylvania and in a part of Upper Hungary–Partium (Vienna Treaty, 1605), and to stop the Ottoman war (Zsitvátörök Treaty, 1606).

Attempts by Archduke Mathias, Emperor Rudolph II's brother, to renew the military alliances with Moldavia and Wallachia (1611)¹⁵ provoked the Ottoman Empire. Between 1611 and 1616, the sultan's armies restored the Ottoman court's firm control over the Carpathian-Danubian principalities.

The military politics and alliances established during the thirteen-year war and, subsequently, the ascension of Stefan Bátorý to the Polish throne constituted a true pattern for the Carpathian-Danubian principalities' next sixty years. A summary of these alliances is shown in the table on the following page.

During the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), Wallachia's Prince Matheus Basarab (1632–1654), an ancient soldier who fought under Michael the Brave, was a zealous supporter of the Holy Roman–German Empire alliance. He argued that the Persian and Venetian wars against the Ottoman Empire made possible a Christian offensive in the Balkans, combined with the general insurrection of subjected peoples.¹⁶ Although approved by Wladislaw IV Vasa, king of Poland, Matheus's plans failed because of the Thirty Years' War and the Cossack Rebellion.¹⁷

The alliance with the Vienna court worked only at the end of the great principalities' resistance against the regenerated Ottoman military power in 1661–1662, but even the famous imperial field marshal Raimund Count Montecuccoli could not avoid defeat in Transylvania (January 1662).¹⁸

From that moment the principalities were obliged by their capitulations to support the Ottoman military campaigns in Upper Hungary (1663–1664), Poland (1672–1678),¹⁹ and Vienna. During the siege of Vienna in 1683, the prince of Wallachia, Serban Cantacuzene (1678–1688), facilitated Christian communications and so contributed to the Ottoman defeat at Kahlenberg and Vienna.

The new Saint League (1684) and its victories (1686, Buda; 1687, Mohacs; and 1688, Belgrade) changed the geopolitical landscape of southeastern Europe. The imperial army and diplomacy exerted a strong pressure on the Carpathian-Danubian principalities and, by the treaties of 1687–1690, forced them to accept the “protection” of the Holy Roman–German Empire.²⁰ In fact, the aim of the imperial Vienna court was to make the status of the principalities similar to that of Habsburg Hungary.

The Ottoman military counteroffensive, led by the grand vizier Mustafa Köprülü, was marked by the Turkish occupation of Belgrade on 8 October 1690, and by the Zarnesti victory won by the Romanian forces of Wallachian prince Constantin Basarab Brancoveanu (1688–1714), the Turkish-Tartars, and the Hungarians under the nominal Transylvanian prince Emericus Thököly. These victories contributed significantly to changing the balance of forces south and east of the Carpathian Mountains.

CHRONOLOGY OF ALLIANCES INVOLVING THE CARPATHIAN-DANUBIAN PRINCIPALITIES

<i>War (Dates)</i>	<i>Alliance Signing (Date and Place)</i>	<i>Carpathian- Danubian Principality Involved</i>	<i>Partners</i>	<i>Peace Treaty Signing (Date and Place)</i>
Thirteen Years' War (1593–1606)	16 August 1594, Jassy	Moldavia	Holy Roman–German Empire	—
	28 January 1595, Praga	Transylvania	Holy Roman–German Empire	—
	20 May 1595, Alba Julia	Wallachia	Transylvania	—
	9 June 1598, Dealu-Targoviste	Wallachia	Holy Roman–German Empire	—
	30 June 1604	Wallachia	Holy Roman–German Empire; Khanate of Crimea	—
Thirty Years' War (1618–1648)	1619	Transylvania	Bohemia (Frederic of Palatinate)	6 January 1622, Nickolsburg
	1623	Transylvania	Protestant League	December 1626, Pressburg
	30 November 1626	Transylvania	Protestant League	—
	26 April 1643, Alba Julia	Transylvania	Sweden	—
	22 April 1645, Muncaci	Transylvania	France	22 August 1645, Linz
	22 February 1646, Fagaras	Transylvania	France	1647–1648, Westphalia
First Northern War (1656–1660)	27 May 1656	Moldavia	Great Dukedom of Muscovy	—
	10 December 1656	Transylvania	Sweden	3 May 1660, Oliva
Carpathian-Danubian Principality's War Against the Ottoman Court (1657–1662)	December 1655, Targoviste	Wallachia	Transylvania	—
	4 October 1659	Wallachia	Transylvania	—
	1661	Transylvania	Holy Roman–German Empire	—
Dutch War (1672–1678)	22 May 1677	Transylvania	France	5 February 1679, Nijmegen

However, the Polish inability to prevent the Tartar's invasion of Moldavia and Wallachia also adds to the strategic understanding of the area.

The imperial victories at Salankemen (1691) and Zenta (1697) imposed the peace of Carlowitz (26 January 1699), but they could not influence the states of Moldavia and Wallachia, which remained in the Ottoman House of Peace; Transylvania, however, came to the House of Austria.²¹

The former relations of the Romanian principalities Moldavia and Wallachia with the Ottoman court, even at the end of the seventeenth century, were supported by geopolitical and strategic realities. The Carpathian Mountains, the Belgrade fortress owned by the sultan, and the pincer strategy used by the Ottomans in cooperation with the Tartars—ready to annihilate any insubordination by Moldavia and Wallachia—made any change of the international state of the Romanian principalities impossible for nearly a century.

Endnotes

1. Geza Perjes, *The Fall of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary: Mohacs 1526–Buda 1541* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989).

2. Serban Papacostea, "Die politischen Voraussetzungen für die wirtschaftliche Vorherrschaft des Osmanischen Reiches im Schwarzmeergebiet (1453–1484)," *Münchener Zeitschrift für Balkankunde* (1978): 217–45.

3. Sergiu Iosipescu, "Stefan cel Mare—coordonate de strategie pontica," *Revista de Istorie* 35, 5–6 (1982): 639–53.

4. Serban Papacostea, *Inceputurile politicii comerciale a Tarii Romanesti ai Moldovei (sec. XIV–XVI)*. *Drum si stat*, in idem, *Geneza atutului in evul mediu romanesc* (Cluj, 1988), pp. 151–204.

5. Aurel Decei, *Relatiile romano-orientale* (Bucharest, 1978), pp. 118–39.

6. Mihai Maxim, *Tarile romane si Inalta Poarta* (Bucharest, 1993).

7. Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la istoria romanilor*, III¹, p. 175.

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 173–74.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 193–94.

10. *Ibid.*, III², pp. 76–77; A. Veress, *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei si Tarii Romanesti*, IV (Bucharest, 1932), pp. 185–88.

11. Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare III¹*, pp. 209–13.

12. G. Pray, *Dissertationes historico-criticae* (Vindobonae, 1774), pp. 155–58.

13. Sergiu Iosipescu, "Unirea lui Mihai Viteazul. Geopolitica si strategie," in *Securitate nationala, politica de aparare si istorie militara in Romania la sfarsit de mileniu* (Bucharest, 2000), pp. 240–43.

14. N. Iorga, *Studii si documente cu privire la istoria romanilor*, IV (Bucharest, 1902), pp. 151–53.

15. Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare*, IV¹, pp. 429–32.

16. Ioan Sarbu, *Relatiile externe ale lui Matei Voda Basarab (1632–1654)*, Rudolf Gräf, ed. (Timisoara, 1992), pp. 114–46.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 164–65.

18. Sergiu Iosipescu, in *Istoria Militara a Poporului Roman*, III (Bucharest, 1987), pp. 275–85, 286–96.

19. N. Iorga, *Studii*, IX (Bucharest, 1905), pp. 125–81.

20. *Monumenta Comititalia Regni Transylvaniae*, XIX, pp. 29–33; I. Lupas, *Documente istorice transilvane* (Cluj, 1940), pp. 423–26; N. Iorga, *Documente privitoare la Constantin*

Brancoveanu (Bucharest, 1901), pp. 43; C. Giurescu, "Tratatul lui Cantemir cu austriacii," in *Convorbiri literare* (1910), pp. 277–80.

21. Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare*, II², pp. 329–35.

A Study of Sovereign States in Coalition Warfare: The Confederate States of America—A Lesson in Principle over Practicality

Robert S. Rush

Confederate independence with centralized power without State sovereignty and Constitutional and religious liberty, would be very little better than subjugation, as it matters little who our master is, if we are to have one.¹

What captivates the Americans more than any other event in their history is the Civil War—or, for purists, the War of the Rebellion. Many Americans can name the major battles and leaders, and can describe the opposing military strategies, weapons, and equipment—those topics so familiar to enthusiasts as well as military historians. Taking a different tack, this paper examines the constitutional aspects of the Southern Confederation and its impact on the outcome of the war, and draws a comparison with today’s wrenching debate among members of the European Union (EU). During my research I discovered that the EU Constitution and that of the Confederate States of America are remarkably similar in that each is the foundation for a confederation of states, “each [member] State acting in its sovereign and independent character.”²

Background

The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States represented two fundamental and contrasting points of view regarding the nature of government. The Federalists favored a stronger central authority ideally to promote the strength, security, and prosperity of all; the Republicans preferred limited government in favor of greater local control in the individual states. Absolute power was in the hands of the people. Through state conventions the people had dissolved the connection with England, created state constitutions, and ratified the federal Constitution.³

Abraham Lincoln’s election to the presidency in 1860 proved to be the catalyst for the secession of Southern states. South Carolina seceded soon after Lincoln’s election, followed by the other Deep South states of Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana. As they saw it, the federal government had assumed powers that were properly reserved to the states. The issue of states’ rights was predominantly economic, but it was closely entwined in the day’s dominant topic—slavery. This same type of dispute had raged in

another U.S. region as early as 1814, when some of the northeastern states proposed seceding from and initiating a separate peace with Great Britain.⁴ Later, during 1832–1833, the issue of whether a state (South Carolina in this case) could nullify federal law again raised the question of the rights of a state versus those of the federal government.

The delegates from the six Deep South states convened in Montgomery, Alabama, and enacted a provisional constitution on 8 February 1861. After making minor changes, they unanimously adopted the Constitution of the Confederate States of America on 11 March,⁵ only one month before the firing on Fort Sumter, South Carolina, and the beginning of the American Civil War. The Confederate Constitution largely followed that of the United States, almost word for word with some critical differences. The analysis in this paper will concentrate on those areas where the Confederate Constitution strengthened presidential powers, reinforced states' rights, and streamlined the process for calling constitutional conventions.⁶

The members of the Confederate constitutional convention decided against forming political parties, seeing them as dysfunctional to efficient government. The smaller states, wanting a system that equalized the small and large states, settled on a means by which a state requesting admittance to the Confederacy would need two-thirds affirmative vote in the House of Representatives as well as two-thirds in the Senate, where each state received one vote. With the above rules, the original six seceding states could block any state's entry into the Confederacy if they felt it might harm them. Their action ensured that the adopted Constitution provided security from majority rule.⁷

Ratification was either through the respective state legislatures or through popular vote; however, many of the Constitution's authors were hesitant to put the document to popular vote because they felt the "common people" would not understand it. Many of those writing the Constitution believed that the masses were unable to comprehend issues of state, and they believed that their greatest danger was the will of a majority who did not, and perhaps could not, understand what was best for them.

Organizing the Government and the Army of the Confederacy

Jefferson Davis, the first and only president of the Confederate States of America, felt obligated to select his cabinet secretaries from different states, with the most important positions going to the most important states. His vice president, Alexander Stephens, was from the largest state, Georgia. The political climate was tempestuous because the exigencies of war and the pull of states' rights versus the needs of the central government caused great dissension within the executive branch. During the Civil War years, the government had five secretaries of war and four secretaries of state. Furthermore, Vice President Stephens spent the last two years at his home in Georgia, vehemently disagreeing with Davis' wartime decisions but not resigning his post.⁸

The Confederate Constitution called for a Confederate Supreme Court, with the same powers as that of the United States Supreme Court. The court provision was not implemented because of a sense that “when we decide that the state courts are of inferior dignity to this court, we have sapped the main pillar of the Confederacy” (p. 427). Although Confederate district courts were established, they were in essence “lame ducks”; under the Constitution and enacted laws, they lacked final jurisdictional power because the yet-to-be-established Confederate Supreme Court was to have that authority. The state supreme courts, which had been in existence since the birth of the United States, had concurrent jurisdiction with the Confederate courts, but lacking a Confederate Supreme Court, their judgments could not be appealed. This arrangement was perhaps suitable for a confederacy of sovereign states, but generated more confusion—and inevitable disaster—because no arbiter was in place to settle any disagreement between the states.⁹

As a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, former commander of the Mississippi Rifles in the U.S.-Mexican War, and former secretary of war, President Davis was very familiar with the organization and operation of armies. Acting much as he had in apportioning cabinet positions, with the consent of the Confederate Congress Davis appointed generals from the different states as commanders of the field armies. He alone had this authority, much to the consternation of the state governors who felt they had the right to appoint generals to command their troops operating with the Confederate Army. Davis selected Albert Sidney Johnston of Texas as commander of the army in the West and Joseph E. Johnston of Virginia as commander of the army in Virginia. He also typically appointed generals from the same states as the troops they commanded.¹⁰

During the first year of the war, units from different states were brigaded together. This arrangement caused problems because the states furnished their troops with uniforms and equipment, whereas the army provided pay, ammunition, and rations while the men were under Confederate government command. Because of the logistical difficulties in providing ammunition of different caliber and delivering equipment from the states, the army found it easier to supply the units in the field when they began brigading state troops together.¹¹

Although between 750,000 and 1,000,000 men served in the various components of the Confederate Army over the four years it was at war, each of the Confederacy’s three main armies never numbered more than 80,000 in any battle.¹² After 1862 few states provided new regiments to the field armies; instead they kept feeding individual replacement conscripts into the veteran regiments. This policy was far superior to the method the opposing Union Army used, which activated new regiments instead of keeping the older veteran regiments filled.¹³ Throughout the war, when feeling the pressure from Union Army invasion or threat of invasion, states called their regiments’ home from the main battlefronts—to the great detriment of those generals fighting the war

with reduced resources. In 1864, with Maj. Gen. William T. Sherman's army threatening the city of Atlanta, Georgia's Governor Joseph E. Brown mobilized the state militia and placed them under Gen. Joseph Johnston's command until he determined the emergency was over and resumed his command of the state militia. After Atlanta fell, Brown withdrew his troops from Confederate service and furloughed them home. He then petitioned President Davis to release all Georgia regiments serving in the main armies so that they might come home "to rally around her glorious flag . . ." (p. 740).¹⁴

A Question of States' Rights

The first real test of the new government came in April 1862, when the Confederate Congress enacted the first conscription act that would keep the regiments on the front line and thereby forestall those soldiers with only twelve month's enlistment from leaving while the war continued. The Confederate Constitution divided the military strength of the states into two classes of organized bodies: the Confederate Army and the state militias (the latter term referring to the organized body of men, not to the individuals). The authority governing the militia was divided between the Congress and the different states. Congress had the power to organize, arm, discipline, and govern any part of the militia that was employed in the service of the Confederacy; the different states were responsible for appointing officers and training the militia in accordance with the discipline prescribed by Congress.¹⁵ Congress could call into service all or any part of the militia to enforce laws, suppress rebellion, or repel invasion; the states could call out the militia to enforce state laws, suppress rebellion, or repel invasion. Under the Confederate Constitution, the states could not keep troops or ships during times of war or peace, but they could maintain a militia "being necessary to the security of a free state" (p. 1135).¹⁶

Many of the states' rightists believed that the Conscription Act violated the sections of the Constitution addressing the sovereignty of states to establish militias, and that President Davis or the central government did not have the authority to raise troops directly in their states. They also maintained that any soldiers for national service had to be raised and forwarded by the governors themselves.¹⁷ It was "certainly never contemplated" (p. 11) that Congress should direct the president to assume this power under the general power to raise armies.¹⁸ Governor Brown was the most vocal in this assertion, writing that Georgia had seceded from the United States "rather than submit to the consolidation of all power in the hands of the central or Federal Government. Now the new Confederate Government was moving in the same direction as the United States, for by the conscription act the President was given power not only to disorganize state troops but also to destroy state governments by disbanding their 'law making power.'" ¹⁹ This "late act of Congress . . . strikes down her [Georgia's] sovereignty at a single blow and tears from her the right arm by which she alone can maintain her existence and protect those most dear

to her and most dependent upon her.”²⁰ Brown further insisted that the “states expressly and carefully reserved to themselves the right to appoint officers of the militia” even when called into Confederate service.²¹

Vice President Stephens promoted “the ultimate absolute sovereignty of the several states”²² and took the position that “the idea of getting independence first and constitutional rights afterward was false because ‘our liberties once lost may be lost forever. . . .’ ”²³ It appears that Stephens was putting the proverbial cart before the horse; he failed to realize that for the Confederacy’s survival, the states had to forgo some of their assumed rights during wartime. The states themselves held firm to their rights, to the detriment of the common good.

All parties to this controversy wanted the South to win the war, but not by infringing on the rights of states. Both the United States and the Confederate States were leagues formed by sovereign states, with the unions intended to be the servant of the many rather than the master. Brown refused to allow Congress to be the judge of what law was necessary and proper; instead, he argued that the final decision was up to the states (as with the nullification argument of 1832), and that he could not ignore the “bold and dangerous usurpation” (p. 1156) by Congress of the rights of states and the rapid strides toward military despotism.²⁴ Although conscription continued throughout the war, and to an extent became more draconian, the states still resisted, with the state courts upholding the act in some cases and in other cases exempting soldiers who applied to them.

Throughout the war the Southern states withheld for their own defense, even when not threatened, as many supplies and troops as they could. During the early months of 1861, the seceding states seized their respective federal armories containing weapons and ammunition. Upon request of the Confederate government, they transferred most of the materiel into its custody, although some kept a large part for their state militia forces.²⁵

Governor Brown was one of those men reluctant to transfer any of the seized weaponry until his militia was armed. He used the remainder in an attempt to coerce the central Confederate government into accepting regiments that were organized by him but did not meet War Department regulations. He refused Secretary of War Leroy P. Walker’s request to transfer Confederate munitions out of the state until Walker agreed to buy war materiel from Georgia.²⁶

Before the war, the South operated in a *laissez-faire* capitalist society, with no real relief agencies and the states providing no social welfare. With many of the men away at the front, or dead or wounded in hospitals, the women and disabled citizens at home looked to their governments for assistance. As the central government and the states impressed goods needed for the war effort, the civilian food system broke down; for example, salt for curing was not to be had and cotton cards for clothing looms were in short supply. State governments stepped in to obtain contracts for salt, ordered the fields planted

in corn instead of cotton, and organized systems whereby the neediest people were cared for with distribution of foodstuffs and cloth.²⁷

Conclusion

Analytical research on alliances has demonstrated that larger alliances usually are less cohesive and effective and give smaller amounts of attention to each partner. The greater the alliance size, the easier it is for sovereign states to rationalize why they do not need to meet all alliance obligations because they see partner contributions as just a small part of the whole.²⁸ For the South, in its expansion from six to eleven states, the demand for states' sovereignty while fighting a battle of survival pulled the states and the central government apart.

The states' secession from the Union and subsequent forming of a coalition was based on common need—not for reasons of shared values, institutions, or a sense of community.²⁹ Each state looked out for itself. As expected of any political leader, Brown and other governors saw their first obligation to their states; however, they were unable to see beyond their states and failed to realize that the best defense was in defeating the enemy before he reached their borders. As a result, a tug of war developed between the central government fighting the war for the common good and the sovereign states determined to defend their respective territory. The latter labored to maintain as many forces as possible within the states, whereas the former wanted forces to join the main armies fighting first on the perimeter of the new nation and then within its heartland. In the end, with their states invaded, governors bemoaned the fact that no large centralized army existed to defend their areas.³⁰

Even though the Southern states represented a section of the United States, there was sectionalism within the Confederacy itself. The six Deep South states that seceded first were leery of changes that might be initiated by newer members of the confederation. These states established rules for supermajorities so that they would always have a veto over those states they believed had less conviction in the "cause," even though these border states suffered most during the war.³¹

Although not stated explicitly, the Confederate States of America was born under the principle of proportionality, whereby the central government was to limit itself to taking only those actions necessary to achieve the government's objective. Instead, the Civil War forced the Confederacy to nationalize most aspects of military, commercial, and social life to a degree not previously seen in the United States. This was a sort of "organizational nationalism dedicated toward centralization and uniformity—rather than that of loyalty and brotherhood."³² Even without the war, the extreme sovereign states' rights theory used to build this confederation of states might have doomed it over time because of differences in states' philosophies and economies.³³

This paper has addressed the trials and tribulations of the Confederate States of America in organizing a government comprising sovereign states, and the interplay between two points of view. As noted in the introduction, there are similarities between the period of the Confederacy (1860–1865) and the current EU debate over its own constitution. Here is an enumeration of those similarities:

- power of the central government in relation to the sovereign states;
- proportionality;
- EU enlargement;
- the “two speeds” of Europe, with the old members forming a core group having more voting rights than the newer members would “earn” later;
 - supermajority with 55 percent of the voting states and 65 percent of the population;
- the role of the courts in settling disputes between states;
- discussion of the European Defense and Security Initiative (especially the agreement on size, mission, and other facets); and
- centralization of standards for welfare, employment policies, and taxation.

Many people trace the EU Constitution to the Zollverein and German Unification. Those actions, however, were smaller states joining Prussia, with its monarch maintaining control over all. As discussed earlier, this southern confederation of the sovereign states better exemplifies the problems facing the EU countries today and in the future. At what point does the common good of the whole usurp the desires of those states or countries wishing to go another way?

Endnotes

1. Joseph Brown, Governor of Georgia, Annual Message to Georgia Legislature, 3 Nov 1864, *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 70 vols. in 128 parts (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880–1901), series 4, vol. 2, pp. 738–39 (hereafter cited as *OR*).

2. “Preamble to the Constitution of the Confederate States of America, 11 Mar 1861,” in James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Confederacy, Including the Diplomatic Correspondence, 1861–1865* (Nashville: United States Publishing Co., 1905), <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/csa/csa.htm> (hereafter cited as *Confederate Constitution*).

3. William C. Davis, *Look Away: A History of the Confederate States of America* (New York: Free Press, 2002), p. 9; Richard E. Ellis, *The Union at Risk: Jacksonian Democracy, States’ Rights, and the Nullification Crisis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

4. The White House Historical Association, President and War Powers: “Lincoln and the Civil War,” http://www.whitehousehistory.org/04/subs/04_a03_c01.html.

5. Although Texas was a member of the Confederacy, its delegates to the convention missed the initial session and voted only on the final version of the document.

6. *Confederate Constitution*.

7. Davis, *Look Away*, pp. 104, 106.

8. Lawrence Henry Gipson, “The Collapse of the Confederacy,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 4, 4 (Mar 1918): 450–51; Margaret E. Wagner, ed., *The Library of Congress Civil War Desk Reference* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002), pp. 181–84.

9. *Southern Historical Society Papers*, 52 vols. (Richmond, 1876–1910, 1914–1959), 47 (1930), p. 210; J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, “The State Courts and the Confederate Constitution,” *Journal of Southern History* 4, 4 (Nov 1938): 434, quote on p. 427.

10. Davis, *Look Away*, p. 91; Joseph E. Johnston, *Narrative of Military Operations during the Civil War* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1959), p. 59; Jefferson Davis, *Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* (New York: Appleton & Co., 1881), pp. 308–09. Relative rank also played a part, and the first five generals of the Confederate Army—all former U.S. Army officers ranking from brigadier general to captain—were given seniority by Davis, not from their rank in the U.S. Army, but it appears from the date and class rank with which they graduated from the United States Military Academy. Johnston, *Narrative of Military Operations*, p. 72; Association of Graduates, *Register of Graduates and Former Cadets of the United States Military Academy 1802–1980* (West Point, N.Y., 1980), throughout.

11. Orders of Battle, First Bull Run, Seven Day’s Battles, Second Bull Run, and Antietam. By Chancellorsville, most state troops were brigaded together; with a few regiments of state troops, such as those from Arkansas and Tennessee who did not have large representation in the Army of Northern Virginia, brigaded with other states.

12. Wagner, *Desk Reference*, pp. 237–326.

13. Leonard Lerwill, *The Personnel Replacement System in the United States Army* (Washington: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 1954), p. 87; William T. Sherman, *Memoirs of General William T. Sherman*, 2 vols. (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1875), II:387.

14. *OR*, series 1, vol. 39, part 2, p. 827; vol. 4, part 3, p. 1138; vol. 52, part 2, pp. 735–40, quote on p. 740.

15. *Ibid.*, series 4, vol. 1, p. 1135. Jefferson Davis’s reply to Governor Brown on the subject of conscription.

16. *OR*, series 4, vol. 1, pp. 1133–38, quote on p. 1135.

17. Davis, *Look Away*, p. 90.

18. Joseph H. Parks, “States Rights in a Crisis: Governor Joseph E. Brown Versus President Jefferson Davis,” *Journal of Southern History* 32, 1 (Feb 1966): 3–24.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

20. *OR*, series 4, vol. 2, p. 130.

21. *OR*, series 4, vol. 1, p. 1117.

22. “Correspondence of Toombs, Stephens and Cobb,” cited in American Historical Association, *Annual Report 2* (1911): 655.

23. N. W. Stephenson, “A Theory of Jefferson Davis,” *American Historical Review* 21, 1 (Oct 1915): 84.

24. *OR*, series 4, vol. 1, pp. 1156–59, quote on p. 1156.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 228, 292; Frank Lawrence Owsley, “Local Defense and the Overthrow of the Confederacy: A Study in States Rights,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 11, 4 (Mar 1925): 492–93; *OR*, series 4, vol. 1, pp. 228, 292.

26. Davis, *Look Away*, p. 119.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 280–317.

28. Ole R. Holst, D. Terrance Hopman, and John D. Sullivan, *Unity and Disintegration in International Affairs* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of Maryland, 1985), p. 21.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

30. Owsley, “Local Defense,” pp. 490–525.

31. Davis, *Look Away*, p. 118.

32. Richard E. Beringer, Herman Hattaway, Archer Jones, and William N. Still Jr., *Why the South Lost the Civil War* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), p. 213.

33. Gipson, “Collapse,” p. 444; Holst et al., *Unity and Disintegration*, p. 38.

The Relations Between the German Imperial Navy and the K.u.K. Austro-Hungarian Navy, 1871–1914

Rüdiger Schiel

Within the scope of a dissertation project at the Munich Bundeswehr University, I am studying the relations between the German Imperial Navy and the Imperial and Royal (K.u.K.) Austro-Hungarian Navy from 1871 to 1914. The research focuses on the issue of how the relations between the two navies developed during that period, and how these relations affected the military and political environment, both nationally and internationally.

Following the supremacy of Prussia in Germany against the Habsburg monarchy, which had been established in the battle of Königgrätz in 1866, a German national state emerged in the center of Europe after the successful war against France. The German imperial chancellor Otto von Bismarck then laid the foundation for the rapid security-political rapprochement between the two (since 1871) sovereign and equal countries. The Dual Alliance of 1879 marked the formal beginning of the security-political cooperation between these two powers of the European concert. From today's perspective, this cooperation in the military field is mostly regarded as a cooperation oriented to a future land war. The Dual Alliance had at most a theoretical relevance in issues concerning the navies of the two states. This is particularly true for the possibility of common strategic planning that might have been directed against Russia, which was later integrated into the Triple-Entente with Great Britain and France.

The wording of the Dual Alliance was ambiguous regarding the navy. In Article I there was a mention of assistance with the “whole armed force,” apparently including the navy, but in Article II assistance involved the “complete army force,” obviously without navy involvement. In its practical implementation, only demands and mutual requirements concerning the land forces were derived. This situation did not change in the 1909 consultations of the chiefs of the general staffs of both states in or during the update of those consultations in 1912.¹

Both states did have maritime interests, however, and each maintained a navy. Their maritime interests were not suited to providing the basis for a German–Austro-Hungarian security cooperation in the maritime-military field. Apart from training tours, a short colonial-political intermezzo, and timely limited operations mostly in the eastern Mediterranean, Austria-Hungary focused

its maritime-military considerations and planning mainly on the Adriatic Sea. Exceptions to this rule were the one stationary vessel in Constantinople and the country's commitment in East Asia.² The German Imperial Navy mainly focused its strategic considerations on the North and Baltic Seas. From 1897, its objective under the "risk theory" concept was to build a fleet with its "best war power between Heligoland and the Thames."³ In addition to this primary focus, which was closely linked to the concept of deterrence and at the same time calculated the "global" effect, Germany's fleet performed political tasks all over the world with its transoceanic units. In contrast to the Imperial and Royal Navy, the German Imperial Navy fulfilled additional duties within the scope of German colonial policy from 1894 onward.⁴

The fact that their maritime interests did not overlap played an important role in the relations of both navies—relations that gradually developed into a cooperation. This emerging cooperation became particularly clear in 1909 when the German state secretary at the Reich Navy Office, Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, mentioned to the secret emissary of the Imperial and Royal Navy, Commander Baron Alfred von Koudelka, that a ground war between the countries might be conceivable but it would be impossible at sea. Against this background, von Tirpitz agreed to allow the Austro-Hungarian emissary to take a look at the highly sensitive German construction plans and planning documents for capital shipbuilding.⁵

This first bilateral activity was the basis for a manifold cooperation between the two navies. After they had more or less existed side by side in the first years after 1871, the relations between them became closer and more varied, especially after 1908. With the aim of emphasizing the variety of the relations, this paper focuses on a retrospective and summarized presentation of the relations from the vantage at the beginning of the First World War in 1914.

The highlight of the countries' developing relationship was cooperation in the fields of technology and intelligence. The sharing in the field of capital shipbuilding already mentioned was of special importance. In return for Germany allowing Austria-Hungary to have a look at its extensive plans and their implementation,⁶ the Austro-Hungarian side obviously kept the German Reich permanently informed of their own developments in the field of capital shipbuilding.⁷ The technical and organizational aspects of mines and torpedo technology were highly sensitive to both sides, and for a long time were exempt from disclosure to the partner.⁸ This was particularly true for mines and for barrier operations to be conducted with those mines.⁹ The restrictions were removed for the first time in 1911 when the Imperial and Royal Navy lifted exclusively for its German partner.¹⁰ There was a transfer of torpedo technology from Austria-Hungary to Germany in the first years of the German navy's existence.¹¹ A more balanced exchange took place in the field of radio technique where both sides had an almost equal share.¹² In this area, the mutual support in the transmission of long-distance radio messages played a very important role.¹³

In another form of navy-relevant technology exchange, the two naval attachés escorted firms that wanted to sell their products in the respective partner country.¹⁴ The specific exchange of goods included German guns,¹⁵ Austro-Hungarian torpedoes, German torpedo boats,¹⁶ and finally German submarines. Initially, Austria-Hungary bought two submarines from the Germaniawerft shipyard in Kiel for test and comparison purposes.¹⁷ After those submarines had proved to be best suited for the intended purposes—compared with two other assessed types—five of that type were ordered for the Imperial and Royal Navy in 1913.¹⁸ Because of the outbreak of the First World War, however, the ships were not delivered.¹⁹

Research on the development of the relations in the field of military intelligence offers some of the best opportunities to trace the peculiarity of the two navies' relationship. This becomes particularly clear if this relationship is compared with the partners' relations with other navies. A list of the Reich Navy Office for the Chief of the German Admiralty in 1914 indicates that, in terms of both quality and quantity, the exchange of information between the navies (made through the German naval attaché) was far more important than were those exchanges in which third navies were involved.²⁰ Beginning in 1913, the direct exchange of intelligence between the two intelligence services had been reestablished (and it may be noted that sources offer no information about a disruption, but they are clear that reestablishment was needed).²¹ In the files I have researched to date, there is evidence that an exchange took place, but the contents of that exchange are not known. The quality of the exchange can be estimated from the number of letters sent through the two attachés.²² Research shows that the Austro-Hungarian side paid great attention to the reciprocal nature of the exchange of intelligence information, that is, that the information shared was of equal value.²³

In military practice the two navies cooperated several times in crisis management operations of the European great powers, and this cooperation was sometimes very close. Common actions included participation in the international fleet demonstrations of 1880 off Montenegro²⁴ and off Crete in 1886,²⁵ the Boxer Rebellion of 1900–1901,²⁶ and the international fleet actions of 1912 within the framework of the first Balkans war²⁷ and of 1913 in the Skutari issue.²⁸

This cooperation became particularly close during the 1912 international fleet action. According to a report of the Austro-Hungarian ambassador in Constantinople, the Germans offered their battle cruiser S.M.S. *Goeben* to support the Austro-Hungarian cruiser S.M.S. *Aspern* (alone at Constantinople) in case war broke out between Austria-Hungary and Russia; furthermore, the Germans would request the surrender of the two Russian cruisers that were also there. If the Russians denied that request, the German cruiser would have begun a battle against the two Russian cruisers outside Turkish waters and likely would have destroyed them. The S.M.S. *Aspern* probably would have fought alongside the German cruiser.²⁹ That “near battle” ought to be regarded

as the peak of the relations during the period studied,³⁰ particularly if a declared state of war is taken as a yardstick for such an operation.

The first real combined maritime combat mission took place immediately before the outbreak of the First World War when the Austro-Hungarian cruiser S.M.S. *Kaiserin Elisabeth* joined its German ally in battles against the Japanese besieger in the German leasehold area of Tsingtao in China and was finally lost by sinking after all ammunition had been fired.³¹ Austro-Hungarian and German seafarers went into Japanese captivity together.³²

In the course of operational planning and strategic considerations for employing their own sea forces, both sides did not have many significant items in common during the period studied. Both sides made their own plans. A relevant change took place in connection with the Second Naval Convention of the Triple Alliance in 1913. After the first Agreement of 1900, which had focused only on delimiting the areas of operations,³³ in 1913 the Triple Alliance succeeded in reaching a multinational and, in parts, common agreement. However, this was not a German–Austro-Hungarian project. The members of the Triple Alliance—Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy—together faced the task of waging a naval war to achieve at least a temporary sea supremacy in parts of the Mediterranean.³⁴ This supremacy was to be used, among other things, to relieve the German western front through a landing operation of Italian troops in southern France.³⁵ From the German side, the Italian offer was regarded as serious but not particularly crucial. Austria still entertained subliminal doubts about Italy's reliability as an ally.³⁶ Despite all official and openly displayed Italian manifestations of loyalty, Great Britain too considered Italy an uncertain element for the Alliance, particularly for its relationship with Austria-Hungary.³⁷ It is therefore surprising that despite expressed German and Austro-Hungarian doubts about Italy's loyalty to the Alliance, no alternative plans to the operating concept of the Triple Alliance were developed.

In the field of training, although the sides were inspired by one another, they did not blindly adopt each other's measures and thus neglect their own specific characteristics. This mutual inspiration was mainly the result of individual reciprocal expert visits to training facilities and of reports by the naval attachés on training methods.³⁸ It cannot be concluded that a planned and organized exchange took place.

As time went by, the social contacts at all levels became closer and even cordial, as made evident by reports of unit and ship commanders who had direct contacts with naval personnel of the other state. These contacts reached from the naval leadership³⁹ and naval attaché levels,⁴⁰ from stays at shipyards in the partner state⁴¹ through small combined maneuvers and combat exercises⁴² and the usual mutual visits to ships,⁴³ to marginal events like football games.⁴⁴ Although there were a few negative comments unearthed in research, the personal relationships among the members of both navies were generally positive. As far as social contacts are concerned, there were no recurring basic problems as had been the case in the relationship between members of the German Impe-

rial Navy and the French Navy.⁴⁵ The quality of German–Austro-Hungarian relations obviously was finally so good that, in 1913, the Austro-Hungarian *hafenadmiral* (naval district commander and port admiral) waited with a naval band at Pola station at midnight to welcome a personnel transport of two officers and seventy-eight troops for the German cruiser S.M.S. *Breslau*.⁴⁶ Another expression of the good relationship was the great financial and organizational expense incurred to receive the German guests on ships in Austria-Hungary.⁴⁷ It is interesting that no Austro-Hungarian return visits were made to ports in the German Reich during this period.⁴⁸

A rather significant issue in the assessment of international relations is the contacts according to protocol, including the mutual adoption of military customs, traditions, symbols, uniforms or parts of uniforms, and the awarding of medals and decorations. A clear indication of the extraordinary quality of the relations between the German and the Austro-Hungarian naval forces is the outstanding number of medals mutually awarded, compared with the numbers among other countries.⁴⁹ The same is true for the remarkably good treatment according to protocol that was provided by both sides.⁵⁰ This fact was well expressed in the preferential treatment accorded the German or Austro-Hungarian naval attaché.⁵¹

In the period in question, both navies at least participated in the support of scientific activities. In this respect, the share of the combined German–Austro-Hungarian activities focused on the relatively small area of geophysics.⁵² If we add the medical service, the spectrum is much broader. The relations in the medical field included, for instance, medical care for the Austro-Hungarian naval detachment in Tientsin provided by the German naval medical officer on-site.⁵³ It is interesting that there were no specific bilateral activities in the field of financial cooperation, or “burden sharing,” except for a few rumors about alleged German guarantees for the first generation of capital ships ordered by the Imperial and Royal monarchy and built officially at the risk of the shipyard.⁵⁴ It is not known that the Germans made any requests of Austria-Hungary concerning an increase in the navy budget, but, the navy administrations exchanged information about prices asked by national producers of armaments⁵⁵ and about more efficient clearing procedures.⁵⁶

The relations between the two navies had almost no influence on the fleet propaganda vigorously produced by the two countries. Although both countries had fleet associations that were strongly supported by the navies as well as active foreign branches in the respective partner state, there are no hints that an official cooperation between the two fleet associations took place.⁵⁷

The two cooperating navies adhered exactly to the political premises, so deliberate navy-specific solo actions within the scope of these relations were absolute exceptions. I have found only one example of such a deviation, in the field of technology transfer: in 1914 Austro-Hungarian naval circles disregarded a directive from the heir apparent Archduke Franz Ferdinand to exchange the results of demolition tests with the German side.⁵⁸ Apart from

that one exception, it did not seem that deviations were necessary because no official in a relevant position appeared to object to the increasingly closer cooperation of the two navies.

The previously mentioned lack of combined operational planning might be the result of geographic conditions that did not support planning solely based on German–Austro-Hungarian cooperation. With the inclusion of Italy, the geographic premises improved so much that a combined strategic operational planning began to make sense. This was specified in the two naval conventions of the Triple Alliance cited earlier. The possibility of a failure of the Triple Alliance or of those plans was obviously not taken into account. Despite widely entertained doubts, officials in relevant political and military positions probably did not want to admit such a possibility. Even when Germany realized that its own naval strategy and armaments against Great Britain had failed,⁵⁹ nobody in Berlin thought to exploit the Triple Alliance in the Mediterranean to set up a new action point against Great Britain. Considerations of the British naval leadership of 1912 show that the possibility of such a new approach was not without foundation.⁶⁰

In summary, it can be said that from 1871 to 1914 relations between the Imperial Navy and the Imperial and Royal Navy improved and their cooperation got better. At this point in my research, I believe the two cooperating navies mainly acted only within the scope of their political premises. During the period, alternative alliances were not considered at relevant positions in either navy.

Developments in connection with the outbreak of war in 1914 put the maritime relations on a totally new basis. With the neutrality of Italy, the two sea powers were again geographically divided and did not have common operational plans. This situation had immediate effects. Austria-Hungary focused on the Adriatic Sea, and the German Reich largely had to relinquish its presence in the Mediterranean. Only in the course of war did the cooperation of the two navies become more specific and prompt combined plans and operations.

Endnotes

1. Stephan Verosta, *Theorie und Realität von Bündnissen. Heinrich Lammasch, Karl Renner und der Zweibund (1897–1914)*, (Vienna, 1971), pp. 113–25, 341–50, 401f; Manfred Rauchensteiner, “Die k.u.k. Armee im Zweibund,” in Helmut Rumpler and Jan Paul Niederkorn, eds., *Der “Zweibund” 1879. Das deutsch-österreichische Bündnis und die europäische Diplomatie* (Vienna, 1996), Zentraleuropa-Studien, vol. 2, pp. 245–60; Wilhelm Deist, “Militärische Aspekte des Zweibundes,” in Rumpler and Niederkorn, *Der “Zweibund,”* pp. 261–75; Jürgen Angelow, *Kalkül und Prestige. Der Zweibund am Vorabend des Ersten Weltkrieges* (Cologne, 2000); Lothar Höbelt, “Der Zweibund. Bündnis mit paradoxen Folgen,” in Michael Gehler et al., eds., *Ungleiche Partner? Österreich und Deutschland in ihrer gegenseitigen Wahrnehmung. Historische Analysen und Vergleiche aus dem 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1996), *Historische Mitteilungen*, Beiheft 15, pp. 295–313.

2. Lothar Höbelt, "Die Marine," in Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, eds., *Die Bewaffnete Macht* (Vienna, 1987), Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918, vol. 5, pp. 687–763 (hereafter cited as "Marine"); Karl Gruber, *Seemacht unter rot weiß roter Flagge*, vol. 1, (Salzburg, 2005), pp. 125–54; Karin Winter, *Österreichische Spuren in der Südsee. Die Missionssreise von S.M.S. ALBATROS in den Jahren 1895–1898 und ihre ökonomischen Hintergründe* (Vienna, 2005).

3. Rolf Hobson, *Maritimer Imperialismus. Seemachtideologie, strategisches Denken und der Tirpitzplan 1875 bis 1914* (Munich, 2004), Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, vol. 61, p. 257.

4. Fritz E. Giese, *Kleine Geschichte der deutschen Flotte*, (Berlin, 1966), p. 63.

5. Lothar Baumgartner, ed., *Denn Österreich lag einst am Meer. Das Leben des Admirals Alfred von Koudelka* (Graz, 1987), p. 117.

6. The German side provided a study commission of representatives of the Imperial and Royal Navy with the opportunity to get detailed information about recent developments, particularly in the field of technology in the Imperial Navy. The report written as a result of this study commission can be found among the files of the Austro-Hungarian naval attaché in Berlin. See Österreichisches Staatsarchiv/Kriegsarchiv (ÖStA-KA) MS k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1911–1912, Karton 3; Res. Nr. 19/12.

7. This is particularly obvious from the continuing reports of the German naval attaché in Vienna. His reports about visits to Austro-Hungarian shipyards serve to illustrate this. See ÖStA-KA Marinesektion/Präsidialkanzlei (MS PK) 1911, XI 5–XII/3, Karton XII-2/1 Deutschland/Deutscher Marineattaché Wien und Rom, Res. Nr. 2846/1911; Bundesarchiv/Militärarchiv (BAMA) RM 3/2930, RMA Schriftwechsel mit dem Marine-Attaché in Wien, 09/1911–09/1912, Bl. 206–216.

8. After the reservations against a disclosure of information in this sensible field had waned, at least the Austro-Hungarian side insisted on the principle of mutuality. See ÖStA-KA MS PK 1909, XII 2–XIV 2, Karton XII-2/1 Deutschland/Deutscher Marineattaché in Wien und Rom, Res. Nr. 2733/1909.

9. How sensitive this topic was can be gathered from statements on this topic in the annual reports of the Imperial and Royal Navy. "Considering the strict secrecy of this resort, we must refrain from the discussion of relevant tests and trials" ("Annual Report of the Royal and Imperial Navy for the Year 1904," [Vienna, 1905], p. 11).

10. On the occasion of the visit of the German naval attaché in Vienna, Count Posadowski, to Pola in October 1911, it was decided "in this case to override the existing restrictions for foreigners[. . .]." See ÖStA-KA MS PK 1911, XI 5–XII/3, Karton XII-2/1 Deutschland/Deutscher Marineattaché Wien und Rom, Res. Nr. 4191/1911.

11. Albert Röhr, "Vorgeschichte und Chronik des Torpedowesens der deutschen Marine bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts." *Schiff und Zeit* 7 (1978): 48–50. The fact that a technology transfer from Austria-Hungary to Germany took place even after 1908 is mentioned at least in British files. Because of the high sensitivity of the specifications for torpedoes and mines, this information, however, is to be used with care. See Public Record Office, FO 244/751, 1910 Correspondence of H. M. Embassy at Berlin 12 Military to Naval and Mil. attachés orders; Naval Attachés business Nr. 32, p. 5.

12. Exchanges took place on the equipment status in the signal sector (ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1911–1912, Karton 3, Res. Nr. 62/1911, and ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1914, Karton 5, Res. Nr. 45/1914), and on radio technical achievements in their own area (ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1913, Karton 4, Res. Nr. 167/1913). In addition, results of radio intelligence against potential enemies were exchanged (see ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1914, Karton 5, Res. Nr. 198/1914 and ÖStA-KA MS PK 1913, XI4/3-XII2, Karton XII-2/3 Deutschland/Deutscher Marineattaché Wien, Res. Nr. 4535/1913).

13. Nikolaus A. Sifferlinger, *Auslaufen verspricht Erfolg. Die Radiotelegraphie der k.u.k. Kriegsmarine* (Vienna, 2000), pp. 60, 67, 70, 76.

14. An example is the attempt of Austro-Hungarian firms to make it possible to place contracts, through the Imperial and Royal naval attaché, for Imperial and Royal Navy submarine equipment parts built at the Germaniawerft shipyard in Germany. See ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1913, Karton 4, Res. Nr. 133/1913. On the German side, the naval attaché brokered an offer of the German Gutehoffnungs-Hütte for an Austro-Hungarian tender for a large floating dock to the Imperial and Royal naval section. See BAMA RM 3/2931, Schriftwechsel mit dem Marine-Attaché in Wien, 10/1912 bis 07/1913, Bl. 49.

15. Lawrence Sondhaus, *The Naval Policy of Austria Hungary. Navalism, Industrial Development and the Politics of Dualism* (West Lafayette, Ind., 1994), pp. 45–46.

16. Franz F. Bilzer, *Die Torpedoboote der k.u.k. Kriegsmarine von 1875–1918* (Graz, 1984), pp. 67, 71.

17. BAMA RM 3/2929, RMA Korrespondenz mit dem Marine-Attaché in Wien, 06/1907–08/1911, Bl. 10–12.

18. Erwin Sieche, *Die Unterseeboote der K.u.K. Marine* (Wölfersheim-Berstadt, 1998), Marine-Arsenal mit internationalen Flottennachrichten und Marinerundblick, vol. 42, p. 11.

19. Wladimir Aichelburg, *Register der k.(u.)k. Kriegsschiffe. Von Abbondanza bis Zrinyi* (Vienna, 2002), pp. 477–80 (hereafter cited as *Register*).

20. BAMA RM 5/963, Austausch von Dienstvorschriften d. Marine mit dem Ausland.

21. ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1913, Karton 4, Res. Nr. 26/1913.

22. *Ibid.*, 1914, Karton 5, Res. Nr. 35/1914.

23. ÖStA-KA MS PK 1909, XII 2-XIV 2, Karton XII-2/1 Deutschland/Deutscher Marineattaché in Wien und Rom, Res. Nr. 2733/1909; ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1913, Karton 4, Res. Nr. 106/1913.

24. Carl-Heinz Becker, Jochen Brennecke, et al., “Maritime Chronik,” *Schiff und Zeit* 11 (1980): 72.

25. G. Schefbeck, “1886: Blockade Griechenlands,” *Schiff und Zeit* 24 (1986): 69.

26. “Gedenktage 1976, Vor 75 Jahren,” *Schiff und Zeit* 3 (1976): 63.

27. “1912: . . . im Rahmen des Risikogedankens,” *Schiff und Zeit* 25 (1987): 69.

28. ÖStA-KA MS PK 1913, XII 9/3-13/5, Karton XII-13/5 Balkanstaaten/Albanien; Res. Nr. 3065/1913.

29. ÖStA-KA Militärkanzlei Seiner k.u.k. Hoheit des Gdk. Eh. Franz Ferdinand 1912, Mf/239 Blatt 1f.

30. There are no explicit reports to indicate that naval units comprising either only German or only Austro-Hungarian soldiers engaged in joint operations in the mentioned international operations. The extent and the importance of Austro-Hungarian–German cooperation during the Boxer Rebellion (in particular the seizure of the Taku forts) still awaits research. See Georg Lehner and Monika Lehner, *Österreich-Ungarn und der ‘Boxeraufstand’ in China* (Vienna, 2002), Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs, Sonderband 6, p. 293; Claudia Ham, and Christian Ortner, eds., “Mit S.M.S. Zenta in China. ‘Mich hatte auch diesmal der Tod nicht gewollt,’ ” in *Aus dem Tagebuch eines k.u.k. Matrosen während des Boxeraufstands* (Vienna, 2000), p. 118.

31. ÖStA-KA Marinesektion/Operationskanzlei 1914, I 1-3, Karton I-1/1 Missionen/Stationsschiff in “Ostasien,” Res. Nr. 3671/1914. Apparently, at the moment when the Royal and Imperial Navy was involved in acts of war in Tsingtao, Austria-Hungary and Japan were not on war footing.

32. Valentin Perkonig, “Erlebnisse eines Tsingtau-Kämpfers,” *Österreichische Militärgeschichte Folge* 4 (1996): 54f.

33. Höbelt, “Marine,” p. 712; Karl Fanta, “Technische und operative Marineplanung der Zentralmächte vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg,” Phil. diss. (Vienna, 1998), pp. 433f.

34. Höbelt, “Marine,” p. 720f; Walter Hubatsch, *Der Admiralstab und die obersten Marinebehörden in Deutschland 1848–1945* (Frankfurt am Main, 1958), p. 156f; Hans Hugo Sokol, *Österreich-Ungarns Seekrieg 1914–18* (Zurich, 1933), pp. 43–49.

35. ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1913, Karton 4, Res. Nr. 09/1913.

36. Holger Afflerbach, *Der Dreibund. Europäische Großmacht- und Allianzpolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Vienna, 2002), Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs (Band 92), pp. 776–78.

37. E. W. R. Lumby, ed., *Policy and Operations in the Mediterranean* (London, 1970), *Publications of the Navy Records Society*, vol. 115, p. 13.

38. ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1911/1912, Karton 3, Res. Nr. 36/12, 90/12; BAMA RM 3/2930, RMA Schriftwechsel mit dem Marine-Attaché in Wien, 09/1911–09/1912, Bl. 38–45.

39. ÖStA-KA MS PK 1911, XI 5-XII/3, Karton XII-2/3 Deutschland/kuk Militärattaché Berlin, Res. Nr. 1314/1911.

40. BAMA RM 3/2930, RMA Schriftwechsel mit dem Marine-Attaché in Wien, 09/1911–09/1912, Bl. 129–134.

41. ÖStA-KA MS PK 1913, XI4/3-XII2, Karton XII-2/11 Deutschland/Dockung Goeben Pola, Res. Nr. 4157/1913; ÖStA-KA MS PK 1914 I 1-4/7, Karton I-1/1, Missionsreise öu SMS “Kaiserin Elisabeth” nach Ostasien, Res. Nr. 3732/1914.

42. Erwin F. Sieche, “Österreichisch-ungarischer Flottenbesuch zur Eröffnung des Kaiser-Wilhelm-Kanals,” *Schiff und Zeit* 41 (1995): 4. Austro-Hungarian naval detachments conducted combined combat exercises with the respective German detachment, inter alia, during the international action in Skutari or, prior to this, in China. See ÖStA-KA Militärkanzlei Seiner k.u.k. Hoheit des Gdk. Eh. Franz Ferdinand 1914, 45-12/14, Detachment in Skutari, gemeinsame Uebungen mit dem deutschen Detachment.

43. The visits of German warships to Austria-Hungary are almost completely listed in the several issues of the German *Marineverordnungsblatt* between 1880 and 1914. The visits of Austro-Hungarian warships to the German Reich or German dependencies are listed under the names of the ships in Aichelburg, *Register*.

44. By the way, football games, at least in China, were won almost exclusively by the Austro-Hungarian side. See ÖStA-KA MS PK 1913, I 1-4/8, Karton I-1/1, Missionen/Stationsschiff in Ostasien, Res. Nr. 5915/1913.

45. ÖStA-KA MS PK 1913, XI4/3-XII2, Karton XII-2/9 Deutschland/Deutsche Schiffe “Goeben” und “Strassburg” in Pola, Res. Nr. 2708/1913; Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes R 2269, Deutschland Nr. 138, Marine-Angelegenheiten, vol. 46, 01.11.12-04.04.13.

46. ÖStA-KA MS PK 1913, XI4/3-XII2, Karton XII-2/10 Deutschland/Deutsche Ablösung Detachment für Skutari, Res. Nr. 3186/1913.

47. *Ibid.*, Karton XII-2/9 Deutschland/Deutsche Schiffe “Goeben” und “Strassburg” in Pola, Res. Nr. 2707/1913.

48. The last visit of an Austro-Hungarian warship was made by the S.M.S. *Szigetvár* in 1902, within the scope of the Kieler Woche to Kiel and Neufahrwasser near Danzig. See Aichelburg, *Register*, p. 416.

49. *Marineverordnungsblatt* Nr. unknown (1900), p. 220; BAMA RM 5/1670, Fiche 5, Bl. 209.

50. Österreichisches Staatsarchiv/Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv, PA III-170, Mappe Preußen Berichte 1912, Bl. Nr. 187

51. ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1913, Karton 4, Res. Nr. 16/1913; BAMA RM 3/ 2930, RMA Schriftwechsel mit dem Marine-Attaché in Wien, 09/1911–09/1912, Bl. 129–134.

52. *Marineverordnungsblatt* Nr. 2 (1884), p. 23.

53. ÖStA-KA MS PK 1913, VIII 4/3-4/13, Karton VIII-4/12 Orden, Anerkennungen etc./ Orden an fremde Untertanen, Res. Nr. 488/1913.

54. Christoph Ramoser, *K.u.k. Schlachtschiffe in der Adria. Österreich-Ungarns Tegetthoff-Klasse*, Ph.D. diss., Vienna (1998), *Publikationen des Heeresgeschichtlichen Museums/ Militärgeschichtliche Dissertationen österreichischer Universitäten*, vol. 11, pp. 110–14.

55. ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1913, Karton 4, Res. Nr. 36/1913; ÖStA-KA MS PK 1913, XI4/3-XII2, Karton XII-2/3 Deutschland/Deutscher Marineattaché Wien, Res. Nr. 3352.

56. ÖStA-KA MS PK 1909, XII 2-XIV 2, Karton XII-2/1 Deutschland/Deutscher Marineattaché in Wien und Rom, Res. Nr. 2904/1909.

57. ÖStA-KA Marinesektion k.u.k. Marineattaché Berlin 1914, Karton 5, Res. Nr. 11/1913 [Note: archive is mislabeled; it should be 1914].

58. Ibid., Res. Nr. 145, v. 11.06.1914.

59. Werner Rahn, ed., "Strategische Optionen und Erfahrungen der deutschen Marineführung 1914 bis 1944: Zu den Chancen und Grenzen einer mitteleuropäischen Kontinentalmacht gegen Seemächte," in *Deutsche Marinen im Wandel. Vom Symbol nationaler Einheit zum Instrument internationaler Sicherheit* (Munich, 2005), Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte, vol. 63, p. 201f.

60. Lumby, *Mediterranean*, p. 20.

The Alliance Proving Grounds: Canada in the Anglo-Boer War and the Great War

Ronald G. Haycock

Alliances are an absolute necessity for Canada now and have been throughout its history. The country is both indefensible and unassailable.¹ Moreover, protected historically by only a ragtag local militia and a few regulars, mostly British led, Canada had always been a very junior player in such alliances.² The country simply reacted to events initiated by the major partners who made all of the strategic decisions. Their demands on Canada were of the lower order—demands for raw manpower and some limited technical and tactical skills. Alliance relations were not always smooth, but in time Canadians learned how to exploit their historical circumstance, to mature and so reflect their sovereignty and their character inside the structures. Often this process took the form of acrimonious and divisive debates over domestic, cultural, and political questions strained by the demands of the alliance involvement; at other times the process emerged in the practical issues of who commands or controls what.

A growing awareness of its own national self-interest, a desire to be consulted, and the often prickly subject of who pays the bills are part of the history of Canada's alliance relationships. All of this is both the parent and child of a growing nationalism juxtaposed with the increasing sacrifice of Canadian human and material treasure on foreign fields in the name of the alliance. Two of the seminal experiences for Canada came in the Anglo-Boer conflict of 1899–1902 and in the Great War twelve years later. But it was the Boer War that identified all of the main issues of being in an alliance.

In the hot summer of 1899, as the situation between Great Britain and the Boer republics deteriorated, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Canadian prime minister, was extremely reluctant to give in to the increasing pressure from London to support what he considered the latest British adventurism in Africa. He knew that active military involvement would greatly exacerbate the cultural tensions between English and French Canadians.³ They had already been sorely tested in the recent issues over religious education and French language instruction, and in the trauma of putting down the Riel Rebellion by the French Canadian Métis of the Canadian Northwest a few years earlier.⁴ In 1899 the beleaguered Laurier's best course was to do nothing, but that luxury wasn't left to him as the Boer crisis heated up. Publicly, imperialist Canadians wanted action while the French Canadians increasingly saw no issue warranting a Canadian

response. Indeed, some of them were openly sympathetic to the two Boer republics, saying that this was exactly what an avaricious Britain had done to French Canada 150 years earlier.⁵

Laurier's foot dragging frustrated the imperial proconsuls in Canada, the governor general, the Earl of Minto, and the British commander of the Canadian Militia, Gen. Sir Edward Hutton. For his part, the arrogant and impatient Hutton had openly bragged about having tamed Australian politicians when he had been posted there and he boasted he would do the same thing in Canada. Furthermore, he really did not believe that any Canadian soldiers—whom he described as a “menace”—were good enough to help British arms.⁶ What both he and Minto really wanted was official Canadian government endorsement for British policy toward the two Boer Republics. With the aid of the British colonial secretary and the acquiescence of the governor general, Hutton created a secret plan to raise a Canadian contingent for African service. He hoped to force the prime minister into an official endorsement when the contingent's existence was publicly sprung on him.⁷

Hutton's plans did not turn out quite as he had hoped, however, because his blunt condemnations of Canadian martial skills had twiggged the nationalistic nose of more than a few of the Dominion's senior militiamen, and they were bent on proving him wrong. They mounted their own very vocal campaign to send a separate force that would demonstrate Canada's military competence, responsibility, and maturity. One of most vocal such advocates was the irrepressible militiaman and member of parliament Col. Sam Hughes, who later became the militia minister in the Great War. If Laurier allowed this volunteer group to go without officially endorsing it, it would scupper Hutton's careful sub-rosa planning. As the conflict approached in late September 1899, Hutton in desperation leaked the existence of his secret official contingent to the Canadian press and had the Colonial Office post a letter thanking the Canadian government for sending the force (of which it knew little and that it certainly had not promised to send).⁸

Accompanied by a rising wave of imperial enthusiasm from English Canada, a severe split in his own cabinet, and the prime minister's loss of his Quebec political lieutenant, Hutton's public revelations of the secret contingent forced Laurier's hand. When the war broke that October, he grudgingly announced that the government was sending a special contingent, much the way that Hutton had planned. Laurier was quick to point out, however, that the troops were volunteers and not part of the regular Canadian Militia. Moreover, the contingent would be under British command and Ottawa would pay only until it reached South Africa.⁹ No doubt Laurier thought it was better this way; if anything went wrong, Canada could blame the British.

And so Canada went to its first overseas war. Before it was over two-and-a-half years later, there would be more than eighty-three hundred Canadians in several contingents, and nearly five hundred of them would be casualties.¹⁰ This thirty-four months in the alliance proved very significant as Canadians

dealt with who commanded and who controlled in all aspects of their war effort. First and perhaps easiest were the questions of unit organization and a national Canadian commander for the first contingent. The British had originally insisted on bodies no bigger than half-companies and the total force to be commanded by no higher a rank than major. Certainly the War Office wanted the Canadian volunteers dispersed among British troops.¹¹ But Ottawa demanded that they go as a battalion-size single unit—a body large enough to befit the national enthusiasm and the fact that most were Canadian born. Reluctantly the War Office agreed but pointed out that, in theater, the authority of the contingent's British commander Hutton could be superseded if a dire situation dictated troop dispersal. Nevertheless, Ottawa's point was made and the Canadians were to remain together and be led by one of their own, even though under completely British military law, supply, pay, and medical care.¹²

Surprisingly and perhaps tinged by internal alliance jealousy of the Australians and the New Zealanders who seemed far more willing to contribute larger numbers of troops sooner, Ottawa promptly offered a second contingent. But London quickly and politely refused it. After all, now that Australians, Canadians, and New Zealanders were officially in the fray, imperial solidarity was clearly demonstrated to the world. Furthermore, the war would be short. The British had a very low opinion about Boer or Canadian military talent being able to oppose or aid their own professional soldiers.¹³

What actually happened quickly was a shock. By the middle of December 1899, in what was called "Black Week," the Boers soundly trounced the larger and confident but operationally inefficient British forces at Stormberg, Magersfontein, and Colenso. Suddenly the British War Office accepted the second Canadian force. This larger contribution heightened the Canadians' national pride and the British defeats lessened their colonial cringe over the long-held view that the "soldiers of the queen" were infallible. Then, in late February 1900 while "marching to Pretoria," Field Marshall Frederick Sleigh Roberts' columns won their first big battle at Paardeberg. And it was the Canadian volunteers under their national commander who seemed to have done the deed.¹⁴ Back home, all Canadians felt the instant surge of national pride that can only be won by force of arms. Until this first foreign victory was replaced by the Canadian Corps' heroic and bloody feats at Vimy Ridge in April 1917, Paardeberg remained the most singular military accomplishment of the nation. As for the soldiers, this was not only a mostly Canadian-born force but also a highly literate one. Canada's soldiers wrote home both to family and newspapers about it all—the good, the bad, and the ugly. For their part, Canadians increasingly devoured any war news because the British seemed reluctant to share much information. This fact alone made Canadians much more alert to and critical of imperial ways.¹⁵

Over the next two years, as the war ground through its long guerrilla stage and the rest of the Canadians arrived, clearly the British were seriously deficient in caring for the colonials in their charge and for themselves. Food

was intermittent and of low quality; uniforms and equipment were inadequate for extremes of cold and heat; and troops sometimes were in rags. British pay was less than Canadian militiamen got at home and that irked. But worst of all was the decrepit British Army Medical Services. In fact, disease rather than the “silky whine of Mauser” caused most of the casualties. But those Canadian families back home who were affected by either—and one of them was Canada’s militia minister who lost his only son—were more than anxious to make sure their soldiers got the best care and recognition.¹⁶ Canadians were learning that alliance interests had to be worthy of national sacrifice.

War was also expensive. Increasingly, Canadians felt that if their human wealth and tax dollars were being expended in the alliance, there should be some financial offsets, so they lobbied hard to win British Army contracts and to secure Canadian business opportunities in South Africa. Most of the big contracts, however, remained in Britain. Fortunately, the conflict was good for Canadian agricultural, raw resource, and some banking businesses, and it certainly gave a new assertiveness to Canadian international dealings.¹⁷

When the war was over in May 1902, Laurier was relieved that the nation had come through it as unified as it had. But clearly this unity was fragile and narrowly maintained. The fighting prowess of Canada’s soldiers helped obviate the national divisions let loose by the war. Nevertheless, the prime minister was determined that such future support for Britain would not be automatic, nor would it set any precedent.

In the next decade that he remained in office, Laurier steadily worked on securing more sovereignty while still remaining in the alliance. For instance, when the British proposed an integrated Army of the Empire, Laurier resisted even though British doctrine, training, and equipment remained the model for Canada. Gone was the naive assumption that if Canada helped England in her foreign wars, then England would help Canada.¹⁸ This was made patently clear when Britain sided with the Americans against their so-called Senior Dominion over the Alaska panhandle territorial dispute just after the Boer War. By 1909 Laurier had established a Department of External Affairs and was insisting that the nation handle more of its own affairs abroad. The following year, during the acrimonious naval debates in which the British Admiralty wanted the colonies to make direct man, ship, and money contributions to a truly imperial navy, Laurier instead established the national naval service, the Royal Canadian Navy, with the proviso that only Ottawa could decide if it was to be put at England’s disposal.¹⁹

The Boer War also produced nationalist and sovereign impulses within Canada’s Department of Militia and Defence. First, the Canadian cabinet fired the haughty British commander Gen. Sir Edward Hutton for political meddling and usurping civil primacy.²⁰ At war’s end, the militia minister initiated a three-part policy of creating a citizen militia, lessening British influence by increasing domestic military efficiency, and cooperating but not integrating with British arms. Ironically, one harmful aspect of the Boer War experience

was the preponderant faith that this minister and many other Canadians placed in the natural prowess of citizen volunteers over professional soldiers. Fighting in the Boer War alliance and British defeats seemed to support that belief—but it was wrong.²¹ Had the British been less arrogant at the command level and better professionals in South Africa, there might have been a worthy model for the junior allies.

In 1904 a new Militia Act righted the chronic confusion in civil military relations between British soldiers serving in Canada and their Canadian defense ministers. Henceforth, Canadian politicians were clearly in charge. Then the defense minister opened top command of the militia to a Canadian and promptly added all sorts of military services to modernize and give better care to the soldiers. During the war, when the British could not or would not supply Canada with modern small arms—as they said, because the British requirements came first—militia minister Sir Frederick W. Borden (a cousin and political opposite of Sir Robert Borden, who became the Conservative prime minister of Canada in late 1919) adopted a rifle of advanced design to be made in Canada—a rifle completely different from the one in imperial service.²²

For Canada, participation in the Boer War as part of the British alliance structure was a seminal event because it tested nearly all of the issues experienced by junior members in such associations to the present day. And so it was repeated during Canada's involvement at Britain's side in the Great War twelve years later. The conflict differed profoundly in intensity, size, and suffering, but the alliance issues were remarkably similar.

By the time that the Great War's armistice came in November 1918, Canada had nearly three-quarters of a million people in its armed forces with one hundred thousand casualties and more than sixty thousand dead. During the four years of war, Canadians experienced both bloody victory and defeat. The nation bitterly divided over both the cost and the participation in a war that seemed to a significant part of the population not to be within Canada's interests.

At first, the senior ally wanted only Canada's manpower. Again, the Canadian militia minister had to insist that the troops be kept together as one formation that grew so rapidly it became a corps of four heavy divisions.²³ It was a seesaw struggle to get Canadians in command of their top formation—the Canadian Corps. A British reluctance to give it up and a lack of qualified Canadians to take it over meant the process took three years of battle experiences and diplomatic wrangles.²⁴ In the beginning, Canada had no representatives either at British General Headquarters or in the War Cabinet. There was little consultation about the disposition of Canadian troops, and information about casualties or war news was no easier to obtain. A frustrated militia minister appointed his own "eyewitnesses" to find out what was going on—the first one was Lord Beaverbrook, an expatriate Canadian with strong Ottawa ties who was then a prominent British member

of parliament and influential newspaper publisher. The Canadian government also had to insist that notifications about its dead and wounded be made in its own name, not Britain's. And it created its own organization to publicize the Canadian war effort.²⁵ Several times during conflict, notably after the battles around Ypres and the Somme, the anxious Canadian prime minister and his aggressive militia minister went to Britain both to object to the slaughter and to seek information.²⁶ All Canadians wanted to know that their troops, suffering and dying in such numbers, had adequate care. More than once a serious brouhaha erupted between Ottawa and London over the inadequacy of the medical services. In addition, the War Office's rejection of much Canadian-made equipment (such as the Ross Rifle or military transports) raised nationalist hackles.²⁷ It seemed to Canadian politicians and depression-stressed businessmen alike that Britain placed most of its massive and lucrative war contracts with the United States while only wanting more and more Canadian soldiers for the killing fields.²⁸

By late 1916 much of the antagonism between the junior and senior ally was forcefully lessened when the Canadian government consolidated its authority by creating a Ministry of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada in London. The ministry was responsible directly to the Canadian cabinet to run its war effort overseas.²⁹ By the following year, the Canadian prime minister was actively participating in the British War Cabinet. No doubt some of this newfound Canadian sovereignty within the alliance resulted from British Prime Minister David Lloyd George's ongoing battle with the "trade union of the generals" as he sought to assert his own and civilian power over them. Perhaps it was a sort of alliance within an alliance in which Lloyd George recognized Canada as a junior but sovereign partner because he needed Canada.³⁰ Certainly Britain needed Canadian troops, munitions, and food stuffs. When the Treaty of Versailles negotiations came in 1919, the Canadian prime minister spent many months in England or Paris, ensuring that Canadian interests were nationally represented. His efforts resulted in Canada gaining separate recognition both at Versailles and in the League of Nations, and in being regarded as an integral part of the British Empire.³¹ It was clearly what the sixty thousand Canadians who died in the Great War deserved. But it would not have been so clear had not all the alliance issues been identified in the earlier South African conflict and then pursued vigorously.

Endnotes

1. Desmond Morton, "Defending the Indefensible: Some Perspectives on Canadian Defence, 1867–1987," *International Journal*, 42: 627–44.

2. Stephen Harris, *Canadian Brass: The Making of a Professional Army, 1860–1939* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), chapters 1 through 5.

3. Henri Bourassa, "The French Canadian in the British Empire," in Carl Berger, ed., *Imperialism and Nationalism: A Conflict in Canadian Thought* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1969), pp. 67–73.

4. Peter B. Waite, *Canada 1874–1896: Arduous Destiny* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971), chapters 9 through 13.

5. Carman Miller, *Painting the Map Red: Canada and the South African War, 1899–1902* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1993), pp. 16–30.

6. Library and Archives of Canada, (hereafter cited as LAC), Manuscript Group [MG] 27, II, D23, Sir Sam Hughes, *Papers*, vol. 1, f 11, speech by Sam Hughes, MP, on the Active Militia-Training of Officers, House of Commons, 14 Apr 1902, pp. 1–14. Hughes was highly critical of obsolete British tactics. Well before the war, he had predicted that the British army would pay dearly for its obsolete ways. It did!

7. Norman Penlington, “General Hutton and the Problem of Military Imperialism in Canada, 1898–1900,” *Canadian Historical Review* 24 (1943): 156–71.

8. Parliament of Canada, House of Commons, 1900, *Sessional Papers* 77, “Copies of All Correspondence, Telegrams, and Cablegrams That May Have Passed between Major General Hutton and Lieut-Col Sam Hughes . . . in Connection with His Volunteering for Service in South Africa. . . .” Also see Ronald G. Haycock, *Sam Hughes: The Public Career of a Controversial Canadian, 1885–1916* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), pp. 67–82.

9. LAC, The Earl of Minto *Papers*, MG 27, II, B1, vol. 18, Hutton to Minto, 18 Jan 1900; and C. P. Stacey, *Canada and the Age of Conflict: A History of Canadian External Policies, Vol. 1: 1867–1921* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1977), pp. 57–71.

10. Brian A. Reid, *Our Little Field Army: The Canadians in South Africa* (St. Catharines, Ont.: Vanwell Publishing, 1996), pp. 9–13.

11. Desmond Morton, *The Canadian General: Sir William Otter* (Toronto: Hakkert, 1974), pp. 160–66.

12. LAC, *Hughes Papers*, MG 27, II, D23, vol. 2 contains Hughes’s reactions to the British regular soldiers’ disdain for Canadian militia talent.

13. For the assessment, see LAC, Sir E. T. H. Hutton *Papers*, MG 21, G3, Hutton to Buller, 18 Jun 1899; *ibid.*, Hughes to Hutton, 10 Oct 1899; LAC, Sir Wilfrid Laurier *Papers*, MG 26, C769, Hughes to Laurier, 4 Oct 1899, pp. 37831–34.

14. Lord Thomas Pakenham, *The Boer War* (New York: Random House, 1979). Chapters 18, 19, 20, and 21 describe in detail the defeats of British arms during “Black Week.” Nobody was more surprised at the Canadian victory . . . unless it was Hutton!

15. Parliament of Canada, *Debates of the House of Commons*, 14 Apr 1902. Also see Miller, *Painting the Map Red*, p. xiii, in which he describes the public craving for and the wide reportage of the war, especially by the soldiers themselves where “each one almost to a man [was] a war correspondent.”

16. W. Hart-McHarg, *From Quebec to Pretoria with the Royal Canadian Regiment* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1902), pp. 154–58. This is a first-hand description of the bad conditions. Also see J. Castell Hopkins and Murat Halstead, *South Africa and the British-Boer War*, vol. 2 (Toronto: War Book Publishing, 1900), pp. 681–97; Morton, *Canadian General*, p. 203; Miller, *Painting the Map Red*, pp. 119–22; and the *Hansard Index* [record of the proceedings of the Canadian House of Commons], 6 Jun 1900, p. 6790.

17. Miller, *Painting the Map Red*, pp. 424–28.

18. Joseph Schull, *Laurier: The First Canadian* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 356–57, 407–08, 465, 480–501.

19. *Hansard Index*, 11 Jul 1905, p. 9180; Richard A. Preston, *Canada and “Imperial Defence”* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1964), chapter 13; John Hilliker, *Canada’s Department of External Affairs: The Early Years, 1909–1946* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1990), chapter 1.

20. Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Sir F. W. Borden *Papers*, OLB, vol. 12, p. 922, Borden to Hutton, 10 Feb 1900; Desmond Morton, *Ministers and Generals: Politics and the Canadian Militia, 1867–1904* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), pp. 156–60.

21. Miller (*Painting the Map Red* pp. 9, 72) describes the “militia myth” in Canada; also see Haycock, *Sam Hughes*, chapters 1, 2, 6, 9, 10.

22. Carmen Miller, "Sir Frederick William Borden and Military Reform, 1896–1911," *Canadian Historical Review*, 50, 3 (Sep 1969), pp. 265–84 .
23. Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada* (Edmonton, Ont.: Hurtig, 1985).
24. Harris, *Canadian Brass*, p. 111.
25. Archer Fortescue Duguid, *Official History of the Canadian Forces in the Great War, 1914–1919*, vol. 1 (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1938), appendix 229, pp. 162–72; Haycock, *Sam Hughes*, pp. 258–87; Desmond Morton, *A Peculiar Kind of Politics: Canada's Overseas Ministry in the First World*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), pp. 47–90.
26. Government of Canada, *Documents on Canadian External Relations*, vol. 1, 1909–1918, no. 165 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1967), PM to Acting High Commissioner in the United Kingdom 30 Oct 1915; *ibid.*, no. 171, Acting High Commissioner to CO, 3 Nov 1915 (hereafter cited as *External Relations Documents*).
27. LAC, *Hughes Papers*, MG 27, II, D23, Hughes to Borden, 1 Sep 1916.
28. *External Relations Documents*, vol. 1, no. 128, PM to Acting High Commissioner in the United Kingdom, 14 Jun 1915.
29. *Ibid.*, no. 252, Order in Council: PC 2651, annex "Ordinance for the Constitution of the Ministry of Overseas Forces of Canada," 28 Oct 1916.
30. *Ibid.*, no. 475, PM to Acting PM, London, 5 Apr 1917, private; *ibid.*, no. 476, Extracts from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Imperial War Conference, "Constitution of the Empire," 16 Apr 1917. All of the Canadian frustrations over the war are revealed in the Canadian PM's June 1918 secret memo on the state of relations in the alliance. See *ibid.*, no. 341, "Memorandum by the Prime Minister," London, 15 Jun 1918, secret.
31. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, *The Paris Peace Conference of 1919*, no. 101 "Full Power Issued by H. M. the King to the Prime Minister," 10 Apr 1919; *ibid.*, no. 54, PM to the Prime Minister, U.K., requests representation on the League of Nations Commission similar to other small nations, 6 Feb 1919. For a good survey of Anglo-Canadian relations during the war and at the peace conference, see R. Craig Brown, "Sir Robert Borden, the Great War and Anglo-Canadian Relations," in D. G. Creighton and J. S. Moir, eds., *Character and Circumstance: Essays in Honour of Donald Grant Creighton* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1970), pp. 201–24.

The Dual Alliance and Austria-Hungary's Balkan Policy

Ferenc Pollmann

Discussing the causes of the outbreak of the First World War, international historiography usually acknowledges the importance of the system of secret alliances that divided the main European states into two hostile groups. At this point, scholars chiefly mention only the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, ignoring herewith the most permanent coalition in that period, one established in 1879 and enduring to the end of war: the Dual Alliance (or *Zweibund*).

Paying no particular attention to the German–Austro-Hungarian treaty sometimes has been justified by the curious allegation that in 1882 Italy would have joined the Dual Alliance, which, therefore, would have been dissolved legally in the new pact. Even distinguished historians seem to consider the Triple Alliance an extended version of the Dual Alliance. It must be stressed, however, that Italy never entered the *Zweibund* (the existence of which remained secret, at least officially, until 1888). Italy became a member of a new coalition that included Germany and Austria-Hungary, a pact called the Triple Alliance. The original German–Austro-Hungarian treaty, on the other hand, continued in force, and after 1902 it would be renewed automatically for three years unless one of the contracting parties canceled the agreement. Because no such move ever occurred, the Dual Alliance remained in effect even after 1915, when Italy denounced the Triple Alliance and sided with the Entente.

During its approximately half-century of existence, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy had always attached great importance to relations with Germany. Not only the geographic neighborhood but also their common history could explain such an attitude. The Austrian defeat at Sadowa in 1866 clearly demonstrated the real proportion of military power between the two empires. Nevertheless, as a result of the Compromise of 1867, the dualist Austria-Hungary remained at least by half a German state with a ruling German nation of its own. After the Franco-Prussian war, the unified Germany's preponderance practically determined the direction in which the Habsburg Empire had to adjust its foreign policy. Austro-Hungarian foreign minister Count Friedrich Ferdinand von Beust had already drawn the lesson from the German unification. Implementing a rapprochement with Germany fell to his immediate successor. Profoundly convinced that for Austria-Hungary the Russian threat would be much more serious than that of the unified Germany, Count Julius Andrassy¹ tried from the beginning of his tenure as foreign secretary to fabricate an international

coalition against the czarist empire. His efforts were in vain. In this respect, Berlin refused him, too. Moreover, he could not ignore the offer of his German colleague Prince Otto von Bismarck to establish a treaty engagement among the three conservative monarchies—Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Russia. The Three Emperors' League, the main element of the Bismarckian international system, was signed in 1873. Andrassy temporarily set aside his anti-Russian plans and took the matter in good faith. The treaty was, in fact, only a consultative pact without any stipulations or limitations. The governments undertook to consult each other on matters of mutual interest and guaranteed each other that if one went to war with a nation in Western Europe, the other two would remain neutral. The league's real cementing force was each contracting party's fear of being outmaneuvered by the two others.

To some extent, the league resembled the three-legged stool of a shoemaker—stable if one sits on its center, but easily overturned if not. Bismarck eagerly kept watching over his allies in order to prevent them from getting too close to each other, while his colleagues in Austria-Hungary and in Russia suffered from the same suspicion. Nevertheless, the cooperation worked with minor difficulties until the Russo-Turkish war in 1877–1878 and the Congress of Berlin. Deprived of most of its acquisitions during the bloody campaign against the Ottomans, Russia felt humiliated and blamed its allies, Germany and Austria-Hungary. Consequently, the relations between the czarist empire and its two allies deteriorated significantly. Under the circumstances, German chancellor Bismarck proposed to Andrassy that they establish a general alliance between the empires of William II and Francis Joseph I. This offer was not the realization of Andrassy's original plan—an anti-Russian aggressive alliance—but the Hungarian aristocrat was completely aware of the difficult German situation and he easily managed to refuse to undertake any obligation that would plunge Austria-Hungary into war with France. The treaty between the two countries, signed on 7 October 1879, remained defensive in character and aimed exclusively against Russia. Although neither of the contracting parties considered the pact a long-term obligation, the Dual Alliance survived many crises and remained unchanged under the successors of both Bismarck and Andrassy. Nevertheless, the alliance exerted determinant influence on Austria-Hungary's internal and foreign policy, and gradually became the most important stabilizing factor of the dual monarchy.²

What, then, is the relevance of the Dual Alliance for the Balkan affairs of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy? Although the wording of the agreement³ did not mention even the name of the changeable peninsula, it is quite obvious that both Bismarck's and Andrassy's real aim connected indirectly to the Balkan concerns. While they mentioned Russia, they thought of the southeastern part of the European continent. In Euclidean space, the shortest way between any two points is the direct line. In political (and, of course, historical) space, however, this formula sometimes does not work. Responsible for Austria-Hungary's foreign affairs, Andrassy had to fasten his eyes on Russia because

he understood that for the Habsburg state the way to the Balkan Peninsula led through the czarist empire. Needless to say, Bismarck was well aware of this fact, too, but his goal in perfecting the Dual Alliance and his interpretation of the finished agreement differed significantly from that of his Austro-Hungarian partner. This discrepancy between the German and Habsburg readings of the true meaning of the alliance kept characterizing the Bismarckian era and caused a lot of trouble to both contracting parties. Special piquancy was added to the differing interpretations by Andrassy's resigning his post just after signing the alliance and then, as an influential member of the Hungarian parliament, heavily criticizing both his Foreign Ministry successors and Bismarck for deviating from what he thought to be the original goals of the pact.

Having tied Austria-Hungary to Germany with the Dual Alliance, the German chancellor soon returned to his original conception of foreign policy—the Three Emperors' League. Andrassy, on the other hand, regarded the German–Austro-Hungarian alliance as an anti-Russian pact that would provide for the dual monarchy the necessary support in case it got into a clash with Russia over Balkan affairs. Did the original text of the agreement support such an interpretation? Despite its obviously defensive character, this interpretation also might be gathered from the pact's concise wording. Formulating even diametrically opposed interpretations rests on the definition of the *casus foederis*, the situation under which the terms of the alliance come into play. According to Article I of the alliance “should, contrary to their hope, and against the loyal desire of the two High Contracting Parties, one of the two Empires be attacked by Russia the High Contracting Parties are bound to come to the assistance one of the other with the whole war strength of their Empires, and accordingly only to conclude peace together and upon mutual agreement.” It deserves attention that the regular phrase *sans provocation de sa part* (that is, unprovoked attack) is missing from the text. Consequently, it would not matter if the aggressive Russian moves were or were not elicited by a preceding Austrian action—say, on the Balkan Peninsula. Nevertheless, the interpretive limits of the term *being attacked* could be loose. An invasion, with enemy troops crossing the border of the state being invaded, evidently satisfies the condition of the *casus foederis*. However, threatening measures, such as massing troops along the border or even mobilizing without beginning hostilities, might only prompt a partner's deliberation about an obligation “to come to the assistance.”

Andrassy, his successor Heinrich von Haymerle, and all the Austro-Hungarian supporters of an aggressive anti-Russian policy wanted to have a broader interpretation of the *casus foederis* accepted in Berlin. Their efforts proved unsuccessful, however, because Bismarck did not intend to enter into war against Russia for Austria-Hungary's interest on the Balkan Peninsula. The German chancellor professed that the stronger party of the alliance must set the pace, noting “within an alliance, there is always a horse and a rider.”²⁴ Bismarck openly declared that for Germany the *casus foederis* would not extend

over the Balkans, and he did not urge cooperation between the German and Austro-Hungarian General Staffs nor a synchronizing of operative planning.⁵ In his interpretation, the Dual Alliance served to keep Austria-Hungary at a distance from Russia and restrained the czarist empire from either confronting or embracing the dual monarchy. Backing up aggressive anti-Russian plans did not fit into this framework at all. Without Bismarck's approval, any promises on behalf of the German military leadership toward their Austrian colleagues concerning the modalities of a future joint action against Russia were meaningless.

When William II was enthroned as emperor of Germany and king of Prussia in 1888, things changed significantly. Two years later, Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, had to go, and a new German foreign policy was inaugurated. Austria-Hungary's position in the Dual Alliance had been modified as well. Unlike the Bismarckian era, the dual monarchy could perceive distinct evidence of support from Berlin concerning the Balkan affairs. Germany seriously worried about its doomed ally, whose fate seemed to be similar to that of the Ottoman Empire. An active Balkan policy would be needed against this threatening outcome, and Berlin promised full support for such a new course. Germany's backing up was efficient during the crisis of annexation, and later, to Vienna's great surprise, its alliance partner declared acceptance of the *casus foederis* for the Balkans and initiated intense cooperation between the chiefs of the two General Staffs. Despite the constant urging of the Austro-Hungarian chief General Franz Conrad von Hotzendorf,⁶ however, again there was no elaboration of a synchronized common deployment. Although the two military leaders agreed to accept the principles of a common strategy based on the plan devised by Alfred von Schlieffen,⁷ the Germans refused to tell the Austrians that in all probability they would have to hold off the mighty Russian army without any significant German contribution.

On the other hand, the deployment of the necessary Austro-Hungarian divisions in Galicia would make it impossible for the dual monarchy to realize its most important war aim—defeating Serbia. In fact, war aims of the two allies not only differed from each other but, to some extent, also could be achieved against each other. The mutual distrust may be explained by this, as well as from the different military strengths of Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Moreover, as the international relations grew more unfavorable for the participants of the Dual Alliance, their interdependency deepened. Anglo-German antagonism prevented the powers from loosening their bonds to the alliances and seeking connections with members of other coalitions. On the eve of the First World War, the Dual Alliance—established as a defensive pact—mutated after 1909 into a bloc, had similarity to the classic movie titled *The Defiant Ones*, in which Sidney Poitier and Tony Curtis play fugitives shackled together and trying to survive. Each step they take demands cooperation and this causes serious difficulties for each man. As their interdependency increased, it was hardly possible for the stronger party to set the pace, especially

when temporarily ceding power to the weaker member, as happened when William II gave Austria-Hungary a blank check of support in July 1914. As Günther Kronenbitter, one of the best German experts on the history of German–Austro-Hungarian relations of the time, has written, “despite the fact that it was Austria-Hungary that triggered the Third Balkan War and thereby provoked the outbreak of the Great War, historians interested in the origins of World War I have tended to focus on the system of international relations or on Germany’s role before and during the July crisis. Even today, it seems to be received wisdom among scholars in Germany and elsewhere to consider the Habsburg Monarchy as the weak-willed appendix of the powerful German Reich.”⁸ Kronenbitter considers the hesitation of the Austro-Hungarian chief of the General Staff to abandon the Serbian campaign and transfer the bulk of the dual monarchy’s army to the Galician theater before receiving reliable reports on the Russian general mobilization to be evidence of an attempt to exploit the given situation for setting the pace and carrying out his own war, no matter what happened with the Schlieffen plan.⁹ To be sure, Conrad von Hotzendorf was rather pressed by Austro-Hungarian policymakers to achieve quick military success on the Balkan Peninsula and restore the prestige of the Habsburg Monarchy as a great power. On the other hand, it is true that after writing out the blank check, the German government and the Kaiser showed signs of uncertainty¹⁰ and kept their ally in the dark about unconditional support for an Austro-Hungarian war against Serbia. In Vienna, therefore, one could not know whom to believe—the Kaiser of 5 July or the Kaiser of 30 July, chief of the General Staff Helmuth von Moltke or chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg.

Endnotes

1. The best modern contribution to the Andrassy literature is István Diószegi, *Bismarck és Andrassy: Magyarország a Nemet Hatalmi Politikában a XIX. Század Masodik Feleben* (Budapest: Teleki Laszlo Alapitvány, 1998).

2. Stephan Verosta, *Theorie und Realität von Bündnissen. Heinrich Lammasch, Karl Renner und der Zweibund (1897–1914)* (Vienna, 1971).

3. The English version of the text is available at <http://www.lib.byu.edu/~rdh/wwi/1914m/allyahg.html>.

4. Quoted in Holger H. Herwig, “Disjointed Allies: Coalition Warfare in Berlin and Vienna, 1914.” *Journal of Military History* 54 (July 1990): 269.

5. About the German–Austro-Hungarian military cooperation during the Wilhelminian era, see Graydon A. Tunstall, *Planning for War Against Russia and Serbia: Austro-Hungarian and German Military Strategies, 1871–1914* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

6. Concerning the chief, see Lawrence Sondhaus, *Franz Conrad von Hötzendorf: Architect of the Apocalypse* (Boston: Humanities Press, 2000).

7. Terence Zuber, “The Schlieffen Plan Reconsidered,” *War in History* 6, 3 (1999): 262–305.

8. Günther Kronenbitter, “Austria-Hungary and World War I,” in Günter Bischof and Anton Pelinka, eds., *Austrian Historical Memory and National Identity*, vol. 5 (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1997), p. 342.

9. Kronenbitter's latest volume about this theme is "*Krieg im Frieden.*" *Die Führung der k.u.k. Armee und die Großmachtpolitik Österreich-Ungarns 1906–1914* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003).

10. To understand the role of the kaiser, see Holger Afflerbach, "Wilhelm II as Supreme Warlord in the First World War" *War in History* 5, 4 (1995): 427–49.

The International Expedition in China, 1900–1901: The Concept of a Sole Command

Emmanuelle Braud

The international military expedition in China in 1900 has been the subject of several studies.¹ It was even the topic of an American movie, *Fifty-Five Days at Peking*.

In 1900 an allied army comprising approximately one hundred thousand soldiers from Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Russia, and the United States entered Peking after crushing the Boxers' antiforeigner rebellion.² From an insurrection, China's case became a war. Quickly, those eight nations, who would fight each other fourteen years later, decided to conduct a joint military action to defend and retain their hegemony in China.

The success of such a multiparty venture relies on the necessary cooperation of forces and on the unity of the high command. Through this example of an exceptional international effort, I wish to illustrate the concept of unified command by stressing in particular the difficulties inherent in deploying such a configuration of forces.

First, we will consider the historical background and the nature of this military operation. Then, we will try to discern the realities and the limits of the concept of sole command, especially from the testimonies of the three successive commanders of the French Expeditionary Corps, Colonel de Pélacot,³ General Henri Frey,⁴ and General Emile Voyron.⁵

Historical Background and Nature of the Expedition

First, we will look at the system of unfair treaties and the foreign influence in China. Second, we will consider the Boxer Rebellion and the creation of an international coalition army.

Unfair Treaties and Foreign Influence

During the nineteenth century, following the first Opium War (1840–1841)⁶ that allowed the initial influence of the European powers, the signing of unfair treaties⁷ opened China to foreign trade and to western domination.⁸ From that point, the powers present in China entered a period of competition during which they effectively established their diplomatic and financial networks. France

secured its position in the southern regions of China, thanks to the dynamism of its financial groups rather than to its trade.

In 1898 foreign influence was encouraged by Chinese emperor Guangxu, who favored complete westernization and attempted a series of social and institutional changes intended to modernize China. The experience lasted only one hundred days. On 21 September 1898, the conservative party, driven by the empress dowager Cixi and the army, took power in a coup.

Meanwhile, the Yihetuan⁹ revolt, known in the West as the Boxer Rebellion,¹⁰ began in the north of China and spread gradually across the country, to shouts of “Support the Qing [dynasty] and exterminate the foreigners!” It was this shared aversion for westerners and the willingness to end foreign influence that brought the rebels together with the imperial court in 1898.

The Boxer Revolt and the Creation of an International Coalition Army

The Christian missions, the legations,¹¹ and the concessions—all tangible signs of the foreign presence—crystallized the violence of the Boxers Revolt. Day after day, the rebellion spread, and by the end of May, Peking was threatened. Resorting to force became necessary for all countries united by the same interests and constrained to act jointly in this theater of operations. On 20 May 1900 the various foreign ministers present in China asked their respective governments to send troops to repress the rebel insurrection.

Although such overseas military expeditions were not unusual, it was difficult to set up plans for this operation and to carve an expeditionary corps from a permanent army. The military contingents engaged were not homogeneous, either in their strength or in their composition. Great Britain, Germany, Japan, and Russia—having extensive interests in China—sent between eighteen thousand and twenty thousand men to challenge the rebellion forces. Austria-Hungary, Italy, and the United States sent fewer troops. France held a particular position because of its Indochinese settlement and of the role that it wanted to play in Southeast Asia. The leaders of the great powers in China consulted each other to set up a unified command. Each decision would emanate from a council formed by all of the allied chiefs.

On 20 June the battle of Peking¹² began when the German minister Baron von Ketteler was murdered and when the Boxers burned down the legations. The Chinese imperial government declared war on the Allied Powers the following day.

For the westerners, the aim was to defend their freedom of trade and the significant opportunities that China presented for their own economic markets. Their immediate objective was to restore peace. On 4 August some twenty thousand Allied soldiers were mobilized toward the Chinese capital, and ten days later Peking fell to their force. The Allied occupation quickly extended over the whole Petchili region as far as the Shanghai harbor.

My intention is not to relate in detail the military operation,¹³ but rather to reveal the need for a sole command in an effort based on the cooperation of eight national contingents. In the second part of this paper, we will address the concept of sole command. First, we will consider two examples to describe why such cooperation was needed. Then, we will look at the Franco-Russian plan, and finally address the nomination of Field Marshal Alfred von Waldersee to the rank of supreme commander.

The Concept of Sole Command

As shown previously by the Boxer uprising, in a time of crisis it is absolutely necessary to preserve unanimity of views and to search for compromise. The great powers had to stand together because the system of unfair treaties could only work when there was joint action.

In 1904, General Emile Frey, who commanded the French Expeditionary Corps from 24 July to 22 September 1900, assessed the weaknesses and strengths of this multinational Allied force in China. From the beginning of the operation, a sense of common purpose existed among all the expeditionary forces. However, Frey noted the complete lack of understanding among the ground operations at the start of the campaign and in the creating of joint operational plans. He also cited a lack of cohesion and uniformity of action in conducting military operations.

That lack of understanding, which didn't rule out solidarity in most of the operations, resulted from the contingent commanders' absolute independence from one another. Two examples illustrate that fact.

Two Examples

From the first days of July, contingent commanders were aware of the lack of understanding and coordination, and they reported the situation to their own governments. The war diaries of the campaign confirm their critical remarks. Here is an extract from the diary of Lieutenant Colonel Ytasse:

Such decision or such measure adopted during a council by the allied commanders was not executed by such power, as it had made up its mind one hour after the council. Each contingent acted in that way, generally for itself, without finding it necessary to warn its neighbouring contingent either about the modifications it brought to a plan that had just been consulted, or about an operation it was about to conduct on its initiative, and without worrying about the serious consequences that might result from that for the others.¹⁴

The attack on the city of Tientsin illustrates this decision-making mechanism used by the Allies, as well as a general feeling of incoherency. On 2 July 1900 the Allied council decided jointly to attack the city on 4 July. No coordinated attack occurred, but on several occasions and without any previous

agreement, the Americans, the English, and the Japanese on one side and the Germans and the Russians on the other tried to start the projected operation.

On 12 July the commanders of the contingents held a council of war and agreed to start the coordinated operation again the next day. They clearly defined the role of each contingent. The Italians and the French were in the front guard; the Austrians, Germans, Japanese, and Russians were at the rear. For the Japanese and the French troops, the objective was to take the suburbs of the city and the town walls; the Americans were to scout out the progression. Quickly, a lack of reinforcements stopped the troops' advance, and the soldiers were immobilized in their own positions. The decisions made in the joint war council were not followed and a challenge began among the different corps. Throughout the action, complete confusion ensued because of the absence of a supreme authority directing the operation.

This episode prompted the Allies to build a supreme command for the international forces. Their first attempt failed because of rival political interests, differing national interests, and mutual suspicion.

The French-Russian Project

The results of a lack of unified command worried the Allied governments. On 12 July 1900 the Russian foreign minister agreed with his French counterpart to suggest to the other powers a common plan to settle the issue of multinational military cooperation by establishing a war council comprising the commander of each expeditionary corps. This proposal seemed to offer a resolution to many diplomatic and military difficulties that arose in trying to establish unified actions in the current circumstances. On 27 July, however, U.S. Secretary of State John Milton Hay informed the other governments that no decision on the proposed coordination of action had been made by the United States. With regard to the creation of a supreme command of Allied armies in China, he suggested an international conference to settle the question. Concerning military operations, he declared that they would have to be led by a council of war.

The Franco-Russian proposition to entrust command of the international army to the Russian major general Nicholas Linevitch was not accepted because the other generals didn't want to give up their liberty of action. However, the idea of establishing a supreme command of the international forces was forming in the various command bodies.

Nomination of Field Marshal von Waldersee to the Rank of Supreme Commander

Shortly after Peking's capture, the Allies heard of the nomination of Field Marshal von Waldersee to the rank of supreme commander. His nomination

was a decision of the governments concerned, following a proposal by Emperor Guillaume. What did such a decision mean for the contingent chiefs? The first act von Waldersee took immediately provoked discontent. He chose no longer to call together the council because he believed a commander rationally exercises his authority without being obliged to seek advice from his subordinates. This decision, which went against the resolution previously adopted by the great powers, didn't take into account the new diplomatic and military order inherited from the capture of Peking, and from the pacification of the first occupied territories. For everyone, von Waldersee's nomination was too late. The fight had been won by troops under national command with no designated supreme commander. Moreover, removing the joint council denied the victors a voice when the negotiations for peace started.

The French were first ordered¹⁵ by their government to recognize the preeminence of the rank of Field Marshal von Waldersee.¹⁶ But as soon as the legations were released, General Voyron¹⁷ received the order to keep his independence of action, thereby overriding the new international rule.

Conclusion

We could say that in 1901 the great powers in China are victorious over the Boxers, but more than ever in competition with one another. Cooperation was generally improvised because of the lack of a common plan. The outline of a sole command remained more theoretical than realistic.

To build a peace that ensured the national interests of each of the Allied powers in China, and to avoid a potential confrontation among the Allies, the nations set up a political, economic, financial, and military system of control with the creation of the occupation corps¹⁸ that in 1901 followed the expeditionary corps. That system lasted until 1916.

Endnotes

1. Voir notamment Pierre Loti, *Les derniers jours de Pékin* (Paris, 1902); Raymond Bourgerie and Pierre Lesouef, *La guerre des Boxers (1900–1901)* (Paris, Economica, 1998); Pierre Lorain, "Les armes de la guerre des Boxers, 1900–1901," *Gazette des armes* 75 (Oct 1979) and 76 (Nov 1979).

2. J. Cheminon and G. Fauvel-Gallais, *Les événements militaires en Chine* (Paris: Chapelot, 1902).

3. Colonel de Pelacot, *Expédition de Chine de 1900 jusqu'à l'arrivée du General Voyron* (Paris: Charles-Lavauzelle, n.d.).

4. General H. Frey, *Français et Alliés au Péchili: Campagne de Chine de 1900* (Paris: Hachette, 1904).

5. General Voyron, *Rapport sur l'expédition de Chine* (Paris: Charles-Lavauzelle, n.d.).

6. La guerre de l'opium en 1840–1841 avec l'Angleterre s'achève avec le traité de Nankin. La Chine est obligée d'ouvrir au commerce britannique cinq de ses ports (parmi lesquels Canton et Shanghai) et de céder aux Anglais l'îlot de Hongkong. En 1844, des avantages analogues sont accordés aux Etats-Unis et, par le traité de Whampoa, la France obtient notamment la tolérance de la religion chrétienne et l'apostolat des missionnaires.

7. These treaties included the Treaty of Nankin (1841) signed with Great Britain, the Treaty of Whampoa (1844) signed with France and the United States, and the treaties of Tien Tsin (1860) with France and with Great Britain.

8. *Histoire de la Chine Moderne (1840–1919)* (Paris: Editions du Centenaire, 1978).

9. The name means “righteous and harmonious fists.”

10. Bourgerie and Lesouef, *La guerre des Boxers*. Voir également, Shat, 7 N 1668, attaché militaire en Chine, “étude d’ensemble sur la guerre des Boxers, 2 avril 1900.”

11. Shat, 7 N 1667, un rapport de l’attaché militaire en Chine du 13 février 1895 insiste sur la nécessité de protéger militairement la légation de France à Pékin.

12. Loti, *Les derniers jours de Pékin*.

13. Concerning this, see in particular Cheminon and Fauvel-Gallais, *Les événements militaires*.

14. Cité dans Voyron, *Rapport*.

15. Shat, 11 H 28, état-major: registre d’ordres du corps expéditionnaire (1900); minute des ordres généraux (1900–1901); et Shat, 11 H 29, instructions aux commandants du corps expéditionnaire (1900–1901).

16. Shat, 11 H 29, mission du Feld-marshal von Waldersee (Sep 1900).

17. Voyron, *Rapport*.

18. Amaury Verron, *Le corps français d’occupation de Chine, 1901–1945*, maîtrise d’histoire (Université de Nantes, 1996).

PART TWO

THE INTER-WAR YEARS, WORLD WAR II,
AND THE COLD WAR

In the Shadow of the Great Allies: Romanian-Italian Relations, 1919–1927

Petre Otu

In the second half of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth century, Romania and Italy—two Latin countries—faced a similar historical evolution. Both countries completed their state construction in the middle of the nineteenth century, and from 1833 until the First World War they had been members of the same political and military alliance—the Triple Alliance.¹

In 1914 both countries proclaimed their neutrality toward the world conflict, refusing to comply with the contractual obligations of the alliance although they remained members of the Central Powers. In those years the solidarity of interests enabled good cooperation between the two countries. On 23 September 1914 they signed the Romanian-Italian agreement through which the two parties pledged not to give up neutrality without informing each other. They agreed to consult one another on important matters, and Italy agreed to Romania's rights toward Banat and Transylvania.

On 6 February 1915 the parties concluded a new four-month agreement. The document resembled a mutual assistance treaty because it stipulated that in case of unprovoked aggression by Austria-Hungary, the contractual parties would provide mutual support. Hoping to become a great power, however, Italy did not comply with the assumed obligations, and on 20 May 1915 Italy joined the Triple Entente (comprising France, Great Britain, and Russia).

On 17 August 1916 Romania signed a treaty with the Entente. Two weeks later (28 August), Romania entered World War I. In this way, after an interruption of almost a year and a half, Romania and Italy were allies again, now as parts of the same alliance, namely the Entente.²

During the war, Romanian-Italian cooperation was not as strong as the cooperation between Romania and France or Romania and Russia. Their great cooperative achievement was setting up the Romanian Legion in Italy. Composed of three regiments and commanded by Brig. Gen. Luciano Ferigo, the legion contributed to the Italian army's victories against Austro-Hungarian forces, from Monterelo, Victoria Veneto, Piove, Cimone, and Gropa. The legion's role on the battlefield has been recognized by the American, British, and French governments.³

Although at the end of the First World War Romania and Italy were on the side of the winning powers, their status was different when the Paris

Peace Conference convened in 1919. Italy was part of the main conference structures charged with making decisions (that is, the Supreme Council, the Tenth Council), and it was among the countries that had “general interests.” Romania was placed in the category of the states with “limited interests.” This distinction left its mark on the cooperation between the Romanian and Italian delegations participating in the portions of the conference that took place in the French capital. It should be noted that the chief of the Italian government, Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando, was the only one among the four great powers (France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States) who emphasized that Romania had been forced to sign a separate peace with the Central Powers in Bucharest on 17 May 1918.⁴

The two countries were discontented with the manner in which the Paris peace forum addressed their interests and wishes. The accords should have been followed by greater cooperation between the countries after the war. Romania, however, remained devoted to France, which it believed to be the power able to guarantee the political and territorial status quo established in Versailles. This belief marked the relationship between Bucharest and Rome during the entire interwar period.⁵

Italy did not appreciate the prevailing influence of France in central and southeastern Europe. Italian authorities were displeased by the initiatives of Quai d’Orsay, the French Foreign Ministry, in this region, feeling that they left Italy in a secondary position. Although it was not necessarily an invention of Paris, the Little Entente set up in 1920–1921 distressed Rome. The new organization, composed of Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia, was seen as an obstacle to increasing Italian influence in the center and the southeastern portion of Europe.⁶ The disputes between Italy and Yugoslavia regarding territorial problems on the shores of the Adriatic Sea were well known. Although in November 1920, Italian Prime Minister Giovanni Giolitti signed a treaty with Yugoslavia through which Italy gave up claim to Dalmatia in exchange for the sovereignty of Istria and Zara, the tension between the two countries continued to be significant.

Romania was Yugoslavia’s ally within the Little Entente, and the Bucharest-Paris axis constituted the base of Romania’s foreign policy. This was the main reason that the Romanian-Italian relationships remained practically frozen in the first two years after the war. As an illustration of the strain in the countries’ dealings, the negotiations for the purchase of equipment and war materials was never concluded, and the Romanian government’s intention to buy the ship *Varese* from Italy was not finalized.

A threshold in the evolution of relations between the two countries was the Conference of Genoa (10 April–19 May 1922) in which twenty-four European states were represented by their prime ministers or ministers of foreign affairs. The conference goal was to discuss problems of international economic cooperation. In this context, special attention was given to the economic cooperation between the European states and Soviet Russia, which was

represented by a delegation led by Gheorghe V. Cicerin, the minister of foreign affairs. The purpose of the conference was not achieved, especially because of two apparently unconnected events. The first one was the 16 April 1922 signing of the Rapallo Pact, between Germany and Soviet Russia, which made Cicerin even more relentless in promoting the Soviet goals. The second event was Raymond Poincaré's replacement of Aristide Briand as prime minister of France. Poincaré was more intransigent than Briand with regard to concessions to be made to Soviet Russia.

During the Genoa Conference, Romanian prime minister Ion I. C. Brătianu, head of the Romanian delegation, had some meetings with Italian political leaders to discuss the state of bilateral relations. The most significant result of these meetings was the foundation of the Romanian-Italian Chamber of Commerce, which opened in Milan at the beginning of 1923.⁷ During the conference, the Romanian prime minister traveled to Rome (26 April 1922) and was received in audience by King Victor Emmanuel III. Brătianu was also received at the Vatican by Pope Pius XI. The rise of fascism in Italy in the autumn of 1922, as a result of the "march against Rome," did not change Romanian-Italian relations, which remained at a low level.

In 1923 Italy went into conflict with Greece because of the assassination of members of the Italian Commission working at the Greek-Albanian border. Rome gave an ultimatum to Athens and occupied the island of Corfu. Great Britain and France disagreed with Italy's fascist attitude, and Italy was placed in a political-diplomatic state of isolation. The Italian diplomat became more conciliatory toward the Little Entente and Soviet Russia. The ratification of an Italian-Yugoslavian frontier treaty manifested this new attitude.

Although the relationship between Italy and Soviet Russia improved, there was no thaw in the relationship between Rome and Bucharest. Romanian foreign affairs minister I. G. Duca visited Italy in January but the visit was characterized by a visible coldness. As a result, the intended 1924 visit of the Romanian sovereigns, King Ferdinand and Queen Mary, was cancelled. To overcome the obstacles and facilitate the sovereigns' visit to Italy, in July 1924 the Romanian National Bank signed an agreement with the Italian government concerning the consolidation of treasury bills held by Italians. This kind gesture, however, was not enough to lessen the Italian government's apprehension. For its part, Moscow was relieved because the Russians believed that a visit to Rome by King Ferdinand might convince Italy to ratify the 28 October 1920 Paris treaty that gave Bessarabia (historically the eastern part of Moldavia) to Romania.⁸ This treaty had been signed by France, Great Britain, Italy, and Japan, but three of the four powers had to ratify it before it could be enforced. Great Britain did so in 1922 and France ratified it in 1924, but Romania needed either Italy or Japan to ratify the document. Bucharest's efforts concentrated on Rome because the Japanese government maintained good relations with Soviet Russia and was not inclined to comply with any Romanian request that stood against the interests of the Soviets.⁹

After the 1925 Treaty of Locarno, as a guarantor Italy gained a more important role in international relations. Benito Mussolini had the ambition to ensure his country a status of great power and to eliminate the French influence in the central and southeastern portions of the continent. He became very interested in developing contacts with Romania, suggesting that he would want to ratify the 1920 treaty. Mussolini knew that there was animosity between Paris and London, the British government being the partisan of the balance of power on the continent. And he was aware of the remark by Constantin Diamandy, the Romanian minister in the capital of France, in which he pointed out that in its external politics "Italy has always followed London."¹⁰

Mussolini first thought that an alliance with Romania would facilitate the creation of a treaty in Eastern Europe that would be similar to the one signed in Locarno in 1925—a treaty in which Italy would have a significant role. This idea was never put into practice, however, and Rome remained interested in strengthening relations with Bucharest. That goal was clearly revealed by Italian diplomats Dino Grandi and Salvatori Contarini who declared to Romanian minister Alexandru M. Lahovari that a "Romanian-Italian alliance is now excluding a French-Romanian alliance."¹¹

Italian officials pointed out that this declaration raised serious problems because it endangered the Romanian external political instruments on which the country based its security and integrity (that is, its relations with France, the Little Entente, and the agreement with Poland¹²).

The liberal government, led by Ion I. C. Bratianu, was eager to prove that Bucharest's politics would not change. The Romanian Ministry for Foreign Affairs wanted to establish relations with Italy that were similar to those Romania had with France and the Little Entente countries. When the government led by Alexandru Averescu came to power in March 1926, it was a good sign for Romanian-Italian relations. The new prime minister had a partiality for Italy and strong connections to the country. He had studied at the Superior War School in Turin from 1884 to 1886, and had married an Italian woman, Clotilde Caligaris.¹³ The prime minister's connections created the premise of improving the relations between the two countries and unraveling the problem of ratifying the Peace Treaty of Paris. Averescu met unofficially with Benito Mussolini in 1924, and they agreed to intensify Romanian-Italian connections. As Averescu took power in Romania, contacts between Bucharest and Rome tightened. The new prime minister, escorted by his minister for foreign affairs Ion Mitilineu, didn't want to change the country's external orientation, but in the context of signing the Locarno Pact, enlarging of the net of Romanian international treaties was considered appropriate.¹⁴

The Italian government proved ready to sign a treaty with Romania, but Romania had to comply with the economic request that Italy have a series of outlets in the Romanian market. The bilateral negotiations continued and the Italians accepted an amity treaty without any stipulations regarding territorial integrity or a guarantee of borders. A very important moment during these

negotiations was the visit of Mihail Manoilescu to Rome in May 1926. The purpose of the visit was to address and solve economic issues. Discussion of the issues with finance minister Volpi di Misurata led to the signing of various economic agreements. A ten-year loan of two hundred million Italian lire (approximately two billion Romanian lei) was obtained at an annual interest rate of 7 percent. An interest-free loan in goods was also obtained through which the Romanian government ordered the building of the submarine *Dolphin*. Its construction lasted more than a decade, and when completed, the *Dolphin* was the only submarine the Romanian navy owned in the first part of the Second World War. During the same visit, Romania granted to Agip, a corporation involved in oil exploration, a series of oil fields (petroliferous lands).¹⁵

But the most substantial result of the visit was the agreement through which Romania's war debt toward Italy was established, a part of it was reduced, and a fifty-year repayment schedule at 1.5 percent per annum was set. The mutually advantageous solutions to their economic problems appeared to smooth the course of political negotiations between the two nations, but on 10 June 1926 the Averescu government signed a treaty with France. The document, an absolute priority for Romania, had been negotiated by the liberal government led by Ion I. C. Brătianu, but its ratification had been postponed several times. At last the French government agreed to sign this treaty, and although the agreement had little practical value because it was not followed by a military convention that the Romanians had wanted, the treaty was a significant success for Romanian diplomacy.¹⁶ Under the circumstances, Averescu believed that another visit to Italy would be appropriate to show the friendly spirit of Bucharest. He visited Italy in September 1926, escorted by his minister for foreign affairs, Ion Mîtilineu. The Romanian delegation was received with full honors. Mussolini and Averescu signed a friendship treaty and exchanged letters, through which Italy promised to ratify the 28 October 1920 Treaty of Paris.¹⁷

Despite the apparent conviviality of the visit and the exchange of promises, however, Italy did not ratify the 1920 treaty. In deciding not to do so, Mussolini took into account two elements: Rome's wish to maintain good relations with Moscow (which did not encourage ratification), and his own intention to hold Romania in check. Mussolini feared that when Italy ratified the Treaty of Paris, Brătianu, Romania's most powerful politician, would replace the Averescu government with a liberal one oriented exclusively toward France, to the neglect of Italian interests.

The Soviet Union reacted to the news of the Romanian-Italian friendship treaty with obvious and official hostility and protest. France and the member countries of the Little Entente were also displeased. The Averescu government was dissatisfied by the result of the Italian agreements, and it continued pressing the Italian authorities to ratify the Paris treaty. With that end in view, in January 1927 Mihail Manoilescu visited Italy, this time to negotiate the first Romanian commercial convention after the war. The Romanian diplomat met

with Marshall Pietro Badoglio, who told him that it is necessary to insist that Mussolini complete the promised ratification. The decisive moment came during Manoilescu's meeting with Mussolini. The Italian leader showed his discontent with Romania's devotion to France. As an answer, Manoilescu declared that it was difficult to fight "in Romania in order to obtain the smallest place for Italy, extorting something from the sentimental monopoly, which French are enjoying."¹⁸ And, he insisted, not ratifying this treaty would turn Romanian public opinion against Italy. Manoilescu also tried to relieve Mussolini's doubts about the stability of Averescu's government.¹⁹ Manoilescu succeeded in getting Mussolini's agreement concerning the ratification of the Paris treaty. It is highly likely that Manoilescu's persuasive power was responsible for changing Mussolini's mind. During the Manoilescu visit, news of the Romanian-French agreement was released to the media. Ratifying the treaty was a good opportunity for Mussolini to counteract France and to increase his prestige in Romania. This time he kept his word and on 9 March 1927, King Victor Emmanuel III approved the treaty, thereby joining Bessarabia with Romania. On 10 March 1927 final ratification was accomplished in a solemn session of the Italian parliament called specifically for that purpose. On 23 May 1927 the Italian ambassador to Paris, G. Manzoni, presented to the chief of Quai d'Orsay the official treaty ratification. There was a warm exchange of telegrams between Mussolini and Averescu, and the Romanian prime minister sent messages of thanks to King Victor Emmanuel III and to Marshall Badoglio. Thus, the most significant stage of Romanian-Italian relations during the interwar period came to an end.²⁰

The reactions of other countries to the Italians' ratification are interesting. Through the voice of Aristide Briand, France reproached Romania for concluding the treaty with Italy. Romania's partners in the Little Entente acted with restraint. The American representative in Bucharest, W. S. Culbertson, considered the ratification to bear special importance within European politics, but he didn't believe the Bessarabia problem was solved. He thought that this ratification was the result of signals from Great Britain, which agreed with a greater economic presence for Italy in central and southeastern Europe. Moscow vehemently objected to ratification of the treaty, conveying signals to Bucharest that the Soviet Union would not give up on Bessarabia. The Soviet diplomacy insistently pressed Japan not to follow Italy's example—an action that was very successful.²¹

Improving relations with Italy enabled Bucharest to renew French-Italian connections. Playing a key role in this matter was Constantin Diamandy, the Romanian minister to Paris, a well-connected diplomat and a man trusted at the Quai d'Orsay. On 18 September 1927 Aristide Briand thanked Diamandy for measures taken to improve the contact between France and Italy. Four months later, Philippe Berthelot and Beaumarchais, highly placed French diplomats, thanked Diamandy again for mediating a relaxation of tensions and concluding an agreement between the Italian and French governments.²²

Even when the Averescu government was removed and the Liberal Party took power, there were attempts to maintain good relations with Italy. Nicolae Titulescu, minister for foreign affairs, made the first official visit of his ministry to Italy in early 1928 (24 January to 1 February). Although Titulescu did not accept some of the provisions of the treaty between Romania and Italy, he intended to give Italy “the proper place.”²³

Endnotes

1. Gheorghe Nicolae Cazan and Serban Radulescu-Zoner, *Romania si Tripla Alianta, 1878–1914 (Romania and the Triple Alliance, 1878–1914)* (Bucharest: Editura Stiintifica si Enciclopedica, 1979).

2. Valeriu Florin Dobrinescu, Ion Patroiu, and Gheorghe Nicolescu, *Relatii politico-diplomatice si militare romano-italiene (1914–1947) (Romanian–Italian Political-Diplomatic and Military Relations, 1914–1947)* (Pitesti, Romania: Editura Intact, 1999), pp. 15–96; Central Historical National Archives (CHNA), fond Constantin Diamandy, file 30, f. 11–58; file 107, f. 9–35.

3. Paulo Alberini, “L’*intervention de l’Italie et de la Roumanie dans la Grande Guerre. Manque de simultanéité. La Constitution de la Légion Roumaine en Italie.*” *Acta III: The 3rd International Colloquium of Military History*, Bucharest-Sibiu, 3–6.IX.1996, pp. 123–28.

4. Petre Otu, *Alexandru Averescu: Militarul, omul politic, legenda (Alexandru Averescu: The Soldier, the Statesman, the Myth)* (Bucharest: Editura Militara, 2005), pp. 202–11; Alexandru Marhiloman, *Note politice (Political Notes)*, vol. 3, 2d ed., Bucharest: Editura Machiavelli, 1995), pp. 102–45.

5. For the analysis of Romanian-French relations during the interwar period, see, among others, Maria Georgescu, *Romania, Franta si securitatea Europeana in anii '20. Sperante si iluzii (Romania, France and European Security during the '20s: Hopes and Illusions)* (Bucharest: Editura Militara, 2004).

6. For a better understanding of the evolution of the Little Entente, the following works should be taken into account: Eliza Campus, *Mica Intelegere (Little Entente)* (Bucharest: Editura Stiintifica, 19680; Milan Vanku, *Mica Intelegere si politica externa a Jugoslaviei, 1920–1938: Momente si semnificatii (Little Entente and Yugoslavia's Foreign Policy, 1920–1948: Moments and Significances)* (Bucharest: Editura Politica, 1979); and Mihai Retegan, *In balanta fortelor: Aliante militare romanesti interbelice (In Balance of Forces: Interwar Romanian Military Alliances)* (Bucharest: Editura Semne, 1997).

7. Regarding the Genoa conference, see CHNA, fond Directia Generala a Politiei, file 59/1921, f. 1–57.

8. Paul Cernovodeanu, *Basarabia. Drama unei provincii romanesti in context politic international (Bessarabia. The Tragedy of a Romanian Province in International Political Context)* (Bucharest: Editura Albatros, 1999), pp. 120–31; Nicolae Titulescu, *Basarabia–pamant romanesc (Bessarabia–Romanian Land)* (Bucharest: Editura Rum-Irina, 1992), p. 64; and Ion Agrigorioaiei and Gheorghe Palade, *Basarabia in cadrul Romaniei intregite, 1919–1940 (Bessarabia within Reunited Romania)* (Chisinau: Editura Universitatii, 1993), p. 36.

9. In fact, a Soviet-Japanese convention regarding their bilateral relationship was concluded in Beijing on 20 January 1925. Among the documents pertaining to this convention were the secret letters exchanged by representatives of the two governments, through which, at Moscow’s request, the Tokyo cabinet agreed not to ratify the Treaty of Paris, until it was ratified by all other signatories. Although the Soviet-Japanese agreement was not made public until after 1920, the Bucharest government was aware of its existence. A series of articles on this subject, signed by diplomats from Bucharest’s ministry for foreign affairs, was published in the international press. Ion Constantin, *Romania, marile puteri si problema Basarabiei (Romania, Great Powers and the Problem of Bessarabia)* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedica, 1995), pp. 23–30.

10. CHNA, fond Constantin Diamandy, file 111, f. 127.
11. Mihail Manoilescu, *Memorii (Memoir)*, vol. 1 (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedica, 1993), p. 59.
12. The agreement with Poland, signed on 3 March 1921, stipulated a mutual support against unprovoked Soviet aggression. The Little Entente was formed in 1922–23 by Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia to preserve the Eastern and Central European status quo.
13. Otu, *Alexandru Averescu*, pp. 15–21.
14. CHNA, fond Alexandru Averescu, file 51, f. 1–37.
15. Manoilescu, *Memorii*, pp. 63–66.
16. Petre Otu, “La signification du traité du 10 Juin 1926 entre la Roumanie et la France,” in *Bâtir une nouvelle sécurité. La coopération militaire entre la France et les Etats d’Europe Centrale et Orientale de 1919 à 1929* (Actes du colloque organisé en Dec 1999) (Paris, 2001), pp. 493–500.
17. For this visit, see Manoilescu, *Memorii*, pp. 67–68; Raoul Bossy, *Amintiri din viata diplomatica (Memories of a Diplomatic Life)*, vol. 1 (Bucharest: Editura Humanitas, 1993), pp. 110–22; and CHNA, fond Alexandru Averescu, file 51, f. 37–57.
18. Manoilescu, *Memorii*, pp. 78–81.
19. *Ibid.*
20. CHNA, fond Directia Generala a Politiei, file 78/1927, f.1–36. Although securing the treaty ratification was a major diplomatic achievement for Romania, it should be noted that the most valuable recognition of Bessarabia’s incorporation with Romania would have been from the Soviet Union. No such recognition was forthcoming. However, when circumstances were favorable in July 1940, the Soviet Union didn’t hesitate to resort to armed force and to annex the region.
21. *Relatii romano-sovietice: Documente (Romanian-Soviet Relations: Documents)*, vol. 1 (1917–1934), coordinator Dumitru Preda (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedica, 1999), pp. 67–71; Valeriu Florin Dobrinescu, *Romania si sistemul tratatelor de pace de la Paris (1919–1923) (Romania and Peace System Treaties from Paris)* (Bucharest, 1994), pp. 63–78.
22. CHNA, fond Constantin Diamandy, file 110, f. 2–17; file 111, f. 13–21.
23. Nicolae Titulescu, *Politica externa a Romaniei (Romania’s Foreign Policy)*, edited by George C. Patra, Constantin I. Turcu, and Ion M. Oprea (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedica, 1994), p. 173.

Munich 1938: A Failure To Honor Treaty Obligations

Thomas S. C. Garrett

Although the Munich Agreement of 29 September 1938 often is seen as a singular event, in reality it was the last of many failures to restrain aggression. The path that began at Versailles in 1919 and ended twenty years later in Poland passed through Munich in 1938. Along the way, many treaties were violated. It must always be remembered that the effectiveness of any treaty is directly dependent on two interrelated conditions: the will and the ability of the signatories to fulfill their treaty obligations. This paper examines the interplay of these two crucial factors in determining the fate of Czechoslovakia in 1938.

The surrender of the Sudetenland region of Czechoslovakia to Germany was the result of the French failure to honor its military commitments to Czechoslovakia and of Great Britain's failure to support France at that time. Moreover, the United States, champion of a Czechoslovak Republic in 1919, failed to support those three democracies against the aggression of a totalitarian Germany. Moreover, the League of Nations proved irrelevant. In the end, this was a failure of will on the part of these democracies and a triumph of will on the part of Hitlerian Germany.

The guns of the Great War begun in August 1914 finally fell silent in November 1918. It was then time to make the peace. Representatives of the victorious powers met in Paris the following January to work out the series of treaties necessary to end the war. In June 1919, after difficult negotiations among themselves, the victors presented the treaty for signature by the German representatives. Because Germany was forced to accept the treaty without any revisions on its part, the Treaty of Versailles was truly a dictated peace.¹

Moreover, the victors' peace rested on the moral assertion by President Woodrow Wilson and the Allied leaders that the cause of this war was a premeditated evil that must be punished. Under Article 231, the so-called war guilt clause, Germany assumed total responsibility for causing the war and its consequent vast destruction of life and property. So it was, in large part, that the punitive measures against Germany—economic, military, and political—rested on that assertion.

Another facet of punishment, or vindictiveness, was denying Germans the right of self-determination. The union of Germany and Austria was specifically prohibited. Also, in redrawing the maps of Europe, a large German minority in Czechoslovakia and a smaller one in Poland were denied inclusion in a German nation-state.

When the anger and bitterness and hatred faded, thoughtful people came to see that the causes of the war were far more complex than evil manifestations of German wickedness. Certainly Germany bore a heavy responsibility, but Article 231 was simply not true. Then there was the victors' denial of German self-determination: a principle accorded everyone but the Germans. Was that just? Was a disarmed, weak Germany a good thing?²

This questioning, especially in Britain, started in the 1920s and grew especially strong in the 1930s. When reconsidering the issues began, the will to enforce the Versailles Treaty's harsh measures against Germany began to falter and the victors began to doubt their collective wisdom as manifested in the treaty they had forced on Germany.

Furthermore, the postwar world they established was different. Previously the balance of power was the framework within which the various states conducted their affairs. That system failed catastrophically in 1914. In seeking a better way, Wilson proposed creating a moral equilibrium as the basis for nations coexisting without war. The mechanism for arriving at this pacific state was the League of Nations and international disarmament.

Thus, signatories of the Treaty of Versailles also joined this league, which would make war obsolete. In practice, however, it was extremely difficult to substitute moral equilibrium for balance of power as a basis for conducting relations between states.³ Given Wilson's influence at the Paris talks, it is bitterly ironic that the United States Senate never ratified the treaty their president signed. Thus, without the United States, only Great Britain and France stood as the major powers in the league.⁴ Such an approach by the victors rested on perpetuating German military weakness. This made it possible for Germany to reasonably claim that it continued to experience discrimination. Over the coming years, Germany argued that either the other nations should disarm to its level or it should be allowed to rearm. From that time forward, German policy goals were to regain its strength and freedom of action in all spheres—political, economic, and military; that is, to cast off the chains of Versailles. The German rearmament program, which Gustav Stresemann began secretly in the 1920s, was openly completed by Hitler in the 1930s.⁵

Hitler's rise to power began awkwardly. In November 1923 he led a Nazi *putsch* in Munich that failed. Not quite ten years later, on 30 January 1933, and in accordance with the German constitution, President Paul von Hindenburg named Adolf Hitler chancellor. What Hitler's attempted coup failed to accomplish outside the law he had achieved legally. Much of his program was to undo the Treaty of Versailles. As chancellor he began the work of escaping from the strictures of what the Germans called the Versailles Dictate. In truth, escaping the limitations of Versailles and consolidating his power proved interrelated.⁶ Throughout this period Hitler's aims were abetted by British guilt over unfair treatment of Germany in the postwar settlements coupled with British and French aversion to war and their widespread pacifism.⁷

On 14 October 1933 Germany withdrew from the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations. In this defiance, Hitler was bold in his flagrant violation of the Treaty of Versailles. International reaction was ineffective. Whereas the league expressed regret at German withdrawal, Britain and France had no unified response because of their own internal divisions.⁸

On 9 March 1935 Hitler formally announced that Germany had secretly built an air force, and again this direct violation provoked no serious response from either England or France. Thus emboldened, Hitler reintroduced conscription (*Allgemeine Wehrpflicht*) on 16 March. Germany was openly rearming in direct violation of Part V of the Treaty of Versailles. Although this formal repudiation caused diplomatic surprise in Europe, no British or French armies marched to compel German obedience.⁹

In 1931 and 1935 Japan and Italy attacked other members of the League of Nations. The primary significance of both the Manchurian Incident and invasion of Ethiopia was that the aggressors successfully defied the world and kept their conquests. Hitler duly noted this successful defiance of the league and planned accordingly. In direct violation of both the Versailles and Locarno treaties, he marched some twenty thousand German troops into the Rhineland, symbolically remilitarizing that region on 7 March 1936. Although he nervously awaited international, especially French, reaction, he had no real reason for concern. Despite spirited statements about not accepting the threat of German guns within range of Strasbourg, nothing of substance came from France. Britain, meanwhile, condemned the German move but urged moderation to all concerned.¹⁰

Thereafter came meaningless legal and diplomatic maneuvering. The Locarno powers met in London to consider the Rhineland issue. There, Pierre Étienne Flandin, French minister of foreign affairs, stated most forcefully in the meetings of 10 and 13 March 1936 that the next challenge from Germany would not be an attack on France or Belgium, but most likely an attack on Czechoslovakia or Austria.¹¹ Then-current British pacifism combined with the strong feeling that Germany was doing no more than asserting just sovereignty over its own land played a major role in British reluctance to support the French position, and Britain urged restraint. Belgium and Italy, the other powers present, also refused to support the strong French stand. Hitler won again.¹²

While others on the world stage thus equivocated, the führer moved with singleness of purpose. On the afternoon and evening of 5 November 1937, Hitler held a secret meeting in Berlin with his senior military and diplomatic leaders. In a little more than four hours, he outlined his plans for obtaining living space (*Lebensraum*) for the German people by diplomacy and by force of arms.

Hitler's first step was the immediate consolidation of the Great German Reich, so Austria and Czechoslovakia must be subjugated as a preliminary to the wider conquests necessary to ensure German economic security.¹³ Later that same November, British and French leaders met in London for two days (29–30) to develop a common course of action regarding all matters relating

to the Spanish Civil War, which had begun the previous July. British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain discussed with the French their treaty ties to Czechoslovakia. Although Great Britain had no military obligation to Czechoslovakia, because of its affiliation with France, Britain would have to support its ally in the event of war. It seemed that Chamberlain, who wholeheartedly endorsed a policy of appeasement toward Germany, was seeking a way for both countries to avoid any commitments that involved Czechoslovakia.¹⁴ French foreign minister Yvon Delbos understood the implications of Chamberlain's questions. His response was to treat the Czechoslovak issue as a matter of legal concern rather than of political or strategic significance, emphasizing that those French treaty commitments might not apply if unrest by the German minority in Czechoslovakia were supported by German military intervention. Chamberlain took this possible loophole and made it into a rationale for appeasement. Austria was not even mentioned.¹⁵ It was an ironic coincidence that although Hitler was preparing the diplomatic and military basis for German territorial expansion, Chamberlain unintentionally strove to create a British national policy that, in effect, would assist Hitler.¹⁶

Earlier, in 1934, Hitler planned to annex Austria but was thwarted by Italy. By 1938 much had changed. Mussolini and Hitler were together in the Axis. Moreover, French and British opposition to German self-determination, forbidden in the Versailles Treaty, was not strong. On 13 March 1938 Hitler carried out the *Anschluss* (annexation of Austria). Such an act by Germany would earlier have meant war but when the annexation took place there was not even a war of words in the League of Nations.¹⁷

With the *Anschluss* accomplished, Hitler turned his gaze toward Czechoslovakia. His specific focus was what Nazi propaganda called the Sudetenland, home to nearly 3.5 million ethnic Germans. Since 1937 Hitler had been threatening Czechoslovakia on behalf of these kin, initially demanding special rights for them. Hitler began intimating that he was prepared to use force to add the Sudetenland to the Great German Reich.¹⁸ France had a treaty commitment to defend Czechoslovakia, but Great Britain had to support France and did not want to get drawn into a central European war. On 22 March, the British foreign secretary Lord Halifax reminded French leaders that the Locarno guarantee applied only to defending the borders of France. In short, should France go to war in Central Europe to honor its treaty commitments to Czechoslovakia, it would do so without Great Britain. It was painfully clear that Britain thought its participation in mutual security extended no farther than the borders of France.¹⁹ In late July the British cabinet sent Lord Runciman to Prague. His official purpose was to learn if there was any possible way to achieve conciliation between Germany and Czechoslovakia over the Sudetenland. The practical outcome of his visit, however, was to demonstrate that Great Britain did not really want to defend Czechoslovakia.²⁰

Throughout the summer of 1938, Hitler, a master of psychological warfare, created and nurtured the perception that war over the plight of the Sudeten

Germans was near. In fact, despite the war hysteria and fear he stirred up, Hitler made no specific threats. It was in this climate of dread that Britain, especially, looked to the annual Nazi Party Congress (*Reichsparteitag*) in Nuremberg with horrid anticipation; fearful that Hitler might declare war or make demands that would lead to war.²¹ Throughout the eight days of the *Reichsparteitag*, various Nazi leaders and functionaries made speeches and comments that fanned German anger and fed French and British uncertainty. The culmination was the führer's speech on the concluding night, 12 September. Although he continued his harsh but nonspecific threats and engaged in a vicious personal attack on the Czechoslovak leadership, no ultimatum or declaration of war was forthcoming.²²

Chamberlain, hoping to sustain peace, arranged to meet with Hitler at Berchtesgaden on 15 September. Hitler ranted for several hours about the alleged abuse and mistreatment of the Sudeten Germans. After listening with patient concern, Chamberlain agreed to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia. At a follow-up meeting in Bad Godesberg on 22 September, at which details about plebiscites and other issues were to be arranged, Hitler increased his demands to include the immediate evacuation of the entire Sudeten territory. This evacuation, stated Hitler, would begin on 26 September and be complete in no more than forty-eight hours. Additionally, to weaken the remnant of Czechoslovakia even more, he demanded border changes in favor of Poland and Hungary on behalf of their own minorities.²³

Between Chamberlain's meetings with Hitler at Berchtesgaden and Bad Godesberg there were intensive Anglo-French meetings in London on 18–19 and 25–26 September. The parties met to refine their plans to placate Hitler and avoid war.

The outcome produced by the convergence of appeasement and Hitler's ambitions was ratified in a four-power conference held in Munich to resolve the details of ceding the Sudetenland to Germany. On 29–30 September 1938, France, Germany, Great Britain, and Italy formalized the dismemberment of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. Indeed, the Munich Conference was nothing more than a *fait accompli*: merely a venue at which to work out the details of great decisions already made. Czechoslovakia was not included in the deliberations that decided its fate. Only afterward were its leaders and citizens informed of the details of their country's funeral.

The Czechs did know what was happening, however, because Britain and France told them frequently that if they refused to meet Hitler's "reasonable demands," and war ensued, they would fight alone. Thus, their splendid army and superb fortifications were nullified by diplomacy.²⁴ And so on 1 October 1938, German troops occupied the Sudetenland. Poland and Hungary also annexed lands from Czechoslovakia that contained their ethnic kin.²⁵

In retrospect it is easy to disparage the appeasers and their often naïve views. Even so, most of them were good, sincere men opposed to war who sought to transcend the failed methods of the past with new solutions to in-

ternational crises. By following a deliberate policy of appeasement, Britain and France clung to the hope that Hitler's declarations of peace were sincere. Germany, meanwhile, was following a course that took it from impotence, through restored equality, to territorial expansion, and finally superior force. The British and French hope invested in Hitler's good intentions soon proved no substitute for a resolute policy. After having served as midwife to the virtual destruction of Czechoslovakia, Chamberlain was surprised and angered when less than six months later what remained of that much-reduced state disappeared from German maps. On 14 March 1939, the Germans militarily occupied Bohemia and Moravia, establishing the façade of a protectorate two days later. Meanwhile, Slovakia proclaimed independence.²⁶

Events moved ever more quickly. Hitler looked to his next targets. On 21 March Germany proposed to Poland a settlement for both Danzig and the Polish Corridor. The next day German troops occupied Memel, bloodlessly taking it back from Lithuania. Four days after that, Poland rejected German proposals.²⁷

In the west, finally noticing the true value of the führer's pledged word, Chamberlain was forced to conclude that Hitler was not a gentleman. As a consequence and after consultation with his French colleagues, Prime Minister Chamberlain declared on behalf of both Britain and France that, as of 31 March, their two countries guaranteed Poland's independence. On 6 April there was an Anglo-Polish declaration exchanging promises of mutual assistance. This declaration culminated in a formal agreement of mutual assistance concluded on 25 August.²⁸

Why should Hitler believe the British and the French were serious now? Czechoslovakia, the only real democracy in Central and Eastern Europe, had been betrayed by the two largest democracies in Europe. Why would England and France now fight to defend Poland, a military dictatorship that had helped dismember Czechoslovakia? Besides, the führer's claims on Danzig and his efforts to alter the Polish Corridor were basically no different than his claims on Czechoslovakia the previous year. What had changed was the British attitude. Hitler had used up his reservoir of good will at Bad Godesberg and Munich.²⁹

Looking back it also is easy to see how British and French efforts to maintain peace under the system created at Paris in 1919 failed. Horrified by the vast expenditure of blood and treasure in the Great War of 1914–1918, Britain and France, among others, sought to maintain the peace. Although their goal was worthy, it proved no guarantee of a worthy outcome. That goal, compelled also by practical political, economic, and military reasons, drove them to seek continued peace at almost any price.

Whereas the Munich Conference of 1938 was a single event, in the larger context it was the culmination of attitudes and events that began in the 1920s. The process of acceding to each new German treaty evasion or demand made it harder and harder to resist the inevitable next evasion or demand. Moreover,

in their revulsion against war, Britain and France failed to note that Hitler did not share their attitude. The League of Nations consistently demonstrated throughout the 1930s that it had no power beyond moral force, and that force was easily ignored by those who had a different morality.

Out of this conference came several interrelated failures: those of the systems created by the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, and that of Britain and France to honor their treaty obligations. Consequently, the failure of the Munich Conference to secure and maintain a lasting peace must be seen within the context of these multiple, concurrent, interrelated failures during the period from the end of the First World War almost to the beginning of the Second World War. The sum of these failures gave Adolf Hitler success after success until Britain and France realized that, in their quest to maintain peace with Germany, they had given away too much.

Hitler did not realize this change in attitude, and so he reached as he had so often and so successfully before, for another acquisition. Before 1939 the British and the French miscalculated, but in 1939 it was the führer who did so. The result was world war.³⁰

Endnotes

1. Heinrich Beenken, pub., *Der Vertrag von Versailles* (Berlin: Verlag Der Tuermer, 1933), pp. 2–3. See also Charles L. Mee Jr., *The End of Order: Versailles 1919* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1980), pp. 203–25.

2. *Der Vertrag von Versailles*. See also Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994), pp. 244–45.

3. Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, pp. 244–45.

4. Mee, *End of Order*, pp. 262–63.

5. Hans W. Gatzke, *Stresemann and the Rearmament of Germany* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1954), pp. 89–106.

6. S. William Halperin, *Germany Tried Democracy: A Political History of the Reich from 1918–1933* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1965), pp. 213–27, 517–26. See also Golo Mann, *Deutsche Geschichte 1919–1945* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1973), pp. 122–40.

7. John W. Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich: Prologue to Tragedy* (New York: Viking Press, 1964), pp. 248–49, 359. See also Robert Graves and Alan Hodge, *The Long Week-End: A Social History of Great Britain 1918–1939* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1963), p. 324.

8. Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 292–97. See also Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, pp. 237–38.

9. Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, pp. 247–48. See also Reich Ministry of the Interior, *Reichsgesetzblatt*, Teil I, “Proklamation der Reichsregierung an das deutsche Volk,” and “Gesetz fuer den Aufbau der Wehrmacht,” 16 Mar 1935 (Berlin: Reichsverlagsamt, 1935), pp. 369–75; and *Der Vertrag von Versailles*, Teil V, as well as *Reichsgesetzblatt*, Teil I, “Wehrgesetz,” 21 May 1935, pp. 609–14; “Erlass des Fuehrers und Reichskanzlers ueber die Dauer der aktiven Dienstpflicht in der Wehrmacht,” 22 May 1935, p. 614; “Erlass des Fuehrers und Reichskanzlers ueber die Uebertragung des Verordnungsrechts nach dem Wehrgesetz,” 22 May 1935, pp. 615–80.

10. *Der Vertrag von Versailles*, Teil III, Abschnitt III: Linkes Rheinufer, Artikeln 42–44. See also Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 304.

11. W. N. Medlicott et al., eds., *Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919–1939*, vol. 16 (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, n.d.), pp. 84–89. See also Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 304.

12. Medlicott et al., *Documents*, p. 110.
13. "Minutes of the Conference in the Reich Chancellery, Berlin, November 5, 1937 [so-called Hossbach Memorandum], which appear in English translation in *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918–1945*, series D, vol. 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), no. 19. See also Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 30th ed. (Munich: Verlag Franz Eher Nachfolger, 1933), pp. 726–58; Mann, *Deutsche Geschichte 1919–1945*, p. 169; Christopher Thorne, *The Approach of War, 1938–1939* (London: Macmillan, 1971), pp. 40–41.
14. Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, p. 14; Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 308.
15. Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 308.
16. Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, p. 14.
17. *Reichsgesetzblatt*, Teil I, "Gesetz ueber die Wiedervereinigung Oesterreichs mit dem Deutschen Reich," 14 Mar 1936, pp. 237–38. For the official Nazi view of the Versailles Treaty at the time of the *Anschluss*, see Der Reichsorganisationsleiter der NSDAP, pub. "Nie wieder Versailles," *Der Schulungsbrief*, V. Jahrgang, 3. Folge (Berlin, Mar 1938). See also Rene Albrecht-Carrie, *A Diplomatic History of Europe since the Congress of Vienna*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), pp. 526–29.
18. *Der Vertrag von Versailles*, Teil III, Abschnitt VII: Tschechoslowakei, Artikeln 81–86; Albrecht-Carrie, *Diplomatic History*, pp. 522–24.
19. Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, pp. 30–40; see also Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, pp. 311–12.
20. "Lord Runciman to the Prime Minister [Runciman Report]," 21 Sep 1938. This is reprinted as Appendix D in Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, pp. 445–51. It is worth noting that also on 21 Sep Lord Runciman sent a similar letter to President Benes. See also Albrecht-Carrie, *Diplomatic History*, p. 523.
21. Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 312; see also Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, p. 84.
22. Zentralverlag der NSDAP, *Der Parteitag Grossdeutschland vom 5. bis 12. September 1938: Offizieller Bericht ueber den Verlauf des Reichsparteitages mit saemlichen Kongressreden* (Munich: Franz Eher Nachf., 1938). The transcript of Hitler's speech is printed in the chapter titled, "Die grosse Schlussrede des Fuehrers vor dem Kongress," pp. 323–47.
23. Mann, *Deutsche Geschichte 1919–1945*, pp. 171–78; see also Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, pp. 311–14; Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, pp. 118–82.
24. Albrecht-Carrie, *Diplomatic History*, pp. 521–27; see also Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, pp. 50–51, 152, 157–59; Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, pp. 311–14.
25. *Reichsgesetzblatt*, Teil I, "Erlass des Fuehrers und Reichskanzlers ueber die Verwaltung der sudetendeutschen Gebiete," 1 Oct 1938, pp. 1331–32; see also Arnold Wolfers, *Britain and France between Two Wars: Conflicting Strategies of Peace from Versailles to World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1966), p. 127; Donald S. Detwiler, *Germany: A Short History* (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1976), pp. 196, 198–99; Albrecht-Carrie, *Diplomatic History*, p. 528.
26. *Reichsgesetzblatt*, Teil I, "Erlass des Fuehrers und Reichskanzlers ueber das Protektorat Boehmen und Maehren," 16 Mar 1939. For Chamberlain's reaction, see Wolfers, *Britain and France*, p. 293, fn. 35; and Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, pp. 349–59.
27. Wolfers, *Britain and France*, pp. 292–303; see also *Reichsgesetzblatt*, Teil I, "Gesetz ueber die Wiedervereinigung des Memellandes mit dem Deutschen Reich," 23 Mar 1939, pp. 559–60.
28. "Agreement of Mutual Assistance between the United Kingdom and Poland [with Protocol]." This is reprinted as Appendix O in Wheeler-Bennett, *Munich*, pp. 478–81; see also Wolfers, *Britain and France*, pp. 292–303.
29. Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, pp. 315–17; see also Wolfers, *Britain and France*, pp. 289–92.
30. "German Army Attacks Poland," *New York Times*, 1 Sep 1939; see also, "Britain and France in War at 6 a.m.," *New York Times*, 3 Sep 1939.

Bulgaria's Preordained Choice in 1941 and 1944

Anatoliy Prokopiev

Two weeks after the beginning of World War II, Bulgaria declared its neutrality. The monarch and the government strove to be extremely cautious in assessing the situation and arriving at a decision. Still fairly fresh was the memory of World War I, Czar Boris the 3d remembered the abdication of his father, and the ministers could not forget the trials of some people from among the state leadership of that time.

At this point, coalitions had not been formed, and the ultimate outcome of the war remained unclear. The czar was not overly sure that Germany would be victorious and he was uncertain about the strength of that nation's alliance with Italy, although he did reckon that "rapprochement with the Soviets would amount to plunging into a river of unknown depth."¹ Caution was reinforced by the state of affairs in the region. The neighboring members of the Balkan Pact were ready to confront Bulgaria if it entered the war on the side of Germany or Italy. Furthermore, the armed forces of the states of the pact had superiority that commanded respect.

Neutrality, however, was tantamount to benevolence toward Germany, and this was not accidental. First and foremost, Bulgaria associated with Germany its hopes for a revision of the Neuilly Treaty.² What's more, the two states were linked economically—some three-quarters of Bulgaria's exports went to the Third Reich, and the armaments of the Bulgarian army were predominantly of German origin.

The fate of Bulgaria's neutrality, however, was not entirely in its own hands. It was dependent on the aspirations of the great powers, especially on the interests and plans of Germany. Berlin held the Balkan Peninsula among the regions "of special value from the military, military/economic, and transportation/technical viewpoint." The Third Reich's craving for economic and political expansion into southeastern Europe had become "the constant strategic goal" of its foreign policy. The prolonged stationing of German troops in the peninsula ensured sizable military and strategic advantages and access to large quantities of raw materials.³

Germany had been attaining its tasks and executing its actions gradually. Before the autumn of 1940, German military efforts had been aimed at regions relatively remote from the Balkans. Reich leaders, however, had never missed an opportunity to demonstrate their interest in this area—an interest categorically revealed by Hitler and his foreign minister, Joachim von Rib-

bentrop, at their meeting with Bulgaria's prime minister, Bogdan Filov, on 27 July 1940. They further stressed their willingness to act as an arbitrator in the local territorial disputes. Bulgaria was promised every support, including the handing over of the captured armaments acquired by the German army in its previous combat actions.

While completing the implementation of its undertakings in northern and western Europe, Germany constantly was looking at the east. At the same time, on 27 September 1940, Germany, Italy, and Japan concluded a trilateral pact. The proposals to join this pact were sent out to other states. By the end of November, the pact was joined by Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia.

On 16 October 1940 Bulgaria too received an ultimatum-like demand to join the pact. Six days later the czar sent to Hitler his personal letter, thus dispensing with the political tension that had built up in the country. Bulgaria's response to Germany's proposal was negative, and the main reasons quoted as underlying this refusal were the unprepared state of the Bulgarian army and the threat on the part of the Balkan agreement. Boris the 3d implored Hitler to give another consideration to the implied need for altering Bulgaria's current policy, stating that such alteration "would exhaust immediately our moderate potentials" and would lead to "the fading of the economic life and production in the country."⁴

The Bulgarian monarch also withstood the pressure of Germany during his personal meeting with Hitler on 18 November. The German dictator was not exceedingly convincing when claiming that what he requested was not Bulgaria's participation in the war, but solely its signing of the Trilateral Pact.

This refusal by Sofia caused some annoyance in Berlin, but in no way did it immobilize the military machine already set in motion. The Third Reich had its own vested interests in the Balkans, and Bulgaria simply could not be bypassed. On 13 December 1940 Hitler approved Directive 20 on the campaign to be staged by the Wehrmacht in the Balkans. Operation *MARITTA* was aimed solely against Greece. The operation's plan envisaged the concentration of a powerful strike force in the territory of Romania, to be followed by its passage through Bulgaria, and its seizure of the northern coast of the Aegean Sea and, if necessary, the entire territory of Greece.⁵

Nobody asked Bulgaria for its opinion on this plan, and it was not seen as an obstacle in the German army's path to the south. All this became clear during the meeting of the führer and Bogdan Filov that took place on 4 January 1941, when Hitler stated that the number of troops amassed for the operation were so great that they would be able to preclude any "compilation." Hitler's threatening tone was clear enough for the prime minister, and he understood that there was neither time nor room for further maneuvering. The predictable ultimate outcome of going on with the game of mutual pretensions and retreats presented no viable alternative.⁶

The pressure on Bulgaria continued in every direction. The number of German troops in Romania was growing persistently, and numerous pontoon

detachments were being concentrated along the Danube's left bank. On 20 January 1941 the Council of Ministers of Bulgaria spent eight hours discussing the military and political situation in the Balkans. The ministers concluded that the state was unable "to counteract the German march," and they decided in principle on Bulgaria's joining the Trilateral Pact.⁷

From that moment on, the events took their logical course. Early in February several official documents were signed. The major ones among them were the "Neubacher" intergovernmental agreement and the protocol between the Command of the 12th German Army deployed in Romania and Bulgaria's Staff of Armed Forces. These documents actually regulated all of the issues of the stay, provisioning, and responsibility of the German armed forces who were to enter Bulgaria when it joined the pact. Also agreed on was the German forces' interaction with Bulgaria's army (which was not to take part in Operation MARITTA).

The official termination of Bulgaria's 18-month neutrality took place on 1 March 1941 at Vienna's Belvedere Palace when Prime Minister Filov signed the minutes on joining the Trilateral Pact.

Why would Bulgaria again link her path with Germany despite the unpleasant memories of the previous world war? This was due to economic, political, and military factors and prerequisites. One could name among them the substantial economic dependence of Bulgaria, the two countries' similar sad fate after the First World War and their general desire to do away with the Versailles terms, the unwillingness of other powers to give ear to Bulgaria's justified territorial claims, the growing belief that it was only Germany that could safeguard Bulgaria's interests, the German assistance in the evolvment of Bulgarian armed forces, Germany's swift victories in all of the preceding campaigns, and so on.

For two decades after the First World War, Bulgaria had been kept in isolation, held under suspicion, blamed for all sins, and neglected to the benefit of the adjoining states. All this had given rise to a feeling of mistrust toward the great powers that had been applying the Versailles system, and to a growing perception of common interests with Germany. The latter's actions and promises appeared to be both inspiring and convincing.

Germany farsightedly retained the role of the sole intermediary between Bulgaria and Romania in resolving the issue of returning Dobroudja to Bulgaria in September 1940. Germany promised to afford Bulgaria access to the White [Aegean] Sea between the Struma and Maritsa rivers. Although Hitler initially had opposed Bulgaria's expansion to the west, following the takeover in Belgrade on 27 March, he conceded to all Bulgarian demands concerning the western fringes and Vardar Macedonia. Thus, a potential for addressing Bulgaria's painful national concerns was created.

The impact on Bulgaria of the rest of the great powers was not equal to that of Germany. Moreover, there was no coordination of this impact whatsoever. Great Britain tried to do everything in its power to prevent Bulgaria

from joining the Trilateral Pact. From the very beginning of the war until the spring of 1940, Britain tried to create Balkan alliances involving Bulgaria and carry out military operations in the Balkans with Bulgaria's participation, even to the point of trying to include Bulgaria in the joint common system to oppose Germany. In the summer and fall of 1940, Great Britain's objective became more moderate: to maintain Bulgaria's neutrality the way it had been proclaimed, certain pro-German sympathies notwithstanding. After late 1940, and specifically in the beginning of 1941, it had already become evident that Bulgaria was no longer able to resist Germany's entreaties, and the sole demand Britain put before that government was that it not engage actively with Germany.⁸ Certain downgrading of Great Britain's policy was apparent in its attempts to account for the attainable. Ultimately, however, Great Britain completely failed to reach its objectives.

The Soviet Union's attempts to draw Bulgaria closer to itself also proved fruitless. The Bulgarian government declined to accept a Soviet proposal it received in November 1940 to sign a pact of mutual assistance. Leaders in Sofia were terrified of potential "Baltization" and "bolshevization." The fear of such developments had been steadily growing as Berlin kept sending specifically selected information about Moscow's intentions in the Balkans.

This course of events attested to a certain closeness in the British and Soviet interests in the region, specifically in what concerned the orientation of Bulgaria. However, similar interests had not resulted in any unity of actions. Great Britain viewed with apprehension any potential growth of Soviet influence in the Balkans. The Soviet Union, in its turn, tried to refrain from any actions that could provoke a premature confrontation with Germany, and to some degree was reluctant to engage in any joint initiatives with Great Britain. The relations between Moscow and London were dominated by mistrust and suspicion.

The United States displayed no ambitions to determine or to direct the behavior of Bulgaria. It had not aspired to preclude Bulgaria's joining the Trilateral Pact because it deemed such aspiration unattainable. Washington's policy was marked, first and foremost, by efforts to maintain Bulgaria's neutrality for as long as possible—not by threats or warnings of punishment, but by efforts more along the lines of compassion, admiration, and incentives for nonalliance.⁹

Diplomatic pressure remained the only option for Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States in trying to influence the policy of Bulgaria. They were devoid of real power that could dictate the course of events in the region. Germany alone had such power, as represented by the 680,000-strong grouping of armed forces deployed in Romania. Bulgaria's choice was preordained by the military factor. The country had no possibilities for confronting the Wehrmacht, which had already defeated adversaries far stronger than the Bulgarian army. Moreover, there were no moral grounds to demand that its soldiers defend the artificial Versailles borders in the Balkans, beyond which a million and a half of their compatriots were left.

The great powers lost no time in responding to the fact of Bulgaria's joining the Trilateral Pact. On 3 March, in a note sent to the Bulgarian government in Sofia, leaders in Moscow declared that the Soviet Union did not share Bulgaria's view of the properness of its attitude because this would lead to expansion of the war and to Bulgaria's involvement in it. Bulgaria's joining the pact, however, did not result in the two states breaking their diplomatic relations.

Great Britain's reaction was very intense. Its interests in the Balkans were strongly affected and some blame for it was ascribed to the actions of the Bulgarian government. On 5 March Great Britain recalled its diplomatic mission from Sofia and declared an economic blockade of Bulgaria.

The response of the United States likewise was not long in coming, but it was limited solely to freezing Bulgarian assets. It appeared that Washington was somewhat aware of the predicament in which Bulgaria had found itself. The United States, however, warned that it could declare war if Bulgaria were to extend military assistance to the countries of the pact.

Bulgaria's prolonged reluctance in joining the coalition had its own direct aftereffects. It had affected adversely the prestige of the Axis to a significant degree. Simultaneous acceptance with celebratory fireworks in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania planned by Hitler for October 1940 did not occur. Bulgaria's refusal became a model to be followed by other states under pressure by the Trilateral Pact.

Greece, at war with Italy since 28 October 1940, profited from the delay in Bulgaria's joining the pact. It managed to withdraw three military units from the Bulgarian border and deploy them against the Italian army. Furthermore, the launching of Operation MARITTA had been delayed, and that afforded Greece more time to prepare its armed forces for a countereffort.

Bulgaria joined the Trilateral Pact on the strict condition that the country would not take part in combat actions in the Balkans. Moreover, this condition extended to any other future military operations of the pact. It is not by accident that Operation BARBAROSSA did not expect any participation of Bulgarian armed forces. Neither would those forces later make their appearance at the Eastern Front.

In 1944 Bulgaria was put to the test one more time. The certain defeat of the Third Reich prompted the Bulgarian government to take practical action—all the more practical because the Red Army was unwaveringly forcing its way toward the Balkans. The fears of bolshevization of the country were becoming more topical. Eyes were turning toward the governments of the western democracies with whom, unfortunately, Bulgaria was at war. With those democracies rested the hopes for an armistice that could prevent the Soviet troops from invading Bulgaria.

The government of Ivan Bagrianov that came to power on 1 June 1944 undertook some decisive steps in this direction. Stoicho Moshanov was entrusted with a secret mission of establishing an unofficial contact with the

British and informing them of the government's desire to renounce the state of war with Great Britain and the United States. With this task he left for Turkey on 8 August. At a meeting with the British ambassador in Ankara, Moshanov begged for the terms under which Bulgaria could withdraw from the war.

Diplomacy was grinding slowly, while the events at the Eastern Front were advancing at a rapid pace. The Soviet armed forces had crushed the enemy's Yassy-Kishinev grouping, entered Romania, and were approaching the border of Bulgaria. Once again, like four years before, the country was exposed to a mighty military force that the Bulgarian army was unable to oppose. Moreover, there was neither the ability nor the willingness to do so. On the demand of British representatives, Moshanov went to Ankara on 28 August, and later to Cairo. But it was already too late; the die had been cast, and once again Bulgaria had no options. On 5 September the Soviet Union declared war on Bulgaria, and a few days later armed forces of the 3d Ukrainian Front invaded the country. There was no hope for Bulgaria, which had long been allocated to the area of Soviet influence.

Such allocation was finally confirmed several months later at the Yalta Conference of Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Joseph Stalin. This time the new allies demanded not only a territory for deployment of their troops, but also provision of armed forces. The British ambassador in Cairo informed Moshanov that "Russia was counting on a strong Bulgarian army which, hand in hand with the Soviet armed forces, would fight until the Germans are finally ousted from the Balkans."¹⁰ This was authorized by the 28 October signing in Moscow of an armistice agreement between Bulgaria on one hand, and Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States on the other. This agreement obligated the Bulgarian government to "sustain and make available such ground, naval, and air forces that could be directed for service under the general guidance by the Allied (Soviet) High Command."¹¹

Bulgaria did not defy this demand by the Allies. It was interested in taking part in a war geared to defeating Hitler's Germany. Its armed forces went through mobilization, and by the beginning of October already numbered more than 450,000. Most of those troops took part in the combat operations in eastern Serbia, Vardar Macedonia, and Kosovo. One joint army unit later was engaged in combat actions inside Hungary and Austria until the end of the war.

The inclusion of the Bulgarian army in the actions liberating the Balkans was dictated by military and strategic needs. At that time (September 1944), the 3d Ukrainian Front preparing for the Belgrade offensive numbered only one army (the 57th) and several corps. Its troops were capable of action solely within a limited strip in northwestern Bulgaria. But there was already a dire need to advance upon the enemy as far as the shores of the White [Aegean] Sea. The Yugoslav people's liberation forces, which could act in the rear area of the German grouping, lacked heavy armaments (tanks, artillery, and airplanes), and they were still clinging to guerilla war tactics. By that time

the enemy had a grouping of forces in Yugoslavia and Greece that numbered more than 900,000 people.

Only the Bulgarian army's input could shift the situation to a ratio of troops and arms favorable to the Allies, and thereby enable them to engage in a successful offensive action over a wide front line. General Erich Richberg, head of staff of the German "E" Army Group, remarked, "It went without saying that considering the strive for further unchallenged evolution of their operations, the Russian command had to account for the German armed forces in Greece, and to preclude their engagement in the events. The major task of blocking and liquidating this enemy the Command entrusted to the Bulgarian army that had recently joined them."¹² A clear assessment was also provided by General Mikhailo Apostolski, one of the leaders of the Yugoslav army, who stated, "From the operational viewpoint, the most advantageous approach was including the new popular-front Bulgarian army into the war against the German armed forces in the territory of Serbia and Macedonia."¹³ Even Yugoslavia's leader Josip Broz Tito reckoned that the need for Bulgarian participation in the war extended beyond the Balkan Peninsula's confines "until Hitler's war machine was ultimately eliminated."¹⁴ (This opinion, however, did not prevent Tito from completely changing his attitude after the war.)

The agreement of 28 October put Bulgaria into a position of subordination to and dependence on its new allies. The Allied Control Commission located there had an unlimited authority to regulate and monitor adherence to the armistice terms. In fact, this commission was in control of the entire economic and political life of Bulgaria, with all the ensuing adverse effects on the country.

Thus, in the years of the Second World War, Bulgaria was twice forced to choose an ally, as each of the great powers proved to be in need of Bulgaria's territory, economy, and armed forces. The strategic location of Bulgaria at the crossroads of East and West had its own dear price. Sadly, it was ultimately paid not by the interested ally, but by the Bulgarian people.

Germany afforded Bulgaria the access to the White [Aegean] Sea, the western fringes, and Vardar Macedonia. The people named Boris the 3d "the Uniter Czar," and believed that the huge sacrifices of the previous three wars had not been in vain. In the autumn of 1944, the country's new allies shrunk Bulgaria to its prewar borders. But that was by far not the sole adverse effect it suffered. The decisions adopted at Yalta in February 1945 predefined the attitude of the great powers toward Bulgaria during sessions of the Paris Peace Conference in the summer and fall of 1946. Although Bulgaria had lost thousands of men and suffered huge material losses in the war against Germany, it was not recognized as a co-fighting country, with all the negative consequences. Bulgaria was cast into the Soviet sphere of dominance not of its own free will, and the winds of the Cold War were already blowing around the world. The great powers were redrafting again the borders in Europe, pursuing only their own interests.

Endnotes

[Although the titles are presented in English here, all references are in Bulgarian.]

1. Bogdan Filov, *Dimitrov, Ilcho Ivanov. Diaries (Dnevnik)* (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestveniiia front, 1990), p. 200; V. Toshkova, *Bulgaria in the Balkan Policy toward the U.S.A. in 1939–1944* (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestveniiia front, 1985), p. 53.
2. The peace treaty was signed in November 1919 at Neuilly-sur-Seine, France, between Bulgaria and the victorious states in World War I. Bulgaria suffered from the treaty's heavy economic, political, and military sanctions.
3. R. Nikolov, *Bulgaria–Germany Military and Economic Relations in 1941–1944*, (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestveniiia front, 1991), p. 10.
4. *Bulgaria–Germany Relations and Links, Studies and Information*, vol. 1 (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestveniiia front, 1971), p. 442.
5. *History of the Second World War 1939–1945* (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestveniiia front, 1977), p. 299.
6. R. Nikolov, *Collected Works*, p. 14.
7. B. Filov, *Collected Works*, p. 231
8. I. Dimitrov, *England and Bulgaria (1938–1941)* (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestveniiia front, 1983), p. 239.
9. V. Toshkova, *Collected Works*, pp. 124–25.
10. *Centuries: Essays, Memoirs, Documents from the Thirteen Centuries of Bulgarian History* (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestveniiia front, 1972), p. 191.
11. *Foreign Policy of the People's Republic of Bulgaria*, vol. 1 (1970), p. 15.
12. *History of the Patriotic War in Bulgaria 1944–1945*, vol. 4 (Sofia: Izd-vo na Otechestveniiia front, 1984), pp. 203, 239.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*

From Isolation to Intervention: Anglo-Canadian Defense Relations from the Canadian Perspective, 1935–1939

B. J. C. McKercher

I came back each time in my thoughts to the condition of Canada and the world at the present time. Europe may be in a state of war very soon; Britain may be drawn in; we may have very big problems on our hands here—the country itself divided. Lapointe immediately said there would be no going to war by Canada.

– Mackenzie King, October 1935¹

In the latter half of the 1930s, Anglo-Canadian relations lacked the political intimacy that had existed before 1919. The reason lay in Canada, more specifically, with the foreign policy of the Liberal government led by William Lyon Mackenzie King, which took office in October 1935. To a large degree this ministry pursued what today might be called a two-track diplomacy: a political track distinguished by a determination to remain isolated from the difficult situations emerging in Europe and the Far East, and an economic track defined by an aggressive determination to improve the depression-ravaged Canadian economy by pursuit of trade agreements with other powers, chiefly the United States. The isolationist impulse stemmed from Mackenzie King, who served as his own minister of external affairs. And at the base of his calculations lay two crucial factors. First, given that the province of Quebec provided a substantial number of Liberal members of Parliament and that they and his chief Quebec lieutenant, Ernest Lapointe, held deep-seated reservations about Canada becoming involved in another war to help defend British interests, Mackenzie King saw isolation as essential for domestic unity. Second, since 1922, when Mackenzie King led his first government, he and his advisors opposed any notion of Canadian support for an “imperial” foreign policy. Although part of the grounds for doing so lay in the domestic realm—Quebec’s antipathy toward reinforcing British diplomatic strategy—the main reason derived from the advent of Canadian nationalism. For a range of English- and French-speaking Canadians, Canada existed as a sovereign and independent state, and its foreign policy had to reflect and protect Canadian interests and values.

Nonetheless, when Britain was forced to declare war on Nazi Germany in early September 1939, Mackenzie King’s government saw it as Canada’s “self-

evident national duty” to support the mother country²—though it declared war on 10 September, one week after Britain did so, in a show of independence. In this way, Canadian foreign policy and its handmaiden, defense policy, underwent a transition in the five years after October 1935. This process is one of great historiographic controversy in Canada, encompassing debate over both the question of isolationism and the desires of domestic opinion, split between English-speaking Canada and Quebec, to support Britain in a second “Great War.”³ In this context it is important to remove the crust of this controversy to see precisely how and why Canada willingly joined with Britain and its other imperial allies to meet the lethal threat posed by Nazi Germany in the autumn of 1939.

The election of Mackenzie King’s government in October 1935 came in the midst of the Abyssinian crisis caused by the ambitions of Benito Mussolini’s fascist regime to expand the Italian empire in East Africa. Before the election the Canadian Conservative government of Richard Bennett had decided to support British efforts through the League of Nations to restrain Mussolini’s regime by applying economic sanctions—ultimately, an oil embargo. The British wanted to limit Italian gains so as to keep in place an Anglo-French-Italian tripartite agreement formed at Stresa, Italy, the preceding April—an alliance that had as its purpose the containment of Nazi Germany in Europe. Bennett’s government endorsed the league actions on 14 October 1935 by its membership in a league body called the Committee of Eighteen, which oversaw sanctions. But Mackenzie King’s Liberals won office on 14 October and, in its first foreign policy endeavor, the new government reversed the Canadian position in the Committee of Eighteen. In Geneva this action saw the effort to impose sanctions collapse—the Canadian vote gave a slim majority to the opponents of the embargo. The net result was that the league now lacked the ability to restrain the Italians and, by May 1936, Abyssinia was absorbed by Italy. Not only did British security problems in the Mediterranean and the Red Sea become more difficult, but agreements reached at Stresa collapsed and Mussolini’s Italy began to move into the orbit of Nazi Germany.

In terms of Canadian foreign and defense policy, abandoning Bennett’s diplomatic initiative witnessed the emergence of a Canadian Liberal foreign policy that was followed by Mackenzie King until after the Munich Conference of September 1938. The central elements of that policy, which amounted to political isolation, involved domestic stability and nationalism. On 29 October Quebec’s Lapointe threatened to resign “if the government were to decide for military sanctions.”⁴ He would take with him a large number of Quebec ministers and members of Parliament. At the same time, the deputy minister of external affairs, O. D. Skelton, a staunch Canadian nationalist who had been ignored by Bennett in supporting sanctions, argued that Canada had no interests and only faced danger if it supported Britain and the League of Nations.⁵ Mackenzie King’s rationale for staying aloof was simple: “Our own domestic situation must be considered first, and what will serve to keep Canada

united. To be obliged to go into war would force an issue that might become a battle between imperialism and independence. At all costs, this must, if at all possible, be avoided.”⁶

For the next three years Mackenzie King and his government worked hard to keep Canada out of the difficult world of great-power politics in Europe and the Far East. It followed that after Neville Chamberlain’s rise to the premiership in Britain in May 1937, Mackenzie King’s foreign policy endorsed the strategy of appeasement that was followed in London. Indeed, in June 1937, following an Imperial Conference in the British capital, the Canadian prime minister journeyed to Germany to meet Adolf Hitler. He left feeling that Hitler was a man who could be trusted and who sought only to right the wrongs of the Versailles Treaty.⁷ More important, he left believing that the foreign policy that he had been pursuing for almost two years in Ottawa was correct—that Canada had little need to concern itself with the political machinations of Europe or with any efforts that the British might deem necessary to contain German strength. When Hitler launched his policy to gain control of Austria, Mackenzie King thought it justified in terms of Hitler’s pan-German ambitions that were constrained by the treaties of both Versailles and St. Germain. It is not surprising that Hitler’s subsequent gambit to dismember Czechoslovakia by demanding the territory of the German-speaking Sudetenland also found a receptiveness in Ottawa. Mackenzie King endorsed the Munich agreement; his only worry was that Chamberlain would come under attack from anti-appeasers like Alfred Duff Cooper, the war secretary who resigned over the way that the Chamberlain government was handling the German question. “England and the Empire,” Mackenzie King remarked privately, “are well rid of the kind of thing he stands for.”⁸

What Duff Cooper and other anti-appeasers like Winston Churchill stood for was the adoption of a hard line toward Nazi Germany that laid out the limits beyond which Hitler could not move with impunity. Chamberlain’s goal entailed finding diplomatic and military means to safeguard British security. This produced a situation whereby Chamberlain’s government sought to meet legitimate German grievances without endangering British interests and, at the same time, to rearm to deter possible German aggression. Chamberlain called this “the double policy of rearmament and better relations with Germany and Italy.”⁹

Such a strategic prescription was lacking in Canada. Mackenzie King and his foreign policy advisors looked to avoid European entanglements, all the while limiting the improvement of the Canadian armed forces so as to have more public funds for social and other programs indispensable for the reelection of the Liberal government.

As the international situation darkened over the next twelve months, however, Mackenzie King reluctantly found international circumstances and the importance of the Anglo-Canadian relationship forcing his ministry to strengthen the Canadian forces. When Hitler broke the Munich agree-

ment in March 1939 by occupying the rump of Czechoslovakia, Mackenzie King, like Chamberlain, understood that appeasement was dead. In Britain the government began moving to establish that hard line long advocated by the anti-appeasers. It offered guarantees to Poland, Romania, and Greece; it introduced peacetime conscription; it moved toward France, looking to reestablish close Anglo-French military ties based on the precedents established between 1914 and 1918; and it looked to find other allies, chiefly Soviet Russia and the United States. But as it had done at least since 1935, it did not bother to win over Canadian support. Quite simply, the British did not want to ask Mackenzie King's government this question: would it support Britain in a crisis involving Germany? It could not rely on getting a positive answer. Hence, it planned for war on the assumption that Canada would find it in its interests to support Britain in a moment of peril. As an admiralty war planner argued in early 1938, "Whilst the possibility of Canadian neutrality in the event of Great Britain becoming involved in war has long been recognised, it is considered that we are fully justified in basing our plans and policy on the more probable eventuality that the Dominions will cooperate with the Mother Country in war time."¹⁰

Here lay the diplomatic problem confronting Canada. In the midst of the Sudeten crisis, Lapointe had argued that war might be averted. Mackenzie King's response had been cautious. "That is our natural instinct but it looks to me as though Hitler was determined to challenge, if need be, the world, probably with the understanding that he has with his allies, Italy and Japan."¹¹ He even quarreled with Skelton, who was scathing in his criticism of British foreign policy. "Whatever our sympathies with Germany's victims might be," Skelton argued, "it is incredible that we would tamely accept the role cast for us by some overseas directors, namely, that every twenty years Canada should take part in a Central European war, sacrificing the lives of tens of thousands of her young men, bringing herself to the verge of bankruptcy, risking internal splits and disturbances."¹² Mackenzie King's assessment in response was that "... whilst care has to be taken as to determining the part Canada may be called upon to play, and the steps toward that end, that our real self-interest lies in the strength of the British Empire as a whole, not in our geographical position and resources."¹³ He understood that the Czech crisis lay pregnant with danger for European stability. Canada's interests might not necessarily mean isolation. Support for Britain in some way short of armed intervention could preserve unity in the empire, and it might ensure good Canadian-American relations, the other side of the supposed "North Atlantic Triangle" of English-speaking peoples. As Mackenzie King also told Skelton, in terms of Canadian "self-interest" being tied to a strong British Empire: "That not to recognise this would be to ultimately destroy the only great factor for world peace, to lose the association of the United States and the British Empire and all that would mean for world peace. That it would place Canada in an ignominious position."

The Munich Agreement of 30 September 1938 staved off war. But weakened Canadian armed forces needed to be improved and expanded should a new crisis arise that could not be contained. Thus, in the autumn of 1938, Mackenzie King's government approved new defense spending of \$73 million for 1939–1940. Defense spending for 1937–1938 and 1938–1939, respectively, was \$32.8 million and \$34.8 million.¹⁴ The funds for 1937–1939 were actually increases over earlier years when, in the estimation of Charles Stacey, the official military historian of the Canadian armed forces during the Second World War, the Canadian armed forces suffered “decades of neglect.”¹⁵ To a large degree, however, the limited improvement of Canadian forces before the autumn of 1938 was designed to bolster Canadian sovereignty and meet the unfavorable assessments of domestic defense critics. In no sense were the forces being readied for overseas operations or joint operations with Britain because of Canada's isolationist foreign policy. But increased defense spending by late 1938 unknowingly provided Mackenzie King's government with a structure on which expanded Canadian forces could be built after the March 1939 Czech crisis and the end of appeasement.

By the outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939—unforeseen a year earlier—the Royal Canadian Navy (RCN) possessed six modern destroyers (four of which were bought from the Royal Navy) and a seventh was soon to be acquired. Eleven regular and twelve reserve squadrons comprised the Royal Canadian Air Force, although not all had their full complement of aircraft. Nonetheless, established air bases were being improved and new ones constructed. The regular Canadian Army numbered four thousand with support from a reserve force of six thousand. But its weapons were not the most modern—in fact, the reserves were armed with Great War–vintage rifles. And it was the limited weapons of all three armed services that constituted a major problem for Canadian military leaders. Canada's defense industry was minuscule because Canadian governments traditionally relied on supplies from British factories. But the British government had begun rearming in a massive way as early as 1934–1935; and in February 1938, following a major defense review, Chamberlain's government committed to spending £1.6 billion in a major rearmament program that was to be completed by 1941. Accordingly, Canada could not rely necessarily on the British arms industry to supply even the moderate improvement of Canadian defenses.

Still, although the Canadian forces attempted to use the public funds provided to them to improve their effectiveness, their connection to British planning remained limited. For instance, effective cooperation between Canadian and British intelligence had been undermined in early 1937 by the Canadian Cabinet deciding that direct liaison between the British and Canadian air and army general staffs would not happen. Any Canadian communications would be gone over by the minister of national defense and then sent to London via the Department of External Affairs and the Canadian High Commission. The reverse process would also occur.¹⁶ The reason flowed from Mackenzie

King's desire to limit Canadian commitments. However, in some areas, based on British assumptions that Canada would support Britain in a war crisis, Anglo-Canadian cooperation was found to be possible. Thus, when the British Admiralty began to prepare contingency plans for defending transatlantic sea routes in wartime by the use of armed convoys—an echo of the experience in the Great War—the RCN was allowed to align its planning with that of the Royal Navy.¹⁷ In practice, this would entail RCN coordination with the British America and West Indies Fleet. From a political point of view in Ottawa, such a policy could be based on a claim of neutrality, as the United States had done between 1914 and 1917, and it would allow for as little disruption to trade as possible.

The Czech crisis in March 1939 precipitated a change in Canadian public opinion—or, at least, in English-speaking opinion—about isolation from Britain's difficult position. The net result was that as the situation in Europe worsened over the spring and summer, culminating in the conclusion of the Nazi-Soviet nonaggression pact on 23 August 1939, Mackenzie King's government could not ignore the attitudes of voters. The province of Ontario had provided Mackenzie King with his electoral victory in 1935, and influential Cabinet ministers were accordingly chosen to represent Ontario's interests at the national level.¹⁸ Indeed, Ontario had larger representation than Quebec. And as Ontario's opinion came to support Canadian involvement on Britain's side if it went to war—and did so overwhelmingly when Britain declared war on Germany on 3 September 1939—Mackenzie King understood the political reality:¹⁹ his government could fall from power at the next election. But as it was in so many areas of Mackenzie King's governance, he balanced political expediency with an understanding of Canadian national interests. As he had told Skelton just before the Munich conference, "our real self-interest lies in the strength of the British Empire as a whole, not in our geographical position and resources." He and his government would support the British war effort politically, economically, and militarily. It would do so willingly. But it would do so in a way that only strengthened and extended Canadian interests. With its decision to intervene in the Second World War, Canada and its foreign and defense policies had entered a new phase.

Endnotes

1. Mackenzie King diary, 19 Oct 1935, Manuscript Group, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa [MG] 26 J13.

2. J. L. Granatstein and R. Bothwell, "A Self-Evident National Duty: Canadian Foreign Policy, 1935–1939," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 3 (1975): 212–33.

3. T. Copp, "Ontario 1939: The Decision for War," in N. Hillmer et al., eds., *A Country of Limitations: Canada and the World in 1939* (Ottawa, 1996), pp. 109–19; J. L. Granatstein, *Canada's War* (Toronto, 1975), chapters 1–2; J. L. Granatstein, "Staring into the Abyss," in J. L. Granatstein, ed., *Toward a New World: Readings in the History of Canadian Foreign Policy* (Toronto, 1992), pp. 47–63; D. C. Watt, *Succeeding John Bull: America in Britain's Place, 1900–1975* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 50–52. Then compare inesti-

mable C. P. Stacey, *Canada and the Age of Conflict: A History of Canadian External Policies, Vol. II: 1921–1948. The Mackenzie King Era* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1981), pp. 237–69.

4. Mackenzie King diary, 29 Oct 1935, MG 26 J13.

5. *Ibid.*, 25 Oct 1935, MG 26 J13; Skelton memorandum [on a telephone conversation with Bennett], 10 Oct 1935, Department of External Affairs, *Documents on Canadian External Relations*, vol. 5, pp. 391–92.

6. Mackenzie King diary, 29 Oct 1935, MG 26 J13.

7. *Ibid.*, 29 Jun 1937, MG 26 J13.

8. *Ibid.*, 2 Oct 1938, MG 26 J13.

9. I. Colvin, *The Chamberlain Cabinet: How the Meetings in 10 Downing Street, 1937–1939, Led to the Second World War—Told for the First Time from the Cabinet Papers* (New York: Taplinger, 1971), p. 46.

10. Phillips [Director of Plans, Admiralty] minute, 5 Jan 1938, ADM [Admiralty Archives, National Archives, Kew] 1/944.

11. Mackenzie King diary, 24 Sep 1938, MG 26 J13.

12. Memorandum on “Central European Situation,” 11 Sep 1938, Record Group, National Archives, Ottawa [RG] 25, D1/724/66, RG 25, D1/726/74/7.

13. This and the subsequent quotation in this paragraph are from MacKenzie King diary, 12 Sep 1938, MG 26, J13.

14. C. P. Stacey, *The Military Problems of Canada: A Survey of Defence Policies and Strategic Conditions Past and Present* (Toronto: Ryerson, 1940), appendix C.

15. Stacey, *Age of Conflict*, vol. II, p. 220.

16. J. G. Eayrs, *In Defence of Canada: Appeasement and Rearmament: From the Great War to the Great Depression* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), pp. 83–84.

17. Lane to Chief of the Naval Staff, 5 Aug 1938, RG 24 3971/NSS 1048-48-01/4; Admiralty Plans Division memorandum, “Convoy at the Outset of a War with Germany,” 19 Feb 1938, ADM 1/9501; Meyrick [commander in chief, America and West Indies Station] to Secretary of the Admiralty, 31 Jan 1939, RG 24/3852/NSS 1018-6-2/2.

18. Mackenzie King diary, 15–25 Oct 1935, MG 26 J13, for his efforts at Cabinet-making.

19. Copp, “Ontario 1939.”

Soviet Impact on the Czechoslovak Armed Forces

Mikhail Stefanski

In this paper I draw attention to the fate of two Czechoslovak ministers of defense, Ludvik Svoboda and Aleksei Czepicka. Svoboda was minister of defense from 1945 to 1950, and Czepicka from 1950 to 1956. Both ministers lived through political rises and falls closely related to the Soviet politics and Soviet impact on the Czechoslovak armed forces. In stressing this I attempt in no way to minimize the impact of the internal factors, too, on their destinies. The struggle for a greater share in the power structure was innate also in Communist ministers. Hence, only an analysis of both external and internal factors will enable us to assess more objectively the role that these two ministers-general played in their respective historical periods.

The Cold War changed the attitudes of the world powers toward the countries within their spheres of interest—countries that later would be formed into the political-military blocs. These changes were becoming apparent gradually after the end of World War II. In 1947 the stance of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) with regard to the states in its bloc became different from that in the first postwar years. The Soviet Union's interests were centered on gathering information on the condition of the Czechoslovak army and its command cadre.

The minister of defense of the Czechoslovak armed forces, Ludvik Svoboda, became the center of particular attention for the Soviet military and political bodies. His activities in the ministry and the army were being evaluated, first and foremost from the viewpoint of his mindset toward Communists. In a report on the situation in the Czechoslovak army prepared by Mikhail Suslov late in 1947 for the higher Soviet authorities, Svoboda was sharply criticized for his failure to support officer-Communists in their instructive work in the army—a failure blamed on Svoboda's bias for a nonpartisan status of the army—and for his failure to promote Communists to command positions.¹ This Soviet criticism of the minister of defense in 1947 attested to the fact that the Soviet leadership was worried by the minister's attitude toward Communists, as well as by the notion that, in case of a political upheaval and a takeover of power in Czechoslovakia, the Czechoslovak army would not take the Communists' side without reservation.

These misgivings on the part of the USSR became aggravated following the creation of the *Informbureau* in September 1947. The formation of this

agency comprising the nine European Communist parties was a sign of confrontation of the socialist camp with the western camp. In mid-1947, however, the Soviet censure of Svoboda and of some other Communist figures did not affect their status directly. This environment changed only in February 1948 after the Communists had taken over the monopoly of power. The USSR authorities eyed with mistrust the variegated composition of the command cadre in the Czechoslovak army. Command posts there were held by officers and generals who during World War II had represented the forces of resistance, fighters against Nazism in Western Europe, and particularly in Great Britain. Since the beginning of the Cold War, this Soviet mistrust was focused on a portion of the officer cadre with pro-western orientation. Political cleanups after the takeover in February 1948 dealt exactly with this segment of officers and generals.

Svoboda, however, did not belong to this segment. He became an army officer in 1915, after graduation from the Ludvik High Military School in Budapest. He fought within the ranks of Czechoslovak legions in Russia, and battled against the Germans. After World War I he became a battalion commander, a regiment commander, and a Hungarian-language instructor at the Czechoslovak military academy. When World War II began, he went to Poland, and when the latter was defeated, he went to the USSR. He was promoted to the military rank of general in war years when he commanded Czechoslovak units in the Soviet Union. In April 1945 he was appointed the minister of defense, and then promoted to the rank of General of the Army in August. The government program of April 1945 put before the minister of defense the task of building up a new army fashioned on the Soviet model. Standardization of the armaments, training, and management, as it was adopted in the Soviet army, was advancing at a slow pace for both objective and subjective reasons. It was not, however, this sluggish pace of conversion of the army to the Soviet model that was drawing the censure of the Czechoslovak government and of the Soviet envoys prior to mid-1949. In 1947 this Soviet criticism was aimed at the weak support afforded to Communists before they managed to take over the power.

Holding his post of minister of defense, Svoboda wasted no available opportunity to stress the need for partnership with the Soviet Union. Despite his grand merits in World War II battles and his Soviet military decorations for the part played by the Czechoslovak unit in combat actions in the Soviet Union's territory, however, the trust placed in Svoboda was dissipating. Undoubtedly this diminishment of trust might have been caused in part by the fact that the Cold War placed new demands on the role of the armed forces and their commanders and stressed the buildup of the arms industry. This could also be the reason why Svoboda was dismissed from his post of minister of defense in April 1950. Soviet distrust of Svoboda as expressed in a letter addressed to K. Gotwald, president of the Republic, was described as follows: "Our military people hold General Svoboda a person not worthy of trust, as the

one with whom it would not be possible to share military secrets of the USSR without restraint.”² This letter about not trusting Svoboda was the response of the VKP(b) (the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [Bolsheviks]) Central Committee to a request for sending in military advisors. The distrust and his discharge from the post of minister of defense triggered harsh criticism of him by his deputies, Bedrich Raicin and J. Prohazka. In the report they presented to Gotwald, they blamed Svoboda for all negative aspects in the Czechoslovak army of that time—namely, its poor management and training, its low morale and political awareness in the army caused by its adherence to the principle of nonpartisanship, the unresolved issue of standardization, and so on. This report culminated in accusing Svoboda of having the lion’s share in the onset of the adverse situation with the command in the armed forces.³

The reasons for his discharge from the position of minister of defense were explained by Rudolph Slanski, secretary-general of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPC), at the secret conference of secretaries of the Communist Parties and ministers of defense from the five states making up the Soviet bloc. At that meeting in Moscow, 9–12 January 1951, in the presence of Stalin and the Soviet generalship, Slanski revealed that the takeover in February 1948 failed to become a turning point in the evolution of the Czechoslovakian armed forces. The causes cited were Svoboda’s remaining in his ministry post and his surrounding himself with officers oriented toward western military doctrines. Slanski stated that it was the Czechoslovak government’s mistake that Svoboda could hold the key position in the army for so long, and it was only on Stalin’s insistence that he was dismissed.⁴

During the visit by Minister of Defense Aleksei Czepicka to Moscow in July 1951, Stalin inquired about Svoboda. Stalin asked to convey to President Gotwald “that [Gotwald] failed to see in Svoboda the person [Svoboda] was in true reality.”⁵ Stalin’s words served as an indirect prompt to apply repressive measures. Svoboda was discharged from the position of chairman of the State Committee for Sports, and he became unemployed. The state security authorities furnished to President Gotwald information claiming that Svoboda had been among the enemies of the people since 1945, that he had sabotaged the government’s Koscice program, and that he had let Josip Broz Tito’s agents infiltrate the Czechoslovak army’s ranks and hand over military secrets to the Yugoslavs.⁶

Svoboda was jailed by the end of 1952. In a letter from jail addressed to President Gotwald, he denied the accusations brought against him, insisting that he was neither a traitor nor a spy nor a saboteur. He asked Gotwald to release him from jail.⁷ Svoboda’s release was influenced by the politics-laden trial in which Raicin, deputy minister of defense, was sentenced to death; and Prohazka, second deputy minister, was relieved of his position. These huge Communist-inspired court proceedings against 14 Communist personalities that took place late in November 1952 (directed by the Soviet advisors and Czechoslovak security agencies and by the consultants invited to take part

in preparations for the proceedings) somehow drew the attention of the state security people away from Svoboda. After his release Svoboda was employed as an accountant at a farming cooperative.

Svoboda's life took a new turn in mid-1954. This abrupt turn was the deed of Nikita S. Khrushchev, a high Soviet representative who took part in the Congress of Czechoslovak Communists. Khrushchev demanded from the CPC a vindication of Svoboda and suggested his membership in the CPC Central Committee. A paradoxical fact in this situation was that although four full years had passed since Svoboda's discharge from his ministry post, his negative image remained deeply ingrained in the minds of the Czechoslovak leadership. A negative judgment could be heard in the report presented to the CPC Congress by Aleksei Czepicka, the person who next occupied the post of minister of defense. Czepicka insisted that from 1945 to 1950, when Svoboda was the minister, the government program was not implemented and the new Czechoslovak armed forces were not reorganized according to the Soviet model. The army's management and the positioning of the armed forces were not up to the true demands of defense, and the western border of Czechoslovakia had remained permeable. Enemies penetrated the army, and the armed forces were unfit for action.⁸ Czepicka's assessment was greeted by the Congress audience with loud applause of agreement. The flipside of Czepicka's report was a recitation of the grand successes scored after he was named minister of defense.

It should be mentioned that after 1956, a review of past political trials began in Czechoslovakia, specifically looking at the trials of Rudolph Slanski and of other people convicted in November 1952. New attitudes were forming about the need for increasing the rate of buildup in the arms industry, the management of the army, and other actions associated with the heavy cost of maintaining the armed forces.

The further destinies of the former minister of defense Svoboda and his successor Czepicka evolved along diametrically opposite lines. Following the appeal by Khrushchev to the Czechoslovak leadership, Svoboda became a scientific worker, and later director of the Military History Institute in Prague. He wrote a memoir of his combat experiences in the USSR, titled *From Buzuluk to Prague*.⁹ After 1963 Svoboda tried to revive his political career, although he was then already an old-age pensioner.

As one of the major devotees of Stalinism in Czechoslovakia, Czepicka retained his post of minister of defense until April 1956. His discharge was belated because of the slow, nearly immobile pace of de-Stalinization in Czechoslovakia in the years preceding the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. However, Czepicka's political views were becoming less strongly shared by the Czechoslovak leadership after the demise of Stalin and Gotwald (Czepicka's father-in-law). The weakening of his position also resulted from a certain relaxation of international tensions, with the ensuing lesser prominence of the armed forces and arms industry.

Czepicka was in power from 1950 to 1953. This minister of defense was not subjected to any degree of government supervision, and any requests for budgeting or for covering other logistics needs of the army were presented by him for consideration and decision to the political secretariat of the CPC Central Committee (of which he was a member and in which he had no opponents). Any dissent on the part of other members of the political secretariat, however small, led to intimidation, that is, to a claim that the opponent was underrating the true significance of defense. Czepicka's prominent status within the narrow circle of state and Communist Party leadership was rooted not only in his familial relationship with Gotwald, the country's president and Communist Party chairman, but also his strong ties with Soviet politicians and military advisors in the Czechoslovak armed forces and state security agencies. Colonel-General Dimitri Gusev—the chief Soviet military advisor—was a participant in sessions of the ministry's narrow consulting body whose members, other than the minister himself, were his four deputies.¹⁰ Czepicka's restricted consulting body played a key role in the decision-making process on the most important issues concerning the armed forces and the arms industry. In the mechanism of Soviet-Czechoslovak military exchanges, General Gusev was the crucial intermediary in handling requests by the Ministry of Defense. These Czechoslovak requests went via Gusev to Stalin himself. Gusev and Czepicka were tied together not only by a good business relationship, but also by a personal friendship. A lawyer by trade, from 1946 to 1947 Czepicka was minister of internal trade and from 1948 to 1950 minister of justice. He was a prominent person in the National Front empowered to regulate relations between the state authorities and the religions in Czechoslovakia at that time. Although he had no military background, he held the rank of General of the Army. At one time he stated that he was receiving his military education from Gusev, the Soviet military advisor, who promised that in a few years Czepicka would master relevant knowledge at the level of a Soviet military academy graduate.

Having been promoted to the position of minister of defense, Czepicka transformed the Czechoslovak armed forces into the Soviet model in every respect. The presence of 280 military advisors¹¹ in the army altered the essence of the ministry, the General Staff, and the military districts and units. The military advisors were embedded in the planning office (Military Economics Office), at the arms industry enterprises, and in military units at the regiment level. In addition to these activities of the advisors, the Czechoslovak armed forces were controlled in other ways. A military coordination committee fully dominated by the Soviet Union was formed in February 1951, with the participation of Stalin, the Soviet generalship, and the ministers of defense and Communist Party secretaries-general of the five states. This committee drafted lists of requests and made decisions related to the arms industry; it also submitted plans for investments and bills of other armed forces logistics needs, which were approved for a period of three years by the Moscow conference of January 1951.

That conference in Moscow proved to be a significant event in Czepicka's career. At this secret conference, Stalin asked the defense minister to make a report on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, whereas reports of other delegations were delivered by their Communist Party secretaries-general. Even in 1956, when Czepicka had been dismissed from his ministry post, he recollected with pride that Stalin had entrusted him personally with a task for which he would be accountable before Stalin, that is, making the Czechoslovak armed forces fully combat-ready by the end of 1953.¹² Stalin's benevolence was considered his personal award. During 1951 Czepicka visited Moscow once more. At a session of the VKP(b) Central Committee's Presidium, he informed Stalin and other Presidium members of the investigation launched in the case of people of high authority whom the Communists had arrested earlier in the year. Upon a request by Stalin, he familiarized those attending with the substance of accusations brought against Slanski and Vladimir Clementis. The visit to and the conversation with Stalin at the latter's dacha on 23 July 1951 was another unique reward granted to Czepicka—unique because Stalin hosted no other Czechoslovak politician after 1948. True, in 1952 Stalin met with the Czechoslovak delegation to the congress of Soviet Communists, but he did not speak personally with either one of them.

The top-secret mission entrusted to Czepicka in Moscow had its tragic repercussions. Following the visit of Soviet representative Anastas Mikoyan in the fall of 1951, Secretary-General Slanski was arrested. Within a single year one of the most notorious political trials was orchestrated, with fourteen people accused. The involvement of Czepicka in the initiation of this trial and other political trials of generals and officers was evident. In 1952 General Raicin, who headed military intelligence, was sentenced to death. Following Raicin's conviction, command of the intelligence service went under Czepicka's direct control as minister of defense, a move that reinforced his position even further.

In January 1953 Czepicka became deputy chairman of the government. He supervised the three ministries most involved in the arms industry. The minister of defense dictated his demands to the ministries of general engineering, metallurgy, and chemical industry. A failure to implement the tasks of the arms industry brought about harsh castigation. The authority Czepicka enjoyed was shared with no other ministers or government members.

Czepicka's great fall came in April 1956 when he was dismissed from his ministry post. He worked one more year at the Committee for Discoveries and Standardization. At the age of 48 he retired and never returned to politics. From conversations with him in 1968, connected to exoneration of those convicted in the political trials of 1948–1954, it was clear that he had not abandoned his radical views. He was an avid Stalinist, and regarded Khrushchev's policy aimed at reducing the international tension as erroneous and adverse for the Soviet Union. Czepicka persisted in his belief that after the demise of Stalin, it was still necessary to maintain the buildup of big armies that would bring about socialism in Western Europe.

Svoboda's destiny was evolving differently at the time. Following Khrushchev's intervention, Svoboda was publicly re-acknowledged as a general and the former commander of the Czechoslovak army corps in the USSR. The year 1968 opened fine horizons for Svoboda, as it did for other people victimized by Communist politics in the 1950s. An attempt to proceed with a social reform, to correct the errors committed then, created an environment where Svoboda could return to the political stage, although he was not among the advocates of such reforms. With Soviet support, following the resignation of Antonín Novotný in March 1968, he was elected president of the Czechoslovak Republic. In this way he joined the circle of the most influential people in Czechoslovakia. For the first time he displayed his firm political posture during the bilateral Czechoslovak-Soviet talks in the town of Čierna-na-Tisou (in eastern Slovakia) in late July 1968. His addresses before the larger audience there and his talks with Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev were more like the backing of the Soviet position than a corroboration of the Czechoslovak reform and its initiators.

The most prominent period in Svoboda's political career occurred at the moment of the military intervention of the Warsaw Treaty's armed forces and during a brief period after that. As president he declined to recognize the takeover by the formation of an illegal workers-and-peasants' government that would acquire the power from Alexander Dubček and government chairman Oldřich Černík Cerník. Joined by a delegation, Svoboda went to Moscow to demand from the Soviet leadership the release of interned Dubček, Cerník, Joesf Smrkovski, František Krigel, and others. When he arrived in Moscow, political talks were begun. We have learned of the dramatic nature of these talks from the memoir written in emigration by Zdeněk Mlynář, a participant in the talks and an advocate of the reforms. The memoir and other available documents attest to the fact that Svoboda was unambiguously backing the standpoints that the Soviet party included in the talks' final document, titled *Moscow Protocol*. In its essence this document amounted to a political dictate and spelled the end to the reforms in Czechoslovakia. The protocol legalized the military intervention by the armed forces of five countries of the Warsaw Treaty, and the ensuing Czechoslovak-Soviet agreement sanctioned the stationing of an 80,000-strong unit of the Central Group of the armed forces of the Soviet Army in Czechoslovakia. Thus, these agreements became associated with Svoboda, restoring as they did the neo-Stalinist regime with its political punitive measures, and paving the way for using the Czechoslovak armed forces to suppress opposition to Soviet occupation.

In the 1950s similar political repression had been applied to Svoboda himself and others. Twenty years later, following the military intervention, it contributed greatly to the revival of the neo-Stalinist system with all its negative effects. In both the 1950s and the 1970s, the Soviet impact was clearly evident. The difference was solely in that the political repression of the 1950s culminated in the execution of numerous generals and officers; in the 1970s

it resulted in somewhat milder punitive measures, most frequently discharge from the armed forces.

Endnotes

1. T. V. Volokitina, G. P. Murashko, A. F. Noskova, and T. F. Pokivailova, *Moscow and Eastern Europe* (in Russian) (Moscow, 2002), pp. 89–90.
2. Report by the Commission of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee on political trials and vindication (known as the Piller Commission) (mimeographed, 1970), p. 10 (hereafter cited as CPC Report).
3. State Central Archive (SCA), Collection of CPC Central Committee, 100/24, vol. 56 and others, 903 (Prague) (hereafter cited as SCA Collection).
4. CPC Report, p. 11.
5. SCA, Commission on Re-Consideration of Political Trials in 1949–1954 Period, I, vol. 2 and others (Prague), report by A. Czepicka on talks at the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee Presidium in Moscow on 23 Jul 1951.
6. SCA Collection.
7. *Ibid.*
8. A. Czepicka, presentation at the Tenth Congress of the CPC, Prague, June 11–15, 1954, pp. 225–34.
9. In the town of Buzuluk, the Czechoslovak military unit had been formed.
10. SCA Collection, 100/1, vol. 56 and others. Agenda of thirty-fourth session of Narrow Consulting Body under Minister of Defense, 16 Aug 1950.
11. K. Kaplan and P. Kasatik, *Gotwald's People* (Prague: Litomysl, 2004), p. 144.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 145.

From Commands to Coordination: Defense Industry Cooperation within the Member-States of the Warsaw Pact, 1956–1965

Pál Germuska

Development Projects and the Institutional Frames

In the first years of the Cold War, the Soviet Union and its satellite states, preparing for the third world war, started an enforced armament project. According to Stalin's commands, the self-sufficiency had a special priority: each socialist country was obliged to equip its own army with weaponry, vehicles, and ammunition. This is why the smaller Communist states also tried to develop every branch of their defense industry. The same equipment was produced under Soviet licenses and instructions in every socialist country, so the intertrade of armaments among these states was negligible from 1952 to 1954.

Beginning in the mid-1950s, there were serious changes in Soviet strategic thinking, primarily owing to the rapid development in atomic and missile technology.¹ The key issue of this change was the idea that the modernization of the East European armies could not be delayed. After the establishment of the Warsaw Pact, long-term comprehensive programs to rearm and restructure the allied forces had been elaborated in all partner-states (according to Soviet guidelines).

The frame organization of the socialist economic cooperation, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON), was established in 1949. The cooperation practically was confined to bilateral relations in the first years. From 1954 onward, more and more efforts were made to harmonize the national plans for the years 1956–1960. In May 1956, at the Seventh Session of the COMECON, seven standing committees were founded (foreign trade, construction engineering, chemistry, energetics, nonferrous metals, metallurgic, and mineral oil and natural gas industries) to coordinate the most important industrial branches and territories.²

The meeting of the Communist and Workers' Party leaders, held in Moscow on 23 June 1956, decided that the plans of the defense industry and the mutual delivery of war supplies for the years 1956–1965 should be coordinated. A month later (between 20 and 30 July), again in Moscow, the delegations of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland,

Romania, and the USSR signed a protocol on multilateral cooperation and the division of military production. In this document the production of more than seventy types of weaponry, vehicles, measuring instruments, and other military equipment was divided among the partner-states over the next four years.³

To coordinate the international specialization and the division of labor in the defense industry, a new COMECON board was established—the Standing Committee on Defense Industry Cooperation (briefly, the Defense Industry Committee). Its first meeting was held in Moscow, between 23 and 28 September 1956, and seven professional subcommittees were created (airplane industry; infantry and artillery weapons; armored vehicles, tanks, and mechanized artillery; production of ammunitions, exploding compounds, and gunpowder; telecommunications; warship manufacturing; and chemical defense).⁴

In the next eighteen months, the Defense Industry Committee was not really effective because of the Polish crises and the Hungarian revolution in October 1956 and the long debate on the modernization of the Warsaw Pact armies.

The turning point in the history of this multilateral cooperation was the session of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Party between 20 and 23 May 1958. The development of armament cooperation was the second item on the meeting agenda.⁵ The Soviet proposal said that in the preceding two years the partner-states had not contracted with each other for supply of any equipment because of cost-accounting problems. In addition, the Supreme Command of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces was late with the final nomenclature for the active weapons, and the needs of the armies had radically changed. The Soviet delegation recommended that the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact be equipped with mutual supplies, and that generally there was no need to build new military factories.⁶

The meeting passed resolutions that the specialization of the socialist defense industries would organize more efficiently and the partner-states should cover their requirements of conventional weapons themselves. It also ensured that there were national obligations to incorporate into the general state plans for the next years.⁷

In 1959, beyond the annual meeting of the Defense Industry Committee, there were nearly twenty section and subcommittee sittings and meetings.⁸ Thus, it was no surprise when these boards were dissolved in the next Moscow meeting on 4 and 6 October 1960.⁹ In that year the main tasks of the Defense Industry Committee were to standardize products and spare parts, and to integrate the different technologies. In the field of ammunition production, this work had resulted in savings.¹⁰

In the early 1960s two factors sped up development of defense industries in the Eastern Bloc: the Berlin crisis and a modification in the Soviet military doctrine. Because the Soviet Army General Staff supposed that the next war would be an "all-out nuclear war," all the armed forces of the satellite states had to be trained to use missile-mounted nuclear weapons. At the same time

it was clear that conventional forces should be developed as well to crush the enemy as quickly as possible in its own territory. This all meant that it was necessary to modernize the allied armies and equip them with the newest Soviet armament.¹¹

The main motive for the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact in its Moscow meeting on 28–29 March 1961 was to decide to start a four-year comprehensive rearming and modernizing project: 2.8 billion rubles were earmarked for military investment and development (nearly 70 percent of the Soviet military expenditure in that year).¹²

The next meeting of the Defense Industry Committee (in Moscow on 25–27 July) paid special attention to the modernization program. The committee finalized the division of the most important weaponry and equipment in the production of missiles, fighters, armored vehicles, and telecommunications.

To ease the capacities of the Soviet military industry, the committee adopted a resolution that all partner-states had to obtain the raw materials and equip themselves with small arms and ammunition through internal suppliers.¹³

In Moscow between 3 and 6 August, the conference of the East-Central European party leaders reinforced the requirements of the March meeting. The key directions of army development also were identified: the antiaircraft defense and the motorized forces were to be developed primarily.¹⁴ In addition, referring to the tensions in Germany, in the last days of August the Supreme Command of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces ordered the allied armies to be ready for war by 1 October 1961.¹⁵

Although the Berlin crisis was solved peacefully, the preparations advanced with great strides in the Eastern countries. One of the first steps of the military integration was building up the common antiaircraft defense system by the spring of 1962.¹⁶

The expanding mutual supply among the socialist countries (including the arms trade) demanded a more elaborate system of multilateral consultations. This problem generated institutional reforms in the COMECON. On 6 June 1962 the Moscow meeting of the Soviet bloc's ruling parties accepted the "fundamental principles of the international socialist division of labour." The following day at the Sixteenth Session of the COMECON, a new board was founded by the vice prime ministers of the partner-states—the Executive Committee of the COMECON. This committee declared that the first phase of the socialist integration had been terminated and new prospects were opened to improve international cooperation.¹⁷

The next step in the reorganization process was modernizing the COMECON Secretariat according to the resolutions of the Executive Committee in December 1962. The secretariat had been restructured and the defense industry section (under the code-name General Department) had received thirty officers as consultants and technical experts.¹⁸ This department was responsible to the Defense Industry Committee for preparing its meetings with all the discussed materials and proposals. The principles of international specialization

and cooperation in producing armaments were also codified by the General (Military Industry) Department. That document, which was confirmed by the Defense Industry Committee on 20–25 April 1963, mentioned the effective utilization of capacities and permanent technological development as main goals. It also stated that specialization and cooperation should be organized in consideration of the interests of all member-states. The recommendations of production specialization had to be elaborated by the committee. One type (or group) of weapons and equipment should be produced in only one country, and that country was obliged to cover the needs of the other member-states.¹⁹

On 2 July 1963 the Executive Committee of the COMECON evaluated the last year's activity of the Defense Industry Department. The committee finalized the structure of the department with 25 people. This section worked fully independent of the COMECON organization; it was subordinated solely by the president of the Defense Industry Committee. The primacy of the Soviets was also obvious because the department was filled exclusively by members of the Soviet Army.²⁰

The annual meeting of the Defense Industry Committee between 28 November and 3 December 1963 improved the principles of specialization and cooperation, and accepted the statute of the committee. The committee, of course, was based in Moscow where consultations had to be held at least twice a year.²¹

The main task of the member-states' representatives on the Defense Industry Committee in 1964 was to compromise with each other first in the methods of harmonization and later in the actual figures for investment and production plans in armaments for the years 1966 and 1970.²² While talks continued, an old problem came up again—dozens of military plants had a problem with overcapacity. On one hand, these enterprises originally were created according to the wartime requirements, and, on the other, some countries did not comply with mutual agreements and ordered supplies from the USSR rather than from the specialized partner-state. At the Defense Industry Committee meeting on 9–13 April 1965, it was decided that increasing mutual supplies should be encouraged in the next five years, and that international cooperation should be intensified.²³ Because of these recurring difficulties, the Warsaw Pact countries sought new markets for socialist arms, and it was in the developing world that military and technological support became one of the most important elements of Soviet expansion.

There is evidence that the mutual supplies were multiplied inside the COMECON, and that export of armaments expanded significantly in every socialist country. In Hungary, for example, one-third of the total military production in 1963 was sold abroad, and in the next four years this rate reached 47 percent. When we take a closer look at the exported Hungarian equipment, we can see that the export rate of the specialized products exceeded 50 percent of total armament exportation,²⁴ and in the 1980s it reached 70–80 percent. Although there are no public figures on the total amount of COMECON's

mutual military supplies, it may be assumed that the tendencies were similar in the other countries, and it might have totaled more than one hundred million rubles per year.

Motivations and Profitability

The production specialization was based on the Communist ideology that aimed at avoiding duplication and competition in the framework of COMECON. The intensification of mutual cooperation might have been improved by the smaller partner-states (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary) rather than by the Soviet Union. The major weakness of Central-Eastern European countries was the narrow internal market that resulted in limited production, uneconomic scales, and lack of flexibility in their military industry. This is why their defense enterprises were export oriented. They also worked in civilian production and were interested in the international division of labor. The smaller part of military production was sold in the domestic market, and the remaining part—generally specialized products—was exported. External trade helped raise the productivity of the different countries' defense industries.

The USSR was led by different motivations as a consequence of the soaring costs of modernization. The Soviet Union wanted to reduce the tasks of its overburdened defense industry complex, and it tried to allocate production of conventional weaponry.

In the period analyzed, according to resolutions of the Defense Industry Committee, the Hungarian military industry had been specialized in armored vehicles, radar, telecommunication equipment, and some type of guns. The Polish defense industrial sector had a concern in weaponry, aircraft, military electronics, and armored vehicles. Czechoslovakia was involved in production of small arms, aircraft, tanks, and explosive compounds. The Bulgarian armament industry had been specialized in anti-aircraft missiles, ammunitions, optical devices, anti-tank armament, navigation radar, and so forth. Thanks to this specialization, the Soviet defense industry had the chance to concentrate on military high-technologies such as missiles, space research, infrared and laser technology, and the like. By the end of the 1960s, hundreds of military products were made in bilateral or multilateral cooperation.

Although it can be debated, I support the view of Bulgarian historian Dimitar Dimitrov²⁵ that the COMECON defense collaboration resulted in more advantages than disadvantages. To the advantages discussed above, I would add that military industry production helped balance bilateral trade relations at the COMECON level. Furthermore, the Central-Eastern European Warsaw Pact member-states in their bilateral relations with the Soviet Union might have been net receivers of sources, products, and technologies. It can be said that the defense industry cooperation among the countries of the pact was one of the most beneficial and profitable sectors of the COMECON integration.

As historian Matthias Uhl has pointed out, in the first half of the 1960s, “The Warsaw Pact had been transformed from an organization existing only on paper into an important element of Soviet security and military policy.”²⁶ Similar significant changes and improvements can be traced in the military industries of the Eastern Bloc. Although the Soviet supremacy had never been debated inside the defense industry cooperation, the direction of the transformation was well seen: from direct commands to multilateral coordination.

Endnotes

1. On the new military industry branches, the rocketry and nuclear industry, see details in Mark Harrison, “New Postwar Branches (1): Rocketry,” in John Barber and Mark Harrison, eds., *The Soviet Defense-Industry Complex from Stalin to Khrushchev* (London: Macmillan, 2000); and Nikolai Simonov, “New Postwar Branches (2): The Nuclear Industry,” in Barber and Harrison, eds., *Soviet Defense-Industry Complex*.

2. János Meisel, *A KGST 30 éve (Thirty Years of the COMECON)* (Budapest: Kossuth Press, 1982), p. 13.

3. Hungarian National Archive (MOL) M-KS fond (f.) 276, cluster (cs.) 53, guarding unit (g.u.) 300.

4. *Ibid.*, cs. 66, g.u. 43.

5. Jordan Beav, “The Evolution of the Warsaw Pact Organizational Structure and Decision Making Process, 1955–1969.” Paper presented at the Military History Working Group Third International Seminar, “NATO and Warsaw Pact—The Formative Years 1948–1968,” Prague, 7–11 April 2003, p. 6.

6. MOL XIX-A-16-i, box 8, 10.

7. Jegyzőkönyv a KGST Hadiipari Állandó Bizottsága 5/60. sz. üléséről. (No. 5/60, Protocol on the Meeting of the Defense Industry Committee of the COMECON), Moscow, 4–6 Oct 1960, MOL XIX-F-6-dd, box 60.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*

10. A KGST Hadiipari Állandó Bizottságának 1960. évi munkájáról és további tevékenységéről szóló beszámoló (Report on the Work and the Further Activity of the Defense Industry Committee of the COMECON in 1960), 26 Mar 1961, MOL XIX-F-6-dd, box 61.

11. Baev, p. 7; Matthias Uhl, “Nuclear Warhead Delivery Systems for the Warsaw Pact, 1961–65: Documents from the Russian State Archives of Economics and the German Federal Military Archives on the Reorganization and Modernization of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Bloc,” 2002, pp. 1–2.

12. Uhl, “Nuclear Warhead,” pp. 1–2.

13. Az érdekelt KGST országok képviselői értekezletéről készült 1/61. sz. jegyzőkönyv (No. 1/61, Protocol on the Meeting of the Involved COMECON Countries), 25–27 Jul 1961, MOL XIX-F-6-dd, box 61.

14. Csaba Békés, “Hungary and the Warsaw Pact, 1954–1989: Documents on the Impact of a Small State within the Eastern Bloc,” 2004, pp. 4–5.

15. Jelentés a Magyar Néphadsereg feladatairól (Report on the Main Tasks of the Hungarian People’s Army), 4 Sep 1961, Military History Archive (HL) Files of the Hungarian People’s Army, 1963/T 68/015/4. cs. 6, pp. 1–12.

16. Határozvány a Varsói Szerződésben részt vevő államok egységes honi légvédelmi rendszeréről (Decree on the Joint Air-Defense System of the Countries Involved in the Warsaw Pact), 20 Mar 1962, MOL M-KS f. 288, cs. 5, g.u. 261, pp. 42–50.

17. Meisel, *Thirty Years*, pp. 14, 16–17.

18. KGST VB harmadik ülésének jegyzőkönyve (Protocol on the Third Meeting of the Executive Committee of the COMECON), Bucharest, Dec 1962, MOL XIX-F-6-na, box 1011.

19. A KGST Hadiipari Állandó Bizottsága 8/63. sz. ülésének jegyzőkönyve (No. 8/63, Protocol on the Meeting of the Defense Industry Committee of the COMECON), Moscow, 20–25 Apr 1963, HL Files of the National Planning Office (OT), box 107.

20. Jegyzőkönyv a KGST Végrehajtó Bizottság VII. üléséről a hadiipar kérdéseivel kapcsolatban (Protocol on the Seventh Meeting of the Executive Committee of the COMECON Concerning the Questions of the Defense Industry), Moscow, Jul 1963, Central Record Office of Ministry of Defence, 855/1/26.

21. A KGST Hadiipari Állandó Bizottságának 1963. November 28–December 3. között Moszkvában megtartott 9/63. sz. ülésének jegyzőkönyve (No. 9/63, Protocol on the Moscow Meeting of the Defense Industry Committee of the COMECON), 28 Nov–3 Dec 1963, HL OT, box 108.

22. A KGST Hadiipari Állandó Bizottságának 1964. május 12–14. között Moszkvában megtartott 10/64. sz. ülésének jegyzőkönyve (No. 10/64, Protocol on the Moscow Meeting of the Defense Industry Committee of the COMECON), 12–14 May 1964, HL OT, box 109.

23. Az OT jelentése a KGST Hadiipari Állandó Bizottságának 1965. április 9–13. között Moszkvában megtartott 11/65. sz. üléséről (Report of the National Planning Office on the No. 11/65. Meeting of the Defense Industry Committee of the COMECON), Moscow, HL OT, box 110.

24. Jelentés a Kohó-és Gépipari Minisztérium 1963. évi haditechnikai tervének teljesítéséről (Report on the Plan Fulfilment in the Defense-Related Sectors of the Ministry of Metallurgy and Constructional Engineering), MOL XIX-F-6-v, box 144; *A hadiipar helyzetének és szerkezetének alakulása 1963–1967. évek között* (Transformation of the Situation and the Structure of the Defense Industry between 1963 and 1967), (Budapest: Central Statistical Office, 1968), p. 6.

25. Dimitar Dimitrov, “The Restructuring and Conversion of the Bulgarian Defense Industry during the Transition Period,” Paper 22, International Center for Conversion, Bonn (2002), pp. 14–15.

26. Uhl, “Nuclear Warhead,” p. 1.

The German-Japanese Naval Alliance in World War II: Genesis and Extent of a Challenge to Anglo-Saxon Predominance at Sea

Johannes Berthold Sander-Nagashima

The roots of the naval dimension of the German-Japanese Alliance in World War II date back to the early post-World War I years when the existing world order changed profoundly. Germany was limited by the Versailles Treaty to a fleet of thirty-six small, aging vessels, with no submarines or aircraft. Despite the Japanese Empire being among the victors in the war, the Five-Power Naval Limitation Treaty concluded in Washington in 1921 contractually limited the tonnage of the Japanese fleet's capital ships to a 5:3 ratio relative to both the Royal Navy and the U.S. Navy. Although this limitation stopped the arms race developing at sea and saved the Japanese from ruin, it was considered discriminatory and potentially dangerous by a large faction in the Imperial Japanese Navy (IJN). That faction was led by the influential Admiral Katô Kanji, who had been the deputy chief delegate for naval matters at the Washington Naval Conference.

The conference also ended the Anglo-Japanese Alliance because Great Britain (as well as her Commonwealth partners and the United States) had become suspicious of the former Japanese ally. The Japanese had become an unwelcome competitor trying to set up a sphere of predominance in China during the war, at the expense of the European powers (and, of course, the Chinese) who had enjoyed semicolonial prerogatives there. As a side effect of the Washington treaty, the Anglo-Saxon¹ powers had become unwilling to support a further modernization of the Japanese fleet and the Japanese had to look elsewhere for the advanced technology they could not yet master. Germany was regarded as a highly promising source for this technology. After an extended tour of inspection in Europe and the United States in 1919–1920, Katô had concluded and enthusiastically reported at home that German products were of the best quality worldwide. Because German naval know-how and material had been set free in huge amounts after the formerly second-largest fleet in the world had ceased to exist, Germany became something of a gold mine for Japanese naval experts who did their best to skim the German market; flocked to the country in large numbers; and, Versailles Treaty notwithstanding, even initiated strictly secret cooperation with the Germans in precisely those areas that were officially forbidden—submarines and aircraft.

The links thus established between the Japanese and the Germans gained importance when the Washington treaty stipulations were extended to cruisers at the 1930 London Naval Conference. The extension raised bitter resentment in the IJN. Katô, by that time the head of the Japanese Naval General Staff, and thus one of the IJN's three top brass hats, almost provoked a constitutional crisis when he insisted on his right to personally present to the emperor his misgivings about the treaty. Although the Navy Ministry in cooperation with court circles was able to defeat Katô, it was a costly victory. In an unprecedented act, Katô's followers informed the press of his misgivings, and public opinion as well as the middle echelons of naval officers quickly closed ranks in favor of his position. From that point forward, the days of the "treaty faction" were numbered. In the long run the rising tide of the "fleet faction" could not be stemmed effectively—an undertaking that proved highly dangerous for anyone who tried to do so or who was suspected of doing so. Younger officers actually attempted to assassinate flag officers of the treaty faction. The mounting resistance in the IJN and among the Japanese public made it quite clear that continuing the Washington and London treaty stipulations would not be politically feasible in Japan. Thus, a renewed arms race at sea could be expected when the treaties expired in 1936.

In such a situation, an able ally would be an asset for the Japanese, and they obviously considered the German Navy (still called the *Reichsmarine*) a favored candidate for that position. This preference became apparent in the increased visits of VIPs and experts beginning in 1934. The IJN was even willing to take unprecedented steps: in early 1935 the Germans were granted an inspection of a Japanese aircraft carrier. Considering the extreme secrecy that the IJN usually observed, this was simply unthinkable for representatives of any other foreign navy and it showed that the IJN was seriously interested in doing business with the Germans. They even topped their offer a short time later by inviting a German commission to be instructed on the construction of carriers, and to watch and even participate as passengers in the actual air traffic aboard one of the Japanese carriers. The commission stated in its report that not only had the expectation been more than fulfilled but the Japanese officers who had attended the commission had displayed a personal and sincere desire to cooperate with the Germans. For their part the Japanese had asked to be granted an inspection of the latest German "pocket battleship" and the blueprints of the latest German dive-bomber design.

The whole move seemed actively aimed at supporting the building of a significantly more powerful German fleet that would be a potentially serious threat to the Royal Navy—and thus a significant diversion that would help the Japanese in case of a conflict with the Anglo-Saxons. It was therefore not at all surprising that Germany's unilateral declaration of *Wehrhoheit* (that is, the right to independently decide the strength and composition of the German armed forces) that for all practical purposes removed the Versailles Treaty stipulations was enthusiastically endorsed by the Japanese. They even hinted

that they would like to see the Germans participate in the upcoming second London fleet conference. But their delight was short-lived because the signing of the Anglo-German Fleet Treaty only a few months later clearly showed that the German side was not yet willing to steer a course of confrontation against the British.

Despite its disappointment, the IJN wished to continue friendly relations with its German counterpart, although it no longer advocated German participation in the anticipated London conference. In the opinion of IJN leaders, such participation would only strengthen the powers who advocated the ratio principle, whereas the Japanese now sought equal rights—that is, the right to build an amount of tonnage in capital ships and cruisers equal to that of the Anglo-Saxons. It was apparent that relations between the Japanese and German navies had cooled a bit when the Germans considerably dragged their feet in paying back the Japanese favors, and when the German naval attaché's British colleague in Japan repeatedly tried to use the seemingly better relations between the Royal Navy and the *Kriegsmarine* to gather details from his German counterpart about the IJN's planned expansion. The Japanese were quite aware of this, and they were worried. They kept the Germans in the dark about the IJN, although they continued to treat the German attaché significantly better on a ceremonial level than they treated his colleagues. At the same time (about 1936), the German attaché discovered how precarious the British position at Singapore (the British Empire's key position in southeast Asia) would be in case of tensions with Japan, especially if there were a diversion for the British in Europe. He predicted that in such a case the Japanese would take advantage of such a golden opportunity and seize Singapore.

The next serious test of the IJN's actual willingness to support the *Kriegsmarine* in case of war with the British was the Sudeten Crisis of 1938. Although the *Kriegsmarine* called only for intelligence support, the right of supply vessels to travel in Japanese-controlled waters, and propagandistic support, the IJN was not ready to make any clear promises. Its support of Germany would have to be decided on a case-by-case basis and German vessels would be protected "if possible." The Japanese Naval General Staff, however, did try to provide the Germans with information on the movements of allied ships—but it requested strict secrecy about this cooperation. The navy was especially interested in keeping it secret from the Japanese Navy Ministry. This indicated the often difficult situation within the IJN itself. Both the Naval General Staff and the Navy Ministry were command authorities whose leaders enjoyed direct access to the throne—a privilege that each jealously guarded and that often contributed to a lack of mutual trust and an unwillingness to exchange information.

To define more fully the IJN's changed relationship with the Germans, it should be noted that conditions between the IJN and the Japanese Army were even more extreme than those between the IJN and Navy Ministry. The IJN viewed with considerable sorrow the army's plans on the Asian

continent against China and the Soviet Union because navy leaders saw the United States as Japan's main enemy, and they sought to secure the oil fields under British and Dutch control in the East Indies. In the event of war with the British, securing the fields would guarantee the oil supply needed to fend off an expected thrust across the Pacific Ocean—a defensive plan known as the navy's "southern thrust strategy" that was in opposition to the Japanese Army's "northern thrust" plans. Consequently, the IJN showed little interest in the alliance negotiations conducted by General Ôshima Hiroshi, the Japanese ambassador to Germany, because it saw them simply as a strengthening of the unwanted northern thrust plans. The IJN held the same regard for the later signing of the Tripartite Pact (1940). The German fleet, still rather weak, would be able to contribute little in an armed conflict with the United States, so the IJN considered actual cooperation with the Germans in case of war to be worthwhile only when it came to technology. A side effect of this attitude was the IJN's actually endorsing the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939, a move that shocked diplomatic and army circles in Japan. The army believed the pact diminished the probability of a war between the Soviet Union and Germany, so army inclinations to start a conflict with the Soviets would not be fostered. The IJN considered the war in China, which had evolved from the Manchurian Incident in 1932 and became an uncontrollable and unwinnable undertaking in 1937, a highly problematic diversion of resources away from defensive preparations against the main threat: the United States.

When World War II finally broke out in Europe in 1939, the IJN again proved reluctant to make clear pledges of support to the Germans. But even without active support, being on friendly terms with the IJN seemed a benefit to the *Kriegsmarine*. The simple facts that the IJN was the third-largest fleet in the world and that it easily could threaten British and Commonwealth shipping in the Far East seemed to blunt Britain's traditional and sharpest naval weapon against continental European adversaries—the blockade. British confiscation of goods destined for Germany aboard Japanese merchantmen was immediately threatened with reprisal by Japanese confiscations from British ships off the Chinese coast, a threat that the British could not ignore because they were in no position to prevent it.

For a while it seemed possible that blockade would not be applied to Japanese merchantmen carrying goods for Germany, but soon the British decided to test the Japanese determination in this respect. In January 1940 a British cruiser stopped the Japanese steamer *Asama Maru* not far from the IJN's base at Yokosuka and forcibly removed twenty-one Germans traveling aboard the ship. This action provoked sharp verbal protests from the Japanese government and an enraged outcry by the Japanese public. The actual "retaliation," however, was extremely tame: a British steamer was stopped by Japanese vessels in the China Sea but released to continue its course after its papers were checked. Clearly the IJN was rather unwilling to use serious force against British ships. The Japanese were willing at least to grant the German

commerce raiders safe anchorage and a certain degree of logistic support in the Pacific, provided their nominal neutrality would not be compromised by the Germans' activities.

A very special windfall profit for the *Kriegsmarine* was the capture of the British steamer *Automedon* in the Indian Ocean in November 1940. The ship carried highly secret papers of the British cabinet that revealed in detail the weakness of the Singapore fortress and the nation's inability to hold it successfully against a Japanese attack. This was especially intriguing from the German Navy's perspective because it seemed to present a golden opportunity to prompt the Japanese partner to attack this position and thereby create a global diversion for what was at that time the German Reich's only remaining major adversary in the war. With the captured cabinet papers as an "ace up his sleeve," the German Navy commander in chief, Erich Raeder, even tried to convince Hitler at the end of December 1940 that Germany and Japan should concentrate their efforts against Great Britain instead of embarking on Operation BARBAROSSA, Hitler's plan for the invasion of Russia. The dictator, however, was fixed on his plan for a war of annihilation against the Soviet Union, and Raeder's proposal was declined. What was evident was the limited influence the *Kriegsmarine* could exert on German war plans. It was clearly inferior to the influential high commands of the army and even of the *Luftwaffe*. Raeder, however, was unwilling to let this opportunity pass by and, in concert with Joachim von Ribbentrop's Foreign Ministry, tried to use the captured documents as levers to incite the Japanese to join the war against Great Britain. But the Asian partner was not ready for this. Because, in Japan's opinion, this would mean facing war with the United States at the same time, and they declined the German entreaties. It was the *Kriegsmarine's* time to be disappointed.

This disappointment must have been considerable indeed because in May 1940 the German Naval War Staff (*Seekriegsleitung*) already had developed visions of a path leading to nothing less than worldwide German predominance. In a three-step process, first the British would be defeated by the combined power of the German, Italian, and Japanese fleets; then the same combination of countries would subdue the United States; and finally there would be the "showdown" between Germany and Japan for worldwide predominance. In other words, the Japanese partner was already seen as a future adversary—although in a rather distant future. For the time being, however, the *Kriegsmarine* tried to maintain good relations with the Japanese counterpart—an effort documented by the strictly confidential information about Operation BARBAROSSA given to IJN representatives in Germany by their *Kriegsmarine* contacts in mid-April 1941, ninety days earlier than Ambassador Ôshima Hiroshi received it and given despite Hitler's forbidding its release. This was not good news for the IJN, however, and more than a month elapsed after the attack against the Soviet Union before IJN Tokyo informed the naval attaché in Berlin about the Japanese government's unease over the turn of events—only after IJN Berlin had complained about being kept in the dark.

When the Japanese finally joined the war against the Anglo-Saxon powers with their attack at Pearl Harbor and in southeast Asia, the Germans had received no clear prior information about Japanese plans, but that fact did not discourage the *Seekriegsleitung* from believing that its global visions of a successful outcome of the war could be affected by the inclusion of the IJN. German naval planners pictured a scenario in which the army would take the Suez Canal, would advance from southern Russia over the Caucasus Mountains into Iraq, and would join hands with a Japanese thrust across India (in which the IJN would disrupt British sea lines of communication in the Indian Ocean and especially in the Persian [Arabian] Gulf). Thereby vital Commonwealth communication and sea lanes to their Soviet ally through the Oman Strait would be cut, and the Naval War Staff expected that British and Russian warfighting capabilities would collapse as a result. The forces that had to act in such a plan, however, were neither under control of the *Seekriegsleitung* nor did those authorities who held control of them (the *Oberkommando der Wehrmacht/Oberkommando des Heeres* [OKW/OKH, or German Army High Command] and the IJN) have any inclination to comply. General Franz Halder of the OKH dryly commented in his diary, "Those people dream in terms of continents." Although the army conducted an offensive at the southern part of the eastern front in the second half of 1942, its objective was to sever the enemy from its supplies of Caspian oil, *not* to join hands with the Japanese in the Middle East. Necessary reinforcements of the *Afrikakorps* to enable them to take the Suez Canal were not provided by the OKW/OKH; and the IJN, although they did conduct carrier group operations in the Indian Ocean in the spring of 1942, directed those operations against the British possessions there. The Japanese had no intention of doing anything directly or indirectly against the Soviets because they did not want to divert their efforts to secure the Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere especially from the American threat. Japan was not at war with Stalin's empire and the IJN intended to keep it that way.

Any serious possibility of mounting coordinated naval warfare by the German and Japanese navies was nullified only a short time later by the devastating Japanese defeat at Midway Island in June 1942, and by the battle of attrition in the Solomon Islands that finally paralyzed Japanese naval offensive capabilities. When the Japanese withdrew from Guadalcanal in February 1943 and the *Kriegsmarine* suspended the Battle of the Atlantic in May of the same year, it was clear that the tide had turned in favor of the Allies in the war at sea.

In a move characteristic of the cleaved state of the different German high-command authorities, when the German naval attaché in Tokyo realistically reported dim prospects for a positive outcome of the war, he was severely reprimanded by the OKW, who answered that "every analysis of a military and naval situation had to be based on a sound optimism." Also characteristically, the *Seekriegsleitung* told him that he should tell the OKW what they wished to hear, but should continue to report the facts to them.

What now remained to constitute German-Japanese naval cooperation was the offer of Japanese bases in the Indian Ocean for German U-boat operations and a certain amount of blockade running. But both efforts can be summed up under the heading “too little, too late.” During the whole war, both sides neither exchanged details of their operational intentions nor were inclined to reveal their true situations, especially after humiliating defeats like Midway or the Battle of the Atlantic. What lingered was the keen interest of the IJN in German advanced technology, and that interest resulted in a steady stream to Tokyo of detailed wireless reports on the latest German developments. Because of their successes in code breaking, these reports became one of the Allies’ prime sources of high-grade intelligence.

Conclusions

The evidence indicates that at the basis of German-Japanese naval cooperation lay the common wish to revise the Anglo-Saxon-dominated world order of the 1920s and 1930s, especially its naval dimension. There were differences in their specific aims, however. Although the British were the main point of reference for the German navy, the IJN focused on the United States. The Germans more or less failed to adequately appreciate where the Japanese stood when a more direct cooperation between the two nations came into sight in the late 1930s. Some of the officers of both navies, however, shared a certain degree of psychological commonality because they shared authoritarian and monarchic views and were critical of liberal concepts of democracy, which were perceived as dangerous influences to be stemmed.

Japan’s interest in technical know-how stayed keen at all times and occasionally led to a certain amount of German skepticism and to their feeling of being scammed. But for their part, the Germans did drag their feet when it came to adequately paying back Japan’s extraordinary offer of carriers. Both sides’ wish to use the other as a diversion was repeatedly visible, but neither of the partners ever was willing to initiate close cooperation by fully sharing intelligence, operational intentions, and the like. If we consider the relationship between the two navies on a higher level, it is noticeable that enlightened political thinking was thoroughly alien to the officer corps of both navies. Partners were seen merely as a means to predominance, and each would turn into an enemy as soon as it became an obstacle or a competitor. This underlying social-Darwinist view of the international system prevented each nation from viewing other states (and so any allies) as entities with their own legitimate rights and as a community of equals, more or less.

In the final analysis, from the early 1920s until the end of World War II, the IJN and the German Navy generally saw each other as means to and as objects of domination, instead of as real partners. This probably was one of the important differences in the relations between Germany and Japan, compared with the relations enjoyed by the navies of the Anglo-Saxon “cousins.”

Endnote

1. The term *Anglo-Saxon* applies at times to Great Britain *or* the United States, or to Great Britain *and* the United States.

PART THREE
THE COLD WAR

Hungary's Role at the Birth of the Warsaw Pact

Tamás Nagy

The integration of the Federal Republic of Germany into the Western political, economic, and military organizations started pursuant to the Paris treaties signed on 23 October 1954. The new expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization took off the agenda for an indefinite time the issue of reunifying Germany with Europe. The Soviet leadership was pressured to react and had to reevaluate the military agreements concluded earlier with the countries within its sphere of influence. The 1947 Paris peace treaties left the German question open and therefore gave both Moscow and Washington freedom to maneuver. The Soviet Union, led by Nikita Khrushchev, got the opportunity in the region it controlled to establish the organization of the Warsaw Pact on 14 May 1955. Doing so demonstrated the new type of Soviet great power and military thinking. The countries of the Warsaw Pact received the chance under Soviet guidance to harmonize their military policies.

The day after the foundation of the Warsaw Pact was set in place, the representatives of the victorious great powers of the Second World War signed the Austrian State Treaty. The creation of an independent and neutral Austria lowered the level of confrontation between the great powers in Central Europe, but also changed the political-military environment around Hungary. According to the political-military understanding of those times, the location of the Hungarian Army was supposed to be shaped in such a way that the Hungarian and Soviet military forces stationed along the border of Austria and Hungary would be able to fulfill both defensive and offensive tasks.

The Hungarian military leadership had the following most important tasks to complete during the period of creation of the Warsaw Pact:

- positioning the Hungarian People's Army;
- continuing the reduction of forces already begun; and
- accommodating on Hungarian territory the Soviet troops transferred from Austria.

The already uneasy situation of the military leadership became more difficult with the power struggle between the conservative and reform forces in

the leadership of the Hungarian Workers' Party after the death of Stalin in 1953. In the beginning of 1955, a temporary victory was won by the hardline Mátyás Rákosi¹ over the reform-minded Imre Nagy,² but the revolution of 1956 put Nagy back into the position of Hungarian prime minister.

Main Decisions of the Hungarian Political Leadership During the Establishment of the Warsaw Pact

In March 1955 the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers' Party received a letter from Moscow in which First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Khrushchev asked the opinion of the Hungarian party leadership about the creation of a military organization under the leadership of the Soviet Union:³

In view that the decision of the Paris treaties were adopted by the parliaments of the signatory countries, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party considers useful to conduct already a preliminary exchange of views in a strictly confidential manner about the realization of the decisions of the Moscow meeting of December 2, 1954 and if the ratification of the Paris treaties takes place common measures should be applied to assure the security of the European countries which participated at the meeting. In our view these goals will be served best by concluding agreement on friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance between the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Albania. We have prepared the draft of such an agreement.⁴

The draft agreement was approved after an examination, and on 5 May 1955 the Political Committee of the Hungarian Workers' Party (HWP) authorized Prime Minister András Hegedus,⁵ the head of the delegation travelling to Warsaw, to sign the document on the establishment of the military organization. During this meeting of the HWP Political Committee, General István Bata, the defense minister analyzing the international situation, stated that the Hungarian People's Army would face the following difficulties in the future:

. . . with signing the Austrian treaties it is clear, that troops will be pulled out from Austria and the question emerges about the withdrawal from Romania and Hungary too. . . . The Hungarian armed forces, at least in the beginning will not be sufficiently prepared, and the possibility of keeping one division on the territory of Hungary emerges, or if it is not absolutely necessary, a proposal should be worked out, as the strength of the Hungarian army is not sufficient to cover a hundred kilometre long zone.⁶

The party leaders did not take the suggestions of the defense minister into consideration. The following excerpt from Rákosi's speech demonstrates well

how uninformed the party leadership was about the intentions of the Soviet Union:

If the treaty on Austria will be concluded, it will happen by the end of the year. We will have hundred different opportunities meanwhile to determine, what we would like to ask to keep here.⁷

The procrastinating attitude of the Hungarian leadership was very much influenced by the constant reduction in the size of the Hungarian People's Army, which began in 1953. The Hungarian government decided on 7 September of that year to decrease the strength of the army by an additional twenty thousand soldiers. The reduction in military spending, however, could not continue the same way as before. The lack of resources in the Hungarian People's Army reached a level that was noticed in Moscow. As a sign of this, on 15 September 1955 the Political Committee of the HWP approved the Soviet proposal introduced by Defense Minister Bata, which determined exactly what military developments should be executed by Hungary, and when they should occur:

It is necessary to harmonise and get the approval of the planned adjustments in the protocol of the army development plan by the governments of the Soviet Union and HPR [Hungarian People's Republic]. On behalf of Hungary the Defence Minister, the Vice-President of the Planning Bureau and the Chief of Staff will travel to Moscow.

Deadline: Between 15.10. and 15.11.1955⁸

The letter from the Soviet military leadership signaled that Moscow was determined to lead an effective military organization. For this purpose it put under its control the military expenses of the Warsaw Pact states, and made them accept regulations from the chief commander of the Joint Military Forces of the Warsaw Pact, and this was approved at the 6 October session of the HWP Political Committee.⁹ Because the chief commander of the Joint Military Forces was always a Soviet marshal, the countries nominated their national deputies. Hungary put under the direct control of the Joint Command six rifle divisions, two mechanized divisions, and two combat plane divisions.¹⁰

The gradually developing organizational structure of the Warsaw Pact and the significant Soviet military forces transferred to Hungary from Austria dramatically changed the military policy landscape of Hungary.

At its 7 July session, the HWP Political Committee approved the changes in the new operational directions. It endorsed the minister of interior's proposal concerning regrouping the border-control troops along the Western borders—a proposed plan that was justified the following way:

The Western (Austrian) border of the Republic of Hungary is the main and most active direction of the border control. The importance of the firm and secure control of this part of the border is increasing recently as:

- a. there is a new situation after the signing of the Austrian state treaty,
- b. as a result of the increasing class struggle the border violation attempts towards the West are on the rise, and we can also anticipate more activities of the imperialist secret service agencies on our Western borders.¹¹

Emergence of the Massive Soviet Military Presence in Hungary

The Paris Peace Treaty, which settled the Second World War, exactly determined what kind and what size of military presence the Soviet Army was allowed to keep on the territory of Hungary:

The Soviet Union retains the right to keep such military forces on the territory of Hungary, which may be necessary in order to keep the communication lines with the Austrian occupation zone of the Soviet Army.¹²

The Soviet leadership was interpreting this point of the peace treaty very flexibly, and it stationed Soviet military troops in Hungary in far greater numbers and in locations that differed from what the specified tasks really required.¹³ The number of Soviet formations in Hungary increased spectacularly after the signing of the Austrian State Treaty, and there was immediate need for a military infrastructure to support them. On 28 March 1955 the Hungarian defense minister proposed to the Defense Council the construction in the area of Mezőkövesd of an airport capable of serving long-distance bomber planes.¹⁴

To accommodate the constantly relocating Soviet troops, the Republic of Hungary's council of ministers agreed to hand over to the guest troops (Soviet Army) military and training ranges (12 April 1955, decision number 6017/12.04.1955).¹⁵ The Hungarian government thus transferred the physical and financial responsibility for accommodating the Soviet Army to the Hungarian defense ministry. As a result of this measure, the Hungarian People's Army increased the number and value of the properties in its possession, but it could not use them because they were automatically transferred to Soviet forces.

On 31 May 1955, after the creation of the Warsaw Pact, the Political Committee of the HWP agreed to the relocation from Austria to Hungary of a Soviet fighter plane division and one reconnaissance airplane wing. Addressing the Political Committee, the defense minister reasoned about the new Soviet troops in the following way:

Examining the request I found that the placement of these airplane formations on the territory of Hungary would increase the air defence of our country.¹⁶

In September 1955 the number of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary increased again. A Special Corps was created with its center in Székesfehérvár. This corps contained two mechanized divisions; one fighter plane and one fighter-bomber plane division; one pontoon bridge regiment; and additional air defense, service, and other specialized troops.¹⁷

Conclusions

Establishing the Warsaw Pact and creating a neutral Austria signified a new era for Hungary. In 1955 in Central Europe two military organizations were established—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact—and over time these alliances created enough military might to accomplish their mutual annihilation. With their establishment, however, uniform systems were created that made the European military forces transparent. It seems paradoxical, but only these well-conceived and organized military alliances could create the stable foundation for future disarmament negotiations. The contortion of history is that Hungary contributed to European security by again losing its independence, which it did not regain until the end of the twentieth century.

Endnotes

1. First secretary of the Hungarian Workers' Party who represented the Stalinist line in Hungary.

2. Hungarian Communist politician, prime minister (from 4 July 1953 to 18 April 1955 and from 24 October to 4 November 1956).

3. Hungarian State Archive (HSA), Hungarian Workers' Party, Political Committee (PC), fond (f.) 276, guarding unit (g.u.) 53/221, p. 16.

4. *Ibid.*

5. Hungarian prime minister (from 15 April 1955 to 23 October 1956).

6. HSA HWP PC, f. 276. g.u. 53/229, p. 19.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 21.

8. HSA HWP PC, f. 276, g.u. 53/247.

9. HSA HWP PC, f. 276, g.u. 32/250.

10. Report to the Joint Command, 30 Sep 1955, Hungarian Military Archive (HMA) Hungarian People's Army (HPA), Staff Secretariat Documents, Operational Leadership, box 74.

11. HSA HWP PC, f. 276, g.u. 53/240.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 84.

13. Miklós Horváth, *Az 1956-os forradalom és szabadságharc és a Varsói Szerződés Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 114. évfolyam Budapest 2001. 4.szám 601–03.o.

14. HMA HPA, Secretariat of the Ministry of Defense, 1955/T, box 1, p. 50.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

16. HSA HWP PC, f. 276. g.u. 53/234, p. 100.

17. Horváth, *Az 1956-os forradalom és szabadságharc és a Varsói Szerződés* 604.o.

The Contribution of the Hellenic Navy to NATO's Geostrategy

Andreas Toussas

The Hellenic Navy's Bases

The Hellenic Fleet constitutes the spearhead of Hellenic naval power and is considered a means of prevention against any ill-intended activity and a means of defending the country's national interests. Therefore, it is always ready to take the following actions:

- to contribute to the security of Greece's territorial integrity;
- to secure Greece's sovereign rights in the Greek seas; and
- to maintain open and free communication and transportation sea lines.

To fulfill all of these missions, the Hellenic Navy has many different kinds of ships, chosen on the basis of the complexity of contemporary naval circumstances. The most important role is played by the two major naval bases, on Salamina Island and in the Suda Bay at the western part of the island of Crete. The naval bases are essential for maintaining the fleet and they respond to all kinds of naval necessities. In addition to their national significance, the two bases, and especially the one at Suda Bay, have great geostrategic importance.

The national naval base of Greece was founded on Hydra Island in 1827, and that same year was transferred to the island of Poros where it functioned until 1878. From there it was transferred to its current home on Salamina Island.

Most of the Navy's activities are developed at Salamina where the infrastructure necessary for supporting all units of the fleet is located. This base has always been the heart of the Greek Navy and enables the Greek warships to sail and fight effectively over the whole length and breadth of the Aegean Sea. The base infrastructure is adequate for the maintenance and repair of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) vessels.

As part of the NATO plans, the Suda Bay Naval Base in Crete was founded in 1959. Then, as now, it constituted the repair unit of the Navy. Its strategic importance was shown in the Gulf War of 1991 when Coalition Force warships used the Suda Bay Naval Base as their only supply center. The Suda base is

geostrategically advantageous for the allies and especially the Americans. It is located a secure distance from the operational theaters, next to a civil airport and a military air base, and Suda Bay offers high levels of security for ships and personnel.

The base plays a vital part in support of NATO's interests, and the alliance is spending a great deal of money to preserve and improve its deployments and facilities. The base infrastructure has all the necessary warship repair and support supply facilities, including the necessary defensive infrastructure for radionuclear, biological, and chemical warfare.

Suda Bay Naval Base comprises the following facilities:

- a refueling base for warships in the area of Akrotiri, Chania, and Crete;
- a base with a special jetty from the small island of Paliosuda for unloading and storing military materials at the Marathi area of Suda, where there are storehouses for fuel, armaments, and ammunition;
- an airport that serves as an advanced station for aeronautical cooperation and Navy reconnoitering vessels, and as an alternative airstrip for the airplanes of aircraft carriers; and
- a naval communication system capable of connecting with all American bases and the vessels of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean.

The operational capabilities of this base are quite clear, particularly in the event of high alert or deployment in the Middle East.

One of the most important stations at Suda Bay Naval Base is the FORACS (Fleet Operational Readiness Accuracy Check Site) Station, the only station in the Mediterranean Sea where electromagnetic systems are calibrated. Another important office on the base is the FLS (forward logistic site), founded in 2002. It offers logistic support at all levels for NATO ships, supplying spares, fuel, ammunition, cargo, mail, and food. Some of the Mediterranean's largest jetties and platforms are situated at Suda Bay Naval Base. The base keeps many fuel tanks and therefore has a special command, the Fuel Administration.

Security is very important for the effective functioning of the base. There is a permanent American security staff (Naval Coastal Warfare), and a Greek squad from the underwater Special Forces charged with the security of allied ships. Because of the current Iraq situation, security is very tight, but the security level generally varies from light to high, according to circumstances.

The Naval Hospital of Crete takes care of all current and emergency incidents.

NATO's Geostrategy

The strategic importance of the Suda Bay Naval Base constitutes a fundamental point of NATO's geostrategic structure. Its strategic significance is naturally

imparted by Crete's geopolitical role in administering the local and peripheral security environment as well as that of the whole international system.

To the British geopolitician Halford Mackinder, Crete had great importance. By his belief that Eurasia was the geographical pivot and heartland of history, Mackinder established the theoretical basis on which NATO was set and drew a connection between the NATO security system with the Eastern Question of the earlier centuries. Mackinder believed that "the Aegean is of vital importance for the containment of a northern land power,"¹ and he basically defined the Eastern Question as a conflict that would have its operational theater in the Black Sea, the Bosphorus and Dardanelles Straits, and the Aegean Sea. This conflict would occur because an "eastern land power" coming from the north would enter the warm south seas and meet the resistance of western naval powers. Mackinder held that Crete should be the platform of control in defending the region because "the geography herself situated this island in the southern point of this space."² Indeed, a simple look at the map of the eastern Mediterranean is enough to convince us that Crete constitutes a point of total control of the Mediterranean Sea toward the east and south and of the Aegean Sea and the Black Sea toward the north. Mackinder stressed Crete's long-standing importance when he wrote of Crete as a place where Minoan civilization developed:

Modern research has made it plain that the leading seafaring race of antiquity came at all times from that square of water between Europe and Asia which is known alternatively as the Aegean Sea and the Archipelago, the "Chief Sea" of the Greeks.

Unfortunately, there is not enough time for us to deal with the geopolitical importance of Crete in all the centuries that passed from the third millennium BC when the Minoan civilization appeared to the middle of the twentieth century when the island was being placed in the geostrategic architecture of the European Atlantic Alliance. We can discuss in general, however, the great significance of Crete in the military operations of the Second World War.

Because of its strategic value, Crete was of interest to both the British and Hitler. The occupation of Crete by the British, or at least an assurance that the island would remain under Allied or friendly forces, was vital to the British because it offered them the following advantages:

1. It gave considerable protection for British bases in North Africa against the attacks of the Nazi Luftwaffe, forcing the latter to launch its attacks from the remote airfields of mainland Europe.
2. It served as a forward aeronautical base and a base of amphibious operations toward the shores and islands of the Aegean and the Dodecanese islands.
3. It contributed to the security of transportation from the harbors of the

Pacific and Indian Oceans, through the Suez Canal, toward the British bases of the Mediterranean and the Middle East. Given that the greatest part of the resupply sources for those British bases came from India, Australia, and South Africa, the importance of who occupied or controlled Crete is clear.

4. Crete was the only free section of the Greek territory with both Greek and British forces and in which the free Greek state still existed, by virtue of the presence of the king, the government, and the national armed forces. Consequently, it was extremely important for Greece and Britain, both morally and politically, to hold it.

On the other hand, if Crete was occupied by the Axis, it would offer to those forces the following strategic advantages:

1. capacity for direct air force threat against the Allies' sea and air lines of communication, particularly against the British Fleet in the Mediterranean Sea;
2. an excellent base of operation toward the Middle East and the North Africa area in general; and
3. safe Aegean Sea lines, provided that Turkey remained neutral or pro-Axis, and free naval communication with the ports of the Black Sea and the Adriatic Sea.

The following communiqué from the Nazi General Headquarters, dated 12 June 1941, sums up the strategic importance of the island of Crete for the adversary powers in the Mediterranean area, during the Second World War:

Today, in the context of the NATO architecture, the Suda Bay Naval Base constitutes one of the most significant bases for the domination of three factors: A. Of the Greek state in eastern Mediterranean. B. Of the NATO alliance in the sensitive security system of north-south and west-east, where there are the borders of the great civilizations of the planet: the strategic size of the Suda Bay Naval Base permits to the west factor to improve and support its positions towards the Arabic world in the East and to the western economy to constitute a stable multiplier for the power of western political strategy. C. Of the wider Anglo-Saxon factor, over the security system of the whole planet: Crete is one of the most important naval bases of the 6th fleet of the American Navy which controls the worldwide geopolitical system.

The main importance of the Suda Bay Naval Base in NATO's security system, and eventually in the wider western security system, was proved once more in Operation DESERT STORM, during the first Gulf War in 1991. Speaking at the Chios Island conference titled "Geopolitics of the Sea," presented by the Hellenic Naval Academy and the University of the Aegean in September 2002, Professor Massimo DeLeonardis stated, "From a strategic point of view, the Persian Gulf begins at the Suda Bay."

The Allied Forces of the eastern Mediterranean, comprising eight ships, and the Allied Forces of the Atlantic, comprising six ships, are sailing continuously in the Mediterranean, and those ships quite often enter various harbors to rest their crews. For this reason a special permanent permission to anchor at all Greek ports has been granted to avoid time-consuming procedures. American warships have the right to anchor in the famous jetty K-14. This right is based on bilateral agreements between Greece and the United States.

From a defense and strategy point of view, the American naval base at Suda in the northwest part of Crete is a horizontal zone of Anglo-Saxon geopolitical influence. It is definitely the largest and most important American base of this kind in the eastern Mediterranean Sea. In the Gulf of Suda, there is enough permanent anchorage to let the whole Sixth Fleet sail in! In the surrounding area, there are ground and underground facilities of all kinds. The base operates on the Greek-American agreements of 1959. It mostly serves the United States Navy, for which it is a primary support center in the area, secondarily serves the members of NATO, and finally the vessels of the Hellenic Fleet.

Endnotes

1. Halford Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality: A Classic Work on Geography and World Power* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1962), p. 108, figure 25.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 33–34.

The Fourth Republic and the Korean War: A French Contribution to the Cold War, 1950–1954

Olivier Lahaie

At the end of the Second World War, France had an illusion of greatness because of victory over Nazi Germany. When the United Nations was created on 26 June 1945, France, a member of the Allied nations, had a place in the Security Council. This international organization was built on the principle of collective security, written on October 24 within the framework of Article 51 of the United Nations charter, against aggression of the type committed by Nazi Germany. Gradually, it became evident that this organization could be used by the West for protection against the Communist threat in Europe.

On 5 March 1946 Churchill delivered his famous “Sinews of Peace” speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, and warned of the new order taking shape in Europe, one cut by an “iron curtain.” At this time in the West, the Soviet threat seemed more serious than a future and hypothetical revival of a strong Germany.

The postwar years offered many disappointments for France, which included coping with shortages and obtaining essential supplies. France, a colonial nation, had difficulties in reestablishing its authority in Indochina, a stance that was condemned in Washington. More and more the country believed that it was becoming a secondary power, living at the United States’ expense. On 1 January 1947 the Anglo-American bizonia was set up in Germany. France was pushed aside on the international political stage by its former allies. Moreover, France was not ready to commit to formal alliances. However, it became clear that the situation in Europe was deteriorating and that France would soon have to choose its camp. In a speech on 12 March 1947, American President Harry Truman presented his country as the unique hope of the free world in the face of the expansionist communism.

According to the United States, European nations had to stand firm against the hegemonic will of the Soviet Union around the world—and to check that will by using different means, even by a show of force. Georges Bidault, the French foreign secretary, denounced both the Communist danger and the numerous French servicemen who wanted to cooperate more openly with the United States. From 10 March to 5 April 1947, France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States met in Moscow to discuss the future of

Germany, and that conference revealed the different perspectives and intentions of the former allies.

On 22 March French Communist representatives voted against war in Indochina. By their attitude they weakened the three-party coalition for the general elections of November 1946, and they openly criticized the policy of wage and price freezes that was defended by the socialist Council President Paul Ramadier. Moreover, on 5 May the government dismissed Communist ministers after they supported strikes at Renault factories. French public opinion really began to turn against Communist activists, who were seen as likely to stir up controversy against the security of the state. Ramadier accused the French Communist Party (FCP) of being a “clandestine conductor, able to lead the assault against the democratic authority, and able to open a crisis for the regime.”

On 5 June 1947 the Marshall Plan was announced. The Blum-Byrnes Agreement of 28 May 1946 enabled France to pay off its war debt to the United States, but it was the nation’s acceptance of \$2.7 billion through the Marshall Plan on 12 July that enabled the country’s economic recovery. In order to benefit from the plan, France adopted a less inflexible attitude toward Germany—an attitude that corresponded more to the Anglo-American approach.

At the end of June the FCP’s anti-Americanism became evident during a party congress. Maurice Thorez, who steered a strong Communist Party comprising a quarter of the French electorate, strongly criticized “American expansionism,” drawing his arguments from the Leninist analysis of imperialism. For the FCP this was no time to make wide political alliances.

Besides the usual peaceful arguments in favor of defending colonized peoples, the FCP added speeches in favor of the Soviet Union. A good part of the French intelligentsia adopted an anti-American and pacifist attitude, and some of them embraced the Communist vision of the world.

Charles de Gaulle, having denounced the FCP’s allegiance to the Soviet Union, warned that Soviet tanks were “two stages of the cycle Tour de France” deep into the country. On 18 September 1947 European Communist parties actively undertook to support the policies of the Soviet Union, and that position was joined by representatives to the National Assembly, Jacques Duclos and Etienne Fajon. On 5 October the Soviet Union created Comintern to oppose the Marshall Plan. In October and November 1947, taking advantage of the explosive economic and social situation, insurrectionary strikes organized by the Confédération Générale du Travail broke out in France. Jules Moch, the home secretary, quelled the strikes, but it was evident that an appeal for American help was the only way that France could counter a major Communist threat because France already was in the grip of Hô Chi Minh’s guerrilla warfare in Indochina.

The conference concerning Germany, held in London from 25 November to 19 December (and again involving France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union,

and the United States), failed to reach a consensus. Although it became increasingly evident that the United States would defend the countries of Western Europe in case of aggression by the Soviet Union, Vincent Auriol, president of the French Republic, hesitated to take a position too clearly in favor of the Americans so as not to alienate the Soviet Union entirely. No one really knew how much help America could bring to Europe in case of a major attack. The American position toward France, a colonial power, was rather critical and it raised questions. Finally, the French found it difficult to accept the idea that it was vital for France to seek the protection of another country as an indication of national decline on the international scene.

On 25 February 1948 the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia revealed the Soviet Union's influence in a country not occupied militarily by Soviet troops. The Czech coup d'état served as an electric shock treatment for the undecideds on all sides. The Soviet Union showed also its refusal to organize free elections in the countries that it controlled, in violation of the Yalta agreements. The situation thus seemed to degrade in Europe as it split ideologically and geographically into two conflicting blocs. The blockade of Berlin in April graphically illustrated this fracture. That same month the Organization for European Economic Cooperation was created to coordinate the Marshall Plan. Its creation stressed the anchoring of Western Europe in the capitalist camp.

For France the question of respect for its territorial integrity seemed to surpass some concessions about the protection of its sovereign power. So, despite the existence of the European Defense Treaty signed on 17 March 1948 in Brussels, on 4 April 1949 France joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a defensive alliance with Canada, the United States, and nine other European countries. It seemed to France that any resistance to a Soviet attack was impossible without American support. The French Communists opposed the French government's position. On 23 May France did not oppose the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany, which was followed on 7 October by the creation of the German Democratic Republic. On 29 August the Soviets successfully detonated their first atomic bomb, and immediately it seemed urgent and necessary for France to take its place under the umbrella of American atomic protection.

In Asia the climate was also disturbing for France. On 1 October 1949 the Communists took over power in China and Mao Zedong proclaimed the People's Republic. Despite America's help, the nationalist Chiang Kai-shek was not able to resist. Sixty thousand Chinese people fled to Formosa, Taiwan. For the United States the Communist threat in Asia thus became more significant, and in Washington it was no longer heresy to think that the French government could be helped in its fight against the *Việt Minh* (the League for the Independence of Vietnam) in Indochina by counterbalancing the delivery of Chinese weaponry to the Communist guerrillas. In fact, France was not leading another "nasty colonial war"; now it was defending the West.

It was in this critical international context that the French Fourth Republic, facing the problems just described both at home and in its colonies, had to react as a major power to the crisis in Korea. As a crossroad between China, Japan, and Russia, Korea has always been of political interest to those three imperialist powers. A Japanese colony since 1910, the country organized a Communist guerrilla war for independence that began in 1938. At the Potsdam Conference in 1945, the Soviet Union and the United States decided that the Japanese troops located above the 38th Parallel would surrender to the Russians, and those located in the south would surrender to the Americans. Soviet soldiers entered North Korea on 12 August 1945, and the Americans entered South Korea on 8 September. Originally a simple line of coordination, the 38th Parallel, had become a real border by 1948, one that separated twenty million Communist Koreans in the north from ten million Koreans living under a democratic regime in the south. In September 1947 the United Nations General Assembly organized elections to establish a unique government for all of Korea, but the Soviet Union refused to apply this process in the north. For their part the Communist leaders did not oppose a reunification, but they pictured one that favored them—by force if necessary. South Korea was created on 13 July 1948; the constitution of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was voted on 8 September 1948 and Kim Il Sung became the national leader.

The political situation was completely blocked in the years preceding the start of the Korean crisis. The Soviet soldiers left North Korea in December 1948, and American troops left South Korea in June 1949, following the request of the United Nations General Assembly.

With Stalin's agreement, apparently testing the reactive capacity of the United States, North Korea decided to invade U.S.-supported South Korea. At dawn on 25 June 1950, using border incidents as the excuse, armored cars belonging to two North Korean armed corps, crossed the 38th Parallel and invaded South Korea by surprise. Seoul was occupied two days later, the same day Truman announced "the acceleration of the military assistance to the forces of France and associated States in Indochina and the dispatch of a military mission to provide close working relations with those forces."

South Korea was the theater of an indescribable panic, exacerbated by the withdrawal of the government. On 27 June 1950 the United Nations Security Council, boycotted by the Soviet Union, ordered North Korea to stop its aggression (that is, withdraw to the 38th Parallel); and the United States, at the United Nations' request, took up arms beside the South Korean forces at the beginning of July. To relieve the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Navy, three American divisions gradually were sent to South Korea between 5 July and 1 August. They had painful moments before a resolute and exceptionally well-equipped enemy. The American troops, outnumbered by the Communist forces, owed their safety only to massive firepower and air support.

After the landing of seventy thousand marines at Inchon on 15 September, General Douglas MacArthur, whose troops were henceforth supported

by United Nations reinforcements (Belgian, Dutch, English, Greek, Philippine, Thai, and Turkish) led a victorious counteroffensive that reached the Yalu River at the end of October 1950. The North Koreans lost one hundred thousand men.

Although in late November General MacArthur envisioned taking the war into China, Washington, with an eye toward U.S. public opinion, slowed down this prospect. MacArthur was ordered to take a defensive approach. The North, now helped by half a million Chinese soldiers, prepared a strong counteroffensive.

For France, which was already facing an ideological war in Indochina, the Korean War confirmed the American theory about the hegemonic will of Communist doctrine and the absolute necessity of containing it. In the difficult internal context described above, the French decision to join the Korean conflict has to be appreciated as courageous. At that precise moment the French government faced a ministerial crisis, and even if Korea had remained a country remote from French concern, the consequences of the Korean crisis could have major international repercussions in Europe. On 12 July 1950 René Pleven, the French prime minister, held a dim view of a third world war that could degenerate into an atomic conflict (a solution considered by MacArthur in Korea before his replacement by General Matthew Ridgway). Although on 30 June the United Nations stated its intention to become involved militarily in managing this major crisis in Korea, France waited until 25 August to define the scope of its contribution because its army was understaffed and lacked funds. Since 1945, when France's military budget was 41 percent of the national budget, military expenditure as a share of national expenditure had fallen to 18 percent by 1950—and most of that was used for the war in Indochina. France could send to Korea only a battalion of volunteers, constituted for better coordination on the model of an American battalion. General Raoul C. Magrin-Vernerey, better known as "Monclar," led the French troops, assisted by Major Le Mire. The strength of the French battalion (FB/UNO) was fixed at 39 officers, 172 noncommissioned officers, and 350 men; 20 officers, 90 noncommissioned officers, and 400 supplementary men stayed in France as reinforcements. The French frigate *La Grandière* was sent to Korea on 25 July to support the United Nations forces.

In October 1950 France faced victorious Việt Minh offensives at Cao Bang and on the Red River delta at Tonkin. Cao Bang was evacuated with difficulty on 3 October and Lang Son fell. The French army lost six thousand men in Indochina during 1950.

The FB/UNO left Marseilles on 25 October and arrived in Pusan on 29 November, after a stopover in Saigon. With the dramatic events in Indochina as a backdrop that brought attention to the Communist push throughout Asia, a Sino-Korean counteroffensive against the United Nations forces took place on the Yalu River in November 1950. China engaged twenty armed corps. On 11 December the FB/UNO was attached to the American 2d Division to

be adequately equipped. It formed the 4th Battalion of the 23d U.S. Infantry Regiment within which it remained throughout the campaign. On 21 December the FB/UNO went to the front near Chungju, then to the north at Wonju on the 29th. There, on 10 January 1951, the FB/UNO faced a Communist offensive. With bayonets in hand the FB/UNO bravely took control of Hill 247, and this first action gained the respect of the other allied soldiers. On 27 January the offensive finally was contained on a line from Pyongtaek to Wonju to Samchok. The United Nations forces passed then in turn to the offensive.

Visiting France on 31 January, Dwight D. Eisenhower (then supreme commander of the NATO forces), who was aware of the French effort in Asia, declared American support for France's policy in Indochina. In February 1951 the members of the FB/UNO were engaged with their American companions in the Battle of the Twin-Tunnels, surrounded by four Chinese divisions in Chipyong-Ni from 13 to 15 February. Horrified by the piles of corpses in front of their lines, the troops saw firsthand not only the fierce fighting spirit of the Chinese but also their total contempt of death. For its success the FB/UNO received its first French and American unit combat awards. The fighting around Hill 1037, located on the symbolic 38th Parallel, lasted from 3 to 5 March, in temperatures as low as minus 40 degrees Fahrenheit.

Along the front the situation began to improve. The United Nations Command (UNC) forces took Seoul on 14–15 March, then moved northward; the Sino-Korean forces retreated. But on 22 April and 16 May, the Chinese mounted a violent and strong counterattack with 475,000 soldiers. The French contributed to the defense of the Yanggu-Chunchon axis. Because of the United Nations air superiority, the Communists lost eighty thousand men to gain of only 55 kilometers; by comparison, the UNC lost seven thousand men. From 15 to 16 May the Chinese attacked the French positions in the Puchaetul Valley. On 23 May the last UNC counterattack took place. The front was stabilized near Inje at the beginning of June on a 200-kilometer line.

In view of the obvious defeat of the Chinese, the Soviet Union's representative to the United Nations proposed on 23 June to open negotiations about a cease-fire; but the first negotiations were quickly halted by the intransigence of the Communist bloc.

On 29 June the FB/UNO, which was rewarded for its bravery, participated in the relief of the 3d South Korean Corps at Inje. On 30 June 1951 there were 738 French troops within the UNC's total strength of 554,577 servicemen. A diplomatic solution seemed increasingly imperative, and armistice negotiations resumed on 10 July in Kaesong. Nevertheless, again the dialogue stopped.

On 1 September 1951 the Pact of San Francisco was formed by Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, within the framework of the American doctrine of containment. One week later Japan signed a security treaty with the United States.

Between 13 and 26 September the FB/UNO was engaged in defensive fights at "the Bowl" and at "Heartbreak Ridge," the other name for Hill 931.

The French soldiers took the battle to the Chinese four times, sustaining losses of sixty deaths and 260 wounded. At just that time, General Jean de Lattre, wanting to take advantage of the American will to counter globally the Communist threat in Asia, asked for military help to fight against the Việt Minh in Indochina.

In Korea the front was stabilized. The Chinese had amassed nine armed corps and had twelve corps in reserve—nearly a million soldiers with the North Korean forces, not counting thousands of unskilled laborers who might be pressed into service. The Allies were completely outnumbered by the flood of Communist troops, but they succeeded everywhere in defending their positions, thanks to their artillery and aviation support. On 27 November negotiations established a line for the armistice.

From January to April 1952 the FB/UNO participated in a series of skirmishes during the Battle of the Iron Triangle, a Chinese stronghold. The summit of the Iron Triangle was located near Pyongyang, with its base between Chorwon on the west and Kumhwa on the east. On 6 May 1952 President Auriol who wished to connect the war in Indochina to that in Korea, asserted to John Foster Dulles, the U.S. secretary of state, “We are the pillar of the western defence in Southern Asia, and if this pillar collapses, Singapore, Malaysia, India should be preys for Mao Tsé-toung.”

From July to August, violent Chinese attacks took place on “T-Bone Hill,” and the FB/UNO contributed to the defense. At the beginning of October, hard fighting took place at “Arrowhead,” where the first Chinese assault on the French positions on Hill 281 was preceded by ten hours of artillery bombardment. After three assaults, the Chinese had lost six hundred men in front of the FB/UNO lines. On 1 March, as a Chinese battalion attacked its positions, the FB/UNO received its first South Korean unit combat award; the battalion also received supplementary French and American awards. Despite negotiations about an armistice and heavy losses, the Communists still had 800,000 men on the ground against the UNC, and at least 500 T-34 tanks and 1,000 MiG jet airplanes.

On 5 March 1953 Stalin’s death allowed a negotiated exit from war in Korea. On 18 July there was an unsuccessful attack by two Chinese regiments on the positions of the French battalion at Chungasan. The armistice was signed on 27 July in Panmunjon and Munsan. It was guaranteed by the Soviet Union and the United States. The FB/UNO concluded its relationship with the American 2d Infantry Division on 9 October.

In Korea 12 French officers, 43 noncommissioned officers, and 208 men died (180 of them killed in action). There were 1,008 men wounded and 7 men are still missing in action. By comparison, the global losses of UNC forces comprising troops from twenty-one nations were 383,000 killed or wounded. The Sino-Korean forces lost two million men in this human-expensive adventure. It was a victorious FB/UNO that left Korea for Indochina on 6 November 1953, after two years, seven months, and twenty-eight days there.

The Korean question was definitively sealed at the Conference of Geneva in May 1954; the fate of French Indochina was also sealed there because of the fall of the entrenched camp of Diên Biên Phu.

Cooperation Beyond the Iron Curtain: The Relations Between Romania and the United States During the 1960s and 1970s

Carmen Rijnoveanu

With the parties on opposite sides as a result of the new international order that emerged at the end of the Second World War, the evolution of Romanian-American relations has been marked by the political realities, limits, and constraints that existed at the time. Basically, until the early 1960s the level of relations between the countries was low. The situation began to change in the early 1960s and reached its highest point of development in the late 1960s and during the 1970s.

In analyzing the evolution of the Romanian-American relations in the 1960s and 1970s, three important factors should be taken into account: the evolution of relations between Moscow and Washington, the autonomous policy promoted by the Bucharest regime and the detachment from Moscow, and the American political strategy toward Eastern Europe.

To what extent did the United States view Bucharest's policy of "independence" as a trustworthy policy? What were the main objectives followed by the leaders in Bucharest? Was there really a coherent strategy in this regard? What did Washington actually hope to gain by encouraging the political course promoted by Romania? How did Moscow react to Bucharest's initiatives? Was this a reaction to the way alliances were changing at the time?

These are only a few of the questions for which I would seek answers, taking into account the constraints that still exist because of incomplete documentation and limited access to some archival documents.

The improvement of Romanian-American relations that began in the 1960s was a result and a consequence of the new political course initiated by Bucharest's leadership in relation to Moscow. Romania's political course was reshaped at the beginning of the decade. Without renouncing its allegiance to the socialist camp, Bucharest's regime launched a policy of detachment, even autonomy, from the constraints imposed by Moscow to enhance its subordination and exploitation of the satellite states. In the first phase a dispute developed at the economic level, but it also had significant political implications. In essence, Romanian leader Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej refused to accept for Romania the role assigned to it within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON)—specifically that of "breadbasket" for the industrialized members of the Warsaw Pact, such as East Germany and

Czechoslovakia.¹ Taking this position provoked an open conflict with Moscow within COMECON. Taking advantage of favorable conditions provided by the worsening of Sino-Soviet relations, Romania went farther and publicly expressed its striving for "independence." Bucharest issued the April Declaration in 1964,² a document considered to be the foundation of the whole policy of autonomy during Communist rule.

The opening toward the West should be understood in this context. Documents consulted show that the opening of Romania toward the West was based on practical and opportunistic reasons. On one hand, Romanian leader Gheorghiu-Dej hoped to get significant economic support to be able to develop a national economic policy and to reduce the Soviet pressures over Romania. On the other hand, he hoped to enhance his country's credibility at the international level and strengthen the political power it would need to carry on a successful policy of detachment from the Kremlin "master." There were other reasons for emphasizing the economic dimension of the relations established between Romania and the United States: doing so would not challenge Moscow and would avoid any of Moscow's possible reactions that could have stopped the Bucharest leadership's "independent" political course.³ Therefore, the main Romanian interest was to get significant economic and financial support from the West, especially from the United States, in order to carry on its new political course.

Washington's answer to Bucharest's opening toward the West, despite the restrictions that existed, was the result of a clear political judgment determined by the evolution of Soviet-American relations, and the American strategy toward Eastern Europe that first wished to weaken Moscow's control over the satellites by encouraging opposing tendencies within the rival bloc.

Until 1965 the level of political and economic relations that developed between Romania and the United States had a relatively low dynamic, the main focus being on the economic and cultural dimensions. An example is the agreement signed on 9 December 1960 through which some cultural exchanges were set up between the countries, including art exhibitions, theatre performances, books, and other publications. This agreement was significant because it was the first signed by Washington and a Communist country.

Simultaneously, the Bucharest government made some decisions, considered necessary by authorities in Washington, that aimed at increasing Romania's political credibility—clearing up the reparations problems, unsolved after the nationalization process begun in 1948, that had to be paid to some western countries, and deciding a general amnesty for political prisoners. (As a result, between 1962 and 1965 at least 12,750 prisoners were released from Romanian prison camps.)⁴

Romanian-American relations took a significant first step on 18 May 1964 with the signing of a high-level bilateral agreement. Among other provisions, the agreement stipulated the negotiation of a new consular agreement, the enlargement of the programs on cultural and information exchanges, the

building of commercial offices in Bucharest and New York City, and the setting up of some facilities to promote tourism in both countries. Also decided was that the diplomatic mission in both capitals, having a rank of legation, would receive a higher rank and be transformed into an embassy. In August, Petre Balaceanu became the first Communist ambassador in Washington, and in November, William Crawford was appointed the first U.S. ambassador to the Romanian People's Republic.

This new evolutionary course of bilateral relations soon got practical results. In 1964 the United States' volume of bilateral trade with Romania tripled that of 1963, growing from \$2 million to \$6 million.⁵

Before Nicolae Ceausescu came to power in 1965, political relations between Romania and the United States were limited. Nevertheless, there is a debatable issue that, if confirmed, should represent the first high-level political contact between the sides. There was a meeting between the Romanian minister of foreign affairs, Corneliu Manescu, and the American secretary of state, Dean Rusk, on 4 October 1963 in Washington. According to some testimonies belonging to Raymond L. Garthoff, under the pressure of the Cuban missile crisis, a Romanian official contacted his Washington counterpart to make it known to Washington that Romania would not consider itself automatically involved in the Soviet Union's risky policy, and that it would remain neutral in any conflict generated by Moscow. If true, this would be the first unambiguous affirmation of Romania's policy of "independence" toward Moscow.⁶

Romanian-American relations significantly improved after Ceausescu came to power in March 1965. Ceausescu's tough foreign policy position and his constant opposition to Moscow had a strong impact at the international level and influenced many of Washington's decisions regarding future relations with Romania. Bucharest's position within the Soviet bloc gave a strong impetus to the development of Romanian-American political and economic relations as well as to Washington's gestures of willingness toward Romania.⁷ One example was Ceausescu's reaction to the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia. In view of the Romanian Communist Party's policy of "nonintervention in the domestic affairs of another state," the Romanian leader refused to join the other East European members of the Warsaw Pact in their invasion on 21 August 1968, and he publicly denounced it. An appreciation of Romania's political usefulness as a "thorn in the flesh" of the Soviet Union prompted a period of increasing Western and especially American courtship of Ceausescu.⁸

After 1968 the level of economic relations between the nations developed significantly. Highly placed American government officials visited Romania, many high-level contacts were established, and many agreements in different fields were signed. Moreover, during the Tenth Congress of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP), which opened on 6 October 1968, one of the main guidelines of economic development that continued until 1980 was formulated, namely, trade development with "all countries" regardless of social system. Delegates also decided to increase the amount of foreign trade

by 40–45 percent over the trade volume of the previous plan for 1966–1970. The United States had an important role to play in this foreign trade development, so in 1970 exports to America increased by 500 percent over those of 1965, and Bucharest's leadership envisioned a further increase during 1970. If we compare the average volume of Romanian exports to the United States for April–June 1975 with that of the same period of 1976, we see an increase from \$18 million to \$45 million; American exports to Romania increased by \$4 million in 1976 over the previous year.

With Washington's support, on 14 November 1971 Romania was accepted as a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In June 1973 the Common Market granted Romania a preferential regime for its products, and thus it became the first Warsaw Pact country to have such a status. On 15 December 1973 Romania became the first country from the Communist bloc affiliated with the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.⁹ Also, Romania and the United States signed a two-year agreement for exchanges and cooperative actions in such fields as education, culture, science, and technology. That agreement was the most complex part of the exchange program initiated in 1960 because it included governmental, social, professional, and civic exchanges between the countries.

On 28 July 1975 Romania was granted "most-favored-nation status." Although it seemed to have an economic character, Washington's decision to grant that status had a strong political significance. The United States rewarded Romania's autonomous policy within the Warsaw Pact and gave to Ceausescu—a rebel of the Soviet bloc—a unique international status among all the other Communist countries. These achievements enabled a growth in economic bilateral contacts. The highest level of Romanian-American exchange reached \$1 billion in 1980, when Romania became the most important Eastern European market for American goods and the United States became Romania's third-most-important trading partner.

Being aware of all the advantages he could get, Ceausescu was interested in sending as much proof as possible of his policy of "independence." There were some spectacular gestures, such as his refusal to cut off relations with Israel during the Six-Day War (June 1967), contrary to Moscow's orders; the official recognition of the Federal Republic of Germany and the visit by German chancellor Willy Brandt to Romania (3–7 August 1967); the refusal to participate in the military invasion of Czechoslovakia (August 1968); and the position adopted by Romania in the context of the Yom Kippur War (1973). Certainly the positions adopted during the Czechoslovakian crisis and toward the Arab-Israeli crises in 1967 and 1973 decisively influenced America's policy toward Romania.

Among the reasons explaining these foreign policy decisions was Ceausescu's goal of gaining a certain "protection" from the West in case Moscow acted against him. Such a concern took a more credible shape in the context of

the Czechoslovakian crisis in August 1968. According to some documentary evidence, Washington leadership was concerned about Romania's fate, and it took some actions in supporting Bucharest's regime. On 30 August 1968 the United States sent a note to Moscow stating, "We do not know what is going to happen" if Soviet forces did something against Romania. Soviet ambassador Anatoli Dobrynin had a meeting with Dean Rusk to give assurances that "the rumors regarding a possible Soviet attack against Romania are ill-founded."¹⁰ In his memoirs Dobrynin revealed that he had met with Rusk on 23 August. On that occasion, an American official stated, "On behalf of whole humankind, we please you not to do such a thing because the consequences are difficult to be predicted."¹¹

The visit to Romania by U.S. President Richard Nixon (2–3 August 1969) marked another important moment in the history of Romanian-American relations. The reasons for the visit have been the subject of much debate. It was believed that Nixon aimed at launching an image "strike" against Moscow, which had constantly refused to support Washington in its effort to bring the Vietnam War to an end. Other writers have taken into consideration America's strategy toward China and the role Romania could play in that regard. For Romania, the visit was first an image gain, a recognition of Romania's international status¹² and implicitly of its leader, but also an indirect message to Moscow. For this visit Ceausescu delayed even the Tenth Congress of the RCP to which all "brotherly" socialist countries had been invited. At the same time, the meeting with the American president was another opportunity for Ceausescu to make clear the main political principles on which his "strategy" was based:

Regarding Romania [said the Romanian leader to his American counterpart], the development of the relations with United States could not affect us at all having in view that we understand these relations as being relations based on equality of rights, nonintervention in the domestic affairs and which are not determined at all by what Romania is doing in the relations with other countries. . . . In this context, I would like to say that for us no "limited sovereignty doctrine" is available. . . . Regarding the way Romania should act, we want to decide by ourselves here, in Bucharest, and nobody else, either from Moscow, Washington or Beijing nor from Paris, London or elsewhere.¹³

The consulted documentation shows that the priorities of Nixon's agenda did not focus on Romania but especially on two other nations very important to Washington—China and Vietnam. The attention paid to Romania should be seen in the context of these two priorities and the long-standing U.S. objective of encouraging dissidence within the Soviet bloc. American diplomacy was interested in taking advantage of what in diplomatic terms is called "good offices," and Romania became an important element at the level of American strategic thinking.

Regarding the Chinese problem, the United States asked for Bucharest's support to send Beijing different messages—not only ones of an informative

character but also ones expressing the clear desire of the U.S. government to establish closer relations with the People's Republic of China.¹⁴ Nixon's declaration is significant in this regard: "If you ever consider that it is in your own interest, of your government, to assume by yourself the role of mediator between China and [the] United States, we would welcome this."¹⁵

Regarding Vietnam, President Nixon sought a possible answer in Bucharest.

You said that North Vietnam wants peace, on an acceptable basis, but we have no proof in this regard. If we could get your help in finding an answer to this question then we could have a very important element and this will be a great contribution in finding the peace. . . . I wish to have a direct communication channel between us in case that we would want to send each other information of a high importance, to have the guarantee that we could talk together as we would do directly. I would prefer not to use for such communications the ordinary diplomatic channels which would involved [*sic*] on the same network thousands of people and at the end the news are known in 60 capitals.¹⁶

Did America really take into consideration such a possible role for Romania? Or was it only an attempt to force Moscow to play a more active role in solving the Vietnam War crisis? Considering the further evolution of events, a positive answer to the second question seems more credible. This also could be an answer to many questions regarding America's interest in Romania during this period. Did Ceausescu really understand that? Newly declassified documents will give us more answers to this question.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that the improvement of Romanian-American relations has been a consequence of the evolution of forces ratio between the Cold War superpowers, and that they developed according to the priorities and directions of both political-military blocs.

One of Washington's major objectives toward Eastern Europe was to weaken Moscow's control over its satellite states and to encourage centrifugal movement within the camp. From this perspective Washington had to encourage and support the position adopted by Romania within the Warsaw Pact. Thus, the major American interest focused on Moscow and on the evolution of Soviet-American relations that defined the nature of the relations between Washington and Bucharest during this period.

As for Romania, understanding its policy requires that we take into account, on one hand, the Romanian leadership's desire to play a distinct role within the frame of global confrontation between Warsaw Pact and North Atlantic Treaty Organization states, and, on the other hand, the limits and constraints imposed by its allegiance to the Communist sphere and the nature of the Com-

munist regime itself. Nevertheless, it should be said that Romania never had in view a possible change of the existing alliances and it constantly took care not to challenge Moscow. Significant from this point of view was Ceausescu's declaration during his meeting with Richard Nixon in 1969:

If we would have had the impression that Mr. Nixon wants to come to Romania to convince us to weaken the relations with our friend states or to change our domestic preoccupations, probably we would not have agreed on this visit. It is right that our Soviet friends have been somehow discomfited due to the agreement regarding your visit in Romania. *We informed them 36 hours before the official statement.* They did not tell us anything. Neither good nor bad. From this point of view, nothing of what they did or said could not be seen as a disagreement to this visit. . . . The world is going on ahead, the old conceptions should disappear and they will.¹⁷

Neither Gheorghiu-Dej nor Ceausescu ever put to discussion the alliance with the Soviet Union or allegiance to the political-military structures of which Romania was part. The character of the Romanian Communist regime was never a subject for negotiation despite the evolution of relations with Western countries. The establishment and development of the relations between Washington and Bucharest should be understood based on those realities.

The end of the 1970s marked a review of American foreign policy priorities and a change in attitude toward the Eastern European states. The link between foreign assistance programs provided to a country and the recipient country's level of respect for its citizens' human rights has become the main focus of American policy. For a few years more, because of Ceausescu's foreign policy, the Romanian regime enjoyed special treatment by the Americans, despite multiple signals that his government was infringing on its people's human rights. Until the 1980s Ceausescu succeeded in convincing Washington that the observance of human rights in Romania did not represent a problem, and thus he maintained a normal political course at the level of Romanian-American relations. The evolution of Romanian-American relations during the 1980s and implications of the major movements within the international arena are topics for future analysis.

The situation changed during the 1980s when Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev assumed many of the same directions that Romania had promoted. The resultant decrease in the significance of Ceausescu's policy led to a decline in Romanian-American relations.

Endnotes

1. Dennis Deletant, *Romania under Communist Rule* (Bucharest: Civil Academy Foundation, 1998), p. 141.

2. "Statement on the Stand of the Romanian Workers' Party Concerning Problems of the Communist World and Working Class Movement," issued on 22 Apr 1964 by the Plenum Session

of the Central Committee (CC) of the Romanian Workers' Party, 15–22 Apr, Central Historical National Archives (CHNA), Fund CC of RCP, chancellery section, file 23/1964, f. 12–29.

3. Referring to the main reasons that prompted the regime from Bucharest to open various cooperation bridges with the West, Ion Gheorghe Maurer, one of the most important Romanian political personalities during the Communist period, stated, "Romania aimed at taking benefits from the situation arising between both political-military blocks. It was such a context favorable for getting the sympathy and support of those capitalist countries the Soviets got to a conflict. Because of this we visited these countries. For getting their support. And of course we got it." See Lavinia Betea, *Maurer si Lumea de Ieri*, Fundatia Culturala "Ioan Slavici" (Arad, Romania, 1995), p. 145.

4. Victor Funza, *Istoria Comunismului in Romania (History of the Communism in Romania)* (Bucharest: EVF, 2004), pp. 395–96; see also Shorthand of the Meeting of the Politburo of the CC of the RCP, 16 Aug 1961, CHNA, Fond CC of the RCP, chancellery section, file 36/1961, f. 2–5.

5. Joseph Harrington, *Romanian-American Relations 1940–1990* (Iasi, Romania: European Institute Publishing House, 2002), p. 242.

6. This episode was presented by Raymond L. Garthoff in "When and Why Romania Distanced Itself from the Warsaw Pact," *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* (January 1993).

7. Vezi Cristian Popisteanu, "Primavara de la Praga si diplomatia romana," *Magazin Istoric* 9 (September 1998).

8. Deletant, *Romania under Communist Rule*, p. 167.

9. Romania's adhesion to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has been considered a measure appropriate to the RCP's foreign policy, namely, the development of the relations with all countries despite their political and economic system. See Note Regarding the Interests and the Conditions of a Possible Adhesion of Romania to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, CHNA, Fund CC of the RCP, chancellery section, file 74/ 1971, f. 54–56.

10. Harrington, *Romanian-American Relations*, p. 269.

11. Florin Constantiniu, *O istorie sincera a poporului roman* (Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic, 2002), pp. 481–82. The American government's involvement in order to support Romania was also confirmed by Romania's prime minister of that period, Ion Gheorghe Maurer, who stated, "After Czechoslovakia has been overrun I was informed by the French and the American ambassadors that following the message we sent to them, French president de Gaulle and American president Johnson approached the Soviets and took a firm position against their intention to attack Romania short after Czechoslovakia" (Betea, *Maurer*, p. 154).

12. Ceausescu made known on various occasions his support for improving Sino-American relations. See Protocol no. 4 and Shorthand of the Common Meeting of the Executive Committee of the CC of the RCP and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania (SRR), 29 Feb 1972, CHNA, Fond CC of the RCP, chancellery section, file no. 21/1972, f. 4–6.

13. Note on the Talks between Nicolae Ceausescu, President of State Council of the SRR, and Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, CHNA, Fond CC of the RCP, foreign relations section, file 51/1969, f. 113–166.

14. Mircea Nicolaescu, "Washington-Beijing via Bucharest," *Magazin Istoric*, 3 (March 2003): 45–48.

15. Note, Ceausescu and Nixon, CHNA, Fond CC of the RCP, foreign relations section, file 51/1969, f. 113–166.

16. *Ibid.*

17. *Ibid.*

Security Through Flexibility?

The Federal Republic of Germany and the Change of NATO Strategy in the 1960s

Dieter Krüger

Massive Retaliation

In the early 1950s the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conventional shield forces were intended to delay any Soviet offensive operation until the Americans could deploy and their nuclear strategic air war take effect. It was only after the Bundeswehr had been set up, however, that a significant delay of the Soviet ground forces could be expected.

Since 1952–1953 the British and the Americans had pursued the concept of responding to any aggression that went beyond the local dimension with the massive use of nuclear weapons. Accepting this strategy, NATO conceded that a conventional defense that might come near to being effective would overtax the economies of its members.¹ Consequently, from the mid-1950s on, the armed forces of the NATO alliance were equipped with tactical nuclear weapons. Air-launched nuclear weapons were particularly important because they struck into the depth of the advancing enemy. Authority to decide on the use of nuclear weapons rested with the American Supreme Allied Commander in Europe (SACEUR), after release by the U.S. president. Until such time, the nuclear warheads were to remain in depots under U.S. custody. Deterrence could be effective only if the SACEUR had authority to release or order the use of nuclear weapons in an emergency (as he had once requested in July 1953) without having to enter lengthy consultations with the member-states. Ultimately, the sovereignty of the Allies was at stake, but Canada, Great Britain, and the United States successfully evaded the issue that the U.S.-dominated NATO command might use nuclear weapons without consulting the Allies in the case of a surprise attack.²

In 1957 the SACEUR, General Lauris Norstad, assured the German Bundestag that limited wars would be unlikely, declaring that he would quickly gain control of a nuclear war using the four hundred aircraft and additional ballistic missiles at his disposal, if necessary even independently from the U.S. Strategic Bomber Command.³ In the same year the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) had to admit that it would need considerably more time to achieve the agreed quick buildup of its armed forces. Consequently, the federal minister

of defense, Franz Josef Strauß, and the federal chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, requested that the Bundeswehr be equipped with tactical nuclear weapons.⁴

If deterrence failed, the fate of the NATO strategy depended on the preparedness of the president of the United States to release the tactical nuclear weapons held by the shield forces and to retaliate against an attack exclusively on the European continent, albeit using the United States' own strategic nuclear weapons. That probably would have resulted in Soviet nuclear weapons being used against North America. The Germans faced an unpleasant alternative: either be overrun or be defended by the United States and the NATO alliance. The alliance, however, only would have been able to defend itself successfully if it used nuclear weapons at an early stage. With a nuclear war on their territory, the Germans inevitably ran the risk of collective destruction, as NATO exercises had proved. The consequences were like trying to square the circle: for the sake of preserving its population, the FRG had to ward off the use of nuclear weapons, and at the same time strive to achieve the lowest possible threshold for their use in order to maintain its integrity. In 1957 Strauß kept the dilemma from the German public by claiming that the U.S. nuclear weapons on German soil were the *ultima ratio* in an emergency. In fact, the alliance would have only been able to refrain from the use of nuclear weapons in the unlikely event of local clashes with the enemy.⁵

The atomic strike plans of 1954 confirm the well-known automatism. After their release by the SACEUR (release hour), his nuclear strike forces would work their way through a Europe-wide catalog of targets that mainly included the enemy air forces (counter air) and their lines of communication (air interdiction). The SACEUR program then would be followed by the implementation of the regional target catalogs of the major subordinate commands. Given the use of warheads with an explosive force of 2 to 750 kilotons and multiple attacks on individual targets in some cases, the nuclear devastation of Eastern Europe in general and of East Germany in particular can well be imagined. The strike plan of 1959 was directed specifically against the growing nuclear potential of the opponent, with all top-priority targets situated on Soviet territory. In contrast, the forty-four targets sited on East German territory were only at priority levels 3 to 8.⁶ This change might have taken into account the sensitivities of the German ally because many West German military leaders had reservations about an early and extensive nuclear operation.

With the approval of the German Bundestag, in spring 1958 the German Air Force became part of the SACEUR's nuclear hammer, his "Quick-Reaction Alert Forces," with twenty-five strike aircraft assigned to them in 1959 and fifty later on. Minister of Defense Strauß argued that, in procuring the American fighter/fighter-bomber F-104G Starfighter, the federal government had made a decision in the spirit of the new allied strategy: "turning away from a pronounced defensive approach and towards offensive tactics, or strike capacity."⁷ In 1959 Strauß promised to set up two missile units, which the SACEUR wanted to include in his atomic strike plan in addition to the F-104

strike aircraft. Not surprisingly, Strauß asked to be involved at least in the specification of nuclear targets situated in Germany. The SACEUR, General Norstad, however, unequivocally insisted that he bore the sole responsibility for the atomic strike plan and that it would not be revealed to the national ministries of defense.⁸

Flexible Response: The Weakening of the Alliance Strategy

With the Soviet Union's nuclear potential increasing, doubts arose among many Western Europeans about the preparedness of the United States to fight the opponent with nuclear means and, at the same time, to incur high risk on its own territory. In the German Bundeswehr it was mainly the Air Force that advocated the idea of massive retaliation, whereas the Army always favored appropriate conventional capabilities.

In September 1960 the Bundeswehr staff came to the opinion that, in an emergency, government leaders would endeavor to conduct a conventional defense as long as possible and would resort to tactical nuclear weapons only if that failed. Thus, the confinement of the use of tactical nuclear weapons to Europe became more and more probable. It was believed that deterrence, which was essential for German survival, could be maintained by balanced armed forces with sufficient conventional armaments and nuclear multipurpose weapons for tactical operations and strategic retaliation.⁹ In December 1960 the SACEUR issued a strategic policy directive pointing in the same direction as the thoughts of the Bundeswehr staff: conventional attacks and incursions below the threshold of a general nuclear war initially would be repelled with conventional means and then by selective nuclear strikes. They were not necessarily to result in total nuclear war.¹⁰ To be effective, however, this plan required that the allied nuclear forces survive the enemy's conventional attacks until such selective nuclear strikes were employed.

With his policy directive, General Norstad had aligned himself with the newly elected U.S. president. In April 1961 the Kennedy administration had asked the Europeans to focus their armament efforts on the conventional forces. For its part, the NATO alliance was to establish political guidelines defining the conditions under which to use nuclear weapons. Although President John F. Kennedy wanted to adhere to those guidelines, this request was received with general skepticism. Britain was the only country to support the demand for a new balance between conventional and nuclear capabilities, but its objective differed from that of the United States. The British considered a Soviet incursion into Europe most unlikely, and they wanted to ignore conventional armaments and focus on the buildup of a national nuclear second-strike capability. With the Athens Guidelines of May 1962, all alliance members except France declared that a limited conventional war was the most probable risk and a flexible response was required. At the same time, strategic deterrence was accepted as the domain of the U.S. president: he alone would have to decide

on the use of nuclear weapons—Athens Guidelines or not.¹¹ In the eyes of the German military representative, Johannes Steinhoff, to a certain extent the United States had overruled the valid NATO strategy.¹²

This shift in strategy brought about a significant change for the German Air Force and the air forces of Italy and the Benelux countries (Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg). They had procured the Starfighter—more or less a manned rocket designed to deliver nuclear warheads to their targets over intermediate ranges—and now the expensive system was meant to attack in a conventional role with comparatively ineffective iron or napalm bombs. The main problems were not additional training or enhanced logistic and economic requirements. Rather, the continental European NATO nations ran the risk in the initial phase of a conventional war of losing, the largest share of those weapon carriers that would be needed for projecting a credible nuclear threat to the enemy, that is, nuclear escalation. In 1963 the German Air staff rightly concluded that under these circumstances, “the wrong weapon system had been chosen.”¹³ The Air staff hoped in vain to provide their showpiece aircraft for a SACEUR integrated nuclear force. The United States tied the desired gradual replacement of German strike aircraft by U.S.-made nuclear-armed Pershing missiles—in fact more a short-range than an intermediate-range ballistic missile—to the conventional dual role of the strike aircraft.¹⁴ In the end the role shift was implemented. In view of the impending reductions in U.S. and British troops in West Germany, the foreign office in 1966 regarded this change of capabilities as an indication of the discrepancy between the security and strategic needs of the FRG and the changed ideas of the United States and the alliance.¹⁵

The Germans believed they would at best be able to repel a reinforced Soviet regiment, given the conventional capabilities available.¹⁶ Nevertheless, they went along with the change to the flexible response strategy because the alliance also promised to mount a defense with Benelux, British, and U.S. troops along the border between East and West Germany—the famous “forward defense.” Being fully aware that the German Air Force would not be able to resist the U.S. pressure, Steinhoff (appointed Air Force chief of staff in 1966) transformed the German Air Force according to the strategy of flexible response.¹⁷ The demand for early selective use of nuclear weapons and for the firing of nuclear mines on German territory, however, was proof of the serious doubts the Germans still had about the alliance’s ability to block a larger attack with conventional means for more than a few hours. It is no wonder that even Adenauer believed his generals had only very vague ideas of what a nuclear war would be like.¹⁸

Basically, the conditions that had existed in the early 1950s reemerged. In accordance with their national interests, those possessing tactical nuclear weapons retained decision-making authority as to when they would release their air- and sea-based nuclear forces. Until nuclear release occurred, those forces fighting on the ground would wither through attrition, and the countries

again turned desolate in a conventional-type defense. The essential difference from the early years, however, was that during the intervening period the Soviet Union had undertaken expanding its second-strike potential. French Prime Minister Charles de Gaulle accused the United States of trying to avoid the nuclear escalation as long as possible or at least to limit it to the European territory west of the Soviet Union. Although even Chancellor Adenauer harbored suspicions about the American nuclear guarantee, he remained convinced that a Communist Western Europe would constitute far too high a risk to be acceptable to the United States.¹⁹ Indeed, if the conventional capabilities of NATO in an emergency were not sufficient to prevent enemy assaults over a wide area, the strategy of flexible response would mean not more security for states without nuclear weapons, but less—particularly for an exposed frontline state like the FRG. Ludwig Erhard, federal chancellor since 1963, still acknowledged the logic of a nuclear strike and counterstrike as the most reliable form of mutual deterrence. Any doubts about this would only help the enemy. At the same time, however, he was convinced that the nuclear power of the United States alone would guarantee the security of the FRG.²⁰ In fact, the outcry in 1957 against the declared intention of the Adenauer government to arm the Bundeswehr with nuclear weapons deterred the Federal Republic from developing its own limited deterrence capacity. As a consequence, the Germans were virtually condemned to rely on the United States.

Nuclear Codetermination

The Starfighter aircraft and Pershing missiles represented Germany's hope of one day achieving substantial codetermination in the nuclear policy of the alliance's leading power in exchange for its contribution to the SACEUR Strike Forces. Of course, neither Kennedy nor de Gaulle nor the British wanted to grant the Germans a finger on the trigger because "the desire to keep Germany free from nuclear weapons was a key policy objective of postwar politics."²¹

Only for a very short historical moment in 1957–1958 did the Europeans have a chance to set up an independent integrated nuclear force. France realized it had incurred many technical and financial problems when it decided in favor of its own bomb. The trilateral cooperation with the Germans and Italians offered a way out.²² For an instant, even British foreign secretary Selwyn Lloyd flirted with the idea of a European bomb. However, Great Britain decided in favor of bilateral nuclear cooperation with the United States.²³ They granted genuine codetermination in the form of a veto.

De Gaulle hardly had come to power when he dropped nuclear cooperation with the Germans. He wanted to build a nuclear force that was exclusively under French authority. His general objective was to reestablish France's global leading position, if possible based on a continental leadership with the Federal Republic of Germany as a privileged junior partner.²⁴

The United States sponsored the multilateral SACEUR nuclear force (MLF) as a means of preserving U.S. operational control over nuclear weapon systems and simultaneously enabling European NATO allies to participate meaningfully in the management of a Western nuclear deterrent assigned to NATO.²⁵ De Gaulle fought the plan, which, as before, would have given the U.S. president the final decision on the use of nuclear weapons. In his view, the new alliance strategy of flexible response meant less security for both France and the Federal Republic of Germany. Therefore, against the backdrop of the 1963 Elysée Treaty, de Gaulle hoped that under the key phrase *European nuclear power* the Federal Republic would rather accept a French nuclear security guarantee than the uncertain one given by the United States. For Chancellor Erhard this vague concept was not a realistic alternative. France's *force de frappe* still had to be established—and cofinanced; furthermore, like the U.S. president, de Gaulle reserved the right to decide on the use of nuclear weapons. In contrast, the FRG hoped to use the MLF over the long term to develop an Allied second-strike capability in whose use Germany would also have a say. Furthermore, it hoped that France and Great Britain would contribute their potentials.

Sticking to the MLF, the FRG became entangled in the maelstrom between France and Great Britain and the United States. In opposition to the MLF, Britain submitted a counterproposal that aimed at retaining sovereignty over its own nuclear forces while denying Germany any access to nuclear weapons. The attitude of the United States toward France's nuclear ambitions was in sharp contrast to its treatment of the British. This fueled political dissent in Europe between Britain and France, with France blocking British accession to the European Economic Community as a result.²⁶ Bonn tried to resolve the crisis between the sparring nations by relaunching an initiative for coordinating European states' security and defense policies. The undertaking was thwarted, however, because Germany was almost exclusively aligned with the United States in matters of security policy.²⁷

Finally, in their partners' view, the Germans seemed interested in the MLF only because they hoped to get a finger on the nuclear trigger. For the time being, there was no alternative solution promising more German influence on the decision to release nuclear weapons—a decision on which the fate of the German people depended. For President Kennedy, and later for President Lyndon Johnson, the MLF merely served the purposes of keeping the Germans out of the wake of France's nuclear policy and of making the intended nuclear weapons nonproliferation treaty palatable to them. This treaty, signed by the FRG in 1969, actually amounted to that nation's permanent renunciation of nuclear weapons. The crisis of NATO and European policy was settled at the expense of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Conclusion

On the one hand, it was the establishment of the Bundeswehr that made the strategy of flexible response possible. On the other, the security policy gain achieved by the Federal Republic as a consequence of having its own armed forces was balanced by the serious disadvantage of the new strategy—namely, the lack of sufficient conventional capabilities. Confident of its future conventional capabilities, the German Army in particular pursued a strategy that would have turned out to be rather dubious in the event of an emergency. Although some of the Army generals might have dreamed of the tank battles of former years, German Army commanders resorted very easily in everyday training of the use of nuclear weapons.²⁸ The German Air Force reluctantly gave in because it was not yet able to fight a conventional war. The Germans were permanently denied genuine participation in the nuclear process within NATO. A European alternative failed because of the nationally oriented nuclear policy of Britain and France. For both European partners the FRG was a glacis—a buffer zone in case the worst happened. This role increased Germany's dependence on the U.S. nuclear guarantee, and in view of the nuclear stalemate between the superpowers, the guarantee was a matter of faith. The existence of the Bundeswehr only seemed to widen the Federal Republic's scope for action in foreign and security policy matters and to enhance its influence within the alliance.²⁹ In reality, the FRG was urged to accept a strategy that was not in its interest.

Endnotes

1. Robert A. Wampler, *Ambiguous Legacy: The United States, Great Britain and the Foundation of NATO Strategy, 1948–1957*, Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1991.

2. Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) Historical Office (SHO) Mons/Belgium, *SHAPE History July 1953–Nov. 1956*, pp. 79–82, 142; Christian Greiner, "Die militärische Eingliederung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland in die WEU und die NATO 1945 bis 1957," in Hans Ehlert, Christian Greiner, et al., eds., *Die NATO-Option, Munich 1993* (Anfänge westdeutscher Sicherheitspolitik 1945–1956, ed. Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt, vol. 3), pp. 608–13, 625–27; Christian Greiner, "Die Entwicklung der Bündnisstrategie 1949 bis 1958," in Bruno Thoß, ed., *Die NATO als Militärallianz. Strategie, Organisation und nukleare Kontrolle im Bündnis 1949 bis 1959* (Munich, 2003) (Entstehung und Probleme des Atlantischen Bündnisses bis 1956, ed. Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt, vol. 4), pp. 17–174 (see especially pp. 111–15, 126f. 134f, 138–41); Klaus A. Maier, "Die politische Kontrolle über die amerikanischen Nuklearwaffen. Ein Bündnisproblem der NATO unter der Doktrin der Massiven Vergeltung," *ibid.*, pp. 251–420 (see especially pp. 328s, 332s, 337–51); Johannes Steinhoff and Reiner Pommerin, *Strategiewechsel. Bundesrepublik und Nuklearstrategie in der Ära Adenauer-Kennedy* (Baden-Baden, 1992), pp. 18–24.

3. Federal Archives, Military Department, Freiburg/Germany (BAMA), BW1/54931, Statement General Norstad to the German Bundestag Defence Committee, 21.3.1957.

4. Greiner, "Eingliederung" pp. 738s.
5. Ibid., pp. 742s.
6. See SHAPE Central Records (SCR), classified material.
7. BAMA, BL1/1908, Conversation Norstad/Strauß, 20.11.1959; Axel F. Gablik, *Strategische Planungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1955–1967. Politische Kontrolle oder militärische Notwendigkeit?* (Baden-Baden, 1996), p. 175s.
8. BAMA, BL1/8542, FÜ L III 8 to COMAIRCENT, 15.11.1960, BL1/1753, FÜ L II Memo, 28.12.1959; BL1/1909, classified material; SHO, *SHAPE History 1966*, p. 257; Gablik, *Planungen*, pp 147–49; Steinhoff and Pommerin, *Strategiewechsel*, pp. 38–41.
9. BAMA, BW2/2718, Memo v. Hobe, 15.9.1960.
10. NATO Archives, Brussels/Belgium, International Military Staff (IMS), Documents on CD-ROM, CD10, MCM-17-61, Standing Group Memo, 2.2.1961 (Encl "Basic Strategic Guidance for Allied Command Europe," 13.12.1960).
11. BAMA, BW2/20070, classified material, BW2/20055, North Atlantic Council, 23.6.u. 18.9.1961; NATO Archives, Brussels/Belgium, International Staff (IS), Documents on CD-ROM, CD14, C-R(61)23, North Atlantic Council, 6.6.1961; *ibid.*, CD16, C-R(62)1, North Atlantic Council, 5.1.1962; *ibid.*, IS, CD23, PO/61/449, Statement, 26.4.1961; IMS, CD09, LOSTAN 3771, Standing Group Representative to Standing Group, 7.6.1961, LOSTAN 3856, Standing Group Representative to Standing Group, 2.8.1961; SHO, *SHAPE History 1967*, vol. II, pp. 87s; Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) 1961–1963, vol XIII, S. 283, 304f., Gavin to State Dept, 19.4.1961, Finletter to Kennedy, 29.5.1961.
12. BAMA, BL1/1027, German Military Representative Rpt 1962/I, 15.4.1962, pp. 25s, 38s, BL1/1753, Steinhoff to Panitzki, 15.3.1963.
13. BAMA, BL1/1908, FÜ L II 1 to FÜ B, 21.3.1963.
14. SHO, *SHAPE History 1960–1965*, vol II, p. 155; BAMA, BL1/1855, Conversations Gilpatric/v. Hassel/Schröder, 13.2.u.8.5.1963; www.isn.ethz.ch/php/collections/coll, Memorandum of Conversations McNamara v. Hassel, u.a, 9.12.1963; Christian Tuschhoff, *Deutschland, Kernwaffen und die NATO 1949–1967. Zum Zusammenhalt von und friedlichem Wandel in Bündnissen* (Baden-Baden, 2002), p. 233s.
15. Akten zur Auswärtigen Politik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (AAP) 1966, S1082–1089, Memo Diehl, 17.8.1966.
16. IS, CD14, C-R(61)23, North Atlantic Council, 6.6.1961.
17. Johannes Steinhoff, "Die Luftwaffe im Wandel der NATO-Strategie: Flexible Abschreckung durch konventionelle und nukleare Kampfmittel," *Jahrbuch der Luftwaffe* 6 (1969): 8–11.
18. As he mentioned during a conversation with de Gaulle on 3 March 1963. See Documents Diplomatiques Français (DDF) 1963, vol. I, p. 91; AAP 1963, p. 112.
19. DDF 1961, vol. I, pp. 690, 693, 695s, 704s, Conversation de Gaulle/Kennedy, 1.5.1961; DDF 1962, vol. II, p. 42s, 181–84, Conversations de Gaulle/Adenauer, 5.7.a.6.9.1962; DDF 1963, vol. I, pp. 92s. Conversation de Gaulle/Adenauer, 21.1.1963.
20. AAP 1963, vol. III, pp. 418, 1470–78, Conversation Erhard/Roberts, 18.11.1963, Conversation Erhard/de Gaulle, 21.11.1963; AAP 1964, pp. 790s, Conversation Erhard/de Gaulle, 6.7.1964.
21. Susanna Schrafstetter and Stephen Twigge, *Avoiding Armageddon. Europe, the United States, and the Struggle for Nuclear Nonproliferation, 1945–1970* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2004), p. 209.
22. Peter Fischer, "Das Projekt der trilateralen Nuklearkooperation: Französisch-deutsch-italienische Geheimverhandlungen 1957/58," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 112 (1992): 143–56; Mervyn O'Driscoll, "'Les Anglo-Saxons,' F-I-G and the Rival Conceptions of 'Advanced' Armaments Research & Development Co-operation in Western Europe, 1956–1958," *Journal of European Integration History* 4, 1 (1998): 105–30.
23. Dieter Krüger, *Sicherheit durch Integration? Die wirtschaftliche und politische Zusammenarbeit Westeuropas 1947 bis 1957/58* (Munich, 2003) (Entstehung und Probleme

des Atlantischen Bündnisses bis 1956, ed. Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt, vol. 6), pp. 475s.

24. Burkard Schmitt, *Frankreich und die Nukleardebatte der Atlantischen Allianz 1956–1966* (Munich, 1998), pp. 111–13.

25. FRUS 1961–1963, vol. XIII, S. 253–56, 268, 271, 287–90, 333–35, 362, 366–68, Memos, 1.2.u.15.3.1961, Dowling to State Dept., 10.4.1961, Policy Directive, 20.4.1961, Rusk to McNamara, 29.10.1961, Conversation Kennedy, Stikker et al., 6.2.1962, Memo, 15.3.1962; Schrafstetter and Twigge, *Armageddon*, pp. 136–39, 142s, 148–50.

26. Christoph Hoppe, *Zwischen Teilhabe und Mitsprache: Die Nuklearfrage in der Allianzpolitik Deutschlands 1959–1966* (Baden-Baden, 1993); Matthias Schulz, “Integration durch eine europäische Atomstreitmacht? Nuklearambitionen und die deutsche Europa-Initiative vom Herbst 1964,” *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 53 (2005): 275–313, see especially pp. 296–303; Schmitt, *Frankreich*, pp. 131–33, 157s, 163–78, 180–98; Schrafstetter and Twigge, *Armageddon*, pp. 143–48, 151–53.

27. AAP 1964, vol. II, pp. 1102–04, 1189–91, 1233–35, Memo Carstens, 2.10.1964, Conversation Carstens/Couve de Murville, 24.10.1964, Kleiber to German Foreign Office, 4.11.1964; Gabriele Clemens, “‘Zwischen allen Stühlen’: Ludwig Erhards Europa-Initiative vom November 1964,” in Peter Kruger and Gabriele B. Clemens, eds., *Nation und Europa.: Studien zum internationalen Staatensystem im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2001), pp. 171–92; Schulz, “Integration,” pp. 305–10.

28. Gablik, *Planungen*, pp. 257–60.

29. Schrafstetter and Twigge, *Armageddon*, pp. 165–67, 171–73, 179s, 182–85, 188–94.

Canadian NATO Mutual Aid and the Reinvigoration of the Hyde Park Agreement: A Multilateral Program in the Interest of Bilateral Defense Trade

Michael A. Hennessy

This is a narrow paper, narrowly conceived.¹ It examines the relationship between the origins of Canada's North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) mutual aid program and the bilateral Canadian-U.S. exchange of notes that reinvigorated the Hyde Park defense production-sharing agreement. Little known outside North America, the Hyde Park Agreement (1941) was the cornerstone accord reached during the Second World War that helped harmonize North American defense production. It is one of the pillars of what Canadians like to consider their "special relationship" with the United States. The reaffirmation of the agreement on 26 October 1950 ensured the continuity of this postwar economic arrangement.² But the details concerning the exchange of notes and the quid pro quo with the United States over NATO mutual aid has had little or no examination in the secondary literature. Most accounts stress the seamlessness between the wartime and postwar arrangements, but this paper demonstrates that the transition was neither seamless nor a sure thing.

Since the end of the Cold War, a body of literature has developed that suggests that during the Cold War Canada was rather an unwitting victim of escalating international tensions, American militarism, and continental integration, and that it had little ability to formulate a coherent national security strategy.³ This school of thought contends that Canada was unable to guide its own strategy through this period. The little-examined deliberations reviewed in producing the present discussion reveal that Canada was able to maintain a clear view of its economic, political, and military interests and, in persisting in that view, was able to convince the United States to accept an exchange of diplomatic notes outlining the terms of defense-related economic cooperation that were fully acceptable to Canada.

Of the post-Second World War agreements, Edgar and Haglund⁴ cited the October 1950 exchange of diplomatic notes as perhaps the most significant postwar agreement predating the Defense Production Sharing Agreement in the late 1950s. The exchange of notes came on the heels of the outbreak of war in Korea, and the relationship between the signing of the diplomatic notes and the outbreak of the war is too easily thought of as effect and cause. The spurt

of defense spending that followed the outbreak of war presents an interesting lesson in *post hoc ergo propter hoc* historical argumentation. The records of the Canadian federal cabinet show that whereas the situation in Korea proved a real forcing cone for defense relations with the United States, the exchange of diplomatic notes in October 1950 was not an example of cause and effect.⁵ Cabinet records show the United States had already moved into a practical accommodation with Canada to revivify the Hyde Park Agreement, in practice if not in name, before the outbreak of the Korean War.

Wartime Cooperation

Wartime cooperation between Canada and the United States produced a legacy of agreements and agencies of lasting value to Canadian economic prosperity and defense preparedness. Since the early 1940s, there have been some fifty bilateral defense production agreements signed between Ottawa and Washington that more or less conform to the wartime agreements reached at Ogdensburg (New York, 1940) and Hyde Park (New York). The former agreement facilitated joint planning for hemispheric defense; the latter, as will be discussed in greater detail later in this paper, enabled expanded defense production on a continental basis. Together they are pillars of the so-called special relationship between Canada and the United States. It is a relationship that virtually removed the border between the two nations relative to the production, purchase, and priority of military commodity supply.

Before the Second World War, Canada perpetually ran a trade deficit with the United States. Canadian trade with Great Britain served as the chief means of raising U.S. dollars to finance Canadian purchases from its southern neighbor. R. S. Sayer described the relationship as one of "bilateral unbalance within a balanced 'North Atlantic Triangle.'" By the spring of 1941, the American lend-lease program and the exhaustion of United Kingdom gold reserves jeopardized continuation of this trade pattern. The Hyde Park Agreement undertaken by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister William Mackenzie King, at the Canadian's request, forestalled the economic consequences for Canada.

The Hyde Park Agreement contained two elements of lasting significance. First, it established the general principle of mobilizing the resources of the "continent" in which each country "should provide the other with the defense articles which it is best able to produce . . . and that production programs should be coordinated to this end." Second, the agreement recognized that U.S. purchases in Canada would be essential for materially assisting "Canada in meeting part of the cost of Canadian defense purchases in the United States." In practice this enabled Canada to complete the fabrication of British-ordered war materials paid for through U.S. lend-lease, and encouraged U.S. companies to seek supplies from Canada.⁷ These measures prevented Canada from facing economic collapse in pursuit of continuing the mutual war effort.

The first years of peace, however, brought a rekindling of American protectionism, at least among members of the U.S. Congress.⁸ In the post-1945 period, growing tensions between the American executive and legislative branches over trade issues and defense spending challenged the smooth continuation of the Hyde Park arrangement, the “special relationship” notwithstanding. Despite the developing Cold War and the creation of a legion of bodies to plan defense mobilization of industry for NATO and North America (such as the Joint Industrial Mobilization Planning Committee), by 1949 it was more difficult for Canada to purchase weapons and military systems components from the United States than it had been in 1939. Moreover, U.S. defense purchases in Canada had all but ceased.

Since the war two large barriers had arisen to restrict Canadian defense purchases from the United States. The Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 raised administrative and legal difficulties. The act was intended to allow the U.S. administration to provide weapons for impoverished European and other powers. Even though Canada had been prepared to pay cash for its purchases from the United States, the global application of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act prevented normal commercial transactions for U.S.-built weapons. Second, the U.S. Congress had become more vigilant in applying the long-standing Buy America Act. Although this act allowed purchases of military equipment from Canada for the U.S. Armed Forces, the act stipulated that an official of the U.S. administration must declare that it was in the national interest of the United States for the purchase to proceed. Canada found this an unreliable means of ensuring a trade balance in defense purchases. Continued reliance on an exceptional action of this sort could not provide a sound bases for joint planing of industrial mobilization.⁹

By 1949 the Hyde Park Agreement survived in name, but not in practice. The original agreement never fully overcame the restriction of the Buy America Act. The executive branch could not strike down this act of congress. During the war the executive branch could and did circumvent it by having the U.S. War Department and the secretary of the Navy inform their procurement officials that the Buy America Act was suspended as far as Canada was concerned. For all practical purposes, trade in war material and production priorities were to assume it was in the “national interest” to eliminate the border. But after the war there was no call for such a declaration until the late 1940s. Implementation of the Marshall Plan complicated matters by enhancing American reluctance to issue such statements. Although it allowed American defense officials to enter into procurement of military equipment from countries such as Canada, Section 408(e) of the U.S. Mutual Defense Assistance Act (US HR5895–1949) also provided that “prior to any such transfer or execution of any such contracts, any such nation shall have made available to United States *the full cost, actual or estimated* [italics added for emphasis], of such equipment, materials, or services, and shall agree to make available forthwith upon request any additional sums that may become due under such contract.”

This limitation imposed immediate problems for Canadian procurement. For instance, Canada was building U.S.-pattern F-86 jet fighters but was required to purchase the engines from a U.S. manufacturer. Canada had to issue an irrevocable letter of credit payable on demand by American authorities for purchases from the United States. This provision was contrary to standard Canadian trade practices and contrary to financial accountability under various aspects of Canadian legislation, particularly the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.¹⁰ In short, American government contractual regulations called for actions contrary to Canadian legislation concerning the probity of government purchasing.

The Early Cold War Period

American strictures posed a bilateral hurdle to fulfilling Canada's multilateral defense agenda under NATO. The deputy minister of the Department of Finance, Clifford Clark, penned the aide-mémoire that served as the basis for the diplomatic notes exchanged in October. Clark, deputy minister since 1932, had participated in all the financial arrangements made with the United States before, during, and now after the war. He called for having whatever necessary new arrangement couched in the language of wartime cooperation and the special relationship. His aide-mémoire—originally intended as guidance to Canadian representatives both at the Washington embassy and at the various quasimilitary committees discussing Cold War mobilization planning—contained what he termed the “recital clause.” Its mantra consisted of reciting the special wartime agreements, Ogdensburg, Hyde Park, the Permanent Joint Board of Defense, and other agencies and agreements that now, with the North Atlantic Alliance, had progressively and continually brought cooperation and coordination to a common program for the defense of North America.

The Canadian creed included a recapitulation of the Hyde Park Agreement. Clark pointed out the desirability of having reciprocal legislation designed to facilitate procurement from each country for defense equipment and supplies that each country could most effectively and economically produce. Furthermore, Canada would seek the authority for the Canadian government to purchase military products directly from private U.S. contractors, something prevented under existing U.S. legislation.

Reciprocity would help ensure maintenance of Canada's U.S. dollar reserves. Clark proposed a revolving fund, not to exceed approximately \$25 million for the total value of outstanding contracts, that could handle claims for immediate payment and fulfill the requirements of American law without tying up too many funds. The \$25 million figure represented at the time one-quarter to one-third of Canada's annual defense purchasing requirements from the United States. A similar arrangement was proposed for U.S. defense purchases from Canada. The Korean War coming in midyear soon obviated the

planning figure; nevertheless, the Canadian government proved successful in moving the U.S. administration toward Clark's proposed means of reciprocity involving a revolving fund.¹¹

Clark's draft passed to the Canadian Department of External Affairs to massage it into a memorandum for delivery to the American secretary of defense and the American secretary of state. This memorandum outlined the history of the special defense procurement relationship with the United States in almost the exact words used in Clark's original draft, and the only possible courses of action suggested were those proposed by Clark.

Action on his proposals, however, did not come through normal diplomatic means. Neither External Affairs nor the U.S. State Department pursued the matter to its conclusion. Instead, the respective defense departments proved the venue through which matters were resolved. Action through those quarters came in the face of immediate difficulties associated with Canada receiving parts for American-designed F-86 fighters then being built in Canada. The Department of Finance resisted making special payment schemes for parts of the F-86, but in this case did so. Canada wished to avoid such a situation in the future, particularly because the means used in this case promised to tie up large sums of Canada's holding of U.S. dollars. In the case of the F-86, Canadian reserves of U.S. dollars would be tied up for the life of the contract, perhaps twenty-four months or longer. So Canada sought to have the United States accept governmental letters of credit for the full amount of the contract. Such irrevocable letters of credit would be guaranteed by the Canadian government and arranged through a U.S.-chartered bank. Canada would accept providing automatic payment rights to appropriate U.S. government authorities, but only in accordance with normal contractual progress payments and delivery payments. Such a progress-payments scheme clearly differed from the full-payment provisions of the Buy America Act and the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of the U.S. Congress.

In March the deputy minister of defense, "Bud" Drury, visited Washington in an effort to sort out some of the production, supply, and payment problems delaying shipments to Canada. Drury grew dismayed at the State Department's inability to focus on the Canadian problems (because of its attention to the global situation and domestic politics). The U.S. secretary of defense, Louis Johnson, displayed a much greater willingness to pay attention to Canada's problem. In the office of the secretary of defense, Drury discussed Clark's revolving fund. He also secured a promise from the secretary of defense to exercise some of his prerogatives to place into the American Defense Budget Appropriation Act provisions to allow U.S. defense-related purchases from Canada. Drury reiterated to the secretary of defense that special legislation along the lines of Hyde Park was the preferred option. Secretary Johnson averred on the question of new legislation but undertook to use his prerogatives to make provision in his budget appropriation to allow purchases up to a specified amount from Canada.¹²

Consequently, the Canadians would move toward accepting a two-track approach, continuing to call for legislation to address the problem while making practical accommodation with the U.S. secretary of defense. The Truman Administration consequently promised to move all of the U.S. Armed Forces toward greater procurement from Canada, and accepted the principle of reviving the Hyde Park Agreement. Moreover, Drury secured a promise from Secretary Johnson that American defense purchases from Canada would approach reciprocal levels measured in the value of manufactured and value-added products rather than raw materials.

Although Secretary Johnson promised to undertake to ensure more purchases from Canada by U.S. Armed Forces in 1949, he previously had pledged to the U.S. Congress in closed executive hearings that such external purchases would not be made. This pledge was made despite the fact that any strict legal interpretation of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act would have permitted off-shore purchasing.¹³ Squaring the two undertakings required considerable finesse on Johnson's part. Subsequent visits by the Canadian minister of defense and the secretary of state for external affairs refined and confirmed the American's agreement.¹⁴

In May, just several weeks before the outbreak of the Korean War (26 June 1950), the secretary of defense informed his agencies that sales to and purchases from Canada up to a respective value of \$25 million were consistent with the national interest. This statement overcame the barrier of the Buy America Act. The revolving fund arrangement also was confirmed as consistent with the Mutual Defense Assistance Act.¹⁵ These undertakings proved a partial recapitulation of the principles of Hyde Park.

However, full recapitulation only followed the outbreak of war and was done so as part of a quid pro quo arrangement concerning NATO mutual aid.

The Korean Impetus

With the outbreak of the Korean War in late June 1950, the new world crisis focused American attention on defense and security issues. Subsequently, defense production in both countries moved onto a war footing. To put an end to its defense purchasing difficulties, Canada continued to push for a clear and public recapitulation of the Hyde Park Agreement and legislative changes. U.S. reluctance to introduce special legislation did not disappear. Authorities there had always maintained that open warfare would compel a reduction of all the previously arranged barriers to Canadian procurement from the United States. Canadian officials continually countered that proper mobilization planning and the maintenance of a healthy industrial base could best be developed prior to any period of open warfare, but preparations on Canada's part were hampered by U.S. military trade restrictions. These arguments had only succeeded in Johnson taking the aforementioned steps to ease Canadian

purchases from the United States. For all practical purposes, his actions solved the Canadian problem.

With the Korean War, the United States proved more interested in revitalizing the Hyde Park Agreement—not simply as a means of solving the Canadian problem, but rather as both a means of encouraging greater Canadian defense spending and as a way to tie the revised agreement to a multilateral NATO mutual aid program.

The practical accommodation made by Johnson was satisfactory to fill Canada's proposed defense spending program. With the outbreak of the Korean War, however, the United States wanted Canada to expand its defense program. Canada responded to those pressures by arguing further expansion was impossible without a more elaborate means of remedying the defense trade issue. Almost as soon as the Korean War began, U.S. authorities dropped the \$25 million limitation. In the flurry of subsequent talks, Canadian officials largely reiterated the arguments previously advanced.¹⁶

Quite clearly the United States made it known they would only be willing to contemplate a statement along the lines of Hyde Park if Canada contributed more directly to a rapidly expanding mutual aid program for European allies. Subsequent pronouncements regarding the special relationship and continuation of Hyde Park that came with and followed the exchange of notes on 26 October 1950, consequently, were directly tied to Canada's own European mutual aid commitments to NATO. Thus, an agreement originally forged for continental defense was revived by Canada's contribution to European defense.¹⁷ This was attractive to the administration in Washington because it could hold out Canada's commitment to a congress that was showing signs of resisting the administration's expanded NATO mutual aid program.

For some time the Canadian government had been examining the development of a full-fledged mutual aid program. To accommodate the American request only required Canada to announce a total figure rather than simply continue ad hoc deliveries of obsolete war material to various European countries. Consequently, as the summer of 1950 closed, the Canadian government prepared statements consolidating all of its mutual aid deliveries to Europe in time for the 8 August meeting of the Canadian-U.S. Joint Industrial Mobilization Planning Committee (in Ottawa). The government made a clear declaration of intention to spend \$75–100 million in mutual aid over the next year or two. The final details would be left to later government decisions.¹⁸

The U.S. administration still remained concerned about having to convince the U.S. Congress about making special allowances for Canada if the criticism could be raised that Canada was not pulling its international weight. The declaration of a comprehensive Canadian contribution to the NATO mutual aid program promised an effective means of forestalling those criticisms. The proposed quid pro quo was much in keeping with Canadian thinking at that time. Subsequent delay in the final signing of the note entailed the U.S. executive branch overcoming resistance on Capitol Hill.¹⁹

Although in late July Canadian authorities anticipated that the U.S. State Department would forward such a formal proposal, it was not forthcoming. Great opposition still resided within the wholly U.S. National Security Resources Board, which proved wary of offending U.S. industries. Nevertheless, U.S. authorities put forward a draft statement of principles of agreement that largely fulfilled the same function as the Hyde Park Agreement and it became the basis of the final draft of the notes exchanged in October 1950.²⁰

Conclusion

Secondary sources have yet to acknowledge the quid pro quo associated with the October notes, or the modus operandi that predated the Korean War. This paper has revealed Canadian aspirations, negotiating positions, departmental concerns, and strategic interests leading up to this arrangement. The framing and constant refrain of Clark's "recital clause" that tied Cold War defense relations with the special relationship hammered out during the Second World War predates the Korean emergency. The mere reiteration of the "special relationship" was not enough, but it proved the ticket when new multilateral issues united the bilateral discussants. The importance of Canada's multilateral relationship with NATO is generally ignored in examinations of its "special relationship" with the United States—but in this case it proved vital.

Endnotes

1. This essay relies on recently declassified Canadian accounts found primarily in National Archives of Canada (NAC) Record Group (RG) 2 (Cabinet), RG 25 (External Affairs), vols. 4498, 4499; RG 49 (Defence Production), vols. 707–708; RG 24 (National Defence), vols. 4500–4501; National Defence Headquarters, Directorate of History and Heritage, Col. Charles Raymont Collection, 73/1223, file 1334–1349, Cabinet Defence Committee minutes.

2. Claude Beauregard, "Military Cooperation between Canada and the United States: 1937–1951," *The McNaughton Papers* 4, (1993): 59–70.

3. Andrew Richter, "Canadian Defence Policy in a Changing Global Environment, 1945–1952," *McNaughton Papers* (Winter 1995/96): 1–24.

4. Alister D. Edgar and David Haglund, *The Canadian Defence Industry in the New Global Environment*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995), p. 63.

5. For the cause-and-effect explanation, see J. L. Granatstein and Norman Hillmer, *For Better or For Worse. Canada and the United States to the 1990s* (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1991), p. 181.

6. R. S. Sayers, *Financial Policy, 1939–45* (London, 1956), pp. 232–33, cited J. L. Granatstein, *How Britain's Weakness Forced Canada into the Arms of the United States*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), p. 33.

7. For the Hyde Park agreement, see R. A. MacKay, ed., *Canadian Foreign Policy 1945–1954. Selected Speeches and Documents*, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1970), pp. 58–59.

8. Laurence R. Aronsen has gone farthest in mining the wealth of materials dealing with U.S.-Canadian defense production relations in the late 1940s and early 1950s, but he has remained silent on the role of the panel. See his draft manuscript, "American National Security and Economic Relations with Canada, 1945–1954: The 'Indispensable Ally'" (Westport, Conn.: Praeger Press, forthcoming).

9. NACan RG 25, vol. 4489, panel minutes, 27 Feb 1950, 10 Mar 1950.
10. NACan RG 25, vol. 4498, file 500030-k-40 pt. 1, ED-7 “Re: Procurement of Canadian Defence Requirements in the United States,” DM Finance draft aide memoire, 27 Feb 1950.
11. NACan RG 25, vol. 4498, pt. 1 Clark’s aide memoire, ED-7, 27 Feb 1950.
12. NACan RG 25, vol. 4498, panel minutes, 16 Feb, 27 Feb, 10 Mar 1950.
13. On Johnson’s promise, see personal and secret letter in the Canadian Embassy, Washington, to James George in the Department of External Affairs, dated 21 Jun 1950, in NACan RG 25, vol. 4498, f. 50030-k-40 pt. 1.
14. *Documents on Canadian External Relations, 1950* (hereafter cited as DCER) (Ottawa, 1996), pp. 876–965; *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950* (hereafter cited as FRUS), vol. III (Washington, 1977), passim, contained details of the diplomatic exchanges. David Jay Bercuson, *True Patriot: The Life of Brooke Claxton, 1898–1960* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), p. 180.
15. Bercuson, *True Patriot*, p. 180. See discussion of these arrangements, Panel minutes, 6–7 Jun 1950. The panel exercised oversight regarding the use of the revolving fund and set priorities for items that could make use of it. See Panel minutes, 3 Oct 1950.
16. “Additional Canadian Defence Procurement and North Atlantic Mutual Aid,” telegram WA-1913, 25 Aug 1950, *DCER 1950*, p. 965.
17. For the full text of the note, see MacKay, *Canadian Foreign Policy*, pp. 86–87.
18. NACan RG 25, vol. 4498 f. 5003-k-40 pt. 1, Panel minutes and memorandum, J. George, memorandum from Mr Reid, 26 Jul 1950.
19. Memorandum for the Acting Under Secretary of State, regarding item number 4, on the economic defense panel agenda, Jul 31, 1950, and discussion contained in *DCER 1950* and *FRUS 1950*, vol. 3.
20. NACan RG 25, vol. 4498 f. 5003-k-40 pt. 1, minutes of Panel, 8 Aug 1950.

Austria as a Theater of Operations in the Strategic Plans of the Warsaw Pact

János Jakus

The era of the Cold War, which generally was characterized by the rivalry of bitterly opposing military alliances (that is, of the Warsaw Pact [WP] and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO]) carried the threat of “matching” military powers. Researchers today no longer investigate whether the saber rattling that lasted for decades was founded on realistic situation assessments, or if the manipulative propaganda of the competing political powers influenced the wording of the intentions of the military decision makers.

The WP as a significant military alliance has ceased to exist, so we may conclude that its aims have not stood the test of historical time. The absurd reliance on aggressiveness was greater on the WP side than on the NATO side. It must be said, however, that although it guarded the values of democracy, NATO left no doubt about its readiness to use military force if its basic interests became endangered. The degree of the sides’ opposition, as far as I am concerned, was founded on faulty situation assessments and evaluation on both sides.¹

In the 1970s and 1980s the WP planned to use its available military force and capabilities outside its area of responsibility. Only in 1987, following the Berlin session of the WP Political Consultative Board, do we see some change in approach. As a result of political and military situation assessments produced there, and in the spirit of detente, the WP’s higher military leadership counted on conducting initial defensive operations in its own territories and then, exploiting its success, planned a conversion to strategic offensive operations.

Whereas eternal neutrality did not pose an obstacle to the application of military force for the WP in the 1970s and most of the 1980s, from 1987 on there was a change in this respect, too. The dominant view became that the WP would not take preventive steps if Austria let NATO forces move through its territory or airspace, but when the pact launched its strategic offensive operation following a successful defense, the alliance would not take Austria’s neutral status into consideration. That is, in such a situation Austria would not remain “untouchable.”²

Luckily all this belongs in the storehouse of political and military hypotheses of a past era, but the danger of a confrontation between the military blocs was realistic. By what logic did the military decision-making bodies of the WP imagine the conduct of an armed conflict in the Austria theater of

operations? To answer this question, we need an outline of the leading bodies of the military alliance comprising the former socialist countries.

The Leading Political and Military Bodies of the WP in the 1970s and 1980s

In peacetime the highest political body of the WP was the Political Consultative Board (PCB). It was summoned at regular intervals, and in its sessions the highest-ranking delegations of the member-states, led by the main (first) secretaries of the Communist and Workers' Parties, took part. The supreme commander and the head of staff of the Joint Armed Forces also were included in the work of the sessions. The PCB, as a collective body of leadership, regularly assessed the world's military and political situations as well as the activity and probable intentions of NATO. Based on these assessments, it compiled declarations and proposals for coordinating the foreign political and military efforts of the member-states.

The PCB also was supposed to make political decisions on the use of WP armed forces. In particularly important affairs, however, practice proves that decisions were not made collectively by summoning the board. Rather, decisions to use military force in a certain crisis situation were made following bilateral consultations between the Soviet leadership and the party and state leaders of the individual member-state concerned. For example, the 1968 invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia by the armed forces of five WP member-states and the aggression against Afghanistan by the Soviet Army were not the decisions of the PCB. And, of course, however the decisions were made; it was the opinion of the Soviet Union, the strongest member-state of the alliance, that was dominant.

Among the highest bodies of WP military leadership (the Committee of Defense Ministers, the Supreme Command and Staff of the Joint Armed Forces, the Military Council of the Joint Armed Forces, and the Military Scientific and Technical Board), the Supreme Command and Staff of the Joint Armed Forces (JAF) was of special importance.³ In the JAF staff, the general staffs of the members of the alliance also were represented. The major tasks of the staff were to

1. plan the wartime use of the WP armed forces;
2. plan and conduct training and allied exercises;
3. cooperate in logistics and weapons development; and
4. organize and coordinate signal communications and theater-of-war preparation.

Actually the Supreme Command and JAF staff fulfilled exclusively peacetime leadership functions (like the PCB it did not play any role during

the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia). Its strategic planning and command activity mostly was restricted to joint exercises, although at the sessions of the Military Council of the Joint Armed Forces the issues of improving military capabilities were dealt with, apart from the analysis of political security questions.

The Soviet forces earmarked for the joint armed forces of the WP at time of war were tactically assigned to the Soviet general staff at peacetime; similarly, the armed forces of the other member-states earmarked for the alliance formations were controlled nationally. The Soviet army groups (fronts) to be used in the European war region planned their moves in peacetime, based on their zone of responsibility and on the directives of the Soviet general staff, including the large-scale use of the armed forces of those WP countries with whom they intended to cooperate in their activities—for instance, within an allied front.

The high commands of the strategic directions, which were components of the Soviet leadership structure (such as the Southwestern Theatre of Operations Command, deployed in Kisinyov) developed their plans of application and submitted them to the Soviet general staff via the higher bodies of leadership. From those parts of the application plans that concerned the national armed forces, the Soviet general staff developed proposals for the individual member-states. The proposals set forth the theater of war, the strategic direction, the assignment, the nature of reinforcement (or support), the identity of those who would cooperate, and the tasks for which the armed forces of the given country would be used. Tasks were always set within the framework of a bilateral consultation at which the general staff of the concerned nation usually was represented by the first deputy of the chief of the general staff and the director of operations. Basic information on strategic planning always appeared in the proposals prepared by the Soviet general staff, whereas the documents issued by the JAF staff focused on the support issues of the operations. Accepting the proposals was obligatory for the armed forces of the given country and, generally, proposals were not altered even if the individual national interests were emphasized, although some member-states expressed their independent opinions in the late 1980s.⁴

The Soviet general staff and the JAF staff always gave the representatives of the national armies as much information as was crucial for them to make preparations. For instance, the Hungarian military leadership never had precise information on the details of the strength and tasks of the allied front conducting activities in the defined direction. Based on the proposals issued, the plans for using the national armed forces had to be prepared and submitted for approval (in text and graphic [map] formats) in three copies (one in Hungarian, two in Russian). Generally, new plans were prepared for the wartime use of the WP armed forces as well as the Hungarian People's Army every five years, with annual revisions.

On the whole, strategic planning by the WP was characterized by the following factors:

- Soviet dominance in planning and leading the allied armed forces;
- restricted national sovereignty of other WP member-states; and
- distrust on the part of the Soviet higher political and military leadership toward other member-states and their armed forces.

Overall Views on the Strategic Planning of the WP

The WP viewed Europe as a major independent war region. Its area was divided into three sectors: northwestern, western,⁵ and southwestern theaters of operations. Within the theaters of operations, strategic zones (whose keeping and losing had decisive effects on the fulfillment of strategic tasks) and strategic directions were distinguished. What follows is an outline of some important factors connected with the southwestern theater of operations. The southwestern theater comprised the North Italian strategic direction (general direction: Szombathely-Graz-Klagenfurt-Udine-Milan-Turin, and Budapest-Kaposvár-Ljubljana-Gorizia-Milan-Turin; applicable force: one or two fronts), and the Balkan strategic direction leading toward the Greek and Turkish strategic zones (applicable force: one or two fronts).⁶

Initially, in the Danube Valley and in the North Italian operational directions of the North Italian strategic direction, following artillery and air force preparation and using atomic weapons (or by permanent alert to use atomic strikes), a Soviet-Hungarian allied front (the southwestern or Carpathian front) would launch an offensive against the NATO and Austrian troops deployed on the territory of Austria. Overwhelming those troops should create favorable conditions for the WP forces to break into the territory of Italy.⁷

The following armies and units belonged to the fronts planned for application in the southwestern theater of operations:

Combined Troops

- one to three combined armies;
- one to three combined corps;
- reserve divisions; and
- an airborne assault brigade.

*Missile and Artillery Troops*⁸

- one or two missile brigades;
- one artillery division;
- one or two independent (nuclear) artillery brigades; and
- one or two independent rocket launcher brigades.

Front Aviation

- two to three fighter divisions;
- one or two fighter-bomber divisions;

- one bomber division;
- one or two air reconnaissance or air-to-ground wings;
- one or two combat helicopter wings; and
- transport, radioelectronic jamming, medical, liaison, and command support troops.

Front Air Defense Troops

- one or two air defense brigades;
- four to five independent air defense missile regiments;
- one air defense radar reconnaissance regiment (or brigade); and
- one air defense artillery brigade.

Front Reconnaissance Troops

- one or two airborne reconnaissance battalions (possibly brigades); and
- one signal reconnaissance regiment.

The operations of the troops of the front were generally supported by an aviation force and radioelectronic jamming, engineering, antichemical, and logistic troops. As reinforcement, it could have received one or two artillery divisions or one or two artillery brigades, one or two antiarmor brigades, and other units or special and combat service troops from other arms.⁹

The purposes of the front's offensive operations, which were included in the immediate and the ultimate goals set for it, were to destroy the nuclear weapons of the enemy; to stop the deployment of the opposing main forces together with their strategic and tactical reserves moving forward; and to occupy and hold the zones, areas, and facilities crucial for the continuation of the attack.

The scale of the offensive front planned for application in the North Italian strategic direction is described here.

1. In the phase during which the immediate goal would be achieved:
 - a. width of offensive segment of the battle area: 240–260 kilometers (km);
 - b. depth of immediate area of operations: 220–300 km;
 - c. pace of attack: 20–22 km/day; and
 - d. time set for achieving immediate goal: 11–14 days.
2. In the phase during which the ultimate goal would be achieved:
 - a. width of offensive segment of the battle area: 280–300 km;
 - b. depth of ultimate area of operations: 280–310 km;
 - c. pace of attack: 25–30 km/day; and
 - d. time set for achieving the ultimate goal: 9–11 days.

The front had two hundred to three hundred nuclear warheads of twenty to thirty megatons each, and it was capable of simultaneously delivering one hundred to one hundred fifty strikes representing a force of ten to fifteen megatons.¹⁰

In this strategic direction, the line of the Danube formed the right-hand boundary between the western and the southwestern theaters of operations. On its left flank, in the Balkan strategic direction (Bulgaria, the Dardanelles) at a distance of several kilometers, where the Soviet, Bulgarian, and Romanian allied forces were to be used, lay noncommitted (neutral) Yugoslavia, whose western regions (Croatia and Slovenia) belonged to the Adriatic strategic direction, according to the Soviet strategic concept.¹¹

The general staffs of the alliance member-states developed only their own plans for the operations defined by the tasks and requirements set by the Soviet general staff. And, based on such sketchy knowledge, the highest political leaders confirmed them with their signatures.

Austria as a Theater of Operations

In this region, Soviet strategy was modified several times from 1955 on (that is, from the time of Austria's declaration of neutrality), depending on the internal and foreign political situations of the Soviet Union and other international factors, and the personal concepts of the changing Soviet higher political and military leaders.¹² Modifications based on situation assessments took place as follows:

1. Although Austria was a neutral state, it had links to NATO. Therefore, the WP (that is, the Soviet Union) considered it a "western" nation and a potential enemy in any armed conflict with Europe.
2. During an armed conflict with the WP, NATO would ignore Austria's neutrality in all circumstances, and it would be used as an area of deployment.¹³

Interpretations of the neutrality of Austria and of the role of the Austrian defense forces, as well as its expected operations, often changed. The conditions under which Austria's neutrality (which was guaranteed by the western great powers) could be violated was the subject of debate.

As far as Austria was concerned, the imaginary "critical threshold" was modified to a certain extent. There had been a ruling view (by the influence of Marshall Rodion Malinovsky) that prescribed as obligatory the immediate intervention of WP armed forces if the borders or airspace of a neutral country were violated. That view was modified by the 1970s to say that if Austria let NATO troops onto its territory or, possibly, allowed the deployment of NATO forces along the Austrian-Hungarian or the Austrian-Czechoslovakian borders, its neutrality should be considered abandoned, and WP troops then had the right to launch an offensive as a form of self-defense against NATO forces preparing for aggression and against the Austrian forces supporting them. The Soviets assumed that the Austrian army basically was prepared for defensive tasks and that it would support the deployment of NATO forces

on its territory, but its active participation in an offensive action could not be ruled out.

From the WP options concerning Austria outlined above, it becomes obvious that in this strategic direction the occupation of Austria could not be identified as an independent goal in warfare, but as the occupation of an area of deployment both for NATO and for WP armed forces. Depending on Austria's behavior, the WP decision makers imagined the following confrontation scenarios between the troops of the two alliances on Austria's territory:

- *Scenario 1:* An overall (strategic scale) atomic war breaks out between the member-states of NATO and the WP. While emphasizing its neutrality, Austria obviously supports NATO's political and military measures. The Austrian armed forces prepare for a defensive operation against the troops of the WP member-states along the country's eastern and northern borders. The bulk of Austrian defense focuses on blocking the possible directions of attack and holding or defending the key zones of the country.

- *Scenario 2:* A limited war breaks out between the member-states of NATO and the WP. Austria abandons its neutrality. Under the pretext of assistance, it allows NATO forces (one West German division, four Italian mountain brigades) to enter its area. The German and Italian troops conduct active defense in cooperation with the Austrian armed forces against the attacking WP troops, thus supporting the right flank of NATO's central European force. Meanwhile, the Austrian forces make an effort to create the conditions for strategic and tactical cooperation between central and south European NATO forces.

- *Scenario 3:* Following a period of political tension, an overall atomic war breaks out between NATO and the WP. NATO delivers multiple unexpected strikes against the strategic first echelons of WP armed forces. Simultaneously, Austria declares that it is joining NATO. The Austrian troops conduct active defensive operations against the attacking WP troops with the aim of supporting the forward concentration and combat application of major NATO forces (initially, two West German and two Italian divisions; during operations, two or three corps altogether) that enter Austrian territory. The West German troops would be concentrated forward in the direction of Munich-Salzburg-Linz-Vienna, while the Italian troops would be deployed forward along the lines of Dobriaco-Lienz as well as Tarvisio-Villach toward Klagenfurt-Graz. The combat application of these forces in the north would be from the zone of Kitzze-Prodersdorf in the direction of Bruck-Győr, and from the zone of Mattersburg-Kirschlag in the direction of Neunkirchen-Veszprém; In the south, the combat application would be from the zone of Rechnitz-Güttenbach in the direction of Obervart-Kaposvár, and from the zone of Güssing-Fehring in the direction of Obervart-Nagykanizsa-Nagyatád.¹⁴

Use of the Hungarian People's Army in the Strategic Offensive Operations of the WP¹⁵

The core of the WP offensive operation plan, which consisted of a detailed mission plan and its various support plans, on the North Italian strategic direction was as follows: At the time of an immediate war threat, the Fifth Army of the Hungarian People's Army (four divisions, including one tank division, one missile brigade, one artillery brigade, one air defense artillery brigade, and one air defense missile brigade, army aviation forces, and support and combat service support units), as well as the 3d Corps of the Hungarian People's Army (two divisions and combat service support units)—altogether, 120,000 troops, 1,200 tanks, 1,300 guns and mortars, 9 battlefield missile-launcher sites, and 18 tactical missile-launcher sites—will be reassigned to the southwestern front command to be formed from the Soviet Southern Army Command stationed in the area of Hungary. From the Soviet troops staying in Hungary, one division as well as the Hungarian 3d Corps will be assigned to the Hungarian Fifth Army and another Soviet division will be the reserve for the front. The remaining two Soviet divisions, together with the Soviet corps redeployed from the Carpathian military zone, will form the right flank of the front, partly in the area of Czechoslovakia, and will be applied in combat along both banks of the Danube River.

The basic tasks of the Fifth Army were as follows:

1. Quickly eliminate the Austrian security zone established near the state border.
2. Quickly overcome the fortified sites, territorial support zones, and other crucial sites and the so-called key importance sites and the reinforced areas within them.
3. Take hold of the vital political and administrative facilities as well as traffic junctions, especially mountain passes, and reservoir dams and other important constructions.
4. Isolate areas of operations from rear reserves to prevent their deployment and destroy them in battle.
5. Overcome the major passes of the Alps without significant destruction, for which purpose airborne and helicopter-transported troops, outflanking and forward detachments, and maneuver task forces were planned.

According to plans, at the outbreak of a war, the Hungarian Fifth Army, reinforced with the aviation units and artillery units of the front, would launch an offensive operation in a two-echelon operational structure along the whole of the Austrian-Hungarian border, toward the Danube Valley and the North Italian operational directions. The army's aims would be to overcome the Austrian defense before Italian and West German units arrived and to destroy those units in battles as they arrived, thus fulfilling the task of the first operation

of the army (which was also the immediate task of the front) by the twelfth to fourteenth day of operations. Making their way near the passes leading to northern Italy, the bulk of the troops would form a bridgehead to prepare for the second operation of the army, as a result of which they were to reach the Lombardian–Venetian Plain and thus perform the ultimate task of the front.

In this situation the right-flank troops of the front planned to exploit their offensive operation in the direction of Linz-Munich. The fate of Vienna was an issue to be addressed in preparations and exercises where plans changed during the years. Contrary to the concepts of the previous decade (that is, atomic strike, a separate operation to occupy the city because the fall of Vienna was expected to end the Austrian resistance), surrounding and blocking Vienna with three or four divisions was the task in the 1970s. The assumption was that no significant forces were available to defend the Austrian capital. Therefore, with the Soviet division launching an attack from the area of the Bruck fortifications, the Hungarian tank division breaking forward toward Wienerwald, and one or two divisions of the Soviet forces attacking on the right flank of the front along the left bank of the Danube, the right flank of the Hungarian Fifth Army would arrive at the edge of Vienna and break the resistance of the defensive forces or at least cut off the city from the rest of Austria until the army's first operation was completed.

The plans for operations did not include the size of the new allied forces entering the area of Hungary or the specific order of their forward concentration, although the Hungarian Fifth Army could have been reinforced only with further Soviet divisions during the offensive operations in order to replace those destroyed in combat, engaged in combat, or drifting away from the main forces. The Hungarian People's Army had a great number of trained reserve troops, but it did not have heavy military vehicles. Equipping reserve soldiers and integrating them into full combat units was not satisfactorily organized.

From an analysis of various data, the decision makers concluded that the twofold or threefold superiority of strength needed for carrying out a successful offensive operation in the main direction was available. The force superiority calculated on the basis of operational figures would have enabled the force to keep the daily pace of attack in the full depth of the army's area of operations.

The main forces of the Soviet and Hungarian troops staying in the area of Hungary—in peacetime—were capable of occupying their so-called alert areas in case of a war-danger alert within the prescribed time standards (two or three hours). Those alert areas were fifteen to twenty kilometers from their garrisons and were prepared to some extent. The permanent alert troops of the Hungarian Fifth Army could be filled to war strength in twenty-four hours; that is, these troops were capable of reaching “full alert” status in a day and then, within the time limit prescribed in the plans for forward concentration, seemed ready to deploy offensively in the area of the Austrian border.

Following forward concentration, during march and after four to six hours of situation update, the first echelon of the Fifth Army could have reached a

state of readiness to eliminate the Austrian security zone and then to break through the areas of defense.¹⁶

Summary

The WP had developed strategic plans for a confrontation with NATO, but it had no coherent military doctrine in the modern sense. Such documents were not prepared because the machinery and the mechanisms of the party state—the party and government programs—carried the military doctrines. This is quite clear if one studies the resolutions of the party congresses or the five-year government programs.

It was the political and military leadership of the Hungarian People's Republic that undertook the responsibility to create a coherent military doctrine following the 1987 session of the PCB. I believe Hungary accomplished more in this area than any of the other WP member-states. It is obvious from the documents made during the process of doctrine development that in the late 1980s the Hungarian leadership conceived and planned the tasks and missions of the Hungarian People's Army, relying on real political and economic processes, and as a result "empirical strategy" gradually lost favor with Hungarian military experts. It can only be hoped that Hungarian military experts, politicians, and security policy researchers do not forget basic military and strategic knowledge about the application of armed force.

Endnotes

1. The American doctrines and armament projects coming from the period examined can be relied on for information on the application of NATO forces. It has to be noted, however, that data compiled by the various WP commands after the analysis of information from various sources did not conform to reality in a number of cases, for instance, the overestimation of the number of operational tanks with NATO troops. A similar phenomenon can be observed with the quantitative and qualitative data on troops and major war equipment.

2. It is discussed in detail in Lajos Mórocz, "Major Factors Determining the Change of Military Doctrines. Development and Trends in the Military Doctrine of the Hungarian People's Republic," 1988. (With Mórocz's permission, copies of some chapters are in the possession of the author.)

3. The Supreme Command of the JAF was set up at the time of the establishment of the WP but the staff, where the delegates of the armed forces of the member-states were sent, was organized only in 1969. The commander and the staff commander (chief of staff) positions were always filled by Soviet generals.

4. At the sessions of the JAF Military Council, the Romanian delegation had objections in some cases. These mostly referred to insignificant areas and notably did not hinder drawing the final conclusions of the consultations. However, in the late 1980s, the restructuring of the Hungarian People's Army and its preparatory talks were subject to serious debate within the alliance. The Soviets viewed the changes introduced in the Hungarian People's Army plans as not allowing the integration of new components (brigade, corps) into the system of command and control.

5. It can be mentioned as an example that the Western theater of operations was divided into the north German strategic direction (leading toward the north German, central French,

and La Manche strategic regions), and into the south German strategic direction (capacity: two fronts; leading toward the south French strategic region).

6. Detailed data on it are available in Kálmán Varga's dissertation, "The Military Geographical Characteristics of the Segments in Austrian Territory of the North Italian and the Danube Valley Operational Direction and Their Impact on the Activity of the Tactical and Tactical Reconnaissance Forces," Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library.

7. From the Hungarian People's Army, an army and a corps, altogether six divisions were planned to be applied in the strength of the front. (To support the offensive capabilities of the troops of the Hungarian People's Army, remarkable Soviet aviation and artillery reinforcement and support were required in every case.) Based on the directive on the first offensive operation by the WP, the Hungarian Fifth Army was generally planned for application on the left flank of the front, in the direction of the main strike. Its immediate task was to seize the passes of the Steier-Alps, 100–120 km into the southeast of Austria, and its ultimate task was to reach the border crossings of the Italian-Austrian border, 120–150 km deeper than the place of the immediate task in the territory. The area covered by the immediate and the ultimate tasks could vary, depending on whether the operations were planned for using atomic weapons or conventional weapons. In the case of applying atomic weapons, the depth of the area of operations increased.

8. The missile units were generally equipped with R-300 and R-70 missiles, which were suitable for delivering atomic warheads. In the Hungarian People's Army (HPA), nine battlefield and eighteen tactical missile launcher sites were in service. The HPA never had the atomic warheads planned for application; they had to be assigned to them by the front commander before the combat mission. The regulations on the transfer and reception of the atomic warheads were not known. The reception of the warheads was planned only in theory, on paper, during the various exercises by the Hungarian missile units. The Hungarian military leadership did not even have information about whether the atomic warheads were deployed or stored in the country.

9. The strength of the southwestern or Carpathian front was never known exactly. To conclude the above-mentioned composition, the alliance exercises conducted in the area of Hungary can be relied on.

10. The Hungarian political and military leadership had only partial knowledge about the operations conducted in the North Italian strategic direction, but did not know the full or actual plan for the deployment and use of the Soviet armed forces in this area; neither did they have any information about the neighboring western theater of operations (for example, the forces planned for the territory of Czechoslovakia) or about the Adriatic strategic direction. The Hungarian Fifth Army would have gotten out of the command of the Hungarian General Staff as early as "war danger" and "full alert" (that is, before the outbreak of a war). The role of the highest level of Hungarian military leadership was restricted to replacing the strength and the logistic support of their own troops as well as creating suitable conditions for the transit and forward concentration of the newly arriving Soviet forces—not exactly known to them.

11. Detailed information is available on it in Mórocz's dissertation. As for the plans on this strategic direction, the Hungarian leadership had only assumptions about the alliance plans because (1) it did not know the strategic concept of the alliance, or, more exactly, had only information concerning the Hungarian troops; (2) it knew as much about the scale and direction of movement of the allied reserve troops planned in advance as allowed by the required logistic support; (3) it was not aware of the strategic concept about Yugoslavia along its southern border; and (4) it lacked thorough knowledge about the tasks of the allied Czechoslovakian front.

12. All this can be followed in chapters 3 and 4 of Mórocz, "Major Factors."

13. For detailed information on it, see Zoltán Ady, "The Military Political Situation and Expectable Behaviour of Austria," Ph.D. diss., Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library.

14. An assumed version of an offensive NATO force toward Hungary in the 1970s and 1980s: (1) Danube Valley direction of operations—3 divisions; 10 tactical or battlefield mis-

siles; 16 atomic artillery guns; 460–80 tanks; 410–20 artillery guns, mortars, rocket launchers; 480–500 antiarmor guns; 250–60 antiarmor missiles; 5–6 air squadrons; and 80–100 combat aircraft, 54 of which are capable of delivering nuclear devices. (2) North Italian direction of operations—2–3 divisions; 1–2 independent brigades; 6 tactical or battlefield missiles; 2 atomic artillery guns; 500–20 tanks; 1,000–1,100 artillery guns, mortars, rocket launchers; 760–80 antiarmor guns; 180–200 antiarmor missiles; 12 air squadrons; and 180 combat aircraft, 84 of which are capable of delivering nuclear devices.

15. The participation of the HPA in the planned strategic offensive operations raised a number of issues because of the military geographical characteristics of the theater of operations. See the Ph.D. diss. by Boldizsár Bakity, titled “Problems of the Structure and Equipment of Land Combined Troops and Their Solutions with Special Regard to Midland and Highland Terrain,” Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library, Budapest.

16. The deployment was remarkably obstructed by the fact that the movement of the bulk of the Soviet troops toward Czechoslovakia crossed the forward routes of the Hungarian troops, and the priority of movement at the crossings was not really decided in the 1970s or later. Not addressing this issue endangered the planned forward concentration of the Hungarian troops. It was basically not changed by the east–west war road network through the country. This issue is discussed in detail in István Héjja’s Ph.D. diss., “The Military Geographical Evaluation of the Transport Network of the Hungarian People’s Republic with Special Regard to the Road Network,” Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library, Budapest.

PART FOUR

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN
PEACE OPERATIONS

Military Partnership of Russia with CIS Member-Countries, 1991–2004

Oleg Belosludtsev

The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) was formed on 8 December 1991, when the heads of state of Belarus, the Russian Federation, and Ukraine signed an agreement reaffirming traditional ties between the former member-states of the Soviet Union. Currently, the members of the CIS are all of the states that previously formed territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), with the exception of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The collapse of the USSR Armed Forces began in the fall of 1991. In the CIS formation period, Marshall E. Shaposhnikov, the last minister of defense of the USSR, came up with a concept of transforming the Soviet armed forces into the Joint Armed Forces of the CIS. The underlying intention was to retain for five years under single command the common structures and defense systems, and the CIS member-countries were asked to refrain from forming their own armed forces until the transformation of the Joint Armed Forces had been completed.

Shaposhnikov's plan failed to find support among the leadership of some of the independent states, and it was not implemented. Instead, the thought was that maintaining unified control over the military space of the former USSR would be achieved with general-use forces, a concept approved in February 1992 by eight of the CIS member-countries. The plan did not exclude the transfer of the joint military inheritance to the jurisdiction of individual states within a shorter term.¹ The shaping of national armed forces had already begun by the spring of 1992, however, and that put an end to plans for a general-use force. The subsequent military coordination among the CIS member-countries evolved along the lines of partnerships among the armed forces of the sovereign states. The development of Russia's military partnerships with the CIS member-countries can be conditionally broken down into three phases.

The first phase (December 1991 through March 1993) involved active and intensive inventorying of the armaments and military hardware that the former Soviet Army had situated in the territories of the newly formed states—their distribution and the creation of the various national armed forces being the indispensable attribute of statehood. In this phase, first steps were made in stipulating a legal basis for bilateral relationships with the CIS member-countries in the military and political spheres. Between July and December 1992 bilateral agreements were drafted and signed specifying the parameters for

distribution of military property; the terms of withdrawal for units and detachments to Russia's territory; the procedures for training the military cadre at institutions of higher education of Russia's Ministry of Defense; and the rules of military service for people in the ranks of officers, ensigns, midshipmen, and others.

The second phase (early 1993 to late 1994) involved defining the main task and providing legal interpretation on an intergovernmental level as to the status of the Russian troops deployed outside Russia. Gathering at negotiations were representatives of military units and delegations composed of high-level representatives of the member-states, with the active input of people from all interested agencies of military management. These negotiations yielded comprehensive work on developing and coordinating the draft legal and regulatory documents and intergovernmental programs (programs of military departments) needed to implement the previously reached understandings in the areas of military partnership, coordination of activities, and management of interaction both within Russia's Ministry of Defense and with the interested federal executive authorities.

The third phase (early 1995 through 2004) featured an expansion of practical efforts aimed at ensuring joint security, including the drafting and signing of bilateral military cooperation plans; implementing all managerial measures to execute the formerly reached understandings; perfecting (by amendments and additions) and further developing the existing legal base; and monitoring the actions of the central military authorities in putting the existing accords into practice.

Russia's military partnership with the CIS member-countries was developing at three levels: (1) within the framework of the CIS structure, (2) within the framework of the Collective Security Treaty (CST), and (3) proceeding from the bilateral agreements and accords.

Within the framework of the CIS structure, Russia's partnership with the member-countries is effected via the Council of Ministers of Defense (CMD), serving as the CIS's highest body of military cooperation. The council was formed on 14 February 1992 by resolution of the Council of Heads of States, and it deals with conceptual approaches to the issues of military policy and military building of the CIS member-countries.² The CMD also makes proposals aimed at preventing armed conflicts inside the states' territories and at their borders, and at forming and directing the activities of groups of military observers and joint peacekeeping forces in maintaining peace in the CIS.

Currently taking part in CMD activities with full rights are the ministers of defense of nine countries. Moldava, Turkmenistan, and Ukraine participate as observers. The permanently active working body of the CMD is the Staff for Coordination of Military Partnership (SCMP) whose status is not inferior to that of the General Staff of Armed Forces of the receiving state, that is, of Russia. The SCMP was formed on 24 September 1992 by altering the structure of the CIS Superior Command of Joint Armed Forces.³ The SCMP is intended

to promote all-inclusive military cooperation of the CIS and coordination in executing the decisions of the Council of Heads of States and of the CMD in the military domain.

The main forms of CMD activities are its sessions held as needed—as a rule, at least once every four months. An extraordinary session of the CMD can be convened by resolution of the Council of Heads of States or the CMD chair, or by request of any CMD member seconded by at least one-third of the CMD members. In addition to the CMD full sessions, there are working meetings, consultations, conferences, and exchanges of opinions on the most topical issues of military partnership. Since its inception, the CMD has initiated and convened forty-three sessions of the member-states. Moreover, the CMD has drafted and approved 476 documents on various aspects of military partnership, including 151 documents addressing such essential issues of defense and military formation as peacekeeping, settlement of problems of common security, and enhancement of the joint system of air defense. They have addressed matters related to joint tactical training of the armed forces and military-technical cooperation, to social/legal safety for military personnel and their family members, and to training and education of the military cadre. The member-states' ministers of defense or their authorized agents have taken part in signing all documents approved by consensus in the CMD—360 to date.

The most important component of military partnership under the CIS auspices is peacekeeping, the prevention and resolution of armed conflicts. Over the period being discussed, four peacekeeping operations have been conducted in the following conflict areas within the CIS territory: (1) in the Dniestr River area (Moldava) since 1992, (2) in southern Ossetia (Georgia) since 1992, (3) in Tajikistan from 1993 until 2001, and (4) in Abkhazia (Georgia) since 1994. No active combat exchanges have taken place in these conflict zones since their respective peacekeeping actions began. In 1997 a process of national reconciliation began and it has led to an integration of the political and public structures of opposing factions in Tajikistan.

One of the most prominent manifestations of the fruits of military partnership among the CIS member-countries has been the launching and functioning of the joint system of air defense. On 10 February 1995 the heads of ten member-states signed an agreement to create a joint air defense system.⁴ This joint system comprises a portion of the signatories' air defense equipment and forces under direct control of their armed forces commanders.

The following actions deserve special mention in the creation and development of the CIS joint air defense system:

- restoring two-way data exchanges on air situation among the states' executive bodies;
- launching and perfecting a system of joint tactical and combat training for air defense forces (equipment and personnel) of the states that are parties to the joint air defense agreement; and

- launching a system of joint combat air operations for parties to the agreement.

The actions of the joint air defense system's personnel and equipment are coordinated from the central command post of the Air Force of Russia, which also is responsible for financing 50 percent of the joint system.⁵

Since 1 April 1996 Russia's air alert duty actions have been joined by the Air Defense Forces of the Republic of Belarus, and since 1 May 1996 by the Air Defense Forces of the Republic of Kazakhstan.⁶ Since 15 April 1999 joint air alert duty has been maintained by the Russian Federation and the Republic of Armenia. On 27 August 1999 the ministers of defense of the Russian Federation and Ukraine signed a procedural statute on the interaction of their air alert duty forces. On 21 December 1999 ministers of defense for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Kazakhstan approved the instructions on joint actions and a plan of joint activities for air defense duty officers.⁷

Starting in 1995, each training period has included joint command and staff training exercises for the joint air defense system combat control and alert forces of the CIS member-countries, with the participation of tactical groups under their commanders of air defense forces. Since 1999 coalition training exercises with field firing have been taking place at the Russian Ashuluk firing range.

The next higher level of military partnership between Russia and the CIS member-countries is cooperation under the Collective Security Treaty (CST). The CST was signed in Tashkent on 15 May 1992. The treaty was signed initially by six of the CIS member-countries—Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan—and later was joined by Azerbaijan (24 September 1993), Georgia (9 December 1993), and Belarus (31 December 1993). The agreement was registered with the United Nations Secretariat on 1 November 1995.

On 2 April 1999 the heads of six states (Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Tajikistan) signed the Protocol on Extension of the Collective Security Treaty. The treaty focuses not as much on building a common security system as on shaping a defense alliance geared to dissuade and repel an external threat. Chapter 1 of the treaty confirms the obligation of the states to refrain from the use or threat of force against other member-states and to seek a peaceful solution to any disputes among themselves or with other states. The provisions of Articles 2 and 4 stipulate the activation of a mechanism of mutual consultation if there is a threat to the security, territorial integrity, or sovereignty of either one or several of the CIS member-countries, or a threat to international peace; and those articles further define the obligations of mutual aid, including military assistance, along the lines of exercising the right to common defense per Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, if an act of aggression is committed against any state that is a party to the treaty.

The treaty's ideology as a sum total of the shared approaches to protection from an external threat, safeguarding of sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and political stability has found its expression in the concept of common security of the states—parties to the Collective Security Treaty. It was approved by a resolution of the Collective Security Council on 15 February 1995.⁸

The treaty was invoked in the autumn of 1996, the summer of 1998 in connection with a worsening situation in Afghanistan, and in the autumn of 1999 when international terrorist groups infiltrated the territory of Kyrgyzstan's Batken District.

The joint command and staff exercise "Southern Shield of the Commonwealth—99" was held in the provinces of Osh (Kyrgyzstan) and Fergana (Uzbekistan) in autumn 1999. The military command bodies and armed forces of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Republic of Kyrgyz, the Russian Federation, the Republic of Tajikistan, and the Republic of Uzbekistan participated in the exercise. Their participation demonstrated the resolve of treaty signatories to join efforts in countering the expansion of international terrorism and Islamic extremism. Since that time, Southern Shield exercises have been held regularly.

The need for further development and deepening of military and political partnerships among treaty signatories, in the interest of ensuring and reinforcing national, regional, and international security; of building close and comprehensive allied relations in the foreign policy, military, and military-technical spheres; and of countering transnational challenges and threats to security culminated in the founding of the Collective Security Treaty Organization. This international/regional organization was established on 7 October 2002 in Kishinev (Moldova).

Russia has been maintaining military cooperation on a bilateral basis with all of the CIS member-countries, both the parties to the CST and those who have not joined it. Bilateral agreements or records of understanding on military partnership have been concluded with all of these states, and joint events have been staged along all lines of military interaction. The major forms of partnership have been as follows:

- educating and training military troops;
- drafting and introducing plans for state defense, military operations, and combat actions;
- creating tactical groups of forces (troops) for direct engagement in combat actions;
- exchanging intelligence;
- directly involving Russian advisors and experts in the work of national staffs in times of peace or war, and in combat actions;
- eliminating the aftereffects of local wars and armed conflicts, and of natural disasters; and

- jointly holding and participating in international conferences and symposiums, and other activities involving military science, sports, tourism, and so forth.

Thus, the evolution of the military partnerships between Russia and the CIS member-countries from 1991 until the present time has demonstrated that it is an extremely important and necessary component of the Russian Federation's foreign policy, alongside the political, economic, social, legal, and other types of intergovernmental cooperation. This partnership is based firmly on the common principles that enable the amalgamation of national and joint interests for the sake of strengthening the defense and of building and training the national armed forces.

However, this process of military partnership sometimes has failed to live up to expectations. An effective mechanism of execution and control over the implementation of the agreed documents and joint decisions has not been finalized. A procedure for devising practical actions commensurate with changes in the military and political environment has not been put in place.

Russia's renowned philosopher Vladimir Solovyov, when deliberating on Russia's destiny, mentioned that if Russia "does not renounce the law of force and does not adhere to the force of law, she would never be crowned with success in any of her deeds, be they external or internal."⁹ It appears that this postulate is fully applicable to the military partnership of Russia with the CIS member-countries.

Endnotes

1. *Sodruzhestvo* (Commonwealth) (in Russian), Information Gazette of the Council of Heads of States and Governments of CIS, issue 2, Minsk, 1992, pp. 50–54.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ten Years of Council of Ministers of Defense of CIS Member States: Experience and Lessons of Military Partnership* (in Russian) (Moscow, 2002), p. 114.
4. Head Agency for International Military Partnership of Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation (1951–2001) (in Russian), Moscow, 2001, p. 199 (hereafter cited as Head Agency).
5. V. A. Prudnikov, "Developing Integration in the Military Sphere" (in Russian), *Voin Sodruzhestva* (Warrior of Commonwealth) 4 (1998): 2.
6. Head Agency, p. 201.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Sodruzhestvo* issue 1 (18), 1995, pp. 45–51.
9. V. S. Soloviov, National Issue in Russia (in Russian), St. Petersburg, 1891, p. 7.

Participation of the Russian Military Contingent in the Peacekeeping Operation in Kosovo: Experience Gained and Lessons Learned

Mikhail Georgievich Lyoshin

On 10 June 1999, following consultations with the United Nations (UN) and the European Council, and upon receiving a confirmation from Belgrade of the full-scale withdrawal of the Yugoslav armed forces from Kosovo, the North Atlantic Council suspended the combat actions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Joint Military Forces against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY).

On the same day the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1244, which was voted on by fourteen nations—the Security Council members, except China. Point 5 of the resolution stated a decision “to have deployed in Kosovo, under the auspices of the United Nations, the international civilian presence and security presence with the necessary personnel and equipment.”¹ In accordance with Addendum 2 to the resolution, international security forces with substantial NATO involvement “should be deployed under joint command and control, and should be authorized to create safe conditions for all people in Kosovo, and to assist in safe return to their homes of all displaced persons and refugees.”² According to this resolution the duties of “the international presence for security” in the composition of multinational forces included precluding renewal of combat actions, demilitarizing the Kosovo Liberation Army and other armed groups of Kosovo Albanians, and building up a secure environment for the return of refugees and for activities of the civilian personnel.

Also on that day, in Cologne (Germany), a stability agreement was signed for the countries of southeastern Europe.³ More than forty countries, organizations, and regional groups worked out a joint strategy to ensure stability and growth in the region, and establish cooperation among themselves in implementing that strategy.

Two days after these two highly significant documents were signed—on 12 June 1999—NATO forces entered Kosovo. In accordance with the NATO Joint Military Forces Supreme Command’s Plan #10413, “Joint Sentinel,” the entire territory of Kosovo was divided into five task sectors, with units of the multinational Kosovo Force (KFOR) made responsible for ensuring security

in each sector. In preparing for this peacekeeping operation, NATO took into account its experience with multinational forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

On 20 June 1999, after the supreme commander of the Joint Armed Forces of NATO in Europe had confirmed that units of the Yugoslav force structures had left Kosovo, the secretary general of NATO officially terminated the air campaign against the FRY.

The total strength of the KFOR contingent when fully deployed was to reach some fifty thousand troops. By April 2000 deployed in the territory of Kosovo were forty-one thousand military personnel from the armed forces of thirty-nine countries (nineteen NATO countries, plus twenty countries outside the alliance, including armed forces of sixteen NATO partners), with more than two thousand troops deployed at the KFOR rear areas in Albania, Greece, and Macedonia.

It should be mentioned that, during the first half of June 1999, highly tense discussions took place between Russia and NATO concerning the issue of allocating to the Russians a separate sector in the territory of the province.⁴ From Russia's viewpoint on the one hand, this allocation would formally equalize its status with NATO's five leading countries (France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States) in taking part in the peacekeeping mission. On the other hand, Russian peacekeepers would be deployed to areas with a predominantly Serbian population, which would accept these peacekeepers in their community. This approach, however, failed to find support among the NATO countries. As they saw it, the allotment in Kosovo of a separate sector not under direct control of the alliance would be equivalent to breaking down the province into occupation zones, leading to their subsequent breakaway.

In the situation that had transpired, the Russian leadership concluded that any further unyielding stance on the separate task sector issue might severely aggravate the relationship not only with the United States, but also with the European NATO members. Russia could not ignore this possibility, but it did not abstain from a display of force by moving a Russian brigade assault battalion from Bosnia and landing it at Kosovo's Slatina Airport a full day ahead of the NATO forces' official entry into Kosovo. And notwithstanding the fact that this arrival of Russian paratroopers had been coordinated with the "north" division commander, the ultimate goal of this action proved to be a surprise for NATO political and military leaders.⁵

In any event, traces of progress gradually became evident in negotiations on the scale and format of participation of Russian units in the KFOR. An outcome of this diplomatic dispute was the Helsinki Agreement, "Agreed Points of Russian Participation KFOR," signed by Russian and U.S. ministers of defense on 18 June 1999. The agreement specified the principles to be reviewed and approved by the leadership of Russia and NATO as a basis for Russian participation in efforts to establish peace in Kosovo. The following areas for peacekeeping duties were defined for the Russian military contingent:

- two areas of deployment in the central portion of the “center” sector of the multinational brigade (MNBR) of Great Britain: Vrele settlement—Slatina Airport, and Kosovo Pole settlement where the Russian military hospital was to be located; and
- three task zones in three MNBR sectors: in the northeastern portion of the “east” sector of the U.S. MNBR—Kosovskaya Kamenica community. The units were accommodated in the following base areas: Kosovskaya Kamenica, Strezovce, and Korminian. In the southern portion of the “north” sector of the French MNBR: Srbica community. In the northern portion of the “south” sector of the German MNBR: Malishevo community.

The total count of the Russian military personnel in the Kosovo territory was to be 2,850 troops, plus troops for the support of airport activities and 16 liaison officers embedded with NATO units. If the number of the alliance troops were to be reduced, the Russian troop count was to be reduced proportionally—and that actually did occur late in 2001.

As was true for other national units, the Russian units were granted the right to decline to execute certain individual tasks. The agreement provided for involvement of the Russian armed forces in KFOR on the terms set up for all national components within NATO.

The following guiding documents delineating the participation of the Russian military contingent (RMC) in the composition of the international forces for ensuring security in Kosovo:

- UN Security Council Resolution 1244, 10 June 1999;
 - Decree of the President of the Russian Federation, 25 June 1999;
 - Resolution of the Council of the Russian Federation, 25 June 1999;
- and
- Directive of the Government of the Russian Federation, 26 June 1999.

The Russian military contingent to be deployed in Kosovo was formed from the directives of the Russian Federation’s minister of defense on 29 May 1999 and of the head of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation on 24 June 1999.

The involvement of all national contingents of the KFOR, the Russian one included, was based on Operational Plan #10413 of the “Joint Sentinel” action. Proceeding from this plan, participation of the RMC in the first phase of the KFOR operation was to be broken down into three stages:⁶

- First stage—regrouping troops;
- Second stage—deploying troops and integrating them into the KFOR operation; and
- Third stage—engaging in the operation.

Execution of the operation's first-stage tasks was carried out from 5 July through 8 August 1999. During this stage the RMC command refined plans for the entry of the advance units and main forces into their task zones, and stipulated the rules of interaction with the KFOR national units. Regrouping the RMC was effected by air, sea, and rail.

The main tasks of the second stage were implemented according to plan by the end of August. All units and detachments, except Tactical Group 12, were deployed and accommodated in the base areas (camps) and task zones where they began the duties entrusted to them.

The RMC advance groups were deployed between 11 and 13 July. The main forces (Tactical Groups 11 and 13) were deployed between 26 July and 13 August in their task zones, respectively, in the sectors "south" (Germany) and "east" (the United States).

Units of Tactical Group 14 (excluding the 1st Airborne Company) were deployed in their task zones in the "north" sector (France) between 24 July and 5 August, and took these zones under their control. Because the local Albanian population had blocked the road in the area of the city of Orehovec (Slovenia), Tactical Group 12 was unable to enter its task zone and was disbanded.

As the groups completed their assigned tasks, force reduction began. Thus, when one tactical group and certain units were pulled out in October 2001, the RMC was reduced to two tactical groups; an airborne company; an artillery group; and units and detachments of combat, logistics, and technical support. From 2001 through the first half of 2002, the units of the Airborne Forces were replaced by those of the Ground Forces, mainly from the Moscow Military District that were sent to Kosovo after receiving instruction at a special training center.⁷

From 14 May through 1 July 2002, the RMC was reduced gradually as a result of a resolution by the Government of Russia and a directive by the head of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation. Russian peacekeepers left three of the five sectors and remained solely in the "center" and "east" sectors. During his visit to Italy in February 2002, Russian Minister of Defense Sergei B. Ivanov said, "We assume that our contingent in Kosovo has become excessive; specifically in the sectors where no Serbs had been left, and where simply nothing is happening right now. So, to remain there and do nothing—we do not see much sense in that."⁸ Some 13,000 personnel and 400 pieces of combat equipment were recalled to Russia. The resulting management and personnel structure of the RMC comprised tactical groups, an artillery group section, and a support detachment. Thus, the RMC personnel dwindled to 650 and combat equipment and motor vehicles to 250.⁹

On 16 May 2003 the head of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation following the decision made by the president of Russia early in May, signed a directive for the complete withdrawal of Russian peacekeeping forces from the Balkans before 1 August of the same year.¹⁰ In execution of this directive, starting in late July, Russian military contingents

of the total personnel count of 970 were recalled from the Balkans, including 650 from Kosovo and 320 from Bosnia and Herzegovina. The withdrawal of the Russian peacekeeping forces from Kosovo was carried out by rail and air, and from Bosnia and Herzegovina by air only. By 11 June the RMC combat equipment was being moved to Leskovac (Serbia and Montenegro), and the first train with equipment and personnel left for Russia on 17 June. Safeguarding the Slatina Airport was delegated to a Finnish battalion of the KFOR, and the task zone in Tactical Group 13 to an American brigade of the “east” sector. Until 20 June, however, Russian servicemen performed technical support functions at the airfield.¹¹ As a contribution to economic and social restoration of the autonomous province, Russia handed over to the KFOR command the movable and real property of the military units of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation that had been part of the international security presence in Serbia and Montenegro.¹²

Not all of the problems that the Russian peacekeepers had to face could be solved easily, and the RMC peacekeeping mission did not always run smoothly. In the task zone of Tactical Group 14 (“north” sector), the local population, guided and instigated by former members of the Kosovo Liberation Army, often refused to make true contact with the Russian peacekeepers, claiming that their assistance was not needed.

The interaction between the RMC and KFOR forces, in relation to the tasks to be executed and their location and timing, was carried out mainly by

- the RMC and the KFOR via the liaison and interaction groups of the KFOR staff;
- tactical groups and the MNBR via the liaison and interaction groups of the MNBR staff; and
- tactical groups and national units in their own and adjoining task zones via the liaison and interaction groups of the tactical groups.

At the Pristina Airfield, interaction with the director of air operations in Kosovo was managed through the RMC deputy commander for aviation, who was head of the airfield.

In general, interaction with the international and local (Kosovo) civil structures was considered one of the major factors in furthering the successful attainment of peacekeeping goals by the RMC. This interaction was carried out at three levels: central (in Pristina), regional (in sectors where the task zones of the Russian tactical groups were located), and local (directly in the areas where the tactical groups were deployed).

In Pristina continuous exchanges were maintained with central bodies of the international structures: the UN Mission in Kosovo, the International Civil Administration, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Economic Reconstruction Division, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) Mission. Exchanges at this level

were predominantly for information sharing and were carried out mainly by the political advisor to the RMC commander. Interaction at regional and local levels dealt mainly with practical daily matters to restore normal life in the province as soon as possible. These interactions were conducted mainly through contacts with the regional and local administrations appointed by the UN head of mission, with the "field" divisions of the UNHCR, the OSCE Mission, and other structures. The RMC command further maintained links with representatives of the Yugoslav authorities, that is, with the leadership of the FRY government's Committee for Cooperation with the UN Mission in Kosovo.

In the power vacuum that had set in locally, the RMC representatives not only had to communicate with the international and Yugoslav civil organizations, but also had to establish contacts with the unofficial local civil structures that, although illegal from the formal viewpoint (that is, appointed by leaders of the former Kosovo Liberation Army), were enjoying real authority among the local population.

During their watch in Kosovo, Russian troops inspected more than 600,000 vehicles; seized about 30,000 diverse pieces of arms, large quantities of ammunition, and more than 1 kilo of narcotics; and apprehended more than 1,000 people for violations of various kinds. Jointly with the units of the "east" MNBR, they apprehended Agim Bereshu, commander of an illegal armed group. Russian military medics provided skilled medical care to some 24,000 local residents, KFOR personnel, and people from various international agencies. More than two hundred babies were delivered in the Russian military hospital in Kosovo Pole. Beside that, RMC personnel took part in extinguishing more than seventy fires and restoring forty homes. Russian units successfully handled the tasks of escorting and ensuring the security of representatives of international organizations and local people during the voting for representatives to the Kosovo Assembly and for the province's lawful leadership.¹³

For the Russian military personnel, involvement in the peacekeeping operation in Kosovo has been a unique learning experience in a special environment. Officers and enlisted personnel perfected their practical skills by working in extreme situations. They gained experience by establishing relationships with the local population and offering impartial assistance to both sides of the conflict to all people in the province. The solid foundation that they had built up with multinational forces in dealing with crises has been especially important. These peacekeeping actions in the Balkans truly have been the first instance of close and large-scale partnership between Russian troops and armed forces of the North Atlantic Alliance. Previous interactions between our respective armies had been limited mostly to joint exercises by individual units.

According to General Harold Kujat, chair of the NATO Military Committee,

This first case of practical combat partnership between Russia and NATO has vividly demonstrated that much could be yielded by cooperation between the military. However, this experience has also brought to light a series of practical problems, which we kept encountering while pursuing our strategic goals. The “Balkan operations” have taught us numerous lessons. One of them resides in that there are many differences between the armed forces of Russia and those of the NATO countries, and not only in how we do things and what we do, but also in the layout of the troops, in military command structures, and in the logistical support. Hence, interaction between our armed forces proved to be not as simple as one could perceive at the first glance. Our experience of joint actions in the Balkans further has highlighted that full “combat compatibility,” i.e. the ability of the troops to interact easily and efficiently in attaining the common objective, was impaired by the language barrier, incompatibility of the equipment used, and unlike techniques and approaches to actions. Therefore, in order to expand the capability for closed interaction and the scale of subsequent operations in which Russia and NATO could participate jointly, one of the most essential tasks should be enhancing our operational compatibility.¹⁴

In the course of sessions of the Russia–NATO Council in June 2003, the foreign ministers and ministers of defense of the NATO member-countries gave credit to the substantial contribution of the Russian contingents to KFOR’s attaining the common goal of promoting the onset of peace and stability in the Balkans. They further expressed their belief that the practical experience and mutual trust gained by the interaction in conducting these operations had built a solid foundation for subsequent expansion of partnerships between the armed forces of Russia and other countries.¹⁵

Endnotes

1. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10, 1999, World after Kosovo, Russian Collection of Abstracts, Moscow, 2001, pp. 238–47. See <http://www.un.org/russian/documen/scresol/res1999/res1244.htm>.

2. Ibid.

3. O. A. Zhirmov and T. V. Ivleva, “The Kosovo Crisis and Its Consequences for World Community,” *Analytical Review* (2002): 33–50.

4. U. V. Morozov, V. V. Glushkov, and A. A. Sharavin, “The Balkans of Today and Tomorrow: Military and Political Aspects of Peacekeeping,” Moscow, 2001, pp. 279–81.

5. Interview with Colonel-General L.G. Ivashov, former head of Main Office for International Military Cooperation of Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation, *Independent Military Review* 14 (2003).

6. Morozov, Glushkov, and Sharavin, “Balkans of Today and Tomorrow,” pp. 283–87.

7. Interview with Major-General N. Kriventsov, Commander of the Russian military contingent in Kosovo. *Krasnaya zvezda (Red Star)*, 23 Jan 2002.

8. Quoted from *Izvestia*, 5 Feb 2002.

9. *Independent Military Review* 23 (2002).

10. Reported by ITAR-TASS, <http://www.izv.info/politic/news47879>, 16 May 2003.

11. *Izvestia*, 1 Jun 2003.

12. *Izvestia*, 29 Aug 2003.

13. According to data of the official Web site of the Russian Federation Ministry of Defense, and interview with Kriventsov, Information Bulletin of Department of Information and Press of the RF Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 30 Apr 2002.

14. Interview with General G. Qujat, chairman of NATO Military Committee (in Russian), *Krasnaya zvezda (Red Star)*, 26 Feb 2004.

15. *NATO News 2* (2003): 9.

Boots on the Ground: Thoughts on the Future of the Canadian Forces

Andrew Leslie

In democratic nations, governments have a responsibility to defend their citizens from dangers, both foreign and domestic. According to Canada's first published and very recent National Security Policy, "There can be no greater role, no more important obligation for a government, than the safety and protection of its citizens."¹ In terms of absolute results, the Canadian historical record in protecting its soil from the ravages of war has been exemplary, at least in comparison to the vast majority of our international friends and allies. Over the years many hundreds of thousands of Canadians have served their country honorably and well in defending the nation, both at home and abroad, as members of Canada's armed forces. Our country has taken a great deal of pride in their exploits, most recently on those occasions when they have served to prevent the outbreak of war in faraway lands, very often under appalling conditions.

For more than a century, Canadians have been secure in the knowledge that, aside from the relatively recent risks of nuclear war, they had no direct enemies who could attack them with impunity because of the accident of geography that placed them under the benevolent protection of a friendly superpower. Canada was free to spend the vast majority of its resources on national development and social programs, and its energies were focused on keeping together and relatively coherent a grand experiment in federalism.

Recent events and tragedies around the globe, however, are indicative of a period of sustained and dramatic changes to the international security context, and a lot of Canadians may be unsure of the way ahead for members of our profession of arms. What is certain is that more changes are coming, and that a globally connected Canada will be a part of those changes, like it or not. And though Canadians are growing increasingly aware of and sensitive to the dangers that lurk in the international context,² there is very little discernable evidence to suggest that expenditures on national security or military capabilities have broken into the uppermost priorities of where, or how, the Canadian electorate would like their tax dollars spent. This is especially true because such resources must come at the expense of social programs and quality-of-life issues.³ In any case, a variety of "tough calls" and new ways of thinking about Canada's defense requirements will be called for in the coming months and years to better protect Canadians against the new threats facing our nation, both at home and abroad.

The aim of this paper is to contribute some ideas to the long-standing professional debate on the future of the Canadian Forces and the requirement to ensure that Canada's security needs are met in an increasingly dangerous and complicated world. Without getting into any specific details, some broad suggestions will be offered as to the possible way ahead for the Canadian Forces. It is hoped these will generate discussion, commentary, and criticism, all of which will enable those interested in the debate to exchange ideas and learn from each other.

Background

Canada more than paid its share in lives and overall effort in helping our allies during the titanic struggles of the two world wars, but the Canadian political authorities—of all varieties—have usually operated on the principle that there has never really been a direct, external military threat to Canada, with two significant exceptions. The first exception concerned the United States in the early years before and immediately after Confederation.⁴ The second more recent threat was that of the Soviet Union and the concomitant risk of nuclear Armageddon during the Cold War. In both cases there was very little that the people of Canada could do about such threats unilaterally, either defending against or defeating foreign foes of such magnitude.⁵ The very pragmatic, very Canadian policy has been to seek, or accept, the defense of allies, to deter would-be enemies, and to balance the influence of powerful friends and neighbors. Historically, Canada's contribution to such efforts has been the minimum that the Canadian authorities thought reasonable to provide for such defense, both at home and abroad. This minimalist approach to defense expenditures, originated in necessity and a product of frugality, has grown to be a part of what the majority of Canadians may think of as a virtue,⁶ because it has enabled Canadians to focus their resources on nation building and social programs.

Canada is among the most blessed of nations, whose people are remarkably compassionate, secure, and free to make whatever choices they might wish within the bounds of the law. Although as a nation we have some internal issues that merit concern and deserve attention, our problems fade into relative insignificance compared with those facing the vast majority of our fellow global citizens. Though far from perfect, the political entity that is Canada is about as close to perfection in nationhood as one might expect to find, though some will disagree with this very personal opinion that has developed after many years spent overseas. If every nation and collective had the same values, principles, and economic benefits that Canada currently enjoys, there would be little or no need for any military forces, anywhere.

Confident and perhaps even righteous under the shared security umbrella provided by our immediate neighbor and largest trading partner, there is no historical evidence to suggest that Canadians have ever been enthusiastic about

spending money on their armed forces.⁷ As previously mentioned, Canadians are proud of the work that their representative soldiers, sailors, and aircrews have conducted around the world in helping the weak or protecting the innocent, but the policy decisions concerning Canada's international ventures since the 1950s have been less than consistent.⁸ As a result, the electorate's "bottom line" toward defense spending has been equally inconsistent, approaching that of benign tolerance; with the occasional public outcry when something has gone badly wrong, or when the state of the Canadian Forces crossed some ill-defined embarrassment threshold in terms of its equipment or operational deficiencies.⁹ In the past the result usually has been a brief flurry of attention and exchanges in the court of public opinion, as various interest groups and security stakeholders jockeyed for position in support of their respective agendas. After the spotlight moved on, the situation reverted to the status quo, more or less—sometimes a lot less. Dealing with the effects of budget cuts, or doing more with less, has been the hallmark of Canada's armed forces throughout most of their history,¹⁰ although there have been some recent and very welcome exceptions. For decades the men and women of the Canadian Forces have quietly struggled to carry on with their assigned defense priorities as best they could, as did the rest of Canadians in their pursuit of their larger national priorities.

Although it is a matter of opinion, it would appear that Canada's national priorities since the earliest days of Confederation have centered on nation building, keeping the country together, and social development/quality-of-life issues. Because security was both implied and assumed, thanks to the geographic blessing of having a superpower as a neighbor, Canada's long-term defense priorities have remained remarkably consistent throughout the last century, and have included national sovereignty, the defense of Canada and North America, assistance to the civil authorities in times of crisis or disaster, and "such international undertakings we voluntarily assumed in cooperation with our friends and allies."¹¹ Because there was little need to do more, the adage of "keeping the generals out of Cabinet, the military out of the Treasury, and the soldiers out of Commitments" was the common historical trend, although not absolute.¹²

The Winds of Change

As mentioned earlier, there is a strong belief among internationalists and security experts that things have significantly changed. The tragedies and horrors of the 9/11 terrorist attacks and their aftermath are well-known, as is the end of the Cold War and the resulting period of relative instability and international chaos that gives every indication of growing worse with each passing year. What is not as well understood are the causes that led to these new global conditions and the long-term effects of the various responses and solutions that are under active consideration or prosecution by a variety of our

friends, allies, and trading partners. There appear to be new challenges, new threats, and new security concerns. Globalization, the growing gap between the rich and poor nations, ruthless and predatory warlords whose only interest is in seizing or keeping power, fanaticism, corruption, new information and transportation technologies, banditry, the spread of horrors such as weapons of mass destruction, environmental disasters . . . the list is almost as long as one might wish to make it.¹³ And while very few of these problems are new to those who have studied some history, what is new is that their results can have a dramatic and immediate impact on both Canada's social development and quality of life—a direct national priority—and our security, which, until recently, most Canadians may have taken for granted.

In the past, security often was thought of as a largely military affair. In today's complicated and sometimes bewildering world, security has become a much broader issue. Many of the potential threats to Canada's security are nonmilitary in nature, and with the changing times have come an understanding that any defense "demands the involvement of all elements of society in a way in which security in the Cold War did not."¹⁴ Patterns of behavior and beliefs about sovereignty, economics, national interests, national values, social development, the willingness to help others, a drive toward democratic institutions and representational government, the rule of law, quality of life, human rights, and national culture are all parts of the larger equation of security requirements and potential solutions.¹⁵ Like every nation, Canada has her own unique beliefs and points of view.

Sovereignty, Economics, and Security

In the often-quoted words of one of Canada's preeminent military historians, Charles Perry Stacey, "Canada is an unmilitary community. Warlike her people have often been forced to be; military they have never been."¹⁶ Interesting thoughts, especially when one considers that they were crafted by a man who had just completed the definitive historical work of Canada's army at war. This belief did not spring into being in 1955, at the time of publishing. It may not even have been accurate, as our earliest history is quite violent and most of the tipping points have been marked by military accomplishments.¹⁷ But it reflects a point of view that has grown stronger with the passage of time, and there is an argument to be made that it is now an enduring fact of national life within the Canadian consciousness. The idea of "Canada as an unmilitary community" can trace its genesis back to before Confederation, and is closely linked to geography, the cultural heritage of the nation, and to the recognition that most Canadians have seen themselves as living in a country that, in the words of Desmond Morton, is "undefensible and invulnerable."¹⁸

In the past, Canada's enormous borders, vast coastline, relatively sparse population, and extremes of weather made the nation essentially indefensible to a concerted and direct attack from a foreign foe that had the ability to reach

Canada. Without the help and influence of friends and allies, the costs of defending Canada in a sometimes turbulent and dangerous world would have been flatly impossible.¹⁹ As for its invulnerability, Canada has been protected by virtue of one of the most important, perhaps even sacrosanct, American strategic doctrines dating back to 1823, a fact well known to the leadership of our nation from its earliest days. To quote one of our greatest prime ministers, Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

You must not take the militia too seriously, for though it is useful for suppressing internal disturbances, it will not be required for the defense of the country as the Monroe Doctrine protects us from enemy aggression.²⁰

In the intervening decades, this belief has remained relatively constant, although the idea of reciprocity and the obligations of Canada with respect to those American defenders began to creep into the political consciousness of key leaders at least sixty years ago. In a very thoughtful and eloquent monograph written in 1962, one of Canada's premiere strategists, R. J. Sutherland, made the argument that the United States has been, and will always be, vitally concerned with the overall security situation in North America, and "by reasons of geography alone the United States is bound to defend Canada from external aggression almost regardless of whether Canadians wish to be defended. We may call this the involuntary American guarantee . . . this guarantee, however, is subject to certain conditions."²¹ He then went on to quote from a 1938 speech by Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King, one of the most moderate of men ever to lead Canada during a war:

We, too, as a good friendly neighbor, have our responsibilities. One of them is to see that our country is made as immune from possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it, and that should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to make their way, either by land, sea or air, to the United States across Canadian territory.²²

For argument's sake let us assume that the words of Canada's Senator Raoul Dandurand during his 1924 address to the League of Nations are more valid today than they were when first spoken: "We live in a fire-proof house, far from the inflammable materials. A vast ocean separates us from Europe."²³ His direct implication was that Europe—or somewhere other than Canada—was the source of the flames. Consider the scenario of another attack on the United States, on a scale similar to or even larger than 9/11. If it should turn out that the attack was launched by terrorists who gained access to American territory via Canada, the reaction from our American friends might be abrupt and decisive—not only to our economy as the shared frontier goes through the equivalent of a lockdown and approximately C\$1.8 billion in Canadian-U.S. trade per day piles up at the border crossings²⁴, but also to our sovereignty. If Canada cannot adequately defend itself, and cannot live up to its implied

security responsibilities as outlined by Mackenzie King, then others will assume those responsibilities. Quoting once again from Canada's National Security Policy, "There can be no greater role, no more important obligation for a government, than the safety and protection of its citizens."²⁵

The Americans have much the same belief, and they have a recent tendency for overwhelming and dynamic action when large numbers of their citizens are murdered. Canada, for example, could suddenly find itself with its maritime approaches under the firm and direct control of somebody else, and if a nation is not providing for its own defenses, how sovereign is it? Even if one believes that Canada is relatively immune from attack—and this could be a very serious mistake—the same cannot be said for the United States, and there can be no doubt that the defense of Canada and North America is a vital priority, not only for the Canadian Forces, but for all those elements that contribute to national security. Our economic stability and certain measures of our sovereignty depend on it.²⁶ This may be particularly true if the Americans develop the belief that Canada has *not* done all it might have to see that "enemy forces should not be able to make their way, either by land, sea or air, to the United States across Canadian territory." It is in our national interest to do all that we can to help our largest trading partner protect itself, just as they help us.

The question that defies an immediate answer is how much is enough?

Canada's standard of living is among the highest in the world, and our social programs demand a rich and dynamic economy to sustain them. We are a trading nation with roughly 80 percent of our international trade and 40 percent of our gross domestic product tied to the relatively free flow of goods to and from the United States.²⁷ What affects the American economy will also affect us. In much smaller measures, the same is true for the European Union and some of the voraciously expanding economies in the Far East. To put this in terms that can be readily understood, one in four Canadian jobs is based on international trade.²⁸ Both the United States and the European Union are massive trading entities whose commercial interests are truly global in scale. The rich, industrialized nations are increasingly interconnected, not only with each other but with many nations that are suffering the direct effects of the very worst of the new security challenges, as discussed earlier. What happens in a faraway place can and will have an immediate financial impact at home, more so now than ever before. A 5 percent reduction in international trade could cost Canada billions of tax dollars that the various levels of government use to fund our social development and quality-of-life programs.

Let's consider some specific examples. A 15 percent reduction could wipe out the equivalent funding for a significant portion of our health-care system.²⁹ A 30 percent reduction is almost beyond talking about in polite company. The point is that those things that interest us most as Canadians are extraordinarily fragile and vulnerable to what happens elsewhere in our world. It is in our national interest to assist our friends, allies, and trading partners in bringing social progress and eventual stability to those less fortunate than we, wherever

and through whatever means we can, if our quality of life and standards of living are to be maintained. Canada has evolved into a sophisticated and wealthy trading nation whose economy is inextricably linked with global markets. By whatever index one might wish to use, the long-term historical trend of our international contributions of soldiers, civilians, and funds to help others—so that we help ourselves—is not as robust as one might think,³⁰ although there have been some recent and focused successes such as in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

Some Ideas on the Way Ahead

Because most nations naturally are quite parsimonious when it comes time to decide where and how much they can afford to spend to assist others, it would seem to make sense that Canada carefully choose a few selected areas or countries in which our military, diplomatic, and developmental help would most benefit us and our principal trading partners. And we should focus our resources (people, time, and money) accordingly.³¹ The planning for such efforts should be long-term and strategic in nature because the aim is to help ourselves by helping others. All too often our international efforts (military and civilian, time and money) have been a kilometer wide and a centimeter deep, which is a short-term approach that caters to the many special interest groups that make up Canada's international assistance community. But there is no discernible evidence to prove that this scattered approach is particularly successful, although there have been many localized and heartwarming victories. Although it sounds remarkably simplistic, some of the greatest strategists have told us that concentration of effort and selection and maintenance of the aim are keys to eventual victory,³² and one can make the argument that our current, diffuse tactics are not working very well.

The idea of *focusing* a significant portion of our national contributions to international aid and development may well cause shivers from various groups and narrowly specialized organizations that are relatively comfortable with the status quo,³³ but the changing nature of the security threats facing Canada would seem to demand a change in approach to how we help solve the bigger international issues of failed states, despotic warlords, appalling violations of human rights, and the responsibility to protect the defenseless. Some thought should be given to enhancing the coordination of the many key agents *before* a Canadian mission is launched; to concentrate the effort to maximize the effect. The defense, diplomacy, development, and trade concept reflects the nascent stages of a “whole-of-government approach,” and it worked very well in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)–led mission in Afghanistan in 2003–2004. The net should be spread wider to include all those international and nongovernmental organizations that receive Canadian taxpayer dollars. Some of them are ferociously independent and their leadership might well bristle at the idea of someone attempting to coordinate their efforts,³⁴ but the

aim should be to get the best value possible for the taxpayer dollar. The overall objectives of the humanitarian mission should reflect the goals and objectives of the Canadian government, especially if it is contributing most of the money. In the absence of vast additional sums for defense, diplomacy, and development, we have very little choice but to think outside our current boxes. And once again there is no discernible proof that the Canadian electorate is willing to accept a significant decline in social programs to help unfortunate others in faraway lands.³⁵

With respect to the Canadian Forces, a logical and realistic solution would appear to be predicated on modest, flexible, well-equipped, and superbly trained military forces capable of two interconnected activities, namely, domestic and international operations. The emphasis within each of these two activities should be somewhat different than in the past. Several examples spring to mind, but it might be appropriate to choose one from each of the services—while reminding ourselves that the Army, Air Force, and Navy do many things apart from the following activities. An admittedly simplistic explanation of previous Cold War imperatives from 1950 to 1990 had the Army worrying about killing large numbers of tanks somewhere in Europe; the Air Force focusing on detecting and shooting down other manned, high-performance military aircraft; and the Navy working hard on the challenges of finding and destroying enemy submarines. There is no doubt that these skill sets and capabilities still will be required so as to ensure a certain range of interoperability with our allies, and to maintain the government's range of force employment options well into an uncertain future. After all, who can reliably predict what will happen in 2020 and beyond, and the United States may not remain the only superpower for long.³⁶

It can take fifteen years (and sometimes longer) to introduce sophisticated new equipment into the Canadian Forces. This is an issue that points toward the need to rethink how Canada produces its defense capabilities. It is well beyond the scope of this paper, but it underlines the fact that one has to consider very carefully the implications of throwing something away. Once a capability is gone it can take many years to reacquire the equipment, and years after that to train people adequately to have a fighting chance to defend the nation.

But what degree of emphasis—which translates into people, time, and money—do these or other activities currently deserve? Can they be used for something else that is related to a contemporary domestic or international mission, and does it make operational or financial sense to do so? In an increasingly complex and interconnected world, the threat has changed. As that threat changes, so should our emphasis on how best to employ the very finite resources available to defend the nation.

For the reasons of sovereignty and economic stability, as discussed earlier, the first priority of the Canadian Forces should be those capabilities dedicated to the defense of Canada and North America, with an emphasis on providing the surveillance and “teeth” within the larger context of Canada's domestic

security strategy. Particular attention and specialized capabilities to cover the air and maritime approaches to the nation would seem to be of paramount importance—especially when one considers the established trading patterns and the potential threats—as would the ability to interoperate with the military forces of the Americans, with whom we should be working even more closely. Closer integration would increase efficiency, minimize the blind spots, and, to be blunt, enhance the ability to react should something go very badly wrong—*while maintaining sovereignty*. Changes to the ways in which the Canadian domestically focused forces are organized, controlled, trained, and equipped would appear to be in order because the current mechanisms are, of necessity, products of the Cold War, and may not be as joint and integrated with the supported civilian agencies as they could be. Within this domestically focused force, the army reserve component—the militia—might emulate the model already established by the naval and air reserves, which are assigned specific and important roles, responsibilities, and equipment to accomplish their assigned tasks. Inasmuch as the reserves already are located in hundreds of Canadian communities, perhaps they should be the first *military* responders when the next manmade or natural disaster comes our way, while still maintaining a crucial capability to help the regular army on international missions.

The argument that *focused* efforts, across the spectrum of national capabilities, are more important than ever before is as valid for the military as for any other agency. Any military contribution to international operations must be seen as one more tool in the box of capabilities that Canada, in conjunction with her friends and allies, would bring to bear on the crisis.³⁷ What a *focused* military can provide is security and the ability to protect those who are unarmed or vulnerable, enabling the civilian experts to get on with the difficult work of social reconstruction or humanitarian assistance. To do this they need superbly trained and effective “boots on the ground.” Lots of them, and the more the better. What the international community should try to avoid is the temptation to accept contributions of poorly trained, poorly equipped soldiers who are unable to prevent themselves being locked into their compounds, hostages to the local warlords. That having been said, it is true that organizations such as the United Nations can only pick from among the military forces that have been offered by the respective nations, and Canada’s participation in United Nations missions has been declining for some time (although our participation in active NATO missions has been rising). The days when a blue United Nations helmet acted as a guarantor of invulnerability and credibility to lightly equipped international forces are long gone.³⁸ More often than not, the deployed military forces in contemporary operations have to be equipped and ready to fight—if they *look* tough and *are* tough, walk softly but firmly, and are well equipped with a wide range of combat power, and if the rules of engagement are sufficiently robust and flexible to nip incipient problems in the bud before they can explode out of control. The hope is that lethal force may not have to be used—at least, not much.³⁹ Hope, however, is not a recommended planning method.⁴⁰

A disorganized and poorly armed intervention or security force, thrown into the midst of ruthless warlords and hideously complicated venues—within local circumstances where respect for individual rights, due process, or the value of human lives is at a minimum—is asking for nothing but trouble. And the local thugs and predators, some of them armed with weapons ranging from suicide bombs to main battle tanks and heavy artillery,⁴¹ will be only too happy to provide that trouble if they believe they can get away with it.

Using the analogy of a helping hand, the political leaders and diplomats are extending the hand. The civilian humanitarian and development experts are the open palm. The international military forces in stabilization or crisis response missions are the steel fist, wrapped in a covering of understanding of and respect for the local culture and a detailed knowledge of what has to be done to provide security. In this context, security has a variety of interwoven dimensions. One is defensive, or relatively passive. The other is offensive, or relatively aggressive. How much of the steel is exposed, and in which dimension, depends on the local circumstances on a day-by-day basis. What is clear is that the ability to deliver precise, carefully controlled, and deadly combat power is more important than ever before in this era of fourth-generation warfare,⁴² which is a blend of the political, economic, social, military, and technological skills used in unconventional operations to establish whatever the conditions for success might be. (As an aside, who is to say that the whole paradigm of conventional versus unconventional warfare will not reverse itself, prompting the majority of future Western military forces to be equipped, organized, and trained to fight a terrorist or insurgent foe as a matter of routine?) It might be only when called for by a very specific mission that they would organize to fight a large standing army. The conventional threat might be the terrorists and insurgents, and the unconventional threat the massed military formations of anybody silly enough to present such a target-rich environment to the devastating abilities of modern military forces.⁴³

Canadians, both uniformed and civilian, historically have proven themselves to be particularly good at the sorts of complex and dangerous stabilization missions that require superbly trained and robust “boots on the ground.” In the absence of almost unlimited funding, it would seem to make sense to focus on an activity at which the nation excels, and for which there is an ever-increasing demand. The chief of land staff has articulated the United States Marine Corps concept of a three-block war as a guiding concept for the Canadian Army.⁴⁴ In one block of a city, the ground forces are fighting terrorist or warlords that have been preying on the local residents. In the second block, they are patrolling with local security forces and helping them keep order. In the third block, they are providing security and helping humanitarian relief agencies with hundreds of refugees or displaced persons. This concept is equally applicable to air and maritime assets within their respective domains.

For example, a Joint Support ship could be floating offshore, providing readily deployed, self-contained command and control facilities and logistical

support to the ground troops while an escorting frigate is boarding local vessels and checking for terrorists or contraband weapons.⁴⁵ Meanwhile, another frigate may have just launched a surface-to-surface weapon to destroy a cave entrance that shelters murderers who refuse to surrender to a combined team of local and international ground forces. Overhead, a very large transport aircraft engaged in a humanitarian relief flight is bringing much-needed medicines donated by a Canadian pharmaceutical company to the locals, and a heavy helicopter gives a lift to a civilian medical team from a Canadian-funded non-governmental organization that has to get up into the mountains to help some wounded farmers. A smaller, more agile and robust helicopter is escorting the Canadian ambassador and the international coalition commander—who is a Canadian because Canada has focused its international contributions into a couple of mission areas, and is one of the largest force contributors to this particular mission—to a critical meeting with some local power brokers.

The point behind these imagined examples is to argue that the Canadian Forces have to think and operate as a single entity with air, land, and naval assets working as a team both at home and abroad. They have to learn how to work even more closely with all of the elements that can help in achieving the Canadian government's objectives, as well as those of whatever international coalition we may choose to work with. The days of the three traditional services operating in relative isolation from each other, with the Air Force acting as the supporting bridge between the Army and Navy, have to come to an end. This implies changes to the command and control mechanisms, to the way the Canadian Forces equips and trains its teams, and even to the way the troops are educated and view the profession of arms within the larger political and social context in which they will have to operate at home and overseas.

Conclusion

The threats to Canada and Canadians have changed, and the Canadian Forces will have to evolve to meet these emerging dangers, both at home and abroad. There is no proof that the Canadian electorate is convinced that security has precedence over social programs, and it is fair to assume that democratic governments do what the electorate wants them to do. It must, therefore, be further assumed that any additional resources for the Canadian Forces will be augmented in graduated, incremental doses. The inference is that the Canadian Forces will have to initiate whatever changes they can largely from within existing funds—hopefully somewhat enhanced—which points to the need for tough and determined leadership that will lead to some structural and procedural changes, internal reallocations, and the possible elimination or reduction of systems and infrastructure that are no longer vital to deal with the new security challenges that we, as a nation, might face in the future.

The challenges will be immense, especially if one agrees with the idea that the average Canadian may still want more “butter than guns,” where social

programs trump security issues. It is enormously difficult to change large and complex organizations at the best of times, and even more so when the day-to-day business of defense and security has to continue without significant interruption. When combined with the inevitable funding pressures and natural resistance to change from all types of interested observers and participants, life within the Canadian Forces is going to become even more interesting than before. Still, the future looks a lot brighter than it was because, for the first time in *decades*, the funding for the Canadian Forces has risen several years in a row; and there is every indication that this trend will continue. The key, of course, is whether there will be a long-term commitment from all the interested stakeholders for continued and sustained investments into the military instrument, which is a vital component of fulfilling a nation's ultimate responsibility to its citizens. "There can be no greater role, no more important obligation for a government, than the safety and protection of its citizens."⁴⁶ We live in fascinating times.

Endnotes

1. Government of Canada, *Securing an Open Society: Canada's National Security Policy* (Ottawa: Privy Council Office, Apr 2004), p. vii, <http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca>.

2. "Understanding Shifting Attitudes Towards Risk," *The Security Monitor*, <http://www.ekos.com/studies/default.asp>.

3. *Ibid.* Although the trend since 9/11 (2001) is for Canadians increasingly to tolerate moderately restrictive security measures over convenience, and anywhere from a quarter to half of the respondents on various studies are willing to support increased security and defense expenditures, health care seems to remain the number-one concern, followed by a lengthy list of other social development programs.

4. Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada: From Champlain to Kosovo*, 4th ed. (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1999), pp. 70–77.

5. David Bercuson, "Canada-US Defence Relations Post-11 September," in David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson, and Norman Hillmer, eds., *Canada among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus* (Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 125–28.

6. Douglas L. Bland and Sean M. Maloney, *Campaigns for International Security: Canada's Defence Policy at the Turn of the Century* (Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004), pp. 64–66.

7. The two World Wars are two possible exceptions to this general attitude, but even then there was something less than unanimity.

8. Rod B. Byers, "Peacekeeping and Canadian Defence Policy: Ambivalence and Uncertainty," in B. D. Hunt and R. G. Haycock, eds., *Canada's Defence: Perspectives on Policy in the Twentieth Century* (Mississauga, Ont.: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993), pp. 179–96.

9. J. L. Granatstein, *Who Killed the Canadian Military* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 2004), pp. 187–90.

10. J. L. Granatstein, *Canada's Army: Waging War and Keeping the Peace* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), pp. xi–xii, and as outlined in Bland and Maloney, *Campaigns*, chapter 5, which covers budgeting for national defense in the 1990s and is highly recommended reading.

11. Douglas Bland, "Everything Military Officers Need to Know about Defence Policy Making in Canada," in David Rudd, Jim Henson, and Jessica Blitt, eds., *Canadian Strategic Forecast 2000—Advance or Retreat: Canadian Defence in the 21st Century* (Ontario: Canadian

Institute of Strategic Studies, 2000), p. 28. The quote in parentheses is from Canada's longest-serving minister of national defense, Brooke Claxton.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

13. Joseph S. Nye Jr., "US Power and Strategy after Iraq," *Foreign Affairs* 82, 4 (Jul/Aug 2003): 60–73.

14. Christopher Donnelly, "Security in the 21st Century: New Challenges and New Responses," (CND [2002] 090 [FINAL] 21 May 2003, NATO p. 4/14

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 4/14–5/14.

16. C. P. Stacey, *Official History of the Canadian Army in the Second World War: Six Years of War, Vol. 1* (Ottawa: Government of Canada, Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1955), p. 3.

17. Grant Dawson, in David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson, and Norman Hillmer, eds., *Canada among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus*, (Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 191–93.

18. Desmond Morton, "The Military Problems of an Unmilitary People," *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Militaire* 51 (1982): 7.

19. Morton, *Military History*, pp. 70–73. The British tried after the war of 1812, and expended a considerable portion of their defense resources in the attempt, eventually abandoning the effort.

20. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as quoted in George Stanley, *Canada's Soldiers: The Military History of an Unmilitary People* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1960), p. 294. Laurier's use of the term *militia* should be placed in context; he was referring to Canada's military capability, of which the militia formed the vast majority.

21. R. J. Sutherland, "Canada's Long Term Strategic Situation," *International Journal* 17, 3 (Summer 1962): 201–02.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 202.

23. Quoted in an article by Joseph T. Jockel and Joel J. Sokolsky, "Dandurand Revisited; Rethinking Canada's Defence Policy in an Unstable World," *International Journal* 40, 8 (Spring 1993): 1117.

24. Andrew Cohen, *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World*, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2003), p. 110.

25. Government of Canada, *Securing an Open Society*, p. vii.

26. R. B. Byers, *Adelphi Papers*, No. 214, "Canadian Security and Defence: The Legacy and the Challenges," (London: Jane's Publishing, 1986), pp. 17–19.

27. Cohen, *While Canada Slept*, pp. 109–11.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 109.

29. *Ibid.* Canada trades about C\$800 billion worth of imports and exports per year. Fifteen percent of this figure would be C\$120 billion. The potential implications are staggering.

30. Cohen, *While Canada Slept*, pp. 175–78.

31. Jennifer Welsh, *At Home in the World: Canada's Global Vision for the 21st Century* (Toronto: HarperCollins, 2004.), pp. 21–23.

32. Sun-tzu, *The Art of War*, Ralph D. Sawyer, trans. (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1994), pp. 134, 138–40.

33. Cohen, *While Canada Slept*, pp. 173–75.

34. This comment is based on the author's personal experiences on a variety of international missions. The concepts of independence and autonomy for a large number of international and nongovernmental organizations are crucial as they do not wish to be identified with any military or armed group, thus preserving their absolute neutrality and credibility with all local elements. Having said this, civilian aid workers now are victims of choice for some terrorists/warlords/insurgents, because they represent "soft" targets that will generate enormous publicity when they are attacked. If they can be intimidated into withdrawing from the mission area, the appearance is that the terrorists/warlords/insurgents are gaining the upper hand. In fourth-generation warfare (see note 42), perception can be as important as reality.

35. Welsh, *At Home in the World*, pp. 175–76.

36. Evan S. Medeiros and M. Taylor Fravel, “China’s New Diplomacy,” *Foreign Affairs* 82, 6 (2003): 22–35.

37. David Eaves, *From Middle to Model Power: Recharging Canada’s Role in the World* (Toronto: Canada25, 2004), pp. 31–32.

38. Numerous examples exist. In one, the author was a member of the United Nations force in the former Yugoslavia. During the heavy fighting of August 1995 in and around Knin, a rebel stronghold, the lightly equipped blue-beret forces were essentially powerless and many people died. This particular mission failed.

39. Some contributing nations, usually those with limited international experience, may not understand that stabilization or intervention forces may have to be prepared to fight to protect the weak and the innocent. One of the most difficult and delicate tasks an international force has is in trying to determine what contributing nations will actually allow their respective forces to do.

40. Gordon R. Sullivan and Michael V. Harper, *Hope Is Not a Method* (New York: Random House, 1996), pp. 3–12.

41. To use but one example, various warlords had hundreds of heavy weapons in and around Kabul in 2003–2004 (tanks and artillery) until they were removed and placed into ISAF/NATO-monitored cantonment sites.

42. Thomas X. Hammes, *Strategic Forum*, No. 214, “Insurgency: Modern Warfare Evolves into a Fourth Generation,” pp. 1–3, <http://www.ndu.edu/inss>. First-generation warfare was dominated by massed manpower, reaching its peak during the Napoleonic Wars. The second generation was dominated by firepower, culminating in the First World War. The third generation was dominated by maneuver as originated in the Second World War, reaching its peak during Operation Desert Storm. For further information, see http://www.d-n-i.net/second_level/fourth_generation_warfare.htm.

43. Max Boot, “The New American Way of War,” *Foreign Affairs* 82, 4 (2003): 41–58.

44. That was Lt.-Gen. Richard Hillier, chief of land staff, at an Army Conference in Ottawa, Canada, in October 2003.

45. At the risk of stating the obvious, this scenario might not be applicable in some circumstances. For example, Afghanistan is landlocked.

46. Government of Canada, *Securing an Open Society*, p. vii.

Reorganization of the Gendarmerie in Macedonia: An Example of European Military Cooperation, 1904–1914

Yann Galera

The reorganization of the gendarmerie in Macedonia following the Balkan insurrection in 1903 is a significant example of European military cooperation for three reasons: this collaboration attests to a strict distribution of the administration zones by the European powers; its positive results compared with its weak mobilized manpower available; and this international assistance, although modest, strongly compensated for the failing central capacity.¹

Throughout the nineteenth century, the great European powers became involved in the Ottomans' affairs with the secret hope of gaining substantial advantages. The Ottoman Empire—known as “the sick man of Europe” according to Czar Nicholas the First—no longer had the force to cope with foreign interference. The risk of a general confrontation in Europe, however, prevented Austria or Russia from benefiting from this decline. Following the Treaty of Berlin (13 July 1878), the Ottoman Empire's territories in Europe were reduced to Albania, Macedonia, and Thrace.²

Macedonia, populated by Albanians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbs, Turks, and Valaques, as well as by Jewish, Orthodox, and Moslem communities, quickly became a subject of concern for the European powers eager to guarantee the status quo and general peace. Comprising the three provinces (*vilayets*) of Kosovo, Monastir, and Salonika, Macedonia developed the objectives of its neighbors (Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia, and, to a lesser extent, Romania).³ These ambitions supported the confrontations between the Christian majority and the Moslem minority, and devoted their energies to a true war of influence by encouraging interethnic clashes among the various communities of the Orthodox Rite. The 1894 creation of a secret society, the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO), supported by Bulgaria, led to a true escalation in violence and especially to a supposed civil war.

The Ottoman government, which hoped to benefit from competition among the Christian communities, was obliged to intervene to restore the public order and to protect the Turkish community. The government's reaction was brutal: the Ottoman army and the gendarmerie, with Moslem strength, now massacred Christian populations. Order was not restored. The IMRO hoped to benefit from the situation and to prompt the intervention of the European powers by attacks against their economic interests in the Balkans.

Essential Reorganization

After the St. Elijah's Day Uprising (2 August 1903), Europe was shocked by accounts of "Turkish atrocities." The Bulgarian insurrectionists of Macedonia took arms against the Turks, and killed almost six thousand people. In response, the Ottoman power struck back at nearly two hundred villages, killing almost five thousand people. The atrocities committed by the gendarmerie are damning. Following the crisis, all reports from the Ottoman general officers were alarmist in tone. The organization and readiness of the army battalions and companies were haphazard.⁴ The organization of the gendarmerie was also inadequate. Officers and gendarmes did not know how to use their weapons properly, did not have discipline, and in many places did not wear their uniforms. Corruption seemed widespread.

Vienna and Saint Petersburg, whose interests in the Ottoman Empire opposed one another, agreed to a Russo-Austrian neutrality pact on the Balkans and decided to impose in Constantinople a program of reforms that Sultan Abdul Hamid II would have to apply to end the massacres. Franz Josef and Nicholas demanded reforms and the deployment of an "international gendarmerie" under the control of foreign officers. The Mürzsteg reforms of 2 October 1903 ratified this agreement between Russia and Austria-Hungary. France, Great Britain, Italy, and Germany supported Austria-Hungary and Russia in their approach. The European powers decided to agree on the question of Macedonia.⁵

To end the abuses committed by local authorities and to bring peace to the area, the former foreign officers were dismissed. The Mürzsteg agreements stressed that some embassy officers who remained there, especially the Swedes, knew neither the language nor the local customs, and consequently they could not be very useful. Therefore, the task of reorganizing the gendarmerie in the three *vilayets* was entrusted to a foreign general officer familiar with the Middle East. This general officer was serving the imperial government with few European soldiers sharing the different districts. The great powers thus played the role of controllers, instructors, and organizers. In this manner they also were able to supervise the troops and their relationships with the population. If it seemed necessary, the officers could request the addition of certain numbers of foreign and noncommissioned officers.

Furthermore, the Mürzsteg agreements contemplated creating joint committees comprising equal numbers of Christians and Moslems to investigate crimes and disorders after the uprising. Specifically, the agreements required the Turkish government to provide funds for reinstating exiled Christian families in their original localities (particularly in Bulgaria), and for helping Christians whose belongings were lost or destroyed in the Turk massacres. In Christian villages burned by Turkish troops, the reinstated Christian inhabitants were excused from paying taxes for one year. Because most of the abuses had been committed by lower-ranking soldiers, the agreements required that

most of them be discharged or punished. Abdul Hamid, who protested this attack on his sovereignty, was not able to avoid it. Under strong European pressure, the Ottoman government committed itself to reforming its military organization.⁶

An international military commission, chaired by the Italian general Emelio Degiorgis, met at Constantinople in February 1904. Each power in the "European concert" (Austria-Hungary, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russia) sent a delegate, a senior officer, to represent it. France appointed Colonel V erand, who had led the cavalry of the French Republican Guard since 1901. The language of diplomacy being French, V erand was supported at the time of his nomination to the secretariat of the committee. After several weeks of particularly difficult discussions concerning the distribution of officers, the military delegates reached an agreement.⁷ Each of the five powers would be in charge of a zone and would appoint five officers to manage the gendarmes in Macedonia. These gendarmes would be recruited among Moslems and Christians. The foreign officers who were under contract to serve the Ottoman government would restrict themselves to reorganizing the gendarmerie and playing a role in army training.

General Degiorgis, who served the Ottoman government from his office at Salonika, was named to lead the reorganization of the gendarmerie in Macedonia. His military assistants, such as French colonel V erand, remained in the service of their countries. The role of Degiorgis and other officers engaged at the service of the Ottoman government only involved helping the military reorganization. They did not interfere with the military command, although the gendarmerie command remained in the hands of the Ottoman officers.

Role of the International Commission

The zone distribution prompted tough discussions. Only Germany refused to be given a sector. Eventually the division was completed as follows: the Austrian officers received the sector of Uskub (Skopje) in the province of Kosovo, the Russians the sector of Salonika, the Italians the sectors of Monastir and Kastoria, the British the sector of Drama, and the French the sector of Serr es near the Bulgarian border.

A senior officer (assistant soldier), supplied directly by his government and wearing his national uniform, was appointed to each sector. The national soldiers under their orders served the Ottoman Empire and wore the new uniform of the Ottoman gendarmerie. In April 1904 the following French officers were appointed: Captain Lamouche (sapper officer), considered an orientalist; captain of the gendarmerie Biche-Latour; artillery lieutenants Enchery and Massenet; and infantry lieutenant Sarrou. In July the captain of the gendarmerie Foulon replaced Biche-Latour because of poor health. The initial manpower (five for each of the European powers) increased slightly at a later time. In 1906 nearly fifty-five foreign officers were charged with

managing the reorganization of the gendarmerie. The German military representative—the only one who had no assistants—was designated the inspector of the gendarmerie schools.⁸

The first task of the administrators was to purge the local gendarmerie. To replace the departing soldiers, new gendarmerie schools were created. In Salonika, for example, a school for officers opened with volunteer officers and noncommissioned officers from the Ottoman army; another school of pupil-gendarmes trained volunteers taken on contingent.

The service of the gendarmerie in Macedonia mostly was modeled on the French gendarmerie. The French decree of 20 May 1903, which established the gendarmerie's organizational relationships to the various government ministries, was translated into Turkish and then adapted to fit local realities. The old distribution system with centralized forces in a "headquarters" town gave way to the French model of squads (*brigades*) spread across the whole territory. Thus, military forces were well distributed throughout the area. For each administrative unit, the number of Ottoman officers was limited and did not exceed sixty. There were fewer noncommissioned officers than officers. For all of Macedonia, the military force theoretically would number 4,700 men organized into 462 squads.

Problems Remain

Christians and Moslems supported the presence of the foreign officers, but Ottoman authorities tried to block reforms. A March 1906 memorandum by Commandant Delon, the French military attaché for Turkey, emphasized the daily struggles of the gendarmes. Indeed, with this memorandum foreign officers tried to accelerate the reorganization of the international military force. Their complaints were signed by the ambassadors of Austria-Hungary, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia and sent to the Sublime Porte (the sultan's open court).⁹

The memorandum maintained that the gendarmerie intervened in all cases of crime and offense, no matter who the perpetrators were. Additionally, on the orders of General Degiorgis, the gendarmes closely monitored the Macedonian soldiers and civil servants. Gendarmerie patrols were accomplished under extremely difficult conditions: patrols of three or four men worked for eight hours a day and had to cope with a better-armed population. The gendarmes demanded replacement of their old Martini rifles because the dangerous situation they encountered required better weapons. Degiorgis thus demanded that the gendarmes be provided better rifles and revolvers as soon as possible.

The military reorganization commission also asked for a stricter enforcement of laws pertaining to civilian firearms. In the countryside most Moslems were armed with rifles and revolvers. It was noted that gendarmes were expected to control any armed person who did not have a license to carry a weapon. However, the judiciary never applied the law against those who ille-

gally carried firearms. For example, the memorandum pointed out that because rural policemen did not need a weapons license, many people pretended to be members of the rural police. Overall, the gendarmes did not feel supported by the judiciary or the population.¹⁰

The sultan took these requests into account, but the claims of the international commission about the shortfall in military numbers did not go unheeded. At the end of September 1906, 3,789 personnel were present out of a total of 4,581 men. To correct this shortfall, the central service of the reorganization periodically incorporated in the gendarmerie 300 soldiers chosen among the men of any rank present in the army. The soldiers were admitted to the gendarmerie school. The Italian system concerning the recruitment of the pupil-gendarmes had not yet been adopted. Starting in 1907, the Macedonian gendarmerie recruited volunteers for a five-year period of service. To overcome a lack of interest, however, young military conscripts were assigned to the gendarmerie.

Within three years, the behavior of the gendarmes improved. At last, pocket handbooks that summarized rights and duties were distributed to the gendarmes and noncommissioned officers. Blackmail and extortion committed by gendarmes ended when they received better and regular pay and were lodged in barracks at the state's expense.

While armed bands were spreading violence, a certain number of nationalist officers—called the Young Turks—reproached the sultan for his autocracy and rejected Turkey's dependence on Europe. Following a short revolution, the Young Turks took over power on 24 July 1908. They were supported by the army and a lot of mutineers who rebelled against not getting paid. Abdul Hamid was deposed and replaced by his brother Mehmet V in April 1909.

Eager to give Mehmet V evidence of their confidence, the five powers offered to evacuate Macedonia. The Young Turks in power then asked the French, British, and Italians to extend their mission of reorganizing the gendarmerie to the whole empire. Colonel Baumann of the gendarmerie succeeded Vêrand in March 1908, becoming inspector general of the Ottoman gendarmerie and being promoted to brigadier general.

The counterrevolution began in April 1909. The gendarmerie in Macedonia played a large role because it dispatched nearly five hundred gendarmes charged to maintain the public order in Constantinople. This reduced the number of Salonika gendarmes, but made it possible to constitute a serious core for the reorganization of the gendarmerie in the capital. Beginning in July 1909, the central service of the Ottoman gendarmerie was transferred from Salonika to Constantinople, and the reorganization of the Macedonian gendarmerie extended to the units from the Ottoman Empire in Europe, Asia, and Africa. The number of temporarily assigned officers decreased quickly. In conflict with Turkey, the Italians withdrew in 1911.¹¹ From 1912 on, only two countries were still represented on the commission—Great Britain and France. The number of temporarily assigned officers was twenty-three in 1912 and fourteen in 1914.

The actions of these officers, dispersed in stations isolated from the Levant and now falling under full Ottoman sovereignty, remained limited; all officers were recalled in August 1914.

While the reorganization of Macedonia's gendarmerie took place under the initiative and control of the European powers, beginning in 1909 the general reorganization was at the behest of only the Ottoman government. On the eve of the First World War, the Ottoman government undertook to suitably train and manage its gendarmes. In 1910, nearly 650 officers (out of 1,200) and nearly 10,000 troops (out of 30,000) followed the new teaching as exemplified in the new schools of gendarmerie.¹²

In summary, despite serious issues (restricted funds, recruitment difficulties, and resistance of civil servants of the Ancien Régime), the results of the military reorganization were mostly positive, thanks to the agreement among the members of the various missions. This international cooperation was a good model for the Ottoman government, which precociously knew enough to reorganize its gendarmerie and recover its full sovereignty.

Endnotes

1. Bernard Mouraz, "Des gendarmes en Macédoine. Le déclin de l'Empire ottoman, 1904–1911," *Armées d'aujourd'hui* 249 (Apr 2000): pp. 84–86.
2. Pierre Renouvin, *La crise européenne et la Première Guerre mondiale (1904–1918)* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1969), pp. 27–30.
3. Gabriel Effendi Noradounghian, *Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'Empire ottoman*, t. IV, 1878–1902 (Paris: Librairie Cotillon, 1903), pp. 175–92.
4. Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Correspondance politique et commerciale (nouvelle série), vol. 415 (Macédoine, gendarmerie internationale), sous-série Turquie.
5. MFA, *Documents diplomatiques. Affaires de Macédoine. 1903–1905* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1905), no. 409, annexes.
6. MFA, Commission de publication des documents relatifs aux origines de la guerre de 1914, *Documents diplomatiques français (1871–1914)*, 2d série (1901–1911), vol. 4 (5 Oct 1903–8 Apr 1904) (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1932), no. 38, pp. 53–54.
7. MFA, Correspondance politique et commerciale (nouvelle série), sous-série Turquie, no. 415, Gendarmerie internationale.
8. Lt.-Col. Léon Lamouche, "La réorganisation de la gendarmerie ottomane," *Questions diplomatiques et coloniales. Revue de politique extérieure* 31, 340 (16 Apr 1911): 470–80.
9. Rapport du commandant Delon, attaché militaire à l'Ambassade de France en Turquie à Monsieur le Ministre de la Guerre (Etat-Major de l'armée–2e Bureau), Constantinople, 17 Jul 1906, Service Historique de la Défense, Archives du Ministère de la Défense, 7 N 1635, rapports 1905–1908.
10. Lamouche, *Gendarmerie réorganisée des Trois-Vilayets de Roumélie. Rapport sur la marche et la réorganisation pendant les années 1904 à 1908 et la situation actuelle de la gendarmerie réorganisée*. Angers, Germain et G. Grassin, 1908, p. 118.
11. Lamouche, "La réorganisation de la gendarmerie ottomane."
12. Correspondance politique et commerciale (nouvelle série), 1897–1914, vol. 430.

Glossary

CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CMD	Council of Ministers of Defense
CMH	Center of Military History
COMECON	Council for Mutual Economic Assistance
CPC	Communist Party of Czechoslovakia
CST	Collective Security Treaty
EU	European Union
FB/UNO	the French battalion sent to fight in the Korean War
FCP	French Communist Party
FRG	Federal Republic of Germany
FRY	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
HPA	Hungarian People's Army
HWP	Hungarian Workers' Party
IJN	Imperial Japanese Navy
IMRO	Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
JAF	Joint Armed Forces
JMF	Joint Military Forces
KFOR	Kosovo Force
K.u.K.	Kaiserlich und Koeniglich [Imperial Austrian and Royal Hungarian Navy]
MHWG	Military History Working Group
MLF	multilateral nuclear force
MNBR	multinational brigade
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OKW/OKH	Oberkommando der Wehrmacht/Oberkommando des Herres [German Army High Command]
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PCB	Political Consultative Board [Warsaw Pact]
PfP	Partnership for Peace
PfPC	Partnership for Peace Consortium
RCN	Royal Canadian Navy
RCP	Romanian Communist Party
RMC	Russian military contingent
SACEUR	Supreme Allied Commander in Europe
SCMP	Staff for Coordination of Military Partnership [CIS]

UN	United Nations
UNC	United Nations Command
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
VKP(b)	Communist Party of the Soviet Union [Bolsheviks]
WP	Warsaw Pact

Selected Bibliography

- Ady, Zoltán. "The Military Political Situation and Expectable Behaviour of Austria." Ph.D. diss. Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library, Budapest, 2000.
- Arbatova, N. K. "Relations between Russia and the West after Kosovo Crisis." Number 6. In Russian. Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 2000.
- Beav, Jordan. "The Evolution of the Warsaw Pact Organizational Structure and Decision Making Process, 1955–1969." Paper presented at the Military History Working Group Third International Seminar, "NATO and Warsaw Pact—The Formative Years 1948–1968," Prague, 7–11 April 2003.
- Békés, Csaba. "Hungary and the Warsaw Pact, 1954–1989: Documents on the Impact of a Small State within the Eastern Bloc." 2004. Available at www.isn.ethz.ch/php.
- Dimitrov, Dimitar. "The Restructuring and Conversion of the Bulgarian Defense Industry during the Transition Period." Paper 22, Bonn: International Center for Conversion, 2002.
- Gus'kova, E. Yu. "History of Yugoslav Crisis (1990–2000)." In Russian. Moscow, 2001.
- Harrison, Mark. "New Postwar Branches (1): Rocketry." In John Barber and Mark Harrison, eds., *The Soviet Defense-Industry Complex from Stalin to Khrushchev*. London: Macmillan Press, 2000.
- International Institute for Strategy. *Numbers of Military Balance from 1970 to 1990*. London, 1990.
- Ivashov, Colonel-General L. G., former head of Main Office for International Military Cooperation of Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation. Interview, in Russian. *Independent Military Review*, no. 14, 2003.
- Kovács, Gábor. *The Structure and Service System of the Austrian Armed Forces*. Budapest: Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library, 2000.
- Kriventsov, Major-General N., commander of the Russian military contingent in Kosovo. Interview, in Russian. *Krasnaya zvezda (Red Star)*, 23 January 2003.
- Meisel, János. *A KGST 30 éve (Thirty Years of the COMECON)*. Budapest: Kossuth Press, 1982.
- Mórocz, Lajos. "Major Factors Determining the Change of Military Doctrines. Development and Trends in the Military Doctrine of the Hungarian People's Republic." 1988.

- Morozov, Yu V., V. V. Glushkov, and A. A. Sharavin. "The Balkans of Today and Tomorrow: Military and Political Aspects of Peacekeeping." In Russian. 2001.
- Nikitin, A. I. *Peacekeeping Operations: Concepts and Practice*. In Russian. Scientific Reports Series, 117. Moscow, 2000.
- Palotás, István. *The Tactical Use of Forces*. Budapest: Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library, 2000.
- Pohl, Árpád. *The Logistic Support of the Austrian Federation Army (Bundesheer)*. Budapest: Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library, 2001.
- Qujat, General G., chair of NATO Military Committee. Interview, in Russian. *Krasnaya zvezda (Red Star)*, 26 February 2004.
- Simonov, Nikolai. "New Postwar Branches (2): The Nuclear Industry." In John Barber and Mark Harrison, eds., *The Soviet Defense-Industry Complex from Stalin to Khrushchev*. London: Macmillan Press, 2000.
- SIPRI 2000 Yearbook. "Armaments, Disarmament, and International Security." In Russian. Moscow, 2001.
- Stefancsik, Ferenc. *The Military Geography of the Neighbouring Countries: The Areas Near the Borders*. Budapest: Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library, 2001.
- Uhl, Matthias. "Nuclear Warhead Delivery Systems for the Warsaw Pact, 1961–65: Documents from the Russian State Archives of Economics and the German Federal Military Archives on the Reorganization and Modernization of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Bloc." 2002. Available at www.isn.ethz.ch/php.
- United Nations Security Council. Resolution #1244 of June 10, 1999. World after Kosovo. In Russian. Collection of Abstracts, pp. 238–47. Moscow, 2001.
- Valentine. Lieutenant-General M., commander of Kosovo Force. Interview, in Russian. *Independent Military Review*, no. 30, 2002.
- Varga, Kálmán. "The Military Geographical Characteristics of the North Italian and Danube Valley Direction of Operations in Austrian Territory and Their Impact on the Activity of Tactical and Tactical Reconnaissance Forces." Ph.D. diss. Zrínyi Miklós National Defence University Academic Library, Budapest, 2000.
- Vasilieva, N., and V. Gavrilov. "The Balkan Dead End? Historical Fate of Yugoslavia in the Twentieth Century." In Russian. Moscow, 2000.
- Zhirnov, O. A., and T. V. Ivleva. "Kosovo Crisis and Its Consequences for World Community: Analytical Review." In Russian. Moscow, 2002.

Contributors

Lieutenant Emmanuelle Braud, a Ph.D. candidate, is affiliated with the French Defense Historical Service.

Colonel Oleg Belosludtsev, Ph.D., is deputy chief of the Military Encyclopedia Department, Russian Federation Ministry of Defense Institute of Military History in Moscow. His areas of interest are military history of CIS countries, local conflicts, and international military cooperation. **Leonid Gornik** translated his paper from the original Russian.

Yann Galera is a lieutenant in the Gendarmerie Department of the French Defense Historical Service. He earned a Ph.D. in contemporary history from the Sorbonne University in Paris. His degree dealt with the representations of French military men throughout the twentieth century. He has written several articles about the image of military institutions in the press, music, and cinema, and has published books about the French riot of February 1934 and about the press at the end of the nineteenth century.

Thomas S. C. Garrett, Ph.D., is command sergeant major at the U.S. Army Center of Military History in Washington, D.C. He is a member of the Army Reserve, and in 2003 he served in Operation IRAQI FREEDOM as a member of the Military History Group, Combined Forces Land Component Command. In civilian life he is a professor of history in the University of Kentucky Community College System, teaching classes in European and Middle Eastern history. Garrett is the author of *Iron Cross and Swastika: An Historical Interpretation of Military Symbolism in the Third Reich* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1990), and he has written many reviews and commentaries on historical, military, and diplomatic topics.

Pál Germuska is secretary of the Institute for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution in Budapest, where he has worked since 1995. He earned a Ph.D. in the history of economy and society from Eötvös Lóránd University in Budapest. He has written extensively on the history of the Hungarian socialist cities and the history of the Hungarian defense industry during the socialist era. His paper is part of a research project on the Hungarian defense industry from 1948 to 1980. The project is supported by the Bolyai János Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Ronald G. Haycock, Ph.D., is professor of military history and war studies at the Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario. During his thirty years at the college, he has served as chair of the War Studies Graduate Program, head of the Department of History, and dean of the College of Arts. He is the author of books and scholarly articles, and he specializes in Canadian defense policy, war and technology, strategy, and strategic thinkers.

Michael A. Hennessy, Ph.D. is an associate professor of history and war studies at the Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, and chairs the Department of History. His teaching fields include war technology, intelligence, foreign policy, naval policy, and low-intensity conflict. He is the former deputy project director of the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, and remains a research fellow there. He served as the founding editor of the *Canadian Military Journal/Revue militaire canadienne*, and is a member of its editorial and advisory boards. He also serves on the editorial board of *Defence Studies: The Journal of the Joint Services Command and Staff College* (U.K.). Hennessy's publications include *Strategy in Vietnam: The Marines and Revolutionary War in I Corps, 1965–1971* (with B. J. C. McKercher), *The Operational Art: Developments in the Theory of War*, and *War in the Twentieth Century: Reflections at Century's End* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1997, 1996, and 2003, respectively).

Sergiu Iosipescu is senior researcher and chief of the Department of Military History in the Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History in Bucharest, Romania. He holds a Ph.D. in medieval history from the Romanian Academy, Institute of History. He is a historian and archaeologist specializing in the Middle Ages and early modern times.

Lieutenant Colonel János Jakus is a military historian with the Hungarian Army Military History Institute and Museum.

B. J. C. McKercher is professor of international history and chair of war studies at the Royal Military College of Canada. He is an expert on British foreign and defense policy from 1870 to 1941, and has written widely on the Anglo-American relationship and the North Atlantic Triangle from the Boer War to the Second World War. His book *Transition of Power: Britain's Loss of Global Preeminence to the United States, 1930–1945* (Cambridge University Press, 1999) has been released in paperback.

Dieter Krüger, Ph.D., studied history, political science, educational science, and philosophy at Marburg University in Marburg, Germany, and at the European University Institute in Florence, Italy. He has served as archivist and section chief at the Freiburg Military Archive, and as head of

the former Berlin Document Center. He is now a historian at the Military History Research Institute in Potsdam, Germany. **Birgit Krüger** translated his paper from the original German.

Major Olivier Lahaie works for the Historical Service, French Ministry of Defense, Chateau de Vincennes in France.

Major General Andrew Leslie is a doctoral candidate at the Royal Military College of Canada. He has command experience in domestic and international operations at regimental, brigade, area, contingent, and joint task force levels.

Colonel Mikhail G. Lyoshin is deputy chief of the Foreign Military History Department at the Russian Federation Ministry of Defense Institute of Military History in Moscow. **Leonid Gornik** translated his paper from the original Russian.

Major Tamás Nagy, Ph.D., serves as an officer in the Hungarian Army and teaches military history and defense policy at Zrinyi Miklos National Defense University in Budapest. His special field of research is the Cold War period.

Colonel Petre Otu holds a Ph.D. in military history. He is the deputy director of the Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History in Bucharest, and president of the Romanian Commission for Military History. Otu has written courses and handbooks on military history, geopolitics, and geostrategy. He has written, cowritten, or coordinated more than thirty books; and has written one hundred studies and scholarly articles on Romanian military policy in the twentieth century, the evolution of the Romanian military establishment, and international military relations.

Ferenc Pollmann is affiliated with the Institute and Museum of Military History in Budapest, Hungary.

Lieutenant Colonel Anatoliy Prokopiev, Ph.D., is senior researcher in the Military History Research Section of the G. S. Rakovski Defense and Staff College in Sofia, Bulgaria. Before that, he taught military history at the military academy in Veliko Tirmovo. His recent publications include *History of the Guard Unit in Bulgaria* and *Bulgarian Anti-Debarquement Defense during WW I and WW II*.

Carmen Rijnoveanu is a scientific researcher at the Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History in Bucharest. Among her publications are *Romania–NATO: Chronology 1989–2004* (Bucharest: Military Pub-

lishing House, 2004); and “The Attacks of September 11: Consequences on the North Atlantic Alliance’s Development,” and “Romania’s Stand on the Czechoslovak Crisis in 1968,” published in *Review of Military History*, 2002 and 2003, respectively.

Robert S. Rush, Ph.D. (Command Sergeant Major, U.S.A. [Ret.]), served in leadership positions from squad leader through continental army sergeant major, with assignments in regular, ranger, light, and mechanized infantry units. Upon retirement, he attended Ohio State University and earned his doctoral degree in military history. He is the author of seven books, including *Hell in Hürtgen Forest: The Ordeal and Triumph of an American Infantry Regiment* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2001) and *GI: The US Infantryman in World War II* (Oxford, U.K.: Osprey, 2002), and two chapters in *Story of the Noncommissioned Officer Corps* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2005). He also has had articles published in *Revue internationale d’histoire militaire*, *Historie A Vojenství*, *Armed Forces and Society*, *Military Review*, *Army History*, *On Point*, *Army Trainer*, and *The NCO Journal*. Rush is a historian with the U.S. Army Center of Military History, where he has written and spoken extensively on unit rotation and individual replacement policies. He currently serves as coordinator for the Partnership for Peace Consortium’s Military History Working Group.

Johannes Berthold Sander-Nagashima, Ph.D., is a commander in the German Navy and works as a historian in the Military History Research Institute in Potsdam. He is the author of a forthcoming book detailing the history of the German Navy from 1955 to 1970.

Lieutenant Rüdiger Schiel, a member of the Bundeswehr, is a qualified political scientist. Following course work at Bundeswehr University in Munich in the 1990s and troop assignments between 1998 and 2004, he is now a staff member at the Military History Research Institute in Potsdam, Germany.

Erwin A. Schmidl, Ph.D., is head of the Department of Contemporary History at the Institute for Strategy and Security Policy of the Austrian National Defense Academy, Vienna. His areas of research are modern military, political, colonial, and cultural history (including the evolution of international peace operations from the nineteenth century) and Cold War history. In 1995–1996 Schmidl was senior fellow at the United States Institute of Peace in Washington, D.C. Before that he served with the United Nations observer mission in South Africa. His books include *Going International in the Service of Peace: Austrian Participation in International Peace Operations Since 1960* (Cologne: Vehling, 2005) and *Peace Operations Between War and Peace* (London: Frank Cass, 2000).

Mikhail Stefanski, Ph.D., is a researcher at the Institute of Military History, Bratislava, Slovak Republic. His area of interest is Czechoslovak and Slovak history since 1945, particularly the Cold War and the 1968 armed intervention into Czechoslovakia. **Leonid Gornik** translated his paper from the original Russian.

Andreas Toussas is a vice admiral of the Hellenic Navy. He graduated from the Naval Academy of Greece, and has taken professional training courses at the Hellenic National Defense College and at the Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management (United States). He has held leadership posts in various naval and fleet units, in the Hellenic Navy General Staff, and in the Hellenic National Defense General Staff. He has served as assistant Greek naval attaché at the Greek embassy in Washington, D.C., and has taken part in international peace operations in the Balkans, with the NATO-led Kosovo Force, where he was responsible for implementing Operation HARVEST. Since 2004 he has been a research member in the Hellenic Commission on Military History working on aspects of Greek military history. He has authored and presented papers on military history at several conferences.