About This Journal

"Modus Vivendi" is Latin for "way of life," but in international studies parlance, it signifies "a state of affairs where two opposing parties agree to differ." Therefore, we feel that *Modus Vivendi* is an appropriate name for a journal dedicated to an intelligent discussion of global issues, and this journal is designed to be an open forum for any views concerning international affairs.

Modus Vivendi selects articles which are submitted anonymously by students of Rhodes College. The evaluation process is extensive and each paper is graded by the editors according to the highest standards of research and scholarship. In this way, *Modus Vivendi* serves as a vehicle for recognizing outstanding papers pertaining to international affairs. Further, it is one of only a few journals which recognize undergraduate scholarship in this field.

This year's journal contains articles covering vastly different cultures, time periods, and issues. This is the essence of international studies- to analyze and learn from other societies. We are often struck at how international affairs pervades the daily life of the intellectual. The international environment affects the way in which students of all disciplines view themselves and others. The international political arena provides countless discussion topics, among all people, not just I.S. majors. To arrive at some level of understanding in this arena, we must have open discussion of these issues. Further, an intellectual eclecticism is necessary for the adequate study of international phenomena. Thus, we encourage students of all disciplines to submit to this journal.

Special thanks must be given to the faculty advisor, Dr. Frank Mora, and Dr. Andrew Michta, for his support and internet genius. We would also like to thank Brenda Somes for her continuing support, understanding and patience with our use of her computer. This journal could not have been possible without the technical assistance of Taylor Armstrong. Of course, thanks goes out to the entire International Studies Department and the Rhodes College Student Government for their support.

Although it has taken many long hours of reading, re-reading, editing, re-editing and printing, the process itself has been worthwhile and rewarding. We hope that you enjoy the result. Also, please visit us via the International Studies Web Page at "http://www.is.rhodes.edu".

The Editors of *Modus Vivendi*

American Intervention in Russia:

A Study of Wilsonian Foreign Policy

Christopher Palazzolo

Some nine months after the Bolshevik Revolution in the midst of WWI, Allied forces intervened in the Russian civil war, including "associate" American troops. This intervention would last beyond the armistice in late 1918 until early 1920, with Japanese forces refusing to relinquish their military forces in Siberia until 1922. Many considered this event to be a minor aberration in American foreign policy, but its importance should not be ignored, as American participation in intervention would sour American-Russian relations for quite some time. In fact, this diplomatic failure is often entirely ignored in American foreign policy texts. The question has always remained why President Wilson became involved with such an ill-fated and misguided scheme.

As a result, a great number of divergent interpretations of Wilson's decision to intervene have appeared. There are those scholars, for example, who explain Wilson's decision as a means of defeating imperialist Germany and those who believe that Wilson simply participated in Allied plans in order to be seen as a "good ally." Still more accentuate Wilson's foreign policy towards the Far East and his attempt to curb Japan's expansionary tendencies. The most compelling of the interpretations center upon Wilson's feelings toward Bolshevism as well as his war aims. Many of these analyses, it should be noted, deal primarily with the Siberian intervention and fail to explain the North Russia intervention at Murmansk and Archangel. Thus, it seems necessary to include both campaigns in any further examination of these events, though emphasis will be placed upon the more significant Siberian aspect.

President Wilson's main objective was first and foremost to win the war against Germany, but once this goal had been achieved, American troops remained in Russia, threatening the Bolsheviks. Consequently, there must have been some other motivating factor for Wilson to compel him to aid in intervention. Wilson was also avowedly anti-Bolshevist and refused any dealings with the Bolshevik government in hopes that a democratic Russia would emerge. Thus, Wilson may have also seen in intervention a means to assist those forces trying to depose the Bolshevik regime. The possibility then exists that Wilson was searching for the opportune moment to intervene. True, Wilson was under great duress and pressure from his Allied partners, but he was also keenly aware of the counterproductive effects of an ill-advised intervention. Another important subsidiary element in Wilson's decision to intervene surrounds his relations with Japan, which would have been the only Allied partner able to spare troops for an intervention. Though some scholars have denied Wilson's apprehensions of Japanese designs in Manchuria and Western Siberia and find that revisionist theories have falsely attached a post-WWII stigma to Japanese-American relations, the evidence does seem to point more in the direction of the contrary.[1]

The brief analytical background above can be reduced to a more simple thesis that this study will consider in more detail. The primary objectives of intervention centered around the successful pursuit and completion of the war, especially after the Brest-Litvosk treaty in March 1918. However, behind this additional effort to defeat Germany was an anti-Bolshevik sentiment that compelled Wilson, in the words of one author, not to produce a counterrevolution in Russia, but rather "to prevent the establishment [and consolidation] of Bolshevism."[2] Wilson's relations towards Japan should be emphasized as well, not so much in light of his fears over her imperialist ambitions, but rather as it relates to the strengthening of the Bolshevik regime. Thus, it seems that at first one can not separate the influence of Wilson's anti-Germanism with his avowed anti-Bolshevism in his diplomacy towards Russia, yet once the war with Germany was completed, the fight against Bolshevism became dramatically clear.[3] This analysis will be completed by looking at Wilson's thought process concerning intervention from the very inception of the idea (immediately after the Bolshevik coup) until its actual fruition almost a year later, by way of documents concerning the possibilities of intervention and other historical evidence.

When President Wilson called for a declaration of war against Germany on April 2, 1917, he praised the fortuitous events occurring in Russia since March.[4] These "wonderful and heartening" circumstances had arisen with the overthrow of the Tsar in March and his replacement with a supposedly more democratic regime under the auspices of Alexander Kerensky. Wilson took a very idealistic approach to the new government, for it represented the final realization of the latent democratic desires of the Russian people, repressed under Tsarism. Behind these accolades of principle, though, was the "naïve supposition" that the new democratic elements would inspire the Russians to fight with "renewed zest" against German autocracy and imperialism.[5] However, almost as soon as the U.S. entered the war, the Russians bowed out as the war-wearied sentiments of the Russian people became evident. The last surge of Russian morale failed miserably in an attempt to crush the Austro-Hungarian forces in the summer of 1917.[6] It was due to this war fatigue that the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin and Trotsky, were so easily able to depose Kerensky's regime, already quite weak, by November of the same year. The initial violent responses to the coup were a foreshadowing of Allied plans to intervene. The Allies, at first, were not greatly shocked by the suppression of the democratic Kerensky regime as they were by the Bolshevik plan to remove Russia from the war effort and to forge a general armistice. This view of the Bolsheviks in light of the anti-German struggle begins the merging of anti-Bolshevist and anti-German sentiment in U.S. foreign policy towards possible intervention in Bolshevik Russia. Thus, any attempt to persuade Russia back into the war would inherently be an integration of anti-Bolshevik and anti-German foreign policies.

Despite Lenin and Trotsky's attempts to organize a general armistice, the Allies were indignant to such an idea because at that point in the war, such a peace with Germany would be seen as a blatant capitulation to the enemy's imperialist designs.[7] This rejection by the Allies did not prevent the Russians from entering into their own talks with Germany at Brest-Litvosk in December. Almost immediately after the commencement of these talks, calls for intervention were voiced, particularly by the Japanese and the

French. Early calls for intervention by the Japanese were shunned by the Wilson administration, which was not only suspicious of Japanese intentions in the area, but also of the possible counterproductive aspects of intervention. Wilson feared that intervention would help the Bolsheviks gain more sympathy among the Russian people, who would see intervention as an attack upon Russian territorial integrity.[8]

Instead, Wilson reacted to the coup by refusing to recognize the Bolshevik regime, which would help later on to actually justify the need for intervention. The proposed goals of the French/Japanese intervention strategy were painted in terms of the war effort. The objectives centered around reestablishing the Eastern Front and preventing German acquisition of war supplies in North Russia which would allow them to penetrate into Siberia.[9] Beneath these war aims was an evident hatred and disgust for the Bolsheviks who were thwarting the democratic beliefs of the Russian people and betraying them to an autocratic Germany. President Wilson was certainly of this anti-Bolshevist persuasion, but felt that intervention would be useless at the time, since there was still hope that the talks with Germany would break down and that Russia would rejoin the war. Thus, some possible conciliation was possible if Wilson could only "reform" the Bolsheviks into "liberal" democrats. Wilson attempted this by restating the war aims in his Fourteen Points (the sixth being devoted solely to the Russian situation[10]) and offering the Bolsheviks a more "purified Entente."[11] This address to the Bolsheviks served as a way to counteract the Bolshevik publication of the Allied secret war treaties and be more "open" concerning the Allied purpose in the conflict.

Wilson earlier agreed to support anti-Bolshevik groups instead of any sort of intervention, in hopes that these factional powers would gain strength with U.S. aid. Secretary of State Lansing, in a memorandum to Wilson in December 1917, just a month after the November Revolution, pointed out that if the U.S. allowed the Bolsheviks to stay in power, it would signal the final "elimination of Russia as a fighting force" which would in turn prolong the misery of the war "for two or three years."[12] Lansing believed that if the Bolsheviks could be supplanted, the Russian armies could be reorganized by spring or summer of 1918 and reconstitute the Eastern Front. Colonel House, an aid to Wilson, also believed that this would be the best means to compel Russia back into the conflict. Wilson listened carefully to the words of advice from Lansing and House, since he held these two officials in quite high regard (although he still had somewhat of a grudge with House over U.S. entry into WWI). The most promising faction that seemed poised to overthrow the Bolsheviks was located in South Russia under the leadership of General Kaledin. However, as it remained illegal to extend aid to an unrecognized political group, Wilson and Lansing had to bypass Congress and to indirectly offer aid to Kaledin through the British and French. The aid never quite reached the general; yet, the initial movement to assist the anti-Bolshevist groups demonstrates how the anti-Bolshevist sentiment of Wilson and his advisers was mixed with his desires to defeat Germany. If the Bolsheviks could be overthrown and replaced with a pro-Western regime, not only would the war against Germany be revived, but the Russian people would be able to express their democratic traditions. According to some, it was even the "missionary duty" of the U.S. to deliver the Russians from the atheistic communists.[13] Diplomatic non-recognition then would serve as the best course of action at the present

time to delegitamize the current regime and continue Wilson's delusive faith in Russian democratic desires. It would not be until November 1918, though, with the signing of the armistice, that the underlying anti-Bolshevist rationale would become so overt.

Wilson was indeed fearful of the first mention of Japanese plans in Siberia, since Japan demanded the freedom to act alone in the pacific rim. Wilson's fears need to be seen, though, in relation to his anti-Bolshevism and anti-Germanism. If Japan were to act alone as it intended, Russo-Japanese war memories might resurface, pushing Russia into the arms of Germany. In a declaration from the U.S. government in March, the administration expressed his concern that Japanese intervention would create "a hot resentment" in Russia and would "play into the hands of the enemies of Russia, and particularly into the hands of the enemies of the Russian Revolution."[14] The revolution in question was the "true" March Revolution under Kerensky. This statement therefore provides a good example of Wilson's anti-Bolshevist tendencies. His anxieties are concentrated upon the weakening of the authoritarian Bolshevik regime. Yet, Wilson's policy towards intervention had more than one idea behind it. One finds that Wilson is arguing against lone Japanese intervention not only because it would strengthen the Bolsheviks, but also because it would be detrimental to the struggle against Germany.

Much speculation also surfaced that the Bolsheviks were simply on the payroll of the Germans as subversive agents.[15] This rampant belief among many Americans added to the Wilson composite policy of defeating the Germans by defeating the traitorous Bolsheviks. The forged Sisson documents published in early 1919 were supposed "undeniable evidence" of Bolshevik betrayal.[16] The argument then went that once Germany was defeated, Russia would no longer be under her subjection and would be able to realize once again its democratic goals.[17] Thus, it seems that "throughout 1917 and 1918 the dedication to fighting Germany had distracted and distorted American attitudes toward Russia."[18] The need for a postwar liberal order became the principle concern for Wilson who knew such an ideal world could not exist with the continued presence of the German imperialists and the Bolsheviks. Thus, it was in the interest of the moral and superior U.S. state to remove such immoral threats from power. This moralism and ethical frame of reference would eventually have a tremendous impact on Wilson's decision to intervene.

When the Bolsheviks finally signed the treaty with Germany at Brest-Litvosk in March of 1918, the calls for U.S. participation in an Allied intervention became more vehement, since almost instantly after the signing, the Germans began their new offensive in the West. Messages from State Department officials still in Russia (since the March Revolution) urged the Wilson administration to oppose the Bolsheviks and support a policy in support of anti-Bolshevik and anti-German elements (which were seen as intrinsically tied).[19] At the same time, there were numerous appeals emanating from "various centers of Russian anti-Bolshevism inside and outside of Russia" that wanted a reestablishment of the March Revolution and to "resume the war as an ally of the Entente."[20] At the time of the signing there was an actual Bolshevik invitation to the Allies to station themselves at Murmansk, in order to protect wartime ammunition as the Germans began to threaten Finland. This early invitation was accepted by Britain and

France who sent some troops to the North Russian port, but not so much by the U.S., who decided to only send one warship until further notice.[21]

At this point, Wilson considered a joint Japanese-American expedition in Siberia. He began searching for a way to recognize the Russian people in a manner that would be "palatable" to them, in order to assuage his moral anxieties.[22] He remained opposed to any intervention if it was not directly desired by the Russian people. On March 10, he had informed Russia of "America's desire to be of help to them."[23] The message elicited no positive response from any group. Wilson knew that if intervention ensued without such a request that it would be seen as an invasion and prove to be disastrous. Despite such misgivings, Wilson believed that he knew the deep aspirations of the Russian people. He knew that they wanted assistance in overthrowing the Bolsheviks. Wilson preferred, as he often did, to view reality in light of his own moral beliefs (possessed by all "good" peoples), rather than concerning himself with the actual circumstances at hand.[24] Wilson was consequently dealing with a moral dilemma at the time since any interference in Russia could be viewed as a breach of self-determination. Yet, Wilson regarded Bolshevism as a subversion of his moral beliefs. Despite his misgivings, Wilson chose to honor his moral axiom, at least until intervention could be organized in a more pragmatic and non-invasion like manner.[25] Wilson still found himself susceptible though to his perception as a "bad ally." At this point, he also began to oscillate between the attitudes of Colonel House a moderate anti-Bolshevic, and the more staunch communism of his trusted Secretary of State, Lansing.

Often Wilson had been opposed to the intervention of France and Britain since he felt that they had some sort of ulterior economic or imperialist motives that would have the counterproductive effect of pushing the Russian people toward the Bolsheviks.[26] Furthermore, he did not see the practical feasibility in the reestablishment of an Eastern Front, as espoused by his wartime partners, since Japan would not go any further west than Lake Baikal.[27] Hence, any sort of intervention would be arranged without help from the French or British. However, Wilson did become more inclined to intervention when he heard of the possibility that the anti-Bolshevik forces, fearing that no aid would come from the Allies, were contemplating joining the Germans.[28] Despite this change in inclination, Wilson remained hesitant in calling for any sort of intervention. He continued this policy for the most part, despite his desires to prevent the consolidation of the Bolshevist regime and thwart Germany. His moral dedication not to become involved in the Russian civil war prevented him from proposing an outright interventionist policy.

So, in order to avoid military intervention and at the same time express his anti-Bolshevik and anti-German sentiments, Wilson began to look for anti-Bolshevik groups in Russia, although there were few with much legitimacy.[29] He informed Lansing of his interest in "several nuclei of self-governing authority" that had sprung up in Siberia.[30] He further instructed Lansing that it would give him "a great deal of satisfaction to get behind the most nearly representative" of these groups, depending on its level of organization and leadership.[31] Thus, it was obvious that Wilson was looking for some way to prevent the Bolsheviks from establishing their power. Also, Wilson had been watching the Cossack anti-Bolshevist leader Georgi Semenov to see if there was any possible way to assist him,

without intervention.[32] However ,Wilson, by late May, had decided that intervention was a feasible policy. Although intervention had always appealed to him as a solution to his problems in his ideal postwar order, he now began to develop in earnest a plan for becoming directly involved in Russia's political struggles. He had voiced to British Ambassador William Wiseman that he would even consider intervening in spite of the wishes of the Russian people, if he could just find the opportune moment.[33] Yet, it should be noted that Wilson continued to take a very careful policy towards the whole affair because of his past disastrous experiences in the Mexican civil war.[34] Wilson also understood that intervention might jeopardize the establishment of his beloved League of Nations in the postwar international arena.

The opportune moment finally came with word of 50,000 Czech exiles, trying to get out of Russia by way of the Trans-Siberian railway, in order to make it back to Europe and fight on the Western Front.[35] Somehow, on their voyage through Siberia, the Czechs had become involved in several skirmishes with the Red Army. The worst aspect of this situation was the supposed Bolshevik-arming of Austro-Hungarian prisoners of wars, who were now attacking the Allied contingent of Czechs. These reports became an impetus for Allied intervention in both Siberia and North Russia, despite the eventual realization that such reports were vast exaggerations of the real situation.[36] Wilson now saw the origins for a plan of intervention that might succeed in reaching both his goals of deposing the Bolsheviks and the Germans. As noted, Wilson always possessed a soft spot for nations in search for self-determination such as the Czechs.[37]

In a note from Paul S. Reinsch, the minister in China, Lansing was informed that the Czechs were "sympathetic to the Russian population" and comprised "the most serious means [menace] to extension of German influence in Russia."[38] Reinsch sent an earlier message to Lansing expressing the need for Allied intervention in Siberia, reporting that *both* German influence and Bolshevik influence were threatening the stability of Siberia.[39] When Lansing relayed the message to Wilson, the President stated that he saw the "shadow of a plan that might be worked, with Japanese and other assistance . . . these people are the cousins of the Russians."[40] Lansing, after having considered this favorable information, asked whether or not it was possible "that in this body of capable and loyal troops may be found a nucleus for military occupation of the Siberian railway."[41] Lansing believed that the U.S. could prevent the establishment of Bolshevism in Siberia with Czech help. Assistant Secretary Long also articulated similar sentiments when he stressed the pros of intervening in liaison with the Czech situation since they [the Czechs] "were antagonistic to the Bolsheviks" and "available to be used as a military expedition to overcome Bolshevik influence, and under Allied guidance to restore order."[42]

Thus, the Czechs and their anti-Bolshevik Siberian allies served "as the potential nucleus for a pro-Allied and orderly Siberia free from German and/or Siberian influence."[43] Furthermore, public opinion was on the side of Wilson, since there were many Czech immigrants in the U.S., in addition to the fact that Americans had a "soft spot" (like their president) for oppressed nations such as the Czechs.[44] In fact, there was widespread opinion both among the public and among the hawks in Congress that the Wilson administration should have acted sooner in the affair.[45] At the same time, Wilson had to

keep in mind that there were also strong public groups condemning any meddling in Russian affairs. The expedient information concerning the Czechs arrived as Wilson was devising an economic commission to be sent to Russia under Herbert Hoover.[46] The primary objective of the commission would be to render aid to the non-Bolshevik forces in hopes that possible broader intervention could ensue in the future. Also, if the commission was attacked, it would provide an immediate justification and impetus for intervention.[47] The plan for economic intervention provides the evidence that the Wilson administration had indeed adopted an intervention strategy, but had continued searching for a better means of justification.

Wilson's mixed goals became obvious as the benefits and possible solutions to both his fears of the extension of Bolshevism and German imperialism materialized in the Czech legion, whose "rescue" could be legitimized in an ethical sense in accordance with his fundamental ethical stance. Subsequently, Wilson believed that he could allay the fears of interference in Russian affairs. Although he truly felt that the reconstitution of the Eastern Front would never succeed, he was still able to justify intervention by rescuing an Allied contingent "engaged in heroic resistance to the Germans"[48] and aiding them in their trip back to Western Europe (by way of Vladivostok), where they could rejoin the Western thrust against Germany. Despite this providential turn of events, Wilson continued to place tremendous pressure upon himself as he worried about intervention's possible problems. A letter that he received on July 3 from Lieutenant Colonel Raymond Robins highlighted some of his lingering questions over the initiative. In the telegram, Robins writes that intervention, "unless welcomed by the great mass of the Russian people" would be counterproductive and would be a betrayal of the president's ethical war aims.[49] As he identified the ethical roadblocks to intervention, Robins stressed its necessity to obstruct Germany's menacing imperialist designs on Russia.

Almost at the same time of Robins' telegram, yet another appeal (the sixth) arrived from the Supreme War Council asking for U.S. support of Allied intervention in Siberia in order to shorten the war and "prevent the isolation of Russia from western Europe."[50] The council also mentioned the necessity of Japanese leadership of the intervention near Vladivostok. Concurrently, Secretary Lansing had agreed to join the League for the Regeneration of Russia in Rome that called for Allied support of a democratic Russian regime, opposed to both the Germans and the Bolsheviks.[51] Wilson also started to pay closer heed to another pro-democratic Russia organization, the All-Russian Union of Democratic Societies, that urged economic aid to East Russia as a means to bring social order to the region and prevent its penetration by German forces.[52] Wilson liked these ideas and in late June stated that such "cooperatives" would "be of very great service as instruments of what we are now planning to do in Siberia."[53] Wilson's statement indicates that a defined and firm strategy had already been developed in regards to intervention.

The entire undertaking came to a head just three days later on July 6, with a special conference dedicated just to U.S. Russian policy. It was at this meeting that President Wilson announced his intention to support a limited intervention in Siberia. In Lansing's memorandum of the conference, the need to aid the "present situation" of the Czecho-Slovaks and move them towards Irkutsk is stressed. They would join the Japanese in a

bilateral force to perform this task. The belief that the armed Austro-Hungarian prisoners of war still existed as a threat is also identified: "The purpose of landing troops is to aid Czecho-Slovaks against German and Austrian prisoners."[54] However, reports from those stationed in the region continued to deny the validity of such reports.[55] Therefore, Wilson's attempt to merge his major policy considerations become evident once more. All his policy desires could be attained by intervention and were justifiable in light of the U.S. policy of non-recognition towards the Bolshevik regime.

On July 17, Wilson drafted his *Aide-Mémoire* which described U.S. intentions in both North Russia as well as in Siberia. It is necessary to look at this persuasive document in some detail in order to reveal possible undercurrents in Wilson's motives for intervention. The *Aide-Mémoire* states the rationale behind the intervention in terms of the war. The first sentence effectively emphasizes this point: "The whole heart of the United States is in the winning of this war."[56] Wilson tries to assure Russia that U.S. motives are not intended to take advantage of Russia, but rather to serve her and prevent her from being overrun by the German forces. At Murmansk, the only possible American objectives could be to guard military stores and supplies from the encroaching Germans. The most ambiguous aspect of the document, however, is Wilson's statement that military intervention is sanctioned, "Only to help the Czecho-Slovaks consolidate their forces and get into successful cooperation with their Slavic kinsmen and to steady any efforts at self-government in which the Russians themselves may be willing to accept assistance."[57] This statement seems to indicate that the Slavic forces in Siberia should help the Russian people realize their democratic legacy (a heritage which never existed) by aiding in their attempts to create a "self-government;" i.e., in opposition to the Bolsheviks. Wilson's subtle argument thus communicates quite persuasively a dual policy incentive of defeating the Bolsheviks and the Germans. The basis for the expedition to Murmansk (and later Archangel) appears somewhat ambiguous as well, since the proposed mission to protect and guard military goods "which may subsequently be needed by Russian forces" is extended to, "Render such aid as may be acceptable to the Russians in the organization of their own self-defense."[58] The principal point here is that the Russians to which Wilson is referring are the Russian people, *not* the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks are those preventing the true Russian people from defending themselves. Furthermore, in his *Aide-Mémoire*, Wilson promises that the U.S. (or any of the other Allies, for that matter) would not engage in any questionable interference in Russia's internal affairs or territorial integrity. This document would be made public through a State Department dispatch on August 3. The message, essentially the same as the *Aide-Mémoire*, continued the ambiguities of Wilson's decision. In the August 3 document, the public was informed that the Czechs were moving westward rather than eastward to Vladivostok, despite the fact that the goal of the intervention was *supposedly* to help the Czechs *leave* Russia. Again, Wilson's real motives behind intervention become strikingly conspicuous with such evidence.

As for Siberian intervention, Wilson had proposed a dual project between U.S. and Japanese forces, for he had fears that the French and British had ulterior imperialist motives (though the Japanese did as well) in Russia and that the number of troops that they were demanding would make intervention seem rather like an invasion. Wilson was

very adamant on this point since he continued to believe, as he did when the first calls for intervention emerged, that a large intervention force would be misunderstood by the Russian people not as aid, but rather as an assault on their territory. Such an action would make them more susceptible to Bolshevik cries of capitalist encirclement and sovereignty or even to possible German tutelage.[59] Briefly, Wilson's idea of non-interference went as follows: the U.S. forces would protect Vladivostok as well as guard the Transiberian railway, so that the Czechs could consolidate their position and act as both a coordinated anti-Bolshevik as well as anti-German force. The U.S forces would only be "establishing defensive positions," so that the intervening troops would be seen as neutral, but who in reality, "Would be maintaining a pipeline to nourish the anti-Bolshevik army."[60]

The expedition thus went into effect. Wilson's hopes that intervention would be on a small scale were soon shattered as the French and British began overt attacks upon the Bolsheviks near Murmansk and even overtook the adjoining port of Archangel. These attacks were extremely counterproductive in that they instigated a crackdown by the Bolsheviks, which became known as the "Red Terror." Wilson, while condemning the actions of the other Allies took advantage of the terrorist activities and justified the need to eliminate the Bolsheviks, albeit by way of a rather covert manner, apart from the overt belligerency of the other Allies.[61] As for Siberia, the French and British were incensed that Wilson as an ally would have not notified them of his intentions and so quickly became a part of the force in the region, with the French going so far as declaring the Czechs an honorary contingent of their own military forces.[62] However, what was most unsettling to Wilson was the enormous amount of troops sent by the Japanese. Instead of the allotted seven thousand that Wilson had called for, the Japanese sent a total of almost 70, 000 troops, which only helped to confirm Wilson's apprehension that the Japanese were poised to "take over political, military, and economic control of the Chinese Eastern Railway."[63] The Japanese, in fact, were creating discord in the chaotic circumstances in order to consolidate their control.[64] Wilson, in various messages to Lansing indicated that this new state of events was "inconsistent" and "altogether foreign" to the U.S. designated policy.[65] More importantly, the Japanese actions made the intervention resemble an invasion. In August, Wilson sent many documents both the European allies and to Japan censuring them for their desires to expand the operation in Russia. Wilson had to be assured that anti-Bolshevist/anti-German intervention would *not* be seen as an invasion.

With the war in Germany coming to end in the late months of 1918, Wilson's strategy in Russia became somewhat more evident as a note from Lansing on September 9 indicates, applauding the Russian people's acceptance and joining of the Czech forces. For the most part, events continued to move slowly in Russia, and then just two months later, on November 11, the armistice in Europe was signed. The end of the war in Europe must be considered the defining point in discussion of Wilsonian strategy in intervention, since the anti-Germanism aspect of his policy exited the scene, with the anti-Bolshevik motive taking center stage. Although Wilson could point to the fact that U.S. forces were only remaining in Russia as a means of keeping together Allied unity, evidence points to the fact that Wilson and important members of his administration were also involved and had been involved in aiding the Whites (the non-Bolsheviks) ever since the launching of the affair. Most of this aid had been extended without the knowledge of Congress, since

much partisan dispute would have ensued otherwise.[66] Some of the most arresting evidence that remains is the rapport between Wilson and the Russian embassy (established during the March Revolution), led by Boris Bhakmetev.[67] Throughout late 1918 and 1919, Wilson used the embassy to procure weapons and other needed military supplies for *both* the Czechs and the White armies as indicated by a dispatch for 25,000 rifles to be handed over "to the Russian army being formed at Omsk."[68] Furthermore, much evidence exists that the War Trade Board was secretly facilitating the nourishing of the Czech *and* White armies, which were also helped out by Wilson's contribution of ten million dollars from his own war fund.[69]

Wilson had not really intended on staying in Russia so much longer after the war, but several events constrained him from doing so. Some important considerations for Wilson were keeping some sense of Allied unity in the whole affair so that he could hold his ground at the peace conference in Paris. However, the anti-Bolshevik strategy and rationale were still strong for Wilson, who in fact rejected two proposals like the Prinkipo talks and the Bullet Mission[70] to mediate the Russian civil war since either one would have meant at least partial recognition of the Bolshevik regime, something Wilson had never intended to do. Yet, he also rejected plans at the peace conference, vehemently espoused by Winston Churchill, to use overt force against the Bolsheviks, since he felt as before that such force would only help to strengthen the regime.

Rejecting both extremes, Wilson favored a strategy that would, "Undermine Bolshevism peacefully without damaging the interests of the Russian people"[71] and without acknowledging the Bolsheviks whatsoever. The fears of Bolshevism had in fact increased in the early months of 1919, augmenting Wilson's anti-Bolshevist strategy, with the communists making dramatic appearances in both Germany (during the Spartacist uprising) and Hungary. This communist "intrusion" into Europe made Wilson more apt to join the Allies in supporting Admiral Kolchak, a strong anti-Bolshevist leader who had established a strong army at Omsk. He was now advancing towards the Volga by April 1919.[72] Wilson, though pleased to see this turn of events, was still afraid that the U.S. might become too involved in actual physical collisions with the Bolsheviks as they guarded the railway. In a briefing of the Siberian military to the Council of four in early May, the President described his military dilemma in Siberia. During the conference, he expressed regret over the whole intervention affair since, "He had always been of opinion that the proper policy of the Allied and the Associated Powers was to clear out of Russia and leave it to the Russians to fight it out among themselves."[73] Yet, by late May his fears of Bolshevism's consolidation in Russia had reappeared as he agreed to help Kolchak, in spite of Kolchak's less than inspirational leadership.[74] According to a message sent by Lansing to Henry Polk the Acting Secretary of State, the President was intending, "To take up with Congress the entire question of economic support for Russia and particularly the pertaining of the Siberian railroad."[75] Congress, however, would certainly dispute such large appropriations. Despite the lack of formal recognition and faith in the Kolchak nation, Wilson did show his support by extending economic and financial aid (again, mostly from his own war fund) to the leader for the remainder of the year. To be brief, this support for Kolchak had no great impact on his campaign, which was largely unsuccessful due to his terrorist-like actions against Russian citizens, dubbed the "White

Terror." The terror actually generated sympathy for the approaching Red Army, instead of any hatred.[76] Therefore, intervention proved to be counterproductive just as Wilson had feared after uneasily making the decision almost a year and a half before. Finally, by early 1920, American troops were removed from Siberia, several months after the removal of those in the North. The evidence that Wilson's strategy in intervention was greatly influenced by his anti-Bolshevik sentiments can be augmented by Wilson's actions even after intervention was over. The U.S. continued to take part in a blockade (which had been established several months earlier) to try and starve out communist held areas and even manipulated supposed relief missions to Russia to debilitate the Bolshevik regime.[77] Most of such tactics resulted in dismal failures, as the Bolsheviks succeeded in the consolidation of their control. Thus, the only path left for foreign policy remained that policy adopted in December of 1917 which was to continue non-recognition of the regime. Non-recognition would remain as the policy of the U.S. towards Russia until 1933, under Roosevelt.

To offer some sort of conclusion, Wilson had wanted to create a political arena in Russia in which anti-Bolshevik elements could freely compete, with some chance of success "for the allegiance of the Russian people."[78] However, what Wilson had been wanting to create was an arena that had never existed in Russian political history. Once again, despite his lessons from Mexican intervention, Wilson let his moral ideology dominate his thinking. Yet, Wilson never thought that he was truly "interfering" in the negative sense of the word, since as long as the Allies were "steadying the efforts of [the] Russians (i.e. liberal Russians)" in reestablishing true Russian democratic institutions that were anti-Bolshevik as well as anti-German (during the course of the war), there was no "real" interference in Russian affairs taking place.[79] Another way of stating this same idea for Wilson was that self-determination would be in no danger of jeopardization, since the Bolsheviks, by repressing the democratic institutions of the March Revolution had actually removed Russia's self-determination. Therefore, it was imperative that the anti-Bolshevik forces be bolstered so that the Russian people could regain their sense of liberty and self-determination. At first, this self-determination had been threatened by both the Germans and the Bolsheviks, but when the war ended, self-determination had still not been achieved for the Russian people.

In making the decision to intervene, Wilson had to deal with pressure not only from the domestic public, whose early enthusiasm diminished once the war was over, but from the international community as well, who constantly sent him persuasive messages from the Supreme War Council and even tried to convert Wilson's closest administration officials. However, in his role as the executive, Wilson was defiantly independent, though at times he was heavily influenced by Lansing and to a lesser extent by his aid House. Yet, he retained throughout the decision-making process a firm handle on what was going on. The rational policy-making paradigm remained rather clear in these diplomatic circumstances, with Wilson playing the major actor. His decision to intervene came after having weighed the alternatives and the possible consequences of intervention (particularly its potential counterproductive effects) in a very rational manner. Wilson took every step and precaution to ensure that the undertaking would not be misunderstood as an invasion. The calculation of the national interest focused on the

creation of a just postwar order and thus a rational means to establish this ideal centered upon the removal of the German imperialists as well as of the Bolsheviks. Wilson tried to bypass Congress several times in order to pursue his objectives of a just postwar settlement/liberal order that would be purged of its immoral components, namely German imperialism and Russian radical left-wing ideology. In the end the decision was his, as his stubborn morality took precedence and he embarked on a "moral" diplomatic policy all his own. As in his Mexico fiasco, Wilson believed that he knew what other peoples wanted. For some reason, the "oppressed" peoples' aspirations always agreed with his personal assessment. Theories that tone down Wilson's own sentiments and ethical beliefs and reduce the decision to intervene as the simple result of administrative and Allied pressures, mistakenly ignore the evidence discussed above, stressing Wilson's personal sentiments and moralism concerning intervention in the Russian civil war.

NOTES:

1. For a discussion that criticizes the revisionist stress on Wilson's relations with Japan, see Christopher Lasch. "American Intervention in Siberia: A Re-interpretation." *Political Science Quarterly*. Vol. 77, no.2 (June, 1962), pp. 205-223; Eugene P. Trani. "Woodrow Wilson and the Decision to Intervene in Russia: A Reconsideration." *Journal of Modern History*. Vol. 47, No. 3, (September 1976), pp. 440-461.

2. Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. (San Rafael: Presidio Press, 1977), p. 136.

3.N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. (Oxford University Press: New York, 1968), p. 104.

4. John Lewis Gaddis. *Russia, the Soviet Union, and the United States: An Interpretive History* . (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1978), pp.57-58.

5. Thomas A. Bailey. *America Faces Russia: Russian-American Relations from Early Times to Our Day.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950), pp. 232-233.

6. Ibid., p. 234.

7. Rhea Foster Dulles. *The Road to Teheran.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944), p. 119.

8. John Lewis Gaddis. *Russia, the Soviet Union, and the United States: An Interpretive History* . p. 68.

9. Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. pp. 37-38.

10. The text of the sixth point is as follows: "The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest

cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and an unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished form their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy."

11. Rhea Foster Dulles. *The Road to Teheran.* pp. 119-21.

12. Lansing to Wilson, December 10, 1917. *United States Department of State*, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: The Lansing Papers, 1914-1920* . (2 vols.; Washington, 1939-1940). Vol. 2, pp. 343-346 as excerpted in *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*, Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1969), pp. 27-28; hereafter cited as *Lansing Papers* in Unterberger.

13. Peter G. Filene. *Americans and the Soviet Experiment, 1917-1933.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 42-43.

14. Polk to Ambassador Morris, March 5, 1918. United States Department of State, *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Russia, 1918* . (3 vols.; Washington, 1931-1932), II, pp. 67-68 as excerpted in Unterberger, p. 31; hereafter cited as *U.S., Foreign Relations*, in Unterberger.

15. For a full discussion of the German-agent theory, see Christopher Lasch. "American Intervention in Siberia: A Reinterpretation. *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 77, No. 2, (June 1962), pp.205-23.

16. For a deep study of the validity of the Sisson Documents, see George F. Kennan. "The Sisson Documents." *Journal of Modern History*. Volume 28, No. 2, (June 1956), pp.130-154.

17. Peter G. Filene. *Americans and the Soviet Experiment, 1917-1933.* p. 40.

18. Ibid., p. 48.

19. N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. passim.

20. Ibid., p. 89.

21. Leonid I. Strakhovsky. *The Origins of American Intervention in North Russia: 1918* . (New York: Howard Fertig, 2nd ed.,1972), pp. 72-73.

22. Ibid., p. 75.

23. Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. pp. 39-40.

24. John Lewis Gaddis. *Russia, the Soviet Union, and the United States: An Interpretive History* . p. 58.

25. William A. Williams, "American Intervention in Russia: 1917-1920" (Part Two). *Studies on the Left*. Vol. 4, No. 1, (Winter 1964), p. 44.

26. John M. Thompson. "Allied and American Intervention in Russia, 1918-1921" in *Rewriting Russian History*. Cyril Black, ed. (New York: Random House, 1956), p. 321.

27. George F. Kennan, "American Troops in Russia: The True Record." *Atlantic Monthly*. Vol. 203, No. 1, (January 1959), p. 38.

28. N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. pp. 89-90.

29. Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. p. 40.

30. Quoted in William A. Williams, "American Intervention in Russia: 1917-1920" (Part Two). p. 48.

31. Woodrow to Lansing. Quoted in N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. pp. 95-96.

32. Ibid.

33. Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. p. 41.

34. Eugene P. Trani. "Woodrow Wilson and the Decision to Intervene in Russia: A Reconsideration." p. 444.

35. The exact number as often been disputed with ranges from 45,000 to 70,000 and is sometimes heavily exaggerated.

36. George F. Kennan, "American Troops in Russia: The True Record." p. 40.

37. Ibid.

38. Reinsch to Lansing. *U.S. Foreign Relations, 1918, Russia*. Vol. 2, pp. 206-207 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. p. 34.

39. Reinsch to Lansing. Quoted in N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. p. 99.

40. Wilson to Lansing, June 17, 1918, *Lansing Papers*. Vol. 2, p. 363 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. p. 35.

41. Lansing to Wilson June 23, 1918. *Lansing Papers*. Vol. 2, p. 364 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. p. 35.

42. Quoted in William A. Williams, "American Intervention in Russia: 1917-1920" (Part Two). p. 52.

43. N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. pp. 99-100.

44. George F. Kennan, "American Troops in Russia: The True Record." p. 42.

45. Thomas A. Bailey. *America Faces Russia: Russian-American Relations from Early Times to Our Day.* p. 243.

46. Ibid.

47. Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. p.48.

48. Christopher Lasch. "American Intervention in Siberia: A Re-interpretation." p. 217.

49. Robins to Lansing, July 1, 1918. *Lansing Papers.* Vol. 2, pp. 365-366 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. pp. 35-6.

50. Supreme War Council to Wilson, July 2-3, 1918. *U.S. Foreign Relations, 1918, Russia*. Vol. 2, pp. 245-6 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. p. 37.

51. N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. p. 98.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.

54. Lansing memorandum July 6, 1918. *U.S. Foreign Relations, 1918, Russia.* Vol. 2, pp. 262-3 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. pp. 39-40.

55.George F. Kennan, "American Troops in Russia: The True Record." p.40.

56. Aide-Mémoire, July 17, 1918. *U.S., Foreign Relations, 1918, Russia.* Vol. 2, pp. 287-290 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. pp.40-42.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid.

59. N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. p. 105.

60.Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. p. 50.

61. Peter G. Filene. *Americans and the Soviet Experiment, 1917-1933.* p. 46.

62. Betty Miller Unterberger. *America's Siberian Expedition, 1918-1920: A Study of National Policy* . (New York: Greenwood Press, 1956), p. 232.

63. Ibid., p. 231.

64. Ibid.

65. Wilson to Lansing, August 23, 1918. *Lansing Papers*. Vol. 2, pp. 378-79 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. pp. 43-44.

66. Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. p. 80.

67. See Chapter 5 of Maddox for a long and detailed discussion of Wilson's secret relations with the War Trade Board and the American embassy. Another study of interest by Robert James Maddox focusing solely on these questionable acts is "Woodrow Wilson, the Russian Embassy, and Siberian Intervention," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 36, No. 4, (November 1967), pp. 435-448.

68. Ibid., p. 82.

69. Ibid., p. 137.

70. The first proposal was the Prinkipo proposal which involved a conference of conflicting elements in Russia to be held on the Prinkipo Islands in the Sea of Marmara under the supervision of the Allies. The Bolsheviks accepted the invitation in order to gain some legitimacy. However, the Whites under Kolchak refused to come, partly because of French pressure. The second proposal to end the civil war was the Bullitt proposal. William C. Bullitt, an ambassador was sent to Russia in March 1919 to try and formulate a cease-fire. He returned from Lenin with some promising offers for a cease-

fire. Yet, at the was repudiated at the Peace Conference and the possibility of a negotiated end to the civil war was abandoned.

71. John Lewis Gaddis. *Russia, the Soviet Union, and the United States: An Interpretive History* . pp. 80-81.

72. Rhea Foster Dulles. *The Road to Teheran.* p. 149.

73. Policy Briefing May 9, 1919. *U.S., Foreign Relations, 1919, Russia.* pp. 345-347 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. pp. 48-49.

74. Ibid.

75. Message from Lansing and McCormick to Polk, May 26, 1919. *U.S. Foreign Relations, 1919, Russia.* p. 386 in Betty Miller Unterberger, ed. *American Intervention in the Russian Civil War*. pp. 49-50.

76. Rhea Foster Dulles. *The Road to Teheran.* p. 149.

77. Robert J. Maddox. *The Unknown War with Russia: Wilson's Siberian Intervention*. p. 137.

78. John Lewis Gaddis. *Russia, the Soviet Union, and the United States: An Interpretive History* . p. 82.

79. N. Gordon Levin, Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. p. 109.

From Playwright to President:

Vaclav Havel's Contribution to the Democratization of the Czech Republic

Jennifer Bean

The road to democracy has been neither short nor simple for any of the Eastern European nations, and the Czech Republic is no exception. Over the past seven years the world has witnessed extensive social, political, and economic transformations, as nations that were once considered enemies to much of the world have now joined hand in hand to nurture young democracies. Charismatic leaders, many of whom are former dissidents, have altered the political and geographic face of the world forever. Chief among these eminent figures is the Czech poet and playwright, Vaclav Havel. Havel, initially through words and later through actions, was the dominant voice of opposition to the Czech communist regime. From his early days as a playwright, a stalwart in the underground realm of the intellectuals, and throughout his tenure as president of the Czech Republic, Havel has provided much insight about the ills of the totalitarian regime, single-handedly posing solutions and initiating reform.

An examination of communism's genesis in the Czech Republic leads the reader to an understanding of the basis for popular opposition to the regime, as well as of the function of intellectuals, specifically Havel, in a repressed society. Havel burst onto the Czech political scene in the early 1960s and played a significant role in all of the events leading up to Czech democratization, including the Prague Spring, Charter 77, and the formation of the Civic Forum. Along the way he composed revolution-defining pieces such as "Letters to Olga" and "The Power of the Powerless", as well as open letters to individual communist leaders. The prolific writer then guided a nation in the throws of turmoil through a peaceful revolution, witnessing the birth of an entirely new commonwealth. In the first half of the 1990s, he dealt with many of the pivotal issues that will determine the economic and political presence of the Czech Republic in the international sphere, including proposed membership in the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), in hopes of preparing the young nation for a significant role in the new millennium.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC

Communism took root in Czechoslovakia in April 1945, and the Communists, with Soviet support, rapidly increased their political power during the Third Czechoslovak Republic, lasting until 1948. All political, social, and industrial structures were nationalized along Marxist lines, and Czechoslovakia soon became the epitome of a Soviet satellite state. The government took stringent actions against anyone whom they believed to have been an enemy of the state. These people were labeled dissidents and thrown into either prisons or labor camps. Following the death of Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, some measures of liberalization were taken to appease the rioting and general unrest of farmers, intellectuals, and students; however, a traditional Soviet system was reimposed when Antonin Novotny assumed the presidency in 1957.

These changes negatively affected the condition of the Czechoslovak economy, and, at the beginning of 1968, a progressive faction of the Czechoslovak Communist Party decided that radical changes were necessary to avoid a major governmental collapse. In January, Novotny was replaced as general secretary of the Party by Alexander Dubcek, and in the following months the regime made a deliberate attempt to add a more democratic dimension to its political structure, attempting to separate itself from its association with the USSR. This time of dramatic liberalization became known as the "Prague Spring." The reforms won mass support from those in Czechoslovakia; however, they evoked only hostility from the Soviet Union and the other eastern European socialist nations, which feared the spread of the tide of liberalization. On August 20, 1968, more than half a million Warsaw Pact troops invaded Czechoslovakia and occupied the country. A treaty known as the Moscow Agreements was then signed which authorized the Soviet military occupation of Czechoslovakia indefinitely. These actions provoked worldwide condemnation of the Soviet regime.

In April 1969, Dubcek was ousted, and in 1975 he was replaced by Gustav Husak. Husak halted all reforms connected with the Prague Spring, and the reformers involved were either exiled or imprisoned. A clandestine resistance emerged during that decade, with its most defiant act occurring in 1977 with the establishment of the Charter 77 movement, in which several hundred individuals signed a document charging the Husak regime with basic violations of human rights. This opposition was suppressed by the regime, but never quite eliminated.

In 1987 Husak resigned and was succeeded by Milos Jakes, another strong Soviet supporter. By 1989, however, a tide of reform was overwhelming Eastern Europe, and Jakes was unable to repress the mass demonstrations which swept his nation. In November 1989, he stepped down, and the government began negotiating with an opposition group known as the Civic Forum, led by the Czech author Vaclav Havel. In December, a new government took office, and Havel was selected as president.

Free-market reforms introduced over the next two years benefited the Czechs more than the Slovaks, and this economic disparity led to negotiations that resulted in the creation of two separate republics, the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Havel had resigned as president of Czechoslovakia in July 1992, only to be elected as the Czech Republic's first president in late January 1993. In 1994, the government signed the Partnership for Peace agreement with members of NATO as a precursor to joining that alliance. The Czech Republic is presently seeking membership in the European Union, an endeavor which will be helped by the state's success in its aggressive pursuit of market-based economic plans. Indeed, the Czech Republic is becoming one of the most economically, politically, and socially advanced republics to emerge from the former Eastern Bloc.

VACLAV HAVEL AS PLAYWRIGHT

Vaclav Havel is perhaps better known for his political accomplishments than for his artistic ones, but he has nevertheless enjoyed tremendous success in both pursuits. He earned world acclaim as a playwright during the 1960s, writing such pieces as The

Garden Party (1963) and The Memorandum (1965), both implementing parables to indirectly comment on the unbearable conditions of life under the communist umbrella. Writer Timothy Garton Ash articulates that playwrighting is what Havel regards as his life's true calling: "The rest, his political activity, his essays, his letters from prison, his role as a moral and political authority for thousands of Czechs and Slovaks; . . . all this is secondary. His real work is writing plays."[1]

Havel draws on many personal experiences for his literary efforts. His childhood certainly impacted the way that he perceives the world: "My childhood feeling of exclusion, or of the instability of my place in the world . . . could not but have an influence on the way I viewed the worlda view which is in fact a key to my plays."[2] Havel grew up in an environment where, due to the acquaintances of his parents, he often spent time in the company of intellectuals. The early 1950s were years of diminished societal restrictions, and therefore Havel could spend time with these scholars without being targeted as an enemy of the state. Of that time, Havel comments, "I felt at home among [intellectuals] long before I got into that public culture."[3]

His debut into this prohibited culture formally occurred in the 1960s, when he began working at a small Prague theater which had become known as a hub of the period's avant-garde.[4] Havel perceives theater as a reflection of the society from which it evolves. In retrospect he suggests that the Prague theaters in the 1960s "were one of the important manifestations and mediators of this intellectual and spiritual process in which the society became aware of itself, and liberated itself, and which inevitably led to the familiar political changes in 1968."[5]

Havel's plays provide a dark and somewhat sarcastic perception of life in a communist state. He asserts that he is trying to propel the viewer "into the depths of a question he should not, and cannot, avoid asking; to stick his nose into his own misery, into my misery, into our common misery, by way of reminding him that the time has come to do something about it."[6] A common theme in his theatrical works is what he believes to be the existence of a crisis of human identity in the citizens of any communist regime. Havel theorizes that with the loss of God, man has lost the foundation to which he relates everything else. He assumes that what follows is the gradual division of man's personality into separate, incoherent fragments. This is the impetus for man's loss of identity.[7]

After Havel publicly denounced the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia following the Prague Spring, his plays were banned by the government indefinitely. At this point in time, his writing abruptly became more political. He began composing essays instead of plays, unabashedly expressing his ideas as his own, instead of simply as one facet of a character's mentality. "After 1968, when he was . . . forbidden to continue his literary critique of language, he transformed his own life into a magnificent demystification of language: He became one of the principal movers behind, creators of, and spokesmen for Charter 77."[8]

Although he had moved past the era of his fictional compositions, Havel did not disassociate himself from Czech theater, and he astutely recognized its re-politicization in the 1980s, just preceding the 1989 revolution:

Once again there is that unexplained movement from below, that departure from the norm, the deliberate avoidance of ideology, the lively and understanding audiences. Again they are a symptom of wider social awakening, a sign of activity under the surface. Theater has always been the first to alert us to this. I follow these theaters, and I rejoice in them.[9]

Havel had accurately interpreted the signs that the political orientation of the people was beginning to consolidate itself into a powerful force that the Czech government could no longer deny. Massive changes would await not only Czechoslovakia, but Eastern Europe in its entirety, in the future.

THE PLACE OF INTELLECTUALS AND YOUTH IN A SUPPRESSED SOCIETY

"I . . . live in a country where a writers' congress, or a speech delivered at it, is capable of shaking the system."[10] Havel's words reveal his acknowledgment of his own capabilities. He argues that there is indeed justification for the success of intellectuals in creating political impulses in the Soviet Bloc countries: "[T]hose who are not politicians are also not so bound by traditional political thinking and political habits and therefore, paradoxically, they are more aware of genuine political reality and more sensitive to what can and should be done under the circumstances."[11] In other words, those who are capable of observing the faults of a system that is presumed by the elite to be infallible are also capable of formulating the most effective resolutions to the totalitarian system's inevitable conflicts.

In Havel's eyes, the role of the intellectual is to provide criticism and doubt. He feels that intellectuals were suppressed or exiled because the intellectual could not fit any role assigned him by the state. Thus, "[a]n intellectual stands out wherever he is."[12] Havel experienced firsthand the trials an intellectual dissenter faces when he publicly opposes the state. He explained that when these pressures became too much for him to bear, he reminded himself that "the real test of a man is not how well he plays the role he has invented for himself, but how well he plays the role that destiny has assigned to him."[13]

Havel also points to the discontent of the youth as an important liberalizing force in totalitarian regimes. He contends that increasing contacts with the West since the mid-1950s led to a process of gradual disenchantment with the regime on the part of the Czechoslovak youth, thus providing an impetus for mass societal reaction. The improvement in East-West relations resulted in a tremendous increase in the number of Western tourists visiting Czechoslovakia, followed by the establishment of cultural and educational programs with several Western countries.[14] This dispelled the idea that Communism made everyone equal, because those who had become exposed to the West realized that many outside their borders had much more, materially and intellectually

speaking, than the Czechoslovak people themselves. Other factors leading to the alienation of the youth included economic stagnation, growing difficulties in entering the universities, and the apparent inability of the Novotny regime to effect major changes.[15]

THE PRAGUE SPRING

Throughout the 1960s the dissatisfaction of dissenters grew, culminating in the Writers Congress in the summer of 1967, which Havel attended. As a direct consequence of this Congress, the Czechoslovak government announced several changes that would profoundly affect the direction of the regime. The first was new elections for lower party organs throughout the republic. This resulted in an extraordinary rejuvenation of proliberalization membership in the regime. A second modification was the publication of a new party program in April which was aimed at introducing democracy to all levels of the government.[16] Perhaps the most important facet of Czech liberalization was the abolition of censorship in the spring of 1968. "There is little doubt that the remarkable outburst of the freedom of expression . . . did more to infuriate the leaders of the Soviet Union, Poland, and East Germany than any other single act during the Prague Spring."[17]

At this point the Czechoslovak leadership found itself immersed in an unusual situation: "[It] both sympathized with and feared the rising expectations of society."[18] The reformers themselves provided little further direction to the movement and the leadership had no clear perception of what was actually occurring. At this point, Havel was still very much involved with his theatrical occupation and did not undertake a leading role in the Writers Congress, but it did provide him with his first occasion to speak on political themes publicly. Havel felt that the reformers had turned a blind eye to the effects their actions could have on Czechoslovakia's relations with the Soviet Union: "Captives of their own illusions, they continually kidded themselves that they could somehow explain all this in private to the Soviets, that the Soviets could be mollified with promises . . . So they glossed over their differences with the Soviets, closed their eyes to the warning signals, and succumbed to the illusion that they could remain in control of developments."[19]

In fact, the Czechoslovak liberalization was resented and criticized by the majority of the Soviet Bloc states. Their displeasure found its ultimate expression in the 1968 invasion. Later, Havel commented that the "Kremlin leadership undertook the invasion only because it knew there would be no military resistance here. Even the aging Brezhnev leadership would have been rational enough not to risk a new Vietnam in the middle of a Europe that was armed to the teeth."[20] Gradually, the old forms of communist rule were reimplemented, but it was still possible to speak and write freely. Havel recalled that people could protest, but that all they could protest against was the fact that their protests were being ignored.[21] In Havel's 1977 essay "Second Wind," he noted that "out of the rubble of the old world a sinister new world grew, one that was intrinsically different, merciless, gloomily serious, Asiatic, hard."[22] The wrath of the Soviet motherland was assaulting the Czechoslovak satellite nation without restraint.

The Prague Spring carried defining ramifications for the nature of the totalitarian regime itself. Having learned the lesson that when the door to a plurality of opinions is opened the totalitarian system itself is jeopardized, those in power set a new objective: self-preservation.[23] The Moscow Agreements were a consequence of this single-minded goal. Havel later reprimanded the Czech citizens in an open letter to Alexander Dubcek, the former First Secretary of the Communist Party and the champion of the Prague Spring reforms. Havel insisted that "the Moscow Agreements were in fact the instrument of [the people's] self-deception. Because they did not clearly and unambiguously say yes to the intervention, they provided [the citizens] with the illusion of success, while at the same time they laid the groundwork for the eventual necessity of saying 'yes' unambiguously."[24] Dubcek neither renounced his actions during 1968, nor spoke out publicly in support of them; he simply disappeared from political life altogether. Havel had hoped to stimulate a reaction against the Soviet invasion with this letter, but in fact no visible changes resulted from its distribution.

Havel effectively summarizes the events of that spring in 1968 in his essay entitled "The Power of the Powerless":

It is frequently forgotten . . . that this encounter was merely the final act and the inevitable consequence of a long drama originally played out chiefly in the theater of the spirit and the conscience of society. And that somewhere at the beginning of this drama, there were individuals who were willing to live within the truth, even when things were at their worst.[25]

To Havel, the lack of original support for the dissenters still haunted him. He could not punish the people for not taking action, even though it was their own lives at stake. Instead he wished for them to understand that in not taking action at the inception of repression, the citizens had made a choice for the future generations of the nation, including their own children. Havel could not comprehend why the people did not realize that it was not just themselves, but their own children whom they were harming.

"Dear Dr. Husak" was an open letter written by Havel in April 1975. It was addressed to Dr. Gustav Husak, then the General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. This essay was Havel's first major public statement after being blacklisted in 1969, and it induced deep transformations in the general mood in Prague through its dissection of the effects of the new repression on culture and day to day life.[26] It raised the hope that Husak's regime would one day end, and by making this culmination seem inevitable, it brought this event significantly closer.[27]

Though Havel did not in fact play a pivotal role in the Prague Spring of 1968, it may be said that his commentaries appearing afterward forever altered the public's conscience. The citizens began to look at the actions of their leaders in a much more cynical fashion and to evaluate their lives in a Western-influenced state of mind. This transformation of the public's thought process created a populace ripe to any idea (or manipulation) that claimed it could turn their lives in a more favorable direction.

CHARTER 77

In the mid-1970s, the Czech government began an increased crackdown on those members of society whom they considered to be dissidents. These actions culminated in the September 1976 trial of four musicians from the Czech underground music scene. Primary among these "criminals" was Ivan Jirous, the artistic director of "The Plastic People of the Universe," a rock band that formed the nucleus of the cultural opposition. In addition to his musical pursuits, Jirous had also become a friend of Havel's, and therefore Jirous's incarceration provided material for some of Havel's most politically charged works to date. Havel was one of the few nonparticipants allowed to observe the Prague trial.

Havel and his friends immediately foresaw the effects of this trial. They considered the case an attack by the totalitarian system on human freedom, noting that those arrested were not common criminals, but musicians striving to express themselves. Havel declared that a "judicial attack against them . . . could become the precedent for something truly evil; the regime could well start locking up everyone who thought independently even if he did so only in private . . . Here power had unintentionally revealed its most proper intention to make life entirely the same."[28]

Havel defined his role in the affair as a leader of the opposition, and proceeded to make use of his contacts and authorial prowess to conjure up interest in the affair and stimulate action in support of the accused.[29] He and his colleagues planned a campaign for popular resistance, but always with the hope that the regime would retreat with dignity, so as to avoid bloodshed by either side; this opposition group had not yet reverted to violence as the only solution. Havel continued to organize protests in support of the defendants and wrote an essay entitled "The Trial" in October 1976, describing their persecution. The open letter eventually evolved into a petition signed by over seventy people, and the trial gained media attention as well as the mass opposition of the people.

Havel says that "[t]he state was caught off guard; obviously no one had expected that the case of the Plastic People would arouse such a response."[30] Initially the government counterattacked with a defamation campaign against the defendants, but it soon retreated when it realized that public support was not in the government's favor. In the end, only four of the many accused were actually sent to prison. Havel was indirectly responsible for the majority of the defendants' freedom, but it proved ultimately to be at the cost of his own.

Havel envisioned the movement in support of the defendents as a major building block in the formation of organized resistance to the Czech regime: "[I]t was here, in some connection with the case of the Plastic Peoplethrough newly established contacts and friendshipsthat the main opposition circles, hitherto isolated from each other, came together informally."[31] Later these groups became the core of what became known as the Charter 77 Movement. Havel had almost single-handedly provided the impetus for the first significant dissident movement since the Prague Spring.

The three principal spokesmen for Charter 77 were Havel, Jan Patocka, and Jiri Hajek. Of those three, only Hajek signed the document because Havel had been imprisoned, and Patocka had died, some said from exhausting interrogations imposed on him by the Czech police.[32] Havel mentions that signing the Charter was not easy for everyone many had to overcome their ancient inner aversions (in favor of Communism) but everyone was able to do it, because they all felt that no matter how the Charter turned out, it would be impossible to wipe it out of the national memory.[33]

Technically, the Charter 77 manifesto states that it does not form the basis for any oppositional political movement and that it demands only respect for valid laws and for the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights. However, the Czech government did not see the situation in that light. Havel was soon arrested for the first time. He had made no secret of his involvement with the Charter 77 Movement and was taken directly into custody as he was delivering the Manifesto to the Czechoslovak government, parliament, and media. Havel was then deceived by his interrogators, and even by his own lawyer, while in prison; he was told that the Charter had created havoc within society. He explained, "I had the feeling that, as one of the initiators of the Charter, I had hurt many people and brought terrible misfortune upon them. I took upon myself an inordinate share of the responsibility, as though the other Chartists hadn't known what they were doing, as though I alone was to blame."[34]

In October of 1978, Havel wrote what would become his "most penetrating analysis of the totalitarian system and how people resist it": The Power of the Powerless.[35] The best testimony to the power of this piece comes from Zbygniew Bujak, the Polish politician and former Solidarity activist. In the late 1970s Bujak was attempting to organize resistance to the communist bosses of an Ursus factory. He had become discouraged at the lack of response and began to doubt the significance of his efforts. Then he discovered a copy of Havel's "The Power of the Powerless": [The essay's] ideas . . . strengthened us and persuaded us that what we were doing would not evaporate without a trace, that this was the source of our power, and that one day this power would manifest itself . . . When I look at the victories of Solidarity and of Charter 77, I see in them an astonishing fulfillment of the prophecies contained in Havel's essay.[36]

Thus, Charter 77 found its principal spokesman and creator not within a government body or a guerrilla force, but in a playwright who had witnessed enough of what he considered to be injustice that he was compelled to take action. A decade later, the effects of Havel's work on Charter 77 still held much resonance within society: "Today [the Charter] is a firm part of social life here, even though its position is marginal . . . Today it is hard to imagine a time when the Charter did not exist."[37]

HAVEL'S INCARCERATIONS

In the spring of 1977, Havel gave his assurance to the Czech authorities that he would no longer participate in activities that could be punishable and that he would avoid appearances that carried political connotations, but he refused to disclaim his involvement in Charter 77 or repudiate its effects on Czech society. Swedish writer Harry

Jarv recounts that "since then he has been arrested so many times that it must be difficult for him to keep count; altogether he has spent about five years in prison."[38] Havel's multiple imprisonments not only allowed him ample time to complete several essays, but also gave him insight into the Czech political system that few citizens would ever experience. Havel described his imprisonment as "a necessary period of [his] life which had to happen (the fact that it happened so late is . . . quite surprising)."[39] This declaration indicates that Havel was well aware that his actions were illegal according to the government, but that he would take the required risks because he felt so strongly that change was imperative.

Havel's March 1979 essay, "Reports on My House Arrest," elaborates on another kind of imprisonment that he faced. He and his wife Olga were confined to their country home on several occasions, a punishment just short of total exile. At times Havel was severely harassed by the guards at his door, and he was allowed out of the house only sparingly. He presumed that all of this harassment had one purpose: to make emigration his most suitable option. Thus, worldwide perception would be that the regime did not force him out of his country and that his departure was completely his decision. In "Reports on My House Arrest," he firmly expounded, "I have no intention of emigrating, and I have never given it any thought."[40]

Havel and several other members of The Committee to Defend the Unjustly Prosecuted were arrested on May 29, 1979, and charged with subversion. An October trial concluded with Havel sentenced to four and a half years in prison. During his incarceration he was allowed communication with only one personhis wife Olga. Havel employed this opportunity to fill his letters to her with political messages; these pieces of writing espoused definite abhorrence for the Czechoslovak political system. Although prison censors confiscated many of these letters, some did in fact reach Olga's hands. This is how Havel kept the resistance alive throughout his time in prison.

"Letters to Olga" was completed on September 4, 1982. German author Heinrich Boll described the letters as a reflection of the scale of Havel's moods throughout his imprisonment: "melancholy, anxiety, hypersensitivity, apathy, indifference, resignation, and total self-doubt to the point of feeling worthless."[41] Clearly, the censors and prison personnel had denied Havel the knowledge of the effects his writing was having on the rapidly strengthening dissident society.

THE CZECHOLSOVAK DEMOCRATIZATION: HAVEL'S REVOLUTION

"Revolution is chaos," Havel has said, "and I'm a lover of order. I've always been put off by revolutions . . . And here I am, not only in a revolution, but right in the middle of it."[42] Throughout the 1980s, Havel repeatedly watched windows of opportunity open and close for the Czechoslovak people. Around the world, Russian President Mikhail Gorbachev's programs of glasnost and perestroika were having resounding effects, but Havel refused to allow himself to become disillusioned with empty promises of liberalization, as so many of the Czech people had done before him. When Gorbachev visited Czechoslovakia in July 1987, Havel remarked,

I feel sad; this nation of ours never learns. How many times has it put all its faith in some external force which, it believed, would solve its problems? How many times has it ended up bitterly disillusioned, forced to admit that it could not expect help from anyone unless it was prepared, first and foremost, to help itself? And yet here we are again, making exactly the same mistake. They seem to think that Gorbachev has come to liberate them from Husak![43]

In the late 1980s, Poland, Hungary, and the USSR were attempting to transform their respective communist totalitarian systems into more democratic entities. Czechoslovakia's leadership was "resisting tooth and nail."[44] The truth of the situation was that even though the regime endorsed such ideas as perestroika, it made only minor changes in its policies in order to appease society's increasing unrest. Furthermore, the regime had set strong precedents for the legitimacy of its power. After the 1968 suppression, the regime was able to construct limited but authentic social bases for itself. "It satisfied Slovak nationalism by retaining the federal structure; it exercised patronage over the half-million jobs of those purged as supporters of the Prague Spring to promote a generation of working-class activists; it offered the population a range of economic concessions; and it used the threat of Soviet invasion far more directly than elsewhere in the region."[45]

Havel's April 1987 essay "Stories and Totalitarianism" expanded on his earlier theories of the nature of the totalitarian regime and what effects this regime has on its people. He explains that the boundaries of a government of the Czechoslovak sort were nonexistent: "Once the claims of central power have been placed above law and morality, once the exercise of that power is divested of public control, and once the institutional guarantees of political plurality and civil rights have been made a mockery of, or simply abolished, there is no reason to respect any other limitations."[46] Havel witnessed firsthand what this repressive atmosphere can do to a people: "Ride the escalators in the Prague subway and watch the faces of people going in the opposite direction . . .The faces moving past are empty, strained, almost lifeless, without hope, without longing, without desire."[47] Havel's descriptions of life in this oppressive atmosphere were smuggled out of Czechoslovakia and read worldwide. These statements, conveying images of hopelessness and despair, were perhaps those accounts which most impacted societies free from the totalitarian burden.

The emergence of preliminary aspects of civil society occurred near the end of the decade, in the final period of the Soviet Union's decay. The Czechoslovak state was still strong enough to prevent society from becoming a possessor of political power, but it had relaxed significantly in specific areas. The result was that society had been given enough room for various interest organizations to evolve: "Although the state probably intended this as a concession that could later be retracted, a concession exercised over a period of time gradually acquires the force of custom and comes to be perceived as a right by those concerned . . . The effect of this discretionary regime was to weaken the autonomous exercise of power by society, to create a mindset that looked to short-term solutions."[48]

By 1989, Havel could foresee that change was inevitable. The tide of reform engulfing neighboring nations, such as Hungary and Poland, could not possibly leave Czechoslovakia untouched. In 1990, East-European analyst Mark Kramer stipulated that,

[T]he danger is . . . that the regimes will fail to heed popular sentiments until it is too late. By eschewing any hint of political liberalization . . . Czechoslovak officials may be able to assure stability in the short to medium term, if public expectations remain low. But the potential flaw in this strategy . . . is that popular demands could increase anyway because of the "winds of change" blowing in from Moscow.[49]

Havel understood that the situation in Czechoslovakia was at a crossroads in history. He recognized that the situation could shift in either direction, unleashing a fresh wave of repression or witnessing the birth of an entirely new Czechoslovakia: "Never in the past twenty years has the situation been as wide open as now."[50]

THE CIVIC FORUM

In November 1989, demonstrations against the Czechoslovak government began en masse. This produced a volatile climate ripe for oppositional organization. An ideologically diverse group of oppositionists in both the Czech and Slovak regions organized themselves into the Civic Forum and Public Against Violence, respectively. Havel was one of the driving forces behind the Civic Forum. Encouraged by the deterioration of the Soviet Union and the successes of opposition movements in neighboring lands, a few thousand people joined the tiny core of long-persecuted activists. "Before long fear changed sides: where people had been afraid to oppose the regime, they came to fear being caught defending it. Party members rushed to burn their cards, asserting they had always been reformists at heart."[51]

In rapid succession the opposition ousted Jakes, compelled Prime Minister Ladislav Adamec to resign, and chased Husak from the largely ceremonial office of president.[52] The rest of the Communist party leaders realized that their defeat was imminent, and immediately stepped down. Marian Calfa, Adamec's successor, was persuaded by the Civic Forum to incorporate opposition politicians into the new government, including Havel as president and Alexander Dubcek as Speaker of Parliament. They would serve in an interim government and complete the necessary preparations for the forthcoming free elections. "In one sense, the Civic Forum . . . was Charter 77 writ large. Like the Charter, it was a coalition of all the forces in society (and by 1989 there were many) that had sought a nonviolent, nonpartisan solution to the crisis."[53]

Voters in 1990 gave the Civic Forum and its allies large majorities in parliament, and Havel was immediately reelected to a two-year term as president of the reborn Czechoslovakia. "Vaclav Havel had enormous moral authority which propelled him to the presidential palace in a very short space of time. Once there, he added to his authority and built up his charisma by a series of initiatives, but also through his personal charms and abilities as a communicator, so that he was effectively above criticism."[54] Havel had never thought of himself as anything but a writer, and therefore this new position as

leader of such a rapidly changing nation proposed many challenges for the intellectual. He understood his mission to be one of speaking the truth about his country, not prescribing policies for its change.[55]

Havel gave his first major public address as president of the Czechoslovak state on New Year's Day, 1990. His "New Year's Address" was broadcast on Czech and Slovak Radio and Television, and published worldwide. He urged the Czechoslovaks not to misunderstand their liberation. Havel felt that it was crucial for the people to understand that by not opposing the regime strongly enough to dismantle it in its early days, they were partly at fault for its repression in recent years: "We had all become used to the totalitarian system and accepted it as an unchangeable fact and thus helped to perpetuate it; . . . none of us is just its victim: we are all its co-creators." He went on to say, "[T]he best government in the world, the best parliament and the best president, cannot achieve much on their own . . . Freedom and democracy include participation and therefore responsibility from us all."[56]

PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS:

FIRST YEARS IN POST-COMMUNIST CZECHLOSLOVAKIA

The destruction of a social and political system is much easier than the construction of a new one. Western democratic institutions imported by postcommunist reformers did not match the social and political realties of Czechoslovakia in the early 1990s. The leaders' aim was to gradually transform those realities until this incongruency diminished.[57] Ethnic discord was one of these realities. Prior to the fall of communism, Havel had noted that the regime had cultivated in the people such a profound distrust of all generalizations that they had become largely immune to all nationalistic ideals.[58] In 1991, however, there was an abundance of evidence to indicate that the ethnicity problem would become a key issue, not only in Czechoslovakia, but in the majority of the eastern European nations. "Praguecentrism," the idea that Prague was (or should be) the center of all Czechoslovak political and social influence, was becoming more stringently opposed by Slovakians day by day. "The only way of resolving the ethnic issue in Central Europe [was] seen through 'redrawing' the national frontiers as they [saw] fit."[59]

Slovak nationalism became an increasingly critical issue when it began interfering with the daily functions of the state. The highly nationalistic Slovak activists prevented President Havel from completing his May 1990 Bratslavian visit without event. Even those Slovakians living in the Bratslavia region who were presumed to be his followers appeared as though they might use force to expel him from their capital.[60]

Havel had not yet seen the end of Slovak nationalism. The free-market reforms that had been introduced after the fall of the communist regime were making incredible progress in Czech sections of the nation, but the Slovak region was lagging far behind. This feeling of inferiority, coupled with the Slovak desire for national autonomy dating back to the post-World War I years, produced a seriously strained political situation within the government. In 1992, two parties dominated the assembly: The Movement for a

Democratic Slovakia, led by Vladimir Meciar, and the Civic Democratic Party, led by Vaclav Klaus. As Slovakia moved toward independence, the Slovaks in parliament blocked Havel's bid for a second presidential term; it became clear that no solution could be forged. On January 1, 1993, the Czech Republic and Slovakia emerged as independent nations.

The preamble to the new constitution of the Czech Republic, adopted on December 16, 1992, resolves to develop a nation that is "the home of equal and free citizens who are conscious of their duties towards others and their responsibility towards the whole, as a free and democratic state based on the respect for human rights and the principles of civic society, as part of the family of European and world democracies."[61] In late January 1993, the Chamber of Deputies elected Vaclav Havel as the Republic's first president. He vowed to use his experiences in creating this independent nation to influence the policymaking of the state, bringing about a better future for the Czech Republic and all of its free citizens.

ECONOMICS OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC:

FROM A NATION REPRESSED TO WORLDWIDE SUCCESS

In the early communist years, rapid industrialization was emphasized to the exclusion of everything else. The supply problems that developed during this period resulted in public discontent which had to be forcibly repressed. Economic planners paid little attention to the issue of consumer demand because it was impossible to dictate and difficult to manipulate. In "Stories and Totalitarianism" Havel described the early economic system as one that had "demonstrated that without a plurality of economic initiatives, and of people who participate in them . . . an economy will stagnate and decline."[62]

Havel theorized that this type of economy could not maintain any level of success. He felt that a totally nationalized and centralized economy would gradually open up a chasm between man and the economic system, providing a basis for the ineffectiveness of that system. "Having lost his personal relationship to his work, his company, to the many decisions about the substance and the purpose of his work and its consequences, he loses interest in the work itself. The company allegedly belongs to everyone, but in reality it belongs to no one."[63] It was this specific characteristic of the Leninist-socialist economy that Havel sought to remedy when he came into power, stating that his preferred economic system was one that was based on a plurality of many decentralized, structurally varied, and preferably small enterprises.[64]

In the early 1990s, Czechoslovakia joined many other postcommunist countries when it imposed "shock therapy" methods of market reform. This was to the detriment of consumers. "In a time of turbulent events, the population of these countries went along with the idea of free enterprise in the abstract hope for early prosperity. However, reared as it was in the spirit of former notions about social welfare, it turned out to be unprepared to do without a guaranteed 'social minimum'."[65] When the system could not

adequately provide for its people, as the previous communist system had done, a feeling of discontent spread throughout the state, endangering its democratic base of legitimacy.

Soon after this initial economic crisis, things began to improve dramatically in the Czech region, so much so that, as previously mentioned, the economic disparity within the nation eventually caused its split. In 1995 Vladimir Dlouh, the Czech Republic's Minister of Trade, placed an open call on the world wide web for foreign investors interested in the Czech Republic. The statement emphasizes that the government's objective is to complete its economic transformation into a full free-market economy, and to sustain a business environment conducive to profitable investment and growth for Czech and foreign companies alike.[66] The Czech Republic is developing all of the institutions it feels are necessary for a very successful free market economy which should, in turn, stabilize and legitimize the government in the eyes of the Czech people.

Accompanying this new international outlook in relation to the Czech economy is an intense effort to join the ranks of the European Union. In 1994, the Czech strategy was described as minimalist, "seeing the grouping of central European states as a consultative body."[67] But more recently, Prime Minister Klaus, influenced by Havel's desire for an intensely international state, has continued opposition to membership in any group which subsequently could be offered as an alternative to their real goal of integration into the EU.

HAVEL'S VISION FOR THE FUTURE

"Our country . . . can now permanently radiate love, understanding, the power of spirit and ideas. It's precisely this glow that we can offer as our specific contribution to international politics."[68] This was how Havel envisioned Czechoslovakia's role in the new global arena in 1990. The geographic position alone of the Czech Republic makes it an important bridge between the East and the West. Moreover, it is fast becoming the economic forerunner of the region. Politically, the nation is searching for its own berth in NATO to accompany its desired integration into the EU. Further progress towards European integration is seen by some observers as an important pillar of a new security architecture. "As Vaclav Havel put it, 'Europe should gradually move towards the ideal of an entirely new security system as a forerunner of a future united Europe, which would provide some sort of security background or security guarantees.'"[69]

The Czech Republic is now declaring that it regards the North Atlantic Alliance as a guarantor of European, as well as its own, security.[70] The main detractor to this plan is Russia. It has repeatedly voiced its objection to any eastward expansion of the military alliance that it regarded as a mortal enemy during the Cold War. Eastward expansion could have negative ramifications, erasing much of the work done over the past decades to decrease the threat of nuclear war worldwide: "Some in Moscow have said they would not go ahead with ratifying the START II nuclear arms treaty if NATO expanded."[71] At the writing of this article, it remained to be seen what would become of the Czech Republic's bid for entrance into NATO.

HAVEL'S LAST WORDS?

Vaclav Havel is still occupying the presidency of the Czech Republic. He is, however, considering retirement in order to resume what he considers to be his life's passion: writing. He still believes that much needs to be done to secure democracy in this world. In a 1991 speech, Havel stated that "[p]lanetary democracy does not yet exist, but our global civilization is already preparing a place for it; it is the very Earth we inhabit, linked with Heaven above us."[72] He believes that democracy must be interpreted as something other than a product that can be imported and imposed on any peoples with ease: "Democracy is seen as something . . . that can be exported like cars or television sets, something the more enlightened purchase and the less enlightened do not."[73]

Havel has mentioned that he felt a strong kinship to those revolutionary youth he visited in the United States in 1968.[74] Thus, perhaps his true home is among those revolutionaries who consistently place themselves in danger for the good of their people. As he foresees, "[G]iven its fatal incorrigibility, humanity probably will have to go through many more Rwandas and Chernobyls before it understands how unbelievably short-sighted a human being can be who has forgotten that he is not God."[75] It is therefore highly unlikely that this man of words will care to part with any utterance that he considers to be his last. As long as there exist oppressive situations which he feels must be altered, he will forever be writing, the poet, the dissident, and the father of a nation meshed into one.

NOTES:

1. Timothy Garton Ash, "PragueA Poem, Not Disappearing," in *Vaclav Havel: Living in Truth*, ed. Jan Vladislav (London: Faber & Faber, 1986), p. 220.

2. Vaclav Havel, *Disturbing the Peace: A Conversation with Karel Hvizdala*, trans. Paul Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990), p. 6.

3. Ibid., p. 27.

4. Milan Kundera, "Candide Had to Be Destroyed," in *Vaclav Havel: Living in Truth*, ed. Jan Vladislav, trans. K. Seigneurie (London: Faber & Faber, 1986), p. 259.

5. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, pp. 51-52.

6. Ibid., p. 199.

7. Vaclav Havel, "It Always Makes Sense to Tell the Truth," in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. and trans. Paul Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), pp. 94-95.

8. Kundera, p. 261.

9. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, p. 55.

10. Vaclav Havel, "A Word About Words," in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. Paul Wilson, trans. A.G. Brain (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), pp. 379-380.

11. Vaclav Havel, "The Power of the Powerless," in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. and trans Paul Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), pp. 160-161.

12. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, pp. 166-167.

13. Paul Wilson, introduction to *Disturbing the Peace: A Conversation with Karel Hvizdala*, by Vaclav Havel (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990), pp. XIV-XV.

14. Andrzej Korbonski, "Comparing Liberalization Processes in Eastern Europe." *Comparative Politics*, 4, no. 2 (1972), pp. 241-242.

15. Ibid., p. 239.

16. Ibid., p. 243.

17. Ibid., pp. 245-246.

18. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, p. 95.

19. Ibid., pp. 95-96.

20. Ibid., p. 103.

21. Ibid., p. 110.

22. Vaclav Havel, "Second Wind," in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. and trans. Paul Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), pp. 8-9.

23. Vaclav Havel, "Stories and Totalitarianism," in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. and trans. Paul Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), p. 331.

24. Vaclav Havel, "Letter to Alexander Dubcek," in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. Paul Wilson, trans. A.G. Brain (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), p. 45.

25. Havel, "The Power of the Powerless," p. 151.

26. Paul Wilson, introduction to *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, by Vaclav Havel, ed. Paul Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), p. ix.

27. Ibid., p. viii.

28. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, pp. 128-129.

29. Ibid., p. 129.

30. Ibid., pp. 131-132.

31. Ibid., pp. 130-131.

32. Harry Jarv, "Citizen Versus State," in *Vaclav Havel: Living in Truth*, ed. Jan Vladislav

(London: Faber & Faber, 1986), pp. 242-243.

33. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, p. 138.

34. Ibid., pp. 66-67.

35. Wilson, Introduction to *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, p. vii.

36. Ibid., p. viii.

37. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, p. 185.

38. Jarv, "Citizen Versus State," p. 242.

39. Heinrich Boll, "Courtesy Towards God," in *Vaclav Havel: Living in Truth*, ed. Jan Vladislav (London: Faber & Faber, 1986), p. 205.

40. Vaclav Havel, "Reports on My House Arrest," in *Open Letters: SelectedWritings 1965-1990*, ed. and trans. Paul Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), p. 228.

41. Boll, "Courtesy Towards God," p. 209.

42. Wilson, introduction to *Disturbing the Peace*, pp. XVI-XVII.

43. Vaclav Havel, "Meeting Gorbachev," in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. Paul Wilson, trans. George Theiner (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), p. 352.

44. Vaclav Havel, "Testing Ground," in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. Paul Wilson, trans. A. G. Brain (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), p. 373.

45. George Schopflin, "Post-communism: Constructing New Democracies in Central Europe," *International Affairs*, 67, no. 2 (1991), p. 243.

46. Havel, "Stories and Totalitarianism," p. 337.

47. Ibid., p. 348.

48. Schopflin, "Post-communism: Constructing New Democracies in Central Europe," p. 242.

49. Mark Kramer. "Beyond the Brezhnev Doctrine- A New Era in Soviet-East European

Relations?" *International Security*, 14, no. 3 (1990), p. 58.

50. Havel, "Testing Ground," pp. 375-376.

51. Timur Kuran, "Now or Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989," *World Politics*, 44 (October 1991), p. 24.

52. Michael Bernhard. "Civil Society and Democratic Transition in East Central Europe." *Political Science Quarterly*, 108, no. 2 (1993), p. 324.

53. Wilson, introduction to *Disturbing the Peace* pp. XIII-XIV.

54. Schopflin, "Post-communism: Constructing New Democracies in Central Europe," p. 240.

55. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, p. 8.

56. Vaclav Havel, "New Year's Address,"in *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, ed. and trans. Paul Wilson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), pp. 391-392.

57. Schopflin, "Post-communism: Constructing New Democracies in Central Europe," p. 236.

58. Havel, "A Word About Words," p. 387.

59. Mecheslav Senkevich. "East-European Prospects." *International Affairs* (Moscow: June 1991), pp. 47-48.

60. Alexei Kaznacheyev. "Old Relationship is Destroyed. What Now?" *International Affairs* (Moscow: September 1991), pp. 20-21. Bratslavia is the capital city of Slovakia.

61. "Preamble" in "Czech Republic." A. Tschentscher, ed., [http://www.rrz.uni-

hamburg.de/law/ez00000_html], 10 October 1995.

62. Havel, "Stories and Totalitarianism," p. 341.

63. Havel, *Disturbing the Peace*, p. 13.

64. Ibid., p. 16.

65. Senkevich, "East-European Prospects." p. 50.

66. Vladimir Dlough, "Message from the Czech Republic Minister of Industry and Trade," [http://www.webpress.net/ipk/czinvest/message.html], 12 October 1996.

67. George Kolankiewicz. "Consensus and Competition in the Eastern Enlargement of the EU." *International Affairs*, 70, no. 3 (July 1994), pp. 483-484.

68. Havel, "New Year's Address," p. 395.

69. Jan Zielonka. "Europe's Security: A Great Confusion." *International Affairs*, 67, no. 1 (1991), p. 136.

70. Senkevich, "East-European Prospects." p. 45.

71. Terrence Hunt, "NATO Looks to Expand Eastward," *Arkansas Democrat- Gazette*, 23 October 1996, 14A.

72. Vaclav Havel,"The Spiritual Roots of Democracy," [http://www.opencenter.org/lapis/havel.html], 12 October 1996.

73. Ibid.

74. Boll, "Courtesy Towards God," p. 212.

75. Havel, "The Spiritual Roots of Democracy."

Colombia's Dirty War:

The Clash Between State and Society

Alan Dossey

When examining modern-day Colombia, the inordinate level of violence is impossible to overlook. The road towards a viable democracy in Colombia has been unpredictable and costly, both economically and in terms of human life. Unlike many other South American countries, Colombia does not have a record of bureaucratic authoritarian (BA) regimes, and the only dictatorship in the twentieth century lasted for less than five years. Civil war and guerrilla violence has instead shaped this country's history. The Colombian government has met this threat with inconsistent policies. At times it has chosen to ignore the internal conflicts, hoping they would fade away sooner or later. At other points in history, the government has fervently campaigned to bring an end to the violence. After attempting to negotiate peace for many years, the Colombian government has finally, though still unofficially, decided to fight back with repression and terrorism, launching what some historians call Colombia's Dirty War.[1] This essay describes the historical context from which the Dirty War emerged, then studies the roles that politics, the economy, society, and political culture have played in contributing to the rise of this violent, insurgent attack on Colombian society.

ORIGINS IN HISTORY

Contrary to the norm in Latin America, twentieth century Colombia has not been marked by authoritarian government, military coups, or revolution, nor has it been the model of democracy and modernity. Rather, the only distinct pattern throughout Colombia's 175 year history has been that of continual violence. In his inauguration speech 7 August 1994, President Ernesto Samper borrowed a quotation from former President Manuel Toro, who wrote 120 years earlier: "We belie our pretension of being civilized, moral, and dignified people when, under the most futile pretexts, we appeal to arms or we proceed to commit acts of violence."[2] What was true then is certainly true today. To understand the rise of the Dirty War, a brief explanation of Colombia's political history since 1930 is necessary.

From Violence to Stability: 1930-1974

As in the rest of the South America, 1930 was an important turning point in Colombia, because the state was forced to confront the effects of a world-wide recession. While other Latin American countries resolved to penetrate society and unite the people under the state, Colombia failed to consolidate power, leaving the landowners and political elite considerable influence over the direction in which the country could go. In accordance with the interests of these elite classes, wealth was not redistributed, the poor became poorer, and a sizable middle class failed to emerge in Colombia during the early twentieth century. Colombia was also facing formidable challenges emanating from the two competing parties: the Liberals and the Conservatives. The division between the two

had already resulted in six civil wars, but the conflict had yet to be permanently resolved. Virtually every institution and individual in Colombia sided with one of the parties, including the Catholic Church. The rivalry climaxed in 1946, after the assassination of a prominent liberal political leader. The country soon fell into an eight year period of intense fighting, which became generically labeled *La Violencia.* The civil war resulted in 200,000 dead as well as the establishment of Colombia's only military dictatorship of the century, that of Gustavo Pinilla from 1953 to 1957.[4] Moreover, an entire generation of Colombians grew up believing that hate, violence, and murder was simply a way of life in their nation. Hence, the current technique of the state engaging in violence to solve disputes is neither novel nor intolerable to the Colombian society.

The next phase in Colombian history was the regime of the National Front, which lasted from 1958 to 1974. It was essentially created by two men, Alberto Lleras Camargo (Liberal) and Laureano Gómez (Conservative), both ex- presidents. The National Front was an attempt at limited democracy, whereby the Liberals and the Conservatives agreed to alternate Presidential power every four years and divide political power, within the Congress and Judiciary, equally between the two parties. Furthermore, no new parties were allowed to participate in elections during this period. The first stipulation brought considerable success. Power was exchanged every four years without violence, thus creating unprecedented stability in Colombia. The second stipulation, however, created an issue that Colombians have only recently recognized as a problem. By limiting the democratic process to only two parties, the National Front became highly exclusionary, not allowing for the participation of those who were either disenchanted with the system in the wake of *La Violencia*, or those who did not feel represented by the traditional parties. Without alternative institutional channels, some of these people formed the guerrilla groups that have plagued Colombia ever sense. The National Front unintentionally plant the seeds for Colombia's Dirty War specifically because it failed to represent or recognize significant sectors of Colombian society.

The Guerrilla and the State

During the National Front, the guerrilla movement was confined to the countryside and did not heed much military and political progress.[5] The limited success of the guerrillas during this time is best explained by their organizational immaturity, their ideological foundations, and the relative stability of the National Front regime. However, once these factors were removed, there was an immediate change in the performance of the guerrilla groups. They became more likely to use violence in urban areas as opposed to rural warfare, and they gained political influence in the cities as well. While it is important to realize the continual change of the guerrillas' violent activity, it is also necessary to understand that these groups, which formed in the wake of the Cuban Revolution, all were diverse in their specific ideological origins. For example, the Colombian Revolutionary Army (FARC) was officially founded in 1964, though it traces its roots ten to fifteen years prior to that date. Three other principal guerrilla groups made their appearances in the wake of the Cuban Revolution. The National Liberation Army (ELN), like the FARC, was founded in 1964 by a group of university students who travelled to Cuba and had become convinced of Che Guevara's *foquismo* theory. The Popular

Liberation Army (EPL) made its first appearance in 1967 as a Maoist-oriented group dedicated to the idea of the prolonged popular war. Finally, the Nineteenth of April Movement (M-19) was founded in 1972 on a political basis: its radical members claimed fraud in the 1970 election.[6] Yet, despite the diversity in the origins of Colombia's guerrilla groups, it is important to recognize that they were all results of a highly exclusionary, limited democracy in which legitimate channels to the government were closed off. Hence, violence was the only outlet to express political, social, and economic grievances.

After the National Front ended in 1974, the government's answer to the guerrilla violence was *apertura*, or a "democratic opening," which would allow the guerrilla groups to form political parties and offer candidates.[7] This was successful to some extent, but it quickly became clear that the guerrillas did not want to abandon their means of operation for a ticket to the congressional seat. They had become accustomed to a tradition of violence, and to give up that tradition at the promise of a politician was not a simple decision. In 1978, Julio Cesar Turbay Ayala was elected President, and he quickly decided that the best way to cope with the guerrillas was through repression. On 6 September 1978, he signed the Security Statute (*Estatut de Seguridad*) which "granted military and police forces extraordinary authority in their anti-subversive operations and which restricted civilian rights."[8] Yet, instead of reducing the violence like he intended, guerrilla warfare only increased during Turbay's term.

The 1980s ushered in still greater violence, along with false promises of amnesty and failed attempts at negotiating peace with the guerrilla groups. The early 1990s, however, witnessed the demobilization of the M-19 and EPL under the governments of Virgilio Barco and César Gaviria, respectively. President Gaviria attempted to complete the peace process by renewing talks with the FARC and the ELN, but neither the guerrilla groups nor the government were willing to fulfill each other's demands. In October 1992, Gaviria suspended talks indefinitely, ordering the military to begin a major offensive against the guerrillas. Thus the routine violence that Colombia was becoming accustomed to suddenly escalated into a Dirty War.

With a change in presidents in 1994 came a change in policy once again. President Ernesto Samper made peace the platform of his election. Without first implementing a cease fire, Samper announced that "the new negotiations would be discreet and could involve neutral mediators."[9] Momentarily, it seemed that the ELN and FARC were willing to negotiate in the peace process. The ELN even went so far as to provide the Colombian government with a list of twelve demands, including a reduction in military spending, the elimination of military impunity, and the replacement of neoliberal economic policy.[10] But this was all obscured once again by the rising action of death squads and terrorist groups that were tolerated, if not partially created, by the Colombian government and drug dealers. The ELN and FARC have attempted to retaliate through further violence, kidnapping, and sabotage. The leading cause of death in Colombia continues to be homicide, and it now appears that President Samper is following in former President Gaviria's footsteps.[11]

A WEAK STATE

It is clear that the Colombian Dirty War has its roots in *La Violencia* and the National Front. *La Violencia* created a tradition of violence which the National Front cultivated even more. Yet the Dirty War is more than simply a product of Colombia's history. It has much more direct and immediate causes. The most notable of these is political. More specifically, Colombia suffers from a weak central state.

For the purposes of this essay, Guillermo O'Donnell's definition of the state, based on the legal and security functions of the state, will be used. His argument is that the state's ability to demand allegiance from its citizens is based on the effectiveness of the law.[12] In Colombia, as in many Latin American countries, the constitution appears to be democratic and modern in doctrine, but it rarely functions properly in action. For example, in 1991, President Gaviria wrote a constitution that theoretically should give more power to the people. But in 1992 he began a violent military campaign in the countryside against suspected guerrillas, demonstrating the extreme power of the state. This contradictory type of behavior has plagued Colombia in the past and still lingers today. "A situation in which one can vote freely and have one's vote counted fairly but cannot expect proper treatment from the police or the courts calls into question the liberal component of that democracy and severely curtails citizenship."[13] This clearly applies to the political situation in Colombia.

The weakness of the Colombian state manifests in the violence and corruption under the Samper government as well. Allegations that Samper's 1994 election campaign was financed by Cali drug money have prevented the President from establishing the much-needed legitimacy from society. In 1995, Samper's campaign manager and defense minister were arrested in this connection, both claiming that drug money was involved in the campaign and that Samper was fully aware of it. In early 1996, Samper's finance minister resigned and the attorney general was arrested on suspicion of drug links as well. Even if President Samper is not guilty, the majority of Colombians seem to think he is, and this seriously impedes the President's approval rate and ability to embark upon any significant social or economic reform.

In addition to this significant obstacle, Samper's government is weakened by the lack of consistency in the President's rhetoric and actions. A year ago, Samper was promising to bring the guerrillas to the negotiating table, but now he plans to spend an extra $400 million this year to fight them.[14] New anti-guerrilla battalions are being formed, and at least twenty new attack helicopters are on the way. Furthermore, the government plans to set up "red zones," areas of heavy conflict where the army will have wider powers of search and seizure than elsewhere.[15] Ironically, Samper vowed against this action in his inauguration speech: "[N]o state can demand respect of its own citizens if its own agents act in an arbitrary manner, trampling individual rights."[16] Yet in May 1996, Samper said "We have to invest more to develop the offensive capacity of our forces."[17] Indeed, this is not the talk and action of a president who seeks immediate peace.

The result of Samper's contradictory actions is further violence. During a two day assault in April 1996, nearly fifty people died, more than thirty were injured, and ten were kidnapped. A similar skirmish occurred in May with equivalent damage.[18] Meanwhile, "the guerrillas seem to be getting more numerous, richer, better armed, and more widespread . . . They have shown little inclination of late to negotiate."[19] Why has Samper's recent escalation in fighting the guerrillas not succeeded? Again, the answer lies in a lack of legitimacy. Many Colombian peasants will support the guerrilla cause before they support Samper's. In many areas, the guerrillas have established para-statal organizations and provide many of the public goods neglected by the state, such as health care, education, and even a crude judicial system.[20] Without the backing of the people, the government's efforts are worthless. Though on the surface it seems as if Samper is strengthening the power of the state by augmenting his anti-guerrilla forces, ultimately the state is becoming more and more illegitimate by its random attacks and breaches of freedom, thus further weakening the state.

The Colombian state has rarely been able to establish its legal authority and legitimacy throughout the entire country. The citizens view the government as an instrument of the ruling classes, elitist, and corrupt. In recent history, the state has been debauched by its shifting policies and rumored correlation with drug cartels. The law therefore remains ineffective in a state that lacks legitimacy. Going full circle to O'Donnell's principle, the ineffectiveness of the law characterizes the weak Colombian state.

ECONOMIC ISSUES

Although the Colombian guerrillas may have a covert political agenda, their motivations for existence do not end there. Between 1990 and 1994, the state oil company, Ecopetrol, lost $550 million in the form of lost revenue from pipeline attacks, lost royalties, repairs, and security costs.[21] In 260 weeks, one pipeline near the Venezuelan border was blown up 229 times.[22] Another pipeline, completed in 1986, had suffered 345 ELN attacks, according to Ecopetrol in 1995.[23] This indicates that the guerrilla groups have an economic agenda as well, and as pointed out earlier, many of the ELN's published demands have an economic basis. This section will argue that the Dirty War is in many ways a result of Colombia's economy and of the struggle between society and the state for control over it.

Whereas in the political arena Colombia suffers from a lack of regime legitimacy, in the economic realm Colombia suffers from a lack of consensus. For the purpose of this essay, the term consensus denotes agreement, or harmony between the policies of the government and the expectations of society. While there has been some change in Colombian institutions and policy, society's expectations have changed at a faster pace, creating a growing gap between state and society, which manifests itself in the rising conflicts of the Dirty War.

Corruption in the National Front

As noted earlier, the immediate consequence of the National Front regime was political stability. This was true for the economy as well. Elitists shared economic interests under the National Front regime which was reflected in the relatively continuous policies. This encouraged economic growth, demonstrated by the rise in income per capita during this time. In the 1950s, growth was 1.6 percent; it accelerated in the 1960s to 2.2 percent, and then in the 1970s to 3.3 percent.[24] In addition to its stable growth rate, the National Front government is noted for its reluctance to make drastic policy changes. Economic policy was mostly reactive, responding to changes in the international market and to internal pressures. It was easily capable of adapting to both external and internal demands, and this has been exhibited in its lack of strikes, recessions, and conflict. During the National Front government, consensus between the state and society led to stability and growth.

Nevertheless, the National Front regime was not economically flawless, and the world is only beginning to realize its long term detrimental effects. It created a certain standard of corruption that quickly became the norm. Power and power connections generated wealth, and this arrangement was easily accepted by society. The first reason that corruption was particularly intrinsic in the National Front government lies in how the government was initially formed. As discussed earlier, the National Front government attempted to find a democratic solution to the party conflict which had culminated in *La Violencia*. Furthermore, the National Front government sought to prevent any future conflict by limiting the terms and restricting political competition. In short, conflict became anathema during this time period from 1953-1975. One can easily recognize how this carried over into Colombia's attempts at capitalism. In a free market, competition is not discouraged, but rather necessary. When consumers notice that other consumers have a comparative advantage because of who they are or who they know, their first intuition is to join that group with the comparative advantage. This decreases competition and ultimately hinders economic development. Those who were not so lucky as to have connections to the elite, or who sought escape from state control of the economy, created a new sector of the economy: the informal sector. In addition, an underground economy, or black market emerged from this environment. By its very nature, therefore, the National Front regime was not only politically exclusive, but economically exclusive; it prevented capitalistic, free market transactions and development from occurring naturally.

A second explanation for the origins of corruption during the National Front is that the weak Colombian state (inadvertently or purposely) served to promote or encourage economic corruption. "Colombia's protectionist policies, being based on tariffs and nontariff trade barriers as well as other trade policies, promoted contraband as a socially acceptable economic activity."[25] The state made impractical laws and was unable to properly enforce them, making illegal activity more feasible. For example, in 1967, the government "made it illegal for Colombian residents to hold foreign exchange or other financial assets in or outside the country."[26] For obvious reasons, this law was unrealistic and impossible to enforce upon every citizen. Furthermore, the Colombian state has a long history of contraband and smuggling which began with colonization. Smuggling everything from emeralds to coffee, Colombia has had a black market for centuries, which has only modernized for the twentieth century. The weak government and its

policies during the National Front regime, therefore, only contributed to the emergence of corruption in Colombia.

In a traditionally hierarchical society, skipping a step here and there to reach the top of the ladder more quickly was not an uncommon practice. As more and more people did this, the public sector grew, and "the limits between legal and illegal use of pubic funds became blurred."[27] By 1974, the system had become increasingly complex, silently encouraging economic activities that ultimately led to corruption and a wider gap between state and society, between the elite and the impoverished. The creation of this gap and the eradication of state-society consensus that followed made conflict no longer an inconceivable notion.

The Rise of Conflict

In many ways, the Colombian economy climaxed during the National Front. Import substitution industrialization (ISI) led to immediate growth while the political system created remarkable stability. But with the end of the National Front, that stability could no longer be relied upon and ISI quickly revealed its faults. From 1975 to 1982, the Colombian economy entered a period of denouement, gradually slowing due to changes in policy, the effects of corruption, and the development of the illegal drug industry. Colombia went into crisis in 1982, and since then has been searching for new growth.

The National Front regime may have contributed to the genesis of corruption in the Colombian economy, but its end in 1974 did not mean the departure of corruption. In fact, with the end of Colombia's economic boom, the corruption only grew worse. The first post-National Front government was headed by Alfonso López Michelsen, and his stated goal was "tackling the chronic problem of unequal income distribution and associated severe poverty and malnutrition."[28] His answer was to increase government spending on social services while simultaneously undertaking a major income tax reform. This tax reform, while in the short term providing increased revenues, created more problems than it solved. The old elite did not appreciate being suddenly taxed for the benefit of the poor or lower classes. Thus, the reform induced them to search for legal and illegal ways to avoid taxes. Furthermore, the tax system placed "disproportionate demands on the middle and lower classes," which made them "reluctant to pay their taxes or to support the tax reform because they believe[d] that they [had] already paid more than their share."[29] López's tax reform was therefore only minimally successful, and his social objective was clearly not met.

In 1978, Julio César Turbay was inaugurated president. He eventually outlined his economic goals in the National Integration Plan (PIN). The major ambition was to increase the degree of regional autonomy and political decentralization. To achieve this, the government undertook a massive public investment program, financed the construction of roads, and improved communication systems.[30] By concentrating spending on this area, Turbay neglected other areas, and the country became very vulnerable to changes in domestic and international conditions. The problems that had just emerged during López's term exacerbated while Turbay was in office. Tax evasion

increased, there was a growing fiscal deficit with public sector revenues dependent on the external sector, and inflation was on the rise again.[31] Furthermore, corruption flourished and the underground economy grew substantially. As a result, the gap between state and society widened even further.

In 1982, Belisario Betancur was ushered in as the newly elected president. Under the strategy of *Desarollo con Equidad* (Development with Equity), Betancur sought to solve and eliminate the problems that had developed during the previous two presidencies through greater government intervention. The government nationalized several banks and finance companies and increased the regulation of industry. Public reaction was twofold: his policies were successful but society did not approve of the increased participation of the state. Furthermore, the level of violence increased significantly during Betancur's term, and it finally became clear that the state-society consensus that had existed during the National Front and lingered into the 1970s was now outmoded.

After Betancur, Presidents Barco, Gaviria, and Samper each campaigned to redistribute income and provide for higher growth. Unfortunately, the trends since 1975 have continued. Corruption and illegal transactions have increased. In 1985, the underground economy accounted for 8.7 percent more of the GDP than in the 1974-1976 years.[32] Ten years later, it can be said that "there is virtually no Colombian resident who does not break a law associated with economic behavior."[33] It is clear that the informal economy has grown faster than the formal economy since the 1970s. The lack of economic consensus between the state and society has thus created an ever-widening gap between the two entities. Today, the state attempts to fight the illegal drug industry and the growing guerrilla insurgency with physical force, contributing to the Dirty War. By revitalizing the economic consensus that the state and society once shared, Colombia's Dirty War could possibly be significantly abated.

Before moving on to the next variable in the rise of Colombia's Dirty War, it will be useful to review the following three points. It has been argued so far that the recent violence exhibited in Colombia is a result of historic trends, a weak and illegitimate central government, and a fragmented, corrupted economy. No particular variable carries more weight than the other, and they are not necessarily independent. For example, the reader may have noticed that one of the reasons for the growing corruption was the weak state, yet the state was further weakened by the growing corruption. It can be seen how these causes therefore in many ways benefit from the one another's existence; they are in many ways interdependent, as they did not occur separately, but rather simultaneously. It is important for the reader to keep this in mind as he reads the second half of this essay.

SOCIETAL FACTORS

When evaluating the role of society in the causes of Colombia's Dirty War, one cannot criticize the Colombian people for what they did during the years leading up to the war, but instead must focus on what society failed to do to prevent it. Because this essay is measuring the influence society *could* have had on the state to prevent the Dirty War, the evidence is less tangible and may seem abstract. Yet, this essay will still argue that if the

society had taken a different course of action, the Dirty War could have been postponed, if not prevented entirely.

The role of society is an important factor because, as explained above, it was the people who legitimized the political system and who conceded to the government's economic policies for so long. Society's time to participate was when the state was developing a new system of government and creating its economic policies in the late 1950s. Yet as a whole, society remained silent during this time. For example, the National Front regime was created by two ex-presidents who were by definition from the elite class. Had the Colombian society demanded greater representation in writing its stipulations, the National Front may have allowed for greater political participation. Since there was no such demand though, the National Front was created to exclude certain sections of society, and ultimately everyone suffered because of it. Thus society missed its initial opportunity to assert itself politically; soon this became not one opportunity lost, but convention.

The state was quick to take advantage of such a submissive society. During the last forty years, there has been what Luís Restrepo calls a gradual "coup d' état of civil society."[34] In contrast to the classic Latin American coup, in which a particular section of society asserts its power to overthrow and replace the government, the Colombian government has strived to foster its own interests in an attempt to transform society. Clientelistic government is best maintained by a society that is clearly divided by class, yet believes it is somehow united. The Colombian state successfully established such a system using the "carrot and stick" method. First, the state distanced itself from society, making it more difficult for Colombians to know the inner workings of the government. Then, in order to keep society complacent, the state periodically provided for the lower classes of society. For example, the roads and communication lines that López boasted about furnishing were initially well received in the countryside, but they were made of the cheapest materials available and by the time he was out of office, major repair was essential for their operation to continue.[35] For the most part, society seemed to accept this as fact of life and did not demand greater attention from the government. As a result, weak government policies continued which allowed for the evermore widening gap between state and society.

The "carrot and stick" technique, though it may have initially seemed successful, permitted a certain extent of leakage. Those who decided not to follow state policy and ordinance took one of two paths, both of which had the same result: further isolation from the state. The nonconformists and dissenters either chose to join the informal, underground sector of society or they chose to join the guerrillas. (More democratic routes, such as demonstrating or lobbying are not assessable or worthwhile under the present government.) The former choice was the most popular of the two. Though it meant settling for a lower standard of living, people were relatively free of government regulation and could live their lives by simply avoiding the frequent skirmishes between the government, guerrillas, drug dealers, and death squads, as opposed to participating in them. Once one chose to enter the informal sector, it was difficult, if not virtually impossible, to leave it. Soon people realized that life was not any better in the informal

sector than it had been previously. Consequently, the most recent trend has become to join or support guerrilla groups. As the state became weaker and illegitimate, and as the economy simultaneously became more corrupt, more and more Colombians, particularly rural peasants, shifted their allegiance to the guerrillas. Today, an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 guerrillas remain active, and their number is growing daily.

It should be clear that the previous evidence suggests that society is finally beginning to assert itself after all the years of being walked upon and ignored. The state has reacted by implementing repression and further regulation. Though Colombian society's assertion remains weak and fragmented by party line and class, the source of indignation has not disappeared. The demands of society lack strength not because they are inappropriate, but because they are about forty years late.

POLITICAL CULTURE

Another important consideration in an analysis of Colombia's Dirty War is the role played by Colombia's political culture. In many ways, political culture answers two questions: Why has society failed to assert itself for so long? Why do Colombians tend to feel greater provincial loyalty than national loyalty? Political culture determines the way society, and indeed the state, behaves. There are several aspects of political culture that are particularly relevant to the Dirty War in Colombia.

Left over from the days of colonialism, Colombia's society has long isolated the wealthy elite from the rural peasants, allowing little room for a middle class to develop or maneuver in between. It is best illustrated by a triangle, where the wealthiest class, which directs the state, is positioned at the very top of the triangle; the lower classes, which represent the majority of society, are positioned at the bottom of the triangle; and the middle classes are caught in between the two, with an enormous, often-times intimidating, potential to expand. The importance of this social triangle must not be overlooked when analyzing the causes of the Dirty War, as it is evident that in Colombia the relationships between these classes are conflictual, rather than consentual. It is key to note that this social triangle is accepted and accommodated in Colombia, as it is in most of Latin America. Upward mobility within the system usually occurs through either the military ranks or the pursuit of higher education, and it is not a simple task. Whether or not an individual advances from one sector of society to another often depends on luck, being in the right place at the right time, and knowing the right people. Traditionally, the elite class in Colombia is made up of a few well-known families. Access to political power, therefore, is limited and exclusionary. This combination will lead to violence. Moreover, this has resulted in the further distancing of the classes, which encourages friction and conflictual relations between classes.

As alluded to earlier, the heritage of violence in Colombia often serves to cultivate greater violence. Prior to the National Front, an entire generation matured believing that violence and murder were acceptable, and since its demise in 1974, another generation has grown up believing the same. Jorge Osterling describes the significance of this most accurately:

Almost any Colombian citizen has experienced the murder of a close relative, ancestor, friend, or acquaintance, and such experiences are told and repeated within the family. The survivors wish for revenge, and hatreds are passed down from one generation to the next. Consequently, some families bring up their dependents in an environment in which violence- especially the murder of a family enemy- is a tacitly accepted resort.[36]

Furthermore, for those who do witness violence, intimidation and fear often stops them from speaking out. Children are usually taught not to cooperate with authorities and to deny witnessing a violent incident.[37] After such a long history of violence, it is apparent in Colombia that all classes participate either directly or indirectly in promoting it further.

A final element of Colombia's political culture that has contributed to the rise of the Dirty War is individualism. It is not uncommon for children to be taught that "they are more important than anyone else, and that their needs come first."[38] This results in a low level of tolerance for different points of view, something vital for a liberal democracy. The high importance of individualism corresponds with a low level of nationalism. Outside the major cities, for example, Colombians value their town or province much more than they do the nation, which is to them far away, corrupt, and inconsequential. Breaking national laws does not carry a social stigma, and this is a key reason the state has not been successful in establishing its legitimacy. This ties into the ability for local guerrilla bands to establish para-statal organizations within the provinces. If the FARC or ELN is able to provide the peasants and rural workers with a few services that the state cannot provide, the people are distanced even further from the state, nationalism diminishes, and it becomes more difficult for the state to identify with society.

The political culture of Colombia has thus indirectly contributed to the rise of the Dirty War. The structure of society, the heritage of violence, and the high level of individualism have all functioned to increase the gap between state and society, making negotiation difficult and repression facile.

CONCLUSIONS

This essay has attempted to illustrate that the Dirty War in Colombia is a result of a combination of co-dependent factors. In contrast to the military dictatorships of the Southern Cone and Central America, the Dirty War in Colombia is conducted behind the facade of democracy, whereby elections take place, but true representation, participation, and justice are absent from the political system. This essay has argued that the Dirty War is a consequence of an enormous hiatus between the state and society, between the ruling elite and the common man. When the state and society are distanced to such a great extent, and when viable democracy has yet to be fully established, several trends become evident; Colombia illustrates them perhaps better than any other Latin American country today.

First, it is apparent that certain factions of society will renounce the exclusionary political system and form cliques. If they believe no democratic alternative is available, these groups will use sabotage, kidnapping, or violence to advance their demands. This course

of action was visible during the National Front regime in Colombia, and has been exacerbated since 1974 by the government's inconsistent policies and changing posture toward the guerrilla threat.

A second trend that has resulted from the state-societal gap in Colombia is the growth of corruption, the black market, and the informal or underground economy. When people see that the wealthy class is primarily made up of those who participate in illegal activities, they will emulate that pattern, leading eventually to an acceptable level of corruption. Once that corruption surpasses the accepted level, however, the people will reject the economic system. Furthermore, as people feel less represented by the state, they will do more to avoid its intervention, such as dodging regulations or evading taxes. Colombia has recently experienced a breaking of the state-societal consensus once taken for granted. When the state and society fail to come up with an alternative, the result is violence on the part of society and repression on the part of the state.

When the state decides to impose its will upon society, whether through repression, regulation, intervention, or simply not allowing for uniform participation in politics, society may choose to be proactive or reactive. In the case of Colombia, it is clear that until just recently, society has been reactive to the state's demands. This may be due to a number of circumstances, but the end result has been disastrous for society. Knowing that society would not serve as a check, the state has become less representative, more corrupt, and further distanced from society. Thus the state is no longer capable of identifying with the needs of the people, campaign promises are seldom upheld, and the foundations of democracy slowly crumble. Recently, since Colombian society has finally decided to become proactive, it finds that the state is very inflexible and set in its ways. It will take more than scattered guerrilla violence to create substantial change.

Finally, it is evident that after years of violence and a common political culture, the Colombian state and society have become further distanced. Violence is now a generally accepted method of resolving disputes, individualism is emphasized over nationalism, and the overall structure of society is one that discourages meaningful change or mobility. These characteristics have all contributed to a widening of the state-societal gap in Colombia.

The state's most recent answer to societal pressure has clearly been repression, whether in the form of a limited and exclusionary political system, the nationalisation of banks and industries, or the actual use of military force. These very acts, however, threaten the fragile democracy Colombia has struggled for so long to establish. Society's reaction so far has been limited, but it is clear that the guerrilla groups are expanding and more people are becoming actively involved in initiating change. This essay has argued that the Dirty War has been long in preparation. It did not result from a specific event, but rather from the gradual combination of a number of circumstances, both explicit and intangible. "It is a war of intimidation and extermination fought against all of the forces that might broaden the narrow bipartisan regime and transform armed struggle into political struggle."[39] Thus, it can be concluded that the Dirty War is the Colombian government's answer to a new political imperative stimulated by a changing society.

NOTES:

1. Among others, see Luís Restrepo's *The Crisis of the Current Political Regime and Its Possible Outcomes* or Eduardo Pizarro's *Pasado y Presente de la Violencia en Colombia*, for references to Colombia's "Dirty War."

2. "Los derroteros de Samper para el Salto Social," *El Espectador*, 8 Aug. 1994. p. 9A.

3. Harvey F. Kline. "Colombia: The Attempt to Replace Violence with Democracy." Howard J. Wiarda and Harvey F. Kline, eds. *Latin American Politics and Development*. 4th ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), p. 181.

4. Luís A. Restrepo. "The Crisis of the Current Political Regime and Its Possible Outcomes." Charles Bergquist, Ricardo Peñaranda, and Gonzalo Sánchez, eds. *Violence in Colombia: The Contemporary Crisis in Historical Perspective*. (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1992), p. 286.

5. Lawrence Boudon. "Guerrillas and the State: The Role of the State in the Colombian Peace Process." Victor Bulmer-Thomas and Laurence Whitehead, eds. *Journal of Latin American Studies*. (England: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 281.

6. Harvey F. Kline, *Latin American Politics and Development* . pp. 188 and 194.

7. Osterling, Jorge P. *Democracy in Colombia*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1989), p. 282.

8. Lawrence Boudon, *Journal of Latin American Studies* p. 284.

9. "Doce puntos de negociación del Eln." *El Tiempo*. 9 Nov. 1994. p. 15A.

10. Harvey F. Kline, *Latin American Politics and Development*. p. 175.

11. Guillermo O'Donnell. "The State, Democratization, and Some Conceptual Problems." William C. Smoth, Carlos H. Acuña, and Eduardo A. Gamarra, eds. *Latin American Political Economy in the Age of Neoliberal Reform*. (New Brunswick, 1994), p. 159.

12. Ibid., p. 167.

13. "Colombia's Guerrillas Flourish as its President Fades." *The Economist*. 11 May 1996. p. 37.

14. Ibid.

15. Lawrence Boudon, *Journal of Latin American Studies* pp. 291-2.

16. "Colombia's Guerrillas Flourish as its President Fades." *The Economist*..

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. Lawrence Boudon, *Journal of Latin American Studies* 289.

20. "Guerrilla Economics." *The Economist*. 13 Jan 1996. p. 40.

21. Ibid.

22. "Colombia's Other Gangsters." *The Economist*. 25 March 1995. p. 48.

23. Francisco E. Thoumi. *Political Economy & Illegal Drugs in Colombia*. (Boulder, CO: United Nations University, 1995), p. 26.

24. Ibid., p. 100.

25. Ibid., p. 101.

26. Ibid., p. 90.

27. Ibid., p. 43.

28. Jorge P. Osterling, *Democracy in Colombia*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1989), p. 273.

29. Francisco E. Thoumi, *Political Economy & Illegal Drugs in Colombia*. p. 47.

30. Ibid., p. 52.

31. Ibid., p. 98.

32. Ibid., p. 99.

33. Luís A. Restrepo. "The Crisis of the Current Political Regime and Its Possible Outcomes." Charles Bergquist, Ricardo Peñaranda, and Gonzalo Sánchez, eds. *Violence in Colombia: The Contemporary Crisis in Historical Perspective*. (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1992), p. 287.

34. Francisco E. Thoumi, *Political Economy & Illegal Drugs in Colombia*. p. 44.

35. Jorge P. Osterling, *Democracy in Colombia*. p. 270.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid.

39. Luís A. Restrepo, *Violence in Colombia: The Contemporary Crisis in Historical Perspective*. pp. 288-289.

From Gaullist Annoyer to Euro-Gaullist Leader:

French Foreign Policy Under Jacques Chirac

Allen Freeman

On July 16, 1995, newly elected French President Jacques Chirac became the first French head of state to publicly recognize that France was responsible for war crimes and horrible atrocities committed against Jews during the Vichy regime of Marshal Philippe Pétain. A shock to France and to the world, Chirac's decision broke with a past tradition where French presidents avoided an acknowledgment by claiming the Vichy government was illegitimate and bore no link to modern day Fifth Republic France.[1] The acknowledgment, coming on the anniversary of the day some 13,000 Jews were herded into Paris sports arenas and finally shipped to German concentration camps, is a landmark in that close to 80,000 French Jews died in the concentration camps and that the French government was in fact responsible for their deportation.[2] For many decades after the war, no one in France wanted to be reminded of its treatment of the Jews, and the Gaullists in power perpetuated this sentiment by depicting "Vichy and its collaborators as the work of a handful of extremists, with most of the French silently or actively supporting the resistance."[3] Although this paper will not focus on the institutional cover-up of war crimes in France, it is important to recognize Chirac's move as a symbolic yet significant indication of the direction of French foreign policy after the Cold War, an indication that Chirac has no qualms of breaking with sacrosanct political traditions in the name of leading France in a new European and geopolitical context.

This broken tradition of silence concerning French war crimes is one of many traditional elements of French politics. In fact, much of the tradition in French foreign policy is a result of the important impact of General Charles de Gaulle and his actions during early Fifth Republic France. Following a failed Fourth Republic that would sweep him into office, de Gaulle began an ambitious project to reverse what he saw as France's fallen and shameful position in the post-World War II period.[4] General de Gaulle lived through the humiliating and shocking defeat of 1940 and vowed to recover what France had lost in terms of its rank and prestige. This ambition to attain *grandeur* was the key to French foreign policy for years after de Gaulle. As Philip Gordon points out, "none of his successors abandoned this aim, and throughout the 1970s, 1980sand so far in the 1990s as wellmaintaining and augmenting France's status and rank has been the a primary element of French strategic culture."[5]

This continuity in French foreign policy is indeed astonishing given the fact that even Presidents who critiqued Gaullist principles before being elected, such as François Mitterand and Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, stayed true to the General's ideas and policies throughout their terms in office.[6] Why have his policies endured so long? Analysts cite several reasons. First of all, Gaullist principles are very flattering and easy to accept for a country "given toward national exceptionalism." Additionally, Gaullist ideas appear to be so ingrained in the French mind-set that politicians consider it to be political suicide to attempt any kind of debate of them. Finally, the very stature of General de Gaulle looms

over France: how could one possibly criticize the figure that rescued France from war and led it throughout a successful reconstruction?[7]

With respect to the end of the Cold War, it remains to be seen if Gaullism will continue to be the mainstay of French foreign policy or if a new set of ideas will replace it in a new world context. The bipolar world that de Gaulle critiqued is over and the multipolar one that he envisaged is in its place. European integration successfully ushered in not only a common marketplace, but also a political union intent on bringing about a common currency in 1999 to bind the countries together even more. In this spirit comes the election of Gaullist Jacques Chirac, the first new French president in fourteen years. Like de Gaulle, Chirac is a strong-willed, ambitious politician. He is "impetuous, a gambler in his own way, whose instinct for snap decisions can border on the reckless."[8] Known as "*le bulldozer*", Chirac's energetic and dynamic leadership will be put to the test as he sets to reduce double digit unemployment and strengthen European integration. In terms of foreign policy, many wondered if a new Gaullist at the Elysée would bring about another period of strong, nationalistic Gaullism, perhaps even more intense than that of his Socialist predecessor, François Mitterand.

But Chirac is in an interesting position. As the first president elected since the end of the Cold War, he has an obvious ability to forge a new path for France in an integrated Europe.

Despite an election largely focusing on domestic concerns, Chirac, portraying a good Gaullist, has acted on foreign policy issues and has made a series of decisions that could give a plausible indication as to the future of French foreign policy. Firstly, Chirac issued an *"irrévocable"* decision to restart French nuclear testing in the Pacific, a move that has angered both Asian countries and France's European neighbors. Secondly, under the new president, France has taken a significant step towards rejoining NATO's joint military command structure. Lastly, before the U.S. brokered peace agreement in the former Yugoslavia, Chirac took an important role in denouncing Serb atrocities and calling the West to strengthen its forces in the area.

By examining these decisions within the context of Gaullist foreign policy, this paper will show that the return of a Gaullist to the presidency does not necessarily mean a resumption of Cold War Gaullism, but signals an evolving Gaullism more in step with the post-Cold War era. Breaking with traditional Gaullist dogma, these decisions will bolster France's claim to be a credible leader in Europe and in the world by (1) proposingthe Europeanization of the French nuclear deterrent, (2) acting as a catalyst for needed reforms of the Atlantic Alliance and the creation of a European defense identity, and (3) proving that France *is* a formidable geopolitical power with real worldwide leadership capabilities.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND A EUROPEAN "*FORCE DE FRAPPE"*

Perhaps the most important or most publicized act of President Chirac's first four months in power was his controversial and "irrevocable" decision on June 13, 1995 to resume

French nuclear testing in the Pacific after a moratorium on testing was declared by his predecessor François Mitterand. To ensure the credibility of the French nuclear arsenal and to enable France to move in the future towards simulation testing and to signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1996, Chirac gave his authorization for a final series of up to eight tests between September 1995 and May 1996. Although Chirac and his ministers assure the tests are only to preserve the operational ability of existing weapons, many critics point toward a general French military wish to fortify the *force de frappe* or deterrent with newer and more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Worldwide anger and consumer boycotts followed the decision, specifically in the South Pacific area, but also among many European nations. The environmental group Greenpeace led protests against the ecological effects of the tests and sent its Rainbow Warrior II boat to the area around the Muroroa Atoll, where the tests took place.

In light of the obvious doubts about the seriousness of French technological reasoningbehind further nuclear testing (many contend the quality of the French deterrent is neither contested nor threatened), one can assume that the decision of Mr. Chirac is a more complicated one, one with political rather than technological or strategic reasons; "for after all, nuclear arms are above all a political weapon."[9] In fact French or Gaullist history points to the importance of the French *force de frappe* to the independence of France, a guarantor of its worldwide prestige.

Although initially begun during the troubled Fourth Republic, the idea of a credible French nuclear deterrent was the brainchild of President Charles de Gaulle. To de Gaulle, the ideas of *grandeur* and *indépendance* were the reasons behind the policies he took to rebuild post-World War II France and to return to it the power and prestige it once had. In his own words, "France is not really herself unless in the front rank," and de Gaulle envisaged an independent France leading the world.[10] For de Gaulle, France had a special right and duty to play the role of world power simply because it is France. His France was the leader of civilization, language, culture, and science, a country responsible to the world. Independence ensured France the freedom to seek out its rightful place, its proper *rang* in the world. De Gaulle's idea of French independence was also rooted in his belief in the primacy of the nation-state and his fear of entangling alliances and federations that would undermine French authority.

A French nuclear arsenal was de Gaulle's way of both guaranteeing France's independence through its own self-defense while also bolstering its power in the world political arena. Strategically, the *force de frappe* acts as a deterrent, that is, it deters any possible military action against France with the threat of a nuclear retaliation. Originally limited to just nuclear bombers, the French nuclear force now comprises both submarine-launched missiles as well as ground-based short and long-range ballistic missiles. So theoretically, no country would risk attacking France for fear of a calamitous retaliation of one of these weapons of mass destruction. Even though during the Cold War France was in reality protected by the U.S. nuclear umbrella against a nuclear attack from the Soviet bloc, de Gaulle doubted American commitment to European security and thus ordered the pursuit of a nuclear deterrent of France's own.

Beyond strategic military reasoning behind the development of the *force de frappe*, it is also apparent that military power is very important to France's political rank in the world. On its own, "France demonstrated that membership in the world's nuclear club was obtainable"[11] and even guaranteed a French seat in the U.N. Security Council, a position of only the world's most powerful players. With the advent of a nuclear force of its own, France could demand to the world that it be taken seriously, and indeed the force has amplified France's international stature. The *force de frappe* is a defiant slap in the face to the bipolar system of the Cold War, a blow in favor of a multipolar world where middle-sized countries like France could play an important role.[12]

The most recent history of the French nuclear deterrent is best described by that famous Gaullist continuity of French leaders who have maintained a Gaullist outlook on the importance of France's *force de frappe*. Through the years, testing continued and improvements and enhancements were made. This remained the same even during fourteen years of socialist rule under Mitterand who even initiated a nuclear submarine program. However, Mitterand ultimately chose to fall in line with international sentiment and declared a moratorium on French nuclear testing.

When Chirac broke with the moratorium imposed by his predecessor, many jumped to understand the political reasoning behind the Gaullist move. Chirac's decision appears to be a symbolic one that points towards the future of the European security system and France's role in it. As Chirac faced a flurry of biting criticism around the world for his decision to restart testing, France was forced to defend the controversial move. Many Western powers could not understand why France joined renegade China as the only nuclear club member still openly testing nuclear weapons. Many attributed the seemingly pointless tests to Gaullist muscle-flexing, intent only on annoying France's allies with incessant talk of *indépendance* and *grandeur*. Was France only reminding the world of its geopolitical importance and military might? As the verbal attacks on France escalated, especially in the South Pacific, many French leaders remained defiant. For them, it was the independent French nuclear deterrent itself that was being attacked and their Gaullist response was that the decision was an independent French choice concerning the need to maintain the very credibility of the *force de frappe* itself.

Despite French claims that the decision was private and irrevocable, criticism persisted, notably from France's European neighbors and partners. For them, the unilateral decision by France to restart nuclear testing was but another sign of the difficulties of European integration-containing unilateral actions by member-states. For France, who has long championed wider European ties including a common foreign and security policy, the decision seemed to reflect a return to a nationalistic Gaullism where France's independence and prestige are paramount. In response to increased Eurocriticism, criticism that posed a threat to France's credibility as a country devoted to European integration, French statesmen changed tactics and deflected mounting remarks from Europe by linking the tests to the needed establishment of a European nuclear deterrent, led of course by Gaullist France.

The French nuclear deterrent has always been a sensitive topic in Europe and given the uncertainties of the post-Cold War era, the discussion of a European nuclear deterrent is indeed timely. Dominated by the nuclear blocs of the Soviet and American hegemonies, the French deterrent was of little importance during the Cold War since France was ultimately protected by the American nuclear umbrella. But in today's multipolar world where American hegemony seems to be broken considering mounting budget deficits and a rebirth of isolationism in the U.S., perhaps smaller nuclear deterrents like the *force de frappe* are more plausible.

Indeed, to blunt criticism about the tests, French leaders focused on the need for a European nuclear deterrent to ensure a viable Europe. For Chirac, threats to France and Europe have not disappeared with the end of the Cold War and in this period of instability the notion of deterrence is still real.[13] France also believes that for Europe to exist, it must have its own defense, a defense strengthened by a French nuclear deterrent. In an article in the conservative daily *Le Figaro*, National Assembly President Philippe Séguin states "It is the criticism [about the tests] from Europe that hurts the most... Making the French nuclear force available for the defense of Europe would be an essential element of stability for the continent...By developing its nuclear weapons at a modest yet efficient level of performance, France is working for Europe as a whole."[14]

These formal remarks by head French statesmen were most astonishing in that they appeared to be not just a politically-deft spin of worldwide hostility towards the testing but rather sincere suggestions for a reevaluation of European nuclear security policy. Given the diminishing prospects of a large-scale bloc vs. bloc nuclear war, a smaller European *force de frappe* is more viable and could be an effective means of deterring a limited nuclear attack against the Old Continent. This idea was attractive to other European nations, especially the Germans who showed an interest in the sincerity of the French proposition. One German Christian Democrat spokesman offered that by some bizarre "ruse" of history, the resumption of nuclear testing at Mururoa could be a catalyst for advancing the discussion of European defense.[15] Klaus Kinkel, the German Minister of Foreign Affairs judged the idea of a concerted European deterrent "interesting" and that it should be discussed and studied attentively.[16]

The idea of a joint nuclear deterrent is not a simple one, however, and poses many questions if not problems. Historically, this is not the first time France has proposed its nuclear force to its European neighbors. However, at that time the Soviet bloc was of immediate concern and the *force de frappe* was but a weak alternative to an omnipotent American nuclear umbrella. For those countries, the choice was between yielding to an ambitious Gaullist France more concerned with its own image or keeping the powerful Americans involved in Europe. The current multipolar world offers different challenges, and France appears less Gaullist in that it is less concerned with itself, yet no one wishes to expel the Americans from a role in European nuclear security issues. Daniel Vernet of the French centrist daily *Le Monde* recognizes many logistical concerns of a joint nuclear deterrent: Can the *force de frappe*, which is based on defending French nuclear territory, be enlarged geographically? What are "vital interests" common to all Europeans, interests capable of justifying a recourse to nuclear arms? What role will a deterrent force play in a

world dominated not by a single threat but by diverse and scattered multiple risks? How will Germany, which has renounced nuclear weapons and refuses to have "its finger on the button,"[17] participate in a European deterrent?

Although many questions linger and it is certain that any real Euro-deterrent is years away, the possible existence of such a force is revolutionary, particularly for France. First of all, in contrast to traditional Gaullist nuclear policy which maintained that nationalism or self-interest was the overriding concern for a nation's military defense, France was suddenly making a significant step towards supranationalism in a sensitive area-the illustrious *force de frappe*. In plain speaking, France was proposing a discussion of Europeanizing the French nuclear force. After twenty years of protecting only the French territorial "sanctuary," Jacques Chirac was using his nuclear tests to affirm a possible new French contribution to a common European defense. Additionally, the move strengthens French aims to be a leader for the fledging E.U. by laying on the altar of closer European unity a prized and deeply private aspect of national defense. To counter the mounting economic leadership of Germany, France has used the resumed testing and the prospects of a Euro-deterrent to bolster its position as the strategic leader of a unified Europe. The plan is ultimately most beneficial to Europe, for it is only France who could deliver such nuclear leadership to a leaderless Europe (Great Britain still remains hesitant toward further military/security integration in the European Union). Though for a while many have been interested in the idea of a nuclear force for Europe, other countries have always recognized that "the ideas must come from France."[18]

In conclusion, it appears that France's resumption of nuclear testing is an important factor in the beginning of a sincere discussion of the future of nuclear weapons in Europe and an interesting example of French foreign policy after the Cold War. If the decision initially appeared to be a traditional Gaullist one, intent on frustrating its Western partners by acting unilaterally in the name of independence and prestige, the testing finally suggests a changing, evolving Gaullism. If France formerly defied its European neighbors by competing with the American nuclear umbrella in offering with pride its own smaller deterrent, President Chirac advocated a kinder and more open Gaullist deterrent, bent less on *indépendance* and more on cooperation. Even if a Euro-deterrent does pose political and logistical uncertainties, Chirac's move is significant because it is ultimately unlike the rigid traditional French Gaullist foreign policy that has maintained the deterrent as a weapon reserved only to France, a weapon preserving French independence. Charles Millon, the French Defense Secretary, captured this evolution of French policy by stating recently, in what is clearly a different, more European-Gaullist fashion, "the French deterrent is, at the same time, an essential guarantee for our independence and a major strategical asset for European construction."[19]

REAPPOCHMEMENT WITH NATO AND THE "EUROPEAN PILLAR"

If the Gaullist tradition of independence and prestige long dictated French nuclear policy, similar traditions have had a lasting effect of France's attitude toward European security and namely NATO, Europe's long-standing security structure. Like the defiant *force de frappe*, France has had an uneasy relationship with its European neighbors and more

importantly with the Americans concerning the Atlantic Alliance. Following World War II, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was created to keep the United States involved in European security issues, primarily to balance an apparent threat of a Soviet invasion of Western Europe. The Alliance turned out to be most successful because it helped foster one of the longest periods of peace on the European continent and ultimately prevailed with the end of its principal enemy in the demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.

Although most European nations were generally supportive of American involvement in Cold War-Europe, French President Charles de Gaulle distrusted NATO, which he saw to be a vehicle for American hegemony in Europe. As explained earlier, de Gaulle rejected the bipolar world of the Cold War and demanded an independent role for France, free from either of the two blocs. After complete dependence on the "anglo-saxons" (de Gaulle's nationalistic term for the Americans and British) to save France during World War II, the General vowed never again to put France's defense in the hands of an outside power. De Gaulle feared that the Americans eventually withdrew from Europe as their fiscal budgets tightened and interests turned inward, and would thus renege on their commitment to defend the Old Continent in case of Soviet attack. Furthermore, de Gaulle's hostility toward the Alliance lay in his disapproval of supranational institutions, especially those that concerned defense, which falls under national domain. A pragmatist, de Gaulle believed in the primacy of the nation-state and thought that diplomacy was to be conducted only bilaterally. To him, it was unreasonable to assume a country would rush to defend a third nation simply on the basis of a signed treaty of mutual defense.

These hostilities came to a head in the 1960s under President de Gaulle. "To free France from American tutelage,"[20] de Gaulle first refused further integration of French forces into NATO, which he viewed as a direct assault on French sovereignty. De Gaulle additionally turned towards Moscow in hopes of warming Franco-Soviet relations in the early 1960s. Finally, in 1966, President de Gaulle advised Western leaders of his decision to remove all French forces from NATO's joint military command, a move that also forced NATO to relocate its general headquarters from Paris to Brussels and to evict all NATO troops from French soil.[21] De Gaulle stressed that France remained committed to the principles of NATO but would not participate in any of its joint military exercises. The defiant move by de Gaulle shocked and angered many of France's European partners, and the resolve of Western unity seemed weakened.

Like the traditional Gaullist view towards France's nuclear deterrent, the move away from NATO had serious effects on France's idea of European security. From the time of de Gaulle, "the withdrawal from NATO remain[ed] the sacred cow of French foreign policy."[22] The decision put France into a position where it could pursue a policy of détente with the Soviets and be an independent critic of Western policies (like the war in Vietnam) while remaining safely protected by the American security umbrella. The withdrawal from NATO and the nationalistic policies of de Gaulle annoyed other Western powers because they felt that Gaullist actions second-guessed American leadership in European defense and in general weakened Western solidarity. However,

French leaders remained committed to de Gaulle's almost mythical decision of withdrawal for roughly two and a half decades after the famous General.

While the theme of independence has always been implemented pragmatically and France never had any intention of trying to 'go it alone,' even its most cooperative leaders - Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and François Mitterandhave been careful to uphold this aspect of the Gaullist legacy.[23]

If an American-led security structure was unacceptable to the independence-minded French, in what form should a new defense identity for Europe take? In fact, the French hostility toward NATO was the theoretical inspiration of a traditional French drive to create a "European" defense identity, that is a defense force composed of European nations independent of the U.S. The idea went nowhere as many European powers felt that to create a European-run defense body would send a message to Washington that American support was no longer wanted in Europe; this was unthinkable.

Later, in the 1980's, France continued to play the role of semi-independent NATO critic while seeking the development of a European-only defense force. This time the French turned to their German neighbors, who were becoming more and more cordial to the French idea of a joint Euro-force. In 1986, as part of Operation Bold Sparrow, 20,000 French troops conducted joint military exercises with some 55,000 German soldiers in Bavaria. This, along with subsequent exercises and the formation of a Franco-German Brigade, "was a powerful symbol of cooperation and a testing ground for future forms of bilateral military integration."[24] The two countries also committed to restarting a dormant security treaty known as the Western European Union (WEU). Despite these initial successes, Franco-German military cooperation faced a series of setbacks in the early 1990s.

As the Franco-German brigade expanded into what became the Eurocorps, a joint military body open to other E.U. member countries, this supposedly hallmark example of post-Cold War European military cooperation did not reflect serious dissension existing between the leading contributors. The discord was based on ambiguities of the Euro-force in relation to the dominant NATO security structure. As Gordon points out, there were formidable differences between both country's goals for the corps: Whereas French leaders seem to see it as the basis for a European army that would eventually be able to ensure European security without the U.S., Germany has portrayed it as a means to strengthen the European contribution to NATO and link France more closely to NATO's integrated commands.[25]

Although the new post-Cold War context gave many European leaders hope that France would perhaps reevaluate the French position with regards to NATO, Mitterand answered that there could be "no question of rejoining covertly or more overtly NATO's military organizations" and that "France's relationship with NATO has not been modified."[26] Accordingly, Germany and other European powers failed to be convinced that the long-held Gaullist desire to develop a independent European defense force was anything but a veiled wish to supplant American leadership. This hostility towards Washington is the

crux of the traditional Gaullist attitude on European security policy from de Gaulle to Mitterand. Although France's European neighbors, like Germany, remained committed to the NATO defense structure even after the Cold War, France, under Mitterand, continued to embrace the Gaullist aim of replacing NATO with a French-led European defense force, independent of the Americans. The Gaullist reticence towards NATO hindered any discussion of reforming post-Cold War European security structures, discussion that was needed for the Alliance to cope with a new geopolitical scenario.

When Jacques Chirac became the new French president in 1995, it was clear that the political atmosphere in Europe had evolved. At the behest of France and Germany, the historical 1992 Maastricht Treaty included wording emphasizing the development of a common foreign and security policy for the new union and identified the WEU as a new European defense force that in the future could be responsible to the E.U. Additionally, a new consensus emerged that identified the need of reforming NATO to ensure its viability in the post-Cold War. In light of huge American troop reductions in Europe and mounting isolationism as seen in America's lack of involvement in Bosnia until 1995, Europeans and Americans alike were warming up to the idea of a European entity somewhat independent of the U.S. If the Alliance adopted a position more open to French wishes of an independent European identity, the French themselves seemed to be more cordial toward NATO.

For years, this Gaullist policy of remaining an outside critic of the "hegemonic" Alliance while refusing any reevaluation of France's position in NATO perpetuated a sense of coolness between France and its allies. But recently, many French leaders like former Defense Minister Pierre Joxe began to see important disadvantages to de Gaulle's move and the mythical effect on French policy thereafter.[27] Despite widespread wishes to reevaluate France's NATO position, however, the topic was "taboo," and until Chirac, "no one want[ed] to take responsibility for making the first move."[28] In fact, Gaullist President Chirac became the first French head of state to take important steps to bring France closer to the Atlantic Alliance, a significant break with Gaullist tradition. An important impetus for the warming of relations began in Bosnia, where France first cooperated in bilateral action with Great Britain, and secondly played an important role in NATO's Implementation Force. Additionally, the Gulf War led France to realize that cooperation between the Allies was unquestionably needed. This new cooperation with NATO marked a significant turn in French attitudes toward the United Sates and France's NATO allies, and in December 1995, France formally announced a "partial rapprochement with NATO's military organization ."[29]

The landmark announcement confirmed indications that Chirac was indeed taming traditional French hostility to NATO. While accepting rapprochement, the Chirac administration continued to emphasize the Gaullist aim of creating a European defense identity and that the formation of this body would become the "price" for full French membership in NATO.[30] But this time, Chirac made it clear that any European defense force must come from within NATO, a reformed NATO that would continue to ensure American participation. The repositioning by Chirac on this traditionally divisive issue is indeed historical. After thirty years of an "anti-American orientation of French proposals

for a European security identitywith its implications of total European autonomy,"[31] Chirac was bringing France back into the NATO fold.

In a formal state visit to the United States, President Chirac outlined to President Clinton a NATO composed of "an American pillar quite obviously, and a European pillar which would gradually develop."[32] European leaders as well listened with interest to the plans for a dual pillar military structure. In light of the December announcement of "partial rapprochement with NATO's military organization and a willingness to contemplate a complete remarriage,"[33] the French were finally convincing their European partners and the Americans that a larger European role in defense was important; and that now it was no longer a means of supplanting American participation but a necessary reform of what would be a stronger, more plausible post-Cold War Alliance.

On June 4, 1996, NATO leaders responded to French overtures and formally accepted the proposition to develop a European identity for the alliance. In a most historic moment, NATO leaders agreed on the new formation of "combined joint task-forces [or] flexible headquarters to manage coalitions" created to defend some non-NATO territory.[34] If America chose not to participate in such a joint task-force, the WEU, an older military alliance of 10 E.U. members countries, would run the coalition while using NATO equipment.[35] On top of this, the Alliance may still act on Franco-British proposals to have "the NATO deputy commander, traditionally a European, to double up as WEU supreme commander."[36] Robert Hunter, the American ambassador to NATO termed the June 4, 1996 agreement "the first significant change in the way the Alliance does business since 1966, when the French left the military structure."[37]

The partial rapprochement with NATO is an important step in the formation of a new European security architecture after the Cold War. Gaullist principles have long kept France out of the NATO loop, a position that left France unable to foster needed discussion about a European identity for the Atlantic Alliance. Chirac's cordiality with the formerly mistrusted Alliance has propelled France into a strong position to realize needed changes. Instead of maintaining an anachronistic antagonism toward the alliance, an antagonism based more on tradition than good politics, Chirac chose to accept a more realistic direction for French security policy. In the current political context, Chirac realized he could both accept American participation, which is important to European security, and make French aspirations for an independent European defense a reality.

The move by Chirac is politically shrewd and reflects a modern and responsible Gaullist leadership for France now able to act constructively toward European integration. By wholeheartedly embracing a continued American presence in European security issues, France convinced its partners that the creation of a European identity is not a way to replace American leadership, but rather a much needed reform of an aging alliance. In the end, the Chirac move satisfies all. By providing a way for the Europeans to act on their own, the Americans are somewhat relieved of a large financial burden of defending Europe while still preserving an active role in questions of European defense. The Europeans, on the other hand, were able to bring the French closer to NATO and the idea of a joint European defense identity seems more and more realistic, a fact that will

strengthen the drive toward other European integration. For Chirac, Gaullist dreams of a Euro-defense were finally being realized and at the same time France emerged as a leading source of ideas for Europe's future, post-Cold War security architecture.

COURAGE IN BOSNIA: FRANCE AS A GEOPOLITICAL LEADER

In the early nineties, as Western European leaders were rallying together to promote a new, tighter political union as drawn up in the Maastricht Treaty, other forces were unraveling stability in the East. In what would be the bloodiest European conflict after World War II, the ethnic violence in the former Yugoslavia ran counter to hopes of greater integration and peace on the European continent. Western powers' attempts to curtail the violence and end the genocidal atrocities were abysmal and left many wondering about the West's commitment to humanitarian rights and the future of European security in a context remarkably different from that of Cold War times. For the European Community which had just put in place goals of a common foreign and security policy, "the situation in Yugoslavia was a test of conflict resolution capacity."[38] But Europe's response to the crisis turned out to be ineffective. Although public sympathies were for direct European action to end the violence, European powers resorted to passive economic sanctions and cease-fires that would be broken one after another.[39] Later in the conflict, in the face of inability, the Europeans turned to the United Nations and to NATO to resolve the crisis. Finally in 1995, the Americans brought about a shaky end to the war.

French policy towards resolution of the Balkan conflict has varied, especially between the two presidents Mitterand and Chirac. Contributing to the initial incoherence of the European response at the start of hostilities was the siding of the big E.U. countries with different players in the conflict. Largely divided along nationalistic lines of another era, each large country sided with its historical favorite: Germany stunned its neighbors with a quick recognition of Croatia while France maintained a tradition of supporting Serbia.[40] As the hostilities continued and evidence of Serb-committed atrocities mounted, Mitterand joined the West and rallied behind the new nation-state Bosnia. On June 28, 1992, François Mitterand captured the hearts of the war-ravaged Sarajevo residents by landing at the Bosnian capital and left hope that the war would soon end. The euphoria was short-lived, however, and as the war dragged on many reproached Mitterand for having betrayed Bosnia by allegedly stopping a military assault on Serb lines and not directly denouncing Serbian expansionism.[41]

Not unlike his sudden and decisive moves to restart French nuclear testing and further French rapprochement with the Atlantic Alliance, the newly-elected Jacques Chirac broke with Mitterand's legacy of indecision in Bosnia. In his first publicly televised press briefing, Chirac squarely put the blame on the Serbian aggressors and defended the UNPROFOR force of "blue helmets" in Bosnia. After several peacekeepers were taken hostage and used as human shields to defend Serb positions, Chirac resolutely denounced the "barbarous and scandalous" actions of the Serbs.[42] Later, he issued an ultimatum to France's partners, threatening a withdrawal of French forces if the West did not strengthen the U.N. contingent to protect against further "humiliation" of French soldiers.[43] One Bosnian journalist commented that "from the time of President Mitterand,

France has always been in the defense of Serb interests, but Chirac had the merit to break with French tradition and is the first European head of state to firmly denounce the aggression against an independent Bosnian state."[44]

While Bosnian leaders were heartened by Chirac's statements, Western powers were stunned by the passionate calls to military force in Bosnia. Many attributed the firm line to a new strong-willed de Gaulle-type leader at the Elysée, a leader unwilling to tolerate humanitarian abuses and Western quiescence. At a time when the Allies seemed hopelessly impotent in the face of another scourge of genocide and other war atrocities on the European continent, Chirac "set an example for the West on Bosnia....and may even rescue what remains of Western moral credibility ."[45]

Though French leadership in Bosnia was eventually superseded by American involvement and the apparent success of the famous Dayton peace accord, it is important to recognize Chirac's move as part of a larger aim to increase French leadership in the world. France has long been an international power as evidenced by its many former colonies, continuing influence in the Third World, and a seat on the U.N. Security Council. But the Cold War diminished the geopolitical importance of middle-sized powers like France because the East-West conflict dominated the geopolitical scene. In a new multipolar scenario, countries like France are in a stronger position to influence events around the world. Indeed, at a time when U.S. global leadership appears "tired of leading" and with an American electorate more concerned with pressing domestic problems, it becomes not just possible but necessary that another strong Western power take its place.[46]

The fact that France wishes to reassert its role in the world and fill an apparent leadership vacuum comes as no surprise. Global leadership has always been an integral part of Gaullist foreign policy in France. Underscoring the acquisition of a nuclear deterrent and a long defiance of American hegemony in Europe, national ambition and the quest of grandeur would also be the basis for a strong global leadership role for France. Defying the bipolar system of the Cold War, de Gaulle's France played an important role in the Third World.[47] Primarily directed to former French colonies in Africa and in the South Pacific, France took an active responsibility in furthering development and stability in these troubled regions of the world. In a speech to the National Assembly in 1962, de Gaulle outlined his vision of France's role as a leader of the Third World:

In order to resolve the world's greatest problemthe accession of all peoples to modern civilizationFrance can and must play a weighty role. She must know how to develop her economic, technical and cultural resources so as to lend widespread assistance to others.[48]

French largesse to the Third World in turn assured support for other controversial French policies and would boost France's international *grandeur*.

In a post-Cold War context no longer limited by the confines of the two hegemonic blocs, President Chirac reversed Mitterand's "aloof, cautious, and calculating" approach to foreign policy and has sought to expand Gaullist involvement around the world.[49] Far

more active than his Socialist predecessor who was limited by declining health and a hostile political environment, Chirac has become an "energetic, blunt-speaking interventionist player."[50] At an economic summit in Bangkok, Chirac urged a new "Europe-Asia partnership," and then in Cairo a similar "Europe-Arab partnership." The latter would be an indication of an Chirac's intent on expanding French presence in the Arab world, a presence that was often at odds with American diplomacy in the region.

Indeed, after gaining some popularity in Muslim circles for standing up to Serb-committed atrocities against Bosnian Muslims, Chirac appeared to be developing a more pro-Arab *politique* for France. Following an Israeli bombing campaign of southern Lebanon, French foreign minister Hervé de Charette sided with the Lebanese and conducted his own shuttle diplomacy to resolve the conflict, second-guessing American diplomatic efforts in the region.[51] Hoping to put positive pressure on an unruly regime in Iran, France (along with other European powers) has steadfastly remained com mitted to a "constructive" dialogue with the Islamic state against the wishes of the U.S. At the time of this writing, Paris had broken yet again with Washington, refusing to endorse a recent American cruise missile attack against Iraq in response to an Iraqi military attack in the northern Kurd-dominated region. When the Americans subsequently expanded a southern Iraq no-fly zone, France declined to use French jets to defend the larger area.

From Bosnia to Lebanon to Iraq, Jacques Chirac has asserted a new place for France in the post-Cold War international arena, but important questions linger about the long-term viability of French actions. In speeches around the world, Chirac has become what *Le Monde* calls a potential European "prophet,"[52] speaking on the behalf of not only France, but of Europe as a whole. But other European powers are questioning whether Chirac warrants such praise. In fact, many are criticizing what appears to be a series of unilateral moves that are in stark contrast with a professed French support of a common foreign and security policy (CFSP).[53] Indeed, France has long been an outspoken proponent of a common European approach to foreign policy issues and Chirac's individual diplomatic efforts appear to undercut French faith in CFSP. To lend credibility to other French interests in a common currency and in tighter political union, President Chirac might have to reevaluate his recent unilateral diplomatic moves or risk jeopardizing French leadership in Europe. Additionally, Gaullist foreign policy has always been controversial in its traditional opposition to American diplomacy and support of rogue characters that in the past have hampered any credibility for French leadership in the world. Since the Gaullist refusal of the bipolar world and the accordingly small role for middle-sized powers, France has stubbornly opposed yielding to the American hegemon. From the French opposition to American involvement in Vietnam to its broad support of Third World countries, France has pursued an individual approach to world politics. But French resistance to American hegemony has often taken the form of questionable arms sales to renegade countries and support of despotic regimes. Recently, France has not only maintained diplomatic ties with Iran, but has warmed relations with communist China. Hoping to stymie high unemployment with a new trading partner, Chirac courted China's prime minister Li Peng, whose regime is widely criticized for humanitarian abuses and the infamous Tiananmen Square massacre.[54] The move could undermine French good intentions and discredit French claims to be a real world leader since diplomatic relations

with tyrants are not always productive and can anger other nations around the world. In order not to squander an opportunity to become a plausible post-Cold War world leader, Chirac must be careful to not rival American leadership but to complement it, a goal which he has already publicly stated. But in complementing it, discretion should be used when dealing with renowned troublemakers like China and Iran.

CONCLUSIONS

Finally, it is clear that French foreign policy since the Cold War is best characterized by continuity. From Charles de Gaulle to François Mitterand, French presidents have maintained a traditional Gaullist outlook to France's role in Europe and around the world. It was de Gaulle who initiated a French political tradition that stressed recovering lost prestige and *grandeur* by defying the rigidities of the bipolar Cold War system. The creation of an independent nuclear deterrent, the withdrawal of French participation in NATO's joint military command structure, and a independent "go-it-alone" diplomacy became the highlights of Gaullist foreign policy that permeated French politics for nearly thirty years.

It took the election of Gaullist Jacques Chirac to evaluate and reform some key aspects of Gaullist foreign policy in order to better position France as a credible European and global leader. First, Jacques Chirac has seriously proposed that the once independent French nuclear deterrent be extended to France's European neighbors and partners. Rather than maintaining a stubborn and dated French policy of reserving the deterrent for the defense of France only, Chirac's proposals signal a Gaullism more in line with European unity and common, not independent, defense. Secondly, Chirac appears more and more ready to bring France back into NATO, some three decades after President de Gaulle's partial removal of France from the Atlantic Alliance. By softening French hostility to American participation in European security, Chirac has been able to argue effectively for the development of a European pillar within the Atlantic Alliance.

Lastly, Chirac has indicated in a flurry of diplomatic action that France intends to play a significant leadership role in an uncertain post-Cold War world arena. As seen in Bosnia and in the Middle East, Chirac has embraced a strong, international Gaullism intent on making France a real world leader. Ultimately, Chirac's legacy will be a renovated and more viable Gaullism for a post-Cold War France. Where Gaullist principles in the past kept France "out of the loop," reduced to playing an insignificant and outside role in European defense, Chirac has become a sort of reformed-Gaullist committed to an American presence in Europe and a Europeanized *force de frappe*. These reforms coupled with a renewed concern over France's role in the world will ensure Gaullist France a chance to be a credible leader in Europe and around the world.

NOTES:

1. Tony Judt. "Uneasy Truths About France's Past, and Europe's Present." *The New York Times*. 23 July 1995: p. 15.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Charles Hauss. *Comparative Politics: Domestic Responses to Global Change*. (St. Paul, MN: West Publishing, 1994), p. 125.

5. Philip Gordon. "The Franco-German Security Partnership." Patrick McCarthy, ed. *France-Germany 1983-1993*. (London: Macmillan, 1993), p. 140.

6. Philip Gordon. *A Certain Idea of France*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 164.

7. Ibid.

8. Thomas L. Friedman. "A Leadership Partner for America?" *The New York Times*. 23 July 1995: p. 15.

9. Gilles Martinet. "When the Enemy is called Whoever." *Le Monde*. Author's translation. 3 September 1995: p. 9.

10. W.W. Kulski. *De Gaulle and the World*. (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1966), p. 3.

11. Wilfrid L. Kohl. *French Nuclear Diplomacy*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 3.

12. Ibid., p. 124.

13. Philippe Séguin. "France. Guarantor of Europe's Strategic Independence." Le Figaro. *FBIS-WEU-95-150.* 3 August 1995: p. 16.

14. Ibid., p. 17.

15. "Paris and Bonn Search for a Nuclear Dialogue." *Le Monde*. Author's translation. 9 September 1995: p. 2.

16. Ibid.

17. Daniel Vernet. "Bonn Remains Prudent on the Question of a Common Deterrent." *Le Monde*. Author's translation. 1 September 1995: p. 4.

18. "Paris and Bonn Search for a Nuclear Dialogue." *Le Monde*, p. 2.

19. Charles Millon. "Towards a New Defense." *Le Monde*. Author's translation. 27 February 1996: p. 13.

20. Hauss, *Comparative Politics: Domestic Responses to Global Change*, p. 125.

21. Ibid.

22. Daniel Vernet. "The Dilemma of French Foreign Policy." *International Affairs.* Vol. 68, No. 4, (1992), p. 661.

23. Gordon, "The Franco-German Security Partnership," p. 141.

24. Ibid., p. 150.

25. Ibid., p. 153.

26. Gordon, *A Certain Idea of France*, p. 167.

27. Vernet, "The Dilemma of French Foreign Policy," p. 661.

28. Ibid.

29. "Nato Acquires a European Identity." *The Economist*. 8 June 1996: p. 51.

30. Ibid.

31. Karl Kaiser. "Reforming NATO." *Foreign Policy*. No. 103, (Summer 1996), p. 141.

32. Jacques Chirac. *France-2 Television Network*. News conference. *FBIS-WEU-95-114*. 14 June 1995: p. 22.

33. "NATO Acquires a European Identity." *The Economist*. 8 June 1996: p. 51.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38. Catherine McArdle Kelleher. *The Future of European Security: An Interim Assessment*. (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1995), p. 107.

39. Ibid., p. 116.

40. Vernet, "The Dilemma of French Foreign Policy," p. 657.

41. "Jacques Chirac, Sarajevo's Friend." *Le Monde*. Author's translation. 31 October 1995: p. 2.

42. Ibid.

43. Jacques Chirac. *France-2 Television Network*. p. 22.

44. "Jacques Chirac, Sarajevo's Friend." *Le Monde*, p. 2.

45. Judt, "Uneasy Truths About France's Past, and Europe's Present," p. 15.

46. Friedman, "A Leadership Partner for America?" p. 5.

47. Vernet, "The Dilemma of French Foreign Policy," p. 663.

48. Alfred Grosser. *French Foreign Policy under De Gaulle.* (Toronto: Editions du Seuil, 1965), p. 60.

49. Friedman, "A Leadership Partner for America?" p. 15.

50. "Chirac Astride the World." *The Economist.* 11 May 1996: p. 45.

51. Ibid.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

Colonels in the Crimea:

The Role of the Soviet Military in the August Coup

R.J. Milnor-Beard

The August Coup, spanning five days from the eighteenth to the twenty-third of August, was an elitist putsch engineered to revive the waning Soviet military. The Soviet armed forces, in a state of decline accentuated by President Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms, was desperate to regain the political influence once held by the hardliners of previous years. Thus, the August Coup was not a negotiated revolution but instead an elitist putsch, spearheaded by senior officers in the Soviet armed forces and KGB, designed to restore the power and prestige of their respective institutions. This paper analyzes the role of the Soviet military in the August Coup by examining six causal factors: the military's belief of impending catastrophe as a result of Gorbachev's economic reforms, the upcoming signing of the Union Treaty, the declining political viability of the armed forces, the politicization of the military, Gorbachev's escalating arms and troops reductions, and Gorbachev's restructuring of the *nomenklatura*.

IMPENDING CATASTROPHE OR OPPORTUNITY

In early August 1991, Soviet President and General Secretary of the Communist Party Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev left Moscow on vacation to his dacha at Foros, in the Crimea. On the seventeenth of August, KGB troops surrounded Gorbachev's dacha. His personal security chief, Yuri Plekhanov, allowed them unannounced entry.[1] So began the August Coup.

The short-term goal of the Soviet military and KGB was to isolate Gorbachev. This was accomplished by the KGB rerouting and monitoring all telephone calls issued from or made to the Crimea. All telephone calls from the regions around Moscow, Kiev, Sevastopol, and Simferopol would be intercepted by a KGB operator.[2] Consequently, all calls to and from President Gorbachev were diverted and disconnected.

Why did the KGB and Soviet military isolate Gorbachev from the outside world? Why did they surround his Crimean dacha and place him under house-arrest? What instigated the August Coup? The first answer to these questions can be seen in the military's fear of an impending catastrophe as a result of Gorbachev's free-market oriented economic reforms. On August 17, 1991, KGB Chief Vladimir Kryuchkov called a meeting at ABC, a KGB compound outside of Moscow, where the coup conspirators voiced their opinions about the desperate state of the Union.[3] The group's concerns were well summarized by Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, arguing that:

The situation is catastrophic. The country is facing famine. It is in total chaos. Nobody wants to carry out orders. The harvest is disorganized. Machines are idle because they have no spare parts, no fuel. The only hope is a state of emergency.[4]

The military elite seemed to think that the Soviet Union was in a state of impending catastrophe. But were these the military's true motives in initiating the August coup d'etat? Was the threat of a collapsed Soviet economy and national chaos the catalytic cause of the military's actions? Later evidence adds skepticism to such a claim.

Vice President Gennady Yanayev arrived at the Kremlin on August 18, the day after Gorbachev was isolated in the Crimea, and was asked to sign a state of emergency order. This order, in the absence of Gorbachev, would effectively make Yanayev the Soviet President. There he was told by Valery Boldin, Gorbachev's Kremlin Chief of Staff, that Gorbachev "either had a heart attack or a stroke or something."[5] With such dubious evidence as to Gorbachev's incapacity, Yanayev hesitated. He later said in interviews that he didn't feel qualified to sign the order, and that he wanted proof that Gorbachev was ill. Kryuchkov answered these doubts with an argument similar to Pavlov's a day earlier, exclaiming, "Can't you see? If we don't save the harvest there will be hunger and in a few months the people will be on the streets. There will be civil war."[6]

Vice-President Yanayev was convinced to sign the state of emergency order and on August 19, 1991, the GkChP, the State Committee for the State of Emergency, assumed power in the Soviet Union.[7] According to Russian Federation Deputy Prosecutor General Yevgeny Lisov, interrogations of the putschists after the coup revealed that their objectives were to eliminate the Soviets, ban all political parties except the CPSU (the Communist Party), to eliminate market relations, and to curtail rampant crime through the use of twenty-four hour military patrols.[8] Thus, according to most of the conspirators, the motive and immediate causation of the coup was to prevent the Soviet Union's fall into chaos. However, I argue that the true causation of the August Coup was seeded much closer to home for the conspirators.

The military's motive in initiating the August coup was not the prevention of catastrophe, hunger, and civil war in the Soviet state as they professed. Instead, it was a two-fold attempt to raise the power of the military first, they sought to regain the Soviet military's lost prestige, and second, it was an attempt by the senior officers of the state security apparatus to hold on to their last vestiges of power. Pavlov convened a meeting of all of the government's ministers on August 19.[9] There, many of the ministers voiced their fears of losing their jobs or privileges under the Gorbachev regime. In the words of David Remnick, "...one minister after another rose to say the committee was their last hope. They made little secret that what they wanted most was a chance to stay in power, to hold on to the last sweet scraps of privilege."[10] For the putschists, saving the Soviet Union was merely a metaphor for saving their own positions of power within it.

THE UNION TREATY

The Union Treaty, scheduled to be signed on August 20, was designed to give an unprecedented amount of sovereignty to the Soviet republics. According to the Union Treaty, the individual republics of the Soviet Union would be allowed to elect their own president, parliament, and maintain their own armed forces.[11] Such a measure would further diminish the central power structure of the Soviet Union, transforming it from a

unitary system into what would resemble a confederacy. The central government would lose its monopoly on power and policy-making, since such a confederal union would be empowered only to "...perform functions delegated to it by the states that are parties to the treaty."[12] The Union, and the state security apparatus, would be weakened significantly. The Soviet military was threatened by the impending reform and, more specifically, the military's diminished influence in such a confederal union.

President Gorbachev and his family flew from Moscow to Foros on August 6, 1991.[13] On that very day, a matter of hours after Gorbachev's departure, KGB chief Kryuchkov ordered two top KGB officials to make detailed drafts analyzing the possibilities of enacting a state of emergency and its consequences. Kryuchkov was joined by General Pavel Grachev of the Soviet Ministry of Defense, to whom he warned, "But after the Union Treaty is signed it will be too late to institute a state of emergency."[14]

Gorbachev was planning to return to Moscow from his dacha in Foros on August 20; this date would mark the signing of the Union Treaty between himself and Russian President Boris Yeltsin.[15] Kryuchkov and his conspirators decided that they could wait no longer. He notified his fellow putschists Vice President Gennady Yanayev, Interior Minister Boris Pugo, and Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoly Lukyanov that the time to act had come. Subsequently, on the eighteenth of August, a delegation was sent to Gorbachev's dacha to deliver an ultimatum support the state of emergency or step down.[16] These instances suggest that the idea of instituting a coup predated the Union Treaty, but that the upcoming treaty acted as the immediate causal factor which prompted the timing of the coup.

The military recognized that if Gorbachev were to sign the Union Treaty, they would be hard pressed to execute their bid for power. Many senior officers within the military felt that, after the treaty's signing, the military and state security apparatus would be too diluted to conjure enough influence for a putsch. Thus, the Union Treaty was the immediate cause for the August Coup, that causation which pushed the coup off of the drawing boards and into the streets of Moscow.

Melor Sturua has posited that the Union Treaty was the event which turned Gorbachev's advisers against him.[17] This argument escalates the impending signature of the treaty from a catalytic cause to an intermediate or possibly underlying cause. In his article in *Foreign Policy*, Sturua argues that:

only when Gorbachev betrayed his advisers by preparing to sign a union treaty that would have loosened the Kremlin's control over the republics, seriously weakening the central party *apparat*, did his advisers strike.[18]

Sturua proposes that Gorbachev's advisers did not turn against him until the preparations for the Union Treaty. I argue that this reasoning is false. President Gorbachev's advisers, the coup plotters, struck long before he left for the Crimea. The August Coup was a long time coming, and not the wholesale product of a treaty.

There were many signs that a coup d'etat, backed by the Soviet military and state security apparatus, would be led against Gorbachev; furthermore, the seeds of dissent were planted long before August of 1991. On September 9, 1990, an unexplained alert sent over a division of Soviet airborne troops into Moscow.[19] Could this have been a trial run for what would become the August Coup? If so, this would mean that the inception of the coup was over a year before its actual occurrence. Government officials within the Gorbachev regime were also wary of an impending military coup d'etat. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, upon his resignation in December 1990, warned that a dictatorship was approaching.[20]

The United States intelligence community was also aware of a possible military bid for greater power within the Soviet government. On June 20, 1991, United States Secretary of State James Baker secretly met Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh in a Berlin hotel room.[21] There, Baker told Bessmertnykh that:

It seems that there may be an attempt to depose Gorbachev . . . According to our information, Pavlov, Yazov, and Kryuchkov will take part in the ouster . . . It's urgent. It must be brought to Gorbachev's attention.[22]

This information was passed to the American ambassador in Moscow, Jack Matlock, from Mayor Gavriil Popov of Moscow.[23] Thus, within Soviet political circles, the military's intentions to oust Gorbachev were known two months in advance of the actual coup.

No, the August Coup was not a spontaneous event. The preparation for the Union Treaty was nothing more than a precipitating cause for the putsch. As evidenced by troop maneuvers and political murmurs, the discontent which surfaced in the guise of the August Coup lingered within the Soviet military for quite some time. Thus, the Union Treaty served to crystallize the military's discontent and push the coup into existence; it was the precipitating cause. But if the Union Treaty served to crystallize the Soviet military's discontent, what engendered that discontent in the first place?

THE DECLINE OF POLITICAL INFLUENCE

Power is often defined as the ability to make others do what they ordinarily would not. In past years, the Soviet military was a pivotal instrument in the Soviet Union's assertion of power and influence abroad. However, during the Gorbachev era, the state security apparatus experienced a significant downsizing in force, capacity, and influence. Why did the Soviet military feel it must act to regain global prestige? The answer revolves around the legitimacy of the political use of the military. In a state of lessened global prestige, as the Soviet military was experiencing due to spending cuts and new political thinking, the armed forces began to lose legitimacy abroad as a viable political actor. The military felt that it needed to regain its lost prestige in order to once again influence politics abroad.

Examples of the Soviet military's past political influence on world events are plentiful. Spanning the period from June 1944, to August 1979, the Soviet military used its armed

forces as a political instrument 190 times.[24] Of these 190 incidents, 158 were coercive. Thus, in the vast majority of examples, the Soviet military imposed its policies by the direct use of force abroad.[25] In June of 1953, the Soviet cruiser *Sverdlov* joined Queen Elizabeth's coronation procession. July of 1962 marked the placement of missiles in Cuba. The Soviet military took part in the 1971 insurgency in Sri Lanka, as well as the 1973 Dhofar rebellion in Oman. The Soviet navy cleared the Suez Canal in July of 1974.[26] These are just a few of many examples of the Soviet military's projection of power and political influence.

However, Soviet thinking as to the use of the armed forces as a political instrument changed markedly under President Gorbachev. No longer was the military seen as a reasonable solution to foreign policy dilemmas. This change in policy was described by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei V. Kozirev in his article "Regional Conflict Co-Operation and Competition", in which Kozirev explained that "...it has been emphasized that the use of force or the threat thereof are inadmissible for achieving political, economic, or any other goals."[27]

Why did the Soviet military feel it must act to regain global prestige? Global prestige was critical because without it the military would be unable to influence politics abroad. It would be, in the true sense of the word, powerless. Gorbachev was seriously curtailing the military's power by avoiding its use as a possible political instrument. This decline in political influence and, consequently, in power was an underlying cause for the August Coup. In order to regain legitimacy abroad, and thus viably influence foreign politics, the Gorbachev regime had to be infiltrated or deposed; the military did both.

THE POLITICIZATION OF THE MILITARY

Why did the Soviet military engineer and execute the coup d'etat? The reason was their need to regain a power lost in an era of reform. With the onset of Gorbachev's reforms of glasnost and perestroika, the military no longer held the monopoly of opinion on security issues. The military's influence over state security decisions and foreign policy was gradually eroding, giving way to the input of other governmental and extragovernmental institutions. In an effort to combat this loss of intragovernmental power the military chose to politicize itself.[28]

The politicization of the military can be outlined using S.M. Meyer's concepts of enabling and motivating factors.[29] According to Meyer, the causal factors leading up to the military's decision to politicize were twofold. First, there were underlying, or "enabling," factors which influenced the military's attitude on general issues. Second came the immediate, or "motivating," factors which moved the military to action.

Meyer defines enabling factors as "those developments, events, and conditions that facilitated the politicization of the Soviet military."[30] A major enabling factor for the politicization of the military was Gorbachev's reform of glasnost. Glasnost, or "openness," attempted to make the Soviet government more accepting of outside influences and to dismantle the image of a separated, monolithic, and overpowering "big

brother" form of government. However, for the military, glasnost meant an end to a nearly exclusive monopoly of opinion on state security issues.

Glasnost inadvertently made the military more accountable for its actions. With the new nature of inquisitiveness which the reforms inspired, the military could no longer hide its budget from other government officials. Upon realizing that the military was spending hundreds of millions of dollars more than was previously revealed, Soviet politicians demanded cutbacks.

Although the reduction of funding did alarm the military, its real threat was a lost monopoly of opinion. In the past, the military had the last word on state security issues; acting as the only font of knowledge. While they did not directly make the policy decisions, the state security apparatus did provide the only knowledge used to make those decisions. Glasnost's greatest threat to military influence was its allowance of other governmental institutions and outside consultants to engage in state policy-making.[31]

Gorbachev, through the glasnost reforms, expanded the arms control decision-making process. He opened policy discussions to a special Politburo commission comprised of experts from the Foreign and Defense Ministries, the Military-Industrial Commission, KGB, Central Committee, Academy of Sciences, and members of the Supreme Soviet.[32] While the majority of the commission were traditionally involved in the decision-making process, new additions such as the Academy of Sciences and members from the Supreme Soviet input diverse opinions. These opinions were usually contrary to the established military dogma.

Civilian specialists had previously competed with the General Staff on evaluations of political-military conditions in the world. However, under Gorbachev, these outside experts were given a much greater standing in the governmental decision-making process. The attention paid to such civilian analysts was increased so much as to often usurp the recommendations made by the military and General Staff.[33] Civilian agencies began to seriously vie with the military as a source of military and technical expertise within the upper levels of government. This newfound opposition was crystallized in December of 1988, when civilian analysts clashed with military officials in the Politburo's open debates. A vast majority of the civilian experts argued that the military was demanding far more resources than were required to maintain a policy of "minimal sufficiency".[34] While the military vehemently asserted its need for more funds, the Politburo instead accepted the civilian interpretations of requisite Soviet force levels.

The Soviet military viewed this shift in policy-making influence from its own apparatus to other governmental institutions and civilian experts as a serious threat to its power, legitimacy, and ability to govern policy according to its own threat perceptions. The growing reality of no longer being capable of monopolizing Soviet policy on security issues made the military aware that it must regain influence in Gorbachev's new political order. That power which it lost through glasnost it hoped to regain through politicization.

While enabling factors refer to the underlying causes of military politicization, the motivating factors represent the immediate causations which served as a catalyst for action. Meyer describes motivating factors as "... those forces, issues, and developments that actually drive the institutional politicization of the military."[35] While the enabling factors established an environment of discontent within the military, the motivating factors were those immediate issues which the military saw as a direct threat to their position of power; issues which, the military felt, must be handled quickly and decisively.

The decline of central authority within the Soviet government was a motivating factor for the politicization of the military.[36] The Soviet government under President Gorbachev was characterized by a progressive decay of the major institutions of the center. Once monolithic state institutions, such as the Communist Party and GOSPLAN, were losing power to regional powers within the republics. An increasing amount of political power, dominated by the central state government in the past, was flowing out of Moscow and into the individual Soviet republics and territories. With the decline of these institutions, the military was left as one of the last institutional manifestations of center. The central presence of the military projected an image to the Union of itself as a surrogate for central authority. By portraying itself as an icon of central authority, the military almost instantly became the target of nationalist and separatist criticism.

The embodiment of nationalist resistance towards central authority, and consequently the Soviet military, were in the form of "limiting laws".[37] Beginning in the mid-1980s, Soviet republics began to individually limit the power of the Soviet military within their own borders. Limiting laws were passed banning the Soviet military's practice of conscription in the Georgian, Armenian, Moldovian, and Lithuanian legislatures.[38] In some cases, limiting laws even affected the closing of Soviet military bases. Kazakhstan effectively coerced the shutdown of the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing range by refusing to provide food and water to the facility.

Why did the Soviet military allow such insubordination in the republics? The very fact that limiting laws were enacted testifies to the weakening of the military. I suggest that the Soviet military wanted to suppress such measures of nationalism, but found itself powerless to do so. Realizing that it was no longer capable of changing policy through force, the military instead turned to politics. The politicization of the military was its only option to reinstill its power in the increasingly nationalist republics.

A second motivating factor for the politicization of the military was the increasing anti-military sentiment running throughout Soviet society.[39] The Soviet incursion into Afghanistan in December of 1979 began the military's downward spiral in the eyes of Soviet society. This conflict was seen by much of the Soviet public as a loss of life without purpose.

If Afghanistan began the downward spiral of public opinion, then the events of 1989 solidified the public's disapproval of the military. The massacre of nationalist demonstrators in Tblisi, Georgia, by the Soviet army in 1989 could not be disguised as an action necessary for state security. Anti-military attitudes in Soviet society were further

intensified by the subsequent military massacres in Vilnius, Riga, and Baku in the late 1980s.

As of 1990, the Soviet military could no longer ignore the anti-military currents prevalent in Soviet society. The military attempted to mobilize reserve troops to stabilize the conflict in Azerbaijan and Armenia in January of 1990. Within hours of the announcement, thousands of reservists' mothers inundated military comissariat offices with visits and telephone calls refusing to allow their sons to fight in "foreign wars."[40] Twenty-four hours after the original call-up announcement, Minister of Defense Yazov appeared on Soviet television and rescinded the mobilization order.

The military was facing a challenge that it had never predicted in its analyses of Cold War threats; this threat came from within. Media attacks on the Soviet military had become common. Contempt and ridicule of fundamental military values patriotism, sacrifice, duty, and the historical significance of past campaigns were in abundance amongst the general public.[41] Public attacks on uniformed military personnel were becoming increasingly common.

The military was not only losing its influence over state policy and decision-making, but over Soviet society as well. In his *Foreign Policy* article, Melor Sturua suggested that:

Stalin's most important legacy to his successors was not the hydrogen bomb, the innumerable Soviet armed forces, or the all-powerful Communist Party. Rather, it was the fear he instilled in the Soviet people through his indescribable reign of terror ... But ultimately they [the military] could not increase or even preserve this fear, and it gradually dissipated, giving way to hatred and disrespect among the Soviet people. Their mocking anecdotes about ossified general secretaries were a sign of a serious lack of legitimacy.[42]

The legitimacy of the Soviet military was now in question. If the military could no longer control policy, was disregarded by individual republics, and was countermanded and mocked by the public, what was its place in a totalitarian regime?

The politicization of the military was an attempt to regain its lost influence over government and society by infiltrating the political system, in effect, by changing the institutions from the inside- out rather than the outside-in. The military realized that it could no longer affect lasting change through the use of force the public's resistance was far too entrenched in common thought for that but it could reinstate supportive policy by instilling military politicians in the new political order. These military politicians found their way into the very heart of the Gorbachev regime, but found that they could only delay and hinder reforms; they could not stop them. The next step for the military was to complete the infiltration of the political system by creating an entirely new one. The next step was a coup d'etat.

SCALING BACK: THE EFFECTS OF GORBACHEV'S FORCE REDUCTIONS

While the Union Treaty acted as the main catalytic force for the putsch, and the declining political and social influence of the military was the underlying cause, the intermediate cause can be identified as the actual physical deterioration of the Soviet armed forces. The Soviet Union undertook unprecedented force reductions during the Gorbachev presidency. With a new political thinking which de-emphasized military coercion in foreign relations, the need for a large military was increasingly difficult to rationalize. In 1990, Foreign Minister Andrei Kozirev wrote:

perestroika has opted for the new political thinking which aims to make interstate relations free from ideology and rejects military and power methods in solving international problems, seeking instead solutions based on a balance of interests and the primacy of law and universal human values.[43]

Gorbachev viewed military force reductions as a means to both remove the coercive element of force from Soviet interstate relations and to spearhead arms reductions between the two superpowers.[44] However, the military considered force reductions as a threat to the Soviet military's prestige, influence, and defensive capability. While it is generally accepted that the argument of diminished defensive capability as a result of arms reductions was sophistry, attempting to strengthen an argument for an increased military budget, the threat to prestige and influence were real in the minds of the military elite. As a superpower, much of the nation's political viability rested in its large and powerful military. With a diminished military component, the state would lose commensurate credibility. The Soviet military's font of power resided in its coercive ability; a capability which was a product of an extremely developed armed component. A weakened Soviet military would inevitably cede global prestige and influence to the other pole, the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This lessening of global prestige would consequently translate into a loss of power, a diminished capacity to make others do what they otherwise would not.

Gorbachev began his campaign of force reductions in 1986 with a proposal to eliminate all Soviet nuclear weaponry by the year 2000. Later that year, at the Reykjavik Summit in October, President Gorbachev proposed a fifty percent cut in nuclear ICBMs within five years and a complete elimination of ICBMs with ten years.[45] This move startled the military, which did not expect a proposal to forfeit its most effective deterrent and political bargaining tool.

The Soviet military's argument for a larger military budget than that of the United States because of more immediate geographic threats, known as the "Geostrategic Asymmetries" argument, was invalidated by Gorbachev in April of 1986.[46] The Soviet military had for years argued that being surrounded by China, Western Europe, and nationalist factions in the near abroad, it required a greater budget than the United States to defend itself against a greater number of threats. By including Soviet territory east of the Urals in a European conventional arms reduction treaty, Gorbachev replaced the military's "geostrategic asymmetries" argument with his own philosophy of "reasonable sufficiency".[47] The "reasonable sufficiency" argument, which became Warsaw Pact

doctrine in 1987, implemented unilateral conventional force reductions to a predetermined level sufficient to the defense of the state.[48]

Gorbachev's push for unilateral arms reduction was evident in the autumn of 1987, when he dismantled an asymmetrical Soviet advantage in intermediate and short-range nuclear weapons in concessions to the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty.[49] Two years later during a visit to Bonn, West Germany, M.A. Gareev announced the disbanding of the Operational Manoeuvre Groups one of the hallmarks of the Soviet offensive military strategy.[50] The theme of these various unilateral cutbacks culminated in the January 18, 1989, announcement of Soviet military budget reductions. After a speech in the United Nations, President Gorbachev announced a 14.2% reduction in the 1989 Soviet military budget. In addition, he imposed a 19.5% reduction in the commanded production of arms and military equipment.[51]

The Gorbachev regime also drafted a plan for a massive military withdrawal of Soviet forces from the European Republics and members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO). Gorbachev's plan consisted of the removal of 10,000 Soviet tanks; 8,500 artillery systems; and 800 combat aircraft.[52] Nearly fifty percent of active Soviet tank strength in Central Europe was removed. This withdrawal of forces from the near abroad threatened many of the military's senior officials. Many of the military elite, such as General Varennikov, were upset over what they felt was NATO's use of a collapsed Eastern Europe and reunified Germany to strengthen its own strategic positions.[53] The majority among the military believed that NATO and WTO asymmetries should be eliminated mutually, and that unilateral reductions such as those pursued by Gorbachev were leaving the Soviet Union open and vulnerable.

Gorbachev married his unilateral arms reductions to large troop withdrawals and reductions. The spring of 1988 marked the withdrawal of Soviet troops from a protracted conflict in Afghanistan. Later that year, conventional force reductions were discussed in the Moscow Superpower Summit. Furthermore, mutual reductions in the NATO and WTO armed forces of 500,000 troops per organization were also proposed.[54] While mutual reductions were not agreed upon, Gorbachev did announce a unilateral Soviet reduction of 500,000 troops on December 7, 1988.[55]

On the same day, Chief of the Soviet General Staff Marshal Akhromeev suddenly retired. This one action by one of the highest ranking military officials in the Soviet government symbolized the military's dissatisfaction with Gorbachev's reforms. The Soviet military watched as its forces were reduced and its superpower status dwindled away. With a diminished armed component, the military would no longer be as capable to affect politics abroad. With less funding, their once cutting-edge systems would become outmoded and obsolete. The military suspected that what was once the fear of the world would become the laughing stock of the West. In order to regain the Soviet military's global prestige, and its place amongst the most powerful and influential forces in the world, the reforms and reductions would have to be stopped. In this manner, Gorbachev's policy of arms reductions served as an intermediate cause for the August Coup.

THE DEMISE OF THE *NOMENKLATURA*

Did the Soviet military elite perceive a personal threat to their positions and prestige? The second of Gorbachev's major reforms, known as perestroika , was a restructuring of the Soviet government. This reform was designed to reenergize the government with new thinkers and push out the *nomenklatura*, those professional politicians who were groomed by Communist hardliners and entrenched in the Soviet bureaucracy. Gorbachev was actively recruiting younger, reform-minded statesmen to replace this *nomenklatura*. This restructuring of the Soviet government put the positions of the military elite in great peril. Many of the military's most senior officers were openly opposed to Gorbachev's reforms and, with his new policy of perestroika, were now extremely susceptible to losing their positions. If the military elites were to lose their positions, they would also lose the prestige and benefits which the communist system tied to those posts. I argue that none of the state security apparatus' officials wanted to lose the comforts of their positions, and thus they employed all measures possible to ensure that they remain entrenched in those positions. These measures could have begun with limited appeasement and conciliation of the Gorbachev regime but quickly moved to the politicization of the military and finally to a putsch. Thus, a fear amongst senior military officials of losing their positions and individual prestige to Gorbachev's restructuring of the government served as an intermediate cause of the August Coup.

Gorbachev's reforms were intended to bring *demokratizsiya* to the Soviet armed forces.[56] This *demokratizsiya*, or democratization, of the military apparatus was engineered to eliminate the laziness, lack of personal control, alcoholism, and bullying which characterized the military's officer corps.[57] However, the old system was benefiting many of the elites already in power. What Gorbachev deemed as inefficiency, the *nomenklatura* saw as legitimate perquisites of their positions. Moreover, these perquisites were something that the elite were not willing to forfeit.

The threat to the military elite's positions and standing was shown to be far more than just a perceived danger. In 1988, Gorbachev began to actively appoint and dismiss government officials according to their respective ideologies. An example comes from the CPSU's Politburo reshuffle on September 30, 1988. The military's opposition to unilateral disarmament reforms was so strong that Gorbachev's reductions could not pass through the Politburo. In order to accomplish his reforms Gorbachev displaced his main opposition. He demoted Yegor Ligachev and forced the retirement of Andrei Gromyko, the two leaders of the opposition to arms reductions, and replaced them with more reform-minded politicians.[58] After this restructuring to gain a political advantage, Gorbachev's Foreign Minister Eduard A. Shevardnadze restaffed the upper ranks of the Foreign Ministry with those statesmen who agreed with and supported Gorbachev's reforms. This restructuring entailed the firing of Andrei Gromyko's first deputies and seven of his eight deputy ministers.[59]

While the demotion of Ligachev and the retirement of Gromyko were public examples of Gorbachev's power in perestroika, the Soviet military became aware of this threat to their individual positions long before 1988. Gorbachev began to restructure the military

command as early as 1985. Gorbachev systematically restaffed many positions in the Soviet military in order to purge hardliners from positions of political influence. This restaffing often pulled young, pro-reform officers out of the junior levels of military service. In July of 1985, Army General Yuri Maksimov was appointed Chief of the Strategic Missile Force from his previous position among the relatively obscure ground services.[60] The reason for this promotion was that Maksimov was one of the few senior officers who would accept reductions in the size and prestige of the land-based nuclear forces. Three years later, Gorbachev appointed a new Chief of General Staff from deep within the junior ranks of the Soviet military. Mikhail Moiseyev was granted the appointment in December of 1988, being a Moscow outsider and never before a member of the General Staff.[61]

An interview with Russian Prosecutor General V. Stepankov in 1992 revealed the extent of the threat of restructuring for the military elite.[62] In interviews with the arrested putschists after the August Coup, Stepankov discovered that Gorbachev had held a secret meeting in the summer of 1991 with Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Kazakhstan's President Nazarbayev. They agreed in confidence to reorganize the government after signing the Union Treaty, eliminating some of the most senior officers in the state security apparatus. Among the list of *nomenklatura* to be replaced were Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, Defense Minister Dmitry Yazov, and KGB Chief Yanov Kryuchkov the main conspirators in the August Coup.[63]

Gorbachev's policy of perestroika, and the intragovernmental restructuring which it entailed, posed a serious threat to the individual comforts of the military elite. Senior military officers witnessed fellow members of the once-revered *nomenklatura* being demoted, fired, and forced to resign; their prestige, power, and perquisites stripped away and handed down to the new office-holders. Just as the military felt the need to retain and regain its power and influence as an institution, its elite also would not allow their own power and influence to be lost. Kryuchkov knew of Gorbachev's secret meeting to restructure the government in 1991, and thus was faced with the immediate threat of losing his position and influence.[64] The military's attempt at politicization was countered by Gorbachev's removal of the military's professional politicians. How could the military elite retain their positions of influence? The answer came to being in August of 1991. The answer was a coup.

CONCLUSIONS

The 1991 August Coup was not a spontaneous revolution. Instead, it was the culmination of six causal factors which, together over time, resulted in a military coup d'etat. These causations can be categorized as underlying, intermediate, and immediate (or catalytic) factors. Underlying causes consist of those events which establish a certain disposition in the actor, such as discontent and dissatisfaction towards the government. Intermediate causes are those events and issues which accentuate the disposition formed by the underlying cause, but are not yet forceful enough to spur the player into direct action. Immediate, or catalytic, causes are the final occurrences which, with the pressure of

underlying and intermediate causes behind them impel the player into direct action; they are the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back.

The underlying causes of the 1991 August Coup were the Soviet military's decline in political influence and the politicization of the security apparatus. While in past years the military was a primary actor in the shaping of foreign politics, the Gorbachev regime moved away from military coercion as a political instrument. The Soviet government's unwillingness to use the military to influence politics abroad served to weaken its legitimacy. Thus, the military's decline in political influence threatened their global prestige and, consequently, their ability to affect political decisions abroad.

The second underlying cause which led to the August Coup was the politicization of the Soviet military. This politicization was a result of enabling factors, such as the military's loss of governmental influence due to perestroika, and the motivating factors of a decline in central authority and growing anti-military sentiments within Soviet society. The reforms of glasnost forced the military to share policy-making with other governmental institutions and civilian experts.

These new voices often contradicted the military's viewpoints, and often took precedence over the once monopolistic influence of the military's advisers. A decline in central authority weakened the Soviet military in the eyes of the republics, which began to enact limiting laws curtailing its once-pervasive influence. Lastly, the growing anti-military sentiment within Soviet society began to erode the support of the masses. The military was faced with a tripartite threat to its legitimacy. The military's first option was to politicize and attempt to change the new political reforms from within. When this did not work, due largely to Gorbachev's restructuring of government positions, the military saw a putsch as its only remaining option to maintain its legitimacy.

The intermediate causes of the August coup stemmed from both an institutional and personal level. Gorbachev's unilateral force reductions threatened the institution of the military with a diminished capacity to act and, more importantly, a fall in global prestige. As a superpower, the root of the Soviet Union's global political influence rested in its powerful armed forces. The military saw the reduction of its forces as a reduction in its global influence and standing.

The second intermediate cause of the putsch, Gorbachev's restructuring of the *nomenklatura*, posed a personal threat to the military's senior officers. President Gorbachev's aggressive appointment of ideologically similar officials put at risk the positions of anyone who opposed reform. The senior officials of the Soviet military had become accustomed to the comforts which their positions afforded them, and they were not willing to lose those perquisites to Gorbachev's reforms. The military elite's efforts to ensure their own personal prestige and influence comprised the second of the intermediate causes which led to the August Coup.

The immediate, or catalytic, causation for the 1991 coup was delineated by an impending limitation on the Soviet military's ability to act. While the military intimated that it feared

impending chaos as a result of Gorbachev's economic reforms and enacted a state of emergency with the signature of Vice President Yanayev, the argument of "impending catastrophe" appears to be only a facade disguising the true motivations for the putsch.

If the Soviet military did not believe that such a threat to order existed, what was their motivation to initiate the coup? What was their catalyst for action? The defining event which precipitated the August Coup was the Union Treaty. The Union Treaty would have further weakened the central authority of the Soviet Union, and delegated broad powers to the individual republics. As one of the few remaining institutional manifestations of center, the Soviet military faced a threat to its power and influence within the Union. If the treaty was enacted it would severely curtail the military's political influence within the Soviet Union by granting greater sovereignty to the republics, thus lessening the center's hold on authority. The Union Treaty was scheduled to be signed on August 20, and the coup began three days earlier. This was no accident. The military knew that if the treaty was signed, the ability to execute the putsch could have been lost forever. The recurring theme of the August Coup was the struggle to retain influence. All six of the coup's causal factors were based in the military's desire to maintain its influence, both within the state and without. As the military lost influence within the Soviet government, it consequently lost influence within the global community. Such a loss of influence meant a diminished capacity to compel others to comply with the military's agenda; this was a loss of power. The Soviet military was an institution based on the use of power, both within the state and without, and the loss of such power constituted a serious threat to its legitimacy. The August Coup was the Soviet military's final effort to regain primacy in the domestic political system, and to once again assert its influence in the global community.

NOTES:

1. Jonathan Steele. *Eternal Russia Yeltsin, Gorbachev, and the Mirage of Democracy.* (Cambridge, MA Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 60.

2. Ibid., p. 61.

3. David Remnick. *Lenin's Tomb The Last Days of the Soviet Empire.* (New York Random House, 1993), p. 450.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 457.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., p. 3.

8.Valery Rudnev. "Prosecutors Complete Coup Investigation." *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press.* Vol. 44, no. 32 (September 9, 1992), p. 18.

9. David Remnick. *Lenin's Tomb The Last Days of the Soviet Empire.* (New York Random House, 1993), p. 472.

10. Ibid.

11. G. Alimov. "Accord Reached on a New Union of States." *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press.* Vol. 43, no. 46 December 18, 1991), p.10.

12. Ibid.

13. David Remnick. *Lenin's Tomb The Last Days of the Soviet Empire.* (New York Random House, 1993), p. 448.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid., p. 450.

16. Ibid.

17. Melor Sturua. "The Real Coup." *Foreign Policy.* Vol. 85, (Winter 1991/1992), p. 71.

18. Ibid.

19. S. Miller. "The Soviet Coup and the Benefit of Breakdown." *Orbis.* Vol. 36, (Winter 1992), p. 70.

20. S. M. Meyer. "How the Threat (and the Coup) Collapsed The Politicization of the Soviet Military." *International Security.* Vol. 16, (Winter 1991/1992), p. 69.

21. David Remnick. *Lenin's Tomb The Last Days of the Soviet Empire.* (New York Random House, 1993), p. 436.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

24. Stephen Kaplan. *Diplomacy of Power Soviet Armed Forces as a Political*

Instrument. (Washington D.C. The Brookings Institution, 1981), p. 689.

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid., pp. 689-693.

27. "The Strategic Implications of Change in the Soviet Union." *Adelphi Paper.* (London Brassey's for International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1990), p. 46.

28. S. M. Meyer. "How the Threat (and the Coup) Collapsed The Politicization of the Soviet Military." *International Security.* Vol. 16, (Winter 1991/1992), p. 7.

29. Ibid., pp. 8-18.

30. Ibid., p. 8.

31. Ibid.

32. Daniel Calingaert. *Soviet Nuclear Policy under Gorbachev A Policy of Disarmament.* (New York Praeger, 1991), p. 20.

33. Ibid., p. 24.

34. Roy Allison. "Gorbachev's New Program for Conventional Arms Control in Europe." Susan C. Clark, ed. *Gorbachev's Agenda Changes in Soviet Domestic and Foreign Policy.* (Boulder, CO Westview Press, 1989), p. 250.

35. S.M. Meyer. "How the Threat (and the Coup) Collapsed The Politicization of the Soviet Military." *International Security.* Vol. 16, (Winter 1991/1992), p. 16.

36. Ibid., p. 23.

37. Ibid., pp. 24-25.

38. Ibid., p. 25.

39. Ibid., pp. 17-18.

40. Ibid., p. 35.

41. Ibid., p. 18.

42. Melor Sturua. "The Real Coup." *Foreign Policy.* Vol. 85, (Winter 1991/1992), p. 64.

43. "The Strategic Implications of Change in the Soviet Union." *Adelphi Paper 248.* (London Brassey's for International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1990), p. 46.

44. Ibid.

45. Christopher Bluth. *New Thinking in Soviet Military Policy.* (New York Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1990), p. 42.

46. Roy Allison. "Gorbachev's New Program for Conventional Arms Control in Europe." Susan C. Clark, ed. *Gorbachev's Agenda Changes in Soviet Domestic and Foreign Policy.* (Boulder, CO Westview Press, 1989), p. 239.

47. Ibid.

48. Christopher Bluth. *New Thinking in Soviet Military Policy.* (New York Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1990), p. 93.

49. Roy Allison. "Gorbachev's New Program for Conventional Arms Control in Europe." Susan C. Clark, ed. *Gorbachev's Agenda Changes in Soviet Domestic and Foreign Policy.* (Boulder, CO Westview Press, 1989), p. 243.

50. Christopher Bluth. *New Thinking in Soviet Military Policy.* (New York Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1990), p. 94.

51. Roy Allison. "Gorbachev's New Program for Conventional Arms Control in Europe." Susan C. Clark, ed. *Gorbachev's Agenda Changes in Soviet Domestic and Foreign Policy.* (Boulder, CO Westview Press, 1989), p. 256.

52. Ibid., p. 261.

53. Jonathan Steele. *Eternal Russia Yeltsin, Gorbachev, and the Mirage of Democracy.* (Cambridge, MA Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 70.

54. Roy Allison. "Gorbachev's New Program for Conventional Arms Control in Europe." Susan C. Clark, ed. *Gorbachev's Agenda Changes in Soviet Domestic and Foreign Policy.* (Boulder, CO Westview Press, 1989), p. 240.

55. Ibid., pp. 246, 260.

56. Christopher Bluth. *New Thinking in Soviet Military Policy.* (New York Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1990), p. 31.

57. Ibid.

58. Roy Allison. "Gorbachev's New Program for Conventional Arms Control in Europe." Susan C. Clark, ed. *Gorbachev's Agenda Changes in Soviet Domestic and Foreign Policy.* (Boulder, CO Westview Press, 1989), p. 245.

59. Daniel Calingaert. *Soviet Nuclear Policy under Gorbachev A Policy of Disarmament.* (New York Praeger, 1991), p. 20.

60. Ibid.

61. Ibid.

62. Valery Rudnev. "Will August Putsch Case Ever Go to Trial?" *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press.* Vol. 44, (September 9, 1992), p. 14.

63. Ibid.

64. S.M. Meyer. "How the Threat (and the Coup) Collapsed The Politicization of the Soviet Military." *International Security.* Vol. 16, (Winter 1991/1992), pp. 7-35.