Democratizing Communist Militaries

Democratizing Communist Militaries

The Cases of the Czech and Russian Armed Forces

Marybeth Peterson Ulrich

Ann Arbor

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS

To Mark, Erin, and Benjamin

Copyright © by the University of Michigan 1999
All rights reserved
Published in the United States of America by
The University of Michigan Press
Manufactured in the United States of America
♾ Printed on acid-free paper

2002 2001 2000 1999 4 3 2 1

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher.

A CIP catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Ulrich, Marybeth Peterson.
Democratizing Communist militaries : the cases of the Czech and Russian armed forces / Marybeth Peterson Ulrich.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 0-472-10969-3 (acid-free paper)
1. Civil-military relations—Russia (Federation) 2. Civil-military relations—Former Soviet republics. 3. Civil-military relations—Czech Republic. 4. Russia (Federation)—Armed Forces—Political activity. 5. Former Soviet republics—Armed Forces—Political activity. 6. Czech Republic—Armed Forces—Political activity. 7. Military assistance, American—Russia (Federation) 8. Military assistance, American—Former Soviet republics. 9. Military assistance, American—Czech Republic. I. Title.
JN6520.C58 U45 1999
322′.5′09437109049—dc21 99-6461
CIP

Contents

List of Tables vii

Acknowledgments ix

List of Abbreviations xi

Introduction 1

Chapter 1. A Theory of Democratic Civil-Military Relations in Postcommunist States 5

Chapter 2. A Survey of Overall U.S. Democratization Programs and Military Democratization Efforts in the Postcommunist States 44

Chapter 3. Postcommunist Military Democratization Needs: An Assessment of Democratic Political Control in Russia and the Czech Republic 70

Chapter 4. An Assessment of Postcommunist Military Professionalism: The Russian and Czech Militaries' Democratic Deficits 108

Chapter 5. The Effectiveness of U.S. Military to Military Democratization Initiatives in Russia and the Czech Republic 154

Chapter 6. Conclusions and Prescriptions for Improving Democratization Outcomes in the Postcommunist States 182

Appendix A. Military to Military Contacts Conducted in the Czech Republic through the Joint Contact Team Program 189

Appendix B. Military to Military Contacts Conducted in Russia through the Defense and Military Contacts Program 205

Notes 219

Selected Bibliography 259

Index 283

Tables

1. A Comparison of Democratic and Soviet Models of Political Control of Military Institutions 12

2. A Comparison of Democratic and Soviet Models of Military Professionalism 24

3. JCTP Supporting Units' Areas of Focus 57

4. Inverted Pyramid of ACR Officer Personnel 124

5. Proposed Pyramidal ACR Force Structure 125

Appendixes

A1. Events That Could Not Be Classified as Supporting Either the Enhancement of Democratic Civilian Control of the ACR or the Professionalization of the ACR as a Military Institution in a Democracy 189

A2. Events That Could Be Categorized as Supporting the Enhancement of Democratic Civilian Control 197

A3. Recruitment and Retention 198

A4. Promotion and Advancement 199

A5. Education and Training 199

A6. Officership and Leadership 200

A7. Prestige and Public Relations 202

A8. Chaplain-Related Events 202

B1. Defense and Military Contacts with Russia That Could Not Be Classified as Specifically Supporting Either the Enhancement of Democratic Civilian Control or the Professionalization of the Russian Military as a Military Institution in a Democracy 205

B2. Contacts That Could Be Categorized as Supporting the Enhancement of Democratic Civilian Control 213

B3. Contacts That Could Be Categorized as Supporting an Aspect of Professionalization of the Russian Military as a Military Institution in a Democracy 215

Acknowledgments

This work is the culmination of a process of scholarly inquiry begun within the Department of Political Science at the University of Illinois. I would like to thank the faculty members there who inspired and stimulated my interest in the process of democratization in postcommunist states in general, and in the process of military democratization specifically. I owe a particular debt to my doctoral dissertation committe chairman, Professor Edward Kolodziej, for his personal guidance throughout the research and writing. His dedication to his craft in both the classroom and in his research continues to inspire me. The regional expertise of Professors Roger Kanet and John Lepingwell was also invaluable. I am further indebted to Professors Kolodziej and Kanet for their continued interest and assistance as the project advanced throught the publication process.

The United States Air Force Institute of National Security Studies (INSS) also played a critical role by generously funding numerous trips to Central and Eastern Europe and to the former Soviet Union to gather invaluable field research. Lt. Colonel Jeff Larsen, Lt. Colonel Peter Hays, and Dr. James Smith, directors of INSS, all provided support at key points in my research. I am also grateful to the Department of Political Science at the United States Air Force Academy, led by Colonel Doug Murray and Colonel Bill Berry, which sponsored my graduate studies at the University of Illinois and facilitated my ability to bring the manuscript to fruition. The professional editorship at the University of Michigan Press, beginning with Chuck Myers in acquisitions and culminating with Kevin Rennells's stewardship through copyediting, has crafted the work into a polished and credible publication.

I thank my parents for their patience, pride, and continued interest throughout the publication process. Above all, I credit my husband Mark for holding down the fort on the home front and caring for first one and then two small children when I traveled in support of the project. Without his logistical and continuous personal support, completion of the book would not have been possible. Erin and Benjamin also deserve credit for their sacrifices in support of Mommy's work schedule.

Finally, I thank the Department of National Security and Strategy at the U.S. Army War College, led by Colonel Joe Cerami, whose interest in this topic

has resulted in a position where the study and teaching of civil-military relations will become a key component in the education of senior professional officers from all over the world.

Abbreviations

ABM	Antiballistic Missile
ACR	Army of the Czech Republic
AOR	Area of Responsibility
AP	Associated Press
BALTOPS	Baltic Operations
CBM	Confidence Building Measure
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CFE	Conventional Forces in Europe
CGSC	Command and General Staff College
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CINC	Commander in Chief
CINCPAC	Commander in Chief, Pacific
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CJCS	Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
CSA	Czechoslovak Army
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
CSPA	Czechoslovak People's Army
CTR	Cooperative Threat Reduction
CZ	Czech Republic
DAO	Defense Attaché Office
DCS	Direct Commercial Sales
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DISAM	Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management
DLI	Defense Language Institute
DOD	Department of Defense
DSAA	Defense Security Assistance Agency
EIMET	Expanded International Military Education and Training
EEU	European Economic Union
EU	European Union
EUCOM	European Command
FAM	Familiarization Tour
FAO	Foreign Area Officer
FBIS	Foreign Broadcast Information Service
FMS	Foreign Military Sales
FSU	Former Soviet Union

FY	Fiscal Year
G-7	Group of Seven
GAO	Government Accounting Office
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
HQ	Headquarters
ID	Infantry Division
IMET	International Military Education and Training
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INSS	Institute of National Strategic Studies
IWG	Interagency Working Group
J-5	Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
JCTP	Joint Contact Team Program
JPRS	Joint Publication Research Service
KSC	Communist Party of Czechoslovakia
MAG	Military Assistance Group
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MFN	Most Favored Nation
MLT	Military Liaison Team
MOD	Ministry of Defense
MP	Member of Parliament
MPA	Main Political Administration
MWR	Morale Welfare and Recreation
NA	Not Applicable
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCO	Noncommissioned Officer
NDU	National Defense University
NED	National Endowment for Democracy
NGB	National Guard Bureau
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NIS	New Independent States
NSC	National Security Council
O-6	Colonel
OAS	Organization of American States
OPIC	Overseas Private Investment Corporation
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense
OSIA	On-Site Inspection Agency
PACOM	Pacific Command
PCS	Permanent Change of Station
PKO	Peacekeeping Operations
PME	Professional Military Education
POC	Point of Contact
POW	Prisoner of War
PPBS	Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System

RAF	Royal Air Force
SALT	Strategic Arms Limitation Talks
SecDef	Secretary of Defense
SEED	Support for East European Democracy
SPACECOM	Space Command
SRF	Strategic Rocket Forces
STRATCOM	Strategic Command
TCT	Traveling Contact Team
TDY	Temporary Duty
TRANSCOM	Transportation Command
UCMJ	Uniform Code of Military Justice
UMA	Military Affairs
UN	United Nations
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
UPI	United Press International
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USAF	U.S. Air Force
USAFA	U.S. Air Force Academy
USAFE	U.S. Air Forces in Europe
USAFNG	U.S. Air Force National Guard
USAREUR	U.S. Armies in Europe
USARNG	U.S. Army National Guard
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USEUCOM	U.S. European Command
USIA	U.S. Information Agency
USN	U.S. Navy
WTO	Warsaw Treaty Organization

Introduction

The post–Cold War world has witnessed a virtual explosion of efforts at democratization within the former Soviet bloc. The proliferation of postcommunist states has challenged the advanced democracies to contribute in appropriate ways to the task of democratic consolidation across all aspects of these transitioning states. The United States' historic commitment to the promotion of democracy abroad, coupled with the increasing acceptance of the idea that the expansion of democracies in the international system increases the likelihood of global peace, has made democratization a top priority of U.S. post–Cold War foreign policy.

Most scholars have focused on the role of civilian institutions in their analyses of the democratic transitions of the postcommunist states, but the democratization of the military institutions of these states should not be ignored. Postcommunist armed forces are key actors in the process of democratic consolidation. The successful democratic transition of postcommunist military institutions is essential to protecting the democratic gains achieved by society overall, and for ensuring that coercive force is not used to reverse them.

The U.S. military along with the militaries of other developed democracies has attempted to positively influence the process of military democratization in the postcommunist states of the former Soviet bloc. However, these efforts have been undertaken without the benefit of being informed by democratic theory or the recognition that professionalism forged within an authoritarian political system must adapt when it is practiced in a democracy. This book develops a theory of civil-military relations for postauthoritarian political systems. Its aims are to provide a theoretical basis for the military democratization currently under way in the region and to shape the policy agenda so that its foundation is supported by the mortar of democratic theory, empirical data, and a normative direction appropriate for states in the process of democratic transitions.

The existing civil-military relations literature contributes little to understanding the problem of the democratic transition of postcommunist armed forces. The classic argument of civil-military relations theorists has been that military professionalism is easily transferable across political systems. Since a hallmark of military professionalism is allegiance to civilian governments that

come to power through legitimate means, civil-military relations theorists assume that transitioning political regimes pose no particular problems for military professionals. The general characterization of civil-military relations proposed by Huntington and seconded by the field is that the focus of civil-military relations is "governmental control" of the military.[1] Neither the type of political system exerting governmental control nor the special problem of transitioning between political systems is taken into account.

However, field research across many of the postcommunist states between June 1994 and March 1997 revealed that the assumptions prominent in the existing civil-military relations literature about the static nature of civilian supremacy and military professionalism do not fit the realities of the states undergoing democratic transitions. Although officers serving within the Soviet bloc may have been "professionals" in the traditional sense of having a high level of expertise, feeling a sense of corporateness, and being generally apolitical, specific norms of behavior developed within an authoritarian system of government are inappropriate when transferred to a democratic political system. This work specifies the professional norms that must be adapted when officers trained within an authoritarian political system transfer their service to a democracy.

The main thesis of this study is that political systems matter and are, indeed, determinants of patterns of civil-military relations. Authoritarian and democratic political systems produce different forms of civilian control and military professionalism. Consequently, shifts in political systems necessarily result in changed patterns of civilian control and military professionalism. A new form of military professionalism is needed to ensure that the armed forces in the postcommunist states become democratically accountable and reflect democratic principles while also functioning as effective instruments of national security. Armed forces in transitioning states must set their sights on achieving these goals although they are burdened with the weight of institutional norms formed while in service to authoritarian states.

Concentrating on two critical dimensions of the military democratization problem—democratic political control and democratic military professionalism—addresses the democratization needs that transitioning militaries face. This study explores the dimensions of democratic political control and military professionalism in depth and identifies specific issue areas on which both internal and external policymakers can focus to further the democratization of postcommunist armed forces. Distinct patterns of *democratic* political control and *democratic* military professionalism must be built. Building these patterns should be the aim of all involved in the military democratization process in the postcommunist states.

A general framework that links professional norms with the infusion of democratic values and recognizes the need for democratic socialization in transitioning states is developed. While drawn primarily from American practice,

it has potentially great applicability to the postcommunist states, when adapted to their historical experiences, habits, and current needs. The model attempts to delineate the norms and habits that must be developed within these armed forces as they progress toward the goal of democratic consolidation.

The goal of achieving democratic political control of the military can be advanced by focusing on specific aspects of the civil-military relationship. First, what constitutional provisions are in place to ensure that the mechanisms for civilian control are sufficient and clearly codified? Second, do democratically accountable civilian leaders control the budgetary authorizations of the military, and is sufficient authority and expertise vested in both executive and parliamentary bodies, as applicable, to adequately exercise democratic oversight of the military? Is there a group of civilian experts in military affairs to advise civilian democratic decision makers and balance the opinions of the military chiefs? Are the operations of the Ministry of Defense (MOD) transparent, and is the MOD accountable to civilian authorities with legitimate authority to oversee its work? Finally, is the military responsive to the democratic expectations of society at large? Does the military have the trust of society to be its guardians of societal freedoms?

The second part of the model focuses on achieving the goal of democratic military professionalism. Specific criteria are enumerated that ensure the presence of democratic norms and practices in the development of postcommunist military institutions. This framework weighs heavily the transitioning military's objective of defending the democratic state while remaining true to democratic societal values, such as the observance of basic civil rights and the just treatment of military personnel.

Specifically, patterns of recruitment and retention, promotion and advancement, officership and leadership, education and training, norms of political influence, prestige and public relations, and the compatibility of military and societal values are addressed. Concentrating on the development of democratic norms in each of these elements of military professionalism enhances both the democratic accountability and competence of the armed forces of transitioning states.

Building these patterns of *democratic* political control and *democratic* military professionalism should be the focus of policymakers who seek to influence the military democratization process in postcommunist states. An examination of the U.S. military's democratization programs in place in the former Soviet bloc, however, clearly shows that no such understanding of the scope of the military democratization problem exists among U.S. policymakers.

The case-study method is used to explore the specific problems of military democratization and democratization assistance in Russia and the Czech Republic. These cases were chosen for both theoretical and practical reasons. The cases represent vastly different paths of democratization in terms of the success to date of their economic transitions, their geostrategic aspirations, and their

diverse patterns of civil-military relations in the Soviet era. However, these differences allow for the comparison of contrasting authoritarian systems in transition within a generally common framework of Soviet norms of military professionalism. Additionally, there are practical policy considerations and implications for the selection of the cases. Of the specific military democratization programs analyzed in chapters 3 through 5, one program includes the states of the former Soviet Union (FSU) as its participants and the other effort is aimed at the democratizing states of the former Eastern bloc. The programs themselves represent varied approaches to facilitating the emergence of democratic norms within postcommunist militaries. The Czech Republic and Russia represent significant cases from each program. Russia is obviously the most influential and potentially the most troublesome state in the FSU, while the Czech Republic, as among the first to receive an invitation for NATO membership, is a key state within the former Eastern bloc.

The dimensions of the military democratization problem are applied to the case countries' postcommunist military institutions in order to assess progress made and democratization needs that remain as the transitions continue. However, an analysis of the activity of the U.S. military democratization programs shows negligible progress toward achieving the goal of military democratization. Policymakers have weakly operationalized the concept of military democratization and have consequently designed unfocused and inappropriate solutions to the continuing democratization needs of the cases.

This book is an attempt to contribute both a diagnosis and a prescription for the problem of military democratization in postcommunist states so that policymakers can address it effectively. First, specific theoretical shortcomings in the classical civil-military relations literature have been identified and adapted to the problems of postcommunist states. Much work remains, however, for theorists to build the concepts needed to guide the successful democratic transitions of authoritarian military institutions. Second, the identification of particular issue areas and desired behaviors across the dimensions of democratic political control and democratic military professionalism offers policymakers specific suggestions for making their democratization programs in the region more effective. Third, an analysis of specific military democratization programs under way in the former Eastern bloc illustrates the gap between theoretical and actual prescriptions to facilitate democratic transitions in postcommunist militaries. The hope is that this study will assist both theorists and policymakers to better understand the problem of military democratization. The models developed and the conclusions drawn in this endeavor may be imperfect, but its undertaking is a beginning toward solving the problem of military democratization in transitioning states and, consequently, may make some contribution toward their democratic consolidation.

CHAPTER 1

A Theory of Democratic Civil-Military Relations in Postcommunist States

This chapter will critique existing theories of civil-military relations and propose a theory of civil-military relations appropriate to the needs of postcommunist democratizing states. The military institutions of the former Soviet bloc must overcome patterns of interaction between civilian authorities and military leaders that contrasted sharply with the norms of interaction that their Western democratic counterparts experienced. The models of postcommunist civil-military relations developed here will focus on constructing two key elements of the military democratization process—democratic political control and democratic military professionalism. These theoretical underpinnings will then be applied to the military democratization process of two specific cases—Russia and the Czech Republic—in chapters 3 and 4. My hope is that the specific enumeration of democratic deficits across the two dimensions of military democratization outlined in the chapter will inform the efforts of policymakers—both within and external to transitioning states—who are dedicated to facilitating military institutions' transitions to democracy.

The Need for a Theory of Democratic Civil-Military Relations in Postcommunist States

The experience of postcommunist states mandates a different theory of civil-military relations than has previously been pursued by states, whether authoritarian or democratic. The purpose of this section is to lay out the elements of *democratic* political control and *democratic* military professionalism characteristic of developed democracies in order to model the policy end point of states undergoing a democratic transition. My goal is to contribute to the delineation of a coherent set of civil-military relations that is responsive to the needs of newly democratizing states and that can also guide policy advisers in reforming these systems. In addition, this model can be used to inform the efforts of developed democracies to assist these states in transition.

Samuel Huntington, arguably the leading theorist of civil-military relations today, has argued that the interaction of the twin imperatives of security and accountability is at the root of the problem of civil-military relations. "The

military institutions of any society are shaped by two forces: a functional imperative stemming from the threats to the society's security and a societal imperative arising from the social forces, ideologies, and institutions dominant within the society."[1] A state's civil-military relations, then, depend on forces that compel the military institution to strive to become a competent military force and the competing forces demanding that the military be accountable and responsive to the society it serves.

The central problem of civil-military relations is resolving the tensions that inevitably arise from these competing imperatives. The classical focus in the literature has been on civilian control of the military defined as "governmental control of the military."[2] This general characterization of the problem of civil-military relations has traditionally been accepted by theorists in the field.[3]

The Imperative of Democratic Political Control

In the case of a democratic state, or of a state engaged in the process of democratic transition, there exists the additional and more demanding challenge of ensuring that national security is achieved at the least sacrifice of democratic practices, norms, and values. With regard to military institutions within democratic societies, the most important of these values is that civilian authorities, elected and appointed, direct the military institution. The military must serve the democratic state and remain under its control. Although civilian control of the military is a goal for all states, its achievement in democratic states depends on the interaction between democratic institutions and military institutions charged with defending both the state and its democratic values.

Considering the total context of the military institution's political environment is the most analytically powerful approach to take when studying its behavior. This is because the political role that the military institution can play within a state is derived from the position of the military subsystem within the overall political system.[4] This insight implies that the type of political system that a military institution serves matters. Consequently, variances between political systems or transitions to new political systems must necessarily affect the behavior of the military. For this reason, analyzing the military institution in isolation from its social and political setting is a limited and insufficient approach.

Civilian control is best understood by considering a set of relationships. "The nature and extent of civilian control reflect shifting balances between the strengths of civilian political institutions on one side, and the political strengths of military institutions on the other."[5] It is appropriate, then, to attempt to illuminate which relationships are relevant and how they can best be structured to

enhance civilian control in general, and democratic political control in particular, especially as these relations apply to postcommunist reform efforts.

The conditions of postcommunist states engaged in democratic transition are distinct from the conditions that characterized the military institutions in stable political systems. Democratic states insist on military subordination to its civilian leadership and, by extension, to democratic processes of authority and control, resting ultimately on the freely expressed opinion of unfettered electorates in choosing officeholders. Therefore, many of the widely held assumptions underlying traditional approaches to civil-military relations need to be reexamined in light of the experience of the postcommunist states in transition from authoritarian rule.

The Deficiencies of Traditional Approaches to Civil-Military Relations

Samuel Huntington's concepts of subjective and objective civilian control alternately emphasize the maximization of civilian power through ideological controls and the achievement of civilian control through the fostering of military professionalism."[6] Subjective civilian control assumes the military's participation in politics and encourages the political socialization of the military so that its values mirror those of the state.[7] In contrast, objective civilian control assumes complete apolitical behavior from military professionals. Indeed, Huntington contends that, since one of the basic foundations of military professionalism is obedience to any civilian group that secures legitimate authority in the state, professional officers would have no desire to interfere with questions of policy. Instead, their full attention would be devoted to carrying out the state's political aims with maximum effectiveness and efficiency once these have been determined.[8]

Objective civilian control is Huntington's clear preference for modern states. "Subjective civilian control is fundamentally out of place in any society in which the division of labor has been carried to the point where there emerges a distinct class of specialists in the management of violence."[9] In Huntington's view, objective civilian control is the only option that contains the power of the military vis-à-vis civilian groups while also maximizing the likelihood of achieving military security.[10]

In *The Soldier and the State,* Huntington's concept of the military professionalism characteristic of objective civilian control mandates that no political role, no matter how responsible, can be allowed for the military. Such a perspective does not sufficiently reflect the dynamics that operate within a democratic state. In the politics of democratic states all institutions compete for resources and attempt to influence policymakers who make decisions affecting

their organization. In reality, military institutions must cooperate with their oversight bodies to pass on professional expertise and lobby for the support of their professional recommendations regarding national security.

Even more important to the democratic adjustment of postcommunist militaries is Huntington's assumption of a brand of military professionalism that is unquestionably loyal to whatever government has legitimately come to power. Such an analysis ignores the ideological adjustments that necessarily accompany shifts in political systems.[11] As citizens of the states they serve, military personnel inevitably undergo some form of socialization that transmits the values of the state. Servicemembers develop a set of beliefs that forms the basis of their motivation for their service to the state. When society embraces a new set of values, as in the process of transition from authoritarian rule, some adjustments must also be made to reorient the motivation for service of military members.

Moreover, to assume that the military as a subunit of society, albeit a group isolated to some degree, is totally impervious to monumental political and economic changes that may sweep a state ignores the fact that military personnel, like all participants in the life of the state, are affected by significant changes within it. A liberalization of the political system or the transformation of economic patterns will inevitably affect the military whose members share many of the same expectations and values as their civilian counterparts. This is particularly true when political changes result in negative outcomes for the military that may undermine, threaten, or perhaps even destroy previous levels of status and material well-being. Such is the case in many of the transitioning postcommunist states. While the military increasingly comes to share the values of society, it also resists changes and the values underlying them if its status and well-being are threatened.

Huntington has great difficulty accepting the possibility of a professional military institution that is also socialized ideologically to defend a particular political system. Yet he assumes that soldiers born in democratic states will naturally act as democrats without any particular effort in the military socialization process to ensure that such behavior occurs. Huntington's most recent writings continue to espouse universally accepted norms of military professionalism narrowly defined as accepting objective civilian control and focusing purely on military matters. No specific attention is given to differentiating between norms of military professionalism in authoritarian and democratic political systems.[12]

Military professionals in modern democratic states, however, are socialized to defend a particular form of government. Military professionals in democracies believe that the protection of democratic institutions and of the individual freedoms of their countrymen depends on their service. In consolidated

democracies, there exist expectations within society at large and within the military that democratic values matter and that all organs of the government, including the military, should reflect and uphold them. The military not only defends the political order advanced by the democratic regime, it must allow itself to be shaped by that order. As such, human rights abuses within the military are not normally tolerated, nor are strategies of organization and leadership endorsed that conflict with standards prevalent throughout the rest of the democratic society. This emphasis on democratic values is carried out as long as military effectiveness is not sacrificed. In the routine conduct of their duties and especially in combat scenarios, military personnel enjoy limited freedom. Overall, though, military professionalism in a democracy is monitored by the civilian overseers to ensure that the norms, practices, and values of the democratic state are replicated in the behavior of its military arm to the greatest extent possible.

Some may argue that demanding such high standards of adherence to democratic values is unreasonable in light of the authoritarian heritage of the transitioning postcommunist states. Certainly the legacy of Soviet era norms of behavior is influencing the course of postcommunist military institutions across the region. This legacy and its specific impact will be discussed at length later in this chapter. However, the prevalence of nondemocratic patterns of political control and military professionalism in a state's history precludes neither the possibility nor the expectation that democratic norms should ultimately prevail as the processes of democratization continue. The existence of "democratic" states with militaries that fall short of democratic norms, South Korea and Taiwan, for example, merely means that such states have not progressed far enough on the continuum of democratization. If the postcommunist states of the former Soviet bloc are to truly democratize there has to be a change in both the ideology and culture of their civil-military relations. Signals from advanced democracies in the West that professional norms and accountability to civilian authority may settle at a "reformed-authoritarian" or "quasi-democratic" state limits the course of military democratization and may dangerously commit NATO allies to the defense of states that are less than democratic.

In reality, a blend of subjective and objective control is found in advanced democratic states and in transitioning states aspiring to become consolidated democracies. An overreliance on universally accepted norms of professionalism that are supposedly applicable to militaries across political systems to ensure democratic political control ignores the ideological transition to democracy that transitioning militaries must make and takes for granted the ideological socialization of militaries that occurs in advanced democracies. Nonintervention in the professional military sphere also assumes that, left to its own devices, militaries in democracies will develop a set of norms and prac-

tices that reflect the values of the democratic state—or that if a set of norms and practices reflective of the state's values does not develop, then such a result is of no real consequence for the preservation of a democratic regime.

The Imperative of Democratic Military Professionalism

Therefore, I propose that in addition to ensuring that processes of democratic political control continue on course, specific attention should also be given to developing appropriate patterns of democratic military professionalism. Distinguishing between *democratic* military professionalism and military professionalism in general assumes that there are significant differences between military professionalism in democratic states and nondemocratic states and in states somewhere between these two extremes on the continuum of democratization.

Professionalism Defined

Civil-military relations theorists agree that the advent of modern technology spurred the growth of specialization, which in turn produced the phenomenon of professionalization. Huntington's widely accepted model of professionalism distinguishes between a profession and other occupations by the presence of expertise, responsibility, and corporateness within a profession.[13] The continued utility of Huntington's conceptualization is borne out by its prominence in course materials used by U.S. commissioning sources when introducing officer candidates to the military profession.[14]

According to Huntington's model, the expertise of a professional stems from a period of prolonged education and experience during which the professional must demonstrate competence in the objective standards of the profession. Military professionals are distinguished from other professionals by the nature of their expertise as managers of violence. The military profession is unique because of the distinct function that society has entrusted to it. The singular responsibility of the military professional is to direct, operate, and control an organization whose primary function is the threat or use of deadly military might against enemy forces and targets designated by the political leadership. Military professionals in all political systems share a mandate to be as competent as possible in their military expertise in order to defend the political ends of their respective states.

Military Professionalism in Democratic States

States seeking to maximize their military security, without compromising democratic values in the national security effort, need to pursue a form of profes-

sionalism that incorporates Huntington's principles of expertise, responsibility, and corporateness and also fosters the penetration of democratic values within the military institution. Both efforts must be deliberately thought out, planned, and executed. In addition, civilian and military participants in the process should be aware of the need to monitor the growth in functional professionalism so that it does not outstrip the concurrent need to ensure that societal values are also internalized. The ultimate goal is to promote the development of both professionals and democrats.

The Legacy of Soviet Patterns of Civil-Military Relations

The legacy of the Soviet era must be considered as the foundation on which adjustments to a democratic system of government will be made. The soldier in the Soviet Union and his comrades in the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) experienced completely different sets of dynamics in relating to their states than did their counterparts in democratic states. The Party relied on the military as an instrument of enforcing and imposing authoritarian rule, yet these political authorities also feared the military because of its potential to employ its resources against the state.

Although Party leaders maintained a monopoly of power within the political system, they did not have a similar monopoly of force. The possession of the instruments of coercive power by states' militaries mandates that all states cultivate stable relations between the military and the civilian leadership so that militaries do not stray from their designated role in the political system. The imperative of Party control in Communist systems was complicated by the fact that no process of orderly transfer of power was present.[15] Potential rivals, then, could always seek to manipulate the military institution for their own purposes, while the opportunity also existed for the military to take sides in political fights as the primary managers of violence in the state. Therefore, continued Party control depended on complete control of the military institution.[16]

In comparison to militaries functioning in democratic societies, the characteristics of military professionalism were markedly affected by the military institutions' roles as instruments of the Communist Party. Such service emphasized subordination to an authoritarian ideology and state rather than upholding the primacy of the individual and the protection of his rights as the central focus of state institutions.

A Comparison of Norms of Democratic Political Control and Political Control in the Soviet Era

Table 1 lays out the norms of democratic political control and contrasts these features with the patterns of political control that were prevalent across the

TABLE 1. A Comparison of Democratic and Soviet Models of Political Control of Military Institutions

Elements of Political Control	Democratic Features	Soviet Features
Constitutional Provisions	Mechanisms for civilian control sufficient and clearly codified.	Communist Party vested with supreme authority
Executive Oversight and Control	Clear chain of command from military leaders to the executive. Presence of expert civilian national security staff. Effective civilian oversight within the MOD. Transparent and responsive MOD and military. Expert advice of military leaders one input to national security decisions. Mutual confidence between civilian and military leaders. Corruption not tolerated. Executive actively educates public on national security policies and priorities.	Clear chain of command from military leaders to party leaders. General Secretary is Communist Party leader and directs party apparatus that carries out party policies. Military exerted influences over military policy and issues of professionalism but accepted the Party as the sovereign authority. Military relatively free of corruption in Soviet era, but corruption rises as transition begins.
Legislative Oversight and Control	Sufficient expertise to oversee budgetary and other oversight issues. Broad control over policy issues and ability to conduct hearings. Transparent MOD and military that allow unrestricted access to information to legislatures. Military responsive to legislative inquiries. Legislators motivated to ensure accountability of the military institution.	Legislature is no counterweight to the party leadership. No real oversight role. Loyal ratifiers of party policy.
Relationship Between Military Institution and Society	No serious tensions between military institution and society. Respect for the military as the guardians of societal freedoms. Limits on the military's access to influence and public participation.	Party was source of military's prestige and status and bestowed upon the military a privileged place in society in exchange for defending the regime. Party controlled all levels of socialization and instilled militarism and respect for the military as hallmark of Soviet political culture. However, the degree of military prestige varied across the Soviet bloc.

Soviet bloc. The elements of political control considered across the variant political systems are the importance of constitutional provisions that enumerate responsibility for political control; the quality of control exercised through the executive, the Ministry of Defense (MOD), and the parliament; and, finally, the relationship of the military to the society at large. The democratic norms presented in this chapter offer a general framework that links professional norms with infused democratic values and socialization. While drawn from American practice, they have potentially greater and more universal applicability, subject to qualifications and adaptations that are sensitive to the historical experience, habits, and current needs of transitioning states.

The Importance of Constitutional Provisions for Ensuring Democratic Political Control

One of the first tasks that a society seeking to become a democracy sets out to complete is the composition of a constitution that codifies its societal goals and values. A constitution is vital for the success of a democratizing society. It ensures democratic political control of the military and defines the powers of governing institutions and their oversight authority over the military. Such constitutional constraints on the military routinely include vesting command of the armed forces in the civilian head of state or government and ascribing to the legislature the power to approve appropriations and to declare war. Power to act in emergency situations without the specific consent of the legislature may be reserved to the executive.[17] Constitutional provisions may also ascribe to legislatures broad oversight capabilities over the military. These normally include the approval of major appointments, the organizational structure of the defense establishment, the powers of civilian and military officials within it, and special investigative powers to ensure democratic accountability.[18] While the legislature may have broad constitutional powers "to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces," the executive may also have broad powers of internal management that allow him to issue orders that may affect internal procedures, responsibilities, and the distribution of authority in the armed forces.[19]

While such provisions are important to include in a written constitution, one must be careful not to confuse shadow with substance when evaluating the effectiveness of civilian control within a democratic state. Theorists agree that formal prescriptions alone are not sufficient for civilian control. Huntington even argues that civilian control is achieved in the U.S. model *despite* rather than because of constitutional provisions.[20] The constitutions of most democratic states contain such formulas as popular sovereignty, policy supervision, and budgetary control.[21] The essential point of evaluation is the reality of the enumerated relationships. Are the formal prescriptions lived out in the life of

the state? Is the influence of the military balanced vis-à-vis the influence of civilian institutions? When valid constitutional designs do not work well in practice, citizens and civilians in positions of political authority must recognize their legitimate power to correct abuses. Action should be taken to right the balance of coordinated authority and control of the armed forces among constitutional bodies, a balance essential to the maintenance of democratic political control.

Constitutional constraints enhance the legitimacy of civilian authorities. If democracy can be crystallized in its most simplistic sense to mean that "the power resides in the active people,"[22] then the elected representatives of the people serving in the various organs of the government must set the policy for a democratic state. Legal prescriptions legitimate the ultimate authority of the people through their representatives, and this legitimation may prevent a potential coup when the possibility of intervention is considered.[23]

Political Control in the Soviet Era

Political control in the Soviet era was characterized by different degrees of centralization at different levels of administration. This enabled the political leadership, embodied in the upper echelons of the Communist Party, to prioritize and concentrate its resources and attention on areas in which it had the greatest interest.[24] Party control extended over every aspect of society's life in the Soviet bloc.[25] While an elaborate bureaucratic structure developed over time separating every conceivable functional area, only the Party leadership had the authority to formulate policy and to oversee its execution. The role of the rest of the institutions of government was to ratify Party policy and to implement it.[26]

The military institution, in this respect, was not unlike other institutions in the Eastern bloc. However, its unique function, managing violence, meant that the Party-military relationship would be characterized by a high degree of mutual dependence. The professional officer in the Soviet bloc resented the constraints on professionalism that service to an authoritarian state entailed, yet he also remained indebted to the state for the opportunity to serve it and to maintain a privileged position within it.

The Soviet experience with the presence of civilians within the defense ministry differed from that of the democratic model, which mandates the presence of civilian staffers in the upper echelons of the body and also has a civilian at the head of the ministry. In the Soviet model, the MOD was essentially militarized; when an occasional civilian was given a top position, that individual was given a military rank and wore a military uniform, as occurred with the installation of Defense Minister Dmitrii Ustinov in 1976.[27]

The dominance of full-time Party apparatchiks at the highest levels of the decision-making process ensured that all policies would serve the Party's in-

terests. Chief among these interests was controlling the military institution. To achieve this end, the Party created military Party organs to carry out Party work within the military. Its latter-day version was embodied in the structure of the Main Political Administration (MPA). Though there is disagreement on whether the Party or state security services exercised more control over the Soviet military and the militaries of the East European regimes, the state security services at least complemented the more formal and open activities of the Party carried out by the political officer.[28]

The patterns of Party control in the East European states modeled those relied upon in the Soviet Union. Governmental structures paralleled those found in the Soviet Union. With regard to control of the military, local versions of the MPA ensured the political reliability of the armed forces and carried out their programs through political officers and basic Party organizations.[29] However, in the East European states, control was exercised at multiple levels: at the domestic level by the Communist Party, on a bilateral level with the Soviet Union, and at the multinational level through the mechanisms of the WTO.[30]

Political control in the Soviet military depended greatly on the symbiotic nature of the relationship between the Party and the military. The Party needed the military to defend the regime from external and internal enemies, to serve as the guardians of the revolution, and to socialize society through military service. On the other hand, the Party was the source of the military's prestige and material status, and the insurer of the continuation of a stable system of government.[31]

In Eastern Europe, however, the legitimacy of ruling communist parties was weak because they had not come to power either through a revolution or by popular demand. Power was handed to the local Communists through the coercive means of Red Army occupation. Consequently, the legitimacy of the armed forces committed to defend the communist regimes was also weak.[32] This complicated the problem of achieving political control. East European Communists were wary of the loyalty of their armed forces and considered the Soviet military, whose troops were present within the WTO states alongside the national militaries, as their ultimate line of defense.[33] For the Soviet Union to permit conditions that would enhance the political legitimacy of the local Communist regimes would necessarily mean loosening Moscow's control over them. Similarly, allowing the development of greater military professionalism within the East European militaries could have led to greater competence and contributed to the enhanced legitimacy of the armed forces, but the price would have been some loss of Soviet control.[34]

A necessary condition of service for the military in both the Soviet Union and the Eastern European states was the forfeiture of much of its professional autonomy throughout the Soviet era. Ensuring the military's continued reliability within political systems suffering from legitimacy problems of varying

degrees required a conscious decision on the part of the political leadership to trade off maximum military efficiency and competence for the objective of political reliability. Political control was maintained through a network of nonautonomous political-governmental bodies that were responsible to the centralized authority embodied in the Politburo and the General Secretary of the Communist Party. In the Eastern European states, these local Party mechanisms were additionally accountable to Party mechanisms within the Soviet Union.

Democratic Political Control in Democratizing Postcommunist States

The gradual advent of democratization across the Soviet bloc has resulted in the simultaneous decentralization of the Soviet era's system of control and the rising influence of other legitimate centers of power characteristic of democratic political systems. These changes have inevitably had a seismic effect on civil-military relations in the postcommunist states. The armed forces of the former Soviet bloc have been forced to adapt to new environments characterized by a new political ideology requiring a conversion of loyalties and patterns of thinking.

The form of democratic political control of the military will vary in the transitioning states depending on whether they have selected presidential or parliamentary political systems. For instance, in Russia, democratic institutions are dominated by a strong executive, and most of the responsibility for democratic political control is lodged in the executive by design. In contrast, the Czech Republic has chosen a system with a strong parliament and a weak president. Control in this case is largely administered through the prime minister and the defense minister who are accountable to Parliament. The model of democratic norms of political control presented in this chapter constructs a general framework of civil-military relations in transitioning states. It must be adapted to the specific historical circumstances, current needs, and future imperatives of democratizing states. Some states may choose to have greater reliance on executive controls, others on parliamentary ones, and still others on a separation of powers between institutions. The important benchmark for success is the proper implementation of whatever system of control is chosen.

The Importance of Executive and Ministry of Defense (MOD) Control in Democratic States

The exercise of democratic political control through the executive is reflected first and foremost through the military's responsiveness to the executive's constitutional powers. Day-to-day executive control, however, is administered

through a ministry of defense accountable to the executive and/or to parliament, as applicable, through the legislature's oversight powers. Militaries in democracies are further characterized by civilian defense ministers whose departments have authority for the organizational and administrative control of the armed forces. Furthermore, sufficient civilian expertise must exist in military matters so that civilian overseers in the MOD can execute their oversight functions effectively.

Executive control also depends on the transparency of the defense ministry and the military services. Defense officials and military officers must be responsive to outside inquiries. Violations of democratic norms and practices or of military procedures and regulations should be swiftly investigated and resolved. Additionally, corruption in any form that may jeopardize the public trust must not be tolerated. Civilian defense officials must also have the capability of accurately assessing the readiness of the nation's military forces and have access to military bases and the appropriate information to make this assessment.

One of the factors that can limit democratic political control is the monopolization of national security information by the military. It is difficult for civilian authorities to maintain control of the military institution if they feel incompetent in matters of national security. Civil-military relations theorists recommend the establishment of a national security council comprised of civilian expert advisers on military affairs to counsel the executive or the prime minister, as applicable, on national security issues.[35] A staff of civilian experts can serve as a filter between the military chiefs and civilian officials while also formulating its advice based on an understanding of the broadest aspects of domestic and international affairs.

The authority of the executive is also vested in the civilian chiefs of the military services and their staffs. The presence of competent civilian bureaucrats capable of overseeing the military organization because of their technical expertise, while also remaining accountable to elected officials, is essential to democratic political control as well. In addition, such officials are an important source of institutional continuity and memory. Under the guidance of a national security council, these civilians are responsible for preparing the budget, allocating missions and responsibilities between the services, and advising the foreign ministry and the prime minister or president on military aspects of foreign policy.[36] Their presence ensures that matters of state policy are initiated by civilian authorities who are accountable to elected members of the government.

While matters of policy may be initiated by civilian authorities, civilian supremacy in any political system depends on a sense of mutual confidence between military and civilian leaders. Military leaders must perceive that their expertise matters and their advice is weighed with great care by competent civil-

ian authorities. Military leaders at least want to be assured that they have access to civilian policymakers and that any strategic decision of the executive is made after considering their expert advice.[37]

Finally, the head of government can play a role in strengthening the relationship between the society at large and the military institution by helping to educate the public on the nation's security policies.[38] The national security policies of a democratic state should be well known and understood by its citizens. The public should understand the efforts of military professionals charged with carrying out the policies, and recognize as well that some national sacrifice of treasure and individual freedoms may be necessary to achieve the nation's security ends.

Elements of Parliamentary Control in Democratic States

One of the chief means for democratic political control in states with parliamentary systems or with a separation of powers between institutions is legislative oversight of military affairs. This supervision may be carried out by specialized defense committees (as is the case in the United States), through broad oversight powers exercised by the entire legislative body, or through a combination of the two. The primary means of parliamentary or alternative forms of control is budgetary.[39] Effective budgetary control depends on access to accurate and specific information regarding proposed programs and expenditures. Control of the budget, like all other aspects of legislative control, also depends on sufficient parliamentary expertise in defense matters to make appropriate judgments.

Legislative oversight of the military also typically includes control over broad matters of military policy, such as the size and organization of the military and the defense ministry, and the confirmation of key military promotions and civilian appointments. Legislative authority may extend, too, to the regulation of recruitment and training practices, approval of salaries, monitoring of housing conditions, and the deployment of troops abroad. Legislative control may rival that of the executive due to specific powers reserved for the legislature that may limit the authority of the executive, such as the confirmation of appointments and control of the purse. However, some constitutions may reserve these powers for the executive or for the prime minister. The multi-party makeup of most legislatures limits somewhat their effectiveness because they lack the focus and unity of the executive.

The quality of legislative oversight varies with the competence and interest of the overseers, as with the executive oversight previously discussed. Do the legislators have the technical expertise, through their own training or by access to expert staffs, to consider carefully different aspects of the budget and relate them to the long-term strategic needs of the state? Are they willing to ap-

pear to be unpatriotic if they question the needs of the military? Are the supervisors too close to those that they supervise to rein them in when appropriate? Is the military responsive to legislative inquiries? Finally, are the civilian overseers sufficiently motivated to invest a lot of energy and resources into overseeing an area of national policy in which their electorate is typically disinterested?

One way to enhance the defense expertise of parliamentarians is through the participation of staffs made up of functional experts to assist in the decision-making process. Unrestricted access to defense ministry, outside civilian, and uniformed military experts through the conduct of hearings on military policy can also improve the defense oversight process. In this respect, the executive and legislature have similar interests in access to the expertise of the military leaders. Just as the executive can call on military leaders directly for their input into national security issues, legislators must also be able to hear directly from military experts when they so desire.

Legislative oversight, like executive oversight, varies according to an array of factors. The most important of these is the relative responsibility for control granted to the parliament by the constitution. Although the powers of budgetary oversight, investigation, and general legislative authority on matters of military organization and policy may reside within civilian bodies, their effective control may be low either by design or because the legislature is not fully implementing its designated authority. Civilian oversight must be evaluated according to the competence and motivation of the civilians filling the relevant positions as well as the resources available to assist them in their supervisory task. The existence of oversight positions alone does not guarantee democratic political control of the armed forces.

Relationship of the Military to the Organs of Government in the Soviet Bloc

The most obvious difference between discussions of civil-military relations in the Soviet era and the norms of democratic civil-military relations previously discussed is that there are not as many axes of the relationship to explore. The only relationship that really mattered was that between the Party and the military. Neither the legislature, the executive, nor the judiciary had separate autonomous realms of authority vis-à-vis the military. Each was present in the Soviet system, but only the authority of the Party, which controlled all institutions of government, mattered. Even the enumeration of powers and rights in the Soviet and East European constitutions mattered little in comparison to the will of the Party.

Political control of Eastern European armed forces, however, depended on both the nature of the Soviet-East European relationship at the interstate level

and the relationship between the military and the Party within each individual Communist state.[40] A variety of coercive and socialization mechanisms were employed to ensure loyalty to both the Soviet Union and the national regime.[41] These included control through the Party apparatus and the establishment of Soviet Army norms and practices throughout the Warsaw Pact nations.

Military and political actors with only the democratic model of civil-military relations as a point of reference are consequently struck by the unidimensionality of the Soviet model. Limited experience with only one primary source of authority over Communist militaries in the Soviet era severely constrains postcommunist actors attempting to transition to a political system in which a more comprehensive set of democratic institutions has legitimate political influence over the military.

The Relationship between the Military Institution and Society in Democratic States

In democratic states, the attitude of the society at large is shaped by such factors as the congruence of military and societal values, the historical role of the military in the society, and the prevalence of outside threats to the society. In democracies it is essential that tensions between society and the military remain low. The gap between society and the military institution can be bridged to some extent through the mutual exchange of societal and military expectations about the role of each in a democratic society.

For instance, the society at large may expect that the military institution place a great value on remaining an instrument of state policy, that it place a premium on military members upholding military virtues, and that democratic principles be reflected in the procedures and practices of the military institution to the greatest extent possible without forfeiting a degree of military security. In order to ensure that these societal expectations are met, citizens may demand that local military commanders and defense and military officials at the national level respond to the military's breaches of democratic norms as perceived by the public. The press can also play a key role in forcing the military and its civilian overseers to remain democratically accountable through its investigative reporting and demands for access to information that should rightly fall in the public domain.

The military institution, on the other hand, may have the expectation that its professionalism is respected and encouraged, that its service is rewarded with an appropriate level of compensation while on active duty and with the possibility of civilian employment upon discharge or retirement, and that the society at large entrusts it with the responsibility for protecting its physical security and way of life. The military can advance the fulfillment of its expectations vis-à-vis society at large by cultivating its relationship with the civilian

community, being responsive to demands for democratic accountability, and upholding democratic values, such as the protection of civil rights, in its institutional practices.

The military institution must realize, though, that it is responsible to a great extent for shaping its image within society. The armed forces must, first of all, be aware of what their image in society is and what the sources and substance of the societal perceptions are. In areas where societal perceptions do not match reality, the military may have to actively seek ways to correct the misperception. Where negative perceptions are valid, then the military should work to reform these practices that induce popular skepticism.

The Military and Society in the Soviet Bloc

Since the Party controlled all levers of socialization—the workplace, the schools, the media, and to some extent the home—militarism and respect for the military institution were deliberately fostered until they became hallmarks of Soviet political culture. The authoritarian nature of the Soviet Union enabled the political leadership to manipulate the terms of the military's relationship with society. High levels of respect were encouraged within the school system; and, from the earliest age, Soviet youths were taught to look forward to their time of compulsory military service.

The use of the military as the primary agent of political socialization among conscript-age youths highlighted the compatibility of military and societal values in the Soviet system. The ideal soldier was, conveniently, also the ideal New Socialist Man—patriotic, hard-working, Communist, morally upright, and respectful of his Commander and comrades in arms.[42] The system of universal conscription that required virtually every Soviet man to perform military service at the age of eighteen gave Soviet males firsthand experience with military values and with the institution in general. Many continued their military service in the reserves, thus carrying on a lifelong affiliation with the military.

The deliberate presentation of military values through all vehicles of Soviet socialization reduced the gap between military values and those desired by the Party in society at large. The result was an overall controlled but positive relationship between the military institution and society. The constant influx of conscripts and their subsequent return to civilian life also contributed to a greater sense of the permeability of the military and civilian worlds.

In the East European states the socialization process was complicated by the anti-Russian and anticommunist sentiment that pervaded the Eastern bloc to varying degrees throughout the Soviet era. First, some basic level of tolerance for Soviet values had to be established. Accomplishment of the political socialization task in the East European militaries drew heavily on the Soviet

model, which was aimed at developing officers who were both "red" and "expert." Moreover, the ideological message transmitted in the East European states was necessarily two-dimensional. Emphasis had to be placed on both socialist patriotism, or nationalism, and socialist internationalism, or obedience to Moscow.[43]

In contrast to democratic societies, whose professional military enlistees and noncommissioned officers (NCOs) voluntarily serve for relatively long periods of time, the militaries of the Soviet bloc were less isolated societal institutions inevitably affected by the social forces influencing its conscript pool. Any significant change in the compatibility of societal and military values has deep consequences for the military institution that must adapt itself to the changing society that it serves. Certainly, shifting from the homogeneous militaristic values of the Soviet era to the pluralist values of a transitioning democratic society challenges the conservative nature of the post-Soviet militaries in the former Soviet Union and across the former Soviet bloc.

The Legacy of Soviet Patterns of Military Professionalism

The unique features of the Soviet political system fostered a distinct form of military professionalism resulting from its tsarist legacy, the socialization processes of the Soviet era, and the constraints of Party control. Authoritarian models of officership and leadership, the harsh discipline of military life, an intense aversion to revealing its internal operations to the public, and the corruption of bureaucratic and personal ethics all came to characterize Soviet military professionalism.

The Soviet army reflected the values of its authoritarian state in that the relationship between officers and soldiers was like that of landowners and serfs. Some landowners were concerned about their serfs' welfare, while others did not even think of them as real people. Consequently, the Soviet Army and its successor, the Russian Army, practiced the traits of slaves: forbearance, suffering, and pretending to get along;[44] and a form of military professionalism developed in which officership was characterized by uneven standards of responsibility for subordinates, coercive rather than motivational forms of leadership, and protection of oneself from the potentially cruel disciplinary arm of the state.

A Comparison of Norms of Democratic Military Professionalism and Military Professionalism in the Soviet Bloc

Developed states strive to achieve the dual goals of professional competence and loyalty to the political regime. The task for consolidated democracies is the

development of an officer corps of expert soldiers who are also democrats, while the task for the communist states of the Soviet bloc was the development of soldiers who were both "red" and "expert." The obvious task for postcommunist states in transition, then, is the conversion of the "red experts" into "democrat experts." This section will focus on the desired professional characteristics of military institutions in service to democratic states and illustrate how inherited patterns of control and behavior from the Soviet era make such a shift in military professionalism difficult.

Table 2 compares characteristics of military professionalism across political systems. Although this model stresses the differences between the Soviet patterns of military professionalism and democratic norms, it is important to note that there is some overlap in several of the characteristics that could be appropriate for military professionals in either political system (indicated by a note). Criteria that ensure the presence of democratic norms and practices are essential for the development of democratically accountable military institutions. The goal is to offer a framework for institutional development that weighs heavily both the objective of defending the democratic state and that of remaining true to the societal values of the democracy it defends.

Both objectives can be achieved if the insertion of democratic norms in the following aspects of the military institution's professional development is deliberately pursued: recruitment and retention, promotion and advancement, officership and leadership, education and training, norms of political influence, prestige and public relations, and compatibility of military and societal values. Each of these elements will be discussed in turn by comparing professional norms that emphasize democratic accountability and military competence with the legacy of the Soviet bloc's pattern of professionalism.

Norms of Recruitment and Retention

Standards of selection into the ranks of military professionals are an essential part of democratic political control. Recruitment objectives can be achieved by manipulating the requirements for acceptance into the various commissioning sources and the enlisted ranks as a whole. For instance, the prestige of the profession can be boosted by increasing the prerequisites and criteria of admission in order to attract superior candidates. Of course, prestige also depends on the quality of the education and training offered as well as the overall status of the profession within society. De Tocqueville argued that the prestige of the military is essential to the recruitment of quality officers, particularly within democracies: "The best part of the nation shuns the military profession because that profession is not honored, and the profession is not honored because the best part of the nation ceased to follow it."[45]

It is essential that democracies have civil and military services whose

TABLE 2. A Comparison of Democratic and Soviet Models of Military Professionalism

Elements of Military Professionalism in a Democracy	Democratic Features	Soviet Features
Recruitment and Retention	Cross-societal, variety of sources. Entry based on merit. Prestige of commissioning sources high. Democratic values reflected in treatment of personnel.	Conscript system led to universal service. Entry into the officer corps related to merit and factors other than merit.
Promotion and Advancement	Merit-based promotion system.[a] Affirmative action based advancement may be used to fulfill democratic norms of inclusion. Performance and seniority balanced. Officers promoted who support democratic principles.	Political influence interferes with merit-based system. Patronage networks compromise bureaucratic norms for promotion.
Officership and Leadership	Styles of officership and leadership reflect democratic principles and respect for individual human rights. Preference for non-authoritarian style of leadership.	Individual rights sacrificed beyond the constraints necessary for military competence. Preference for authoritarian style of leadership. Abuse of soldiers common.
Education and Training	Principles of democracy and the role of military professionals in the state taught throughout the military system. Allegiance to democratic institutions taught. Qualified civilian and military instructors with some civilian participation as students at some levels. Professional ethics emphasized along with military competence.[a]	Extensive and in-depth education and training network. Professional knowledge stressed. Marxist-Leninist ideological training emphasized. Limited appreciation of civilian expertise gained in training. Professional military competence also emphasized.
Norms of Political Influence	Military fully accepts role in the political order.[a] No involvement of military in political feuds. Recognition that some limited degree of political interaction with oversight institutions is necessary. Direct participation in politics is not accepted. Attempts to influence the political process are nonpartisan.	Accepted junior partner role to sovereign Communist Party. Limited political influence in some areas of military affairs. Favored role in society and centralized economy reduced need to lobby for resources. Competed for resources within the "rules of the game."

(*continued*)

TABLE 2.—*Continued*

Elements of Military Professionalism in a Democracy	Democratic Features	Soviet Features
Prestige and Public Relations	Public accountability high. Full disclosure of information. Responsive to outside inquiries. Media has full access. Military actively manages relationship with the public.	Low public accountability. Controlled release of all information to outside inquiries. Limited media access. Militarist socialization methods continually connected military to society.
Compatibility of Military and Societal Values	Accepts legitimacy of democratic institutions. Conceptualization of democracy is similar to society's. Adapts internal operations to reflect democratic societal values.	Military and social values highly compatible. Military used as primary instrument of political socialization. Internal operations reflected corrupted Soviet bureaucratic values.

[a]Indicates characteristics that could be appropriate for military professionals in either system.

social origins and attitudes are broadly representative of society at large.[46] Emphasis on national service academies that draw candidates from across the nation helps to weaken regional ties and develop a broader sense of national identity. Additionally, the existence of scholarships to pay for the education received at the various commissioning sources ensures that officer candidates will be drawn from all economic sectors of the society. Control over the selection and subsequent socialization of its members contributes to the ability of the profession to successfully institutionalize societal and institutional values deemed necessary for democratic accountability and professional competence.

Standards of selection for the Soviet officer corps were boosted by the Party's efforts to enhance the political, economic, and social status of the Soviet officer. Indeed, the emergence of a professional officer corps depended on its portrayal within Soviet society as a prestigious job that also came with a generous package of pay and perks, such as specialized shopping facilities and better than average apartments. The emergence of the commissioning schools as degree-granting institutions also enhanced the prestige and status of the military profession, since Soviet parents placed a high value on careers requiring a degree.[47]

The extensive network of 140 commissioning schools located throughout the Soviet Union and the relative desirability of the profession ensured cross-societal representation throughout the officer corps. The political authorities in the Soviet era placed a high priority on establishing the appropriate incentives of pay and prestige to attract to the Soviet officer corps sufficient numbers of well qualified youths from all spectra of Soviet society. Officers' pay was gen-

erally one-third more than that received by civilians with similar qualifications.[48] Throughout the Soviet era, the promise of housing, access to goods, and a generous pension attracted quality prospects to serve in the officer corps.

In East European militaries, the remaking of the officer corps according to the demographic preferences of the Soviet Union resulted in the replacement of officers from aristocratic or bourgeois backgrounds with those from peasant–working class backgrounds. While these individuals were thought to be more ideologically reliable, their educational qualifications were substantially below those who had previously served. The establishment of East European military academies to educate the second generation of postwar Eastern bloc officers improved the situation. However, even through the 1980s the East European officer corps lacked the level of educational attainment that characterized the Soviet officer corps.[49]

The type of student attracted to service in East European militaries was typically a cut below what the Soviet military colleges could recruit.[50] Those who became military officers came largely from the strata of society that did not place a great premium on university education, but wanted opportunities and material benefits that would be denied them without some postsecondary education.[51] Material incentives rather than ideological motives were the prime motivations for service across the Eastern bloc.[52] The maintenance of an attractive package of pay, housing, and other material perks was a key element of the recruitment and retention programs of the Soviet and East European militaries. The salaries of East European officers were generally 30 to 50 percent higher than their civilian counterparts. Additionally, generous pensions, vacations, and the promise of good civilian jobs upon retirement motivated many to choose military life.[53]

Retention issues focus on offering incentives of adequate pay, quality of life, and opportunities for advancement within the military profession for officers and professional noncommissioned officers (NCOs). These factors enhance the retention of military professionals across all political systems. Military professionals in service to democratic political systems have the additional expectations that standards of treatment in military service will be commensurate with democratic societal values and that procedures for the redress of grievances through oversight authorities exist when civil liberties, human rights, or other standards of democratic accountability are violated.

Norms of Promotion and Advancement

A merit-based, objective system of promotion is one of the fundamental elements of a professional military.[54] Militaries in democracies may also be monitored to ensure that democratic values of inclusion are reflected in promotion patterns. Harmonizing societal aims with institutional preferences without sacrificing military effectiveness, however, is a complex task. Incorporating vari-

ous ethnic and demographic groups within the military is important because such action helps the military's institutional values remain in step with those of society. A comprehensive system of evaluations, periodic testing on essential professional skills, especially those related to technical competence, and the balancing of performance criteria with seniority contribute to professional competence.

On the surface, the Soviet era promotion system seems to have had many of the elements of a merit-based system. Evaluations considered both professional and political characteristics and were reviewed by the officer's immediate supervisors, the political officer, the Secretary of the Party and Komsomol committee, and the chief of the personnel office.[55] However, commanders were required to weigh heavily the strength of officers' ideological convictions in the promotion process.[56] The emphasis on nonprofessional qualities and the involvement of authorities outside the cadre of professional officers meant that even in the most equitably administered version of this system, subjective, nonprofessional factors would come into the process.

The Soviet officer promotion system, however, had other problems besides living with the mandated requirements of considering political qualities and subjecting evaluations to outside reviewers for approval. Corruption within the system, much of it perpetuated by the professional military, made the promotion process, in reality, less than a merit-based system. Supervisors would often manipulate the system to fulfill their own needs by downgrading the reports of good performers in order to retain them or inflating the report of a poor performer in order to get rid of him.[57]

Means of advancement within the Soviet military were also corrupted by the prevalence of a patronage system in which senior patrons could be relied upon to ensure that promotions and desirable assignments went to their protégés, regardless of their qualifications.[58] It was also well known that patrons could protect more junior officers from punishments that could be ruinous to their careers. There were complaints that officers with patrons or good family ties received promotions and desirable assignments near their families regardless of their records.[59] Numerous accounts of such complaints were featured in the Soviet press during Gorbachev's period of glasnost indicating the corruption that had become prevalent in the promotion system through the Brezhnev years and that still continued.

Such abuses are likely in a system that gives so much authority to the immediate commander instead of evaluating officers for promotion through a centralized promotion board. Additionally, the frequency of longer assignments at one post in the Soviet system provided incentives for commanders to keep good junior officers within their unit. A system with more frequent rotations, such as the U.S. system of moving every three to four years, is more resilient to such abuses.

In the East European militaries, professional credentials and reputation

gradually became more important as conditions for promotion, but they never replaced political reliability as the ultimate indicator of success.[60] Additionally, promotion to advanced leadership positions within East European militaries depended on selection for attendance at Soviet military academies.[61] These graduates subsequently formed the pool of candidates for staffing the top command jobs within the WTO. The control of such opportunities essential to career advancement ensured a confluence of interests between Soviet military leaders and East European military elites. The existence of such a Soviet-controlled patronage network also helped to balance the conflicting demands of socialist internationalism and patriotic nationalism.[62]

The postcommunist states need to focus on the establishment of bureaucratic norms for promotion to replace the previous emphasis on the political criteria of military or political leaders.[63] Democratic governments must balance fostering loyalty to democratic institutions with professional competence. This balance is achieved through the creation of merit-based promotion systems and widely known career patterns that standardize requirements for career progression throughout the military. These requirements for advancement should be reinforced and taught in the professional military education (PME) system. In transitioning states, promotions can also be used to promote supporters of democratic military professionalism.

Norms of Officership and Leadership

The core issues of professional officership—*who, why,* and *how* an officer serves—differ markedly in authoritarian and democratic states. Soldiers in democratic states are conditioned to believe that standards of treatment central to life within their democracy are expected within all societal institutions. In addition, in democracies laws come from those elected to create them, and all citizens are subject to them. A commander's individual order cannot supersede the law of the land. Democratic control of the military is partially dependent on the shared democratic socialization of all citizens about democratic principles and the requirements of democratic accountability. While not all democratic states have progressed equally in this aspect of democratization, the standard set forth in the democratic military professionalism model challenges all democratic and democratizing states to meet this ideal.

The model of democratic military professionalism may be challenged on cultural grounds for ignoring the unique authoritarian traditions of democratizing states that continue to influence postcommunist patterns of officership and leadership. While cultural and historical distinctions are important to recognize and account for dissimilar paths of democratization for each case, over time these societies and their civil-military relations will necessarily adapt authoritarian patterns to democratic ones. To accept incomplete adaptations in the

name of cultural and historical uniqueness is to condemn such democratizing states and their militaries to something less than complete democratic consolidation. Indeed, the military democratization programs conducted by the United States and other developed democracies across the former Eastern bloc should take aim at highlighting patterns of behavior that may be attributed to cultural and historical foundations, but are incompatible with democratic norms of behavior. The existence of some militaries in democracies that fall short of the ideals set forth in the democratic military professionalism model should not deter democratizing states from proceeding as far as possible toward the achievement of democratic norms. Indeed, no democratic state epitomizes the ideal on every dimension of the democratic military professionalism model, but such imperfection does not quell societal demands to more closely approximate the goals of the model.

Military leadership in a democracy places a high premium on paying attention to the individual needs of the soldier. In an essay excerpted for use at the service academies, General Edward C. Meyer, a former Chief of Staff of the Army, wrote that "the kind of leadership we need is founded upon consideration and respect for the soldier."[64] The emphasized traits "leading by example," "taking care of the troops," and "respect for the soldier" can be found across political systems, because, over time, these leadership methods have been proven to produce more competent and motivated military forces.

For instance, German NCOs in World War I were particularly adept at these methods. However, these traits are especially appropriate in democratic, open societies due to the expectations of their citizens that human rights will not be unduly sacrificed and also to the existence of oversight procedures capable of monitoring violations of democratic norms and practices. Such characteristics are required elements of democratic military professionalism and are often found lacking in authoritarian systems where similar expectations and oversight capabilities do not occur.

Indeed, Soviet military professionalism was characterized by its lack of rule-bound behavior. While democratic models of military professionalism limit officers' actions through legal mechanisms, the system of *edinonachilie* (one-man command) essentially meant that there were no illegal orders in the Soviet military. The absolute power that commanders held over their subordinates "was exercised by their exclusive right to issue orders, and the assurance that these orders, regardless of what they might entail, would be followed unquestioningly."[65] The system of Soviet-style officership was one that was based on the absolute control and authority of the commander and the denial of legal rights to his subordinates. Junior officers complained that "innovation, initiative, personal pride and motivation" were drained by the exploitation of their superiors and that "those with the right, have more rights" while "those who command, get what they want."[66]

The system relied on personal power and political and personal loyalty. In this respect the military institution was not unlike any of the others within Soviet and East European society. Senior officers routinely used their positions for their own ends—trading the benefits of the influence of their position to another individual willing to trade the benefits of influence within his.

These patterns of officership can be attributed to the traditional Russian attitude toward discipline. Nine hundred years of living under authoritarian systems of government conditioned the Russian people to accept and to expect force as a valid method of rule. Such attitudes were certainly evident in the Soviet military disciplinary system, which was and remains draconian by Western standards.[67] While the East European states did not share the same authoritarian heritage of Russia and the Soviet Union, the patterns of Soviet military professionalism extended to the militaries of the satellite states as well. As a result, behaviors attributed to Soviet military professionalism could also be found throughout the Soviet bloc.

Soviet military professionalism was also characterized by the toleration of *dedovshchina,* or "nonstatutory relations" among soldiers, which was essentially a systematized program of hazing new conscripts.[68] Hazing within the Soviet and East European militaries was much more than some sort of good-natured, morale-building rite of passage as might be found in other militaries. Rather it was a system of controlling behavior not through motivation or leadership, but through the threat of brutal physical punishments. The Committee of Soldiers' Mothers, formed during the liberalizations of the Gorbachev period, reported in 1989 that 3,900 Soviet recruits lost their lives as a result of hazing and hazing-related suicides that can be attributed to the humiliating actions of senior soldiers and officers toward conscripts.[69]

The toleration and reliance on dedovshchina for the maintenance of good order and discipline within the armed forces is evidence of a corrupt sense of military professionalism. It perpetuates a sort of slave mentality of officers and senior enlisted men toward their subordinates and a style of officership based on instilling fear within subordinates. Though prohibited in the criminal code, the disincentives against commanders admitting the existence of violations within their units induce commanders to conceal them.[70]

The Soviet model of military professionalism in these respects falls far short of the democratic model's emphasis on "leading by example," "taking care of the troops," and teaching officers the importance of respecting their soldiers. The Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), which outlines behavioral norms in the U.S. military, obligates superiors to be models of faultless discipline and high moral standards. Any violations are widely publicized, and procedures exist for subordinates to report cases that superiors refuse to forward to the appropriate authorities.

Gorbachev's reforms emphasizing the creation of a political system based

on legal rights threatened the very foundation of officership within the Soviet military as its members began to examine in a new light practices denying individual rights. Subordinates began to question the actions of their superiors and to call for reforms in the press. However, the reliance on these practices throughout the life of the institution and the equating of them with military professionalism has led to deep resistance among senior officers and some junior officers wary of the prospect of incorporating democratic values into post-Soviet styles of officership and leadership.

The transparency of democratic military institutions fosters democratic accountability and makes the existence of institutional corruption less likely. This sense of societal responsibility also contributes to an institutional emphasis on professional ethics.[71] These norms of democratic officership and leadership can be encouraged with officer evaluations that assess leadership qualities that contribute to the achievement of democratic military professionalism. Steady progression in the development of these attributes will then enhance an officer's potential to achieve command positions and advanced rank. Likewise, the presence of an NCO corps with standards of democratic military professionalism similar to those of the officer corps leads to the enhanced technical competence of military forces in all political systems and to the infusion of principles of democratic military professionalism throughout the entire chain of command in democracies.

Officership necessarily undergoes changes when the expectations of the society that it serves change. Transitioning states must incorporate the lessons of democratic military professionalism practiced in consolidated democracies. In democratic systems, styles of officership and leadership are characterized by accountability to democratic values, respect for civil liberties and human rights, stewardship of the public trust, and ethical behavior manifested in the honor code of the profession. The motivation to institute these changes depends on military leaders' own dedication to democratic principles as well as the realization that such changes will result in a more motivated and competent professional military institution.

Norms for Education and Training

Experts have estimated that modern officers spend approximately one-third of their professional careers in formal schooling.[72] In these courses officers acquire their knowledge of subjects ranging from the liberal arts and engineering while studying at a military college, to technical aspects of their craft while training at an artillery officer school or flight training base, to the complexities of joint operations and international relations while studying at the senior service schools. Such comprehensive training is characteristic of professional militaries across political systems. However, some systems place different em-

phases on the value of a broad, general versus a narrow, technical military education.

The preparation of the Soviet officer, though extensive, was narrower than that received by officers with broader responsibilities in other systems. Beyond the particular specialization of the school attended, the core subjects common to all the commissioning schools included Marxism-Leninism, political economy, and CPSU history in the social sciences; math and physics among the general disciplines; and some military subjects such as tactics and military art and science. The inclusion of some type of common core curriculum was supposed to produce "specialists with a broad profile."[73] In comparison with the less specialized philosophy of the U.S. system, however, the Soviet officer's training was less conducive to the preparation of officers who would eventually work with more broadly educated civilians in the policy-making process or to interacting with educated civilians in general.

For the most part, officer education in the East European states among WTO members was part of an integrated system controlled by the Soviet Union. The exception was Romania, which did not allow its officers to be educated abroad.[74] The same methods and curriculum characterized schools across the region. Additionally, the Soviets trained faculty for the East European military schools and academies and sent lecturers and instructional materials to Eastern Europe.[75]

An officer's commissioning source is his first exposure to the principles of the military profession. In these critical formative years of professional socialization, officer candidates are taught what their role in society will be as a military professional. Cadets are taught *who, why,* and *how* they serve. Obedience to the orders of legitimate authority is the first principle of civilian control. Therefore, the question to whom a military professional's obedience is owed cannot be left ambiguous.[76] In a democratic state, commissioning sources emphasize the requirements of democratic military professionalism. Ideally, this process of professional socialization should include deliberate training on the imperatives of democratic political control and the responsibilities inherent in serving a democratic system of government. Such an approach emphasizes that although officers may have a tradition of serving a "nation," "motherland," or "fatherland," their constitutional allegiance is to a democratic government and society. Officers trained in this way learn that their role is to develop their military expertise with the understanding that its employment is subordinate to the directives of political authorities.

Political socialization processes differed substantially between the democratic and Communist systems. In both systems, the prior socialization processes of the school systems ingrained general societal values in the new recruit that could then be refocused to emphasize the specific values of military professionalism. However, with the exception of youths raised in military families,

the typical officer candidate or recruit in a democracy has had very little or perhaps no prior experience in military subjects. In the Soviet system, the prior socialization experience included heavy doses of militarism and political training. Beginning in kindergarten, Soviet children were subjected to patriotic education and military themes in their earliest readers. Such training continued through elementary and secondary school and was supplemented by membership in youth organizations in which military training was a featured aspect of the overall political indoctrination program.[77]

Military-political indoctrination comprised 30 percent of cadets' training time at the higher military training schools.[78] Upon graduation, the new officers' political indoctrination was continued by their units' political officers, who were graduates of a specialized commissioning school for political officer specialists. The main function of the political officer in the military's political socialization program was to generate support for the Communist Party, its leadership, goals, and policies.[79] Short-term political socialization attempts were aimed at instilling minimal social values in conscripts whose terms of service ranged from twelve to thirty-two months.[80] The goal was to mold the "New Socialist Man" who would return from military service properly motivated to continue to build communism in civilian life.[81] Long-range political socialization was aimed at professional soldiers, noncommissioned and commissioned officers alike, with the goal of creating a more enduring bond between professional soldiers and the system.[82]

The same methods of political socialization developed for use in the Soviet military were applied to the East European militaries. Parallel goals were pursued: ensuring the subordination of the military to Party and Soviet rule, transmitting communist ideology to the nation's citizenry by exploiting the opportunities provided by mass conscription, and improving combat effectiveness by instilling in the troops the motivation to defend communist ideals.[83] However, the ideological message varied somewhat in the East European states because it was focused on both building allegiance to Moscow, through socialist internationalism, and loyalty to the domestic Communist Party through an emphasis on the martial traditions of each individual state.[84]

A key element of the postcommunist militaries' successful transitions to democracy would be to revamp the curriculum of the commissioning, precommissioning, and postcommissioning schools. Additionally, attention must be given to socializing soldiers and officers to the values of democratic states. Many of the elements of Soviet military professionalism discussed in this chapter were first learned through the process of professionalization that occurs at the commissioning schools and in the pre-military training that precedes it at the high school level. These topics were then reinforced through the political education that occurred in military units and continued later through the work of Party propagandists in civilian life.[85]

Especially critical areas of instruction would be the role of the military in a democratic state and characteristics of military professionalism in a democracy such as standards of officership and leadership that emphasize respect for the individual, professional ethics, responsibility to a democratic society, and an aversion to corrupted meritorious processes that detract from professionalism and the prestige of military service. These same issues must also be discussed at the higher military academies and general staff colleges as crucial elements of the postcommunist militaries' transitions to service within a democratic state. The extensive infrastructure of the military educational system and the value placed on learning professional military topics throughout the course of an officer's career are positive aspects of the Soviet legacy. These features can be redirected in the postcommunist era to orient postcommunist officers to the professional qualities most compatible to the service of a democratic system of government.

The military is unique as a profession because there are multiple points throughout the career of an officer when he or she can be influenced by an educational experience. Such courses should be monitored to ensure that their curricula reflect changing priorities in the profession and within society at large. Concepts or values that may have changed since an officer underwent training at his commissioning source can be readdressed at later points in his career. In the case of transitioning states striving to incorporate the traits of democratic military professionalism, use of the military education system to reorient officers schooled in authoritarian values is an excellent means of achieving democratic military reform.

A comprehensive understanding of the democratic form of government by military members also entails the acceptance of political conflict as characteristic of the political system. The military must also become comfortable with the uncertainty and problematic nature of political authority in an open society and resist the temptation to intervene in political processes for the sake of its own interests and those of the officer corps.[86] Officers in transitioning political systems will find it particularly difficult to adjust to the multiple axes of democratic oversight and accountability that characterize democracies.

Norms of Political Influence

Another essential component of democratic military professionalism is the degree to which the military institution can participate in the politics of its society without sacrificing its professionalism. Huntington allowed for only an extremely limited role for the military professional in politics. The reality, though, is that armed forces are inherently political institutions. They must compete for resources within democratic states, and their sense of professional responsibility motivates them to seek to influence the conduct of national security by of-

fering their professional expertise to civilian policymakers. Military leaders in a democracy can, accordingly, be expected to lobby legislators and government officials on matters related to enhancing the professionalism and competence of the armed forces and the assessment of national security needs.

Democratic military professionals, however, fully accept their role in the political order and do not offer their services to civilian leaders involved in political feuds. Institutional safeguards exist to ensure that allegiance to democratic institutions supersedes allegiance to particular political figures or policy agendas. Democratic officer corps respect as a priority of professionalism the importance of remaining nonpartisan in political battles—even those that directly impact the future of the military. Their efforts should be focused on the military security of the state and the maintenance of a professional military institution in service to a democratic state.

Indeed, in the United States, military regulations are quite specific in their prohibition and permission of particular forms of political activity. Active duty military members may register and vote in elections, express personal opinions as individual citizens on candidates and issues, make financial contributions to political parties and organizations, attend political gatherings as spectators if not in uniform, and display political stickers or badges when not in uniform and not on duty. Active duty military members may not campaign for or hold elective office, make financial contributions to individual candidates, directly participate in political campaigns, speak before partisan political groups, or march or ride in partisan political parades. In addition, candidates for public office cannot make political speeches or distribute campaign materials at military installations.[87]

Such a nonpartisan orientation not only supports a democratic military institution's emphasis on defending a system of government, but also enhances the influence that the military institution can have on matters of primary importance to it. Military leaders have learned that continued success over time in gaining resources for their services and in influencing strategic national defense policies depends on the careful preservation of a nonpartisan stance.[88] However, military professionals in democracies also understand the importance of balancing this constraint with their advisory role as functional experts on matters of national security that may result in promoting certain matters of military policy to civilian authorities.

The Soviet military's participation in politics was limited in both its scope and political means employed. Most of the Soviet military's participation in politics was confined to internal matters or the dispensation of expert advice to civilian authorities in order to resolve institutional issues. Only a small portion of political behavior crossed into the territory of outright political bargaining,[89] and there was no movement toward direct military rule until the 1991 coup.[90]

The military had some experience with exerting political power vis-à-vis

the Party in the Soviet era, but mostly confined this activity strictly to matters involving military affairs.[91] At times, Party control was loosened and greater professional autonomy granted when the Party was more dependent on the military due to domestic or international crises. It was in these periods that political participation increased.[92] However, ultimate authority always remained with the Party, and military influence generally did not extend beyond limits that were acceptable to the political leadership. Military officers, as agents of civilian leaders, were delegated the authority to make routine decisions on such matters as military training, living conditions, weaponry, and strategy. Additionally, institutional issues such as share of the state budget and demands on the science infrastructure and other national resources to support the military were often based on the advice of military officers whose monopolization of defense expertise gave them special weight in these areas.[93] In general, the interests of the military and the Party coincided,[94] and the acceptance of civilian supremacy was undisputed in the Soviet officer corps.

In the East European states, however, the interests of the military and the state did not coincide as closely as in the Soviet Union. For instance, the push for reform in the military at times surpassed the state's conservatism; and the armed forces of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Romania have been implicated in coup attempts throughout the Communist era.[95] The civilian leadership of the East European states questioned the political reliability of their militaries due to the armed forces' reluctance to support the domestic regime against its internal foes in politically tense situations.[96] Finally, the overall influence of the military in the political system of the East European states lagged that of their Soviet counterparts because of the less extensive representation of military personnel in the highest policy-making bodies of the state. While military membership in the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party varied from 7 to 9 percent since 1972, the level of such membership in Eastern Europe was only 3 percent.[97] These factors combined with the limited legitimacy of the East European regimes and external Soviet military interference prevented the East European militaries from becoming interest groups to the degree that the Soviet military did.[98]

Democratization has resulted in multiple axes of civil-military interface.[99] The evolution of democratic institutions competing for authority in the transitioning states will require the simultaneous evolution of the militaries' liaison skills in working with these transformed and newly instituted levers of civilian oversight. For instance, lobbying for military interests in parliamentary bodies constitutes a new avenue of political influence previously unavailable in the Soviet era. On the other hand, there is a loss of political influence in the overall political process due to the elimination of the Party structures in which Soviet, and to a lesser extent East European, soldiers were represented in the various decision-making bodies of the state.

Officers in postcommunist states, however, must be careful to avoid direct

participation in politics, which undermines professionalism by involving the officer in political trade-offs that might damage the military institution and its ability to achieve its primary function of ensuring the state's military security.[100] A balance must be struck between competence in matters of domestic and international politics (in order to effectively realize the constraints on resources and to offer expert military advice based on an understanding of the comprehensive context of an issue) and active participation in political affairs. The military officer in a democracy must prize his advisory role and so must remain personally above politics. Officers in democratic and democratizing states must be aware of the established norms of influencing the political process while remaining focused on respecting the constraints of democratic accountability.

Norms of Prestige and Public Relations

Centralization of command, the hierarchical arrangement of authority, and the rule of obedience are all necessary and contribute to the *mechanical* solidarity of an army, but esprit de corps gives an army its life.[101] Esprit de corps is grounded in service to a cause and depends greatly on the general sense of prestige that society attributes to the military. Adequate pay, good living conditions, and respect within society for the skills learned by military specialists enhance the prestige of the armed forces.

The degree of prestige that the military institution can earn within society also depends on how well the military meets the expectations of society in practicing military virtues. The military gains a certain amount of respect and political power in society to the extent that society finds the military to be an institution that places a high premium on the military virtues of service, bravery, discipline, obedience, self-denial, poverty, and patriotism.[102] In democratic states, militaries must meet the additional expectation of upholding and practicing democratic norms and practices in the fulfillment of their specialized tasks.

The Soviet military officer enjoyed a considerable amount of status in the Soviet Union and was held in higher esteem than a great majority of occupational groups.[103] The status of military officers in the Soviet Union was "unsurpassed among contemporary world powers."[104] The Soviet Union's preoccupation with national security and fear of encirclement by hostile states led to the military's assumption of a preferential position in the society and the economy that afforded the armed forces influence, privilege, and status greater than any other group.[105]

East European regimes also tried to ensure the loyalty of the military by granting the military material benefits and prestige.[106] However, the prestige of the military profession in the East European states always lagged that found in the Soviet Union because of the lack of legitimacy of the national Communist

regimes. The citizens of these regimes considered the members of the armed forces to be defenders of Soviet international interests and of unpopular subordinate political regimes.[107]

The one-party states were in command of all organs of the media and the release of information to the public. For this reason, the Soviet and East European states were able to fashion a popularized image of the armed forces and the military officer. However, as mentioned earlier, these image-shaping campaigns had less effect in Eastern Europe due to the populations' greater reluctance to embrace the ideological underpinnings of their political regimes. Additionally, the capacity to control the economic incentives of the state enabled it to reward the military profession materially, thus contributing to its overall status in society.

The absence of feedback mechanisms between the citizens and the state resulted in low public accountability of all of the institutions of the state—including the military. A lack of accountability to its own members within the military institution also characterized the Soviet military and the East European militaries molded in its image. As previously discussed, Soviet styles of officership and leadership often resulted in negative outcomes for subordinates who had little recourse to report ill-treatment or neglect on the part of their superiors. In comparison with the democratic model of military professionalism, the Soviet model was concerned with only a contrived sense of public accountability.

Disclosure of all information was controlled, and the responsiveness of all institutions to outside inquiries was virtually nonexistent. Certainly, many of the negative aspects of the military institution became known to society at large through firsthand experience, such as the universally poor treatment of conscripts, but no efforts were made to change the source of these negative images. Instead, the dissonance between firsthand or secondhand accounts of military life and the images propagated by the media organs of the state continued until democratization began across the region under Gorbachev.

Prestige and competence are mutually dependent concepts. Prestige falters when the military institution fails in its function to protect the national security interests, while competence is enhanced when prestige of the military is high. Both society, including the activity of civilian institutions, and the military need to appreciate this relationship and work to improve prestige and professional competence through all means available. This chapter has posited that one means of improving the competence of armed forces in democracies is to foster the traits developed in the model of democratic military professionalism.

Prestige rooted in democratic accountability to civilian society is a trait of democratic military professionalism. Military institutions in democracies work to gain the support of the societies they serve by charging military professionals specifically with the task of managing the military's relationship with the public. In the United States, in all services, the public affairs field is a separate

specialty requiring specific training and expertise like any other career field in order to be effective. These specialists focus on shaping a positive image for the armed forces while also fielding investigative requests from the press, civilian authorities, and the public.

In this way the military institution fulfills the expectation that it will operate according to democratic principles when interacting with the rest of society. The press expects and is normally granted access to military leaders and authorities. The value of disclosure to the public is respected—even if such revelations have a negative impact on the armed forces' reputation in society. However, claims that full disclosure may compromise national security limit the transparency of military institutions in all states. In democratic states, however, transparency of budgets, management planning, strategy, and doctrine are all essential elements of democratic oversight and civilian control. Democratic militaries must have routines of communicating this information to the public and civilian authorities through public affairs specialists and accessibility of military officials before authoritative civilian panels. In general, democracy and secrecy are thought to be incompatible unless measures of the utmost national security are at stake.[108] Even then, appropriate civilian authorities in oversight roles will have access to otherwise restricted information.

The self-image of the military professional is also important, and it is essential that this self-image closely parallel the image of the military professional in society. For instance, professional military officers, and even enlisted troops, place a value on the self-image of service to country versus the image of working as a mercenary. There is also a prevalent self-image that mastery of their jobs requires quite a bit of expertise—an expertise that should be recognized within society at large and rewarded by a society that recognizes the transferability of military skills to the civilian sector.

As discussed earlier when analyzing the importance of the mutual cultivation of the prestige of the military institution by itself and society, such attention will help to attract quality recruits and enhance the professional competence of the military institution. The maintenance of a high level of prestige for the military institution is a critical factor in successfully achieving the dual roles of military professionalism and professional competence. It is important to keep in mind the responsibility of all pillars of a democratic society to foster it.

The Importance of the Compatibility of Military and Societal Values

The most fundamental value that must be mutually held by the military institution and the society it serves concerns what constitutes the legitimate authority of the state. "Where there are competing authorities, or competing ideas as to what ought to be the authority, professionalism becomes difficult if not im-

possible to achieve."[109] Yet a democratic political system assumes that its military officers are positively committed to the principles of civilian supremacy and civilian leadership.[110]

The compatibility of military and societal values was high in the Soviet Union. The ideal Soviet officer was only a slight variation of the ideal Soviet civilian manager—the "New Socialist Man." Those who internalized and valued Party ideals flourished in both the military and civilian worlds.[111] The lack of distinctiveness between military and civilian values, as perceived by the Party leadership, led to less tension between them than might be found in democratic political systems. Militarism pervaded all the Communist states and was prevalent in all phases of political socialization. Conscription, in particular, with its secondary function of socializing conscripts in the values of the Communist regime, fostered the process of transmitting a common set of values across these societies.[112]

In the East European states the interests of the ruling party and the military were generally compatible. However, the legitimacy problem of the imposed Communist regimes led to a greater gap between the values of the societies at large and the military institutions that allegedly defended them. As a result, the quality of the recruited professional soldier was lacking because he did not represent the ideals of the citizenry in the same way that the Soviet officer did for the Soviet people.

As Gorbachev's political liberalization began to unleash new forces in society and within Soviet institutions, the military's social standing and institutional role in society was adversely affected. The most fundamental change was the de-emphasis of the military pillar of Soviet power in favor of increased reliance on economic reform. "Reasonable sufficiency" became the new defense posture, and great economic constraints were placed on military spending.[113]

The sea change in the Party leadership's perception of geopolitics necessarily affected the military's role and, ultimately, its prestige in the transitioning state. The concurrent expectation to participate in the process of perestroika, which entailed enduring increasingly harsh criticism of the military bureaucracy and external public pressure to "restructure" in order to respond to societal needs, proved to be an enormous strain on the military.

In contrast, in the East European states the disconnecting of the militaries from the Communist political regimes has been an opportunity for the divisions between transitioning postcommunist societies and their militaries to heal. The political leaders in the former WTO states have been faced with the challenge of remolding the image of their military forces as defenders of democratic states. Their success depends on the exploitation of the democratic oversight powers granted to them through their constitutions and their determination to inculcate the transitioning militaries in democratic values.

In mature democracies, democratic institutions are strong, and military

professionals are accustomed to the political conflict that takes place between them and to the need for mutual accommodation consistent with democratic structures. There are multiple axes of democratic oversight making demands on the military, and ensuring that oversight authority between institutions remains in balance according to the design of society outlined in either constitutional provisions or other accepted norms is essential. In transitioning states, however, the legitimate authority of state institutions may not be widely agreed upon. When the political system of a state is changing, it is important to assess the degree to which military and societal values are diverging and aggressively employ the levers of civilian oversight and control to bring them back together.

Organizational procedures and methods appropriate under one ideological system may seem to undermine rather than support societal values, in another. When a society shifts from holding subordination to the state as the highest ideal to promoting the rights of the individual, its institutional practices should also change. Military professionalism does not exist within a vacuum that is completely unaffected by changes within the society it serves—especially revolutionary changes. States in transition face the problem of an increasing level of disparity between societal and military values. Conservative leaders of military institutions[114] may reject the notion that the brand of military professionalism developed within an authoritarian political system is inappropriate within a democratic political system. The democratization of society at large may result in less tolerance for such practices as the abuse of conscripts or other harsh practices that exceed the limits of discipline required for the maintenance of a professional military force. The public and civilian authorities will increase outside efforts to humanize and increase the transparency of the military and force the accountability of military officials who resist. An analysis of the cases in chapters 3 and 4 will illustrate the differences between transitioning states where societal consensus on democratic consolidation exists and where some democratization has occurred but there is not an overall consensus on its consolidation across all aspects of society.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the imperatives of democratic political control and democratic military professionalism as essential elements of military institutions in democratic states. Elements of Soviet military professionalism that are incompatible with military professionalism in a democracy have also been highlighted. The goal has been to create a model demonstrating how militaries can be democratically accountable and reflect democratic principles while also functioning as effective instruments of national security.

The survey of the processes of political control and accepted standards of military professionalism in the Soviet bloc has revealed some serious discrep-

ancies between democratic and Soviet era perceptions of military professionalism. Some of these deficiencies can be related to the necessities of authoritarian rule while others can be attributed to practices that were allowed to endure within it. One can expect that characteristics of Soviet era political control that are incompatible with democratic systems of government will eventually adapt to more appropriate forms associated with democratic models of legitimate government. More troublesome will be the corrupt habits of Soviet military professionalism that have been tolerated for decades and that paralleled the pervasive bureaucratic corruption of life in the Soviet bloc.

The process of democratization has had a seismic effect on postcommunist societies and especially on their military institutions. The relationship between the military and democratic institutions in postcommunist states continues to evolve within transitioning political arenas. The penetration of democratic values with the conservative postcommunist militaries has proven to be a slow process. Chapters 3 and 4 will illustrate that many of the norms and practices developed in the Soviet era continue to persist in the postcommunist states.

The task of achieving civilian control and military professionalism in states undergoing democratic transitions is complicated by the shift in the political system from authoritarianism to democracy. In transitioning states, the requirements of *democratic* political control must replace the previous understanding of civilian control. Similarly, the criteria of *democratic* military professionalism must replace earlier concepts of military professionalism practiced under authoritarian political systems. However, this phenomenon of shifting from authoritarian to democratic political systems and the subsequent impact on military professionalism has not been adequately addressed by traditional civil-military relations theory.

Those charged with democratic oversight in the transitioning states and external actors from the West attempting to assist with the process of democratization in the region should be familiar with the discrepancies between methods of political control and patterns of military professionalism in democratic and authoritarian states. Only with such an understanding can legacies of the Soviet era be overcome and new democratic patterns of behavior adopted. These states are confronted with the dual challenge of instituting democratic political control through still evolving democratic institutions while simultaneously inculcating their armed forces with the values of democratic military professionalism. Specific steps must be taken to ensure the political loyalty of the transitioning states' military managers of violence while also focusing on improving the effectiveness of the armed forces. The approach to reform must recognize the interdependent nature of civilian and military institutions and also demand that the military conduct internal institutional reforms.

Most importantly, though, transitioning military institutions, and mature democracies that recognize the need to assist them, need to be well-versed in

the theoretical principles of civil-military relations in a democracy. The imperatives of civilian control in a democratic society and professionalism should guide all efforts to adapt to the ideological sea changes that continue to challenge transitioning states. The prescription is complex, and necessarily incomplete, but ignorance of its contents will lead to something less than the emergence of mature democratic societies with competent and respected military institutions that maximize military security at the least sacrifice of democratic values.

The next chapter will focus on the efforts made by one external actor—the United States—toward assisting the democratic transition of the postcommunist militaries. I will argue that the military assistance programs set in motion since the end of the Cold War have been ineffective predominantly because U.S. policymakers have not understood or applied the theoretical underpinnings that should guide these programs' activities. These programs will only be successful when the contrasting models of political control and military professionalism in democracies and the Soviet bloc are comprehended and applied to them.

CHAPTER 2

A Survey of Overall U.S. Democratization Programs and Military Democratization Efforts in the Postcommunist States

This chapter will survey the military democratization programs that the United States has developed to facilitate the transition to democracy of the military institutions of postcommunist states. The goal is to present an overview of these programs so that their effectiveness can be fully evaluated in the case studies of the Czech Republic and Russia that will follow in chapters 3 and 4. The overall approach of the United States to assisting the transitioning states will also be surveyed within the context of the overall Western aid effort. The aim here is to put the military programs in proper perspective with respect to efforts focused on the overall political and economic transition of the postcommunist states to democracy.

The result is a survey of missed opportunities at every level to assist the transitioning states. The evidence will show that the military effort was plagued by the dual challenge of adapting Cold War era programs to post–Cold War contingencies and creating new military democratization programs with an incomplete conceptualization of the problems associated with transitioning from authoritarian to democratic political systems. It will be demonstrated that incomplete coordination between programs and confusion over mission areas have constrained the effectiveness of U.S. military democratization programs. Finally, the case will be made that the idea of the interoperability of existing democratic forces with the partner states of NATO has been narrowly focused on the achievement of strategic professionalism issues. Not enough attention has been paid to ensuring that partner states develop norms of democratic accountability. Though widely stated, democratization objectives at every level of assistance—political, economic, and military—have been poorly conceptualized and, consequently, ineffectively carried out.

Needs vs. Response: The Overall U.S. Approach to Assisting the Postcommunist States

The dissolution of the Soviet Union and subsequent collapse of the Warsaw Pact has triggered a complete reappraisal of U.S. national security strategy. Particu-

larly fascinating has been the dramatic shift in policy toward the postcommunist states. The previously routinized geopolitical rivalry between the United States and Soviet Union, centered on the zero-sum game of containing Communism, has gradually shifted to the post–Cold War strategy of full-scale engagement aimed at fostering stability and prosperity in the region by encouraging processes of democratic development and market reform.

In August 1994 the Clinton administration released the new national security strategy of the United States in a policy document entitled *National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement.* Its authors argued:

> Our national security strategy is based on enlarging the community of market democracies while deterring and containing a range of threats to our nation, our allies, and our interests. The more that democracy and political and economic liberalization take hold in the world, particularly in countries of geostrategic importance to us, the safer our nation is likely to be and the more our people are likely to prosper.[1]

The strategy of engagement called for pursuing security through "enlargement," a policy based on the concept predominant in recent years in political science literature that "democracies don't fight one another."[2] Those who have documented the "democratic peace" have been able to establish that the relatively peaceful relations of democracies toward each other are not spuriously caused by other factors such as wealth or alliance ties.[3] At the same time, the democratic peace research shows that democracies are not more peaceful in general and that they are as likely to enter war as any other polity—but not war with another democracy.[4]

The theory of the democratic peace has guided the Clinton administration's foreign policy.[5] However, some research in the field contends that such an approach might actually be counterproductive. Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder argue in a widely circulated *International Security* article that states undergoing a transition to democracy are more war prone, not less, and were 60 percent more likely to go to war than states that were not democratizing.[6] This research suggests that the U.S. policy of promoting democratization in states attempting to make dramatic shifts from authoritarian rule might mean a heightened risk of war in the short run.[7] The conclusions of the democratic peace literature, then, apply only to consolidated democracies—not democratizing states. Policy implications of these complementary findings require placing a top priority on the conditions that lead to relatively peaceful democratization and focusing on creating these conditions through external aid.[8] According to the democratization literature, such conditions include giving golden parachutes to elites who lose in the transition process—especially the military—and encouraging the development of a level playing field for political debate.[9]

U.S. assistance to the postcommunist states has been couched largely in strategic terms, with democratization itself viewed as a strategy.[10] Thomas Simons, State Department Coordinator for Assistance to the New Independent States (NIS), characterized the objective of the assistance program as putting "behind us the greatest threat which our republic has faced in its whole history by working with twelve new independent states to help them shed the legacy of decades of despotic communism and to become free, equal, and reliable partners in a better international community for the next century."[11] Ralph Johnson, Coordinator of U.S. Assistance to Eastern Europe, defended aid to the former Soviet Union's satellites similarly: "It was only a few years ago that these countries were members of an alliance that threatened us and threatened our European allies as well. Now they have separated themselves from that alliance and they are rapidly building bridges to Western institutions, including the European Union and NATO."[12] Clearly, U.S. policy reveals a strategic interest in promoting the successful democratic transitions of the postcommunist states of the former Eastern bloc. However, the addendum to the democratic peace literature suggests that the United States should stay focused on achieving the long-term goal of enlarging the zone of stable democracies while also paying attention to minimizing the dangers of the process of democratic transition. What shape has this effort taken, and how effective has it been?

Beginning in 1989 Congress and the Bush administration proposed increased assistance to Central and Eastern Europe. This effort culminated in the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act, signed into law in November 1989, which appropriated $900 million in assistance over three years.[13] This was followed by some limited assistance to the Soviet Union beginning in December 1990 to show support for reform efforts there. With the passage of the Freedom Support Act in October 1992, U.S. support increased substantially following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991. This legislation authorized the expenditure of $400 million across a range of activities to include humanitarian assistance, the promotion of democratic reform, economic privatization, and environmental protection.[14] The Nunn-Lugar program was also initiated in this time frame, becoming law in December 1991. This initiative supported the denuclearization of four Soviet nuclear successor states and will be discussed in greater depth in the section detailing U.S. military assistance.

In April 1992, President George Bush pledged $24 billion in aid to Russia,[15] but from fiscal year (FY) 1990 through FY 1995, only $13.45 billion in grant, donation, and credit programs had been obligated in aid to the former Soviet Union.[16] When assistance did arrive, its direct effect on reform was minimal.[17] U.S. government programs that focus specifically on the FSU include Freedom Support Act activities and the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, which together comprise only 5 percent of all authorized moneys. The rest of

the assistance has come through more than 130 worldwide programs administered by more than 30 separate government agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) food programs, Economic Support Fund financed programs, programs of the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), and other federal agencies.

U.S. assistance programs to Central and Eastern Europe have offered $3.85 billion through the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) program from 1990 through 1998.[18] The U.S. Congress has appropriated $432.5 million for the SEED program for FY 1999.[19] Originally designed for application in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, SEED programs have been carried out in fifteen countries to include assistance to the independent states of the former Yugoslavia. Once a recipient state has moved far enough in the direction of a free market democracy, that country "graduates" from the SEED program. Estonia "graduated" in 1996, followed by the Czech Republic and Slovenia in 1997.[20] Hungary and Latvia were slated to graduate in 1998.[21] U.S. priorities have been privatization and private sector development with only a limited emphasis on public administration, which has been the focus of the EU's (European Union) assistance.[22]

According to the State Department's own account, the prime areas of emphasis of U.S. assistance have been in strengthening democracy through support for local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), the development of a free and independent media, exchange programs, technical assistance to local governments, establishment of enterprise funds for the encouragement of private investment, and advice on the creation of social service systems. "For the most part, the U.S. government provides technical assistance, not cash, to the nations of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. It is trade, not aid, which will provide the bulk of hard-currency capital that the region so badly needs."[23]

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has been the primary administrator of aid across the postcommunist states and has been roundly criticized for its misapplication of third world development principles to those states between the First and Second Worlds. The GAO report previously cited documents a litany of complaints against the USAID from other government agencies involved in the assistance process. "Agency officials [non-USAID] provided numerous examples of frequent and lengthy disputes between USAID and other agencies over money and policy. Many of the agencies we spoke with were highly critical of USAID and expressed strong reservations and concerns about their relationship."[24]

USAID has also come under fire for its lax oversight of aid dollars in the FSU. Charges of corruption against the USAID-funded Harvard Institute of International Development rocked the Western Russian assistance community in the summer of 1997. USAID was charged with inadequate oversight of the $57

million grant allocated to the Harvard group. These charges culminated in U.S. foreign policy embarrassment when Anatoly Chubais requested that the U.S. government cease all market reform work funded through the Harvard organization.[25]

Moreover, the emphasis on assistance aimed at bolstering trade and investment in the region, while governments stall on improving the business environment, has led to speculation that prime beneficiaries of U.S. aid dollars are U.S. corporations optimizing the financial backing of the U.S. government to participate in business enterprises.[26] Grass roots indigenous reform organizations are often ignored by the organizations receiving USAID contracts, which themselves have no experience in Eastern Europe or the FSU.[27] Consequently, much of the U.S. aid is wasted on contracts with Western companies that fund expensive feasibility studies and crowd out private sector investment, but do little to develop market institutions in Russia.[28]

Assistance to the postcommunist states has also been generally criticized for lacking focus and strategic planning. Most democracy assistance organizations tend to assume that the definition of democracy is self-evident and that therefore the goals of democracy assistance organizations do not require extensive elaboration. The management of the assistance programs to the transitioning states has featured duplication of effort, bureaucratic infighting, and weakly focused objectives. The result has been much activity of dubious merit.[29]

Most of the aid to the postcommunist states has come from a much maligned joint effort of the Western democracies. In 1993 the Group of Seven (G-7) industrial countries promised $43 billion in economic assistance to Russia to include $15 billion of debt relief. The West made good on only the debt relief portion of the offer plus $5 billion. Much of the aid was tied to International Monetary Fund (IMF) objectives that could not be met.[30] Overall, Western aid to Russia has been criticized for being absent at times when Russian reformers were in a position to implement reforms (January 1992–December 1993) and so tied to the achievement of IMF objectives that most of the promised aid was never delivered.[31] The combined effectiveness of the multilateral effort of Western democracies to assist the political and economic transition of the postcommunist states is beyond the scope of this study, but it is important to describe the magnitude and general impact of the overall effort in order to understand the relative contribution of the specific U.S. effort.

Similarly, a full accounting of U.S. assistance programs to the postcommunist states exceeds the intent of this study, but the purpose of briefly surveying them as a prelude to an in-depth analysis of U.S. military democratization assistance programs has been several-fold. First, it is important to highlight the great size of the larger effort in order to keep the relative scale of the military's program in perspective. Second, many of the administrative problems

that will be documented in the military's program are also found across the interagency coordinative effort of the main program. Finally, it is important to note that the military's democratization initiatives, beyond Nunn-Lugar, are largely left out of accounts of U.S. assistance to the transitioning states. These efforts are uncoordinated with the civilian-based programs and are virtually unknown, with the exception of the Nunn-Lugar program, to those who have not directly participated within them.

Needs vs. Response: The U.S. Military's Approach to Assisting the Postcommunist States

I have argued that post–Cold War U.S. foreign policy has redirected the instruments of foreign policy toward achieving the goal of enlarging the community of democracies within the international system. Although the responsibility for U.S. assistance to the emerging democracies of the former Eastern bloc clearly falls within the audit of the State Department and USAID, the military instrument of foreign policy has also assumed a significant role. U.S. foreign policymakers have come to realize that, while military institutions in evolving democracies cannot by themselves ensure an overall democratic outcome, a dysfunctional, non–democratically motivated military institution can become a formidable obstacle to the achievement of democratic consolidation in the postcommunist states.

The democratization goals stated in the National Security Strategy of the United States are complemented further in the National Military Strategy and in the various strategies of the U.S. military commands and theaters.[32] From the three primary objectives of the National Security Strategy—enhance security, promote prosperity, and promote democracy—flow the military objectives of the National Military Strategy—promote stability and thwart aggression. Finally, the U.S. military objectives in Europe outlined in the U.S. European Command's Strategy of Engagement and Preparedness are to engage in peacetime, respond to crisis, and fight to win.[33] The aim of engagement in peacetime is to shape the future security environment in order to reduce the likelihood of armed conflict. Security assistance, programs of military to military contacts, and the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies are the primary activities through which the European Command's strategic concept of peacetime engagement is implemented.[34]

Security Assistance

The military instrument of foreign policy, short of direct military intervention and the stationing of troops abroad, has historically been centered on the transfer or sale of arms from one nation to another when such a step was perceived

to be in the national interests of the provider nation. This type of aid is called security assistance. It is important to note, however, that the specific term *security assistance* does not incorporate all of the U.S. military's assistance to foreign militaries. This term applies specifically to programs approved and administered by the U.S. State Department and carried out by the DOD and the Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA). Specifically, security assistance includes arms transfers, Foreign Military Sales (FMS), Direct Commercial Sales (DCS), and International Military Education and Training (IMET).[35] Military to military contacts do not fall under the security assistance purview.

Eventually grant aid was replaced by foreign military sales to economically capable allies with the goal of protecting vital national interests in the form of U.S. oil imports from the Middle East and the containment of communism worldwide. The promotion of democracy in the Cold War era was achieved as an indirect and unwitting benefit of these security assistance programs rather than as the result of a program created with this explicit goal. In some cases, such as the failed Vietnam effort, democratization was not achieved at all. The tendency was to equate the containment of communism with the protection of democratic values in the West in the short term. The long-term hope was for the eventual collapse of communism in the East. The demise of communism behind the Iron Curtain from 1989 to 1991 prompted the general flow of foreign assistance to the region along with traditional security assistance and military to military cooperation programs.

The economic weakness of the postcommunist states precluded the possibility of foreign military sales to the region rendering the traditional form of security assistance inappropriate for these nations. Yet, the burden of transition from communism to democracy was recognized as an overwhelming aim that would require outside assistance. In FY 1994, democratic development was included for the first time as a funded category in the security assistance budget.[36]

Democratization through Military to Military Programs

The U.S. military was charged with a democratization role in the aftermath of World War II when it was charged to denazify Germany and democratize Japan. In these earlier instances, the U.S. military had the advantage of being an occupying force on conquered territory, yet these postwar reform efforts only partially fulfilled their goals. In recent years, the idea that the promotion of democracy should be an *explicit* mission of the U.S. military has been gradually institutionalized throughout its military cooperation and security assistance programs.

However, it is interesting to note that the post–Cold War initiative did not originate in the Pentagon from some do-gooder policymakers far removed from the field, but from practitioners in the European theater eager to use their re-

sources to address needs observed in their area of responsibility. This time the military's effort to play a role in the democratization process would be necessarily less direct since the West did not have the leverage of being a victor in war and had to deal with regimes attempting to carry on with their inherited tools and resources from the Communist era.

The potential for increasing military contacts with the reforming Soviet Union became possible in the late 1980s when American and Soviet generals began to exchange visits. The need for some sort of assistance to the postcommunist militaries of Central and Eastern Europe was recognized in the early 1990s on high-level visits to these states made possible by the collapse of the Iron Curtain. General James P. McCarthy, then Vice CINC of the U.S. European Command (EUCOM), visited Poland in April 1990 where Polish military leaders requested to buy F-16s. Though eager to modernize their inventory with American fighter jets, the Poles neglected to consider their lack of any sort of airspace management system to handle them. General McCarthy told the Poles that the request would have to be denied for this reason, but that he would immediately send in a team of experts to help them devise a modern airspace management system.[37]

The next year, while attending the CSCE Conference on Confidence Building Measures (CBMs), high-ranking officers of the Albanian military repeatedly approached high-level American officers and requested assistance on restructuring their forces. The Albanians were eager to accept preliminary ideas mapped out on napkins over meals in Geneva. After a similar experience in Czechoslovakia, and as the August 1991 coup began to unravel the Eastern bloc, it became increasingly clear to the leadership of the U.S. military that a window of opportunity was at hand.

From the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), General Colin Powell, on down the leadership of the U.S. military recognized that change was inevitable in the previously closed societies of the East and that the United States should maneuver to be an influential force. Interagency Working Groups (IWGs) had been meeting at the Pentagon to approve each individual contact made with the postcommunist states, but this mechanism proved insufficient for the volume of contacts that was beginning to overwhelm the system. Realizing that a lack of coordination was sending a poor impression to the East, General John Galvin, CINC EUCOM, directed that a more centralized program be launched to coordinate at least the contacts in EUCOM's Area of Responsibility (AOR), which included Central and Eastern Europe and the Baltics, but not the rest of the former Soviet Union.[38]

The "military to military" concept became the cornerstone of the U.S. military's democratization strategy toward the former Eastern bloc. This approach seeks to exploit the common bonds of military professionalism across states in order to influence institutional processes and behavioral patterns within transi-

tioning postcommunist states. Democratization objectives have also been incorporated into the U.S. security assistance mission through the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program. The U.S. military effort has four main elements: defense and military contacts conducted under the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program, the Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP), the International Military Education and Training Program (IMET), and the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies. Each of these programs will be discussed in turn.

Defense and Military Contacts Program for the FSU

The current defense dialogue with the former Soviet Union began during the 1987 Washington Summit when Soviet General Staff Chief Sergei Akhromeyev called on Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci. Secretary Carlucci reciprocated with several meetings with Marshal Akhromeyev in 1988. Military to military contacts began with Akhromeyev's July 1988 visit to the United States. Admiral William Crowe, JCS Chairman, and his Soviet counterpart established a two-year plan of contacts that was signed in Moscow in June 1989.[39]

The purpose of these contacts was to alleviate conditions that might have led to conflict. This goal was furthered through the signing of an agreement on dangerous military activities at this time. With the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991 came the opportunity to expand the contacts begun in 1988 with the successor states, primarily Russia. This early progress is the basis of the program in place today in the FSU.[40]

The overall foreign policy contexts that form the backdrop for each program have led to substantial differences in program activity, and especially in the funding available for each program. Although pledges were made to treat each region separately, in reality, overall policy toward Central and Eastern Europe was subservient to Russian interests. Policymakers assumed that progress in Russia was inextricably linked to progress within its former satellites. Resources and general attention subsequently favored Russia over the Central and East European postcommunist states. By mid-1995 policymakers realized, however, that progress was occurring in the former satellites, especially in Central Europe, despite the United States' relative neglect of the region and the lack of progress in Russia.[41] Eventually, the launching of the Partnership for Peace initiative in January 1994 at the Brussels Summit started to funnel aid more in the direction of states eager to move more quickly toward the West.[42]

The opportunity to facilitate the denuclearization of a former adversary has been the primary goal of the defense relationship between the United States and the FSU. The 1991 passage of the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act, better known as the Nunn-Lugar Act, initiated the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program under which the DOD was authorized to transfer up to

$400 million in its first year to facilitate "the transportation, storage, safeguarding and destruction of nuclear and other weapons in the Soviet Union . . . and to assist in the prevention of weapons proliferation."[43] Since 1992 $2.3 billion has been appropriated under Nunn-Lugar,[44] which has led to the dismantlement of over 4,700 nuclear warheads and 800 launchers as well as other progress across the CTR program.[45]

This legislation also proved to be a relative windfall in funding for military to military initiatives with the nuclear powers of the FSU (Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus). In addition to the four major purposes of the CTR program—destruction and dismantlement, safe and secure transport and storage of nuclear weapons and materials, nonproliferation, and defense conversion—the initial legislation set aside $15 million for defense and military contacts in the eligible states.[46]

The purpose of this aspect of the program is "to increase understanding and promote more stable military relations between the U.S. and the FSU states, to encourage support for reform and the development of military forces under civilian control which are more responsive to democratically elected officials, to promote denuclearization of forces in the FSU, and to encourage cooperation in regional crises."[47]

The defense goals stated at the onset of the contact program with the FSU were to facilitate a military responsible to democratically elected civilian authorities, a demilitarized market economy, and a smaller military with defense-oriented forces. Additionally, it was recognized that such a program could influence the military, which is an important factor in the transitioning societies; encourage the downsizing of defense establishments; help the military to better understand Western society; and increase U.S. understanding of defense activity in the newly independent states.[48]

Though the programs for Defense and Military Contacts with the FSU and the JCTP have virtually identical broad policy guidance, each program is overseen by separate interagency working groups (IWGs). The decision not to let the FSU, with the exception of the Baltics, fall under the purview of the USEUCOM Joint Contact Team Program was a deliberate decision rooted in differing schools of thought within the DOD political-military bureaucracy.

The military attaché corps assigned to the Soviet Union was comprised of a large group of Soviet experts who lobbied to keep the military contact mission away from the "nonexperts" at EUCOM. Those involved in the process of continuing contacts with the FSU wanted them to remain under strict Joint Staff guidance. Although the EUCOM effort was respected for its enthusiasm, the perception also existed that it could be too eager to act and was not always as solicitous of the U.S. Embassies' Chief of Missions' preferences as it could have been.[49]

As a result, the military to military contacts aspect of the overall military

cooperation program with the FSU has been run by the attachés in-country. While these officers have linguistic and area training superior to their EUCOM counterparts serving in the JCTP, conducting and facilitating military contacts are just a portion of their overall responsibilities, and they cannot give the attention to this aspect of their duties that full-time specialists could. However, as the in-depth study of the effectiveness of military to military initiatives in the Russian case study will show, the lack of enthusiasm for these contacts among the leadership of the Russian military somewhat alleviates this problem since the unsupportive climate limits the number of contacts that are possible.

The Joint Contact Team Program

General Colin Powell sent a message to General John Shalikashvili, then Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, outlining his ideas to create a program akin to a military peace corps so that the transitioning states would have the alternative to turn away from Russia and toward the United States.[50] Later Powell approved the need for a Brigadier General and a staff of thirty to manage the process. Brigadier General Thomas Lennon, who was slated to become Wing Commander at Homestead AFB before Hurricane Andrew destroyed it, was sent to EUCOM to lead the office created to oversee the program.[51]

The EUCOM Commander used funds set aside for his discretionary use to launch the Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP), and the first Military Liaison Team (MLT) was sent to Hungary in July 1992 as a trial. One year later, a total of ten MLTs were operating in Central and Eastern Europe. Today, there are fourteen MLTs working in Albania, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.[52]

In the first year the program operated with $6 million from CINC (Commander in Chief) initiative funds.[53] The JCTP operated with an appropriated budget of $10 million in FY 1994 and $16.3 million in FY 1995.[54] Beginning in FY 1996 the JCTP's funding was no longer a specific line in the budget for the JCTP. Instead, it was decided that funding should come from the $60 million allocated to the CINCs for discretionary spending. Whether or not this is a positive or negative development for the program has depended on the willingness of each CINC to support it. Since the shift in the funding method has occurred the JCTP has received $15 million annually from CINC activity money. An additional $5.5 million comes from the Reserve Component budget to pay the salaries of reservists in the program.[55]

The JCTP was initiated in the final year of the Bush administration, before the Clinton administration, which was eager to make the promotion of democracy a key military mission, came on board. There was some concern at the State Department that the JCTP should not proceed, because this would "put

the military ahead of the political process."[56] While there was an appreciation at State that contacts between militaries could have positive results, State felt that it had to remind DOD that it was not charged with foreign policy constitutionally and that the military should be careful not to take the lead on foreign policy issues—even those with a national security aspect to them.[57]

As the program began, a new national strategy had not yet been written, nor had the "Bottom-Up Review" been conducted—mechanisms that would help sustain the program past its first year when influencing "dangers to democracy and reform, in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere" would be touted by the new administration as a main pillar of its defense policy.[58]

The fact that the program was launched in a less than perfect political climate is testimony to the firm grasp of the military institution's role in a democracy held by the leadership of the U.S. military. They understood the importance of the military to the processes of transition happening all around them and acted to try to positively influence their counterparts in the postcommunist states. However, as evidence presented later in the study will show, despite attempts to focus program activity on theater objectives, policymakers still do not sufficiently understand how to specifically assist postcommunist militaries transitioning to democracy. Political turf battles plagued the program at its onset and still affect it today, but the recognition that *something* must be done as soon as possible ensured that a program, even an imperfect one, be set in motion to begin to address the U.S. military leadership's goals of influencing the emerging democracies of the East.

The stated objectives of the JCTP have not appreciably changed in the course of the program. They are to assist governments of Central and Eastern Europe and some assigned countries of the FSU to transition to democracy, promote positive long-term relationships, encourage civilian control of the military, establish frequent contacts with mid- to lower-level officers and NCOs, and encourage participation in NATO activities.[59] Its mission statement, "to assist the governments of Central and Eastern European countries and the republics of the former Soviet Union in developing civilian controlled military forces which foster peace and stability in a democratic society,"[60] highlights the JCTP's broad mandate and has also remained consistent over the years.[61]

The democratization mandate evident in mission statements and program objectives has its roots in the law chartering its activities. Title 10, Section 168, "Military to Military Contacts and Comparable Activities," authorizes contacts to encourage the democratic orientation of the military and defense establishments of other countries.[62] The legal basis of the program clearly supports military democratization activities aimed at influencing the ideological orientation of the participant states.

On the one hand, the JCTP accepts responsibility for encouraging further

democratization within transitioning militaries by exposing host militaries to the civic virtues characteristic of military professionals in democracies.[63] Yet, the JCTP also pursues strategic professional goals, such as enhancing participants' interoperability in NATO. As the process of NATO expansion has progressed through increased Participation in Partnership for Peace activities, the JCTP has increasingly steered away from its original democratization mandate to support PfP (Partnership for Peace) objectives. However, its mandate and legal basis as a military democratization program has not changed. As a result, the military democratization function, which this study will show was poorly conceptualized and unfocused in the first few years of the program preceding the theater emphasis on PfP, is no longer the main focus of the program. Meanwhile, key problem areas in the process of military democratization remain unsolved as the PfP states focus on the military interoperability requirements of NATO accession.

The analysis of JCTP policy oversight, guidance, and assessment will be broken into two distinct eras—the "pre-reform" and "post-reform" eras. The "pre-reform" era covers the period from the program's inception to mid-1997 when country work plans subject to the European theater's concept of focused engagement began to be implemented. The "post-reform" era includes the period from mid-1997 to the present.

JCTP Oversight in the "Pre-reform" Era

In the "pre-reform" era, JCTP activity was monitored by the oversight of an interagency working group composed of representatives from the National Security Council (NSC), Department of Defense (DOD), Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Department of State, Joint Staff, and the Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA).[64] In theory, this group was supposed to screen proposed events to ensure that they were supportive of the stated democratization goals of the program, but, in reality, the only events screened out were ones that might "get the program in trouble."[65] Those involved in the policy review process agreed that it had become routine, that the group no longer met in person, and that policy implementers at EUCOM safely assumed that their proposed event would be approved unless it involved specific unauthorized activity.

Events were proposed according to the in-country coordination described earlier, but the menu of possible events was generated by representatives of the U.S. military units, primarily in Europe, that were tasked to support each activity. The U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) is the USAF command that supports JCTP activity by providing the manpower that executes individual events. USAFE described its understanding of EUCOM policy guidance as promoting

"contact initiatives at all levels and across the entire spectrum of specializations."[66]

USAFE briefing papers noted that it was understood that EUCOM policy prohibited events in which training of foreign troops took place or events that could be categorized as combat-related. Consequently, the focus areas in table 3 were listed as the main areas from which MLTs and host nations could expect support for program activity.

Several reactions should have been immediately evident to policy overseers charged with ensuring that the program was focused on its mission of facilitating democratization goals. The first is that any list of "focus areas" twenty-four items long is arguably unfocused. Second, the focus areas did not seem to pay any particular attention to democratization goals. Indeed, what the areas appeared to operationalize were categories of nonlethal military activity, thus ensuring that policy implementers steered clear of the prohibited areas of training and aid with combat-related military assistance. The prominence of the types of events listed above in JCTP program activity was indicative of both an inability to operationalize democratization goals and the inappropriate equating of nonlethality with democratization. Without a strict process of event prioritization, how did the JCTP achieve its program goals?

The answer is that it did not, nor did it seem overly concerned with achieving them. The chief policy overseer at the Joint Staff, a Navy Commander, admitted that the policy from the start of the program had been "not to have a deliberate policy." This was in keeping with General Powell's initial vision that "all contacts are good" and that in the long run lots of interaction will pay off.[67] There may have been some value to this approach, but it begged the question of maximizing the program's effectiveness.

Players involved in the policy chain in Washington agreed that no master plan existed at the Joint Staff for the program. Representatives at the level of the individual services complained that their only role was to sign off on the

TABLE 3. JCTP Supporting Units' Areas of Focus (As stated in USAFE briefing papers obtained at the Pentagon in May 1995)

Airspace Management	Information Management	National Guard/Reserves
Air Traffic Control	Inspector General	Personnel Management
Civil Engineering	Legislative Liaison	Public Affairs
Communications	Logistics	Resource Management
Education and Training	Meteorology	Safety
Environmental	Military Chaplaincy	Search and Rescue
Fire Fighting	Military Legal System	Security Police
History	Military Medicine	Services

supportability of EUCOM's proposed list of events. The services complained further that the lack of more specific guidance frustrated their attempts to carry out their roles responsibly at service-specific levels for policy oversight and implementation.

This approach was flawed on several counts. First, American taxpayers did not get what they paid for. Funding was granted to the program with the assumption that it would directly support the *democratic* transition of the assisted states. Policy overseers openly admitted that they deliberately decided against focusing program activity through the operationalization of its democratization goals and assessing the program's progress accordingly, yet they stressed the worth of working to facilitate democratic civilian control when the program came up for funding every year.

Another problem was the inability to distinguish between program events that might make a military more democratically accountable and encourage democratic military professionalism and those that could conceivably make an ideologically flawed military a better military. The result could be that U.S. military assistance actually contributed to the military buildup of potential foes, whose ideologically based behavior had not changed—all in the name of democratization. The policy oversight as it stood for the first five years of the program's existence—a crucial window of opportunity for influencing the newly democratizing states—was not only less than effective in meeting its stated goals, it was potentially dangerous.

JCTP Policy Oversight in the "Post-Reform" Era

Near the end of 1996, EUCOM policymakers took administrative action in an effort to ensure that JCTP activity supported the new Theater Security Planning System (TSPS) framework that was just being implemented in the European Command's area of responsibility. TSPS is an effort to translate national security strategy, national military strategy, and EUCOM's theater strategy into specific engagement activities in support of these varying layers of objectives.

EUCOM policymakers had finally realized that JCTP program activity had been unfocused and consequently almost impossible to assess.[68] The solution included the addition of another level of policy review at HQ EUCOM to ensure that work plans drawn up in each country also supported EUCOM's theater objectives. The third level of review at the Inter-agency Working Group in Washington, in place to ensure complicity with legal parameters, remained the same.[69]

While this reform resulted in the development of detailed work plans for each country that included the enumeration of specific objectives and metrics to assess them, an analysis of specific program activity conducted in the "post-reform" era revealed a heavy emphasis on military interoperability events vs.

democratization events and continued poor operationalization of the democratization events that remain.[70]

For example, USAFE's "post-reform" era strategy to support the JCTP begins by listing NATO's PfP objectives: transparency, democratization, and interoperability. It goes on to note that transparency and democratization are political objectives and that "it is in the area of 'interoperability' where the military has its primary responsibility to accomplish concrete PfP results."[71] "Focused engagement" directed at enhancing PfP military interoperability may have been accomplished, but at the cost of the continued pursuit of military democratization goals.[72]

How the Joint Contact Team Program Works

The main concept involves deploying teams of U.S. military personnel into the countries in order to perform the dual missions of providing infrastructure building information and presenting the U.S. armed forces as a role model of a highly effective military that operates under civilian control. "The continuous contact with these former enemies demonstrates American values and ideals while encouraging increasing openness, as ideas and experiences are shared in a natural positive dialogue."[73]

An inherent assumption of the program's designers is that ideals and values associated with military service in a democratic political system and the imparting of democratic civic virtues can begin to take root through a series of military contacts. However, the events that occur are largely focused on improving the strategic professionalism and military effectiveness of the transitioning states. The latter goal is the primary motivation of the host countries' participation, while the former goal of imparting democratic values forms the basis of U.S. taxpayers' support of the program. The program's ineffectiveness in achieving its democratizing mission can be traced to the fundamental conflict of goals between assisting and assisted states and the conflict between both missions within the assisting state's program.

The key program element is the Military Liaison Team (MLT), which consists of four to six U.S. military members drawn from all services to include active duty, reserve, and national guard components. These personnel are deployed in-country for six-month intervals with the mission to facilitate visits to the country by U.S. military experts in the form of Traveling Contact Teams (TCTs), and from the country to U.S. military installations either in Europe or the CONUS by host-nation military personnel through familiarization (FAM) tours.

The MLT works in facilities provided by the Ministry of Defense of the host nation—not the U.S. Embassy. The American team is typically supplemented by English-speaking members of the military of the host nation. Such

cooperation is essential for ensuring that the host nation's needs are made known and also to ensure that events are well coordinated in-country.

Event programming is constrained by the "nonlethality" and "no training" prohibitions imposed on the JCTP at the start, which severely limits the effectiveness of the program. These limitations stem from internal bureaucratic battles and are rooted in the State Department's monopoly on training foreign military personnel.[74] Program managers feared that infringing into the State Department's mission area could have jeopardized congressional funding for the JCTP. However, American officers in-country thought that these constraints prevented the host nations from seeing the "real" U.S. military. The role-modeling function is limited when U.S. participants can't really "model" to the point of training. For instance, a pilot exchange might occur, but policy constraints prohibit the pilots from the United States and the host country from flying together, discussing tactics, or exchanging technical information.[75] This is especially important for impact in some of the democratic military professionalism aspects of reform. Important leadership lessons could have been learned from seeing U.S. squads in action and if U.S. units were allowed to actually teach.[76]

Interviews with host nation military personnel from across the region indicated that the utility of information-based exchanges had been exhausted as early as the summer of 1994 and that what they needed was specific follow-up training to incorporate proposed ideas into real reforms. Major Johannes Kert, Chief of Kaitseliit (Estonian National Guard), complained that the MLT should "teach us to fish—not just give us bread."[77] While the restriction against training has not been lifted, JCTP country work plans currently include an emphasis on planning events that explain the "how to" as opposed to the "what to" do.[78]

Involvement of National Guard and Reserve Forces

In July 1992 the United States was asked to participate in a NATO/NACC-sponsored assistance visit to Latvia. Representatives from five NATO countries comprised the delegation, and the United States was given the specific task of addressing the topic "Military Support to Civilian Authorities." Since the National Guard is primarily responsible for performing this function, the National Guard Bureau (NGB) prepared briefing materials on the subject to be used by the U.S. team. The Latvians were impressed with the concepts that were briefed and expressed an interest in learning more. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy subsequently asked the NGB to prepare an assistance plan.[79]

At the same time, USEUCOM was working on finalizing its plan for military contacts in Central and Eastern Europe. An alliance between these two

groups was formed to garner the congressional support necessary to fund the contacts beyond the first year when CINC initiative funds would be spent. It was agreed that the National Guard would take the lead in contacts with the Baltics, but their initiative would fall under the umbrella of the overall USEUCOM Military to Military Contact Program—the JCTP.[80]

The National Guard initiative concentrated initially on assistance to the Baltics. These states looked to the U.S. National Guard as a good model for building some military capability without relying on a large standing army. Besides evoking the negative experience of the years of Soviet occupation, large standing forces would have been impossible within the financial constraints of the Baltic states' democratic transitions. The National Guard also performs a civil defense mission in the United States that is relevant to the needs of these states. In addition, the postcommunist states have large ecological cleanup requirements in which their militaries will be used. There is a great need for the assisted states to learn how to work with civil authorities in these areas.[81]

The National Guard's involvement, supported by the services' reserve components, has developed into a regionwide effort called the State Partnership Program. U.S. state National Guards have been paired with partner states participating in the JCTP on the basis of ethnic ties and climatic, geographic, and economic factors. For instance, Illinois has been linked with Poland due to the high concentration of Polish-Americans in Illinois. Additionally, Guard and Reserve members make up one-half of the manning of the JCTP's MLTs.[82]

The rationale for the state partner dimension of JCTP activity is to build a grass roots relationship between local communities in the United States and postcommunist partner states to facilitate the development of local governmental, academic, industrial, and people-to-people contacts that would not otherwise be possible through the support provided by the active duty components.[83] Guard and Reserve participation in JCTP program activity additionally eases the active components' operational requirements. The JCTP has increasingly relied on Reserve Component resources to staff its events. Reserve Component participation has increased from four percent in FY 1993 to a high of 30 percent in FY 1996.[84] Twenty-one state partnerships have been formed with nations in the former Eastern bloc.[85]

EUCOM's alliance with the National Guard and Reserve forces was a necessary concession for securing the support needed to ensure the continuation of its own efforts in the region. EUCOM program developers realized that the NGB's ability to lobby congressional support exceeded their own and would be an essential element in the JCTP getting off the ground. There have also been fears throughout the life of the JCTP that its funding would not be renewed from year to year, but that some guard dimension of the effort would likely remain in such a contingency.

In a perfect funding environment it is likely that EUCOM would have pre-

ferred to have launched its initiative alone without the complications of merging the separate cultures and expectations of guard and active forces. There have been problems with some of the state political issues that have carried into the program regarding program activity and the quality of personnel deployed to fill the Guard MLT billets.[86] States have also been known to bypass EUCOM bureaucratic procedures, in some cases acting almost as sovereign nations conducting their own foreign policy in the region.[87]

Given the inability of the active forces to fully embrace the JCTP concept with funding and topflight personnel, the National Guard and Reserve enthusiasm for and participation in the program has been a necessary, though sometimes complicating, factor for its continuation. However, the National Guard is even less prepared than the active forces to staff the policy-planning aspect of its participation or to appreciate the need to think through which activities will make a greater contribution to imparting the ideals and values essential to militaries in democratic political systems.

General George Joulwan, Commander of EUCOM, has stated:

> When our servicemembers arrive on the ground the fact that they are citizens of the United States gives them special capabilities. Because they come from a nation of federated states, they understand instinctively the advantages and challenges of many governments working together. . . . American reservists are a unique group, and as citizen soldiers they represent in their persons the concept of a military subordinate to civilian authority.[88]

Unfortunately, this is the type of thinking that has underpinned the JCTP since its inception. "Special capabilities" derived from American citizenship do not necessarily make every contact with Americans a democratizing experience. Only a coherent, focused plan of action based on an understanding of the specific elements required for a military in a democracy will result in program activity that furthers the goal of ensuring the transition of postcommunist militaries to democracy. The Guard's involvement can largely be attributed to budgetary and personnel resource issues. The inclusion of a disparate military component conducting program activity in twenty-one separate U.S. states has made it more difficult to control and focus the events that have occurred there.

The International Military and Education Training (IMET) Program

IMET is a State Department program administered by the Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA). IMET is a component program of the United States Security Assistance Program and provides military education and training on a

grant basis to students from allied and friendly foreign nations. Other key components of U.S. security assistance include the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) Program, Peacekeeping Operations (PKO), and the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund (NPD).[89]

Since 1950 IMET and its predecessor programs have provided education and training for over 500,000 international military students.[90] "The training ranges from basic technical skills to professional military education and is designed to advance the efficiency, professional performance, and readiness of the recipient armed forces."[91] In recent years the United States has funded the education and training of over 5,000 students annually from over 100 countries at funding levels ranging from a high of $56 million in FY 1987 to a low of $21.25 million for FY 1994.[92] The cut of 50 percent in the funding for FY 1994 was the result of Congress's perception of duplication in military assistance programs. In fiscal years 1996 and 1997 $39 million and $43.5 million was allocated respectively to IMET activity in over 100 countries. In fiscal years 1998 and 1999, IMET's funding level has held steady at $50 million.[93] The 23 postcommunist states of the former Eastern bloc have received between 32 and 34 percent of the total IMET budget in recent years.[94]

The philosophy behind IMET is that through participation in U.S. military training and education courses designed for members of the U.S. military, foreign students will be exposed to U.S. military professionalism within the context of American life and culture.[95] The hope is that these individuals will eventually rise to prominence within their own militaries and will positively influence public policy and foreign relations decisions that favor U.S. interests.[96] Program administrators admit that it is impossible to rigorously prove that such influence actually takes place and that there have been a few instances in which IMET graduates rose to prominent positions and followed policy courses that were disloyal to civilian governments. Overall, though, analysts agree that IMET participation has positively predisposed many foreign officers to U.S. values and interests.

This long-standing program was extended to include the states of the former Soviet bloc beginning in 1991.[97] Since that time IMET has been funding nationals of postcommunist states to study in U.S. military education and training programs to expose students to democratic principles prevalent in the U.S. military. The approach of IMET had never been to directly teach foreign students about the U.S. democratic system or U.S. democratic military professionalism, but to expose participants to these concepts by living within the wider U.S. culture and its military subculture.

IMET funds have made possible the training of foreign students in U.S. military institutions and training programs, but the emphasis with this program has been on the training itself. For instance, an allied country may receive several slots at a U.S. pilot training base with the hope of having several pilots re-

turn to their country trained to U.S. standards. What these officers may have picked up with regard to how the military operates in a democracy was incidental, or perhaps irrelevant, if the allied student was not even returning to a democratic regime. For instance, many students from such countries as Saudi Arabia and Iran have participated in this program.

Beginning in FY 1991 a portion of IMET expenditures was earmarked for a new IMET focus area dubbed "Expanded IMET" (EIMET). This initiative expanded IMET to allow the participation of civilian defense officials as well as that of civilians from nondefense ministries and legislatures and individuals from relevant organizations outside of the government, such as the media. These participants take part in courses aimed at enhancing the management of military establishments and budgets, the promotion of civilian control of the military, and the creation of military justice systems and codes of conduct that are in accordance with internationally recognized standards of human rights.[98] The allocation for EIMET has been 10 percent of the total IMET budget[99] for each state although it can be a higher portion of the IMET grant in states with greater democratization needs.[100]

It is important to emphasize that IMET and the JCTP are separate programs administered by different parts of the U.S. defense bureaucracy. The State Department funds and oversees the administration of IMET while the JCTP is funded by DOD with policy oversight from the Joint Staff. Though each program has invested in the achievement of democratization objectives in the postcommunist states, the efforts have been incompletely coordinated, and both programs have competed for the same limited resources.

The Marshall Center

The greatest long-term role in trying to overcome the lack of education in democratic principles of officers and civilian defense personnel of the postcommunist states will most likely be played by the George C. Marshall Center for European Security Studies in Garmisch, Germany. The Marshall Center is a separate initiative from the military to military contact programs and IMET and focuses on educating senior military officers and defense ministry personnel through their participation in courses that stress a broad sense of national security and defense planning in democracies to include political, economic, and military aspects. Its goal dovetails with the mission of the military to military contact programs that emphasize short-term assistance through the establishment of contacts at the middle ranks.[101]

The inaugural group of 50 officers and 25 civilian officials from the foreign and defense ministries of 23 countries graduated in December 1994. Since 1994 more than 600 defense, security, and policy officials have graduated from the Marshall Center's courses.[102] All of the CEE/FSU cooperation partner

states of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council along with students from Bosnia-Herzegovina have participated.[103]

The Marshall Center conducts two five-month courses of study per year along with shorter courses and conferences aimed at specific audiences and topics. It is patterned after the conceptual basis of the Marshall Plan except that intellectual capital is being offered instead of money. The center has targeted rising stars—officers and civilians expected to hold senior leadership positions within their countries' transitioning defense infrastructure—as its preferred students.[104]

Initial reaction to the training was largely positive with a few reservations. "It's a very good initiative," said Gregori Saytsev, who oversees disarmament at the Russian defense ministry and was the spokesman for the six Russian students in the first class. "The course is very one-sided, but it's interesting and important to hear the opinions of others, particularly from CIS countries." He noted, though, that "it's a painful experience to see that the Russians are blamed for everything." A Polish officer from the Polish general staff added that the exchange of ideas possible at the center impressed him most. "I have never experienced a situation like this before, where everybody gives their personal opinion, rather than that of their government."[105] The Marshall Center has adapted its curriculum at the suggestion of some of its alumni by providing more student-driven electives, greater emphasis on Central Asian regional security concerns, and increased student participation.[106]

Funding is provided by the German and American governments, mainly through the U.S. Army budget, with oversight and command and control coming from the headquarters of the U.S. European Command in Germany. Nunn-Lugar funds pay the costs of students from Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan.[107] Since the program started conducting courses it has been funded at a level of $16.1 to $16.8 million dollars annually.[108]

Because the program targets only a few individuals yearly from each participating state, success will ultimately depend on the quality of participants, their future positions within their military institutions, and the student reactions to the education received. These factors are largely dependent on decisions made within the participating states and may limit the effectiveness of the effort. In July 1998 the Marshall Center initiated an alumni association to encourage networking among its graduates. The Marshall Center also posts on its web site follow-on positions obtained by its graduates and their specific achievements according to information voluntarily provided.[109]

Other Military Assistance Efforts

Though not aimed specifically at the goal of democratizing postcommunist militaries, it should be mentioned that substantial funds have also been allocated

to further the NATO membership goals of the postcommunist states participating in the Partnership for Peace program. This commitment stems from President Clinton's promise made in Warsaw in July 1994 to seek funds to promote the interoperability of PfP states with NATO. Known as the Warsaw Initiative, this program has provided about $100 million per year beginning in FY 1996 to support these efforts in 23 partner states.[110] Finally, beginning in FY 1997, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act earmarked $30 million for foreign military financing grants for the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland and $20 million to subsidize the lending of up to $242.5 million for the purchase of defense items.[111]

Despite the importance of the political objective of insisting that the admission of partners as full members be contingent on the progress of democratization, specifically the achievement of democratic political control of the armed forces,[112] little activity at the NATO level has focused on these goals.[113] Specific criteria for democratic civilian control of the partner states began to be developed in the fall of 1995, pushed largely by the U.S. Mission, and some Partnership for Peace resources are beginning to be channeled to achieve this goal.[114] The need for both ideological and military interoperability is finally being recognized as a necessary condition for the enlargement of NATO.

Conclusion: The Effectiveness of the U.S. Military's Democratization Approach

This chapter has introduced the U.S. military democratization programs and suggested that their design flaws have limited the achievement of their aims. The following chapters will illustrate how these programs fall short of meeting the democratization needs of two specific cases, the Czech Republic and Russia, in terms of achieving both democratic political control and democratic military professionalism.

Although it has been demonstrated that democratization is a strategic aim of U.S. foreign policy in the post–Cold War era, the achievement of this goal is elusive in U.S. military democratization programs primarily because there is widespread confusion over how to achieve democratization objectives. These programs, particularly the military to military contact programs, were flawed from the start due to an inability to conceptualize the problem of military democratization. Policymakers understood neither the imperative of democratic political control nor democratic military professionalism. As a result, inconsistent mission statements were born containing elements of furthering both the development of democratic civic virtues and strategic professionalism under the auspices of military democratization programs. Furthermore, the deliberate decision to refrain from assessing the programs until mid-1997[115] led to the perpetuation of poor program designs and the continuation of the bureaucratic infighting and underfunding that has plagued the effort.

Even with the advent of the "post-reform" era in 1997, the goal of pursuing a focused and theoretically sound policy for the fostering of military democratization in postcommunist states remained elusive. "Focused engagement" and the implementation of the programs through the Theater Strategic Planning System only shifted the emphasis in program content to NATO military interoperability goals. In addition, the Program of Defense and Military Contacts with the FSU falls outside the parameters of EUCOM influence and is consequently unaffected by any improvements that may have occurred in the European Command's area of responsibility.

In the "pre-reform" era success was often determined by tracking the frequency of events. It was assumed that the more events that took place, the closer the program was coming to achieving military democratization in its target countries. While the "post-reform" program emphasizes assessing contributions to specific goals laid out for each country, many of these objectives and assessment metrics are insufficiently focused on tracking how well the interactions taking place address specific preexisting obstacles to reform. Progress made toward overcoming obstacles and facilitating headway toward democratic goals is sporadic because the underlying principles and theory that should drive the program are not universally understood.

Personal contact and the opportunity to discuss democratic principles can contribute to a greater understanding of these concepts in the East, and certainly much progress has been made merely by removing the barriers to isolation that once existed, but some still remain. The lack of a formal training program for members of the MLTs inbound to serve in-country limits the effectiveness that they can have. In fact, field research revealed how unfamiliar many team members were with the overall democratization goals of the program. While these goals exist in briefing documents available at the program's headquarters in Stuttgart, they did not seem to loom very large in the planning scheme of MLT members in-country. The reality of their day-to-day life is that they are staff officers "making events happen," which means that logistical details consume their time rather than lofty goals of helping to create democratic institutions. One of the positive benefits of developing country work plans is that specific objectives for each country are circulated at the grass roots level.

However, the in-depth case study analysis of chapter 5 will show that there are still problems conceptualizing which events are best suited to the achievement of particular objectives. Personnel serving in-country still are not sufficiently familiar with the post-Soviet model that they are confronting and the precepts of the American model that they represent. This is especially important considering that the deployments for most MLT members are only six months long, meaning that by the time a serviceman or servicewoman learns these lessons it will be time to redeploy to the West. A positive trend in this dimension of the problem has been the lengthening of the deployments to one year for the Team Chiefs and their deputies beginning in 1997, but these

assignments are still unaccompanied and the officers serve in a Temporary Duty (TDY) status.[116]

Issues of incomplete coordination and internal turf battles continue to plague the overall effort of influencing the postcommunist states. Parts of the U.S. defense bureaucracy that have traditionally played a role in political-military relations are reluctant to share their role or delegate substantial powers to the program. For example, defense attachés have not universally supported the program. The attitude of some of them actually undermines the effectiveness of the program and sends the signal to the host militaries that U.S. defense structures are not complementary or united in purpose.

Additionally, self-imposed limitations, such as providing only information that falls short of actual training, also limit the effectiveness of the military to military programs. The host militaries universally expressed their concern that they do not have a continued need for information briefings, while their need for real training will persist indefinitely. Program constraints and bureaucratic shortcomings such as frequent rotations of most of the MLT members prohibit the fulfillment of more advanced needs. Personnel are also assigned to participate either on the deployed staff or as "experts" in their particular fields without any specific training on the transition in progress that they are charged with influencing.

The success of the U.S. military's effort to facilitate the democratic consolidation of militaries in the postcommunist states depends on many factors. Even though the vast majority of Military Liaison Team members' duties are largely administrative, training on the process of military democratization and the ability to speak the host country's language would greatly enhance their effectiveness. They are well placed to achieve more than they have in the process of military democratization. Coordination among all members of the U.S. team in-country to include the embassy staff and the defense attachés is also important. Additionally, the attitude and support of the host military are key. How motivated are they to reorient their defense structures and processes toward Western models? How severe are the limitations of preexisting obstacles to reform? What image from the Soviet era must the military overcome? What advantages does it have due to its positive image earned in the Soviet period or in the peaceful transition to a postcommunist government? The overall condition of the web of political, economic, social, and military transitions within each postcommunist state also affects the degree of influence that external actors can have on internal processes.

If the goal of positively influencing the democratic transition of the military institutions of the postcommunist states is a matter of such national import and a major thrust of the post–Cold War defense policy, then the U.S. military should embrace this role and ensure that the most competent officers and NCOs are selected and appropriately trained to serve within the program.

Program content must be redesigned to contribute to the achievement of military democratization objectives. Democratization objectives have been overtaken with interoperability objectives. To the extent democratization objectives remain, they are still poorly operationalized. Many of the same events that were prevalent in the "pre-reform" era continue to be pursued in the "post-reform" era, while many of the democratization deficits inherited from the Communists persist. These have been enumerated in chapter 1 and will be explored through in-depth case studies in chapters 3 and 4. In sum, these programs should be engaged in breaking down and adapting the model of the military in a democracy presented in chapter 1 in light of local cultures and needs. As this chapter has begun to show and as the following chapters will bear out, the military to military programs, as currently constructed, have not maximized either their responsibility or opportunity to achieve these goals.

CHAPTER 3

Postcommunist Military Democratization Needs: An Assessment of Democratic Political Control in Russia and the Czech Republic

The promotion of democracy is an enduring characteristic of American foreign policy throughout history. The pursuit of this goal has continued in the post–Cold War era in the form of an American foreign policy focused on facilitating the enlargement of the number of democracies in the international system. But recent research argues that enlargement alone is not a sufficient goal. Democratic consolidation of transitioning states must be achieved in order to achieve the benefits of a democratic peace. Accepting indefinite periods of transition runs the dual risk of transitioning states backsliding into autocracies and of the exhibition of war-prone behavior.[1]

Concretely, this means that the democratic consolidation of the postcommunist states of the former Soviet Union and Eastern and Central Europe should be a primary goal accompanied by the specific simultaneous goal of ensuring that military institutions also progress on the path of democratization. While most attention is focused on progress of civilian democratic institutions in the postcommunist states, the compliance of military institutions with democratic norms should not be overlooked. After all, military institutions possess the expertise and force that can be directed either at the preservation of democratic gains or at their destruction.

Chapter 1 laid out the scope of the military democratization problem with the presentation of models of civilian control and military professionalism for both democratic states and for the communist states of the Eastern bloc during the Soviet era. The following three chapters analyze two cases where the democratization of postcommunist military institutions is under way—Russia and the Czech Republic—and the American response to their democratic transitions. This chapter addresses the specific problem of democratic political control of postcommunist militaries.

Democratic political control of the military depends on constitutional provisions outlining the separation of powers, governmental control, parliamentary oversight, and democratic accountability to the society at large. Whether the executive, the legislature, or some combination of the two has primary over-

sight authority over the military, actual control depends upon how well these responsibilities are exercised. Because military institutions tend to change more slowly than other institutions participating in the democratic transition, progress in democratic military reform is largely dependent on the strength of the civilian democratic institutions charged with oversight.

This chapter highlights the weaknesses that persist within the civilian democratic institutions of the transitioning cases that limit full achievement of democratic political control. These weaknesses, which might be called democratic deficits, include political leaders' varying commitments to democracy, weak budgetary control, lack of expertise on defense issues, insufficient confidence concerning oversight authority, limited political will to influence the defense process, poor relationships between the Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Parliament, and inadequate openness, or transparency, of the defense policy process. Additionally, democratic deficits within military institutions that exacerbate the ineffectiveness of civilian oversight bodies will be explored.

The evidence presented in this chapter and the next will support a central thesis of this work. It argues that democratic control in transitioning states is largely achieved through the presence of shared democratic values across democratizing institutions. The infusion of democratic values into a previously authoritarian society creates expectations that these values will be reflected in all democratizing institutions, including the armed forces. Resistance within one democratizing institution must be met with the enforcement of standards of democratic accountability in others. The expectations of formal institutions, such as parliamentary bodies and elected executives, are reinforced by other influential elements of the transitioning state to include the media and the expectations of the population at large.

An analysis of the cases will show that there are winners and losers in the democratization process. Whether or not the goal of democratic consolidation is ever achieved depends on many factors: the historic predisposition of the state toward democracy, consensus among societal forces that democracy is a common goal, success in overcoming specific democratic deficits that face each state at the point of transition, and ultimately, the matchup between winners and losers within the transitioning state.

Postcommunist militaries are facing many challenges: the loss of status and prestige, the divergence of societal and military values, the structural and ideological reform of their forces, and the sorting out of old Soviet era patterns of behavior and Western democratic standards for military institutions. The aim of this chapter is to assess the democratization progress of the postcommunist militaries of Russia and the Czech Republic in order to specify their continuing democratization needs. The framework developed in the analysis of these cases can subsequently be applied to other military institutions participating in democratic transitions. Once identified, these democratic deficits can be more

effectively addressed by the established democracies. The response of the United States will subsequently be analyzed in depth in chapter 5.

The Collapse of Communism and the Advent of Democracy in Russia and the Czech Republic

The introduction of perestroika and glasnost in the Soviet Union during the mid-1980s proved to be an unsuccessful experiment in the controlled democratization of a socialist state. The openness of glasnost revealed the fault lines of a regime tenuously held together by a corrupted communist system. Those indoctrinated within it long knew that the reality of living under communism contrasted sharply with the ideal socialist state. Greater exposure to the Western world also awakened Soviet citizens to the tremendous gap in the standard of living between the communist East and the democratic West.

Mikhail Gorbachev was persuaded that some hybrid of socialism, democracy, and market economics, carefully managed by the leadership of the Communist Party, was a viable path of reform for the Soviet Union. Consequently, his support for the democratization process was limited and sporadic. In the end he would be the last General Secretary of a great superpower doomed to disintegration by the forces he himself unleashed. Boris Yeltsin, the first popularly elected president of the Russian Federation, emerged as the leader of the democratic factions following the August 1991 attempted coup. He faced the task of continuing the process of democratic reform where his predecessor left off.

The liberalization taking place in the Soviet Union spread through the Eastern bloc. In Czechoslovakia, this culminated in the November 1989 "Velvet Revolution" that swept through the country, resulting in an almost bloodless change of power. The speed with which the Communist regime collapsed evidenced its superficiality and lack of legitimacy among the Czech and Slovak peoples. The two main opposition groups to Communist rule—Civic Forum and Public Against Violence, its Slovak counterpart—remained united through the country's first democratic elections in 1990. By the time Czechoslovakia held its second postcommunist elections in 1992, however, preferences for different paths of economic reform and a resurgence of Czech and Slovak nationalism combined to paralyze the federal government's capacity to continue the democratic transformation process. On 1 January 1993, the Velvet Revolution culminated in the Velvet Divorce, the birth of the Czech Republic, and the rebirth of Slovakia. The Czech Republic proceeded with its plan for a rapid transition to a market economy while Slovakia chose a slower rate of economic transition that took into account the transformation of its large, outmoded heavy industrial sector and a higher rate of unemployment. However, by the end of 1997 it was becoming increasingly apparent that the "Czech miracle"

had begun to fade as both inflation and unemployment rates inched upward at the end of 1997 to 11 percent and 7.5 percent respectively. Gross domestic product (GDP) growth slowed to a rate of 1.5 percent in 1997, and there was a slight deviation from a balanced budget.[2]

The resignation of Prime Minister Vaclav Klaus in December 1997 over the revelation of a party slush fund focused world attention on the weaknesses of the Czech transition. Klaus had been the economic architect of the Czech democratic transition since the birth of the republic. His political fall along with sagging economic indicators raised concerns over the country's stability and threatened its ranking as the leader of Central Europe.[3] By mid-1998 the basis of the Czech model of economic reform had come into question. Analysts criticized Klaus's quick privatization and overzealous monetary policies for preventing necessary company restructuring, allowing corruption to take root, and ultimately setting the Czech Republic on the course of recession. The Czechs' economic growth has subsequently fallen behind the pack of Central European states and will adversely affect the pace of military reform.[4]

The 10.4 million people of the Czech Republic and the 150 million citizens of the Russian Federation are undergoing a transformation of all aspects of their societies—cultural, political, economic, and military. The Czech Republic's historical experience of liberal democracy between the world wars, however, gives it some national memory about and confidence in democratic institutions. Although the intervening period of Communist rule has left its mark on the national, institutional, and individual psyches of the Czech Republic, the unpopularity of the Communist political system made it easier to reject it when circumstances permitted the re-adoption of democratic values.[5]

In contrast, Russian citizens have yet to fully embrace democracy. Many Russians who were sympathetic to perestroika and who believed Western reformers promising that "all you need is democracy and capitalism and all the problems of the Soviet era will be over" came to the conclusion after trying out democracy and capitalism that their problems were "a hell of a lot worse."[6] The very formula designated to propel them forward came into question by many, and frustration with the outcome of the introduction of democratic forces into their previously ordered society led others to reject the concept outright.[7] The cradle of bolshevism is finding it harder to discard its heritage of collectivism, lack of private initiative, and the expectation that the masses will be cared for by the powerful.[8]

With no significant tradition of democratic government or free market economics and an aversion to Western cultural traditions, Russians' opinion of democracy and capitalism is formed primarily from the impact that the introduction of these institutions has had on their individual lives. There are a few prominent new rich who have benefited from the free market, but a middle class

akin to what has formed in their Central European neighbors has yet to develop. Unemployment has not yet reached the high levels that most analysts agree will inevitably occur when Russian enterprises truly succumb to market demands, but many workers are underemployed and sporadically paid.[9] Organized crime reportedly has infiltrated every aspect of Russian society and is associated by many with the evils of capitalism.[10] Criminals act with impunity without fear of the police or judicial system.[11] According to one U.S. embassy observer, "the average Russian doesn't care what kind of state he lives under. All he knows is that ten years ago a loaf of bread cost a few kopecks and now it is 1,000 rubles. If this is democracy, then who needs it?"[12] An overwhelming majority of Russians believe that reforms have hurt them. For instance, when asked in November 1996 about the most optimal economic system, only 35 percent cited the market, while 42 percent believed that a planned economy was best.[13] Four years after the dissolution of the Soviet Union a plurality of 48 percent condemned even the launching of perestroika.[14] In 1996, over two-thirds of all Russians still believed that the breakup of the Soviet Union was a tragic event.[15]

Western observers agree that the period 1989 through 1991 provided a unique window of opportunity for the embracing of democracy and capitalism, but the system did not deliver any benefits for the absorption of democratic values and individual lives did not improve quickly enough. When asked to name the greatest changes that he observed in Moscow since 1991, Defense Attaché Brigadier General Gary Rubus replied, "First, the initial euphoria about democracy and all things Western followed in short order by the West's failure to make good on its commitments. Second, the retreat from democracy and all things Western."[16]

No Soviet institution has been less receptive to the advent of democratization than the military. Democracy has meant only increased hardship along with the loss of societal and material status and, ultimately, loss of purpose for the Soviet and post-Soviet military.[17] It has led to the breakup of the Soviet empire, which the military was instrumental in achieving, to a state of chaos and multiple ethnic conflicts within the region and the country, and to the perceived meddling in military affairs by civilians. The Russian military attributes its reduced status and rapid decline in readiness directly to the process of democratic transition.[18] Never an agent of social change, the post-Soviet Russian military has lagged behind society in all respects in terms of its adaptation to democratic values and processes. Receptivity to Western assistance in these areas has also been poor.

Similarly, the Czech military institution has also been burdened by the ideological and bureaucratic legacy of the Soviet era as it attempts to transform itself into an institution serving a democratic state. It is turning toward the West with the help of Western allies and by its own will to establish an identity separate from its Communist legacy.

Role of the Military in the Transitioning Cases

Perestroika and its foreign policy counterpart, "new political thinking," resulted in a fundamental shift in the role of the military in the Soviet state that was not immediately obvious. Gorbachev's emphasis on economic reform as the remedy of the Soviet Union's societal ills also meant that the role of military power would decrease. It would no longer be the main instrument of state power. Previously, the idea that the Socialist empire was good prevailed; therefore, the armed forces that acquired and defended the empire were good and represented the most esteemed of societal values.[19] Reminiscing on this era, a member of the Russian Security Council staff remarked, "The whole country worked for the Army to be strong. The mission was to free the United States and all other countries of capitalism. The army made up the prestigious main pillar of this ideological goal and money was given to it without a problem. Maybe the people didn't live very well, but the Army was strong and well-supplied."[20]

There is no such consensus on the role of the military in postcommunist Russia. Indeed, there is a side of the debate that does not see a need for an army, while the opposite view argues that the army should be strengthened, though for what purpose is not altogether clear.[21] Meanwhile, of course, the entire strategic context of maintaining and deploying military forces has changed in the aftermath of the Cold War. The ideological basis of the Soviet armed forces has been scrapped by the political leadership as postcommunist institutions struggle to retool themselves in order to deliver the promises of democratic and capitalist societies.

The USSR ceased to exist, but the Soviet military machine remained with 80 percent of the inheritance flowing to Russia, which inherited only slightly more than half of the Soviet Union's territory and population.[22] Though its role as defender of superpower interests disappeared, massive border changes still left a state that stretches from Europe to Asia. The Russian Federation has significant regional interests that are supported by a wide-ranging security policy. Russian defense policy in the era of independence has been centered on the belief that Russia should fill the security vacuum in Central Asia and exert its influence over the states of the former Soviet Union.[23] The most recent evolution of this doctrine published in connection with a reform plan to significantly restructure the armed forces focuses on the possibility of waging local and regional conflicts or one major war.[24] The loss of superpower status has resulted in a psychological need to build a sense of national identity and strength, and to focus on interests in the Russian "near-abroad"—the former Soviet republics that now surround the Russian Federation as independent states.

The starting point for the creation of the armed forces of the Czech Republic is what remains from its predecessor forces, the Czechoslovak People's Army (CSPA) and the Czechoslovak Army (CSA). While the personnel and

equipment of the ACR are drawn primarily from these previous entities, the whole context of employing defense resources has nevertheless changed dramatically. While Czechoslovakia's neighbors included Ukraine (previously the Soviet Union) and Hungary, the Czech Republic shares borders with four friendly and stable neighbors: Slovakia, Poland, Austria, and Germany. With the division of Czechoslovakia, any threats to internal stability due to the presence of itinerant minorities have also subsided. The democratization of the Czech political system and its continuing transformation to a relatively prosperous market economy mandate that the military's role be rescripted to insure that it supports the overall objectives of the Czech Republic as it cuts its ties to the East and embraces the West.

A point driven home repeatedly in interviews with members of the ACR is that they perceived themselves to be serving in the new armed forces of a new state. A member of the General Staff said that they were in the process of "building an army of the Czech Republic—an entity that has never before existed." He added that both the General Staff and the government understood the importance of presenting the armed forces of the Czech Republic in this new light.[25] In reality, however, much of the structure and mindset of the Soviet era remained in the early years of the ACR and remains today. Another military briefer from the Ministry of Defense (MOD), while recounting the achievements of Czech military reform, stressed how the process of reform was made more complex because both the military and the state had to deal with issues that neither had dealt with before, including the formulation of a military strategy specific to the singular needs of the Czech Republic.[26]

Much of the enthusiasm and optimism sensed earlier in the transition had waned by 1997. Junior officers and cadets still talked about being part of a "new army," but their frustration with senior military leaders and politicians charged with defense oversight was also evident. Junior officers complained that senior officers did not really want to change fundamentally their mode of operating to reflect democratic patterns of leadership. Real change could not be possible until they assumed command positions themselves when senior officers brought up in the Soviet system retired, a process that could take a decade. Meanwhile, by the end of 1998 the government has failed to produce a credible defense concept acceptable to the military and capable of providing adequate guidance for the continued transformation of the ACR. Officers at the unit level were frustrated and paralyzed in their ability to plan for their futures because they lacked adequate guidance from civilian leadership.[27]

The first strategic concept prepared by the military, though never approved by Parliament, reflected the views of Colonel General Karel Pezl, the first Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic. He argued that the security of the Czech Republic depends on its adoption of a comprehensive and integrated concept of defense policy in which the military plays only a part: the defense and protection of the sovereignty and independence of the state and

the safety of all its citizens.[28] The *Military Strategy of the Czech Republic,* however, highlights the Czech reliance on European security structures to ensure its ultimate survival in the face of a superior aggressor. While the goal is to build up a "capability to resist by our own military potential an even stronger enemy," the strategy also states that the Czech Republic will "at the same time seek and use all possibilities of international security structures and prospective allies."[29] This 1993 document was compatible with *The Conception of the Foreign Policy of the Czech Republic* issued in the same year, which stated, "NATO and the WEU are the only realistic alternatives for gaining security guarantees for the Czech Republic . . . full-fledged membership in NATO is the long-term and immutable aim" of the country.[30] Subsequent defense concepts also appeared, including several prepared by the Ministry of Defense, but none were formally approved by Parliament. In 1997, the Defense Ministry submitted a new strategic development plan to replace the 1993 document that expired at the end of 1996; however, by the end of 1998 the "Concept for Developing the Army through the Year 2005" had still not been approved.[31] A National Defense Strategy required to lay the groundwork for a more specific National Military Strategy was only passed by Parliament in March 1997. The four-page document developed by the government was immediately and roundly criticized by both defense experts and the military for being hastily prepared, ambiguous, and unclear.[32] The document, allegedly approved by the government in only five minutes, was produced to satisfy NATO requirements for the existence of National Security Strategy before the convening of the Madrid Summit in June 1997 where formal NATO invitations were issued. According to one expert involved in drawing up the strategy, "It is not so much the content of the document as that fact that it exists which is important."[33] Consequently, in the first five years of its existence the Czech Republic has yet to produce a credible national military strategy, and whatever documents the MOD produced were developed separately from an overarching strategy that conveyed the political guidance of the government. The institutions charged with exerting democratic oversight over the military and formally administering the military institution have worked independently of each other and so have failed either to produce sufficient political guidance or to execute a military strategy that logically flows from it.

In contrast, as Russian military doctrine has evolved in the post-Soviet era it has taken a more unilateral approach to security. The role of the military in the defense of regional threats and local conflicts has been emphasized. Special attention has also been given to the protection of the rights of Russian citizens in the near-abroad.[34] Specifically, the southern periphery remains unstable, especially Tajikistan and potentially Kazakhstan, and Russia will continue to have peacekeeping ambitions in the region.[35] Chechnya will also remain a continuing source of tension.

National priorities include regaining some semblance of great power sta-

tus despite the fact that the collapse of the Soviet Union effectively weakened its successor state's power capacity. Specific priorities include an increased reliance on nuclear weapons in order to compensate for weaknesses in conventional capabilities.[36] Russia perceives that the maintenance of a credible defensive posture is necessary to deter against unacceptable encroachments of its security space through multiple waves of NATO expansion. However, economic and political realities, along with a deepening realization that a serious external threat from another major world power does not exist, has tempered ambitions to retain a Cold War force structure. Indeed, the Russian military is in deep financial, organizational, and ideological crisis, and there is a growing consensus that the greatest threat to Russian security is the failure to carry out reform of the Russian armed forces. "As little as two years may be left to salvage the armed forces before they succumb to one kind of convulsion or another—mutiny, disintegration, regional breakup or some combination of them."[37] The war in Chechnya served to highlight the long list of problems present within the Russian military well before the war broke out.

After seven years of drifting without clear guidance from the Russian state, some first steps are being taken to implement critical reforms. In September 1998 Yeltsin signed the framework document that would serve as the foundation for Russian military reform through the year 2005. The document reemphasizes Russia's continued reliance on nuclear weapons as a deterrent to potential aggressors, focuses conventional capabilities on the suppression of local and regional conflicts, reorganizes the system of national military administrative units, clearly divides functional responsibilities among the various power ministries, outlines priorities for cutbacks and consolidations, and merges the Strategic Rocket Forces with the Air Force.[38]

These varied approaches in postcommunist military doctrine and strategy indicate the differing roles that these post-Soviet era military institutions are assuming in their respective societies. Both states are still struggling to define themselves as independent postcommunist states. The military, which plays a role in this redefinition, also acts as an instrument of the still-to-be-delineated state's interests. The process of becoming aware of their new statehood and identity has been especially difficult for those in uniform. In the case of Russia, many of these servicemen are now serving in non-Russian, sometimes opposition, forces, which are directed against the Russian Federation.

Though the primary role of each military remains constant—the protection of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state—secondary roles remain unclear. In Russia, although military doctrine has become increasingly clearer through the government's endorsement of specific documents, societal consensus on these choices is still missing. Many reject the current focus on local and regional conflicts and the virtual dismissal of the possibility of a major war.[39] The decline in military power is an undisputed fact, but the absorption

of this reality and the consequent societal adjustment has been difficult for the officer corps and the leadership.

Additionally, the universal values of military service and the national priority of army socialization have come under fire in the postcommunist era. The absence of societal consensus on the role of the military in Russia stems from the conflict between reformers, who seek to adapt the Russian military to democratic control and standards of conduct, and conservatives, who do not recognize any need to adapt to the postcommunist realities that have taken root in Russian society. For instance, while the press, the population at large, and various political groups have spoken out against the poor treatment of recruits, policymakers within the defense ministry have turned a deaf ear to these calls for reform. The divisive result leads to further disharmony over the role of the military in post-Soviet Russian society.

There is a greater consensus in the Czech Republic on the overall goals of the state and on the military's role in achieving them. Chief among these is integration into Western European and international institutional structures.[40] The pursuit of NATO membership was driven by the same motivation that drives the policy goals of EU membership or the active support of UN operations: the desire to be regarded as a contributing member of all "Western clubs." President Havel argued that in modern-day Europe no better democratic defense structure than NATO exists and that all European states subscribing to NATO's values should be given the opportunity to enter the alliance, provided they are politically and technically prepared.[41]

This goal affects greatly the overall process of democratization taking place in the country and impacts as well the path of military reform. The military is looking to NATO membership as a much-needed impetus to the government to take the needs of the military seriously.[42] Without the focused attention on NATO standardization and modernization that membership in the alliance requires, officers and defense analysts alike fear a continued neglect of ACR needs that could eventually spiral into its collapse.[43] While many senior officers reluctantly embrace the political ideology that comes with NATO membership, most are in favor of NATO membership for the pragmatic reasons of providing for the security of the Czech Republic and securing financing for the military.[44]

The Czech Legacy of Low Military Prestige

While two roles—defense of the state and support of Czech international prestige—can be cited as the main purposes of the newly defined Army of the Czech Republic, a comprehensive analysis of the role of the military in this particular transitioning case would not be complete without some discussion of the desire of the new Czech state to restore the credibility and prestige of its armed forces.

In his outline of the chief tasks facing the armed forces of the Czech Republic, General Pezl listed immediately beneath the two roles already discussed the goal of the armed forces achieving "the position which it deserves in a democratic society, and to be further integrated into that society."[45] When he served as Minister of Defense, Wilem Holan similarly listed giving "the Army back the honor it deserves" as his tertiary goal behind building it into an effective force and working for integration into NATO.[46]

The yearning of the military for some measure of prestige and recognition from society is a pervasive theme in the Czech military's evolution as an institution serving a democratic state. Convincing the Czech populace that the military has a role in its new state is an additional task confronting the government, one that most states do not have to address. It is an issue that affects every aspect of military reform and civil-military relations and that shapes as well the popular perception of what the military's role in the state should be.

Postcommunist Military Democratization Needs: An Assessment of Democratic Political Control

Having explained the general reorientation of the states and their military institutions to the post–Cold War world, the focus now turns to the specific accomplishments of democratic reform. One main objective of this work is to spell out the specific democratization needs of the transitioning militaries. The goal is to explain the specific components involved in postcommunist armed forces' transitions to democratic political systems. Doing so will enable the assessment of progress along these dimensions and also serve as a means of focusing external assistance efforts aimed at facilitating democratic outcomes among the postcommunist military institutions. This assessment will begin with an analysis of military democratization needs related to the achievement of democratic political control of the armed forces.

In both cases, civilian control of the Soviet era military existed in the form of strict control by the Communist Party, but this was neither democratic nor state control. In the post-Soviet era, respect for civilian authorities and the level of experience of civilians within each MOD is too thin. In Russia the problem is more severe because there is yet to develop a state mechanism for democratic political control over the armed forces.

Constitutional Provisions Required for Democratic Political Control

Enforcement of constitutional provisions for democratic political control of the Russian armed forces is limited by the weakness of the judicial branch, which has yet to institutionalize a legal system to guard against abuses of constitu-

tionally designated authority, and by the general lack of widespread respect for the rule of law within the Soviet system.[47] Judges remain subject to influence from the armed forces in high-profile cases, and the judiciary's independence is further undermined by the government's inability to fully fund its operations, preventing it from acting as an effective counterweight to the other branches of government.[48]

Yeltsin's dissolution of the Russian parliament in September 1993, followed in short order by the deployment of military forces to attack the "White House,"[49] illustrated the fragility of constitutional provisions intended to balance authority among the separate branches of government. Indeed, the December 1993 Constitution concentrated more power in the executive. The U.S. government and most of the American mainstream media framed the October 1993 confrontation as a showdown between the lone democrat and several hundred hard-line Communist villains. But Yeltsin's actions raise serious questions regarding the use of violence to prevail over a parliament (composed partially of members opposed to parliamentary government) that was instituted by elections characterized by the same "fair and free" procedures used to elect him in 1991.[50]

Yeltsin's action stripped that particular parliament of any constitutional authority, but some argue that even with the election of a parliament more pleasing to Yeltsin, the separation of powers as outlined in the present constitution is unbalanced because too much strength is given to the executive.[51] These same critics realize, though, that reaching the consensus that would be necessary to change the Constitution is impossible in the short term.

What has evolved in practice is an executive whose decree power vies with parliament's power to pass its own legislation. Parliament does not have formal powers to limit the decrees issued by the president beyond the constitutional requirement of parliamentary confidence in the government.[52] Some of the balance might be righted by exploiting the powers designated for the legislature, especially budgetary authority. More laws governing the responsibilities of oversight, in particular the process of managing national security policy and foreign policy, are necessary if a balance in democratic political control is to be eventually restored.[53] The parliament's influence in these areas is diminished because they have been directly overseen by the president.[54]

As evidenced in the 1994 Laws on Defense and Peacekeeping[55] and Yeltsin's rejection of the 1997 Draft Law on Defense,[56] which attempted to give the Russian Parliament greater oversight authority over the military,[57] the trend is for the Office of the President to propose legislation that consolidates oversight authority in the executive while rejecting parliamentary measures aimed at dividing responsibility between branches of government.

The Russian legislature also has no control over military promotions. Yeltsin established a commission under the Security Council to act as an hon-

est broker to review the names recommended by the MOD, but the commission is ignored when it recommends against a particular promotion. One such promotion involved a returning commander from Germany accused of all sorts of corruption charges, but his friendship with then Defense Minister Pavel Grachev earned him a promotion. For refusing to approve, the head of the commission was fired.[58] One should keep in mind, however, that the Russian system embodying a strong executive and strong presidential authority is consistent with the Russian preference for centralized rule. Deficiencies in democratic political control arise when responsibility for oversight is not effectively implemented.

In the Czech Republic, postcommunist civil-military reform began by ridding the Constitution of communist clauses and establishing new patterns of control between the military, the executive, Parliament, and the MOD. The Czech Constitution names the president as commander in chief of the armed forces. He is required to secure prime ministerial approval for directing the use of military force and to commission and promote generals;[59] however, this unclear delineation of emergency powers could lead to confusion in a crisis and should be resolved constitutionally.[60] Authority for declaring a state of emergency is given to a state body according to legislation dating from 1949, but there is much discussion whether or not such a body is the proper decision-making vehicle in a democracy.[61] During the 1991 coup in the Soviet Union there was no coordinated effort by the relevant ministries in Czechoslovakia to respond to the crisis because the responsibilities of the various state institutions in a time of crisis were undefined.[62] Even with the passage of the formal National Defense Strategy in 1997 there is still no coordinated process for synchronizing the specific measures of individual ministries in a time of national crisis.[63] However, participation in the NATO defense planning process in preparation for alliance accession in 1999 made it clear to Czech government officials that such a crisis management mechanism is needed.[64] In general, the proper controls are in place in the constitutional sense though some imperfections remain that should be addressed in subsequent legislation.

In Russia, however, democratic political control of the armed forces has proven to be a competitive process among adversarial actors vying for influence. Thus far political crises within the nascent Russian Federation have been characterized by conflict between legislative and executive authorities, partially caused by the executive's ineffective implementation of his more powerful means of control. The action taken by the armed forces in these instances did not reflect constitutional loyalty, but preference for the perceived stronger side.[65] This is a dangerous tendency because the prevalence of democratic or nondemocratic processes may depend on the preferences of military forces.

The effectiveness of constitutional constraints in each case depends on how constitutional institutions implement their authority. For this reason, it is necessary to analyze the relationships between the military and the executive,

the legislature, and the populace to which it is accountable in a democratic society.

The Quality of Executive/MOD Democratic Control

One of the hallmarks of democratic political control in full-fledged democracies is the delegation of overall executive oversight of the military institution to a civilian defense minister. Russia has not appointed a civilian either to the position of defense minister or to any of the deputy minister positions with the exception of one. This key figure, Andrei Kokoshin, was reassigned in 1997 to head the newly created Military Inspectorate, leaving no significant civilian presence in the Russian MOD.[66]

Subsequently, Kokoshin was appointed Secretary of the Defense Council and then Secretary of the Security Council when the two bodies merged in the spring of 1998. Kokoshin has been credited with being the key figure behind the development of the "Basic Principles" document that outlines military reform through 2005.[67] However, he was abruptly fired in the midst of Russia's political turmoil in September 1998. No other figure is as well-liked by the president's staff and the opposition has emerged to spearhead the task of military reform.[68]

In the Czech Republic, however, the ACR and its predecessor the CSA have adjusted to a series of six civilian defense ministers. A priority of the Russian Duma is to have a civilian defense minister,[69] but the military has rejected the idea of creating a civilian Minister of Defense. Legislation was proposed in the 1994–95 time frame calling for the statutory institutionalization of a civilian defense minister. However, this may be no relief to democratic reformers because these proposals also limited the role of the MOD to administrative regulation while vesting the General Staff with operational control of the armed forces. In addition, the General Staff would have been made subordinate to the president effectively removing the armed forces from legislative accountability.[70] The 1998 "Basic Principles" document gives the General Staff the power to coordinate operational and strategic planning.[71]

Currently, civilian control of the military exists purely through Yeltsin's installment of a loyal general to head the Defense Ministry and his control of several independent channels of information about the state of affairs of the Army. Civilian control is not dependent on the performance of the democratic institutions of government, but on Yeltsin's personal control and manipulation of information networks that are directly subordinate to him. One analyst went so far as to define civilian control in Russia as "a monitoring system involving the timely delivery of critical reports to the President, a system guaranteeing that military personnel do not become insubordinate and stage a putsch or some other such outrage."[72]

The staying power in office of the Russian Federation's first Defense Min-

ister, Pavel Grachev, amidst long-term implication in corruption scandals and evidence of gross incompetence, illustrated by his declaration that the war in Chechnya could be won by airborne forces in two hours, sends the message that what matters most of all to President Yeltsin is loyalty—not the quality of leadership or operating efficiency of the armed forces.[73] Grachev was selected on the basis of his political reliability, not his military prowess or expertise.[74] Under Grachev, corruption, embezzlement, and theft flourished luxuriantly in the army, and the word *general* came to be associated with the construction of dachas at the state treasury's expense, using soldiers as slave labor.[75] Grachev was universally despised and criticized by his subordinates,[76] including General Alexander Lebed. It was Lebed's ascension to influence due to his success in the first round of the 1996 presidential election that finally enabled Grachev's ouster as a condition of Lebed's support.[77]

Observers agreed that democratic reform was not possible without changing the leadership at the MOD.[78] Grachev's replacement, General Igor Rodionov, was regarded as an outsider not engaged in corruption, but he was not a great advocate of democratic reforms in general or of radical reform programs in the military in particular.[79] He had served less than a year in his post when Yeltsin sacked him in a public rage orchestrated to blame Rodionov for the lack of progress on military reform. The Russian Ministry of Defense had striven first and foremost to keep cuts to its structure and its budget to a minimum, but Yeltsin failed to provide an environment within which anything less than maintaining the present force structure was acceptable. The president neither set priorities nor provided political guidance to facilitate the process of military reform.[80] In this respect, the sacking of Rodionov was more in the Russian tradition of searching for scapegoats than an accurate designation of accountability. General Igor Sergeyev, former head of the Strategic Rocket Forces, appointed as Rodionov's successor in May 1997, has found himself caught between the same forces that stymied the success of his predecessor—a president who demands deep cuts in the Army's strength and a General Staff stubbornly opposed to their implementation.[81] From July 1997 onward, an attempt at military reform began with major organizational changes. However, a key element of military reform—personnel cuts—has stalled due to insufficient funds to pay separating service members.[82]

In Czechoslovakia, among the first adjustments that the General Staff had to make was to adapt to being a subordinate department to the MOD, led by a civilian. In the Czechoslovak People's Army (CSPA), the Chairman of the General Staff had been on an equal level with other ministries, and the Defense Ministry was run by military officers. This subordination of the General Staff to the MOD has been achieved, but as one American serving as an adviser to the MOD put it, "it doesn't mean that everyone likes it."[83] Officers understand that Czech society is better off with democracy than before, but there is also a general feel-

ing that democrats charged with civilian oversight do not have the experience or interest to perform this task capably.[84]

The first civilian Minister of Defense overseeing the CSA was Lubros Dobrovsky. He succeeded General Miroslav Vacek, who had been implicated in a conspiracy to use the military in counterrevolutionary activity during the critical week of 17–24 November 1989.[85] Dobrovsky brought in other civilians with him, including some who had been expelled in 1968, but he was perceived as a weak Havel-type humanist overwhelmed by the task of dealing with a huge army apparatus that was psychologically still in the old regime.[86] The military responded negatively to him and regarded him as a "civilian telling us what to do."[87]

Dobrovsky eliminated the military counterintelligence service and replaced it with a unit subordinate to him charged with monitoring Army criminal activity. Dobrovsky also took great steps to ease the military's secrecy laws, enabling such information as the size of the military and the budget to be made public.[88] In addition, he appointed his defense adviser, Major General Karl Pezl, an officer dismissed during the Prague Spring of 1968, as Chief of the General Staff to begin the shake-up of personnel there. For several months at the end of 1992, a change in cabinets mandated that a Slovak serve as Defense Minister, and Lt. General Imrich Andrejcak presided as the breakup of Czechoslovakia was effected.[89]

The first Defense Minister of the Czech Republic was Antonin Baudys, a civilian mechanical engineer and university professor with no military experience.[90] In his first week in office Baudys declared that "no major changes have been made in the Army since 1989."[91] He initiated the process of lustration, or the cleansing of Czech society of Communist hard-liners and informers,[92] within the military. However, these large-scale political screenings were marred by their lack of objectivity.[93] In addition, Baudys had no credibility as the overseer of the process because many believed that Baudys himself had been a collaborator in the Communist era.[94]

Deep organizational reforms, including many personnel cuts, took place on Baudys's watch and probably gained him many enemies. He also enthusiastically embraced the goal of NATO membership and encouraged movement toward Western military structures and the reorganization of Czech military structures. However, a series of incidents in 1994, including the discharging of a gun on his official plane while it was in flight, the alleged cover-up of a Czech general caught shoplifting while in Sweden, and the public revelation of his own personal policy toward the conflict in Bosnia, became too much of an embarrassment for his party, which subsequently replaced him.[95]

Wilem Holan took office in September 1994 as the third civilian Czech Defense Minister. With this appointment, President Havel tried to quell once and for all any lingering doubts that a civilian could have the necessary expe-

rience to head the MOD. He argued that it is not important that the Defense Minister be a soldier with the same military expertise of the General Staff. "In all democracies the Defense Minister is more a man to supervise the Army on behalf of the public, to make fundamental decisions concerning army life, to care for the authority of the army and of people's confidence in it. In this sense, I think it is good when a politician heads the Defense Ministry."[96]

Holan was a top official at the Foreign Ministry, giving him a background in diplomacy and an appreciation for the importance of negotiating and of quietly making behind-the-scenes progress. He also focused on not making the same mistakes as his predecessor.[97] Holan listed as his main goals "the completion of the transformation of the Army, improving the efficiency of the armed forces, and taking steps toward the integration of the Czech Republic into NATO."[98] He took over the reins of the MOD when the first round of the ACR's technical reorganization was almost complete and qualitative internal changes such as military education reform and personnel management reform were about to begin.

Miloslav Vyborny, succeeded Holan in the new cabinet appointed as a result of the June 1996 elections. The Christian Democratic Union-Czechoslovak People's Party (KDU-CSL), a minor government party, held on to the defense ministry seat in the four-party coalition government. Holan fell out of favor with his party due to the repeated failure of the MOD to develop a defense strategy that was acceptable to the government.[99] Vyborny, a lawyer and former chairman of the parliamentary legislative and constitutional committee,[100] also tried without success to win governmental approval for a military strategy to guide the ACR's further development through the year 2005.[101] In addition he issued warnings that the Czech armed forces would have to be drastically cut unless funding for the ACR significantly improves.[102] However, his plan to cut Army personnel below the 65,000 mark met great resistance within the General Staff and was rejected by Prime Minister Vaclav Klaus.[103]

The June 1998 elections replaced the caretaker government led by Josef Tosovsky and installed the Czech Republic's first leftist government. The Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD) formed a minority government after winning the largest number of seats, but is dependent on the support of Klaus's party, the Civic Democratic Party (ODS). Many believe that the tenuous marriage of the right wing Civic Democrats and left wing Social Democrats will be short-lived.[104] The CSSD gained the defense ministry and named Vladimir Vetchy, a former professor at the Military Academy in Brno, Defense Minister. Vetchy has identified the lack of national legislation,[105] personnel issues, and quality of life programs as the ACR's most burning problems.[106]

Democratic deficits persist across both the Czech and Russian armed forces, although the deficits are more severe in Russia and are pervasive throughout the government. In Russia, secrecy is still the norm. Decrees are

signed but not published, and decision making is shrouded in rumor.[107] The post-Soviet government has proved as adept as its predecessor in hiding military expenditures in civilian portions of the budget.[108] Some complain that specific budget data were more readily available in the late 1980s than they are today.[109] The informational iron curtain made possible such tragedies as draftees dying of emaciation on Russkiy Island and the October 1994 murder of journalist Dmitriy Kholodov, who was investigating corruption within the MOD.[110] Misinformation and a lack of information were also obvious during the war in the Chechen republic. It was often impossible for families to find out about servicemen who had been killed or injured.[111]

U.S. defense attachés in Moscow report that the transparency of military capability is still low and that readiness is still an issue internal to the MOD. Furthermore, external inspections of military forces by oversight bodies has not occurred.[112] Speculation prevails that it is possible for local commanders to hide low levels of training and other unprofessional behaviors from their superiors.[113] A new extradepartmental State Military Inspectorate was formed in August 1997 with the capacity to oversee all the power-wielding departments,[114] but this body was assimilated into the Security Council in May 1998.

Poor transparency within the MOD also makes it impossible to exert control over the ministry. One particularly egregious transgression was the failure of President Yeltsin to halt the bombing of Grozny when he ordered the shellings to cease on 27 December 1994.[115] Yeltsin's impotence as commander in chief fueled speculation that a group known as "the party of war" was dictating policy in the Chechen operation according to the preferences of the chiefs of the power ministries.[116] This incident raised serious questions about the loyalty of the military to Yeltsin—the very objective that he had been so resolute in pursuing. Some regard the Defense Ministry as a pyramid of purely military staffs and administrations whose inner workings are hidden from the public and beyond the control of the political leadership.[117]

In the Czech Republic, overall transparency between oversight bodies and the MOD is good. But discomfort with civilians in oversight positions contributes to the lack of coordination and information sharing between the parliament, MOD, and the military. Officers in the field complain of the frequent receipt of conflicting guidance from the General Staff and the MOD due to the absence of coordination between these bodies.[118]

A 1995 anecdote illustrates this complaint well. A senior officer designated as the leader in the creation of a personnel management reform proposal within the General Staff expressed his frustration at not being allowed to brief his proposals in person to the appropriate people within the MOD. Instead of *presenting* his plan, he was required to *send* it through the mail. This indignity prompted him to say, "We're clerks, not leaders." Once his proposals are received, he added, he is not sure what *they* do with them. "Do they use them to

plot against me? Do they present these materials as their own? What information is ultimately presented to the people at the top?" He was frustrated that someone in his position does not have the answer to such questions.[119] These divisions within and between the General Staff and the MOD have been allowed to persist, resulting in stalled reform efforts and generating criticism from Parliament that the ACR is not forthcoming with reform proposals.

There is also a need for consensus among civilian and military Defense Ministry personnel about how duties should be divided between them. A military officer complained while briefing a group of visiting American air force colonels on the development of Czech military strategy that much of the political wording of the document was done by the military because the civilian "politicians" did not understand that this was their role.[120] While such a statement gives a less than favorable insight into the state of civilian oversight, it also indicates a certain lack of sophistication on the part of the military through its open criticism of these abilities in a public gathering of American and Czech officers. The same charges of poor interagency coordination on defense issues continue to be levied by the American Assistant Secretary of Defense responsible for monitoring Czech progress on NATO interoperability issues.[121]

A democratic deficit characteristic of the Russian military is the inability of the MOD and the government to control the behavior of publicly disobedient officers. Chief among these is the former 14th Army Commander, General Aleksandr Lebed, who openly criticized both the Russian Defense Minister and President, describing the latter publicly as "useless."[122] Lebed resisted a series of attempts by Grachev to remove him from command of the 14th Army and eventually rendered his resignation after Grachev issued an order in April 1995 disbanding the 14th Army's command structure. Lebed argued that his removal and the reduction of forces in the region could result in the loss of the Army's control of weapons in the volatile region.[123] Regardless of the truth contained in Lebed's objections to MOD policy, his long history of public disobedience was indicative of the MOD's inability to control its own officers. Numerous other officers refused to carry out orders or to accept commands in the Chechen conflict and went unpunished.[124]

Charges of corruption also plagued both MODs, but corruption charges persist and have gone unaddressed in the Russian case. Under the Soviet system ministries controlled vast areas and their resources. Officers with access to military property have been selling it for personal gain. As much as $65 million may have been pocketed by Russian generals in such endeavors.[125] The transition to a market economy and the sale of military assets within a generally unregulated environment has created conditions for rampant corruption. Indeed, a major rise in Russian mafia activity is attributed to the crime rings set up by officers in Germany selling off Russian military assets and ferrying stolen German cars to Russia after the fall of the Berlin Wall.[126] U.S. Naval attachés

reported corruption involving ship scrapping activities and naval officers who benefit from such sales. Few of the MOD assets sold off in recent years have found their way back to the national treasury.[127] Indeed, Defense Minister Grachev's dismissal was attributed to a showdown between the haves and have-nots within the military—those who profited hugely from the theft of state property and those who did not. Grachev, himself, was implicated in the misappropriation of at least $5 million by his brother-in-law, a top MOD general,[128] as well as in numerous other opportunities for self-enrichment.

However, the abuse of power within the power structure of postcommunist Russia permeates every aspect of the new nomenklatura so that corruption within a specific ministry, such as the defense ministry, doesn't particularly stand out and has come to be expected by the population.[129] "The old warriors have reappeared with their old customs and traditions. They have their own views of how power should work."[130]

Another underutilized tool for defense oversight in the Russian Office of the Presidency is the Security Council. This body first appeared in the waning years of the Soviet Union, was carried over into the Russian Government, and was enshrined in the new constitution.[131] The main problem with the Security Council as originally conceived was that it defined security so broadly that its responsibilities ranged from management of the economy to environmental and health issues to military affairs. A member of the Security Council staff explained that "before Chechnya the military problem was number ten of ten." The economy was the number one priority and "the military task was our basement of priorities."[132]

Given the broad agenda of the Security Council, one can conclude that it in no way served as a specialized body of national security expertise akin to the U.S. National Security Council. In fact, some accused the Security Council of being sort of a postcommunist Politburo with the only democratic difference being that the Security Council was authorized under the Constitution.[133] Members of the Security Council, however, did not seem particularly concerned that their sphere of responsibilities was too large. Even in the midst of the Chechen War one of the Council's staff remarked, "Our number one priority is still economics. If we decide this question we decide everything." He went on to add that ecology and health are also prime concerns due to the declining birth rate. "Russia is slowly dying."[134] These may certainly be Russia's most pressing problems, but to solve them through the offices of the Security Council meant that more narrowly defined security issues such as the conduct of war and the reorganization of the armed forces continued to receive scant attention.

The Security Council's authority was diluted further by the establishment of parallel bodies. For instance, the Defense Council was established in the wake of the 1996 election to serve as a counterweight to the Security Council headed by Alexander Lebed.[135] It was given the mandate to coordinate the mil-

itary reform effort. In addition another commission was created to oversee the funding of the security ministries and agencies, including the Defense Ministry.[136] This commission also excluded Lebed, who later resigned from the government. In March 1998, the Defense Council was abolished and the State Military Inspectorate was combined with the Security Council to form a new Security Council. This move strengthened the Security Council as it became the only body between the President and the power ministries.[137]

The appointment of civilian Defense Ministers does not ensure effective civilian control. The depth of the civilianization of the MOD depends on the ability of lower-ranking civilians to influence the defense structure as well. In the Czech Republic, civilian defense officials have been challenged by their lack of military knowledge, which seriously limits their influence in the policy-making process[138] and their credibility with military officers.

The Czech Republic nevertheless is progressively giving civilians responsibility for oversight functions with the MOD. Some estimates indicate that 40 percent of the MOD posts were manned by civilians in 1996,[139] many of whom were retired military officers. Civilians working within the Czech defense ministry, however, are often not sufficiently trained in military subjects to perform adequate oversight.[140] As of yet, the perceived and real lack of civilian expertise is not being sufficiently addressed with appropriate education and training programs. The social stigma of being associated with the military—even as a civilian—also affects the ability of the MOD to recruit young professionals to join its ranks.[141]

Other problems include the general aversion of the military to civilian "intruders" and the unfamiliarity of civilian and military collaboration. The continued state of underfunding of the military has led many officers to conclude that their civilian oversight is incompetent and even negligent. These concerns were made public in late 1996 when 338 of the Air Force's 540 pilots signed a letter sent to President Havel and the parliamentary Defense and Security Committee highlighting the Air Force's desperate state in the wake of three jet crashes in November 1996.[142] The pilots complained about obsolete equipment, limited flying hours, poor public relations, and inadequate personnel policies. They also lamented the lack of any government-provided life insurance to compensate for the risk of their duty.[143] Referring to the link between chronic underfunding and the fatal crashes, the pilots argued that "recent developments might arouse the impression that this is a deliberate elimination of the Czech air force."[144]

As previously noted, a better consensus must be reached regarding division and coordination of civilian and military duties. But overall, while some democratic deficits remain, much progress has been made in gaining democratic political control through the Defense Minister, who is accountable to the Prime Minister. During the period of democratic transition, MOD and General

Staff responsibilities have begun to be more clearly spelled out and the skills of civilian oversight developed and respected. On-site Western military observers contend that civilian oversight is evident, but an overall pervasive lack of civilian expertise in the MOD limits its effectiveness.

In Russia, however, reaction to the goal of achieving democratic political control directed by civilian leadership has been overwhelmingly negative and appears to be worsening. Sergey Rogov observed that "the MOD and other 'muscle' agencies are practically no longer subordinated to the government."[145] This is a serious deficiency of democratic political control since the only real authority for oversight falls to the executive and those accountable to him. Secrecy still reigns, and corruption continues only slightly abated by the ouster of Grachev and several of his cronies. The lack of a single advisory council focused on addressing military affairs and security issues compounds the problem. Additionally, the weakness of the legislative input to the process of democratic political control of the armed forces means it is unable to counterbalance the situation in a positive way.

The Quality of Parliamentary Control

In both cases parliamentary control is still developing and exists primarily in budgetary control. Again, effective parliamentary control is more critical in the Czech case, since its parliamentary system vests most of the authority for democratic control of the military in the parliament. In the Russian case, the small authority vested in the parliament relative to the executive will be examined to see how effective this dimension of oversight is.

In comparison to the Communist era, there is a significant increase in parliamentary authority because the Soviet era legislatures routinely approved budgets without even reading the budgetary document.[146] Additionally, in both cases oversight quality is poor due to the lack of civilian expertise in defense issues. Each postcommunist military has also been slow in adjusting to the fact that it is just one of many elements participating in the democratic process and lobbying for resources.

In the Czech Republic, the MOD prepares and presents the defense budget to the Defense and Security Committee in Parliament, which can either modify the proposed budget or reject it. The first detailed budget appeared in 1993–94, giving a significant boost to defense oversight. However, observers complain that Parliament has virtually no control over individual budget line items. Vladimir Suman, while serving as head of the parliamentary Defense and Security committee, complained that "the defense budget process isn't clear enough to know where the money is going. When they finally bring in better accounting techniques, we'd be willing to raise the defense budget. But we want to know how the money is being spent."[147] Even though a modern defense bud-

geting system used by NATO countries was introduced in early 1993,[148] the MOD has hardly utilized this planning resource.[149] As a result, the Defense Minister defends his proposed budget before members of parliament without sufficient justification. Parliamentarians who have neglected to identify specific risks are also at fault.[150] Meanwhile, the military complains that individuals with little substantive knowledge of military issues are driving the budgeting process. Consequently, effective parliamentary control is still missing, and the military feels left out of the process.

In contrast, budgetary control of the Russian Duma is much weaker. Executive control over writing the budget, the lack of transparency regarding budget items, and executive control over all off-budget expenditures has shifted control of financial policy from the parliament to the executive.[151] Specifically, the Ministry of Finance plays a key role in the disbursement of appropriations to the military and has been the primary agency resisting further declassification of the defense budget.[152] Only a relatively few line items are made known to lawmakers. "Any talk of reform is meaningless as long as the MOD's budget request fits onto one page."[153] For example, the proposal for the 1996 defense budget included only nine vaguely described line items or articles. These were broken down into categories such as: Maintenance and Operations, Procurement, Research and Development, Liquidation of Weapons, and Conversion. However, there was no separate line item for personnel costs. This is remarkable since the material state of personnel is the most dire condition of the Russian military.

Some strides toward greater budgetary transparency were made with the passing of the Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Law on Budget Classification, which called for the budget declassification of 120 line items in the 1997 defense budget.[154] The classified addendum contained another 1,000 items. As a point of comparison the U.S. military budget contains 3,000 to 4,000 declassified line items.[155] As the budget is presented it is impossible for a Duma deputy to know very much about how the appropriations will actually be allocated; therefore, there is little control over actual policy. Proposed spending also is not justified against specific threats.[156] In addition, accusations are rampant regarding the mismanagement of Defense Ministry funds. For instance, the State Comptroller has complained that the number of receipts from the sale of military property is unjustifiably low.[157] The MOD is also unable to account for large amounts of scrapped precious metals.[158] 1998 marked the first time that the defense budget was openly published and made available to Russian citizens.[159] However, actual spending depends on whether or not the government can actually raise the revenue to find the budget items. The chronic Russian economic crisis has meant that the military has consistently received significantly less revenue than the expenditures programmed in the budget document.

Finally, weak civilian control over the other power ministries' extramilitary organizations, which garner a portion of the national budget equal to that allotted in the defense budget, compounds the problem of achieving democratic political control over all of the armed forces. As a result, a system of behind-the-scenes distribution of revenues received and of funds allocated across the defense order is preserved.[160]

Overall oversight ability is limited in both cases by lack of civilian expertise in defense issues. In the Czech Republic, Western military observers agree that Parliament has succeeded in achieving a basic level of control, but that it still does not have the sophistication necessary for comprehensive oversight. The results of the June 1996 elections were mixed with regard to defense policy expertise within parliament. On the positive side, some parliamentarians who had gained experience with defense issues moved into positions of general importance. Former Defense Minister Wilem Holan became chairman of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee and First Deputy Defense Minister Petr Necas became chairman of the parliamentary Defense and Security Committee.[161] However, on the negative side only three of the twenty Defense and Security Committee members were retained from the previous parliament. This meant that the lion's share of expertise built up on this committee was lost.[162]

Although the Social Democrats (CSSD) displaced the Civic Democratic Party (ODS) in the June 1998 elections, the preference among party leaders has been for continuity of committee leadership.[163] Michael Zantovsky (KDU-CSL) remained as chair of the Senate Committee for Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Security while Petr Necas (ODS) held on to his post as head of the Chamber of Deputies Defense and Security Committee. However, the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Chamber of Deputies has a new leader, Lubomir Zaoralek, a Social Democrat, who displaced Wilem Holan (KDU-CSL).

There are several explanations for the deficient civilian skill level in the Czech Republic. One is that the split of Czechoslovakia affected the overall skill level of all parliamentarians, since the best politicians at the time were in the upper house (Senate), which was not reinstituted until November 1996. Many of the new deputies entered the lower house practically "from the streets," with little education.[164] Another explanation, provided by the Secretary of the Defense and Security Committee, is that no committee members have expertise in defense matters because "it was undesirable that such persons should be elected or work in Parliament." Such individuals would be associated with the old Communist regime.[165] Additionally, the low priority of defense matters on Parliament's agenda results in the failure of the party elites to serve on the Defense and Security Committee.

Because of the military's monopolization of defense matters in the Soviet era, Russian Duma deputies charged with parliamentary oversight are also ham-

pered by a lack of expertise. A shortage of adequately trained staff available to support the parliamentary defense committees exacerbates the problem. In the Czech Republic, the only staff assigned specifically to the Defense and Security Committee is the Secretary, who performs mostly organizational and administrative work for the Committee. The Secretary said that he tries to be an informed adviser for Committee members as well, but that this is difficult because Committee members sometimes withhold information from him. Upon further probing he admitted that there were no legal obstacles blocking disclosure of information to him, but that this practice had developed in reality.[166]

The lack of staff and methods of analyzing complex budget data mean that decisions are often made on political grounds. For example, in the debate in early 1995 over whether or not to buy new Czech L-159 fighter jets or to modernize the MiG-21s already in the inventory, it was difficult for Parliament to do an accurate cost comparison to see if one solution was more affordable than another. Without the resources to crunch these numbers, budgetary oversight in this matter was driven purely by political factors.[167]

In Russia, deputies have staffers, but they receive no formal training on how to work in either their regional or Moscow offices. The size of a deputy's staff also varies because the government will allow each deputy to have either five staffers who are each paid a small salary, one staffer who is paid five salaries, or any variation in between. It is also not uncommon for one staffer to work for more than one member of Parliament. A former staff member of the Duma Defense Committee remarked that teamwork among the staffs of different deputies is not an understandable concept. She added that committees have little communication with each other, making it difficult to know what is happening in other committees.[168] Consequently, deputies are limited in their ability to forge common strategies on legislation or to form alliances between parties with similar interests.

Additionally, the combination of lack of confidence in defense committees' oversight authority and their timidity toward the MOD affects the degree of oversight that is rightfully in parliamentary purview. For instance, in the Czech case, when asked whether or not the Committee has a role in military personnel matters such as the size of the armed forces, pay and conditions, housing, and education, or in the organization of the MOD, or in the deployment of troops abroad, the Secretary responded that members of parliament (MPs) and the Committee voice their opinions on all these issues but these problems are exclusively under the authority of the Defense Secretary. He added, however, that the approval of Parliament is required to dispatch armed forces abroad.[169] The ACR has been reasonable about asking for money and has accepted and implemented vast reductions in troop levels, the General Staff, and the MOD.[170]

In Russia, "some in the Duma say the military doesn't want to be con-

trolled, but the Duma doesn't use the power it has to control the budget. They talk blindly about various amounts—forty trillion rubles or sixty trillion rubles. But no one speaks in terms of concrete problems or priorities. To have control means having the responsibility to solve problems. Nobody really wants that control."[171] The same is true of the power to influence the course of military reform. "They can do it if they choose to fund one program over another. But the deputies escape from this."[172] Instead a standoff between the Parliament and the MOD has been the norm with the MOD claiming that reform is not possible without the allocation of more rubles. In contrast, as previously noted, the ACR's requests and implementation have been much more realistic.[173]

A former staff member of the Duma Defense Committee remarked about the post–December 1993 parliament, "This Duma was more about agreement with them [the military]."[174] She added that even the most obvious of reforms were avoided. "My deputy tried to pass a Law on Realization and Utilization of Military Production which would have regulated the sales of excess military equipment. The impetus of this law was the sale of tanks and scrap metal from Germany by the military with no controls over where the money went. The bill passed on the first reading but the military stopped the law on the second reading. So the situation remains that what is bought new comes out of the federal budget and what is old is kept by the military."[175] Sergey Rogov added, "Moreover, it looks as if they remember well how the previous conflict between the executive and legislative branches ended, and so they do not want to turn a deaf ear to the military's requests."[176]

Parliamentary oversight is made more difficult by the inability to forge a comfortable working relationship between it and the military. The American attaché in Prague explained that the Czech military does not have much of a direct relationship with the Parliament, and this is compounded by communication problems within the military. "In general, the General Staff and the Parliament could both use a course on diplomacy."[177]

He elaborated further with an anecdote. General Jiri Nekvasil, Chief of the General Staff, insisted on briefing the Parliament himself, and Vladimir Suman, while Chair of the Defense and Security Committee, had to accept the general's briefings. At times, the personality conflict between the two eliminated the possibility of such testimony. Parliament preferred to make up its mind with limited information rather than have personal interaction with people they did not like. Indeed, the first time that General Nekvasil met the Chair of the Parliament was when he escorted the American Vice Chairman of the JCS, Admiral William Owens, on the occasion of the U.S. Admiral's speech before the body.[178]

In the Czech case, all contacts between the military and the Parliament are controlled through the MOD. An officer on the General Staff responsible for reforming the personnel department complained that the only time he has been able to talk with a member of the Committee has been at a course arranged by

the United States, which was jointly attended by people from the General Staff, the MOD, and Parliament. At one of these meetings some MPs offered to meet with him directly, although such interaction is not allowed without approval from the MOD.[179]

In Russia the inability of the MOD to control the activities of all of its officers and the direct participation in politics by some officers makes it impossible to regulate the interaction of all officers and Parliament. But the relationship between the MOD and Parliament has been generally conflictual and the military is more motivated to answer to the President than to answer to Parliament.[180] Grachev's attitude was that the legislature could pass all the laws it wanted, but if they conflicted with any of Yeltsin's decrees, he did not follow them. Grachev repeatedly waffled on whether or not he would support the Constitution or the President if the two had come into conflict again.[181]

There are some signs, however, that the legislative role may be increasing somewhat. In the fall 1994 session the Duma showed some willingness to ask questions and called in generals to testify at hearings. At the same time, the military is becoming more attuned to the fact that the legislature approves its funds and that it is in the military's best interests to defend its requests. Cooperative behavior on the part of the generals has led to some spending increases on their own behalf. Generals from the MOD, however, still insist on testifying before closed committees.[182]

Meanwhile, other interest groups are also seeking allies in the Duma to achieve their specific defense-related goals. The most significant of these is the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers formed in 1988 in response to the increased number of deaths from hazing and other forms of mistreatment in military service. In early 1995 the Duma Committee on Health held hearings and required MOD officials to respond to the allegations of the Mothers' Committee. However, no significant change in policy seems to have arisen from this process.[183]

The parliaments' abilities to access information from other government departments differ significantly between the cases. The Czech Parliament has much more access to defense information than the Russian Duma. In the Czech Parliament, MPs can ask for information from any ministry, and it must be provided even if it is classified.[184] Additionally, the defense acquisitions process is regulated in the Czech Republic as a result of a law passed in 1995 that makes the bidding process more open, or transparent, by limiting the inappropriate influence of political parties and government officials. However, observers say the Czech Republic still falls short of practices that ensure that it gets the best product for the best price, although these changes have left less room for corruption.[185] Irregularities in the acquisition process still persist, and transparency is not uniform. Several pending acquisitions have been canceled due to the MOD's inability to prove that it followed the procedures laid down in the legislation.[186]

In November 1996, the Senate, or upper chamber of Parliament, was seated in the Czech Republic. Although the Czech Constitution made provisions for a Senate four years earlier, the procedures for its implementation could not be worked out until 1996. As of this writing it remains to be seen what influence the Senate will wield in Parliamentary oversight of the military. It is significant to note, however, that it has no power for budgetary oversight and that its intent is to serve mainly as a legislative filter for poor decisions made by the lower chamber, or the Chamber of Deputies.[187] The Senate may propose laws, amend those that the Chamber of Deputies refers to it, and reject laws sent to it by the lower chamber, although such a law may ultimately be approved if the Chamber of Deputies approves it on the second reading.[188] Unlike the Chamber of Deputies, the Senate has one combined committee with responsibility for foreign policy, defense, and security. The current Chairman of the Senate Committee for Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Security, Michael Zantovsky, who is a former Czech Ambassador to the United States, in his brief tenure has been an outspoken critic of the MOD.[189] The Senator lashed out at Defense Minister Vyborny for his slow implementation of NATO accession tasks, for an alleged conflict of interest in the sale of military equipment, and for his inability to carry out personnel reductions.

The inability to address severe problems within the ACR has led to serious morale problems in the ACR. Officers long for a "career concept" that will correct the inverted pyramid of the rank-heavy officer corps and outline the potential for advancement of younger officers. Military education reform has been discussed since 1994, and it is at the top of Defense Minister Vetchy's agenda in the new Zeman government, but no legislation has addressed it. Prime Minister Klaus, whose Civic Democratic Party governed the Czech Republic for most of its transition, was perceived to be focused almost exclusively on economic matters.[190] Long-term investments in the Czech military were avoided, and many politicians took the view that the military was a nuisance "that eats money."[191] Indeed, Prime Minister Klaus's almost total disinterest in defense matters left Havel's presidential authority in military affairs unchallenged.[192]

As a result, the military leadership has filled the oversight vacuum with its own policies and priorities. Alternatively, many areas simply go unattended for long periods of time. For instance, there has been a shortage of military family housing in the areas near Czech bases since the base realignment process began in the early 1990s. Many officers have been commuting for years between their bases and their families on weekends because legislation releasing funds to correct the housing shortage has never been passed. As such problems continue, morale inevitably falls, and officers begin to wonder about the competence and concern of their civilian overseers.

The Western democracies could place a greater emphasis on developing civilian expertise in the Czech Republic through Partnership for Peace outreach

efforts. The current approach focuses on training military personnel to meet NATO standards, while civilian defense officials have few opportunities to participate in such programs. Nevertheless, this could help Czech society achieve democratic political control of the armed forces.[193] Continued civilian incompetence in military affairs will only exacerbate the gap between the civilian and military sectors of Czech society.[194]

Parliamentary control in Russia is at the stage of development where it is possible to lodge complaints and conduct inquiries, but the body being investigated does not really have to respond in a substantive way. Many observers regard the Parliament as largely irrelevant to the political process as a whole, and in a country that is largely being run by presidential decree, many allege that the Parliament is little more than a national debating club. This is especially true in the national security arena. Parliament was not consulted about the decision to use force in Chechnya[195] and does not have the designated authority to confirm the Minister of Defense.

An analysis of the Czech and Russian cases indicates that weak budgetary control, lack of expertise on defense issues, insufficient confidence concerning oversight authority, limited political will to influence the defense process, poor relationships between the MOD and Parliament, and inadequate openness in the defense structures characterize the struggle to achieve democratic accountability over military institutions. While much has been learned by both civilians and military personnel, much remains to be done.

Relationship of the Military to Society

Another strained relationship crucial to the legitimacy and support of a military institution in a democratic state is the bond between society and the armed forces that protect it. In democratic states it is essential that tensions between society and the military remain low and that the military be perceived as the protector of the state's democratic values and ultimately as the territorial defender of the cradle of those values—the sovereign state itself. The attitude of the society is shaped by such factors as the congruence of military and societal values, the historical role of the military in the state, and the prevalence of outside threats. These factors strain the relationship of postcommunist armed forces with their societies. In the Russian case, the relationship has become characterized by an increasingly poor perception of the military institution while the Czechs face the challenge of improving a historically poor relationship.

Russia

In the Soviet era "the Army and the people were one. The military filled all victories and the disappointments of society."[196] But glasnost coincided with mil-

itary failure in Afghanistan followed in short order by the domestic use of military forces in Tblisi, Baku, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Vilnius in the waning days of the Soviet Union. Increasingly objective press scrutiny, which began in the Afghan War, combined with a series of unpopular military missions to spur the downward spiral of respect that culminated in the war in Chechnya. A brief look at present day Russian civil-military relations through the lens of the Chechen War will reveal some valuable insights into the Russian military's potential to defend democratic values within the transitioning state.

The impact of the events in Chechnya on relations between the military and the population at large in Russia are varied and differ depending on the point of view of observers. On-site American personnel who analyzed the conflict from the U.S. embassy regarded the war as a huge mistake that revealed the superficiality of the progress of democracy in Russia. As one U.S. army attaché put it, "What civilized country would do this to its own people and then declare that it's a humane country because it rebuilt the destroyed cities and villages?"[197] Observers from this school of thought argue that the war in Chechnya set back democracy in Russia significantly.[198] The events in Chechnya boded poorly for the government's commitment to democratic principles such as the protection of civil liberties and individual human rights and consultation among democratic institutions before committing armed forces.

The absence of such democratic processes resulted in critical public discourse in the press. Questions were also raised about the potential of the government to deal with the real problems of the country given that so much of its limited financial resources was expended in the war. Some Russian citizens asked, "If we had the money to spend in Chechnya, then why didn't we have it to address some of our pressing social needs?"[199] Among these social needs is improving the living standards of the officer corps. With half of the year's military budget having been spent on the war, no strides were made in improving the salaries and living conditions of the officer corps during the war or its immediate aftermath.

The Russian people overall, though, did not initially protest the need to intervene in Chechnya. There is evidence of some disappointment over the decision-making process leading up to the commitment of forces, but, by and large, the Russian people accepted the initial rationalization of the intervention presented by the government. This is interesting because the case for intervention was presented so poorly.

Indeed, in an interview with a Security Council staff member, it was explained to me how Russia in the post–Cold War era was dedicated to relying more on its instruments of political and economic power with the use of force being a last resort. But when I asked him to apply this logic to Chechnya he said that this was a unique case and went on to lecture me how Russians living there had been oppressed for the past three and a half years, but the government was reluctant to intervene for fear of making the oppression worse.[200] Somehow,

then, it was logical to start a war in which many of these Russian citizens that the government was trying to protect would be killed along with many Chechen civilians, who were also citizens of the Russian Federation, and thousands of servicemen, many of them teenage conscripts. Generally, though, the Russian population accepted the government's argument about the need for some military action. No doubt their cultural predisposition to scapegoat minorities for internal problems and their specific historical regard for Chechens as a criminal race figured into their calculations.[201]

However, as the war progressed and the Russian military's disastrous performance became evident, popular unrest grew. Democrats and human rights activists opposed the war on legal and moral grounds. Nationalists spoke out against the killing of Russian civilians. The Army resisted the war due to the extraordinary toll it had taken on men and equipment, morale, and its public image.[202] A primary cause of the rift between the population and the government in the war was the decision to use virtually untrained conscripts in combat. When the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers organized a protest in Red Square in March 1995, their main complaint was not that the war was unjust or that the intervention should not have taken place, but that the military was sending untrained conscripts into combat.[203] The women escalated their protest of military policy with an attempted march on Grozny in early April to demonstrate for an end to the war and to plead for the release of their sons held as prisoners.[204] Some mothers even pulled their sons, including officers, from the ranks and took them home.[205]

Management of the crisis indicated a mentality at the top of the decision-making apparatus that "people should accept what we say without question. Moscow should decide all problems because there are wise people there." Even democrats take the view that once they come to power they can decide what is best for the country with little or nor further consultation with those who elected them.[206] The decision to launch the Chechen War revealed a return to Soviet era predemocratic practices evidenced by the complete ignorance of public opinion and democratic structures.[207]

However, the unflappable grit of the press in its coverage of the war ensured that Chechnya would go down in history as the first publicly reported and open to the press military operation. Television coverage enabled people to see the negative impact of government policy for the first time and to draw their own conclusions about the wisdom of their leaders who promulgated such an ill-founded policy.[208] The influence of the press as an instrument of accountability to the people increased as its efforts to expose corruption and report objectively from Chechnya continued unabated. With Chechnya, the greatest level of criticism ever was found in the press. Media coverage that splashed uncensored scenes of gore and suffering helped to shape public opinion against the war.[209] This occurred despite the fact, according to the Russian human rights

commissioner, Sergei Kovalyov, that the Russian government made its best effort to generate lies through its propaganda machine in order to control the news from Chechnya.[210] But the accurate accounts reported in many newspapers and in news broadcasts "shredded the official fabrications"[211] and by the midpoint of the war reporters agreed that the military had become more accepting of the press's role and lifted the policy of harassment that characterized the relationship of the press and the military at the onset of the conflict.[212]

The war in Chechnya also marked the first time that the population refused to accept passively the implementation of forces in a conflict. In the previous use of force in a questionable theater, such as in Ingushetia, the population remained silent. This earlier silence may have been attributed to the smaller scale of earlier operations. But, in Chechnya, many for the first time began to ask, "Why?" In a joint press conference with the Chair of the State Duma Committee for Defense in September 1995 the Press Secretary of the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers declared that if the will of the people was not heard an active campaign to frustrate all subsequent call-ups for military service would begin.[213] One Russian analyst predicted that the social conflict between the Army and civilians paralleled the U.S. student movement in the 1960s. "In Russia, though, these tensions may be more dangerous."[214]

The general effect of the war in Chechnya on the relationship of the postcommunist Russian military with society at large was to expose the inadequacies of the Army and to illustrate the expectations for accountability and the protection of civil liberties and human rights that the infusion of democratic values into Russian society has prompted. The result was public outrage.[215] The poor performance of the military highlighted the need for radical reform. The problem is that military reform will not be effective unless it is driven from the top, but the necessary personnel cuts and industrial closures have not been embraced by either Parliament or the military.

The people were able to separate their negative feelings about the military leadership, which came off as extremely incompetent in the execution of the war, from their feelings of sympathy toward the soldiers who were fighting. As a reporter from the military newspaper *Red Star (Krasnaya Zvezda)* put it, "The soldiers and officers fighting are like some kind of super-heroes. Many of them have fought in earlier hot spots such as Ingushetia and Tajikistan and they continue to follow orders despite the lack of virtually any material incentives. All this hard work and for what?"[216] The respect for the post-Soviet fighting man endures among the population, but so does the realization that the military leadership is incompetent and incapable of reforming itself.

So where does all this leave the state of civil-military relations and, in particular, the state of democratic political control in Russia as a result of Chechnya? First, the moral authority of the government was severely damaged if not lost.[217] This chapter has presented evidence that democratic control seems to

have weakened with the lack of parliamentary consultation, poor preparation of the population for the intervention, and the somewhat widespread disobedience of orders by military personnel and local officials who refused to send troops to Chechnya. Some elements of the civil society, though, seem to have been emboldened, including the press in the forefront and the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers, whose increased politicization and effectiveness helped to shape public opinion against the war. More significant, though, are the sustained political apathy of most of the population over the matter, the reluctance of the Parliament to use its authority vis-à-vis the military, and, of course, the reluctance of the military itself to face its own reform and requisite reorganization.

The Czech Republic

Both external and internal observers agree that the last time Czechs believed in their armed forces was during the Thirty Years War of 1618–48. Many also associate this date with the last time the Czech Army put up a fight.[218] The aversion of Czech society to anyone in uniform dates to their participation in the Austrian Empire from 1620 through 1918. In this era of the militarized empire all important Austrians wore uniforms. Since the Czechs were not regarded as one of the leading groups in society they did not hold important positions. Hence they tended not to wear uniforms and came to regard those who did with hostility.[219]

There was a brief respite in this negative attitude toward people in uniform from 1918 to 1938 in appreciation of those Czechs who fought for independence. Negative feelings toward the Czechoslovak military recurred with the 1938 occupation by the Germans after the politicians ordered the military to remain in its barracks without a fight. Faced with the abandonment of its democratic allies, Czechoslovak political leaders succumbed to the terms of the Munich Agreement and fled to Britain. The population rejected the German occupation, but could not muster an armed resistance to it.[220] Most officers either fled and fought for the Allies or stayed behind and retired from military duty.[221] Despite the political nature of decisions ruling out armed resistance to the Germans, the people blamed the military for their fate and experienced renewed hatred for uniforms while living under Nazi rule. The successes of Czechs who fought in the Red Army and helped to liberate the homeland at the end of the war may have mitigated this to some extent. Particularly noteworthy was the Czechs' performance in the 18 October 1944 Battle for Dukla Pass in which 6,500 Czechs were killed in the defeat of German forces there.[222]

Official histories of the development of the CSPA call the period from 1945 to 1948 the era of "the struggle for the democratization of the armed forces."[223] The goals of officers who had served with the democratic allies, primarily with Britain, conflicted with those who had come under Communist influence while serving with the Red Army. The interwar officer corps was drawn

mainly from the Czechoslovak Legion formed in 1918 that gained world renown for its five thousand mile march across Siberia fighting the Bolsheviks.[224] These officers held the highest positions in the interwar period and upon their return from Britain expected high postwar positions.[225]

These ambitions collided with those of Czechs who served during World War II with the Red Army, however. The service record of these forces and their association with the Soviet "liberators" of Czechoslovakia, along with the political clout of Communists immediately following the war, resulted in the dominance of the Communist faction of the Czechoslovak armed forces after World War II. The Czechoslovak air forces, which had served with distinction with the Royal Air Force (RAF) during the war, returned home to heroes' welcomes. Once the Communists came to power, however, many of these officers were stripped of their wings, sent to forced labor camps, and harassed throughout the rest of their careers because of suspicions that they were pro-Western.[226]

The postwar Czechoslovak army drew its ranks from workers who received military educations and became faithful to Marxist-Leninist ideals. However, the Soviet Union did not consistently hold the CSPA in high esteem. The 1950s had been the "golden years" of the CSPA. During this decade it developed into a force that was both "red and expert," and it became the Soviet Union's junior ally in the Third World.[227] Tensions increased in the 1960s, however, as CSPA leaders began to question whether or not they were being offered as sacrificial lambs to the Soviet cause. As the Prague Spring developed, Czechoslovak officers became more outspoken and threatened to protect the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia.[228] When the Soviets invaded in 1968, presidential orders confined the military to the barracks, although the Soviet Union's view of the CSPA's reliability was nevertheless severely damaged. As a result, the CSPA came to lag behind other Warsaw Pact states in modernization of weapons, and it lost its role in the Third World. In addition, Soviet troops remained stationed in Czechoslovakia.[229]

The Czechoslovak people, however, again blamed the military for not resisting the Soviet invasion and since 1968 have held the military institution in low esteem. The military in the Soviet era, consequently, became associated with oppressive Communism, and it is this image that persisted through the Velvet Revolution and still persists today.[230] It was reinforced in the Soviet era by the military's neutrality in the 1948 Communist coup, its passivity in the 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion, and its apparent supporting role in counterrevolutionary activities in 1989.[231] On 23 November 1989 the Defense Minister, Milan Vaclavik, drew up orders for the possible use of force and the CSPA issued a statement asserting that it would "defend Communism [and the] achievements of socialism."[232] Fortunately, the orders were never issued.

The Czechoslovak, and now the Czech, military also suffered and still suffers from a dismal competency image. Czechs generally portray the military in caricature form, and most would have a difficult time putting the words *mili-*

tary and *professionalism* together in the same sentence. People who approve of the military come predominantly from military family backgrounds.[233] The bumbling image of the Czech soldier portrayed in *The Good Soldier Schwejk* of Czech literary fame prevails. Czechs for the most part have traditionally believed that the Army is unnecessary and that the security of the country depends upon the will of the great powers.[234] Public support for the military increases when the military is viewed as a means of facilitating the Czech Republic's integration into Western institutions through NATO expansion.[235] However, society is still divided on the issue of NATO membership. In a 1996 opinion poll, one-third of citizens were unequivocally in favor of entry into NATO, one-third did not know, and one-third were opposed.[236] On the eve of the issuance of the formal invitations for NATO membership in July 1997, 63 percent of the Czechs surveyed said they would vote for NATO membership in a referendum.[237] In October 1998, six months prior to the Czech Republic's entry into NATO, 55 percent of the Czech population supported NATO entry.[238] However, the common perception remains that officers are incapable of holding real jobs and that mandatory conscription is a waste of time.[239]

At the birth of the Czech Republic in January 1993, 51 percent of the population expressed confidence in the army's capacity to defend the republic against an assault from another country. By December 1994 the number had fallen to 30 percent.[240] A U.S. Information Agency (USIA) poll conducted in September 1994 placed the Czech Republic twelfth of twelve European states surveyed, with a 41 percent confidence rating in its military.[241] Most recently, a 1997 poll found that only 24.5 percent of the population is convinced that the Czech Republic has a quality self-defense force.[242]

A series of incidents marred the image of the ACR from its inception. One of the most embarrassing for the MOD was a burglary committed in the MOD building by off-duty conscripts while conscripts on duty slept. This incident, on the heels of several others, prompted a Czech daily to note that "the fact that weapons are being stolen from the Czech Army arsenals and are being traded is known even to babies. Citizens concerned ask whether the Army whose headquarters are easily burglarized is capable of action or not and they want to hear a clear answer. Minor scandals indicate what is going on in the armed forces."[243] More recently 1996 Air Force crashes have had a negative impact on the Air Force's public image of competency, even though most objective observers attribute the accidents to lack of sufficient funding for maintenance and flight hours.[244]

An American military attaché compared the ACR's image problem to U.S. service members "trying to wear a uniform in the Vietnam era. The difference, though, is that the U.S. officer corps knew that it had to earn its respect back. Czechs think that they should just get respect."[245] This attitude is slowly changing, though, as the MOD seeks ways to send a signal to the ranks that disciplinary infractions and violations of internal laws and regulations will be punished.

Community relations have also improved as local political leaders begin to understand the economic benefits of being supportive of local military garrisons. A Czech major related how shortly after the revolution a mayor came to a meeting about closing the local military base and said, “I hate the military.” The mayor then proceeded to decide to close the base not on logical grounds, but on his negative personal feelings. Later when he realized how many local jobs would be affected he went back to the base and said that he wanted it to stay, but it was too late because the base had already been slated to close.[246]

An expert on Czech politics at the U.S. embassy confirmed that in the early days after the revolution, municipal governments had the authority to eliminate local bases. This practice continued until federal authorities realized that such unbridled authority could affect national security. For instance, of the dozens of military airports in operation before the revolution, only four or five remain. Some of the airports hastily closed may have to reopen to meet the needs of the air force. By 1997 the MOD had become strong enough to outweigh the desires of local authorities, who themselves have become more pragmatic, and security factors carry more weight than personal animosity and public opinion do.[247]

President Havel, Prime Minister Klaus, and other popular democrats led a campaign for public support of the idea that the Czech Republic needs a competent military supported by its people. “At present, nobody is directly threatening our state, our freedom, and the democratic values adopted by our society. This is why many people tend to consider the army to be an unnecessary luxury, to consider the money to be spent on it to be wasted, national service to be a waste of time, and military training to be folly.” He added that real dangers do exist and that such an attitude can be suicidal.[248] However, public support of the ACR suffered from the army’s well-publicized support of leftist political parties in the June 1996 election.[249] The 50 percent of soldiers who voted for leftist candidates are ostensibly representative of elements of the ACR that are resistant to change.

While national leaders can lend their support and make resources available, as they have in the Czech Republic, there is much that only the military institution can improve by focusing on issues of internal reform. Closing the gap between Soviet-style military professionalism and the type of military professionalism characteristic of democracies would do much to enhance the public image and the competency of both the Czech and Russian militaries. This issue will be the focus of the following chapter.

Conclusion

An analysis of the Russian and Czech cases has illustrated two variant levels of progress in the task of democratization. A steady advance toward democratic consolidation has characterized the Czech case. The result has been the devel-

opment of normalized election procedures, the continued maturation of democratic institutions that effectively balance political power, and a clear shift toward democratic ideological goals and Western institutions. Although the task of democratic consolidation is not yet complete, such progress has earned the Czech Republic a respected place among the market democracies of the international system[250] and membership in NATO.

The specific task of democratic political control of the military has consequently fared better than in most of its neighboring postcommunist states. However, significant problems remain in each of the dimensions of democratic political control presented in this chapter. While basic mechanisms exist by which the democratic government can control national security policy and ensure compliance with oversight bodies,[251] much work remains to be done to deepen the process of democratization in Czech civil-military relations. Established democracies should continue to encourage the further democratic consolidation of the Czech Republic to ensure that it does not backslide toward authoritarianism and a propensity for aggressive behavior.[252]

The Russian case, in contrast, has sequentially moved forward and backward in its democratic transition. "In Russia today almost none of the major institutions of representative government work in a reliable way: constitutional rules change to fit the needs of the moment; constitutional courts take sides on transparently political grounds; elections are postponed or announced on short notice; and political parties are transitory elite cliques, not stable organizations for mobilizing a mass coalition."[253] Russia remains indefinitely stuck as a transitional state that runs the risk of further democratic backsliding into political chaos and economic decline.[254] The democratization theorist, Guillermo O'Donnell, has argued that a new species of democracy has come into existence characterized by the failure to consolidate the regime through mature democratic institutions. He calls this phenomenon delegative democracy because they have some elements of representative democracy and are enduring. Such states are mired in economic crisis and have inherited corrupt patterns of political authority that limit the advance toward representative democracy. However, such cases may not show signs of authoritarian regression.[255]

In both cases, the degree of prevalence of democratic values and expectations (as evidenced in the oversight capability of developing democratic institutions, the media, and the society at large) has determined the extent of democratic political control of the armed forces. In the Czech Republic, there is greater national consensus in society supporting democratic values and the achievement of Western democratic standards of behavior within all democratizing institutions, including the armed forces. In Russia, the pervasiveness of democratic values and expectations within its democratizing institutions and society at large has not been as great. But the clash between elements of Russian society that hold democratic expectations and those who resist meeting them is growing more evident.

My main impression after the conclusion of my field research in Moscow was one of pessimism for the very continuation of democratization in Russia. The coalition of political forces is mired in its own self-interest and the pursuit of the greatest allocation of resources to their lobby to the detriment of the possibility of the reprioritization of resources that could result in the increased democratic and economic health of the Russian Federation as a whole. The case has borne out Mansfield and Snyder's hypothesis that losers in the process of full-fledged democratization will fight to resist it. Such actors continue to thwart the development of democratic institutions that threaten their power; and they ultimately contributed to reckless policymaking that led to the war in Chechnya and the further weakening of democratic accountability.[256]

Among the big losers in the Russian democratization venture have been the military and its associated industrial allies. The weakness of democratic institutions charged with ensuring democratic political control of the armed forces has allowed the post-Soviet military establishment to resist attempts to subordinate it to the oversight of legitimate democratic bodies. Democratic deficits across every dimension of democratic political control analyzed are severe and persistent, with the singular exception of the press. In this case, established democracies should be wary of assuming that states with the characteristics of delegative democracies pose no threat to the stability of the international system. Any external action or lever that can facilitate the strengthening of democratic institutions and encourage the adoption of international democratic norms should be taken.

This chapter has focused on presenting the democratic deficits that exist in the Russian and Czech cases in terms of democratic political control of the armed forces. The dimensions of constitutional, executive, parliamentary, and societal control of postcommunist militaries were analyzed in depth and problem areas highlighted. The hope is that such an analysis will serve to target assistance efforts so that specific democratization needs are met and the task of democratic consolidation is advanced. The past history of transitional states has shown that anything less than the achievement of democratic consolidation may result in belligerent behavior and the disruption of the stability of the international system. Much work remains to be done, but an awareness of which efforts bear more fruit will enhance the potential for success.

CHAPTER 4

An Assessment of Postcommunist Military Professionalism: The Russian and Czech Militaries' Democratic Deficits

A primary theme of this work is that there are significant differences between military professionalism in democratic and nondemocratic states. The civil-military relations literature on civilian supremacy, however, does not distinguish among the types of political systems to which regimes owe their loyalty. The assumption is that professional militaries will remain loyal to whichever government comes to power through legitimate means.[1] The problem with such an assumption is that it ignores *how* the officer corps comes to accept the principle of civilian supremacy[2] and how this professionalism is manifested. I contend that the ideological underpinnings of the state must play some role in the inculcation of the value of civilian supremacy in the officer corps. Consequently, military professionalism must be reoriented through new methods of inculcating the concept of civilian supremacy in states that experience a shift in the ideological underpinnings of the state from authoritarian to democratic rule. Most troubling are cases that do not make a clear shift in the ideological basis of their state. Transitioning states, which still lack societal consensus on whether or not democratic norms of accountability should displace the norms of state and institutional behavior that characterized the authoritarian regime, remain perilously perched between ideologies. As a result, military professionalism also remains caught between two systems.

When states make the political transition from authoritarian to democratic rule, the infusion of democratic values in the transitioning society begins to permeate all of its institutions, including the military, affecting the expectations of those within the institution and those to whom it is accountable. The model of democratic military professionalism developed in chapter 1 balanced the dual goals of developing professional competence as a means of protecting the democratic state and the importance of reflecting in institutional practices the societal values of the democracy that the military defends. Democratic states have long recognized the quality and competency benefits of building military institutions reflective of their societies.

Transitioning states are still learning the interrelatedness of these issues and tend to address competency and value-related issues sequentially rather than simultaneously, with the latter often classified as a luxury to be concen-

trated on at some later date. Furthermore, transitioning militaries may remain caught between two models of military professionalism resulting in only a partial adoption of democratic norms in their institution. An analysis of the Czech Republic's and Russia's adaptations to the infusion of democratic values into their governing bodies and societies illustrates the tensions that persist when Soviet-style military professionalism meets a Western-style one with a marked emphasis on the inclusion of democratic norms.

This chapter highlights the ongoing struggle facing postcommunist militaries as they attempt to adapt to the presence of democratic values in their societies and to the subsequent expectations of developing democratic institutions and the society at large as represented by public opinion and the media. In the process, I analyze military professionalism in the postcommunist era by highlighting the overall adjustments that the Russian and Czech militaries have made and, most importantly, examine the democratic deficits in military professionalism that exist across the dimensions of the model of democratic military professionalism presented in chapter 1. As in the previous chapter, the purpose of this analysis is twofold: first, to specify the democratic deficits that persist in the realm of postcommunist military professionalism; second, to lay out specific problem areas that can serve to focus the assistance efforts of established democracies engaged in the task of facilitating the democratic transition of postcommunist militaries. An examination of the cases will show the challenges that democratic political transitions pose for military institutions in postcommunist states.

Redefining Military Professionalism in the Postcommunist Era

Professionalism is a difficult subject to address with officers in transitioning states formed under the Soviet model. Indeed, for a Western officer to challenge the quality of that professionalism or its appropriateness to the postcommunist military in which the officers of a transitioning state serve is to call into question the very nature of the military to military relationship—the common bond that all officers share as military professionals.

In most respects Soviet-style military professionalism featured the characteristics of Huntington's definition: expertise, responsibility, and corporateness.[3] The Soviet model put great emphasis on developing specializations across all workers and infused in each citizen his/her responsibility to perform that specialty for the good of the state. The military was set apart as a separate caste with its own cultural features and practices. However, these similarities between the Western and Soviet systems do not explain the fundamental differences inherent in the military professionalism of each due to differences in the underpinning value systems of each political system.

In democratic models civilian control is executed across multiple axes of

democratic accountability, and it is rooted in democratic values. Consequently, a unique set of societal expectations results concerning habits and patterns of behavior within democratic military institutions.[4] These societal expectations include democratic accountability, transparency, respect for civil liberties and human rights, and dedication to democratic values. These criteria assume an importance at least equal to the military values of expertise, responsibility, and corporateness in defining the operational code of a professional military officer in a democracy.

In the Soviet model civilian control was executed through a single axis, the Communist Party.[5] The state was founded on the value of authority, which served as the basis of military professionalism and civilian supremacy. Democratic values and patterns of behavior within the Soviet bloc were either a generation removed from the citizens' experience or had never been experienced. While both models can and did develop brands of military professionalism that precluded military intervention, patterns of behavior below this common denominator will be distinct, depending on whether democratic or authoritarian values characterize the state.

The relevant question in the transitioning states, then, is not whether the officer corps is professional, but whether it possesses a brand of professionalism appropriate to the type of state that it serves. The evidence presented in this chapter supports the argument that a hybrid form of military professionalism characterizes transitioning states, a form that features characteristics of both authoritarian and democratic models.

Since the advent of perestroika in the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc, transitioning states have had to grapple with the infusion of democratic values into their societies. The process of democratization has created democratic expectations within both society at large and among the members of postcommunist military institutions. One result has been the development of a fundamental conflict between the maintenance of good order and discipline in the ranks and the belief common among many that since the arrival of democracy, military discipline was no longer required.[6]

Finding a balance between the competing forces of authoritarian and democratic principles is the common theme found in each of the dimensions of democratic military professionalism to be presented. The ACR is just now starting to take a hard look at what brand of postcommunist professionalism they need. They are asking key questions such as What is officer competence? How should we evaluate this? How can we instill these qualities? How can we attract good young people to the ranks?[7] But, in Russia, the resistance to change along the professional dimensions outlined in chapter 1 is much greater, and even the most basic questions regarding the military's adaptation to democratization have not yet been seriously considered by the military institution.

According to the reports of U.S. military attachés in Moscow, senior Russian officers credit Marxist-Leninist principles for the buildup of the Soviet armed forces to superpower status and therefore are hesitant to turn away from these principles. On a visit to the office of Admiral Ivanov, the head of the Kuznetzov Academy (the Russian equivalent of the U.S. Naval War College), U.S. Lt. Commander Charles Justice noted that a huge statue of Lenin remained on academy grounds and that a large painting of Lenin still hung over the admiral's desk. When the U.S. attaché asked why these things still remained, the admiral replied that his generation was responsible for building up the Soviet Navy, and their success was possible because of Marxist-Leninist principles. He added that, as long as he remained in his post, Lenin would remain. But once he left the academy he would approve Lenin's departure as well.[8]

The admiral's remarks indicated that he realized that times had changed, but that he did not want to change himself. This anecdote sums up the attitude of many older officers who have spent their whole professional lives under one system and one philosophy. Although the present political leadership purports to lead a democratic state, the military institution has been slow to acknowledge that it must adapt to whatever consequences the change in the political system has on its institutional practices.

Indeed, many Russian military personnel and military observers blame the advent of democratization as the cause of the Soviet and now Russian military's decline. "It's interesting. Democracy in the army is not possible. We have suffered through democracy with the army and saw the results in Chechnya. It has been difficult to call it an army since democratization came."[9]

An analysis of the Czech case will illustrate that even in the best transitioning cases, where society as a whole has embraced the idea of adopting democratic values and where the military has adopted wide-ranging reforms, the impact of democratic values on military professionalism has lagged other aspects of reform. The Czech case shows a certain inability to address structural and ideological reform simultaneously. But the issue of reforming the military, so that its practices reflect the values of the transitioning democratic society, has been addressed more as structural reform nears completion. Analysis of the Russian case, however, will reveal a military and a society that are more reluctant to embrace democratic values and to discard Soviet era practices.

The following section will lay the foundation for an analysis of the specific democratization deficits in military professionalism noted across the cases by highlighting which overall structural and ideological adjustments have been made by the Russian and Czech militaries. Clearly, structural reform is the easier transitional task, but in neither case is even this nonideological task complete.

Achievements of Postcommunist Military Reform in Russia and the Czech Republic

Russia

The greatest potential for substantial military reform in Russia was in the perestroika era when the restructuring of the Soviet Union was driven from the top and political forces were capable of demanding change. There was much discussion in the press, Parliament, and among officers about various courses of reform. This peaked in the period prior to the August 1991 coup and the subsequent dissolution of Parliament later in the year.[10] The military as an institution, though, was never excited about reform, continued to argue for more advanced technology for the armed forces, and interpreted all attempts at reform as thinly veiled attempts to downsize the military.[11]

In the late Soviet era there was conflict between pragmatic high-ranking officers, who understood the impossibility of Marxist economics sustaining military capability, and Party ideologues resistant to change.[12] There was hope that with the creation of the Russian Federation on 1 January 1992 there was also the possibility of creating a new military for the new state. Some of Yeltsin's more reform-minded advisers tried to sway the new Russian Ministry of Defense (MOD) using intense lobbying for the institution of a reform agenda, but at the end of the day the Russian military inherited the old Soviet General Staff and MOD framework.[13] The CIS military chief, Marshal Evgenii Shaposhnikov, endorsed the creation of a civilian defense ministry and called for greater professionalization of the officer corps,[14] but Grachev's arrival as Russian defense minister slowed markedly the pace of reform.[15]

The consensus of Western and Russian analysts alike is that no substantive reform has yet to occur in the postcommunist Russian military. A plan announced in 1997 by Defense Minister Sergeyev to markedly reduce and consolidate the Russian armed forces has met significant resistance from both military and political leaders. Generals fear their services will lose in the restructuring, and politicians are hesitant to support any increases in the defense budget to fund the reform.[16] Analysts agree that the crux of any reform effort is reducing the scale of the armed forces so that they bear some relationship to both the threats they must meet and the resources they receive.[17] But the armed forces have not been restructured in response to redefined political goals of the state and an assessment of threats to its security.[18] "The problem now is making an Army that used to be 5.5 million strong into a force of 1.5 million.[19] We have to make a small force from a large one with quality."[20] However, Russian lawmakers say the simple fact is that the nation is too broke to maintain the military and too broke to shrink it. The upfront costs of retiring officers on a large scale is immediate and prohibitive.[21]

The negative consequences of delaying cuts in force structure have been evident throughout the postcommunist period. Sergey Rogov, an analyst at the USA-Canada Institute and a strong advocate of military reform, has argued that "Russia today is over-saturated with a huge number of undermanned and poorly supplied units and formations, as well as hastily organized armaments and equipment warehouses. These conditions have overstrained the support infrastructure of the Armed Forces and made it impossible to ensure normal combat training for the troops."[22] He argued, further, that the war in Chechnya demonstrated that an underpaid, undermanned, untrained Army can hardly achieve military goals even in a low intensity military conflict. "The failure to implement military reform creates a very dangerous threat to national security in Russia."[23] Four years later the progressive rotting of the Russian military machine has caused an increasing sense of insecurity in the West as well. National security experts in the United States warn that the inability of Russia to maintain a safe nuclear deterrent operation is the greatest threat to the physical security of the United States.[24]

An American naval attaché stationed in Moscow witnessed, firsthand, officers and families living in derelict hulls and barracks in Kaliningrad. He heard the pleas of the Baltic Fleet's commander for the construction of housing units for 19,000 officers and their families. Fulfillment of this need would have required a major commitment on the part of the government. However, the U.S. Lt. Commander added, "the government has never decided if it really needs those 19,000 troops stationed in Kaliningrad."[25] Although a poorly organized drawdown occurred, a bloated force remains that the military wants to preserve even it cannot afford to equip or train it. As a result, the forces that remain become more and more degraded.[26]

General Sergeyev's reform plan approved by President Yeltsin in July 1997 proposes to cut ground forces from 1.7 million to 1.2 million troops by 1 January 1999, combining the services into two main branches: strategic deterrence nuclear forces and general purpose ground, sea, and air forces. The plan also envisions a gradual transition toward professionalization as ground forces are further reduced to levels between 500,000 and 600,000 troops, half of them reservists, by 2005. Additionally, the plan calls for increased reliance on nuclear weapons as Russia's conventional capabilities are improved through investment in new technologies. Aspects of the plan had already begun to be implemented by late 1997. The integration of missile troops, the space force, and aerospace defense troops into a united Strategic Purpose Forces was already under way,[27] and for the first time the State Duma earmarked money to reduce the armed forces.[28] But not enough money has been budgeted by the Duma to finance the desired cutbacks,[29] and the government's continual inability to collect taxes may result in other cuts in budget authorization. In addition, comprehensive reform will depend on a coordinated leadership effort

between the MOD, the Finance Ministry, and the Duma, which has yet to show an ability to cooperate at such levels.

In the postcommunist period, the Russian MOD has demanded unsustainable levels of defense spending, devoted disproportionately to salary and social needs, and even this commitment has been woefully inadequate. As much as 85 percent of the military budget has gone to salary and social needs, with salary at times absorbing more than 60 percent of the total. As a result, there has been almost no money for training and operations.[30]

Experts estimate that the major streamlining required to reform the Russian military would cost $70 billion a year. The 1998 defense budget is $13 billion. Military reform has remained such an intractable problem because it has proven impossible to finance up front and it is also dependent on progress made on economic reforms.[31] Professionalization of some segment of the conscript force is an example of a costly but essential aspect of military reform.

A halfhearted attempt at professionalizing a small segment of the enlisted force was undertaken by offering some conscripts "contract service" in which soldiers would be given higher pay, better housing, and increased responsibility in exchange for a longer term of service in a nonconscript, "professional" status. The problem is that contract and draft service did not turn out to be appreciably different since the government could not deliver the benefits agreed upon in the contract.[32] Additionally, contract troops were primarily used in auxiliary duties instead of in main combat units, so no significant gains in the control of troops through this system was possible.[33] Military leaders complain that prohibitive costs make the transition to a professional army impossible, but many see this as an excuse to perpetuate the familiar Soviet system despite overwhelming evidence from the war in Chechnya that this system is inappropriate for the current needs of the Russian state.[34] The truth is somewhere in between. To balance these claims, some former Warsaw Pact allies, who have moved as far along the professional army scale as their budgets will allow and who maintain complete professionalization as a long-term goal, could serve as models.

Observers agree, however, that senior military leaders have not been eager to seriously deal with the critical needs of the armed forces through reform. Only the recent efforts of Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev have given the Russian military grounds for hope that structural reforms may be carried out. With regard to the adaptation of the military to the distinct demands of a democratic political system, "practically no state policy [has been] directed toward a sensible transition from an army of a totalitarian government to the army of a legal one."[35] The power relationships and trade-offs of loyalty for quality that have characterized the postcommunist era have also ensured that it is unlikely that reform will be spurred by the government, either. The national political leadership has interfered little in military affairs, preferring to stay out of such

internal matters while it simultaneously called on the military to play the role of arbiter between the executive and legislative branches of government. Pandering to military leaders by all sides in the December 1996 parliamentary elections indicated that placating them in return for votes has become a top priority of political parties.[36] Such dependence on the military institution in domestic political battles reduced the likelihood that the government will insist on a path of reform unsupported by the military elite.

The Czech Republic

In the wake of the Velvet Revolution, the Czechoslovak military was caught up in the changes sweeping the country and wanted to be a part of them. The first postcommunist politicians, most of whom had antiregime backgrounds and little expertise in military issues, were ambivalent about the military in general, but interested in ensuring that certain reforms were implemented there. This led to a series of steps being taken immediately after the revolution.

The first substantive measure was to purge the officer corps of Communist sympathizers. This was accomplished mainly by transferring the political officers and officers of the military defense intelligence service.[37] Officers' records were examined, and anyone who had ever served in these positions, even if currently serving in another position, was reassigned or fired. The defect of this approach was that it allowed many good officers to be swept away in the pursuit of "Communists" while some political hacks who served in nonpolitical specialties were allowed to stay. Additionally, 150 of the 156 general officers serving at the time of the revolution were immediately dismissed.[38] However, critics complain that many of the officers who were removed from their positions through the attestation and lustration process remain hidden on the payroll in less-exposed jobs or received newly created civilian positions within the defense establishment.[39]

The next major steps in the reform process were to downsize, reorganize, and redeploy the Czechoslovak military substantially in response to the new strategic environment. However, even before 1989, the CSPA was in the process of drawing down from a force of 200,000 to meet the limits imposed in the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty, which put a cap on Czechoslovak forces of 93,300.[40]

The split of the country in January 1993 into the Czech Republic and Slovakia compounded a reorganization process that was already under way and called for yet another revision of the strategic concept. By all accounts the division of military personnel and assets went smoothly according to a ratio of 2:1 with the Czech Republic getting the larger share of resources.[41] The separation of Czech and Slovak politicians, in turn, facilitated a clear consensus on how to proceed with further reform of the ACR.[42]

The new ACR came into existence with a force structure of 106,447.[43] In June 1993 the government approved a draft of the new Czech Army structure that called for the ACR to be drawn down to a force of 65,000 by the end of 1995.[44] Most of the physical realignment of the ACR was completed in 1994, and by the end of 1997 the ACR fell below 65,000 troops.

When Social Democrat Vladimir Vetchy was appointed defense minister as a result of the June 1998 elections, he inherited a proposal to cut the total number of personnel working for the Army from 78,000 to 60,000 by 2003. The proposal would have required a drop from 65,000 to 56,000 uniformed soldiers and the transformation of the Army into a 100 percent professional service. Vetchy believes the proposed reductions are too severe and he has reversed the plan to eliminate conscription.[45]

In general, organizational reform in terms of the restructuring and redeployment of units to meet a post–Cold War Czech national security strategy has been completed with the exception of making personnel cuts necessary to correct the inverted pyramid of the officer corps. Reform has been slower in terms of *how* the military functions as an institution. Many remnants of the Soviet model remain although the Czechs are enthusiastically reviewing Western models of military professionalism.

The dual dissolutions of the Warsaw Pact and Czechoslovakia forced the military leadership to focus on structural issues of adaptation to new strategic realities to the exclusion of other aspects of military reform, particularly those related to the democratic transformation of the Czech military institution. Although some progress was made in this area while the structural reforms were being carried out, democratic reforms did not become the focus of attention until mid-1995. As one member of the Czech General Staff put it, "It's easy to disband a unit in one to two months, but not so easy to rebuild one."[46] The leadership of the ACR is beginning to make the connection between building a quality force and reassessing many of the modes of operating inherited from the Soviet era that are incompatible with the norms of military professionalism found in democratic military institutions.

Democratic Military Professionalism

The remainder of this chapter will address the progress that has been made along the dimensions of democratic military professionalism developed in the framework presented in chapter 1: recruitment and retention, promotion and advancement, education and training, officership and leadership, norms of political influence, prestige and public relations, and the compatibility of military and social values. The contrasting progress made in the Czech and Russian cases will illustrate how enthusiasm for the success of democratization across all institutions of the transitioning society and the transferring of these societal

expectations for democratic values to military members results in varying rates of progress in the achievement of democratic military professionalism.

Recruitment and Retention

Chapter 1 emphasized that the type of candidate attracted to the military institution is an important factor in maintaining democratic civilian control, competency, and the prestige of the military. As postcommunist militaries transition to democracy, the type of person that they have set out to recruit and retain is also changing. In the Soviet era, both countries attracted officer candidates in search of stability and of a quality of life superior to what these individuals could have otherwise achieved in society at large. The prestige of military service was an added incentive in the Soviet Union, but in Czechoslovakia, lack of prestige was a disincentive to serve. The common perception in the CSPA was that only "second class people with no other opportunities" chose the military as their profession.[47]

In the postcommunist era, the primary recruitment and retention factors of pay, prestige, opportunity for advancement, and overall quality of life are all currently working against both Russia's and the Czech Republic's struggles to build a quality officer corps.

In Russia, the general economic decline and failure to downsize the force have resulted in a precipitous decline in living standards. Paychecks have been arriving months late for years. The wives of officers of an aviation squadron threatened to block the airfield's landing strip unless back pay was forthcoming.[48] Thirty airmen conducted a hunger strike in protest of their 3-month delay in pay.[49] When it does arrive, real pay when indexed for inflation has declined and is meager. For instance, the salary of a captain in January 1994 was $186 per month, but by February 1995 had declined to $89 per month.[50] In 1997, the pay of platoon commander, an essential position crucial to the future of the army, was $111 per month.[51] Servicemen's pay has not been indexed for inflation since 1995.[52] At the end of 1998, reports from the field indicated that soldiers are still not regularly paid on time.[53]

Additionally, 120,000 officers and their families are without government housing to which they are entitled.[54] Despite a presidential decree mandating that servicemen receive vouchers for reimbursement of housing costs, actual budget authorization will permit the funding of only 21,300 apartments in 1997. With 200,000 more servicemen slated to move because of the closing of military bases and 700,000 more cuts planned if the military reform plan is implemented, at the current rate the resolution of the housing problem will take at least ten years.[55] Meanwhile, government auditers say that senior military officers stole the equivalent of $14 million earmarked for new apartments. In a 1994 survey fewer than one-quarter of defense ministry officers described their

overall living conditions as good or very good. One in three described their living conditions as poor or very poor.[56] Three years later living conditions were reported to be even worse with shortages of food, clothing, and medical attention.[57] So desperate were 60 homeless army officers that they stormed a new apartment building in a town outside Moscow and installed their families in it.[58]

The quality of life has also declined appreciably for Czech officers continuing to serve in the democratic era. At the time of the Velvet Revolution 90 percent of the CSPA was deployed on the Western border. When forces started to relocate from this area, many fully equipped garrisons were abandoned that had provided family housing, quality schools for children, and job opportunities for officers' wives. Now there are new garrisons, but they are not fully equipped, and wives have trouble finding jobs in less developed areas of the country, which consequently exacerbates the overall decline in family income. Because there are fewer garrisons overall, the ones that remain are overcrowded, often making it impossible for officers to live with their families at their new posts. Throughout the country, the housing crisis is acute, and since Czech officers have traditionally depended on the availability of housing in local communities, in the current environment there is no excess housing to allot to personnel from the local base. As a result, most officers and nonconscript professional soldiers live in base dormitories during the work week and commute to visit their families on the weekend.[59]

It is clear that the overall declining situation for the military family is a negative factor in the retention of officers, particularly the younger ones with the potential for more opportunity outside the military. In the Czech Republic, economic prosperity made it difficult to retain officers because the military could not keep up with the improved standard of living within the private sector. The Czech Republic's relatively booming economy led to a general labor shortage in the country, which translated into substantial job opportunities for young Czechs. In recent years, officers have been leaving the ACR at a rate of 10 percent per year. The bulk of the ongoing exodus is made up of young officers with state-funded military educations and difficult-to-replace expertise,[60] such as pilots. These officers cited low prestige of the military profession, poor housing, and a shortage of prospective opportunities in the armed forces as their reasons for leaving.[61] The near departure of one young lieutenant drew international attention: Lieutenant Petr Vohralik, a 1997 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, asked to be released from the Czech Army after only a few months as a platoon commander, due to the inability of the state to support its soldiers. He remarked that some things could be endured, even inadequate financial support, "but people should have the hope that these things will finally end, and I have lost this hope."[62] After a meeting with Defense Minister Vyborny and a subsequent promotion to the post of lieutenant commander of the elite 4th rapid deployment brigade, Vohralik decided to remain in the ACR.[63]

As the market economy develops, a rich/poor division is becoming more prevalent in Czech society, which will negatively affect the military's ability to recruit from among the university-bound and college-educated youth.[64] Wages in the ACR are on par with the pay of professionals not employed by foreign companies and joint ventures.[65] However, the government has also kept wages artificially low with wage controls.[66]

In Russia, the hardships are more acute. It is important to point out, though, that it is difficult to generalize about conditions of service across all components of the Russian military forces. The hardships experienced are not spread across the five services evenly. To illustrate this point, the U.S. Defense Attaché in Moscow, General Gary Rubus, contrasted the differences between a typical Strategic Rocket Forces (SRF) unit and a tank unit that has redeployed from East Germany. Officers in the SRF unit probably still have their old apartments, are suffering from real salary decreases due to the effect of inflation, probably have access to some off-budget goods in the locale of the base, and are not deployed to a "hot spot." The officer in the tank unit, on the other hand, is probably living in a tent city separated from his family due to the lack of new housing and may have been sent to fight in Chechnya.[67] Conditions are certainly not great in any unit, but disparities such as these have led to severe divisions in the military.[68]

One major factor in the solution to the officer recruitment and retention problem is obvious: creating favorable social conditions that will better satisfy those already in service and lead to increased competition among officer candidates. Reducing force levels to a point where these conditions can be provided is thus a critical step. There is a general feeling within the Czech officers corps that the government is not concerned with solving the military's problems. Officers complained that the Parliament seems to have no interest in passing either the legislation needed to reduce the rank-heavy officer corps or to allocate sufficient funds to the military's infrastructure and training needs.[69]

Similarly, servicemen in the Russian military feel that the state has abandoned its soldiers. From the Russian servicemen's point of view, they are doing the same important job that they had done before, but the material reward is not congruent with their responsibility to the state.[70] Service in Chechnya was worth $150 per month to a general officer, $50 to a lieutenant, and $30 to a conscript. Meanwhile the proposal for the 1998 military budget does not call for any increase in salaries.[71] Junior officers are particularly hard to recruit and retain in both countries. In Russia, the problem is worsened by the dramatic decline in material status and prestige that has beset the Russian officer corps. Since 1992, officers leaving the service before reaching retirement age have annually become twice as numerous as in the previous year. Of the 300,000 officers and NCOs slated to leave the military between 1998 and 2000, 60 percent will be below retirement age.[72] In 1997, of the 20,000 officers discharged into

the reserve, one in three was under the age of 30.[73] Additionally, 40 percent of the lower-level command positions in the army and navy are vacant.[74] Contract servicemen have been put through crash courses to earn the rank of warrant officer in order to fill low-level troop command positions. Junior lieutenants have also been selected for intensive training courses to accelerate their assumption of mid-level command positions.[75]

The declining interest in the countries' military academies reflects the common lack of interest in the military profession. In the Czech Republic, military academies are only able to fill their MOD authorized quotas at rates of 25 to 50 percent. Consequently, there is no competition for admission.[76] Indeed, interviews with the social science faculty indicated that the quality of military cadets was quite low compared to university students. One faculty member remarked that the military academies are "the rubbish bin of the educational system."[77] Academy officials may think that discipline would deter even more students from attending military schools. Such anemic enrollment rates may eventually threaten their own positions. Ironically, however, it is just such attitudes that perpetuate the negative image of Czech society toward its military. Unless the ACR is transformed into a respected organization that projects an image of competence and excellence, Czech citizens will be reluctant to serve and to send their children to serve within such an organization. Recruitment of candidates may improve, though, as the general higher educational climate of the Czech Republic changes.

Similarly, in Russia competition for entrance to military schools has virtually disappeared.[78] Faculty at the Russian Kachinsky air force academy report that in the 1980s the academy had ten applicants for each position. In the early 1990s this number declined to two applicants per position and has recently increased to about three applicants per position.[79] But still, one-half of all qualified applicants get in—a much less competitive figure. Nationwide, the competition for each slot has declined to 1.5 persons per position.[80] Schools are forced to accept candidates who have failed their entrance examinations, while the number of gold medal candidates has declined by 300 percent from the 1980s.[81]

In Russia many of the new military academy graduates are not going to serve in the armed forces.[82] Because the education received at these institutions is still respected, these graduates are favored for civilian jobs and shun their military option because of the lack of social guarantees there.[83] Additionally, the Commandant of the Kachinsky Academy said that he determines which cadets are selected himself based on personal interviews. This means that there is no official mechanism for ensuring that the cadets at his institution are representative of the society at large. The absence of demographic controls falls short of optimal recruiting practices in advanced democratic states.

The slow progress of personnel management reform that will be addressed

fully in the following section also contributes to the retention problem. Reform of this type is beginning to be discussed in Russia and proceeding with great difficulty in the Czech Republic. In both cases many young officers with ambition and marketable skills have already left to seek their fortune in the private sector. Those who remain tend to want the security that goes with the job such as medical care and apartments (for those lucky enough to have housing) and do not think that there are better opportunities for them elsewhere. In addition, the immobile character of both societies due to the difficulty of obtaining housing makes the practicality of relocating low.[84] Many young officers look to the swollen senior officer ranks and decide that advancement opportunities are limited and apparently not improving. Officers from both of the countries are using some of the "good deals" available to junior officers such as English-language training, courses in the West, and service with UNPROFOR (UN Protection Force) and other peacekeeping missions to either enhance their résumés or save enough money to ease the transition of leaving the service.[85]

Great recruitment and retention problems also exist on the conscript side in both cases. In the Czech case, the problem is attracting young people to serve as experts alongside conscripts. In Russia, the problem is much more severe and centers around getting enough conscripts to show up for duty. One in six of the young Russians drafted will dodge the draft, and five times the number that serves will be granted deferments.[86] This has led to a situation where officers outnumber conscripts.[87] In order to field eight divisions in Chechnya, the resources of twenty-four divisions were combined.[88] Conscript service is almost universally avoided by resourceful young Russians. Reportedly, $1,000 can buy a document to present to the local military commissariat proving that a person has already served in the military while $500 can purchase a health certificate certifying that a young recruit is medically unfit to serve.[89] In 1989, 3,000 people avoided the draft. By 1997, the number rose more than tenfold to 32,000. But aloof law enforcement agencies have instituted proceedings against only 32 of these "evaders."[90]

The greatest potential recruitment problem, meanwhile, has scarcely been addressed: increased professionalization of the Russian enlisted force. The war in Chechnya painfully demonstrated the low level of military competence that has been achieved four years after independence with a force of demoralized officers and low-quality conscripts. Analysts agree that the solution is to professionalize at least some percentage of the conscript force. Limited attempts to do this have thus far failed.

As noted earlier, a campaign to sign up 30 percent of the conscript force as contract servicemen sputtered due to lack of financial and psychological commitment to the program on the part of the MOD. Furthermore, around 90 to 95 percent of conscripts, when surveyed, indicated that they had no desire to continue to serve under contract.[91] Recruitment of individuals to meet broader

professionalization goals would require the extension of major incentives, which would be beyond the means of the military budget unless personnel were significantly cut. Meanwhile, the Russian military continues to deal with its "manpower problem" through such solutions as the extension of conscription service from eighteen months to two years. Economic constraints and the unpopularity of military service mean that reliance on a conscript system that produces low-quality soldiers will continue, despite stated government goals to the contrary.

Recruitment and retention issues plague both militaries. While some strides have been made in the Czech Republic, all indications from Russia are that these problems are only becoming worse. In the Czech Republic, the government and the military have backed off from their commitment to a fully professionalized Army, but are focusing on ways to attract volunteers to serve as the experts in the ACR.[92] Continued economic growth makes this a reasonable aim. But the military must continue to work hard on its agenda of reform items aimed at making the actual ACR more competent and attractive to serve in than the prevailing current image suggests. Failure to address these issues bodes poorly for the likelihood that officers and conscripts alike will remain loyal indefinitely to a democratic state that is not coming close to meeting their most basic needs. Political and military leaders must determine an appropriate military force structure for their state and search for the means to adequately support it. Some evidence of such leadership can be found in the Czech Republic and may be beginning to develop in Russia.[93] Only such a step will lead to the fostering of a military institution willing to support and defend a democratic political system and way of life to which it will one day, hopefully, feel a debt.

Promotion and Advancement

Many of the elements of the Soviet model of personnel management described in chapter 1 remain in the Russian and Czech cases. The prime defects of the inherited system of the Communist era are that it promoted officers automatically based on time in service, often made promotions without giving the officer of the higher rank increased responsibility, and ultimately created an officer corps that allowed for a disproportionate number of officers to serve in the higher ranks with no expected standards of competency driving their daily performance or their next promotion.[94] Cronyism characterized the advancement of officers throughout the system.[95]

Many from provincial regions became officers as a means of acquiring a college education and leaving their towns. Others preferred service as an officer to serving any time as a conscript. Additionally, in Russia, the practice of counting time served in outpost regions as double that served elsewhere for officers' pensions made it possible for an officer to serve ten years in an area such as the Far North and earn a pension for twenty years of service. Such of-

ficers are not concerned about earning promotions when their first significant promotion to Major could occur after they are eligible for retirement.[96]

The promotion of officers on time instead of on merit led to the development of a disconnection between rank and position. Officer competency would be recognized by the assignment of greater authority to an officer often resulting in more senior officers working for officers junior to them in terms of rank.[97] The development of this practice over time contributed to the blurring of traditional lines of authority within the military hierarchy. But even position advancement often depended more on political reliability than professional competence since the evaluation of officers weighted ideological factors disproportionately over individual ability. This dilution of a merit-based system, where an officer's evaluation is based on an objective and standardized assessment of his or her contribution to the unit's mission, led to a distorted view of "merit" that is difficult to reform today.

In the Czech Republic these problems have been recognized, and much attention has been focused on how to correct them, but no adequate solution has been implemented. In Russia there is little evidence that any reform of the promotion and advancement system is in the offing.[98] Indeed, evidence concerning how cuts were made following the withdrawal from the West points to a continuation of past practices. Many of the officers who redeployed to Russia were simply retired early without competition among all officers. Those in the middle ranks not yet eligible for retirement have been kept on the rolls as "extra" officers. Many of these officers are staying on because the state does not have the means to discharge them with the proper social guarantees.

In the Czech case the main problem in the area of promotion and advancement is that the career expectations of older officers who remain in the ACR are clashing with those of the young people that the ACR needs to retain and attract. For those officers formed under the Communist era system, "growing old with the Army and reaching higher rank based on years of service was completely normal and there could be no shortage of higher-ranking officers. Central organs were inflated and within these units the men with gold shoulder boards frequently performed work worthy of incompetent auxiliary personnel."[99] On the other hand, junior officers have no vision for promotion to Colonel, perceive that reform of the system will never take place, and expect that politics will always matter more than merit.[100] The lack of a "career concept" has plagued the ACR since its inception.[101]

NATO and U.S. officials alike have singled out the inability of the ACR to reform its personnel system as one of its greatest obstacles to NATO accession.[102] The ACR is in great need of a pyramidal force structure with a defined up-or-out philosophy. Other necessary reforms include an evaluation system built on merit and a professional development program for officers and NCOs focused on improving both technical and leadership skills.

The inverted pyramid that now characterizes the ACR is dysfunctional at

TABLE 4. Inverted Pyramid of ACR Officer Personnel

Rank	Number
Generals:	22
Colonels:	753
Lt. Colonels:	3,985
Majors:	4,003
Captains:	4,024
First Lieutenants:	2,969
Lieutenants:	791
Second Lts:	324

Total Officers: 16,849 Total Personnel: 57,012

Warrant Officers and NCOs: 8,972
Other conscripts: 31,191

Source: Czech News Service, "Deputy Minister Provides Figures on Size of Czech 'Army,'" 10 October 1997.

several levels. There is an excessive total number of officers in the ranks and the ACR has been unable to recruit sufficient numbers of conscripts to stay on as professional soldiers.[103] The Czech Army is composed of 67 percent officers while the average in NATO countries is 27 percent.[104] The principal problem of the rank and age imbalance of the ACR's personnel structure remains an intractable problem unresolved by appropriate legislation.[105] Table 4 indicates the inverted pyramid of the ACR present at the end of 1997.[106]

Table 5 shows the redistribution of the officer ranks that was proposed in 1995, but had not yet been enacted at the end of 1998. This proposal reflects an ideal distribution of ranks: .3 percent Generals, 4.7 percent Colonels, 11 percent Lt. Colonels, 17.5 percent Majors, 24.5 percent Captains, 22 percent Senior Lts., and 20 percent Lts. and Junior Lts. combined. The actual distribution according to the 1997 data is: .1 percent Generals, 4.4 percent Colonels, 23.7 percent Lt. Colonels, 23.8 percent Majors, 23.8 percent Captains, 17.6 percent Senior Lts., and 6.6 percent Lts. and Junior Lts. combined.

Wilem Holan, Defense Minister at the time of the 1995 proposal, remarked, "The ideal pyramid of ranks is clear to us. The current appearance of the rank hierarchy pyramid is also known. Inverting to its proper shape depends, first, and foremost, on the interest shown by young people in serving in the

TABLE 5. Proposed Pyramid of ACR Force Structure

Rank	Number
Generals:	30
Colonels:	470
Lt. Colonels:	1100
Majors:	1750
Captains:	2450
Sr. Lieutenants:	2200
Jr. Lieutenants:	2000

Source: ACR General Staff document made available to U.S. Military Liaison Team, March 1995.

Czech Army."[107] His successor, Miloslav Vyborny, argued that the ability of the state to offer new conditions of service is another key component of the solution.[108] However, neither minister nor their successors, Michal Lobkowicz and Vladimir Vetchy, have demonstrated the will or ability to direct the reform within the MOD. Critics maintain that precise rules for completing the downsizing of the ACR have been successfully resisted by high-ranking army officials throughout the transition era.[109]

The Director of Personnel for the ACR General Staff, Colonel Josef Jelik, attributed resistance to change at the MOD and within the General Staff as the primary obstacle blocking the implementation of personnel management reform. The main problem, he explained, is that "competing interests are operating. Activity that is in the best interests of the organization is threatening to other people of a certain age."[110] The junior and senior officers have a fundamentally different personal stake in the reform agenda. Officers older than forty want to stay in the system as long as possible because each extra year served increases the military pension benefits that they must live on until they can receive a government pension at age sixty.[111] Of these officers, 60 to 70 percent are against making any changes that will force involuntary separations.[112]

Colonel Jelik added that while some reform-minded officers use their influence to move the effort along, they work side by side with “resisters.” The presence of “rehabilitated” officers, the “1968ers” called back to advise within the MOD, compounded the situation further. Though politically reliable, these officers, who in their youth served in a completely different era, could not understand the contemporary problems confronting the ACR.[113] Even the effectiveness of reform-minded officers depends on an array of factors: support through the chain of command, the amount of independence granted to those working at the top for reform, and the freedom to direct subordinates to implement the plan.[114]

General Jiri Nekvasil, whose 5 year tenure as ACR chief of staff dated back to the Czech Republic’s inception, remarked upon his dismissal from his post in March 1998 that the failure to achieve personnel reform during his term was “shameful.” “I was naive to think that everybody in the Defense Ministry and the General Staff had good intentions for the army. Some high-up functionaries insisted on their well-paid jobs, and were indifferent to the fate of the troops. If clear rules on personnel had been approved, many of them would have had to leave the army.”[115]

Besides the downsizing of the higher ranks—righting the inverted pyramid—the main elements of reform in the promotion and advancement of officers being considered include the development of an officer career pattern, the creation of a professional military education system to support the new career pattern, and the implementation of a new promotion system based on merit-based evaluations and centralized promotion boards. The development of a career pattern would establish for the first time concrete requirements for progression through the ranks and eliminate officers who do not progress, thus ensuring a pyramidal officer corps. But it is crucial that a career pattern and the implementation of a merit-based promotion system take place simultaneously so that officers who meet the new criteria are evaluated favorably and advance.

Observers agree that time is running out in the implementation of a new career pattern and promotion system. A message must be sent to the younger officers that change is on the way and that their potential for advancement within the ACR is limited only by their ambition and merit. But as MOD bureaucrats and resisters to change continue to stall the process, the clock ticks and the inverted pyramid becomes more distorted by the day as junior officers continue to leave the service.

In the Czech case, there is no certainty that the proposed reforms will be implemented, but the importance of ensuring continued progress is recognized by many within the government and MOD. External pressure by NATO overseers will give an additional impetus to the prospects of reform. Meanwhile, in Russia, recognition of the necessity for adapting the promotion and advancement system to the norms of democratic states has not yet occurred. Equality of opportunity is a basic value of democratic societies, and those who serve

democratic states expect that the institutions in which they serve will reflect the democratic values of the state. More importantly, standards of democratic accountability demand that expenditures spent on military personnel result in the most competent force possible to defend the values of the state. Finally, corrupted cronyism, lack of a widely recognized career path, and a priority on job security instead of job performance combine to create a package of disincentives for motivated service to the state.

Officership and Leadership

The aspect of military professionalism most in need of reform due to the infusion of democratic values into postcommunist societies is the legacy of authoritarian styles of officership and leadership. In the tsarist system, and later across the Soviet bloc, the role of subjects and citizens of the state was to serve the state. In a democracy, the state exists for the sake of the interests of the people whose primary concern is preserving their civil liberties and human rights. Indeed, democratic control of the military is partially dependent on the shared socialization of all citizens, including those in military service, about the principles of democratic values and accountability.[116] Soldiers in democratic states are conditioned to believe that standards of treatment central to life within their democracy are expected within all societal institutions. These opposite priorities within authoritarian and democratic states result in fundamental differences in relationships between the state and its citizens and among citizens of the different types of states.[117]

For these reasons, the core issues of professional officership—*who, why,* and *how* an officer serves—differ markedly in authoritarian and democratic states. These issues are difficult to address because modification involves changing long-practiced behavioral patterns that have come to be associated with "professionalism" as officers in the Soviet bloc knew it. The answers to the *who, why,* and *how* questions vary according to the historical position of the military in each case. In the CSPA, the case could be made that an officer's answer to the question *who* do I serve was, ultimately, himself. Since he could not protect the people of his state from the Soviet Union, which essentially controlled the CSPA, the standard motivation of defense of the state was denied the Czechoslovak officer. Serving in the coercive pillar of an illegitimate and less than beloved local Communist regime also denied him the satisfaction of protecting a system of government valued by the population. The answer to the *who* question in the Russian case is more positive because Soviet officers had the satisfaction of serving a state that was the cradle of the world communist movement. The Soviet military was instrumental in the spread of communist ideology, which had greater legitimacy among the Soviet people than among the citizens of the allied states in the Warsaw Pact.

The answer to the *why* question was similar to the *who* and *what* questions

but also featured an incentive-based dimension. Soviet society rewarded its officer corps beyond material levels that most Soviet workers could expect and undoubtedly lured some citizens to serve for this reason as well. Similarly, the CSPA attracted officers who liked the fact that the military was essentially a socialist state within a socialist state. *Why* serve? The response for many was, "because I don't have to work and I'll still get paid." "Schwejkism" prevailed in the CSPA with the corresponding opportunity to exist by doing nothing.[118] In Czechoslovakia, the prime motivation for service in a social institution loathed by the civilians of the state was to have a means of existence within it.

These different motivations for service in an authoritarian state led ultimately to distinct differences in *how* Soviet era officers served, differences that persist today. The abuse of one's position power was prevalent throughout the Soviet system and also characterized the behavior of officers toward their subordinates. "The order of the commander is law" was the phrase stated in armed forces manuals.[119] Unlimited one-man command continues in the Russian army and has actually become more severe with the removal of the political officers who used to restrict some actions of the commander. Consequently, practices that respect the dignity of each soldier and that are not directed toward suppressing the individual are still absent.[120] In democratic states, laws come from those elected to create them, and all citizens are subject to them. No individual's order, even that of a military commander, could override the law of the land.

These contextual factors led to a different concept of leadership among Soviet era officers that persists today and that is negatively affecting the competency of the postcommunist armed forces. "The conscript-officer relationship has always been unhealthy and even Soviet era people have acknowledged this as a crucible of corruption."[121] This was noted especially in the Afghan War when the poor quality of the NCO corps and the poor socialization of troops were identified as key reasons why Soviet troops were performing poorly in a modern battlefield situation.[122] The atrocities committed in Chechnya by Russian troops indicated that problems of leadership negligence and poor discipline persist in the postcommunist era.[123] According to one analyst, "the Russian military is simply a devourer and wrecker of Russian youth."[124]

The concept of *leadership* as it is understood in the West did not exist within the CSPA or the Soviet Army. Leadership as understood by and taught to U.S. officers has never been and is not currently part of officer development. The concept that "leaders are made and not born" is fundamental to the U.S. system of officer and leader development.[125] The assumption of the American military education and training system is that leadership qualities can and should be taught and that the permeation of these traits across the military institution is essential to its professional competency. Furthermore, the system assumes that democratic values, when appropriate, should be present within mil-

itary institutions that serve democratic states. With regard to officership and leadership, the proper appropriation of democratic values includes respect for the rule of law and law-bound behavior, respect for the individual and nontoleration of the violation of civil liberties and individual human rights, equal opportunity for advancement based on merit, and the positive use of democratic ideology as a motivator for service.

The course of instruction at Russian and Czech military academies in this respect remains unchanged. U.S. Air Force Academy officers who visited the Kachinsky Higher Military Aviation School for Pilots, a Russian undergraduate military college, noted the lack of systematic training in leadership as a glaring difference in the approaches between U.S. and Russian military colleges.[126] The U.S. Army attaché in Prague went so far as to argue that "there are no traditions of leadership in the Czech military." Throughout the course of his three-year tour he has never come across a single block of training on leadership anywhere.[127] He added that the whole concept of motivation is foreign to them. "Everything is always someone else's problem. The 2 percent of ACR officers who have the attitude that their mission is to serve the state have some international experience and are probably natural born leaders."[128]

The primary difference between the Russian and Czech cases on the issue of officership and leadership is that the Czechs recognize that their inherited system is defective and are considering steps to correct it. Senior Czech officers admit that in the past the military's disregard for individuals serving within it was extreme. One member of the ACR General Staff related that before 1989, when there was a requirement to store all military equipment under roof, at times the equipment lived better than the soldiers, whose barracks might go unheated because the fuel was needed to keep the equipment depots warm.[129]

Another Czech officer related that besides the top priority of improved living conditions, what officers want most is better leadership. "If they get these two things they might stay in."[130] A Czech officer who attended the USAF professional military education (PME) course for captains told the U.S. Army attaché upon his return that "I've seen your military and don't want to go back [to his own]."[131]

An incident that occurred within the Czech UNPROFOR forces is indicative of the state of leadership at the unit level in the ACR. An NCO "fragged" or murdered an unpopular officer who held a leadership position within the unit. This incident within the highly touted volunteer United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) unit highlighted the persisting enmity between officers and soldiers. The U.S.-trained Czech major who related the story seemed disgraced by the incident involving his countrymen and fellow officer and explained how such a thing could occur: "Most officers don't know what leadership means."[132]

An American attaché thought that the fragging incident was also indica-

tive of weaknesses in the officer evaluation system. Officers are judged suitable for advancement and continued service based on the record of psychological examinations, which has led to a mentality that effectively equates psychological stability with good officership. Apparently, the "fragged" officer had satisfactory psychological exams and was deemed fit to lead.[133] This example demonstrates how a method of evaluating officers devoid of expectations of traits indicative of good leadership may produce stable officers, but not necessarily ones who are good leaders.

ACR leadership style could be influenced through a new evaluation system that records development across specific leadership traits and awards ratings accordingly. Such changes have been considered. One proposal for a new ACR officer evaluation form featured eighteen attributes such as "ability to lead subordinates," "setting the example," "will to be the best," and "independence in fulfilling tasks," which can be considered pure officership qualities that are apolitical and intrinsic to merit.[134] The new proposal differed from the old evaluation form, which was a purely narrative form not focused on measuring any specific attributes and which emphasized psychocultural aspects of an officer's personality.

However, not much progress will be made in changing Communist era officer behavior patterns unless those who evaluate and those being evaluated understand the leadership traits being measured. Such a change also requires broad compliance to effect an institution-wide impact. Observers worry that compliance at all levels will be difficult to achieve because many officers in the field are resistant to implementing the reform.[135]

A meeting with a group of four senior Czech officers from the ACR General Staff, who were graduates of the first Marshall Center class, indicated that Western-style leadership traits are becoming more widely known. Before the meeting, I had been warned that one of these officers was a great fan of General Norman Schwartzkopf and that he had read his book numerous times. This tip alerted me to the possibility of turning the discussion to U.S.-style generalship and leadership and the willingness of the Czechs to adapt their ways.

When the opportunity presented itself I asked the alleged Schwartzkopf fan, General Jiri Martinek, what about General Schwartzkopf's leadership style impressed him the most. The Czech general responded that the main lesson he learned from reading the book was that General Schwartzkopf was an officer who perfectly understood the problems of a commander and who never forgot that every subordinate had a family and that one day that soldier might have to leave the family behind. General Martinek added that General Schwartzkopf "understood how to train soldiers and how to live with them, how to live with his own family, and how to actively rest." When asked if such a style of leadership was possible in the ACR, he responded that he did not think that it was so far-fetched for them to achieve, that he understands it and that other re-

formers also understand it, and that ultimately when their transformation is complete, they will achieve it.[136]

Though most of the ACR senior leadership, through the benefit of extensive and repeated exposure to Western officers, are beginning to understand the U.S. "leadership concept," beyond this exposure and the individual experiences of the limited number of officers who have participated in IMET courses, most officers "don't know it, haven't been taught it, and don't see it."[137] Most officers are used to being told what to do and they understand that either they do it or get chewed out. The old leadership style is still prevalent. Positive motivation is absent, and authoritarian styles prevail.[138] Although commanders educated in the West are serving in important command and leadership positions, such as the commanders of the ground and air forces,[139] the leadership style has fundamentally remained unchanged from the dictatorial top-down leadership style of the past.[140]

A U.S. officer studying at the Czech Command and General Staff College observed that no fundamental curriculum changes beyond the elimination of Marxist-Leninist themes have occurred there. For instance, there is still no dimension of the curriculum that deals with leadership or leadership in combat. The focus is on managerial and business techniques. Such concepts as "leading by example" and the "Be, Know, Do" mantra instilled in U.S. Army officers are still foreign to the Czechs.[141] However, some recognition by Czech military leaders of the gap between Soviet era leadership practices and the norms of leadership expected in advanced democratic states indicates that a greater potential for reform exists in the Czech case.

In Russia, however, many Russians, even some who advocate the need for military reform in other respects, do not recognize the leadership deficit of the Russian officer corps. Their argument contends that officer-subordinate relationships are constant across all military institutions and do not change as a result of time or because of a change in the political system.[142] But those with experience serving within the military institutions of democracies disagree. Brigadier General Gregory Govan, former U.S. Defense Attaché in Moscow and a Russian military expert with experience serving as a draftee in the U.S. Army and in observing the treatment of conscripts in Russia, made the reverse argument that democracy does make a difference in the treatment of troops.[143]

In free societies, military institutions created to protect a certain quality of life tend to reflect these values in the life of the institution. This is a result of their lifelong socialization within a society built on democratic values. U.S. officers involved in planning joint exercises with Russian forces have recognized this blind spot among their Russian counterparts and consciously try to model the positive motivation that characterizes U.S. officership and the attention that is given to quality of life issues for troops participating in such exercises. "We try to show that our commanders actually think about these things—that it is

part of their computations in military planning."[144] The American officer's observation highlights the disparity in expectations between democratically socialized soldiers and those socialized to expect little from their leaders. However, as democratic values take root and become more pervasive, expectations of soldiers in transitional states will also change accordingly. The Czech case is beginning to bear out this hypothesis.

But in the Russian case, Soviet era leadership practices continue virtually unaffected by the change in political system. One indication of poor leadership among Russian officers is the high death rate among conscripts in military service.[145] A particularly atrocious incident occurred among conscripts serving on Russkiy Island, fifteen to twenty of whom starved to death.[146] The commander in this case was eventually relieved of his command, but was never brought up on criminal charges. It is unclear, though, whether the commander in question was reprimanded over the incident of emaciation or because he opposed a commission set up to investigate his corrupt behavior involving the sale of MOD property.[147] The suicide rate has also been rising in the Russian military. According to the Russian Military Procuracy's own figures, 423 soldiers committed suicide in 1995. In 1996 the number grew to 543. In 1996, 1,071 soldiers were murdered, mostly by other soldiers.[148]

Perhaps the greatest evidence of leadership practices devoid of any appreciation of human rights is the persistence of *dedovshchina*, or hazing, in the Russian military.[149] The number of reported incidents continues to increase, but official statistics do not accurately portray the problem since commanders are still more likely to conceal than to report incidents in their units.[150] Dedovshchina includes various forms of physical and mental abuse, including the use of recruits as personal servants of more senior soldiers. But the practice goes way beyond commonly accepted notions of hazing in that it pits the strong against the weak in an effort to psychologically humiliate and physically break down soldiers—often to the point of death.[151] Dedovshchina is also the leading cause of suicides.[152] Military leaders claim that every effort is made to punish those who participate in the practice, but credible reports indicate that the practice continues unabated and that many officers continue to permit and even encourage dedovshchina.[153] The brutal treatment by older soldiers along with malnutrition and widely known poor conditions of service is a major deterrent to military service and also a major cause of desertion.[154]

The system of disciplining through corporal punishment and allowing unsupervised harassment in the conscript ranks is related both to the detached leadership styles of commanders who permit the practice to continue and to the warped sense of interpersonal relations brought to military service by the conscripts themselves who perpetuate the behavior against each other. This pattern of mistreating conscripts, sometimes to the point of death, is evidently another blind spot of many in Russian society. "Kids and mothers are against it, but not

really the people at large. We in the West play it up a lot more than it matters in Russia."[155] Another Western expert noted, "They've tried to stop it, but it's too cultural."[156]

The main group advocating reform in this area is the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers although other human rights groups have also been active in trying to eliminate the practice.[157] Before the war in Chechnya, the top goal of the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers was to eliminate hazing. The group's goals are to force commanders to take responsibility for incidents in their units, to prevent the malnourishment of soldiers, to pressure the MOD not to accept soldiers unfit for service, and for the MOD to be generally more responsive to the inquiries of the Committee.[158]

The mothers try to work directly with commanders and with the MOD. But the mothers have found that many commanders are indifferent to the problem and that the MOD refuses to address the problem systematically. "If a commander happens to be a good one, then the mothers can have a good relationship with him, but many allow the hazing to continue. Commanders think that hazing is convenient for them—it maintains discipline. It's much easier to let it go than to try to fix the problem."[159] Meanwhile the MOD has failed to lay out any negative consequences for commanders who allow the practice to persist.

The mothers have tried to pressure the MOD by lobbying their allies in the Duma to hold hearings on the topic, which only highlighted the MOD's unwillingness to respond to the problem. The lead general sent to the hearing was very antagonistic and did not even try to address the problem. Others presented false statistics and made inane comments like "See, a lot of officers are getting killed too" or "We're not the only ministry with problems." But even the involvement of parliamentary committees has done little to alleviate the problem. The hearings are not televised, and nothing ever seems to come of them. The committee can make a report, but has no executive authority to take any greater steps.[160]

Possible solutions to the dedovshchina problem include stationing conscripts closer to home where it is more likely that parents can monitor their sons' status, stationing soldiers in units of similar ethnic, geographic, and social origins to reduce the likelihood of tensions between troops, and increasing accountability among troops returning to the same cities after their service. Those who support this solution contend that the problem was able to persist so long because Marxism-Leninism taught that interpersonal conflicts within the military were impossible. When they happened, military leaders denied that a problem existed.[161]

However, the best solution is to demand higher standards of leadership and to reform the system of leader development so that conscripts understand what behavior is acceptable and so that commanders learn how to enforce and model

higher standards of interpersonal relations.[162] The institution of an NCO corps charged with leadership responsibilities would also be a major step toward solving the dedovshchina problem and raising the competency level of the Russian military in general.[163] "The problem is that all officers are professionals and all conscripts are not professional. Officers, by definition, cannot perform an NCO's function because they have no enlisted experience."[164] Russian conscripts have no NCO role models, empathizers, or teachers and no means of leadership between themselves and their officers. Western observers agree that the lack of NCOs is a tremendous disadvantage with regard to the leadership quotient of the Russian armed forces and stems from a culture that neither appreciates the needs of individuals nor is able to self-identify this particular democratic deficit. "Exploiters of troops would not have a future in an NCO system."[165]

The bullying of conscripts in the ACR is still rife.[166] Half the young men who go to serve in the ACR are afraid of hazing.[167] Former Defense Minister Holan referenced the negative feeling that common knowledge of the practice conjures up in the public's mind when he promised to "ease the fears of mothers whose sons currently serve" as one of his goals upon taking office.[168]

As in Russia, Czech observers attribute the persistence of the practice to the absence of an NCO corps and to the combined effect of the officer drawdown and the misinterpretation of democracy in the ranks. Officers about to be cut had little concern about the disciplinary state of their command, while those serving under them initially assumed that the new democratic CSA and, later, the ACR would not require the strict discipline of the past.[169]

The ACR leadership has realized the importance of building an NCO corps to fill the leadership vacuum between the officers and the conscripts, but faces an uphill battle in convincing enough conscripts to stay on for another three to five years to serve as platoon commanders. An American officer serving on the Military Liaison Team related an anecdote about how one ACR general came to value the idea of having NCOs in the unit. He said that the general realized that such a person with individual responsibility over the troops might be able to reduce the destruction of equipment and facilities that routinely takes place when the troops go unsupervised.[170] While this newfound motivation may not spring from hearts of commanders who have suddenly been converted to the cause of taking an interest in and caring for their troops, any movement toward inserting a professional NCO to serve as a junior leader between the officers and the conscripts would be a step toward achieving the goal of improved leadership.

While Russia's reform plans have called for progress in professionalization, these motivations have been directed at increasing technical competency, not toward improving the broken leadership system. Russian military leaders in their contacts with Western militaries have been impressed by the great amount of responsibility given to Western NCOs and would like to have pro-

fessionals in their force with such levels of expertise, but such plans that have been tried in the past, the *proposhik* and warrant officer systems and the contract servicemen systems, have not involved giving these more highly trained enlisted men responsibility for controlling troops that even comes close to the power still reserved for officers. Indeed, the contract servicemen fighting in Chechnya were implicated in the worst brutalities there and were considered to be little more than mercenary ex-convicts incapable of instilling leadership in troops.[171]

Soviet standards of ethical behavior also contribute to the democratic deficit of military professionalism among Russian officers. In the Soviet system, where direct salary compensation was low, a premium was placed on protecting such assets as information and friends. Contacts, were, and continue to be (in the postcommunist era of near hyperinflation), Russians' lifeline for all valuable commodities in life. The habit of circumventing established procedures, many of which are now codified in the rule of law, to procure one's wants also characterizes the behavior of many Russian officers who put a higher priority on taking advantage of every lucrative opportunity than following the standards of democratic accountability.[172]

U.S. military observers report that training in professional ethics is neither formalized at military colleges nor emphasized as an expected character trait of officers. U.S. Air Force Academy officials noted that cadets at the Kachinsky Higher Military Aviation College were shocked that U.S. academies had honor codes.[173] A separate group of American cadets reported, in their discussions with Czech cadets, that a premium is not placed on the instruction of honor or ethics nor is there an honor code.[174] "They're not taught anything about this at all. Whatever it takes to accomplish the mission is OK at the top. It's better for an officer out in the field not to whine about inadequate resources [that is, to get the resources needed through any possible means]."[175] Corruption is widespread and widely known to exist within the Russian military. "It is known that Dudayev got weapons from Russian military sources and that high military circles use their influence to gain riches. Much of the money put in the budget to improve officers' salaries was never seen by them."[176]

This section has highlighted the need for leadership and officership in both the Czech Republic and Russia that is characterized by accountability to democratic values, respect for human rights, stewardship of the public trust, and ethical behavior. Such reforms will not only make the transitioning militaries better reflectors of their transitioning democratic societies, but lead to increased competence as a military institution due to the adoption of more effective leadership styles. These reforms, however, must be accompanied by a simultaneous change in the education and training system to teach these desired qualities. Like so many other aspects of reform, success depends on supportive measures being carried out concurrently in other areas.

Education and Training

A key component in the democratic professionalization of postcommunist militaries is the reform of their education and training systems. It is in this period of an officer's career that professional socialization occurs and an awareness of professional expectations develops. Military professionals in training acquire the technical expertise they will need to perform their craft as well as the cultural norms of their caste in society. It is through a series of these formative educational experiences that officers are taught the answers to the key questions of military service: *who, why,* and *how* they serve. As the discussion of the democratization of officership and leadership styles illustrated, even the answer to the question *how* an officer serves can change as the ideological character of the state changes.

A key question in the post-Soviet era regarding the education and training system of the postcommunist militaries is how this system is adapting to the vast ideological changes that have taken place within the state. A brief examination of changes taking place in the curriculum of military colleges and of the ongoing struggle to reach a consensus on what should comprise the content of ideological training will help illuminate the evolution of this particular aspect of the cases' democratic deficit.

Fundamental change in the approach to developing future officers through the military education system has not yet occurred in either case. The plan for reform of the military education system in Russia assumes that the historical experience and traditions of training officers' cadres are rich and unchangeable.[177] Those directing the reform profess that any changes will rely on this model, which needs only to be qualitatively improved.[178] In neither case has there been a shift away from the technical specialization approach to officer education that contrasts with the United States' method of training generalists who specialize later on in their careers. However, in Russia, a major component of the MOD education reform plan adopted in 1993 is to extend the period of training at military schools from four to five years in order to allow time to acquire a civilian specialty. This change will improve the social protection of officers by providing them with qualifications recognized in the military and that meet the state standards for civilian professionals.[179] But curriculums remain very rigid, with an emphasis on memorization and no electives.[180]

In the Czech Republic, legislation directing the reform of the military education system has been expected for years,[181] but has yet to materialize.[182] In the absence of such legislation, the faculties of the military academies have done little to transform their institutions to produce disciplined and well-educated graduates who are competent in their profession and socialized to serve a democratic society and system of government. Although official publications of the Brno Military Academy trumpet curriculum revisions resulting

from "consultations with Western democratic militaries," when questioned faculty members could not come up with any specific examples of these changes.[183] Indeed, some junior civilian faculty members remarked that such claims in the English language version of the catalog are most likely for Western consumption and do not reflect any real changes in approach.[184]

While the overall approach to undergraduate military education has not changed, there is some evidence that there have been some positive changes in the teaching of courses in the social sciences that shape cadets' attitudes toward the role of the military in society and in which cadets learn about their transitioning political system. An exchange of letters with the head of the social sciences department at the Kachinsky Higher Military Aviation School revealed some telling insights into the problem of giving cadets the ideological grounding needed to serve as military officers.

Lt. Colonel Yuri Runaev commented, upon reviewing the curriculum I sent him outlining how the U.S. Air Force Academy trains cadets in political science, that the American academy defends too strongly the American political system and "propagandizes" American cadets on the correctness of democracy. "All of us have our own definite opinions and political positions, but we don't impose on the cadets a particular system of ideas."[185] At Kachinsky, Marxism-Leninism is taught side by side with democratic capitalism, and cadets are not taught that they have a particular obligation to defend one political system over the other. Still absent is instruction that can help the future officer understand *who, why*, or *how* he/she serves as a military professional in service to a democratic state.

Of course the danger in this is that military officers in democratic states do not have the choice of defending the political system of their choice. They are the protectors of one type of political system—as imperfect as it may be—democracy. While American cadets certainly are free to learn about anything they want, an institutional responsibility of all commissioning sources is to ensure that graduating cadets understand, respect, and are motivated to defend the American political system.[186] Additionally, cadets must understand the principle of democratic civilian control of the armed forces and the proper role of the military in politics and in society at large.

Observers argue that instruction in the social sciences will be limited by the dogmatic training of the professors in this area, most of whom have been carried over from the Soviet era. The great majority of those in charge of incorporating new ideas into the social science curriculum of Russian military colleges are former professors of Marxism-Leninism.[187] In the Czech Republic the former "politruks," whose careers were based on boundless loyalty to the KSC (Communist Party of Czechoslovakia), still rule the military schools and control the teaching of political science.[188] A Russian journalist related that after he used the term *paternal state* in one of his articles referring to the for-

mer Soviet Union and Russia, he received twenty to thirty letters from political scientists at military academies complaining that *paternal state* is a feature of the relationship between capitalism and society. "Even if they are not so devoted to Communist ideas any longer, they are too dogmatic in their thinking to really change much."[189]

In neither case do commissioning sources actively embrace the promotion of democratic values or allegiance to a democratic constitution. In the Czech Republic, Marxism-Leninism has disappeared, but its replacement has been some study of comparative political systems and Czech history with a nationalist emphasis.[190] This may be attributed to a delayed understanding of how to practically implement curriculum changes to reflect the democratic values that have been adopted by society as a whole. The Czechs must learn that the abandonment of Marxist-Leninist ideology does not necessarily mean that democratic ideology will fill the vacuum.

In the Russian case, the continued prevalence of Marxism-Leninism as a legitimate choice suggests that there is no accord on the permanence of democratic institutions. While the Russian military professor advocated his institution's support of multiple political systems as the more libertine approach to military education, such behavior indicates his uncertainty about what institutions will ultimately prevail in Russia and perhaps his personal hedge against an uncertain future. This new reserve in giving cadets answers to the *for whom* and *for what* questions may be explained by a lack of consensus on what the best response to these questions might be. It is also indicative of the fluidity of power in Russia and an unwillingness by those beholden to multiple sources of power to advocate the supremacy of any single political ideology. In advanced democratic states, such as the United States, military cadets may hold varying political views, but they are taught that challenging the Constitution, except through accepted procedures, is not acceptable. This tripwire against legitimate military involvement in politics is completely absent in the Russian case and perilously left unstated in the Czech case.

Beyond the system of military colleges, much of the ideological shaping and socializing was done by the political officers. The position of political officer has been completely eliminated in the Czech case. However, in Russia the continuing need for officers specializing in the ideological training and socialization of Russian troops has been recognized. "When we made the inclination toward the de-ideologization of the armed forces we committed a mistake. We spoke about the liquidation of Party influence and therefore were convinced that this idea was correct absolutely. The smashing of the communist ideology, though, left a big vacuum which is very dangerous and which was started to be filled by Zhirinovsky and others."[191] As a result, the former Lenin Military Political Academy that used to specialize in the training of political officers for the Soviet military has been renamed the Military University and redesigned to

train the political officer's counterpart in the postcommunist era—the "educational" officer. The Military University is also the only higher military educational institution that trains interpreters, lawyers, journalists, teachers, psychologists, sociologists, and cultural workers.[192]

The observation by many that the Russian military lost its orientation when political officers stopped working has led to the development of a general consensus that some political training in the military should continue. "A man with no tsar in the head doesn't know what to do," remarked one Russian military observer.[193] Additionally, when political officers were eliminated many of their nonideological duties such as looking after the morale and welfare of the troops have gone unfulfilled by others. The new educational officers are intended to fill these gaps with their primary task being the "orientation" of the troops or the so-called upbringing of the soldiers.[194] Other tasks will include information-psychological support, military-social and cultural-leisure activities, and serving as liaisons to religious groups.[195]

The problem is, however, that there is still not a consensus on what this new orientation should be. Faculty at the reshaped educational officer academy in Moscow agree that military personnel who take up arms should be convinced of *for whom* and *for what* he or she is serving, but those responsible for answering these questions are falling back on "the Motherland" as the motivation for postcommunist servicemen and servicewomen in Russia: "A specific characteristic of Russian history is to be devoted to the Motherland. In the very difficult Russian history a constant was the Motherland."[196] Lt. General Sergey Zdorikov, Chief of the MOD Main Educational Work Directorate, stated that the position of his department and the Army is clear. "We serve not leaders, but the state. We are responsible to the people."[197] His successor, Lt. General Vladimir Kulakov, admitted two years later when education officers were already engaged in their work with the troops that the ideological niche once filled by the Party and its organizations is still empty.[198] What is needed, according to Kulakov, are officers who first acquire military specialties and then undergo subsequent training, much like political officers did so that they will learn to talk with people in the language of the professional educator and skillfully influence the hearts and minds of their subordinates."[199]

Those who settle on the Motherland for the object of one's loyalties must answer the question "which Motherland?" Should Russian soldiers dedicate themselves to defending the boundaries of the present-day Russian Federation or the territory of the former Soviet Union where many Russians live in the near-abroad?[200] This approach to service is flawed if defense of the state does not include the defense of democratic institutions. Indeed, such an approach can lead to defending the dismantling of democratic institutions if the perception of the military leadership is that such institutions run counter to the people's interest.

There is not as much enthusiasm for focusing on serving a democratic state because the "democratic Motherland hasn't given its children anything that would inspire them to give something back to it. Americans may say that they serve to defend the Constitution, democracy and rights that they have, but Russians don't feel any such obligation to the democratic state yet."[201] So, in the short term at least, the ideological training of Russian troops as guided by newly minted educational officers features a heavy dose of Russian history and traditions with a smattering of training on democratic principles. The foundation of the "new ideology," General Zdorikov professed, must be "Statehood, Patriotism, and Professionalism."[202] However, Zdorikov, the general responsible for coordinating the new educational work, had no objections to officers running for and serving in the state Duma.[203]

Thus far, the education officers assigned to work with the troops have not yet found their place. Commanders have been negative about their incorporation into the units, and former political officers, who perceive themselves to have much more experience in educational work, are resentful of the new education officers. The greatest reasons for the education officers' ineffectiveness most likely lie in the absence of an intellectual framework for their work. The only subunit of the armed forces dedicated to research in military-sociological studies was abolished in 1994 due to lack of financing.[204] Additionally, adaptations of the military education system, in general, must be preceded by the development of a national security concept and military doctrine compatible with the Russian Federation's current political and economic capabilities.[205]

In the Czech military education system little is being done to actively embrace the promotion of democratic values or allegiance to a democratic constitution. Although 30 percent of the cadets' four-year curriculum used to be devoted to such courses as Scientific Communism and the History of the Communist Party, only thirty classroom hours are set aside in the postcommunist curriculum for the study of philosophy, history, economics, and political science. The political science course consists of ten one-hour lectures and five seminars. Only one lesson is devoted to the basic principles of democracy. Another lesson discusses the main political parties and movements, while a third explains the main political ideologies of governments. There are no lessons devoted to explaining the role of the military in a democratic society or the norms of behavior of military officers in service to a democratic state. The instructors of political science at the Brno Military Academy, two recent university graduates, agree that the time dedicated to teaching cadets about democratic political systems and to their role within it is woefully inadequate in the course of a four-year curriculum.[206] They contend, too, that much of the cadets' instruction in philosophy, economics, and history is tainted because many Communist era ideologues still rule the military schools and negatively influence the teaching of these subjects.

The Czechs fail to understand that the mere abandonment of Marxist-Leninist ideology does not necessarily mean that democrats will result from programs that do not specifically educate students about democratic principles and the democratic political system. Many Czechs are averse to the idea of filling the Marxist-Leninist vacuum with democratic themes because they perceive any deliberate education or training on political subjects to be "indoctrination."

The question of ideological reorientation is virtually ignored and is related to confusion over what role, if any, democratic values should play in the transition of Czech military forces. Czechs have placed a high priority on the "professionalization" of their military and credit the time recouped from the performance of ideological tasks to making this "new professionalism" possible. As a result, ideology has been thrown out completely and no ideological reorientation is occurring.[207] Marxist-Leninism has not been replaced by democracy; political ideology has simply disappeared. "There's no time to worry about *who* or *why* they serve."[208] Professionalism and ideological orientation are considered two unrelated concepts that can be addressed sequentially—time permitting. As a result of these deficiencies in the training of military professionals and conscripts, the tripwire against legitimate military involvement in politics is perilously left unstated in the Czech case.

The misinterpretation and subsequent misappropriation of democratic values to military life is also evident through behavior observed at the remaining Czech military academies. U.S. Air Force Academy cadets who visited the ACR military academy at Brno on a weeklong cadet exchange visit in March 1995 reported that discipline was lax and practically nonexistent there. The explanation they received was that the behavior was a reaction to the strictness of the days under Communism and stemmed from the equating of discipline with authoritarianism.[209] My own site visit to the Brno Military Academy in March 1997 with another contingent of U.S. Air Force Academy cadets confirmed these earlier reports. Academy officials lamented the erasure of discipline that had characterized the academy in the Communist era and blamed government officials for not "passing laws to help us."[210] Cadets are free to do as they please in the afternoons and evenings, because "they do not like to be told what to do." Uniforms are only worn while cadets attend classes. Even officers wear uniforms only when performing official duties, not while traveling to or from work or when walking about the town.

The Czech Defense attaché to the United States agreed that the compatibility of democracy and discipline is a lesson that has been lost on many associated with the ACR. Through the course of his assignment in the United States he has visited both the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. "We need many more people to go and see what discipline looks like there." He added that he thought his colleagues

would be surprised at what they see and that "if we want to be in NATO, we will need this discipline."[211] However, others fear that stricter disciplinary standards will further reduce interest in the military academies, which are currently only filled to 50 percent capacity.[212]

Finally, I will address the democratic deficits in the Professional Military Education (PME) system. PME is defined as education that recurs throughout a professional soldier's career and is normally focused on preparation for a specific rank or technical specialty. The IMET program has afforded the Russians and Czechs, as well as their postcommunist neighbors, the opportunity to attend various PME courses in the United States and in some NATO countries. But of the cases presented in this study, only the Czech Republic has taken full advantage of exposing its officers to the West's broad-based approach to officership through this program.

However, the PME system predominant in the ACR is the technical-based system inherited from the Communist era. No significant adjustments to this system have been made.[213] While attendance at Western, and especially U.S., PME programs has become an important discriminator in a Czech officer's record, a comparable program has not yet developed internally for the vast majority of officers who will never be selected to study in the West.[214] More importantly, the lessons learned abroad effectively do little to change the face of the ACR unless similar PME lessons are systematized in the Czechs' own system.

The development of some semblance of an NCO corps also depends on the creation of an education and training system that prepares servicemen for these ranks and their corresponding responsibilities. The ACR is developing a program to train some contract professionals on the roles and responsibilities of NCOs, but no parallel program is being set up to ensure that officers understand NCOs' roles and responsibilities.[215] Obviously, training NCOs without preparing officers for their integration into units will be less than effective.

Some Czech reformers argue in favor of revamping the whole system to achieve their goal of developing a semiprofessional ACR. Defense Minister Lobkowicz proposed abandoning the conscript-based system entirely, but his successor, Vladimir Vetchy, reversed the plan.[216] Hope remains, however, that some young Czechs can be attracted to serving as "professionals" within the semiprofessional ACR. This proposal would have all potential officers and NCOs beginning their military service as conscripts, subsequently serve as NCOs, and then those willing and able could progress on to university-level officer commissioning programs. The theory is that attrition at the commissioning schools could be reduced if the cadets had prior military experience.[217] However, it also assumes that service in the lower ranks will make a positive impression on the future officer candidates and that the training provided there will be considered an attractive alternative to other vocational-type training available in the civilian sector. However, the Czech MOD has determined that

50 percent of the negative information acquired by the public about the Army comes from their contact with conscripts.[218]

Reformed education and training programs are a crucial element in the democratization and professionalization of both the ACR and the Russian military. Without such a system in place, it is unlikely that any reform agenda will be successful. The hallmarks of professionalism are learned in the formative experience of a military academy or in the hands-on military training of an NCO. A broad education in which democratic values are taught and internalized so that officers and NCOs, and conscripts for that matter, know *who, why*, and *how* to serve is an essential prerequisite for both democratic military professionalism and competence. Reform is also necessary for the boosting of the institution's prestige as a whole and of the educational institutions that serve it.

Norms of Political Influence

There are some similarities between the Czech and Russian cases with respect to understanding what the norms of acceptable political behavior and influence are for a military in a democratic state. The lack of experience of being a player in democratic processes affects both cases; however, the Russian military lags markedly behind the Czechs because it has not yet fully accepted its role in the new political order.

> Russia has made only limited progress toward creating an apolitical military and setting up institutional safeguards to prevent the use of coercive force by political leaders intent on gaining or maintaining power. The Russian Armed Forces remain, in essence, the old Soviet Armed Forces—an institution traumatized by the breakup of the USSR and coexisting uneasily with the new political order.[219]

The Russian military's trauma is increasingly being played out by its inappropriate participation in the election process. While many officers still adhere to the idea that apolitical behavior is a hallmark of military professionalism,[220] others are endorsing a more direct political role.[221] Officers' participation in elections dates to the first Russian elections, when civilian candidates allied with officer candidates in an effort to woo the military vote.[222] In 1993, deputies who had good contacts with local generals were well supported because "soldiers will vote how officers tell them."[223] In addition, commanders can control which political blocs have access to garrisons to promote their platforms and candidates.[224] The isolation of many military bases also makes it possible for the military to control closed areas and deliver the vote.[225]

The All-Russian Officers' Assembly created in the first half of 1995 is led by some of the top plotters of the 1991 coup. The movement's aim is to seek

the support of active duty officers, reservists, and sympathetic civilians to support candidates of Communist, agrarian, and nationalist blocs.[226] Additionally, every major political party or bloc has recruited a senior officer to serve in its leadership[227] to help sway the military vote, which is estimated to account for one-third of the nation's registered voters.[228]

Even more disturbing is the presence of active duty officers serving in parliament. As one analyst noted, "It is as if the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff were elected to serve in the Congress." In the 1996 election, the MOD endorsed a slate of 123 officers, many of whom were still on active duty.[229] In some cases, officers from the official MOD slate were ordered to run against retired officers, such as General Boris Gromov, who had fallen out of favor with Grachev and the Ministry.[230] Even Grachev himself indicated a desire to run and authorized the collection of signatures on his behalf to qualify.[231] Colonel General Lev Rokhlin, former Chairman of the Duma's Defense Committee, was a particularly outspoken military parliamentarian.

The alliance building between the military and its civilian leadership that used to be based on accommodating the army's demands in exchange for subjugation to Party rule seems increasingly to have shifted to the political arena in the democratization era. However, the military candidates and blocs do not profess a unified agenda. Some, like the All-Russian Officers' Assembly, are opposed to the democratic and economic reforms that have taken place and seek to roll them back. Others are centrists who support the postcommunist government.[232] Still others are tied to the singular interests of the MOD, which has the aim of increasing the defense budget and improving the living conditions of soldiers without significantly reforming the MOD itself. Finally, the group the government is most eager to silence is Lev Rokhlin's Movement in Support of the Army, the Defense Industry, and Military Science,[233] which has its origins in Rokhlin's vocal opposition to the military reform plan launched in July 1997. Rokhlin called upon the military to unite in opposition against the military reform plan.[234] A Chechen war hero and former supporter of the government, Rokhlin moved into the opposition due to his perception that the proposed cuts to the ground forces will leave a hollow Army outnumbered by Interior Ministry troops[235] that he alleged Yeltsin is favoring as a sort of praetorian guard.[236] Rokhlin's murder in August 1998 puts into question the continued political impact of his movement.

Some justify the increased direct political involvement as fulfilling their duty to ensure that the problems of the armed forces are adequately addressed in order to protect the state.[237] Such rationalizing is the result of the evolution of postcommunist military professionalism within a context of ambiguous ideological allegiance. Loyalty to the Motherland has been preserved as the ideological point of consensus from the Communist era. Clearly, allegiance to democratic norms of political participation for soldiers has not yet taken root,

especially when adherence to such norms may be perceived as contrary to the interests of the Motherland as understood by the military. Though some officers still profess that an apolitical, professional military should be the norm, their views are being overshadowed by activists who have decided that this goal should be subordinate to restoring the honor of the armed forces and the state.

The Czech Republic, in contrast, has not been plagued by any rumblings from the ACR for direct participation in politics. The Czech deficit in democratic norms of political influence is characterized more by an unwillingness to participate in politics even by legitimate means and stems from a lack of experience in the political process. For example, present legislation permits cadets to attend military academies for one year, which counts as their mandatory year of conscript service, and then transfer to a civilian university by paying back the academy $30 for each month of training. Current law also permits civilian firms to "buy out" the active duty service commitments of academy graduates at the same rate, enabling those graduates to acquire an academy education and fulfill their military commitment with no active duty service. Faculty members also cited legislation that governs all higher education in the Czech Republic calling for students to elect officials of the universities. With no exception for military schools, the Rektor of the Brno Military was consequently elected by the Senate of the academy, which includes cadet representatives. Because funding levels are also determined by the number of students in attendance at both military and civilian schools, military faculties are eager to retain students, while civilian faculties are happy to take military students into their programs. Such procedures put academy authorities in a difficult position with respect to enforcing standards.[238] Academy officials seemed incapable of solving their serious problems of discipline, funding, and recruitment of potential cadets without some sort of outside intervention by political authorities. There seemed to be little willingness to unilaterally impose regulations to enforce discipline or to lobby for legislation that was needed to ensure that the academy, specifically, and the military, in general, functioned in an efficient and disciplined manner.

There are several levels on which progress needs to be made. First, the ACR must become more astute at putting its own political house in order by developing processes through which ideas can compete openly and freely between the ranks, the General Staff, and the MOD. Second, members of the military institution in authoritative and expert positions need to more assertively develop positive working relationships with the direct oversight bodies in Parliament and with the population at large that has indirect oversight authority through its elected representatives.

Additionally, the attitude that sees professional officers as completely apolitical beings does not recognize the proper amount of political savvy and awareness that is not only appropriate, but essential, to a military institution in a democracy. Although Huntington extols apolitical military officers as the

purest professionals, such a view does not take into account the degree of lobbying and the political transmission of expert advice that is needed from time to time to ensure that civilian national security policymakers make well-informed judgments.

The evidence presented in the section on education and training showed that military academicians at military colleges in both the Czech Republic and Russia are struggling with this issue. Indeed, the first question put to me in my correspondence with a faculty member from a Russian military college on the subject of teaching political science at military schools was, "It seems that the American Armed Forces have a political role in your country, but why do we hear that the Army of the USA is outside of politics? How is it possible to explain this?"[239]

The Russian military's confusion stems, at least partially, from its reluctant involvement by political actors in political feuds. The Russian military was averse to taking sides in Yeltsin's fight with Parliament in October 1993, but ultimately participated in order to preserve order in the capital. The use of the military for such roles is dangerous for states in transition, because a certain amount of indebtedness to the military is created that may distort the military's perception of what norms of political influence it must adhere to in a democracy. The military may expect rewards for its behavior that go beyond what military institutions whose coercive powers had not been called upon would expect.

There is evidently still a lot of confusion about the proper role of the military institution in the democratic political process. One observer explained, "The problem up to now has been that in general neither the military nor society at large understands the political process. On the institutional level, few people understand political decision making or legislative procedures."[240] If the military leadership wants to ensure that its institution does not become involved in political conflicts, then it must provide the means for those serving in the armed forces to attain an understanding of the political process and what the proper role of soldiers is vis-à-vis the democratic state. It is not good enough for the military to get comfortable with being an apolitical institution if behaviors associated with this status are not understood. Transitioning militaries must understand the political processes happening around them and develop institutional practices that are compatible with the norms of political participation and influence in a democracy.

While the Russian case shows an inconsistent pattern of political behavior ranging from direct participation in politics to ignoring training on an officer's proper role in the political arena, the Czech case shows an extreme aversion to ideology and politics in any form. Both cases need to become comfortable with the norms of political influence of militaries in democratic states. An officer in service to a democratic state should learn the precepts of demo-

cratic ideology and his/her proper role as a defender of its democratic institutions. Officers should also be aware of the established norms for influencing the political process of a democratic state while remaining focused on respecting the constraints of democratic accountability.

Prestige and Public Relations

Chapter 3 discussed extensively the relationship between society and the military as an essential element of democratic political control. The importance of transparency as a means of democratic oversight and the expectation that democratic values will be evident within all transitioning institutions were highlighted. This section and the final section of the chapter will briefly revisit this issue in the specific context of military professionalism. The aim is to present the issue from the internal perspective of the military institutions in transition and to show the progress made in the Czech Republic and Russia on actively managing the military relationship with the public.

In both the Czech Republic and Russia there is an insufficient understanding within the military that it must earn the respect of society and that it is largely responsible for the perpetuation of its own negative image. In the Czech Republic, Western observers note that although the ACR tends to dwell on its negative image, it misses some simple ways to work on it. The U.S. Army attaché noted that the Czech bases are by and large very "dumpy" and that little things like painting the front gate and flying the Czech flag go undone. There is a tendency, he argued further, for the Czechs to attribute their image problems to outside forces and not to take responsibility to improve some things on their own.[241] Political leaders must also take part in strengthening the prestige of the ACR through their material support and the provision of concrete political guidance.[242] The poor level of financial support from the government has led officers to question their worth to society. "Society must ask the question whether it wants the army in the first place or else it can be disbanded."[243]

In Russia the picture is one of a demoralized military that is often at odds with the public. A survey of military elites in Russia reported that regrets about Russia's loss of status as a military and political world power were a central theme. Seventy percent of the officers questioned described the decline of the Soviet Union as a "disaster for our country," and more than 40 percent of those questioned whether military means should have been used to prevent it.[244] Negative self-images of perceived prestige within society also characterized the survey results. Only 11 percent of mid-level and senior officers thought that officers enjoyed popular respect while only 4 percent said that General Officers are respected by the populace.[245]

A U.S. attaché who spoke at a forum of Afghan and Vietnam vets in Volgograd during the Chechen War questioned those in attendance about their feel-

ings for the plight of the conscripts in Chechnya. He discovered that the citizens there had little sympathy for their countrymen. “They thought that these guys were stupid not to find some way to get out of conscription. They were either too lazy or stupid to find a way out of their service.”[246] Commenting on the tactics that the Russian military is using to try to limit the shortfall of conscripts, other Russian observers report that “draft campaigns resemble military operations with future soldiers being escorted to the military draft offices at gun point.”[247]

Impoverishment of the Russian officer corps is a prime reason for its demoralization, but freedom of the press has also contributed to the widespread propagation of a negative image for the military. The press has been an important player in pressuring the military into being more responsive to the public. In this sense, the free press has made the military more accountable than it would have been on its own and has led to the military leadership’s greater acceptance of the idea that it cannot just do whatever it wants and ignore the public reaction to its behavior.[248] At the same time, the era of glasnost began a period of increased negative scrutiny of the military beginning with the tarnishing of the military’s image through objective reporting of the Afghan War, followed by the revelation of widespread corruption scandals and practices, and continuing to the largely negative reporting on the war in Chechnya.

Some attempt has been made to address the issue of working actively to repair the damaged image of the Russian military through the creation of a public affairs department at the MOD. “In this way Grachev was actually some improvement over Yazov at first with regard to public relations. He had some appreciation of politics in a democracy.”[249] This office, though, has no doubt been kept very busy fielding the corruption charges continually waged against various general officers. There are also some ACR officers serving in the public affairs specialty at the MOD and Corps levels.

While some public relations infrastructure exists that was previously missing, most observers concur that tremendous needs remain with regard to the Russian MOD’s willingness to be a transparent institution. Lack of truthful information is such that “society does not even know the colossal efforts required to resolve the problems inherited from the military sphere.”[250] Western observers think that the ACR has been more forthcoming in providing information to the public than other postcommunist militaries in the region, but that its responsiveness depends on whether or not the media has independently discovered a particular issue.[251] A U.S. trained public affairs specialist confirmed that there are still some lingering problems of obsessiveness with secrecy within the MOD. Often information that he thinks should have been routinely passed to him is not. No routine for passing on information commensurate with his responsibilities of communicating ACR activity to the public had yet developed.[252]

Both cases have shown that there is an important link between the tasks of improving the military's prestige and its responsiveness to the people. Reforms that are clearly communicated to the population will lead to improved coverage in the press and greater public support for the professionalization and transformation of the military. Both military institutions must convince all who serve in their ranks at all levels that democratic populations expect and deserve full accountability from all institutions of government including the military. This is especially true in the Czech case where the prospects for professionalization and reform are greater. The ACR is dependent on cultivating goodwill among the Czech population to support the higher spending levels that will be required to support a professional force. Both countries must also assure recruits that they can serve without fear and willingly commit to careers as NCOs and officers. Continued lack of reform, reliance on secrecy, and acceptance of corrupt behavior, on the other hand, will result in a continued downward spiral of prestige and low support among the public.

Compatibility of Military and Social Values

A central theme of this entire work is that societal institutions should reflect overall societal values. When societal values change, then the values of its subordinate institutions should adapt to these changes. A characteristic of the U.S. military is that it reflects the democratic values of U.S. society. "Our people are jealous of their military and will hold the government accountable for its misuse. This goes well beyond people not wanting their treasure wasted. Militaries are inevitably a reflection of the society that they serve."[253] The necessity of adapting to democratic civilian oversight is teaching transitioning militaries that no institutions in democracies exist in a political vacuum. While military institutions are not and should never be democracies, the values inherent in militaries should reflect the democratic values of such states.

In the Czech case, there is cross-institutional consensus on what constitutes the legitimate authority of the state. There is no question that the leadership of the ACR respects the principle of democratic civilian control although it has shown its inexperience in being subject to it. All societal institutions, though equally inexperienced, are working toward the common goal of consolidating democracy. President Havel has expressed his confidence in the ACR leadership: "I realize that, after all those complicated personnel changes, the Army is led by a relatively good team of younger generals who are willing to build the democratic army of a democratic state."[254]

In the Russian case, however, the advent of democratization has led to an increasing level of disparity between democratic values and the values of the post-Soviet military institution. For the first time, the military was put under scrutiny and subject to negative criticism; and for the first time Russian society

began to reject some of the military's values. The military particularly laments the across-the-board demilitarization of society that is taking place.[255] The situation is compounded by an overall lack of consensus within society as a whole concerning the acceptance of democratic values.

One fundamental value that Russian society is rejecting is the conscript system. A survey of draft age youth revealed that 70 percent of draftees are convinced of the needlessness of military service, 35 percent said that under certain circumstances they could forsake the Motherland, and 50 percent thought that such virtues as military duty, patriotism, and honor are from the past.[256] "The highly urbanized and educated mass culture is no longer going along with a conscript system based on beating youth into compliance. These elements make the continuation of such a conscript system untenable. Only the dregs too slow to get away are serving. So military leaders have an insoluble dilemma if they dream of maintaining the old model."[257]

At present, the military is providing a negative socialization function giving conscripts the worst possible introduction to what the state is capable of doing through service within a tough and brutal system. Mothers disillusioned by the senseless loss of their sons in Chechnya and the absence of government accountability regarding the fate of conscripts, either those presently serving or those who died in service, now protest that they never would have let their sons go to the military if they had known the true conditions. "We are ashamed and pained by our country."[258] Mothers who once regarded military service as the duty of all young Russian men now attend meetings where they learn how to avoid the draft and advocate for their sons subject to conscription.[259]

But abandoning the historical socialization function of the Russian military by forfeiting the military's claim on the great majority of Russian male youths would be a tremendous concession to changing priorities of Russian society. Even those who advocate abolishing the draft caution against some possible negative side effects that may lead to the widening of the gap between civilian society and the professional military. "If the consolidation of the military caste and its further politicization are not prevented, the democratic process in Russia can be greatly jeopardized."[260]

The Czech military, on the other hand, never felt the oneness with the state and its people that the Soviet military did and is consequently not clinging to its previous socialization function. Indeed, the ACR welcomes the day when the treasury will be able to finance the goal of converting the ACR to a professional all-volunteer force. However, as the ideology driving the Czech political system has dramatically shifted away from Communism to democracy, different institutions within society have adapted to these changes at different rates. It is important to carefully monitor the potential divergence of military and societal values as the postcommunist era continues. The democratic leaders of the Czech Republic must continue to use their influence to craft for the ACR a re-

spected and valued niche in the transitioning state. The continued perception of military service as a profession for social misfits cannot be allowed to persist.

Eventually the oversight capabilities of nascent democratic institutions will gain in strength and experience, and forcing reforms that will bring the values of the transitioning state and the military institution that serves it into line. In the Czech case, these values will be democratic and the ACR will be compelled to root out remaining institutional habits from the Soviet era that conflict with the expectations of its democratic citizens—both in and out of uniform. In the Russian case, the permanence of democratic values is less certain, but the rejection of some Soviet era practices such as conscript service seems clear. Authority is a value that is still important in varying degrees in transitioning societies. But unrestricted use of authority, as evidenced in authoritarian leadership practices, has come into conflict with the expectations of postcommunist citizens. Those responsible for military oversight have already rejected and will continue to reject such practices.

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to highlight the differences in military professionalism between democratic and transitioning states. Military professionalism in all states is measured by the degree to which civilian supremacy of the armed forces has been achieved. However, military professionalism in democratic states is differentiated further by loyalty to democratic political systems and their inherent democratic values. States undergoing transitions from authoritarian to democratic political systems face the unique challenge of adapting inherited forms of military professionalism so that norms of democratic accountability are evident in the transitioning military institution. The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that often transitioning militaries find themselves caught between two incompatible systems of military professionalism. Additionally, progress in the military sphere of democratization seems to lag progress achieved in other transitioning democratic institutions.

Specific democratization deficits have been outlined across the seven dimensions of democratic military professionalism first presented in chapter 1. First, in the area of recruitment and retention, there is a need to address the basic needs of the armed forces in order to attract and retain quality personnel. Developing appropriate and sustainable force structures that can support soldiers at a higher level will facilitate achievement of this goal. Second, deficits were noted in both cases regarding the need for merit-based promotion systems unscarred by corrupt procedures. Further development of competency-based advancement practices will result in a more skilled officer corps on which the people's treasure is spent more efficiently. Third, improvements in standards of officership and leadership depend on the effective democratic socialization of

all citizens, including those who serve in the armed forces and those who oversee them. The infusion of democratic values into a transitioning political system results in the development of higher expectations of treatment compatible with democratic principles. There is also the need to institutionalize democratic values through a society-wide emphasis on the rule of law that does not tolerate violations of ethical standards or corruption. Fourth, education and training programs must include clear instruction on *who, why,* and *how* military personnel serve in democratic states. The motivation for service must not be ambiguous and must be characterized by allegiance to a democratic political system as embodied in the state's constitution. Fifth, there is a need for further education on the norms of political influence in democratic states. Both countries suffer from a lack of experience in being players in democratic political systems. The Russian military has shown an inconsistent pattern of preferring apolitical behavior in some cases, but the recent trend is for direct political participation. The Czech military, on the other hand, revealed an extreme aversion to politics that falls short of an appropriate role in the political system. Sixth, in the area of prestige and public relations, both cases must work harder to earn the respect of their populations. Greater transparency and abandonment of old habits of secrecy and the control of information will enhance this process. Additionally, military institutions must respond to societal demands to instill democratic values that clearly communicate the accomplishment of democratic reforms in order to boost the prestige of the armed forces. Finally, transitioning military institutions need to work on improving the compatibility of military and societal values. The implementation of democratic reforms can reduce the gap that has developed since the advent of democratization. Democratic expectations in society at large have outstripped the ability of military institutions to respond to them.

In the Czech Republic democratic values have begun to take root and the combined focus of the population and its newly created democratic institutions is to complete the transition to democracy. While the transition for the military has been difficult, there is no question regarding their loyalty to the democratic state. Indeed, a general motivation to eventually achieve the dimensions of Western-style democratic military professionalism was noted although many democratization deficits still exist. In Russia, however, democracy has not been a positive experience for the military or for many other elements of post-Soviet society. It has meant only a loss in material status, increased disorder, and discontinuity with the familiar past. "It may be understandable for us what the American dream is, but we cannot say, 'What is the Russian Dream?'"[261] The Russian officer corps, like much of the Russian citizenry, is a adrift in a sea of confusion—searching for values to guide their everyday lives. One result is a military institution that has made virtually no progress in responding to the shift from an authoritarian to a democratic political system. Severe democratization

deficits persist across all dimensions of democratic military professionalism presented in the chapter.

The following chapter will look at the U.S. response to the democratization deficits described in the Czech and Russian militaries. Specific measures taken to aid each case will be analyzed to determine the extent to which U.S. military assistance programs effectively meet the democratization needs of each military in terms of both democratic political control and democratic military professionalism.

CHAPTER 5

The Effectiveness of U.S. Military to Military Democratization Initiatives in Russia and the Czech Republic

Chapters 3 and 4 illustrated that the democratization needs of the Russian and Czech militaries are great. Chapter 2 laid out the general U.S. response to the needs of postcommunist militaries across the former Soviet bloc and began to make the case that although some effort has been made to take advantage of military assistance opportunities in the region, failure to operationalize the concepts of *democratic political control* and *democratic military professionalism* severely limited the effectiveness of the outreach programs created. This chapter will highlight the disparities between the democratization needs of the Russian and Czech militaries and the specific steps taken through U.S. assistance programs to facilitate their transitions to democracy.

U.S. Military Presence in the Soviet Era

U.S. military presence in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in the Soviet era was primarily in the form of Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) attaché personnel charged with collecting as much intelligence information as possible as they conducted their military diplomatic duties in the U.S. Embassy. The need for expert intelligence collectors merited an extensive period of preparation, to include language training, before these officers deployed in-country. These officers also usually had some regional or country-specific expertise. These positions have remained a constant presence from the Soviet era through the present and have affected subsequent efforts to influence the militaries of the region.

In the Soviet era, the military relationship between the USSR and the United States was centered around planning to wage war against each other and searching for ways to gain the upper hand in this endeavor. The intelligence work of attachés in Czechoslovakia also centered around collecting intelligence on the Soviet Union. Military diplomacy focused on dangerous activities or the prevention of them such as monitoring incidents at sea, air intercepts, and arms control compliance. In this respect, the relationship was adversarial with a focus on negative activities.[1]

The openness created by perestroika and glasnost led to the possibility of initiating positive defense and military contacts between the superpowers. As noted earlier, the first exchange of this kind was in 1988 when General Akhromeev came to the United States to visit his counterpart, Chairman of the JCS, Admiral William Crowe. At this meeting a two-year plan for defense and military contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States was developed jointly by representatives of the JCS and the Soviet General Staff. Ten events were approved by both sides focusing mostly on high-level visits that were centered on reciprocity and protocol. By the second year of the program Generals Powell and Moiseev were the chiefs of their respective militaries, and the program was broadened at the request of Powell to include more exchanges with less formality overall.[2] The military to military relationship that has developed with Russia in the postcommunist era has its origins in these early attempts to establish a series of friendly defense and military contacts during the Bush administration.

U.S. Military Presence in the Postcommunist Era

The overall relationship between the Soviet Union's main successor, Russia, and the United States can be characterized by two main dimensions. First, it is a strategic relationship rooted in the enforcement and negotiation of arms control treaties and, more recently, the management of Russian reaction to NATO expansion.[3] Second, there is an assistance dimension aimed at promoting democracy, economic reforms, and the dismantlement of nuclear weapons. The military to military programs explored throughout the rest of this chapter are just one small part of this overall bilateral relationship. These initiatives are a natural outgrowth of friendly relations and reflect the historic tendency in American foreign policy to foster democracy when such opportunities arise.

The first attempts at outreach toward the transitioning Czechoslovak state beyond the traditional exchange of information between attachés came in 1990 with initial military contacts between American and Czechoslovak general officers. Some key visits occurred early on during which some assistance was given with respect to the organization of a new military doctrine and strategy and processes of acquisition management. These early meetings also paved the way for Czechoslovak participation in the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program through which the United States sent the first Czechoslovak officer to the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC) at Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas, in 1991.[4] The U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) deployed its seventh MLT to the Czech Republic in July 1993 and four Czech senior officers were among the first class to graduate from the Marshall Center in December 1994.

U.S. Military to Military Programs in Russia and the Czech Republic

The survey of regional military to military programs in chapter 2 noted that the Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP) and the program for Defense and Military Contacts with the former Soviet Union (FSU) have virtually the same broad policy guidance. The stated goals of the program of contacts with the FSU is "to facilitate a military responsible to democratically elected civilian authorities, a demilitarized market economy, and a smaller military with defense-oriented forces."[5] Similarly, the mission of EUCOM's Joint Contact Team Program is "to assist the governments of Central and Eastern European countries and the republics of the former Soviet Union in developing civilian controlled military forces which foster peace and stability in a democratic society."[6]

The following analysis of events that have occurred under the auspices of these programs indicates that there is a significant gap between events that can be categorized as directly or even indirectly addressing the task of democratization facing the Czech and Russian militaries and those that cannot be classified as democratization events. Indeed, a substantial portion of events can be categorized only as supporting postcommunist militaries' quests to be better militaries—a goal that does not coincide with the stated missions of the JCTP or the program of Defense and Military Contacts with the FSU, which are ideologically driven and justified.

The events are broken into "pre-reform" and "post-reform" eras for the Czech Republic. The implementation of "Focused Engagement" in mid-1997 coincided with a deliberate shift away from democratization events toward interoperability events, although neither the legal basis nor the mission statement of the JCTP has changed in the "post-reform" era. The analysis will show that even in the portion of events dedicated to military democratization objectives, poor conceptualization and operationalization of the components of military democratization still result in less than effective activity. The events for the Russian case run chronologically and are not separated into separate eras, since no major reforms in the administration of the military to military program with Russia have been attempted. The tables in appendixes A and B detail the events that have occurred under the auspices of these programs.

It is difficult to detect any particular focus areas of emphasis through an analysis of program activity. It is especially difficult to come to the conclusion that any sort of operationalization of the programs' mission statements was ever done and that some effort was made throughout the implementation of the program to facilitate the occurrence of events that would contribute to the democratic transitions of the militaries.

In Russia, between January 1991 and December 1997, 329 defense and military contacts occurred under the official auspices of the Program of Contacts Between the Department of Defense of the United States and the Ministry

of Defense of the Russian Federation. Of the events recorded in the tables, I categorized 79.9 percent as not directly contributing to the democratization focus areas outlined in the models. Only 20.1 percent of the defense and military contacts recorded could be classified as contributing to one of the focus areas of a military in transition to a democracy according to the framework developed in chapter 1.

In the Czech Republic, of the 340 events recorded through FY 1998, I categorized 81.2 percent of them as not contributing to the military democratization goals of the program. I classified 18.8 percent of the events as contributing to one of the focus areas of a military in transition to a democracy. Breaking this data into the "pre-reform" and "post-reform" eras reveals remarkably similar results. Of the 238 events that took place through June 1997, 81.1 percent did not contribute to military democratization objectives, 81.4 percent of the 102 events from June 1997 through FY 1998 were categorized as not contributing to military democratization objectives. It appears, then, that the reforms have had little effect on the emphasis of military democratization goals in terms of percentage of program activity dedicated to achieving them.

These remarkably similar statistics across the cases speak to the amount of attention that is likely to be paid to democratization issues within programs that do not specifically attempt to ensure that program activity achieves this goal. The degree of success, however, must be considered to be an accidental occurrence since there is no evidence that either the policymakers or policy implementers had any knowledge of such a framework as they directed and carried out the programs' activities. Any such classifications are the result of applying the framework after the events have been carried out.

In the Russian case many of the events recorded in tables B.1 and B.2 (see appendix B) were exchanges of high-level delegations of various defense officials and personnel whose trips in-country did not necessarily focus on democratization needs. I categorized many of these events as contributing to democratization needs simply because civilian defense officials were involved or because the exchange occurred between educational institutions, with the assumption that at least exposure to representatives from these components of the U.S. defense community might have some impact on perceptions of civilian control and issues involving education and training. In contrast, events that fell into the democratization category in the Czech case tended to be more clearly focused on achieving specific democratization needs of postcommunist militaries in transition. It should also be kept in mind that the Russian contacts recorded include only the list of official contacts agreed to by the two governments under the auspices of the defense and military contacts program. The tables do not include contacts associated with arms control implementation, cooperative threat reduction, or other less formal contacts that may have occurred. Experts estimate that contacts related to arms control inspections and scientific and technical military contacts comprise 75 percent of the overall defense and

military contacts between the United States and Russia.[7] But these types of technical assistance contacts make no claims to be facilitating democratization outcomes.

The use of frequency criteria is limited since it does not consider the qualitative impact of particular events. It may be that one particular event was many times more successful than another and that great program impact could have occurred within just a few events. However, I began with this assessment tool because, at least in the "pre-reform" era of the JCTP, it was the only assessment tool that the program had applied to itself. There was a management mentality in the first six years of the JCTP that equated degree of program activity with success. An excerpt from USAF Pentagon briefing papers offers a self-congratulatory appraisal: "Probably the best measure of our success is they like what they see and keep asking for more. Here are some numbers on how many air force contacts we've had."[8] These comments accompanied a chart that illustrated through the use of bar graphs the increase in event activity across two fiscal years. By 1997, however, the increased operations tempo of active duty forces in Europe combined with the drawdown in active duty forces in the theater by 50 percent since 1992 resulted in a 10 percent drop in overall event activity and a greater dependence on Reserve Component forces to support them.[9]

The focus on activity over the achievement of specific objectives created a dilemma for the team chiefs in-country who had been accustomed to fulfilling specific mission objectives in their daily duties. A team chief in the Czech Republic in the 1994–95 time frame shared his frustration that no clear definition of victory had been laid out for his team by the program's policymakers. "When can we declare success?"[10] He added that it was an interesting position to be in, when U.S. military thinking at the time was putting such a premium on laying out objectives and criteria for success.

Additionally, he noted that no one at USEUCOM had ever asked him about specific aspects of progress in the Czech Republic. When he did offer information indicating that progress had been made in a particular area, no one asked him *how* this progress was achieved. Indeed, his desk officer back at the program's headquarters requested that such information be deleted from future reports since it was not relevant to the specific administrative function of recording how much money was spent and which particular events took place in the previous week.

The MLT in place in the Czech Republic during my field research was motivated to achieve program success, but limited by its directives and policy guidance.[11] Their in-country experience resulted in the frustrating realization that those charged with overseeing the program had low expectations of what could substantively be accomplished by their team and had set up a bureaucratic mode of operations that practically guaranteed that only limited progress was possible.

A partial explanation of this phenomenon is that the JCTP is a political-military program in which operators have been allowed to both develop the flawed policy guidance and implement the program on the ground. A National Defense University scholar observed that those running the program have to learn as they go, but that this was unlikely since operators cannot be expected to understand the theoretical issues that should underpin and subsequently drive program activity.[12] Improved guidance did not come until mid-1997 and consisted of an intermediary level of oversight within EUCOM to ensure that program activity supported the objectives of the European theater.[13]

Previously, an approach that was generally passive and focused on offering a menu of services versus the development of a particular product (democratic military institutions) had developed. This led to a situation where the team in place lacked the means to maximize the possibilities for contributing to the deepening of military democratization as the potential for greater sophistication developed. The management of the program in the "pre-reform" era made it almost impossible for a conscientious, and perhaps uniquely enlightened, operator to improve the quality of the activity that had preceded him or her.

In Russia there were similar complaints from the U.S. attachés about policy guidance in their military to military contacts program. Policy planners at the Pentagon described the process of choosing which events should be proposed from the U.S. side as "unsophisticated." The U.S. defense attaché charged with the duty of presenting the list of proposed U.S. events to his counterpart in the Russian General Staff Foreign Liaison Office said that he starts with a list of 150 unprioritized proposed events from the U.S. side that is comprised of inputs from all of the services. Then the Russian and U.S. officers review the list and winnow it down based often on reciprocity issues, that is, offering to host a type of delegation that the other state had hosted previously. He said that there is no specific guidance other than this in determining many of the contacts and that "in general the process of choosing events will not grow in sophistication until we push it." He added that the United States has never figured out what it wants the military to military contact program with Russia to be. Do we want it to show how successful our system is, break down barriers from the Cold War, achieve interoperability, or influence senior decision makers?[14]

The Army officer at the Pentagon with the responsibility for determining the Army's inputs to the annual list of proposed events also complained about the absence of prioritization on the part of the United States about what its goals for military contacts with Russia should be. He said that in the honeymoon period right after Yeltsin took over, the DOD threw too much too fast at the Russians without focusing on objectives. "Powell's guidance to engage at all levels often and anywhere was well-intentioned, but not practical."[15] He went on to say that this lack of prioritization was regrettable because the scarcity of

Russian economic resources severely constrained their level of participation in exchanges and other contacts.

Personnel involved with the program agree that there really is no broad plan guiding the contacts or supervision over what happens. "The idea is to let 1,000 flowers bloom."[16] Brigadier General Reppert, a former army attaché to Moscow and U.S. Defense Attaché to Russia as of July 1995, said that the Russian General Staff assumes that there is a master plan to the U.S. approach and has repeatedly asked to see it. But the general admits, "There hasn't been one. We've taken the Johnny Appleseed approach—throwing seeds everywhere and hoping that some trees grow. This is why when we look back over the program we can see that we've tended to pursue paths of least resistance."[17] This is due in part to the tighter micromanagement of the program of contacts with Russia vis-à-vis other FSU states. The Russian program is controlled at higher echelons with extensive Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) involvement with inputs from other interested departments. The result, perhaps counterintuitively, is a less coordinated and defined program than the others in the FSU. Complaints persist from officers charged with implementing the program of contacts that this "unsophisticated process" is due primarily to the lack of clear political guidance detailing what the program should do. This results in a "grab-bag, ad hoc program driven by the 'good idea du jour' of various department heads and appointees."[18]

The primacy the United States placed on its relationship with Russia relative to the other postcommunist states in the region also affected program activity. Initially, many more high-level exchanges of civilian defense officials and generals occurred in Russia than in its postcommunist neighbors. "Everyone wants to do stuff with the Russians—not just the components that should rightfully be involved."[19] Eventually, though, bilateral and multilateral activity with other FSU states, and especially with Ukraine, surpassed the number of exercises with Russia. To date six exercises have occurred between the U.S. and Russian militaries, while nine have occurred with Ukraine.[20]

Bureaucratic Limitations of the Programs' Effectiveness

The Czech Republic and the JCTP

The greatest bureaucratic limitation of the Joint Contact Team's effectiveness is in the policy driving the manning of the MLTs and the Joint Contact Team at EUCOM. While the assignment of highly trained professional military personnel with some fluency in the host nation's language and some area expertise would enhance the effectiveness of the in-country teams, in reality the quality of each MLT varies substantially, and there are no specific criteria for filling the available positions.

A team chief who had served in the Czech Republic said that from his vantage point manning of the teams is done by the "Hey you!" method.[21] That is, anyone who wants to come and live in Central or Eastern Europe for six months to a year unaccompanied by their family has a good shot at the job. No special expertise is required, nor is any such training provided in preparation for the deployment. The weeklong orientation course at EUCOM headquarters does not include any country orientation, nor is it possible to attend a Defense Language Institute (DLI) course before deployment in-country.

A U.S. Army officer involved with program oversight at the Pentagon explained that the language ability to man the teams is not uniformly available in the data base across services. In 1996, however, the Air Force took some first steps to self-identify personnel with language ability. Another contributing factor is that the greatest source of area specialists in the U.S. officer corps, the U.S. Army's Foreign Area Officers (FAO), has dwindled due to the disincentives of the U.S. Army's personnel management system. The promotion rate of these officers lagged so substantially behind line officers that interest in becoming an FAO decreased significantly. This problem has been noted and is being addressed, but it has existed throughout the life of the JCTP and also affects the quality of attaché staffing at embassies.[22] Meanwhile the Air Force has begun the process of instituting its own foreign area officer specialty, but it will be years before this initiative will be able to influence current programs.[23]

In the case of the Czech Republic there are additional cultural obstacles that have affected the scarcity of U.S. military officers with Czech heritage. Again, these are related to the negative image that Czechs have traditionally had of military service. Since Czechs have not historically placed a cultural premium on military service, those who emigrated to America did not encourage their sons to make the military their profession. Consequently, the search for a team chief or team members with a Czech background has been difficult.[24]

The Defense Attaché staffs remain the only military entities in which linguistic and area expertise training dollars are invested. These officers have the skills to influence military reform and are interested in doing so, but the strict separation of MLT and DAO duties relegates the DAO staff to its traditional intelligence collecting and representational functions. The MLT, although its members do not have the specific training investment of the DAO staff, typically has much greater access to their counterparts in the host military. The result is a situation where the U.S. military entity in-country with the most potential for influence is not prepared to take advantage of its unique opportunity.

The team chief in place during the course of my research in the spring of 1995, Colonel Peter R. O'Connor, was an active duty U.S. Army Colonel whose previous assignment was Chief of Personnel for the U.S. Army in Europe. He was aware of the opportunity to serve in the Czech Republic because his college classmate and U.S. Army colleague Colonel Paul B. East served in the

position of Team Chief for the second half of 1994. His previous experience as a member of the Military Assistance Group (MAG) in Korea as a young officer and his friendship with a Czech officer who was his classmate at the Army War College also contributed to his interest in the assignment and caused him to actively seek the six-month position.

His personal interest in personnel management reform resulted in an attempt to influence this aspect of Czech military democratization, even though he had no specific area expertise or language ability. Colonel O'Connor is an example of an individual who proactively promoted a personal agenda, which met a real need in the Czech military's development as a democratic institution. It is important to note that neither this particular focus area nor the brief assignment of Colonel O'Connor to serve as team chief was a result of deliberate JCTP policies. Indeed, these events occurred despite the obstacles inherent in the JCTP bureaucracy. In the end, the positive influence he was able to have was limited to the length of his short tour in Prague. Over three years after his departure from Prague, none of the proposals he worked to advance had yet been implemented.

Another staffing issue is related to the involvement of the National Guard Bureau (NGB) in the program. As chapter 2 illustrated, its involvement is closely associated with its ability to garner congressional support and funding for its programs. This involvement also translates into the guard and reserve forces being allocated a portion of the MLT billets. However, there is a substantial difference between a career active duty colonel who has risen through the ranks in the up-or-out active duty service and a reservist of similar rank in terms of both being a professional role model and having professional expertise—a difference that host countries are surely capable of detecting.

As one of the key Pentagon civilians charged with the oversight of the JCTP put it, "The idea of using reserve and guard personnel would make more sense if they were the only source of talent."[25] However, manning the teams with reserve and guard personnel is more a function of bureaucratic politics and the reluctance of active components to offer their best and brightest for these positions than any particular expertise or talent that only these forces possess.

There are also numerous disincentives for the participation of active duty officers to serve in the program. First, for most team members, the assignment is not a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) that is considered a reassignment to new duties, but a Temporary Tour of Duty (TDY) that requires a leave of absence from one's current assignment. This presents several hurdles for these officers. First, the officer's commander must release him for the length of the duty. Many jobs simply cannot be left for six months at a time without some negative impact on mission accomplishment; this is especially the case with outstanding officers, particularly those of higher rank, who may be serving in crit-

ical positions. Second, since that officer is not replaced in his primary duties, colleagues may not be enthusiastic about assuming the officer's duties in his/her absence. Third, the temporary duty status of the assignment does not allow for the shipment of household goods or for the officer to be accompanied by his/her family. There are, then, several deterrents on both the career enhancement and the family support front that adversely affect the manning of the program.

The policy of rotating the teams every six months also negatively impacted the effectiveness of the program. Despite its obvious drawbacks, the rotation policy has, for the most part, endured because it is less expensive to support a service member in a temporary billet than to pay for a move. Indeed, 180 days is the maximum length of a temporary duty before regulations mandate that a permanent change of station be executed. Program managers exploit this provision to the greatest extent possible. However, the greatest complaint of the host countries involved this particular policy. Generally, when directly asked about what aspects of the program could be improved, personnel from the host country are reluctant to make any negative comments for fear that the U.S. side might be offended, but the rotation issue is the one exception to this otherwise strict protocol.[26] The MLT Team Chief admitted that the frequent turnover of U.S. personnel interrupts continuity and that the Czechs are frustrated by it. "They build a team with us. The U.S. side of it leaves, and then they have to build another team."[27] This policy was modified in late 1996 when the Team Chief for the MLT in Belarus was the first assigned to a yearlong assignment. Deputy Team Chiefs are also eligible for the one-year tours. These are permanent change of station assignments, but they are still considered to be remote tours and therefore are still unaccompanied.[28]

The short duration of the assignments also limits the application of the learning curve that each new team member must endure. By the time cultural and professional acclimation is accomplished, the team member only has a few months left in the position before a replacement comes on board and must relearn many lessons. Such circumstances do not foster the feeling that there is enough time in-country for any great commitment to linguistic, cultural, or academic study related to the mission to pay off. The provision for one-year tours for some team members will alleviate this long-standing problem with the program somewhat.

Through 1996, the program lacked a requirement for keeping accurate records of the substantive content or impact of accomplished events. This compounded the difficulty of maintaining continuity in the program. There were no standardized procedures for the completion of after-action reports from either the host country or from the TCT deployed to assist it in some way. Remarkably, the officer with the chief day-to-day oversight of the program at the Joint

Staff explained that "a conscious decision was made not to get involved with assessment. Our approach has been to give them the information and let them act on it."[29]

The MLT files were in such a shambles in some locations that it was difficult for follow-on teams even to know which particular events had taken place. One policy overseer also admitted that this policy was a "complication" when the JCTP defended its budget requests every year. At these times advances in democratic civilian control were talked up, because program managers did not want to say that they were intentionally not pursuing specific goals in the program.[30]

All of this is related to the "exposure mentality" of the program, which was present at the start, and also to the policy of not having specific goals. The theory that all exposure was good and that it was not necessary to track specific types of exposure made it impossible to exploit the lessons learned or to provide the appropriate follow-up events as the program matured in each host country.

Beginning in mid-1997 with the implementation of country work plans organized around specific objectives and metrics, assessment has taken on a greater role. However, assessment initiatives will not significantly improve the effectiveness of the program if the objectives selected for assessment do not sufficiently address the designated key result areas or if the key result areas are inappropriately selected.

In the case of the Czech Republic, the key result areas selected to focus events are:

1. Promote Stability through Regional Security
2. Promote Democratization
3. Promote Military Professionalism
4. Closer Relationships with NATO[31]

As discussed in chapter 2, in general the development of focus areas has highlighted the general shift in program emphasis toward NATO interoperability goals. The analysis of event activity earlier in this chapter clearly showed that these events comprise the vast majority of all events. My analysis here will concentrate on the failure to effectively operationalize the key result areas related to military democratization.

The key result area focused on promoting democratization is supported by three specific goals: (1) develop a transparent democratic defense planning system, (2) develop a system of military law, and (3) improve/promote civil-military cooperation. This "model" of promoting military democratization barely touches on the multidimensional model posed in chapters three and four. Furthermore, even the accomplishment of these limited goals is hindered due

to the selection of events to support the desired goals. For instance, the events selected to support the development of a transparent democratic defense planning system are a familiarization tour on the research and development of military uniforms and field equipment and the visit of a team of experts on system program offices. These two events will have a limited impact on achieving the goal of transparent defense planning systems.

The Country Work Plan's development of the key result area of military professionalism is of particular relevance to my model of democratic military professionalism. Its particular goals are to (1) increase respect for human dignity and individual rights of service members, (2) establish a professional NCO corps, (3) establish a professional officer corps, and (4) establish standardized military training and education.[32] As with the democratization key result area discussed above, these particular goals, though important, represent only a small part of the comprehensive model of democratic military professionalism developed in chapter 4. Furthermore, the selection of events to support even these limited goals suggests their achievement is at risk. For instance, events selected to increase human dignity and individual rights include only chaplaincy events (which can potentially influence only the small portion of soldiers with religious faith) and medical events. Similarly, events selected to support the establishment of a professional officer corps are a series of interactions with various career specialties. There are no events related to the development of an officer Professional Military Education (PME) system or to other leadership development activities. Discussion of these two particular focus areas illustrates that the achievement of military democratization goals will not be significantly advanced in the "post-reform" era. A comparison of the types of events that have occurred in both the "pre-reform" and "post-reform" eras reveals that the same types of events continue to occur, although they have been assigned to specific program goals. However, the pertinence of many events to specific goals, especially to the only remaining goals related to democratization, is certainly questionable.[33]

Russia and the Defense and Military Contacts Program

In contrast to the Czech case, significantly greater bureaucratic constraints are present within the Russian defense bureaucracy that limit the effectiveness of the U.S. program. Defense attachés implementing the program of contacts report that numerous obstacles are put up by the Russian Ministry of Defense to impede the process. The Russian military hierarchy in general is very cautious about links between the two militaries and strictly controls all contacts at the highest levels of the MOD.[34] The perception among the U.S. attachés in-country is that the whole MOD organization exists to thwart U.S. cooperation efforts and that a "gatekeeper mentality" prevails among their Russian coun-

terparts.[35] The Russian military has for several years been showing signs of wanting to cooperate more, but has been constrained by obstructionism at high MOD levels.[36]

An additional obstacle on the Russian side is that Russia still has a predominantly military-run Ministry of Defense while the U.S. Department of Defense is led primarily by civilians. It is difficult for the Russians to comprehend that a high-ranking civilian defense official has the same or higher status as a multi-star general officer. “The Russians understand general officers—not high-ranking civilian equivalents. They don’t really deal with civilians in their military culture and in fact detest them.”[37] Overall, this network of defense ministry counterparts has been difficult to develop on both sides, and the Russian military seems set on perpetuating the myth of civilian nonexpertise.

On the U.S. side officers carrying out the program at the Pentagon complain that staffing is grossly inefficient to handle the program effectively. “Just a few action officers are working on it. Senior officers at the Joint Staff need to be actively engaged in order to develop a long-range strategy.”[38] From 1995 to 1998 JCS staffing of the offices in charge of contacts with all the FSU increased from two to four to twelve personnel. However, officers still complain that the increased staffing has not been commensurate with the rapidly growing programs in twenty-one separate states, including an extremely active Ukrainian program. The Joint Staff has been significantly “outgunned” by the State Department’s staffing, which has assigned individual desk officers to each country in addition to the embassy staffs working issues in-country.[39]

Overall Impact of Military to Military Contacts in Russia and the Czech Republic

Russia

The reviews are mixed from the field on the overall impact that the U.S. effort to conduct defense and military contacts has had on the Russian military. One school of thought argues that the more contacts there are, the greater the external influence will be. Such interactions help to encourage an awareness of global military standards and may be an impetus to reform.[40] Another school posits that the contacts as they have proceeded are useful to a point, but not as much as we might think. “We have the attitude, ‘If only you were like us. . . .’ We show them things that don’t have a lot of relevance to them like recruiting stations and $10 million child-care centers. They have a concept of what’s ‘Russian’ and what will work for them.”[41] A third school thinks that the cultural differences between the two societies are so great and the Russians so fundamentally resistant to change that change will take no less than a generation—

if it even happens then. One observer thought that, in general, Russians and Americans could not even agree on what specific problems existed.[42]

Anecdotal evidence exists supporting the argument that the various exchanges have left lasting impressions. A former U.S. Defense Attaché to Moscow who served a term during the perestroika era, Brigadier General Gregory Govan, remembers Russian officers' first impressions on their first visits to the United States. "They commented on the real patriotism that they saw, the respect of officers and the military that was earned instead of bestowed, and the importance of NCOs."[43] He added that he hoped that the Russians learned the lesson that the people in the U.S. military were more valued because the U.S. military is a reflection of a society that values all people. Govan's predecessor, then Brigadier General Ervin Rokke, concurred that the "higher-ups who have gone to the United States on trips appreciated the quality they saw and were curious about how it was achieved."[44]

Others complained that the endless exchange of delegations accomplishes little. Many of the U.S. military attachés in Moscow mentioned a phenomenon that they have dubbed "delegation euphoria"—when one-time participants in exchanges get charged up over visiting the other country for the first time and discovering that their counterparts are human beings who superficially appear to be very much like themselves. These critics argue that too much "military tourism" takes place and that more emphasis should be put on exercises where military personnel from both states get to work together as professionals on a common problem. Proponents of this approach put a high premium on the achievement of interoperability above all other goals.

While there is some disagreement on how much positive impact the interactions that have taken place between the Russian and U.S. militaries have had on Russia, all observers agree that the receptivity of the Russians to the U.S. outreach effort has been disappointing. "As the program was originally conceived, we thought that the Russian military would be a key player in a lot of issues and could use its channels to push certain agenda items. But it turned out that the military was unwilling to talk about substantive issues. [In the end] they proved to be poor interlocutors."[45] In this vein an Army planner at the Pentagon added, "We're a lot more interested in engaging them than they are in being engaged. We have a sort of messianic 'military in a democracy' approach while they don't even perceive the need for such reform. They will only participate in activities of value to them like exercises and high-level visits."[46] The Russians have also been concerned about spying, cultivation, and recruitment of their officers who have participated in various exchanges and opportunities for education in the United States.[47] In the year preceding the issuance of NATO invitations at the July 1997 Madrid Summit, the Russians were particularly stand-offish in protest of NATO expansion. However, some pragmatism re-

turned to the relationship since the signing of the May 1997 Founding Act, which details the NATO-Russia relationship and created processes for Russia to have a voice in NATO.[48]

It seems, then, that the potential to influence the course of democratic reform in the Russian military through defense and military contacts with the United States has been limited by the Russians' unwillingness to be objects of such efforts. In this respect, had the continuation of contacts depended on Russian enthusiasm, then many agree that the relationship would have died. U.S. personnel driving the program should be credited with prodding the relationship and keeping it alive. However, even the presence of formidable obstacles on the Russian side does not excuse the lack of prioritization and poor policy management that has characterized the U.S. effort. The program can still benefit from the laying out of clear goals, the recognition of the democratization needs of the Russian military, and the prioritization of program activity to further whatever ends are deemed worthy of pursuing.

The Czech Republic

Despite the legion of problems previously outlined, some progress has been made toward the democratization of the ACR because of the presence of the American MLT. First and foremost, the day-to-day contact that the U.S. team members have with members of the ACR exposes the Czechs to the U.S. military's approach to leadership and its mode of operations in general. Regardless of the subject of the interaction, there is some role modeling benefit to be gained just by working with each other.

The United States has distinguished itself from the other Western allies by investing more resources into its military outreach effort than any other player. The Germans, British, French, and Dutch have all offered various assistance opportunities, but none of these is as large as the U.S. effort. The Czechs have rewarded the U.S. commitment with the granting of enviable access to its top military policymakers through the assignment of prime office space in the corridor of the Chief of the General Staff. This allows frequent contact with Czech officers at the highest levels and puts the MLT, particularly the Colonel who heads the team, in a prime position to influence these individuals and the path of reform. It is a position of access much envied by the U.S. defense attachés. However, the limitations placed on the program, its focus on soft issues, and the poor preparation of the U.S. personnel serving within it result in much of this access being wasted.

Specific strides were made in the area of personnel management reform because of the efforts of Colonel Peter R. O'Connor, who served as team chief in the first half of 1995. Several TCTs related to these reforms took place dur-

ing his tour, and he used his personal influence and access to politics among senior Czech officers for progress in this area. He was regularly briefed on the Czech proposals for reform, and his feedback on these measures was solicited and often incorporated into the next revisions that appeared.[49] However, none of these reforms was implemented before his tour ended in May 1995. The leadership of the ACR continues to stall the implementation of significant reforms within the personnel system, and outside observers uniformly point to this issue as a major obstacle to NATO accession.

On the leadership front, the prevalence of U.S. NCO participation on many of the TCTs has had a positive impact on ACR reform. Again, regardless of the specific purpose of the visit or exchange, the opportunity to see U.S. NCOs in positions of responsibility and expertise has illustrated to the Czechs the void within their own chain of command. All descriptions of further ACR reform feature prominently the goal of building such a system and can be directly attributed to the exposure to Western militaries that has been possible in the post-communist era.

Beyond these general observations it is difficult to point to other specific accomplishments related to the democratization goals of the program. Given the degree of program activity, it is credible to assume that many other ideas may have been adopted due to the exchanges of ideas that have occurred on multiple occasions. It is not unrealistic to assume that a discussion on the differences between the U.S. and Czech militaries' approaches to officership could take place during a TCT set up with the purpose of exchanging information on air traffic control systems. However, all that policymakers can be sure of is that air traffic control topics were discussed. The mere linking of certain events to the newly stated focus areas implemented in 1997 does not necessarily ensure progress toward a certain goal.

Similarly, the Czechs have probably received many intangible benefits from participating in the numerous familiarization tours to the United States and Germany that have exposed them firsthand to the way of life of democratic, free-market societies. While general exposure is necessary, following initial visits up with appropriate visits focused on making particular strides in the ACR's democratization needs would result in more tangible progress.

An objective analysis of the MLT's alleged mission and the resulting program activity in the case of the Czech Republic reveals an enormous gap between the program's stated goals and the outcomes that resulted from the events generated under the program. This deficit can be directly attributed to the unwillingness and inability of program overseers to evaluate the progress of their program's activity for its first five years. The decision not to assess resulted in the acceptance of random activity as satisfactory, the failure to operationalize the stated goals of the program until its fifth year of existence, and, ultimately,

the expenditure of millions of dollars without a clear plan to maximize their effectiveness.

Assessment of IMET Effectiveness

A separate effort to influence the process of military reform has been made through the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program. Clearly, the Russian MOD has not embraced this U.S. initiative, and consequently what little participation takes place has little or no influence on the military reform process. Whereas many of the Eastern European armed forces look to the United States as their role model and actively seek U.S. training, the Russian armed forces do not. The Czech military, in contrast, has embraced the program and has been an influential tool in the overall military assistance effort in the Czech Republic.

Russian participation in IMET began in 1992 with the attendance of a few officers at U.S. senior service schools. U.S. attachés on the ground in Moscow reported that getting the program off the ground was difficult due to the lack of English language training among Russian line officers, suspicions on the part of the Russians that the program was a U.S. attempt to recruit spies, and general obstructionism within the MOD.[50] Additionally, the program suffered a major setback when the second Russian student sent to the United States defected.

The officially stated U.S. objectives for the Russian IMET program are "to actively engage officers of the Russian military (from junior to senior grades) and civilians who may influence government policy formulation via military education and training courses in an effort to promote the concepts of civilian authority and respect for human rights during the conduct of military operations."[51]

Only a handful of Russian officers have participated in IMET since 1992. Of the three officers who attended courses in the United States in the first year, one defected, one was discharged upon his return to Russia as a security risk, and U.S. attachés were informed by MOD officials to "stay away" from the third. However, six officers were allowed to participate in the program in FY 1994.[52] Only five Russian officers attended professional military education courses (PME) in the United States in FY 1995 while the remaining nineteen Russian participants went to defense management courses, but most of these attendees were civilians. In fiscal years 1996 and 1997 participation averaged twenty-three students per year. A recent focus area for the Russians has been English language training.[53]

Initially, the United States designated the lion's share of the FSU IMET budget for Russian participation, but by FY 1996 Ukraine was receiving the greatest portion of IMET funding for the FSU.[54] Russia turned back $200,000

of the $700,000 offered by the United States to fund Russian students in FY 1995. In contrast, Ukraine spent all of its $600,000 IMET budget for FY 1995 and asked for more funding.[55] In fiscal years 1996 through 1998, Russia received an average of $817,000 to participate in IMET.[56]

A major problem affecting the IMET program in Russia is that

> The Russian MOD neither requested U.S. security assistance nor desires it. Although some element within the MOD apparently agreed to the U.S. IMET initiative, or else was forced to accept it, other factions have been waging a war to negate it. Elements within the Russian military leadership mistrust U.S. intentions and consider American trained officers as tainted/corrupted.[57]

As a result, all of the criteria on which IMET effectiveness is measured in other cases indicate that the impact of IMET in Russia has been negligible. American officers complain that the MOD does not send officers who could benefit from participation in the program professionally. Most of the officers sent have either been close to retirement or GRU officers interested in the opportunity to gather military intelligence in the United States. "Some of the guys they send over to the United States are on a boondoggle—it's some kind of payback vacation in the United States. When some get back, the Russians don't seem to know what to do with them because they've been 'infected.'"[58]

Most of the Russians who have studied in the United States are reluctant to maintain contact with the U.S. military attachés when they return home citing the possibility of future "difficulties" if they do so. Those who have communicated with the U.S. attachés report that they are frustrated that they are not using what they have learned and are losing their ability to speak English.[59] Clearly IMET participation is not considered to be a "merit badge" for promotion. Officers are often criticized for becoming "Westernized" and sometimes specific retribution is exacted, such as being removed from housing lists.[60]

Only the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is taking full advantage of slots allocated to it under the Expanded IMET (EIMET) program that funds educational opportunities for civilians involved in defense. The MFA has sent many of its "rising stars" to courses in the United States and stands in line to accept fallout money that the MOD turns back. Most of the MFA participants have attended defense resource management courses in the United States.[61]

One bright spot in the Russian IMET program is the Russian interest in some of the programs offered through the Naval Postgraduate School's Center for Civil-Military Relations. This program was established and continues to be supported by IMET funds. Russia's interest in moving on military reform resulted in a MOD request for a team of experts from the Center for Civil-Military Relations to come to Moscow in January 1998 to conduct a workshop

on the transition from a conscript to a professional force.[62] However, the request for this information was a rare display of initiative and interest on the part of the MOD with regard to its participation in IMET.

An additional problem affecting Russian participation is the systemic difference between U.S. and Russian military education systems. Attendance at IMET does not fit in with the career patterns of Russian officers, which would affect participation even if the MOD was more enthusiastic about the program. U.S. officers attend PME throughout their careers, while Russian officers attend at fewer points in their careers. A U.S. attaché used a two-ladder analogy to explain this difference.

> The American ladder is six feet tall with rungs equally spaced; the Russian ladder is two meters tall with fewer rungs unequally spaced. In terms of this example, the American educational rung does not fit into the Russian ladder of professional military development. Unfortunately, this gulf between the two systems is widest at the junior officer level, where the bulk of traditional IMET opportunities are centered.[63]

In sum, the combination of xenophobia, systemic differences, and sporadic willingness to consider military reform have severely constrained the potential impact that IMET can have on the Russian military. One constant positive influence of the program has been the participation of civilians in EIMET. U.S. program administrators will continue to push for progress in this area. However, the impact on the Russian military has been negligible, and the program's only value in this respect has been through its symbolism as a U.S. gesture of military cooperation.

Czechoslovak participation in the IMET program began in 1989 with the enrollment of a CSA officer at the U.S. Army's Command and General Staff College. Participation expanded in the following years to reach the level of thirty to fifty officers taking part in courses in the United States per year at an annual cost of approximately $760,000.[64] In FY 1998 the IMET budget for the Czech Republic and the other NATO invitees rose dramatically by over 50 percent.[65]

While the overall impact of the IMET program is limited due to the small numbers of officers participating, a few of these graduates have made a substantial impact on the progress of democratic reforms in the ACR. One name that was repeatedly mentioned in-country and in Washington, DC, was ACR Colonel Peter Luzny who graduated from the U.S. Army War College under the auspices of the IMET program.

Upon his return to the Czech Republic he became the Chief of Strategic Planning at the General Staff. His ability to apply his knowledge of the defense budget rationalization process taught at the U.S. Army War College enabled the

ACR to receive a 20 percent increase in its budget over Parliament's initial allocation.[66] Colonel Luzny had been marked as a bright young star within the General Staff, however, he eventually came into conflict with other more senior officers who were resistant to other changes that he recommended, and he resigned from the ACR in May 1995.

Officers who have studied in the United States and in programs of other Western allies have been placed in important command positions in the units serving in Bosnia and the Rapid Deployment Brigade—the elite units of the ACR.[67] The chief of staff of the ACR, Major General Jiri Sedivy, graduated from the U.S. Army War college in 1994.[68] In addition, the commander of the ground forces, the Chief of the Air Force, and the Deputy Chief of Staff of the ACR have all attended IMET courses in the United States.[69] The civilian leadership within the MOD has asserted that the intellectual potential of the ACR rests in the officers who have studied at U.S. military schools. "They are men who are not only very well prepared in their field of expertise, but also newly motivated for service in the transforming Army of the Czech Republic."[70] In addition, the ACR Chief of Staff has stated his preference that study in the West should be a criterion for promotion and command.[71] However, NATO officials are concerned that officers linked with the Communist regime attend programs abroad as part of a "people laundering" process in order to advance their careers.[72]

The Czechs lean on their IMET participation to lend credibility and prestige to their officer corps. Some fear that these officers will be given undue preference in promotions if the merit-based promotion system goes into effect, but such an opinion does not necessarily mean that IMET graduates are successfully making great inroads into the democratization and general transformation of the ACR or that their specific training is being applied.

Because IMET participation is such an individual experience, it is difficult for lone officers to change their unit upon their return. Czech junior and midlevel officers, who have participated in U.S. courses, report that when they relate the stories of their experiences in the United States to their colleagues, the reaction is if they had been to the moon. Their colleagues were convinced that such things could not be possible. Junior officers also reported that senior officers did not welcome suggestions rooted in the younger officers' Western experience.[73] Not until many officers of a single unit have had the experience of studying in the West will the lessons learned there be more likely to be applied at home.

U.S. officers who observe the implementation of IMET in the Czech Republic, including the selection process of those who attend U.S. courses and their utilization upon their return, report serious deficiencies on both fronts. First, the requirement that all participants speak English fluently limits the pool of officers who can participate. Selection, then, is not dependent on an officer's

leadership skills or performance record, but on his language ability. Additionally, most of the officers with English language capability have already been selected to participate in one of the courses. Program administrators are trying to alleviate this problem by offering specialized English language training to officers with basic English skills selected to attend a specific training course.[74]

The preferential treatment that officers who studied in the United States receive when they get home breeds resentment among those officers who are not English speakers.[75] Additionally, although the United States assumes that its dollars are being spent on the very best and brightest that the ACR has to offer, in reality the deficient selection process means that "the United States has been getting twos on a scale of one to ten."[76] The Czechs still do not have the strategic planning skills to maximize the opportunities inherent in the IMET program. The personnel system presently is not set up to look for the most qualified people or to decide how best to utilize the program. The Czech Defense Minister has admitted that personal contacts rather than merit often drive participation in IMET.[77]

Specifically, the ACR personnel system lacks a requirement for officers who have returned from U.S. IMET courses to be put in a job that uses their newly acquired skills. Many of these officers have gone on to serve in menial posts.[78] A Czech graduate of a German war college explained that officers who graduate from Western academies are often considered dangerous rivals for their aging superiors, who try to get rid of them.[79] Another problem is that regulations requiring officers who have received valuable training in the United States and polished their language skills to stay in the ACR for a specified period of time are not enforced.[80] NATO officials have been monitoring with dissatisfaction the fact that officers who have studied at the expense of NATO countries' taxpayers in elite military colleges retire early or are permitted to leave the service.[81] The controversy surrounding the first Czech West Point graduate's petition to leave the service after only a few months was remarkable for the absence of any public outrage over the failure of the MOD to expect several years of military service from him before he was free to employ his new computer science degree in the civilian job market.

To their credit, U.S. personnel charged with implementing the program have tried to make it clear that it is important for the integrity of the program and even continued participation that its administration be perceived as legitimate and fair. Program guidelines, however, reserve the rights of selection and career commitment to the host countries. In cases of extreme abuse U.S. officials have approached the parliaments of host countries to invite them to use their oversight authority to influence the process, but such a step has not yet occurred in the case of the Czech Republic.[82]

The most significant IMET contribution to the democratization process of the ACR has been the participation of civilians in courses designed to enhance

civilian oversight. The Military Education Teams sent from the Center for Civil-Military Relations at the Naval Postgraduate School have been widely praised by the Czech civilians and military officers who participated. The first of these seminars, which focused on the problems of civil-military relations in a democracy, was attended by civilian officials, military officers, and parliamentary representatives in 1994. "Perhaps the seminar's most important aspect was its establishment of an open forum for frank dialogue among military professionals and their civilian counterparts who, by their own account, had experienced few such opportunities in the past."[83] Military Education Teams also traveled to the Czech Republic in 1996 to host workshops for the MOD on military justice and Czech concerns over the processes of integration into NATO.[84] Expanded IMET has concentrated on sending civilians and military personnel to defense resource management, civil affairs, Judge Advocate General, and National Defense University courses.

IMET has offered valuable opportunities for military personnel and civilians to benefit from participation in U.S. military education programs. Many individuals have personally benefited from their experiences, but without the systemization of lessons learned within the internal organs of the MOD and within military units, widespread impact is not possible. The real aim of IMET, some maintain, is to cultivate relationships between the United States and officers abroad so that former IMET participants who later reach positions of influence will be friendly to U.S. interests. The cost per participant is great, but the gamble is that the investment is well worth it if even just a few of the bets pay off.

While an influential tool in the overall U.S. military assistance effort in the region, and in the Czech Republic in particular, program implementation limitations and the limited number of participants restrict the transforming effect that this specific lever of influence can wield. Improved standards of student selection and utilization that are more actively monitored by the United States and appreciated by the participating militaries could make the effort more effective. Continuing to target more of the spending on English language training and on civilians motivated to apply their course work will also yield greater results. Or the resources could be focused on designing new programs aimed at influencing transitioning states' education and training needs.

The Marshall Center

Six Russians and four Czechs have participated in each of the three classes that have gone through the Marshall Center since its inaugural class graduated in December 1994.[85] It is difficult to assess the impact of this particular military democratization tool, because only a few officers and civilians have had the opportunity to attend since the program was launched. However, the comments of

some of the school's first students indicate that they are benefiting from the opportunity to attend the Garmisch retreat.

The spokesman for the Russian students, Grigory Zaitsev of the Russian Foreign Ministry, said, "It's important for us to keep sending people here—a lot of our military don't have enough knowledge of questions of planning and civilian control of the army."[86] Another Russian graduate of the five-month course on the relationship between democratic governments and their militaries, Lt. Colonel Sergei Soldatenkov, said that, "They are trying to do good things [here]. I will tell other officers that the experience was worth it. But I'm not sure that I'll be able to continue. Back in Moscow, it will be easy to lose touch."[87]

The Czech senior officers who attended as members of the first class universally found the experience to be worthwhile. The four officers, all members of the General Staff, related their experiences in a March 1995 interview. Led by General Pavel Jandacek, Deputy Chief of the General Staff, these officers agreed that the course was an opportunity to meet with democracy on a wider scope and to get familiar with the situation of security in Europe. General Jandacek added that his previous understanding of democracy was that it meant that everyone was entitled to their own opinion. He realized, though, by participating in the Marshall Center program with his colleagues from across the region that it was also important to get others to agree with his opinion if change was to be possible.[88] His colleague added that he learned that in democratic thinking all conclusions on a particular issue may be different, but none of them is necessarily wrong.[89]

The group of Czech graduates agreed that the success of the Marshall Center in the long run will depend on several factors. First, countries must responsibly select the students who attended. The ACR sent four of its most influential officers, but they were certain that other countries had sent their "second strings" who could not have the same relative impact when they returned home. They warned that countries currently sending top officers will refrain from doing so in the future if they perceive that a universal standard of student selection is not being employed.

Zaitsev said that it was difficult to find Russians to come to the course because the Russian mass media had labeled the school as an instrument of American propaganda. "Bosses were afraid of sending personnel." An American faculty member confirmed that the typical Russian student was average to above average compared to the others, but they were more hard-line than most. He added that in a few instances attendance at the school seemed to be some sort of reward unrelated to any motivation to apply the lessons learned at Garmisch at home.[90]

Zaitsev added, "The course is very one-sided, but it's interesting for me to hear the opinions of others, particularly from the CIS countries."[91] The Rus-

sians' classmates from the former Eastern bloc complained, though, that the Russians brought with them an adversarial conception of NATO, and this affected their attitude toward classmates from former Warsaw Pact states eager to gain NATO admittance. A Polish officer described this mentality as the biggest obstacle between them. "For them, it is all NATO, the United States and the West on one side, and Russia and the East on the other. It is still the old way of thinking."[92]

General Jandacek said that he thought his Russian classmates did learn a lot in the course, saying, "The discussions with them at the end of the course were quite different than the ones in the beginning. But they'll revert back to the norms of the home environment when they return. No one at home will believe what they learned."[93] The Czechs complained, too, that the students were from states with such different levels of understanding about democratic principles that the pace of the program was too quick for those with very limited experience and too slow for those with more. However, the Marshall Center is reluctant to track students according to their states' levels of democratization due to political sensitivities.[94] The absence of officers from the West in significant numbers also took away from the program, leading the officers from the East to feel that they were inferior and that the West did not think that any lessons could be learned from them.[95]

In response to a question about whether or not he thought a program that reached so few officers could ever make a significant impact, General Jandacek shared his "sand particle theory." He said that the Marshall Center graduates will each go back as individual sand particles in their militaries that are a minute speck on the giant sand hill that comprises the whole military. But eventually there will be more and more sand particles that have had the experience and some may eventually attain the very top positions on the hill. Then these particles will be in a position to dominate the entire hill and communicate with others at the top of other hills. He added that already in the few months since graduation, he has had the opportunity to deal with the Defense Minister in Latvia who was his classmate at Garmisch.[96]

Though the individuals affected thus far in the ACR have been few, it seems that the Marshall Center's classroom and picturesque mountainous environment have had a positive impact on those Czech officers who were the first to enter its doors. Since the receipt of their NATO invitations, however, students from the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland have also questioned whether or not they should still attend courses aimed at helping them adapt to a democratic political system. In their view, the task is complete, and they should now be attending NATO schools, such as the NATO Defense College.[97]

The effectiveness of the course within each postcommunist state depends on the willingness of each participating country to send quality students and to draw on their expertise when they return home. This is a major problem in the

Russian case, because the MOD has refused to send uniformed Army, Navy, or Air Force personnel. Only officers from the border troops and civilians from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have had the green light to attend.[98] The staff of the Marshall Center has had its sights set on Russia as the most important target due to its military primacy in the region, but has been continually frustrated in its attempts to solicit quality Russian participation. The current overall state of the Russian military, which is plagued by corruption, declining morale exacerbated by the war in Chechnya, widespread public disobedience of orders, ties with organized crime, and inappropriate participation in politics, indicates that civilian control of the military is tenuous. Unfortunately, it seems that Russia's Marshall Center graduates have only had individual encounters with the nature of liberal democracy and the role of the military within it. These graduates' opportunities to bring these lessons to the Russian defense establishment at large, which is in dire need of learning them, have been scant.

The potential exists for the Marshall Center to be a meeting place and democratic training ground of import for senior defense officials and officers across the postcommunist region. The challenges facing the Marshall Center include rethinking the approach developed in 1993 to meet the current needs of postcommunist states now years into their democratic transitions, determining how to come up with a diplomatic solution to the question of different categories of states needing instruction at different levels in the democratization process, and revising the curriculum to target officers at all levels with courses of appropriate focus and length.[99]

The Future of U.S. Military Assistance Programs in Russia and the Czech Republic

The Russian MOD's strict control of defense and military contacts with the United States means that the future of the program depends on the attitudes of the senior military leadership in the MOD. Attitudes within the MOD range from those of people who are somewhat positive about military to military contacts to the opinions of "Cold War dinosaurs not interested in contacts."[100] U.S. officers contend that most of the senior Russian generals give lip service to the effort in an attempt to be politically correct, but do not really support it. Meanwhile, the nearly frozen military to military relationship exhibited throughout the beginning of the program and continued with the hostile response to proposals to expand NATO has thawed a bit with the signing of the Founding Act in 1997.

Chechnya has driven home the limited degree to which the Russian military has internalized reforms. The military leadership has also been able to successfully resist post-Chechnya efforts at military reform. Some U.S. officers

think that this reality should make the United States reevaluate its approach of reaching out to the Russians. "A shotgun approach is not good enough. Any contact may not be good. We should be concerned if we are dealing with the right individual who is serious about absorbing what we have to offer."[101] Meanwhile, the Russians have come to the conclusion that the political value of hobnobbing with us is declining. Both sides, then, are withdrawing in the relationship.

The part of the relationship that is considered most secure is the continuation of practical programs like Nunn-Lugar that are perceived as serving mutual interests. Additionally, program managers think the United States should be persistent in its efforts to include younger officers in contacts in order to give them direct exposure to many of these ideas. Such an engagement may pay off in the long run when the Soviet era military leadership finally fades into retirement.

In the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, April 1999 has been set as the end of the Joint Contact Team Program. Originally envisioned as a short-term program, the JCTP has already survived beyond its initial projected life of two years, and there are no immediate plans to shut down operations in participating states still working toward their NATO invitations. Policymakers have said, though, that when the program is slated to end, it will be phased out according to the progress made within each country. This chapter has documented how untenable that objective will be since criteria for victory in the realm of military democratization were developed so late in the life of the program. Additionally, the conceptualization of these goals continues to be poor, and they have been insufficiently assessed. The conceptualization and assessment of NATO interoperability goals have been much more successful. IMET and the Marshall Center are envisioned as long term programs that will continue indefinitely with the goal of achieving gradual impact in all of the postcommunist states.

The infusion of Partnership for Peace funds and goals into the region has begun to overshadow the JCTP and has led to its de facto shift away from military democratization goals. Beginning in March 1995 EUCOM headquarters issued a memo to its MLTs directing those operating within Partnership for Peace states to earmark 75 percent of all contacts to support the host nation's Partnership for Peace Individual Partnership Plan objective.[102] Between 1995 and 1997, 92 percent of the 1,532 JCTP-facilitated events aimed at the six top candidates for NATO membership (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia) were related to NATO PfP areas of cooperation. These events focused primarily on standardization, communications, exercises, logistics, and training.[103] This represents a substantial shift from democratization objectives to goals centered on making postcommunist militaries better

fighting forces prepared to contribute to NATO. Focusing on the latter objectives without ensuring that the former have been accomplished is a dangerous prospect in the long term.

It seems, then, that in order to survive, the JCTP is internally shifting its focus from its original abstract, "never able to operationalize" goals of facilitating democratization to an emphasis on NATO interoperability issues. The JCTP simultaneously got into the assessment game with its new self-assigned, more easily quantifiable mission. To the extent a democratization component of the de facto mission has survived, it continues to be poorly operationalized, leaving significant military democratization problems still unaddressed. While such a switch may be a shrewd adaptation to the winds of congressional funding, it can also be seen as an abandonment of the JCTP's original mission. The question is, has anybody noticed?

Conclusion

Perestroika and glasnost afforded the United States an opportunity to engage the Soviet Union in democratization issues, and the effort has continued in the post-Soviet era. Meanwhile, November 1989 marked the opening of the window of opportunity for the United States to influence the process of democratic transition in Czechoslovakia and, later, the Czech Republic. Within these overall efforts, the U.S. military accepted its delegated role to influence the transition of the postcommunist militaries. The goal was to facilitate the development of military institutions that are democratically accountable and that act as positive factors in the overall progress of the democratic transitions.

Chapters 3 and 4 illustrated that democratization deficits still exist in both militaries studied in the areas of democratic political control and democratic military professionalism. The United States should continue to monitor these deficits and exploit opportunities to positively influence them. However, an objective analysis of the U.S. effort to assist in the democratization needs of Russia and the Czech Republic concludes that the U.S. attempt has fallen short of its potential. The ACR continues its struggle to become more proficient as a democratically accountable military institution and to achieve the standards of democratic military professionalism prevalent in the West. The Russian military, meanwhile, seems to be disinterested in making any progress in alleviating its democratic deficits.

The United States' inability to overcome its own Cold War legacy as evidenced in the persistence of Cold War bureaucratic inertia accounts for much of the lack of success. The United States was unable to release adequate resources from its defense arsenal (which is still poised to counter the massive Soviet threat) to fund and staff sufficiently efforts to help postcommunist militaries make the ideological and organizational shifts necessary to consolidate

democracy in the region. Additionally, the insufficient aid to the states at large at the beginning of the transitions contributed to the dire economic conditions of many postcommunist states and to the development of negative views about democracy. This is particularly true in the case of the Russian military. The focus on NATO expansion issues has only shifted emphasis away from improving the early deficiencies in programs aimed at facilitating military democratization in the region.

Both the Russian and Czech cases illustrated the deficiencies of the uncoordinated and poorly conceptualized democratic military assistance programs that resulted. Particular attention was given, in the Czech case, to the U.S. European Command's Joint Contact Team Program because it was the centerpiece of the effort to have a mass impact in Central and Eastern Europe. The JCTP's shortcomings, and those described in the program of Defense and Military Contacts with the FSU, indicate a lack of learning from previous military assistance efforts in the U.S. military's history and the inability of the U.S. military to exploit its political-military expertise to provide the theoretical underpinnings necessary for the programs' success. In the Czech case, reforms in the administration of the JCTP have resulted in first steps to focus and assess program activity, but not in ways that are effectively maximizing the opportunity to lend military democratization assistance. In the Russian case, no significant changes have occurred in the oversight and administration of the military to military contact program.

This chapter has presented two contrasting examples of recipients of U.S. assistance and of the variations in assistance that exist in programs aimed at Central and Eastern Europe and the FSU. The Czech Republic was presented as a postcommunist state enthusiastically accepting Western and in particular U.S. attempts to assist it. The main characteristic of the Russian case was its unwillingness to be assisted in a similar way. The inability and increasing unwillingness of the Russian military leadership to discard Cold War thinking and practices has certainly impeded the development of the Russian military as a democratic institution. However, opportunities have been lost in both cases due to a failure to maximize all tools available to positively influence postcommunist regimes at this critical transitional moment in history. The United States should remain steadfast in its effort to influence the process of democratization across the region and within military institutions in particular. The prize of stable democracies as the successor states of the former Soviet bloc is too great a windfall for the international community not to pursue at every opportunity.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions and Prescriptions for Improving Democratization Outcomes in the Postcommunist States

In the post–Cold War era, U.S. foreign policy goals and grand strategy have increasingly become tied to the idea of pursuing the "democratic peace." Specifically, U.S. policy has focused on enlarging the number of democracies in the international system[1] despite the dangers inherent in the transitional period of democratization.[2] The democratizing states of the former Eastern bloc have been prime targets of this effort.

However, the combined effects of inadequate funding from Western coffers and an insufficient understanding of how best to foster democratic transitions in the postcommunist states led to uneven results in the effectiveness of Western and U.S. assistance efforts to the region. This was especially true of the U.S. military's attempt to influence the democratization of postcommunist military institutions.

The U.S. military programs were flawed from the start because they did not address the scope of the military democratization problem across two critical dimensions: democratic political control and democratic military professionalism. The military democratization initiatives failed to sufficiently take aim at patterns of professionalism forged in the Soviet era that are incompatible with democratic norms of military professionalism.

The task of democratizing the postcommunist militaries is complicated by widely held, putatively classical assumptions of civil-military relations, promoted by such theorists as Samuel Huntington. These traditional views do not take into account the specific problems of states transitioning from authoritarian to democratic rule. Traditional interpretations of military professionalism ignore both *how* the officer corps comes to accept the principle of civilian supremacy and *how* this professionalism is manifested in particular behaviors and practice. The ideological underpinnings of the state must play some role in the inculcation of the value of civilian supremacy in the officer corps. Ideological shifts, in turn, result in different forms of military professionalism, defined by norms and behavior patterns in the conduct of their social functions as "managers of violence."

The comparison of democratic and Soviet-style military professionalism in chapter 1 showed that military professionalism is not a static phenomenon immune to changes in political systems. Indeed, the evidence presented in chapter 1 demonstrated that there are many elements of the form of military professionalism practiced in the Soviet bloc that are incompatible with military professionalism in a democracy. Additionally, great adjustments must also be made to democratic methods of political control where multiple actors have legitimate roles in the process of democratic oversight. These differences cannot be addressed, however, unless military professionals from both systems are aware that they exist.

Chapter 2 began the process of assessing the match of theory and policy in the implementation of democratization assistance programs. The survey of the overall U.S. democratization assistance effort showed missed opportunities at every level. Political, economic, and military programs were poorly conceptualized and consequently ineffectively carried out. The U.S. military democratization programs in particular clearly lacked an understanding of the challenges confronting the postcommunist militaries faced with the task of transitioning from authoritarian to democratic political systems.

An analysis of specific military democratization initiatives, which have been applied across the Soviet bloc, revealed low levels of funding, poor coordination among similar efforts, inconsistent mission statements, and an appalling lack of strategic vision for the achievement of military democratization objectives in the region. The inability of U.S. military policymakers to diagnose the democratization needs of the transitioning militaries inevitably led to the prescription of inappropriate solutions for their problems. The advent of Partnership for Peace initiatives under the auspices of NATO enlargement served largely to focus attention away from military democratization tasks in favor of NATO interoperability objectives. Consequently, the U.S. military's contribution to the overall strategic aim of assisting in the process of democratic consolidation across the former Soviet bloc has been negligible.

Chapters 3 and 4 applied the criteria developed in chapter 1 for military institutions in democracies to the specific cases of Russia and the Czech Republic. Their military democratization needs were identified across the two critical dimensions of the military democratization problem: the achievement of democratic political control and democratic military professionalism.

The evidence presented in chapter 3 illustrated that democratic deficits persist within both the civilian and military institutions of the transitioning cases that limit the full achievement of democratic political control. The specific democratic deficits explored included the existence of weak budgetary control, shortage of expertise on defense issues, insufficient confidence within civilian oversight bodies to exercise control, limited political will to influence

the defense process, poor relationships between ministries of defense and parliaments, inadequate transparency throughout democratic institutions, and the strength of civilian and military leaders' commitment to democracy.

Chapter 4 examined the second critical dimension of the military democratization problem in the two cases—democratic military professionalism. Once again the criteria for democratic military professionalism developed in chapter 1 were applied to the specific postcommunist experiences of Russia and the Czech Republic. The evidence presented highlighted the difficulty of adapting inherited forms of military professionalism to the norms of democratic accountability found in the military institutions of developed democracies.

An examination of the democratic deficits explored across the cases in specific issue areas—recruitment and retention, promotion and advancement, officership and leadership, education and training, norms of political influence, and compatibility of military and societal values—suggested that militaries transitioning from authoritarian to democratic political systems find themselves caught between two incompatible systems of military professionalism. The evidence also supported the contention that progress in the military sphere of democratization lags behind progress achieved in other democratic institutions in the process of transition.

The contrasts between the experiences of Russia and the Czech Republic were clear and can be attributed to the varying degree of consensus on democratic norms and practices across democratizing postcommunist institutions. Overall, a steady though hesistant advance toward democratic consolidation characterized the Czech case, while Russia was shown to be sporadically moving forward and backward in its democratic transition. The overall progress of democratization in each transitioning state subsequently affected the path of democratic transition for their militaries.

In both cases, the prevalence of democratic values and expectations as evidenced in the oversight capability of the developing democratic institutions, the media, and the society at large determined the extent of democratic political control of the armed forces. Adapting inherited forms of military professionalism from the Soviet era to the norms expected of militaries in service to democratic states also depended on societal attitudes toward democratic values and the ability of democratic institutions to enforce standards of democratic accountability.

In the Czech case there was greater consensus on the importance of consolidating democratic values and meeting Western democratic standards within all democratizing institutions, including the military, although the implementation of many democratic norms in the military institution remains problematic. In Russia democratic values have made some inroads in the authoritarian culture, and expectations have taken root that they will continue to be protected to at least some degree. However, the actual implementation of norms of

democratic accountability across all postcommunist institutions has been met with stiff resistance from military and civilian authorities in the government who are reluctant to subordinate themselves to legitimate democratic oversight bodies. Progress is limited further by the failure of postcommunist governments to build democratic institutions capable of consolidating democracy.

The evidence showed that the need for external assistance is great even in the most advanced of the cases. However, U.S. military democratization programs have been plagued by their long delay in the development of a framework to focus their assistance efforts. An analysis of the Czech and Russian cases across both dimensions of the military democratization problem laid out the specific democratization needs of these militaries across a variety of issue areas. The hope is that the identification of specific democratization deficits will lead to deliberate efforts to address them and result in an end to the randomness and weak conceptualization of democratization objectives that currently characterize program activity.

Finally, chapter 5 analyzed the effectiveness of the U.S. military programs in the cases. An in-depth analysis of program activity in Russia and the Czech Republic was conducted in order to measure the degree to which the military democratization needs presented in chapters 3 and 4 were being addressed. An objective study of the implementation of the military assistance programs in Russia and the Czech Republic showed that the United States' attempt has fallen short of meeting the military democratization needs of these armed forces. Although the attitude toward the West and Western assistance was markedly different between the two cases, with the Czech Republic's enthusiasm contrasting with Russia's reluctance, opportunities for influence have been lost in both cases, and, presumably, throughout the region.

The military to military outreach efforts between the United States and the countries studied were found to be particularly deficient in terms of adequate policy guidance and evaluation, sufficient funding, and appropriate staffing to carry out their vaguely conceptualized objectives. The shortcomings of the military democratization programs indicated a lack of learning from previous military assistance endeavors and a fundamental inability to exploit U.S. political-military expertise in order to design effective programs.

Through the identification of specific shortcomings in the civil-military relations literature and an analysis of post–Cold War military democratization programs, this book has attempted to develop the theoretical underpinnings needed to guide the democratic transition of postcommunist militaries that are lacking in both theory and practice. The hope is that the development of civil-military relations theory that is appropriate to the needs of the transitioning states in the former Soviet bloc will influence the work of U.S. and NATO policymakers as well as domestic actors in the transitioning states engaged in the struggle to facilitate the democratic transitions of postcommunist militaries.

Unfortunately, the role of the military institution in the democratization process of the postcommunist states has been neglected at every level. Civil-military relations theorists have failed to offer appropriate solutions and recommendations for the specific problem of militaries transitioning from advanced authoritarian states to democratic states. The assumption that military professionalism is constant across political systems was subsequently reflected in assistance programs that did not address the distinctiveness of professional norms and practices between militaries in service to democratic political systems and those loyal to totalitarian regimes. The resultant emphasis on strategic interoperability instead of ideological issues related to the shift in the political system has led to the proliferation of programs mistakenly believed by their implementers and overseers to be effectively addressing the problem of military democratization. In reality, however, these programs have done little to focus resources on the specific democratization needs of the postcommunist militaries. Ironically, the efforts undertaken to date may actually be counterproductive because they have fostered military and strategic competence over ideological compatibility. There is a danger in providing such one-sided assistance to militaries serving states that have not yet become consolidated democracies and that consequently pose a greater threat to the stability of the international system.

The promotion of democracy in the post–Cold War world has emerged as a pillar of U.S. foreign policy and the foreign policy of NATO member states, but the pursuit of this aim, especially at the military level, has been ineffective. There are many reasons for this: the United States' inability to overcome its own Cold War legacy, the scarcity of economic resources across the developed democracies, universal unfamiliarity with the unique problem of simultaneous political and economic transitions, and low public support for overseas assistance. While the current international context prohibits an influx of aid that even begins to approach Marshall Plan proportions, the limited appropriations released for democratization ends could be utilized much more efficiently if policymakers had a better understanding of which steps would lead more directly to democratization outcomes.

U.S. military democratization efforts have a particularly acute need for such policy guidance based on sound analysis of the task at hand. Policymakers have shown a virtual ignorance of the dimensions of the military democratization problem and have been content to squander precious resources on the perpetuation of either unfocused, random activities or focused, but weakly conceptualized frameworks. An almost complete breakdown between theory and practice has characterized the effort due to policymakers' inability to understand the problem of military democratization.

Meanwhile, the task of democratic transition continues in the postcommunist states within their societies at large and within their military institutions

in particular. Whether or not these states ever join the family of consolidated democracies depends on their steady progress along a range of transitional issues. Their militaries are just one of many postcommunist institutions in transition. However, the support of the military for the overall process of transition, along with the realization that it, too, must adapt its patterns of political accountability and professionalism to democratic norms, is an essential condition for the achievement of democratic consolidation.

Different political systems result in different patterns of civil-military relations that in turn affect the conduct of states in the international system. States with mature democratic institutions are more likely to behave peacefully in their international relations. Democratic gains achieved by civilian institutions are threatened by postcommunist militaries that are not similarly transformed. The democratic peace thesis depends for its successful implementation on militaries that are both supportive of democratic institutions and that are professional in meeting states' external and internal security needs. The achievement of this outcome is not a free good, but comes at substantial cost to the states themselves and to the external actors whose interests dictate the provision of extensive resources in the realm of expertise, financial support, and membership in relevant democratically based international organizations. The application of a theory of civil-military relations for states in transition from communist rule is crucial for both the success of individual postcommunist transitions and for the achievement of the democratic peace.

APPENDIX A

Military to Military Contacts Conducted in the Czech Republic through the Joint Contact Team Program

TABLE A1. Events That Could Not Be Classified as Supporting Either the Enhancement of Democratic Civilian Control of the ACR or the Professionalization of the ACR as a Military Institution in a Democracy (asterisked items indicate familiarization tours)

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact
CZ-159	U.S. Forces Organization	31 Aug–2 Sep 93
CZ-162	U.S. Army Parachute Team (show)	2 Sep–9 Sep 93
CZ-163	15th International Minutemen Competition (Germany)	10–12 Sep 93
CZ-169	Desert Storm Briefing	20–24 Sep 93
CZ-168	Force Structure Methodology	20–24 Sep 93
CZ-171	Tops in Blue Show (Entertainment Troupe)	21 Sep 93
CZ-198	Aviation Logistics FAM (Germany)	2–4 Oct 93
CZ-172	Cheb Shooting Competition	28–30 Oct 93
CZ-192	USAFE Ambassador Band (Concert)	3–7 Nov 93
CZ-195	Flight Safety	15–19 Nov 93
CZ-196	Follow Up Desert Storm Brief	22–24 Nov 93
CZ-30	Air Traffic Control Training	29 Nov–3 Dec 93
CZ-31	Chemical Defense Unit	6–10 Dec 93
CZ-22	C4 Assessment	12–18 Dec 93
CZ-37	Medical Services	13–17 Dec 93
CZ-38	Security Forces	13–17 Dec 93
CZ-43	Logistics Management	3–7 Jan 94
CZ-26*	Czech Chemical Unit to U.S. Chemical Unit FAM (Germany)	18–21 Jan 94
CZ-35	Logistics System Structure/Organization	24–28 Jan 94
CZ-138*	NATO Communications and Information Systems FAM (Germany)	24–28 Jan 94
CZ-114	Physical Fitness Programs	29 Jan–4 Feb 94
CZ-21	Airspace Management	7–8 Feb 94
CZ-83	U.S. General Officer Visit, Brig. Gen. Garret to CR	14–16 Feb 94
CZ-75*	Security Police Information FAM (Germany)	14–18 Feb 94
CZ-36*	Logistics Information System FAM (Germany)	21–26 Feb 94

(*continued*)

TABLE A1.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact
CZ-42*	Command and Control Reliability and Security FAM (Germany)	21–25 Feb 94
CZ-49*	Command and Control Systems FAM (Germany)	21–25 Feb 94
CZ-72*	Air Traffic Control FAM (Germany)	7–11 Mar 94
CZ-174	TX National Guard visits to brief State Partnership Program	16–17 Mar 94
CZ-139	Brig. Gen. Lennon, Commander of JCTP, visits	16–17 Mar 94
CZ-85	Air Defense at Corps and Division Level	21–25 Mar 94
CZ-173	U.S. General Officer visits to discuss C4	5 Apr 94
CZ-59	U.S. Air Traffic Control Commander visits CR	11–13 Apr 94
CZ-77	Environmental Security	11–15 Apr 94
CZ-142*	Medical Conference FAM (Germany)	17–21 Apr 94
CZ-177	Brig. Gen. Lennon, CC of JCTP visits again	20–21 Apr 94
CZ-106	Peacetime Use of Engineering Troops	18–22 Apr 94
CZ-153	Cheb Shooting Competition	23–25 Apr 94
CZ-67	Ground Force Operations	25–29 Apr 94
CZ-50	Housing and Construction Services	25–29 Apr 94
CZ-184	Cheb International Shooting Contest	28–30 Apr 94
CZ-183	National War College Visit	2–5 May 94
CZ-97	Pilot Training Program	2–6 May 94
CZ-134*	Military Engineering Conference (Germany)	2–6 May 94
CZ-115*	Artillery Training FAM (Germany)	2–6 May 94
CZ-113	Field Construction	9–13 May 94
CZ-188	Peacekeeping School Briefing	17 May 94
CZ-147	Festival of Brass Bands	20–23 May 94
CZ-63*	HQ to Brigade Command and System Reorganization FAM (Germany)	7–18 Jun 94
CZ-199*	Civil Protection FAM (Slovakia)	13–17 Jun 94
CZ-44	Engineering Operations Planning	13–17 Jun 94
CZ-130*	Real Property Management FAM (Germany)	27 Jun–1 Jul 94
CZ-129*	Fire and Hazardous Materials FAM (Germany)	27 Jun–1 Jul 94
CZ-56*	Deployment of Mechanized Operations FAM (Germany)	18–22 Jul 94
CZ-46	HQ to Brigade Command System Reorganization	7–11 Nov 94
CZ-218	Engineering Officer Exchange FAM (Germany)	17 Nov–5 Dec 94
CZ-52*	Strategic Defenses Planning FAM (Germany)	30 Nov 94
CZ-121	Military Administration and Archives Preparation	30 Nov 94
CZ-88*	Air Sovereignty Information FAM (U.S.)	11–17 Dec 94
CZ-236	JAG Officer Exchange	31 Dec 94
CZ-244	Organization of Mechanized Forces Brigade	31 Dec 94

(*continued*)

TABLE A1.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact
CZ-201*	CZ 1st Corps Installation Bus Tour FAM (Germany)	31 Dec 94
CZ-267	Medical Information Systems FAM (U.S.)	1–14 Jan 95
CZ-84	History of Air Force Operations in Conflicts	16–20 Jan 95
CZ-279*	Infantry Officer Exchange FAM (Germany)	30 Jan 95
CZ-281	Engineer Officer Exchange	30 Jan 95
CZ-278*	Air Defense Officer FAM (Germany)	30 Jan 95
CZ-256*	Tactical Communications FAM (U.S.)	30 Jan 95
CZ-284*	Field Artillery Exchange FAM (Germany)	31 Jan 95
CZ-251	Bed Down of Airbase Facilities	6–10 Feb 95
CZ-290	Lt. Gen. Keller Visit (U.S. General and EUCOM Senior Officer)	9–11 Feb 95
CZ-275*	Rotary Wing Unit FAM (Germany)	13–16 Feb 95
CZ-258	Communications Forces Training	18–25 Feb 95
CZ-268	Information Officer Observer Exchange	4–17 Mar 95
CZ-280	Engineer Officer Exchange	5–11 Mar 95
CZ-273	Geodetric Security	13–16 Mar 95
CZ-270	Logistics Training in the U.S. Army	18–25 Mar 95
CZ-269	Health Care Logistics/Military Pharmacy FAM (Germany)	19–23 Mar 95
CZ-283	Armor Officer Exchange	30 Mar 95
CZ-263	Air Traffic Control Operations	1–5 Apr 95
CZ-292	Tactical Flying Training Programs	1–7 Apr 95
CZ-255	Military Health Care Logistics	3–7 Apr 95
CZ-265*	Health Care Personnel FAM (U.S.)	9–15 Apr 95
CZ-317	Operations Planning Interoperability	20–27 Apr 95
CZ-299	Air Defense Observer Exchange	5–10 Apr 95
CZ-316*	Corps Level Plans and Operations FAM (Germany)	11–15 May 95
CZ-305	Disaster Relief Planning	20–26 May 95
CZ-318	Command Post Tactical Communications	23–30 May 95
CZ-319*	Computerized Simulators FAM (Germany)	25–29 May 95
CZ-331	Field Tactical Communications and Control	10–15 Jun 95
CZ-315	Legal Jurisdiction of Troops	15–20 Jun 95
CZ-330*	Conduct of Training in Mechanized Units FAM (U.S.)	19–25 Jun 95
CZ-471*	U.S. Calibration Standards and Techniques FAM	8–12 Jan 96
CZ-396	Cooperation at Corps and Brigade Level TCT	22 Jan–1 Feb 96
CZ-440	Chemical Troops Winter Sports TCT	1 Feb 96
CZ-370*	Orientation Training Systems for Logistics FAM	20–24 Feb 96
CZ-472	Calibration Standards and Techniques TCT	26 Feb–1 Mar 96
CZ-431*	Organization and Functioning of J-6 Directorate FAM	26–29 Feb 96
CZ-500	Adjutant General of Texas National Guard Visit TCT	9–14 Mar 96

(*continued*)

TABLE A1.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact
CZ-447*	Organization and Training Management of Electronic Warfare FAM	11–15 Mar 96
CZ-419*	USAFE Command Center FAM	11–15 Mar 96
CZ-451	Navigation Landing and Command Systems TCT	18–22 Mar 96
CZ-465	Organizational Responsibility and Authority of Military Police TCT	25–27 Mar 96
CZ-372	Installation Logistics Support TCT	25–29 Mar 96
CZ-468*	Training of Fire Support Coordination FAM	8–11 Apr 96
CZ-414	10th Special Forces Group Visit TCT	8–12 Apr 96
CZ-509	Annual European Health Services Support Medical/Surgical Congress	14–19 Apr 96
CZ-448	Organization and Training in Electronic Warfare TCT	22–26 Apr 96
CZ-456	Conduct of Medical Care in the Czech Army	22–24 Apr 96
CZ-337*	C3I Usage during Peacetime FAM (Germany)	29 Apr–3 May 96
CZ-502*	Environmental Engineering Conference FAM	5–11 May 96
CZ-423	Security Regulations TCT	6–9 May 96
CZ-434*	Planning and Acquisition of C4I System FAM	11–18 May 96
CZ-498	Logistical Support of Air Bases TCT	12–18 May 96
CZ-406	3d Group Air and Ground Communications TCT	13–17 May 96
CZ-401	Management of Brigade and Battalion Tactical Field Training TCT	27–31 May 96
CZ-494	Exercise Planning Orientation Exchange	29 May–22 Jun 96
CZ-429	Signal Regulations TCT	3–6 Jun 96
CZ-418*	Long-Range Surveillance Unit Visit FAM	17–21 Jun 96
CZ-511	Industrial Security Conference	17–21 Jun 96
CZ-409*	Squadron /Wing Pilot Orientation FAM	24–28 Jun 96
CZ-457*	Management of Neurological and Clinical Labs FAM	24–28 Jun 96
CZ-514	Standardization Conference	25–26 Jun 96
CZ-381*	Mobile Army Surgical Hospital FAM (Germany)	8–19 Jul 96
CZ-432	Organization and Functions of J-6 TCT	8–12 Jul 96
CZ-398	Information Exchange of Construction Engineers TCT	22–26 Jul 96
CZ-427*	Signal Functions Interoperability FAM	22–25 Jul 96
CZ-462*	Combat Unit Simulator Training FAM	23–24 Jul 96
CZ-488	Engineer Officer Orientation Exchange	4–30 Aug 96
CZ-420	Management of Computer Networks TCT	5–9 Aug 96
CZ-461*	Battlefield Medical Support from Flight/Platoon to Battalion FAM	6–12 Aug 96
CZ-424	Computerized Message System and Document Handling TCT	6–10 Aug 96
CZ-453*	Command and Control of Logistics Information Systems FAM	19–23 Aug 96

(*continued*)

TABLE A1.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact
CZ-416*	Logistics Support in the U.S. Army FAM	26–30 Aug 96
CZ-407	Air Base Security TCT	9–15 Sep 96
CZ-452	Management and Operations of Logistics Information Systems TCT	9–13 Sep 96
CZ-497*	Logistical Support of Air Force Bases FAM	9–14 Sep 96
CZ-399*	Cooperation at Corps and Brigade Level FAM	11–16 Sep 96
CZ-369	Medical Command Visit TCT	23–27 Sep 96
CZ-442*	Orientation of Training for Chemical Troops FAM	17–21 Oct 96
CZ-486*	Airborne Operations FAM	19 Oct–2 Nov 96
CZ-460*	Visit to USAF Aerospace Medicine Lab FAM	20–26 Oct 96
CZ-474	Digital Terrain Data for Staffs and Troops TCT	21–25 Oct 96
CZ-413*	Visit to 10th Special Forces Group at Ft. Carson FAM	24–31 Oct 96
CZ-421*	Management of Computer Networks FAM	28 Oct–1 Nov 96
CZ-478*	Logistics Information Exchange	1 Nov–11 Dec 96
CZ-512*	Air Defense Artillery Officer Exchange Program	1–20 Nov 96
CZ-439*	Civil Defense Planning Officer Exchange FAM	1–5 Nov 96
CZ-495	Airborne Operations TCT	3–9 Nov 96
CZ-499*	Aircraft Logistics and Maintenance at Air Base Level FAM	4–10 Nov 96
CZ-408*	Air Base Security FAM	4–8 Nov 96
CZ-449*	Management of Training for Mechanized Units FAM	4–8 Nov 96
CZ-506*	Organization/Training of Field Artillery Units FAM I	11–15 Nov 96
CZ-533*	Organization/Training of Field Artillery Units FAM II	11–15 Nov 96
CZ-403*	Information Exchange of Engineers FAM	12–15 Nov 96
CZ-410*	Aircraft Maintenance Management FAM	14–18 Nov 96
CZ-458	Medical Reconnaissance TCT	1–6 Dec 96
CZ-404	Logistics Management at the Tactical Level TCT	2–6 Dec 96
CZ-436	Managing Design of Application Software TCT	2–6 Dec 96
CZ-517*	43rd International Veterinary Medicine Conference FAM	2–5 Dec 96
CZ-508	Artillery Unit Visit to the 4th Rapid Deployment Brigade TCT	3–6 Dec 96
CZ-504	Planning of Training at 4th Rapid Deployment Brigade TCT	27–31 Jan 97
CZ-530	Armed Forces Aptitude Assessment	3–7 Feb 97
CZ-483	Environmental Security Visit TCT	3–7 Feb 97
CZ-522*	Real Property Management FAM	10–14 Feb 97
CZ-441	Orientation of Training for Chemical Troops TCT	17–21 Feb 97
CZ-467	Military Police Field Orientation TCT	24–28 Feb 97
CZ-555*	Fixed Communications Systems FAM	24 Feb–1 Mar 97
CZ-573*	Foreign Language Institutions FAM	3–7 Mar 97

(*continued*)

TABLE A1.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact
CZ-570	Artillery Visit to 4th Rapid Deployment Brigade TCT	10–14 Mar 97
CZ-529*	Prepositioning of Materials Conference FAM	10–14 Mar 97
CZ-565*	Fire Support Coordination at Division Level FAM	16–21 Mar 97
CZ-576*	Division Level Staff Procedures FAM	17–21 Mar 97
CZ-542*	Air Base Facilities Management FAM	14–18 Mar 97
CZ-583*	Engineer Officer Exchange TCT	14–18 Apr 97
CZ-587	European Regional Medical Conference	5–8 May 97
CZ-556*	Air Defense Operations FAM	5–9 May 97
CZ-580*	Logistics Officer Exchange	11–17 May 97
CZ-438*	Management of Civil Defense Disturbances FAM	12–16 May 97
CZ-582*	Material Management Maintenance Officer Exchange	12–16 May 97
CZ-475*	Topographical Engineering Company Terrain FAM	12–16 May 97
CZ-553*	Artillery Field Demonstrations FAM	12–16 May 97
CZ-544	Specialized Diagnostic and Test Equipment TCT	12–16 May 97
CZ-588	Environmental Engineering Conference	12–16 May 97
CZ-521*	Military Contracting Process FAM	26–30 May 97
CZ-584*	Mechanized Unit Training Ranges FAM	26–30 May 97
CZ-562*	C4I Support FAM	1–6 Jun 97
CZ-549*	Meteorology FAM	2–6 Jun 97
CZ-554*	Air Traffic Control FAM	2–6 Jun 97
CZ-577*	Field Artillery Officer Visit FAM	8–13 Jun 97
CZ-443	Development of Standardization for Chemical Units TCT	16–20 Jun 97
CZ-566	Air Force Logistics TCT	23–27 Jun 97
CZ-546	Air Force Radar Support TCT	23–27 Jun 97
CZ-575*	Texas Army National Guard Staff Procedures FAM	4–10 Aug 97
CZ-539	Procurement, Storage, and Distribution of Subsistence Items TCT	18–20 Aug 97
CZ-550*	Weapons Systems Maintenance FAM	7–12 Sep 97
CZ-531	Research and Development of Military Uniforms and Field Equipment TCT	21–27 Sep 97
CZ-548*	Extension of Missile Life Cycles FAM	21–27 Sep 97
CZ-543	Long-Term Storage of Military Equipment TCT	6–10 Oct 97
CZ-545*	Air Force Radar Support FAM	13–19 Oct 97
CZ-604	Air Base Security TCT	18–25 Oct 97
CZ-658	Air Traffic Control Operations TCT	3–7 Nov 97
CZ-631	Close Quarter Battle/Combatives	1–6 Nov 97
CZ-647	Mechanized and Tank Unit Training and Operations TCT	16–21 Nov 97
CZ-608	Aircraft Support Interoperability TCT	17–21 Nov 97
CZ-633*	High Performance Aircraft Simulators FAM	17–21 Nov 97

(*continued*)

TABLE A1.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact
CZ-490	Deployment Officer Orientation	Nov 97
CZ-568*	Special Forces Cold Weather Operations FAM	Nov 97
CZ-627	Armstrong Laboratory FAM (U.S.)	1–5 Dec 97
CZ-491*	Logistics Officer Orientation FAM	1–12 Dec 97
CZ-492*	Material Management and Maintenance Officer Orientation	1–12 Dec 97
CZ-656	Brigade and Battalion Staff Operations TCT	18–23 Jan 98
CZ-552	Company Level Operations in Mechanized Unit FAM	1998 TBA
CZ-612	Brigade and Battalion Command and Staff Planning FAM	21–26 Feb 98
CZ-581	Brigade and Corps S-3 Officer Exchange TCT	23–27 Mar 98
CZ-642	Transportation, Storage, and Distribution of POL TCT	Mar 98
CZ-639	Precision Measurement Equipment Lab FAM	Mar 98
CZ-634	Acute Trauma Medical Training TCT	Mar 98
CZ-613	Combat Search and Rescue Operations FAM	Mar 98
CZ-660	Engineer Support in Dangerous Areas TCT	Mar 98
CZ-657	Tribological Diagnosis of Aircraft Engines	Mar 98
CZ-659	Medical Support during Military Exercises TCT	Mar 98
CZ-592	Terrain Analysis TCT	5–9 Apr 98
CZ-653	Logistics Operations TCT	12–18 Apr 98
CZ 638	Precision Measurement Equipment Lab FAM	13–17 Apr 98
CZ-591*	Research and Development of Military Uniforms and Military Equipment	20–24 Apr 98
CZ-597	Chemical Protection and Logistics in Civil Defense TCT	Apr 98
CZ-599	Brigade and Battalion Level Logistics TCT	Apr 98
CZ-623	Airfield Maintenance and Repair FAM	Apr 98
CZ-489	Corps Staff Officer Operations and Training Orientation FAM	Apr 98
CZ-618	Container Systems FAM	Apr 98
CZ-648	Artillery Training and Operations TCT	Apr 98
CZ-654	Maintenance of Ground Force Equipment TCT	Apr 98
CZ-644*	Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Warfare FAM	Apr 98
CZ-628	Divers' Life Support Maintenance	Apr 98
CZ-630	Introdution to Protocol TCT	Apr 98
CZ-645*	Auxiliary Power Systems for Electricity FAM	Apr 98
CZ-614	Military Police Operations TCT	3–9 May 98
CZ-605*	Field Artillery Operations FAM	3–9 May 98
CZ-626*	Multinational Medical Support FAM	May 98
CZ-609	Destruction of Munitions TCT	May 98
CZ-640*	U.S. Army Meteorology Support FAM	May 98
CZ-625	Air Force Logistics TCT	May 98
CZ-594	Military Hospital FAM	May 98

(*continued*)

TABLE A1.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact
CZ-601	Engineer Brigade Staff Operations TCT	May 98
CZ-632	Logistics Information Systems FAM	10–16 May 98
CZ-663	Maintenance of Armored and Infantry Fighting Vehicles FAM	17–23 May 98
CZ-607	Nuclear Biological and Chemical Training School FAM	1–9 Jun 98
CZ-616	Field Tactical Communications Control (C4I) TCT	1–5 Jun 98
CZ-610*	Mechanized Infantry Small Unit Training FAM	7–13 Jun 98
CZ-635	Air Force Pilot Training Familiarization TCT	Jun 98
CZ-637	Intermediate Avionics Repair Squadron TCT	Jun 98
CZ-615*	Airborne/Air Assault Operations	Jun 98
CZ 646	Airport Lighting Systems TCT	Jun 98
CZ-593	Medical Training Center TCT	Jun 98
CZ-619*	Long-Term Storage of Materials and Armaments FAM	Jul 98
CZ-643	Transportation Operations	Jul 98
CZ-600	Rigger and Airborne Operations	Aug 98
CZ-636*	Corps Support Operations FAM	Aug 98
CZ-641	Washing, Dry Cleaning, and Repairs of Clothing	Aug 98
CZ-620	Flight Operations FAM	Sep 98
CZ-611	Staff Training Exercises TCT	Sep 98
CZ-617	Engineer River Crossing Operations TCT	Sep 98
CZ-598	Military Mountaineering TCT	Sep 98
CZ-595*	Advanced Topographical Engineering Visit FAM	Sep 98
CZ-606	Supply and Maintenance at Depot Level TCT	Sep 98
CZ-629*	Armored Fighting Vehicle/Infantry Fighting Vehicle Training FAM	Sep 98
CZ-655*	System of Storage and Conservation of Vehicles FAM	Sep 98
CZ-645	Auxiliary Power Systems FAM	1998
CZ-680	Unit Force Design TCT	1998
CZ-624	Logistics Education and Training TCT	1998
CZ-676	Development of Tactical Vehicle Maintenance Personnel FAM	1998 TBA
CZ-675	Military Computer Network Setup TCT	1998 TBA
CZ-670	Flight Operations FAM	1998 TBA
CZ-669	Air Ground Operations TCT	1998 TBA
CZ-568	Cold Weather Operations FAM	1998 TBA

TABLE A2. Events That Could Be Categorized as Supporting the Enhancement of Democratic Civilian Control

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-197	Resource Management	4–7 Oct 93	U.S. experts discussed resource management issues with members of the General Staff and military finance personnel
CZ-141	Legal Conference FAM (U.S.)	2–9 Mar 94	Czech military legal experts went to Washington, DC, to receive legal briefings from U.S. experts
CZ-143	Resource Management	10–12 Mar 94	Expert from National Defense University presented briefing on defense resource management
CZ-189	Legal Support I	21 Jun–5 Aug 94	Col. Janega, USMCR, consulted with Czech military legal experts about the draft law for military service
CZ-205	Legal Support II	30 Nov 94	Team of U.S. military lawyers discussed the UCMJ and other aspects of the U.S. military legal structure
CZ-73	Resource Management FAM (Germany)	30 Dec 94	Czech planning officers received a 1 hour briefing on financial management procedures
CZ-325	Corps Levels PPBS FAM (Germany)	1–5 Apr 95	Visit U.S. base to get orientation of PPBS system
CZ-435	Planning and Budgeting for Command/ Infantry	18–22 Mar 96	Discuss planning process
CZ-473	PPBS at the DOD and Air Staff Level FAM	11–19 May 96	Visit Pentagon to discuss PPBS
CZ-450	Organization of U.S. Army Legal Services FAM	21–25 May 96	Visit U.S. base to discuss legal issues
CZ-430	MOD Gaming of Staff Decision Making FAM	17–21 Jun 96	Visit USAFE staff to discuss decision making in MOD
CZ-664	PPBS Middle Manager Roles	7–12 Dec 97	Discussed PPBS system with middle managers

(*continued*)

TABLE A2.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-470	PPBS Procedures for Defense Planning FAM	23 Feb–6 Mar 97	Visited Pentagon to discuss defense planning procedures
CZ-536	Legal Role of National Guard in Natural Disasters FAM	3–6 Jun 97	Discussed role of National Guard in disaster relief
CZ-572	Military Legal System TCT	23–27 Jun 97	Discussed formation of a military legal system in ACR
CZ-538	Defense Policy Planning FAM	14–18 Jul 97	Discussed defense planning issues at the Pentagon
CZ-649	System Program Office TCT	12–16 Jan 98	Discussed acquisition process
CZ-590	International Agreements and Military Law FAM	15–21 Mar 98	Discussed military law at upper echelons

Tables A3–A7 list events that could be categorized as supporting an aspect of professionalism of the ACR as a military institution in a democracy.

TABLE A3. Recruitment and Retention

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-167	Officer Accession and NCO Development	19–24 Sep 93	Group of U.S. officers from Maxwell AFB presented a briefing
CZ-326	Personnel Management/ Recruiting FAM	3–14 Apr 95	Visit U.S. base and discuss recruiting issues
CZ-329	Personnel Management/ Recruiting TCT	5–12 Jun 95	U.S. personnel experts visit Czechs to discuss recruiting issues
CZ-501	Family Policy/Quality of Life FAM	15–23 Apr 96	Visit U.S. base to discuss quality of life issues
CZ-559	Community Family Support TCT	9–13 Feb 96	U.S. team visited Czechs to discuss improving family support in the community
CZ-537	Community and Family Support Programs TCT	19–23 Nov 96	Texas National Guard unit visits Czech to discuss these issues
CZ-560	Community and Family	7–12 Jun 97	Visit Texas to discuss family

(*continued*)

TABLE A3.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
	Support FAM		support issues
CZ-561	Armed Forces Recruiting TCT	13–17 Oct 97	U.S. team visits to discuss recruiting issues
CZ-671	Quality of Life Programs and Benefits FAM	1998 TBA	Visit U.S. base to discuss quality of life issues and benefits

TABLE A4. Promotion and Advancement

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-87/47	Rank/Duty Position Compatibility and Career Development	24–28 Jan 94	Czech personnel directorate received briefings on various personnel management topics
CZ-76	Veteran/Retiree Benefits	13–16 Nov 94	NA
CZ-112	Civil-Military Personnel System FAM (Germany)	29 Jan–4 Feb 94	NA
CZ-191	Personnel Management	1–3 Jun 94	U.S. military personnel experts presented information to Czech personnel officers
C650	USAF Pilot and Maintenance Personnel Exchange		8–12 Dec 97
CZ-681	Promotion, Command, and School Selections	1998 TBA	Discuss processes of selecting officers for promotion, command, and PME

TABLE A5. Education and Training

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-160	English Language Instructor Conference (Germany)	31 Aug–8 Sep 93	Czech English language instructors attended a conference in Germany
CZ-164	USAFA Cadet Exchange	11–24 Sep 94	5 Czech cadets and 1 officer visited the USAFA
CZ-624	Air Force Logistics Education and Training	May 98	Discuss education and training methods

TABLE A6. Officership and Leadership

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-167	Officer Accession and NCO Development	19–24 Sep 93	Group of officers from Maxwell AFB presented a series of briefings
CZ-14	Mathies NCO Academy FAM (UK)	18–22 Jan 94	3 CZ Air Defense Colonels went to a U.S. NCO Academy in the UK. Goal was to provide visitors with information on how the U.S. educates and trains NCOs and to show how service members live, work, and play. Also showed how the U.S. provides for the health and welfare of its airmen
CZ-33	Maj. Gen. Kuba Visit to U.S. Base FAM (Germany)	15–16 Feb 94	Major General Kuba, Chief of CZ Ground Forces, and 5 CZ officers tour U.S. tactical units and training facilities
CZ-60	General Major Matejka Visit to U.S. Base FAM (Germany)	10–12 Mar 94	Gen. Matejka and 4 colonels tour U.S. tank training and facilities in Germany
CZ-135	CZ Senior Leadership/ General Officer FAM (Germany)	12–14 Apr 94	Senior CZ officers including Chief of Gen Staff hosted by Lt. Gen. Keller HQ USEUCOM. Saw U.S. base and support structures
CZ-200	NCO Orientation	15 Apr 94	MLT members visited a CZ Air Defense Unit to hold informal discussions with junior officers and NCOs of the brigade
CZ-133	Professional NCO Corps FAM (Germany)	25–29 Apr 94	Lt. and Capt. Commanders went to U.S. NCO Academy in Germany and HQ EUCOM. Met with students and learned about the duties and responsibilities of NCOs
CZ-180	Role of the NCO	9–16 May 94	4 U.S. Senior NCOs briefed the role of NCOs and toured CZ training facilities
CZ-252	General Officer Visit to U.S.	11–12 Oct 94	NA
CZ-320	Commander/Human Care Officer Program	12–18 Mar 95	U.S. Navy Flag Officer from Joint Staff toured facilities and talked about the importance of human care of the troops as a responsibility of a commander

(continued)

TABLE A6.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-391	Human Care Officer TCT	4–8 Jan 96	Discuss taking care of troops
CZ-481	State Partnership Human Care FAM	21 Feb–3 Mar 96	Visit National Guard Unit to discuss taking care of troops
CZ-485	Human Care Officer TCT	24–28 Mar 96	U.S. team visit Czechs to discuss care of troops
CZ-484	Human Care Officer TCT	10–18 May 96	U.S. team visits Czechs to discuss care of troops
CZ-516	NCO Development	28 Jul–10 Aug 96	Discuss development of NCO Corps
CZ-466	U.S. Military Police Academy Visit FAM	11–15 Aug 96	Visit U.S. military police academy
CZ-578	Noncommissioned Officer Development FAM	21–24 Jan 97	Visit U.S. base to discuss NCO development
CZ-515	Human Care Officer TCT	18–21 Mar 97	U.S. team visits Czechs to discuss development of Human Care Officer career specialty
ZZ-60	NCO Orientation FAM	8–11 Sep 97	Travel to U.S. base to discuss the role of the NCO
CZ-662	NCO Professional Development TCT	10–16 May 98	Discussed Professional Military Training for NCOs
CZ-661	Training Management for NCO Development FAM	12–18 Jul 98	Visit U.S. to discuss NCO development
CZ-665	NCO Academy Right Seat FAM	1998 TBA	Trip to U.S. base to get orientation to U.S. NCO Academy

TABLE A7. Prestige and Public Relations

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-48	Community Relations	30 Jan–3 Feb 94	Community Relations
CZ-445	Public Affairs FAM	25–29 Mar 96	Public Affairs
CZ-557	Public Affairs Officer Responsibilities FAM	21–25 Apr 97	Visited U.S. base in England to discuss role of Public Affairs Officer
CZ-651	Press Center Activities TCT	30 Nov–4 Dec 97	U.S. team discusses military press center activities
CZ-652	Environmental Protection TCT	26–29 Jan 98	Commander's Role in Environmental Protection
CZ-674	Public Relations and Communications Systems FAM	1998 TBA	Public Relations

Additionally, a series of events occurred sponsored by the Chaplains assigned to the Joint Contact Team in Stuttgart. These events were justified as facilitating the democratization process of the ACR because they encouraged the development of chaplaincy programs. They were also meant to foster the development of "quality of life" issues aimed at supporting the individual soldier and his/her family considering the whole context of their life situations. These events also indirectly support officership goals in that they encourage commanders to look out for the spiritual needs of those under their command and to protect their rights.

TABLE A8. Chaplain-Related Events

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-128	Chaplaincy Conference (Stockholm)	31 Jan–4 Feb 94	2 Czechs attended NATO chaplaincy conference
CZ-125	Chaplaincy	20–23 Feb 94	EUCOM Chaplain Visited CR
CZ-245*	Chaplaincy FAM	22 Aug–3 Sep 94	NA
CZ-246	Chaplaincy TCT	31 Oct 94	NA
CZ-248	Chaplaincy TCT	7–11 Nov 94	Chaplain Supa discussed the establishment of human/spiritual care services
CZ-249	Chaplaincy TCT	5–9 Dec 94	NA
CZ-287	Human Care Services TCT	28 Feb–10 Mar 95	NA

(*continued*)

TABLE A8.—Continued

Event Number	Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Specific Democratization Area Addressed
CZ-479	Chiefs of Chaplains Conference	4–10 Feb 96	NA
CZ-586	Chiefs of Chaplains Conference	3–7 Feb 97	NA
CZ-683	Chiefs of Chaplains Conference	2–6 Feb 98	NA
CZ-603	Commander/Chaplain Relations	Aug 98	Discuss interactions between commanders and chaplains

APPENDIX B

Military to Military Contacts Conducted in Russia through the Defense and Military Contacts Program

TABLE B1. Defense and Military Contacts with Russia That Could Not Be Classified as Specifically Supporting Either the Enhancement of Democratic Civilian Control or the Professionalization of the Russian Military as a Military Institution in a Democracy (Exchanges of delegations and high-ranking officers that could not be attributed to a specific functional area of the democratization framework developed in chapter 2 were included in this table.)

Description of Contact	Date of Contact
Rifle and Pistol Competition at Fort Benning, GA	10–17 Jan 91
Soviet Incidents at Sea Delegation Visits U.S. for Annual Review	7–14 May 91
U.S. Coast Guard Cutter Visits Vladivostok	26–30 May 91
Military Staff Talks on Research in the USSR	3–8 Jun 91
Soviet Ships Visit Mayport, FL	16–20 Jul 91
CJCS Colin Powell Visits USSR	22–28 Jul 91
USAF LTG Jaquish (Acquisitions) Visits USSR	14–21 Aug 91
Far East Commander Kovtunov Visits US (Alaska, California, and Hawaii)	8–15 Sep 91
Air Force Chief of Staff McPeak Visits Russia	1–8 Oct 91
CINC of CIS Navy Chernavin Visits U.S.	4–10 Nov 91
Soviet Rear Services Delegation (Logistics) Visits U.S.	3–7 Dec 91
Visit to Washington by CIS CINC Shaposhnikov (with President Yeltsin)	1 Feb 92
USAF Strategic Bombers and a Tanker Visit Russia	4–8 Mar 92
Sec. Def. Meets with Russian Deputy MOD Grachev in Brussels	31 Mar 92
Visit by the Commander of CIS Air Forces Deynekin	7–12 May 92
U.S. Military Band participates in Moscow for commemoration of end of World War II	9 May 92
Visit by Russian Officers to U.S. military chaplains	17–21 May 92
Incidents at Sea (INCSEA) Annual Review and Navy Staff Talks in Russia	20–27 May 92
U.S. Coast Guard-Russian Arctic Search and Rescue Exercise in Bering Sea	9–13 Jun 92
Chief of Naval Ops (CNO) Admiral Kelso Visits Russia	14–19 Jun 92

(*continued*)

TABLE B1.—Continued

Description of Contact	Date of Contact
DepSecDef Atwood Meets with Russian FM Kozyrev to sign agreements on nuclear weapons SSD	17 Jun 92
U.S. Ship Visit to Severomorsk and PASSEX	1–5 Jul 92
23rd Army Band Visits St. Petersburg	7–18 Jul 92
DepSecDef Atwood Meets with Acad. Kuntsevich to Sign CW Agreement	10 Jul 92
Visit by Russian Air Force Fighter Aircraft	13–17 Jul 92
DIA Director LTG Clapper Visits Moscow	18–21 Jul 92
USSPACECOM Visit to Baykonur Cosmodrome	27 Jul–1 Aug 92
U.S. Army Participation in Kayak Competition in Russia Far East	1–12 Aug 92
USAF Delegation Visit to Moscow Airshow	10–18 Aug 92
DepSecDef Atwood Meets with Russian UN Ambassador Voronstov	18 Aug 92
CINCPAC Visit to Russia	24–28 Aug 92
U.S. Navy Blue Angels Visit Russia	4–5 Sep 92
U.S. Army Foreign Military Studies Office Visit to Russia	6–11 Sep 92
USAF Fighter Aircraft Visit Russia	14–18 Sep 92
CMC General Mundy Visits Russia	13–19 Sep 92
Ship Visit to Vladivostok for Consulate Opening	20–22 Sep 92
Russian Ships Arrive in Gulf to Participate in MIF	2–3 Oct 92
DepSecDef Atwood Meets with Amb. Lukin to Sign Agreement on Nuclear Storage Facility	6 Oct 92
CIS Gen. Stolyarov Visits Chaplains Board	13 Oct 92
Visit by GRU Chief Ladygin	7–14 Nov 92
Bilateral Working Group in Russia	15–16 Dec 92
Visit by EUCOM J-5 to Russia	1–3 Feb 93
CINC Russian Ground Forces Semenov Visit to U.S.	13–20 Feb. 93
Russian Participation in Military Ski Event	1–6 Mar 93
Russian Military Historians Visit U.S.	14–28 Mar 93
U.S.-Russia Search and Rescue Exercise Planning Conference	17–22 Mar 93
Russian Air Traffic Control Delegation Visits U.S.	21–24 Mar 93
SecDef Meets with Russian Foreign Minister	25 Mar 93
U.S. Military Chaplains/General Officers Visit Russia	29 Mar 93
Search and Rescue Exercise in Russian Far East (Tiksi)	19–24 Apr 93
Russian Participation in U.S. Military Medical Seminar	19–24 Apr 93
PACOM-Russian FEMD Working Group Meeting	22–29 Apr 93
CJCS Meeting with CIS CINC in Brussels	28 Apr 93
U.S.-Russian Joint Staff Talks in U.S.	3–7 May 93
U.S.-UK-Russian Naval Conference in the UK	3–7 May 93
Russian Rear Services Delegation Visits U.S.	22–27 May 93
Incidents at Sea (INCSEA) Review and Navy Staff Talks	22–29 May 93
Russian Ship Visit to New York City	26 May–1 Apr 93

(*continued*)

TABLE B1.—Continued

Description of Contact	Date of Contact
Russian Air Force Regiment Visits Charleston AFB	4–9 Jun 93
Sec Def Meeting with MOD Grachev in Europe	5–6 Jun 93
DIA Visit to Moscow	7–11 Jun 93
Russian Navy Participation in BALTOPS Exercise	16–17 Jun 93
Russian Air Force Engineering Academy Visit to Edwards AFB	21–26 Jun 93
USAF Test Pilots Visit Russia	30 Jun–4 Jul 93
Russian Ship Visit to Boston	7–10 Jul 93
Russian General Koltunov visits OSD	20 Jul 93
Russian Participation in PACOM RC Conference	1–7 Aug 93
Russian Visit to TRANSCOM	14–18 Aug 93
U.S. Coast Guard-Russian Search and Rescue Exercise Planning Meeting	18 Aug 93
CSA Visit to Russia	18–24 Sep 93
USN Ship Visit to Vladivostok	18–20 Sep 93
Russian Visit to DEOMI at Patrick AFB	27–30 Oct 93
Asst SecDef Horton Visits Moscow on Hotline	1–6 Nov 93
DepSecDef visit to Russia on Conversion	7–11 Nov 93
Russian General Lobov participates in U.S. Army conference on geopolitics and security	18–23 Nov 93
CINC Russian SRF Visits U.S.	28 Nov–3 Dec 93
Vice Admiral Smith Visits Moscow on Submarine Talks	13–16 Dec 93
Russian Visit to Ft. Leavenworth on Peacekeeping	13–17 Dec 93
Visit by Russian General Manilov on Doctrine and Security Policy	3–6 Jan 94
UnderSecDef Wisner and Asst to CJCS Lt. Gen. Ryan Meet with Russian MOD-General Staff during Moscow Summit	4 Jan 94
U.S.-Russian Search and Rescue Exercise Planning Conference in Alaska	19–21 Jan 94
PACOM O-6 Working Group Meeting in Russian FEMD	24–30 Jan 94
Visit to OSD by Russian MOD Environmental Chief Grigorov	14–15 Feb 94
CG 3ID and Staff Visit Russian 27th GMRD on Peacekeeping Exercise	14–18 Feb 94
USN P-3 PASSEX with Russian Ship in South China Sea	16 Mar 94
U.S.-Russian-Canadian Search and Rescue Exercise II in Alaska	21–25 Mar 94
DOD Sponsored Historical Conference in Washington	21–25 Mar 94
Peacekeeping Seminar at Ft. Leavenworth	21–27 Mar 94
EUCOM J-5 Maj. Gen. Link Visits Moscow and Meets with Border Guard Commander Nikolayev	28 Mar 94
Visit of CINC Russian Space Forces Ivanov to SPACECOM	11–15 Apr 94
Planning Conference for U.S.-Russian June Amphibious Exercise	20–25 Apr 94
U.S.–Russian Bilateral Working Group Meeting (and SSWG Meeting)	4–6 May 94
Visit by Gen.-Col. Kulikov, Russian DepMin for Internal Affairs	7–8 May 94

(*continued*)

TABLE B1.—Continued

Description of Contact	Date of Contact
DEOMI Participation in Russian Humanitarian Academy Conference	22–25 May 94
CINCTRANSCOM Visit to Russia	23–27 May 94
Dep. CINC USAREUR Visit to Russia on Peacekeeping Exercise	26–28 May 94
Visit by Russian Border Guard Commander Gen.-Col. Nikolayev	1–5 Jun 94
USN Ship Visit to Baltiyse, Russia	17–19 Jun 94
Ship Visit with 3D Marine Division Commander to Vladivostok and a U.S.-Russian Maritime Disaster Relief Exercise	18–23 Jun 94
Visit to Naval War College for U.S.-Russian-Ukrainian Cooperative Game	20–25 Jun 94
USN Test Pilot School Visit to Russia	22–25 Jun 94
USN Ship and Navy Oceanographer Visit to St. Petersburg	28 Jun–2 Jul 94
U.S.-Russian O-6 Working Group Meeting at PACOM	4–11 Jul 94
DIA Director LtGen Clapper Visit to Russia	8–15 Jul 94
Visit by Russian MOD Communications Chief Gen.-Lt. Gichkin	18–22 Jul 94
CG 3ID and Staff Visit to Totskoye Russia on Peacekeeping Exercise	26–30 Jul 94
Naval War College Students Participate in Academy of Science Conference	31 Jul–10 Aug 94
U.S. Coast Guard-Russian Maritime Border Guards Search and Rescue Exercise	2–5 Aug 94
Russian Flight Test Center Visit to NAS Paxtuxent	15–20 Aug 94
Sister Base Visit to Barksdale AFB by Russian aircraft	21–26 Aug 94
U.S. Delegation Visits Russia for Joint Staff Talks	22–28 Aug 94
CINC STRATCOM Admiral Chiles Visit to Russia Strategic Rocket Forces	28 Aug–3 Sep 94
Peacekeeping Field Training Exercise in Totskoye Russia	2–10 Sep 94
OSD and EUCOM Observers Visit Russian Disaster Relief Exercise	4–10 Sep 94
U.S. Coast Guard-Russian Maritime Border Guards Search and Rescue Exercise Off Alaska	4–10 Sep 94
Defense Mapping Agency Visit to Russia	21–28 Sep 94
USS Belknap Visit to Novorossiky, Russia	4–6 Oct 94
Russian SRF Delegation Visit to STRATCOM	17–21 Oct 94
SSWG Meeting in Moscow	17–18 Oct 94
Russian Participation in the USN Sponsored Black Sea Invitational Naval Exercise	20–26 Oct 94
Russian Sister Base Visit to Edwards AFB	21–26 Oct 94
Russian Participation in PACOM MILOPS Conference	30 Oct–4 Nov 94
Navy Test Pilot School Delegation to Russia	2–12 Nov 94
Commandant U.S. Coast Guard Visit to Russia	8–11 Nov 94
Gen-Lt Bogdanov from Russian General Staff Visit to DJ-5 and Installations	14–22 Nov 94

(*continued*)

TABLE B1.—Continued

Description of Contact	Date of Contact
DOD Delegation Observation of a Russian Disaster Relief Exercise	16–23 Nov 94
Russian Participation in the EUCOM Law of War Conference at the Marshall Center	5–9 Dec 94
Airborne Troops Delegation to Ft. Bragg	Feb 1995
General Staff Delegation to Attend USPACOM Peacekeeping Seminar	Mar 1995
U.S. Joint Staff Talks Steering Group Delegation	Apr 1995
USAF Delegation from Langley AFB to the Frontal Aviation Center at Lipetsk	Apr 1995
U.S. Navy Delegation to trilateral U.S.-Ukraine-Russia Talks	Apr–May 1995
USAF Delegation on Airspace Control Visit to Russia	Apr–May 1995
U.S. Navy Ship Visit to St. Petersburg	May 1995
Coordination Visit for Aircraft from Barksdale to Visit the Bomber Aviation Base at Ryazon in June	May 1995
Delegation of U.S. Veterans to Celebrate the 50th Anniversary of World War II	May 1995
U.S. General Maslin Visits Moscow for Nonproliferation Talks	May 1995
Bilateral Working Group Delegation to Russia	May 1995
U.S. STRATCOM Delegation to Strategic Rocket Forces for Technical Seminar	May–Jun 1995
Delegation Headed by the Chief of the Main Staff of Ground Forces to U.S. Army Facilities	Jun 1995
Delegation headed by DepAsstSecDef for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence to Russia	Jun 1995
Working Group on Document Security Visits U.S.	Jun 1995
CINC Space Command Visit to Russia	Jun 1995
U.S. Pacific Command O-6 Working Group Delegation Visit to Russia	Jun 1995
Coastal Forces of the Fleet Delegation to U.S. Marine Corps Facilities	Jun 1995
Air Defense Force Units Visit Elmendorf AFB, Alaska	Jun–Jul 1995
Fourth Frontal Aviation Delegation to Langley AFB	Jun–Jul 1995
Border Guard Delegation Visits Alaska	Jul 1995
Russian Delegation from Engels Air Base Visits Davis-Monthan AFB	Jul 1995
U.S. Coast Guard Delegation Visits Border Guard Training Facilities	Jul 1995
General Staff Delegation for Joint Staff Talks	Aug 1995
Delegation Headed by Commander U.S. Pacific Air Forces to Khabarovsk	Aug–Sep 1995
Cooperation from the Sea 95 Exercise (Hawaii)	Aug 1995
Chief of Naval Ops Visit to Russia	Fall 1995
Russian Navy CINC Visit to U.S.	TBA 1995
USAF Delegation from Edwards AFB to the Schelkovo Research Center	Sep–Oct 1995
Strategic Rocket Forces Delegation to Attend U.S. STRATCOM Space and Missile Competition at Vandenburg AFB	Sep–Oct 1995

(*continued*)

TABLE B1.—Continued

Description of Contact	Date of Contact
OSD and State Department Working Group in Moscow	Sep 1995
U.S. Coast Guard Delegation Visits Petropavlovsk	Sep 1995
Delegation from the Rocket Forces and Artillery of Ground Forces to Ft. Sill	Sep–Oct 1995
Commander Border Guards Visits U.S.	Oct 1995
U.S. Army Delegation from 6ID to an Exercise in the Far East Military District	TBA 1995
U.S. Navy Delegation for Navy Staff Talks and Incidents at Sea Review	TBA 1995
Delegation from Davis-Monthan AFB Visits Engels Air Base	1995
Russian Delegation Headed by the Commanders of the Far East Military District and the 1st Air Army to USPACOM	TBA 1995
Main Intelligence Directorate of General Staff Delegation to U.S.	TBA 1995
Ships from the Russian Pacific Fleet with Naval Infantry On-board Visit U.S. and Conduct a Combined "Cooperation from the Sea" Exercise	TBA 1995
U.S. Delegation Visits Moscow to Discuss C3I	Jan 96
Second U.S. Delegation Visits Moscow to Discuss C3I	Jan 96
U.S. Army Delegation Attends Commonwealth of Independent States Conference	Jan 96
Russian Environmental Delegation Visits U.S.	Feb 96
Delegation from U.S. Military Medical School Visits Russia	Mar 96
Bilateral Working Group in Russia	Mar 96
Chief of Staff of U.S. Army Visits Russia	Mar 96
Russians Participate in Military Operations Conference at Pacific Command (Hawaii)	Mar 96
Kuznetov Search and Rescue Exercise in Iceland	Mar 96
Russian Defense Conversion Delegation Visits U.S.	Apr 96
Pacific Command Medical Conference in Sydney	Apr 96
Exercise Planning Meeting in U.S.	Apr 96
Chief of Naval Operations Visits Russia	Apr 96
Russia-U.S.-United Kingdom Conference in UK	Apr 96
Defense Conversion Conference in U.S.	May 96
Naval Staff Talks	May 96
Military History Conference in St. Petersburg	May 96
Russian Naval General Shevtsov Visits U.S.	May 96
Planning Meeting for Arctic Search and Rescue Exercise	May 96
Colonels Working Group Meets in Hawaii	May 96
Planning Meeting for Visit to Russian Air Defense Base	May 96
Russian Environmental Delegation Visits U.S. National Guard	Jun 96

(*continued*)

TABLE B1.—Continued

Description of Contact	Date of Contact
Military Operations Conference	Jun 96
USCG Ship Visits Petropavlovsk	Jun 96
USCG Delegation Visits Petro Communications Center in Russia	Jun 96
Delegation from U.S. Military Medical School Visits Russia	Jul 96
U.S. Naval Ship Visit to St. Petersburg	Jul 96
Russian Environmental Delegation Visits U.S.	Jul 96
Airborne Squad Exercise	Jul 96
Russian Airborne Troops Visit Exercise in U.S. (Balance Ruby 96)	Jul 96
U.S. Naval Ship Visit to Vladivostok	Jul 96
Delegation from Russian Medical Academy Visits U.S. Military Medical School	Aug 96
Russian Artillery Delegation Visits Ft. Sill	Aug 96
Cooperation from the Sea Exercise (Vladivostok)	Aug 96
U.S. Unit from Pacific Air Forces Visits Russian Air Defense Base	Aug 96
Commander of Border Guards Visits Alaska and USCG	Aug 96
Exercise After Action Meeting in Moscow	Aug 96
Chief of Russian Military Intelligence Visits U.S.	Sep 96
Arctic Search and Rescue Exercise in Russian Far East	Sep 96
Russian Naval Officers Visit 6th Fleet Ship	Sep 96
Military and Civilian Air Traffic Control Delegation Visits U.S.	Sep 96
Delegation from Edwards AFB Visits Schelkovo Air Base	Sep 96
East Asian Security Conference	Sep 96
Exercise Planning Meeting in U.S.	Sep 96
Commander of Pacific Command Visits Russia	Sep 96
Chief of Army Artillery Visits Russia	Sep 96
Delegation from U.S. Military Medical School Visits Russian Medical Academy	Oct 96
Cooperative Threat Reduction Reception in Moscow	Oct 96
Chairman JCS Visits Russia	Nov 96
Meeting on EUCOM Naval Exercise	Nov 96
Exercise Planning Meeting in Moscow	Dec 96
U.S. Air Traffic Control Delegation Visits Moscow	1996
Russian Chief of General Staff Visits U.S.	1996
U.S. Naval Ship Visits Baltyisk	1996
Baltops PFP Exercise	1996
Peacekeeper 96-Combined Crusade Exercise	1996
Russian Naval Ship Visits Norfolk	1996
U.S.-Russia Search and Rescue Exercise Meeting in Alaska	Jan 97
Navy Strategic Studies Group Visits Russia	Jan 97
Gore-Chernomyrdin Committee Meeting in Washington	Feb 97

(*continued*)

TABLE B1.—Continued

Description of Contact	Date of Contact
U.S. Navy Delegation to Russian Academy of Science Conference	Feb 97
U.S. Army Delegation to International Terrorism Conference in Moscow	Mar 97
Russian Far East Military District Commander Visits U.S. Space Command	Mar 97
Arctic Search and Rescue Meeting in Alaska	Apr 97
U.S.-Russian Defense Consultative Group Bilateral Meetings in Washington	Apr 7
Russian Air Force Delegation Attends USAF 50th Anniversary	Apr 97
U.S. Delegation to Moscow to Discuss Air Traffic Cooperation	May 97
Russian Naval Delegation Participates in U.S.-Russia-UK Naval Conference (Newport, RI)	May 97
USAF Test Pilots Visit Gromov Flight Research Institute	May 97
6th Annual Colonel's Working Group Meeting	May 97
Military Medicine Bilateral Meeting in St. Petersburg	May 97
U.S.-Russian Navy Staff Talks in Moscow	May 97
Russian Pacific Fleet Visits U.S. Marine Corps Base in California	May 97
U.S.-Russian Meeting on Defense Telephone Link System in Moscow	Jun 97
Chief of Russian Navy Staff Visit to U.S.	Jun 97
Commandant U.S. Coast Guard Visits Russia	Jun 97
Russian Officers Attend East Asia Security Symposium	Jun 97
U.S. Naval Ship Visit to Vladivostok	Jul 97
U.S. Space Command Delegation to Russian Airborne Competition in Moscow	Jul 97
Russian Air Defense Delegation Visits Ellsworth AFB	Jul 97
U.S.-Russia Environmental Security Exchange	Jul 97
Theater Missile Defense Exercise Planning Meeting	Aug 97
U.S. Space Command Delegation Visits Far East Military District	Aug 97
U.S.-Russian Exercise Planning Meeting for Emergency Response Exercise	Sep 97
U.S.-Russian Joint Staff Talks on Military to Military Contacts	Sep 97
Russian Delegation to Environmental Cooperation Conference	Sep 97
U.S. Coast Guard Ship Visit to Far East Military District	Sep 97
U.S.-Russia Meeting on Theater Missile Defense Exercise	Sep 97
Russian Delegation to Naval History Conference	Oct 97
U.S.-Russian Meeting on Defense Telephone Link System	Oct 97
U.S.-Russia-Canada Search and Rescue Exercise in Alaska	Oct 97
Russian Delegation Visits Elmendorf AFB to Discuss Radioactive Waste Disposal	Oct 97
Commander USSTRATCOM to Moscow	Oct 97
MOD Biodefense Officials Visit U.S. Army Medical Research and Material Command	Oct 97
U.S.-Russian Defense Consultative Bilateral Meetings in Moscow	Oct 97

TABLE B2.—Contacts That Could Be Categorized as Supporting the Enhancement of Democratic Civilian Control

Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Area of Democratic Civilian Control Addressed
DepSecDef Atwood Visits Russia on Defense Conversion	29 Oct–5 Nov 91	Exposure to top civilian defense official
U.S. Military Journalists Visit Russia	8–11 Oct 91	Democratic accountability, relationship with society, prestige and public relations
Under Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz and Four Service Operations Deputies Visit Russia	19–22 Feb 92	Exposure to top civilian defense official
Visit by Russian Deputy Minister of Defense Kokoshin	8 Jun 92	Kokoshin is the only high ranking civilian with the MOD
Visit by Russian President Yeltsin Accompanied by MOD Grachev	16–17 Jun 92	Both had opportunities to meet with U.S. counterparts responsible for democratic civilian control of U.S. armed forces
DepUnderSecDef for Policy Libby Visits Moscow	15–18 Jul 92	Exposure to Top Civilian OSD Official
Secretary of the Army Stone Visits Moscow	2–3 Oct 92	Democratic accountability, Exposure to Top Army Civilian
UnderSec Wolfowitz, Asst. Sec. Jehn, and UnderSec Libby Visit Russia	10–15 Oct 92	Exposure to Top Civilian OSD Officials
Russian Dep MOD Kokoshin Visits U.S.	17–18 May 93	More exposure to U.S. Civilian Control by only top ranking civilian in Russian MOD
Russian Dep MOD Gromov Visits U.S.	20 May 93	Military MOD official gets exposure to U.S. system of Civilian Control
Russian MOD Grachev Visits U.S.	8–10 Sep 93	Top MOD official gets exposure to top U.S. DOD civilian officials
Asst. Sec. Def. Allison Visits Moscow	4–5 Nov 93	Exposure to Top Civilian Defense Official
SecDef Visit to Russia	17–18 Mar 94	Top U.S. Civilian Defense Official Meets with Russian Counterpart
Visit by Russian Dep MOD Kokoshin with PM Chernomyrdin	21–23 Jun 94	Opportunity for Russian Civilian Defense Official to Meet with U.S. Counterparts
UnderSecDef–Policy and Rep Dorn Visit Russia	20–21 Jul 94	Exposure to Top Civilian Defense Official
SecDef Meeting with Russian MOD Grachev in New York	26 Sep 94	Meeting Between Top Defense Officials

(*continued*)

TABLE B2.—Continued

Description of Contact	Date of Contact	Area of Democratic Civilian Control Addressed
SecDef Meeting with Russian MOD Grachev during Washington Summit	27 Sep 94	Meeting between Top Defense Officials
AsstSecDef Carter Holds First SSWG in Moscow	21 Oct 93	Exposure to Top Civilian Defense Official
AsstSecDef Allison Visits Moscow	21–24 Oct 93	Exposure to Top Civilian Defense Official
AsstSecDef Allison Visits Moscow	28–31 Dec 93	Exposure to Top Civilian Defense Official
AsstSecDef Carter Visit to Russia	7–9 Sep 94	Exposure to Top Civilian Defense Official
Visit of Russian Duma Delegation to Norfolk and the Pentagon	30 Sep–4 Oct 94	Parliamentary Control
DepSecDef Visit to Russia	Jan 1995	Exposure to Top Civilian Defense Official
SecDef Visit to Russia	Apr 1995	Exposure to Top Civilian Defense Official
Duma Delegation Visits PACOM	Apr 1995	Duma Members Exposed to Military in Democracy
Russian Generals Visit U.S. Civilian University	Sep 1995	Meet U.S. Civilian Defense Experts
Duma Delegation Visits Ellsworth AFB	1996	Duma Members Interact with Military in Democracy
Russian Generals Visit Washington	Jan 1997	Meet Civilian Defense Officials
U.S.-Russian Participation at “Military Support to Authorities” Conference in Moscow	Apr 1997	Discuss Civilian-Military Cooperation
Russian Delegation to U.S. to Visit National Guard	May 1997	Gain Familiarity with Role of National Guard

TABLE B3.—Contacts That Could Be Categorized as Supporting an Aspect of Professionalization of the Russian Military as a Military Institition in a Democracy

Contact Description	Date of Contact	Area of Professionalism Addressed
Medical Service Delegation (Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation)	22–27 Apr 91	Retention, Education and Training, Leadership, and Prestige
Military Academy of the General Staff Visits U.S.	28 May–4 Jun 91	Education and Training
IMET Team Visit to Moscow	22–26 Jul 92	Leadership and Officership, Education and Training: Presented opportunity for Russians to attend U.S. military schools
Visit by Russian Military Medical Experts in Substance Abuse Treatment	1–11 Jul 92	Retention, Education and Training, Leadership, and Prestige
Russian Cadets Visit West Point	6–10 Jul 92	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Air War College Visit to Russia	16–27 Sep 92	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Gagarin Air Academy Visits U.S.	2–6 Nov 92	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Russian IMET Orientation Visit to U.S.	1–15 Dec 92	Leadership and Officership, Education and Training
LTG Shoffner and Delegation from Command and General Staff College Visit Russia	6–12 Dec 92	Leadership and Officership, Education and Training
Russian Visit to the U.S. Air Force Academy	6–14 Mar 93	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
USMA Cadets Visit Russia	12–21 Mar 93	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Frunze Commandant Visit to Ft. Leavenworth (U.S. Army Command and General Staff College)	27–28 May 93	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
U.S.-Russian Midshipmen Exchange	28 May–15 Jun	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Russian Cadets Visit USMA	15–21 Jul 93	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Russian Army Staff visit to TRADOC (Training and Doctrine Command)	26–31 Jul 93	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Russian visit to Air University	26–31 Aug 93	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training

(*continued*)

TABLE B3.—Continued

Contact Description	Date of Contact	Area of Professionalism Addressed
U.S. Army Foreign Military Studies Office Visit to Frunze Academy	6–10 Sep 93	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
HQ DA Visit to Frunze on FAO Training	7–9 Sep 93	Explore possibility of U.S. Army officers studying at Frunze
U.S. Army Combined Arms Center Visit to Russian Vystrel Training Center	23–27 May 94	Education and Training
Visit by Russian IMET Orientation Team	16–30 Jun 94	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
USAF Air Education and Training Command Visit to Russia	16–30 Jun 94	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
USAF Institute of Technology Visit to Zhukovsky Engineering Academy	18–24 Jul 94	Education and Training
Visit by Russian Army Squad to Alaska	2–19 Sep 94	Officership and Leadership
Kachinsky Academy Staff Visit USAF Academy on Sister Base Visit	12–18 Sep 94	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Visit of Russian General Officer Delegation to Naval War College at Newport and Washington	25–28 Sep 94	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Frunze Staff Visit to Marshall Center	22–28 Sep 94	Education and Training
Delegation of the High-Level Officers Course at Vystrel to Ft. Leavenworth	Feb 1995	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College Instructor Delegation to Frunze Academy	Mar 1995	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
USAF Delegation to Kachinsky Air Force Academy	Apr 1995	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Frunze Academy Delegation to U.S. Army Command and General Staff College	TBA 1995	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training
Russian Cadets Visit USCG Academy	Jun 1996	Officership and Leadership, Education and Training

(*continued*)

TABLE B3.—Continued

Contact Description	Date of Contact	Area of Professionalism Addressed
Industrial College of the Armed Forces and National Defense University Delegation Visit Russia	Dec 1996	Education and Training
Russian General Officer Representative to SHAPE Visits National Defense University	Feb 1997	Education and Training, Officership and Leadership
Russian Officers Visit U.S. Sergeants Major Academy	Sep 1997	Education and Training, Officership and Leadership
Commandant, U.S. Army War College Visits Frunze Academy	Sep 1997	Education and Training, Officership and Leadership

Notes

Introduction

1. Samuel P. Huntington, "Civilian Control of the Military: A Theoretical Statement," in *Political Behavior: A Reader in Theory and Research,* ed. Heinz Eulau, Samuel J. Eldersveld, and Morris Janowitz (Glencoe: Free Press, 1956), 380. Among those in agreement with Huntington are S. E. Finer, *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics* (New York: Praeger, 1962); Bengt Abrahamsson, *Military Professionalization and Political Power* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972); Claude E. Welch Jr., *Civilian Control of the Military* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1976); Amos Perlmutter, *The Military and Politics in Modern Times* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), and in *The Political Influence of the Military* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980).

Chapter 1

1. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), 3.
2. Samuel P. Huntington, "Civilian Control of the Military: A Theoretical Statement," in Heinz Eulau, Samuel J. Eldersveld, and Morris Janowitz, eds., *Political Behavior: A Reader in Theory and Research* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1956), 380.
3. Among those in agreement with Huntington are S. E. Finer, *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics* (New York: Praeger, 1962); Bengt Abrahamsson, *Military Professionalization and Political Power* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972); Claude E. Welch Jr., *Civilian Control of the Military* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1976); Amos Perlmutter, *The Military and Politics in Modern Times* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), and in *The Political Influence of the Military* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980).
4. Alfred Stepan, *The Military in Politics: Changing Patterns in Brazil* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), 7–8, 54.
5. Welch, *Civilian Control of the Military,* 1.
6. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 80–83.
7. Ibid., 80–83.
8. Ibid., 83–85.
9. Ibid., 85.
10. Ibid.
11. W. H. Morris Jones pointed out the unlikelihood of the military officer cohort

always acting as perfectly obedient neutral instruments in the hands of policymakers in his essay "Armed Forces and the State," *Public Administration* 35 (winter 1957): 411–16, also found in Amos Perlmutter and Valerie Plave Bennett, *The Political Influence of the Military: A Comparative Reader* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 51–55.

12. Samuel P. Huntington, "Reforming Civil-Military Relations," in Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner, eds., *Civil-Military Relations and Democracy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 3–11.

13. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 8.

14. Robert K. Angwin, Capt., "Professionalism: A Model," *An Introduction to the Military Profession* (West Point, NY: U.S. Military Academy, 1984). This article has also been excerpted for use in *Foundations of the Military Profession,* a course book used in Military Arts and Science 220, a core course for all cadets at the U.S. Air Force Academy.

15. Zolton D. Barany, *Soldiers and Politics in Eastern Europe, 1945–1990* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), 11.

16. Roman Kolkowicz, "Toward a Theory of Civil-Military Relations in Communist (Hegemonial) Systems," in *Soldiers, Peasants, and Bureaucrats,* ed. Roman Kolkowicz and Andrzej Korbonski (London: Allen and Unwin, 1982), 233.

17. Elmer J. Mahoney, "The Constitutional Framework of Civil-Military Relations," in *Civil-Military Relations,* ed. Charles L. Cochran (New York: The Free Press, 1974), 35, 45.

18. Welch, *Civilian Control of the Military,* 6–8.

19. Mahoney, "The Constitutional Framework of Civil-Military Relations," 49.

20. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 163.

21. Welch, *Civilian Control of the Military,* 8.

22. Giovanni Sartori, *Democratic Theory* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962), 90.

23. Welch, *Civilian Control of the Military,* 8.

24. Ellen Jones, *Red Army and Society* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1985), 23.

25. Roman Kolkowicz, *The Soviet Military and the Communist Party* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), 15–18.

26. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 2.

27. Bruce Parrott, "Political Change and Civil-Military Relations," in *Soldiers and the Soviet State,* ed. Timothy J. Colton and Thane Gustafson (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 59–60; Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 105.

28. Bradley R. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992), 54. For more information on the role of KGB and state security services see Jonathan Adelman, ed., *Terror and Communist Politics: The Role of the Secret Police in Communist States* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1983) and Amy W. Knight, "The KGB's Special Departments in the Soviet Armed Forces," *Orbis* 28 (summer 1984): 257–80.

29. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 52.

30. Ibid., 51.

31. Barany, *Soldiers and Politics in Eastern Europe,* 9–10.

32. Jonathan R. Adelman, "Toward a Typology of Communist Civil-Military Relations," in *Communist Parties in Politics,* ed. Jonathan R. Adelman (Boulder: Westview Press, 1982), 6–8.

33. Ibid., 7–8.

34. John F. Brown, "Détente and Soviet Policy in Eastern Europe," *Survey* 20 (spring/summer 1974), 46–58; Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 28.

35. See Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 428; Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier* (New York: The Free Press, 1971), 348.

36. Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier,* 363–66.

37. Ibid., 367–69.

38. Harold D. Lasswell, *National Security and Individual Freedom* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1950), 80–81.

39. Abrahamsson, *Military Professionalization and Political Power,* 161.

40. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 3.

41. Ibid., 6–10.

42. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 150.

43. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 89–94.

44. Gregory Govan, Brigadier General, Commander, On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) and former Defense Attaché in Moscow, 1987–1991, interview by author, Washington, DC, May 1995.

45. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (New York: Langley, 1840), vol. II, book III, 266–67.

46. Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier,* 8, 253.

47. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 82–85.

48. Herbert Goldhammer, *The Soviet Soldier: Soviet Military Management at the Troop Level* (New York: Crane, Russak, and Co., 1975), 25. For an explanation of the pay system see J. E. Moore, "The Soviet Sailor," 170.

49. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 94–97.

50. For statistics on the academic qualifications of cadets in the Soviet Union and in Russia today see Oleg Vladykin, "A Declining 'Curve' of the Military Salary Level Is Becoming Increasingly Threatening: Current Social and Financial Policy with Regard to Servicemen Is Leading to a Cadre Catastrophe in the Armed Forces," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 16 February 1995, 1, 3, *JPRS-UMA-95-007,* 21 February 1995, 23. For comparable statistics on the case of Hungary in the Soviet era see Ivan Volgyes, "The Military as an Agent of Political Socialization: The Case of Hungary," in *Civil-Military Relations in Communist Systems,* ed. Dale R. Herspring and Ivan Volgyes (Boulder: Westview Press, 1978), 156.

51. Volgyes, "The Military as an Agent of Political Socialization: The Case of Hungary," 156–59.

52. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 97; Volgyes, "The Military as an Agent of Political Socialization: The Case of Hungary," 157–58.

53. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 106–10.

54. Perlmutter and Bennett, eds., *The Political Influence of the Military,* 205.

55. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 88–89.

56. Goldhammer, *The Soviet Soldier: Soviet Military Management at the Troop Level,* 286–87.

57. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 89.

58. John P. Willerton Jr., "Patronage Networks and Coalition Building in the Brezhnev Era," *Soviet Studies* 39, no. 2 (April 1987), 175–204.

59. V. Seledkin, Colonel, “Kak ne podarit’ rodnomu cheloveku! . . . “ [How not to be obliged to relatives! . . .], *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 12 December 1986, 2. As cited in Brenda Vallance, “Corruption and Reform in the Soviet Military,” *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 7, no. 4 (December 1994), 704.

60. Zoltan D. Barany, “Civil-Military Relations in Comparative Perspective: East-Central and Southeastern Europe,” *Political Studies* 41, no. 4 (December 1993) 596–97.

61. Christopher D. Jones, *Soviet Influence in Eastern Europe* (New York: Praeger, 1981), 13.

62. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 102–6.

63. Stepan, *The Military in Politics,* 55.

64. Edward C. Meyer, General, “Leadership: A Return to Basics,” *Military Review* (July 1980) as excerpted in Burke and Critchlow, *Foundations of Military Professionalism,* 59.

65. Vallance, “Corruption and Reform in the Soviet Military,” 704.

66. “Pis’ma marshalu” [Letters to the Marshal], *Ogonek* no. 1 (January 1990): 3–4.

67. C. N. Donnelly, “The Soviet Soldier,” in *The Soviet Military: Political Education, Training and Morale,* ed. E. S. Williams (London: Macmillan, 1987), 113.

68. For a description of such behavior see Victor Suvorov, *Inside the Soviet Army* (New York: Macmillan, 1982), 222–23.

69. Gennady Zhavoronkov, “Save and Protect,” *Moscow News* no. 30 (August 1990), 11.

70. Muranov, Colonel-General Anatoliy Ivanovich, “A Law Against Dedovshchina,” 2; Suvorov, *Inside the Soviet Army,* 255–56.

71. The general emphasis that all professions place on professional ethics is described in Abrahamsson, *Military Professionalization and Political Power,* 63.

72. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 13.

73. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 85, cited I. N. Shkadov, *Voprosy obucheniya I vospitanya v voyenno-uchebnykh zavedeniyakh* (Moscow: Voyenizdat, 1976), 117–19.

74. Jones, *Soviet Influence in Eastern Europe,* 225.

75. Ibid., 204.

76. Kenneth W. Kemp and Charles Hudlin, “Civilian Supremacy Over the Military: Its Nature and Limits,” *Armed Forces and Society* 19, no. 1 (fall 1992): 9.

77. For a full account of the political indoctrination program that was conducted from nursery school through the beginning of military service see E. S. Williams, “Political Education and Training,” in *The Soviet Military: Political Education, Training and Morale,* ed. E. S. Williams (London: Macmillan, 1987), 11–38. See also Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 151–53.

78. Williams, “Political Education and Training,” 39.

79. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 156.

80. Volgyes, “The Military as an Agent of Political Socialization: The Case of Hungary,” 146.

81. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 150; Goldhammer, *The Soviet Soldier: Soviet Military Management at the Troop Level,* 208.

82. Volgyes, “The Military as an Agent of Political Socialization: The Case of Hungary,” 146; Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 92.

83. Gitz, *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe,* 91.

84. Ibid., 92.

85. Goldhammer, *The Soviet Soldier: Soviet Military Management at the Troop Level,* 243.

86. Idea offered by Edward A. Kolodziej, Research Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois.

87. Air Force Instruction (AFI) 51-902. This is the U.S. Air Force regulation that details permissible and prohibited political activities of USAF personnel.

88. Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier,* 234.

89. Timothy Colton, *Commissars, Commanders, and Civilian Authority: The Structure of Soviet Military Politics* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 242–44, 246–48, 248–49.

90. For a thorough treatment of the reasons for and implications of August 1991 as a break point in Soviet civil-military relations see John W. R. Lepingwell, "Soviet Civil-Military Relations and the August Coup," *World Politics* 44 (July 1992): 561–72.

91. Colton, "Perspectives on Civil-Military Relations in the Soviet Union," 35.

92. Kolkowicz, *The Soviet Military and the Communist Party,* 33.

93. Colton, *Commissars, Commanders, and Civilian Authority,* 242–44, 246–48.

94. Kolkowicz, "Military Intervention in the Soviet Union: Scenario for Post-Hegemonial Synthesis," 129.

95. Barany, "Civil-Military Relations in Comparative Perspective: East-Central and Southeastern Europe," 598–99.

96. Ibid.

97. Ivan Volgyes, "Military Politics of the Warsaw Pact Armies," in *Civil-Military Relations: Regional Perspectives,* ed. Morris Janowitz (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981), 198.

98. Adelman, "Toward a Typology of Communist Civil-Military Relations," 4.

99. Lepingwell, "Soviet Civil-Military Relations and the August Coup," 568.

100. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 71.

101. Finer, *The Man on Horseback,* 6–7.

102. Ibid., 9.

103. Colton, *Commissars, Commanders, and Civilian Authority,* 267.

104. Raymond L. Garthoff, "The Military in Russia, 1861–1965," in *Armed Forces and Society,* ed. Jacques van Doorn (The Hague: Mouton, 1968), 255–56.

105. Kolkowicz, "Military Intervention in the Soviet Union: Scenario for Post-Hegemonial Synthesis," 114–15.

106. Barany, *Soldiers and Politics in Eastern Europe,* 20.

107. Ibid., 173.

108. Lasswell, *National Security and Individual Freedom,* 65.

109. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State,* 35.

110. Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier,* 253.

111. Jones, *Red Army and Society,* 93.

112. Barany, *Soldiers and Politics in Eastern Europe,* 8–9.

113. Parrot, "Political Change and Civil-Military Relations," 78–86.

114. Perlmutter, *The Military and Politics in Modern Times,* 8.

Chapter 2

1. The White House, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (Washington, DC: GPO, July 1994), 2. Two subsequent versions of this document were

released in February 1995 and February 1996 without significant changes to the original concept. Beginning in 1997, the document was retitled *A National Security Strategy for A New Century.* The promotion of democracy remains a core national security objective justified by the arguments of Democratic Peace Theory.

2. See Dean Babst, "A Force for Peace," *Industrial Research* (April 1972); Peter Wallensteen, *Structure and War: On International Relations, 1820–1968* (Stockholm: Raben & Sjogren, 1973); Melvin Small and J. David Singer, "The War-Proneness of Democratic Regimes," *Jerusalem Journal of International Relations* 1, no. 1, 1976; Michael Doyle, "Liberalism and World Politics," *American Political Science Review* 80 (1986): 1151–61; Zeev Maoz and Nasrin Abdolali, "Regime Types and International Conflict," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 33 (March 1989); Bruce Russett and William Antholis, "Do Democracies Fight Each Other?" *Journal of Peace Research* 29, no. 4 (1992): 415–34; Bruce Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); and Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn- Jones, and Steven E. Miller, eds., *Debating the Democratic Peace* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997).

3. Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace,* 119.

4. Carol R. Ember, Melvin Ember, and Bruce Russett, "Peace Between Participatory Polities," *World Politics* 44, no. 4 (July 1992).

5. Most recently, the 1998 *A National Security Strategy for a New Century* argues that the promotion of democracy is a key objective of the Clinton administration and that "we recognize that the spread of democracy supports American values and enhances both our security and prosperity . . . our strategy must focus on strengthening the commitment and institutional capacity [of states in transition] to implement democratic reforms." The White House, *A National Security Strategy for a New Century* (Washington, DC: GPO, October 1998), 5, 34; available from http://www.jya.com/nssr98.htm; Internet.

6. Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," *International Security* 20, no. 1 (summer 1995): 5–38. See also Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and War," *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 3 (May/June 1995): 79–97.

7. Mansfield and Snyder, "Democratization and War," 80.

8. For a survey of the research in democratization and democratic consolidation see Don Chull Shin, "On the Third Wave of Democratization," *World Politics* 47 (October 1994): 135–70.

9. Mansfield and Snyder, "Democratization and War," 95–97.

10. *Economist,* "Foreign Aid: The Kindness of Strangers," 7 May 1994, 20.

11. Thomas Simons Jr., Coordinator, U.S. Assistance to the New Independent States (NIS), opening statement in a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee European Affairs Subcommittee on U.S. Assistance to Europe and the New Independent States, 28 March 1995. From the *Federal News Service* transcript, 4.

12. Ralph Johnson, Coordinator, U.S. Assistance to Eastern Europe, opening statement in a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee European Affairs Subcommittee on U.S. Assistance to Europe and the New Independent States, 28 March 1995. From the *Federal News Service* transcript, 7.

13. Jeremy D. Rosner, "Clinton, Congress, and Assistance to Russia and the NIS," *SAIS Review* 15, no. 1 (winter–spring 1995), 19.

14. Ibid.

15. *Economist,* “Russia in Need,” 15 January 1994, 16.

16. GAO Report: GAO/NSIAD-95-10, 7 February 1995, 2. Obtained from the Federal Document Clearing House via Lexis-Nexis Information Service.

17. Michael McFaul, *American Policy Towards Russia: Framework for Analysis and Guide to Action* (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 1997), 54.

18. Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on European Affairs, “Hearing on U.S. Aid to Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union,” FDCH Political Transcripts, 7 May 1997. U.S. Congress, Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998, 105th Cong. 1st sess., 143 *Cong. Rec.* S7623.

19. U.S. Congress, Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999, 105th Cong. 2nd sess., *Cong. Rec.* S9996.

20. Testimony before the European Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, “Administration’s FY 1998 Request for Assistance to Central and Eastern Europe and the FSU,” Federal News Service, 7 May 1997. Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia have been recipients of SEED aid.

21. Testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, “Prepared testimony of Madelaine Albright, Secretary of State,” Federal News Service, 16 June 1998.

22. Janine R. Wedel, “U.S. Aid to Central and Eastern Europe,” *Problems of Post-Communism* 42, no. 3 (May–June 1995): 50.

23. Talbott, “U.S. Support for Reform in Central and Eastern Europe and the NIS,” 335.

24. GAO Report: GAO/NSIAD-95-10, 7 February 1995, 23.

25. Mark Whitehouse, “What Went Wrong?” *Moscow Times,* 3 June 1997.

26. David Kramer, “Russian Aid II,” *National Interest* no. 39 (spring 1995): 79.

27. Ariel Cohen, “Aid Russia, But Reform the U.S. Program,” *Problems of Post-Communism* 42, no. 3 (May–June 1995): 34.

28. McFaul, *American Policy Towards Russia,* 56–57.

29. Thomas Carothers, “Enlarging Democracy,” *Current* no. 367 (November 1994): 23; “Foreign Aid Outlives Its Mission,” *Moscow Times,* 13 August 1997.

30. *Economist,* “Russia in Need,” 16–17.

31. *Economist,* “Russia: The Road to Ruin,” 29 January 1994, 23.

32. George A. Joulwan, General, Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command, statement before the House National Security Committee, 19 March 1996.

33. *USEUCOM Strategy of Engagement and Preparedness,* November 1996, 8.

34. Ibid., 16.

35. George A. Joulwan, General, Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command, statement before the House National Security Committee, 2 March 1995, Federal News Service.

36. Louis J. Samelson, ed., *The Management of Security Assistance,* 14th ed. (Wright-Patterson AFB, OH: Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management, April 1994), 7.

37. James P. McCarthy, General, ret., interview by author, USAFA, 22 April 1994.

38. Frederick P. A. Hammersen, Lt. Colonel, interview by author, Marshall Center, 7 June 1994.

39. *Talking Points on Defense and Military Contacts with the FSU, 1993.* Paper obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

40. *Mil-To-Mil Contact Programs for FSU/Central Europe.* USAF briefing obtained at the Pentagon in May 1995, 4.

41. Bruce Messelt, OSD Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in East and Central Europe, interview by author, the Pentagon, May 1995.

42. The Warsaw Initiative, launched in July 1994, expended $308.6 million in fiscal years 1995–97 to support the PfP activities of 23 partner states. See GAO Report: GAO/NSIAD-97-164, "NATO Enlargement: U.S. and International Efforts to Assist Potential New Members," 1 June 1997; available from http://www.fas.org/man/gao/nsiad97164.htm; Internet.

43. Dunbar Lockwood, "The Nunn-Lugar Program: No Time to Pull the Plug," *Arms Control Today* 25, no. 5 (June 1995): 8.

44. Jeff Erlich, "Study: Fund Russian Disarmament," *Defense News,* 7 September 1997, 24. *Deutsche Presse-Agentur,* "Pentagon Ups Its Funding for Scrapping Eastern Europe's Nuclear Weapons," 28 July 1998.

45. William Perry, Secretary of Defense, Federal News Service, 7 November 1996. Richard Lugar, *Congressional Press Releases,* "Lugar to Meet on Nunn-Lugar Oversight," 14 August 1998.

46. *Mil-To-Mil Contact Programs for FSU/Central Europe,* 13.

47. *Semi-annual Report on Program Activities to Facilitate Weapons Destruction and Nonproliferation in the Former Soviet Union,* 30 April 1994, section 5.

48. *Talking Points on Defense and Military Contacts with the FSU, 1993.*

49. Gordon Stirling, State Department Russian Desk Officer and Point of Contact on the Inter- agency Working Group (IWG) for Military to Military Contacts, interview by author, Washington, DC, May 1995; and Les Aspin, *The Bottom-Up Review: Forces for a New Era* (Washington: GPO, 1 September 1993) 2.

50. Charles Helms, Captain, USAF, former Executive Officer to General Lennon, interview by author, 2 June 1994, HQ EUCOM, Stuttgart, Germany.

51. McCarthy, interview.

52. JCTP Military Liaison Teams, accessed 20 October 1998; available from http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jctpsysadmin/jctpmlts.htm; Internet.

53. These are discretionary funds available to all of the theater CINCs (i.e., EUCOM, PACOM, SOUTHCOM . . .).

54. JCTP briefing papers acquired June 1994 at HQ EUCOM, Stuttgart.

55. JCTP Briefing obtained from HQ EUCOM, November 1997.

56. Ibid.

57. Stirling, interview.

58. Aspin, *The Bottom-Up Review: Forces for a New Era,* 2.

59. JCTP policy paper obtained from HQ USEUCOM, November 1997. This statement is not significantly different from one stated in a July 1994 JCTP policy paper.

60. JCTP mission statement from briefing slide in HQ USAFE Military to Military briefing obtained at the Pentagon in May 1995.

61. The most recent mission statement is "to deploy teams to selected countries of

Central Europe to assist their militaries in the transition to democracies with free market economies." JCTP Briefing obtained from HQ EUCOM, November 1997. It should be noted that in JCTP parlance Central Europe includes the same countries included in the previous mission statement with a few others. The complete list was noted in this chapter under the heading "The Joint Contact Team Program."

62. Joint Contact Team Briefing obtained from HQ USEUCOM, November 1997.

63. A more complete analysis of democratic military professionalism is the subject of chapter 4. I will argue that there is a unique brand of democratic military professionalism that military members from transitioning states should learn that adapts habits acquired under authoritarian systems to practices that reflect the democratic values of the state. I will further suggest that U.S. military assistance programs focus on developing these practices within the military institutions of transitioning states.

64. *Military to Military Contact Program Bottom Up Review.* Briefing prepared by the JCTP reviewing its progress through 1993. Obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

65. Interviews with various representatives from the IWG verify this conclusion.

66. Statement from briefing slide in HQ USAFE Military to Military briefing obtained at the Pentagon in May 1995.

67. Dirk P. Deverill, Commander, USN, Joint Staff, Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate, European Division, interview by author, the Pentagon, May 1995.

68. Lt. Colonel Karen Daneu, Czech Republic EUCOM Desk Officer, interview by author November 1997.

69. JCTP Briefing obtained from HQ EUCOM, November 1997.

70. The argument is more fully developed in chapter 5.

71. *U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) Strategy of Focused Engagement.* Obtained from HQ USAFE, November 1997.

72. Ibid.

73. JCTP briefing papers acquired in June 1994, HQ EUCOM, Stuttgart, 1.

74. Only the State Department's IMET program is allowed to train foreign military officers.

75. Ron Maxwell, Major, USAF Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in Eurasia, Central and Eastern Europe, interview by author, the Pentagon, May 1995.

76. Andrew R. Wielkoszewski, Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army Attaché, Czech Republic, interview by author, Prague, March 1995.

77. Johannes Kert, Major, Chief of Kaitseliit, Estonian National Guard, interview by author, Tallinn, June 1994. Kert was later appointed Commander of the Estonian Defense Forces in January 1996.

78. *Country Work Plan for the Czech Republic, FY98,* obtained from the Czech Military Liaison Team, November 1997.

79. Wayne P. Gosnell, Colonel, U.S. Army National Guard, Chief of International Initiatives, National Guard Bureau, 26 August 1993 Concept Paper, 1–2.

80. Joseph A. Giddis, Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army National Guard, "Bridge to America: National Guard Support of the U.S. EUCOM's Joint Military to Military Contact Program," paper prepared for the U.S. Army War College, May 1994, 12.

81. Margaret West, Major, USAF National Guard, Point of Contact for Guard and Reserve involvement in Military to Military Programs, interview by author, Arlington, VA, National Guard Bureau HQ, May 1995.

82. This is up from 30 percent in 1995. Joulwan, "Statement before the House National Security Committee," 2 March 1995; JCTP Briefing obtained from HQ EUCOM, November 1997.

83. Gosnell, Concept Paper, 5.

84. *State Partnership Stockholders Report,* EUCOM: March 1997, 6.

85. Ibid., 1. The state partnerships are: Czech Republic–Texas, Poland–Illinois, Hungary–Ohio, Estonia–Maryland, Latvia–Michigan, Lithuania–Pennsylvania, Slovakia–Indiana, Belarus–Utah, Ukraine–California, Uzbekistan–Louisiana, Kazakhstan–Arizona, Kyrgystan–Montana, Turkmenistan–Nevada, Georgia–Georgia, Moldova–North Carolina, Romania–Alabama, Bulgaria–Tennessee, Macedonia–Vermont, Albania–South Carolina (inactive MLT), Croatia–Minnesota, Slovenia–Colorado.

86. For instance, MLT members reported that some personnel had been sent back to the United States as a result of criminal or inappropriate behavior in-country. These activities ranged from improper promoting of personal business interests to charges of the rape of a foreign national.

87. MLT members in the Czech Republic reported that their state partner, Texas, had inappropriately tried to arrange a military exercise with the Czech Army without coordinating with EUCOM or DOD.

88. Joulwan, "Statement before the House National Security Committee," 2 March 1995.

89. Samelson, *Management of Security Assistance,* 14th ed., 41–46.

90. Spiro C. Manolas and Louis J. Samelson, *The United States International Military Education and Training (IMET) Program: A Report to Congress,* reprinted in *DISAM Journal* 12, no. 3 (spring 1990): 2.

91. Manolas and Samelson, *The United States International Military Education and Training (IMET) Program: A Report to Congress,* 20.

92. Samelson, *The Management of Security Assistance,* 14th ed., 44.

93. Bob Livingston, "Responsibility Funding Taxpayers' Overseas Investments," *Congressional Press Releases,* 17 September 1998.

94. Keith Webster, DSAA Coordinator for Central and Eastern Europe and the FSU, interview by author, November 1997.

95. Manolas and Samelson, *The United States International Military Education and Training (IMET) Program: A Report to Congress,* 1.

96. Ibid., 4.

97. U.S. EUCOM briefing slide prepared in 1994. Obtained by the author at the Pentagon in May 1995.

98. Warren Christopher and William J. Perry, letter to the Honorable Strom Thurmond, Chairman of Senate Committee on Armed Forces, 7 April 1995, 1.

99. Samelson, *Management of Security Assistance,* 14th ed., 44.

100. For instance, the Security Assistance Officer (SAO) in the Czech Republic was directed to target 20 percent of the total Czech IMET grant for EIMET courses.

101. Hammersen, interview.

102. "Marshall Center Inaugurates Alumni Program." Accessed 21 October 1998; available from http://www.marshall.adsn.int/news%20release-98/9827.htm.

103. Joulwan, "Statement before House Armed Services Committee," 18 March 1997.

104. Charles Squires, Major, Executive Officer to the Director, Marshall Center, interview by author, Marshall Center, June 1994.

105. Shearmur, "Eastern European Officers Study Peace at a NATO Base," 4.

106. Joulwan, "Statement before House Armed Services Committee," 18 March 1997.

107. Hammersen, interview.

108. *George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies.* Briefing slides obtained at the Pentagon in May, 1995; Interview with officer from the Joint Staff by author, November 1997.

109. "Marshall Center Inaugurates Alumni Program."

110. Walter Slocombe, Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, "Statement Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee," 28 October 1997; GAO Report: GAO/NSIAD-97-164, "NATO Enlargement: U.S. and International Efforts to Assist Potential New Members," 1 June 1997.

111. GAO Report: GAO/NSIAD-97-164, "NATO Enlargement: U.S. and International Efforts to Assist Potential New Members," 1 June 1997.

112. *Partnership for Peace Framework Document,* January 1994, document obtained at NATO headquarters.

113. Marybeth Peterson Ulrich, "The United States and Partnership for Peace: Building Democratic Partners?" Paper presented at the International Studies Association annual conference, Toronto, March 1997.

114. James Kinzer, Major, USAFA faculty member assigned to U.S. NATO Mission, June–August 1995, interview by author, Colorado Springs, September 1995. See also Brooks Tigner, "Military Clout Dilutes East European Democratic Hold," *Defense News,* 20–26 November 1995, 35.

115. Incidentally, by this time two of my articles criticizing these aspects of the programs had circulated through the DOD policy-making community. See Marybeth Peterson Ulrich, "When East Meets West: Fostering Democracy in Postcommunist States," *Airpower Journal,* vol. 9, Special Edition 1995, and "Democracy and Russian Military Professionalism: Why Full NATO Partnership Is Still a Long Way Off," *Airpower Journal,* vol. 10, Special Edition 1996.

116. Daneu, Lt. Colonel, EUCOM Desk Officer for the Czech Republic, interview by author, November 1997.

Chapter 3

1. Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," *International Security* 20, no. 1 (summer 1995): 5–38.

2. The Economic Intelligence Unit, *EIU ViewsWire,* "Czech Republic Country Update," 5 November 1997; *EIU ViewsWire,* "Czech Republic 5 Year Forecast Table," 23 October 1997.

3. Jane Perlez, "For the Czechs, The Fairy Tale Is All Over Now," *New York Times,* 1 December 1997, A1.

4. Czech News Agency (CTK), "Czech Economic Miracle Stripped of Magic-Der Spiegel," 14 April 1998; Czech News Agency (CTK), "Revival in Czech Republic in 2000 at the Earliest-IFO," 29 October 1998.

5. *Swiss Review of World Affairs,* "Eastern Europe: Approaching the West," 3 January 1995.

6. Ervin J. Rokke, Lt. General, Commander National Defense University, former Defense Attaché in Moscow, 1986–87, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

7. David Hoffman, "General Arises in Russia's Presidential Race: Alexander Lebed Has Commanded Attention of a Growing Number of the Disaffected," *Washington Post National Weekly Edition,* 30 October–5 November 1995, 19.

8. *Swiss Review of World Affairs,* "Eastern Europe: Approaching the West," 3 January 1995.

9. Penny Morvant, "Unemployment: A Growing Problem," *Transition* 1, no. 6 (28 April 1995): 46–50; Carol J. Williams, "Millions of Russians Protest Unpaid Wages," *Los Angeles Times,* 28 March 1997, A20.

10. Lee Hockstader, "Crime Atop Chaos: In Post-Communist Russia, the Strong Arm of the Mafiya Is Everywhere," *Washington Post National Weekly Edition,* 20–26 March 1995, 6–7. See also Stephen Handelman, *Russia's New Mafiya* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

11. Daniel Zwerdling, "Russian Mob Big Crime Problem in Moscow and New York," *All Things Considered,* National Public Radio Transcript # 1818-6, 15 April 1995. See also Deutsche Presse-Agentur, "More Than 9000 Crime Groups in Russia," 13 June 1997 and Douglas Farah, "Russian Mob, Drug Cartels Joining Forces," *Washington Post,* 29 September 1997, A1.

12. Ilona W. Kwiecien, Lt. Colonel, Assistant Army Attaché, U.S. Embassy, Moscow, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

13. Michael McFaul, "American Policy Toward Russia," 48.

14. Fred Hiatt, "A Nation Up for Grabs," *Washington Post National Weekly Edition,* 3–9 April 1995, 17.

15. McFaul, "American Policy Toward Russia," 48.

16. Gary Rubus, Brigadier General, Defense Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow 1991–95, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

17. Brian D. Taylor, "Russian Civil-Military Relations After the October Uprising," *Survival* 36, no. 1 (spring 1994): 5.

18. Rubus, interview.

19. Boris Zhelezov, Research Fellow, Center for International Security, USA-Canada Institute, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

20. Vladimir Pirumov, Chairman of Scientific Council, Security Council of the Russian Federation, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

21. Pirumov, interview.

22. Sergey Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 3 November 1994, 1, 5. *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 13.

23. John W. R. Lepingwell, "The Russian Military and Security Policy in the 'Near Abroad,'" *Survival* 36, no. 3 (autumn 1994): 70.

24. Vladimir Kikilo, "Secret Report on Russian Military Doctrine Published in USA," *TASS,* 17 October 1997.

25. Jiri Martinek, Colonel, Chief of Operations, General Staff of the Czech Republic, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

26. Statement made in MOD briefing on Czech military reform presented to visiting American Colonels from the U.S. Air War College, March 1995.

27. Interviews by author with cadets and junior officers at the Brno Military Academy and the Namest and Pardubice air bases, March 1997.

28. Karl Pezl, Colonel General, "The Role of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic," in a special edition of *Czech Military Review* on the topic of *Military Doctrine and Military Reconstruction in Post-Confrontational Europe* (Prague: General Staff of the Czech Armed Forces, 1993), 36.

29. *Military Strategy of the Czech Republic,* an information briefing provided by the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic, 3.

30. MZV Praha (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prague), *Dokumenty 1993,* 322–23.

31. Tomas Horejsi, "The Army's Costly Mistakes," *Prague Tyden,* 13 October 1997, 38–47; *Prague Respekt,* "Defense Minister Views Army Reform, NATO," 7–13 September 1998, 12.

32. *Jane's Intelligence Review,* vol. 9, no. 5, "Czech Military Criticizes Defense Strategy," 1 May 1997, 194.

33. *Prague Tyden,* "Unwillingness to Define Enemy Hampers Army," 29 April 1997.

34. Jacob W. Kipp, "Russian Military Doctrine and Military Technical Policy: An American Military Historian's Perspective," *Comparative Strategy* 13 (1994): 30–31.

35. Pavel Baev quoted in Paul Mann, "Russians Sound Alarm Over Stalled Reforms," *Aviation Week and Space Technology,* 146, no. 22 (26 May 1997): 64.

36. Kiklio, "Secret Report on Russian Military Doctrine Published in USA."

37. Alexei G. Arbatov, Deputy Chairman of the Duma Defense Committee, quoted in Mann, "Russians Sound Alarm Over Stalled Reforms."

38. The Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press, vol. 50, no. 31, "Yeltsin Okays Principles of Military Development," 2 September 1998, 8; Official Kremlin International News Broadcast, "Press Conference with Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev," 12 August 1998.

39. Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 14; Aleksandr Koltyukov, Colonel, "False Premise of Military Reform. The Idea That Russia Should Prepare to Participate in Local Wars Is Untenable," *Moscow Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 7 November 1997; *FBIS-UMA-97-311,* 10 November 1997.

40. R. C. Longworth, "Time for NATO to Admit Trio from Europe," *Chicago Tribune,* 16 October 1994, 1. This article also discusses the desire for EU membership.

41. Vaclav Havel, "New Definition—North Atlantic Treaty Unchanged," *Warsaw Polityka,* 22 June 1996, 13; *FBIS-EEU-96-121,* 21 June 1996, 6.

42. Interviews by author with personnel assigned to the Brno Military Academy and with officers stationed at the Namest and Pardubice air bases, March 1997.

43. Karel Tesar, Instructor of Political Science, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno.

44. Vaclav Blaha, Lt. Colonel, Professor, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno.

45. Pezl, 35.

46. Wilem Holan, Czech Minister of Defense, *Prague Radiozurnal Radio Network,* 22 September 1994; *FBIS-EEU-94-185,* 23 September 1994, 6.

47. Boris Yeltsin, "I Don't Believe People of Russia Were Meant for the Whip," *Komsomolskaya Pravda,* 19 August 1995, 1–2; Fred Hiatt, "Political Elites Vie for Power in Russian Quasi- Democracy: Transition from Communism at Stake," *Washington Post,* 26 March 1995, A1; *Economist,* "Russian Law: Groping Ahead," 2 September 1995, 42–48.

48. *1997 U.S. Department of State Human Rights Country Reports,* "Russia Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1996," February 1997.

49. The White House is the popular term for the building where the Russian parliament meets. For more on the September 1993 crisis see Thomas F. Remington, *Politics in Russia* (New York: Longman, 1998) 45.

50. *The Nation,* "Rump Roast: Russian Parliament and Boris Yeltsin," editorial, vol. 257, no. 12 (18 October 1993), 12.

51. Michael McFaul, "Why Russia's Politics Matter," *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 1 (January/February 1995), 92.

52. Remington, *Politics in Russia,* 53.

53. Zhelezov, interview.

54. Remington, *Politics in Russia,* 53.

55. Stephen J. Blank, *Russian Defense Legislation and Russian Democracy* (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, August 1995). This document contains a thorough analysis of both draft versions of these laws and their implications for democratic political control of the military.

56. *ITAR-TASS,* "Yeltsin Rejects Duma Law on Civil Defense," 25 July 1997; *FBIS-SOV-97- 206,* 25 July 1997.

57. Lev Rokhlin, General, Chairman State Duma Defense Committee, "Russia's Security. What Could Be More Important?" *Rossiyskaya Gazeta,* 6 June 1996, 6; *FBIS-SOV-96-111,* 10 June 1996.

58. James H. Brusstar, Senior Research Professor, National Defense University, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

59. Jeffrey Simon, *Central European Civil-Military Relations and NATO Expansion* (Washington, DC: Institute for National Strategic Studies, April 1995), 129–30.

60. Ibid.

61. Political briefing delivered by Brno Military Academy Social Science faculty, March 1997, Brno.

62. Tomas Horejsi, "There Will Be a War on Tuesday," *Prague Tyden,* 13 May 1996, 18–20.

63. Jan Piskacek, "The Defense Strategy is Rather Lame," *Prague Denni Telegraf,* 1 April 1997, 2.

64. Interviews by author with Czech liaison officers to the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE), Mons, Belgium, June 1998.

65. James H. Brusstar and Ellen Jones, *The Russian Military's Role in Politics* (McNair Paper 34) (Washington, DC: National Defense University, January 1995), 27.

66. Pavel Felgengauer, "Uncontrolled Generals," *Sevodnya,* 3 September 1997, 2; "FBIS Foreign Media Note: Kokoshin Appointments," 2 September 1997.

67. *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press,* "Yeltsin Okays Principles of Military Development."

68. AP Worldstream, "Russia's Security Council Chief Fired," 10 September 1998.

69. Daniel J. Hartmann, Lt. Colonel, Assistant Army Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

70. Blank, *Russian Defense Legislation and Russian Democracy,* 16–23.

71. *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press,* "Yeltsin Okays Principles of Military Development."

72. Felgengauer, "Uncontrolled Generals."

73. Adam R. Wasserman, Policy Planning Staff, U.S. Department of State, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

74. Benjamin S. Lambeth, "Russia's Wounded Military," *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 2 (March/April 1995): 93.

75. Igor Korotchenko, "Grachev Is Ousted as Minister of Defense," *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 19 June 1996, 1. Found in the *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press,* 68, no. 25 (17 July 1996): 6.

76. A 1994 survey of Russian military elites indicated that less than one in five expressed trust in Grachev with over half expressing mistrust in him. *Military Elites in Russia 1994,* 4.

77. Andrei Poleshchuk, "Grachev Is Ousted as Minister of Defense," *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 19 June 1996, 1. Found in the *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press* 68, no. 25 (17 July 1996): 6.

78. Olivia Ward, "Trouble in the Ranks as its Top Officers Make a Run for Political Office: The Once Formidable Russian Army Falls in Disorder and Decay," *Toronto Star,* 5 November 1995, F5; James Howcroft, Major, Assistant Marine Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

79. *Segodnya,* "Newspaper Analyzes Reasons for Defense Ministry Personnel Changes," 24 May 1997.

80. Pavel Felgengauer, "An Administrative Dressing Down Instead of Military Reform," *Sevodnya,* 23 May 1997, 1. Found in the *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press* 69, no. 21, 2.

81. *The Economist Intelligence Unit, ViewsWire,* "Russia Politics: Dilapidated Army," 2 June 1997.

82. BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, "Sergeyev, Yeltsin Discuss Quarterly Defense Budget," 4 November 1998.

83. Kenneth L. Kladiva, Faculty Member, Defense Systems Management College and PPBS adviser to the Czech MOD, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

84. Milan Rezac, Professor and Head, Air Force Department, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, Brno, March 1997.

85. Simon, *Central European Civil-Military Relations and NATO Expansion,* 118.

86. Jiri Pehe, Director of the Open Media Research Institute (OMRI), interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

87. Jan Sternod, Political Officer, U.S. Embassy Prague, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

88. Simon, *Central European Civil-Military Relations and NATO Expansion,* 119–20.

89. Ibid., 124.

90. Jan Obrman, "Military Reform in the Czech Republic," *RFE/RL Research Report* 2, no. 41 (15 October 1993): 37.

91. Prague CTK, 7 January 1993; *FBIS-EEU-93-005,* 8 January 1993, 11.

92. For more on the lustration process in Czech and Slovak society at large and specific legislation governing it see Carol Leff, *The Czech and Slovak Republics* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997), 85–89.

93. Additional problems with the lustration process are discussed in chapter 4.

94. Pehe, interview.

95. Pehe and Sternod, interviews.

96. Vaclav Havel, President of the Czech Republic, interview with CTK, 25 September 1994.

97. Richard Byrne Reilly, *Prognosis Weekly,* 18 January 1995, 5; *FBIS-EEU-95-035,* 22 February 1995, 6.

98. *Prague Radiozurnal Radio Network,* 23 September 1994; *FBIS-EEU-94-185,* 23 September 1994, 6.

99. Czech News Agency (CTK), "Government Likely to Approve Strategic Army Development Plans," 25 March 1997.

100. Czech News Agency (CTK), "Biographies of New Ministers," BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, 28 June 1996.

101. As of this writing, the proposed concept was being re-drafted by the Zeman government.

102. *Jane's Intelligence Review,* "New Czech Defense Minister Threatens Military Cuts," 1 November 1996, 483.

103. Klara Gajduskova, "U.S. Said Worried by 'Low' Czech Defense Spending," Reuters, 22 October 1996.

104. *Economic Intelligence Unit,* "Czech Republic Politics: Few Bet on Survival of Minority Government," 7 August 1998.

105. Czech News Agency (CTK), "Defense Minister Supports NATO Membership," 18 July 1998.

106. Mlada Fronta Dnes, "Defense Minister to Review Army's Economic, Personnel Situation," 21 July 1998.

107. Hiatt, "Political Elites Vie for Power in Russian Quasi-Democracy: Transition from Communism at Stake," A1.

108. Mark Galeotti, "Decline and Fall: The Russian Defense Budget," *Jane's Intelligence Review* 6, no. 9: 386.

109. Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 14.

110. Charlton, "Under Pressure, Defense Minister Shows up in Court for Libel Case," *AP Worldstream,* 25 October 1995.

111. Ward, "Trouble in the Ranks as Its Top Officers Make a Run for Political Office," F5.

112. Kwiecien, interview.

113. Howcroft, interview.

114. Ilya Bulavinov and Maksim Zhukov, "Andrei Kokoshin Gains Oversight Authority Over All Power-Wielding Departments," *Sevodnya,* 29 August 1997, 1, *Current Digest of the Post- Soviet Press,* 69, no. 35 (1 October 1997): 6.

115. Timothy Heritage, "Russian Armed Forces Face Inquiry Over Bombing," *Reuters World Service,* 10 January 1995.

116. *Economist,* "After Chechnya," 14 January 1995, 44.

117. Felgengauer, "Uncontrolled Generals."

118. Interviews by author with Brno Military Academy faculty, March 1997.

119. Josef Jehlik, Colonel, Director of Personnel, Czech General Staff, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

120. Statement made in MOD briefing on Czech military reform presented to visiting American Colonels from the U.S. Air War College, March 1995.

121. Franklin D. Kramer, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. Statement before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 22 October 1997.

122. Michael Peyrard, "On the Chechnya Front We Realized That Our Leaders Were Mad," *Paris Match,* 9 February 1995, 58–59; *FBIS-SOV-95-024,* 6 February 1995, 28–29.

123. Mikhail Leontyev, "Will the President Sign Off On Lebed's Resignation?" *Sevodnya,* 7 June 1995, 1. Found in the *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press* 47, no. 23: 22.

124. Jensen, interview. See also Frederick C. Cuny, "The War Nobody Can Win," *The New York Review of Books,* reprinted in the *Sacramento Bee,* 9 April 1995, F1.

125. Lambeth, 93.

126. Gregory Katz, "Russian Mafia Sets Off Growing Wave of Crime," *Dallas Morning News,* 10 September 1995, 1A.

127. Justice, interview.

128. Bernard Kaplan, "Military Battles Over Secret Funds," *Orange Country Register,* 3 August 1996, A21.

129. Martin Malia, "The Nomenklatura Capitalists: Who's Running Russia Now?" *New Republic,* 22 May 1995, 17.

130. Alla Y. Gerber, Member of Russian Parliament, as quoted by Alessandra Stanley, "Russia's New Rulers Govern and Live, in Neo-Soviet Style," *New York Times,* 23 May 1995, A4.

131. H. H. Gaffney, Center for Naval Analyses, *National Security Decision-Making in Russian and in the United States.* Paper obtained from the Atlantic Council, Washington, DC.

132. Pirumov, interview.

133. Brusstar, interview.

134. Pirumov, interview.

135. Pyotr Yudin, "New Defense Council Adds to Kremlin Rift," *Defense News* (14–20 October 1996), 72.

136. Ibid.

137. Tamar A. Mehuron, "Organization of the Russian Armed Forces," *Air Force Magazine,* October 1998, 52.

138. Reka Szemerkenyi, *Central European Civil-Military Reforms at Risk,* Adelphi Paper 306, December 1996, 11.

139. Ibid., 13.

140. George D. Dunkelberg, U.S. Defense Attaché to the Czech Republic, interview by author, March 1995, Prague. The U.S. Defense attaché in Prague MOD observed that "there are lots of people in positions who don't know what they're doing."

141. Ibid.

142. *Flight International,* "Accidents Force Czech Air Force to Increase Training," 4 December 1996.

143. Tomas Horejsi, "Teaching a Horse Not to Eat; The Air Force Is Still Looking for a Way Out of Crisis," *Prague Tyden,* 2 December 1996, 16–20.

144. *Czech News Agency (CTK),* "Defense Minister Annoyed With Pilots' Protest," 12 December 1996.

145. Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 14.

146. Igor Brett, Secretary of the Defense and Security Committee of the Czech Republic, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

147. Brendan McNally and Jan Stojaspal, "Army Gaff Bodes Ill for NATO Bid," *Prague Post,* 5–11 June 1996, 4; *FBIS-EEU-96-123,* 25 June 1996. 10–11.

148. PPBS (Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System) is a budgeting system that forces policymakers to determine national defense priorities before funds are allocated for defense. This computer planning system allots funds according to these priorities and can determine how much any component of the ACR is spending. Its implementation requires specialized financial expertise, which presently only civilian bureaucrats in the MOD possess.

149. "Unwillingness to Define Enemy Hampers Army," *Prague Tyden,* 29 April 1997.

150. Tomas Horejsi, "The Army's Costly Mistakes," *Prague Tyden,* 5 November 1997, 38–47.

151. McFaul, "Why Russia's Politics Matter," 93.

152. Tatyana Skorobogatko, "'Wartime Budget' or 'Survival Budget,'" *Moskovskiye Novosti,* 19–26 October 1997, 7; *FBIS-UMA-97-297,* 24 October 1997.

153. Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 20.

154. Skorobogatko, "'Wartime Budget' or 'Survival Budget.'"

155. Ibid.

156. Zhelezov, interview.

157. Vladimir Kostrov, "Military Ask for Money; They Are Asked to Look in Their Own Pockets," *Ruskkiy Telegraf,* 24 October 1997, 3; *FBIS-UMA-97-300,* 27 October 1997.

158. Laurence Peter, "Corruption Scandals Rock Russian Military Establishment," *Agence France Presse,* 20 July 1996.

159. Petr Karapetyan, "Defense Budget Open for First Time Government Seeking Sources to Fund Military Reform," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 6 February 1998, 1, 3; FBIS Document FTS 19980210000323.

160. Sergey Kharlamov, Colonel, and Lt. Colonel Aleksandr Markov, "Armed Forces: Problems, Solutions," *Armeyskiy Sbornik,* no. 2 (February 1997), 5–8; *FBIS-UMA-97-093-S,* 1 February 1997.

161. Simon, *NATO Enlargement and Central Europe,* 238–39.
162. Ibid.
163. Czech News Agency (CTK), "Chamber of Deputies Elects Members of Committees," 22 July 1998.
164. Ibid.
165. Brett, interview.
166. Ibid.
167. Dunkelberg, interview.
168. Olga Kashina, Humphrey Fellow, University of Maryland, former staff member of the Duma Defense Committee, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.
169. Brett, interview.
170. Brett, interview.
171. Alexander Golz, reporter for *Krasnaya Zvezda* (Red Star—the main military newspaper), interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.
172. Ibid.
173. Brett, interview.
174. Kashina, interview.
175. Ibid.
176. Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 14.
177. Dunkelberg, interview.
178. Ibid.
179. Jehlik, interview.
180. Howcroft, interview.
181. Brusstar, interview.
182. Williams, interview.
183. Kwiecien, interview.
184. Brett, interview; and Andrew R. Wielkoszewski, Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army Attaché, Czech Republic, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.
185. Dunkelberg, interview.
186. McNally and Stojaspal, 10–11; and *Hospoparske Noviny,* 7 August 1996, 3; *FBIS-EEU- 96-156,* 12 August 1996, 14.
187. Up to this point all references to Parliament have referred to the only chamber of Parliament that existed until November 1996, the Chamber of Deputies. Referring to the lower chamber as the Chamber of Deputies has only become prevalent since the installation of the Senate.
188. Pavel Tigrid, "What the Senate Can and Cannot Do," *Lidove Noviny,* 16 October 1996, 9.
189. Michael Zantovsky, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Security Committee. Interview by author, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado, 24 October 1997.
190. Interviews by author of officers, academics, and defense analysts at the Brno Military Academy, Namest and Pardubice air bases, March 1997.
191. Milan Rezac, Professor and Head, Air Force Department, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno.

192. Szemerkenyi, 9–10.

193. Vernon Penner, "Restructuring for the Future: Partnership for Peace," *National Defense University Strategic Forum,* no. 97 (December 1996).

194. Szemerkenyi, 64–73.

195. Otto Latsis, "The Real Winners in Losing War," *Izvestia,* 5 January 1995, reprinted in *World Press Review* 42, no. 3 (March 1995): 16.

196. Golz, interview.

197. Kwiecien, interview.

198. *The Economist,* "The Wrong Man for Russia," 7 January 1995, 13–14; *The Nation,* "Botched Operation: Russian Troops in Chechnya," 30 January 1995, 116.

199. Kwiecien, interview.

200. Pirumov, interview.

201. Natasha Singer, "As Ethnic Wars Haunt Yeltsin, Others Wonder, 'Who's Next?'" *The Ethnic Newswatch* 98, no. 31 (13 January 1995): 1; Vanora Bennett, "Scared Chechens in Moscow Feel Russian Noose Tighten," *Reuters,* 2 March 1995.

202. Cuny, "The War Nobody Can Win," F1.

203. Kwiecien, interview.

204. Sergei Shargorodsky, "Soldiers' Mothers Take Their Anti-War Protest to Chechnya," *AP Worldstream,* 20 March 1995; *Ekho Moskvy Radio, Moscow,* 25 March 1995, translated in *BBC Summary of World Broadcasts,* SU/2263/B, "Chechen Peace March Proceeds Despite Ban," 28 March 1995.

205. Cuny, "The War Nobody Can Win," F1.

206. Zhelezov, interview.

207. Peter Ford, "Yeltsin's War in Chechnya Reveals Old Soviet Ways Can Persist," *The Christian Science Monitor,* 30 December 1994, 1; Latsis, "The Real Winners in a Losing War," 16.

208. Tom Birchenough, "TV Has Role in Chechnya War," *Variety,* 27 February–5 March 1995, 59; Thurston, interview.

209. Valentina Starova, "Russian Press, Government Discuss Chechen Coverage," *UPI,* 28 February 1995.

210. *The Nation,* "Botched Operation: Russian Troops in Chechnya," 30 January 1995, 116.

211. Ibid.

212. Starova, "Russian Press, Government Discuss Chechen Coverage," *UPI,* 28 February 1995.

213. Valentina Melinkova, Press Secretary of the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers of Russia, press conference with Sergei Yusenkov, Chair of the State Duma Committee for Defense, 18 September 1995, *Official Kremlin International News Broadcast.*

214. Zhelezov, interview.

215. Jensen, interview.

216. Golz, interview.

217. *The Economist,* "The Wrong Man for Russia," 13–14.

218. Czech Major, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

219. Blanka Prokesova, Department of Culture, Czech MOD, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

220. Petr Cornej, *Fundamentals of Czech History* (Prague: Prah, 1992), 42.

221. Condoleeza Rice, *The Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Army, 1948–1983: Uncertain Allegiance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 38.

222. Ibid., 34–37.

223. Ibid., 38.

224. Ibid., 45–46.

225. Ibid., 39.

226. Richard Byrne Reilly, "One Hawk Scatters Many Crows," *Prognosis Weekly,* 1–7 December 1994, 6.

227. Condoleeza Rice, "Warsaw Pact Reliability: The Czechoslovak People's Army," in *Soviet Allies: The Warsaw Pact and the Issue of Reliability,* ed. Daniel N. Nelson (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984), 127.

228. Ibid., 129.

229. Ibid., 140.

230. Prokesova, interview.

231. Simon, *Central European Civil-Military Relations and NATO Expansion,* 113.

232. *London Times,* 24 November 1989.

233. Wielkoszewski, interview.

234. Jiri Pehe, "The Czech Republic and NATO After the Elections," *Lidove Noviny,* 2 July 1996, 8; *FBIS-EEU-96-130,* 5 July 1996, 7.

235. Szemerkenyi, 49.

236. Pehe, "Czech Republic and NATO."

237. *Czech News Service, CTK,* "Czech Delegate in Brussels Assures on NATO Commitments," 6 October 1997.

238. The poll was conducted by the Institute for Public Opinion Research (IVVM). *Czech News Service, CTK,* "Poll: More Than Half of Czech Population Backs NATO Entry," 1 October 1998.

239. Robert L. Leininger, Lt. Colonel, Security Assistance Officer, U.S. Embassy Prague, interview by author, March 1995, Prague; Martin Polacek, "Our Army Is Not Capable of Defending the Country," *Lidove Noviny,* 21 August 1997, 1.

240. Jan Stojaspal, "Latest Poll Finds the Good Soldier Schwejk Still Typifies the Czechs and Their Army," *Prague Post,* 8 February 1995. Poll was conducted by the Center for Empirical Research (STEM).

241. USIA, Office of Research and Media Reaction, "Majorities in the Czech Republic Favor PFP, NATO Membership," *USIA Opinion Analysis,* 27 December 1994, 2–3. The other eleven states in order of descending military confidence levels were: Croatia, Britain, Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, France, Germany, Bulgaria, Slovakia, Albania, and Estonia.

242. Prague CTK, "Poll Suggests People Pessimistic About Defense Capability," 22 April 1997.

243. CTK, 6 December 1994, *Survey of Czech Press. Rude Pravo.* A comprehensive review of Czech military scandals can be found in Horejsi's "The Army's Costly Mistakes," *FBIS-EEU-97- 309,* 5 November 1997.

244. Tomas Horejsi, "Training a Horse Not to Eat; The Air Force is Still Looking for a Way Out of Crisis."

245. Wielkoszewski, interview.

246. Miroslav Krcmar, Major, Member Czech liaison team to the U.S. MLT (Military Liaison Team), interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

247. Interviews by author with Brno Military Academy faculty, March 1997.

248. Vaclav Havel, *Prague Radiozurnal,* 18 September 1994.

249. Radek Adamec. "The Soldiers Are Worried About Their Jobs," *Lidove Noviny,* 13 June 1996, 1; *FBIS-EEU-96-116,* 14 June 1996, 16.

250. Hans Binnendijk and Patrick Clawson, "Rethinking Grand Strategy," *Washington Quarterly* 18, no. 2: 109.

251. Christopher Donnelly, "Armies and Society in the New Democracies," *Jane's Intelligence Review* 7, no. 1: 3. Donnelly outlines in this article the specific structural elements needed to establish effective civil-military relations according to Western democratic standards.

252. Samuel P. Huntington, "Democracy for the Long Haul," *The Straits Times (Singapore),* 10 September 1995, 1; Mansfield and Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," 5–38.

253. Mansfield and Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," 23.

254. Binnendijk and Clawson, "Rethinking Grand Strategy," 109.

255. Guillermo O'Donnell, "Delegative Democracy," in *The Global Resurgence of Democracy,* ed. Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996) 94–108.

256. Mansfield and Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," 19–25.

Chapter 4

1. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957); S. E. Finer, *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics* (New York: Praeger, 1962); Claude E. Welch Jr., *Civilian Control of the Military* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1976).

2. Brian D. Taylor, *Professionalism and Politicization in the Soviet and Russian Armed Forces,* paper delivered at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, 31 August–3 September 1995, 8.

3. Huntington, *Soldier and the State.*

4. This is the argument laid out in chapter 2.

5. Roman Kolkowicz, "Toward a Theory of Civil-Military Relations in Communist (Hegemonial) Systems," in *Soldiers, Peasants, and Bureaucrats,* ed. Roman Kolkowicz and Andrzej Korbonski (London: Allen and Unwin, 1982), 233; Ellen Jones, *Red Army and Society* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1985), 23. This is the argument laid out in chapter 3.

6. Jiri Giesl, Major General, Defense, Military, and Air Attaché, Embassy of the Czech Republic, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

7. Robert L. Leininger, Lt. Colonel, Security Assistance Officer, U.S. Embassy Prague, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

8. Charles C. Justice, Lt. Commander, Assistant Naval Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

9. Vladimir Pirumov, Chairman of Scientific Council, Security Council of the Russian Federation, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

10. Vitali N. Tsygichko, Professor Doctor, Head of Center of National Security Studies, Academy of Sciences and adviser to the Federation Council on military reform, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow. See also Aleksey Makarin, "Vladimir Smirnov: The Army Must Be Assigned Realistic Missions," *Segodnya,* 26 May 1995, 5. *JPRS-UMA-95-025,* 20 June 1995, 14, 16. Smirnov argues that hopes for military reform that were great in 1990–91 have disappeared.

11. Gregory Govan, Brigadier General, Commander, On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) and former Defense Attaché in Moscow, 1987–91, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

12. Ervin J. Rokke, Lt. General, Commander National Defense University, former Defense Attaché in Moscow, 1986–87, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

13. Govan, interview.

14. John W. R. Lepingwell, "Soviet Civil-Military Relations and the August Coup," *World Politics* 44 (July 1992), 565.

15. Tsygichko, interview.

16. Bill Gertz, "Russia to Slash Ground Forces, Rely on Nukes; Military Resists Reform Plan," *Washington Times,* 17 October 1997, 1.

17. Mann, "Russians Sound Alarm Over Stalled Reforms," *Aviation Week and Space Technology* 146, no. 22 (26 May 1997), 64.

18. Ivan Malevich, Colonel, "Military Reform in Russia: Military Reform Is More Than Reform of the Army Alone," *Kommersant-Daily,* 15 July 1995, 5; *FBIS-UMA-95-159-S,* 17 August 1995, 17–20.

19. The Soviet Army had 5.6 million troops. According to General Staff statistics, the Russian Army was cut from 2.8 to 1.7 million troops between 1992 and 1996. The 1997 reform proposals set 1.2 million as the targeted reduction level.

20. Pirumov, interview.

21. Mann, "Russians Sound Alarm Over Stalled Reforms."

22. Sergey Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 3 November 1994, 1,5. *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 14.

23. Ibid., 14.

24. James Kitfield, "Low Pay and Loose Nukes," *National Journal,* 19 September 1998; Paul Mann, "Pessimism Deepens Over Russia's Fate," *Aviation Week and Space Technology,* 20 July 1998, 22.

25. Justice, interview.

26. Tsygichko, interview.

27. Vladislav Kuznetsov, "General Praises Reform of Russian Strategic Forces," *ITAR-TASS,* 4 November 1997; *FBIS-UMA-97-308,* 6 November 1997.

28. Funding to pay the transition costs and retirement benefits of 50,000 officers was set aside in a special fund. Mann, "Russians Sound Alarm Over Stalled Reforms."

29. Skorobogatko, "'Wartime Budget' or 'Survival Budget'."

30. Ibid. See also Georgiy Lukava, *Armeyskiy Sbornik* no. 4 (April 1995): 11–13; *FBIS-UMA- 95-139-S,* 20 July 1995, 6–7.

31. Mann, "Pessimism Deepens Over Russia's Fate," 23.

32. Justice, interview.

33. Makarin, "Vladimir Smirnov: The Army Must Be Assigned Realistic Missions," 5.

34. Adam R. Wasserman, Policy Planning Staff, U.S. Department of State, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

35. Makarin, "Vladimir Smirnov: The Army Must Be Assigned Realistic Missions," 5.

36. *Economist,* "A Real General Election," 23 September 1995, 44.

37. These actions affected approximately 1,650 officers of the Military Counterintelligence Service and 3,800 political workers. Jan Gadzik, "On the Deplorable State of the Czech Army," *Cesky Tydenik,* 6 July 1995; *FBIS-EEU-95-189,* 29 September 1995, 6.

38. Bruce Messelt, OSD Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in East and Central Europe, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC; Kenneth L. Kladiva, Faculty Member, Defense Systems Management College and PPBS adviser to the Czech MOD, interview by author, March 1995, Prague; Leininger, interview.

39. Vaclav Zaspal, "On the Deplorable State of the Czech Army," *Cesky Tydenik,* 6 July 1995; *FBIS-EEU-95-189,* 29 September 1995, 6.

40. General Staff of the Czech Republic, *The Army of the Czech Republic,* 1.

41. Jan Obrman, "Military Reform in the Czech Republic," *RFE/RL Research Report* 2, no. 41 (15 October 1993), 37.

42. Messelt, interview.

43. *Prague Report,* 3 January 1993, 3.

44. Giesl, interview.

45. Quentin Reed, "The Jane's Interview," *Jane's Defense Weekly,* 30 September 1998.

46. Jiri Martinek, Colonel, Chief of Operations, General Staff of the Czech Republic, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

47. Jan Sternod, Political Officer, U.S. Embassy Prague, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

48. Vitaliy Denisov, Captain, "'Do Not Disturb': Servicemen in the Group of Russian Forces in the Transcaucasus Have Seen This Sign at the Cashier's Office Window for Several Months Now," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 18 July 1995, 3; *FBIS-UMA-95-153-S,* 9 August 1995, 1.

49. *The Straits Times,* "Scapegoating in Yeltsin's Russia," 26 May 1997, 40.

50. Oleg Vladykin, "A Declining 'Curve' of the Military Salary Level Is Becoming Increasingly Threatening: Current Social and Financial Policy with Regard to Servicemen Is Leading to a Cadre Catastrophe in the Armed Forces," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 16 February 1995, 1, 3. *JPRS-UMA- 95-007,* 21 February 1995, 21–23.

51. Oleg Odnokolenko, "It Will Be Entirely Old Men on Parade," *Segodnya,* 1 November 1997, 1.

52. Vladimir Koltsov, "Division of Deserters Wandering Around Russia," *Russkiy Telegraf,* 12 November 1997, 1; *FBIS-UMA-97-317,* 13 November 1997.

53. Anne Garrels, "Russia's Military: Part I," *National Public Radio, Morning Edition,* 17 November 1997, Transcript # 97111711-210; Tony Barber, "Reform Rattles Through the Ranks," *Financial Times,* 15 April 1998, 5.

54. Garrels, "Russia's Military: Corruption," *National Public Radio, Morning Edition,* 19 November 1997, Transcript # 97111912-210.

55. Andrei Korbut, "'Mirages': The President Signed the Edict on Housing Certificates for Servicemen, But the Army of Homeless Officers Will Not Decrease by Much," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 17–23 October 1997; *FBIS-SOV-97-323,* 19 November 1997.

56. James H. Brusstar and Ellen Jones, "Attitudes within the Russian Officer Corps," *INSS Strategic Forum* no. 15 (January 1994), 2.

57. Garrels, "Russia Military: Part I."

58. Barber, "Reform Rattles Through the Ranks."

59. Interviews with Czech officers during March 1997 base visits to Namest and Pardubice.

60. Tomas Horejsi, "Army Faces More Changes: Defense Minister Wants Fighter Planes Instead of Bread Rolls," *Tyden,* 9 September 1996, 16; *FBIS-EEU-96-177,* 12 September 1997.

61. Zaspal, "On the Deplorable State of the Czech Army," 7; Martin Polacek, "NATO Is Following the Replacement of the Generals," *Lidove Noviny,* 4 July 1997, 5; *FBIS-EEU-97-185,* 8 July 1997.

62. Lt. Vohralik was one of only two Czech officers to graduate from U.S. service academies. The other, Lt. Petr Miller, is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. He has also publicly stated his dissatisfaction with conditions in the ACR, but has indicated that he will give the government more time. See *Czech News Service (CTK),* 7 November 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-311,* 7 November 1997; *CTK,* 12 November 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-317; CTK,* 13 November 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97- 317,* 13 November 1997.

63. *Czech News Agency, CTK,* "West Point Graduate Vohralik Decides to Stay in Czech Army," 6 March 1998.

64. Christopher Lord, Professor, Institute of International Politics, Charles University, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

65. Milan Fuchs, First Lieutenant, interview by author, March 1997, Pardubice Air Base.

66. *Economist,* "Czech Republic: Special—The New Bohemians," 22 October 1994, 23–27.

67. Gary Rubus, Brigadier General, Defense Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow 1991–95, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

68. Ibid.

69. Interviews with Czech officers during March 1997 base visits to Namest and Pardubice.

70. A U.S. Marine attaché related a meeting he had with an officer in March 1995 who was working at a nuclear sub repair facility and had not been paid since the previous November. The Russian officer remarked, "We're not making macaroni here. We're doing serious work." James Howcroft, Major, Assistant Marine Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

71. Koltsov, "Divisions of Deserters Wandering Around Russia."

72. Odnokolenko, "It Will Be Entirely Old Men on Parade."

73. Koltsov, "Divisions of Deserters Wandering Around Russia."

74. Odnokolenko, "It Will Be Entirely Old Men on Parade."

75. Yevgeniy Shalnev, “Russian Warrant Officers Used to Fill Vacant Officer Posts,” *ITAR- TASS World Service,* 4 November 1997; *FBIS-UMA-97-308,* 4 November 1997.

76. Rezac, interview, and interview with Barry Midkiff, Capt., U.S. Army, Exchange Student at the Czech Command and General Staff College, Brno Military Academy, March 1997. Indeed, interviews with the social science faculty indicated that the quality of military cadet vs. university student was quite low. One faculty member remarked that the military academies are “the rubbish bin of the educational system.”

77. Zdenek Kriz, Instructor of Political Science, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno.

78. Vladykin, “A Declining ‘Curve’ of the Military Salary Level Is Becoming Increasingly Threatening: Current Social and Financial Policy with Regard to Servicemen Is Leading to a Cadre Catastrophe in the Armed Forces,” 1, 3. *JPRS-UMA-95-007,* 21 February 1995, 23.

79. Correspondence with Colonel Yuri Runaev, Head Social Sciences Department, Kachinsky Air Force Academy, June 1997.

80. Oleg Falichev, “The Military Cap Becomes the Lads,” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 31 August 1995, 1; *FBIS-UMA-95-177-S,* 13 September 1995, 26.

81. Vladykin, “A Declining ‘Curve’ of the Military Salary Level Is Becoming Increasingly Threatening: Current Social and Financial Policy with Regard to Servicemen Is Leading to a Cadre Catastrophe in the Armed Forces,” 1, 3. *JPRS-UMA-95-007,* 21 February 1995, 23.

82. In 1994, 1,630 officers between the ages of 21–22 left the Army’s ranks. Vladykin, “A Declining ‘Curve’ of the Military Salary Level Is Becoming Increasingly Threatening: Current Social and Financial Policy With Regard to Servicemen Is Leading to a Cadre Catastrophe in the Armed Forces,” 1, 3. *JPRS-UMA-95-007,* 21 February 1995, 21.

83. Boris Zhelezov, Research Fellow, Center for International Security, USA-Canada Institute, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

84. Howcroft, interview.

85. One Czech Major, who has attended a yearlong course in the United States through IMET, served on the Czech liaison team to the U.S. MLT enabling him to make many trips abroad and served in UN peacekeeping units explained his departure plan. He related that one more tour with the Czech peacekeepers in Yugoslavia would give him enough of a nest egg to leave the service and move his family to a small Czech city where he has been offered the job of director of marketing for a small firm. Peacekeepers receive a per diem paid by the UN that far exceeds the basic pay of troops serving within the Czech Republic. Despite his excellent service record and selection for many opportunities in the West, he sees no future in the ACR officer corps or at least not an opportunity comparable to what he can arrange for himself in the Czech economy. Krcmar, interview. Defense Security Assistance Administration (DSAA) officials admit that the same phenomenon is occurring within the Russian IMET program. DSAA, interview, December 1997.

86. Bulavinov, “Lunatics and Criminals Will Not Serve Their Country Any More.” *Kommersant-Daily,* 10 October 1997, 3; *FBIS-UMA-97-288,* 15 October 1997.

87. *Economist,* “A Real General Election,” 44.

88. Paul H. Nelson, Colonel, Chief of Staff, On-Site Inspection Agency, U.S. Army Russian Foreign Area Specialist, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

89. Ilona W. Kwiecien, Lt. Colonel, Assistant Army Attaché, U.S. Embassy, Moscow. Main embassy liaison with the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow. See also Anne Garrels, "Draft Dodgers," *National Public Radio Morning Edition,* 18 November 1997, Transcript # 97111812-210.

90. Vladimir Matyash, "Healthy Youths Will Fill the Army's Ranks," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 10 October 1997, 1; *FBIS-UMA-97-287,* 14 October 1997.

91. Valdemar Fedorov, Major General, ret. and Colonel Aleksandr Tereshchenko, "Army Strength in Its Reserve: On Certain Aspects of Armed Forces Acquisition of Privates and Sergeants," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 3 October 1997, 2; *FBIS-SOV-97-296,* 23 October 1997.

92. *Czech News Service, CTK,* 4 November 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-308,* 4 November 1997.

93. In January 1998 a Military Education Team from the Naval Postgraduate School was scheduled to conduct in Moscow, at the MOD's request, a workshop on transitioning from a conscript to a professional NCO force. Keith Webster, DSAA Russian Desk Officer, interview by author, December 1997.

94. Paul B. East, Colonel, U.S. MLT Team Chief, Czech Republic, interview by author, July 1994, Prague.

95. See chapter 3 for a summary of this argument.

96. Zhelezov, interview.

97. George D. Dunkelberg, Colonel, U.S. Defense Attaché to the Czech Republic, interview by author, July 1994, Prague.

98. According to an April 1995 interview with the author, Colonel William Thurston, U.S. Air Attaché to Moscow said that there is evidence that some among the Russian military leadership may be exploring ways to increase the importance of merit in the system. When General Colonel Sergeyev, Commander of the Strategic Rocket Forces, and Admiral Chiles, Vice Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, met in a high level visit in 1994 the United States provided the Russians information on how the U.S. officer evaluation system works, at the request of the Russians. The specific request for information concerned how the United States assesses the degree to which an officer's performance contributes to the mission of the unit.

99. Vaclav Smejkal, "Where Are the Four Wheels of the Army Vehicle Headed?" *Ekonom,* January 1995, 27–32; *FBIS-EEU-95-065,* 5 April 1995, 13.

100. Peter R. O'Connor, U.S. MLT Team Chief, Czech Republic December 1994–May 1995, interview by author, March 1995, Prague. In this interview, Colonel O'Connor related his own interview with an especially promising Czech junior officer who had attended the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Ft. Leavenworth, KS, and who had worked closely with the U.S. MLT.

101. Vladimir Marek, "Now It Is the Matter of a Law and of the English Language," *A-Report,* 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-308,* 4 November 1997.

102. *Czech News Service, CTK,* 8 October 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-281,* 8 October 1997. Franklin D. Kramer, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 22 October 1997.

103. Katerina Sladkova, "Interview with Defense Minister Vyborny," *Tyden,* 20 January 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-017,* 20 January 1997.

104. *Czech News Service, CTK,* "Czech Army Reduction to 60,000 By 2003," 29 June 1998.

105. *Czech News Service, CTK,* 12 November 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-317,* 13 November 1997.

106. Chart provided by officers of the ACR General Staff, Prague, March 1995.

107. Wilem Holan, interview by Ferdinand Peroutka, *Denni Telegraf,* 31 May 1995, 5; *FBIS- EEU-95-107,* 5 June 1995, 12.

108. Jaroslav Spurny, "Things Are Different from Place to Place," *Respekt,* 14–20 October 1996; *FBIS-EEU-96-206,* 20 October 1996.

109. Zaspal, "On the Deplorable State of the Czech Army," *FBIS-EEU-95-189,* 29 September 1995, 11.

110. Josef Jehlik, Colonel, Director of Personnel, Czech General Staff, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

111. O'Connor, interview.

112. Jehlik, interview.

113. By 1997 most of the officers recalled from the Prague Spring had retired (again).

114. Jehlik, interview.

115. Prague CTK, "Outgoing Czech Army Chief on 'Shameful' Personnel Situation," 17 March 1998.

116. *Chicago Tribune,* "Editorial," 27 November 1995, section 1, p. 14. This editorial in endorsing the firing of an American Navy admiral dismissed for making inappropriate comments regarding the behavior of sailors in Okinawa argued that "Democracies can and should demand principled behavior from those who fight. . . . America's flag and star officers must represent American values."

117. For a review of the differences in officership and leadership in democratic and Soviet era military institutions, see chapters 2 and 3.

118. Wielkoszewski, interview. The "good soldier" Schwejk is a character from Czech literary fame who embodies the Czech perception of the bungling soldier.

119. Anna Bukharova, Major, Scientific Associate (faculty member), Higher Military Humanities College on Scientific and Research Work, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

120. Makarin, "The Older Officers Must Make Room for the Younger Ones," *JPRS-UMA-95- 025,* 20 June 1995, 13, 15.

121. Bukharova, interview.

122. Wasserman, interview.

123. *The Economist,* "Still Bleeding," 10 June 1995, 44.

124. Anatol Lieven, "Disarmed and Dangerous," *The New Republic,* 22 December 1997, 22.

125. Chapter 2 fully develops this point in the presentation of the model of democratic military professionalism.

126. David A. Wagie, Colonel, Professor, USAFA, James H. Head, Colonel, Vice Dean, USAFA, and Gerrold G. Heikkinen, Captain, USAFA faculty member, interviews by author, May 1995, USAFA.

127. Wielkoszewski, interview.
128. Ibid.
129. Martinek, interview.
130. Krcmar, interview.
131. Czech Lt. Hosa as told to Lt. Colonel Andrew Wielkoszewski and relayed in an interview by author.
132. Krcmar, interview.
133. Wielkoszewski, interview.
134. O'Connor, interview.
135. Ibid.
136. Martinek, interview.
137. Dunkelberg, interview.
138. O'Connor, interview.
139. Joseph Reynolds, SSgt, Security Assistance Officer, U.S. Office of Defense Cooperation, Prague. Telephone interview by author, 8 December 1997.
140. Wielkoszewski and Midkiff, interviews.
141. Midkiff, interview. In addition, the U.S. Army Captain has focused many of his assignments on pointing out the gap that he perceives in Czech leader development. For instance, he has written papers for the Czech faculty on such topics as leadership and professional ethics.
142. Tsygichko, interview.
143. Govan, interview.
144. Howcroft, interview.
145. According to Ministry of Defense statistics, in the first 8 months of 1993, 1,222 servicemen died. Twenty-five percent of these deaths were attributed to suicide. Ministry of Defense officials reported that 518 deaths, including 74 officers, occurred in the first 6 months of 1994. MOD statistics for 1995 are 392 deaths, one-third of them suicide. In 1996 the number of suicides went up to 123. The Mothers' Rights Foundation estimated that in 1996 thousands of soldiers died as a result of criminal acts by fellow soldiers or officers, by committing suicide, or by not receiving sufficient medical attention. See *U.S. Department of State Human Rights Country Reports, 1994, 1995, 1996,* which report on human rights practices for individual countries. See also Koltsov.
146. Garrels, "Russia's Military: Part I."
147. Justice, interview.
148. Lieven, 22.
149. *U.S. Department of State Dispatch,* March 1995.
150. Anatoliy Muranov, Colonel-General of Justice, "A Current Theme: A Law Against Dedovshchina," interview by Ivan Ivanyuk, *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 1 September 1995, 2; *FBIS-IMA- 5-187-S,* 27 September 1995, 7–9.
151. Lieven, 22–23.
152. Lieven, 22.
153. "Russia Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1996," U.S. Department of State Human Rights Country Reports, 1996; Oleg Getmaneko, "Stopping Hazing: Prosecutor's Office Snap Inspection Teams Prove Their Effectiveness," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 28 November 1997.

154. Hazing and hunger are cited as the reasons more than 7,000 deserters roamed Russia in 1997. Koltsov, "Divisions of Deserters Wandering Around Russia."

155. Nelson, interview.

156. Rokke, interview.

157. *U.S. Department of State Dispatch,* March 1995.

158. Kwiecien, interview.

159. Ibid. See also *U.S. Department of State Dispatch,* March 1995.

160. Kwiecien, interview.

161. Zhelezov, interview.

162. Some Russian military leaders who do not think that foreign models are relevant to reform in any other respect make an exception for the idea of creating an NCO corps to raise the combat capability of troops through the infusion of technical expertise and leadership. See Igor Rodionov, Colonel-General, "An Alternative: After Chechnya: A New Turning Point in the Reform of the Armed Forces or a Repeat of Past Mistakes?" *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 9 February 1995, 3. *JPRS-UMA-95-007,* 21 February 1995, 15.

163. *U.S. Department of State Dispatch,* March 1995.

164. John C. Reppert, Brigadier General, former U.S. assistant army attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow, and U.S. Defense Attaché to Moscow designate, July 1995–. Interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

165. Ibid.

166. Spurny.

167. Tomas Kellner, "Army Targets Hazing Ritual," *Prague Post,* 7 March 1995, 1.

168. Richard Byrne Reilly, "With Its Chief Out, Where Is the Czech Army Headed?" *Prognosis,* 8 October 1994, 8; *FBIS-EEU-94-222,* 17 November 1994, 9.

169. Sternod, interview.

170. O'Connor, interview.

171. *The Economist,* "Chechnya: Still Bleeding," 44.

172. The issue of corruption in postcommunist military institutions and in society at large is dealt with more thoroughly in chapter 5.

173. U.S. officers reported that the Russian cadets were interested in what the consequences of violations were and were amazed that disenrollment may be the designated punishment. The Commandant at the Russian academy asked the student body if they would like such a system implemented at Kachinsky and the cadets laughed as if such a concept was an impossibility. Head, interview.

174. Brittany Stuart, Cadet, U.S. Air Force Academy, interview by author, May 1995, USAFA.

175. Howcroft, interview.

176. Tsygichko, interview. Dzokhar Dudayev was the Chechen rebel leader.

177. Gennadiy Radionov, Lt. General, "Military Education Today and Tomorrow," *Orientir* no. 9 (September 1994): 3–8. *JPRS-UMA-94-043,* 26 October 1994, 9–10. Lt. General Radionov is the Russian Federation MOD Military Education Directorate Chief.

178. Yuriy Goncharov, "In the Channel of Renewal: Concept of Development of a System of Military Education of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation," *Orientir* no. 9 (September 1994), 58–62. *JPRS-UMA-94-043,* 26 October 1994, 12.

179. Gennadiy Radionov, Lt. General, "Two Educations—For One Higher Educational Institution Course of Study," interview by Oleg Vladykin. *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 15 December 1994, 2. *JPRS-UMA-95-001,* 11 January 1995, 17. See also Ilya Panin, Colonel General, Chief of Russian Federation Ministry of Defense Main Directorate of Cadres and Military Education, "See What Is Important: Urgent Cadre Policy Problems During RF Armed Forces Reform and Ways of Solving Them," *Armeyskiy Sbornik,* February 1998, 10–15; FBIS Document FTS 19980608000436.

180. Members of a U.S. Air Force Academy delegation who visited a Russian military college in April 1995 reported that their hosts showed them yellowed lesson plans indicating that change had not occurred in those particular courses for some time. The overall message received by the American officers was that the administration of the college was overwhelmed by budgetary problems that had left the institution in disrepair and that the lack of available funds was the institutional excuse for lack of change. Wagie, Head, and Heikkinen, interviews.

181. *Denni Telegraf,* "The Army Will Prepare a 'Defense University,'" 24 August 1995, 2; *FBIS-EEU-95-166,* 28 August 1995, 12.

182. Milan Rezac, Air Force Department Head, Brno Military Academy, interview by author, Brno, March 1997.

183. Brno Military Academy Senior Staff, interviews by author, March 1997, Brno.

184. Brno Military Academy Junior Civilian Faculty Members, interviews by author, March 1997, Brno.

185. Yuri Runaev, Lt. Colonel, Head, Social Science Department, Kachinsky Higher Military Aviation College, Volgograd, Russia. Correspondence received by the author in August 1995.

186. By the way, I explained all this in my reply to Lt. Col. Runaev. Perhaps the contacts made in the writing of this dissertation will actually help change for the better the course of democratic military professionalization in Russia.

187. Alexander Golz, reporter for *Krasnaya Zvezda* (Red Star—the main military newspaper), interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

188. Zaspal, "On the Deplorable State of the Czech Army," *FBIS-EEU-95-189,* 29 September 1995, 8–9.

189. Golz, interview.

190. Lord, interview.

191. Nikita Chaldimov, General, Chief Deputy of the Commandant of the Higher Military Humanities College, the former Lenin Military Political Academy, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

192. Alexander Pelts and Vladimir Pavlov, "Interview on a Timely Topic: Education Will Not Tolerate Trifles," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 26 June 1996; FBIS Document FTS 19970404001084.

193. Pirumov, interview.

194. Bukharova, interview.

195. Sergey Zdorikov, Lt. General, Chief of Russian Federation MOD Main Educational Work Directorate, "Just What Ideology Does the Russian Army Need Today?" Interview by Vasiliy Semenov, *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 8 September 1995, 1–2; *FBIS-UMA-95-192-S,* 4 October 1995, 2.

196. Bukharova, interview.

197. Zdorikov, "Just What Ideology Does the Russian Army Need Today?" *FBIS-UMA-95-192- S,* 4 October 1995, 3.

198. Aleksandr Shaburkin, "Ideological Niche of Military Service," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 3–9 October 1997; *FBIS-SOV-97-307,* 3 November 1997.

199. Vladimir Kulakov, "The Profession of Officer/Educator of Special Significance Today," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 30 December 1997, 1, 3; FBIS Document FTS 19980123000740.

200. Indeed, one proposal for the reform of servicemen's ideological education suggests that soldiers should be taught that the near-abroad is a sphere of the Russian Federation's most immediate and vitally important political and military-strategic interests. See Aleksandr Kokorin and Viktor Samoylov, "A Position: Fruitless Years of Talking Shop: A Realistic Approach to Military Reform in Russia Is Still a Problem," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 8–14 February 1997, 1, 4; *FBIS-UMA-97-057-S,* 14 February 1997.

201. Bukharova, interview.

202. Zdorikov, "Just What Ideology Does the Russian Army Need Today?" *FBIS-UMA-95-192-S,* 4 October 1995, 3.

203. Ibid.

204. Kokorin and Samoylov.

205. Valery Mironov, Colonel General, Chief Military Expert with Russian Federation Government Chairman, "Cadres: Problems and Prospects of Army Education," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 31 October–13 November 1997, 1, 4; *FBIS-SOV-97-328,* 24 November 1997.

206. Zdenek Kriz and Karel Tesar, Instructors of Political Science, Brno Military Academy, interviews by author, March 1997.

207. USAFA cadets visiting the Czech military academy at Brno noted that the cadets they came in contact with did not cite service to country as a primary motivator for enrollment at the military academy. No prime ideological reasons were cited. Stuart, interview.

208. Sternod, interview.

209. Robert B. Russell, David Nilles, and Brittany Stuart, Cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, interviews by author, USAFA, May 1995.

210. Interviews with senior faculty members, Brno Military Academy, by author, March 1997, Brno.

211. Giesl, interview.

212. Statement made in MOD briefing by Deputy Director of Education and Head of University Level Education on Czech military reform presented to visiting American Colonels from the U.S. Air War College, March 1995.

213. Zaspal, "On the Deplorable State of the Czech Army," *FBIS-EEU-95-189,* 29 September 1995, 7–8.

214. Dunkelberg, interview.

215. Reynolds, interview.

216. Quentin Reed, "The Jane's Interview," *Jane's Defense Weekly,* 30 September 1998.

217. Reynolds, interview.

218. Jindra Jiresova, Interview with Zdenek Borkovec, Director of the Czech Republic MOD, "Fortune Smiles on Those Who Are Prepared," FBIS Document FTS 19971103001390.

219. James H. Brusstar and Ellen Jones, *The Russian Military's Role in Politics* (McNair Paper 34) (Washington, DC: National Defense University, January 1995), 3–4.

220. A Russian journalist who accompanied a group of visitors from London to a Russian military college reported that the British delegation was shocked when the chief of the college told them that no version of political science was taught there. The chief justified this curriculum decision by saying, "The Army is not involved in politics." Golz, interview.

221. The Chairman of the All-Russian Officers' Assembly defended his movement by saying, "The army is an instrument of politics, so it should take part in the fate of our country." Deborah Seward, "Former Soviet Generals Vow to Oppose Yeltsin in Parliamentary Vote, " *AP Worldstream,* 17 August 1995.

222. Natalie Gross-Hassman, "A Military Coup in Russia?: Prospects and Constraints," *Jane's Intelligence Review* 7, no. 11 (1 November 1995), 493.

223. *The Financial Times,* "Military Vote Uncertain," 12 May 1995.

224. Anatoliy Stasovskiy, "The Army and the Elections, " *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 2 September 1995, 1; *FBIS-UMA-95-187-S,* 27 September 1995, 5.

225. Scott, "Russian Army Drafted for Vote Rigging Duty," *Sunday Times,* 1 October 1995.

226. Ibid.

227. Anatoliy Verbin, "Russian Generals March in Parliamentary Campaign," *Reuters,* 3 October 1995.

228. This estimate includes the military-industrial complex, pensioners, and relatives of active duty forces. Carey Scott, "Russian Army Drafted for Vote Rigging Duty," *Sunday Times,* 1 October 1995.

229. Verbin, "Russian Generals March in Parliamentary Campaign," *Reuters,* 3 October 1995.

230. A Russian newspaper reported that in the district where Gromov is running the commander of the local military school was ordered to nominate himself to run against Gromov. The commander complied. Yulia Kalinina, "Khaki-Colored Duma," *Moskovsky Komsomolets,* 1–4, 11 October 1995. Obtained through the *Russian Press Digest.*

231. Kalinina, "Khaki-Colored Duma." Obtained through the *Russian Press Digest.*

232. *Economist,* "A Real General Election," 44.

233. Pavel Felgengauer, "Military Reform Is Turning into a Revolution," *Sevodnya,* 22 September 1997, 1–2. *Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* 22 October 1997, 4.

234. Pyotr Yudin. "Opposition Grows Against Yeltsin Military Reform Plan," *Defense News,* 14–20 July 1997, 18.

235. Alan Philps, "Dissident General Sees Chance to Force Yeltsin to Quit," *The Daily Telegraph,* 4 November 1997, 16.

236. Katrina vanden Heuvel and Stephen F. Cohen, "The Other Russia: Moscow Glitters, the Economy Collapses, the Army Rumbles," *The Nation* 265, no. 5. (11 August 1997), 24.

237. Kalinina, "Khaki-Colored Duma." Obtained through the *Russian Press Digest.*

238. Brno Military Academy senior faculty members, interviews by author, March 1997.
239. Runaev correspondence.
240. Golz, interview.
241. Wielkoszewski, interview.
242. Petr Pithart, Senate Chairman, quoted in *Czech News Service, CTK,* 4 November 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-308,* 4 November 1997.
243. Lt. Petr Miller, U.S. Naval Academy graduate, quoted in *Czech News Service,* 13 November 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-317,* 13 November 1997.
244. *Military Elites in Russia 1994,* 4.
245. Ibid.
246. Howcroft, interview.
247. Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 13.
248. Govan, interview.
249. Ibid.
250. Rogov, "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform," *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 15.
251. Dunkelberg, interview.
252. Holecek, interview.
253. Govan, interview.
254. Vaclav Havel, President of the Czech Republic, *Prague Radiozurnal,* 29 January 1995; *FBIS-EEU-95-019,* 30 January 1995, 6.
255. For instance, Defense Minister Grachev protested the decline of military-patriotic education in schools and the demilitarization of such texts as alphabet primers. Such practices, he argued will lead to the demise of the military ideals of the state. Aleksandr Kovalev, "Educating a Patriot, Serviceman, and Citizen Is Today the Main Task for a School," *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 20 October 1994, 1, 3. *JPRS-UMA-94-044,* 2 November 1994, 7–10. See also Igor Rodionov, Colonel-General, "We Do Not Want to Militarize Society Again: On Military Reform and Reform of the Armed Forces," *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 23 December 1994, 1, 3. *JPRS-UMA-95-003,* 31 January 1995, 22. The author argues, "Let them not reproach us for attempts to militarize society again, for a systemic approach to safeguarding the country's military security is characteristic of any democratic 'civilized' state of the West."
256. Lukava, *Armeyskiy Sbornik, FBIS-UMA-95-139-S,* 20 July 1995, 8.
257. Wasserman, interview.
258. Olga Miravanovna in Anne Garrels, "Russia's Army: MIAs," *National Public Radio Morning Edition,* 20 November 1997, Transcript # 97112011-210.
259. Garrels, "Russia: Draft Dodgers."
260. Sergey Rogov, "The Future of Military Reform," an unpublished paper, January 1995, 23. See also Ivan Malevich, "Five Reforms: How This Was in the Past," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye* no. 2 (22 April 1995), 3. *JPRS-UMA-95-022,* 16 May 1995, 21. The author argues that the most democratic means of fielding an army is through conscription assuming that all citizens are equally likely to serve.
261. Golz, interview.

Chapter 5

1. Gregory Govan, Brigadier General, Commander, On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) and former Defense Attaché in Moscow, 1987–91, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

2. William K. Harris, Policy Assistant, DOD Office of Soviet and East European Affairs, interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

3. Council on Foreign Relations. *Russia, Its Neighbors and an Enlarging NATO* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1997).

4. Robert L. Leininger, Lt. Colonel, Security Assistance Officer, U.S. Embassy Prague, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

5. *Talking Points on Defense and Military Contacts with the FSU, 1993.*

6. JCTP mission statement from briefing slide in HQ USAFE Military to Military briefing obtained at the Pentagon in May 1995.

7. John C. Reppert, Brigadier General , former U.S. assistant army attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow, and U.S. Defense Attaché to Moscow designate, interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

8. Excerpt from USAF briefing papers obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

9. *JCTP Briefing,* obtained from HQ USEUCOM, November 1997.

10. Peter R. O'Connor, U.S. MLT Team Chief, Czech Republic, December 1994–May 1995, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

11. My major field research trip to Prague occurred in March 1995. A previous trip occurred in July of 1994 and a brief trip occurred in March 1997 and June 1999.

12. Jeffrey Simon, National Defense University Faculty Member, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

13. See chapter 2.

14. James Howcroft, Major, Assistant Marine Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

15. Stephen Freeman, Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in Russia/Eurasia, interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

16. Andrew S. Weiss, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

17. Reppert, interview.

18. Interview by author with officer assigned to the Joint Staff, November 1997.

19. Charles C. Justice, Assistant Naval Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

20. The exercises with Russia include: Peacekeeper 95 (took place in the US), Cooperation from the Sea 95 and 96 (took place in Hawaii and Vladivostok), and Arctic Search and Rescue 96 and 97. The exercises with Ukraine include: Peaceshield 95 (Lviv, Ukraine), Autumn Allies 95 (Camp Lejeune, NC), Amphibex 95 (Odessa, Ukraine), Peaceshield II (Ft. Leavenworth, KS), Peaceshield 96 (Lviv, Ukraine—Russia, and 9 other PfP states took part), Autumn Allies II (Virginia), Cooperative Neighbor 97 (Lviv, Ukraine—9 PfP states besides Russia took part), Sea Breeze 96 (Odessa, Shirokiy Lan, and Donuzlave, Crimea), and Peaceshield 97 (Camp San Luis Obispo, CA); interview by author with Joint Staff Officer, November 1997.

21. O'Connor, interview.

22. Hank Richmond, Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in Central and Eastern Europe, interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

23. James E. Kinzer and Marybeth Peterson Ulrich, *Political-Military Affairs Officers and the Air Force: Continued Turbulence in a Vital Career Specialty* (U.S. Air Force Academy, CO: Institute for National Security Studies, April 1997).

24. Andrew R. Wielkoszewski, Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army Attaché, Czech Republic, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

25. Harris, interview.

26. When I asked the Czech Defense Attaché to the United States this question he was careful to preface his remark with, "This is not meant to be a negative comment, but rotating the teams every six months is too much. The deployments should be at least one year long." Jiri Giesl, Major General, Military and Air Attaché, Embassy of the Czech Republic, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

27. O'Connor, interview.

28. Colonel Thomas Hayes, MLT Team Chief, Czech Republic, interview by author, November 1997.

29. Dirk P. Deverill, Commander, Joint Staff, Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate, European Division, interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

30. Ibid.

31. *Country Work Plan of the Czech Republic, FY98,* 5–7.

32. Ibid., 6–7.

33. The key result areas of the Czech Republic's Country Work Plan, supporting objectives, metrics, and events are provided in appendix C of the Work Plan.

34. Ilona W. Kwiecien, Lt. Colonel, Assistant Army Attaché, U.S. Embassy, Moscow, interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

35. Justice, interview.

36. Interview by author of Joint Staff Officer in the Russia, Ukraine, Eurasia division, November 1997.

37. Harris, interview.

38. Freeman, interview.

39. Interview by author of Joint Staff Officer in the Russia, Ukraine, Eurasia division, November 1997.

40. Adam R. Wasserman, Policy Planning Staff, U.S. Department of State, former CIA military analyst, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

41. Howcroft, interview.

42. Paul H. Nelson, Colonel, Chief of Staff, On-Site Inspection Agency, U.S. Army Russian Foreign Area Specialist, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

43. Govan, interview.

44. Ervin J. Rokke, Lt. General, Commander National Defense University, former Defense Attaché in Moscow, 1986–87, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

45. Weiss, interview.

46. Freeman, interview.

47. Weiss, interview.

48. Interview by author of Joint Staff Officer in the Russia, Ukraine, Eurasia division, November 1997.

49. O'Connor, interview.

50. Justice, interview.

51. Christopher D. Bott, Lt. Commander, Assistant Naval Attaché, *IMET Two Year Training Plan for Russia 1996–97.* Document obtained from Lt. Commander Bott by the author in Moscow, April 1995.

52. Report prepared in December 1993 by officers in the defense attaché office in Moscow for inputs to a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the U.S. military to military contact program in Russia.

53. Webster, interview.

54. Ibid.

55. Richmond, interview.

56. Webster, interview.

57. Report prepared in December 1993 by officers in the defense attaché office in Moscow for inputs to a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the U.S. military to military contact program in Russia.

58. Howcroft, interview.

59. Bott, *IMET Two Year Training Plan for Russia 1996–97.*

60. Webster, interview.

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid.

63. Report prepared in December 1993 by officers in the defense attaché office in Moscow for inputs to a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the U.S. military to military contact program in Russia.

64. Interview by author with DSAA officer with responsibility for the Czech Republic, November 1997.

65. Webster, interview.

66. Simon, interview.

67. Jan Gadzik, "Czech Army Looking for a Form Press," *Lidove Noviny,* 9 February 1995, and carried over CTK national news wire, 9 February 1995.

68. Tomas Horejsi, "Jiri Sedivy—A Timorous Leader Makes No Mistakes," *Prague Tyden,* 30 March 1998, 14; FBIS Document FTS 19980415000468.

69. Joseph Reynolds, Staff Sergeant, Security Assistance Manager for the Czech Republic, interview by author, November 1997.

70. Wilem Holan, Defense Minister, "For Joining NATO, We Have the Support of the United States and Canada," *Lidove Noviny,* 5 December 1994, 5; *FBIS-EEU-94-236,* 8 December 1994, 13.

71. O'Connor, interview.

72. *Czech News Service, CTK,* 7 November 1997; *FBIS-EEU-97-311,* 7 November 1997.

73. Miroslav Krcmar, Major, Member Czech liaison team to the U.S. MLT, interview by author, March 1995, Prague; Junior officers interviewed by author at the Pardubice and Namest air bases, March 1997.

74. Interview by author with DSAA officer with responsibility for the Czech Republic, November 1997.

75. Krcmar, interview.

76. George D. Dunkelberg, Colonel, U.S. Defense Attaché to the Czech Republic, interview by author, July 1994, Prague.

77. Leininger, interview; *Czech News Service,* 7 November 1997.

78. Jan Gazdik, "The Army Is Not Exercising, Laws Are Lacking, Claims Necas," *Mlada Fronta Dnes,* 23 September 1997, 2; *FBIS-EEU-97-266,* 23 September 1997.

79. Gazdik, "Clinton Put a Knife to Army Officials' Throat," *Mlada Fronta Dnes,* 14 June 1997, 2; FBIS Document FTS 199706160016303.

80. O'Connor, interview.

81. Gazdik, "The Army Is Not Exercising."

82. Mark Cheek, Point of Contact at the Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA) for International Military and Education Training (IMET) programs in Russia, East and Central Europe, interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

83. Message sent from the U.S. Embassy in Prague by the Security Assistance Officer to Washington, DC, 6 April 1994.

84. Reynolds, interview.

85. E. Douglas Menarchik, Marshall Center faculty member, telephone interview by author, 25 September 1995.

86. Malcolm Shearmur, "Defense Planning Courses Learning Not to Spy," *The Warsaw Voice,* 15 January 1995. Obtained from the Lexis-Nexis News Service.

87. Justin Burke, "Red to White: Ex-Communists Taught Democracy 101," *The Christian Science Monitor,* 19 December 1994. Obtained from the Lexis-Nexis News Service.

88. Pavel Jandacek, General, Deputy Chief of the ACR General Staff, December 1994 Marshall Center graduate, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

89. Jiri Martinek, Colonel, Chief of Operations, General Staff of the Czech Republic, interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

90. Menarchik, interview.

91. Shearmur, "Defense Planning Courses Learning Not to Spy."

92. *Moscow Times,* "Training the Military in the Art of Democracy, " 31 December 1994. Obtained from the Lexis-Nexis News Service.

93. Jandacek, interview.

94. Menarchik, interview.

95. Jandacek, interview.

96. Ibid.

97. Interview by author of Marshall Center faculty member, December 1997.

98. Ibid.

99. Ibid.

100. Freeman, interview.

101. Wasserman, interview.

102. HQ USEUCOM memo dated 25 March 1995 entitled "JCTP Goals."

103. GAO Report: GAO/NSIAD-97-164, "NATO Enlargement: U.S. and International Efforts to Assist Potential New Members," 1 June 1997; available from http://www.fas.org/man/gao/nsiad97164.htm; Internet.

Chapter 6

1. The White House, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (Washington, DC: GPO, July 1994). For more on the evolution of this document, see chapter 2, note 1.

2. Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," *International Security* 20, no. 1 (summer 1995): 5–38; Alexander V. Kozhemiakian, *Expanding the "Pacific Union": The Impact of the Process of Democratization on International Security,* unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1995.

Selected Bibliography

Books

Abrahamsson, Bengt. *Military Professionalization and Political Power.* Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972.

Adelman, Jonathan R., ed. *Communist Parties in Politics.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1982.

———. Terror and Communist Politics: *The Role of the Secret Police in Communist States.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1983.

Almond, Gabriel. *The American People and Foreign Policy.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1950.

Ashkenazy, Daniella, ed. *The Military in the Service of Society and Democracy.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994.

Baev, Pavel K. *The Russian Army in a Time of Troubles.* Oslo: International Peace Research Institute, 1996.

Barany, Zoltan D. *Soldiers and Politics in Eastern Europe, 1945–1990.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Blank, Stephen J. *Russian Defense Legislation and Russian Democracy.* Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, August 1995.

Boyle, Peter G. *American-Soviet Relations: From the Russian Revolution to the Fall of Communism.* London: Rutledge, 1993.

Brown, Michael E., Sean M. Lynn-Jones, and Steven E. Miller, eds. *Debating the Democratic Peace.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997.

Brown, Seyom. *The Faces of Power: Constancy and Change in United States Foreign Policy From Truman to Reagan.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Brusstar, James H., and Ellen Jones. *The Russian Military's Role in Politics.* McNair Paper 34. Washington, DC: National Defense University, January 1995.

Burke, Alan W., Capt, and Capt. Robert D. Critchlow, eds. *Foundations of the Military Profession.* Dubuque: Kendall Hunt, 1994.

Carothers, Thomas. *In the Name of Democracy: U.S. Policy Toward Latin America in the Reagan Years.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Cochran, Charles L., ed. *Civil-Military Relations.* New York: Free Press, 1974.

Colton, Timothy J. *Commissars, Commanders, and Civilian Authority: The Structure of Soviet Military Politics.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Colton, Timothy J., and Thane Gustafson, eds. *Soldiers and the Soviet State.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Combs, Jerald A. *The History of American Foreign Policy.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986.

Cornej, Petr. *Fundamentals of Czech History.* Prague: Prah, 1992.

Council on Foreign Relations. *Russia, Its Neighbors and an Enlarging NATO.* New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1997.

Cossaboom, Robert T. *The Joint Contact Team Program.* Washington, DC: Joint History Office, JCS, 1997.

Danopoulos, Constantine, and Daniel Zirker, eds. *The Military and Society in the Former Eastern Bloc.* Boulder: Westview, 1999.

DePorte, A. W. *Europe between the Superpowers.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Diamond, Larry, and Marc F. Plattner, eds. *Civil-Military Relations and Democracy.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

———. *The Global Resurgence of Democracy.* 2d ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

De Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America.* 2 vols. New York: Vintage Books, 1945.

Eulau, Heinz, Samuel J. Eldersveld, and Morris Janowitz, eds. *Political Behavior: A Reader in Theory and Research.* Glencoe: Free Press, 1956.

Finer, S. E. *The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics.* New York: Praeger, 1962.

Gitz, Bradley R. *Armed Forces and Political Power in Eastern Europe.* New York: Greenwood Press, 1992.

Goldhammer, Herbert. *The Soviet Soldier: Soviet Military Management at the Troop Level.* New York: Crane, Russak, and Co., 1975.

Graebner, Norman A. *Ideas and Diplomacy.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Handelman, Stephen. *Russia's New Mafiya.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Herspring, Dale R., and Ivan Volgyes, eds. *Civil-Military Relations in Communist Systems.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1978.

———. *Russian Civil-Military Relations.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Holmes, Leslie. *Post-Communism: An Introduction.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Soldier and the State.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

———. *The Common Defense.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

———. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Janowitz, Morris. *The Military in the Political Development of New Nations.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

———. *The Professional Soldier.* New York: Free Press, 1971.

———, ed. *Civil-Military Relations: Regional Perspectives.* Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981.

Johnson, Lonnie R. *Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbors, Friends.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Jones, Christopher D. *Soviet Influence in Eastern Europe.* New York: Praeger, 1981.

Jones, Ellen. *Red Army and Society.* Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1985.

Kennan, George F. *American Diplomacy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Khmel, Alexander, Lt. General. *Education of the Soviet Soldier: Party Political Work in the Soviet Armed Forces.* Moscow: Progress, 1972.

Kinzer, James E. and Marybeth Peterson Ulrich. *Political-Military Affairs Officers and*

the Air Force: Continued Turbulence in a Vital Career Specialty. U.S. Air Force Academy, CO: USAF Institute for National Security Studies, April 1997.

Kolkowicz, Roman. *The Soviet Military and the Communist Party.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Kolkowicz, Roman, and Andrzej Korbonski, eds. *Soldiers, Peasants, and Bureaucrats.* London: Allen and Unwin, 1982.

Kolodziej, Edward A. *The Uncommon Defense and Congress, 1945–1963.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1966.

Lasswell, Harold D. *National Security and Individual Freedom.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1950.

Leff, Carol. *The Czech and Slovak Republics.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1997.

Lippmann, Walter. *The Cold War: A Study in US Foreign Policy.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

McFaul, Michael. *American Policy Towards Russia: Framework for Analysis and Guide to Action.* Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, April 1997.

Michta, Andrew A. *Red Eagle: The Army in Polish Politics.* Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1990.

———. *The Soldier-Citizen: The Politics of the Polish Army after Communism.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.

Nathan, James A. and James K. Oliver, *United States Foreign Policy and World Order.* 3d ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1985.

Nelson, Daniel N., ed. *Soviet Allies: The Warsaw Pact and the Issue of Reliability.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.

Nolan, Cathal J. *Principled Diplomacy: Security and Rights in US Foreign Policy.* London: Greenwood Press, 1993.

Osgood, Robert E. *Ideals and Self Interest in America's Foreign Relations.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Perlmutter, Amos. *The Military and Politics in Modern Times.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Perlmutter, Amos, and Valerie Plave Bennett, eds. *The Political Influence of the Military: A Comparative Reader.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

Remington, Thomas F. *Politics in Russia.* New York: Addison-Wesley, 1999.

Rice, Condoleeza. *The Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Army, 1948–1983: Uncertain Allegiance.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Russett, Bruce. *Grasping the Democratic Peace.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Samelson, Louis J., Dr., ed. *The Management of Security Assistance.* 14th ed. Wright-Patterson AFB, OH: Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management, April 1994.

Sapir, Jacques. *The Soviet Military System.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1991.

Sartori, Giovanni. *Democratic Theory.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962.

Schroeder, Paul W. *The Transformation of European Politics 1763–1848.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Scott, Harriet Fast, and William F. Scott. *The Armed Forces of the USSR.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.

Simon, Jeffrey. *Central European Civil-Military Relations and NATO Expansion.* Washington, DC: Institute for National Strategic Studies, April 1995.

———. *NATO Enlargement and Central Europe.* Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1996.

Smith, Tony. *America's Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Staar, Richard F. *The New Military in Russia: Ten Myths That Shape the Image.* Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1996.

Stepan, Alfred. *The Military in Politics: Changing Patterns in Brazil.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Suvorov, Viktor. *Inside the Soviet Army.* New York: Macmillan, 1982.

Taylor, Robert L., and William E. Rosenbach, eds. *Military Leadership.* 3d ed. Boulder: Westview, 1996.

Van Doorn, Jacques, ed. *Armed Forces and Society.* The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

Wallensteen, Peter. *Structure and War: On International Relations, 1820–1968.* Stockholm: Raben & Sjogren, 1973.

Weigley, Russell F. *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Policy and Strategy.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973.

Welch, Claude E., Jr. *Civilian Control of the Military.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1976.

Williams, E. S., ed. *The Soviet Military: Political Education, Training and Morale.* London: Macmillan, 1987.

Articles

Babst, Dean. "A Force for Peace." *Industrial Research* (April 1972): 55–58.

Barany, Zoltan D. "Civil-Military Relations in Communist Systems: Western Models Revisited." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 19 (summer 1991): 75–99.

———. "Civil-Military Relations in Comparative Perspective: East-Central and Southeastern Europe." *Political Studies* 61, no. 4 (December 1993): 594–610.

Binnendijk, Hans, and Patrick Clawson. "Rethinking Grand Strategy." *Washington Quarterly* 18, no. 2, 109–26.

Brown, John F. "Détente and Soviet Policy in Eastern Europe." *Survey* 20, (spring/summer 1974): 46–58.

Brusstar, James H., and Ellen Jones. "Attitudes within the Russian Officer Corps." *INSS Strategic Forum,* no. 15 (January 1994).

Carothers, Thomas. "Enlarging Democracy: Democracy and Human Rights." *Current* no. 367 (November 1994): 17–23.

Christopher, Warren. "American Foreign Policy: The Strategic Priorities." *Vital Speeches of the Day* 60, no. 6 (1 January 1994): 162–67.

———. "America's Commitment to Human Rights." *Dispatch* 5, no. 6 (7 February 1994): 53–60.

———. "International Affairs Budget: An Investment in Peace and Prosperity." *Dispatch* 5, no. 7 (14 February 1994): 79.

———. "Advancing the Strategic Priorities of US Foreign Policy and the FY 1995 Budget," *Dispatch* 5, no. 10 (7 March 1994): 113–19.

———. "America's Fundamental Dedication to Human Rights." *Dispatch* 6, no. 6 (6 February 1995): 73–77.

Churchill, Winston. "Speech at Fulton, MO, 5 Mar 46." *Vital Speeches of the Day* 12 (15 March 1946): 329–32.

Cohen, Ariel. "Aid Russia, But Reform the U.S. Program." *Problems of Post-Communism* 42, no. 3 (May–June 1995): 32–35.

Donnelly, Christopher. "Evolutionary Problems in the Former Soviet Armed Forces." *Survival* 34, no. 3 (autumn 1992): 28–42.

———. "Armies and Society in the New Democracies." *Jane's Intelligence Review* 7, no. 1, 3–7.

Doyle, Michael. "Liberalism and World Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80, no. 4 (December 1986): 1151–69.

Dulles, John F. "A Policy of Boldness." *Life* 19 May 1952, 146–57.

Ember, Carol R., Melvin Ember, and Bruce Russett. "Peace Between Participatory Polities." *World Politics* 44, no. 4 (July 1992): 573–99.

Galeotti, Mark. "Decline and Fall: The Russian Defense Budget." *Jane's Intelligence Review* 6, no. 9: 386–87.

Hutchings, Robert L. "U.S. Aid to Central and Eastern Europe: A Call for Imagination." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* 4, no. 17 (26 April 93): 292–94.

Jones, W. H. Morris. "Armed Forces and the State." *Public Administration* 35 (winter 1957): 411–16.

Kemp, Kenneth W., and Charles Hudlin. "Civilian Supremacy Over the Military: Its Nature and Limits." *Armed Forces and Society* 19, no. 1 (fall 1992): 7–26.

Kennedy, John F. "Inaugural Address." *The Department of State Bulletin,* 6 February 1961, 175–76.

Kipp, Jacob W. "Russian Military Doctrine and Military Technical Policy: An American Military Historian's Perspective." *Comparative Strategy* 13 (1994): 25–41.

Knight, Amy W. "The KGB's Special Departments in the Soviet Armed Forces." *Orbis* 28 (summer 1984): 257–80.

Kramer, David. "Russian Aid II." *National Interest* no. 39 (spring 1995): 78–81.

Lake, Anthony. "From Containment to Enlargement." *Dispatch* 4, no. 39 (27 September 1993): 658–64.

Lambeth, Benjamin S. "Russia's Wounded Military." *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 2 (March/April 1995): 86–98.

Larson, Charles R., Admiral. "IMET: A Cornerstone of Cooperative Engagement." *DISAM Journal,* (summer 1993): 96–102.

Lepingwell, John W. R. "Soviet Civil-Military Relations and the August Coup." *World Politics* 44 (July 1992): 561–72.

———. "The Russian Military and Security Policy in the 'Near Abroad'." *Survival* 36, no. 3 (autumn 1994): 70–92.

Lockwood, Dunbar. "The Nunn-Lugar Program: No Time to Pull the Plug." *Arms Control Today* 25, no. 5 (June 1995): 8–13.

Manolas, Spiro C., and Louis J. Samelson. "The United States International Military Ed-

ucation and Training (IMET) Program: A Report to Congress." Reprinted in *DISAM Journal* 12, no. 3 (spring 1990): 1–47.

Mansfield, Edward D., and Jack Snyder. "Democratization and the Danger of War." *International Security* 20, no. 1 (summer 1995): 5–38.

———. "Democratization and War." *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 3 (May/June 1995): 79–97.

Maoz, Zeev, and Nasrin Abdolali. "Regime Types and International Conflict, 1816–1976." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 33, no. 1 (March 1989): 3–35.

McFaul, Michael. "Why Russia's Politics Matter." *Foreign Affairs* 74, no. 1 (January/February 1995): 87–100.

Morvant, Penny. "Unemployment: A Growing Problem." *Transition* 1, no. 6 (28 April 1995): 46–50.

Obrman, Jan. "Military Reform in the Czech Republic." *RFE/RL Research Report* 2, no. 41 (15 October 1993): 37–42.

Odom, William E. "The Soviet Military in Transition." *Problems of Communism* 39 (May/June 1990): 51–71.

Pezl, Karel, Colonel General. "The Role of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic." Czech *Military Review,* special edition, 1993. Prague: General Staff of the Czech Armed Forces, 1993, 32–37.

Penner, Vernon. "Restructuring for the Future: Partnership for Peace." *National Defense University Strategic Forum,* no. 97 (December 1996).

Rogov, Sergei. "Military Reform: Now or Never." *European Security* 1, no. 1 (spring 1992): 5–12.

Rosner, Jeremy D. "Clinton, Congress, and Assistance to Russia and the NIS." *SAIS Review* 15, no. 1 (winter–spring 1995): 15–36.

Russett, Bruce, and William Antholis, "Do Democracies Fight Each Other?" *Journal of Peace Research* 29, no. 4 (1992): 415–34.

Shin, Don Chull. "On the Third Wave of Democratization." *World Politics* 47, no. 1 (October 1994): 135–70.

Sicherman, Harvey. "Winning the Peace." *Orbis* 38, no. 4 (fall 1994): 523–45.

Small, Melvin, and J. David Singer. "The War-Proneness of Democratic Regimes." *Jerusalem Journal of International Relations* 1, no. 1 (summer 1976): 50–69.

Szemerkenyi, Reka. "Central European Civil-Military Reforms at Risk." *Adelphi Paper 306* (December 1996), 11.

Talbott, Strobe. "US Support for Reform in Central and Eastern Europe and the NIS." *US Department of State Dispatch* 5, no. 21 (23 May 1994): 332–37.

Taylor, Brian D. "Russian Civil-Military Relations After the October Uprising." *Survival* 36, no. 1 (spring 1994): 3–29.

Ulrich, Marybeth P. "When East Meets West: Fostering Democracy in Postcommunist States." *Airpower Journal,* vol. 9, Special Edition 1995.

———. "Democracy and Russian Military Professionalism: Why Full NATO Partnership is Still a Long Way Off." *Airpower Journal,* vol. 10, Special Edition 1996.

Vallance, Brenda J., Lt. Colonel. "Corruption and Reform in the Soviet Military." *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 7, no. 4 (December 1994): 703–24.

Wedel, Janine R. "US Aid to Central and Eastern Europe." *Problems of Post-Communism* 42, no. 3 (May–June 1995): 50.

Willerton, John P., Jr. "Patronage Networks and Coalition Building in the Brezhnev Era." *Soviet Studies* 39, no. 2 (April 1987): 175–204.

Newspapers, Magazines, and Broadcasts

Adamec, Radek. "The Soldiers Are Worried About Their Jobs." *Lidove Noviny,* 13 June 1996, 1; *FBIS-EEU-96-116,* 14 June 1996, 16.

AP Worldstream. "Russia's Security Council Chief Fired," 10 September 1998.

Barber, Tony. "Reform Rattles Through the Ranks." *Financial Times,* 15 April 1998, 5.

BBC Summary of World Broadcasts. "Sergeyev, Yeltsin Discuss Quarterly Defense Budget," 4 November 1998.

Bellamy, Christopher. "Disgruntled Military Poses Constant Threat." *The Independent,* 28 October 1995, 11.

Bennett, Vanora. "Scared Chechens in Moscow Feel Russian Noose Tighten." *Reuters,* 2 March 1995.

Birchenough, Tom. "TV Has Role in Chechnya War." *Variety,* 27 February–5 March 1995, 59.

Bulavinov, Ilya. "Lunatics and Criminals Will Not Serve Their Counry Any More." *Kommersant-Daily,* 10 October 1997, 3, *FBIS-UMA-97-288,* 15 October 1997.

Bulavinov, Ilya and Maksim Zhukov. "Andrei Kokoshin Gains Oversight Authority Over All Power-Wielding Departments," *Sevodnya,* 29 August 1997, 1; *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press,* 69, no. 35 (1 October 1997), 6.

Burke, Justin. "Red to White: Ex-Communists Taught Democracy 101." *The Christian Science Monitor,* 19 December 1994. Obtained from the Lexis-Nexis News Service.

Charlton, Angela. "Under Pressure, Defense Minister Shows Up in Court for Libel Case." *Associated Press Worldstream,* 25 October 1995.

Chicago Tribune. Editorial, 27 November 1995, section 1, 14.

Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press, 50, no. 31, "Yeltsin Okays Principles of Military Development," 2 September 1998, 8.

Czech News Service, CTK. 6 December 1994, *Survey of Czech Press.*

———. "Biographies of New Ministers," *BBC Summary of World Broadcasts,* 28 June 1996.

———. "Defense Minister Annoyed With Pilots' Protest," 12 December 1996, 16–20.

———. "Czech Delegate in Brussels Assures on NATO Commitments," 6 October 1997.

———. 8 October 1997, *FBIS-EEU-97-281,* 8 October 1997.

———. 4 November 1997, *FBIS-EEU-97-308.*

———. 7 November 1997, *FBIS-EEU-97-311.*

———. 12 November 1997, *FBIS-EEU-97-317.*

———. 13 November 1997, *FBIS-EEU-97-317.*

———. "West Point Gradauate Vohralik Decides to Stay in Czech Army," 6 March 1998.

———. "Czech Economic Miracle Stripped of Magic—Der Spiegel," 14 April 1998.

———. "Czech Army Reduction to 60,000 By 2003," 29 June 1998.

———. "Defense Minister Supports NATO Membership," 18 July 1998.

———. “Chamber of Deputies Elects Members of Committees,” 22 July 1998.
———. “More Than Half of Czech Population Backs NATO Entry,” 1 October 1998.
———. “Revival in Czech Republic in 2000 at the Earliest—IFO,” 29 October 1998.
Cuny, Frederick C. “The War Nobody Can Win.” *New York Review of Books,* reprinted in *Sacramento Bee,* 9 April 1995, F1.
Denisov, Vitaliy, Captain. “‘Do Not Disturb’: Servicemen in the Group of Russian Forces in the Transcaucasus Have Seen This Sign at the Cashier’s Office Window for Several Months Now.” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 18 July 1995, 3. Found in *FBIS-UMA-95-53-S,* 9 August 1995, 1.
Denni Telegraf. “The Army Will Prepare a ‘Defense University’.” 24 August 1995, 2. Found in *FBIS-EEU-95-166,* 28 August 1995, 12.
Deutsche Presse-Agentur, “More Than 9000 Crime Groups in Russia.” 13 June 1997.
———. “Pentagon Ups Its Funding for Scrapping Eastern Europe’s Nuclear Weapons,” 28 July 1998.
Diamond, John. “Administration Defends Russia Aid Program with AM-Foreign Policy.” *Associated Press Worldstream,* 23 May 1995.
The Economic Intelligence Unit, *EIU ViewsWire.* “Russia Politics: Dilapidated Army,” 2 June 1997.
———. “Czech Republic 5 Year Forecast Table,” 23 October 1997.
———. “Czech Republic Country Update,” 5 November 1997.
———. “Czech Republic Politics: Few Bet on Survival of Minority Government,” 7 August 1998.
Economist. “Russia in Need.” 15 January 1994, 16.
———. “Russia: The Road to Ruin.” 29 January 1994, 23.
———. “Foreign Aid: The Kindness of Strangers.” 7 May 1994, 20.
———. “Czech Republic: Special—The New Bohemians.” 22 October 1994, 23–27.
———. “The Wrong Man for Russia.” 7 January 1995, 13–14.
———. “After Chechnya.” 14 January 1995, 44.
———. “Still Bleeding.” 10 June 1995, 44–45.
———. “Russian Law: Groping Ahead.” 2 September 1995, 42–48.
———. “A Real General Election.” 23 September 1995, 44–46.
Ekho Moskvy Radio, Moscow, 25 March 1995. Translated in *BBC Summary of World Broadcasts,* SU/2263/B, “Chechen Peace March Proceeds Despite Ban.” 28 March 1995.
Erlanger, Steven. “Russia Watchers in US Feel Bipartisan Anxiety.” *New York Times,* 17 June 1996, A9.
Erlich, Jeff. “Study: Fund Russian Disarmament,” *Defense News,* 7 September 1997, 24.
Facts on File, 55, no. 2828, 85; 54, no. 2806, 636.
Falichev, Oleg. “The Military Cap Becomes the Lads.” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 31 August 1995, 1. Found in *FBIS-UMA-95-177-S,* 13 September 1995, 26.
Farah, Douglas. “Russian Mob, Drug Cartels Joining Forces,” *Washington Post,* 29 September 1997, A1.
Fedorov, Valdemar, Major General, ret., and Colonel Aleksandr Tereshchenko. “Army Strength in Its Reserve: On Certain Aspects of Armed Forces Acquisition of Privates and Sergeants,” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 3 October 1997, 2, *FBIS-SOV-97-296,* 23 October 1997.
Felgengauer, Pavel. “An Administrative Dressing Down Instead of Military Reform.” *Sevodnya,* 23 May 1997, 1; *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press* 69, no. 21, 2.

———. "Uncontrolled Generals." *Sevodnya,* 3 September 1997, 2.
———. "Military Reform is Turning into a Revolution," *Sevodnya,* 22 September 1997, 1–2. *Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* 22 October 1997, 4.
Financial Times. "Military Vote Uncertain." 12 May 1995.
Flight International. "Accidents Force Czech Air Force to Increase Training." 4 December 1996.
Ford, Peter. "Yeltsin's War in Chechnya Reveals Old Soviet Ways Can Persist." *The Christian Science Monitor,* 30 December 1994, 1.
Gajduskova, Klara. "U.S. Said Worried by 'Low' Czech Defense Spending." *Reuters,* 22 October 1996.
Garrels, Anne. "Russia's Military: Part I." *National Public Radio, Morning Edition,* 17 November 1997, Transcript # 97111711-210.
———, "Draft Dodgers." *National Public Radio Morning Edition,* 18 November 1997, Transcript # 97111812-210.
———. "Russia's Military: Corruption," *National Public Radio, Morning Edition,* 19 November 1997, Transcript # 97111912-210.
———. "Russia's Army: MIAs." *National Public Radio Morning Edition,* 20 November 1997, Transcript # 97112011-210.
Gadzik, Jan. "Czech Army Looking for a Form Press." *Lidove Noviny,* 9 February 1995. Found in CTK, 9 February 1995.
———. "On the Deplorable State of the Czech Army." *Cesky Tydenik,* 6 July 1995. Found in *FBIS-EEU-95-189,* 29 September 1995, 6.
———. "Clinton Put a Knife to Army Officials' Throats." *Mlada Fronta Dnes,* 14 June 1997; *FBIS Document FTS 1997061603.*
———. "The Army Is Not Exercising, Laws Are Lacking, Claims Necas." *Mlada Fronta Dnes,* 23 September 1997, 2; *FBIS-EEU-97-266,* 23 September 1997.
Gertz, Bill. "Russia to Slash Ground Forces, Rely on Nukes; Military Resists Reform Plan." *Washington Times,* 17 October 1997, 1.
Goncharov, Yuriy. "In the Channel of Renewal: Concept of Development of a System of Military Education of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation." *Orientir* no. 9, September 94, 58–62. Found in *JPRS-UMA-94-043,* 26 October 1994, 12.
Gross-Hassman, Natalie. "A Military Coup in Russia?: Prospects and Constraints." *Jane's Intelligence Review* 7, no. 11 (1 November 1995), 493.
Havel, Vaclav, President of the Czech Republic. *Prague Radiozurnal,* 18 September 1994.
———. Interview by *CTK,* 25 September 1994.
———. *Prague Radiozurnal,* 29 January 95. Found in *FBIS-EEU-95-019,* 30 January 1995, 6.
———. North Atlantic Treaty Unchanged," *Warsaw Polityka,* 22 June 1996, 13; *FBIS-EEU-96- 121,* 21 June 1996, 6.
Heritage, Timothy. "Russian Armed Forces Face Inquiry Over Bombing." *Reuters World Service,* 10 January 1995.
Hiatt, Fred. "Political Elites Vie for Power in Russian Quasi-Democracy; Transition from Communism at Stake." *Washington Post,* 26 March 1995, A1.
———. "A Nation Up for Grabs." *Washington Post National Weekly Edition,* 3–9 April 1995, 17.

Hockstader, Lee. “Crime Atop Chaos: In Post-Communist Russia, The Strong Arm of the Mafiya is Everywhere.” *Washington Post National Weekly Edition,* 20–26 March 1995, 6–7.

Hoffman, David. “General Arises in Russia’s Presidential Race: Alexander Lebed has commanded attention of a growing number of the disaffected.” *Washington Post National Weekly Edition,* 30 October–5 November 1995, 19.

Holan, Wilem, Czech Minister of Defense. *Prague Radiozurnal Radio Network,* 22 September 1994. Found in *FBIS-EEU-94-185,* 23 September 1994, 6.

———. Interview by Ferdinand Peroutka, *Denni Telegraf,* 31 May 1995, 5. Found in *FBIS-EEU- 95-107,* 5 June 1995, 12.

———. “The Older Officers Must Make Room for the Younger Ones.” Briefing reported in *Mlada Fronta Dnes,* 4 September 1995, 2. Found in *FBIS-EEU-95-173,* 7 September 1995, 14.

Horejsi, Tomas. “There Will Be a War on Tuesday.” *Prague Tyden,* 13 May 1996, 18–20.

———. “Army Faces More Changes: Defense Minister Wants Fighter Planes Instead of Bread Rolls.” *Prague Tyden,* 9 September 1996, 16. *FBIS-EEU-96-177,* 12 September 1996.

———. “Teaching a Horse Not to Eat; The Air Force Is Still Looking for a Way Out of Crisis.” *Prague Tyden,* 2 December 1996, 16–20.

———. “The Army’s Costly Mistakes.” *Prague Tyden,* 5 November 1997, 38–47.

———. “Jiri Sedivy—A Timorous Leader Makes No Mistakes.” *Prague Tyden,* 30 March 1998, 14; *FBIS Document FTS 19980415000468.*

Hospoparske Noviny. 7 August 1996, 3; *FBIS-EEU-96-156,* 12 August 1996, 14.

Huntington, Samuel P. “Democracy for the Long Haul.” *Straits Times (Singapore),* 10 September 1995, 1,4.

ITAR-TASS. “Yeltsin Rejects Duma Law on Civil Defense.” 25 July 1997; *FBIS-SOV-97-206,* 25 July 1997.

Jane’s Intelligence Review, “New Czech Defense Minister Threatens Military Cuts,” 1 November 1996, 483.

———. “Czech Military Criticizes Defense Strategy,” 1 May 1997.

Jiresova, Jindra. Interview with Zdenek Burkovec, Director of the Czech Republic MOD, “Fortune Smiles on Those Who Are Prepared.” *FBIS Document FTS 19971103001390.*

Kalinina, Yulia. “Khaki-Colored Duma.” *Moskovsky Komsomolets,*1–4, 11 October 1995. Found in *Russian Press Digest.*

Kaplan, Bernard. “Military Battles Over Secret Funds.” *Orange County Register,* 3 August 1996, A21.

Karapetyan, Petr. “Oleg Sysuyev: Changes in Social Policy Are Essential.” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 18 November 1997, 1, *FBIS-UMA-97-324.*

———. “Defense Budget Open for First Time. Government Seeking Sources to Fund Military Reform.” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 6 February 1998, 1,3; *FBIS Document FTS 19980210000323.*

Katz, Gregory. “Russian Mafia Sets Off Growing Wave of Crime.” *Dallas Morning News,* 10 September 1995, 1A.

Kellner, Tomas. “Army Targets Hazing Ritual.” *Prague Post,* 7 March 1995, 1.

Kharlamov, Sergey, Colonel, and Lt. Colonel Aleksandr Markov. "Armed Forces: Problems, Solutions." *Armeyskiy Sbornik,* no. 2 (February 1997), 5–8; *FBIS-UMA-97-093-S,* 1 February 1997.

Kikilo, Vladimir. "Secret Report on Russian Military Doctrine Published in USA," *TASS,* 17 October 1997.

Kitfield, James. "Low Pay and Loose Nukes," *National Journal,* 19 September 1998.

Kokorin, Aleksandr and Viktor Samoylov. "A Position: Fruitless Years of Talking Shop: A Realistic Approach to Military Reform in Russia Is Still a Problem." *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 8–14 February 1997, 1, 4; *FBIS-UMA-97-057-S,* 14 February 1997.

Koltsov, Vladimir. "Division of Deserters Wandering Around Russia." *Russkiy Telegraf,* 12 November 1997, 1, *FBIS-UMA-97-317,* 13 November 1997.

Koltyukov, Aleksandr, Colonel. "False Premise of Military Reform. The Idea That Russia Should Prepare to Participate in Local Wars is Untenable." *Moscow Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 7 November 1997; *FBIS-UMA-97-311,* 10 November 1997.

Korbut, Andrei. "'Mirages': The President Signed the Edict on Housing Certificates for Servicemen, But the Army of Homeless Officers Will Not Decrease By Much." *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 17–23 October 1997, *FBIS-SOV-97-323,* 19 November 1997.

Korotchenko, Igor. "Grachev Is Ousted as Minister of Defense." *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 19 June 1996, 1. *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press,* 68, no. 25 (17 July 1996): 6.

Kostrov, Vladimir. "Military Ask for Money; They Are Asked to Look in Their Own Pockets." *Ruskkiy Telegraf,* 24 October 1997,3: *FBIS-UMA-97-300,* 27 October 1997.

Kovalev, Aleksandr. "Educating a Patriot, Serviceman, and Citizen is Today the Main Task for a School." *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 20 October 1994, 1, 3. Found in *JPRS-UMA-94-044,* 2 November 1994, 7–10.

Kremlin International News Broadcast. "Press Conference with Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev," 12 August 1998.

Kulakov, Vladimir. "The Profession of Officer/Educator of Special Significance Today." *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 30 December 1997, 1,3; *FBIS Document FTS 19980123000740.*

Kuznetsov, Vladislav. "General Praises Reform of Russian Strategic Forces." *ITAR-TASS,* 4 November 1997; *FBIS-UMA-97-308,* 6 November 1997.

Latsis, Otto. "The Real Winners in a Losing War." *Izvestia,* 5 January 1995. Reprinted in *World Press Review* 42, no. 3 (March 1995): 16.

Leontyev, Mikhail. "Will the President Sign Off On Lebed's Resignation?" *Sevodnya,* 7 June 1995, 1. Found in the *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press* 47, no. 23: 22.

Lieven, Anatol. "Disarmed and Dangerous." *New Republic,* 22 December 1997, 22.

Litovkin, Viktor. "Deputies Told to Send 211,000 Soldiers Home, but They Are Unlikely to Succeed." *Izvestiya,* 11 October 1995, 1–2. Found in *FBIS-UMA-95-206-S,* 25 October 1995, 7.

Longworth, R. C. "Time for NATO to Admit Trio From Europe." *Chicago Tribune,* 16 October 1994, 1.

Lukava, Georgiy. *Armeyskiy Sbornik* no. 4 (April 1995): 11–13. Found in *FBIS-UMA-95-139-S,* 20 July 1995, 8.

Makarin, Aleksey. “Vladimir Smirnov: The Army Must Be Assigned Realistic Missions.” *Segodnya,* 26 May 1995, 5. Found in *JPRS-UMA-95-025,* 20 June 1995, 14–16.

Malevich, Ivan, Colonel. “Five Reforms: How This Was in the Past.” *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 22 April 1995, no. 2, 3. Found in *JPRS-UMA-95-022,* 16 May 1995, 21.

———. “Military Reform in Russia: Military Reform is More Than Reform of the Army Alone.” *Kommersant-Daily,* 15 July 1995, 5, *FBIS-UMA-95-159-S,* 17 August 1995, 17–20.

Malia, Martin. “The Nomenklatura Capitalists: Who’s Running Russia Now?” *New Republic,* 22 May 1995, 17–23.

Mann, Paul. “Russians Sound Alarm Over Stalled Reforms.” *Aviation Week and Space Technology* 146, no. 22 (26 May 1997): 64.

———. “Pessimism Deepens Over Russia’s Fate.” *Aviation Week and Space Technology* 149, no. 3, 22.

Marek, Vladimir. “Now It Is the Matter of a Law and of the English Language.” *A-Report,* 1997, *FBIS-EEU-97-308,* 4 November 1997.

“Marshall Center Inaugurates Alumni Program.” Accessed 21 October 1998; Available from http://www.marshall.adsn.int/News%20Release-98/9827.htm.

Matyash, Vladimir. “Healthy Youths Will Fill the Army’s Ranks.” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 10 October 1997, 1. *FBIS-UMA-97-287,* 14 October 1997.

McKinsey, Kitty. “The Velvet Divorce Set Good Example.” *The Gazette* (Montreal), 17 October 1995, D14.

McNally, Brendan and Jan Stojaspal. “Army Gaff Bodes Ill for NATO Bid.” *Prague Post,* 5–11 June 1996, 4; FBIS-EEU-96-123, 25 June 1996, 10–11.

Mehuron, Tamar A. “Organization of the Russian Armed Forces.” *Air Force Magazine,* October 1998, 52.

Melinkova, Valentina, Press Secretary of the Committee of Soldiers’ Mothers of Russia, and Sergei Yushenkov, Chair of the State Duma Committee for Defense, Press Conference, 18 September 1995, *Official Kremlin International News Broadcast.*

Mironov, Valery, Colonel General, Chief Military Expert with Russian Federation Government Chairman, “Cadres: Problems and Prospects of Army Education.” *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 31 October–13 November 1997, 1,4; *FBIS- SOV-97-328,* 24 November 1997.

*Mlada Frinta Dnes.*23 May 1996, 2; *FBIS–EEU-96-102,* 24 May 1996, 5.

———. “Defense Minister to Review Army’s Economic, Personnel Situation,” 21 July 1998.

Moscow Times. “Training the Military in the Art of Democracy.” 31 December 1994. Obtained from the Lexis-Nexis News Service.

———. “Foreign Aid Outlives Its Mission.” 13 August 1997.

Muranov, Anatoliy Ivanovich, Colonel-General, Chief of the Directorate of Military Courts. “A Law Against Dedovshchina.” Interview by Ivan Ivanyuk. *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 1 September 1995, 2. Found in *FBIS-UMA-95-187-S,* 27 September 1995, 7–9.

The Nation. "Rump Roast: Russian Parliament and Boris Yeltsin." Editorial, 18 October 1993, 12.

———. "Botched Operation: Russian Troops in Chechnya." 30 January 1995, 116.

Odnokolenko, Oleg. "It Will Be Entirely Old Men On Parade." *Segodnya,* 1 November 1997, 1.

Panin, Ilya, "See What Is Important: Urgent Cadre Policy Problems During RF Armed Forces Reform and Ways of Solving Them." *Armeyskiy Sbornik,* February 1998, 10–15; *FBIS Document FTS 19980608000436.*

Pehe, Jiri. "The Czech Republic and NATO After the Elections." *Lidove Noviny,* 2 July 1996, 8; *FBIS-EEU-96-130,* 5 July 1996, 7.

Pelts, Alexander and Vladimir Pavlov. "Interview on a Timely Topic: Education Will Not Tolerate Trifles." *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 26 June 1996; *FBIS Document FTS 19970404001084.*

Perlez, Jane. "For the Czechs, The Fairy Tale Is All Over Now." *New York Times,* 1 December 1997, A1.

Peter, Laurence. "Corruption Scandal Rocks Russian Military Establishment." *Agence France Presse,* 20 July 1996.

Peyrard, Michael. "On the Chechnya Front We Realized That Our Leaders Were Mad."

Paris Match, 9 February 1995, 58–59. Found in *FBIS-SOV-95-024,* 6 February 1995, 28–29.

Philps, Alan. "Dissident General Sees Chance to Force Yeltsin to Quit." *Daily Telegraph,* 4 November 1997, 16.

Piskacek, Jan. "The Defense Strategy is Rather Lame." *Prague Denni Telegraf,* 1 April 1997, 2.

Polacek, Martin. "NATO is Following the Replacement of the Generals." *Lidove Noviny,* 4 July 1997, 5, *FBIS-EEU-97-185,* 8 July 1997.

———. "Our Army Is Not Capable of Defending the Country." *Lidove Noviny,* 21 August 1997, 1.

Poleshchuk, Andrei. "Grachev Is Ousted as Minister of Defense." *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 19 June 1996, 1; *The Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press* 68, no. 25 (17 July 1996): 6.

Pomfret, John. "Can Russia Serve With the West?" *Washington Post National Weekly Edition,* 13–19 November 1995, 13–14.

Prague CTK, 7 January 93. Found in *FBIS-EEU-93-005,* 8 January 1993, 11.

Prague CTK, 17 March 1998, "Outgoing Czech Army Chief on 'Shameful' Personnel Situation." *FBIS Document FTS19980317000403.*

Prague Radiozurnal Radio Network, 23 September 1994. Found in *FBIS-EEU-94-185,* 23 September 1994, 6.

Prague Respekt. "Defense Minister Views Army Reform, NATO." 7–13 September 1998.

Prague Tyden. "Unwillingness to Define Hampers Army." 29 April 1997.

Radionov, Gennadiy, Lt. General, Russian Federation MOD Military Education Directorate Chief. "Military Education Today and Tomorrow." *Orientir* no. 9, September 1994, 3–8. Found in *JPRS-UMA-94-043,* 26 October 1994, 9–12.

———. "Two Educations—For One Higher Educational Institution Course of Study."

Interview by Oleg Vladykin, *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 15 December 1994, 2. Found in *JPRS-UMA-95-001,* 11 January 1995, 17.

Reed, Quentin. "The Jane's Interview." *Jane's Defense Weekly,* 30 September 1998.

Reilly, Richard Byrne. "With Its Chief Out, Where is the Czech Army Headed?" *Prognosis,* 8 October 1994, 8. Found in *FBIS-EEU-94-222,* 9.

———. "One Hawk Scatters Many Crows." *Prognosis Weekly,* 1–7 December 1994, 6.

———. *Prognosis Weekly,* 18 January 1995, 5. Found in *FBIS-EEU-95-035,* 22 February 1995, 6.

Rodionov, Igor, Colonel General. "We Do Not Want to Militarize Society Again: On Military Reform and Reform of the Armed Forces." *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 23 December 1994, 1,3. Found in *JPRS-UMA-95-003,* 31 January 1995, 22.

———. "An Alternative: After Chechnya: A New Turning Point in the Reform of the Armed Forces or a Repeat of Past Mistakes?" *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 9 February 1995, 3. Found in *JPRS-UMA-95-007,* 21 February 1995, 15.

Rogov, Sergey. "Will the Russian Armed Forces Stand Fast: The Forgotten Military Reform." *Nezavisimaya Gazeta,* 3 November 1994, 1,5, *JPRS-UMA-94-050,* 30 November 1994, 13–20.

Rokhlin, Lev, General, Chairman State Duma Defense Committee. "Russia's Security. What Could Be More Important?" *Rossiyskaya Gazeta,* 6 June 1996, 6; *FBIS-SOV-96-111,* 10 June 1996.

Schafer, Susanne. "AP Military Writer." *Associated Press Worldstream,* 6 January 1995.

Scott, Carey. "Russian Army Drafted for Vote Rigging Duty." *Sunday Times,* 1 October 1995.

Seledkin, V., Colonel. "Kak ne podarit' rodnomu cheloveku! . . . ," [How not to be obliged to relatives! . . .] *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 12 December 1986, 2.

Segodnya. "Newspaper Analyzes Reasons for Defense Ministry Personnel Changes," 24 May 1997.

Seward, Deborah. "Former Soviet Generals Vow to Oppose Yeltsin in Parliamentary Vote." *AP Worldstream,* 17 August 1995.

Shaburkin, Aleksandr. "Ideological Niche of Military Service." *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye,* 3–9 October 1997; *FBIS-SOV-97-307,* 3 November 1997.

Shalnev, Yevgeniy. "Russian Warrant Officers Used to Fill Vacant Officer Posts," *ITAR-TASS World Service,* 4 Novmber 1997, *FBIS-UMA-97-308,* 4 November 1997.

Shargorodsky, Sergei. "Soldiers' Mothers Take Their Ant-War Protest to Chechnya." *AP Worldstream,* 20 March 1995.

Shearmur, Malcolm. "Defense Planning Courses Learning Not to Spy." *Warsaw Voice,* 15 January 1995. Obtained from the Lexis-Nexis News Service.

———. "Eastern European Officers Study Peace at a NATO Base." *Prague Post,* 25–31 January 1995, 4.

Shogun, Robert. "GOP's Big Guns Rake Clinton's Handling of Foreign Policy." *Los Angeles Times,* 28 July 1994, Part A, p. 20, col. 1.

Singer, Natasha. "As Ethnic Wars Haunt Yeltsin, Others Wonder, 'Who's Next?'" *The Ethnic Newswatch* 98, no. 31 (13 January 1995): 1–2.

Skorobogatko, Tatyana. "Wartime Budget or 'Survival Budget.'" *Moskovskiye Novosti,* 19–26 October 1997, 7; *FBIS-UMA-97-297,* 24 October 1997.

Sladkova, Katerina. “Interview With Defense Minister Vyborny.” *Tyden,* 20 January 1997, *FBIS-EEU-97-017,* 20 January 1997.

Smejkal, Vaclav. “Where Are the Four Wheels of the Army Vehicle Headed?” *Ekonom,* January 1995, 27–32. Found in *FBIS-EEU-95-065,* 5 April 1995, 13.

Spurny, Jaroslav. “Things Are Different From Place to Place.” *Respekt,* 14–20 October 1996, *FBIS-EEU-96-206,* 20 October 1996.

Stanley, Alessandra. “Russia’s New Rulers Govern and Live, in Neo-Soviet Style.” *New York Times,* 23 May 1995, A4.

Starova, Valentina. “Russian Press, Government Discuss Chechen Coverage.” *UPI,* 28 February 1995.

Stasovskiy, Anatoliy. “The Army and the Elections.” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 2 September 1995, 1. Found in *FBIS-UMA-95-187-S,* 27 September 1995, 5–7.

Stojaspal, Jan. “Latest Poll Finds the Good Soldier Schwejk Still Typifies the Czechs and Their Army.” *The Prague Post,* 8 February 1995.

Straits Times. “Scapegoating in Yeltsin’s Russia,” 26 May 1997, 40.

Swiss Review of World Affairs. “Eastern Europe: Approaching the West.” 3 January 1995.

Sysuyev, Oleg. Russian Government Deputy Chairman. Interview by Petr Karapetyan, “Oleg Sysuyev: Changes in Social Policy Are Essential.” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 18 November 1997,1: *FBIS-UMA-97-324.*

Tigner, Brooks. “Military Clout Dilutes East European Democratic Hold.” *Defense News,* 20–26 November 1995, 3, 35.

Tigrid, Pavel. “What the Senate Can and Cannot Do.” *Lidove Noviny,* 16 October 1996, 9.

Vanden Heuvel, Katrina, and Stephen F. Cohen. “The Other Russia: Moscow Glitters, the Economy Collapses, the Army Rumbles.” *Nation,* 265, no. 5. (11 August 97): 24.

Verbin, Anatoly. “Russian Generals March in Parliamentary Campaign.” *Reuters,* 3 October 1995.

Vladykin, Oleg. “A Declining ‘Curve’ of the Military Salary Level is Becoming Increasingly Threatening: Current Social and Financial Policy With Regard to Servicemen is Leading to a Cadre Catastrophe in the Armed Forces.” *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 16 February 1995, 1,3. *JPRS-UMA- 95-007,* 21 February 1995, 23.

Ward, Olivia. “Trouble in the Ranks as its Top Officers Make a Run for Political Office: The Once Formidable Russian Army Falls in Disorder and Decay.” *Toronto Star,* 5 November 1995, F5.

Whitehouse, Mark. “What Went Wrong?” *Moscow Times,* 3 June 1997.

Williams, Carol J. “Millions of Russians Protest Unpaid Wages.” *Los Angeles Times,* 28 Mar 1997, A20.

Williams, Daniel. “Yeltsin Orders Military Reform,” *Washington Post,* 17 July 1997, A22.

Yeltsin, Boris. “I Don’t Believe People of Russia Were Meant for the Whip.” *Komsomolskaya Pravda,* 19 August 1995, 1–2.

Yudin, Pyotr. “New Defense Council Adds to Kremlin Rift,” *Defense News,* 14–20 October 1996, 72.

———. “Opposition Grows Against Yeltsin Military Reform Plan.” *Defense News,* 14–20 July 1997, 18.

Yurkin, Anatoliy. “Military Budget Plan Will Put Army ‘On Brink of Survival’.” *ITAR-TASS,* 4 October 1995. Found in *FBIS-UMA-95-206-S,* 4–5.

Zaspal, Vaclav. “On the Deplorable State of the Czech Army.” *Cesky Tydenik,* 6, 10, 13 July 1995. Found in *FBIS-EEU-95-189,* 29 September 1995, 5–13.

Zaynashev, Yuriy. “Commander: Colonel-General Boris Gromov: ‘I Cried the Entire First Year in the Army’.” *Moskovskiy Komsomolets,* 18 May 1995, 2, *JPRS-UMA-95-025,* 20 June 1995, 4.

Zdorikov, Sergey, Lt. General, Chief of Russian Federation MOD Main Educational Work Directorate. “Just What Ideology Does the Russian Army Need Today?” Interview by Vasiliy Semenov, *Krasnaya Zvezda,* 8 September 1995, 1–2. Found in *FBIS-UMA-95-192-S,* 4 October 1995, 1–6.

Zhavoronkov, Gennady. “Save and Protect.” *Moscow News,* August 1990, 11.

Zhuravlyov, Pyotr, and Aleksey Kirpichnikov. “Innovation: Hawks Win Hands Down.” *Segodnya,* 8 April 1995, 1. Found in *JPRS-UMA-95-020,* 2 May 1995, 9.

Zwerdling, Daniel. “Russian Mob Big Crime Problem in Moscow and New York.” *All Things Considered,* National Public Radio Transcript # 1818-6, 15 April 1995.

Documents

Abrams, Eliot. *Current Policy #112.* Washington, DC: Department of State, 1983.

Air Force Instruction (AFI) 51-902.

Aspin, Les. *The Bottom-Up Review: Forces for a New Era.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1 September 1993.

Bott, Christopher D., Lt. Commander. *IMET Two Year Training Plan for Russia 1996–1997.*

Christopher, Warren, U.S. Secretary of State, and William J. Perry, Secretary of Defense. Letter to the Honorable Strom Thurmond, Chairman of Senate Committee on Armed Forces, 7 April 1995.

Country Work Plan of the Czech Republic, FY98.

Current Documents, 1985. 1 March 1985, 973.

Defense Attaché Office, Moscow. Report prepared in December 1993 by officers in the defense in Moscow for inputs to a report to Congress on the effectiveness of the US military to military contact program in Russia.

Dokumenty 199. MZV Praha (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prague): 322–23.

GAO Report. GAO/NSIAD-95-10, 7 February 1995, Federal Document Clearing House.

GAO Report. GAO/NSIAD-97-164, “NATO Enlargement: US and International Efforts to Assist Potential New Members,” 1 June 1997; available from http://www.fas.org/man/gao/nsiad97164.htm; Internet.

General Staff of the Czech Republic. *The Army of the Czech Republic.* 1994.

George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies. 6 January 1995 background paper. Obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies. Briefing slides. Obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

Gosnell, Wayne P., Colonel, US Air National Guard, Chief of International Initiatives, National Guard Bureau, *Military to Military Concept Paper,* 26 August 1993.

HQ USAFE (Headquarters U.S. Air Forces in Europe) Military to Military briefing. Acquired at the Pentagon, May 1995.

JCTP policy paper. Attained from Lithuanian MLT (Military Liaison Team), July 1994.

Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP) briefing papers. Acquired at HQ EUCOM (Headquarters European Command), Stuttgart, June 1994.

JCTP briefing. Obtained from H.Q. European Command, November 1997.

JCTP Military Liaison Teams Home Page. Accessed 20 October 1998; Available from http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jctpsysadmin/jctpmlts.htm; Internet.

Livingston, Bob, "Responsibly Funding Taxpayers' Overseas Investments, 17 September 1998. *Congressional Press Releases.*

Lugar, Richard, "Lugar to Meet on Nunn-Lugar Oversight," 14 August 1998. *Congressional Press Releases.*

Military Elites in Russia 1994. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung: Munich and Moscow, August 1994.

Military Strategy of the Czech Republic. An information briefing provided by the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic.

Military to Military Contact Program Bottom Up Review. Briefing prepared by the JCTP reviewing its progress through 1993. Obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

National Guard State Partnership Program: Real People, Real Success. National Guard Bureau: Washington, DC, September 1994.

Partnership for Peace Framework Document. January 1994. Obtained at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, June 1994.

Perry, William, Secretary of Defense, 7 November 1996. *Federal News Service.*

Semi-annual Report on Program Activities to Facilitate Weapons Destruction and Nonproliferation in the Former Soviet Union, 30 April 1994, Section 5.

State Partnership Stockholders Report. EUCOM: March 1997.

Talking Points on Defense and Military Contacts with the FSU, 1993. U.S. Army internal memorandum. Obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

U.S. Air Force Briefing. *Mil-To-Mil Contact Programs for FSU/Central Europe.* Obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) Strategy of Focused Engagement. Obtained from HQ USAFE, November 1997.

U.S. Congress. *Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act,* 1998, 105th Cong. 1st session., 143 Cong. Rec S7623.

U.S. Congress. *Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act,* 1999, 105th Cong. 2nd session., Cong. Rec. S9996.

U.S. Congress. House of Representatives. National Security Committee, 2 March 1995, *Federal News Service.*

National Security Committee, "Prepared Statement of George A. Joulwan, General, Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command, 19 March 1996.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Appropriations Committee. "Prepared Testimony of Madelaine Albright, Secretary of State," 16 June 1998, *Federal News Service.*

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. "Overview of 1995 Foreign Policy Agenda and the Clinton Administration's Proposed Budget." *Department of State Dispatch* 6, no. 8, 20 February 1995.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations, "Prepared Statement of Franklin D. Kramer, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs," 22 October 1997.

Committee on Foreign Relations, "Prepared Statement of Walter Slocombe, Undersecretary of Defense for Policy," 28 October 1997.

European Affairs Subcommittee on US Assistance to Europe and the New Independent States, 28 March 1995, *Federal News Service.*

European Affairs Subcommittee*,* 22 August 1995, *Federal News Service.*

European Affairs Subcommittee*,*"Hearing on U.S. Aid to Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union." 7 May 1997. *FDCH Political Transcripts.*

U.S. Department of State. *1993 Report to Congress on Human Rights Practices.* Washington, DC: GPO, February 1994.

———. *1994 Report to Congress on Human Rights Practices.* Washington, DC: GPO, February 1995.

———. *Russia Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1996,* February 1997.

U.S. European Command Briefing on the Military to Military Contact Program, 1994. Obtained at the Pentagon, May 1995.

U.S. Embassy, Prague. Message sent from the U.S. Embassy in Prague by the Security Assistance Officer to Washington, DC, 6 April 1994.

U.S. Embassy, Prague. Security assistance memo attained in Prague, March, 1995.

U.S. European Command Strategy of Engagement and Preparedness, November 1996.

USIA, Office of Research and Media Reaction. "Majorities in the Czech Republic Favor PFP, NATO Membership." *USIA Opinion Analysis,* 27 December 1994.

The White House. *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement.* Washington, DC: GPO, July 1994.

The White House. *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement.* Washington, DC: GPO, February 1995.

The White House. *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement.* Washington, DC: GPO, February 1996.

The White House. *A National Security Strategy For A New Century.* Washington, DC: GPO, May 1997.

The White House. *A National Security Strategy For A New Century.* Washington, DC: GPO, October 1998.

Interviews

Blaha, Vaclav, Lt. Colonel, Professor, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno.

Borowski, Robert J., Commander, U.S. Navy Reserve, Poland MLT member. Interview by author, November 1995, Colorado Springs.

Brett, Igor, Secretary of the Defense and Security Committee of the Czech Republic. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

Brusstar, James H., Senior Research Professor, National Defense University. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

Bukharova, Anna, Major, Scientific Associate (faculty member), Higher Military Hu-

manities College on Scientific and Research Work. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Chaldimov, Nikita, General, Chief Deputy of the Commandant of the Higher Military Humanities College, the former Lenin Military Political Academy. Interview by author April 1995, Moscow.

Cheek, Mark, Point of Contact at Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA) for International Military and Education Training (IMET) programs in Russia, East and Central Europe. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

Daneu, Karen, Lt. Colonel, EUCOM Desk Officer for the Czech Republic. Interview by author, November 1997, telephone and e-mail, Stuttgart.

Deverill, Dirk P., Commander, Joint Staff, Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate, European Division. Interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

Dunkelberg, George D., Colonel, U.S. Defense Attaché to the Czech Republic. Interview by author, July 1994 and March 1995, Prague.

East, Paul B., Colonel, U.S. MLT Team Chief, Czech Republic. Interview by author, July 1994, Prague.

Freeman, Stephen, Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in Russia/Eurasia. Interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

Fuchs, Milan, First Lieutenant. Interview by author, March 1997, Pardubice Air Base, Czech Republic.

Giesl, Jiri, Major General, Defense, Military, and Air Attaché, Embassy of the Czech Republic. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

Golz, Alexander, reporter for *Krasnaya Zvezda.* Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Govan, Gregory, Brigadier General, Commander, On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) and former Defense Attaché in Moscow, 1987–1991. Interview by author, May 1995, Pentagon.

Hammersen, Frederick P. A., Lt. Colonel. Interview by author, June 1994, Marshall Center, Garmisch, Germany.

Harris, William K., Policy Assistant, DOD Office of Soviet and East European Affairs. Interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

Hartmann, Daniel J., Lt. Colonel, Assistant Army Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Hayes, Thomas, Colonel, MLT Team Chief, Czech Republic. Correspondence with author, November 1997, e-mail, Prague.

Head, James, Colonel, Vice Dean, U.S. Air Force Academy. Interview by author, May 1995, USAFA, Colorado Springs.

Heikkinen, Gerrold G. Captain, USAFA faculty member. Interview by author, May 1995, USAFA, Colorado Springs.

Helms, Charles, Capt., USAF, former Executive Officer to General Lennon. Interview by author, 2 June 1994, HQ EUCOM, Stuttgart, Germany.

Holecek, Oldrich, Captain, Czech MOD Public Affairs Officer. Interview by author, March, 1995, Prague.

Howcroft, James, Major, Assistant Marine Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Interviews with cadets and junior officers at the Brno Military Academy and the Namest and Pardubice air bases by author, March 1997, Czech Republic.
Interviews with Brno Military Academy faculty by author, March 1997, Brno, Czech Republic.
Interviews with Czech liaison officers to the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE) by author, June 1998, Mons, Belgium.
Jandacek, Pavel, Major General, Deputy Chief of the ACR General Staff. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.
Jehlik, Josef, Colonel, Director of Personnel, Czech General Staff. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.
Jensen, Don, Political Officer, U.S. Embassy Moscow. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.
Justice, Charles C., Lt. Commander, Assistant Naval Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.
Kashina, Olga, Humphrey Fellow, University of Maryland, former staff member of the Duma Defense Committee. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.
Kert, Johannes, Major, Chief of Kaitseliit, Estonian National Guard. Interview by author, June 1994, Tallinn.
Kinzer, James, Major, USAFA faculty member assigned to U.S. NATO Mission, June–August 1995. Interview by author, August 1995, USAFA, Colorado Springs.
Kladiva, Kenneth L., Faculty Member, Defense Systems Management College and PPBS advisor to the Czech MOD. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.
Krcmar, Miroslav, Major, Member Czech liaison team to the U.S. MLT. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.
Kriz, Zdenek, Instructor of Political Science, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno.
Kwiecien, Ilona W., Lt. Colonel, Assistant Army Attaché, U.S. Embassy, Moscow. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.
Leininger, Robert L., Lt. Colonel, Security Assistance Officer, U.S. Embassy Prague. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.
Lord, Christopher, Professor, Institute of International Politics, Charles University. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.
Martinek, Jiri, Colonel, Chief of Operations, General Staff of the Czech Republic. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.
Maxwell, Ron, Major, USAF, Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in Eurasia, Central and Eastern Europe. Interview by author, May 1995, Pentagon.
McCarthy, James P., General, ret. Interview by author, 22 April 1994, USAFA, Colorado Springs.
Menarchik, E. Douglas, Marshall Center faculty member. Telephone interview by author, 25 September 1995 and December 1997, Marshall Center, Garmisch, Germany.
Messelt, Bruce, OSD Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in East and Central Europe. Interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.
Midkiff, Barry, Capt., U.S. Army, Exchange Student at the Czech Command and General Staff College. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno Military Academy.

Nelson, Paul H., Colonel, Chief of Staff, On-Site Inspection Agency, U.S. Army Russian Foreign Area Specialist. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

Nilles, David, Cadet, U.S. Air Force Academy. Interview by author, May 1995, USAFA, Colorado Springs.

O'Connor, Peter R., US MLT Team Chief, Czech Republic December 1994–May 1995. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

Pehe, Jiri, Director of the Open Media Research Institute (OMRI). Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

Pirumov, Vladimir, Chairman of Scientific Council, Security Council of the Russian Federation. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Prokesova, Blanka, Department of Culture, Czech MOD. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

Reppert, John C., Brigadier General, former U.S. assistant army attaché U.S. Embassy Moscow and U.S. Defense Attaché to Moscow designate, July 1995–July 1998. Interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

Reynolds, Joseph, Ssgt, Security Assistance Officer, U.S. Office of Defense Cooperation. Prague. Telephone interview by author, 8 December 1997, Prague.

Rezac, Milan, Professor and Head, Air Force Department, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno.

Richmond, Hank, Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army Point of Contact for Military to Military Programs in Eastern and Central Europe. Interview by author, May 1995, the Pentagon.

Rokke, Ervin J., Lt. General, Commander National Defense University, former Defense Attaché in Moscow, 1986–87. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

Rubus, Gary, Brigadier General, Defense Attaché, US Embassy Moscow 1991–1995. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Russell, Robert B., Cadet, U.S. Air Force Academy. Interview by author, May 1995, USAFA, Colorado Springs.

Simon, Jeffrey, Faculty Member, National Defense University. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

Simmeth, Harry G. Jr., Colonel, U.S. Army, Ukrainian Division Chief, Russia, Ukraine, Eurasia Division, Joint Staff. Interview by author, October 1997, Colorado Springs.

Squires, Charles, Major, Executive Officer to the Director of the Marshall Center. Interview by author, June 1994, Marshall Center, Garmisch, Germany.

Sternod, Jan, Political Officer, U.S. Embassy Prague. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

Stirling, Gordon, State Department Russian Desk Officer and Point of Contact on the Inter- agency Working Group (IWG) for Military to Military Contacts. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

Stuart, Brittany, Cadet, U.S. Air Force Academy. Interview by author, May 1995, USAFA, Colorado Springs.

Tesar, Karl, Instructor of Political Science, Brno Military Academy. Interview by author, March 1997, Brno.

Thurston, William H., III, Colonel, Air Attaché, U.S. Embassy Moscow. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Tsygichko, Vitali N., Professor Doctor, Head of Center of National Security Studies, Academy of Sciences and advisor to the Federation Council on military reform. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Wagie, Colonel David A., Professor, U.S. Air Force Academy. Interview by author, May 1995, USAFA, Colorado Springs.

Wasserman, Adam R., Policy Planning Staff, U.S. Department of State. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

Webster, Keith, Russian Desk Officer, Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA). Telephone interview by author, December 1997, Crystal City, VA.

Weiss, Andrew S., Policy Planning Staff, Department of State. Interview by author, May 1995, Washington, DC.

West, Margaret, Major, USAF National Guard, Point of Contact for Guard and Reserve Involvement in Military to Military Programs. Interview by author, May 1995, National Guard Bureau HQ, Arlington, VA.

Wielkoszewski, Andrew R., Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army Attaché, Czech Republic. Interview by author, March 1995, Prague.

Williams, John, Political Military Officer, U.S Embassy Moscow. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Zantovsky, Michael. Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defense and Security Committee. Interview by author, 24 October 1997, USAFA, Colorado Springs.

Zhelezov, Boris, Research Fellow, Center for International Security, USA-Canada Institute. Interview by author, April 1995, Moscow.

Unpublished Papers, Speeches, and Briefings

Czech MOD Briefing on Czech Military Reform. Presented to visiting American Colonels from the U.S. Air War College, March 1995, Prague.

Gaffney, H. H., Center for Naval Analyses. *National Security Decision-Making in Russian and in the United States.* Paper obtained from the Atlantic Council, Washington, DC.

Giddis, Joseph A., Lt. Colonel, U.S. Army National Guard. “Bridge to America: National Guard Support of the U.S. EUCOM’s Joint Military to Military Contact Program,” Paper prepared for the U.S. Army War College, May 1994.

Kozhemiakian, Alexander V. *Expanding the “Pacific Union”: The Impact of the Process of Democratization on International Security.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1995.

Loo, Maritta, Lt. Colonel, U.S. MLT Acting Team Chief, Czech Republic. Comments in fax sent to author, June 1995.

Runaev, Yuri, Colonel, Department Head, Department of Social Sciences, Kachinsky Higher Military Aviation School for Pilots. Letters to Marybeth Peterson Ulrich, 1994–1998.

Ulrich, Marybeth P. “The United States and Partnership for Peace: Building Democratic Partners?” Paper presented at the International Studies Association annual conference, Toronto, March 1997.

Taylor, Brian D. “Professionalism and Politicization in the Soviet and Russian Armed

Forces." Paper delivered at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, 31 August–3 September 1995.

Vallance, Brenda., Lt. Colonel. "The Military in a Strong Democracy: A Comparative Approach." Research paper prepared for the Institute of National Security Studies (INSS) located at the USAFA.

Voronstov, Yuli, Russian Ambassador to the U.S. Speech given at the U.S. Air Force Academy, 19 April 1995.

Index

Afghanistan, Soviet War in, 99
Akhromeyev, General Sergei, 52, 155
Albania, military to military contacts with U.S., 51, 54
All-Russian Officers' Assembly, 143, 144
American foreign policy. *See* Foreign Policy, U.S.
Andrejcak, Lt. General Imrich, 85
attachés, military
  intelligence collection role, 154, 161
  regional expertise, 161

Baku, 99
Baltic states
  Baltic fleet, 113
  U.S. National Guard role in, 61
Baudys, Antonin, 85
Belarus, military to military contacts with U.S., 53, 54
Brno Military Academy, 86, 136, 140, 145
Brussels Summit (1994), 52
budgetary control, 13, 18
Bulgaria
  armed forces, 36
  military to military contacts with U.S., 54
Bush Administration, 46

Carlucci, Frank, 52
case-study method, selection of Czech and Russian cases using, 3–4
Chechnya
  Duma role in war, 98
  as impetus to military reform, 178
  relations with Russia, 77
  role of Russian press, 100
  Russian military readiness, lack of, 113
  Russian use of contract servicemen in war, 135
  use of Russian conscripts in war, 100, 150
  war with Russia as a case study for Russian civil-military relations, 99–102, 178
Christian Democratic Union-Czechoslovak People's Party (KDU-CSL), 86
Chubais, Anatoly, 48
Civic Democratic Party (ODS), 86
civilian control of the military
  civilian expertise, 91, 174–75
  considered as a set of relationships, 6
  in the Czech Republic, 83–107
  democratic models of, 109–10
  objective, 7–9
  parliamentary control, 91–98
  patterns of, 2
  in Russia, 83–107
  in the Soviet model, 110
  subjective, 7–9
  in transitioning states, 42
civil-military relations
  in democratic states, 6, 8–10, 11–21, 37–41
  in Eastern Europe, 19–20, 36, 37–38, 40
  functional imperative, 6
  party control in Communist systems, 11
  societal imperative, 6
  in the Soviet Bloc, 12, 19–20, 22–43, 37–41

civil-military relations (*continued*)
  theory for postcommunist states, 5–43, 185–87
  traditional approaches to, 6–10, 108, 182
  twin imperatives of, 5–6
Clinton Administration, 45
Committee of Soldiers' Mothers, 96, 100, 101, 102
  opposition to hazing, 133
Communist Party
  control of the military in Eastern Bloc, 15–16, 36
  control of the military in the Soviet Union, 15–16, 35–36
  in East European states, 36
  of the Soviet Union, 32, 36
Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), 51
conscripts, 121
constitutional provisions for democratic political control, 12, 13–14, 41, 80–83
  in the Czech Republic, 82
  in Russia, 82–83
contract service. *See* professionalization, of conscript militaries
Cooperative Threat Reduction program, 46, 52
Croatia, military to military contacts with U.S., 54
Crowe, Admiral William, 52, 155
Czechoslovakia
  armed forces, 36, 75
    Battle for Dukla Pass, 102
    Czechoslovak Legion, 103
    military to military contacts with U.S., 51, 155, 180
    struggle for democratization in, 102–3
    in World War II, 102
  elections, 1992, 72
  1948 Coup, 103
  Support for East European Democracy program, 47
  Velvet Divorce, 72
  Velvet Revolution, 72
    Civic Forum, 72
    Public Against Violence, 72
Czechoslovak People's Army (CSPA), 75, 84
  motivation for service in, 127–28
  support for Communist regime in 1989, 85
Czech Republic
  armed forces
    Air Force, 90
    budget, defense, 91–92
    civilian expertise, 93, 97–98
    civilian oversight, 76, 84–85, 88
    conscripts, 121
    defense acquisitions process, 96
    democratic transition, components of, 80, 184
    down-sizing of, 86, 115
    force structure, 116
    housing, 118
    legacy of Soviet era, 74
    lustration process, 85, 115
    military academies, 120, 129, 142, 145
    military education reform, 97
    military to military contacts with U.S., 54
    motivation for service in, 140–41
    NATO membership goals, 79
    NATO's role in military reform, 77, 126
    personnel management reform, 87–88, 97, 123–27, 162, 168–69
    personnel structure, 123–25
    prestige, legacy of low, 79–80
    public relations function, 148–49
    Rapid Deployment Brigade, 173
    relationship with society, 147–49
    role in society, 78–79, 98
    scandals in, 104
    split with Slovakia, 115
    strategic concept, 76–78
    transparency of, 87–88
  birth of, 72

Civic Democratic Party (ODS), 93, 97
Committee for Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Security, 93
constitution, 97
Defense and Security Committee, 90, 93, 94
democratic history, 73
economic situation, 71–72
geostrategic location, 76
National Defense Strategy, 82
National Security Strategy, 77
Parliament
Chamber of Deputies, 97
quality of civilian control, 91–98
relationship with General Staff, 95–96
Senate, 97
public opinion support for NATO membership, 104
Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD), 86

dedovshchina, 30, 132–34
Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), 154
delegative democracy. *See* O'Donnell, Guillermo, concept of delegative democracy
democratic military professionalism. *See* military professionalism, democratic
democratic peace, 45, 182
democratic political control. *See* political control, democratic
democratic transition of postcommunist states, 7, 108–9, 186
democratic values, 9, 20, 26, 106, 131, 138
infusion of, in authoritarian society, 71, 109, 110, 152, 184
role in democratic civil-military relations, 110, 128–29, 141, 149–51, 184
democratization
military. *See* military democratization
winners and losers in process of, 71
discipline, military
in Soviet bloc, 30
in transitioning states, 110, 128, 132, 141–42
Dobrovsky, Lubros, 85
Dudayev, Dzokhar, 135

East, Colonel Paul, 161
edinonachilie, 29
education and training, military system of
in the Czech Republic, 136–43
curriculum, 131, 136–37, 140–41
legislation governing, 136
in democratic states, 31–34, 136
role in democratic socialization, 137
differences between U.S. and Russian systems, 172
NCO Corps, role in, 142, 169
Professional Military Education System
in the Czech Republic, 165
in postcommunist states, democratic deficits of, 142
in Russia, 136–43
in the Soviet bloc, 31–34, 136
Estonia
military to military contacts with U.S., 54
Support for East European Democracy program, 47
ethics, professional
in postcommunist states, 135
role in military professionalism, 135
European Union, 46
Czech membership goals, 79

Founding Act, 168, 178
Foreign policy, U.S.
Joint Contact Team Program, 52, 53, 54–62
bureaucratic limitations of program, 160–65, 182
facilitation of NATO interoperability goals, 56
familiarization tours, 59
focus areas, 57
funding, 54

Foreign policy, U.S. (*continued*)
how it works, 59
legal basis, 55
mission statement, 156
Military Liaison Teams, 54, 59, 67–68, 155, 161–63
National Guard and Reserve forces, involvement of, 60–62, 162
objectives, 55
"post-reform" era, 156, 157, 164–65, 181
"pre-reform" era, 156, 157, 165
Traveling Contact Teams, 59
Russia, U.S. relationship with in post-communist era
military democratization programs, 44, 50–62
achievement of programs' objectives, 66–69, 156–81, 169–70, 179–80, 182, 183
Country Work Plan, 165
Defense and Military Contacts Program for the Former Soviet Union, 52–54, 155, 156, 165–66
future of, 178–80
impact on host countries, overall, 166–70, 185–87
IMET, effectiveness of, 170–75
oversight of, 56–59, 158–60, 163–66, 181, 183, 185
reform of assessment procedures, 58–59, 180, 181
Freedom Support Act, 46

Galvin, General John, 51
Germany, denazification, 50
Good Soldier Schwejk, The, 104
Gorbachev, Mikhail, 27, 30, 40
beliefs on reforming communism, 72
Govan, General Gregory, 131, 167
Government Accounting Office, 47
governmental control of the military, 2, 6
Grachev, Pavel, 82, 84, 112, 144
loyalty to Yeltsin, 96
relationship with Lebed, 88
Gromov, General Boris, 144
Group of Seven (G-7), 48

Harvard, Institute of International Development, 47
Havel, Vaclav, 85, 90, 97, 105, 149
hazing
in Czech Republic, 134
in Russia (*see* dedovshchina)
Holan, Wilem, 80, 85, 93, 124
human rights
abuses in Chechen War, 100
democratic expectations of, 31, 135
toleration of abuses within the military, 9
Hungary
invitation to NATO, 177, 179
military to military contacts with U.S., 54
Support for East European Democracy program, 47
Huntington, Samuel, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 34, 109, 145, 182
characterization of civil-military relations, 2

International Military Education and Training (IMET). *See* United States, Security Assistance Program
International Monetary Fund, 48

Jandacek, General Pavel, 176–77
Japan, democratization of, 50
Jelik, Colonel Josef, 125–26
Johnson, Ralph, 46
Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP). *See* United States, military democratization programs
Joulwan, General George, 62
Justice, Lt. Commander Charles, 111

Kachinsky Higher Military Aviation College, 135, 137
Kazakhstan, 77
military to military contacts with U.S., 53

Kert, Johannes, 60
Kholodov, Dmitriy, 87
Klaus, Vaclav, 86, 105
  priorities of government, 97
  resignation of, 73
Kokoshin, Andrei, 83
Kovalyov, Sergei, 101
Krasnaya Zvezda, 101
Kulakov, Lt. General Vladimir, 139
Kuznetzov Academy, 111

Latvia
  military to military contacts with U.S., 54, 60
  participation in Marshall Center, 177
  Support for East European Democracy program, 47
leadership, military
  in democratic states, 28–31, 127–29
  NCOs, role in, 134, 169
  officer evaluations, role of, 31, 130
  in Russia, 131
  in the Soviet bloc, 28–31, 127–29
Lebed, Alexander, 84, 89
  disobedience of, 88
Lenin Military Political Academy, 138
Lennon, Brigadier General Thomas, 54
Lithuania, military to military contacts with U.S., 54
Lobkowicz, Michal, 125, 142
Luzny, Colonel Peter, 172–73

Macedonia, former Yugoslav Republic of, military to military contacts with U.S., 54
Main Political Administration, 15
Mansfield, Edward D., 107
Marshall, George C., European Center for Security Studies, 49, 52, 64–65, 130, 155, 175–78
  Czech participation in, 175–77
  Russian participation in, 175–78
Martinek, General Jiri, 130
Marxist-Leninism, 32, 111, 131, 133, 137, 138, 141
McCarthy, General James P., 51

Meyer, General Edward C., 29
military democratization, 4
  dimensions of problem, 2, 4, 182, 183
military discipline. *See* discipline, military
military institution
  political environment of, 6
  political role of, 7–8, 34–37, 146
  relationship with, in democratic states, 20–21, 98
  relationship with society in postcommunist states, 98–105, 111
  relationship with society in Soviet Bloc, 21–22
  resistance to change, 8, 71, 112
  transparency of, 31, 38–39, 86–88
Military Liaison Teams (MLTs). *See* United States, military democratization programs
military professionalism, 7, 39, 184
  characteristics across political systems, 23, 24–25, 151–53, 183
  democratic, 2, 9, 10–11, 41, 108, 116–53, 154, 180, 182, 183, 184
    how to achieve, 3
    norms of, 22–43
    role of NCOs, 31
  elements of, 3
  patterns of, 3
  redefining in the postcommunist era, 109–11
  Soviet norms of, 4, 22–43, 109–10, 127, 182, 184
  in transitioning political systems, 41–43, 108–11, 151–53
military reform
  postcommunist, in the Czech Republic, 115–16
  postcommunist, in Russia, 112–15
military to military concept, 109
  arms control contacts, 157
Military University, 138–39
Ministry of Defense
  civilian experts in, 17
  effectiveness of day-to-day oversight, 16–18

Ministry of Defense (*continued*)
Soviet militarization of, 14
transparency of, 17
Moiseev, General Mikhail, 155
Movement in Support of the Army, the Defense Industry, and Military Science, 144

Nagorno-Karabakh, 99
National Defense University, 175
National Security Council, importance of in democratic states, 17
National Security Strategy, 45
of Engagement and Enlargement, 45
NATO, 9, 46, 66
Defense College, 177
enlargement of, 177, 181, 183
Czech participation in, 82
partner states, 44
Russian reaction to enlargement, 167–68
Necas, Petr, 93
Nekvasil, General Jiri, 95, 126
New Socialist Man, 21, 33, 40
Non-commissioned Officer Corps
German, 29
role in facilitating democratic military professionalism, 31, 167
Nunn-Lugar program, 46, 49, 52–53, 179

O'Connor, Colonel Peter R., 161, 162, 168–69
O'Donnell, Guillermo, concept of delegative democracy, 106
officer corps, East European
demographic background, 26
pay and benefits, 26
self-image of, 39
Owens, Admiral William, 95

parliamentary control
elements of, 18–19
range of legislative authority, 18
role of staff, 19
Partnership for Peace, 52, 66, 97, 179, 183
JCTP support of, 56, 179–80
Warsaw Initiative, 66
perestroika, 40, 155, 180
Pezl, General Karel, 76, 80, 85
Poland
armed forces, 36
invitation to NATO, 177, 179
military to military contacts with the U.S., 51, 54
Support for East European Democracy program, 47
political control
democratic, 2, 13, 41, 70–107, 154, 180, 182, 183
in the Czech Republic, 82–107, 180
in Eastern Europe, 19–20
how to achieve, 3, 183
the imperative of, 6–7
norms of, 11–21
in parliamentary systems, 16
in presidential systems, 16
in Russia, 82–107, 180
in East European states, 15–16
nondemocratic patterns of, 9
patterns of, 2, 3
Soviet era, 11–22, 41
role of Communist Party, 14–16
political influence of military, norms of
in the Czech Republic, 143–47
in democratic states, 34–37, 144–46
in Russia, 143–47
in the Soviet bloc, 34–37
political officer role in military-political indoctrination, 33, 138–40
in the Czech Republic, 138
in Russia, 138–40
education officers, 138–40
political systems
adopting new sets of societal values in, 8, 41
transition to new political systems, 6, 41, 45
types that the military serves, 6, 108
postcommunist militaries
challenges faced, 71

democratic adjustment of, 8
legacy of Soviet era norms, 9
postcommunist states, authoritarian heritage of, 9
Powell, General Colin, 51, 54, 155, 159
Prague Spring, 103
press
role in democratic civil-military relations, 20, 39
Russian military, coverage of, 148
prestige, military, 23, 25, 38–39
in Czechoslovakia, 102–5
in Czech Republic, 143, 147–49
norms of
in democratic states, 37–39
in Soviet bloc, 37–39
in Russia, 147–49
professional ethics. *See* ethics, professional
professionalism
definition of, 10
military (*see* military professionalism)
strategic, 44
professionalization of conscript militaries
in the Czech Republic, 122, 141, 142
in Russia, 114, 121–22
professional military as essential element of military reform, 114
promotion systems, military
corruption in, 27–28
in Czech Republic, 122–27
"career concept," 123
as an obstacle to NATO accession, 123
in democratic states, 26–28
role of officer evaluations in, 27
in Russia, 122–27
in Soviet bloc, 26–28, 122–23

reasonable sufficiency, 40
recruitment and retention, norms of
in the Czech Republic, 117–22
in democratic states, 23–26
in Russia, 117–22
in the Soviet bloc, 23–26
Reppert, Brigadier General John, 134, 248n. 164.
Rodionov, General Igor, 84
Rogov, Sergey, 91, 95, 113
Rokhlin, Colonel General Lev, 144
Rokke, Lt. General Ervin J., 167
Romania
armed forces, 36
military to military contacts with U.S., 54
participation in Partnership for Peace program, 179
Rubus, Brigadier General Gary, 74, 119
Runaev, Lt. Colonel Yuri, 137
Russia
attitudes of citizens toward democracy, 73–74
crime, 74
Defense Council, 88–89
Democratic transition, overall progress, 184–85
Duma role in military reform, 113
Duma Defense Committee, 94, 95, 144
economic situation, 74
judicial branch, weakness of, 80–81
Law on Realization and Utilization of Military Production, 95
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 171
national security interests, 78
Russian General Staff Foreign Liaison Office, 159
Security Council, 83, 87, 89
comparison with U.S. National Security Council, 89
Western aid to, 48
Russian armed forces
adaptation to democratic political system, 114
attitude toward democracy, 74, 78–79, 91, 181
budget, defense, 92–93, 113–14
civilian oversight
civilian expertise, 93–95, 166
executive/MOD control, quality of, 83–91

Russian armed forces (*continued*)
parliamentary control, quality of, 91–98
conscripts, 121
public attitude toward conscript system, 150
corruption of, 88–89
draft evasion, 121
housing, 117, 119
military academies, 120, 129
military doctrine, 77
role of nuclear weapons, 78
motivation for service in, 139–40
parliamentary control, quality of, 91–98
pay, 117, 119
peacekeeping, role in, 77
politics, role in, 115
public relations function, 148
receptiveness toward Western assistance, 74, 178–79
relationship with society, 78–79, 98–102, 147–49
social conditions 119
Strategic Purpose Forces, 113
Suicide rate, 132
transparency of, 86–87
Russkiy Island, 132

Schwartzkopf, General Norman, 130
"Schwejkism," 128
Sedivy, Major General Jiri, 173
Sergeyev, General Igor, 84, 112, 113, 114
Shalikashvili, General John, 54
Shaposhnikov, Marshal Evgenii, 112
Simons, Thomas, 46
Slovakia
military to military contacts with U.S., 54
participation in Partnership for Peace program, 179
rebirth of, 72
Slovenia
military to military contacts with U.S., 54
participation in Partnership for Peace program, 179
Snyder, Jack, 107
socialization, democratic, 8, 28, 131–32
in commissioning sources, 32
in Eastern Europe, 20
ideological, 8, 32–34
role of military education system, 138–43
and militarism, 40
of military personnel, 7–9, 32–34
conscript system, role of, 150
in East European states, 21–22, 33
in postcommunist Russia, 79
in Soviet Union, 21
Soldatenkov, Lt. Colonel Sergei, 176
South Korea, 9
Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act. *See* Nunn-Lugar program
Soviet Union
armed forces
interference in East European militaries, 36
motivation for service in, 127–28
military to military contacts with the U.S., 51–54, 180
patterns of civil-military relations in, 11
role of military in society, 12, 21–22, 75
dissolution of, 44
foreign policy, "New Political Thinking," 75
invasion of Czechoslovakia, 103
liberalization within, 72
national security interests, 75
Suman, Vladimir, 95
Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act, 46, 47

Taiwan, 9
Tajikistan, 77
Toqueville, Alexis de, 23
Tosovsky, Josef, 86
transparency. *See* military institution, transparency of

Ukraine
  military to military contacts with U.S., 53, 160, 166
  security assistance from the U.S., 170
Uniform Code of Military Justice, 30
United Nations
  Czech support for peacekeeping operations, 79
  UNPROFOR (United Nations Protection Force), 121, 129
United States
  Agency for International Development, 47–49
  assistance to postcommunist states, 44–52, 155, 181
  Department of Agriculture, 47
  Economic Support Fund, 47
  European Command
    deployment of MLTs, 155
    role in military to military contacts programs, 53
    Strategy of Engagement and Preparedness, 49
    Theater Security Planning System, 58
  Export-Import Bank, 47
  Foreign Area Officers (FAOs), U.S. Air Force, 161
  Foreign Area Officers (FAOs), U.S. Army, 161
  foreign policy (*see* foreign policy, U.S.)
  National Military Strategy, 49
  National Security Strategy, 44, 49
  Office of the Secretary of Defense, 160
  Overseas Private Investment Corporation, 47
  Security Assistance Program, 49–50
    Defense Security Assistance Agency, 50
    Direct Commercial Sales, 50
    Foreign Military Sales, 50, 63
    International Military Education and Training (IMET), 50, 52, 62–64, 131, 155
      in the Czech Republic, 172–75
      expanded IMET, 64, 171, 174–75
      funding, 63, 64, 170–71, 172
      philosophy of, 63
      postcommunist states, inclusion of, 63
      in Russia, 170–72
      in Ukraine, 170
    Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, 63
    Peacekeeping Operations, 63
  State Department, 50
    role in JCTP, 54–55, 60
United States Air Force Academy, 141
United States Army Command and General Staff College, 155, 172
United States Army War College, 162, 172, 173
United States Military Academy, 141, 174
United States Naval Postgraduate School, 175
Ustinov, Dmitrii, 14

Vacek, General Miroslav, 85
Vaclavik, Milan, 103
Values, compatibility of military and societal
  in the Czech Republic, 149–51
  in democratic states, 39–41, 149
  in East European states, 40
  in Russia, 149–51
  in the Soviet Union, 39–41
Vetchy, Vladimir, 86, 97, 116, 125, 142
  Democratic (*see* democratic values)
Vilnius, 99
Vohralik, Lt. Petr 118
Vyborny, Miloslav, 86, 97, 118, 125

Warsaw Initiative. *See* Partnership for Peace
Warsaw Pact, 44
Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO), 11, 15
Washington Summit, 1987, 52

Yeltsin, Boris
  failure to halt Grozny bombing, 87
  management of defense ministry, 84
  role in 1991 coup, 72
Yugoslavia, former, U.S. assistance to, 47
Zaitsev, Grigory, 176
Zantovsky, Michael, 93, 97
Zaoralek, Lubomir, 93
Zdorikov, Lt. General Sergey, 139, 140
Zeman, Milos, 97
Zhirinovsky, Vladimir, 138