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ABSTRACT

How should victorious states manage their vanquished foes to provide for stable post-war international politics? Though there is relatively little work on how states manage victory, the conventional wisdom in international relations scholarship is that moderation in victory is the only approach that will provide post-war stability. That is, defeated states should not be restricted in the post-war era, nor should the gains made by victors be too large. Otherwise, post-war stability is jeopardized.

I argue that restrictive war-ending settlements tend to provide postwar stability when there is a large postwar gap in capabilities favoring the victors and those states actively enforce the settlement. When these conditions hold, postwar stability, defined as no or only minor alterations to the settlement attempted by the vanquished nation, can follow two pathways. The first is the acceptance of the restrictive settlement by the vanquished based on simple coercion, or where the defeated state is unable to challenge the settlement and thus grudgingly endures its treatment at the hand of the victors as long as the power gap favors the victors. The second, coercion plus socialization, is acceptance of the restrictive settlement by the defeated state based on legitimacy, or where the defeated state is eventually socialized to the settlement such that it no longer desires to challenge or alter the settlement even if the opportunity arises to do so.
When the gap in capabilities between the victors and vanquished is not large or cannot be perpetuated because of lack of enforcement, a less restrictive settlement is more likely to provide postwar stability.

To test my arguments against the conventional wisdom, I conduct a comparative analysis of all great power war-ending settlements since 1815. I find that restrictive settlements do in fact lead to postwar stability at least as often as lenient ones. Moreover, the comparative analysis demonstrates that the coercion and coercion plus socialization both enjoy strong support. To further probe the coercion plus socialization model, I conduct an in-depth case study of West Germany after the Second World War. The case demonstrates very clearly that the victorious states instigated a process of socialization in West Germany by constructing a restrictive settlement. By doing so, the war-ending settlement proved remarkably stable.
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The problems of victory are more agreeable than those of defeat, but no less difficult.

Winston Churchill
November 11, 1942

1.1 The Problem of Victory

In the throes of the greatest war the world has ever witnessed, Churchill recognized that even if battlefield triumph could be realized much difficult work lay ahead of the victors. How to treat their vanquished foes was one of the greatest challenges facing the victorious Allies of the Second World War. After every war before and since, victorious nations are presented with the same such difficulties. To secure postwar peace and stability, should the vanquished be treated with leniency or harshness? Should the defeated be allowed to regain antebellum power and independence, or will restricting the defeated state such that it cannot disturb the postwar order best provide international stability?

1 Quoted in Kegley and Raymond (1999, viii).
The victors of the First World War attempted the latter, and the world witnessed the disastrous results. The 1919 Treaty of Versailles clearly played a significant role in sowing the seeds for the greatest war humankind has ever witnessed, as a defeated Germany rose to challenge its treatment at the hands of the victors. After the final defeat of Napoleon in 1815, on the other hand, both the victors and a vanquished, remade France coexisted in a fairly stable international system, one that lasted nearly a half-century by some accounts. While these cases have led most political thinkers to extol the utility of leniency toward the vanquished and counsel against the folly of harshly approaching the defeated, the victors of the Second World War clearly curtailed German power more in 1945 than in 1919 and did so with great success in terms of postwar stability and German acceptance of its treatment. Given this mixed historical record, what is the best way to treat a vanquished great power?

This dissertation provides a simple yet powerful answer. Restrictive war-ending settlements – those that constrain the defeated state’s postwar autonomy and power – tend to provide postwar stability when there is a large postwar gap in capabilities favoring the victors and those states actively enforce the settlement. When these conditions hold, postwar stability, defined as no or only minor alterations to the settlement attempted by the vanquished nation, can follow two pathways. The first is the acceptance of the restrictive settlement by the vanquished is based on simple coercion, or where the defeated state is unable to challenge the settlement and thus grudgingly endures its treatment at the hand of the victors as long as the power gap favors the victors. The second, coercion plus socialization, is acceptance of the restrictive settlement by the defeated state based legitimacy, or where the defeated state is
eventually socialized to the settlement such that it no longer desires to challenge or alter the settlement even if the opportunity arises to do so. When the gap in capabilities between the victors and vanquished is not large or cannot be perpetuated because of lack of enforcement, a less restrictive settlement is more likely to provide postwar stability.

This argument stands in stark contrast to the conventional wisdom of moderation in victory. Though compared to the causes of war much less work has been devoted to this specific issue, there is a strong consensus among scholars of international relations regarding how victors should treat the vanquished: moderation, or even sometimes leniency, in victory is vital to achieving stable postwar outcomes. More specifically, victorious states should limit their own objectives in peace and not saddle defeated states with settlements that appear punitive, or ones that restrict the autonomy and power of the vanquished in the postwar era. While they agree on little else, even opposing theoretical viewpoints share this common conclusion of moderation in victory providing the path to postwar stability. Realists conclude that punitive settlements can disturb the operation of the international system and burden victors with unacceptable postwar enforcement costs. Thus vanquished nations must be brought back into the system as full and legitimate members.2 In addition to the problems of enforcement, liberal institutionalists point to issues of achieving mutually acceptable outcomes and the legitimacy of settlements, and see punitive ones as sowing the seeds of irredentism, revanchism, and feelings of

---

2 Archetypal realists making this argument include Gulick (1955) and Kissinger (1964, 1994).
illegitimacy among the vanquished. In short, with few exceptions the conventional wisdom of moderation in victory is quite common and enjoys widespread support among diverse international relations theoretical traditions.

The notion of moderation in victory, however, has not been subjected to systematic theoretical and empirical inquiry. When one does so, the generally accepted proposition appears flawed. Many of the bases of the standard moderation view are theoretically or logically incomplete at best. Moreover, it is not at all clear that there is a direct empirical link between war-ending settlements that adhere to this maxim and postwar stability. Indeed, victors have achieved prudent victories by limiting the power and autonomy of a defeated state in the postwar era through the implementation of restrictive, or seemingly punitive, war-ending settlements. In many instances, this is the only course that proves to be prudent for victorious states.

The conventional wisdom does not allow that restrictive settlements will be enforced, even if it is costly to do so, when the defeated state is perceived as a potentially significant postwar threat and that this enforcement of a far-reaching war-ending settlement itself provides the victors with an opportunity socialize the defeated state to the postwar order. Thus, the main issues the moderation proponents point to as

---

3 At least in popular connotation Woodrow Wilson is the quintessential liberal in this respect, as he argued publicly for a peace without victory in the Great War where victors and vanquished alike suffered as little harm as possible and all benefited from the conclusion of hostilities. As Wilson wrote, “Only a peace between equals can last. Only a peace the very principle of which is equality and a common participation in a common benefit.” (Wilson 1924, i [quoted in Osiander 1994, 314])

4 Blainey (1973, 17) argues that a harsh treaty is more likely to last, but this is due mostly to the fact that a harsh treaty means that the war ended with decisive victory. See also Hensel (1994). Aron (1966) argues that the most peaceful of international systems are those that are dominated by an imperial power. That is, a single powerful victor imposes its will and perpetually enforces a settlement to provide a world essentially without conflict. These exceptions all involve coercion as the mechanism responsible for postwar stability with a restrictive settlement.
problematic for restrictive settlements can be overcome and, under certain conditions, produce postwar stability. By laying out the conditions under which restrictive settlements can provide postwar stability, I argue that the conventional wisdom is underspecified in several ways. First and most broadly, while there are some conditions under which leniency toward the vanquished is necessary for postwar stability, there are other conditions under which restrictive settlements can do the same thing. Thus, prudence in victory encompasses a wider range of options than is generally acknowledged. Second, the distinction between lenient and punitive – or less and more restrictive – settlements does not solely determine postwar stability. The way the victors approach the vanquished in the postwar order in terms of enforcement of settlements and the ability to foster change in the defeated state is as important as the overall nature of the war-ending settlement. That is, the ability of the victors to legitimate their vision of the postwar world may be just as important as whether the settlement is a moderate or restrictive one. The conventional wisdom, while correctly highlighting the importance of legitimacy, seems to acknowledge only one path to legitimacy; that is, only leniency can produce legitimacy. Under certain conditions, however, restrictive settlements can produce the legitimacy that proponents of the conventional wisdom trumpet as only achievable with a lenient settlement.

The conditions under which victors can achieve prudent victories in terms of postwar stability are especially important when considering great power wars. After any type of international conflict, generally the greatest desire among all combatants is to avoid another costly contest of will and strength, but the victors of great power wars have a particular interest in this. Defeated great powers are inherently more dangerous than
vanquished minor powers, as they can regain the capabilities to aggressively challenge
the postwar status quo and possibly throw the system back into war. Simply put,
victorious great powers have much more to worry about when dealing with defeated great
powers than minor states.

Moreover, how defeated great powers are managed and the ability of victors to
achieve prudence in victory lends insight into the dynamics of stability and change in the
international system. It is commonly argued that war itself, and great power war
specifically, is the major catalyst for change in the international system.\textsuperscript{5} Contests
between the most significant actors in the system are potentially system altering,
especially when the contests concern the fundamental rules and operation of the system.
This may be true most of the time. However, it is probably equally true that what is done
after war is as important to the manner of change as the process of war itself. If
vanquished great powers can be made to accept the victor’s vision of the postwar world it
would follow that the postwar actions of victorious states play a major role in the stability
of the international system. On the other hand, it may be just as clear that the actions of
states lead to great instability, where turmoil is a constant feature of the international
system.

Because there is little theorizing on war-ending settlements and postwar stability,
several steps must first be taken before the conventional wisdom can be compared and
tested against the propositions I develop regarding the stability of restrictive settlements.
The first step is to clearly conceptualize war-ending settlements. Although the terms

\textsuperscript{5} See, for example, Carr (1946), Organski and Kugler (1980, 23) and Gilpin (1981). For an argument that
such momentous change is possible without war, see Mueller (1995).
lenient, moderate, punitive, and others are commonly applied to war-ending settlements, little theorizing has gone behind the application of these characterizations and it is not at all clear how war-ending settlements should be viewed given the stance of the conventional wisdom. Part of the problem leading to some contradictory findings and a general lack of understanding of postwar dynamics may be that there is little conceptual clarity when approaching this issue.

1.2 Thinking Theoretically about War-ending Settlements

After examining some of the ways war-ending settlements have been, I propose a conceptualization of war-ending settlements that relies on the degree to which a victor restricts a vanquished nation’ postwar autonomy and power. This approach not only theoretically grounds understandings of war-ending settlements, but also provides a way to compare war-ending settlements so that the conventional wisdom of moderation in victory can be scrutinized and empirically investigated in subsequent chapters.

1.2.1 Conventional Understandings of War-ending Settlements

As the conventional wisdom posits that leniency among the victors toward the vanquished provides the path to postwar stability, it is imperative to conceptualize explicitly what it means for a war-ending settlement to be lenient compared to punitive. Unfortunately, settlements generally cited among works conforming to the conventional wisdom provide a mixed message such that it is not clear what a lenient settlement does or should entail. For example, the settlement that ended the Franco-Prussian War (Treaty of Frankfurt 1871) contained strategic amputations of territory, temporary occupation, and an indemnity placed upon a defeated France. The consensus is that this settlement
was highly punitive and had a significant role in laying the seeds for the next major war four decades later. On the other hand, the settlement that finally ended the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (Second Treaty of Paris 1815) also included strategic amputations (though of a lesser degree), temporary occupation, and a substantial indemnity. Importantly, the victors also imposed a regime on France. This is generally considered a lenient settlement; indeed, even an enlightened one because of the forethought of the crafters of the peace that produced nearly four decades of relative European stability. But, at least initially, it appears that many of the provisions were similar in these two war-ending settlements, and it is not difficult to see how the 1815 settlement may have placed larger burdens on France than the peace of 1871. And, interestingly, both settlements produced similarly long periods of relative stability, even though the end of the 1871 era of stability was much more devastating than the end of the 1815 period of stability. It may be that the judgment of these settlements has more to do with the eventual outcomes than the settlements themselves. No matter the reason, it seems the conventional wisdom provides little guidance as to how to characterize war-ending settlements.

Some empirical studies of the durability of peace have moved beyond the basic characterizations of war-ending settlements as lenient or punitive. For example, Werner (1999) identifies specific elements of war-ending agreements within three domains – resolution of conflict-driving issues, enforcement of the settlement, and incentives to renegotiate in the postwar period – arguing it is largely incentives to renegotiate, represented by shifts in power between the victors and the vanquished, that leads to instability. Approaching the problem from a credibility of commitment perspective,
Fortna (2003, 2004) focuses on how the institutional strength of war-ending agreements promotes a lasting peace. Similarly, Walter (1997) argues that third parties involvement in creating war-ending agreements tends to prolong the peace by solving credibility of commitment problems that are present anytime two sides decide to stop fighting and are especially prevalent after civil wars. In his examination of the durability of peace, Maoz (1984) differentiates between imposed and negotiated war-ending agreements, and argues that imposed settlements are more stable than negotiated ones. Other works have adopted similar strategies to investigate the durability of peace after conflict, that is, singling-out specific aspects of war-ending settlements to examine their effects on the durability of peace.6

In some ways, this sort of approach to war-ending agreements steps beyond the basic distinction between lenient and punitive settlements. Each study mentioned above highlights specific mechanisms within war-ending settlements that may be important for postwar stability. For example, incentives to renegotiate a settlement seem to increase the chances that a peace will be broken, while strong institutions within a war-ending settlement and third-party enforcers tend to prolong the peace. But while these studies show that certain aspects of a war-ending agreement may be important for postwar stability, none provide a comprehensive framework to view war-ending settlements. Instead, they explore only specific settlement mechanisms related to the durability of

---

6 For example, in a similar yet distinct fashion from Walter (1997), Zartman (1995) focuses on the role of mediators in peacemaking exercises. Like Maoz (1984), Holsti (1991) and Randle (1973) to some degree highlight of the distinction between imposed and negotiated settlements, but with generally opposing opinions as to whether imposed or negotiated settlements are more likely to be durable.
peace. As such, the whole of a war-ending settlement is lost. In this sense, these approaches are less appealing than the basic lenient versus punitive framework. An imposed settlement, for example, does not necessarily mean that it is punitive in nature. Likewise, a negotiated settlement agreed to by one side out of duress but that contains strong institutional mechanisms or third party involvement to guarantee the peace to both sides could theoretically be more punitive than a settlement imposed by an overpowering yet benevolent victor. Focusing only on specific aspects of peace without the context within which they reside raises serious theoretical issues and may even point to the some of the problems that have generated mixed results of the limited extant empirical analyses. In the end, this sort of approach provides little guidance for determining what constitutes prudence in victory.

1.2.2 Targets of War-Ending Settlements: Autonomy and Power

A comprehensive framework to compare war-ending settlements, which typically contain multiple and varied provisions, is needed to scrutinize the conventional wisdom as well as to examine the veracity of the arguments put forth in the next chapter. To construct such a theoretical framework, it is critical to link provisions of settlements to their intended effects. This means that different aspects of war-ending settlements must still be examined, but within the context of how they relate to the overall nature of the settlement. There is a cumulative effect of the specific provisions of war-ending

---

7 See Werner (1999) for a thorough accounting of all the individually hypothesized effects of different aspects of war-ending settlements.

8 Moreover, recent analysis of the durability of peace such as Fortna (2003) and Werner (1999) include observations of cease-fire agreements as well as war-terminating treaties. While appropriate to include when only investigating the durability of peace, cease-fires do not necessarily imply that there is a winner and loser. Many cease-fires are simply the result of draws, outside interventions, or conflicts that end by mutual exhaustion. To investigate the notion of prudence in victory, it is necessary that there be a victorious state and a vanquished state.
settlements that can be understood only when it is known precisely what war-ending settlements accomplish. To put it another way, to understand how victors should approach the defeated, the targets of war-ending settlements and what the victors intend to achieve through such provisions must first be understood.

The most obvious purpose of a war-ending settlement is, of course, to end a war. After two sides have agreed to stop fighting, however, the focus is shifted from the problem of war to the problem of providing postwar stability and protecting the victors’ gains made during the war. After fighting a war, it is hard to imagine otherwise.9 Because of the significant resources spent on the first episode of war, states generally wish to avoid another costly contest and to preserve their spoils. The primary goal is thus to deter threats to the newly established status quo, and this is stated clearly in most war-ending treaties.

What, then, are the mechanisms available to states to achieve postwar stability? That is, how are the provisions of war-ending settlements designed to deter states from disturbing the postwar status quo? Nearly without exception, all provisions of war-ending settlements are designed to lessen states’ ability to engage in a new round of warfare. Thus, in an effort to lessen a state’s ability to aggressively alter the postwar order, war-ending settlements often contain limitations on military forces, deployments, or equipment. Economic restrictions within war-ending settlements can likewise limit states’ abilities to raise the resources necessary for war. War-ending settlements can also bind states to institutional structures that raise the costs of defecting from the postwar status quo. In short, all of these provisions in war-ending settlements, as well as many

---

9 As Kissinger notes, “The success of war is victory; the success of peace is stability.” (1964, 138)
others, are designed to somehow restrict state autonomy and power in the postwar era.\textsuperscript{10} These concepts of autonomy and power are at the very core of state interests. By targeting these attributes, war-ending settlements provide mechanisms to limit challenges to the postwar status quo from the vanquished nation. Each will be discussed in turn.

State autonomy or policy-making independence is the cornerstone of the state system and as such is a core state interest. In Krasner’s (1995, 116) terms, “autonomy means that no external actor enjoys authority within the borders of the state.”

Highlighting the importance of state autonomy, Wendt (1999, 235) further explains: “Autonomy refers to the ability of a state-society complex to exercise control over its allocation of resources and choice of government. In order to reproduce its identity it is not enough for a state-society complex to merely survive, it must also retain its ‘liberty.’ This follows from the fact of state sovereignty.”

\textsuperscript{10} Efforts to limit the postwar autonomy and power of a defeated state may not be the only intended purposes of a war-ending settlement. Punishing the vanquished state for wrongful behavior can also motivate decision-makers and underpin war-ending settlements. Critically examining punishment, however, exposes various purposes of such acts. These include compulsion to improve behavior, deterring future bad behavior, and retribution to extract costs from the offender to satisfy desires of justice. See Nossal (1989). The first two notions of punishment – compellence and deterrence – are exactly what targeting a state’s autonomy and power do. Victorious states may also seek to punish the vanquished, especially if the vanquished were particularly aggressive or pursued policies considered immoral by the victors. If pursing punishment of the vanquished as a just dessert for its actions, retributive justice becomes important. That is, a state could be seen as “getting what it deserves” with a war-ending settlement that contains normatively punitive aspects. For some of the few thoughts on punishment and justice related specifically to war and war-terminations coming from normative political theory, see Walzer (1977, 109-124) and Orend (2000, 135-152). For classic and contemporary thoughts on the justifications and efficacy of punishment, see Feinberg (1970), Gerber and McAnany (1972), and Solomon and Murphy (2000).
At a minimum, autonomy is the ability of states to independently form policy within their own territorial confines and to preserve this independence into the future.\textsuperscript{11} Along with physical survival and economic well-being, maintaining policy-making independence within a given territory must be considered one of the highest goals or interests of a state.\textsuperscript{12} This is particularly important for great powers, which set the course of international politics and, therefore, jealously guard their autonomy. This desire to maintain autonomy among the strongest states in the system largely drives many international relations theories.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11} Autonomy is intimately related to the concept of sovereignty, and indeed is sometimes identical to the concept. Moreover, sovereignty rather than autonomy dominates the discourse of peace treaties and other war-ending instruments as well as international relations scholarship on the independence of actors in the modern state system. Recent work by Krasner (1995, 1999) suggests this, as he notes four kinds of sovereignty: domestic, interdependence, international legal, and Westphalian. An important question then is: why privilege the notion of autonomy over the concept of sovereignty when examining war-ending settlements? While sovereignty is the more recognizable term, its multiple meanings during different historical epochs or different domain specific connotations are problematic both theoretically and analytically. For example, a state can be formally sovereign in one or more ways but still be severely restricted in its ability to act independently in either domestic or foreign policy, or both. Autonomy, on the other hand, implies policy-making independence across a range of state activities and as such is broader than any specific understanding of sovereignty. The conception of autonomy I utilize is most similar to Krasner’s (1995, 1999) notion of Westphalian sovereignty, where autonomy and territoriality characterize this type of institutional structure. However, because different types of sovereignty can imply different types of policy-making independence, the concept of autonomy put forth here also refers to the degree of control a state has within its borders (domestic sovereignty), how a state controls transborder movements (interdependence sovereignty), and the ability of a state to make international agreements (international legal). There are even more historical meanings, interpretations, contestations, and manifestations of the notion and practice of sovereignty. See, for example, Barkin and Cronin (1994), Osiander (1994), and Spruyt (1994). For an application of the difficult issues of sovereignty to the case of postwar Iraq, see Dodge (2004).

\textsuperscript{12} Survival and autonomy are often conflated in realist logic. Waltz, for example, makes the general claim that survival is the only state interest but sometimes places equal value on autonomy (1979, 107). Likewise, Mearsheimer assumes that states seek survival, and included in this is that “states seek to maintain their territorial integrity and the autonomy of their domestic political order.” (2001, 31)

\textsuperscript{13} As Krasner (1995, 121) notes, “The Westphalian model is a basic concept for some of the major theoretical approaches to international relations, including neo-realism and neo-liberal institutionalism, for both of which it is an analytic assumption, as well as international society perspectives, for which it is an empirical regularity.” As one example, according to balance of power logic, to protect their own independence, states band together to oppose great accumulations of power in the international system. Preserving the independence of all significant actors provides guarantees to one’s own autonomy in the anarchic system. See, for example, Gulick (1955), Morgenthau (1965), and Waltz (1979).
Though autonomy is a cornerstone of the modern international system, the concept is frequently compromised, and the model of the perfectly autonomous Westphalian state is regularly violated. Some violations of autonomy are willingly agreed to by states, such as voluntary contracts or conventions that somehow monitor or limit state behavior. In addition, small and great powers alike sometimes bind themselves to international alliances, conventions, institutions, or other mechanisms that, while providing some benefit in terms of security, prestige, or economic gain, inherently place limits on state autonomy.

But non-voluntary, coercive limitations on autonomy, while quite common among smaller powers, are not as common among great powers. Generally, great powers are capable of protecting their own autonomy from the designs and wishes of others. This, however, is not always true in the wake of war. War-ending settlements often, if not always, infringe upon the autonomy of states, even great powers. This coercive

---

14 Examples include states signing human rights treaties or securing resources through sovereign lending (Krasner 1995, 124-136).

15 This is a common theme in international relations scholarship. From the realist perspective, Waltz (1979, 96) shows this quite clearly: “To say a state is sovereign means that it decides for itself how it will cope with its internal and external problems, including whether or not to seek assistance from others and in doing so to limit its freedom by making commitments to them.” Coming from the neoliberal perspective, Ikenberry (2001) uses the logic of binding or self-restraint to build an explanation for the increasing use of international institutions by leading states to construct orders that provide benefits and guarantees to leading and secondary states alike.

16 Owen (2002) notes that the foreign impositions of domestic institutions – a most basic violation of sovereignty or state autonomy – happen quite frequently to smaller powers, especially when great powers wish to expand their power and exert control over smaller powers. This is only one example, but an important one in that great powers rarely suffer such impositions except under extraordinary conditions.

17 See Krasner (1995, 140-144).
measure is by design. A war-ending settlement can be used to attempt to gain a measure of control over a defeated state by limiting its decision-making independence in the postwar world.

Autonomy, then, is very clearly an important aspect of statehood, and is very much related to war-ending settlements to the extent that they do or do not limit policy-making independence. An equally important aspect of war-ending settlements is the extent to which they limit state power. Power, after all, provides the means by which an autonomous state implements its desired ends in the international realm. Thus, power is often targeted by war-ending settlements as a means to provide postwar stability.

Power, however, is not only a means to an end for a great power. Maintaining power is an essential interest for the most significant actors in the international system. Without considerable resources to draw upon in terms of military or economic capabilities, a state is simply not a great power.18 Among other things, significant capabilities are necessary for great powers to thwart other great power attempts at hegemony. Moreover, the capabilities of a great power allow it to pursue interests beyond its own borders.19 If, through the provisions of a war-ending settlement, the capabilities of a great power are diminished to that of a second-rate power or less, its ability to secure its own position in the international system is reduced, as are the state’s abilities to independently pursue its own extraterritorial interests.

---

18 Almost all definitions of great powers are derived from material capabilities. For example, Mearsheimer (2001, 5) defines great powers as a state that has “sufficient military assets to put up a serious fight in an all-out conventional war against the most powerful state in the world.” See Levy (1983, 10-19) for different conceptions and definitions of great powers.

19 In a review of great power definitions and attributes, Levy (1983, 14) concludes that a great power must be “relatively self-sufficient with respect to security” and have the “ability to project military power beyond its borders.”
Thus, restrictions on state autonomy and power strike at the very heart of what constitutes a great power in the international system, enable the victors to chart the course for the vanquished state in the postwar era, and, thus, limit its ability to disturb the victors’ newly established international order.\textsuperscript{20} For the vanquished state, diminished autonomy implies that some options, either in the domestic or international spheres, are simply unavailable. Likewise, diminished power implies lessened ability for the defeated state to deliberately cause instability by challenging a newly established order. Decision-makers are clearly cognizant of this fact, as many war-ending settlement provisions are purposely designed to diminish the autonomy and power of defeated states in the postwar world. In short, victors seeking to ensure stability can target these essential aspects of a defeated great power.\textsuperscript{21}

Whether the margin of victory is large or small, the admission of defeat by one side means that it will lose something in the postwar period. Unlike a normal state of affairs prior to open warfare when there is uncertainty about the strength and the will of an opponent, victory in war provides a temporary advantage or opportunity to craft mechanisms designed to limit the defeated state’s ability to foment future instability.

\textsuperscript{20}This is not to say that these are the only two state interests that could be considered essential. Other scholars expand the list of core interests of states beyond power and autonomy. For example, Wendt (1999, 235-236), coming from a constructivist perspective, adds the notion of collective self-esteem to physical survival, economic well-being, and autonomy to the list of general national interests.

\textsuperscript{21}Most, if not all, of the provisions of settlements cited as extending the durability of peace by Fortna (2003), Werner (1999), Walter (1997) and others do exactly the same thing. That is, strong institutional mechanisms, third party guarantors, and other such provisions limit state’s abilities to act independently as well as often target the power of states. And while this can theoretically apply to victors as well as the vanquished – through strategic self-restraint, for example – states that lose wars are clearly much more the target of such restrictions on autonomy and power.
When one side capitulates to the will of the other, the mechanisms available to the victors are those that relate to the very core of what a state, especially a great power, will defend to the bitter end – its autonomy and power.\textsuperscript{22}

It is not the case that a loss of autonomy and power will occur only when one side imposes a settlement on the other after a decisive military outcome. When war-ending settlements that result from anything other than a perfectly symmetrical bargaining situation or a situation in which both sides simply halt the fight at the same moment without hope of resolution, costs are imposed on the losing side in the form of some loss of autonomy or power depending on the structure of the situation. Assuming that states will expect some benefits of victory, the side with the military advantage would not otherwise cease the fight. Nevertheless, both sides are agreeing to end the war rather than continuing to fight.\textsuperscript{23} By striking a bargain, the losing side is willing, though only grudgingly, to accept the costs of defeat, while the winning side captures the fruits of victory.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} Wars that end in a draw, are halted by outside intervention short of one side gaining an advantage, or ones where both participants simply quit out of exhaustion do not present a victor with an opportunity to manage a vanquished foe and are thus are not the focus of this inquiry. Asking the question of how victorious states craft prudent victory requires that I examine only wars that end with one side clearly having won, even though there can be wide variations in terms of how large victory is. This exclusion of draws or stunted conflicts does not have practical implications for the project, as great power wars since 1815 almost always end with clear winners and losers.

\textsuperscript{23} Or, as some war-termination arguments go, “there are agreements that both side prefer to accept rather than continue the fight.” (Werner 1998, 324) See also Goemans (2000), Ikle (1991), and Kecskemeti (1958).

\textsuperscript{24} This is related to the distinction between “imposed” and “negotiated” settlements mentioned above. The costs of defeat – in terms of autonomy and power – can be quite large or quite small, but there is no reason to assume that bargaining situations – or a negotiated war-ending settlement – necessarily produce more lenient or equitable war-ending settlements as durability of peace arguments such as Werner (1999) or Maoz (1984) seem to do. For example, a state that fears ultimate destruction if it continues to fight faces a situation where the choice is between literal extermination or agreeing to severe restrictions on its postwar autonomy and power. Even if it is only that the eventual loser can force the victor to pay higher costs by
Thus, when there is a clear winner and loser, all war-ending settlements – whether negotiated or imposed, guaranteed through third parties or through the brute strength of the victors, lenient or harsh – are designed to target the defeated state’s autonomy and power to some degree or another in an attempt to provide postwar stability. Nearly every provision of a war-ending settlement, whether generally lenient or harsh, can be understood in terms of how it relates to these core concepts. Territorial provisions may strip a vanquished nation of valuable resources and strategic outposts. Economic provisions may limit a defeated state’s ability to meet other financial obligations or to devote resources to the military. Military provisions can limit a defeated state’s ability to project power. Other provisions that tap into the operation of politics in the defeated state can limit its ability to act independently in the postwar world. In short, all of these potential provisions can tap into the power and autonomy of a defeated state.

Importantly, the losses of autonomy and power by the vanquished are often the very gains made by victors in the postwar world. When a state is saddled with economic reparations that limit its ability to meet other financial obligations, for example, the transfer of resources from the vanquished is most often to the victors. When forced to limit military deployments, the defeated state’s loss in potential coercive power implies a relative gain in such matters for the victors. War-ending settlements, then, are very clearly mechanisms designed to disadvantage the vanquished relative to the victors in the postwar world, and the targets of such settlements are elements that constitute important parts of a great power’s autonomy and power.

fighting on, it can still negotiate as it has some bargaining leverage. The distinction between imposed and negotiated settlements is thus misleading and in the end provides little leverage for the question of postwar stability.
In chapter three, I build upon this conceptualization of war-ending settlements to construct a measure of severity of war-ending settlements. A scale of severity allows comparison of settlements from least to most restrictive or, using the conventional terminology, lenient to punitive. The least restrictive of settlements does not curtail the autonomy and power of the vanquished state in territorial, economic, military, or political domains. The most restrictive of settlements tap into these elements, often to the point that these limitations severely curtail the power and autonomy such that certain foreign policy options are simply unavailable for consideration by the vanquished state.

Thusly understood, it becomes possible to fairly compare the logic of the conventional wisdom and alternative explanations for postwar stability. In other words, by exposing the logic of the conventional wisdom of moderation in victory and having a clear conceptualization of what types of settlements it expects to best provide stability, it is possible to explore ways in which postwar stability may follow the conventional wisdom as well as other types of settlements. This is the general task of the rest of the dissertation.

1.3 Contributions and Limitations of the Dissertation

Answering this question of what is prudence in victory is of paramount importance in both theoretical and practical realms. For international relations theory, it fills a rather conspicuous hole. There is significant theorizing on the causes of war, managing rising powers, and even the decline of hegemons, but little on how to turn
military triumph into prudent victory. Knowledge about how states manage victory to produce postwar stability can deepen international relations theorists’ understanding of cycles of war and peace in the international system.

Furthermore, given that war is often the catalyst for change in the international system, understanding how victors can craft prudent war-ending settlements may lend insight into international relations scholars’ understandings of stability and change in the international system. War often ushers in change in the international system, as states rise and fall and issues within the system wax and wane in importance. But just as war produces change, the way victors manage their triumphs also shapes the course of international politics. Prudent victors can produce long periods of stability wherein the likelihood of conflict significantly drops. An understanding of these dynamics should lead to a better grasp of how change affects the international system and the major states within it. Very much related to this, this one aspect of how victorious or dominant states construct their view of international politics in the wake of war leads to a richer understanding of one important facet of international order.

In the practical realm, since war in the international system is all too common and unlikely to vanish anytime soon, the implications of a theory of managing victory could be significant for policy related matters. With a deeper understanding of the links between the victor’s management strategies and postwar stability, the elements of a
prudent victory can be applied so that if war does occur, the postwar situation can be made more stable than the pre-war era. As such, future conflicts emanating from once defeated states may be prevented.25

Before proceeding, it is also important to note what this dissertation does not do. First the dissertation is chiefly concerned with how war-ending settlements affect the state apparatus of the vanquished, not necessarily how the people within those states are treated. A state can be severely restricted by a war-ending settlement but the people approached humanely, even generously by the victors. On the other hand, a restrictive settlement can go hand-in-hand with the brutal repression of a population. While I discuss the advantages of providing incentives to defeated states within restrictive settlements to help further the socialization process – incentives that may in fact provide material and other advantages to individuals within the defeated state – the main theoretical arguments focus on how the state as an entity is treated.

Second, the circumstances under which a restrictive war-ending settlement is the route that most likely provide postwar stability may be quite limited. Indeed, the purpose of this dissertation is to explicitly delimit these conditions. As such, even though much of the theoretical discussion centers on how restrictive settlements can work, this work is not a plea for the application of such settlements. Spelling out the conditions of when restrictive settlements provide stability implicitly details when less restrictive settlements, those that place few burdens on the vanquished state, are most likely to provide postwar stability.

25 Even if, as Mueller (1989) argues, major war between developed countries is highly unlikely, the insights from great power war-ending settlements may be germane to smaller wars where belligerents are not great powers or there is only one great power involved.
Finally, the dissertation does not examine issues of justice associated with war-ending settlements. Postwar stability and the general notion of prudence in victory are distinct from the justness of a settlement. A war-ending settlement may provide stability but be morally objectionable to all observers. On the other hand, postwar instability that paves the way for more deadly conflict may be just as objectionable. Although an indisputably important issue, it must be a secondary concern until there is a rich understanding of the link between war-ending settlements and postwar stability. Only after this is achieved can the notions of prudence in victory and the justice of war-ending settlements be considered in tandem.

1.4 Plan of the Dissertation

The rest of this work proceeds as follows. The second chapter presents the main theoretical arguments. I first examine the logic of the conventional wisdom, showing that many realists, institutionalists, and other arguments come to similar conclusions about how to achieve prudence in victory. With this as a starting point, I then construct my argument. Building upon the insight that postwar shifts in power are likely causes of instability, I discuss the importance of enforcing the war ending-settlement and, grafting insights from group cohesion literature to postwar problems, show that there are conditions under which this will happen. I then construct two models of how a restrictive settlement can lead to postwar stability: the coercion model and the coercion plus socialization model.

---

26 See Betts (1994, 31-32) on the dangers of confusing peace with justice.
In the three subsequent chapters, I take the first steps toward testing the conventional wisdom and the arguments presented here. Because there is a general lack of knowledge about war-ending settlements but a strong conventional wisdom nonetheless, I examine the universe of great power wars since 1815 in a comparative historical analysis. To ensure a reasonable comparison of all the cases, in the third chapter I develop measures of the restrictiveness of war-ending settlements and postwar stability in addition to defining the universe of cases. The fourth chapter examines great power wars from 1815 to 1905, and the fifth chapter explores the war-ending settlements stemming from the First and Second World Wars. The comparative historical analysis shows quite clearly that the conventional wisdom is, at best, underspecified. Less restrictive settlements at times produce stability, but restrictive settlements lead to postwar stability just as often. These chapters, while not providing a full test of both my models, shows that the conventional wisdom has important limitations and that there are conditions under which restrictive settlements provide postwar stability. This comparative historical analysis also provides a suitable way to choose a case for an in-depth case study to trace the causal mechanisms of the coercion plus socialization model.

Chapter six examines the treatment of West Germany after the Second World War. The extraordinarily restrictive settlement severely reduced West German autonomy and power even after the Western victors decided to rebuild the vanquished state to help balance the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the settlement was eventually legitimized as the coercion plus socialization model would predict. While multiple factors played a role in the West German transformation into a stable status quo state, including some indigenous efforts and the quick economic recovery of the defeated state, the case shows clearly that
the victors jumpstarted this process through the limitations they placed on the defeated state. In the end, the victors socialized the vanquished state to the postwar order such that postwar stability proved remarkably robust.

In the concluding chapter, I weigh the results of the empirical analysis and reexamine the theoretical contributions of the dissertation. I first point to the limitations of the conventional wisdom and highlight the critical role of socialization for war-ending settlements. Given the importance of socialization, I then discuss some of the conditions under which the socialization of a defeated state is more or less likely in light of the empirical results of the dissertation. I then present several avenues of further research related to the problem of victory. Finally, I briefly discuss the implications of the theoretical and empirical insights of the dissertation for two important contemporary cases of vanquished states.
CHAPTER 2

WHAT IS A VICTOR TO DO?

2.1 Introduction

War, especially great power war, is costly in both human and material terms. States that suffer the ravages of war, even if they emerge victorious, are often frightened by the prospect of renewed conflict.\textsuperscript{27} As such, victorious states desire to construct a war-ending settlement that will prevent the seeds of the next conflagration from germinating. This is indeed one element of a prudent victory. Though some efforts are clearly more successful than others, after every war victors attempt to manage the postwar environment, including especially the vanquished foe. The methods employed to do this have varied significantly from war to war, and the levels of stability following different wars have also varied significantly. Unfortunately, we know little about the most successful strategies.

In this chapter, I engage the extant theoretical and empirical work pertaining to postwar stability and construct my arguments regarding the conditions under which restrictive settlements may produce stability. I first explicate the conventional wisdom of

\textsuperscript{27} This has been a primary motivation for the construction of some postwar institutions. Jervis (1985) argues that because the Napoleonic Wars were so costly, the great powers of Europe were able to cooperate through the Concert of Europe. Ikenberry (2001) argues that victorious states have increasingly used international institutions to promote postwar cooperation from the Napoleonic Wars through World War II in efforts to press their wartime advantages as well as to provide stability.
moderation in victory. I show that the logic is not entirely convincing, and that some of
the cases cited as archetypes of moderation in victory actually contain restrictive
provisions – provisions that I argue may actually be evidence of the potential stability of
restrictive war-ending settlements. After exploring the conventional view, I build upon
the insight that the perpetuation of significant power differentials between former
belligerents tends to prolong periods of stability. As explained by the conventional view
and fully developed here, however, enforcement is critical for restrictive settlements to
produce stability. Given the importance of enforcement, I then show how even diversely
interested victorious states may enforce a restrictive postwar settlement, something the
conventional view holds is nearly impossible. If enforcement is ensured, I argue, postwar
stability can then follow by one of two models differentiated by the basis of action in the
defeated state. The coercion model expects that the vanquished state will respond to a
restrictive settlement through rational calculations. As such, the overwhelming power of
the victors and a lack of alternatives for the vanquished may provide extended periods of
stability, but when strategic conditions change or power shifts toward the vanquished
instability should follow as the defeated state is likely to act against the settlement if
given the opportunity. The coercion plus socialization model follows a path from the
shock or trauma of losing a war to the possibility that the victors can socialize the
defeated state such that postwar stability is eventually ensured not through coercion but
rather because the vanquished views the war-ending settlement as legitimate.
2.2 Views on Moderation in Victory

The idea that victorious states should pursue moderate, or even lenient, settlements vis-à-vis the vanquished dominates the landscape of international relations thinking on how to treat defeated states. This notion of moderation in victory conforms to the conceptualization of war-ending settlements presented in the previous chapter. That is, with moderation in victory, realists, liberals, and others imply that defeated states should not be restricted in terms of their postwar levels of autonomy or power, or at least this should not be done in too severe of a manner. This conventional wisdom, it is argued, is driven by the self-interests of the victors, not necessarily because victors should be generous and high-minded in victory or for reasons of justice.

Though generally found only in passing remarks, the balance of power guides the realist claim that it is simply a matter of self-interests, not legitimacy nor necessarily magnanimity, which force victors to approach the defeated moderately or leniently. Without moderation or leniency in victory, a severely weakened great power would create a vacuum in the postwar world. Instability would follow, as other great powers would rush to fill the void. Gulick (1955, 75) captures this logic: “statesmen have often been moderate in their studied attempts to avoid humiliating a defeated power [because] an equilibrium cannot perpetuate itself unless the major components of that equilibrium are preserved. Destroy important makeweights and you destroy the balance.”

An additional impetus to the call for moderation or leniency, a restored defeated state may be needed for balancing in postwar efforts to establish and then maintain international stability. Sheenan notes the wisdom of moderation or leniency:
The victorious states after a balance of power war should seek neither to humiliate nor to destroy their recent enemy or enemies. The reason for such ‘restraint’ is that the recently vanquished will be important counterweights in the postwar balance of power system and their presence may be essential to restrain one or more of the recent victors who subsequently aspire to a dominant role themselves. (1996, 74)

Jervis makes a similar observation: “because today’s adversary may be tomorrow’s ally, crippling [the defeated state] would be foolish … while the state would gain territory and wealth from dividing up the loser, others might gain even more, thus putting the state at a disadvantage in subsequent conflicts.” (1997, 131) Thus, the vanquished should be reintegrated or assimilated into the international system after a conflict, relatively unencumbered by desires of the victors to curtail its autonomy or power.

Beyond how the treatment of a vanquished state can affect the operation of the international system, there are other self-interested reasons for moderation or leniency in victory. Kissinger argues that when a war-ending settlement enshrines an international position that does not coincide with the reality or perception of the defeated state’s power, it is doomed to fail:

In dealing with the defeated enemy, the victors designing a peace settlement must navigate the transition from the intransigence vital to victory to the conciliation needed to achieve a lasting peace. A punitive peace mortgages the international order because it saddles the victors, drained by their wartime exertions, with the task of holding down a country determined to undermine the settlement. (1994, 81)

This concern with holding a defeated state down in the postwar world is a common one. It is argued that a restrictive settlement will, by its very nature, push the vanquished toward revisionism and the victorious powers will not be able to forever keep the vanquished state in a position of inferiority. Harsh settlements produce negative
reactions in the defeated state, making the costs of constructing and enforcing a restrictive settlement far too high. Thus, stability is at risk whenever victors attempt to restrict the autonomy and power of a defeated state.

Realist arguments, then, relying on relative power positions of the victors and the vanquished as well as the operation of the postwar international system, clearly call for moderation or even leniency toward the vanquished by victorious states. Others, coming from a slightly different perspective but still concerned with the overall stability of the international system, pursue similar logic. For example, Doran (1971), examining bids for hegemony and their aftermarts, explicitly argues that victorious states must reintegrate former would-be-hegemons as full and equal partners in international politics for postwar order construction to be successful. This will then ensure the smooth operation of the international system.\(^\text{28}\)

Along similar lines, Oren (1982) centers his argument for moderation in victory squarely upon the self-interests of victorious states. Only war-ending settlements that “skim off the cream of victory while causing the smallest possible increases in enmity on the part of the defeated” can provide for a more stable postwar environment than that one that led to war in the first place (150). Military victories that are pushed too far via restrictive or punitive settlements and provide victors with disproportionate gains turn into political disasters in the postwar world, as the vanquished will reject such settlements. Perceived to be illegitimate, enforcement of such settlements becomes

\(^{28}\) Doran (1971) calls this process assimilation and distinguishes between over- and under-assimilation of defeated states in the aftermath of war, claiming that proper assimilation is critical for the operation of the international system. While emphasizing different mechanisms, Doran’s argument is consistent with the classical balance of power notion of moderation in victory.
If war-making is like surgery, peace-making is like therapy. The victor should consciously practice political therapy on the vanquished for the sake of their mutual interests. There is no greater peril for the victor than to perceive his role and responsibilities as being unilateral. The architects of the new settlement must be able to comprehend the innermost interests of the vanquished and to empathetically assess the particular world of the defeated if he is to serve his own interests. Without possessing and manifesting such capabilities, the victor will fail to defer a new round of warfare, which is, after all, the absolute minimum required of him. (150-151)

If a war-ending settlement too severely alters its international position, the vanquished may feel desperation and turn to violence to overthrow the settlement.29 Thus, constructing settlements that are moderate or even lenient toward the vanquished – where the postwar era can be construed as legitimate by both the victors and the vanquished – is the most prudent course to follow.

Those relying on institutionalist logic also suggest that moderation in victory is the most sensible approach toward the defeated. In a study of the major peace settlements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Ikenberry (2001) argues that victorious states have increasingly used international institutions to successfully construct stable postwar orders. Leading states, through the use of binding institutions that constrain the powerful as well as the weak, construct lasting and stable postwar orders by employing the notion of strategic restraint. Victorious states, by this logic, have an

---

29 Oren (163) specifically cites very disadvantaged defeated states or other actors turning to tactics such as terrorism as a way in which the less powerful will attempt to redress their status.
interest in restraining their own power through “constitutional” means where the arbitrary use of power by the leading state is held in check and weaker states are given a stake in the continuation of the order itself. Weaker states, by this method, are provided with few incentives to disrupt the order. Moreover, weaker states may also be induced to support the system with material benefits distributed by the hegemon’s order. A binding constitutional order, where the gains made by the victorious states are limited and weaker states are simultaneously rewarded and freed of the fear of domination or abandonment, thus lends a sort of legitimacy to the desired order of the victorious leading state and is most likely to provide postwar stability.

Though concerned with the construction of the postwar orders more than the explicit treatment of defeated states, the notion of moderation in victory shines clearly through in this logic. Weaker states, including the defeated state, must be presented with a settlement that does not provide disproportionate benefits to the victor(s) at the expense of the weaker or defeated states nor one that restricts the power and autonomy of only the weaker or defeated states in the postwar era. That is, moderation in victory by way of a settlement that does not restrict the power or autonomy of the defeated state more so than the victorious state is the most prudent course to follow to achieve postwar stability.

Enforcement of war-ending settlements, moreover, is made easier with institutions that limit both sides after a conflict according to this perspective. Ikenberry (2001) claims that leading states face fewer enforcement costs when they pursue strategic restraint. Others echo this sentiment. Fortna (2003) contends that strong institutional structures within cease-fire agreements that bind both sides to an agreement are likely to last longer than others. That is, strong institutions raise the costs of breaking an
agreement, reduce uncertainty about other’s intentions, and help to prevent or control accidents. Walter (1997), highlighting the role of third parties in providing guarantees, argues that these mechanisms can prolong the peace, even among notoriously intractable conflicts such as civil wars. In sum, institutionalist arguments provide an avenue to postwar stability whereby victors bind defeated states as well as themselves with strong mechanism to prevent one side or the other from reneging and possibly violently disturbing postwar stability. Thus, possible sources of conflict between the former belligerents are, as much as possible anyway, muted and enforcement costs of such settlements are reduced.

Though coming from very different starting points, the above realists, institutionalists, and others arrive at a similar conclusion. Leniency toward the defeated, or at a minimum not taking away too much from the vanquished, breeds legitimacy in the postwar order and treatment of the defeated state. Harsh settlements, ostensibly such as the one imposed on Germany after World War I, fail to provide postwar stability as they create a desire within the defeated state to overthrow perceived illegitimate settlements as quickly as possible (Holsti 1991). Only war-ending settlements that take into account the interests of both the victors and the vanquished in terms of power, autonomy, and gains in the postwar world stand a chance of providing stability. The self-interests of the victors, in terms of postwar stability, are best served by the construction of moderate settlements that are perceived as legitimate.
2.3 Is Moderation or Leniency the Path to Postwar Stability?

Though there are differences in the approaches, most mainstream international relations scholarship holds to the notion that moderation or leniency in victory is the most predictable path to postwar stability. While the conventional wisdom may be intuitively and even morally pleasing, upon closer examination there are at least two general issues that make this position less than satisfying.

The first is that the notion that the defeated state itself is often the source of pre-war instability and the main force driving the system to war is often glossed over. Without some sort of alteration to this state or its position in the international system, a defeated state that is handed a settlement that does not restrict its autonomy or power could simply resume the activity that encouraged international instability in the first place.³⁰ While the idea of moderation is supposed to quell this urge in the defeated state according to all perspectives propounding it, leniency or moderation does not necessarily have to address the issues between states driving them toward conflict. Moreover, there is nothing that guarantees a state will accept even a lenient settlement as legitimate if it has not achieved its goals. Thus it could still be the object of revisionism. Because of this,

---
³⁰ This is clear even in Ikenberry’s (2001) argument regarding the use of international institutions. For Ikenberry, the most successful postwar strategies involved the greatest degree of institutional binding. However, Ikenberry’s most successful case in these terms – the settlement of World War II – bound the defeated states to the settlement only after there was a forced regime change in the vanquished states, among other important restrictions placed on the defeated state. For a critique of Ikenberry’s perspective focusing on issues of power in a different light, see Schweller (2001).
moderation or leniency may provide only a brief respite until the defeated state can recoup its strength for another round of fighting. If this is the case, the expense of war is for naught.\textsuperscript{31}

On a systemic level, it seems that those relying on the operation of the international system in their calls for moderation in victory claim that any change is inherently destabilizing. By not altering the status of a defeated state, the conventional wisdom is implicitly calling for the reestablishment of the same international system that launched into war. If the structure of the international system and specifically the autonomy and power of the defeated state are changed too radically, so the logic of the balance of power implies, this change itself can usher in a new era of instability.\textsuperscript{32} But if the dynamics of the international system that led to war are not altered, it is hard to see how the system should be more stable with the second manifestation than it was with the first.

The second general issue is that no matter the wisdom of moderation or leniency, victorious states are not likely to simply accept postwar stability as the sole prize for fighting a war. War may sometimes pose an existential threat, and this is surely a

\textsuperscript{31} This criticism echoes the “peace through empire” notion presented by Aron (1966). That is, if there is not a significant change in the relationship between the victors and the vanquished in the postwar world, another round of conflict is not long in coming. Moreover, as others argue, a defeated state must be forever altered by the loss of the war, either through suffering a staggering defeat (Hensel 1994) or through a harsh settlement (Blainey 1973), or instability is likely to follow. Kissinger (1994, 81-82) is one of the few advocates of the moderation view to explicitly claim that changes in the defeated state may be necessary before it can be fully assimilated into the postwar system.

\textsuperscript{32} For example, Gullick (1955) stresses the importance of the maintenance of a balance of power system in the postwar era where the defeated state is fully reintegrated and Doran (1971) specifically points to the dangers of under- or over-assimilation, where the defeated state is not controlled or where the defeated state is eliminated as a great power actor, respectively. This latter aspect of Doran’s account essentially implies that radical change is disturbing to the operation of the international system and instability will follow over-assimilation.
singular motivation to endure the costs of such activity. But states that emerge victorious
from war have the ability to secure certain gains well beyond mere survival. While
postwar stability is important, especially after exhaustive episodes of conflict, states will
attempt to maximize their gains from war. These gains must be made at the expense of
another state and the vanquished foe is the logical choice. The wisdom of this policy is
not always clear, and in fact may hinge upon on a number of other factors discussed
below. Nevertheless, states have dual ambitions when faced with victory – the promotion
of postwar stability and the maximization of their postwar power and influence.

It may be useful to consider the most often cited case of a successful war-ending
settlement that ostensibly followed the maxim of moderation in victory. Balance of
power theorists claim the treatment of post-Napoleonic France as an exemplar of
moderation, as France was relatively quickly allowed to regain its status as a great power
with wide ranging interest and responsibilities. However, other seemingly punitive
aspects of the 1815 settlement with France are largely ignored. The destruction or
confiscation of French fortifications and the strategic territorial amputations provided for
in the settlement, for example, were intended to curtail French power and provide buffers

---

33 Labs (1997) shows that states do tend to expand their war-aims during a conflict. In the aftermath of
victory, it is thus not only possible that states will attempt to act on these expanded aims but probably very
likely.

34 In fact, the realist version of the conventional wisdom seems to be built almost exclusively upon this one
important case. See, for example, Gulick (1955). The victors in this case assimilated France back into the
international system even after its drive for European hegemony and, with France as a vital member, it is
argued, the Concert of Europe helped to provide European stability for nearly a half a century. Those that
point to the failure of 1919 tend to highlight the differences between that case and the war-ending
settlement of 1815. See Kissinger (1994, 81).
to neighboring states. Moreover, the conditions of peace required that a Bourbon retake the French throne, with the hope that a politically re-made France would be friendlier to its neighbors. Additionally, the gains made by the victors and other states – though they may have been relatively small – were largely extracted from a vanquished France. This settlement, then, placed fairly significant restrictions on the defeated state and provided for some limited benefits to the victors in addition to postwar stability. In the end, such significant alteration to the vanquished state makes it difficult see how 1815 actually closely followed the conventional view.

Though the 1815 case may not have been a perfect case of moderation in victory, the logic of such an approach toward the defeated may still make sense under certain conditions. Lenient settlements, where the defeated state is not restricted in power or autonomy, may now and again provide for postwar stability for exactly the reasons noted by the conventional view. However, the criticisms leveled against the conventional view as well as the problems illustrated by the 1815 case may point to certain, unrealized scope conditions for the moderation in victory proposition. The questions are under what conditions should less restrictive settlements lead to postwar stability, and when can more restrictive settlements that provide some benefits to the victors do the same thing? In the next section, I begin to spell-out the conditions under which restrictive settlements can lead to postwar stability and thus start to better define the range of activities states can pursue to turn military success into prudent victory.

35 Towle (1997, 36-50) examines all of the elements of the 1815 settlement and notes the general lack of interest by scholars in these particular provisions.
2.4 Beyond Moderation in Victory

Though the logic is at times compelling, there are clearly shortcomings in the conventional wisdom. Addressing these shortcomings provides a means to step beyond them and expose the conditions under which more restrictive settlements may provide stability. Expanding the range of interests victors pursue to include both the construction of a stable postwar system and the maximization of postwar gains provides one way to see a prudent victory as something that is beyond simple leniency or moderation toward the vanquished. This flows from the idea that military victory followed by a hollow yet stable postwar era – one where the fruits of victory are not enjoyed – may not necessarily be a prudent use of victory. That is, when victorious states are able to, they will attempt to turn hard-fought military victories into tangible postwar political gains by sometimes constructing a restrictive war-ending settlement. The important question is: how do states do this and simultaneously achieve postwar stability?

2.4.1 Postwar Power Gaps

The significance of the gap in capabilities between the victors and the vanquished in the immediate postwar period is often cited as influencing war-settlement bargaining.

---

This is in line with the claim made above that states will expand when they can after war. For various arguments that claim states will expand when the environment presents the opportunity to do so, see Gilpin (1981), Labs (1997), Mearsheimer (2001), Schweller (2001), and Zakaria (1998).
leverage between the belligerents.\textsuperscript{37} This, however, applies not only to the terms of a settlement. The continuation (or not) of similar gap in capabilities between the former belligerents has a major impact upon the stability of the postwar system.\textsuperscript{38} If victors are able to perpetuate a large gap in capabilities between themselves and their defeated foes, the harder it should be for a vanquished state to challenge the settlement. Since by definition victorious states have shown themselves to be more powerful than the losing state, as long as both sides continue to recognize this fact stability should follow (Blainey 1973, 162-164). Restrictive settlements, then, may provide stability when the measures implemented to keep the defeated state in a position of subservience perpetuates the postwar gap in power between the victors and the vanquished. If power shifts toward the vanquished, postwar stability is threatened.\textsuperscript{39}

The potential stability of a restrictive settlement is significant in as much as this type of outcome for the vanquished may provide the victorious state or states the greatest benefit in terms of status, wealth, or power in the new postwar system. Victorious states are likely to gain the very benefits lost by the defeated state through restrictive

\textsuperscript{37} Bueno de Mesquita and Siverson (1997) find that power differences along with regime type determine how winners treat losers. Werner (1998) shows that bargaining leverage, measured as power differences, significantly influences the terms of the settlement. Goemans (2000) argues that power calculations and regime type will determine war-termination. The notion of a power gap is essential even for institutionalist arguments regarding postwar orders. Ikenberry (2001, 72-79) argues that the willingness and ability of a leading state to pursue a “constitutional order” in the postwar period is dependent on the postwar power gap. While Ikenberry also claims that the democratic nature of the leading state will affect the provision of binding a constitutional, notice that a large power-gap is a necessary condition for a victorious state to implement its designs for postwar order.

\textsuperscript{38} Werner (1999) finds that changes in relative power in postwar eras have a significant impact on the durability of peace. When there is a large power shift between former belligerents the incentives to alter the terms of a settlement become larger.

\textsuperscript{39} Power preponderance theorists argue that war or instability is least likely when the distribution of power is highly concentrated in one actor. When power becomes more diffuse or de-concentrated, instability and war are much more likely. See, for example, Gilpin (1981) and Organski and Kugler (1980).
settlements.\textsuperscript{40} If the situation that allowed for these restrictive measures can be perpetuated, the dual imperatives of a prudent victory – maximizing the benefits of military victory and achieving postwar stability – can be realized.

This, however, does not necessarily diminish the role of a defeated state highlighted by balance of power theorists. The resources of a defeated state may still be important to prevent power imbalances and can be harnessed for the purposes of international system stability. It would require, however, that the defeated state be bound to the victor(s) in such a way that it cannot challenge the war-ending settlement and/or is presented with few incentives to do so.\textsuperscript{41} The power gap between the victors and the vanquished can be exploited to keep the state down though still utilizing it as a makeweight. Importantly, this type of exploitation of relative power positions for the purposes of postwar stability and political gain for the victors requires enforcement.

Enforcement is a key sticking point for many proponents of moderation in victory. Indeed, it is often argued that the costs of enforcing a restrictive or harsh settlement will outweigh any benefits to the victors; it is therefore likely that even if attempts to enforce such settlements are made, they will quickly lapse. This may be especially problematic when enforcement requires that a victorious wartime coalition

\textsuperscript{40} Schweller (2001, 173-174) makes the point that victors will fill the void left by defeated states.

\textsuperscript{41} This is distinct from a credible commitment argument where both sides are bound to an agreement. For Ikenberry (2001), one of the issues is how to bind both the victors and the vanquished to a postwar order. In addition, Fortna (2003) argues that because of the problem of credibly committing to international agreements especially after conflict strong agreements that contain provisions that decrease the incentives to defect or increase the incentives to comply will provide for a more durable peace. In the case of a settlement that limits the autonomy and power of a defeated state and provides gains to the victor, however, it is not that both sides would prefer to cooperate but are concerned that the other will cheat. Rather, it is that the victorious state attempts to take from the vanquished the ability to cheat on or revise the agreement.
maintain cooperation in the postwar era. However, there are conditions under which even victorious coalitions are likely to maintain the levels of enforcement necessary to turn a restrictive settlement into a stable postwar outcome.

2.4.2 Enforcement of Restrictive Settlements: Postwar Threat and Victor Unity

If the restrictions on a defeated state’s autonomy and power are few or nonexistent, victors may not need to worry about enforcing the settlement because they require little behavior alteration from the vanquished state. Indeed, this consideration can drive the construction of a lenient settlement. That is, victors that do not want to enforce restrictions on the defeated state in the postwar era build a settlement that requires little or no enforcement. When dealing with restrictive settlements, however, enforcement is critically important. Because restrictive settlements tap the defeated state’s autonomy and power, it is likely that, as the moderation in victory stance points out, such war-ending settlements will produce resentment in the defeated state and drive actions from the vanquished to alter the postwar status quo. At a minimum, such a settlement will produce more points of contention between the victors and the vanquished than a less restrictive one.

When a war is dyadic in nature, some problems of enforcement may not be present. War-ending settlements that result from such wars may be inherently more likely to be enforced. The victor of a dyadic war, facing a defeated enemy alone, would not necessarily have to take into account the potentially divisive interests of other states in the postwar era, at least in terms of how to deal with the vanquished. Thus, if enjoying a
large postwar power gap and the ability to impose a restrictive settlement, a single victorious state is likely to follow-up with enforcement of the war-ending settlement. Since there are a number of victorious states, the potential divergent interests among allies when time comes to deal with the vanquished state make settlements emanating from coalitional wars more problematic to enforce. A restrictive settlement can lead to postwar stability only when all or most victorious allies are willing to undertake the charge of maintaining the restrictions on the defeated state’s postwar autonomy and power. In short, a certain degree of unity among victorious allies is required.

This notion of unity or cohesion can be a factor of critical importance for the effectiveness of an alliance. That unity or cohesion among the victors can help to promote postwar stability certainly follows. Indeed, unity or cohesion among allies is often cited as key to underwriting a stable postwar era. The formation of the Quadruple Alliance to help enforce the settlements stemming from 1815 is often contrasted to the lack of unity among the victors regarding the Versailles settlement. The initial postwar unity of the allies in the first episode helped to provide stability as the measures designed to prevent the resurgence of an aggressive France could be enforced through allied cooperation, whereas this did not exist in period between the World Wars.

42 See, for example, Liska (1962, 61-115).

43 See, for example, Kissinger (1994, 78-102) for this type of argument. Though this example, I argue, is factually correct, it does not seem consistent with the conventional wisdom of the 1815 settlement. Whereas the harsh 1919 Treaty of Versailles would have demanded that the victors enforce the settlement, if the 1815 Second Treaty of Paris was so moderate and perceived as truly legitimate by the victors and vanquished alike, it should not have required all that much enforcement.

41
However, there is no guarantee that a victorious coalition will remain unified in the postwar period. Given the importance of enforcement to the stability of a restrictive settlement, the crucial questions are what factors drive victors to enforce a settlement and what can push the victorious state unity required for effective enforcement? One possibility is how threat, or the perception of threat, affects group unity and cohesion.

As Coser (1956) points out, threat of conflict or conflict itself can have varying effects on groups. He plainly argues, “The degree of group consensus prior to the outbreak of the conflict seems to be the most important factor affecting cohesion. If a group is lacking in basic consensus, outside threat leads not to increased cohesion, but to general apathy, and the group is consequently threatened with disintegration.” (92-93)

A potentially disparate group such as an alliance of autonomous states may not stand the test of being a cohesive group expected to act in unity even during war. Indeed, Coser intended much his argument for smaller groups such as radical sects, political parties, or, on the largest scale, individual nation-states. While these groups should be expected to be more cohesive than a group of victorious states – states that would certainly have more divergent interests than, say, an individual political party – there are at least two reasons that it may be appropriate to graft Coser’s insights to the issue of war-time alliances and then consider implications for the postwar era.

---

44 In terms of scale, one of the largest examples Coser raises are the societal responses in Britain and France to the Nazi threat, where the British did seem to unify and French society fractured (93-94).

45 Applying Coser’s insights to problems in international politics is nothing new. See Levy (1989) for applications in diversionary theory of war, as well as Christensen (1996) and Schweller (2004) for other applications.
First, some degree of cohesion is required for the type of joint political and military action required to be successful in coalition war. If a group of states drawn together for the purposes of war were not cohesive beforehand, it is likely the trials of war will help to form at least some minimal level of cohesion and unity among the victors in at least some realms. Second, war, especially great power war, is a time of incredible threat in the international system. As such, states facing a common threat are likely drawn together into an at least somewhat cohesive group with a minimal common goal of surviving. Even if there are some divergent issues between allies, a threat as immense as a great power war – and the possibility of losing it – can at times cause allies to coalesce around a single purpose. This notion of common threat bringing states together for the purposes of self-preservation is common in international relations scholarship and historical examples of such instances abound.

Thus, allies can form into a unified or cohesive group during war as common threat and the necessity of joint military action force the issue. Whether this potential unity or cohesion extends into the postwar world, however, is quite another question and


47 This does not mean that there will not be internal conflict between allies during wartime. As Weitsman (2004, 31-33) argues, wartime alliances may have even more instances of conflict than peace-time alliances because states are forced to reckon with their alliance commitments, such as providing mutual assistance, burden sharing for the common defense, and coordinating on war-time strategies.

48 Coser approvingly quotes Winston Churchill’s reflection on the effects of the First World War on British and world society. Churchill saw even disparate nations unified in a common purpose: “The former peace-time structure of society had been … superceded and life had been raised to a strange intensity by the war spell. Under that mysterious influence, men and women had been appreciably exalted above death and pain and toil. Unities and comradeships had become possible between men and classes and nations and grown stronger while the hostile pressure and the common cause endured.” (1956, 90, emphasis added)

49 This is clearly stated in Walt’s (1987) balance of threat theory. For an empirical evaluation of common threat driving alliances for security purposes, see Fritz and Sweeney (2004/05). It should be noted, however, that alliances are not driven by security threats alone. In general, common interests drive alliances, be they for security or profit. See Schweller (1994, 1998).
indeed the most important one at hand. The issue here is how the unique situation of victory in war – where victorious states attempt to maximize the benefits won through battle and ensure postwar stability – positions victors to view the international system and their individual roles within it in similar ways and perceived similar threats.

The most common view is that there is little reason for victorious allies to remain unified after the threat of war is extinguished. After all, defensive alliances are mainly driven by the desire to preserve what states already have. But once victory is achieved, there is little need to preserve an alliance among diversely interested states. Most defensive alliances formed by the unifying affects of conflict are thus less cohesive than alliances formed for other reasons and are likely to crumble when the threat dissipates.50

However, a potentially looming threat is the resurgence of the defeated state as a revisionist power. This threat of the defeated state disturbing postwar stability can keep allies together in order to promote post-settlement enforcement of the provisions levied against the defeated state.51 Enforcement itself, however, is a costly activity for states. It requires significant devotion of resources to monitor the vanquished state’s behavior as

50 Coser (1956, 148-149). Wolfers (1962, 29) claims that with defensively oriented alliances, “any diminution of external threat or of the will to meet it will tend to undermine cohesion and render futile any attempts to save the alliance by inward-directed ‘diversion’.”

51 Costs of enforcement of restrictive settlements would be the same for victors of dyadic wars, but clearly the issue of alliance unity or cohesion may not be present. In this instance, the threat that the single victor perceives emanating from the vanquished in the postwar period that would largely determine enforcement levels.
well as maintaining readiness to use force if necessary. If, however, the perceived threat from the defeated state is great enough, victors will be more likely to undertake such a burden.\(^{52}\)

Even if the threat of instability outweighs the costs of enforcement to individual states, it is almost a given that there will be divergent interests among victorious allies and this could impede enforcement. But if the perceived postwar threat emanating from the vanquished state is severe enough, as well as common to all members of a victorious coalition, these can be overcome. In fact, a degree of conflict internal to the victorious coalition may signify the importance of the issue.\(^{53}\) Inter-allied squabbles over the proper course of action in managing a defeated state or competing visions of the postwar order in general or not, this implies that as long as the victorious states agree that the defeated state itself is a great threat to postwar stability they can still act to enforce a war-ending settlement.

In the end, it may reasonable to expect the victorious states to identify the defeated state as a likely source of instability and thus focus on this potential common threat to the peace. After all, great power war is very costly, and the victors will certainly not forget the course of the war in the postwar period. Blainey identifies just such a

\(^{52}\) The costs of enforcing a restrictive settlement are not unlike the costs of balancing a potential aggressor. Generally, states will eschew the costly activity of balancing because of the resources it requires. See Schweller (1994, 1998) and Sweeney and Fritz (2004). States most likely undertake costly balancing behavior when they are faced with a significant threat. See Fritz and Sweeney (2004/2005). In both the case of balancing aggressors and postwar situations where the defeated state is perceived as a potential aggressor, the devotion of resources to costly activities is driven mainly by threat.

\(^{53}\) Coser writes, “Lack of consensus or lack of solidarity is not synonymous with divergencies and conflicts within the group. If the group reacts to outside threat by inner divergencies over the conduct of the conflict, it indicates that the issue at stake is important enough for the group members to fight about among themselves. This is quite different from the situation in which the members simply do not care about and remain indifferent to the outside threat.” (1956, 93)
development after the three systemic wars since the nineteenth century, claiming that, "the victors remained nervous that the main defeated nation might ultimately rise again … such fears helped to retain some unity among the victors of the previous war." This dynamic can, at times, lead victorious states to take on the costly endeavor of enforcing a war-ending settlement.

The degree of threat posed by the defeated state to the victors may be only one aspect of postwar allied unity, but it is an important one nonetheless. Even if there is significant divergence on other issues, this common identification of the defeated state as a likely source of instability or not may be crucial for the postwar period. Moreover, this dynamic is much more intense when victorious states devise restrictive settlements for the defeated state. Unless other fundamental and inalterable changes occur within the state itself, a vanquished state will not forever remain powerless. A settlement that is intended to permanently curtail the power and autonomy of a vanquished foe thus requires those that impose the settlement not to deviate from it. If there is little cohesion among the victorious powers as to the perception of the threat in the postwar world emanating from the vanquished, a defeated state may be able to take advantage of these fractures between the allies to skirt the provisions of the settlement. In this situation, a less restrictive settlement where the defeated state is not prone to resent the actions of the victors and is thus given less reason to challenge the settlement is likely to prove more stable.

54 Blainey (1973, 119). Blainey (119-120) further claims that a wariness of the defeated state can also sometimes lead to a lessening of tensions among the victorious allies, as well as possibly strengthening the links that the allies had formed during the war. This, however, is dependent upon a number of factors. For example, war provides a way to measure power not only between belligerents, but also between allies. Through fighting, the relative capabilities of all actors are exposed, as are intentions. Calculations based upon this may (or may not) attenuate victor unity in the postwar period.
However important this variable is, there are likely other factors that will drive each victorious state’s perception of threat in the postwar world, many of which may be specific to individual states. For one, victorious states’ position within the system vis-à-vis the defeated state will help to define what is threatening and what is not in the postwar world. If a victory is viewed as a Pyrrhic one, where the costs of victory are tantamount to those of defeat, then clearly all states in the system – other victors, non-belligerents, and the defeated state – may be perceived as a threat to postwar stability and the exhausted victor’s own position within the system. Those states that do not suffer such high costs of victory or have the capacity to overcome such costs may not view the defeated state in the same way. In this sense, the position of each victorious state vis-à-vis the defeated state – and possibly among the victorious states themselves as well – may provide different conceptions of threat in the postwar era. A victorious state geographically closer to the defeated state will be more likely to view the defeated state as a potential future threat to its own security as well as to overall postwar stability.\textsuperscript{55} Victorious states that share a history of conflict with the vanquished will also likely see the defeated state as a potential threat, no matter how much the defeated state lost in the war.\textsuperscript{56}

While the level of commonly perceived threat a defeated state poses should drive allied unity or disunity in many instances, it is likely that there are other potential factors that the victorious allies may coalesce (or not) around in the postwar world, potentially

\textsuperscript{55} Geography has long been a component of threat for most international relations theorists. For discussions of the geographic proximity and threat, see Walt (1987, 23-24) and Mearsheimer (2001, 44).

\textsuperscript{56} For examples of work on international rivalry, specifically the dynamics of rivalry and the propensities of rivals to fight, see Bennett (1998) and Diehl and Goertz (2000).
affecting the enforcement and thus stability of restrictive war-ending settlements. For example, victorious states may diverge in their perceptions of the feasibility, wisdom, or fairness of settlement after the fact. If so, enforcement issues may become objects of debate. Because there will always be some differences between victorious allies, minor rifts that originate during tough negotiations to form the settlement itself could turn into huge gulfs in the postwar period. A divergence of understandings among the victorious states would certainly reduce any unity in enforcing a restrictive settlement if this divergence leads to differing interpretations of how the defeated state should be treated. Moreover, just as ideological similarity among victors may drive unity in purpose, on the opposite end ideological dissimilarity could drive disunity and thus threaten enforcement efforts. That is, even a grave threat to postwar stability may not be enough to keep wartime allies together if there is a huge ideological gulf between two victorious states.\(^{57}\)

Though there are potentially many factors that drive threat perceptions, the extent of threat a defeated state poses to a coalition and to the individual member states of that coalition is likely to drive coalition unity and thus enforcement of a war-ending settlement. But if the enforcement of a restrictive settlement is ensured, postwar stability can follow. This is a critical point. Demonstrating that enforcement is possible counters the conventional view that restrictive settlements will almost never be enforced because of the associated costs. As such, it lays the foundation for the two routes to postwar stability with a restrictive settlement.

\(^{57}\) Ideological affinity is something often cited as driving the formation of alliances. See, for example, Barnett (1996). Moreover, regime type – usually in terms of democracy versus non-democracy – can drive alliance formation as well. See, for example, Gaubatz (1996), Leeds (1999), Siverson and Emmons (1991). If these factors can drive alliances, certainly they can play a part in the dissolution of alliances as well.
2.5 On the Acceptance of Restrictive Settlements

When the perceived threat emanating from a defeated state drives victors to enforce a restrictive war-ending settlement, there are two distinct paths by which postwar stability can follow. While both are initially made possible by a large postwar power gap and enforcement of a restrictive settlement by the victors, the defeated state’s reaction to the postwar status quo can be viewed through the lens of two different bases or motivations for action. The coercion and the coercion plus socialization models imply different behavioral implications and thus different foundations of postwar stability following the implementation of a restrictive settlement.58

2.5.1 The Coercion Model

This route to postwar stability relies on acceptance of the war-ending settlement by the defeated state only out of necessity. Stability based on this sort of acceptance of a restrictive settlement by a defeated state persists only to the point that the victors maintain power advantages over the vanquished. Nevertheless, if a power-gap between the victors and the vanquished can be maintained through enforcement of the settlement, there are at least two causal links that provide reasons to believe restrictive settlements can produce stability based simple coercion.

First, a position of subservience, even if this treatment is felt to be unjust, is likely to produce in the defeated state a lack of willingness to challenge the status quo. That is, if the defeated state perceives that it cannot reasonably effect change in its postwar status

---

58 These two models are in part based on Mann’s (1970) distinction between pragmatic and normative acceptance and March and Olsen’s (1998) distinction between action driven by a logic of expected consequences and action driven by a logic of appropriateness.
because it lacks the capabilities to challenge the victors, it is not likely to engage in such activities. The defeated state may perceive itself to be relatively deprived of its proper status and position in the international system due to its loss in the war and the treatment meted out by the victors, but it can do nothing about it and thus will not waste scarce resources in futile attempts to alter the postwar status quo.

Second, if a state attempts to alter the settlement but is thwarted by the more powerful victor, possibly even suffering severe consequences because of its action, it may be very unlikely to do so again in the future. Essentially, this can be equated with the efficacy of punishment. The effects of negative sanction for revisionist acts, however, may depend on the severity of the punishment following the deed. It may also depend upon the certainty of the punishment. If the victors enforce the restrictive settlement – meaning they consistently respond to acts of revision by the defeated state – it is likely to

59 Harkavy (2000, 362) proposes this, based on a suggestion from Harold Laswell’s observations of overwhelmingly defeated states. This resembles Nietzsche’s notion of ressentiment, where actors may have great anger toward their oppressors but are powerless to take retaliatory action and thus continue to suffer their fates. See Nietzsche (1956[1887]) and Meltzer and Musolf (2002).

60 Social psychological research has shown that individuals that are part of a relatively deprived group will not attempt to change the status quo unless there is a reasonable chance for success. When there is potential to effect change, collective action is likely. However, if individuals are able to achieve upward mobility alone, they are likely to engage in this solo activity though still perceive, and maybe even more so, that their group is relatively deprived. For an overview of relative deprivation and collective action, see Brewer and Brown (1998, 571-573). For applications of relative deprivation to intra- and interstate conflict, see Gurr (1970).

61 The notion of punishment most often manifest itself in international relations literature as deterrence. See, for example, Downs (1989), George and Smoke (1974), Jervis (1989) and Schelling (1960; 1966). Nossal (1989), in manner different than deterrence theory, engages punishment as a motivation for applying international sanctions.
lead to compliance by the defeated state. That is, the negative consequences of revisionism will lead a defeated state that does not have the capabilities to match the victor to adhere to the structure of a restrictive settlement.

These links between a large postwar power gap and compliance by the defeated state can thus both be seen as simple rational calculations by the defeated state based on the victors’ coercive power. The first, however, is a reaction of the defeated state to being ineffectual. Powerlessness can bring complacency, and only efforts to alter the situation that have a reasonable chance of success will even be attempted. Thus, the only requirement for this to produce postwar stability – or at least to minimize attempts to revise restrictive settlements – is for the victors to perpetuate their power advantage. The second, however, requires an active response by the victors at every instance of revisionism by the defeated state. Otherwise, a restrictive settlement is likely to be challenged with increasingly bold moves by the vanquished. Both causal pathways to postwar stability, however, can be broken. When the defeated state feels empowered to make changes or when it can withstand or even resist attempts by the victors to punish challenges, instability is likely to follow. In short, when the defeated state can, it will resist a restrictive settlement if the only mechanism driving acceptance by the vanquished is coercion.

---

62 Lukenbill (1982) finds that when a real possibility of severe punishment for non-compliance is perceived, individuals are much more likely to comply with a coercer’s demands. Molm (1997) finds that in social exchange networks coercive power or punishment (if used) is at least as effective (possibly even more so) as positive reinforcement when the interaction is continuous and punishment is consistent for behavior considered deviant. This presents challenges to the long-standing popular view on the inefficiency of punishment to produce desired behavioral changes, epitomized by Skinner (1938). However, researchers have long observed the effectiveness of punishment in social interactions. See Molm (1997, 44-55) for an accounting of the views on punishment.

63 Or, as Mann (1970) puts it, compliance is gained because no realistic alternative is perceived.
When exogenous factors such as natural disasters, a demographic plunge, or exhaustion of capabilities to the point of extinction are not present, a perpetuation of the power gap depends upon enforcement by the victors. But the rub is that power is dynamic, and defeated states may not be forever powerless even if enforcement is stringent. The vanquished is likely to recover from defeat, even devastating defeat, possibly to the point that it can regain significant power and therefore its ability to challenge the postwar status quo. Because of this and the issues associated with enforcement of restrictive settlements, postwar stability based on this logic may be inherently fragile. As such, if there are factors beyond enforcement that would prohibit the perpetuation of a power gap that would favor the victors, it may be more prudent to pursue moderation or leniency in victory.

But even if enforcement guarantees the perpetuation of a favorable power gap for the victors, the costs of enforcing a restrictive settlement may be exceptional and, in the end, possibly even quite inefficient. Though postwar stability based on the coercion model may be achieved even over very long periods of time, “if a social system relies at base on coercion to motivate compliance with its rules, we would expect to see enormous resources devoted to enforcement and surveillance and low levels of compliance when the enforcing agent is not looking.”\textsuperscript{64} But in the end, if the defeated state is perceived to be significantly threatening in the postwar era and coercion is thought to be the only way to preserve postwar stability, victors may still willingly incur these high costs and

\textsuperscript{64}Hurd (1999, 383-384). This is one of the logics, though differently stated, that leads the conventional wisdom to call for moderation or even leniency in victory. For example, Ikenberry (2001, 52) argues that democratic hegemons increasingly relied more on constitutional ordering systems than coercion-based system at major postwar junctures in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries at least in part because they are less costly.
potential inefficiencies. If so, postwar stability can then follow as a defeated state will accept, at least grudgingly, its treatment at the hands of the victors as well as its place in the international system as it would be futile to do otherwise.

2.5.2 The Coercion Plus Socialization Model

If coercion is somehow replaced as the main enforcing agent, a war-ending settlement may become much less susceptible to breaking down. Stability based on the internalization of norms stemming from a process of socialization that transforms the vanquished state is likely to be much more robust. In essence, this process of socialization imbues a fundamentally new political identity in the vanquished state, one that comports with the victor’s vision of the postwar era. If the socialization process is thorough enough and the new identity and norms are fully internalized, the vanquished state is fundamentally redefined such that it would not act against the war-ending settlement because it is perceived as the legitimate order. The process and result of socialization highlights a route to stability in postwar situations with restrictive settlements that is more likely to endure than stability that is the product of coercion.

---

65 See, for example, Berger and Luckman (1966), Mann (1970), Parsons (1951), and, Weber (1978) on how the process and result of the internalization of norms, rules, or procedures is a critical underpinning of a stable social system.

66 By socialization, I mean “the process by which identities and interests get formed.” (Wendt 1999, 170) There are, of course, other ways to define socialization. Ikenberry and Kupchan build on the ideas of Sigel (1965) to define socialization as “a process of learning in which norms and ideals are transmitted from one party to another.” (1991, 289)

67 Mann (1970, 425) terms such a process normative acceptance, where “the individual internalizes the moral expectations of the ruling class and views his own inferior position as legitimate.” See also March and Olsen (1998) on the logic of appropriateness.
This is quite different from postwar stability based on rational calculations or as a reaction to coercion. Actors that follow rules based on rational calculations are likely to attempt alterations to the status quo when the situation no longer suits their needs. Or, in the case when an actor perceived their place within the postwar order as subservient or inferior and they can resist the victor’s coercive capabilities and thus improve their situation, they will attempt to do so. But if socialization occurs and identities, norms, rules, and procedures are fully internalized by actors, legitimacy is achieved. As such, even if a situation could be viewed as illegitimate from an outside perspective, the actor perceives the status quo as legitimate and values it position within it. Because socialization implies that some sort of identity change has occurred and identity dictates what courses of action are available, what rules and procedures are appropriate, and what

---

68 The coercion and coercion plus socialization model are based largely on bifurcated models of March and Olsen (1998) and Mann (1970). Other scholars, while using other terms, consider more than just these two options. For example, Wendt (1999, 266-278) distinguishes between first, second, and third degree internalization. First degree internalization is when the actor knows a norm but complies only because she has to. Second degree internalization presents actors with choice. That is, she complies with a norm because it is in her interest, but she is not forced to do so. Third degree internalization is, in simplified form, when an actor complies with norms because she feels the norm or rule is legitimate and indeed is even constitutive of her own identity. Hurd (1999) distinguishes between coercion, self-interests, and legitimacy, all of which comport with Wendt’s degrees of internalization. While I agree there is a theoretical difference between first and second degree internalization, or coercion and self-interests, the implications of compliance based on either are largely similar. That is, compliance due to coercion is hard to distinguish from compliance based on self-interests, as Wendt (1999, 270) himself notes. It is easy to see how compliance based on coercion could be construed as a self-interested move. If an actor complies with a norm or rule for fear of punishment or basic motivations of self-preservation, she is certainly acting in her own-self interests. Moreover, the distinction made by Wendt on the acceptance of norms with second degree internalization but only though necessity with first degree internalization is significant, but in either case when the rule no longer benefits an actor, she will no longer follow it. That is, there is not much difference between the situations of when an actor is strong enough to withstand coercion or even attempt to change the status quo and when a rule no longer benefits an actor and thus that actor alters her behavior. One final consideration is an actor may comply through second degree internalization logic but the self-interests include avoiding overly negative outcomes, which are very similar to experiencing coercion. Thus, the behavioral implications for first and second degree internalization are quite similar in that both are more externally driven than full internalization. Thus, this is as much a pragmatic move on my part as it is theoretical, as is my exclusion of the logic of habit put forth by Emile Durkheim and Max Weber. See Hopf (2005) for a discussion of the differences between the logic of appropriateness and the logic of habit.
norms dominate political and social discourse, a defeated state that has been socialized by the victors has an identity tied to a particular status quo. Therefore it is unlikely to act against this without some radical exogenous factor pushing it.69

But this model, where the defeated state views the war-ending settlement and its place within it as legitimate, entails a significant change in the actor. Indeed, this is positing that a great power will accept limitations on its autonomy and power in the postwar world and act to protect a status quo that may favor other states more than itself.70 A critical question, then, is what can bring about this change? Socialization that implies a willing acceptance of a lessened role in the international system and accepting the victors’ visions of a postwar world and would, by most accounts, represent a radical shift in the collective identity of the defeated state. Indeed, this implies that the vanquished state may even relinquish its great power identity. Such changes to identity are usually not easily made.71 As such, it may be very difficult to successfully socialize a defeated state to a restrictive settlement.

69 See, for example, Katzenstein (1996).

70 Hurd (1999, 398) expands upon the distinction between status quo and revisionist states based on legitimacy and self-interests, or when socialization has occurred versus a situation which is still dominated by coercion or rational calculations.

71 Usually such great change to identity (or culture, norms, etc.) that so significantly affects the politics and related behavior of a state or other social group is very slow. Identity or culture, and the resultant common understandings of societal norms, rules, and procedures, reproduce themselves and thus tend to endure. As such, there is generally an expectation of continuity (Hopf 1998, 181). Wendt (1999, 315) claims, “As a self-fulfilling prophecy culture has natural homeostatic tendencies, and the more deeply it is internalized by actors the stronger those tendencies will be.” For an alternative view, see Mueller (1995). Mueller, examining the Cold War and its demise, argues that change can be both rapid and peaceful when ideas change.
But none of this is to say that such great change cannot occur. Though identity, culture, or norms have a general inertia, particularly shocking events can rock the very foundations of this identity such that radical change is possible. That is, just as the trajectory of a massive object can be altered with immense physical force, so too can the continuity of culture and identity can be broken with extraordinary forces. When such seismic events occur, a vanquished state may be successfully socialized to a postwar order that reduces its autonomy and power.

War itself – and especially losing a war – can be seen as this sort of extraordinary force. Losing a war can be tantamount to collective political trauma within the defeated state. The trauma of losing combined with a seemingly restrictive, harsh settlement can discredit the old political establishment in the defeated state and, if the impact is deep enough, lead to radical shifts in the political identity of a defeated state such that the victor’s vision of the postwar status quo defines or at least partially constitutes the vanquished state.

---

72 Eckstein (1992, 270-271). Others postulate very similar mechanisms. Thompson, Ellis, and Wildavsky (1990) argue that when cultures or identity fail to make intelligible events or fail to provide for certain human needs, individuals will turn to alternatives. Berger (1998) argues this occurred in post-World War Two Germany and Japan, where militarist political cultures were replaced with antimilitarist ones largely because of the disastrous results of the war for both states. Katzenstein (1993) makes a similar case for police powers in postwar Germany and Japan.

73 Ikenberry and Kupchan (1990, 292-293) argue that the US and Britain as hegemons most effectively socialized secondary states that experienced domestic political crises, particularly after a war or imperial penetration.

74 Vertzberger (1997, 864) characterizes political trauma this way: “collective political trauma is a shattering, often violent event that affects a community of people (rather than a single person or a few members of it), and that results from human behavior that is politically motivated and has political consequences.” Note, as Sztompka (2000) does, that major events that can instigate collective political trauma (or cultural trauma in his terms) do not necessarily imply that such events will always evoke such a phenomenon. It depends on the depth of impact of such events, as well as other factors.
Though collective political trauma may not be a positive outcome for the defeated on the whole, when the old order in a defeated state faces a crisis of legitimacy because of failed policies, there is an opportunity for something to take its place.\textsuperscript{75} If the old order is so discredited that it loses all popular support, there can even be a void in the political order of a defeated state. This can be an opportunity ripe for exploitation by the victors. Tapping into the very bases of autonomy and power in a defeated state by imposing a restrictive settlement, the victors then have a chance to mold the defeated state.

It is likely, however, that no matter how shocking defeat or how discredited the old guard, even devastatingly defeated states will attempt to maintain their autonomy and power in the postwar period.\textsuperscript{76} This is probably especially true of defeated great powers. At a minimum, they are likely to desire to simply endure their treatment until the victors stop enforcing a restrictive settlement or they regain enough power to alter the situation themselves. But, if the victors impose restrictions on the defeated state so that autonomy is severely curtailed and power limited and this is consistently enforced, even this impulse can be overcome. The combination of the discrediting of the old guard with the installment of the victors vision of the postwar world leads to a situation where the

\textsuperscript{75} Sztompka (2000, 461-463) discusses the models of societal reaction to anomie by Robert Merton and collective reactions to risk posed by Anthony Giddens. Radical societal change, according to both models, is only one of several outcomes. Collectives can innovate, rebel, ritualize, or retreat according to Merton; pragmatically accept and repress anxiety, hold faith that things will improve, cynically begin to live only in the short-term, or engage in societal reconstruction according to Giddens. All of these are possibilities to explore, but, as I argue, victors can act to bring about the most radical of reactions to collective political trauma through exploiting such a phenomenon.

\textsuperscript{76} Conforming to the general idea of cultural or identity inertia, Vertzberger (1997) builds several hypotheses regarding the effects of collective political trauma, but concludes that identity or political culture is generally resilient and usually only short-term effects result from such trauma.
postwar status quo eventually can be internalized. That is, since there was a process of
delegitimation because of losing the war, the victors have the ability to push this process
to the extreme and fill the resulting void with their own brand of ideas.

This would require victors implement far-reaching provisions in the war-ending
settlement. For example, a forced regime change may allow the victors to fundamentally
alter the way domestic politics work in the vanquished state. Victors would certainly
impose institutions and/or rulers that they perceive to be square with their own interests.\footnote{Owen (2002) shows this to be the case. Ikenberry and Kupchan (1991) argue that secondary or weak
states can sometimes be socialized through a regime change, or what they call internal reconstruction.}
If the victors support the regime in the defeated state, it may be legitimized over time if it
provides the state with some sort of benefit. That is, though a forced regime change may
represent a fundamental restriction and the regime itself may have only limited autonomy
and power, a continuation of a regime that provides society with some sort of benefit –
decent economic performance or security against further conflict or instability, for
example – may, in the absence of any credible alternative, bring those in the vanquished
state to view the new regime as the accepted and acceptable governance system.

Moreover, the imposition of a new regime may give the victors an ability to
squash any remnants of the old order, attempt to muscle-out any competing political
identities that emerge, and engage elements of society in the defeated state that are
consonant with the politically identity the victor hopes to instill in the vanquished state
with the socialization attempt. Though it may be most effective with one, victors can still
act to limit the influence of competing political ideologies or identity as well as co-opt
like-minded individuals within the defeated state without forcing a regime change. With
or without a regime change, it is likely that victors would use not only coercive measures but also incentives to push the process of socialization. A vanquished state that is forced to relinquish significant military capabilities, for example, may be bought under the victor’s protection. A significant restriction no matter what as the vanquished state’s autonomy and power are limited by such a move, but the defeated state is not left to completely fend for itself in the postwar war and thus may eventually find such a situation acceptable. If a foreign policy mode is discredited in the vanquished state due to losing the war, victors may be able to fill this void by binding the state to an international institution that guides its postwar international actions. Again, this is a real limit on the vanquished state’s autonomy, but if in the end it provides some benefits to the defeated state it may eventually be legitimated.

With such actions that not only tap into the autonomy and power of the defeated state but also serve to socialize the defeated state, victors are providing the only plausible alternative for the future and therefore set the course for the vanquished state. In this way, change can occur in a relatively short time frame in the defeated state, likely much quicker than most would otherwise expect identity and norms to change.\(^78\) Through the coercion plus socialization mechanisms, the new situation in the defeated state can be legitimized and postwar stability should follow.\(^79\)

\(^78\) Even under extraordinarily restrictive conditions, it is likely that some of the identity of the defeated state would survive in the postwar world even if the victor’s socialization attempt was successful. See, for example, Katzenstein (1993, 268). The claim made here is that the trauma of defeat provides victors with an opportunity to shift this identity to conform to their vision of international politics with a process of socialization. Any recreated identity in a defeated state pushed for by the victors would contain elements of the former identity or norms, even though the dominant ones would be those placed by the victor. Moreover, for pragmatic reasons victors are likely, to some extent or another, to consider the political identities within the defeated state as they attempt to mold the state into a status quo power through a restrictive war-ending settlement.
None of this necessarily implies that the populations within states faced with restrictive settlements will be equally restricted or suffer negative consequences because of the limitations on the state. Populations may be brutally repressed as part of a restrictive settlement. On the other hand, a restrictive settlement does not imply that political and economic inducements targeting the entirety of the population, certain sectors within it, or even individual decision-makers within the defeated state cannot be used to further consolidate a shift in political identity. Providing ostensible benefits to these individuals within the defeated state may give them a stake in the transformation of society and thus further the process of socialization.\textsuperscript{80} However, positive inducements may not be necessary for a process of socialization. For example, it could simply be the defection of another potentially worse treatment that helps to push the vanquished state to internalize a restrictive settlement. That is, if the old order is discredited and the victors provide the only future visions for the defeated state, the least bad option may eventually gain acceptance as the legitimate order.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{79} Another way to view the coercion plus socialization model is that a restrictive war-ending settlement and all of its components act as an institution that shapes the preferences and even identity of the actors dealing with the institution. See Katzenstein (1993, 1997), Hall and Taylor (1998), and Thelen and Steinmo (1992) on the historical institutionalism, especially the sociological variant, which views identity and resulting norms of behavior as the result of a process of historically created institutions and experiences.

\textsuperscript{80} Lipset (1986) argues that economic benefits in particular can help to legitimize even a weak democratic regime. See Ikenberry and Kupchan (1991) on how hegemons can socialize weaker state through the use external inducement that rely on economic and military incentives to slowly bring normative change in weaker states.

\textsuperscript{81} This, in one way, is just a simple extension of Mann’s (1970) idea normative acceptance. That is, real stability can follow normative acceptance of a situation that is objectively bad, but could be potentially worse. An individual may internalize the expectations of the ruling class and then view her own subservient position as legitimate not because tremendous gains are made in such an inferior position, but because the alternative of a different system or engaging in conflict to alter the situation would make her even worse off. Absent the internalization or socialization process, this would simply be the logic of the coercion model.
In short, if victors impose far-enough reaching provisions within the war-ending settlement and enforce these, the process of socialization can take hold. Given a severe power disadvantage and the exogenously placed limitations on their actions under a restrictive settlement, they cannot do otherwise but to initially accept this treatment. As the socialization process progresses from coercion in the early period to internalization, the vanquished state eventually accepts the settlement as legitimate. To put it another way, as time progresses and new norms and ideas become embedded in the politics of the vanquished, restrictions may be followed not necessarily because it is less costly than resisting but because these restrictions on autonomy and power are seen as legitimate or appropriate.82 The self-interests of the defeated state, rooted in its postwar identity shaped by the victors through the socialization mechanism, dictate that it adheres to the new situation.83 As such, if the victor socializes the vanquished state, the costs of enforcing the settlement in the postwar era are eventually reduced.84 If the process of socialization is complete, strategic changes that may under other conditions dictate

---

82 The longer the restrictive settlement is enforced, the more likely internalization will be. As Wendt (1999, 310-311) argues, “As cultural practices get routinized in the form of habits they get pushed into the shared cognitive background, becoming taken for granted rather than objects of calculation. Other things being equal, therefore, the longer a practice has been in existence the deeper it will be embedded in the individual and collective consciousness.”


84 Ikenberry and Kupchan (1990) highlight the role of socialization and specifically its ability to reduce enforcement costs in the context of hegemonic system through three methods: normative persuasion, external inducement, and internal reconstruction.
behavioral changes in defeated state would not necessarily be considered appropriate for the postwar defeated state. In this final instance, a restrictive war-ending settlement would become nearly self-enforcing.

What is key for all of this to work – for victors to fundamentally alter the identity of the defeated state – is the presence of the power-gap necessary to implement a restrictive war-ending settlement, that the gap is perpetuated through strict enforcement and the defeated state experiences a crisis of legitimacy in the immediate postwar period such that there is a void victors can fill with their vision of norms, rules, and procedures that conform with their vision of the postwar order. As such, war-ending settlements that result in the socialization of the defeated state will, all things being equal, be more stable than those that do not.

If the conditions conducive to socialization of the defeated state are not present – that is, if this crisis of legitimacy is not present, victors do not actively attempt to exploit it, or enforcement of the settlement fails – then the coercion logic will dominate the defeated state’s behavior and alterations to their postwar position will be attempted when the strategic landscape provides an opportunity.

2.6 Summary and Hypotheses

In this chapter, I have critically examined the conventional wisdom of moderation in victory and attempted to explicate the conditions under which restrictive war-ending

---

85 Thus, much like the arguments of Kier (1996) and Johnston (1995) regarding cultural or ideational factors determining strategic and military doctrine over external threats or opportunities, this would suggests that environmental changes would not necessarily dictate behavioral changes.
settlements can lead to postwar stability. While the logic of the conventional wisdom is initially appealing, the theoretical discussion demonstrates that victors can achieve prudent victories through the application of war-ending settlements that restrict a defeated state’s postwar autonomy and power.

Counter to the conventional view, enforcement of a restrictive settlement by the victors is possible. I argue it is largely a factor of the potential threat the defeated state itself poses, or is perceived by the victors to represent, in the postwar period. If a large enough threat, victorious coalitions can maintain the unity and put forth the resources necessary to enforce a restrictive settlement. Even maintaining the assumption that defeated states will resist attempts by victors to diminish their status or position in the postwar world, if enforcement is thusly ensured postwar stability can follow two distinct models.

The first, based on the ability of the victors to utilize a large postwar power gap and enforce a restrictive settlement, relies on simple coercion and rational calculations by the vanquished state whereby the defeated state weighs the relative merits of accepting its treatment by the victors or resisting. When revisionism is not reasonable or punishment for revision is likely to be swift and severe, the defeated state will continue to suffer its fate and not disturb postwar stability. The second route is based on the ability of the victors to use their coercive capabilities to start a process of socialization in the defeated
state such that it becomes a status quo power in the postwar world. This produces acceptance of the restrictive war-ending settlement and the victor’s vision of postwar international politics by the vanquished state based on a sense of legitimacy.\textsuperscript{86}

A critical part of the argument is that all of this is backed by significant material capabilities. That is, for restrictive settlements to lead to postwar stability victors must have relatively more power than the defeated state and this must be perpetuated in the postwar world. Assuming that vanquished states will generally resist any attempt by outside forces to diminish their autonomy or power, it is hard to imagine otherwise. But with a large-power gap and enforcement, both the coercion model and the coercion plus socialization models can lead to postwar stability.

The differences between the two models, however, suggest very different behavioral implications. If the coercion model logic is present, when strategic landscapes change, power differentials fluctuate, or the relationship between the victors and the vanquished is transformed, defeated states will alter their behavior in a way that

\textsuperscript{86} While many scholars discuss the importance of legitimacy for postwar stability, those coming from the conventional wisdom are essentially all rationalist explanations that do not delve into the importance of political identity in the defeated states. For example, though in other work Ikenberry does consider more fully “ideas” on state behavior, at least as guides to action or in terms of the ability of experts to shape preferences (1993), Ikenberry (2001) utilizes a very thin notion of legitimacy that is really more about payoffs than ideas, identity, or norms. In terms of internalization or bases of action, Ikenberry is talking of only self-interested action where agents see others and the rules imposed upon the self instrumentally, or through the logic of consequences. It is not clear that the notion that states can fully internalize new political identities, even if they are imposed by victors upon the vanquished, is part of the equation. This instrumental role of ideas within Ikenberry’s analysis is revealed with his clear concern that international orders, “guarantee some mutually satisfactory distribution of gains” between the victorious, leading states and the lesser [including defeated] states (47; see also 35-79). This issue equally applies to rationalist explanations for the durability of peace. Analyses such as Walter (1997) and Fortna (2001) rely on institutional strength or third party guarantees to promote peace, whereby both sides will hold the peace as long as the other side does not gain too much from the situation and both sides think the other is committed to the settlement. Ideas or norms, if discussed at all, in these analysis are at most guides rather than constitutive identities that dictate preferences. See Adler (1997) and Ruggie (1998).
challenges the restrictive settlement. If the coercion plus socialization model logic is present, similar changes would not result in different behavior as the identity of the defeated state adheres that state to the victor’s vision of the postwar status quo.

While the discussion in this chapter presents many testable hypotheses, the two most important ones are:

\[ H1: \text{If a defeated state is faced with a restrictive settlement that is enforced by the victors, postwar stability will follow as long as the vanquished state is not presented with reasonable opportunities to revise the settlement.} \]

\[ H2: \text{If a defeated state is faced with a restrictive settlement that is enforced and it undergoes a process of socialization instigated by the victors, it will not act to revise its postwar position even if there are reasonable opportunities to do so.} \]

The first hypothesis, representing the coercion model, is a base-line expectation in that it is reasonable to expect continuity in the political identity of the defeated state. That is, the proposition implies that there is no socialization process that has changed the defeated state’s identity in the postwar period and thus rational calculations will lead it to attempt to revise a restrictive war-ending settlement when it can resist the coercive power of the victors. The second hypothesis involves the situation where it is reasonable to believe that through the deed of the victors implementing and enforcing a restrictive settlement that acts as a socialization mechanism, the vanquished state’s identity is altered so that it no longer desires to challenge the postwar order.87

87 Wendt (1999, 367) suggest that for purposes of analysis, “Rationalist models would be most useful when it is plausible to expect that identities and interests will not change over the course of an interaction, and constructivist models would be most useful when we have reason to think they will change.” There is, however, a large ontological issue: “either agents are themselves at stake in, or endogenous to, the social process or they are not.” Since the purpose of this work is not to contribute to ontological questions, I set
Of course, these hypotheses stand in contrast to the conventional wisdom where the expectation is that a restrictive settlement will always lead to postwar instability. As such, the null hypothesis is:

*When victors implement a restrictive settlement that reduces the autonomy and power of the vanquished state, postwar instability will follow.*

Because the notion of moderation in victory is so widespread in international relations scholarship, this is a particularly important hypothesis. While the arguments regarding the potential stability of restrictive settlements may (or may not) be logical and the pathways spelled-out above may (or may not) explicate the mechanisms driving this, it must first be seen if restrictive settlements can lead to any type of postwar stability. If not, then the conventional wisdom is likely correct and only through moderation or leniency in victory can states construct prudent victories.

The first empirical step, then, must be to establish links between the severity of war-ending settlements and postwar stability. To do so, I use the conceptualization of war-ending settlements presented in the opening chapter to conduct a comparative analysis of all great power war-ending settlements and postwar periods since 1815. If the conventional wisdom is correct, restrictive war-ending settlements should never or only very rarely lead to postwar stability. If, on the other hand, some cases of restrictive settlements lead to postwar stability, one or both of the hypotheses regarding the mechanisms leading to postwar stability with restrictive settlements are likely present.  

__________________________

*aside this issue for others to decide upon. I propose these hypotheses as contrasting explanatory devises in the way March and Olsen (1998, 953-954) propose institutional changes that involve “different explanations for action” that have different implications for behavior.*
This first empirical step is critical to help define the limits of the conventional wisdom and more fully explicate what prudent victories entail.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND MEASURES FOR THE COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

3.1 Introduction

Since the notion of moderation in victory is so common to international relations theory yet rarely clearly spelled-out or tested, a much needed first step to clarify what prudence in victory entails is to examine the severity of war-ending settlements and the periods that followed each. If the conventional wisdom is correct, less restrictive settlements should lead to postwar stability while more restrictive settlements should lead to instability. If my arguments are valid, restrictive settlements should provide stability when the conditions spelled-out in the previous chapter hold. Toward this end, I conduct a comparative historical analysis of the universe of great power war-ending settlements since 1815.

The cases in chapters four and five are the most important war-ending settlements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Some, such as the 1919 Treaty of Versailles or the 1815 Second Treaty of Paris, are fairly well known. Indeed, these two cases are used by the conventional wisdom as examples of a disastrous war-ending settlement and a very prudent one, respectively. Others, such as the 1856 Treaty of Paris that ended the Crimean War, have received much less attention. All of the cases, from the settlement
that ended the Napoleonic Wars to the settlements of the Second World War, can inform
the puzzle driving this dissertation. As such, the research strategy of broad comparative
analysis provides the best manner to capture the dynamics of multiple important cases
and expose general patterns.

For each case under examination, I provide a brief history of the war-ending
settlement itself as well as the postwar period. But to ensure a broadly comparative
framework, I also employ measures that can be applied in the same way to each case.
Within each case discussed below, the level of restrictiveness of the war-ending
settlement is determined with scale of severity built from the conceptualization of war-
ending settlements provided in the opening chapter. Territorial, economic, military, and
general political restrictions placed on the defeated state within war-ending treaties and
other arrangements constructed for the postwar era are placed within the context of how
much each restricts the defeated state’s postwar autonomy and power. This allows a full
picture of the treatment of the vanquished to emerge while at the same time detailing the
elements of the settlements. To establish any links between the severity of war-ending
settlements and levels of stability, the postwar era for each case is examined for a period
of thirty years with a measure of stability that taps into the defeated state’s attempts to
revise the settlement or issues related to it.

The purpose of this chapter is to very clearly spell-out the measurements used in
the comparative historical analysis. As such, the rest of the chapter proceeds as follows.
First, I define the domain of wars for examination and identify all of the cases of a
defeated great power. Second, I explain in detail the components of the measure of
severity for war-ending settlements. I also operationalize a scale of severity so that all great power war-ending settlements can be judged with the same metric. Finally, I define and operationalize postwar stability.

3.2 Domain of Cases

Attempting to secure their gains from victory and provide postwar stability after major conflicts, victorious states have paid particular attention to the problems of victory after great power war in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Even if sometimes unsuccessful, victorious great powers have expended significant resources trying to get it right. Thus, great power war-ending settlements since 1815 provide an appropriate laboratory to explore the notion of prudence in victory and the arguments presented in the previous chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Power War</th>
<th>Defeated Great Power &amp; Postwar Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frch Rev. &amp; Napoleonic Wars – 1789-1815</td>
<td>France 1816-1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimean War – 1853-1856</td>
<td>Russia 1857-1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian War of Unification – 1859</td>
<td>Austria 1860-1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austro-Prussian War – 1866</td>
<td>Austria 1867-1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Prussian War – 1870-1871</td>
<td>France 1872-1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War I – 1914-1918</td>
<td>Germany 1919-1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II – 1939-1945</td>
<td>Austria 1919-1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary 1919-1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Germany 1946-1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Germany 1946-1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy 1946-1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan 1946-1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Great Power Wars and Great Power Losers 1815-1945
I retrieve my list of great powers and great power wars from Levy (1983, 8-49) and the Correlates of War (COW) data set. There are only minor differences between the data sets in defining great powers, and usually represent issues of timing for entrance and exit as a great power actor. For the domain of wars and thus war-ending settlements under scrutiny, I rely on Levy’s (1983, 72-73) designation of great power wars. Thus, eight wars are included for analysis (Table 3.1). Only the defeated great powers of each war are included.

3.3 The Severity of War-ending Settlements: Territorial, Economic, Military, & Political Restrictions

War-ending settlements tap into the postwar autonomy and power of states and, as such, they should be understood in terms of the degree to which they do so. Great power war-ending settlements vary significantly on the degree to which autonomy and power are affected and also manifest themselves in various ways. War-ending settlements

---

88 Where there are differences between Levy and COW on the timing of a great power entering or exiting as a great power actor, I rely on the COW coding. For example, Levy codes China as entering the great power system in 1949, whereas COW includes China as a great power actor only after 1950. The only alterations I make to either Levy’s or the COW list of great powers is to keep those states that drop out as great power as a result of war in the analysis. To do otherwise would exclude a number of important cases from analysis. The COW data is available online at: http://correlatesofwar.org.

89 The only exception is that I do not include the Korean War (1950-1953). I do so for one main reason: neither side emerged as victorious. Since this project is exclusively concerned with how victors manage defeated states in attempts to achieve prudence in victory, one side must clearly emerge as the winner to be an appropriate case for examination.

90 Austria and Hungary are included in the post-World War I period as cases of defeated great powers because the Austro-Hungarian empire is considered to be a great power until 1918 by both COW and Levy. Because of the break-up of the empire, the newly independent states were handed separate war-ending settlements and thus are treated separately here. Italy was actually defeated by 1943 in World War II. I include data for 1944 and 1945 for Italy, but for the purposes of consistency in presentation, I will refer to the postwar period for Italy as 1946 until 1975. Post-World War II Germany is broken down to examine the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic separately.
generally have multiple provisions, each of which is designed to somehow limit a defeated state in the postwar world. However, most can be considered in one of the four following categories: territorial, economic, military, and political. Each category somehow relates to the autonomy and power of states, and thus each can be an important component of a war-ending settlement.

3.3.1 Territorial Restrictions

Not only do geographical boundaries define states, what is found inside the boundaries of a state can contribute to its power and even autonomy. Moreover, territory is important as much for what it is next to as for what it contains. That is, strategic lands can either help or hinder a state’s interests, depending on who holds them.

A restoration of the antebellum status quo implies no loss of strategic territory and thus no loss of the freedom such territory brings a state in terms of military operations or defensive preparations. Resources within a given territory are also significant for the defeated state in terms of industrial or military production, the traditional elements of power. Thus, at this lowest end of the scale, a vanquished state would not suffer any loss of autonomy or power.

Partial dismemberment of a former belligerent can clearly reduce state autonomy and power. Severing strategic territories from a defeated state can limit its ability to act in either self-defense or aggressively in the postwar era. Critical lines of defense or natural barriers can be eliminated. Further, this sort of partial dismemberment may limit the ability of the defeated state to project power outside its newly drawn borders if strategic outposts essential for offensive operations are severed. Thus, the more land
taken from the defeated state and the more strategically valuable this land is, in terms of military positions and resources within the land, the more restrictive the territorial component of a war-ending settlement.

The most extreme territorial provisions can imply that a defeated state no longer exist as an autonomous, capable actor. Dismemberment or total incorporation into another state can leave the defeated state’s former regime with no political authority within the territories it once held.

3.3.2 Economic Restrictions

Economic provisions within a war-ending settlement can also impair a defeated state’s ability to pursue independent domestic and foreign policy. As punishment for starting a war or as a way to limit the power of a defeated state in the postwar era or both, the costs foisted upon the defeated state can also limit its ability to meet other obligations or desires.91 Importantly, victorious states can alter the future behavior of a defeated state by limiting its economic freedom.92 Thus, economic provisions in a war-ending settlement in the form of reparations or indemnities are clearly linked to autonomy and power.

Economic provisions of war-ending settlements can be linked to other components of a settlement. For example, a state or a portion of a state can be occupied until a bill is paid by the vanquished. Or, to regain international economic status and the

91 For example, Blainey (1973, 90) cites the imposition of an indemnity on Greece after its 1897 loss to Turkey as a way to control Greek military spending.

92 Thus, economic provisions in war-ending settlements have the same putative intent of economic sanctions placed on states for various reasons. See, for example, Knorr (1975). See Baldwin (1985) for other purposes of sanctions.
ability to borrow money, a defeated state may have to pay for damages to state and/or
civilian properties that occurred during the war. Generally, then, a defeated state can be
limited in its financial autonomy until it meets certain conditions of the victors.93

Beyond reparations and indemnities, a defeated state may have economic
resources stripped from its possession, thus lessening its ability to raise resources for
other activities. A vanquished state could also be required to pay for the garrisoning of
occupation forces as well as cover the costs of their operations. In addition, the
vanquished could be forced into a trading relationship by which the victors make
excessive gains, or it could be required to supply raw materials and other commodities
cheaply to the victors or on the world market. These types of economic provisions in
war-ending settlement beyond reparations and indemnities can all have the effect of
lessening a state’s autonomy and power in the postwar world as each limit a defeated
state’s ability to pursue other objectives. Thus, the larger the bill and other economic the
provisions within the war-ending settlement, the more restricted the defeated state is in
terms of economic policy autonomy and power.

3.3.3 Military Restrictions

Limiting the military capacity of a defeated state clearly taps into its autonomy
and power. But for great powers, any restrictions on military power can be particularly

93 While not a penalty as such, even monies granted a defeated state by the victors for the purposes of
rebuilding could be seen as limiting a state’s autonomy or power. That is, just like economic aid
disbursements used for development, often the money is restricted to certain domains of use. Often the
intention of rebuilding a state through loans, grants, or general aid to is either harness the future potential
power of the state or to ensure that it will act in accordance with the victors vision of postwar politics. This
is not unlike Krasner’s argument (1995, 128-133) that sovereign lending often infringes upon sovereignty
through contracting. That is, weaker states may take on loans from others with the requirement that they
meet certain conditions, many of which can violate their autonomy.
important. Because of their wide-ranging interests, significant military capabilities are essential for a great power. A defeated great power that does not suffer any limitations on military forces, equipment, or deployments would not suffer any diminution of autonomy or power and therefore is not restricted in its conduct of foreign (or even domestic) policy in the military realm.

A method of restricting a defeated state’s military options without necessarily diminishing its holdings of military related capabilities is through the neutralization of territory. By making certain lands, possibly of strategic significance, off limits to military deployments, a state is limited in its ability to project power. That is, it cannot launch offensive operations nor augment defensive fortifications within the neutralized area. In a sense, this is the least restrictive of any military provisions in war-ending settlements, as neutralization not only implies that the defeated state cannot use the territory for military operations but also that other states – victors included – cannot utilize the area. The autonomy and power of a defeated state may be restricted with this type of measure, but other states may be equally affected.

More severe restrictions on autonomy and power include limitations on military manpower, equipment, or the manner in which forces are deployed. Limiting the size of a military obviously can lessen a state’s ability to project power, as can the way in which forces are configured or deployed. Restricting a state’s ability to hold certain types of
weapons – such as limitations on naval capabilities or prohibiting weapons of mass destruction – clearly affects a state’s autonomy and power, as second-rate military capabilities cannot match the capabilities of other great powers.94

The most severe form of military restrictions within war-ending settlements would, of course, be the elimination of such forces. This, however, is not likely. As other countries may be tempted to take advantage of its lack of defensive capabilities, state without any military power could be a source of postwar instability. Almost as severe, and much more likely, would be the placing of a defeated state’s military structure – with or without other sorts of limitations – completely under the control of the victors. While a defeated state may maintain some form of coercive capabilities, it would not have the ability to use them as it wished. Thus, a defeated great power’s autonomy and power would be severely restricted with this type of war-ending settlement provision.

3.3.4 Political Restrictions

While all of the above restrictions placed on the vanquished have obvious political implications, other measures imposed on a defeated state can be even more political in nature. In addition, many political restrictions can be pursued in tandem with other limitations.

Victors can limit the autonomy and power of a defeated state in the postwar era through the use of international institutions or other such structures. Inclusion and possibly submission to an international organization that has wide-ranging powers can

---

94 See Tanner (1992) for the most common military restrictions placed on defeated states since the end of the First World War.
limit the policy autonomy of a defeated state and/or harness the power of that state. If the institutional setting is strong enough, such a provision in a war-ending settlement can render a defeated state unable to pursue independent policy options. For example, submission to an alliance may mean a defeated state must consult others before taking military action, thus putting the military under the influence of another actor.

Depending on how tight the alliance is, a defeated state may be made incapable of independent military action.

A rather severe restriction on a defeated state’s autonomy and power is a forced regime change, or reconstitution of the defeated state. The imposition of a domestic governance system, in some ways, is one of the most restrictive measures victors can implement while allowing the defeated state to exist as a more or less autonomous

---

95 Related to this argument is Ikenberry’s (2001) claim that leading states bind themselves as well as lesser states to particular orders through the construction of international institutions. States can certainly try to promote postwar stability by constructing institutions, and these may pertain to the defeated state as much as they do for victors. That is, Ikenberry’s institutional postwar orders can infringe upon the autonomy and power of vanquished states. However, these can be, and indeed often are, independent of the manner in which victors treat the vanquished and additional institutions that have little to do with the overall character of the order victorious state pursue can be used specifically to bind or restrain vanquished nations. Thus, it is more appropriate to view these sorts of institutional strategies that bind the vanquished as one of several provisions within war-ending settlements and management strategies victorious states design for particular defeated states.

96 This is similar to the idea of binding or tethering potential adversaries with an alliance to gain a measure of control over them. See Schroeder (1976) and Weitsman (2003).

97 It is possible that instead of inclusion, exclusion from international bodies can prohibit the defeated state from fully participating in international politics and, in more indirect ways, limit its autonomy and power. For example, as a way to limit a state’s ability to augment its power, a defeated state can be prohibited from joining alliances. Or the vanquished may be excluded from international organizations that promote cooperation in the realm of economics, thus limiting its ability to increase its resources.

98 Owen (2002) finds that forcible domestic institutional promotion is quite common in international relations. According to his database, this has happened at least 198 times in the period of 1555-2000. Moreover, Owen finds that forcible promotion of domestic institutions is most likely when great powers desire to expand their own power and bring weaker states under their influence. Though these are not all cases of victorious state imposing their regime choices upon the defeated, the finding does indicate that this is not an infrequent occurrence and that regime change in the defeated state is a manner in which victorious states can limit the power and autonomy of the vanquished.
entity. Importantly though, imposed regimes can vary in the degree of policy autonomy and power they possess. A vanquished state operating with an imposed regime can enjoy complete policy autonomy. On the other hand, a vanquished state may be subject to outside authority such that it enjoys little or no autonomy. Nevertheless, the abdication of one of the most fundamental aspects of a modern state – deciding how to or who governs – is a severe restriction of postwar autonomy for a defeated state.

The imposition of a new regime can also vary on the type of regime instituted in the defeated state and, generally, states impose regimes on other states that are similar to their own. Obviously, victors that impose an authoritarian domestic structure on the vanquished can install leaders that will serve the interests of the victors. In this sense, an imposed regime could simply be a satellite of the victorious power. However, just as with any other type of imposition, an imposed authoritarian regime can enjoy different levels of autonomy, from full policy-making independence to enjoying little or no independence in domestic or foreign policy.

The imposition of a democratic government in a defeated state, on the other hand, seemingly presents the victors with fewer ways to restrict the vanquished nation in the

---

99 Werner (1996) finds that the possibility of foreign-imposed regime change increases as the relative power gap between the victors and vanquished rises and as the domestic institutions between the victors and the vanquished become more dissimilar. That states must have the capability and willingness to impose a regime on a defeated state lends support to the idea that this is a fundamental way to try to restrict the defeated state in the postwar era. See also Bueno de Mesquita and Siverson (1995).

100 Owen (2002). Though he practiced it in a brutal fashion, Stalin summed-up this logic: “Whoever occupies a territory also imposes upon it his own social system. Everyone imposes his own system as far as his army can reach. It cannot be otherwise.” Quoted in Djilas (1962).
postwar era. After all, the imposition of a democracy implies that, at least eventually, the
defeated state will be able to choose its own destiny. However, the imposition of liberal
democracy can act to restrain a defeated state in several ways.

First, beyond the violation of autonomy that any imposition of domestic
institutional structures represents, when imposing the new democratic regime, victors can
eliminate from the field certain political parties or individual politicians in the defeated
state. Essentially, victorious states can confine the vanquished by taking certain political
options, positions, or ideologies off the table. Only “acceptable” political actors within
the defeated state can even be considered, thus closing certain options for the vanquished
nation that the victors judge to be threats to postwar stability or their vision of the
postwar world.\textsuperscript{101}

Second, either because of normative constraints or institutional barriers to using
violence in foreign policy, the democratic peace research program has shown that
democratic dyads are more peaceful with each other than authoritarian or mixed dyads.\textsuperscript{102}
Following this, a democratic victor may lessen the risks of the vanquished state violently
disturbing postwar stability by imposing democracy, as such an imposition virtually

\textsuperscript{101} Even without a forced regime change, victors can also impose limitations on domestic political activities
such as the outlaw of political parties or civic organizations within the defeated state. This can essentially
rob the defeated regime of former bases of power within the country or the opportunity to govern as it sees
fit.

\textsuperscript{102} The democratic peace literature is voluminous. See, for example, Doyle (1983), Russett (1993), and
Russett and Oneal (2001).
eliminates the possibility of recurrent conflict with the vanquished state.\textsuperscript{103} Moreover, even if victors do not limit the power of a defeated state, an imposition of liberal democracy may make it less likely that a vanquished state will resort to violence in its foreign policy.\textsuperscript{104} Taken together, these arguments suggest that imposed democratic institutions do in fact limit the autonomy of the defeated state, at least as it pertains to its ability to use violence in its foreign policy.

While imposing a regime upon a defeated state can limit its autonomy or power in the postwar world, the most severe restriction a vanquished state could face is a combination of total territorial dismemberment or annexation and occupation of the defeated state such that all political authority is transferred to the victor. This type of absorption of all political authority the defeated state once held is total elimination of the vanquished state’s autonomy and power.

These sorts of political restrictions – from binding the vanquished states with international institutions to the reconstitution of defeated states – can all be used to tap into policy-making independence, depending on the severity of the provisions. Just like territorial, economic, and military provisions within war-ending settlements, these political provisions should be seen as potential restrictions on a defeated state’s autonomy and power.

\textsuperscript{103} Even when democracies have real conflicts of interest, they generally do not turn violent. Dixon (1994) shows that democratic pairs of states tend to resolve any disputes that arise peacefully. In addition, Huth and Allee (2002) show that territorial disputes between democracies generally do not escalate to war.

\textsuperscript{104} Lake (1992) shows that even powerful democratic states do not fight other democracies, and, more importantly, that democracies, though they win most wars they enter, are very slow to anger largely because of the domestic constraints they face.
3.3.5 The Overall Severity of War-ending Settlements

The more and the more severe the territorial, economic, military, and political provisions within a war-ending settlement, the more restricted a state is in terms of its ability to act independently in the postwar world. To determine the level of restrictiveness of a war-ending settlement, I examine the war-ending treaty itself as well as any related agreements.\textsuperscript{105} If there is no official war-ending treaty, other formal and informal agreements between the victors and the vanquished are used. I construct a scale of zero to three for each of the four dimensions of a war-ending settlement so that any settlement can range from zero to twelve in overall severity (Table 3.2).

\textsuperscript{105} I retrieve war-ending treaties and related documents from \textit{Major Peace Treaties of Modern History}, ed. Fred Israel (2002) unless otherwise noted.
Table 3.2: The Severity of War-ending Settlements

3.4 Levels of Postwar Stability

I define stability along similar lines to John Herz: “a system is (relatively) stable where changes are relatively slow, gradual, and peaceful; unstable where they tend to be sudden, far-reaching in impact, and frequently violent.” (1968, 115) However, because I focus on the treatment of the defeated state via the war-ending settlement and

---

106 Other definitions of stability include, for example, Waltz (1979, 161-163) where stability is defined as the persistence of anarchy as well as the fate of the international systems principle or polar powers. Ikenberry (2001, 45) defines stability as “the ability of the political order to contain and overcome disturbances to peace.” Others simply define stability as the absence of conflict (see note 108 below).
its link to postwar stability, I define and operationalize stability as it pertains to the defeated state. That is, I am most interested in postwar changes, or attempted changes, to the war-ending settlement emanating from the defeated state. If there are alterations to the war-ending settlement or the overall treatment of the defeated state but they are relatively slow and gradual, and coincide with the wishes of the victors, the postwar era is stable. If many sudden and possibly violent alterations are attempted or made, the postwar era is unstable.

Since great powers are the focus of this study and, by their very nature, these states have far reaching interests and are likely to come into conflict with other states more often than lesser powers, a single conflict between former belligerents does not necessarily signify an unstable situation. Thus, I use a measure that is based upon the level of conflict in which defeated states are involved during the postwar period. Since this measure must be broadly comparative for all cases of great power war, I use the number of Militarized Interstate Disputes (MIDs) involving the defeated states (Jones, Bremer, and Singer 1996). I compare the number of MIDs for the defeated state to the average number of MIDs great powers experience over the same temporal domain. The fewer MIDs a defeated state is involved in, in a relative sense, the more stable the war-ending settlement, at least with respect to that state.

This is certainly not a perfect measure of postwar stability. MIDs can occur for reasons unrelated to war-ending settlements and thus may at times have little bearing on the type of postwar stability most interesting for this study. On the other hand, a dispute

---

107 System stability or instability is determined by multiple factors, some of which may have nothing to do with the treatment of a defeated state. Thus, in addition to the focus of this work driving me toward a definition of stability that deals only with the defeated state, there are theoretical and practical reasons to do so as well.
with a weaker actor or with one in the periphery could represent an attempt by a vanquished state to make gains in the postwar era to help offset the loses incurred because of the war-ending settlement. Or active involvement in MIDs could be an indication that a defeated great power has been resuscitated or re-assimilated into the great power club.

Because of such issues, I also rely on the timing and number of disputes a defeated state has with any of the victors. The most direct way to alter a settlement is to challenge those that constructed it. As such, disputes with one of the victorious states may signify serious attempts at revisionism. The more disputes the vanquished has with the victors in the postwar era, the less stable the situation.108

3.5 Great Power War-ending Settlements and Postwar Stability 1815-1975

The primary task of the comparative historical analysis is to establish links between the severity of war-ending settlements and postwar stability. If the conventional view holds, restrictive settlements should never or only very rarely lead to stability and lenient or moderate settlements should always lead to stability. Thus, for each instance of a losing great power, I code the war-ending settlement using the metrics detailed above. To get at the levels of postwar stability, I break each thirty-year period into six five-year

---

108 Analyses of the durability of peace, such as Werner (1999) and Fortna (2003), utilize the length of time peace persists where either former belligerent can break the peace. While this is certainly a valid measure under some conditions, it is not entirely appropriate given the focus of this study. If a victor instigates the dispute it is clearly not revisionism on the part of the defeated state. If the dispute is instigated by the vanquished, it likely is revisionism and thus the situation could be considered unstable. However, if victors respond to violent acts of revisionism stability can still follow the occurrence of a dispute, especially if the defeated state’s action is met with resistance and strict enforcement by the victors.
periods.\textsuperscript{109} That is, I sum the number of MIDs for any given five-year period for a
defeated great power and then compare this to the average number of MIDs for all great
power actors in the same period. In addition, I sum the total number of MIDs a defeated
state has with any victorious state over the same five-year period. This aggregation
provides a way to smooth the data so that a broad picture of postwar stability can emerge.

The secondary purpose of this comparative historical analysis is to provide an
initial probe of my arguments regarding restrictive settlements. As such, I examine
fluctuations in the defeated state’s capabilities as a percentage of great power capabilities
as well as power shifts between the victors and the vanquished over five-year periods
using the COW Composite Index of National Capabilities (CINC).\textsuperscript{110} The coercion
model expects that a defeated state will act to revise its treatment if there are reasonable
opportunities to do so. Measuring the power gap specifically between the victors and the
vanquished should capture most opportunities the defeated state may have to alter the
settlement. Measuring the capabilities of the vanquished state relative to the entire great
power population, on the other hand, can help to capture opportunities for the defeated
state to alter its postwar status outside of its relationship with the victors. That is, even if
the relative power between the victors and the vanquished does not change or if the
vanquished state’s capabilities decrease compared to the victors, an increase in the
defeated state’s percentage of overall great power capabilities may indicate opportunities

\textsuperscript{109} The choice of a thirty-year postwar period for examination is essentially arbitrary. However, this
amount of time seems sufficient to get at the main issue of importance: did the defeated state attempt to
revise the settlement or not? A thirty-year span also allows me to breakdown the period into six separate
five-year spans, making analysis less unwieldy. In cases that this is too short of a period, I note an
extension of the temporal aspect of that case.

\textsuperscript{110} The CINC (version 3.02) scores were downloaded from the Correlates of War website
(http://www.correlatesofwar.org) and are detailed in Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey (1972) and Singer
for the state to compensate for loses incurred with the war-ending settlement elsewhere in
the system. Employing both measures ensures that all such power shifts and resultant
opportunities to directly or indirectly revise the settlement are captured.

The coercion plus socialization model, however, implies that a shift in capabilities
that favors the defeated state should not lead to instability. As such, the capability
measures used in the next two chapters cannot necessarily help to differentiate between
the dynamics of the coercion and coercion plus socialization models. However, linking
power figures to postwar stability may provide a good first-cut as those settlements that
remain stable in the face of power shifts that favor the vanquished may be due to a
process of socialization. Thus, the results of the comparative historical analysis can help
to establish criteria to choose a case for in-depth analysis to trace the causal mechanisms
within coercion plus socialization model.

The next two chapters explore the thirteen individual cases in the universe of
great power war-ending settlements. Chapter four examines the first six cases: France
under the 1815 Second Treaty of Paris; Russia under the 1856 Treaty of Paris; Austria
under the 1859 Treaty of Zurich; Austria under the 1866 Treaty of Prague; France under
the 1871 Treaty of Frankfurt; and Russia under the 1905 Treaty of Portsmouth. Chapter
five examines the remaining seven cases: Germany under the 1919 Treaty of Versailles;
Austria under the 1919 Treaty of St. Germain; Hungary under the 1919 Treaty of
Trianon; Italy under the 1947 Treaty of Paris; Japan under the 1951 Treaty of San
Francisco; and both East and West Germany under the victorious Allied management
strategies following the Second World War. At the end of chapter five, I integrate the findings from all thirteen cases. In addition, I use the results from the entire comparative analysis to select a case for in-depth examination to explore the dynamics of the socialization plus coercion model in the sixth chapter.

\[\text{111 Italy was actually defeated in 1943 and was under the influence of the victors from that point on. For Japan, the formal war-ending treaty came only after much of the management strategy was devised during the period of occupation beginning in 1945. For both cases, the occupation periods as well as the formal war-ending treaties are examined. Neither West nor East Germany was given a formal war-ending treaty, at least not until 1990 and German reunification. The cases examine the US-led efforts in the western sectors of Germany and the Soviet efforts in the eastern sectors}\]
CHAPTER 4

GREAT POWER WAR-ENDING SETTLEMENTS FROM THE NAPOLEONIC WARS TO THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR

4.1 Introduction

The great power wars of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century before the World Wars all produced war-ending settlements that provided significant periods of postwar stability. Moreover, starting with the Second Treaty of Paris that brought the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars to a conclusion and ending with the Treaty of Portsmouth that brought the Russo-Japanese Wars to a close, most were at least somewhat lenient settlements. Thus, at first glance it appears that the conventional view of moderation in victory holds true in this time period.

This chapter will show, however, that this may not be entirely accurate. The historical analysis combined with the measures developed in the previous chapter highlight some very interesting characteristics of some cases that confound the conventional view. When the measure of severity is applied to the 1815 settlement, for example, it is not nearly as lenient as balance of power theorists and others would lead us to believe given their reliance on this particular case as a model of moderation in victory. Interestingly, 1815 was more restrictive than the much-derided 1871 Treaty of Frankfurt that ended the Franco-Prussian War and is quite often blamed for laying the seeds of the
First World War. The similarly long periods of stability that followed both settlements, moreover, can largely be attributed to the same factor. That is, rather than the much heralded legitimacy of the 1815 settlement, it appears that coercion worked to provide stability after both 1815 and 1871. This pattern, where either the vanquished state simply could not match the power of the victor or victors or where the victors pursued strict enforcement of the settlement, does much of the work in explaining the patterns of postwar stability in this period.

4.2 Post-Napoleonic Wars: France 1816-1845

The French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (1789-1815) ravaged Europe. Even before the final coalition repelled Napoleon’s Hundred Days and sealed the emperor’s fate at Waterloo, the victors had set to the business of constructing the postwar order. The most pressing problem was obviously how to treat France, a defeated country that retained vast resources and the potential to easily disturb the postwar order. The First Treaty of Paris (May 30, 1814) had been spoiled by the resurgence of Napoleon, but the Second Treaty of Paris (November 20, 1815) laid the foundation for the postwar system of which France, remade in some ways, was a central component.

The treaty reflected an effort by the victors to essentially contain France in the postwar era. As such, the territorial, military, economic, and, most importantly, political restrictions were significant. Though fearful of France in 1814, the First Treaty of Paris was less restrictive than 1815. The shift to greater containment of France came after the resurgence of Napoleon forced the victors to reckon with France’s potential postwar power and ability to foment instability.
French territory was restored to the 1790 borders, but with some modifications. Several northern territories, and the fortifications within those territories, were taken from France. The left bank of the Lauter, including the fortress of Landau, was made German, while Switzerland received territory to unify the canton of Geneva with the rest of the state (Article I; confirmed by Final Act of the Congress of Vienna). A United Kingdom of Holland and Belgium was created as yet another way to contain France (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 14). Though most of these land transfers were small, they represented an effort by the victors to provide France’s neighbors with a buffer from the potentially powerful state.\textsuperscript{112} While the effort on the part of the victorious allies was not necessarily to diminish French power as much as strengthen France’s neighbors because they contained military fortifications these alterations clearly amounted to strategic amputations.\textsuperscript{113}

The victors attempted to ensure France could not regain its nearly hegemonic status by limiting some of its military capabilities. The fortification of Huninguen was destroyed to give the Helvetic Confederacy “new proof of [French] good-will.” (Article III) Though they took caution to ensure that the new monarch of France would not be

\textsuperscript{112} In addition to the territorial transfers to strengthen France’s neighbors, the victorious great powers also gained territorial holdings. Russia received the biggest slice of Poland as well as Finland (from Sweden). Prussia received Saxony and all German territories that Napoleon had taken and land in Westphalia and the Rhineland. Austria got the Tyrol and other Italian lands. Great Britain, though returning some colonies that it held during the war, kept several strategic outposts in the periphery. See Bridge and Bullen (1980, 20-22), Rich (1992, 4-22) and Kegley and Raymond (1999, 112).

\textsuperscript{113} The victorious allies made the argument that the goal was not to weaken France but to increase the capabilities of its neighbors during the construction of the post-ending settlements. See Schroeder (1994), Rich, (1992), Bridge and Bullen (1980). However, it is hard to see how such transfers to France’s neighbors were anything but a relative weakening of the defeated state. In the end, France seemed to take it this way no matter the intentions of the victors. See Bridge and Bullen (1980, 25) who argue that the Second Treaty of Paris itself may have been relatively lenient, but the additional annexes to the treaty provided the means to target France’s great power status.
slighted, the allies essentially cordoned newly drawn French borders with 150,000 troops and the occupation of seventeen different fortresses for five years. All of this was to be paid for by the defeated state, including the garrisoning of troops and maintenance of the fortresses (Article V; the Additional Convention of Paris of November 20, 1815 defined the lines of military occupation). In addition, part of the Somme, regions in Aisne, Marne, Meurthe, Vosges, and single districts of Upper Saone and Doubs were demilitarized (Additional Convention, Article IV).

Some of the military provisions of the Treaty had clear economic consequences. Forcing a vanquished France to pay the costs of garrisoning the victors’ soldiers was a significant burden. In addition to this economic penalty, France was forced to pay the sum of seven hundred billion francs within five years (Article VI and Annexed Convention, Paris November 20, 1815). Thus, French coffers took a hit that, at least to some extent, limited the vanquished states ability to devote resources to other causes.114

The most significant political restrictions placed on France involved the regime of the defeated state and the construction of an international organization designed to defend the postwar order. The First Treaty of Paris required that a Bourbon retake the French throne and this was confirmed by the Second treaty (Article XI). The victors installed this new regime with the hope that a conservative monarch would defend rather than assault the European order.

114 As one historian put it, the indemnity on France was “a large sum but one well within her capacity to discharge, especially in view of her recovery after 1815.” (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 24-25) See also Schroeder (1994, 554) on the economic consequences of France’s defeated.
International institutions were also constructed to restrain France. Austria, Britain, Prussia, and Russia maintained their wartime alliance by forming the Quadruple Alliance the same day the Paris peace treaty was signed, pledging to enforce the settlement on France (Rich 1992, 26). Moreover, Austria, Prussia, and Russia formed the mostly ceremonial Holy Alliance. Finally, the Concert of Europe provided the victors the ability to manage European affairs. All of these actions were designed to protect the postwar status quo against French power and revisionism.115

All of this amounted to an allied desire for “long-term international supervision of the French government.” (Schroeder 1994, 552) France was limited not only territorially, militarily and economically, but also was deprived of many of the “most important attributes of great power status.” (Bridge and Bullen 1980, 25) France’s sway over its weaker European neighbors was limited, the enhanced capabilities of the new great powers would provide some leverage to protect against French revisionism in the larger European context, and, the most fundamental of all choices for a state – deciding who governs – was denied of the vanquished state.116

Although proponents of the maxim of moderation in victory herald this particular case as a spectacular success, in the end, the fear of a powerful, revisionist France led the victors to construct a settlement that was not all that lenient. The provisions of the Second Treaty of Paris, including the annexed and additional conventions, combined with efforts by the victors to strengthen French neighbors and construct international

115 “The clear notion behind both the Quadruple Alliance and the Concert was that there should be some formal and recognized procedure by which the great powers could maintain peace, and the territorial status quo.” (Bridge and Bullen 1980, 2-3).

116 As Schroeder puts it, “France was not entitled to choose a ruler incapable of living at peace with Europe.” (1994, 552)
institutions to bind France to the postwar order show that this war-ending settlement was at least partially restrictive. In fact, when the provisions are applied to the scale of severity developed above it appears to be just above the mid-range of restrictiveness.

| Territorial | Strategic Amputation | 2 |
| Military    | Limit Territory/Minor Weapons | 1 |
| Economic    | Medium                  | 2 |
| Political   | Regime Change/Much Autonomy | 2 |
|             | **Overall Severity**    | 7 |

**Table 4.1 War-ending Settlement for Post-Napoleonic France**

The judgment of this war-ending settlement as a remarkably lenient one, most pronounced with the conventional wisdom, is difficult to fathom given the overall severity of the settlement. The imposition of a new regime, and the fundamental violation of autonomy that it represents, along with the other aspects of autonomy and power lost by France are often glossed-over by those that label this a lenient settlement. Even though Louis XVIII had a great deal of autonomy, especially after discharging the

---

117 How is that the judgment of the conventional wisdom is that this was a remarkably lenient settlement? One possibility is that it is an issue of proportionality. French Revolutionary and then Napoleonic forces ransacked Europe. Given the costs incurred by the eventual victors, the settlement may indeed be lenient toward the state that caused so much destruction. If this is the case, then the conventional wisdom as discussed in the previous chapter is miss-specified. That is, it is not leniency but proportionality in war-ending settlements that leads to postwar stability. This, however, probably does not stand scrutiny as the postwar period, discussed below, shows that even if this was a proportionally lenient settlement, the actions of the victors did not necessarily produce a desire within France to accept the settlement as legitimate.
indemnities and other costs of the war-ending settlement, the placing of a Bourbon on the French throne was an undeniable attempt by the victors to remake France into a staunchly status quo state willing to defend the settlement.\textsuperscript{118}

Though there were minor conflicts and disturbances and even significant disagreements between the great powers, the period of 1816 through 1845 was fairly stable. This lasted at least until the revolutions of 1848, but can quite easily be seen to stretch into the 1850s, prior to the outbreak of the Crimean War. Many factors have been put forth to explain this, including the legitimacy of the settlement to all of Europe, a new era of international cooperation, the exhaustion of war leading to strong desires for peace. The role of the defeated state in the postwar system, however, can be explained mostly by two factors. First, the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy helped to restrain France domestically and internationally. But second, and possibly more importantly, France felt that it could not overthrow the 1815 system. Though the regime imposed in 1815 was fundamentally conservative, and the regime that followed in 1830 acted in much the same way, it was the perceived isolation and weakness of France rather than genuine French acceptance of the settlement that led the state to support and even at times defend the post-1815 status quo.

The pattern of French conflict largely demonstrates this grudging acceptance of the 1815 settlement. In the thirty years that followed the Second Treaty of Paris France was involved in eighteen disputes total (Table 4.2). Thus, France was involved in more than its fair-share of disputes, and on the face of it the period after 1815 would appear to

\textsuperscript{118} Even in the domestic context, the allies pushed the new sovereign in certain directions to protect European stability. Because European leaders saw French instability as the precursor to European-wide instability, the British leader Castlereagh, along with Wellington, counseled Louis XVIII to pursue domestic reconciliation rather than prosecuting any leftover French radicals (Schroeder 1994, 555).
be rather unstable at least with regard to the defeated state. However, many of the disputes were in defense of the European order. That is, France countered instability to protect the postwar status quo. Only five total French disputes (or 27.78%) were directed at or emanating from one of the victorious great powers, and only one actually involved the use of force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Great Power MIDs</th>
<th>1816-1820</th>
<th>1821-1825</th>
<th>1826-1830</th>
<th>1831-1835</th>
<th>1836-1840</th>
<th>1841-1845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FRN MIDs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRN MIDs with Victors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in FRN % of Victor Capabilities</td>
<td>12.12 (21.28)</td>
<td>6.06 (22.57)</td>
<td>5.67 (23.87)</td>
<td>-0.67 (23.71)</td>
<td>9.70 (26.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in FRN % of Great Power Capabilities</td>
<td>9.97 (17.53)</td>
<td>5.02 (18.41)</td>
<td>4.62 (19.26)</td>
<td>-0.57 (19.15)</td>
<td>7.78 (20.64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Great Powers 1816-1846: Austria-Hungary, France, Prussia, Russia, UK
-Victors: Austria-Hungary, Great Britain, France, Prussia, Russia.

**Table 4.2: France Post-French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (1789-1815)**

The forced regime change clearly affected France’s postwar behavior. The new regime desired to rejoin Europe: “From the French point of view, if the terms of the Treaty of Paris caused no great satisfaction, the main task was to regain acceptance in the European community; a policy of fulfillment of her obligations … was adopted as the
devise best calculated to allay suspicions and to remove the taint of unrespectability associated with revolution.” (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 24) France needed to work within the system of great powers to prove that it was in fact willing to defend the European order. By 1818, France was brought into the great power club as a full member by the addition of the vanquished state to the Quadruple Alliance. Until France could prove its commitment to the postwar order, however, this inclusion was intended more to bind France to the existing order than confer French similarity to the other conservative powers.119 Importantly, its treaty obligations in the alliance, and as a member of the Concert of Europe, included the defense of the 1815 settlements.

And it was not long before France had the opportunity to uphold the stability of Europe. The 1823 intervention in Spain demonstrated that France was willing to defend European stability. As soon as French troops helped to restore King Ferdinand’s authority, they evacuated the country.120 Though there was much hand-wringing over this incident and widespread fear what it could mean, this episode, even with all the divergent great power interests involved, showed that the allies could cooperate with the defeated nation to preserve European stability (Schroeder 1994, 627-628).

But in 1830 the regime imposed on France fell. However, one conservative monarch was simply replaced by another, albeit one with a certain revolutionary

---

119 Before France was included in the postwar alliance, the original Quadruple Alliance was renewed at Aix-la-Chapelle and, as Rich (1992, 34) puts it, “the warnings to warmongers [in France] could not have been more clear,” that it was expected to adhere to the status quo. The second treaty at Aix on 15 November 1818 actually brought the vanquished state into alliance with the other great powers.

120 The great powers were very worried that France, if it intervened in Spain, would regain its influence over its southern neighbor and this would be the first step to France breaking its containment. Therefore, France was allowed to intervene alone in Spain only if it withdrew immediately after quelling the uprising, Portugal was left alone, and France did not assist Spain in attempting to regain its colonies (Rich 1992, 40-41). It followed all of these conditions, and thus had restored the legitimate Bourbon monarchy in Spain per the wishes of the other great powers.
Though the victors initially feared otherwise, Louis Philippe acted cautiously until his ouster, just as Louis XVIII had. In several disputes after the 1830, France played a role in protecting European stability. The actions of France in 1831 and 1834 – expelling Dutch forces from Belgium and intervening in the Portuguese crisis of 1834 – were both taken in concert with the other great powers. Thus, throughout the early nineteenth century, the French regime seemed willing to accept the postwar order.

Much has been made of the legitimacy of this settlement. Indeed, the victors consciously attempted to limit any humiliation the Bourbons felt immediately after 1815 for the purposes of securing a stable monarchy in France that could be respected domestically as well as internationally. And even though various regimes in France did mostly act in accordance with wider European goals of stability, both the Bourbon and Orleans monarchies strongly desired to overthrow the settlement. Before the July 1830 revolution in France, the Bourbon monarch’s “main hope of strengthening and popularizing his rule lay in reviving the glory of France and the Bourbon dynasty by foreign-policy victories. He constantly dreamed of overthrowing the treaties, redrawing the map of Europe, expanding in Belgium and the Rhineland, restoring French influence in Italy, and uniting the Continent against Britain.” Louis Philippe, though maybe more moderate in his desires, differed little (Schroeder 1994, 668).

121 Louis Philippe of the house of Orleans claimed sovereignty not through god-given right, but through the will of the French people (Bridge and Bullen 1980, 49)

122 The other great powers made sure of this. Following the July 1830 revolution, Austria, Prussia, and Russia issued the “Chiffon de Carlsbad” in which they agreed to maintain the 1815 settlement and “warned the new regime in France to respect the established order in the rest of Europe.” (Bridge and Bullen 1980, 49)
While France played the role of conservative defender of European stability in several instances, at least a few incidents clearly show the French desire to alter its international position and, more generally, overthrow the 1815 system. In response to an Austrian crackdown on Italian revolutionary movements in 1831, France made a bid for political influence in Italy by implementing a naval occupation of the papal port of Anacon (Bridge and Bullen 1980, 53-54). Nothing much came from this action, and French naval forces were removed when Austrian forces evacuated the Papal states and Parma and Modena. But later French actions in the Near East and North Africa were also attempts to reassert French influence in the regions as well as in the wider political game between the great powers. Throughout the 1830s the French expanded into Algeria, with some action spilling into Morocco. Britain, worried that Gibraltar would be threatened if France gained influence in Morocco, forced the French to back-off its expansion in North Africa (Rich 1992, 73-77). Moreover, in 1840, the Thiers government in France nearly provoked a European war over the Egyptian crisis in an attempt to reassert French political influence. Louis Philippe, alarmed by the possibility of war, forced Thiers to resign to indicate that the French would back down rather than risk war (Schroeder 1994, 742-747).

French desires to regain its power and influence of the pre-1815 system are evident in all of these episodes. France backed-down each time, however, for fear of facing a war while still isolated. Since the Bourbon regime had no allies, it desired peace. The Orleans monarchy was in the same position and thus acted similarly. Though French capabilities slowly recovered after 1816 (see Table 4.2), all the way through the reemergence of a French Empire in 1852 France stated that it sought stability in Europe.
and mostly acted in accordance with this. The only gains that any regime could make would be piecemeal while still facing the 1815 settlement. When each regime, including Louis Napoleon’s that would eventually provoke much instability in Europe, claimed it wanted peace, each “meant that France would not go to war until she had secured allies to guard against the danger of another defeat.” (Bridge and Bullen 1980, 76)

France’s action in Spain and Belgium to ingratiate itself with the European powers did little to end its isolation. Nor did the actions to defend the European order quell the victors’ anxieties over France. Indeed, the other great powers always feared a revival of French revolutionary spirit. Though victorious great power cooperation is marked as over as early as 1821 by some accounts, in every instance that France had opportunities to assert itself – in 1823, 1831, 1834, and 1840 – the conservative victors were able to signal to France that it would be opposed.123 This at least minimal degree of unity among the victors largely explains French hesitancy to seriously challenge the settlement.

In the end, the moderately restrictive settlement of 1815 provided relative stability for a period that Europe had rarely before experienced. Even with French power slowly increasing throughout the period, the vanquished state did not attempt to fundamentally alter the settlement. The French nation, though, did not accept the settlement. Indeed, throughout the nineteenth century the 1815 settlement was condemned in the vanquished state. As long as a conservative monarch ruled France and the victors maintained some degree of unity regarding the danger that France may pose, however, postwar stability

123 As Bridge and Bullen (1980, 15) put it, “In the period before 1848 the three autocratic monarchies were determined that preponderant strength should be on the side of forces of order and on the side of the coalition against France.”
endured. It was not until the mid-nineteenth century – when the nephew of Napoleon took power – that France again fomented significant instability in Europe.

4.3 Post-Crimean War: Russia 1857-1886

The result of the perennial crises in the Near East, the Crimean War began as a conflict between Russia and the Ottoman Empire ostensibly regarding religious issues within the Ottoman Empire. However, the United Kingdom and France entered the conflict largely to halt Russian expansionism and eliminate the Russian threat to European interests in the Near East. Suffering a heavy toll in human and economic terms, Russia accepted defeat at the hands of the allies with the Treaty of Paris on March 30, 1856.

Though Britain pushed for a harsh settlement largely because of public outcry against Russian actions during the war and its persistent competition with Russia in the Near and Far East, France, with political support from Austria, desired a lenient peace. Louis Napoleon thought there gains to be made, and sought rapprochement with the vanquished state. In the end, the provisions of the Treaty of Paris proved rather lenient on Russia.

Russia lost no significant territory as a result of the war-ending settlement. All occupied territory had to be evacuated and a small strip of Bessarabia was taken from the Tsar to “more fully secure the Freedom of the navigation of the Danube.” (Article XX) Other minor territorial amputations occurred in Asia. Overall, the territorial provisions of the Paris Treaty were quite unremarkable except in their leniency.
Militarily, the Tsar faced only the neutralization of the Black Sea (Article XI). Any fortifications along the sea also had to be evacuated, as both Russia and the Ottoman Empire were explicitly prohibited from guarding the coasts (Article XIII). Thus, Russia lost the ability to use this body of water to stage future operations against the Porte or other states but was dealt with no other military limitations.

Russia was forced to relinquish its claim to a privileged position in the Porte’s internal affairs, specifically regarding the protection of Christians within the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, the Ottoman Empire gained footing with Russia when it was admitted into the Concert of Europe, with all members agreeing to respect the territorial integrity of the Empire (Article VII).

Given how little the Treaty of Paris restricted postwar Russia, the overall severity of the war-ending settlement was quite low. Table 4.3 shows how the Treaty of Paris ranks on the scale of severity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Minimal Transfers</th>
<th>Overall Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Territorial</td>
<td>Minimal Transfers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Limit Territory/Minor Weapons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Domestic/Int’l Limitations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3: War-ending Settlement for Post-Crimean War Russia**
According to some, the text of the Treaty made it “impossible to determine who was the victor and who the vanquished.” (Rich 1992, 120) The only blow to Russian power and prestige was the neutralization of the Black Sea. Though it implied no state could use the sea for military purposes, Russia feared that the Turks would invite, or at least not stop, powers friendly to the Porte from entering the body of water. Thus, neutralization may actually expose Russia to threats (Goldfrank 1994, 297). In every other way, the settlement was remarkably lenient given the fairly high costs of the war to the victors.

Although the settlement barely restricted the defeated state at all, Russia saw the settlement as illegitimate and the postwar period saw eventual attempts by the vanquished state at alteration. After 1856, Russian policy “was bent on the revision of the treaty of Paris to the exclusion of all else.” (Taylor 1957, 90) In particular, the neutralization of the Black Sea provoked Russian indignation.124 However, Russian attempts at revisionism came only after several years of stability. Though there is little doubt that Russia desired to overturn the settlement, it could not take advantage of the fissures between the allies regarding enforcement until later in the nineteenth century.125 Russia did attempt to exploit oversights in the treaty regarding the Serpents Island at the mouth

124 Though this was a relatively minor military restriction and was nearly unenforceable unless French and British ships remained nearby to monitor Russian compliance, Russia deeply resented the neutralization of the sea by the victors from the beginning (Taylor 1957, 85). In the postwar period, Gorchakov took over Russian foreign policy with one goal: “I am looking for a man who will annul the clauses of the treaty of Paris, concerning the Black Sea question and the Bessarabian frontier.” Quoted in Taylor (1954, 91).

125 As Bartlett (1996, 72) notes, “Although Russia herself remained too weak to take major initiatives until the 1870s, her new priorities meant that she welcomed setbacks to Austria and Britain, the main defenders of the Treaty of Paris.”
of the Danube and gain control of Bolgrad immediately after its loss (Taylor 1957, 91-93). However, after the war Russia for the most part entered a phase of domestic and military restructuring (Goldfrank 1992, 296).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1857-1861</th>
<th>1862-1866</th>
<th>1867-1871</th>
<th>1872-1876</th>
<th>1877-1881</th>
<th>1882-1886</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Great Power MIDs</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of RUS MIDs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS MIDs with Victors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in RUS % of Victor Capabilities (RUS % of Victor Capabilities)</td>
<td>-23.79</td>
<td>-21.37</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>-15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25.08)</td>
<td>(19.72)</td>
<td>(20.22)</td>
<td>(26.66)</td>
<td>(31.74)</td>
<td>(26.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in RUS % of Great Power Capabilities (RUS % of Great Power Capabilities)</td>
<td>-19.96</td>
<td>-16.50</td>
<td>-2.95</td>
<td>21.96</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>-22.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.24)</td>
<td>(13.56)</td>
<td>(12.16)</td>
<td>(16.05)</td>
<td>(18.34)</td>
<td>(15.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Great Powers 1857-1886: Austria-Hungary, France, Italy (after 1860), Prussia, Russia, UK
- Victors: France, Italy, UK

**Table 4.4: Russia Post-Crimean War (1853-1856)**

Though it never relented on its desire to revise the settlement, Russia took very little action to do so until the 1870s (see Table 4.4). It was only when Europe was otherwise occupied that Russia took the first steps toward altering its postwar position. This coincides with a resurgence of Russian capabilities compared to the victorious
states. Russia had lower than expected militarized disputes until the 1867-1871 period, where an increase in Russian power coincided with a significant jump in the number of disputes. Moreover, post-1871, over seventy-seven percent of Russian MIDs were with at least one of the victors of the Crimean War. Overall, over fifty-seven percent of Russian MIDs in the postwar period were with at least one of the victorious states.

The Franco-Prussian War combined with lack of enforcement by the victors and growing Russian power provided the vanquished state the opportunity to repudiate the clauses of the Treaty of Paris that neutralized the Black Sea in 1871. Moreover, Russia resumed its activities as the protector of the southern Slavs. After the Russo-Turkish War and by the treaty of San Stefano (March 3, 1878), Russia regained most of what was lost with the Treaty of Paris. The strategic strip of Bessarabia that partially controlled access to the Danube was back under the control of the Tsar, Ottoman influence in Southern Europe was replaced by Russian sway in the region, and even Ottoman fortresses on the Danube were destroyed. Russian action, however, alarmed the other great powers. When the issues were reopened at the Congress of Berlin (June-July 1878) Russia was stripped of some of the gains it made in the war (Albrect-Carrie 1958, 172-177).

Though the treaty of Paris was rather gentle on Russia, it seems this did little to quell the vanquished state’s desire to revise the settlement. When the opportunities presented themselves, in terms of lax enforcement by the victors or increases in Russian capabilities, Russia took advantage of them. It was only capable of doing so after a certain amount of time, but eventually the stability of the settlement was destroyed.

126 Albrecht-Carrié (1958, 139-140). This was clearly a symbolic action intended to only eliminate the humiliation Russia felt caused by the provision. Russia did not even have a Black Sea fleet (Taylor 1954, 215).
4.4 Post-Italian War of Unification: Austria 1860-1889

Austria, faced with many internal problems as well as quite a few external threats, lost two wars within a decade. After these defeats, the once powerful state never recovered its power or status within the Europe. The first war, the Italian War of Unification (or, the Austrian War with France and Piedmont), saw Austria goaded into war by Piedmont-Sardinia and France. Cavour, long desiring the unification of Italy, found a willing partner in Louis Napoleon. The French leader, pushed mainly by his desire to overturn the European order, was willing to strike a deal by which, if Austria could be made out as the aggressor, France would aid the Piedmontese in their designs (Rich 1992, 128). After several French and Piedmontese victories, Austria sued for peace. An armistice was signed at Villafranca in July 1859 and on November 10 the Treaty of Zurich laid out the relatively lenient terms of the peace.

Austria lost most of Lombardy to Piedmont-Sardinia, by way of ceding it to Louis Napoleon who then gave it to the Italians (Article III). Venetia, long desired by Italian nationalists, remained under Austrian control and as did the fortresses of Mantua and Peschiera along the Quadrilateral (Taylor 1957, 114). In the end, the territorial provisions of the treaty left Austria in control of much of the land Italian nationalists had hoped for to unify the state.

The economic provisions of the treaty were nearly nonexistent. Austria did not have to pay an indemnity or reparations, nor were any of the land transfers or maintenance of assets within the lands to be paid for by the vanquished state. The only provision that had economic repercussions for the vanquished was the ceding of railway rights within the territories given to the Italians (Articles X). This, however, probably
helped the Austrian economy more than it hurt. The Austrian treasury was in shambles and not only did Austria manage to pass along the costs of maintaining the railways, but the Italians actually paid Austria for ceding them (Article XI).

There were no military provisions in the Zurich Treaty or direct political restrictions on the vanquished state. However, the political results of the war weakened Austria compared to Italy, especially after unification in 1861. During the war, Tuscany, Modena, and Parma overthrew their royal houses and voted to join Piedmont-Sardinia, creating a north Italian Kingdom, and soon after the war Naples revolted and was eventually absorbed by the new Kingdom of Italy (Goldstein 1992, 18). Although the new Italian state was weak, it gained significant power relative to the vanquished state after the war and unification.

The war-ending settlement of 1859 was thus extremely gentle on a vanquished Austria. Even the score of two on this scale may be overstating the severity of the Treaty of Zurich (Table 4.5). However, the troubles for Austria increased as the settlement paved the way for Italian unification and the vanquished state faced new international limitations with a stronger neighbor now sitting on the Austrian southern border.
Territorial  Minimal Transfers  1
Military  None  0
Economic  None  0
Political  Domestic/Int’l Limitations  1

**Overall Severity**  2

**Table 4.5: War-ending Settlement for Post-Italian War of Unification Austria**

General postwar stability followed this extraordinarily lenient settlement. Of the eight Austrian MIDs from 1860-1889, only three (37.50 percent) were with the victors (Table 4.6). The Austro-Prussian War, of course, occurred seven years after the Italian War of Unification, and this was the first militarized dispute with either of the victors. However, Italy’s involvement in the 1866 war was an attempt by a victor of the previous war to collect more spoils. The other two MIDs with either of the victors of the 1859 war were fairly minor – one involved a fortification dispute on Austrian border with Italy in 1877 and the other a show of force directed against France and in concert with Italy and the United Kingdom in 1888. In total Austria had only eight out of sixty-five great power MIDs for the entire period – over twenty-six percent fewer MIDs than the average great power. This, combined with the few militarized exchanges with the victors of the 1859 war clearly demonstrates that Austria did not actively pursue revision of the settlement.
Table 4.6: Austria Post-Italian War of Unification (1859)

The course of history shows this to be the case. Austria did join Prussia in the Danish War of 1864, but largely because it could not side with a nationalist cause lest it foment even more unrest in its own multi-ethnic empire. But for the most part, given its isolation Austrian policy was one of only protecting its remaining interests, not regaining lost ones. The Empire accepted the Convention of Gastein in 1865, which provided Prussia with inordinate gains but allowed Austria to keep the one ally it believed to have (Rich 1992, 195-198). This agreement laid the foundations for the Prussian-Italian engineered war to take even more gains from the already once defeated, troubled Austrian state when Prussia demanded to purchase the Holstein territory Austria had...
gained administrative control of as a result of the Danish War. Though Austria stood firm in this instance, it was fearful enough of the potential for war with Prussia and Italy expanding to include France that it essentially agreed to give Venetia to Italy no matter the outcome of any war if France would stay neutral (Taylor 1957, 163).

For the most part, in the post-1859 period and specifically in the run-up to the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, any international instability involving the vanquished state did not entail Austrian attempts to revise the settlement, but Austrian attempts to keep what few advantages the victors of 1859 and its Prussian competitor had left it with. Instability, therefore, did not follow this lenient settlement, but Austrian impotence may have prevented it from acting in any case.

4.5 Post-Austro-Prussian War: Austria 1867-1896

Already defeated by France and Italy in 1859, the diplomacy of Prussia’s Bismarck pushed Austria into its second defeat within a decade. The Austro-Prussian War, ostensibly about control of Schleswig-Holstein, in the end determined the leadership of the German states. As the course of the war worsened for Austria, France offered to mediate an end to the conflict and the preliminary Peace of Nikolsburg was signed on July 26, 1866 – just over a month after the start of the war. The August 23, 1866 Treaty of Prague formally ended the war, and confirmed the agreement of Nikolsburg. Not a foregone conclusion at the beginning of the war, Prussia, aided by its Italian ally, easily defeated the crumbling empire with superior planning, training, and
firepower and supplanted Austria as dominant state in Germany. Though Prussia was in a position to treat Austria harshly, the war-ending settlement that emerged was fairly generous to the defeated state.

By the Treaty of Prague, Prussia annexed Schleswig-Holstein (Article V) and ceded the entirety of Venetia to Italy (Article II).¹²⁷ In addition, when the small German states of Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Frankfurt that fought with Austria balked at notion of Prussian dominance after the war, the victor annexed them.¹²⁸ While neither Prussia nor Italy took large swaths of Austrian holdings, the territorial components of the settlement signified dwindling Austrian influence in Germany.

The economic aspects of the treaty, while not overly burdensome, placed some pressure on the already strained Austrian treasury. In total, Prussia was to receive forty million Prussian thalers from Austria for the costs of the war (Article XI). But the sum Austria was actually liable for was reduced to twenty million thalers by the five million the defeated state already contributed to support Prussian occupation forces and the fifteen million the Danes owed Austria for the administration of Holstein (Towle 2000, 69).

While there were no direct military restrictions placed on the defeated state, Austria agreed to allow Prussia to control the railways and military of Bavaria, Wurttemberg and Baden during times of war (Goldstein 1992, 11). This did not

¹²⁷ There was a separate war-ending agreement between Italy and Austria. However, the October 3, 1866 Treaty of Vienna mirrored the Treaty of Prague in terms of Austrian losses to Italy.

¹²⁸ Saxony, another German state that fought with Austria, remained independent of Prussia but was forced within the Prussian dominated North German Confederation (Article VI).
necessarily diminish Austrian military capabilities. If, however, another war with Prussia were to occur, Austria would not be able to count on its former allies for transport or military support.

The most significant of all provisions in the war-ending agreement dealt with the roles of Austria and Prussia in larger German affairs. Austria agreed to the dissolution of the Germanic Confederation and, moreover, article IV of the Treaty established the North German Confederation, “without the participation of the Imperial Austrian State.” With this political maneuver, Prussia consolidated power within Germany and relegated Austria to a much-diminished role.

| Territorial | Minimal Transfers | 1 |
| Military | None | 0 |
| Economic | Low | 1 |
| Political | Domestic/Int’l Limitations | 1 |
| **Overall Severity** | || 3 |

*Table 4.7: War-ending Settlement for Post-Austro-Prussian War Austria*
On the scale of severity, the 1866 settlement was fairly gentle on the vanquished state. Losing only minimal territory, incurring moderate economic penalties, and suffering few if any military restrictions, Austria was treated leniently. But losing almost all political power within Germany was a big blow to the historic leader of the Germanic states.

After defeat, Austria turned to domestic reorganization and its growing commercial and strategic interests in the Balkans, seen as the “only remaining area where the empire might be able to expand.” The Austrian empire was remade into the Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy, and the Hungarians began to command more and more decision-making. Thus, “if the Austrians were not yet fully resigned to eclipse in Germany, they were ill-placed to contemplate another war with Prussia ‘for a long time’” and did not try to regain any losses from Prussia or Italy (Bartlett 1996, 89). This predisposition to avoid conflict is very clearly demonstrated in the entire postwar period. Austria was involved in thirty percent fewer MIDs than the average great power from 1867-1896 (Table 4.8). Of the seven it was involved in, only one was with either of the victors, and this was Italy in 1877. Austria had no disputes with Germany after 1866.
The postwar pattern clearly shows that the growing power of Prussia and a relative drop in Austrian capabilities provided the vanquished state with little opportunity to revise its treatment or regain status among the German states. Though there was an effort to create an alliance between France, Italy, and Austria in the late 1860s, it failed to materialize. In any case, such an alliance would do little for Austria in terms of regaining power and status vis-à-vis Prussia, and thus the defeated state was unwilling to align against its vanquisher (Taylor 1957, 193-196). Austria’s fate in Germany was sealed and its attention was only given to the Balkans – an area that may demand Austria gain Prussian support against Russia. After German unification, Austria formally allied itself
with Germany in the Dual Alliance of 1879 and, even though retaining significant conflicts of interests with its southern neighbor, joined Italy in the Triple Alliance of 1881.

Bismarck has been praised for constructing such a lenient settlement for a defeated foe. And, in the end, this mild settlement did produce stability as far as the defeated state was concerned. Although Austria was deposed as leader of the Germanic states, it did not claim the settlement to be illegitimate. However important this acceptance of the new status quo was, Austria weakness in the face of growing Prussian power cannot be discounted as a factor leading to this stability.

4.6 Post-Franco-Prussian War: France 1872-1901

Engineered by Bismarck, the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871 not only unified Germany under Prussian leadership, but also dealt the formerly single greatest European military power a significant blow to its power and prestige. Compared to the Prussian treatment of Austria in 1866, the May 10, 1871 Treaty of Frankfurt was good deal harsher on the vanquished. Unlike Austria, France was handed significant territorial and economic restrictions, though no real military prohibitions were dictated and the political restrictions on France were more of a result of the shift from French to German dominance of continental Europe than the war-ending settlement itself.
Essentially a dictated peace as France felt it was powerless to resist after the fall of Paris, the war-ending settlement’s most significant components involved territorial issues and economic penalties. France lost all of Alsace and most of Lorraine to Germany (Articles I-III). This territorial amputation was a strategic blow to the defeated state as well as a source of French humiliation (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 141).

The economic provisions of the Frankfurt Treaty, though not as much of a source of injury to French pride as losing Alsace and Loraine, were just as harsh. France had to pay a five billion franc indemnity, five hundred million of which had to be paid within thirty days of the reestablishment of a French government, five hundred billion in May 1872, one billion over the course of the next year, and the remaining three billion no later than March 1874 (Article VII). Though the French economy was large enough to endure this massive sum and drastic payment schedule, the state could afford to do little else until it was paid. Only when the entire sum was discharged would the last German soldier leave French territory (Article VII). Moreover, France had to support the German occupation forces in Paris until the vanquished made the initial payments on the indemnity (Article VIII).129

Other provisions also restricted French economic freedom. A most-favored-nation clause was included in the war-ending agreement (article XI) and France was forced to cede all French holdings of and rights to the Eastern Railway Company. Germany was to pay just over three hundred million francs for this, to be deducted from the indemnity. Moreover, should the vanquished nation somehow manage to gain

---

129 Bismarck had wrongly calculated that such a sum would forever cripple the French economy and thus perpetuate German occupation of the defeated state. France experienced an economic recovery in the postwar period and fervently paid off the indemnity (Taylor 1957, 217).
additional holdings of the railway company, these had to be turned over to Germany immediately. If not, then France must cede to Germany concessions on the railway company operating within France for only two million francs (Additional Article II).

Though the only military provisions in the settlement dealt with the occupation of France and there were no political restrictions placed on the defeated state, the economic and territorial provisions take the overall severity of the settlement nearly to the midrange of restrictiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial</th>
<th>Strategic Amputations</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Severity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: War-ending Settlement for Post-Franco-Prussian War France

This moderately restrictive settlement proved stable, at least to a certain point. Initially, the only French desire was to fulfill the terms of the treaty so that the hated occupation could end and France could begin to regain its prewar strength and prestige. Discharging the war-debt a year early, postwar France was then consumed with domestic restructuring and internal political wrangling. Still, French resentment toward its treatment grew incessantly (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 165-166). However, it was powerless
to challenge Germany. Thoughts of the humiliating defeat and the subsequent annexation
of Alsace and Lorraine led even elements of the French Left to the mantra of, “think of it
always, speak of it never.”  

130 Gambetta (Quoted in Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 167). Taylor (1957, 223) argues that Gambetta’s positions
was directed not only to French losses and German dominance of Europe, but also because French national
unity was destroyed and self-determination in the European context was denied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Great Power MIDs</th>
<th>Number of FRN MIDs</th>
<th>FRN MIDs with Victors</th>
<th>Change in FRN % of Victor Capabilities</th>
<th>Change in FRN % of Great Power Capabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872-1876</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-22.80 (104.35)</td>
<td>-13.64 (16.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877-1881</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.68 (101.55)</td>
<td>-0.24 (16.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-1886</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5.19 (96.28)</td>
<td>4.98 (17.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887-1891</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-20.09 (76.94)</td>
<td>-8.08 (16.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1896</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7.19 (71.41)</td>
<td>-2.34 (15.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1901</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-11.51 (63.19)</td>
<td>-8.31 (14.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Great Powers 1872-1901: Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, UK (US & Japan excluded)
-Victor: Germany

Table 4.10: France Post-Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871)
Although French involvement in disputes was higher than the average great power from 1877 through 1902 – over double for the period – most involved French interests outside of Europe, specifically in Asia, the Near East, and Latin America. In fact, over sixty-five percent of all French dispute involvement was either outside Europe or in support of other European great powers. Only three disputes (or about eleven percent of all French disputes) involved France and Germany directly, one in 1885 and two in 1887 (Table 4.10). In all three, France was the recipient of aggression and did not respond militarily to German action.\textsuperscript{131}

The gap in capabilities between the victors and the vanquished indicates France simply could not make any gains relative to Germany: “In the years to come, the French were hostile to Germany when they saw some chance of defeating her, and were resigned to German superiority, if not reconciled to it, so long as they felt themselves too weak to overthrow it.” (Taylor 1957, 217-218) To complicate the matter for France, the defeated nation was without allies until the Franco-Russian alliance of 1894, as Bismarckian diplomacy isolated the vanquished nation (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 194-212). As France slowly gained stronger ties with other great powers through the Franco-Russian alliance shifting from purely defensive to one with a stated goal of maintaining equilibrium in Europe in 1899, the establishment of the Entente Cordiale with Britain in 1904, and the construction of the Triple Entente in 1907, the defeated state began to imagine opportunities to redress the post-1871 status quo. But even after making some limited

\textsuperscript{131} This includes the War Scare of 1875. France was swiftly trying to rebuild its army after defeat and Bismarck, disturbed by French anti-German activity, introduced newspaper stories indicating the danger of the situation. The episode ended in German embarrassment, however, as France came across as a powerless victim of the German will to militarily dominate Europe. France thus achieved a very limited victory (Rich 1992, 220-221; Taylor 1957, 226-227).
strategic gains, showdowns with Germany like the Moroccan Crisis (1905) demonstrated French impotence more than anything else. Such instances, however, also began to alarm other European powers concerned with European equilibrium. In the end, French revisionism toward Germany and the Treaty of Frankfurt would not be fully realized until the opening of the First World War.132

In sum, this somewhat restrictive settlement led to a sort of stability between the victors and the vanquished. Reductions in French power relative to Germany made it impossible for France to challenge the victor, and thus its interests and actions were directed mostly outside of Europe. But undoubtedly the settlement drove French revisionism. Although mostly outside of the period of analysis, France acted to revise its treatment when the opportunity finally arose. Though the period of stability following the Franco-Prussian war was one of the longest in modern European history, this precarious stability would be shattered in 1914.

4.7 Post-Russo-Japanese War: Russia 1906-1935

In an attempt to break the stalemate in Russian-Japanese negotiations over the status of Manchuria and Japanese penetration of Korea, Japan launched the February 1904 surprise attack on Port Arthur. Even though several Japanese sea and land victories were matched by no significant Russian victories, the strain of the war quickly set-in for both sides. With Japan’s economy under pressure and Russia gripped with revolution at

132 Given French weakness vis-à-vis Germany, there were opportunities for the defeated state to reach certain understandings with the victor when other great powers threatened French interests. Conflicts over colonies actually spurred a limited Franco-German entente in the mid 1880s (Taylor 1957, 297-298). This, however, was not long lasting and certainly did not lessen any French desires to overthrow the 1871 settlement. Rather, it was simply a perceived opportunity for the defeated state to make gains outside of Europe.
home, the United States offered to mediate an end to the Russo-Japanese War. The September 5, 1905 Treaty of Portsmouth codified Japanese advantages over Russia and brought the war to an end.

With the Japanese victory, Russia was forced to relinquish some territory. Specifically, Russia ceded its lease of the Liaotung peninsula to Japan, which included Port Arthur, as well as the southern half of Sakhalin Island (Articles V and IX). Though fairly minor, the loss of a strategically valuable port lessened Russia’s capabilities in the Far East. Moreover, Russia acquiesced to Japan’s domination of Korea and both parties agreed to give Manchuria back to China (Articles II and III).

The economic components of the treaty included both railway and fishing provisions, most of which benefited Japan. Russian railway interests in southern Manchuria were transferred to Japan and included all properties in the region utilized by the railways.133 This meant coalmines associated with Russian railway interests would also be ceded to the victor (Article VI). Both the victor and the vanquished were supposed to neutralize any remaining railway holdings in the region so that they could be used “in nowise for strategic purposes.” (Article VII) Japan was also granted fishing rights in the Japan, Okhostsk, and Bering Seas off the Russian coasts (Article XI). Finally, both nations had to accept Most-Favored Nation status for the other (Article XII).

The only provision in the settlement that dealt with military issues affected both the victors and the vanquished, but it hurt Russia’s ability to militarily alter the settlement later more than any Japanese interest. Article IX, giving the southern portion of Sakhalin

133 This took away a significant concession Russia had received from China in 1896, whereby Russia was granted very cheap (in the end, mostly free) access to construct the Manchurian link to the Trans-Siberian Railway (Rich 1992, 320).
Island to Japan, also required that the island be free of military fortifications. Thus, neither the victor nor the vanquished was allowed to concentrate forces there. With the island in Japanese hands, this was a disadvantage Russia was forced to accept.

There were no political restrictions placed on the defeated state, but the treaty enshrined Japanese dominance in Korea and diminished Russia’s role in the Far East. In all, the treaty was fairly gentle on Russia, placing only minor territorial, economic, and military restrictions on the vanquished state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Minimal Transfers</th>
<th>Limit Territory/Minor Weapons</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Overall Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Territorial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: War-ending Settlement for Post-Russo-Japanese War Russia

After the war, Russia mostly dropped out as a significant player in East Asia until the Second World War, though during and after the First World War it did have some militarized disputes in the region. But for the most part, Russia’s attention shifted to the domestic problems facing the Tsar as well as to its interests in the Balkans and other Western issues (Bridge and Bullen 1980, 160-161). A good measure of this shift was due to the domestic toll of revolution and the decline of the Tsarist state’s relative power.
### Table 4.12: Russia Post-Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905)

Prior to the First World War, Russia had no militarized disputes with Japan (Table 4.12). The first MID to occur between the former belligerents was actually Japanese involvement in the Allied intervention during the Russian civil war in 1917. In other instances, it was mostly Japanese aggressiveness in East Asia that led the two into some level of conflict, including the Japanese occupation of the entire Sakhalin Island and the occupation of Vladivostock in 1920. Even later, in the run-up to the Second World War, it was not Russia but Japan that instigated most of the clashes between the two. In all, there were no MIDs between the victors and vanquished from the end of the war until 1917, and then only ten of the Russian total of fifty-eight from 1906 until 1935, or about
seventeen percent of all Russian MIDs. Clearly, much of the instability revolving around Russia in the postwar period was due to the First World War and the revolution. This, in effect, skews the measure of stability in this case. The small number of disputes between the belligerents of the Russo-Japanese war, however, signifies that the postwar situation was fairly stable between the two.

Although the treaty of Portsmouth satisfied neither side, as Russia thought it gave up too much and Japan felt it did not gain the spoils it deserved, in the end some of the few actions taken in the region by the defeated state signified a type of reconciliation with its vanquisher. In 1907 Russia and Japan signed a treaty of navigation and commerce and later an agreement to respect each other’s territorial integrity as well as to promote an open-door policy in Manchuria. Concluded at the urging of France and Great Britain, this largely stabilized the greater East Asian region (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 256). A later treaty recognizing the former belligerents’ spheres of influence allowed both to take advantage of this new understanding, mostly at the expense of China (Rich 1992, 328).

The inability for Russia to regain power in East Asia may account for much of this pattern. Russian power did not increase until after the First World War, and the trend for the Russo-Japanese power relationship was mixed but tended toward a slow relative
increase for the victors.\textsuperscript{134} This, combined with the fact that the treaty was not restrictive and thus raised only limited initial Russian resentment, may explain why the situation between Russia and Japan was fairly stable in at least the immediate postwar era.

4.8 Summary

The nineteenth and very early twentieth century saw mostly lenient, or just moderately restrictive, war-ending settlements applied to the vanquished state. Beyond this, these six cases of great power war-ending settlements demonstrate one other remarkable similarity: the power of the victors generally kept the vanquished states in line. Extended periods of stability followed 1856 as Russian weakness prevented it from acting against the settlement until the 1870s, 1859 and 1866 as Austria had little capacity to act against the victors, 1871 as France was exposed as completely impotent, and 1905 as Russia generally withdrew from Asian competition. Even after 1815, France felt that it was unable to challenge the settlement because of its isolation in international affairs even though its capabilities slightly rebounded.

To be sure, in several of these instances the defeated state may have had little to resent and therefore little incentive to act against the settlement. Austria after both 1859 and 1866 certainly fits this bill, as does possibly Russia after 1905. But in the other cases, the vanquished state did deeply resent the settlement. Objectively a very lenient settlement than only slightly curtailed Russian autonomy and power after the Crimean

\textsuperscript{134} The overall capabilities of Russia far outmatched those of Japan. However, the ceding of a strategic naval station to Japan and the difficulties Russia had in transporting significant military capabilities to East Asia in general, which was further complicated by domestic turmoil, may make this measure of power less reliable in this case. Because of these types of issues, I rely more on the trends of power indicators in this case and in others.
War, the Treaty of Paris was an object of Russian revisionist intentions from the day it was signed. The 1815 settlement – generally trumpeted for its leniency – was, by the measures used here, the most restrictive settlement of the period and one that created nearly the most resentment in the defeated state. Only the 1871 peace, where France suffered fewer restrictions on its autonomy and power, was more hated by the vanquished state.

The next chapter will examine the remaining cases in the great power war-ending settlements, specifically those emanating from the First and Second World Wars. I will return to the cases analyzed in this chapter and provide further analysis at the end of chapter five when it is possible to integrate the findings from the entire universe of great power war-ending settlements.
CHAPTER 5

GREAT POWER WAR-ENDING SETTLEMENTS AND POSTWAR STABILITY
FOLLOWING THE FIRST AND SECOND WORLD WARS

5.1 Introduction

The great power war-ending settlements coming out of the two world wars of the twentieth century all severely restricted the autonomy and power of the defeated state. The 1919 Treaty of Versailles imposed on Germany at the close of the First World War is certainly the most recognizable, and most derided, war-ending agreement of the twentieth century. But the equivalent settlements the victors of the First World War handed Austria and Hungary were nearly as restrictive. And all, in one way or another, ended in disaster.

No First World War settlement, however, was as severe as the treatment a dismembered Germany received after the Second World War. Both East and West Germany were handed far-reaching restrictions that few other vanquished states in history have experienced. The other defeated great powers of the Second World War – Japan and Italy – received only slightly less restrictive settlements. Postwar stability following these settlements, however, proved to be fairly robust.

As the previous chapter did with the six nineteenth and very earliest twentieth century cases, this chapter will analyze the seven war-ending settlements that emerged
out of the two World Wars of the twentieth century. The cases in this chapter very clearly demonstrate that restrictive settlements can lead to postwar stability under certain conditions. Even after 1919, there was at least a short period of relatively stability following the settlements. It was, however, based largely on coercion and thus inherently fragile. The victors did make a few attempts to socialize the vanquished states to the postwar order, but the half-hearted efforts were largely ineffective. As a result, the defeated states, most especially Germany, undertook revisions to the war-ending settlement when the opportunities arose. On the other hand, the 1945 settlements, while also containing the element of coercion, mostly led to robust postwar stability. The permanent diminution of the defeated states’ military capabilities certainly implied that none could directly challenge the postwar order. However, the victorious states’ conscious efforts to socialize the defeated states likely played as large of a role as the power gap between the victors and the vanquished in most post-1945 cases.

5.2 Post-First World War: Germany 1919-1948

After winning the First World War, the victorious Allies set about constructing a comprehensive plan for postwar order and stability. The treatment of Germany was one of the foremost issues. With many Allied debates and quarrels during the process of constructing the war-ending settlement, the June 28, 1919 Treaty of Versailles that emerged very clearly restricted Germany autonomy and power in the postwar world.

The territorial provisions of the treaty deprived Germany of significant swaths of land, as well as the strategic advantages that the territory provided. In the west, Germany
lost Alsace-Lorraine to France, the very territory it had taken from a defeated France in 1871 (Articles 51-79 and Annex). The Rhineland was demilitarized and temporarily occupied (Articles 42-44). Large sections of Germany were given to the Poles in the east, with half of Upper Silesia and the so-called Polish Corridor going to the reconstituted state (Articles 27, 87-93). Moreover, Germany lost all of its overseas possessions either directly to the victors or to the control of the League of Nations (Articles 119-127). In total, Germany lost thirteen percent of its territory, not including its colonial holdings (Goldstein 1992, 47).

Not fixed by the treaty of Versailles but set at thirty-four billion dollars by later commissions, the amount that the Allies claimed Germany was liable for was a sizable restriction on the German economy.\(^{135}\) In addition to the high reparations bill, Germany had to cede the coalmines of the Saar Basin to France free and clear and with any profits to remain with France (Articles 45-50 and Annex Chapters I-III).\(^{136}\) These and other economic issues saddled Germany with a tremendous bill – a bill it would have to pay with fewer resources at its disposal.\(^{137}\)

---

\(^{135}\) The reparations commission set the amount Germany was to pay in 1921 (MacMillan 2001, 192). Articles 231-275 of the Versailles treaty and all the attached annexes contained vast reparations, economic, and financial restrictions on the German state, going so far as to demand, for example, 500 stallions, 30,000 fillies and mares, 100,000 sheep, and 10,00 goats going France and 40,000 heifers, 15,000 sows, and 200 rams going to Belgium (Annex IV, section six).

\(^{136}\) Political control of these regions, however, was given to the League and to be decided permanently by plebiscite (Annex Chapters I-III).

\(^{137}\) John Maynard Keynes, a minor participant in the reparations debates at the Paris Conference, was the first to popularize the sentiment that the vast sums of money the victors demanded of Germany poisoned the postwar period in *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* (1919). For an argument that the sum Germany was liable for, while high, was in fact reasonable, see Trachtenberg (1980).
The military provisions dictated that the German army be reduced to one-hundred thousand personnel and the navy to fifteen-thousand. Germany was allowed no air force, tanks, armored cars, heavy guns, submarines and could retain only six battleships (Articles 160-213). Further, a good part of its existing stock of weapons was to be destroyed, as were all of its fortifications west of the Rhine and along its eastern border (Tanner 1992, 12-13). Thus, Germany was denied the capabilities as well as several strategic outposts vital for waging war.

The political provisions of the treaty were far-reaching as well. Though not striving for nor did they achieve unconditional surrender from Germany, the Allies did in fact demand a regime change in Germany, which was enshrined in the Versailles Treaty as a post-hoc guarantee that the Kaiser and the elitist government would not return to depose the new republic.138 In addition, Germany would be excluded from participating in the newly formed League of Nations as a way to punish the state for the war.139 Moreover, a German-Austrian union would be forever prohibited (Article 80). Finally,

---

138 To arrive at the armistice agreement, the US had demanded that Germany eliminate the authoritarian regime and establish a representative government (Sharp 1991, 9-18). The demand for regime change in Germany was thus a non-negotiable element of the Versailles settlement.

139 Annex to the Covenant of the League of Nations. Though Wilson initially resisted French demands that Germany be excluded from the newly formed international organization, he eventually relented and went so far as to claim that Germany should be treated “like a convict in need of rehabilitation” and that the “world had a moral right to disarm Germany and to subject her to a generation of thoughtfulness.” (MacMillan 2001, 94) The Germans perceived this exclusion as the punishment the victors intended (Osiander 1994, 276-278).
though part of the economic clauses of the treaty and intended to provide legal justification for such large payments by the vanquished state and as a way to *limit* the amount owed, Article 231 assigned all guilt for the war to Germany.\textsuperscript{140}

In the end, the provisions of the settlement represented an Allied attempt to curtail German policy autonomy as well as inherent German power. On the scale of severity, this war-ending settlement is quite restrictive.

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{tabular}{lccc}
Territorial & Strategic Amputation & 2 \\
Military & Limit Deployments/Size/Armaments & 2 \\
Economic & High & 3 \\
Political & Regime Change/Much Autonomy & 2 \\
\textbf{Overall Severity} & & 9 \\
\end{tabular}
\caption{War-ending Settlement for Post-First World War Germany}
\end{table}

While the territorial amputations, military restrictions, and political limitations were significant, the Germans saw the economic components of the settlement as the most severe. But, at least for a while, Germany resigned itself to fulfilling its obligations. As a result, for a limited time the postwar system was fairly stable. From 1919 until 1933, Germany had only eight militarized disputes, over twenty-two percent less than the

\textsuperscript{140} “The Allied and Associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies.” (Article 231)
average great power (Table 5.2). Moreover, there were only four disputes between the vanquished and any of the victorious powers, two of which involved only a threat to respond to force with force by the Germans.

But the term “interwar” itself reveals the failure of the Versailles settlement to establish lasting stability. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the picture of relative stability dramatically changes. Obviously, German disputes begin to rise in the lead-up to the Second World War and then skyrocket as the war begins in earnest. The picture of initial stability followed with severe instability is bolstered by the number of disputes between Germany and the victors of the First World War. This increase in instability coincides with the upward trend in German power.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>1919-</th>
<th>1924-</th>
<th>1929-</th>
<th>1934-</th>
<th>1939-</th>
<th>1944-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Great Power MIDs | 6.4  | 2.3  | 1.6  | 5.0  | 20.1 | 4.7  |

Number of GRM MIDs | 7       | 1       | 0       | 6       | 76       | 13       |

GRM MIDs with Victors | 4       | 1       | 0       | 5       | 8       | 1       |

Change in GRM % of Victor Capabilities (GRM % of Victor Capabilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>-46.39</th>
<th>5.80</th>
<th>-0.83</th>
<th>68.13</th>
<th>29.49</th>
<th>-31.51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.03)</td>
<td>(16.96)</td>
<td>(16.82)</td>
<td>(28.28)</td>
<td>(36.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in GRM % of Great Power Capabilities (GRM % of Great Power Capabilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>-38.56</th>
<th>5.21</th>
<th>-8.17</th>
<th>50.76</th>
<th>30.51</th>
<th>-34.06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

-Great Powers 1919-1948: France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia (USSR), UK, US
-Victors: France, Japan, UK, US (Russia excluded)

Table 5.2: Germany Post-First World War (1914-1918)

That Germany desired to overthrow the Versailles system is not in question. From the beginning of the postwar period, the German aim was to end its isolation, thwart the economic provisions of Versailles, and exploit the differences between the victorious allies. It is not surprising, then, that throughout the early 1920s, Germany failed to meet disarmament terms laid down by the treaty (Henig 1995, 19). In 1923, German inability – or unwillingness – to meet its economic obligations laid-out by Versailles led to the Ruhr Episode, where French and Belgian troops occupied the
region.\textsuperscript{141} Germany was exposed as impotent vis-à-vis France for the time being.

Though a seeming victory for France, this episode did more to expose the significant fissures in the victorious alliance that had very quickly appeared after the war.\textsuperscript{142} Futile German attempts to evade the settlement such as the Ruhr episode demonstrated that it could do little given its power disadvantages and isolation and led to a switch in German strategy from outright resistance to one of passive resistance against the postwar order.\textsuperscript{143}

The relatively hopeful period of the Locarno Agreements (October 1925) followed, whereby Germany was admitted into the League of Nations. Moreover, the Dawes (1924) and Young Plans (1929) eased the burden on Germany’s economy.\textsuperscript{144} Germany then ostensibly switched to the position that it must fulfill the obligations of Versailles to ever hope of regaining what was lost. A calculated move, it was recognition by Germany that it was powerless to alter the settlement given the situation at the time. German Chancellor Stressemann “grasped the essentially brittle nature of the Franco-English relationship, and used it to widen the wedge between the two wartime allies. He

\textsuperscript{141} Prior to the full-blown Ruhr Episode in 1923, with only lukewarm British support for such action, France occupied German towns in the Ruhr in 1920 and 1921 as a result of German resistance to the terms of Versailles (Henig 1995, 37). For general French policy in the Rhineland from 1918 until 1924, see MacDougall (1978).

\textsuperscript{142} Just one month after the armistice signified the German defeated, the British began to worry about French intentions. Lord Curzon wrote in December 1918, “I am seriously afraid that the great power from whom we have most to fear in the future is France.” (Quoted in Sharp 1991, 191).

\textsuperscript{143} Germany attempted to skirt the treaty on the international front as well. In April 1922 at Rapallo, Germany and Russia agreed to economic cooperation and a wiping of the mutual financial claims each harbored from the war. The Berlin Treaty of Friendship and Neutrality followed this agreement in 1926. Seemingly only a neutrality pact, in fact the agreement called for Germany to provide technical support to rebuild the Russian army and “provided for Germany a measure of evasion of the limitations that the peace had placed upon her own armed forces.” (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 429)

\textsuperscript{144} The 1924 Dawes Plan halted the immediate economic crisis in Germany, but in 1929 the Young Plan actually reduced the total amount of reparations Germany had to pay to about one-quarter of the original 1921 amount (Goldstein 2002, 92).
cleverly exploited the British fear of a German collapse vis-à-vis France and the Soviet Union.” (Kissinger 1994, 271) Though times of seeming stability, the German revisionist impulse was still clearly present and this period was one of only “deceptive stability”

The hopeful moments of the 1920s rather quickly turned into despair. The economic turmoil brought on by the Great Depression and the rise of domestic instability in Germany, culminating in the Nazi seizure of power in 1933, need not be recounted here. But it played a significant role nonetheless. Once the Weimar Republic fell to totalitarianism, Germany moved very quickly to position itself to finally destroy the Versailles system. In March 1935, Germany announced the reintroduction of conscription, a clear breach of Versailles. The League of Nations condemned this move, but the great powers of Europe did nothing. Even if France – the state most alarmed by this move – had wanted to act, Britain likely would have opposed the move (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 478-479). Though Britain among other states engaged Hitler with some agreements on military restrictions that altered the Versailles system (e.g., the Anglo-German agreement on Naval Rearmament in 1935), the remilitarization of the Rhineland in March 1936 was clearly a move intended to destroy the Versailles system altogether. From these steps of revisionism by Germany – ones that effectively evaded the purpose of the restrictive war-ending settlement imposed upon it by the victors – to the next great war were not long in coming.

In the end, the very restrictive Treaty of Versailles did produce periods of stability, but only so long as the Allies remained somewhat unified and Germany suffered

---

145 Gatzke (1980, 85). For Stressemann’s “realistic” view of the German position and its needs to fulfill the provisions of Versailles, see also Albrecht-Carrié (1958, 420) and Paxton (1991, 222-223).
from a large power gap. There were minor efforts to socialize the defeated state to the postwar world, including the victor’s desire that a guarantee of German democracy may push the state to accept the settlement and efforts in the 1920s to reduce the burdens of the settlement, but these meager attempts had little effect on Germany’s desire to overthrow the settlement. Thus, it was really coercion that provided the only moments of postwar stability. Once the vanquished state was able to regain significant power and victor disunity helped to destroy and will to enforce the settlement, the world was well on the path to another global conflict.

5.3 Post-First World War: Austria 1919-1948

As part of the losing coalition in the First World War, Austria was subject to similar treatment as vanquished Germany. In a few ways, however, the former empire was handed a more severe war-ending settlement. But because of extreme Austrian weakness in the postwar period, and the recognition of this by the victorious allies, the harsh settlement was transformed to a limited extent into a mechanism to ensure Austria did not fall apart all together. Even with some of the most severe components lessened in intensity, the September 10, 1919 Treaty of St. Germain severely restricted Austrian autonomy and power in the postwar period.

Austria retained only twenty-seven percent of its prewar, imperial territory (Goldstein 1992, 47). The settlement also enshrined the de facto dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Articles 27-35). In addition, the regions of Trentino, South Tyrol, and Istria were given to its neighbor and long-time rival Italy. These reductions,
combined with the fact that Austria was left with no outlet to the sea, severely crippled the power of the already ailing state. Moreover, Austria was faced with a more powerful neighbor to the south, as the territorial transfers completed Italian nationalist designs and more (Goldstein 1992, 48).

Militarily, Austria was limited to an army of thirty thousand personnel and the vanquished state could maintain only a volunteer army with strict rules on the commissioning of officers and numbers of non-commissioned officers (Articles 119, 120, 125, and 126). Other provisions restricted the types of weaponry the vanquished state was allowed (Articles 129-135). Moreover, with no outlet to the sea, the victors saw no need for an Austrian navy (Articles 136-143) and the construction of an Austrian air force was prohibited (Articles 144-148). All of these provisions were to be monitored by an inter-allied commission of control (Articles 149-155). These were severe restrictions indeed but, in the end, vanquished Austria could ill afford much expenditure on any size military.¹⁴⁶

The economic burdens placed on Austria were initially quite large. Determined by later reparations commissions rather than stated in the St. Germain Treaty, Austria was initially expected to pay a large bill to the victors on top of other economic restrictions in the postwar period (Articles 177-233). However, the economy of the vanquished state was in such dire straights that the reparations commission set up to collect Austria’s debt eventually transformed itself into a relief organization; it actually

¹⁴⁶ Some leftover caches of imperial army weapons did, however, make their way to private defense organizations such as the labor movement' Republikanische Schutzbund, anti-socialist paramilitary organizations, as well as some minor localized organizations composed of mainly of farmers (Scheuch 1989, 182).
issued a sizable bond to the defeated state before turning over the mission of stabilizing the Austrian economy to the League of Nations. The League then pursued a similar strategy, providing a considerable loan to the state in return for a guarantee that Austria would not enter into economic agreements with other great powers that may lessen the vanquished state’s independence – clearly a guard against an Austro-German financial union (Carr 1947, 63). Thus, while the reparations bill was lifted, there were still economic restrictions placed on the vanquished state.\footnote{147}

All of these territory, military, and economic provisions, even in reduced form after the signing of the treaty, were significant political barriers for the defeated state.\footnote{148} Austria enjoyed little autonomy given the manner in which the allies and the League both restricted and supported the state. As a final restriction, union with Germany was explicitly prohibited without League of Nations consent (Article 88).

In sum, the provisions laid down by the St. Germain Treaty were quite restrictive. However, because the vanquished state was so weakened by the war the victors feared that if they enforced the treaty, further political embarrassment for the state would merely drive Austria to strongly push for union with Germany (Carr 1947, 10). In the end, only the territorial dismemberment of the former empire and prohibition of a union with Germany were actively enforced by the victors. Thus, while the initial overall severity of the settlement was quite high, but, as time passed, it effectively became less severe as the economic penalties were transformed into binding relief efforts by the victors.

\footnote{147}{Like the Versailles Treaty, there were many clauses that dealt with the internationalization of Austrian waterways, railways, and trade routes, industrial capabilities, and other sorts of provisions that limited the defeated state.}

\footnote{148}{Article 177, like the war-guilt clause in the Treaty of Versailles that blamed Germany for the war, time assigned guilt to Austria for starting the war and extract reparations yet limit them at the same time.}
Territorial                            Dismemberment 3
Military                                Limit Deployments/Size/Armaments 2
Economic                                High 3
Political                               Regime Change/Much Autonomy 2

**Overall Severity** 10

Table 5.3: War-ending Settlement for Post-First World War Austria

It is not clear which factor – the restrictive settlement itself or extreme Austrian weakness – contributed most to a postwar situation that was fairly stable, at least as it pertains to this defeated state. Likely both factors played a large role. Austrian power plummeted after the war and, although there were brief periods of recovery, the vanquished state never came close to the capabilities of the prewar levels of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Table 5.4).

With such minimal capabilities, it is not surprising that Austria was involved in only one dispute with any of the victors in the postwar period. This was a low level dispute with Italy, the United Kingdom, and several of the new states carved out of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire. In total, Austria was involved in only four disputes in the postwar period, or fewer than four percent of great power MIDs from 1919 until 1938 and nearly seventy-four percent less than the average great power.149

---

149 This, however, does not count any disputes Austria was involved in after Anschluss in 1938. Moreover, Austrian capabilities scores do not appear after this time because of the union with Germany.

Average Great Power MIDs 6.4 2.3 1.6 5 20.1 4.7

Number of AUS MIDs 3 0 0 1 ** **

AUS MIDs with Victors 1 0 0 0 ** **

Change in AUS % of Victor Capabilities (AUS % of Victor Capabilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Change in AUS % of Victor Capabilities</th>
<th>(Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>-87.14 (1.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>4.92 (1.28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>-6.25 (1.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>-3.33 (1.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>-84.93 (0.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>3.41 (0.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in AUS % of Great Power Capabilities (AUS % of Great Power Capabilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Change in AUS % of Great Power Capabilities</th>
<th>(Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>-84.93 (0.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>3.41 (0.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>-13.19 (0.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>-3.45 (0.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>** **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>** **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Great Powers 1919-1948: France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia (USSR), UK, US
-Victors: France, Japan, UK, US (Russia excluded)

Table 5.4: Austria Post-First World War (1914-1918)

For the bulk of the postwar period, Austria did not attempt to regain lost lands, evade the military provisions of the settlement, or even seriously attempt to skirt the political restrictions. There were, however, some minor efforts by Austria to overcome the political aspects of the settlement. After the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918, the call for Anschluss in Austria periodically grew strong. But after learning the terms of peace in the St. Germain Treaty, the “national illusion” of union with Germany was shelved for a significant period.\(^{150}\) This desire manifests itself again during the

\(^{150}\) Some Austrians desired Anschluss not only for the value of union with Germany, but also because they thought it may help them regain territory in Bohemia and Moravia. But much of this discussion inside and outside the Austrian government was “so much hot air.” (Scheuch 1989, 181)
Great Depression when there was an effort to create an Austro-German customs union in 1931 at the height of the economic difficulties facing both states. But other states, especially France, stiffly opposed such a breach of the Versailles and St. Germain provisions and the idea was abandoned (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 453-454). Little else of substance materialized in the form of Austrian resistance to its treatment. There is, however, little doubt that Austria was riled by especially its inability to choose union with Germany.

With the coming of the Second World War, however, revisions would be made to the settlement. Though Austria desired union with Germany from the outset of the postwar period, the seizure of power by the Nazis in Germany gave the Austrian government and large portions of the Austrian population pause. Chancellor Dollfuss, fearful of Austria becoming completely subservient to Germany, successfully thwarted several Nazi pushes within Austria in the early 1933 and 1934. Had it not been for Austrian resistance, combined with British and French protestations that Austria must remain independent and secret Italian funding and protection of the Austrian state, Anschluss may have happened before 1938.151 As it happened, the other great powers of Europe abandoned Austria by 1936 and the state reached an accord with Nazi Germany. The rising power of Germany and the lack of will among the victors to stop the German action allowed the most dramatic breach of the St. Germain Treaty as far as Austria was

151 Carr (1947, 204-208) and Schuech (1989, 187-188). Italy went so far as to mobilize 100,000 troops on the Brenner Pass while Austria regained domestic control in 1934 (Paxton 1991, 417). By 1938, however, Italy calculated that Austria under the Third Reich would be to its advantage and abandoned any effort to preserve Austrian independence.
concerned.\footnote{Carr (1947, 207) and Goldstein (2002, 23).} Nazi Germany, having already begun to repudiate many of the provisions of Versailles, occupied Vienna in March 1938. With this German \textit{fait accompli}, Austria ceased to exist as an independent state.

In the end, this war-ending settlement has to be judged as relatively stable with regard to the actions of the defeated state itself. Indeed, prior to the German takeover of Austria, Austria had done very little to challenge the settlement. In part, this was clearly due to Austrian weakness in the immediate aftermath of the First World War and the general downward trend in Austrian power for most of the postwar era. Thus, the vanquished state had only very limited opportunities to revise or challenge the settlement on its own. But it may be equally important that the victors of the First World War lessened the restrictions on the defeated state and essentially provided a means to reconcile Austria with its defeat and the Treaty of St. Germain. Finally, it is telling that the real source of postwar instability and the major breaches of the St. Germain treaty were not solely products of internal Austrian events, but forced by an outside power.

5.4 Post-First World War: Hungary 1919-1948

Because it had just broken free of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Allies treated the newly independent Hungary as a defeated foe. Thus, the treatment it received was nearly identical to Germany and Austria. The Allies gave Hungary a highly restrictive settlement with the June 4, 1920 Treaty of Trianon.

Hungarian nationalist were dealt a serious blow by the treaty, especially by the territorial provisions (Articles 27-35). The state lost seventy-one percent of the territory
containing Hungarian nationals, which meant that sixty percent of the population that considered itself Hungarian was outside the state.\textsuperscript{153} Moreover, the victors drew Hungary’s new borders along lines that differed significantly from its historic frontiers, and also fell largely along artificial lines that provided the defeated state with few natural defensive frontiers. For Hungarian nationalists, defeat in the First World War finally brought independence from Austria but this was little condolence for the “destruction of her historic integrity.”\textsuperscript{154}

Militarily, Hungary was limited to thirty five thousand army personnel (Article 104) and was forced to abandon compulsory military service (Article 103). Like Germany and Austria, Hungary was also limited to in terms of the number officials in organizations that that could be transformed into military units – customs officers, foresters, police forces and the like (Article 107; see also Article 111 on military clubs and societies). In addition, there were strict limits on weaponry (Articles 114-132).

\textsuperscript{153} Furthermore, Hungary lost any outlet to the sea because of the territorial amputations (Goldstein 2002, 25).

\textsuperscript{154} Rothschild (1992, 156). Hungary had gone through a series of political crises as the Austro-Hungarian Empire collapsed due to the pressures of the war. All Hungarian leaders that emerged, however, were essentially Hungarian nationalists that desired to unify the Magyar nation out of the ruins of the former state. For example, Count Károlyi, who came to power in Hungary as the war was clearly lost but not yet over, banked on the leniency of the victors and had hoped the victors would see his program for Hungary as consistent with Wilsonian principles and allow Hungary to emerge as a democratic state containing all people of the Magyar nation. His plans were thwarted very quickly by his own inability to organize a fundamentally new regime in Hungary while fending off Béla Kun’s drive to create a communist outpost in central Europe and the victors’ intentions for the war-ending settlement. When Kun formed the “dictatorship of the proletariat” in June 1919, the Hungarian nationalist desire was just as strong. Indeed, under socialist leadership the Hungarians attempted to reclaim parts of the former Magyar monarch that had been lost as the empire collapsed. After the fall of Kun and the delivery of the terms of peace to the vanquished state, Hungarian governments were no less nationalistic than any of the factions competing for control of the defeated state between 1918 and 1920 (Rothschild 1992, 139-155).
including the prohibition of an air force, and the number of and manner in which officers and non-commissioned officers could be trained (Articles 109-110). Hungary was as restricted in the military realm as Austria.

Just as drastic were the economic components of Trianon. Like the other defeated states of the First World War, the reparations bill was determined by later commissions rather than fixed by the treaty. In nearly every other respect as well, the economic articles of Trianon were like those of St. Germain (Articles 161-210). Hungarians, however, thought that the economic consequences of the peace were even more severe than those imposed on Austria and Germany. Because of the territorial amputations, the defeated state lost fifty-eight percent of its railroad holdings, sixty percent of its road mileage, eighty-four percent of its timber resources, forty-three percent of its arable land, eighty-three percent of its iron ore deposits, and nearly thirty percent of its coal and other components necessary for industrial production (Rothschild 1992, 156). The total economic bill foisted upon the defeated state thus proved a huge burden. These provisions, combined with a troubled Hungarian economy, eventually led the victors to approach Hungary much the same way as Austria. That is, the reparations commission transformed into a relief organization (Carr 1947, 66).

As for political restrictions, the vanquished state had to renounce any efforts to recover ethnic Hungarians left in other states by the settlement and was obliged to respect all minority rights, an issues of great importance to Hungary.\textsuperscript{155} In addition, after the signing of the treaty, the Allies pressured Hungary to pass a law prohibiting a Hapsburg

\textsuperscript{155} Articles 36-72. Carr (1947, 64) argues that the territorial amputations suffered by Hungary eliminated “disaffected subjects of alien race” in Hungary and thus the state was rather unified by the settlement. However, any unity within the defeated state that these territorial and political provisions created was mostly agreement that Hungary must strive to bring all Hungarian nationals within the state’s borders.
from ever again gaining the Hungarian throne and threatening elements of the new Hungarian democratic regime. These sorts of political clauses, especially the ones regarding Hungarian nationals, drew great criticism in the vanquished state and were significant limitations on postwar autonomy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial</th>
<th>Dismemberment</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Limit Deployments/Size/Armaments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Regime Change/Much Autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall Severity</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.5: War-ending Settlement for Post-First World War Hungary**

Overall, Hungary faced severe restrictions on its postwar autonomy and power. Though the economic provisions were eventually relaxed, the other aspects of the treaty dealt Hungary a harsh blow. As such, “Hungary had, since the peace settlement, been second only to Germany in her resentment of the terms imposed on her and in her determination to reverse them at the first opportunity.” (Carr 1947, 64)

Throughout the entire postwar period, Hungary had over thirty-seven percent fewer disputes than the average great power (Table 5.6). Only one dispute from 1918

---

156 This, however, was spurred by two attempts by the former Hapsburg ruler of Hungary to regain control in 1921. Hungary was certainly not too disadvantaged by demand of the victors, but clearly this was an infringement upon Hungarian autonomy pushed by the victorious allies and Hungary’s nervous neighbors (Carr, 1947, 65).
until 1938 was with any of the victorious powers. Just after the armistice in 1919, with
the support of the Allied great powers Romania entered Hungary ostensibly to halt thwart
the socialist revolution in the defeated state. Hungary was the target, not the aggressor in
this case.\textsuperscript{157} Afterward the vanquished state did not have a serious dispute with any of
the victors until the outbreak of the Second World War.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1919-23</th>
<th>1924-28</th>
<th>1929-33</th>
<th>1934-38</th>
<th>1939-43</th>
<th>1944-48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Great Power MIDs</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of HUN MIDs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN MIDs with Victors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in HUN % of Victor Capabilities (HUN % of Victor Capabilities)</td>
<td>-90.62</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-28.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in HUN % of Great Power Capabilities (HUN % of Great Power Capabilities)</td>
<td>-89.04</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>-8.64</td>
<td>-9.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-11.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Great Powers 1919-1948: France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia (USSR), UK, US
- Victors: France, Japan, UK, US (Russia excluded)

\textbf{Table 5.6: Hungary Post-First World War (1914-1918)}

\textsuperscript{157} Goldstein (2002, 25). With much political and social turmoil following defeat, there were many
opposing forces within the defeated state battling for control. The counterrevolutionaries in Hungary along
with the victorious allies welcomed the Romanian army with the hope that would crush the leftist
government (Rothschild 1992, 152).
Opportunities for revision, however, did not readily present themselves initially. Even though from the outset of the postwar period the main Hungarian desire was to bring all Hungarian nationals within the same state and thus significantly revise the settlement, the postwar period proved relatively stable with regard to Hungary. That is, the vanquished state did not actively attempt to revise the settlement. Indeed, there were even a few moments in the early 1920s when it appeared Hungary was willing to comply with the terms of Trianon, and the allies even responded with a few minor alterations to the settlement.158

None of this is to say, however, that the Hungarians were happy with the settlement. Every regime to follow the defeat preached the revision of the treaty. Indeed, even before the vanquished state ratified the war-ending settlement, Hungary had maneuvered to win over the French with the hope of gaining revisions to soften Trianon. After this effort failed, and given the dire situation Hungary faced in the immediate postwar era, many in the vanquished state decided “that a period of domestic consolidation on constitutional, political, cultural, and economic levels would have to precede an eventual resumption of diplomatic and possibly military efforts to achieve revision.”159

Indeed, this was probably necessary. Hungarian power dropped practically the entire postwar period, save 1924-1928, and never came close to the prewar levels of the

158 Demonstrating some “reputable and pacific domestic and foreign policies,” the League of Nations along with Italy and the other great power victors in 1921 sponsored a plebiscite that returned to Hungary a slice of the Burgenland province lost to Austria by the Trianon Treaty. Hungarian actions further prompted the victors to admit the vanquished state into the League of Nations in 1922. This was an important step, as it allowed Hungary to receive a League sponsored reconstruction loan in 1924 (Rothschild 1992, 163).

159 Rothschild (1992, 158). See ibid. (156-158) and Paxton (1991, 191) for Hungarian revisionist desires immediately following the signing of the war-ending settlement.
Austro-Hungarian Empire. Emerging as a weak state that could do little to alter its treatment in 1920, a defeated Hungary remained impotent and could only hope to look to the outside for assistance. Following the economic devastation and political confusion that followed the Great Depression, Hungary turned decidedly to the right and quickly looked toward stronger revisionist powers to be patrons of Hungarian revisionism.

With his appointment as Prime Minister in 1932, Gyula Gömbös – an admirer of Hitler and Mussolini – led Hungary on its way to utilizing the strength of the fascist movement to regain Hungarian lands and people (Paxton 1991, 370-371). In June 1933, an accord was reached between Gömbös and Hitler regarding Hungarian revisionist aims against Czechoslovakia and general German aims in the east (Rothschild 1992, 176). Though there were elements in Hungary that opposed Gömbös and the right radicals, by the mid-1930s Hungary’s course was firmly tied to Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. Violating both Trianon and Versailles, the Hungarian military, dominated by the ultra right, began surreptitiously rearming with the help of Nazi Germany. As violations of the First World War settlements increased and German gains in 1938 and 1939 accumulated, so did Hungarian gains. In partial fulfillment of nationalist desires, for example, Hungary recovered land lost to Slovakia by Trianon and the entirety of Ruthenia. Such gains served only to whet the Hungarian appetite for revision, and the state was drawn closer and closer to the powerful German bandwagon. The lure of Hitler’s power, however, ended when Nazi Germany occupied Hungary in March 1944.160

160 Each Hungarian leader in the late 1930s, even if not initially all that pro-Nazi or cognizant of the conflicting Hungarian and German aims, eventually came around to see the benefits of tight collaboration with the Germans. The Hungarian people too saw this, and the right radicals gained increasing parliamentary representation as the German and Hungarian gains grew. In the early 1940s, however, there
The interwar period, then, ended in disaster for Hungary. But prior to its alignment with Nazi Germany, Hungary did little to disturb postwar stability. It was, however, due solely to Hungary’s diminished capabilities. Hungary resented the Trianon settlement from the beginning, but the only route to revision for Hungary was through the rising power of Nazi Germany in the 1930s. In the end, the fairly restrictive Trianon settlement provided relative stability through the 1920s and into the early 1930s, but this period’s violent end exposed the inherent fragility of stability based on coercion.

5.5 Post-Second World War: Italy 1946-1975

Defeated two years before the end of the Second World War, Italy was not presented with a war-ending settlement until four years after it capitulated. The Treaties of Paris, signed in February 1947, imposed rather severe restrictive on Italy. A product of much wrangling over what to do with the defeated state, even between the British and the Americans, the Italians had hoped for a lenient peace and were quite disappointed when faced with the territorial, military, economic, and political restrictions in the settlement. This, however, changed to some degree when the full tensions of the Cold War erupted, and both East and West courted as many allies as possible. Even though eventually being brought into the Western camp fully, some restrictions on Italian autonomy and power remained. In the end, these actions worked in tandem with Italy’s own desire to adhere to the Western vision of the postwar world. As such, postwar stability followed.

were several efforts by Hungarian elites to extricate Hungary from its relationship with Germany. Such efforts are eventually what drove Hitler to turn on his former ally (Rothschild 1992, 178-188).
By the original 1947 agreement, Italy’s territory was reduced to the 1938 frontiers, with a few exceptions (Part I, Section I, Article 1). Minor territories were fully ceded to France (Article 2; also Annexes II and III), some territory on the Adriatic was lost to Yugoslavia (Article 2 and 11), the Dodecanese Islands in the Aegean Sea were given to Greece (Article 14), and the Allies and Italy guaranteed the status of the free territory of Trieste (Articles 4 and 21; also Annexes VI – X). Moreover, all of Italy’s colonial possessions were renounced, including Italian claims to Libya, Eritrea, and Italian Somaliland (Article 23 and Annex XI). In short, any Italian gains made by war as well as some other minor holdings of some strategic value to its neighbors were lost by the defeated state.

The economic provisions of the treaty provide for significant reparations and other forms of penalties for the aggressive war. While the Western powers eventually renounced any reparations owed to them, Italy was to pay the Soviet Union one hundred million dollars over a period of seven years from, mostly in kind from Italian holdings in Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary and any Italian industrial production (Article 74A). Moreover, Albania was to receive five million, Ethiopia twenty five million, Greece over one hundred million, and Yugoslavia one hundred twenty five million US dollars (Article 74B). Italy was forced to make restitution to all property taken by Italy from the United Nations, prohibited from making any claims against any Allied government for war costs, and was to restore all property to nationals and governments of the United Nations (Articles 75, 76, and 78). For the Italian economy, these and other restrictions were significant especially given the toll of the war.
The Paris agreements significantly curtailed Italian military capabilities as well. For the benefit of Italy’s neighbors, all Italian fortifications and military installations on the Franco-Italian and Yugoslav-Italian borders, along with any armaments present, had to be destroyed. Reconstruction of any kind was strictly prohibited, as were any naval bases (Articles 46-48). Any artillery placed in Sardinia that could reach France was to be destroyed, and all naval armaments in Sicily and Sardinia had to be removed or destroyed (Article 50). Italy was permitted no atomic weapons, self-propelled or guided missiles, guns with a range over thirty kilometers, sea-mines or torpedoes of non-contact type, or torpedoes capable of being manned (Article 51). Moreover, the Italians navy was allowed no aircraft carriers, submarines, or new battleships and naval personnel was limited to twenty-five thousand (Articles 58-60). The Italian army was limited to one hundred eighty-five thousand troops and sixty-five thousand Carabinieri (Article 61) and could have no more than two hundred heavy and medium tanks (Article 58). The air force could not exceed twenty-five thousand personnel and was limited to two hundred fighter and reconnaissance planes and one hundred fifty transport, air-sea rescue, and training aircraft, all unarmed, and prohibited from having bombers.\textsuperscript{161} Finally, to break with the fascist past, Italy was not allowed to acquire war material from Germany or Japan or help either country rearm in any way.\textsuperscript{162}

The political restrictions Italy faced were nearly as severe. In effect, the victors imposed guarantees on Italian democracy, as Italy had to guarantee liberal political rights

\textsuperscript{161} Article 64. Everything over these naval, army, or air force limits was to be given to the Allies to be destroyed (Article 67).

\textsuperscript{162} Articles 52 and 68-69. As similar to restrictions on the other defeated states, former fascists, unless exonerated by law, could not hold power in the Italian armed forces (Article 55). Moreover, paramilitary organizations were explicitly prohibited (Article 63).
to its citizens (Article 15; see also Article 19). Beyond this, Italy had to prohibit the resurgence of fascists (Article 17), renounce any special interests in Albania, China, and Ethiopia (Articles 24-27, 33-38), and must accept all international arrangements made by the Allies, especially the US and Britain (Articles 39-43). Politically, then, Italy was fundamentally restricted not only by the type of government it must maintain but it was also bound to the Western victors’ newly formed postwar order. Thus, the overall severity of the settlement reflected the victors’ desire to curtail Italian autonomy and power in the postwar world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial</th>
<th>Strategic Amputations</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Limit Deployments/Size/Armaments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Regime Change/Much Autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Severity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.7: War-ending Settlement for Post-Second World War Italy**

Initially, the Italians were indignant over the settlement, as they felt they had done enough to purge their recent history by fighting along side the Allies for two years (Hughes 1979, 148). The Italian military was especially angry at its treatment, claiming that Italy could no longer defend itself (Poggiolini and Nuti 1992, 33). Driven by the onset of serious Cold War tensions, Italy eventually managed to get fairly significant
revisions to the military clauses of the settlement.\footnote{Because they knew the US would ignore such actions most of the time given increasing hostility with the Soviets, the Italians actually skirted some of the provisions before revisions were made. Most were relatively minor. For example, Italy retained roughly double the number of tanks allowed by the treaty, but many were not operational. See Poggiolini and Nuti (1992, 35) for this and other examples.} With the one time enemy already acting as a partner in the Cold War struggle in many ways, the US pushed for treaty revisions regarding the defeated state’s military by late 1947. By the advent of the Korean War, the US actually started to pressure Italy to spend more on defense (Smith 1989). At the end of 1951, the US, Britain, and France agreed to amend the treaty with Italy to lessen the military restrictions, and even reduce some of the political limitations on the state.\footnote{Poggiolini and Nuti (1992, 38). In addition, the issue of Trieste, a sore-spot for Italians, was settled in 1954 when the city reverted back to Italian control.}

The conservative Christian Democrats had been staunchly anti-fascist and, as they only gained strength after 1943, the US and the rest of the Western Allies had fairly reliable allies in Italy.\footnote{Hughes (1979, 140-171). The postwar politics of Italy are quite a bit different than those of Germany and Japan. Since Italy had capitulated in 1943 and, only a month later, moved to the Allied side, Italy had some form of a functioning government well before the other defeated great powers. Moreover, it was one that had significant historical roots. See Hughes (1979, 152-163). As such, the Italian government was granted more autonomy than either Japan or Germany in the immediate postwar period. See Sassoon (1997, 208-209).} Nevertheless, the shift in policy dictated by the Cold War did not mean that Italy had an entirely free hand. While any reparations program had long been paid-off or suspended, militarily Italy was within the structure of NATO and thus Italian military forces were bound to the Western powers.\footnote{Rather than paying penalties to the West, by the late 1940s Italy – like the rest of Western Europe – was receiving massive aid through the Marshal Plan. See Hogan (1987).} Though it is difficult to argue that Italy desired otherwise, this type of institutional binding necessarily limited Italian autonomy. The NATO arrangement meant Italy was dependent upon the US for
security and Italy’s desire to bind itself to Europe through the European Coal and Steel Community in the early 1950s – something the Western victors of the Second World War clearly desired – made the state dependent upon European cooperation for economic prosperity. In the end, the democratic regime in Italy held significant domestic autonomy and was bound to the victors mostly through international institutional structures. Thus, the settlement, as it was put into practice after 1951, had relaxed some of the most significant restrictions.

With increased autonomy after revising the 1947 war-ending settlement, Italy theoretically had more latitude to pursue revisions to its treatment. Moreover, the small relative increase in capabilities Italy achieved in the postwar period, though still only a fraction of the US and Soviet Union’s total capabilities, may have even provided Italy with the means to pursue revision and thus be a force of instability (Table 5.8). However, Italian involvement in militarized disputes shows Italy to be a source of great stability in the postwar era. Italy had only eight disputes of any kind in the postwar era, or less than three percent of all great power MIDs, all taking place between 1952 and 1960. Of these, six were with Yugoslavia or Albania. Italy was the recipient of aggression most of the time and did not even respond in kind in four of the six incidents. Italy experienced zero conflicts with any of the victorious great powers. In short, Italy did very little to disturb the stability of the post-Second World War system.

\[167\] In many negotiations and initiative, Italy took the lead and pressed for even more bold cooperation within Europe: “the original architects of Italy’s postwar foreign policy, then, did their best to strengthen the political and economic links that joined the nations of the West.” (Hughes 1979, 248)
What is clear is that from the outset of the postwar period, Italy purposefully had linked its fate to that of the US and NATO and, even though the original 1947 agreement was considered overly harsh, the Italians simply did not desire to disturb the Western postwar order. The Christian Democratic party, which ruled by majority for a large portion of the postwar period, strongly supported Italy’s role in the West. As a result, the US and other victors had to do little to co-opt the most important domestic elements in Italian society to ensure that Italy was socialized to the settlement. Moreover, the relaxation of the restrictions on Italian autonomy and power certainly gave the once vanquished state little cause to be disgruntled. The overwhelming force of the victors,
made apparent to the Italians by the US military forces that remained in the state, and the power of NATO and European integration to bind the vanquished state to the postwar status quo added extra insurance that a reversal of the Italian postwar course was highly unlikely. But the most critical factor was the postwar turn in Italian politics.

By 1949, this was evident. One observer of Italian politics commented “I know of no people in Europe who so painfully want to be democratic. They have had their dictatorship, and it is my firm impression that from right to left the whole people is deathly sick of it.”\textsuperscript{168} While the victors promoted the socialization of the vanquished state by binding and restricting it and even actively helped Italian conservative democratic forces to counter communist and other postwar ideas at critical junctures, Italian democracy and strong commitment to the postwar order quickly emerged largely on its own volition. Once aid spurring an economic recovery was received, the Italian economy boomed and nearly all threats from alternatives to democracy and capitalism were quashed (Sassoon 1997, 26-57). In the end, this settlement that moderately restricted Italy proved to be remarkably stable.

5.6 Post-Second World War: Japan 1946-1975

With the signing of official surrender documents, the war in the Pacific officially ended September 2, 1945. Japan, having been at war for fifteen years in Asia, was

\textsuperscript{168} Harold Smith quoted in Ellwood (1995, 33).
crushed by three years of warfare with the US.\textsuperscript{169} Laying prostrate before the victors, the war-ending settlement between Japan and the Allies reflected the reality of the utter destruction of the country. Not only would the United States – the victorious ally that controlled Japan almost exclusively – restrict the Japanese state so that it could not make war again, but it would also foist massive social and economic changes upon the defeated state in an effort to forever curb the militarist spirit in Japan. The efforts to restrict Japan in the post-World War II era are likely only matched by the settlement with Germany of the same war. Such an “audacious undertaking by victors in war had no legal or historical precedent.”\textsuperscript{170}

In the initial occupation period, Japan had no autonomy and all remnants of Japanese power were crushed by the US. But the circumstances changed with the advent of the Cold War and the erstwhile enemy was eventually allowed, even encouraged, to rearm. However, the focus upon the defeated states persisted and they were indeed

\textsuperscript{169} By the Japanese governments own estimates, at least 2.7 million servicemen and civilians died and one-quarter of the country’s wealth was destroyed. The occupying authority in Japan estimated the devastation was even worse – one-third of all wealth destroyed, and perhaps one-half of all economic potential lost due to the war. Moreover, the Japanese people found themselves living under the most dire of circumstances. Rural living standards dropped sixty-five percent from pre-war levels, with urban living standards faring slightly better at thirty-five less than pre-war levels (Dower 1999, 45).

\textsuperscript{170} Dower (1999, 78). There are, however, differences between the mechanisms used to restrict Japan and Germany after World War II. Nevertheless, the overall effect was the same, as the states were severely restricted in the postwar world.
severely restricted in terms of territorial, economic, military, and political provisions worked into the settlements.\textsuperscript{171} As with the German cases below, the Japanese settlement must be examined given these extenuating circumstances.

Immediately after victory, the US sought to isolate the Japanese Emperor and encourage anti-imperial feelings in the Japanese public. Moreover, the victor targeted militarist traditions in Japan. As such, complete demilitarization would be the first phase of the occupation, followed by the establishment of US bases to prevent a revival of Japanese militarism, and eventually, the reestablishment of a Japanese government “when it could be relied upon to act peacefully.”\textsuperscript{172} According to US General Douglas MacArthur, demilitarization would be total: “Japan will be completely disarmed and demilitarized. The authority of the militarists and the influence of the military will be totally eliminated from her political, social, and economic life. Institutions expressive of the spirit of militarism and aggression will be vigorously suppressed.” The Japanese ministries of the army, navy, and home affairs were abolished. All career military officers were purged from the Japanese ranks, and many members of the Imperial Reserves Association, leaders in finance, commerce, industry, media, and nationalist politicians that supported the aggressive Japanese militarism were purged or forced into

\textsuperscript{171}US planning started for the postwar period in Asia and Europe even before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. In pre-war planning for the post-war period, the United States assumed that the most threatening states after the war would be the defeated states of Germany and Japan (Dunn 1963, 19-21). Because these states were so aggressive, “postwar fears at that time naturally clustered around the current enemies, and the central concern was to prevent them, once defeated, from threatening the world again with their remaining strength or rearming.” (20-21) Even after the Cold War shifted the strategic landscape, these fears, though rarely voiced, never fully abated.

\textsuperscript{172}Towle (1997, 171). Berger (1998) traces how the immediate postwar antimilitarist discourse in Japan has remained a decisive factor in all postwar Japanese defense policy.
To complete the destruction of Japanese material strength, the US destroyed nearly 200,000 Japanese artillery pieces, almost 10,000 aircraft, and 2,400 tanks.

The US pursued other initiatives to limit Japanese capabilities as well. The occupation authorities limited Japanese ability to pursue heavy industry and issued massive reforms for land, labor organization, education, and large capital (zaibatsu). As the occupation worn on, and the US realized that Japan would have to be allowed some form of independent government. As such, the US forced a top-down democratic revolution in Japan. The Japanese constitution, written first in English at the General Headquarters of MacArthur’s occupation forces, provided for a liberal democratic regime. In one of the most important aspects of the new constitution, Article Nine prohibited the state from waging any type of military activity except for defense and essentially demilitarized the country in perpetuity. MacArthur proclaimed to the Japanese public in March 1947 “by the undertaking and commitment Japan surrenders rights inherent in her own sovereignty and renders her future security and very survival

---

173 Allison (2004, 53-54). Civil servants were largely spared from the exclusions forced by the US as the victor needed some Japanese to man the bureaucracies the US would use to run their occupation. Many of those initially purged from the political, business, and military realms would, at least with time, return to their respective fields.

174 Towle (1997, 172). Commonwealth forces, which were very small compared to US forces, destroyed or dismantled smaller munitions and equipment.

175 Allison (2004, 55). Many of these reforms, however, would essentially be scrapped later when it was clear that the US needed Japan as a Cold War ally.

176 Though there were Japanese attempts to write a constitution, MacArthur decided that the Japanese documents were simply unacceptable. On the Japanese reactions to the constitution handed to them by their occupiers as well as debates in Japan regarding the famous article nine of the document, see Dower (1999, 347-400).
subject to the good faith and justice of the peace-loving peoples of the world.”

With this move as the Cold War was beginning to heat up, the US began down the road of granting slightly more autonomy to the defeated state. It would, as the Cold War solidified, lead the US to push for a massive yet constrained rebuilding of Japan and Japanese capabilities in the postwar era.

As the strategic landscape of the postwar era continued to evolve, the US decided that Japan would be the “workshop of democracy in Asia, to defend against the spread of communism from China and the Soviet Union.” (Allison 2004, 53) The victors pursued real economic recovery efforts in Japan, with the so-called “Dodge Line” reforms launched in 1949. This stabilization effort initially resulted in major economic cutbacks, but they laid the foundation for a robust Japanese economy. The US-led efforts in Japan receive a major boost from the outbreak of the Korean War, and the Japanese economy began to flourish.178 Evolving as it was, the US acted to finally transform the victor-vanquished relationship by staring the process to end the occupation in 1951.

The result was the September 8, 1951 Treaty of San Francisco. This official war-ending settlement ostensibly provided the defeated nation with a fairly lenient settlement. This, however, must be viewed in tandem with the actions of the US during the occupation as well as the other institutional structures created by the US that

177 Quoted in Towle (1997, 175-176). At the time the constitution was being formed, the US thought that “permission, such as was granted to Germany after the last war, to retain the [military] services in capsule form would make extinguishment of Japanese military traditions more difficult and would provide a nucleus for the formation of a regular army, navy, and air force at a later date.” (174).

178 Out of necessity, the US turned to Japan for material needed in the war effort in Japan (Allison 2004, 77).
complimented the treaty. Thus, even though the severity of the settlement was lessened a bit as a result of the 1951 agreement, Japan still faced significant restrictions on its autonomy and power.

The San Francisco Treaty itself provided for some territorial alteration to the defeated state. Japan lost all territory acquired in wars since 1895. Moreover, the vanquished state renounced all rights to Korea, Formosa, Kurile Island, portions of Skhalin and the adjacent island, all holdings related to the League of Nations mandate system, any claims to Antarctica, and Spratly and Paracel Islands (Article 2). In addition, Japan ceded several islands and territories to the US, granting the victor the right to exercise complete control over them (Article 3). Though the lost holding were not overly large, the strategic amputations provided the victors with significant advantages in East Asia.

The San Francisco treaty provided for only minor economic restrictions on the defeated state. Technically Japan was liable for reparations to the Allies for damages caused by the war, but it was “recognized that the resources of Japan are not presently sufficient.” (Article 14) Japan was made, however, to enter into negotiations for reparations with countries that it had occupied. Other provisions included issues such as fishing rights (Article 9), civil aviation (Article 13), interests in China (Article 10), payment of POWs (Article 16), and a clause absolving the victors from any financial responsibilities toward Japan (Article 19). Thus, the war-ending treaty itself was quite lenient on the defeated state.

However, these lenient economic provisions must be placed next to the costs Japan endured during the occupation as well as the impact of the territorial losses on the
Japanese economy. Being stripped of access to Korea, Manchuria, and Formosa, Japan lost important raw materials as well as markets for the postwar period. Called “war-termination costs,” Japan was further forced to pay for the major portion of the costs for US occupation forces. This had amounted to about a third of the Japanese government’s budget at the beginning of the occupation (Dower 1999, 115-118). Such huge costs for a devastated economy were tantamount to a large reparations bill.

The war-ending treaty provided for little in the realm of military restrictions, claiming only that foreign military forces could be stationed in Japan by mutual agreement (Article 6). This, however, is extremely misleading. Beyond the constitutional guarantee against Japanese militarism imposed by the US, the security treaty between the US and Japan, also signed in San Francisco, granted the US rights to station forces in Japan indefinitely with little or no Japanese ability to influence US policy in East Asia. The agreement also permitted the US to intervene in the domestic politics of Japan should disturbances arise. Having over two hundred thousand troops stationed in the defeated state after sovereignty was formally given back to Japan meant this was not an empty threat (Welfied 1988, 25-26). Though formally sovereign and facing few restrictions by the war-ending treaty itself, Japan clearly suffered severe restrictions on its military autonomy and power.

Such provisions in the security arrangement between the US and Japan as well as the domestic constraints placed on Japan by the occupation were undoubtedly significant political as well as military restrictions. The San Francisco Treaty provided a few more political restrictions, including matters dealing with the structure and rule of the United Nations and outcomes of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East. Given the
total impact of the war-ending treaty when viewed along with the domestic restructuring undertaken during the occupation and the US-Japanese security agreement, the war-ending settlement for Japan was severely restrictive.

| Territorial | Strategic Amputations | 2 |
| Military    | Limit Deployments/Size/Armaments | 2 |
| Economic    | Medium | 2 |
| Political   | Regime Change/Much Autonomy | 3 |

**Overall Severity** | 9

Table 5.9: War-ending Settlement for Post-Second World War Japan

Such a restrictive settlement flowed directly from immediate US occupation goal of remaking Japan into a peaceful nation. As Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson saw it, “the present economic and social system in Japan which makes for a will to war will be changed so that the will to war will not continue.”

US actions during the occupation and the terms of the 1951 agreements laid the foundations to do just this. Ultimately, this approach proved quite successful for the US in terms of the stability of the Japanese settlement. Although Japan was involved in its fair share of disputes in the postwar period, none were with the US. Moreover, Japan never actually took militarized action in any of the thirty-four disputes from 1946 until 1975. Fifteen of the nineteen

---

179 Quoted in Dower (1999, 75). Besides the rehabilitated wartime politicians that rose to prominence in postwar Japan, one of the few vestiges of the old regime that remained was the Emperor. However, this was a pragmatic move to gain Japanese support and the Emperor held a strictly ceremonial role (280-318).
disputes Japan had with any of the victors of the Second World War were with the Soviet Union (Table 5.10). Japan was firmly in the Western bloc, and all of these disputes were initiated by the Soviets and clearly linked to leftover Soviet-Japanese issues from the war as well as Cold War tensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Great Power MIDs</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of JPN MIDs</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN MIDs with Victors</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in JPN % of Victor Capabilities (JPN % of Victor Capabilities)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-93.66</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>36.07</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>22.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in JPN % of Great Power Capabilities (JPN % of Great Power Capabilities)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-99.99</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>36.07</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>22.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Victors: China, France, UK, US, USSR

**Table 5.10: Japan Post-Second World War (1939-1945)**

In short, Japan made no efforts to revise its treatment. This, however, may have been impossible because severe power disadvantages Japan suffered during the postwar era. Relatively increasing throughout the postwar period, Japan’s capabilities were still
insignificant when compared to the victors throughout the postwar period.\textsuperscript{180} Thus the vanquished state could do little to revise its treatment. Importantly, this was the intent of such a restrictive settlement. However, the far-reaching restrictions the defeated state faced in the political realm, including US efforts to remake the former foe into a peaceful liberal democracy, likely promoted Japan’s acceptance of the postwar status quo as much as the diminution of power. That is, the US was able to socialize the vanquished state to its vision of the postwar order.

Though initially some leaders resisted US efforts to alter Japan’s domestic politics and even thought that once the occupation was over Japan would revert back to traditional indigenous politics, this simply did not happen.\textsuperscript{181} By most accounts, this new liberal democracy took root fairly quickly. And because of the experience of the war itself, a strong anti-militarist domestic discourse arose in Japan so much so that the US had to prod the defeated state to begin significant rearmament in the 1950s.\textsuperscript{182} After the US need for material during the Korean War and the looming Cold War pushed Japan

\textsuperscript{180} At the highest level, Japan’s military capabilities measured with the CINC index amounted to about one one-hundredth of a percent of the victors’ combined CINC index score. Clearly then, Japanese capabilities compared to the US alone – the most important victorious state for the enforcement of the Japanese war-ending settlement – were insignificant.

\textsuperscript{181} Conservatives thought that, after the passage of the constitution, they could simply revise the document when US forces left (Dower 1999, 400). US forces, however, never left and the document has not been altered. Even the Emperor seemed initially defiant. When the constitution was announced to the Japanese public, an accompanying poem by the Emperor was a clear sign to Japan that this alien document would not change the character of the Emperor himself or the Japanese nation (318).

toward rearmament by the mid-1950s, Japan gained some leverage with the victors. Nevertheless, the vanquished state never failed to strictly adhered to the postwar status quo.

All of this, however, took place in the context of overwhelming US power visibly remaining in the vanquished state. The 1960 revision to the Japanese-US security treaty did give Japan more equal footing with its larger partner. But otherwise, the arrangement differed very little in substance from the first as it maintained extensive basing rights for the US and other such provisions and only formally removed provisions regarding the US ability to intervene in Japan to quell civil unrest.\footnote{Welfield (1988, 141-146). This reconsideration of the US-Japanese relationship did spark domestic controversy in Japan, coming from the pacifist and neutralist veins in Japan (159-161).} Japanese autonomy and power thus remained fairly limited.

Even so, the effects the US efforts to socialize the defeated state likely played as large a role as the continued enforcement of the settlement and huge postwar power gap. The US was able to tap into the anti-militarist sentiment in Japan first with a constitution for the defeated state that was itself anti-militaristic. Moreover, the US helped the Japanese economy rebound fairly quickly – both through its need of Japanese resources in the Korean War and through direct aid – helping to stabilize and legitimize the new Japanese democratic regime.\footnote{Cohen (1987, 455-462). Much like the Marshall Plan in Europe, the US provided loan, grant, and direct aid to the defeated state once it was clear that it needed allies in the Cold War struggle. During the latter stages of the occupation and early 1950s, Japan received about two billion US dollars (455).} Once the path toward acceptance of the postwar order was initiated by the US efforts during the occupation, indigenous Japanese forces continued down this road. As such, this settlement that fundamentally constrained Japanese autonomy and power provided robust postwar stability.
5.7 Post-Second World War: East Germany 1946-1975

Maybe even more so than the United States, the Soviet Union was deeply concerned with the possibility of a resurgent Germany after the Second World War. This produced a policy toward what became the German Democratic Republic (GDR) that was highly restrictive in the postwar period. Put more starkly, the Soviets brutally repressed East Germany in their attempt to transform their part of the defeated nation into a staunch communist ally. This approach, however, proved relatively effective. East Germany did little to promote postwar instability, at least as it concerned the Soviet sphere of influence.

In the initial occupation period, at least until mounting Cold War tensions drove the victorious allies further and further apart, the defeated German state was treated as somewhat of a whole. There were different zones of occupation, and thus different practices among the victors, but for the most part the policies regarding the treatment of the vanquished state were at least somewhat similar throughout the entire occupied country.\(^{185}\) As such, the August 1, 1945 Potsdam Declaration between all of the victorious great powers set the stage for the initial treatment of both East and West Germany.\(^{186}\) After this, however, and the eventual creation of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic, the paths of East and West Germany diverged significantly.

\(^{185}\) Conflicts among the allies were evident in 1945 already, especially about how zones were to be administered and how reparations would be drawn from the defeated state. See Trachtenberg (1999, 3-33).

\(^{186}\) Other than the surrender document, there were no immediate formal war-ending agreements between Germany and the Allies, mostly due to the advent of the Cold War and the formation of the two German states. Thus, to determine the severity of the war-ending settlement, document such as the Potsdam agreement and the occupation directives of the individual victorious powers are the most pertinent. The Potsdam Declaration is reprinted in *Documents on Germany 1944-1985*, US Department of State 54-65 (hereafter referred to as Potsdam).
Immediately after defeat, Germany was severely restricted in terms of autonomy and power by the victorious Allies. Territorial restrictions, initially quite severe in their own right, were worsened for the state by eventual dismemberment. This, however, was not necessarily a foregone conclusion. The initial territorial settlement with a defeated Germany emerged from the original agreement for the three Allied powers (and later France) to occupy Germany after the war. German territory east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers was given to Poland, but the Rhineland, Saar, and Ruhr stayed within former German boundaries. The vast resources of these areas, however, were under Allied control given the occupation and reparations schemes. Alsace and Lorraine were, of course, given back to the French. The land transfers from the defeated state to its neighbors amounted to twenty-three percent of post-1918 German territory.\(^1\)

The economic provisions of the settlement were linked to the occupation scheme. The Potsdam Declaration had provided that each occupying power take from its sector whatever it wished and further, because of tremendous losses during the war, the Soviet Union would receive fifteen percent of industrial equipment beyond what was in their zone in exchange for food and coal, plus ten percent free and clear.\(^2\) Immediately after the occupation began, the Soviets stripped everything of value in Eastern Germany and

---

\(^1\) Potsdam (Article VIII) specified the new German-Polish Frontier. For the totality of German territorial losses, see Towle (2000) and Goldstein (1992).

\(^2\) Potsdam Articles (II and III). See also Beschloss (2000, 268).
did receive its share of Western German wealth for a while.\textsuperscript{189} After 1947, however, this sort of reparations-in-kind program ceased, at least in the Western zones. But in addition to the reparations taken from Germany, the initial plan for the vanquished state was that it should be de-industrialized, save any material that could be used as reparations, such that it could not produce material for war. Only the most basic of human necessities were to be provided to the Germans.\textsuperscript{190}

Having to pay for the war through reparations and the occupation of German soil, the victorious Allies also wanted to make sure that Germany could never again rise to disturb the peace of Europe or the world. The military aspects of the settlement were far-reaching. All military or paramilitary organizations in all zones of Germany were eliminated. Most German military equipment was destroyed, all German armed forces were demobilized, and there were severe limitations on any industry that could be used for war-material.\textsuperscript{191} Between the end of the war and January 1947, the victorious Allies destroyed nearly ten thousand tanks, over ten thousand aircraft, over three hundred

\textsuperscript{189} Even before the fighting stopped, the Soviet Council of the People’s Commissars planned to carry out of a policy of economic disarmament. A special committee was to “dismantle as much as possible before the armistice was signed and reparations regulated.” (Phillips 1986, 32) By one estimate, the Soviets ended up dismantling forty-five percent of East German industrial capacity whereas the Western victors removed only eight percent (ibid., 74).

\textsuperscript{190} Potsdam (Articles II and III) laid out the general political and economic principles of the treatment of Germany as well as specified the reparations plan and the goal of ensuring Germany had absolutely no higher standard of living than any other European state. The US held this view until 1947 just as the Soviets did. Joint Chiefs of Staff directive 1067, modeled on the Morgenthau Plan, called for the destruction of industry in the US zone of occupation as well as other extreme measure. See Hammond (1963, 368-371) and Beschloss (2002, 191-192).

\textsuperscript{191} Potsdam (Article II) laid-out the political principles of the occupation, the first of which was the complete demilitarization of the vanquished state. Article IV dealt with the German navy and merchant marine and divided most German naval assets among the victorious powers. See also Towle (2000, 126-129).
warships, and nearly four hundred submarines. With regard to war-making industry, hundreds of factories were destroyed in the Western sectors alone. The Soviets did the same, or shipped entire factories to the USSR as a form of reparations.\(^{192}\)

The political aspects of the settlement were as far reaching as the military and economic issues. Under occupation, each Allied power had total control over its sector. Both the Western powers and the Soviets followed a program of denazification whereby all remnants of Hitler’s regime were to be destroyed. Further, there were to be no political organizations other than those authorized by the occupying authorities. The destruction of all German power, institutions, and ideas during the occupation was in part designed to “convince the German people that they have suffered a total military defeat and that they cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves, since their own ruthless warfare and the fanatical Nazi resistance have destroyed Germany’s economy and made chaos and suffering inevitable.”\(^{193}\)

Along with this policy to purge Germany of Nazism, education was to lay the foundation for eventual democratic governance in Germany. The victors would rebuild the vanquished state into a democracy by controlling German education, directing the

---

\(^{192}\) On difference between US and Soviet policy during this time, see Towle (1997, 152-165) and Naimark (1995, 141-204).

\(^{193}\) Quote in Potsdam (Article II, Section A, Part 3).
reorganizing of local government and the judiciary, encouraging free speech, free press, freedom of religion, and guaranteeing the right of labor to organize. In short, Germany was to be fully reformed through the power of the victors.

In the East, the Soviets pursued this strategy with the Soviet Military Administration in Germany (SVAG) that fully controlled, with only minimal initial help from indigenous communists, all aspects of the initial occupation and worked to transform the German state and society. The Soviets sent Moscow-trained German communists, including Ulbricht, the eventual held of the Socialist Unity Party (SED), to Berlin with the charge, “to support the activities of the occupying powers in the struggle to destroy Nazism and militarism, to re-educate the German people and to carry through democratic reforms.” Though it was obvious to all what this implied, the directive to Ulbricht and others sent into the Soviet sector did not explicitly call for the promotion of socialism in eastern Germany.

The victors’ actions in Germany, and especially those of the Soviet Union in the eastern sector of the vanquished state, were incredibly harsh. The territorial amputations, destruction of all military power, economic penalties, and political directives combined to create a situation few defeated states had previously experienced. In short, the victors stripped the vanquished state of nearly all autonomy and power in the period immediately following the end of the war.

---

194 Beschloss (2002, 269). Potsdam (Article II, Section A, Part 3) declared that the occupation would “prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis and for eventual peaceful cooperation in international life by Germany.”

Germany as a whole suffered what was likely the most restrictive modern war-ending settlement ever constructed, but this would shift somewhat after 1947. However, the East German condition did not markedly improve even after Cold War tensions flared and both superpowers needed to ensure their respective zones of Germany would remain on their side. Compared to the treatment of West Germany, the Soviets were much slower to shift their strategy from one of completely destroying the German state to one of rebuilding with the hopes of creating a reliable ally. Not until after the death of Stalin, who consistently pushed for the dismantling of any and all German power for the benefit of the Soviet Union, and the subsequent turn taken by Khrushchev regarding East Germany did the vanquished state gain a degree of autonomy.\textsuperscript{196} Nevertheless, according

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
Territorial & Dismemberment & 3 \\
Military & Eliminate/Incorporate Forces & 3 \\
Economic & High & 3 \\
Political & Regime Change/Little Autonomy & 3 \\
\hline
\textbf{Overall Severity} & & 12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{War-ending Settlement for Post-Second World War East Germany (GDR)}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{196} Harrison (2003, 1). The combination of the increasing importance of East Germany in the Cold War struggle, the proven record of the German Democratic Republic’s leadership – most notably Ulbrecht – in terms of ruthlessly promoting socialism, and the struggle for power in the Soviet Union after Stalin’s death led to increased bargaining leverage for the East Germans.
to one view, “The German Democratic Republic was a one-party state whose authority rested on twenty Russian divisions and the Communist party apparatus under Ulbricht, who had spent the war in Moscow.” (Paxton 1991, 540)

But even with a turn toward more autonomy, East Germany was severely restricted. Into the 1950s, the Soviets continued to draw reparations from the vanquished state, severely hampering any hope of an economic recovery after the war. By one estimate, East Germany supplied the Soviet Union about seventy billion marks.197 In the economic realm, then, East Germany faced serious obstacles to achieving any type of independence. In terms of policy autonomy, the nascent East German state was dependent upon Soviet approval for the most basic of state functions. The Soviets would not allow the East German communist leadership to close the border between East and West Berlin in 1953 and accelerate the hard-line policy of “Construction of Socialism” for example, proposing instead policy reforms to the Germans that would slow such things as collectivization and industrial development in favor of consumer goods and generally better conditions for the citizens in the vanquished state. It is hard to imagine a more clear violation of autonomy.198

197 This was over two hundred times the rate of reparations drawn by the Western Allies after 1945 (Paxton 1985, 542).

198 Harrison (2003, 21-34). Until 1955, the Soviet intentions toward East Germany were actually quite ambivalent. Clearly, the Soviets dominated East German politics and could force the East Germans to do their bidding. However, the Muscovite wing of the SED led by Ulbritch, the most important party or faction within East Germany, wanted to quickly Sovietize East Germany after 1949 but Moscow generally balked because it was unsure that a divided Germany (which would surely solidify if the SED got its way) was the best plan. It was ultimately resolved by 1955 when the Soviets decided for full integration of East Germany into its bloc and began reconstruction efforts while ensuring SED control in the vanquished state. For these complicated East German-Soviet relations in the early postwar years, see Phillips (1986) and Harrison (2003).
On top of these political and economic restrictions, the Soviets maintained over two hundred thousand troops on East German soil. This show of Soviet force ensured East German compliance or, more accurately most of the time, provided support to the East German communist regime.\textsuperscript{199} After the inclusion of a rearmed West German state in NATO in 1954-55, the Soviet Union countered with the Warsaw Pact in May 1955. East Germany was included as a founding member, but its status was unique – its military forces, allowed a slow rebirth, were not permitted into the integrated command.\textsuperscript{200} This was perceived as a boost to the SED, but the Warsaw Pact also became a critical tool of Soviet control over its allies that, if needed, could be called upon to crush uprisings in the Eastern bloc. On the other hand, the events of 1955 signified a shift in the Soviet strategy to manage East Germany; rather than raping the vanquished state, within the strict confines of the Soviet sphere of influence and continuously propping up the ardently pro-Soviet SED the Soviets would now concentrate on building a strong communist ally in East Germany.

Such an approach appears to have been quite successful in terms of stability. East Germany was involved in relatively few disputes in the postwar era (Table 5.12). Only three of these disputes were directed at any of the victors of the war. Though there were serious disputes with Western victors over Berlin in 1958, 1961 and 1962, for the remainder of the postwar period East Germany did not stir-up instability. The

\textsuperscript{199} For example, when work stoppages and strike threats protesting Ulbricht’s hard-line policies turned into riots in June 1953, Soviet troops backed-up the East German authorities that had been initially unable to control the crowds (Phillips 1986, 133-134).

\textsuperscript{200} Phillips (1986, 155). In a series of agreements beyond the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union and East German normalized their relationship with Moscow renouncing many of its rights over the vanquished state, including the later inclusion of East German forces into the Warsaw Pact structure. These moves, however, coincided with the Soviet decision to fully support Ulbricht and the SED in East Germany.
vanquished state had no disputes with the Soviets in the entire period, significant as the USSR constructed the war-ending settlement and treatment of Eastern Germany. Even if there are problematic issues with the treatment of Eastern Germany, especially regarding how its citizens were treated, it is fairly evident that this war-ending settlement was rather stable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Great Power MIDs</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of GDR MIDs</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDR MIDs with Victors</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GDR % of Victor Capabilities (GDR % of Victor Capabilities)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-93.66</td>
<td>-11.54</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>-3.53</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GDR % of Great Power Capabilities (GDR % of Great Power Capabilities)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-90.65</td>
<td>-11.54</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>-3.53</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Victors: China, France, UK, US, USSR

**Table 5.12: East Germany (GDR) Post-Second World War (1939-1945)**
Because the defeated state’s power never came close to approaching pre-war German levels, postwar stability could easily have been a result of having no ability to resist the desires of the Soviet Union. In part, this is probably true. The victor’s power always loomed in the background, not only with the presence of Soviet troops in East Germany but also by way of the channeling of Soviet power and aims through support of the SED’s rule and repression of any opposition to the postwar order. Though this worked for an extended period of time, the SED never held much legitimacy with the citizenry and, when the opportunity arose, the people of East German brought the communist regime down. Without the power of the Soviet Union to bolster it, the East German regime, brutal though it was, could not protect the postwar order constructed by the Soviets.

5.8 Post-Second World War: West Germany 1946-1975

The Potsdam Declaration, along with the individual occupation policies of the US, Great Britain, and later France, initially guided the treatment of western Germany. As such, the Western Allies pursued similar territorial, economic, military, and political restrictions on the defeated state as Soviets did in their occupation zone. That is, the policies of demilitarization, deindustrialization, denazification, and political restructuring guided the Western victors. The western zones of Germany, however, did not suffer quite the ruthless application of these provisions as the eastern parts of the vanquished state. Nevertheless, it was not until after the rise of Cold War tensions between the superpowers that the treatment of the eastern and western zones of the defeated state

---

201 See the above section on the treatment of East Germany dictated by the Potsdam Declaration.
received significantly different treatment. But even after this time, what was to become the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) remained significantly restricted in autonomy and power (Table 5.13). This shift in Western – most importantly, US – strategy shifted to the point that western Germany gained at least minimal independence in some realms and the overall severity of the settlement was effectively reduced, but not by much.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial</th>
<th>Dismemberment</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Eliminate/Incorporate Forces</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Regime Change/Much Autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Severity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13: War-ending Settlement for Post-Second World War West Germany (FRG)

Even though it was evident to some leaders early in the war that the Soviet Union may constitute a significant postwar threat to the United States and the West, especially Churchill, it was not until 1947 that the US and others appreciably altered their treatment of Germany to reflect this concern. While Germany still had to be held within the bounds of the Allies’ power so as not to be able to again start a war, German power, to some extent, had to be harnessed to meet the growing threat in the East. Thus, the treatment of
West Germany took on a more rehabilitative nature, while retaining important limitations on the state.

This change of US policy is evident in the effort to revise the occupation directive. General Clay, along with the support of the Secretary of State Marshall, pushed for revisions to occupation directive guiding US military forces in Germany, Joint Chiefs of Staff directive (JCS) 1067, in the spring and summer of 1947. By the revised occupation directive, JCS 1779, some provisions for German self-government, very restrictive in the original directive, were made more general and the extent of decentralization of authority in Germany was increased (Hammond 1963, 442-443). The US and its allies also dropped the most restrictive economic measures and increased level of industry plans. When combined with currency and economic reforms starting in 1948 as well as Marshall Plan aid, Germany experienced huge economic growth (Paxton 1991, 541).

Though still officially pursuing an all-German solution, the growing tension with the Soviet Union pushed the Western victors to consolidate their positions within the vanquished state. As such, the US, British, and French merged their occupation zones in June 1948, setting the stage for the creation of a new West German state only a year later. West German political autonomy in this period correspondingly increased, and eventually the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) formed with Konrad Adenauer as the first West German Chancellor.202

202 The London Conferences in early 1948 involving the Western victors produced the July 1948 Frankfort Documents that charged West Germans with constructing a new state. Which much guidance from the victors, Adenauer led the West Germans to a constitution that met Western Allied approval in May 1949. Both documents are reprinted in Documents on Germany 1944-1985 (143-146, 221-258).
The allies constrained the new West German state with both domestic political and military measures and international institutions. Keeping with the desire to never again allow German military power to threaten Europe, West Germany was not allowed to possess military forces. Through the occupation statute that accompanied the emergence of the Federal Republic, the allies retained significant rights within the defeated state, including emergency powers should the new state’s democracy be threatened, broad troop stationing rights, and represented West Germany in all foreign affairs. Moreover, the structure of the West German state – decisively influenced by the Western victors and especially the US – was designed to prohibit a revival of German militarism, severely limited the power of the West German central government, and vigorously protected liberal ideals.

On top of these restrictions, the initiation of plans to economically unify Europe through the European Coal and Steal Community (ECSC) served the purpose of constraining the vanquished state as well. By integrating Europe, West Germany could be economically rebuilt yet bound to the system itself. The US especially pushed for such measures, but the Adenauer government in West Germany did not have to be persuaded. The Christian Democratic Union (CDU) government, led by Adenauer, was

---

203 The occupation statute detailed additional disarmament provisions, economic restrictions, Allied control of West German foreign policy, protection of the Basic Law, and other rights of the victorious occupying powers. See Documents on Germany 1944-1985 (212-214).

204 On the constitutional framework of the Federal Republic, see Oppeland (1996, 74-79). On the decisive influence of the victors, and especially the US, on the shape of the West German constitution, or Basic Law, see Spevack (2002).

205 The Schuman Plan initiated the creation of the ECSC. See Hitchcock (1997) and Milward (1984) for the origins of the Schuman Plan and how it evolved into the wider framework of European integration.
firmly pro-Western and considered European integration the best path for postwar West Germany.\textsuperscript{206}

While the early steps toward the integration of Europe helped to constrain West Germany, the entrance of West Germany into the NATO system was the final and most significant step using international institutional structures to constrain the defeated state. By the Paris Accords of 1954, West Germany gained formal sovereignty, but its autonomy in domestic and international affairs was limited in several ways.\textsuperscript{207} First, and probably most significantly, the Allies retained the right to intervene in West German affairs if the democratic system was threatened. This was rather loosely defined and allowed the continuation of Allied intervention in German affairs to maintain pro-Western politicians. Second, in addition to the FRG renouncing the use of force to attempt to unify the now dismembered German state, the Allies retained final approval rights to any proposed solution to all-German matters. Third, the Allies maintained rights to station military forces within Western Germany, both to provide the West with forward military positions to counter Soviet troops in Eastern Europe and to keep Allied forces on the ground to block any action taken by the Germans that may threaten the newly constructed European postwar system.\textsuperscript{208} Fourth, although NATO membership was the only manner in which West Germany was allowed to rearm, it served to restrict West Germany’s military in several important ways. By the Accords, West Germany was to

\textsuperscript{206} See, for example, Judt (2005, 275).

\textsuperscript{207} The Allies set forth the conditions for Germany to enter into NATO in London in October 1954. See \textit{Documents on Germany 1944-1985} (419-422).

\textsuperscript{208} The Paris Accords officially liquidated the occupation regime in Germany, but this move was by some as little more than a redefinition or, maybe more accurately, renaming of the occupation forces (Albrecht-Carrié 1958, 643).
construct twelve army divisions, along with an air force of 75,000 men and a navy of 25,000. All, however, were completely integrated into the NATO system and thus the West Germany military was effectively rendered unable to act unilaterally. Finally, the FRG renounced the right to build nuclear weapons.209

Once the NATO system was set up and the defeated state’s power could be harnessed for the West without threatening the stability of western Europe, the Federal Republic gained some bargaining leverage with the Western Allies as the former bitter enemy became the linchpin of European containment of the Soviet Union. This leverage, however, was quite limited. After the construction of NATO Germany was tied to the West, “and in important ways made part of the West, but her freedom of action was to be curtailed and she was not to have the same sovereign rights as the other western powers.” (Trachtenberg 1999, 128) Though it would be vital component of the Western strategy to combat the Soviet Union in the Cold War, this system of domestic and international constraints placed important checks on West German autonomy and power.

209 Trachtenberg (1999, 126-127). These final steps toward a West German military were preceded by Allied initiatives to increase West German industrial limitations in 1949 and 1950 as well as the formation of a small barracked West German police force following the outbreak of the Korean War (Bark and Gress (1993, 258-268, 272-291).
Table 5.14: West Germany (FRG) Post-Second World War (1939-1945)

The steps to constrain West German autonomy and power while remaking it into a peaceful nation, in the end, proved very successful. West Germany was involved in only ten total disputes from the end of the war until 1975, or less than four percent of all great power MIDs (Table 5.14). None were with the US or other western allies. Four involved West Germany and the Soviet Union, all between 1961 and 1964 and concerning the Berlin issue. Just as with the other post-Second World War defeated states, however, the Federal Republic’s capabilities were remarkably lower than the victors. West German weakness in the face of the victors’ continued overwhelming
power may help to explain the degree of stability of the West Germany war-ending settlement as much as any other factor.

The role of the transformation of the West German state under the restrictions placed on it by the victors of the Second World War, however, cannot be discounted. West Germany was constrained by a lack of capabilities and the measures introduced by the victors, but the democratic regime in the vanquished state eventually gained strong roots. This was certainly bolstered by the dramatic German economic recovery led by CDU figures like Adenauer and Ludwig Erhard.210 As this process unfolded, the US, which had supported Adenauer from the beginning of the occupation period, gained supreme confidence that the West German chancellor would keep the vanquished state on a pro-Western course.211 Moreover, by the end of the Adenauer era, the West German regime had experience quite a few policy successes and garnered tremendous domestic legitimacy.212

Domestic consolidation of the regime, however, was only one aspect of the transformation. Just as important were West Germany’s actions in foreign policy. The US and West Germany, as well as West Germany and the rest of Western Europe, moved along the same general path in foreign policy. For example, Adenauer enthusiastically

---

210 The transformation of the West German economy from war-ravaged to thriving took place, of course, within the political and social transformations of the defeated state. As such, the pro-western policies of the CDU helped this along but so did external events, such as the Korean War when the US turned to West Germany, like it did to Japan, for material to support the war effort (Overly 1996). No matter the source, the success of the economy provided the West German regime with reserves of good will (Conradt 1989, 223).

211 Adenauer, the founding father of the Federal Republic, dominated early West German politics. Fully supported by the allies, his Chancellorship lasted from 1949 until 1963. On Adenauer’s influence on early West German politics, see Oppelland (1996, 79-89). On the US relationship with Adenauer, see, for example, Craig (1995).

212 See, for example, Conradt (1989 224-263).
embraced European integration. After Adenauer, Brandt’s Ostpolitik coincided with US efforts at détente with the USSR. Anytime West Germany did seek to act on its own, such as the 1970 treaty where the borders between Germany and Poland were first formally recognized, West Germany consulted and informed its western allies (Gatzke 1980, 224). Not only did the international institutions that bound Germany to the system demand that they take this approach to foreign policy, but West Germans showed themselves over and again to be committed to working within the those institutions that fundamentally limited its autonomy. Much more than any other Western state, West Germany pursued a staunchly multilateral approach to foreign policy. Moreover, given the remarkable rebound of the German economy into one of the largest in the world, little of this prowess was put to fundamentally altering the postwar order. In short, the West German regime – designed by the victors as an internal constraint on the vanquished state – became a stable, staunch supporter of the Western postwar order.

The stability of this settlement, then, was bolstered not only by the restrictions placed on the vanquished state and the continuance of an overwhelming power gap favoring the victors, but also by the efforts of the victors to socialize West Germany to the postwar order. Because of these factors, in the end this restrictive war-ending settlement provided for remarkable stability over the entire postwar period and beyond.

5.9 Summary of Comparative Analysis

As the seven cases explored above demonstrate, the restrictive settlements of the great wars of the twentieth century helped to foster both postwar stability and instability.

---

213 See, for example, Schwartz (1995, 561) and Kruger (1999, 250-251).
These results, when combined with the six cases explored in the previous chapter, put the validity of the maxim of moderation in victory in serious doubt. Not only did restrictive settlements produce postwar stability contra the conventional wisdom, but it also seems that leniency is no guarantee of stability.

With regard to the general characteristics of all the great power war-ending settlements in the universe of cases, there is obviously great variation in the level of restrictiveness of the war-ending settlements, as victors constructed settlements ranging from extraordinarily restrictive to extremely lenient. The average war-ending settlement ranked just over seven on the scale of severity and there is about an even split between those cases below and above the mean (six and seven, respectively). All told, states actually applied the maxim of moderation in victory when dealing with their vanquished foes only about half the time. The twentieth century certainly produced the most restrictive settlements as all First and Second World War great power settlements were well above the mean. While the nineteenth century generally produced lenient settlements – such as the post-Crimean War settlement for Russia, the settlements for Austria following the 1859 and 1866 wars – there were some fairly surprising results given the conventional wisdom. The most restrictive settlement of in this era was for France after the Napoleonic Wars. The 1815 settlement scored just below the mean level of restrictiveness, and nearly curtailed French autonomy and power as much as Germany in 1919 and Japan and Italy in 1945. Moreover, though most argue that Germany was much harsher on a vanquished France in 1871 than the conquerors of France in 1815, the victors clearly curtailed French autonomy and power more in the latter.
Great Power Loser | Restrictiveness of Settlement
---|---
Austria 1859 | 2
Russia 1856 | 3
Austria 1866 | 3
Russia 1905 | 3
France 1871 | 5
France 1815 | 7
Germany 1919 | 9
Japan 1945 | 9
Italy 1945 | 9
Hungary 1919 | 10
Austria 1919 | 10
West Germany 1945 | 11
East Germany 1945 | 12

Table 5.15: The Restrictiveness of War-ending Settlements 1815-1945

An important note is that nearly all of the most restrictive settlements were effectively made less severe as the postwar periods wore on. This is especially true with the settlements for Austria and Hungary after the First World War, where reparations commissions were transformed into relief organizations rather quickly. And even Germany was relieved of some burdens after the First World War; while other restrictions remained, the Dawes and Young plans drastically cut the scale of reparations the vanquished state had to pay. After the Second World War and with the advent of the Cold War, the US and other Western victors provided Italy, Japan, and West Germany with a measure of additional autonomy and capabilities when some of the most drastic restrictions were removed. Even East Germany, which suffered the worst fate of all the vanquished great powers under examination in terms of autonomy and power lost,
enjoyed some reduction in the severity of the settlement after the Soviet Union decided to build a strong ally of the defeated state rather than continue the pillage of the pre-1953-54 era.

In each of these post-Second World War cases, however, there were additional mechanism instituted by the victors, such as binding international institutions and additional domestic constraints, to maintain limits on the vanquished states’ autonomy and power. France after the 1815 received much the same sort of treatment. That is, reprieve came in the form of inclusion into the Concert of Europe which gave the French more foreign policy influence in the postwar world. But at the same time the victors made this move with the hope that it would bind France to the postwar order and thus act as an additional constraint on French foreign policy. This example, those from the twentieth century, and others may show that victors often pursue a strategy of at least limited reprieve after constructing a restrictive settlement. Nevertheless, as the discussion below indicates, reducing the severity of a settlement does not always mean that the defeated state will come to see the postwar order as legitimate nor that postwar stability will follow.

Another important note regards the differences in the severity of war-ending settlements of the two centuries under examination. That the most restrictive cases in the universe came from either the First or Second World War could mean that the victors of the World Wars were simply more vindictive than victorious states in the nineteenth century, or that the notion of moderation in victory held much more sway before the era
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214 The war-ending settlements of the nineteenth century averaged about four on the scale of severity, while the twentieth century’s average was over nine.
of global warfare. It could also mean that, in some ways at least, the nineteenth century was a better time to lose a great power war than the twentieth. But this does not necessarily mean that it was better for the victors or for postwar stability. Bringing the restrictiveness of the war-ending settlements together with the analyses of the postwar stability, it is clear that moderation in victory does not always lead to stability and restrictive settlements do not always lead to instability as the conventional wisdom suggests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability/Acceptance</th>
<th>Instability/Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Empire 1859</td>
<td>Russia 1856 (1871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria-Hungary 1866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France 1871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia 1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France 1815</td>
<td>Germany 1919 (1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria 1919</td>
<td>Hungary 1919 (1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy 1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan 1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany 1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany 1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16: War-ending Settlements and Postwar Stability

Given these results, it is quite easy to claim that the conventional wisdom is simply wrong. Quite a few restrictive settlements led to extended stability. Indeed, though by only two cases, they did so more often than lenient ones (Table 5.16). With
the measure of stability and historical analysis used here, there were only three cases of
great power war-ending settlements lead to instability at all. Two were harsh settlements,
but one was a fairly lenient settlement. In the end, it was only the restrictive 1919
German and Hungarian settlements and the lenient 1856 settlement for Russia that did
not produce extended postwar stability.

However, all of the thirteen cases – whether lenient or restrictive – produced some
period of stability, even if it was short-lived. For the most part, Germany initially
complied with the 1919 settlement because of its impotence. By the mid-1920s, it
actually resigned itself to this fate. Only after the total collapse of enforcement and a rise
in German capabilities in the 1930s did the vanquished state seriously challenge the
settlement. Hungary did much the same after 1919, but could only seriously challenge
the settlement by jumping on the bandwagon of Nazi Germany in the 1930s. After 1856,
Russia did little to challenge the settlement until it experienced a relative increase in
capabilities and, maybe more importantly, the rest of Europe was preoccupied with the
Franco-Prussian War. Though these periods of stability were comparatively brief, the
settlements were challenged only when opportunities presented themselves. Thus,
coercion clearly played a large role in promoting the limited stability following each of
these three cases.

Other cases that have to be judged stable display the same sort of characteristics.
While France did very little to challenge the 1871 settlement in the period under analysis,
it clearly resented the settlement from the beginning. In the end, it took over forty years
for the French to gain strong allies in Russia and Great Britain to end their isolation and it
was thus equally as long before France had a real opportunity to attempt to revise the
1871 settlement. The 1815 settlement for France produced a very similar result of extended stability, and largely for the same reasons. That is, the isolation and impotence of France in both instance prevented it from rising against the settlements for very long periods of time.\textsuperscript{215} Moreover, with two other lenient settlements that led to extended stability – Austria after 1859 and 1866 – the vanquished state never fully regained its prewar capabilities relative to the victors.\textsuperscript{216} Though suffering a much harsher settlement, Austria after 1919 was much the same. Coercion, then, likely had a large role in all of these cases whether they were lenient or restrictive.\textsuperscript{217}

In the end, there is fairly strong support for the coercion model for the stability of restrictive settlements. But there also seems sufficient evidence to argue that the model of coercion-based stability applies not only to restrictive war-ending settlements but also to lenient ones. This, in a sense, is not surprising. Under the coercion model, states are essentially deterred from acting against a settlement because of a lack of capabilities or

\textsuperscript{215} Moving beyond the thirty-year period of analysis, opportunities for French revisionist attempts appear shortly after. Louis Napoleon, for example, helped provoke the 1853 Crimean War in an effort to regain power and prestige for France after what he saw as the humiliation of the 1815 settlement. Even though he essentially backed down during the Crimean War, Louis Napoleon again attempted to provoke instability and thereby make gains vis-à-vis the other great powers by conspiring with Italy to launch a war against Austria in 1859. After 1871, France achieved real alliance with Russia and Britain only in 1907. Until then, it was relatively isolated and clearly losing ground to German capabilities. Expanding the temporal domain may force a reclassification of the settlements to unstable, but the mechanism driving the cases remains the same no matter the final outcome or judgment.

\textsuperscript{216} The 1905 war-ending settlement for Russia also led to stability by the measures used in the analysis. Russian capabilities did drop relative to Japan’s after the 1905 until the run-up to the Second World War, but even so Russia was clearly more powerful than Japan during the entire period. For this case, other events are probably much more important than the gap in power between the victor and the vanquished. First, Russia turned away from Asia after its defeat to deal with domestic turmoil and concentrate its foreign policy on the Balkans. Second, it is an understatement to claim that the First World War and the Russian Revolution were more pressing issues than Russian hopes of revising the 1905 settlement with Japan.

\textsuperscript{217} Looking at just the military capabilities of the vanquished states, the restrictive war-ending settlements coming from the Second World War display very similar characteristics. That is, Italy, Japan, West Germany, and East Germany were never able to significantly shrink the gap in capabilities between themselves and the victors.
opportunities to revise the settlement and it should not matter if the settlement is lenient or restrictive. The surprising aspect, at least as far as the conventional wisdom goes, is that vanquished states would want to challenge lenient settlements at all. One of the hallmarks of moderation in victory, according the proponents of the idea, is that leniency does not give the vanquished state reason to challenge the settlement. Few cases, however, actually conform to this. That is, only lenient settlements that coincided with a vanquished state that never recovered from defeat were not the objects of revision.

With these results, it is thus fairly safe to reject the null hypothesis coming from the conventional wisdom of moderation in victory for two reasons. First, restrictive great power war-ending settlements led to stability nearly as often as lenient ones in absolute and relative terms. That is, not only did quite a few restrictive settlements lead to extended postwar stability, but such settlements did so nearly as often as lenient ones. Second, the causal logic presented by the conventional wisdom, or at least as some proponents of the idea see it, appears to be absent. Most importantly, lenient settlements were resented by the defeated state. This did not happen after every case – Austria after 1859 and 1866 may not have desired to overthrow the settlements – but after 1856 and 1871 the vanquished clearly did. To put it another way, it is not at all clear that leniency produced legitimacy. The case held out as the exemplar of how moderation in victory can produce legitimacy and thus robust stability – the settlement for post-Napoleonic France in 1815 – fails on this front as well as another. That is, while 1815 was certainly not the most restrictive war-ending settlement of in the universe of cases, it was not all
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218 The null hypothesis stated: When victors implement a restrictive war-ending settlement that reduces the autonomy and power of the vanquished state, postwar instability will follow.
that lenient. But more importantly, even if the victors implemented a degree of 
moderation in 1815, France decidedly did not perceive the settlement as legitimate. The 
same is true after 1856, as this lenient settlement proved unstable largely because Russia 
perceived the settlement as illegitimate from the day it was implemented.

In the end, this comparative analysis of the universe of great power war-ending 
settlements served at least two important purposes. First, rather than haphazardly picking 
and choosing historical cases from which to cull bits of wisdom and generalizing from 
this, employing the same theoretically derived measures of the severity of settlements and 
postwar stability for each case provides a much more systematic way to test hypotheses 
and generate additional insights. Second, and largely because the notion of moderation in 
victory seems to have been generated from a few cases with little theoretical grounding, it 
clearly demonstrates the many problems of the conventional view. In one sense, then, the 
results show that the conventional wisdom is simply wrong. This, however, does not 
mean that it should be entirely scrapped. Less restrictive settlements may raise fewer 
points of contention between the victors and vanquished in the postwar era and thus the 
application of moderation in victory may be appropriate under certain conditions, but the 
assumption that leniency produces stability based on legitimacy is unwarranted. It seems 
much safer to assume that state will reject any settlement no matter how lenient and, if 
the victors cannot effectively defend their vision of the postwar order, leniency will at 
least produces a smaller number of grievances than a harsh settlement.

Even this, however, has to be qualified. Especially with the war-ending 
settlements coming out of the Second World War, the victorious states plainly attempted 
to socialize the vanquished to the postwar order and their restricted roles in postwar
international politics. While none of the vanquished states ever regained sufficient capabilities to challenge the victors’ postwar order, there is still good reason to suspect just from the brief case analysis presented above that they were successful. That is, these cases point to a process of victor-instigated socialization that led Italy, Japan, and West Germany to accept their restrictive settlements after the Second World War.\textsuperscript{219} That the robust stability these cases demonstrated is due to a victor instigated socialization process, however, cannot be said with certainty given the evidence presented in the comparative analysis.\textsuperscript{220} As such, an in-depth case study is the most appropriate way to fully trace the causal mechanisms presented in the coercion plus socialization model.

5.10 Case Selection for In-depth Analysis

One of the biggest obstacles to demonstrating the coercion plus socialization model is that inaction on part of the defeated state is the hallmark of success. That is, if the victors instigated a process of socialization whereby the vanquished state accepts the postwar order as legitimate, that state will not attempt to revise the settlement even if there are reasonable opportunities to do so. By the measure of capabilities used in the

\textsuperscript{219} Beyond the western settlements of the Second World War, the analysis presented in this and the previous chapter shows that there were other instances where the victors attempted to socialize the defeated state to the postwar order. Reinstalling the Bourbon dynasty to the French throne in 1815 and later admitting France into the Concert of Europe, the victors hoped, would make the French accept the settlement as legitimate. Demanding a democratic government in Germany after the First World War, Wilson especially thought, may make Germany a peaceful nation and accept the consequences of the war. The Soviets, after nearly ten years, did much to bolster the East German regime with the hope that it would gain legitimacy and thus not challenge the war-ending settlement. Possibly because they were not far-reaching enough or they occurred too late in the postwar period, none of these socialization attempts were truly effective as the above analysis of the postwar era for each case clearly demonstrates.

\textsuperscript{220} The coercion plus socialization model (hypothesis two) states: if a defeated state is faced with a restrictive settlement that is enforced and it undergoes a process of socialization instigated by the victors, it will not act to revise its postwar position even if there are reasonable opportunities to do so.
comparative analysis, none of the cases where victors made socialization attempts and robust postwar stability followed presents a vanquished state with reasonable hopes of successfully altering the settlement.\textsuperscript{221} Though it modestly gained capabilities relative to the victors, at its highpoint in the postwar period Italy held just over four percent of victor capabilities (see Table 5.8). In a relative sense, Japan had the most dramatic increase in capabilities in the postwar period but still held less than one percent of victor capabilities (see Table 5.10). West Germany was the most powerful of the vanquished states after the Second World War holding nearly seven percent of the victor capabilities, but suffered a relative decline to the victors over the entire postwar era (see Table 5.14).

Capabilities scores, however, may not expose all of the resources of a state. Examining economic power of the vanquished states presents a slightly different story.\textsuperscript{222} Italy, Japan, and West Germany all enjoyed huge economic booms in the post-Second World War era; Italy’s postwar economy grew by over four-hundred percent, Japan’s topped one-thousand percent growth, and West Germany enjoyed nearly six-hundred percent growth.\textsuperscript{223} And compared to all of the other cases in the comparative analysis, these three states made tremendous gains against the economic power of the victors (Figure 5.17)

\textsuperscript{221} Capabilities for all states in the comparative analysis are measure with Correlates of War Composite Index of National Capabilities (CINC). See chapter three.

\textsuperscript{222} The CINC scores do not include national income. The closest approximation of national income included as on of the six indicators that make up the CINC index is national energy consumption. The other five – military expenditure, military personnel, iron and steel production, urban population, and total population – are most closely associated with traditional elements of military power.

\textsuperscript{223} All GDP figures are OECD data from Maddison (1995). In 1990 US dollars, from 1946 until 1975, Italy’s GDP climbed from about 111 billion to 585 billion, Japan went from 107 billion to 1.2 trillion, and West Germany GDP grew from 115 billion to 805 billion.
Figure 5.1: Vanquished State GDP Growth as a Percentage of Victor(s) GDP
The relative increase these three defeated state made against the victors national income far outstrip any other state under analysis. For the entire period of 1946 through 1975, Italy experience over ninety percent higher growth than the victors, Japan more than a three-hundred percent increase over the victors, and West Germany over one-hundred fifty percent higher economic growth than the victors. In absolute terms, West Germany became the second richest Western nation by 1964 only to be overtaken by Japan in 1966.

Rarely does such impressive economic not coincide with an increase in military capabilities. Especially West Germany and Japan, therefore, are quite exceptional in this sense. In addition, much of the West German and Japanese economic recovery was in industrial and high technology goods – sectors that, if so desired, provide a relatively easy transition from peacetime enterprises into war-making potential. These factors may provide even more reason to believe that there was a successful process of socialization that led these vanquished states to accept the postwar status quo as legitimate. That is, if some sort of legitimation or socialization process did not occur, it is highly likely that these two vanquished states would have used their economic prowess to alter their war-ending settlements.
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224 East German GDP figures are not included in Figure 5.1 because after German reunification the OECD discontinued publishing separate East and West German economic data. However, Maddison (1989) provides some economic data for the Eastern bloc. Including just the Soviet Union as the victor, from 1953 to 1970 (the only years available within the period of analysis), East Germany’s economy grew just one hundred seventy nine percent while the USSR’s economy expanded by more than two hundred percent. Thus, in relative terms East Germany actually lost ground against the Soviet Union.

225 For example, the high point of German economic growth relative to the victors after the First World War in 1941 coincides with about a ninety percent increase in its share of total great power capabilities as measure by CINC scores.
In the next chapter, I test the coercion plus socialization model. There are multiple challenges when attempting to empirically demonstrate the coercion plus socialization model, including showing that the victors instigated the socialization process rather than legitimation of the postwar order due to other factors. I take up this issue and others in the next chapter. The most pressing methodological issue at this point is case selection.

To be able to demonstrate the coercion plus socialization model, any case examined must present opportunities for the vanquished state to challenge the settlement. While Japan experienced higher economic growth than West Germany from 1946 until 1976, both had remarkable potential to transform their economic prowess into military power and, at least hypothetically, seriously challenge the war-ending settlement. From this angle then, either case would be acceptable. However, the West German case presents two advantages over the Japanese case. First, though its capabilities were still rather small compared to the victors, actual West German military capabilities dwarfed those of Japan. Second, had West Germany pursued a strategy of dividing the victors with the hope of gaining some autonomy, it could have done so easier than Japan. While the US dominated West Germany during the occupation and continued to be the dominant victorious state in West German politics after formal sovereignty, the US had to coordinate its German policy with at least two other great powers. Because the US alone was the victor with decisive influence over the vanquished state, Japan had no such potential divisions to exploit. The hypothetical case can be made, then, that West Germany had more opportunities than Japan to challenge the war-ending settlement.
The next chapter shows that West Germany in fact did not take any of these opportunities. The vanquished state did not desire to revise the war-ending settlement or challenge the postwar order chiefly because the victors successfully socialized West Germany to the postwar system. Indeed, West Germany became a pillar of stability in postwar era. Even after a forty-plus year division, reunification of the German nation did not lead to fundamental challenges to Germany’s place within the international order. In the end, this was an extraordinarily successful victor attempt to manage a defeated great power.
6.1 Introduction

The first priority of the victorious states of the Second World War was to ensure Germany would never again disturb the peace. The initial policies, directed by Potsdam and other agreements, very clearly attempted to do this by stripping the defeated state of the capabilities necessary for war. When the division of Germany solidified, the Western victors – most importantly the US – continued to work toward this end, restricting West German autonomy and power even when it became clear the vanquished state would have to be a vital component of the Western strategy to confront the Soviet Union. The restrictions placed on the defeated state, however, did more than just prohibit the defeated state from challenging the post-war status quo. They also created the conditions under which a process of socialization could occur in the vanquished nation, something that was indeed intended by the victors. As legitimacy replaced coercion as the basis of the defeated state’s acceptance of the very restrictive settlement, strict enforcement of the settlement became less necessary as West Germany valued the status quo and was indeed willing to defend it. As a result, this restrictive settlement proved remarkably stable.
The notion that the Second World War and its aftermath fundamentally transformed West German politics and national character is not new. Indeed, many others have established that postwar West Germany underwent a dramatic transformation to become a solidly liberal democratic society.\textsuperscript{226} The horrors of the Third Reich and the utter devastation of the Second World War certainly pushed the defeated state toward a new path.\textsuperscript{227} While the impact of history and memory cannot be denied, the actions of the victors by way of their management strategy significantly, if not primarily, pushed this transformation as well.\textsuperscript{228}

This is not to say that West Germans themselves had no role in the transformation of the defeated state. The horrors of the war and the destruction the Nazis had brought down on all Germans led many, if not most, to reject the former regime. Academics, public intellectuals, writers, and others were pushed toward deep reflection on the Nazi period after defeat, leading to many visions of how Germany could come to terms with its

\textsuperscript{226} See, for example, the contributions to the volume edited by Brady, Crawford, and Willarty (1999). One of the most influential works on the postwar transformation of Germany was Baker, Dalton, and Hildebrandt (1981). Even Jürgen Habermas, one of the most prominent critics of the character of the Federal Republic since the 1970s, notes the transition of West Germany was significant and a provides a solid future for Germany’s future (1994).

\textsuperscript{227} See Banchoff (1999a, 1999b, 1999c), Berger (1998, 1999), Krieger (1999), Markovits and Reich (1999) all of which posit, in one way or another, the power of collective memory in the transformation of West Germany.

\textsuperscript{228} Conradt (1989, 256) notes that postwar socialization, the absence of a credible alternative to democracy, postwar socioeconomic modernization, and the performance of the governance system in the Federal Republic – all directly related to the actions of the victors and the war-ending settlement – are the most important factors cited for the West German transition. See also Ikenberry (2001) and Ikenberry and Kupchan (1991) which highlight the process of socialization as well. However, the latter two works as well as others that cite historical memory as the key factor in the West German transformation tend to downplay the role of the victors in pushing the transformation in West Germany. That is, none fully recognizes key role the restrictive settlement itself played in socializing the defeated state to the post-war status quo.
history and chart a new, peaceful course.\textsuperscript{229} Individual German politicians, many of which had been brought into early occupation era politics by the victors because of shared political leanings and their anti-Nazi credentials, must be recognized as well not only for the domestic political development of the state but also for defining a West German foreign policy that embraced the West. Indeed, the western victors were very lucky to have Konrad Adenauer and other West German politicians that so naturally identified with the West.\textsuperscript{230} But of the groups that thought critically about the future of Germany, none were initially free to implement their ideas.\textsuperscript{231} Moreover, few of the ideas initially resonated with a German public that seemed not to care at all about politics or, in some instances, the recent past.

While not a complete political vacuum, the Allies were able to exploit the relatively large void in immediate post-war German politics. As such, they set the stage for political participation and more, leaving West Germans very few options other than

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item For example, Karl Jaspers argued in \textit{The Question of German Guilt (Die Schuldfrage)} that self-reflection was the only route that could allow the “good” Germany to emerge. Germans, according to Jaspers, must accept collective responsibility – but not criminal guilt – for the Nazi crimes perpetrated in the name of Germany. Though considered by some to be a founding text for a new West German political culture, the work was either scorned or ignored when it first appeared as a published lecture in 1946, leading Jaspers to great despair and to eventually leave Germany for the more tranquil Switzerland. It was only in the 1960s that Jaspers’ work gain wide acceptance in West Germany. On Jaspers’ influence on post-war Germany, see Clark (2002) and Olick (2005, 282-318).

\item Figures like Adenauer and Ludwig Erhard of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) were the Allies – especially US – favorites and thus were promoted over figures such as Kurt Schumacher of the Social Democratic Party (SPD). Adenauer, from the western most part of Germany, in particular shared a common vision with the US and other Western victors and was a willing partner in most processes, such as the formation of the Basic Law, the ECSC, and West German ascension into NATO, leading to the post-war status quo for the Federal Republic. On Adenauer and the US, see, for example, Craig (1995) and Berger (1999, 64-65).

\item As Kruger (1999, 348) argues, “The German impetus and efforts to promote democracy are due honor, but, in fact, there was little choice in view of the stern democratizing intentions of the Western power.”
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the route charted by the victors. In this way, the victors jumpstarted a process of socialization in the defeated state. As the post-war period wore on, the process of transformation relied much less on the direct actions of the victors and thus became more and more German-led. Nevertheless, it remained within the confines of the victors’ initial method of rebuilding and system of restrictions. In this sense, the transformation “owed as much to the Western Allies and their occupation policies as to the Germans themselves.” (Bark and Gress 1993, 87) The victors, after vigilantly enforcing the restrictive settlement for a lengthy period, spurred the transformation of West Germany from a nationalistic, expansionistic, aggressive state into a pillar of stability in the post-war world that accepted the status quo as legitimate.

In the next section, I will briefly describe the challenges of demonstrating the socialization process whereby a defeated state internalizes and accepts as legitimate a restrictive settlement. Though there are a few difficulties that must be overcome, certain strategies provide routes by which this can be done so as to provide an adequate appraisal of the theory. In the third section, I will show that even in defeat Germany was perceived as a potential threat and as such the Western Allies constructed and enforced a settlement that severely restricted the vanquished state. In addition, the section elaborates how the measures implemented by the Allies were intended to push along the socialization process critical for legitimizing the restrictive settlement. In the fourth section, I will demonstrate how the process of socialization in West Germany transformed the defeated

232 Those groups that may have provided some real alternatives – such as the anti-fascist leagues – were marginalized by the victors. Criticism of West German democracy in the 1960s was based in part on the fact that the Allies essentially eliminated these anti-fascist leagues, or Antifa, as political actors in the early occupation period as they became radical rather quickly (Bark and Gress 1993, 103). Many saw the Antifa as a route that would have brought about a truly democratic Germany, one that did not have the trappings of the Allies’ influence.
state into a stable liberal democracy unwilling to challenge a post-war order seen as legitimate. In the final section, I will summarize the findings of the case and provide a final evaluation of the socialization plus coercion model for this case.

6.2 Demonstrating the Process of Socialization

For postwar stability to be attributed to the coercion plus socialization model, any particular case must demonstrate at least two important characteristics. First, it must be shown that the defeated state was socialized to the postwar order by a process instigated by the actions of the victors via a restrictive management strategy. Second, it is critical to show that the defeated state did not attempt to revise the settlement because it perceived the postwar order to be legitimate. While seemingly straightforward, both of these observable implications provide challenges for empirical testing. These challenges, however, can all be overcome or at least minimized.

First, it is imperative to firmly establish the role of the war-ending settlement as a socialization mechanism. That is, it must be made clear that the victors intended to socialize the defeated state to their vision of postwar politics. If socialization is part of the management strategy, victors can and usually do make their intentions to transform a defeated state exceedingly clear. By detailing the contents of the victors’ management strategy, the intended direction of a socialization attempt provides a guidepost by which to judge the success or failure of the victors to legitimate the war-ending settlement.

The second challenge is directly related to the first. That is, even if the victors unambiguously push in a certain direction, legitimation of the postwar status quo can occur for reasons other than a victorious state’s policy. Domestic groups may spur
changes in the domestic character of the vanquished such that the state is effectively socialized to the postwar order through a route having little to do with the victors’ management strategy. Thus, it may be difficult to discern the origins of a transformation in the defeated state. However, it is possible to weigh the relative influence of these groups on the course of postwar politics in the defeated state. Additionally, even if some domestic groups are in lockstep with the victors, efforts of the victorious state to promote certain groups at the expense of others is evidence of the victor’s direct involvement in the political transformation of the defeated state.

Even if the influence of the victors can be firmly established, a restrictive settlement – with provisions to limit a state’s autonomy and power through military, economic, territorial, and general political constraints – is itself designed to limit the ability of a defeated state to revise the settlement. Thus, opportunities for the defeated state to revise the settlement should be limited if the victors enforce the settlement. As such, a third challenge is to distinguish between postwar stability arising from simple coercion and stability resulting from a settlement being legitimated through process of socialization. There are, however, several paths available to minimize this obstacle.

Exogenous changes – such as shifts in the structure of the international system, the decline of a victorious state’s power, the addition of post-war threats facing the victors, or global technological and industrial innovation – may provide instances where the defeated state is able to reacquire policy autonomy or recoup lost power even when the settlement is enforced. Additionally, a vanquished state may gain currency in realms not directly related to the military, economic, territorial, or political provisions of a settlement. Such gains – in moral authority on the global stage or economic capabilities
not prohibited by the settlement, for example – may be translated into opportunities to revise the settlement. Thus, even though the intent of a restrictive settlement is to limit the ability of the defeated state to alter its treatment, there may be opportunities to revise the settlement available to the state. If coercion is the basis of the defeated state’s acceptance of the settlement, such exogenous events should lead to challenges. If a process of socialization legitimized the settlement, then opportunities to challenge the settlement resulting from exogenous events should not be taken.

But even if there are opportunities for the defeated state to challenge the settlement, a final hurdle is to demonstrate exactly why a state did not pursue opportunities for revisionism. If the state was socialized to the postwar order, certain actions to challenge the settlement by striving for greater autonomy or power in the postwar era would be deemed inappropriate or illegitimate. Such actions should be eschewed immediately. But if socialization is thorough enough, such attacks on the postwar order should not even be contemplated by the defeated state.

Thus, an indirect way to establish that socialization is responsible for acceptance of the postwar order as laid out by the victors in the war-ending settlement is to examine the defeated state’s response to other’s attacks on that order. If the vanquished state has been socialized to the postwar order, the defeated state should seek to defend the status quo from other’s challenges. In a different context, the defeated state may accept as legitimate and seek to preserve, for example, mechanisms such as domestic or international institutions imposed by the victors after a process of socialization is
complete. Threats to the character of these institutions – institutions that victors imposed to limit the autonomy and power of the defeated state – would be resisted by the defeated state if it considers them to be legitimate.

In addition, elite- and mass-level opinions of politics may help to establish the political tenor of the state and provide another indirect route to expose the success or failure of socialization attempts. As the socialization process in the defeated state solidifies, domestic attitudes should reflect this through support for the mechanisms within the war-ending settlement. If there are, for example, territorial amputations or domestic and international institutions that fundamentally limit the state’s autonomy and power, such measures should be deemed as legitimate by public and private actors in the defeated state if socialization to the status quo has occurred.

Finally, and at a more general level, since victorious states would only seek to socialize a defeated state to their vision of the postwar order, once the process is complete and the settlement is legitimized the defeated state should perceived their own self-interests to be fundamentally in line the victorious states’ interests. Fulfillment of the victors’ interests thus should not threaten the defeated state and, if socialization has occurred, the tenor of the relationship between the victors and the vanquished should be quite good.233

As the remainder of this chapter will detail, by enforcing such a restrictive settlement the victors hoped to not only limit German ability to disturb the peace again

---

233 If these elements are not present, socialization is likely not responsible for postwar stability. That is, if a defeated state welcomes challenges to the postwar order, resents the institutional constraints it faces, or perceives its interests as fundamentally opposed to the victorious states that constructed the settlement, socialization is not responsible for postwar stability. If the postwar era is fairly stable without these elements, it is likely do to coercion more than anything else.
but also to instigate the socialization process that fundamentally transformed the state into one that valued the postwar order. Embarking on the most ambitious effort to remake a state in modern history, many of the Allies efforts had lasting effects in this case of a very successful restrictive war-ending settlement.

6.3 Threatening Even in Defeat: The Need to Restrict and Transform Germany

When Germany surrendered on May 8, 1945, little of the country was left untouched. The military had been smashed during the Allied armies advance on Berlin, and soon after nearly all leftover German military equipment had been destroyed. Although some factories survived the war relatively unscathed, few could operate after surrender and the Allies seized those that could. Consumer and industrial goods were very scarce, and food and other basic necessities of life were also in short supply. Manpower too was depleted. So many men had been killed or wounded, only German women were left to clear the ruble of war (Bark and Gress 1993, 30-46). Through the late 1940s, it was difficult to imagine that this defeated state – one that gave rise to the image of the ruble-women, or Trummerfrauen – would ever regain its position as the richest, strongest, and potentially most threatening state in Europe.

Despite such devastation, the specter of a recovered Germany unbound in Europe was the primary concern of the Allies in the immediate aftermath of the war. Perceived by some of the Allies more acutely than others but shared by all to a significant degree, at no point in the post-war period did the perception of potential threat abate. Cold War tensions eventually drove the US and Western Allies to encourage West German economic and military growth to confront the threat in the East, yet the victors did not
relent in keeping the vanquished state under tight control through strict enforcement of limitations on the defeated state’s autonomy and power. From the Western Allies perspective, West German power had to be restricted and harnessed simultaneously. Thus, because of the Cold War, the victors’ management strategy evolved as the strategic context of the post-war era changed. But, as nearly all post-war developments through the mid- to late-1950s show, the US and the victorious Western allies were motivated to enforce the restrictive war-ending settlement by the a fear of a powerful, independent Germany. It was only later in the 1960s and 1970s, after all were convinced that the defeated state had been thoroughly socialized, that most suspicions of West Germany faded.

6.3.1 Initial Occupation

Achieving unconditional surrender, the Allies set about ensuring that Germany would never again rise to disturb the peace. Though the Soviet method of destroying German power was much more brutal than the Western Allies – on the individual and state level – all members of the anti-Nazi coalition agreed that German power had to be destroyed to achieve any sort of postwar stability in Europe. The US took the lead in

234 Germans feared the worst after capitulating on 8 May 1945. Stories of the brutality of Soviet forces ran rampant, compelling many in the East to flee before the arrival of the Red Army. See Naimark (1995) on the Soviet brutality toward Germans. Botting (1985, 1-23) recounts how many Germans in the west welcomed the arrival of American soldiers. Though less fearful of the Western Allies and many even glad to see the American and other Western Allied forces arrive, people in the vanquished nation, remembering the peace of 1919 and the destitute interwar years, faced a dire situation. In March 1945, one Berliner scrawled on a wall: “Enjoy the war – the peace is going to be terrible.” Quoted in Bark and Gress (1993, 5).

235 As a signal to the Germans of the coming treatment under Allied occupation, upon the fall of the first major German position, the proclamation Eisenhower posted in English and German read: “The Allied forces serving under my command have now entered Germany. We come as conquerors, but not as oppressors. In the area of Germany occupied by the forces under my command, we shall obliterate Naziism [sic] and German militarism.” Quoted in Beschloss (2000, 159).
the west, though Britain and later France each had their own zones of occupation. Though there were some differences, the occupation policies of the Western Allies largely coincided. Eventually, US policy dominated the western sectors of Germany.

On 10 May 1945, General Lucius D. Clay received his orders from Washington on how the US occupation forces should operate in the vanquished nation. Under the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) directive 1067, Germany would “not be occupied for the purposes of liberation, but as a defeated nation,” and “the principle Allied objective [would be] to prevent Germany from ever again becoming a threat to the peace of the world.” JCS 1067 provided Clay with “supreme legislative, executive, and judicial authority,” in the US zone, and further retained ultimate authority for the commander over all matters unspecified. This directive, combined with the later Potsdam declaration by the US, Soviet Union, and Britain, provided the roadmap for restricting the defeated state while in occupation and specified some mechanisms to start the process of eliminating aggressive, militaristic Nazism in vanquished Germany so that it would

---

236 Thus, Germany suffered severe territorial restrictions during the initial occupation period. Though at the time it was not seen as a permanent solution, the state was in fact dismembered. Moreover, Germany permanently lost twenty-three percent of its 1938 land to strategic amputations, including land east of the Oder-Nisse line to Poland (Goldstein 1992).

237 The text of the revised JCS 1067 (JCS 1067/8 date 10 May 1945) is reprinted in Documents on Germany 1944-1985, US Department of State 15-32 (hereafter referred to as JCS 1067). The original JCS 1067/6 was issued by President Truman’s administration on 26 April 1945.

238 JCS 1067, 16.
forever be prevented from rampaging across Europe.\textsuperscript{239} The Germans would be forced to realize they lost the war because of their own actions, and they would not be able to evade the consequences.\textsuperscript{240}

The US and its Allies first specified the destruction of the Nazi state apparatus. Denazification would begin with all organs of the Nazi party being dissolved, including any laws established by the Hitler regime and all property of the party and its leaders taken under US control.\textsuperscript{241} All members of the Nazi party “who have been more than nominal participants in its activities, all active supporters of Nazism or militarism and all other persons hostile to Allied purposes will be removed and excluded from public office and from positions of importance in quasi-public and private enterprises,” including civic and labor organizations, industry, education, and the media, among others.\textsuperscript{242} Though later criticized for various reasons, the program of denazification was absolutely

\textsuperscript{239} The Potsdam Declaration, issued by the Soviet Union, the US, and Britain on 1 August 1945 after the meetings held outside Berlin 17 July through 2 August, spelled out the reparations scheme, German territorial transfers to Poland along the Oder and Neisse Rivers, specific disarmament requirements and procedures, denazification, education reform, and other aspects of coordinated Allied policy. Thus, the tenor of the document mirrors US policy as reflected in JCS 1067. In some instances, the political directives were exactly the same as the US occupation directive, while in others more specificity was introduced or the subjects were left for future Control Council and other Allied organs decisions. As just one example, though JCS 1067 provided some specific mechanisms to promote the decentralization of German power, Potsdam stressed this goal more concretely. The text of the Potsdam Declaration is reprinted in \textit{Documents on Germany 1944-1985}, US Department of State 54-65 (hereafter referred to as Potsdam).

\textsuperscript{240} JCS 1067 (17). The Potsdam declaration took this goal seriously as well. The purpose of the occupation was in part to, “convince the German people that they have suffered a total military defeat and that they cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves, since their own ruthless warfare and the fanatical Nazi resistance have destroyed the Germany economy and made chaos and suffering inevitable.” (56) The issue of war guilt for all Germans was thus a central theme in the initial occupation period, but without the intended effects on the Germans. The Allies later reigned in their assertions of collective German guilt as it became counterproductive (Olick 2005, 118-125).

\textsuperscript{241} JCS 1067, 18-19.

\textsuperscript{242} Ibib. 19.
necessary in the minds of the Allies because, in addition to the atrocities carried out in its name, the Nazi party was “inextricably linked to Prussian militarism and expansionism.” (Bark and Gress, 1993, 18) Thus, the destruction of German power necessitated the destruction of the party.

Along with denazification, Germany was to be totally demilitarized. The US and other Allies saw the Prussian military tradition, and especially the German General Staff, as a main cause of aggression. As such, anything of military character was outlawed, and the occupation forces were charged with destroying the remnants of German military equipment and organizational structures such as the general staff, officer corps, reserve corps, and military academies, “together with all associations which might serve to keep alive the military tradition in Germany.”

²⁴³ Millions of German soldiers were demobilized, some to be used as laborers for the victorious Allies in activities such as mine clearing.²⁴⁴ Those members of the armed forces suspected of war crimes or holding a certain rank were to be detained for prosecution.²⁴⁵

The economic and financial occupation policies gave Allied forces total command over what was left of the German economy. Strict controls were put in place to prevent

---

²⁴³ Ibib. 20. See also Towle (1997, 126-129). Between the end of the war and January 1947, the victorious Allies destroyed nearly ten thousand tanks, over ten thousand aircraft, over three hundred warships, and nearly four hundred submarines. The Allies so thoroughly disarmed Germany that the only problem that arose was that there were not enough engineers to destroy all the German military equipment designated to be eliminated (157).

²⁴⁴ The Soviets actively used former German soldiers even more than the Western powers yet employed British and American use of German soldiers as a propaganda tool to promote distrust of the Western Allies (Towle 1997, 159-161).

²⁴⁵ Any officer of the general staff corps and all officers (commissioned and non-commissioned) of the Waffen SS and other branches of the SS were arrested as war criminals. Party leaders, members of the SA, high-ranking ministry officials, and associates of the extraordinary Nazi courts were to be detained as war criminals as well (JCS 20-21).
any potential German industrial might from being used for anything but contributing to the operation of the occupation forces, reparations, or maintaining a German standard of living at a level not to exceed “any one of the neighboring United Nations.” The latter was included only to “prevent starvation or widespread disease or such civil unrest as would endanger the occupying forces.” JCS 1067 and Potsdam declared that all industries producing the implements of war were prohibited and to be prevented from resurfacing. Potsdam went further, pushing for a decentralized economy with emphasis on the “development of agriculture and peaceful domestic industries.” Reparations were spelled out in Potsdam, with each occupying power taking their share from their own sectors, and providing the Soviet Union an additional fifteen percent of German industrial capacity from the Western Zones in exchange for coal, food and other resources abundant in the east as well as ten percent of all German industrial capital located in the western zones free and clear. With these directives, the Allies set about dismantling all German industry related to war-making potential. Hundreds of factories

---

246 JCS 18, 23-32 (quote on 18). Especially regarding the economy, the directive often mentions German standards of living, health care, and even some freedoms granted to the defeated nation (e.g., ability for labor to organize). Nevertheless, it is quite clear that none of the occupation resources were to be used to further any of these goals, and the most prominent feature of the document is the restrictions placed on the defeated state. This may reflect that much of the directive was based on the infamous Morgenthau Plan. Roosevelt and Churchill signed on to Morgenthau’s plan for the pastoralization of post-war Germany at the Quebec Conference in 1944, only to repudiate it after domestic furors over the harsh provisions. For Morgenthau’s own view of the Treasury Department’s plans for Germany, officially called the “Program to Prevent Germany from Starting a World War III,” see Morgenthau (1945). For the evolution of the Morgenthau plan and its transformation into JCS 1067, as well as the inter-administration debates on how to treat Germany, see Eisenberg (1996), Hammond (1963, 368-371), and Beschloss (2000).

247 Potsdam (57-58).

248 Ibid. (59-60). Potsdam also directed that Germany be treated as an economic unit (58). This proved a point of serious contention between the Allies, as such a move meant that the US and Britain could end up funding German reparations to the Soviet Union. Because of this and other issues, this aspect of coordinated Allied policy, like many other original all-Allied policies on Germany, was later scrapped.
were destroyed in the US and other Western sectors alone. Though rather extensive, the goal of these economic restrictions was not to make Germany an entirely agricultural nation without any industrial capacity but to make sure that Germany would be able to support itself without threatening others.249

Keeping the Germans down through these expansive territorial, military, and economic restrictions, however, was not necessarily enough for the US or other Western Allies. All of the victors believed that Germany could very easily pose a threat to post-war stability because, even with such far-reaching restrictions, it would be very difficult to keep the defeated state down forever. As McAllister (2002, 251) argues, “Germany’s power at the end of the war indicated little or nothing about the country’s strength in twenty or thirty years, and it was the latter consideration that was most crucial for everyone who thought about the German problem during the Second World War.” The ultimate goal of the Western Allies was thus to transform the defeated state into a Western style democracy. Upon returning from Potsdam, US President Truman declared that Germany would be made into a “decent” nation through building “democracy by control of German education, by reorganizing local government and the judiciary, by

---

249 Towle (1997, 152-165). In this sense, the economic provisions of JCS 1067 and the Potsdam Declaration can be seen as something between Morgenthau’s plan for pastoralization and Roosevelt’s desire to maintain German industrial capacity to “the fullest extent necessary to maintain the Germans so that we don’t have the burden of taking care of them.” Quoted in Eisenberg (1996, 65). The Allies 1946 “level of industry” plan aimed to restrict Germany to roughly fifty percent of the industrial output of 1938 (Overly 1996, 5).
encouraging free speech, free press, freedom of religion and the right of labor to
organize,” among the other provisions included in the Potsdam declaration as well as US
directives for occupation.250

Thus, the political aspects of occupation were as far-reaching as the territorial,
Military, and economic ones. The overriding goal of US policy toward Germany, as
noted above, was first denazification. But a close second was to break the power of the
centralized German state, something thought to have allowed militarism to run rampant.
Federalism and other sorts of checks and balance would come later, but the initial
occupation policies also served this goal. Political parties, which had to be licensed by
the occupation authorities, were prohibited from engaging issues outside their own
regions.251 They were thus confined to the state-level, or Land, with the hope that they
would gain strong regional-level platforms. Beyond a concern with decentralization, the
victors directly decided which political actors would be in power in the initial occupation.
The Allies immediately selected anti-Nazi mayors for each occupied village in their zone,
as well as initially appointed all Land officials. The first real elections in the US zone
occurred by 1946, but all participants – parties and individuals – were subject to US
approval.

Although JCS 1067 and Potsdam upheld freedom of speech and of the press, at
least as to the extent that they did not interfere with operations of the occupation forces,
direct censorship of the media occurred until September 1945. Indirect censorship
followed, with each outlet forced to gain a license from the occupation authorities. Direct

250 Quoted in Beschloss (2000, 269).
251 JCS 1067 (21).
criticism of the occupation or occupation authorities was prohibited, and those media outlets that did so regularly had their licenses revoked.\textsuperscript{252} The US also directly funded some media outlets, including \textit{Die Neue Zeitung}, or The New Newspaper.\textsuperscript{253}

Along with restrictions on German power, denazification, and other politics, education was to lay the foundation for eventual democratic governance in Germany. Nazism, however, corrupted the German education system. Therefore, the Allies shut down the entire system until all remnants of the Nazi past could be purged. A system of “control over German education and an affirmative program of reorientation will be established designed completely to eliminate Nazi and militaristic doctrines and to encourage the development of democratic ideas.”\textsuperscript{254} The US thought that without such education reform, German democracy could not last.\textsuperscript{255}

Through these various political provisions, as well as the territorial, military, and economic ones mentioned above, German autonomy and power was essentially eliminated during the occupation. As tensions between the West and the Soviet Union heated up, however, the danger of a resurgent Germany had to be squared with the other danger of Germany ending up on the wrong side of the Cold War (Gaddis 1997, 116). After 1947, the US and the other Western Allies shifted to a policy of restraining German

\textsuperscript{252} Olick (2005, 142) and Bark and Gress (1993, 156).

\textsuperscript{253} The first issue of this paper included a note from General Eisenhower announcing that the paper was \textit{not} German. Rather, it was one way to reeducate and democratize German citizens and eliminate militarism in Germany (Olick 2005, 142-144).

\textsuperscript{254} JCS 1067 (22).

\textsuperscript{255} Bark and Gress (1993, 164). US policy was not directed at the university level, leading to later charges that German universities had not undergone a democratic transition (173-174).
autonomy and power while also harnessing the vanquished state’s might for the great struggle to come. As such, the groundwork for the socialization of the defeated state laid during the initial occupation would be greatly expanded upon.

6.3.2 The Advent of Cold War Tensions: Constrained Rebuilding

The Potsdam agreement between the major anti-Nazi coalition members, under strain from the beginning, was crumbling chiefly due to issues regarding economic control in the defeated state, most directly related to reparations. Nevertheless, such was the fear of potential German revanchism that, even though the Cold War was solidifying, in early 1947 US Secretary of State Marshall wanted to probe the possibility of revived cooperation with the Soviets because of his perception of the German threat to post-war stability. Unable to come to an agreement in this instance or in later attempts to resolve US-Soviet differences over the German problem, the prospects of reinvigorating all-Allied cooperation relentlessly dimmed. Official policy thus shifted from an unmitigated effort to destroy German power to one intended to rebuild Germany within the strict confines of a Western military and economic system.

One of the first steps by the US was to revise its occupation directive. The new directive – JCS 1779 – stressed that the basic objective of US policy was to “lay the economic and educational bases of a sound Germany democracy, of encouraging bona

---

256 As McAllister (2002, 255) notes, “More than anything else, the question of reparations poisoned the atmosphere of US-Soviet relations and the prospects of lasting great power cooperation over Germany.”


258 The shift in US policy could be dated earlier than 1947, going back to Byrne’s Stuttgart speech in the autumn of 1946. However, most changes to US policy for the occupation of Germany as well as general orientation for European security and stability were implemented in 1947.
fide democratic efforts and of prohibiting those activities which would jeopardize genuinely democratic developments.\textsuperscript{259} As such, General Clay and others in the military government of the US zone were instructed to promote the development of German political institutions and encourage German economic self-sufficiency. Indigenous efforts at governing the local levels, however, would still be monitored by the US. Parties still had to be licensed and the US retained ultimate veto-power over any German legislation in local and regional political bodies.\textsuperscript{260} Economic development, still nominally to be pushed on an all-German basis, could only be non-military and decaretlization of the German economy remained a goal.\textsuperscript{261} The US would encourage private enterprise, but it would be restricted to peaceful pursuits.\textsuperscript{262}

While retaining severe restrictions on the defeated state, parts of JCS 1779 took a very different tone than previous US statements. While the US planned to continue the control of education, media, and the general political development of the defeated state, parts of German culture and tradition unassociated with the recent past were stressed as

\textsuperscript{259} JCS 1779 replaced JCS 1067 and all its amendments as the US occupation directive on 11 July 1947. JCS 1779 is reprinted in \textit{Documents on Germany 1944-1985}, US Department of State 124-135 (hereafter referred to as JCS 1779).

\textsuperscript{260} JCS 1779 (125-127). The retaining of power by \textit{Landers} (JSC 1779, 125) in the US conception of German politics led to the strengthening of the \textit{Landerrat} (legislative body with representatives from each German state) and played a large role in the future federal structure of West Germany discussed below. Political parties, moreover, had to be committed to democratic principles or face de-authorization (126), but nationwide political parties were now encouraged with JCS 1779 whereas these were prohibited by JCS 1067. Overall, the US retained the goal of making all political institutions within the defeated state decentralized and weak.

\textsuperscript{261} Ibib., 128-132. Even with the clear divergence between the US and Soviet Union and the crumbling of all-Allied cooperation, JCS 1779 retained the all-German language of previous directives. This, however, was a fiction by this time.

\textsuperscript{262} Ibib., 132. To encourage the development of a free market as much as possible, General Clay was to “give the German people an opportunity to learn the principles and advantages of free enterprise,” but refrain from interfering too much. In other words, the US wanted to make the German economy as much like the US economy as possible during the occupation period.
valuable assets in the development of a new Germany. US occupation authorities were to respect and allow Germans to preserve “the property of all cultural institutions dedicated to religious, charity, education, the arts and sciences, historic monuments and historic achieves,” and “all other property of cultural value … except for institutions and monuments specifically devoted to the perpetuation of National Socialism or to the glorification of the German militaristic tradition.”263 In short, the US began placing value on certain aspects of German culture, specifically those that could be usefully channeled in the effort to transform the defeated state.264 This new focus, combined with more emphasis on the economic rebuilding of the state to improve material conditions, clearly indicated a shift in US policy.

This shift, however, did not mean that the US and other Allies suddenly found Germany and its future potential power innocuous. The beginnings of the Cold War may have necessitated a focus on rebuilding Germany to an extent as well as efforts to court German allegiance, but the revised occupation directive made clear from the beginning that the defeated state should still be regarded as a potential threat. The new occupation directive for General Clay stated that, while economic rebuilding was necessary, the “necessary restraints to insure that Germany is not allowed to revive its destructive

263 Ibid., 133.

264 Many Germans were doing this as well. There was debate within the defeated state centering on how the Nazi regime had corrupted the “good” part of German culture and history. Many identified the “other” Germany – parts of history and culture that were either untouched by Nazism or could be easily disentangled from the ideology – as a path to regain respectability in the world. Goethe, the great German classicist of the nineteenth century, served as a symbol of the best of German humanism and was part of the “good” Germany many wished to revive. See Olick (2005, 139-152).
militarism,” must remain in place.\textsuperscript{265} The occupation had to create “those political, economic, and moral conditions in Germany which will contribute most effectively to a stable and prosperous Europe,” but there could be “no relaxation of effort to completely and effectively maintain the disarmament and demilitarization of Germany.”\textsuperscript{266}

This context, then, led the US as well as its allies to seriously contemplate rebuilding Germany within the institutional constraints of a unified Europe. Uniting Europe as a means to secure stability had been a vision of US planners for some time, but by 1947 the Western Allies were further pushed along this path as the conflict with the Soviet Union appeared to be solidifying. For the US, constructing a “third force” in global politics by fostering the political and economic integration of Europe could alleviate the military and economic burdens associated with stabilizing the postwar system and balancing Soviet power.\textsuperscript{267} Thus, at the same time the Truman Doctrine of containment was formulated, rebuilding and uniting Europe became policy imperatives for the Western Allies.

As such, the German economy had to be quickly rebuilt. One of the first moves was the merger of the British and US zones of occupation into a bizonal administration

\textsuperscript{265} Ibib., 124. Even under JCS 1067, General Clay, who had recognized earlier than most that it was potentially dangerous to let Germany become too weak because of the Soviet threat in the East, was able to exploit some loopholes to begin rebuilding Germany to a limited extent, or at least not destroy what was left of the German infrastructure. See Beschloss (2002, 191-192).

\textsuperscript{266} JCS 1779 (124-125). Even in 1945, the Allies recognized that there were some elements in Germany that would be very helpful in constructing a non-threatening, neutered power. But, “the process could not be left to entirely to the Germans; there were certainly a number who wished to change but it could not be safely assumed that they would be numerous and determined enough to get their way without aid.” (Balfour 1982, 135)

\textsuperscript{267} Trachtenberg (1999, 62-63). McAllister (2002) develops this theme fully, arguing that the entirely of US policy must be understood in the context of US desires to withdraw from Europe as quickly as possible, but only after significant unification of the continent.
on 1 January 1947. While this would help to create a more functional western German economy, it also signified the first real step toward permanent division of Germany and the emergence of a separate West German state. But by this time, there was a consensus among the Western Allies that no other move was prudent. If Germany had to be rebuilt economically and maybe even militarily, then it had to be tied to the West. Even France – the state with most to fear from a strong Germany – came around to this conclusion, as Germany divided would be made entirely dependent upon the West and could be restrained if there was a Western institutional system in place (Trachtenberg 1999, 73-76).

To get the process of economic rebuilding going, the US Secretary of State Marshall announced the European Recovery Program, or Marshall Plan, in June 1947. All of Europe could apply for funds from the program, including the defeated state. Marshall Plan money began flowing out in 1948 to twelve different west European states. At the same time, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC, later to become the OECD) was created to help disperse aid funds and coordinate the European recovery. Thus, the Marshall Plan not only provided the funds for the rebuilding of Europe, but was also one of the first steps toward fulfilling the US and western Allies hope for a stable postwar system ensured by the economic integration that could pacify western Europe and contain German power (Bark and Gress 1993, 184-185).

268 On the US desire to rebuild Europe at the same time as uniting the continent through the Marshall Plan, see Hogan (1987).

269 From 1948 until 1951, over twelve billion dollars in grants and loans were made. This program not only helped to stimulate European economic development, but also provided a strong signal to the West Europeans that the US was not going to completely abandon Europe. The Soviet Union and other East European states under Soviet influence were permitted to apply for Marshall Plan funds, but the US made this offer knowing that Soviet participation was highly unlikely (Hogan 1987, 40-53).
Policy toward the West German economy thus quickly began to evolve. As put forth in the revised US occupation directive of 1947, the allies slowly expanded the realm of activities the Germans could pursue more or less on their own. This, however, was within limits. The West Germans began constructing their own economic institutions, but they were still subject to Allied approval. After the merger of the Western zones, this meant US approval was most important and thus capitalist principles had to be honored in the German economy. When West German politicians began constructing Land constitutions that called for government control of banks and insurance companies as well as public ownership of all heavy industry, General Clay stepped in to effectively halt the implementation of such anti-capitalist provisions.\textsuperscript{270}

To the chagrin of many in the occupied state, the US also exerted control over the economic recovery of West Germany by openly supporting pro-market politicians such as the CDU’s Ludwig Erhard. The US worked closely with figures like Erhard to implement policies such as the 1948 currency reform in West Germany, a policy that provided economic stability in the defeated state and thus helped the pro-market forces in West Germany to eventually gain the upper hand against the socialists. Though West German capitalists were not exactly like the Americans – the West German pro-market groups placed valued on social market principles – US support gave this initially small group the ability to implement the policies that jumpstarted the West German economic recovery. Despite the fact that these groups were essentially propped-up by the US, the pro-market forces were vindicated and to an extent legitimized in the eyes of the West

\textsuperscript{270} Clay’s move had the additional effect of allowing the US favored Christian Democratic Union (CDU) – very much a pro-market party – to avoid openly opposing the socialist principles that enjoyed much support in the West German public (Bark and Gress 1993, 194-197).
German public by their initial policy successes. During the occupation, however, German economic bodies given credit for stabilizing the economy were subordinate to Allied control and all of the economic policies implemented prior to 1949 saw the Germans act only as “consultants” and not real decision-makers (Spevack 2002, 130-131).

The shift in Western Allied policy toward the defeated state was in some ways rather dramatic. The fundamental goal of limiting German autonomy and power had not changed since 1945, but West Germany had to be made into an asset for the Western Allies for the looming Cold War. The victors thus devised ways to exert control over the vanquished state while at the same time creating the conditions necessary to harness West German power. Such a process continued when the West German state emerged out of the Western zones of occupation in 1949.

6.3.3 The Formation of a New West German State: Democratic yet hardly Free

Even if some of the democratic developments in occupied western Germany were somewhat encouraging, the idea of German nationalism driving Europe toward another war could not be shaken and a strong, independent German state capable of standing-up to the Soviets alone was simply not acceptable to the Western victors (Trachtenberg 1999, 105-106). Thus, the formation of the Federal Republic continued along the lines of previous Western Allied policy whereby the vanquished state was economically rebuilt yet held limited autonomy and power.

271 In the immediate postwar years, there was widespread sentiment among the German population that socialism was the best route to recovery and economic stability. Once West Germans witnessed the results of the CDU-led and American supported reforms, this quickly changed (Bark and Gress 1993, 194-208). The currency reform “provided a foundation for stable prices and wages, and a framework for the revival of the productive industrial economy.” Six months after this reform, industrial production jumped fifty percent (Overly 1996, 6).
Western Allied leaders believed that only a democratic Germany would actively work for post-war stability and at the London Conferences of February-March and April-June 1948 the victors reached consensus on the foundations for a democratic West German state. Although this planning would have a huge impact on the politics of the defeated state for the foreseeable future, the West Germans were not part of the discussions in London nor were they fully informed of all the provisions required by the victors for the emergence of a West German state. In short, “the Allies never assumed that the Germans would themselves define the terms of their own constitution.”

The so-called Frankfurt Documents, providing a vague outline of the victors’ requirements, were officially presented to the West Germans on July 1, 1948. The Germans were to convene a constitutional assembly, consisting of indirectly elected members of Lander parliaments, by September 1948. Any document to emerge would have to be based on the principle of federalism and liberal democratic values. All aspects of the document would be subject to the approval of the US, British, and French occupation military governors. This, from the perspective of the victors, was non-negotiable (Spevack 2002, 341-342).

---

272 Communique Issued at the Conclusion of Informal Talks on Germany Among Representatives of France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Benelux Countries, June 7, 1948 reprinted in Documents on Germany 1944-1985, US Department of State 143-146 (hereafter referred to as London Agreements). The meetings between the US, Britain, France, and the Benelux countries also tackled issues such as West German integration into Western Europe, control of the Ruhr resources, a European security system, and economic reconstruction of Europe – all issues that were assumed to be necessary complements to the emergence of a West German state.

273 Spevack (2002, 113). Among other controversial issues, the London Agreements communiqué did not release details on the victors’ wishes on the status of the Ruhr, the occupation statute, or the Allied military security offices that would come into force once a West German state came into being. Moreover, the document that laid-out the requirements of a West German state, the “Letter of Advice to Military Governors regarding the German constitution,” was withheld from the Germans. Thus, the Germans – not part of the process to begin with – were left largely in the dark. See Spevack (2002, 113-121).
Beyond directing the construction of the new state, the Frankfurt Documents also included the outlines of an occupation statute that would come into force if a West German government were formed. The victors would retain broad rights within the new state, including continued representation of West Germany in international relations, controls on foreign trade and industry, and monitoring of the implementation of the new constitution. Occupation forces would remain in place and the Allies would reserve the supreme right to seize total authority in the vanquished state if needed. Moreover, any amendments to the constitution had to be cleared by the Allies, and laws passed by a West German parliament would only be in force if the Allied High Commands had not declared them unfit. Such broad rights clearly limited German autonomy and potential power, as well as allowed the victors to monitor the democratic progress of West Germany.\(^{274}\)

Only outlining the Allied decisions on the future of the West German state, the Frankfurt Documents were greeted with initial shock. The German press compared the document to the Versailles settlement (Hitchcock 1997, 609). Had they been fully aware of the scope of the victors’ decisions at the London meetings, initial German resentment may have been much greater.

In an appendix intended for only the participants of the London meeting and thus omitted from the Frankfurt Documents, the military governors were to oversee the construction of a state based on: decentralized federal organization; a two chamber system with sufficient power reserved for the chamber representing the Landers; no

\(^{274}\) Spevack (2002, 343). The third document given to the Germans was one regarding the boundaries of the Landers and victor proposed adjustments to make the states more equal.
central powers over education, culture, churches, local administration, or public health; limited central powers for public welfare and police; limited rights for the central government to tax; and a guarantee of an independent judiciary charged with adjudicating between Federal and *Lander* governments as well as protecting individual rights against the state (Hahn 1995, 24; Spevack 2002, 121). A weak central government, so the victors thought, provided one more check on the defeated state’s postwar potential to mobilize resources and cause instability.275

As the Germans worked to create a document to define the West German state – still not knowingly exactly what their parameters were – they did resist some Allied demands. The July 1948 West German objections to the Frankfurt Documents infuriated the Allies and all German counterproposals were firmly rejected. Faced with very little room for maneuver, later that same month the Germans gave in to the Allied positions on

---

275 Clay (1984, 110) and Balfour (1982, 158). The French were initially very reluctant to establish a West German state at all. They maintained official opposition to such a move, as well as opposition to any recovery of German power, until 1948. However even before shifting to a position that a restrained West German state was acceptable, there had been unofficial and private understanding between France and especially the US on the need to reconstruct Germany. The official line of resisting reconstruction was maintained largely because of domestic political pressures (Bungert 1994).
all but three minor points. The Parliamentary Council was thus formed in September and worked under the supervision of the occupation authorities until the spring of 1949.

When the direction of the council’s work on the constitution veered from Allied wishes, the occupation authorities intervened, notably in November 1948 with a restating of the London Agreements and Frankfurt Documents and in March 1949 when the occupying powers demanded clearer definitions of the structure and financial powers of the federal government, a reduction in police powers, and strengthening the independence of the judiciary. March 1949 also saw a memorandum sent to the Parliamentary Council reminding the body that unless they drafted a document to the victors liking, Germany would remain occupied under the current conditions.

While these sorts of direct interventions rather forcefully guided the Germans, the informal contacts between the victors and vanquished played nearly as large of a role in the formation of the new state. Many members of the Parliamentary Council had strong

---

276 Spevack (2002, 345-350). These were on the name of constitution, on the issue of popular referendum on the document, and specific modifications to Lander’s boundaries. The Allies relented on these rather minor issues in part because of Adenauer’s fierce opposition to them. He argued that calling the document that would emerge a “constitution” and having West Germans vote on it would lead the public to believe the division of Germany was permanent. Though Adenauer did not find permanent division personally objectionable, he knew that it would be politically unpopular. Moreover, he opposed a popular referendum because he was extremely wary of the German peoples’ political wisdom in the immediate post-war period (Bark and Gress 1993, 242).

277 To ensure the direction of the Parliamentary Council’s work, all members of the body had been vetted by the US, Britain, and France before work had started (Spevack 2002, 291-292).

278 (Hahn 1995, 6-30). The final approval of the Basic Law by the Allied Military Governors expressed several minor reservations on the state of the document. See Letter from the Military Governors of the Three Western Zones of Occupation to the President of the West German Parliamentary Council Approving, with Reservations, the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany, May 12, 1949 reprinted in Documents on Germany 1944-1985, US Department of State, 260-262.
ties to the US and other allies. Konrad Adenauer, the President of the Council and later the first Chancellor of the Federal Republic, had a particularly good relationship with the US and many of the Allied communications to the Council were directed through him. Through the process of framing the Basic Law, Adenauer had “established himself as the guarantor of American wishes for the development of Western Germany.” These sorts of informal contacts were also useful for public consumption, as they allowed the victors to deny the Basic Law was an Allied diktat. But maybe more importantly, such informal contacts created a mutual understanding of what was and what was not acceptable in the West German constitution and thus helped establish the tenor of the relationship between victor and vanquished. As such, a document that finally met Allied approval emerged in May 1949.

In the end, and very much unlike the Japanese postwar constitution, the occupation authorities did not write the Basic Law. The document contained many indigenous German elements, some aspects taken from the Weimar constitution and other

---

279 In addition, the US employed many German-born legal scholars, such as Carl J. Friedrich, to advise the Germans during the process (Clay 1984, 110)

280 The US had in fact handpicked Adenauer to be mayor of Cologne in the immediate occupation period, only to see him sacked by the British when they took control of the region. Adenauer, however, quickly rose to the top of the CDU, the most pro-western party in Germany. The relationship between Adenauer and the US was at time complicated, but it is clear that at least through the 1950s the US relied on him as their main ally in West German politics. Adenauer was a favorite of Eisenhower administration in particular, and the president place much stock in the German politician’s capabilities and loyalty to the West (Craig 1995, 3-8).

281 Spevack (2002, 294-299). Adenauer himself, even if genuinely pro-Western, approached the relationship with the Allies very pragmatically. He would gain trust only through cooperation, and Germany could only regain independence if the Allies trusted the defeated state. See Adenauer (1966, 193). In this sense, he acted much like Stressemann in the interwar period when the Weimar leader saw fulfillment of the victors’ demands as the only road to recovery after the First World War and the Versailles settlement (Balfour 1982, 173).

282 General MacArthur, frustrated by all Japanese attempts to write a new constitution, imposed his vision of liberal democracy for Japan by drafting the document in English, translating it into Japanese, and then sending it to Japanese authorities for “approval”. See Dower (1999, 347-400).
German constitutional traditions. Moreover, by exploiting the Western Allies’ need to stabilize the Western sectors of occupied Germany because of the Soviet threat the West Germans were able to achieve some of their independent goals against the demands of the victors. But it was through direct intervention and discreetly notifying the vanquished of the limits they faced in constructing the document that the victors ensured that their vision of post-war West German politics would prevail over competing ideas. Western views, and in particular American, of basic individual rights, the division of powers, federalism, and judicial review were, in a sense, exported to West Germany and helped to create a liberal, democratic state friendly to Western-style capitalism. Though they did not impose a new constitution on the defeated state, the victors threatened, cajoled, and co-opted West Germans in their efforts to create a state bound to and constrained by democratic and federal principles as well as foster a new era of politics in West Germany.

283 In part because of these issues, the prevalent view in Germany is that the Basic Law should be seen as primarily an indigenous document. See Spevack (2002, 13-16).

284 Having a staunch and powerful ally within the West German Parliamentary Council like Adenauer made the task of implementing the victors ideas less arduous, but even the most Western oriented of Germans resisted some of the victors policies. Moreover, even though the Americans that had a strong relationship with Adenauer and believed his democratic and Western inclinations were genuine generally did not trust Germany enough to cast it “loose in the hope that things [would] work out for the best.” (Trachtenberg 1999, 105)

285 According to Kruger (1999, 346), the Basic Law embodied the “prerequisites of a Western-style nation-state – democratic, pluralistic, and guaranteeing rights and liberties of the individual.” See also Spevack (2002, 207).

286 The document itself contained provisions that prohibited West German military aggression (Article 26, section 1) and permitted defense policy only within a system of collective security (Article 24).
A variety of internal and external supports would protect the nascent West German democracy.\textsuperscript{287} But in addition to these mechanisms, the occupation statute delivered to the West Germans provided the ultimate protection of the West German democratic system. Fundamentally unaltered by the victors since the first draft of the statute in 1948, the US, Britain, and France all retained the right to intervene in the Federal Republic’s politics should democracy be threatened.\textsuperscript{288} The protection of the Federal Republic’s institutions and external controls fundamentally constraining the vanquished state stood as a pillar of the victors’ system to provide post-war stability vis-à-vis the defeated state.

An equally important part of the emerging system was the victors’ intention to bind West Germany to the rest of Western Europe through political and economic integration. The November 1949 Petersberg Protocol was the first small step in this direction. The agreement between the occupying Allied High Commissioners and the

\textsuperscript{287} Externally, once the Basic Law was in place in October 1949, the Allied High Commission for the Occupation of Germany (HICOG) instituted policies to support the Basic Law. HICOG reserved the right to review all West German legislation and assembled a special review team to scrutinize all Bundestag-passed laws. Internally, the Basic Law had a system built into it for self-protection. Article 87, section 1 allowed for the construction of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution, essentially an intelligence service, which was capable of monitoring extremist groups and other threats to West German democracy. Moreover, the individual rights section of the Basic Law could not be amended in any way. Individuals could lose those basic rights, however, if they tried to destroy the democratic system established by the Basic Law. Anti-democratic parties – those that advocated the destruction of the Basic Law – could be declared illegal. Measures such as these to protect the foundations of German democracy made the Basic Law a framework for so-called “militant democracy.” (Spevack 2002, 491-498)

\textsuperscript{288} Occupation Statute Defining the Powers to be Retained by the Occupation Authorities, Signed by the Three Western Foreign Ministers, April 8, 1949 (reprinted in Documents on Germany 1944-1985, US Department of State, 212-214) details disarmament provisions, economic restrictions, Allied control of West German foreign policy, protection of the Basic Law and Land constitutions, and other rights of the victorious occupying powers.
Federal Republic specified a new relationship between the victors and vanquished.\textsuperscript{289} Dismantling German industry would be considerably slowed and the number and size of ships West Germany could build was increased, effectively signaling that the end of major economic restrictions on the defeated state was in sight.\textsuperscript{290} An equally important aspect of the protocol was the call for the Federal Republic to join the International Authority for the Ruhr.\textsuperscript{291} This was a small step, but an important one nonetheless that began the process of tying the Federal Republic to France and the rest of Western Europe.\textsuperscript{292}

The subsequent Schuman Plan laid the foundation for extensive European integration. A proposal to pool European coal and steel resources in May 1950, the hope was that integration of these vital war resources would make war “not simply unthinkable, but materially impossible.”\textsuperscript{293} This plan, fully supported by the US, linked the recovery of West Germany and significant restraints on its power and autonomy to the recovery of all of Western Europe. Economic prosperity, it was argued, would come

\textsuperscript{289} Protocol of Agreements between the Allied (Western) High Commissioners and the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, November 22, 1949 reprinted in Documents on Germany 1944-1985, US Department of State, 310-313.

\textsuperscript{290} Even when economic restrictions in the form of industrial limitation were completely eliminated, West Germany still suffered some economic penalties. Until 1955, the Federal Republic had to pay to maintain the occupation forces. In 1950-51, this amounted to about forty percent of the federal budget (Balfour 1982, 145-146).

\textsuperscript{291} Somewhat of a precursor to the European Coal and Steel Community, the Ruhr Authority was created in 1948 as a concession from the US and Britain in exchange for France agreeing to the formation of a West German state and relinquishing its long-standing claim to separate the Ruhr from Germany. The Authority initially only enforced German production limits of steel and monitored the production, distribution, and management of the German steel and coal industries (Hitchcock 1997, 608-619).

\textsuperscript{292} West Germany was also asked to join the Council of Europe by the first article of the Petersberg Protocol, something that Chancellor Adenauer desired for mostly symbolic reasons (Banchoff 1999c, 23-24).

\textsuperscript{293} Text of Schuman’s May 9, 1950 declaration (quoted in Hitchcock 1997, 603).
along with security only if the vital industry of steel production could be held under supervision.\textsuperscript{294} Out of the Schuman Plan came the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in April 1951. Now Chancellor of West Germany, Adenauer, with full US support, was happy to pursue European integration. This move, however, displeased much of the West German population.\textsuperscript{295} These steps of economic integration, combined with the boom in industrial production in West Germany as the US need for material grew because of the Korean War, brought prosperity to the West German state.\textsuperscript{296}

Thus, after the formation of the Federal Republic in 1949 and the initial steps toward European integration, there was a type of system to restrict West German autonomy and power. The impetus to politically and economically rebuild West Germany grew steadily as the Western victors required the resources of the defeated state to counter the Soviet threat, but this was done within the confines of European integration whereby all European states, but especially the Federal Republic, would find it nearly impossible to act aggressively against their neighbors.\textsuperscript{297} Just as important for the

\textsuperscript{294} Schwabe (1995, 115-136). Hitchcock (1997) argues that the French were essentially forced into the position to suggest such economic integration because there were few other routes available to restrain the state after the formation of the Federal Republic. Others, such as Milward (1984), argue that the plan was simply the result of the French desire to have access to West German resources.

\textsuperscript{295} Bark and Gress (1993, 270). The Social Democratic Party (SPD) in West Germany was particularly unhappy about the attempts to bind West Germany to this emerging economic structure. But Adenauer persisted, claiming that to recover from the war and build a brighter future the German people “must be given a new ideology. It can only be a European one.” (Quoted in Judt 2005, 275)

\textsuperscript{296} The Petersberg Protocol was revised in 1950 after the outbreak of the Korean War, lifting all steel and ship building limits on West Germany. But limits on West Germany’s ability to use this material for war-making purposes remained. It could, however, produce the raw materials needed by the West. Specifically, the West needed steel, but also machinery and chemicals, “that only Germany, because it was forbidden to produce armaments, could deliver in large quantities.” (Bark and Gress 1993, 268)

\textsuperscript{297} See Hogan (1987, 189-237 especially) on the US desire to rebuild Germany through the Marshall Plan but also ensure that there would be barriers to conflict especially between France and West Germany in the form of European integration.
defeated state were the domestic institutions, supported and enforced through a variety of mechanisms, which fundamentally limited West German power and autonomy. A significant degree of domestic autonomy was regained in 1949, but the victors retained ultimate authority in the defeated state.298

6.3.4 Formal Sovereignty and the Rearming the Federal Republic

Spurred by the growing Soviet threat and the outbreak of the Korean War, the decisions leading to the rearming of the Federal Republic were deliberately taken because of the remaining fear of German power in Europe and the US. Even though the Eisenhower administration was largely confident that Chancellor Adenauer was a responsible German leader, only a West Germany that could not use military power independently was acceptable.

Official policy continued to be demilitarization, but as far back as 1947 many in the US and even Europe realized that German potential was too great to not tap for Cold War purposes. Thus, the events of the Cold War eventually overtook a fear of Germany and remilitarization of the defeated state became a priority for the western victors. It began rather slowly, with the Allied High Commissioners sanctioning the formation of a 12,000-men barracked West German police force shortly after the start of the Korean

---

298 At the formation of the Federal Republic and into the early 1950s, Trachtenberg (1999, 105) notes that the US goal “was to make the Wet German state part of the western bloc – to integrate it into western Europe and into the western community as a whole … a strong and fully independent German state capable of standing up to the Soviet Union on its own was … unacceptable. Germany could not be allowed to become too powerful or too independent. She could not be permitted, as Acheson put it in July 1950, ‘to act as the balance of power in Europe.’ Instead, Germany was to be ‘irrevocably aligned with the West, integrated into the western system, incapable of making trouble on her own.’”
But as international tensions mounted, it was clear that Germany would have to make a significant contribution to the defense of Europe. The pace of rearmament would thus have to increase, but the problem remained of how to do so without threatening the rest of Western Europe.

The proposed solution that enjoyed early support was the European Defense Community (EDC). Calling for a European army, the EDC could provide for European security while ensuring that any West German military power was held in check by a broad institutional framework. American leaders put great stock into this idea, believing that it would help allay their allies’ fears over German rearmament and also allow the US to withdraw from the continent. The EDC treaty was set up by 1952, under which West Germany could rearm but would still be limited in autonomy and the victors would retain many occupation rights. But the plan faced serious obstacles, and

---

299 Bark and Gress (1993, 278-279). Generally, events outside of Europe – especially the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 – helped to consolidate the US-West German relationship whereby the defeated state was increasingly seen as a vital partner. See Morgan (1984, 178-181).

300 See McAllister (2002, especially 171-244) for the origins of the EDC and the debates surrounding its formation.

301 Trachtenberg (1999, 114-122). From the beginning of the post-war period, US policymakers wanted to leave Europe as soon as possible. Both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations were sympathetic to a system that allowed Europe to stand on its own against the Soviet threat and thus unburden American taxpayers. McAllister (2002) convincingly shows that the US, and especially President Eisenhower, wanted to create a “third pole” to balance the Soviet Union and that it was only when it was clear that the EDC plan was unworkable that the US was willing to commit a permanent, large force for the protection of Western Europe.

302 Adenauer was willing to go along with the EDC, although he would have preferred rearmament through other means. Against fierce opposition from the SPD, the Bundestag approved the EDC treaty in February (Bark and Gress 1993, 290).
met with final rejection in 1954. Very quickly, however, the supranational defense organization was replaced with the idea that West Germany would be rearmed on a national basis, but with very significant restrictions and limitations.\textsuperscript{303}

The Paris Accords of 1954 established the NATO system.\textsuperscript{304} Bringing the defeated state into the alliance meant that the West could finally employ West German manpower to counter Soviet power in the east. But it also guaranteed that the defeated state could not use any regained military power to challenge the western victors. The West German state would be totally bound to the alliance and utterly incapable of independent military action.\textsuperscript{305} And, just as in the 1949 agreements, the western victors would retain important rights in the Federal Republic.

The Federal Republic, though relied upon to contribute significant capabilities to NATO, would have strict limits on the size and ability of those forces. West Germany was to create an army of twelve divisions, along with an air force of 75,000 men and a navy of 25,000. These forces, however, were to be completely integrated into the NATO

\textsuperscript{303} France especially was not convinced that the EDC was workable. Moreover, the French demanded great US guarantees to European security to go along with the EDC, which they viewed as necessary to counter both the Soviet and the German threats. But the French motives for toying with a supranational defense of Europe, such as the 1950 Pleyen Plan and then the EDC, were most likely to delay West German rearmament more than anything else. The whole EDC problem for France was the specter of German rearmament, not, as the US and Britain were moving toward, considering the Soviet Union the largest threat (Judt 2005, 244-245). Not willing to go along with the US and Britain on German rearmament within the EDC framework, it was effectively killed with a 30 August 1954 parliamentary vote.

\textsuperscript{304} The October 1954 London meetings set forth the basic structure of NATO with West Germany as a member. See Final Act of the Nine-Power Conference, London, October 3, 1954 reprinted in Documents on Germany 1944-1985, US Department of State, 419-422.

\textsuperscript{305} The idea of allowing a unified, neutralized Germany to exist in central Europe had long been rejected. As Kissinger (1994, 502) puts it, pursuing this path, “was tempting fate to turn loose a united, neutral Germany,” because, “a strong unified Germany in the center of the Continent pursuing a purely national policy had been proved incompatible with the peace of Europe.”
system and rendered incapable of unilateral action. To ensure this, the Supreme Allied Commander of Europe (SACEUR’s) powers were strengthened providing a more integrated structure for the alliance yet still dominated by US power. West Germany renounced the right to build nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and the Western European Union was to inspect and enforce this and other military provisions of the Paris Agreement (Trachtenberg 1999, 127). In short, the West German military – nonexistent in 1954 – would be created and forced to operate in a manner similar to no other member of the alliance.

Ascension into NATO required that the Federal Republic agree to many other provisions that fundamentally limited its autonomy beyond the size and composition of its military forces. West Germany was rendered incapable of negotiating a final German settlement by the Allies’ demand that it renounce the use of force to attempt to unify the now dismembered German state and declaring that only they could provide final approval for any proposed solution to all-German matters (Trachtenberg 1999, 126). Moreover, the Allies retained rights to station military forces within Western Germany. Adenauer embraced this provision, as it provided the West with forward military positions to counter Soviet troops in Eastern Europe. But retaining this right in West Germany also kept Allied forces on the ground in Germany to block any action taken by the Germans

---

306 This size of force was actually close to the proposal of Adenauer in the early 1950s for a West German contribution to the defense of Europe. There had been much larger proposals, such as former the Wehrmacht officer Lt. General Hans Speidel’s 1949 plan for West Germany to contribute fifteen of the twenty-five mechanized divisions thought needed to defend Europe. This sort of military thinking in West Germany was not uncommon even though demilitarization remained official policy until 1954. See Pommerin (1995).
that may threaten the newly constructed west European postwar system.\textsuperscript{307} The maintenance of Allied forces in West Germany was made even stronger by tying the right of Allied troop presence to a Status of Force Agreement (SOFA) with the Federal Republic. In effect, such a move by the Allies meant that no West German government could unilaterally abolish the Allies’ stationing rights.\textsuperscript{308}

Finally, the allies retained emergency powers within West Germany for the purposes of protecting allied troops. This provision could allow the allies to assume supreme authority, “if the democratic regime in Germany were threatened, since the overthrow of the domestic order would automatically endanger the security of western troops.”\textsuperscript{309} Most West Germans trusted the Allies to remain in their country simply as

\textsuperscript{307} US leaders took such a possibility seriously. As late as 1958, in response to the Social Democratic Party’s (SPD) desire to achieve a unified, neutral, and unoccupied Germany through agreement with the Soviet Union, Eisenhower scoffed at the idea of US forces being made to leave. If Socialists came to power, Eisenhower claimed, “we might have to put even more US forces in that country.” Quoted in Trachtenberg (1999, 126-127)

\textsuperscript{308} Bark and Gress (1993, 332). Only with unification in 1990 did the Allies renounce their remaining reserve powers.

\textsuperscript{309} Trachtenberg (1999, 126). This provision, originally in the 1952 agreement for German entry into the EDC, was dropped from the 1954 Paris Accords only because it was politically embarrassing for Adenauer. However, the Chancellor provided verbal and written assurances that the Allies did in fact retain this right.
allies and protectors, not disturbing domestic politics. Nevertheless, the retention of such a right by the allies – a right that implied rather broad and loosely defined powers – was a formidable restriction on West Germany.

Since the western victors were not yet thoroughly convinced that democracy was taking hold in the defeated state nor convinced that West German power was innocuous, the allies demanded significant limitations to the Federal Republic’s autonomy in exchange for outward equality and rearmament. Even facing these restrictions, ascension into NATO was a step toward normalization of West Germany. The new system to constrain West German power and autonomy “would be natural and organic, and hence much more palatable than a control regime that too obviously reflected deep-seated distrust.” (Trachtenberg 1999, 127) The victors thus struck a balance between the need to make sure West Germany was thoroughly tied to the West and ensuring no increase in German power went unchecked.

The 1954-55 agreements were the final shift in the western victors strategy toward the vanquished state. Each step – relaxing some of the conditions of the occupation in

---

310 Bark and Gress (1993, 332-333). Visible US interventions in West German politics in the 1950s were usually on a small scale. In the 1953 Bundestag elections, for example, the US was worried that Adenauer and the pro-Western CDU may lose to the rather anti-western SPD. Dulles, therefore, tried to ensure an Adenauer victory by openly commenting that if the US’s favorite West German politician did lose power, the US would have to rethink its military and economic support of the Federal Republic and, at a minimum, sovereignty for West Germany would have to be put off even farther (Craig 1995, 5; but also see Bark and Gress 1993, 335 and Trachtenberg 1999, 133-134).

311 The right of the Allies to intervene directly in West Germany by declaring a state of emergency in time of war or crisis was held until 1968 when the Bundestag finally passed an emergency powers law, well after the democratic regime had solidified (Bark and Gress 1993, 253).

312 In terms of the scale of restrictiveness developed in the third chapter, the settlement for West Germany in 1945 scored an eleven out of twelve. With the relaxation of some measures post-1954, the territorial, military, economic, and political restrictions on West Germany score eight out of twelve, a level still above the mean for all thirteen cases examined in the survey of great power war-ending settlements. This shift in the severity of the settlement is very similar to the shift for post-First World War Germany.
1947, promoting West German and European economic development with the Marshall Plan in 1948, establishing the Federal Republic in 1949, pushing a model of European integration that fully included West Germany in the early 1950s, and bringing the erstwhile enemy securely into the Atlantic alliance in 1954 – was driven by the mounting tensions of the Cold War. Reluctant as the French were to rebuild its historic rival, France went along with the US and Britain to construct the system; a system that, even if the Allies retained significant say in the future of the state and, in reality, the Federal Republic was not an equal partner with the West, provided West Germany a prosperous future. But all of this was deemed vital. The specter of German aggression never fully faded in the Allies minds and thus the state was treated as though it was a potential threat, but the competition between the East and West demanded that the Western Allies win the

313 Though after the Cold War started US leaders never openly spoke of containing the defeated state, Schwartz (1991, 1995) calls the US approach during this time “dual containment.”
good will of the West Germans.\textsuperscript{314} The Soviet Union had to be met with aggressive containment, while Germany would be contained “with an embrace.” (Hanrieder 1992, 195)

6.4 From Political Void to Legitimation: The Socialization of the Defeated State

The victors’ strategy to manage West Germany – which included severe territorial, military, economic, and possibly most importantly political restrictions – ensured that the defeated state could not easily rise again to disturb the peace. The state was constrained internally by the victors constructing a weak democratic government with multiple protections against backsliding and externally by a web of institutions that ensured the Federal Republic could not act unilaterally. Accepted initially because it had no other choice, these restrictions on the defeated state were eventually legitimized as West Germany was socialized to the postwar order. This process of socialization,

\textsuperscript{314} The issue of nuclear weapons provides a telling example of how the fear of a resurgent Germany led the Allies to maintain and enforce limitations on the defeated state even after the entry of the state into NATO. Already by the mid-1950s many US nuclear weapons were essentially under European operation control, with only nominal US safeguards against European use without US prior authorization. But the next step – the step that would allow the US to reduce its presence in Europe and something Eisenhower was desperate to do – would require agreeing to national nuclear forces for all NATO members. This did not pose much of an issue when it came to Britain and France, or even Italy. But it did with Germany. Eisenhower, because of this drive to exit Europe, was nearly alone in accepting the possibility of a nuclear-armed Germany. Kennedy, assuming office in 1961, put the issue to rest with the position that Germany could not have nuclear weapons; national forces for all NATO members were therefore out of the question. In 1963, Kennedy’s national security advisor, McGeorge Bundy, called the issue a “fixed point … Germany should not have independent control of nuclear weapons.” (Quoted in Trachtenberg 1999, 284) Largely because of the German problem, the US took control of the nuclear issue and pushed for the Multilateral Force (MLF) initiative. Though the name would imply otherwise, MLF was not intended to give Europeans shared control over nuclear forces as the US retain veto power. The entire Kennedy strategy was implemented to keep Germans from getting their hands on nuclear forces. Movements on this front changed the situation little, and in the end the Western allies prevented the emergence of nuclear-armed FRG. Such a move not only restricted West Germany’s access to a nuclear force, but it also mollified the Soviet Union. Trachtenberg (1999, 154-321 especially) details the German nuclear problem for the Western allies as well as for the Soviets. See also Banchoff (1999c, 53-55).
however, took time. It was not until the 1960s and later that the results of the victor
instigated socialization process – that is, acceptance of the postwar status quo – were
evident.

6.4.1 Post-war Void in the German Polity

The notion of “zero-hour” permeated Germany in 1945. Many within the
defeated state, if not initially then at least with the benefit of hindsight, saw May 8, 1945
as the point of rebirth for the German nation. While this is an overstatement – the end of
the war did not fully wipe the German slate clean – it does convey the general problem in
Germany after defeat.\footnote{Olick (2005, 134-135) argues that the “myth of zero-hour” was a useful trope for Germans to later
employ for a variety of purposes. See also Roseman (2001, 179)} The state and its population were teetering on the brink of total
physical destruction and most of the ideas of the past, and especially recent past, were
completely discredited. In this sense, there was a void in German politics.

The destruction of the Second World War itself served to destroy most elements
of the Nazi regime. The victors’ actions to root out all remnants of Nazism through
denazification policies – flawed though they were – further delegitimized and
criminalized the ideology.\footnote{At least initially, however, the discrediting of the old regime may have had more to do with how Nazism
was practiced in Germany than the ideology itself. In November 1945, fifty-three percent of Germans in
the American zone of occupation as well as the American and British zones in Berlin claimed that National
Socialism was a good idea badly carried out. This stayed fairly constant through 1947, but the number of
people that claimed National Socialism was a bad idea went from forty-one percent in 1945 to thirty-five
percent in 1947. It was only in the 1950s and 1960s when a large percentage of Germans thought National
Socialism was a bad idea. See Merritt and Merritt (1970, 171-172).} On top of the disgrace of the old regime, the German nation
generally felt defeated. Unlike after the First World War, there was almost no possibility
of the emergence of a “stab-in-the-back” myth. A generation later most Germans
claimed Germany had been “liberated” from Nazism in May 1945, but in the occupation
period few could deny that the awesome force of the Allies had conquered Germany (Bark and Gress 1993, 11). Having to reconcile what it meant to be German with the evils of the former regime and the complete destruction of the state, those that had the capacity to do so were left to search for what good was left in the country and in being German. But beyond a circle of intellectuals and politicians, in the immediate aftermath of defeat the average German thought little about the recent past, present politics, or the shape of a postwar German state.\footnote{Surveys consistently showed that Germans generally found political issues to be of minimal importance during the occupation and even into the 1950s (Merritt 1995, 327-348). Those Germans that did have the capacity to ponder politics often filled journals and political pamphlets with ideas completely divorced from reality (Bark and Gress 1993, 160-161).} The daily struggle was not to come to terms with the past or to plan for the future but rather finding next meal and adequate housing.\footnote{For the conditions within Germany immediately after defeat, see Botting (1985, 121-148), Bark and Gress (1993, 30-46), and Roseman (2001, 179). The issue of German war-guilt and crimes of the Nazi regime provides a telling example of how the average German, rather than reflecting on the recent past, was consumed with her own situation. Even in the face of shocking evidence of the regime’s atrocities, Germans generally avoided the Allies’ imputations of guilt and many times argued that their postwar condition was tantamount to the plight of victims of the Nazi regime (Olick 2005, 101-102).}

In early years of the occupation German political identity was thus in many ways “profundely up for grabs.” (Olick 2005, 141) In this context, the overwhelming power of the victors, combined with the almost unprecedented reach of Allied postwar policies, allowed the victors to begin the process of imbuing their vision of politics with little real opposition in the vanquished state. Created by the collapse of the former regime and the inescapable reality of defeat, this void in German politics provided the Allies the opportunity to meticulously guide the transformation of the defeated state. At times
Germans protested the victors’ policies, and thus the results of the victors’ efforts to fill the void in German postwar politics with their own vision was sometimes difficult to discern in the early states of the postwar era.319

6.4.2 Filling the Void

As demonstrated earlier in the chapter, the victors set about reshaping Germany very early. Before exporting the formal institutions of democracy to West Germany through the highly US-guided construction of the Basic Law, only pro-democratic (and pro-western) ideas were allowed to flourish in the defeated state. Restrictions on German political activity described above – such as licensing of political parties, vetting individual politicians, strictly supervising any regional political bodies, and censoring the media – had a profound effect on the state. Not only did they imply that West Germany had no option but to adhere to the victors’ wishes in the near term, but they laid the foundation for what the state would become.

As the media had a role in fomenting democracy in the defeated state, the victors vigorously pursued media liberalization in West Germany. This, however, had to be within the confines of the victors’ limits for the state. Because the media within West Germany during the occupation period and after was heavily swayed by the US, it can be argued that, “Western cultural policy had its greatest impact” on West German political culture as the “period of Allied control of the press was decisive in shaping the longer-term patterns of the press up to the present day.” (Carter 2001, 252-253) Many media outlets that are still around today – such as Der Spiegel and Die Zeit – took form and

319 By most accounts, Germans balked, at least initially, at the idea that the US or any outside power could be a legitimate agent of change in German society (Merritt 1995, 396).
were sanctioned by the Allies. The same was true for radio and television broadcast. And in all forms of media, anti-democratic ideas were shut out by the victors. Thus, the victors not only strictly guided the institutional structure to ensure that democracy would constrain West Germany, but the licensing program ensured that only pro-democratic and pro-Western voices were heard in the vanquished state.\textsuperscript{320}

If 1945 was truly a “zero hour” for Germany, the victors were the dominant political and cultural authorities of the occupation that were best positioned to fill the void. But even where there was essentially no option but to follow the victors’ lead, Germans did resist, to some minimal extent anyway, some of the victors’ policies. Though most agreed with the principle of denazification, the policy in practice was seen as arbitrary and was ridiculed by many in the defeated state. Most Germans found denazification programs arrogant, hypocritical, and illegitimate.\textsuperscript{321}  Reeducation – the

\textsuperscript{320} Group 47 (Gruppe 47) emerged from the US closure of Der Ruf, an anti-American newspaper. This eclectic group led the leftist opposition to the CDU and Adenauer in the 1950s and 1960s and laid the foundations for charges in the 1960s that Adenauer and the Allies had prohibited West Germany from truly atoning for past sins and embarking on a genuine democratic path. See Carter (2001, 254-255) and Bark and Gress (1993, 163-164).

\textsuperscript{321} Olick (2005, 95). Denazification contained many contradictions and oversights, and all efforts – direct US and other allies actions as well as later German-led ones – left a feeling that the policy had been ineffective, punishing lower level Nazi’s while some of the “big fish” got away. The US officially stopped denazification efforts in the spring of 1948 – well after the time that US policy switched to one of winning the Germans over for Cold War purposes. The West German state continued to prosecute Nazi criminals after this, though generally on a much smaller scale. See Bark and Gress (1993, 74-81), Merrit (1995, 184-200), and Olick (2005, 118-25).
compliment to denazification – as well as restructuring the German education system was seen in much the same way. But beyond minimal and usually passive resistance, there was little Germans could do to stop such policies.

Even the formation of the Federal Republic in 1949 – a point that marked at least a small increase in the vanquished state’s autonomy – was not seen by all as a triumph for West Germany. Theodor Heuss, the first president of the new West German state, claimed, “We are wandering in the valley of powerlessness. Once again, democracy has not been fought for in Germany; instead, it has been ordered, suggested, allowed, appropriated, licensed, limited, and rationed by the occupying powers. Is this the kind of situation out of which something rightful, powerful, and healthy can arise?” (Quoted in Spevak 2002, 315) Heuss was not blatantly anti-American, nor was he presenting real resistance to Allied policy in West Germany. But questioning the legitimacy and viability of what was perceived as an imposed democratic order at the foundation of the state suggests that many Germans – not least the President of the Republic – resented the situation.

Yet there was no alternative. Although West Germans were bombarded with the victors’ visions of postwar West German politics in the form of institutions, information, and even popular culture, it seems few aspect of the victors’ management strategy for

---

322 The Allies shutdown all German schools upon entering the state. Before reopening, all textbooks were purged of Nazi propaganda and all teachers with Nazi backgrounds were dismissed (Bark and Gress 1993 168-169). US efforts to completely restructure the German education system – something that was traditionally a source of pride in Germany – were effectively resisted. As the US shifted to courting German allegiance, the US gave up the massive reform effect to make the education system more egalitarian and the three-tier system stayed in place. Nevertheless, there were some notable successes such as the establishment and funding of the Free University in Berlin and thoroughly rooting democratic ideals in the West German education system. Though US efforts in this regard are sometimes portrayed as a failure, the cumulative impact of US efforts became evident only after a generation of Germans experienced it firsthand (Tent 1982).
West Germany were fully embraced at the time.\textsuperscript{323} Public support for the new political system is a key indicator of the progress of the vanquished state’s socialization to the war-ending settlement and post-war order since the West German democratic system itself was designed by the victors to reign-in German power and thus act as a restriction on the defeated state. Into the 1950s, there was serious doubt as to whether West Germans were absorbing the democratic ideals foisted upon them by the victors. Almond and Verba (1963) found that West Germans held no real connection to the system. Indeed, they found that there was only a highly pragmatic attachment to the democratic system in the Federal Republic. Based on rather bleak conclusions about the vitality of democracy in West Germany and Japan, Montgomery (1957) argued that real democracy where citizens valued the system in fact could not be imposed from the outside. Within West Germany, specific institutions that embodied democracy – most importantly, the Basic Law – were generally viewed with indifference. Any support that the democratic system in West Germany enjoyed was largely based on the economic factors. West Germans were better off in the early 1950s than in the immediate postwar period, so

\textsuperscript{323} Popular culture may have been the aspect of US influence that was most nearly fully embraced by the West Germans. Through the 1950s most films shown in German theaters were US imports and jazz music surged in popularity in West Germany (Orlov 1999, 259-260). Some of the themes presented in the American imports began to resonate within West Germany and were, at least to some extent, “absorbed and rendered native German.” (Breit 1995, 128) Even so, there was great controversy in the mid-1950s regarding the potential negative impact of specifically American films on German youth (Poiger 1996, 94).
many saw the system as at least better than various alternatives including the example of Soviet dominated eastern Germany. By the mid-1950s, economic success “became the most important indicator of West German’s positive feelings towards their state.”

While it is clear that the process of legitimation of the system certainly did not take hold during the 1950s, there was no real threat that West Germany could take another route. The defeated state had very little room to maneuver. The Allies’ retained the coercive power within the defeated state as well as the specific rights enabling them to quell any threats to the democratic system in the Federal Republic still loomed large. The groundwork for the process of socialization had clearly been laid during the occupation and through the late 1950s, but West German compliance with the war-ending settlement and acceptance of the postwar order was decidedly not based on a sense of legitimacy.

---

324 Spevak (2002, 510). This is reflected in West German attitudes toward economics and politics in the 1950s. As the country became more affluent, the majority of West Germans were “obsessed” with making money and furthering their own material comfort. Critical reflection intended to overcome the past and chart a new political course for the defeated state was left to small intellectual circles (Orlow 1999, 259-260).

325 Jaspers argued this plainly in a 1954 Foreign Affairs article, but for reasons other than just the victors’ remaining coercive capabilities. Citing a continuing political vacuum in the defeated state, Jaspers noted that “the occupying Powers had liberated us [in 1945] but they ad not made us free.” (1954, 597) In his influential 1966 book Where is the Federal Republic Going? (Wohin treibt die Bundesrepublic?) Jaspers argued that Germany had not yet come to terms with its past and could only do so through accepting the limitations placed upon it by the victors, including dismemberment, and pursuing the path of parliamentary democracy. See Bark and Gress (1993 VOL II, 44-45). The 1966 book came just before much wider societal reflection on the West German experience since defeat. Many leftist intellectual began arguing in the 1960s that Adenauer’s tenure as Chancellor simply restored the prewar order that had brought on such destruction. The “Extraparliamentary Opposition” (APO) and student protest in 1968 added to this, voicing that the structure of the Federal Republic and hence the policies of the victors had robbed Germany of the chance for real reform. See Carter (2001, 264-265)

326 Even though Adenauer had gained leverage with the victors as the Cold War heated up, whenever he reached his limit of freedom the Chancellor “always gave way.” Such was the case in 1959 when the US and other Western Allies proposed using military action – maybe even a nuclear strike – to protect West Berlin. Although Adenauer clearly did not want to contemplate this, he had no choice in the matter (Trachtenberg 1999, 275-277).
6.4.3 The Legitimation of the Restricted West German State

By the 1960s and 1970s, things started to change. West German democracy began to solidify, and by the 1970s the domestic institutional structure that had been foisted upon the defeated state was accepted as only the only viable, legitimate future for the state. Moreover, West German foreign policy reflected a meaningful acceptance of the institutions that prohibited the state from acting unilaterally as well as recognition of not only the facts of the postwar order but also the legitimacy of that order. In short, the process of socialization instigated by the victors produced tangible results in this period.

The consolidation of the West German regime is a key feature of this socialization. Some of the most important indicators of the solidification of the transformation, again, are in the areas of support for the West German political institutions. Along these lines, the economic success likely played a large role in making the West Germans accept as legitimate the system of democracy set-up in 1949. The “economic miracle” combined with the social market economy’s continued good performance contributed greatly to feelings of good will toward the West German institutions responsible for guiding the economy. Thus, a process of accumulating good will, or reserves of diffuse support, started in the 1950s when the economic outlook for the defeated state improved markedly. Because of almost three decades of high-level performance, this record of performance was transmitted to new generations and further increased the reserve of diffuse support for West German institutions.327

---

327 See Conradt (1989, 223). In short, when “a system’s high level of performance, its output, can over time take on a life of its own, that is, become a symbol aiding in identification with the political institutions and processes of the regime.” This sort of diffuse support for the system, as performance pushes reserve capital accumulation, may grow slowly, but is really an indication of the perceived legitimacy of the system rather than affect for the system. See also Easton (1975).
Starting out largely as a product of economic benefits, this goodwill spilled over into other areas. Indeed, the institutions responsible for West German economic prosperity were most of the time the very same institutions that defined the politics of the defeated state.\(^{328}\) As this process continued, the entirety of the democratic system in West Germany was legitimized over time. And as the democratic system in West Germany – itself designed as a restriction on the defeated state – gained legitimacy, other restrictions that were tied to the system, such as German territorial loses and the division of the state and interlocking and binding international institutions, also gained legitimacy. In the end, the socialization process was so thoroughly ingrained in West Germany that charting a new course was largely unthinkable. Even in times of economic downturn, such as the 1974-76 recession when many feared that the vitality and legitimacy of the West German system would be called into question, the system enjoyed high levels of support. Indeed, democracy and capitalism were seen by most as the only option for the West German state.

The acceptance of the domestic system may be most importantly reflected in the West German perceptions of the state’s foundational document. At best met with ambivalence when introduced in 1949 and faring little better through the early 1950s, the Basic Law became a valued part of the West German political identity.\(^{329}\) As described

\(^{328}\) In 1959, after the economic miracle and several years of increasing prosperity, thirty-three percent of West Germans pointed to the economic system of the state as a source of pride. This number increased only to forty percent by 1978. With the same time span, West German pride in governmental and political institutions jumped from seven percent to thirty-one percent (Conradt 1989, 229-231).

\(^{329}\) Though the victors hoped that the process of forming the Basic Law would be perceived as a completely German-led effort to avoid the charge of it being an Allied \textit{diktat}, when it appeared in 1949 there was a perception that it was an imposed constitution (Spevak 2002, 509).
above, the victors clearly set the bounds of what a West German constitution could look like, but by the mid-1970s the Basic Law was accepted as an indigenous document and an “integral part of the progressive constitutional history” of Germany. The idea of “constitutional patriotism” gained ground, as West Germans pointed to the success of the democratic system and derived much of their national political identity from the document.330 Moreover, the federal structure of the state and strong element of judicial review, both laid-out by the Basic Law, were thoroughly accepted and thus strengthened democratic legitimacy.331 Such was acceptance of West Germany democracy that by the 1970s, ninety percent of West Germans claimed democracy to be the best form of government and very few identified any other period of German history as a time when the state was better off.332 Given these trends, deviating from the democratic system of West Germany was simply not an option.333

Because of this process, West Germany could successfully meet challenges to the democratic system. For example, extreme political parties either resembling Nazism or

---

330 The idea of constitutional patriotism was introduced in the 1970s and gained even wider acceptance by the influential 1986 Habermas article claiming that it was the only basis for a modern West German national identity (Spevak 2002, 512-513).

331 Kruger (1999) stresses the role of federalism in West German national political identity. The federalism that had been planted in the Basic Law in 1949 and bolstered by the idea of constitutional patriotism was further legitimized by the unprecedented reputation of the Federal Constitutional Court. Kommers (1999) argues that judicial review through the strong, independent judiciary embodied by the Federal Constitutional Court (insisted upon by the victors in 1949) complemented the “law state” tradition in West Germany to strengthen democracy legitimacy.

332 Conradt (1989, 226-234). Haas (1999) also highlights the West German’s feelings of living in the “best” historical period in German history.

333 The perceived necessity of parliamentary democracy in Germany was fairly high beginning as early as 1959, hovering around ninety percent for those with the highest levels of political interest and fifty percent among those with the lowest levels of political interest. An even more striking figure is the number of West Germans that thought that the state could “get along without” democracy. In 1972, only four percent of West Germans highly interested in politics thought this was the case, and only nine percent of people with the lowest levels of political interest thought democracy unnecessary in West Germany. See Conradt (1989, 240).
radical leftist organizations, if they gained significant power or influence, could have derailed the postwar political direction of the defeated state. Such groups never completely withered away, but as the Federal Republic matured they garnered less and less support. During the occupation and through the 1950s, parties inconsistent with democracy from the both the left and right, though certainly not mainstream and indeed even illegal, enjoyed much greater support than in the 1960s and 1970s (Orlow 1999, 262-268; Merritt 1995, 89-120). By the time Adenauer left the West German Chancellorship in 1963, “there was almost no anti-democratic extremism … the vast majority regarded liberal democracy as the best and most effective form of government.”

Beyond extreme parties, the 1970s terrorist wave “challenged West Germany’s ability to defeat internal subversion without resorting to measure that were not sanctioned by the democratic constitution.” While there were some measures that were controversial, such as the 1972 civil servant political litmus test, the measures were applied sparingly and generally the West German government reacted fairly well to this challenge from a small band of extremists (Orlow 1999, 263). In essence, the

---

334 Bark and Gress (1993 II, 4). The West German party system actually emerged quite stable in the postwar period, settling into somewhat of a bipolar structure by the 1960s with the CDU and SPD competing for primacy. When extreme parties gained momentum, such as in the 1966-68 Lander election when the National Democratic Party (NDP) garnered more votes than expected, they were usually met with swift responses. In the case of the rise of the NDP in certain regions, the national parties formed a “grand alliance against it” and helped to make sure the neo-Nazis did not cross the five percent threshold needed to make it into the Bundestag. See Merkl (1999).
government exercised restraint because it was expected. West Germans were extremely sensitive to anything resembling Nazi-style tactics, and a crackdown on individual liberties would be an affront to the postwar democratic tradition.\textsuperscript{335}

That the system was able to weather challenges from within and avoid succumbing to pressures to curtail the democratic freedoms within the state is extremely important for the socialization of West Germany. Through their many efforts, the victors tried to imbue into the defeated state democratic ideals as a frontline of defense against any resurgence of aggression in West Germany.\textsuperscript{336} The solidification of West German democracy was an integral part of the acceptance of the legitimacy of the postwar order.

A similar process occurred with the external limitations on West German autonomy and power. The restrictions West Germany faced in the international realm were unlike any obstacles placed in the way of similarly positioned states, especially considering the potential and later actual economic might of West Germany. The great goal of many of the early leaders of the Federal Republic, especially Adenauer, was that West Germany gain acceptance as a normal great power and be allowed to act as such. Notwithstanding this initial desire, eventually West Germany was socialized to the state’s reduced role in the international system built during the occupation and fully formed in

\textsuperscript{335} The wave of terrorism could have, according to Balfour (1982, 253-254), easily led to blind repression of rights in the Federal Republic. It did not, and measures like the civil servant law of 1972 were repealed as soon as the threat from these small terrorist groups abated.

\textsuperscript{336} Eliminating militarism in West German society, yet another of the victorious states’ goals, certainly occurred as well. Berger (1998) finds a culture of antimilitarism in postwar West Germany, one that continues to resonate in the state’s foreign and defense policy and complements the legitimacy of the democratic regime.
1954. That is, dismemberment of the German state, the loss of significant formerly German territory, and limited foreign policy autonomy through a web of multilateral institutions were all eventually accepted as legitimate.

The division of Germany, lamented by nearly all West German’s during the occupation and early post-war years, eventually became a much less central issue. But even as late as 1965, nearly seventy percent of West Germans thought that one of the most urgent foreign policy goals should be the reunification of Germany. By 1973, only twenty-three percent thought the same. Rather than reunification, sixty-five percent of West Germans thought that European unification was the most pressing foreign policy issue. This certainly reflected, at least on some level, resignation to the fact that there were and would continue to be two German states as well as recognition that the European project had provided great material benefits. But this is also signified a new, distinctly West German identity (Haas 1999, 313). This was one that no longer yearned for reunification of the German state as it had existed before the war (Maier 1999, 280).

At nearly the same time, and largely in tandem with US efforts at détente with the Soviet Union, West Germany pursued better relations with its Eastern neighbors in the late 1960s and 1970s. Brandt’s Ostpolitik essentially reconciled the defeated state with

---

337 Conradt (1989, 227-228). Many segments of West German society were already calling for better relations with the East in 1966, such as religious leaders and Karl Jaspers in particular, when the first West German “peace note” was sent to the states of the East (Gatzke 1980, 211). This was at least in part a pragmatic recognition that the status quo would not change, but also a call for true acceptance of the status quo.
the postwar territorial status quo. In a series of bilateral treaties, first with the Soviet Union in 1970 and later with Poland and Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic recognized the map of Europe. This effort by West Germany legitimized the postwar borders of the German state (Orlow 1999, 256-257). More importantly, this move recognized the legitimacy of territorial loses Germany suffered as a result of the war, including the initially sensitive issue of land east of the Oder-Neisse line (Haas 1999, 313). But the most delicate of the treaties was by far the one reached with East Germany. Not only was this technically difficult because it required Four-Power action, it also meant that West Germany in effect recognized East Germany as a separate state. This complete about-face essentially eliminated West Germany’s ability to rhetorically challenge the legitimacy of the East German regime and muted its claim to represent all Germans. Though it did not mean that the idea of reunification fully faded as a goal of West German policy, the 1972 treaty did signify West German accommodation with the postwar order.

338 This shift in West German attitude toward the postwar order was not just the end of longing. It coincided with the US granting the defeated state a freer hand in its foreign policy. As the West German democracy consolidated in the 1960s, and the western victors realized this, the defeated state could be trusted to act in a manner consistent with the interests of the West in general. Indeed, even before Brandt launched major efforts at détente with the East the US made clear to the West Germans that they were to pursue the initiative themselves (Gatzke 1980, 210).

339 Orlow (1999, 257). Since 1949, West Germany had refused to recognize the East German state and claimed to be the representative government of all Germans. The Hallstein Doctrine went so far as to prohibit West German relations with any state that recognized the communist regime in East Germany. Though much discussion led up to this change in eastern policy, Willy Brandt initiated the major changes in West German policy toward the East when he assumed the Chancellorship. When announcing his policy in 1970, Brandt claimed that “the Federal Republic must voice its own recognition.” Arguing that West Germans had to stop thinking of the West German state as a temporary entity, Brandt’s first official act to implement his brand of Ostpolitik and thus initiate the steps to recognize East Germany was to rename the Ministry of All-German Affairs to the Ministry of Inner-German Affairs in October 1969. This was a symbolic gesture to be sure, but one with significant impact on the relationship between the two German states (Bark and Gress 1993, VOL II 164-168). See also Kruger (1999, 351-352).
West Germany was socialized to the external constraints it faced in other ways too. Deprived of any formal foreign policy autonomy until 1955 and then forced to act only within multilateral institutions that bound them to the Western victors, eventually West Germans perceived multilateralism as the best manner in which to conduct foreign policy.\textsuperscript{340} By the 1960s and 1970s, all major political actors in West Germany were committed to the principle of being tied to the West through international institutions and working through these institutions to achieve foreign policy goals. In short, West Germans became “the world’s most committed and experienced” multilateralists (Schwartz 1995, 561). Though West Germany initially had no choice in the matter, the defeated state soon received great benefits from acting this way. NATO, for example, provided West Germany with security and the European Community helped to bring the once devastated state economic prosperity. Having practiced foreign policy in this way for so long and enjoying tangible benefits from doing so, multilateralism came to be perceived as the only route of West German foreign policy success.\textsuperscript{341}

\textsuperscript{340} Schumacher, the first postwar leader of the SPD, had heavily criticized Adenauer for working so much through institutions (Schwartz 1995, 651). But by the time Brandt of the SPD became Chancellor, all of the major West German political parties identified themselves with such a policy. Brandt, when announcing his foreign policy plan and specifically plans for Ostpolitik, described the continuity of West German policy while hoping to renew efforts to better relations with the East. As such, Ostpolitik was undertaken with the consent of the US and other allies, and “did much to maintain and cement the close relations between Washington and Bonn.” (Gatzke 1980, 219)

\textsuperscript{341} Kruger (1999) takes this even farther, arguing that West German domestic and foreign policy were intertwined in this multilateral setting. West Germany had a “special way of solving problems,” which usually included initiating negotiations among all relevant groups and introducing bargaining processes to integrate conflicting interests. For foreign policy, “this attitude allows for a new form of national identification, supported by an extended influence of domestic policy and public opinion, which ensued from the unusual origins and the very existence of the Federal Republic within the framework of Western integration, a situation that supported the retreat from an arcane sphere of ‘free hand’ power politics and formed a distinct style of foreign policy.” (1999, 250-251)
Thus, by the 1970s the major elements of the victor’s management strategy for West Germany had been largely accepted as legitimate by the defeated. The victors’ efforts to socialize the defeated state seemed largely successful. As the Western victors recognized that West Germany was a source of stability and had reconciled with the postwar status quo, the defeated state increasingly gained leverage. However, the formal restrictions on West German power and autonomy were not lifted during the Cold War. The real test of the strength of the socialization process in West Germany would come after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

6.4.4 German Unification: Opportunities Not Taken

On October 3, 1990, the Federal Republic of Germany absorbed the Democratic Republic of Germany, ending the forty-plus year division of the defeated state.\textsuperscript{342} The speed of the process astounded everyone. It also alarmed quite a few. Britain and France especially resisted moves that would, if the worst happened, allow a reunified Germany to again dominate Europe. Some thought that it was only a matter of time before Germany, already an economic colossus, re-asserted itself in Europe and became a thoroughly normal great power pursuing unilateral interests by first throwing-off the restrictions on its autonomy and power instituted by the victors decades earlier. In short, the revolutionary changes in global and European politics at the end of the Cold War “reawakened old fears about Europe’s domination by an unpredictable German giant.”\textsuperscript{343}

\textsuperscript{342} On the process of reunification, see Judt (2005, 637-643), Pond (1993), and Zelikow and Rice (1995).

\textsuperscript{343} Katzenstein (1997, 1). Mearsheimer (1990) most prominently predicted that Germany would again strive to be a normal great power and thus possibly be a source of instability in Europe as its weaker European neighbors would not be able to balance the power of the reunified state.
These fears, however, were unfounded. The process by which German reunification came about ensured that the enlarged state was still thoroughly tied to the West. Though the Four-Power regime’s authority over Berlin disappeared with the final German settlement, the web of institutions that constrained West German autonomy and prevented unilateral action – most notably NATO and the European Community – were retained and indeed even strengthened. Moreover, West German democratic institutions that fundamentally limited state power were expanded to the east as the German Democratic Republic was simply incorporated into the West German federal structure.

It was not just that the US and other victors of the Second World War demanded that these restrictions remain. The Germans willfully accepted all of these measures that held German autonomy and power in check. Chancellor Helmut Kohl, much like the first postwar Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, had no misgivings about keeping Germany inextricably tied to the West. This, however, was not only for pragmatic reasons. The unquestioned assumption of German policy after reunification was that the path of multilateralism in all foreign policy would be continued. Kohl unequivocally declared that the new, larger Federal Republic would “adhere to the proven course of German foreign policy, most of all to the solid integration of German in the Atlantic Alliance and

344 Katzenstein claims “German unification and European integration were indissolubly linked in 1989-90. (1997, 1)

345 However, the US did very much want to avoid a unified and neutral Germany. The Bush administration thus fully supported Chancellor Helmut Kohl’s bid for reunification within the Western system. See Judt (2005, 640-641).
Moreover, the US relationship in particular was an integral part of German politics, and could not be jeopardized with unilateral action. While full sovereignty was regained in 1990 with the end of the anti-Nazi coalition’s reserved powers in the Federal Republic and Berlin, in practice the new, larger Federal Republic did not act as such.

West Germany had become so thoroughly tied to the institutions that not only provided economic and security benefits but also significantly restrained its power and autonomy that German national interests were inextricably linked to wider European interests and international institutions. While all of these institutions involving European integration and the Atlantic relationship were embraced initially in the 1950s mostly as a way to regain trust and freedom of action, after unification it was unthinkable to act

---

346 Quoted in Banchoff (1999a, 414). All major political parties in reunified Germany agreed on these points. The core of any debate in German foreign policy priorities was over deepening of institutions like NATO and the EU or widening them to include members to the east. See Banchoff (1999c, 145-153).

347 Schwartz (1995). This is as clear in West German politics before unification as it was afterward. As Walther Leiser Kiep, a CDU member of the Bundestag, claimed in 1974 that “the German-American alliance … is not merely one aspect of modern German history, but a decisive element as a result of its preeminent place in our politics. In effect it provides a second constitution for our country.” (Quoted in Schwartz 1995, 555).

348 Katzenstein (1997, 14-15) and Banchoff (1999b, 140). On the strong current of multilateralism in German foreign policy that has lasted through reunification, see also Hellmann (1996).
otherwise. Thus, the richest and potentially most powerful state in Europe, made even more so with reunification, was happy to remain bound to an order that limited Germany’s role in international affairs.

Beyond maintaining the current of West German foreign policy after reunification, the domestic institutional structure of West Germany continued to gain legitimacy. The commission to explore constructing a new German constitution fell into inactivity and the Basic Law, written in 1949, was untouched with the incorporation of East Germany into the Federal Republic. The foundational document of the Federal Republic, decisively shaped by the Western victors, took on a new sense of permanence (Merritt 1995, 401). The federal structure itself, a measure demanded by the western victors of the Second World War to keep the central German government weak, decentralized power even more with the additional of new Lander from the east.

While reunification posed many challenges to the domestic institutions, the character of

349 Katzenstein (1997, 14). Anderson (1997, 83), calling the German propensity to act within the institutions of the European Community “reflexive support for an exaggerated multilateralism,” notes this in the context of the economic integration of Europe. Garton Ash (1994, 68), citing German security policy, claims that because of “attritional multilateralism” it is “virtually unthinkable that a German government would use force or the threat of force unilaterally to achieve a national goal, except for the defense of its own territory.”

350 Moreover, eager to promote stability in the East so as to preserve the status quo in the West, Germany reiterated and restated commitments made during the Cold War. The collapse of the communist regimes in the East made the 1970s Eastern Treaties largely irrelevant. Thus, Germany set to revise the bilateral accords to reflect the new situation, but with the core of the renunciation of the use of force and respect for the borders of German neighbors prominently restated. In addition, Germany again promised to pursue European cooperation and security and agreed – in part to assuage the Soviet Union’s fears about a reunited Germany remaining within NATO – to reduce its force levels to less than that of West Germany before unification. See Banchoff (1999b, 131-145) for these developments as well as others that demonstrated the continuity of German foreign policy toward its neighbors and the strengthening of the institutional frameworks that tied it and the rest of Europe together.

351 Katzenstein (1997, 37). Katzenstein (33) also notes that the structure of West Germany and then united Germany resembles in many ways the structure of the EU itself. European unification has created a sort of “associated sovereignty” and German political institutions and practices create a type of “semisovereignty.” See also Katzenstein (1987).
the Federal Republic’s democracy remained unchanged. Indeed, it only gained strength after 1990, with a “national identity anchored in democratic tenets and institutions” having safely traversed the road from the West Germany of the Bonn Republic to the expanded Berlin Republic (Brady and Wiliarty 1999, 512).

Reunification presented Germany with a tremendous opportunity to expand its role in international relations and thus to finally overcome the restrictions on its autonomy and power placed on it in the immediate post-Second World War era. Given its already huge economy and, with the addition of East Germany even more future potential, there was little that the original anti-Nazi coalition could have done to stop a more assertive unilateral German foreign policy, much less anything that could have stopped a rollback of democratic freedoms or domestic institutions in the reunified state. But because the socialization process was so thorough, Germans maintained that it was in their interest to preserve the vast majority of the status quo. The constraints on Germany – in the form of international and domestic institutions – had, overtime, come to define the state such that alternative routes were unthinkable. In the end, after reunification Germany was still constrained by international institutions, most of which were initially implemented in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War. But this time Germans were free to choose this path.

6.5 Summary

The transformation of Germany in the postwar period is extraordinarily clear. However, the impact of the victors’ actions in the postwar era on this transformation is often under-estimated. The argument made here is not that the victors fully determined
the content of all West German domestic and foreign policy. Rather, the argument is that the victors fundamentally shaped the direction of this transformation with the restrictions they imposed and enforced on a defeated Germany.

This process began in 1945 immediately after victory. The victors, and most importantly the US in the western sectors of the defeated state, set out to destroy German power completely. Institutional constraints were constructed to ensure that any future development in Germany would be in the direction of peace. Even when the strategic context changed such that the defeated state was needed to help balance the Soviet Union, reconstruction of western Germany was pursued in such a way that any regained autonomy and power could not be used to disturb the peace. The basic institutions of the West German state formed in 1949 played a very large role in this. The decentralized, federal structure of West Germany with strict protections of individual rights and bolstered with a strong independent judiciary were constructed at the behest of the victors and served as internal constraints on the defeated state. When the defeated state finally regained formal sovereignty, West German power and autonomy were constrained by a web of interlocking international institutions that ensure it was incapable of unilateral, aggressive action. The evolving institutions of European integration and NATO tied West Germany to the rest of Europe and the North Atlantic community and acted as external constraints on the defeated nations autonomy and power.352

352 Banchoff (1999a, 403) notes, “In postwar period, before unification, no other West European state was enmeshed in as thick a web of international institutions. From the allied occupation regime of the 1940s, to membership in NATO and the EC in 1950s, to the Eastern Treaties of the 1970s and the Two-Plus-Four reunification settlement of 1990, German leaders found themselves embedded in a dense institutional constellation.”
This restrictive war-ending settlement, as would be expected, was not fully embraced initially. But because there was a relative void in postwar German politics, the victors were able exploit their power advantages and instigated a process of imbuing the defeated state with a new political identity in an effort to socialize the vanquished state to the postwar order. With strict enforcement, the promotion of those domestic groups that were favorably disposed toward the west, and the good fortune of positive results from the path demanded by the victors, the settlement eventually gained legitimacy. Many, if not the vast majority, of the restrictions on the state were legitimized over time. A long German military tradition turned into a strong antimilitarist culture. A political culture that had succumbed to authoritarianism over and again became solidly democratic. A state with a history of aggressive expansionism spurned all unilateral action in foreign policy. Calls to reclaim historically German lands were rejected as illegitimate.

Moreover, though the notion of reunification never fully faded, West Germans generally accepted the division of the state. Exogenous events eventually provided an opportunity to reunify the country, but the only route that could be considered was if it could be done with existing Western institutions.

In the end, the socialization of the defeated state occurred as the institutions intended to limit West German autonomy and power were internalized as the accepted, and acceptable, postwar order.\footnote{A particularly important aspect of this case, however, may have been the benefits that the defeated state accrued from the settlement. Even though the provisions of the settlement placed significant limitations on West German autonomy and power, these same provisions provided the basis of economic prosperity and security against a major threat. Moreover, the path to legitimation began in the 1950s when West Germans experienced a huge economic upturn. While it demonstrates clearly that restrictive war-ending settlements can in fact be legitimized and thus provide postwar stability, this case, then, also points to the need to further integrate the role of benefits into the coercion plus socialization model.} The institutions constraining West German autonomy
and power – democracy as set forth in the Basic Law internally, and NATO and European integration externally – over time helped to constituted a new West German political identity rather than rather just constrain its preferences or make the costs of acting against the status quo prohibitively high.\textsuperscript{354} That is, the basis of acceptance of the war-ending settlement went from coercion, or where the defeated state’s powerlessness vis-à-vis the victors dictated passivity, to legitimacy. The restrictive war-ending settlement was not only acceptable, but constituted part of the defeated state’s political identity and thus could not be considered an object of revisionism. The coercion plus socialization model of the acceptance of a restrictive war-ending settlement is thus well established as the mechanism behind the stability of the post-Second World War West German settlement.

\textsuperscript{354} Katzenstein (1997, 3) argues that institutions do this “within particular norms (collective expectations for the proper behavior of actors with a given identity) or for specific collective identities (varying constructions of statehood).” Norms and identities, then, not only constrain preferences, but also “constitute actors and thus shape their interests.” For other historical-sociological approaches toward institutions, norms, and identities, see Hall and Taylor (1998), Steinmo, Thelen, and Longstreth (1992), and Soltan, Uslaner, and Haufler (1998).
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters decisively show that there is not a single path to constructing a prudent victory. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, both lenient and restrictive settlements can provide postwar stability. Indeed, one of the most successful cases of victors constructing a stable postwar system with their management strategy of a vanquished state was West Germany – a state that suffered significant postwar limitations on its autonomy and power.

With this concluding chapter, I will first revisit my arguments regarding the stability of restrictive settlements. I will then review the findings of the comparative analysis of the universe of great power war-ending settlements since 1815 as well as the in-depth case study of post-Second World War West Germany. I will then discuss the areas where the conventional wisdom falls short by way of contrasting my arguments with the idea of moderation in victory, specifically that victors will enforce restrictive settlements under certain conditions and legitimacy cannot be a product of mere leniency. The critical role of socialization is discussed next, as well as the idea that restrictive settlements are in fact more likely to create postwar stability based on legitimacy than lenient settlements. I will then present two areas of future research related to the problem
of victory indicated by the results of this dissertation. Next, I will briefly discuss how the findings of the dissertation may speak to two of the most important postwar situations the US faces today and then finally provide a few closing thoughts.

7.2 The Problem of Victory Revisited

While states may bask in the euphoria of victory for a short while, military triumph immediately presents problems that must be addressed. Not least of these problems is how to treat the vanquished foe to help secure postwar stability as well as the gains made on the battlefield. The hard work of turning military triumph into such political successes in the postwar world is the essence of prudence in victory. The blood spilt and treasure spent to fight the war are in vain if the opportunity to craft a more peaceful and stable era is missed and the fruits of victory are squandered. The only way to avoid this outcome, so posits the conventional wisdom, is to treat a defeated state with leniency. That is, only if the victors pursue moderation in victory will they turn military success into political victory in the postwar era.

While the notion of moderation in victory provides a great service by pointing out some key elements that affect all war-ending settlements such as the issue of legitimacy and the need for enforcement, it falls short in several respects. In the second chapter, I argue that the conventional wisdom is too narrow, and victors can solve the problem of victory by more than one route. That is, under certain conditions, restrictive settlements can be part of a prudent use of victory that ensures postwar stability as well as secures the political gains from the war.
Specifically, if victors enjoy a large postwar power gap and are pushed to undertake the charge of enforcing the settlement because the vanquished state is perceived as a potential threat in the postwar era, stability can follow restrictive war-ending settlements by one of two models. The first – the coercion model – simply relies on the victor’s capability advantages and enforcement of the settlement in the postwar era. If a vanquished state is not presented with reasonable opportunities to challenge the victors because the power gap holds and enforcement is stringent, it will grudgingly endure its treatment. Extended stability can be achieved this way, but when the power gap shrinks or enforcement breaks down the vanquished will rise against the victor’s postwar order. Therefore, stability based on coercion is inherently fragile.

The second – the coercion plus socialization model – presents a way to achieve much more robust stability. This model too relies on a large power gap between the victors and vanquished as well as strict enforcement. But with the political trauma following defeat, victors may be able to exploit the relative void in the vanquished state’s politics and fill it with their own brand of ideas. Though this is likely to be resisted and coercion may be needed to ensure compliance at first, the postwar order, including the defeated state’s limited autonomy and power, can eventually be legitimized. The socialization process, if it takes hold, then roots the vanquished state’s political identity in the postwar vision of the victors.

7.3 Empirical Findings and Implications

Chapters four, five, and six show how the victorious states of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries addressed the problem of victory vis-à-vis the defeated great powers
they faced. While not all victorious states successfully turned their military success into political success, very clearly some of the most successful attempts to manage a defeated great power did not conform to the conventional wisdom. In fact, restrictive settlements led to postwar stability at nearly the same rate as lenient ones and did so based on one of the two logic put forth by my models.

7.3.1 The Comparative Analysis of All Great Power War-ending Settlements

To test the validity of the conventional wisdom versus the coercion and coercion plus socialization models, I examined the universe of great power war-ending settlements since 1815 using a measure of the severity of war-ending settlements and a gauge for postwar stability developed in chapter three in addition to providing structured historical analysis. The comparative analysis shows very clearly that restrictive settlements can lead to postwar stability. Out of the thirteen cases of a great power war-ending settlement, six restrictive settlements and four lenient ones led to extended stability. Only two restrictive settlements resulted in postwar instability, and one lenient one did as well (see Table 5.18 in Chapter Five).

Because I also employed a measure of relative capabilities between the victors and the vanquished along with the gauge of postwar stability, I was able to test for elements of the coercion model within the comparative analysis. All of the cases, in the end, conformed to the expectations of the coercion model. A total of ten cases – 1815 France, 1859 Austrian Empire, 1866 Austro-Hungarian Empire, 1871 France, 1905 Russia, 1919 Austria, 1945 Italy, 1945 Japan, 1945 West Germany, 1945 East Germany – never regained significant capabilities vis-à-vis the victorious state. In addition, all of these cases were in fact the same cases that led to extended stability. Though the Italian,
Japanese, and West German cases after 1945 in particular show different dynamics in the historical analysis and the in-depth analysis of the West German case points to socialization more than coercion as the ultimate cause of postwar stability, in the rest of the cases the inability of the defeated state to successfully challenge the victors surely helped to keep the postwar peace. Those three cases that led to postwar instability – 1856 Russia, 1919 Germany, and 1919 Hungary – all eventually regained significant capabilities that enabled them to challenge the victors. While they were weak compared to the victors, however, each defeated state largely conformed to the postwar settlement.

These results indicate not only strong support for the coercion model of postwar stability under a restrictive settlement, but also, as argued in chapter five, that this model should apply to lenient settlements as well. This is a very clear challenge to the validity of the conventional wisdom.

7.3.2 The Limits of the Conventional Wisdom

The proponents of moderation in victory correctly point out that enforcement is a critical issue for a restrictive settlement. That is, as Kissinger (1994), Ikenberry (2001), and others argue, the costs of enforcing a settlement the defeated state desires to overthrow can be extremely high. However, the comparative analysis and in-depth post-Second World War case demonstrate that victors will undertake the high cost of enforcement. And, as I argue, this is driven largely by perceptions of postwar threat emanating from the vanquished state. After 1815, the conservative continental powers never forgot the turmoil revolutionary France caused and each stood guard against a revival of French expansionism. Enforcement took the form of ensuring the isolation of France and, when needed such as in 1830, reiterating their clear goal of preventing the
vanquished state from disturbing postwar stability. After the Second World War, the Western victors remained on guard against any independent or unrestrained increase in West German power. Acting mostly alone, the US did the same in Japan as did the Soviets in East Germany. Because these defeated state were seen as such great potential threats should they be able to break the constraints of the settlements, enforcement never fundamentally lapsed. There was, in short, a unity in purpose among the victorious states. Even the Second World War, where the Soviets and the US were at loggerheads almost from the beginning, shows this to be the case. That is, the potential German threat was so great – and both the US and Soviet Union realized this, though the latter more acutely than the former – that neither victor was willing to let an unrestricted Germany rise out of the ashes of destruction.

Though it had a much different outcome than the settlements of the Second World War, Germany after the First World War demonstrates equally well the role of threat perception to achieve the necessary enforcement of a restrictive settlement. France was the only victorious state to call for enforcement of the settlement during the entire postwar period. The US, which was almost pathologically uninterested in the European settlement after 1919 save its remaining financial interests in Europe, and Britain, returning to its traditional concern of preventing any one state from dominating the continent, quickly moved away from seeing Germany as the biggest potential problem of the postwar era. This sort of disunity left France to enforce the restrictive settlement alone. But because Germany had so many natural power advantages over its western neighbor, France stood little chance of successfully doing so. Even if the victors had
attempted to enforce the settlement, other factors may have still led Germany to challenge
the settlement. Without victorious state unity in purpose, however, serious challenges to
Versailles may have been almost inevitable.

This case in particular may point out another important aspect of war-ending
settlements and postwar stability not discussed by the conventional wisdom or one that
appears prominently as part of the theoretical arguments I present. That is, the legitimacy
of a war-ending settlement is not just a one-way street; it can be called into question by
the victors as well. After constructing the 1919 Versailles settlement, the US and Britain
essentially had second thoughts. The settlement they constructed, even if it had some
severe internal contradictions, was intended to replace the old balance of power system
that led Europe to war with a new, liberal internationalist order with institutions like the
League of Nations ensuring international peace. How, then, could Germany be blamed
for causing the war if the victors themselves, or at least some of the victors, saw the
international system itself as the cause for war? Thus, how could it be acceptable to
punish Germany with such a harsh settlement? Enforcing the settlement on a vanquished
Germany, then, conflicted with the values and ideals on which the US, Britain, and others
hoped to base a new international order.\textsuperscript{355} Thus, on top of the fact that the US simply
wished to withdraw from Europe and Britain began to see France as its potentially most
dangerous competitor on the continent, at least two of the great power victors began to
see the very settlement they constructed as illegitimate. The individual victor’s
divergence in strategic rationale and ideational divides between the victors crushed any

\textsuperscript{355} Harris (2004, 56-57). Even some elements of French society saw things this way. The counter to this
argument, posed by many, was that Germany imposed even harsher terms on Russia at Brest-Litovsk and
thus would have done the same thing to the victors had the war ended differently.
hope of victor unity or cohesion and made enforcement nearly impossible. This
dissertation considered a very generalized form of threat from the defeated state as a
critical factor for enforcement, but victor perceptions of the legitimacy of war-ending
settlements may be a potentially fruitful area for further research.

Notwithstanding potential further refinements, the approach used in this
dissertation is a step in the right direction as the conventional wisdom comes up
decidedly short on fully explaining or appreciating the issue of enforcement. A related
problem is the conventional wisdom’s assumption that lenient settlements will be
perceived as legitimate by the defeated state and thus require little or no enforcement
effort by the victors. It is certainly true that a war-ending settlement that does not strip
the vanquished state of significant military and economic capabilities, historic or
strategically valuable lands, or the autonomy great powers usually enjoy should provide
fewer points of contention between the victors and the vanquished in the postwar era.
But a settlement should not necessarily be expected to gain more or less legitimacy based
solely on how much the vanquished state loses. Ultimately, a war-ending settlement that
takes anything from the vanquished state is likely to be resented, especially because part
of a great power’s identity is rooted in its ability to act independently in the international
system as well as hold great capabilities to achieve its ends. Thus, enforcement is
likely a critical component of any stable war-ending settlement.

Rather than assume that the severity of a settlement is the main agent driving
perceptions of postwar legitimacy, in the end it is probably much safer to assume that all

---

356 Losing any war could be viewed as a blow to the collective self-esteem (Wendt 1999, 235-236) of a
great power. See also Harkavy (2000) who puts this into terms of humiliation.
war-ending settlements, no matter how lenient or how harsh, will be perceived as illegitimate by a vanquished great power. E.H. Carr was probably correct when he noted that, “nearly every treaty which brings a war to an end is, in one sense, a dictated peace; for a defeated Power seldom accepts willingly the consequences of defeat.” (1965[1947], 4) Unless a war-ending settlement addresses the war-causing issues themselves to the satisfaction of the defeated state (very unlikely) or it suffers absolutely no loss of autonomy or power because of the settlement (again, very unlikely) a vanquished state will be a revisionist state in the postwar era. As such, the coercion model should be the baseline expectation. That is, after any war-ending settlement, lenient or restrictive, a defeated state will be a source of postwar instability by challenging the settlement when reasonable opportunities arise.

This, of course, may only be in the absence of some sort of alteration to the vanquished state. Such an alteration would have to involve, however, relinquishing part of a state’s identity in exchange for another. That is, if a defeated great power is not going to resist limitations to its postwar autonomy and power, it can no longer hold a great power identity.

7.3.3 The Critical Role of Socialization

The coercion plus socialization model provides a way to understand how such a shift in political identity can occur. If victors enjoy a large power advantage and can impose far-reaching restrictions on the autonomy and power of a defeated state experiencing great political trauma, they have an opportunity to mold the defeated state into a fundamentally new actor. A very restrictive settlement can socialize a vanquished state and, as such, provide robust postwar stability. Successful socialization of a defeated
great power to a restrictive settlement implies that the victors instigate a process whereby
the great power identity – one that would dictate challenging any settlement that
restricted its autonomy or power – is replaced by one of a lesser state. That is to say, the
vanquished state takes on a political identity where limitations on autonomy and power
are accepted as legitimate. This model, in many ways, poses the biggest challenge to the
conventional wisdom of moderation in victory. Not only does this represent a route
whereby restrictive settlements foster postwar stability based on legitimacy, but
eventually the enforcement costs of a restrictive settlement are nearly eliminated if
socialization is complete.

The West German case after the Second World War very clearly demonstrates, I
argue, how victors can successfully implement a management strategy that includes
severe restrictions as well as socialization efforts. The western victors essentially
eliminated West German autonomy and power in the initial occupation period. But even
after the rise of the Soviet threat in the East that dictated that West German power be
harnessed for the Cold War struggle, West Germany did not regain full autonomy and
power.\footnote{This points to yet another problem with the conventional wisdom. Gulick (1955), Sheenan (1996), and Jervis (1997) all point out that in balance of power systems, victors should not treat the vanquished harshly because they may be needed for postwar balancing. The victors of the Second World War, however, were all able to severely curtail the power and autonomy of all the vanquished states without massive systemic instability following. Indeed, because the victors harnessed the power of the vanquished states while keeping them fundamentally constrained, the post-Second World War era was much more stable than the prewar system. This, in a sense, was a manually constructed bipolarity; both the US and Soviet Union realized that Germany could easily be a third pole but they were unwilling to do follow this path. The US especially toyed with the idea of making Germany a postwar makeweight against the Soviet Union, but in the end this would have created an unacceptable threat in the postwar system. The conventional wisdom’s insight in this instance is again important, but as with other issues like enforcement and legitimacy there are clearly multiple ways to achieve postwar stability with regard to vanquished state.} The victors constructed internal and external constraints on the defeated state
that prohibited West Germany from acting against the settlement and also jumpstarted the
process of socialization. Exploiting the void in postwar Germany, the victors forced the construction of a liberal democratic regime that ensured the West German state was weak. Moreover, West German foreign policy was so bound to the international structure of the victors that unilateral action was impossible. But as the democratic system enjoyed some successes and the victors strictly enforced the restrictive provisions, nearly all aspects of the settlement were legitimated.

In the end, the West German state never fundamentally challenged the system. This was not solely because of a lack of opportunities; West Germany economic prowess could have led to more military capabilities and the collapse of the Soviet-led system in Eastern Europe provided a monumental opportunity for Germany to regain lost autonomy and power. West Germany did not challenge the settlement because it was accepted as legitimate. Indeed, the postwar West Germany political identity was intricately tied to the status quo. Thus, challenging the postwar order was nearly unthinkable. In short, the restrictive settlement fundamentally transformed the defeated state and helped to provide robust postwar stability.

7.3.4 Successful Victor-instigated Socialization?

Other cases, even though examined only briefly, display some of the same characteristics fully explored in the West German case. The post-Second World War case of Japan, and less so the Italian case, probably conform to the coercion plus socialization model as well. That is, the victorious powers successfully instigated great changes in the political identity of these vanquished state such that they accepted the
postwar order not because of coercion, but because of legitimacy. Ultimately, this model presents a clear route to legitimacy rarely considered by proponents of the conventional wisdom.358

There were, however, other attempts to socialize defeated states. The Soviets intended to socialize East Germany after the Second World War, but the Soviet vision of the postwar world never gained legitimacy in the vanquished state. The limited attempts after the First World War to socialize Germany and the other defeated states, as well as France in 1815, were clearly much less successful than the above cases as well.

These cases, some successful socialization attempts and others unsuccessful, provide several hints for an important question that remains. That is, when will victor-instigated attempts to socialize a defeated state to a war-ending settlement be most likely to succeed? Looking first at domestic political constraints placed on vanquished states, it seems that for socialization to be successful society has to receive some benefits from the arrangement. As chapter six demonstrates, much of the initial legitimacy of West Germany’s domestic political institutions – for example the democratic system embodied by the Basic Law so clearly intended by the victors to constrain the state – actually gained their legitimacy through the initial economic successes of the regime.359 All of the defeated states under Western influence – West Germany, Japan, and Italy – experienced economic booms in the post-Second World War era and this clearly helped

358 Ikenberry and Kupchan (1991) posit a clear role for socialization and the legitimation of an order to achieve stability, but not necessarily within the context of a restrictive war-ending settlement.

359 This conforms nicely with the expectations of those writing about legitimacy in other contexts. Lipset (1986) argued, for example, economic success could go a long way to legitimizing even a weak democratic regime.
to legitimize the domestic order. But still the legitimacy of the domestic institutions that acted to constrain the vanquished state took time to solidify, especially in West Germany and Japan.

On the other hand, East Germany never experienced the economic gains of West Germany, Japan, or Italy. Indeed, it lost ground vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and other communist bloc states in the postwar era. This certainly did not help to legitimize the East German regime. In the end, only the exertion of extreme domestic repression and the backing of the Soviet Union ensured the regime’s grip on power. Germany after the First World War, forced to adhere to a representative form of government by the settlement, never had real economic success that could spillover to bolster the credibility and legitimacy of the Weimar Republic. After 1815, France made a modest economic recovery, but the Bourbon monarchy never held much domestic legitimacy and was deposed in 1830. It may have been, however, that the victors hope to install a new regime in France as a restriction on its autonomy did not last long enough to even have a chance to be legitimated.

All of this raises another important issue. A domestic restriction such as an imposed regime may require an extended period of time to gain legitimacy, but this alone is clearly not sufficient. The East German regime, for example, was in place for over forty years yet as soon as Soviet power crumbled so too did the regime that adhered East
Germany to the Soviet Union.\(^{360}\) Successful socialization regarding other types of restrictions may be susceptible to the same problem. Over time, ties between a state and its former territory may lose strength or feared strategic disadvantages may not appear after a territorial amputation. The issue of German land transfers to Poland vanished in the 1970s as West Germany recognized the legitimacy of the territorial amputation. But other instances show that time alone is clearly not sufficient to legitimize such restrictions. The French motivation for the First World War, for example, was in part to regain Alsace and Lorraine lost to Germany over forty years before.\(^{361}\)

International institutions that bind a defeated state to a postwar order are no different. NATO and the EU provided West Germany as well as Italy with significant benefits over a very long period of time, as did the US-dominated security arrangements for Japan. These institutions – all of which fundamentally restricted the autonomy of the vanquished states more than other members of the institutions – were all accepted as legitimate. Though it clearly did not bind the defeated state to the postwar order as much as the twentieth century examples, the victors of 1815 intended to socialize France by including it in the Concert of Europe. This move, however, was never legitimated. All postwar French leaders held the goal of breaking the system constructed in 1815,

\(^{360}\) Clearly, then, imposing regime as a restriction on a vanquished state’s autonomy and power does not guarantee successful socialization. East Germany’s imposed regime was never legitimized. After the First World War, though they were not forcefully imposed, none of the victor-demanded republican forms of government in the vanquished states gained legitimacy and all fell quickly to other forces. The regime imposed on France in 1815 lasted only fifteen years and did little to legitimize the settlement. In short, though imposing a regime may be an efficient way to tap into the political identity of the vanquished state to effect some sort of socialization, it does not guarantee it.

\(^{361}\) Territory is generally a very emotive issue and can play a critical role in international conflict. Power political considerations certainly matter with regard to territory too, as Vasquez (1993) argues, but the normative consideration may help to drive such strategic importance. Thus, ties to territory, though possible to break, may be particularly strong. Kacowicz (1994) and Forsberg (1996) both demonstrate the difficulty of such issues when dealing with peaceful changes to the status of territory.
including the great power club that was correctly viewed as a restriction on French ability to act independently in the international system. The desire was rarely put into practice, and France even acted to support the system on occasion. This, however, was not because of legitimacy, but rather because France felt it could do little else.

Clearly it is not impossible to do so, but all of this points to significant obstacles to successfully socializing a vanquished state to the victor’s postwar order. Moreover, the most successful cases of vanquished states being socialized to the postwar order may have included a good deal of luck. The West German and Japanese economies received huge boosts from exogenous events and in both cases the victors were able to co-opt or attract domestic political actors with significant common interests. In the end, the success of victors’ attempts to socialize defeated states to the postwar order may be very difficult to predict.

Nevertheless, any victor would likely appreciate the benefits of socializing a defeated state to the postwar order no matter how they treat the vanquished state. Since a defeated great power is likely to resist any war-ending settlement no matter how lenient, legitimation of the postwar order is likely the only way to guarantee postwar stability. It may be, however, that socialization is more likely to succeed with a restrictive rather than lenient settlement. Lenient settlements, though they may raise fewer points of contention, do not necessarily create the conditions under which a victor-instigated process of socialization can occur. By not exploiting military victory with significant constraints on the defeated state and pursuing a strategy of leniency, victors ultimately limit their own ability to affect the political identity of the vanquished state and achieve robust postwar stability.
Several points in the causal chain present this problem. First, the role of political trauma in the vanquished state is critical. Because of this, victors can act to shape a defeated state in their own image. But a lenient approach may prohibit the victors from exploiting this advantage. Leniency does not allow the victors to forcefully insert their own brand of politics into the defeated state. As such, alternatives to the victor’s vision can easily arise and compete with any victor attempts to socialize the defeated state. This is critical because, even if the victors are demanding very few behavior alterations on the part of the defeated state, any war-ending settlement lessens the autonomy and power of a defeated great power. The inability to squash competing visions means that the great power identity that dictates such states jealously guard their autonomy and power is much more likely to survive with a lenient settlement than with a restrictive one. Exploiting the political trauma of defeat with a restrictive settlement may not guarantee that socialization will be successful, but it does imply that that the chances of a victor guiding a fundamental shift in the political identity of the defeated state are much greater.

Ultimately, political trauma in the vanquished state, extensive restrictions that tap the identity of the defeated state, and some accumulation of benefits to the defeated state are all probably required for successful socialization. If one or more of these elements are not present, a socialization process that fundamentally alters the political identity of a defeated state is unlikely to work and the vanquished state should be expected to retain a great power identity that dictates resistance to any of diminution of its autonomy and power. As such, coercion will be the only mechanism holding the stability of any settlement.
Therefore, leniency toward the defeated state will almost always create a situation where stability is much more tenuous. The process of socialization, whereby legitimacy of the postwar order is achieved, may be most easily realized with restrictive settlements. This, in the end, may be the ultimate weakness of the conventional wisdom.

7.4 Avenues of Further Research

Beyond those areas of research that deserve further investigation mentioned above, the general problem of victory opens up quite a few relatively unexplored issues. I note in the second chapter that states will often try to make significant gains in the postwar period, often by constructing a restrictive settlement. That is, victors can turn the losses incurred by a vanquished state into their own postwar gains. But some of the cases in the dissertation point to instances when victors did not attempt to make significant gains: actual losses for Russia, even if resented, were small in 1856; French and Italian gains against Austria were relatively small in 1859; and Austria again lost very little after losing the next war in 1866 to Prussia. That is, these cases show that victorious states will sometimes pursue moderation in victory. But history also clearly demonstrates that victors often do try to make gains at the expense of the vanquished: the victors and neighboring smaller states of France took limited gains at the expense of the vanquished:

---

362 Even a settlement, such as the type Ikenberry (2001) presents, where weaker and defeated states enjoy significant benefits may be subject to this sort of problem. To put it bluntly, Ikenberry’s notion of socialization and legitimacy is a rather thin one. While Ikenberry and Kupchan (19991) present a model where socialization that affects a state identity is possible, strictly institutionalist logics such as Ikenberry’s, or even Fortna’s (2003) and Walter’s (1997), do not necessarily imply a shift in political identity. As such, because the vanquished retains the fundamentally same political identity, even a settlement that limits the returns to the stronger or victorious state and provides some benefits to weaker or defeated states is likely to be challenged as soon as those benefits begin to lessen or subservient states imagine a system whereby even bigger gains can be made. That is, there seems to be nothing other than accrued benefits holding a state to a settlement and thus nothing holding a state back if it thinks it can gain more under a different system.
nation in 1815; Germany gained significant territory at the expense of France in 1871; the victors of the First World War gained from the settlements, especially at the expense of Germany; and the Second World War settlements provided significant gains to the victors. As this work has clearly demonstrated, sometimes these victorious state efforts to make gains were foolhardy, and ultimately were far-outweighed by the eventual costs victors incurred because of vanquished state revanchism.

But an important question is why victorious states sometimes pursue such gains and at other times they do not? Taking one step back from this work and addressing the puzzle of the construction of war-ending settlements may help to provide an even fuller picture of the problem of victory. What influences the management strategies of victorious states? Why do states sometimes choose to pursue lenient settlements but restrictive ones at other times? There are several possible explanations, but few have been fully explored or developed. It may be that just as states generally fight the last war, victors may try to learn from previous postwar situations. Clearly the victors of the Second World War looked back to 1919 and were determined to not make the same mistakes. Alternatively, it may be that the strategic contexts of different postwar environments dictate different management strategies. If a defeated state is needed for postwar balancing, for example, then measures must be taken to harness not only the power but also the good will of that state. In addition, the remaining power of a vanquished state, in a way similar to what I argue in this work, is likely to be considered
a potentially important factor when victors consider what type of management strategy to pursue.\textsuperscript{363} Finally, regime type, as others have argued, may determine the severity of a settlement and overall management strategy.\textsuperscript{364}

All of these factors are probably important. But many of these elements, especially power gaps and regime type, may be considered components of threat. Threat, however, can be seen as largely a product of identity interactions, where dissimilar identities likely produce more severe perceived threats. Factoring in power, if the defeated state and the victors are had very dissimilar identities prior to the war, the victors are, all things being equal, more likely to impose a restrictive settlement on the vanquished. But a critical question remains. While power and regime type likely have a role, what other salient identities have an effect on these outcomes? The rather limited theoretical and empirical work in this general area makes examining the determinants of the severity of war-ending settlements ripe for further research.

A second area of potential future research may tackle the issue of democracy and war-ending settlements. Though democracy and war is a topic that has received considerable attention in international relations literature, much less has been devoted to

\textsuperscript{363} Werner (1998) makes the case that power differential determine the severity of the settlement. That is, states will apply more severe settlements the larger the gap in capabilities between the victors and the vanquished.

\textsuperscript{364} Bueno de Mesquita and Siverson (1997), Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson, and Woller (1992), Goemans (2000), and others all make the case that regimes affect war termination and thus the terms of a settlement in one way or another. That is, as the dissimilarity of the regimes increases, the severity of the war-ending settlement generally increases.
how democracies make peace.\textsuperscript{365} Democracies are in a particularly difficult position to deal with vanquished foes. The strategies of demonizing of the enemy and driving for total victory often require that democracies undertake the costly and very difficult task of remaking their vanquished foes into democracies, or pushing for a fundamental shift in political identity. But war-wariness in democratic publics tends to produce obstacles, possibly severe, to democracies devoting all the resources necessary to ensure a stable postwar situation. It may be that a victorious democratic state will only put forth the resource necessary to successfully transform a vanquished foe if it perceives a significant postwar threat. Otherwise, the domestic costs for the victor may prove too high to push such a transition in the defeated state. If this happens, the situation is particularly dangerous as the tendency to push for complete victory can create a vacuum in the defeated state such that either it becomes a source of instability or an unfriendly regime comes to power.

Interestingly, some of the most successful instances of victor management strategies examined in this dissertation included democratic impositions. Clearly, then, the US in particular was able to work around some of the constraints mentioned above after the Second World War. But because such attempts were not always so successful,
the issue of democracy and victory does raise fundamental questions about the imposition of liberal democracy, including its utility and legitimacy – something that has not received a tremendous amount of attention.366

Understanding the particular constraints on democratic victors may help to point the way around some most problematic issues currently facing the US in Iraq and Afghanistan. While this issue provides a potentially rich avenue of future research, the theoretical and empirical implications of the dissertation as it stands may speak to some important contemporary problems as well.

7.5 The Importance of Getting Prudence in Victory Right

As I pointed out in the opening chapter, none of the theoretical arguments or empirical claims in this dissertation should be interpreted as a call for application of restrictive settlements. However, critically examining the conventional wisdom of moderation in victory and demonstrating that restrictive settlements can provide postwar stability points to when one or the other strategy may help to achieve a prudent victory. Because of the shortcomings of existing international relations theory in this regard, furthering our understanding prudence in victory is theoretically important, and this alone may establish the importance works contributing to a better understanding of how victorious states manage victory, including this dissertation.

366 It also points to the issue of *jus post-bellum* mentioned in the opening chapter. There I argued that we must first fully understand how postwar stability can be achieved before addressing issues of justice with war-ending settlements. It seems that this is not an uncommon approach. While there is significant and continuing work on just war theory, or *jus ad bellum*, there is astonishingly little work devoted to the justice of war-ending settlements even from normative political theory. Two of the few exceptions are Walzer (1977) and Orend (2000). The voluminous work on war criminality and the need for international justice, however, does touch on some issues of legitimacy and justice for post-conflict situations. For a recent exposition on post-conflict justice that takes a very pragmatic view of the possible utility of war-crimes tribunals and related structures, see Snyder and Vinjamuri (2003/04).
But beyond the theoretical implications this dissertation, the problem of victory continues to present itself in the real world of international politics. Thus, refining the notion of prudence in victory could have tremendous policy implications. In addition to the multitude of internal and civil conflicts where victorious actors have had to deal with the vanquished, contemporary international politics provides several instances where the insights gleaned from this examination of great power war-ending settlements may apply. The first and most directly related to this research is the aftermath of the defeat of the Soviet Union and the treatment of Russia. Indeed, this is the only defeated great power victors have had to manage since 1945.

While there are clearly some differences between this case and those examined in this work, some of the implications may still be relevant. Though not militarily defeated, Russia lost the Cold War in every other way imaginable. As such, a type of war-ending settlement began to emerge in the 1990s.\textsuperscript{367} Indeed, just as the Soviet grip on Eastern Europe was crumbling and the foundations of the Soviet Union itself were showing signs of severe stress in 1989-1991, there was a type of armistice between the competing superpowers. The Soviet Union essentially sued for peace in the Cold War struggle, accepting that Germany, the source of the original Cold War tensions between the US and Soviet Union, would be unified within the NATO structure and thus squarely within the Western camp as well as several arm-limitations agreements that, in the end, placed more restriction on the Soviets than the Americans.\textsuperscript{368}

\textsuperscript{367} Many have made the argument that we should look at this as a war-ending settlement like any other. See, for example, Brzeninski (1992) and Clark (2001).

\textsuperscript{368} Clark (2001, 130-138).
These actions alone do not constitute much in the way of restrictions for the defeated state. After the final fall of the Soviet Union and the emergence of Russia as its successor in the 1990s, other actions by the US did possibly infringe on Russian autonomy and potential power a bit more. Certainly, the US did not do this directly. But actions such as NATO expansion, first into central Europe but now even into former Soviet space, can be seen as a reduction of Russia’s role in traditional spheres of influence.\textsuperscript{369} Moreover, the NATO-led war over Kosovo, though maybe a necessary move by the West, displayed the increasing marginalization of Russia’s role in the post-Cold War world.

In the end, whether the victors’ treatment of Russia is lenient or restrictive may be beside the point. But because there are some Russian losses associated with the end of Cold War – the disintegration of the empire, reduced influence in global affairs, marginalization of Russian interests by the West, general economic and military decline – it is likely to resent its treatment in the postwar world. Indeed, after the mid-1990s this increasing seems to be the case.

But the extent to which the victors – the US but also Western Europe – can head off this potential problem is limited. Because of the way the Cold War ended, the types of internal institutional restrictions the victors implemented in the West German or even Japanese case can in no way be matched by similar efforts to institute mechanisms that could socialize Russia. There were certainly initial efforts to encourage political and economic liberalization Russia freely chose in the aftermath of defeat. But these

\textsuperscript{369} Gaddis (1998) claimed this was a very clear indication of an increasingly severe treatment of Russia. That is, taking the US-led alliance right to the doorstep of the defeated state not only reduced Russian ability to act in its former sphere of influence but it could very easily be seen as a hostile move intended to contain the defeated state. See Haslam (1998) for a similar account of the effects of NATO expansion.
prospects were significantly hurt by the Russian financial collapse and did little to help the legitimation of the type of political institutions the West vocally pushed for in Russia.

Bringing Russia into western institutions like the G8 or eventually the World Trade Organization (WTO) and even establishing a formal relationship between NATO and Russia to further cooperation are clearly Western efforts to try to socialize the defeated state, and they could have some impact. However, these institutional settings may be too limited to bind Russia to the postwar order as the West hopes. The NATO-Russian relationship is very narrow, and the damage done by the Kosovo incident is yet to be repaired. Moreover, the open plans to continue NATO expansion is a constant irk to Moscow. In addition, Russian inclusion in the G8 and its possible ascension into the WTO has actually created some antagonism between the US and the vanquished state. Given the inabilities of the victors to significantly influence domestic developments in the defeated state and the thus far ineffectual efforts to socialize it with binding international institutions, if Russia is to be socialized to the post-Cold War order it will have to be a mostly internal effort where the victorious state role is minimal.

Such an outcome is possible. There is nothing predetermined about increasing Russian resentment toward the West or fundamental rejection of the postwar order. But given that the Russian great power identity is still alive, if the state regains significant capabilities vis-à-vis the West it may be more and more likely to resist what it sees as the restrictions it faces in the postwar era.\textsuperscript{370} And given the considerable oil wealth and other resources of the Russian state, it is likely that it will not forever be weak. Thus, because

\textsuperscript{370} Adomeit (1995) argues that the Russian great power identity is quite threatened, as evidenced by its constant advertisement by Russian officials. While this may be a sign of threat, it is very clearly a sign of competition to define the Russian identity in world affairs. See also Hopf (2002) for the construction of and competition for Russian identity as it pertains to great power status and foreign affairs.
of the inability of the West to instigate a process of socialization on its terms, the best course of action for the victors may be to seek to limit the number of issues between the victors and vanquished that could spark significant conflict. In short, the most prudent strategy for the victors to follow, and especially the US, may be leniency.

The second contemporary case this dissertation speaks to may call for the opposite strategy. Though not a great power and thus not in the same category as the cases examined here, the issue of stabilizing Iraq is clearly one of the most important, if not the most pressing, contemporary US foreign policy challenges. Indeed, this case can be seen as just as important as managing a defeated great power, but not for the same reasons. Iraqi capabilities in the postwar era will not, even if they dramatically increase, present a major threat to US security. Instability stemming from Iraq, however, can be argued to threaten larger US interests in the strategically vital Middle East.

No matter declarations of victory, since this war is still raging any speculation on how to ensure postwar stability once the peace is established is surely premature until the security problem of the Iraqi insurgency is solved. Nevertheless, it is abundantly clear that the US plan is to socialize the defeated state to its vision of the postwar world. That is, the US imposed a democratic regime with the hope that it would adhere to the US vision of the status quo in the Middle East.371

Multiple problems along these lines have already been encountered, but the results of this dissertation, and specifically the coercion plus socialization model, imply

---

371 Other restrictions, such as limitation on the military and weapons systems of the state, are likely to stay in place. However, quickly after the fall of the old regime the US was forced to switch to a strategy of rebuilding Iraqi security forces to combat the raging insurgency (Diamond 2005).
that all is not lost.\textsuperscript{372} Though Iraq has enjoyed no material benefit from the imposed regime thus far because of the continued insecurity – indeed, the material conditions are probably worse today than before the war – if security can be established and Iraq accrues some sort of benefit from the new regime, the victor-instigated socialization to a new, democratic regime may yet prove successful. These may be heroic assumption given the current state of affairs. But they are likely no less heroic than what is actually required so that the socialization of this defeated state to the US vision of the postwar order can be successful. As the West German case in particular shows, such a process takes a significant length of time. But because this is not a sufficient component of success, considerable support for the new regime and continued efforts to essentially enforce the terms intended to transform the vanquished state will be required of the US for a long time to come.\textsuperscript{373} Though the applicability of this dissertation’s theoretical framework and empirical findings to the case of Iraq may be limited, it nevertheless points to certain problems the US faces regarding this most recent vanquished state.

\textsuperscript{372} Larry Diamond (2005) discusses the problems of legitimacy the US has faced and continues to face in Iraq since the fall of the former regime and its incredibly inability, or maybe lack of will, to eliminate the rivals to US visions of a liberal democratic Iraq like Muqtada al-Sadr’s radical Islamist alternative. See also Packer (2005). The most comprehensive study of the Iraq campaign and occupation thus far is Gordon and Trainor (2006).

\textsuperscript{373} Unfortunately, it is not all that clear that are factors to push the US to continue to support the imposed regime or expend the resources needed to forcefully guide it in the direction the US desires. Assuming that any strong Iraqi state would not support nor cooperate with groups that may indeed threaten the US with attack such as al Qaeda, any regained Iraqi capabilities would be hard-pressed to actually constitute a real threat to the US. Thus, such an outcome may not be perceived as all that dangerous. In short, because it is not a great power or potential great power like the victors of the Second World War faced in Germany or Japan, enforcement may easily lapse. If this happens, the many alternatives that have presented themselves in Iraq thus far will be far freer to take the political identity of this defeated state in a way counter to US desires. The effects of such an occurrence for US security could be minimal, but it would be a clear failure of a major US foreign policy goal.
7.6 Conclusion

This dissertation opened with Winston Churchill’s caution that the problems states face in triumph are more agreeable than those defeat, but no less difficult to address. While statesmen have probably realized this for centuries, it is unfortunate that the issue of how states manage victory has for far too long not received the full attention it deserves in international relations scholarship. Undoubtedly the problems of victory have real world implications and thus deserve much more scrutiny.

This issue, I believe, is made clear with the conventional wisdom of moderation in victory. While this widely accepted view does indeed provide a valuable service by pointing to important issues facing victors when attempting to construct a prudent victory, it clearly does not provide a fully coherent nor empirically verified explanation for how the treatment of defeated states affects postwar stability. This dissertation provides a vital step in the right direction to understand much better how victorious state’s management strategies relate to postwar stability.

Even if for nothing else than to limit their own future involvement in deadly conflict, victors have a minimum responsibility of constructing the most stable postwar environment possible. Doing so is not easy as the vanquished will quite often resist even a victor’s best intentions. As such, leniency or moderation may not always be the best path to postwar stability. Indeed, sometimes leniency may be simply incapable of achieving a lasting peace. When leniency is likely to fail, restrictive settlements, and especially those that socialize the vanquished state to the postwar order, may help to ensure postwar stability. This, I believe, is no small insight. The problems of victory
will have to be addressed until the problem of war no longer plagues international politics.
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