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Chapter I
Introduction

A. Nature of the Problem

This dissertation focuses on civil-military relations and the use of force in the initiation of war. Its main purpose is to ascertain whether the research findings of Richard Betts in his analysis of U.S. military intervention cases during 1945-75 are applicable to similar cases of war intervention by countries other than the United States. More specifically, this study examines two basic areas of inquiry in five case studies of non-American intervention: (1) the extent to which the civilian and military leadership differ in the degree of aggressiveness each brings to advocating the initiation of war; and (2) the extent to which a military recommendation against war initiation is more likely than one for war initiation to be accepted by the top decision makers.

The generalizability of Betts' findings from the American setting to other countries is a crucial question for students of international relations, especially those of strategic studies in the
United States. This is due to the possibility that "there is a danger that American analysts will overlook the influences of American culture on their mode of analysis. Conclusions may be skewed by idiosyncrasies of American thinking."¹ That is, each actor's behavior in international relations should be understood from its own cultural, ethnic and historical perspective, not just from an American viewpoint.

It is said that we should overcome ethnocentrism in strategic studies.² To this end, this dissertation focuses on the attitudes of civilians and military leaders toward war initiation for the purpose of examining its global applicability. This dissertation is concerned only with war initiation, not with war escalation. The American cases used for comparative purposes have been thoroughly examined in the work of Richard Betts.³ Therefore, the focus of this study is narrowed to the following question: Is the analysis of Richard Betts unique to the American experience or can it be applied to different situations in other countries?

Betts analyzed the role of military advisers in the American foreign policy decision-making process in comparison to civilian advisors, but no one has extended his analysis to civil-military relations in other countries. Therefore, it is the purpose of this dissertation to answer the question, "Are research findings about

American cases valid in the analysis of cases of military interventions by other countries?" In order for research findings to be more generalizable and policy-relevant, it is important to extend the analysis to cases from other countries in order to determine similarities and differences and to analyze the reasons for such conditions.

1) Theoretical Arguments

There are two central views among U.S. scholars about the role of civilian and military strategists in the decision-making process regarding military intervention in other countries or waging a war. The first concerns the relationship between war and politics. This view is related to the Clausewitzian dictum, "war is a continuation of policy by other means," and holds that the civilian strategists should always have control over the military in the process of war, because war is produced by politics. A war is just a means to achieve political objectives, and should be rationally guided by political purposes. Hence, the argument is that civilians dealing with politics, not the military, should make war decisions. Among scholars who argue this viewpoint are Bernard Brodie, Robert Osgood and Henry Kissinger.


The second view focuses on the importance of the military in the initiation of war, a view often made light of by civilian strategists. The latter’s position is that because of the nature of the Cold War and the implications of nuclear weapons, the boundaries between the military and politics have broken down. The sharp distinction between foreign and military policy has been blurred. Civilians perform tasks essentially "military" in nature and the roles of military strategists are indistinguishable from those of civilians.\(^6\) The military view is that it is dangerous to leave war preparation policy only to statesmen. This is contrary to the Clausewitzian dictum emphasizing the concept of traditional apolitical soldiers.\(^7\) In other words, the military hold that they should take part in war initiation decision-making. In addition, the military argues that Clausewitzian ideas even support their argument by drawing the concept of "friction" from the works of Clausewitz. Military operations depend on uncertainties such as intangible variables coming from psychological forces, the continuous interactions with the enemy, and so forth. The concept of friction distinguishes "real" war from "ideal" war, and is inherent in

---

\(^6\) The role of the military is not the same as that of what they used to be. There are inter-service conflicts within the military. See Gene M. Lyons, "The new civil-military relations," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 55 (March 1961), pp. 53-63.

the process of war. The ideal war is searched for by the civilian strategists considering tangible sources such as administration and logistics of war, while the military strategists argue the differences between planning and conducting war. The latter holds that civilians ignore the two dimensions of war that make up the whole of war. Researchers in the military camp includes Bruce Palmer, Jr. and Harry Summers, Jr.

The argument about whether military views should be considered in deciding war initiation needs to be more specific for the development of questions for this dissertation. One side typically blames the other for war initiation, especially when the result would be the loss of a war. It is evident that responsible and effective decision-making requires the influence of the military before war occurs.

For example, the famous civilian strategist, Bernard Brodie, argued that it was such military strategists as two chairmen of the Joint Chiefs, General Maxwell Taylor and Earle Wheeler, who induced President Johnson to participate actively in the Vietnam War. He maintained that the Vietnam War could not have been won, because the U.S. could not obtain an unconditional surrender from the North

---

Vietnamese government such as she had from Japan during World War II. His basic idea of war was:

"The general has indeed been trained or conditioned to want desperately to win, and to be willing to pay any price possible to do so...... However, there also has to be at the top, certainly in the civilian,..... the basic and prevailing conception of what any war existing or impending is really about and what it is attempting to accomplish. This attitude includes necessarily a readiness to continue it or whether it is better to seek some solution or termination other than victory, even if victory in the strictly military sense is judged attainable."\(^{11}\)

In other words, it is against basic Clausewitzian thinking to seek a victory in absolute terms. The underlying assumption of the civilian strategists is that if war is isolated from politics, it seeks idealistic goals such as "unconditional surrender," or "in war there is no substitute for victory" to arrive at the stage of the precondition(s) for peace. These strategists argue that an absolute victory should not be the aim of war, but rather it should be controlled by politics where the war started. Basically, Brodie's view on the nature of the Vietnam War was that it was a conflict among the South Vietnamese; therefore, the military strategies should be limited to achieving this objective in that theater. But the military strategists argued that the Vietcong were supported by the North Vietnamese government and army, which required the extension of the battle fields in Vietnam war.

---

Since different interpretations of the nature of war bring about different prescriptions for it, it is worthwhile to examine how civilians and the military define the nature of war. Especially in the case of the Vietnam War, their views of why it started are completely different, and hence the prescriptions for it differed from each other.

It may be therefore summed up that civilian strategists like Brodie have argued that the U.S. intervention in Vietnam should have searched for such limited aims of warfare as the restoration of the South Vietnamese government. They point out that it was inevitable for the U.S. to fail in the war when she started to attack North Vietnamese territory. The argument is that the failure in the Vietnam War is attributed to the U.S.' being too deeply involved in the war to get out of it, because military considerations dominated politics rather than the reverse. That is, the U.S. in the case of Vietnam War did not follow the idea of Clausewitz in relation to war and politics. As a result, the U.S. should have stopped before she became more deeply involved in it.

The civilian strategists are clear in that they look at the nature of the Vietnam War as a conflict among the South Vietnamese. That is, it was viewed as an essentially political problem, not a military one; therefore, its prescriptions should have focused on solving the political aspects, such as an anti-guerrilla warfare which could provide the South Vietnamese government with security from the
It is said that because the Vietnam War was a revolution, the U.S. should not have neglected the political side of the conflict. They regarded steps taken beyond these procedures as making the Vietnamese situation worse.

It was from the lessons of the Korean War that civilian strategists drew the idea that the U.S. should have been more cautious when she was considering actions to escalate the Vietnam War. In the Korean War, there were also some controversies as to whether the U.S. should have extended the battle beyond the Korean peninsula when the Chinese entered the Korean War. That is, the focus was on the nature of the war aims, either the reunification of the Korean peninsula by the South Korean government (total victory) or the maintenance of the pre-existing status-quo (limited warfare). This argument was well reflected in the Truman-MacArthur debate, which was a typical case in which political and military objectives conflicted with each other. Civilian strategists argue that in such a debate it was inevitable for politics to dominate the military as is shown in the Clausewitzian dictum. They hold that the U.S. should have focused on the restoration of South Korean independence from the start of her intervention in the Korean War, not on the complete destruction of the North Korean government. It was therefore natural that they should have opposed the idea of attacking the Chinese.


Since civilian strategists defined the nature of the Korean War as an attack from the North Korean government supported by the Soviets and the Chinese, they have maintained that its prescriptions should have lain in showing that the U.S. would not tolerate the communists' crossing of the boundaries set up at the end of World War II. After facing direct intervention from the Chinese, the U.S. should have changed her intervention goal to recovering the status-quo in the Korean peninsula, not to destroying the North Korean government, which might have led to producing World War III. The concept of limited warfare was favored by the civilian strategists, while the military stood against it in that the latter were restricted from using every possible means to obtain a victory in war.

Military strategists such as Harry Summers, on the other hand, argued that the civilian strategists had learned the wrong lessons from the Korean War because they had taken from it the idea that the U.S. should not be involved in a land war with China. Summers emphasized that when faced with the Chinese intervention, the U.S. changed the political and military objectives to restore the pre-war status-quo, which meant from the U.S. perspective that the latter's strategy in the Korean War was a success.

In the same manner, he maintained that regardless of threats from the Chinese intervention in Vietnam, the U.S. could have won the war if the military would have been fully supported by the Administration, the Congress and the people, and if the political
objective would have been specified in the right direction. For example, problems concerned with the declaration of war and counter-insurgency strategy were discussed as main mistakes that led to failure in the Vietnam War. More importantly, also related to the above mentioned, is that there was not a clear military objective. The military saw the Vietnam War as a military problem that needed a specific objective to defeat the enemy. In this respect, the military strategists differed from the civilian ones in how they defined the nature of the Vietnam War, bringing about different prescriptions of the situation.

Summers blamed civilian strategists such as Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara for dominating national security policy. The point is that there were no room for the military advisors to suggest advice to the President, which was eventually connected to failure in the Vietnam War. In other words, his argument is that the civilian strategists, from the start of U.S. intervention in the Vietnam War, had no intention to win the war at all. If they had an appropriate political objective relating to intervention, the consequences would have been greatly different.

---


15. Unlike WWII whose objective was an unconditional surrender of Germany, Japan, etc. and the Korean war where the main aim was the restoration of pre-existing status-quo, it was difficult to say why the U.S. intervened in the Vietnam war, because it was a civil war. See George C. Wilson, "Hard-learned lessons in a military laboratory," in Allan R. Millett, ed., *A short history of the Vietnam war* (Bloomington, IN.: Indiana University Press, 1978), pp. 57-9.

From the analysis of civilian and military strategists, some ideas may be drawn as to the role of both strategists in the war process. The military strategists focus on the conduct of war, i.e., how to win the war, which means that once a decision of intervention is made, there should be full support for obtaining victory, however defined. When the war initiation is decided, the decision-makers should allow military considerations to focus on winning the war, because it is the soldiers who conduct the war. The attention of the civilian strategists should focus on the political grounds for the initiation of it.

The main concern of the civilian strategists is the question of why a country starts to intervene in a war rather than the meaning of victory or winning it, and "why" questions should control military considerations at every stage of war process. The civilians argue that the role of military officers is to advise the political leaders about whether the available military capabilities are enough to attain the objective; the final decision to go to war is thus not the soldiers to make. In other words, the adherence of the military to the victory—which is related to the term, "aggressiveness,"--results in civilians' rejection of the viewpoint of soldiers in discussing why to intervene or wage a war. Political objectives that lead to the initiation of war would not necessarily be related to victory.

The conventional wisdom says that the conflict between civilians and the military over each's role in war decision results from the belief that military leaders are basically more hostile than
political ones. It is from this perspective that civilians ignore military strategists when discussing security policy. That is, the term, civilian control over the military, is understood as such by the Clausewitzian school. The military always seeks extremes; therefore, civilians should control the aggressiveness of the military.

Traditional civil-military relations on war initiation assumes that the military rather than civilians has been traditionally considered as being a aggressive entity. In other words, when war initiation or commitment is at stake, it is said that the military has taken a positive attitude toward war, and that once a war decision is made, soldiers have been more aggressive than civilians on extending war, because their goals lie in winning it. The Clausewitzian idea of politics' control over the military results from this assumption that the military is always aggressive, thus aggravating war situations produced by politics.

On this regard, Richard Betts deserves particular attention for his relevance to the traditional view of civil-military strategists, because he provides us with interesting findings that contradict the traditional view of the role of the military in war initiation decision-making. Betts examined the major decisions of the U.S. made since World War II in order to investigate whether the military has been more aggressive than the civilians in escalation decisions, but less so in intervention decisions. He opposed the idea that the military is always aggressive and favors military interventions.

17. For the classic image of militarism that militaries prefer war, see Stephen William Van Evera, Causes of war, Ph. D. Dissertation (University of California, Berkeley, 1984), pp. 206-14.
In addition, he concluded that the military greatly influenced decision-making whenever the Joint Chiefs opposed military interventions, and the influence has been least when they favored intervention. There usually was also differences in recommendations among military leaders. Army chiefs were most cautious, while naval and field commanders were most aggressive.

Betts' analysis of the role of the military demonstrates that we need to go beyond the Clausewitzian dictum that the civilians should control the military in the process of war. That is, the military in the U.S. since 1945 has not always been as aggressive at every stage of the war process as civilians assert, their impacts on security policies have not been so powerful, and there are some variations in the degree of aggressiveness among the military leaders.

Considering Betts' analysis of civil-military leaders on war process, we need to change the traditional concept of civil-military leaders on the war process. At each stage of the war process, civilians and military strategists have different views of military intervention. That is, civilian strategists are usually more aggressive than the military on initiating military intervention, and less so on the expansion of operations.

The important difference between the traditional and Betts' view of civil-military leaders on the war process lies in the fact that civilian and military leaders in Betts' view take different positions on the issue of war initiation from those in the traditional thinking. The military is not more aggressive than civilians. This dissertation focuses on the point of war initiation that gives a clear distinction
between the two types of leaders, not on the position about war conduct on which they agree.

Basically, it is important to understand the civil-military conflicts from the perspective of their emphasis when looking at the war process. The conflicting views of civil-military strategists are attributed to the different perspectives on the process of war.

The military strategists, on the one hand, maintain that because the civilians would not permit the military to take part in discussing problems relating to war conduct as well as to war initiation, the U.S. could not avoid losing the war, even one that she could have otherwise won. On the other hand, civilian strategists try to rely on military perspectives as little as possible when deciding military intervention or even considering the conduct of the war, because they regard the military as focusing too much on victory without considering the fundamental question of why the U.S. intervenes.

2) Basic Hypotheses

A review of the literature on civil-military relations in war initiation shows that most analyses have focused on the United States and on the intervention decision, especially in terms of whether military concerns should be involved. The underlying assumptions of most research lie in the Clausewitzian idea that war is considered as a continuation of policy by other means.

However, as is explained above, Betts' analysis of U.S. intervention cases from 1945 to 1975 challenges this traditional idea
of the war process. In other words, the military was found to be not always so aggressive. Civilians tend to be more aggressive than soldiers on intervention decisions, while the latter is more aggressive than the former on escalation decisions. Also, the military is not always unified when recommending their opinions. Finally, in terms of the impact of the military on decision-making, it has been most powerful when recommending negative advice on war initiation, and least influential when suggesting positive advice on it.\textsuperscript{18}

A limitation of Betts' analysis, however, is that it has not been extended to other countries that have different cultures and regimes. Therefore, this dissertation seeks to examine the validity of Betts' findings when they are extended to cases from other countries. Does Betts' analysis of the attitudes of civil-military strategists on war initiation hold true when applied to other countries? How do they differ in comparison with the United States when initiating military interventions? It is therefore natural for Betts' findings to become hypotheses for this dissertation. Our hypotheses are categorized into two main types: (1) comparative attitudes of civilian and military leaders on war initiation; and (2) the comparative impacts of the military strategists' proposing a positive vs. a negative recommendation for war initiation.

The first major hypothesis is that civilian leaders are more aggressive than their military counterparts in recommending a decision to go to war. This hypothesis concerns the idea that civilians tend not to hesitate to initiate a war if the political goals to be achieved outweigh military costs. Because war is always produced by politics, civilians tend to start a war without reluctance if the politics of the situation demands it. They always understand war initiation from the political perspective, thus making it possible to start a war even if it is not militarily rational.

On the other hand, military leaders hesitate to send soldiers to war, because their considerations come from the military perspective. That is, military strategists tend to be reluctant to initiate war especially if it could lead to a general war, because they rarely consider their military capabilities and the amount of time needed for mobilization as sufficient.

The main focus of military strategists is that once war starts, more efforts should be made to obtain victory by either increasing conventional armaments or even by using nuclear weapons. They argue that it is the best way to destroy the enemy's military capabilities in order to attain victory, because the complete destruction of the enemy's capabilities leads to diminishing the enemy's will to fight. Therefore, military leaders take into consideration their capabilities and need more time to prepare for war, which explains why they are less aggressive when considering the initiation of war.
Another aspect of this first part of our research agenda suggests that if minor interventions are considered, the military strategists become positive toward initiation. If we define "strategy" as decisions about whether force should be used to achieve policy goals, military strategists have only two different opinions, i.e., negative or positive depending on the basis of their estimation of capabilities; for civilians, strategy means more choices than the two extreme situations.\(^{19}\) Therefore, it is not difficult for military strategists to decide to send soldiers in minor interventions where political goals and capabilities are relatively clear to define and stakes are low for both civilians and generals.

Following in the same logic, when there are different estimates of capabilities or when policy goals are assumed to confuse the military, the military advisors are not consistent. This shows that the military strategists are not more aggressive than civilians when intervention decisions are taken into account.

The second major hypothesis deals with the impact of the military's recommendation on decision-making for war initiation. The second hypothesis holds that military leaders are most influential when opposing military intervention and least powerful when advocating it. It implies that top civilian decision makers have a tendency to oppose war initiation even when it might be militarily rational.

It is said that actual decisions to initiate a war are made purely on political grounds by civilians. Military considerations may be, on

the one hand, considered important when they oppose military intervention in that it is soldiers who deal with tactical operations. But their impact is not so crucial. On the other hand, if the military strategists recommend war initiation, it may result in either military intervention or non-intervention depending on the purely political situation. For civilians consider military matters as being already solved. Basically, the military considerations have not had a positive impacts on actual intervention decisions.

B. Previous Studies: War Initiation & Civil-Military Relations

This dissertation compares attitudes and behavior of civilian and military leaders in the U.S. with their counterparts in other countries in situations where they consider war initiation against other country. U.S. attitudes in these situations during 1945-1975 are clearly examined in Betts' analysis. However, his findings are not extended to cases of other countries. In this section, by reviewing the relevant literature, we draw an idea of what scholars have uncovered about civil-military relations in war decision-making. This is important because it shows what my investigation can contribute to this field. Therefore, it is reasonable to start with a general knowledge of war initiation and then of civil-military relations.
Let me begin with the idea of making a distinction between "civilian" and "military". Civilian leaders consist of cabinet members such as the foreign, finance and defense minister. The military leaders are basically generals, especially chiefs of staff, dealing with military operations. The major decision-makers such as prime minister or president are usually considered as top leaders who receive the advice of both civilian and military leaders and who then make a final decision of war initiation. When civilian leaders do not appear clearly in the decision-making loop, top civilian leaders are sometimes considered as civilians.

The study of war initiation has been carried out by many scholars in connection with the causes of war. Waltz provides a useful departure point in various theories of war by explaining the causes of war from three categories: the role of human nature (the individual), the nature and organization of the state (the state), and the nature and organization of international system (the international system). With respect to the first category, some studies argue for the idea that human beings are basically

---

20. It should be noted that we are also faced with conceptual problems in defining who the military and the civilian are as Betts was in his book. Some civilians had military backgrounds before they were chosen at civilian positions. As Allison argued that "where you stand depends on where you sit," those in charge of civilian posts are, in our study, considered as civilians regardless of their military backgrounds. See Graham T. Allison, *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis* (Boston, MA.: Little, Brown, 1971), p. 176.

aggressive, while others stand against it.\textsuperscript{22} It is difficult to explain the occurrence of war only from human nature. The second category maintains that war is caused by the nature of the state itself. For example, Marxists argue that capitalist states are inherently aggressive to obtain raw materials and market, authoritarian governments tend to be more aggressive than democratic ones, and so forth.\textsuperscript{23} The third category emphasizes the nature of the international system on the cause of war. For example, several factors such as balance of power, arms race and so on are considered as playing an important role in causing war.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} For the former, see Konard Lorenz, \textit{On aggression} (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1966) and for the latter, see Margaret Meade, "Warfare is only an invention-not a biological necessity," \textit{Asia} (August 1940).


Considering decision-making of leaders in war initiation, we focus on individuals and governmental organizations to make policies and start with the expected utility concepts used by Bueno de Mesquita who argues that war decision-making is dominated by a single strong leader who is rational, an expected-utility maximizer. He attempts to construct a parsimonious and formalized theory of decisions for war. His proposition is that positive expected utility is a necessary condition for war initiation; if states have negative expected utility they will not go to war.

It should be, however, noted that unlike the rational actor or maximizing theory assuming that decision-making maximize expected utility, there are, in fact, some sources of irrationality in decision making of war initiation. War decisions are not always made on a rational basis by a strong leader. Many perceptual flaws in decision making processes may lead to miscalculations and to war. For example, war occurs when one exaggerates the hostility of the adversary's intentions and makes a decision to act preemptively in order to gain the advantages of striking first as in the 1914 crisis or when one underestimates the hostility of the adversary, thus undermining deterrence as in the case of the U.S. before North Korea.

attacked South Korea in 1950. It can be also argued that the exaggeration and underestimation of the adversary's capabilities may lead to war. The concept of misperception plays an important role in explaining some aspects of war causes, but it is hard to define it.

It should be noted, in addition, that the bureaucratic and organizational level may influence final decisions to go to war, which is in contrast to the concept of rational decision-making. War is not always initiated in a rational sense only by a top leader. Civilian and military leaders have an important influence on war decision making by giving negative or positive advice to a top decision maker. For instance, military organizations prefer offensive doctrines that increase the likelihood of war occurrence. The 1914 case shows that a decisive cause of the war was offensive doctrines. It is not, however, clear whether militaries in fact favor war. Military advice is as cautious as civilian advice when war initiation is decided.

29. Lebow, Between peace and war, p. 90.
Numerous scholars have studied civil-military relations from many perspectives from the earliest days of Western societies. Plato differentiates areas between the guardians and the rulers of the state by arguing that the guardians should be auxiliaries and supporters of the principles of the rulers. His idea is based on the implication that the guardians should always be subservient to the ruler, i.e., the rulers' control over the guardians. Therefore, it would be fair to say that it is Plato who drew the distinction between civilians and the military for the first time in a modern sense.

However, it is from the beginning of a professional military, i.e., since modern military professionalism evolved, that the issue of civil-military relations is considered as a scholarly subject in the field of political science and sociology. Until that time, there had not been much conflict between civilians and the military, because the guardians and the rulers came from the same class and shared the same values. Huntington argues in this regard that the tensions between civilians and the military produced by cleavage between the two give a unique cast to the problems of civil-military relations. Thus, it is important to focus on the term, military professionalism, where conflicts between civilians and the military begin.

---

It is reasonable to start with the works of Huntington, Janowitz and Finer for the analysis of professionalism in terms of civil-military relations. Huntington develops a model that enables both civilian policy-makers and military professionals to understand how each ought to act in order to achieve the most desirable civil-military relationship. He holds that it depends on how to maximize military professionalism by which "objective civilian control" is attained. This term, objective civilian control, is a more realistic and desirable goal when contrasted to "subjective civilian control." The latter is achieved through "civilizing" the military, which leads to an erosion of military professionalism. He opposes the idea of the "politicization" of the military and "militarization" of the civilians. In other words, military men should fully live up to professional ethics, while civilian statesmen ought to respect the professionalism of the military.36

The concept of professionalism, which is characterized as a special type of vocation involving expertise, responsibility and corporateness, is central to Huntington's framework. It is the key to civilians' control over the military. He emphasizes this professionalism as an objective method of control over the military rather than by maximizing civilian authority over it. That is, it is more desirable for civilian control over the military to promote military efficiency rather than to impose civilian values on it.37 The

37. The military ethic looks at human nature as being permanence, irrational, weak, and evil; therefore, it emphasizes the supremacy of society over the individual, and order, hierarchy, and division of function. See Huntington, *Op. cit.*, p. 79.
Huntington thesis is that soldiers should remain apolitical and focus on their own purpose which means success in battle. He argues:

"Politics deals with the goals of state policy... Politics is beyond the scope of military competence, and the participation of military officers in politics undermines their professionalism.... The military officer must remain neutral politically."\(^{38}\)

The assumption in Huntington's idea is that, as Clausewitz asserts, the military is regarded as simply the tool of the civilians controlling state affairs. Although there are some critics of Huntington's argument on the neutrality of military professionalism,\(^{39}\) his main concern is that the best military professional is an apolitical one, focusing on the specifics of military skills, thereby emphasizing the subordination of the military to civilian decision-makers.

By asking a question of why armed services intervene in politics, Finer explains it in terms of the relations between military intervention and the maturity of the political culture where state institutions like the military and legal procedures are respected. He argues that there are civilian matters that the military should not meddle in because there exists a difference between the sphere of the armed services and the rest of the society.\(^{40}\) That is to say, the

---


\(^{40}\) S. E. Finer, *The man on horseback: The role of the military in politics* (New York: Praeger, 1962)
military should be treated as a profession so that their political role is limited to expert advice on strictly military issues.

Unlike the apolitical soldiers school, Janowitz argues that the professionals should develop political and social insights in order to deal with political-military issues and the nature of the international security environment. Janowitz rejects Huntington's theme that the military can achieve its objectives and maintain its professional integrity only if there is a clear-cut distinction between the civilian and military realm. His belief is that the view of soldiers is not monolithic, but basically reflected in two perspectives: the "absolutist" and the "pragmatist." The former is similar to Huntington's apolitical professional trying to apply all means to achieve victory. The latter argues that military men must constrain their use of force, and may become involved in essentially non-military contingencies. The point is that the military profession that has focused on the warrior types or the "heroic leaders" requires the incorporation of new roles, i.e., "military manager" and "military technologist." The new role models show the growing organizational complexity and internal diversity of the military.

His argument is based on the idea that technological development made since World War II brought about two important consequences for civil-military relations. One is the breakdown of the civil-military dichotomy, and the other concerns weakness of force as a useful means to influence international relations. Consequently, the

role of the military has experienced a radical change. That is, the military institution has been civilized by the impact of military technology. In addition, the idea of the garrison state hypothesis by Lasswell also points out the fact that the influence of the military would be expanded in the decision-making process if there are a great threat and insecurity to the state, and that even the world would be dominated by the garrison state. For the threat of war would influence the interests of the military.42

Unlike the schools of Huntington and Janowitz, Sarkesian proposes an equilibrium model on civil-military relations by arguing that the military officers are full-fledged political actors. His idea is that unlike the views of both Huntington and Janowitz, which are based on the premise that the military is a system outside of the existing political-social structure, "the profession is not outside of the political-social system but is in harmonious balance with society."43

The literature review on civil-military relations shows that civilian and military leaders view each other differently. From the civilian perspective, it is ideally desirable to separate the military from civilian sectors because of the uniqueness of the military profession, thereby calling for the military to be neutral and limit itself to recommending advice on military implications on decision.

However, from the military's viewpoint, the distinction between the two has been blurred so that the military is urged to

develop political insights about international security. Additionally, the military interacts its values with the society, and vice versa. The military emphasizes the ignorance of civilians on military implications on security policy. On the other hand, by assuming that military perspectives are always aggressive, civilians focus on political aspects of why war starts rather than military considerations of how to win it. Betts' work is a breakdown of this assumption of civilians, and this dissertation aims at testing Betts' findings.

In sum, it is interesting to note that Huntington and Janowitz focused on American cases, while Finer examined non-American cases, and that no one has yet to study a comparison between American and non-American cases. And the traditional view of civil-military relations assumed that civilians are always less aggressive than military leaders. However, this idea has been challenged by new studies in the field of civil-military relations. Some notable scholars like Betts argue that civilians are not always less aggressive. Civilians are more aggressive in war initiation and less so in war escalation. The next step is to extend Betts' idea into other countries and compare these new views with traditional ones.
Chapter II  
Methodology: Comparative Case Studies

In Chapter I, the literature concerning civilian and the military perspectives on war initiation was reviewed and the question on where this dissertation stands on this field was addressed. From the analysis of the literature review, it may be said that the question to be asked in this dissertation, i.e., whether U.S political-military relations on war initiation are generalizable to other countries, needs to be answered. For the current literature fails to apply U.S theory to cases from other countries, especially on the initiation of war. In order to test this applicability, I have selected such countries as Great Britain from Europe, Israel and Egypt from the Middle East, China from the Communist group, and India from the Third World. For each country one case was selected.

In this chapter, I begin by focusing on the importance of the case method as compared to other methods in studying international relations. Second, I deal with the advantages and disadvantages of case studies, i.e., single or multiple case studies, in order to draw the importance of the comparative case strategy. The main question is:
does the case study method contribute to generalization or theory-
building in international relations? The rationale for the selection of
cases in this dissertation is finally provided by centering on the
question, "why these cases, not others?"

A. Case Studies in the Field of International Relations

In order for the field of political science, including international
relations, to be a genuine "science," most scientific scholars ignored
the value of the historical approach long emphasized by the
traditionalists. By focusing on the empirical method, inductive
reasoning, and the comprehensive testing of deductive hypotheses,
behavioralists tried to obtain a "law" or generalization in political
science, especially in the field of international relations. Their focus
was on a rather large number of case studies rather than a few or
even a single case as done by traditional international relations
scholars.

For example, Singer argues that the traditionalists analyze a
few cases with many variables, while behavioralists study a large
number of cases with a small number of variables.¹ The latter holds
that case studies should contribute to developing a theory or theories
of international relations rather than just describe events. James
Rosenau points out:

¹ J. David Singer, "The behavioral science approach to international
relations: Payoff and prospects," in James N. Rosenau, ed., International
"The fact is that case histories and broad assessments rarely generate further research. If a case writer does not test or derive explicit hypotheses from his materials, others are seldom provoked to apply and extend the comprehension gleaned from them. If the author of the broad assessment does not offer if-then propositions, others are disinclined to pursue the implications of his reasoning in more than a causal fashion. Hence, to repeat, nothing cumulates."  

Rosenau believes that case studies neither test nor yield hypotheses, which leads to difficulty in applying their conclusions to a larger context beyond the specific conditions considered. We thus need a systematic analysis of case histories in order for works of international relations scholars to be cumulative.

However, the attack from behavioralism was not universally accepted, and the behavioralists' view was also attacked by realists and post-behavioralists. The counter-attack from realists is, on the one hand, well reflected in the so-called "Great Debate" between Bull and Kaplan. And the post-behavioralists argue that behavioralism had no moral and normative content.

By focusing on what is, and confining theory to an explanation of it, behavioralism is seen to be devoid of moral content. In addition, while behavioralists have a tendency to work from bottom up, i.e., to make observations and then see if or how they support or reject general propositions, post-behavioralists reject an inductive

---

approach to developing knowledge. Oran Young attacks Bruce Russett on this point.\(^3\) Inductivism holds that if we gather more facts, and obtain strong correlates within the data, we can arrive at knowledge. The critics' argument is that merely accumulating empirical evidence would not provide a basis of explanation.

For example, Waltz says that the inductivists' belief is nothing more than faith. For facts do not speak for themselves just as correlations neither prove causation, nor contain their own explanation.\(^4\) Additionally, Zinnes distinguishes between "additive" and "integrative" cumulation. The former means that one study adds some information to the existing literature on the subject. The latter means that a study ties conceptually and explains a set of research findings; she argues that the mere addition of facts should not be considered cumulation in a theoretical sense. She even criticizes what is called "additive mentality" as an impediment to cumulation in the field of international relations. Integrative cumulation would not take place through the simple process of adding more facts and relations to an existing body.\(^5\) That is, we cannot achieve explanation through the inductive approach. The important point is that data and data collection should not be viewed as ends in themselves and confused with truth itself. The statistical procedures that behavioralists emphasize in analyzing phenomena in international

\(^3\) Oran Young, "Professor Russett: Industrious Tailor to a naked emperor," *World Politics*. Vol 21, no. 3 (1969), pp. 489-93.


relations can reveal the pattern in the data, but such an analysis cannot demonstrate whether the pattern has a theoretical significance if observations are not conditioned by a prior theorizing.

Here, we can acknowledge the utility of a single or a few case studies in that data in case studies can be selected by a sophisticated theoretical scheme. Heclo defines case studies as follows:

"..... the case study in the rigorous sense is meant to be a 'scientific observations', i.e., an observation designed to use selected data rather than merely whatever data is obtained. Such a study is intended to monitor or explicate some larger phenomenon and thus is to be planned under the impetus of theory rather than the excrescent accumulation of whatever data happen to turn up. In an idealized analogue to natural science, political science can then use an extended series of these observations to test the operational deductions from its theoretical hypotheses."^6

Basically, important differences between scholars emphasizing a data base and those stressing prior theory lie in the notion of whether a body of theory could be developed piece by piece, i.e., the parts form a coherent whole. Behavioralists favor it, while the critics are against it. Theoretically, pure inductionism would not go together with pure deductionism in theory-building.

Here, we may find out the importance of case studies in studying international relations in that both approaches can be used at the same time if we rely on case studies. Heclo argues: "Of course, deductive and inductive uses are not mutually exclusive, and a case

study may contain elements of both processes."7 It may be said that case studies sometimes generate hypotheses or are used to test hypotheses or theories. In other words, case studies are used to make up for weaknesses in a statistical approach by showing whether there is an intervening variable between the independent and dependent variable through the intensive analysis of a single case study.8

It may be said that when behavioralism first emerged as an important movement, a single case study as a method in analyzing international relations phenomena was devaluated, but it did not mean that the utility of case studies was degraded.9 Rather, the question focused on which type of case study analysis contributed to more theory development in the field of international relations, a small or large number of cases.

B. Comparative Case Studies and the Quest for Theory

It has already been argued that case studies are, in some sense, more profitable in developing theory in international relations than the statistical analysis of large bodies of data. Furthermore, these studies may overcome the limitations in formal deductive

7. Ibid.
international relations theory based on rationality like deterrence theory by showing empirical generalizations that rely on actual history. In addition, we need to say why comparative case studies rather than any other method are more appropriate to this dissertation.

To begin with, in relation to single-multiple case studies, multiple case studies may deal with the limitations that single case studies have. It is difficult for single case studies to distinguish between "what is unique to the case and what is common to the class of events as a whole," as Lebow argues.¹⁰ This is the basic idea of why we need multiple case studies rather than single ones. Lacking a common theoretical focus, the latter would make little contribution to cumulative theory building in international relations, although they give interesting insights.

But, the counter-attack from the single case school is that the uniqueness of an individual case would be distorted during the process of generalization of many historical cases. However elaborate the generalizations would be, there might be some possibility that they are not genuine causal relations. The question is: how can we make generalizations of historical cases without losing the unique characteristics of each case? George gives an answer to this dilemma:

"... the solution to this apparent impasse is to formulate the idiosyncratic aspects of the explanation for each case in terms of general variable. In this way the "uniqueness of the explanation is recognized but it is described in more general

terms, that is, as a particular value of a general variable that is part of a theoretical framework of independent, intervening, and dependent variables."

The qualities of uniqueness in each case are not lost, as Verba argues, if it is considered as one of a class of such events although it happened only once. That is, even though we lose some information in each case, we can make empirical generalizations of cases if they would not hurt the "validity of the theory and its utility." Simplification would not always mean some loss of unique characteristics in each historical case; rather it helps in theory-development in international relations. Here, we need to identify various types of case studies in studying political science, as Eckstein and Lijphart argue.

---

14. Harry Eckstein, "Case study and theory in political science," in Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby, eds., Handbook of political science, Vol. 7 (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975), pp. 96-123; Arend Lijphart, "Comparative politics and the comparative method," The American Political Science Review, Vol. 65 (September 1971), pp. 691-693. The former divides the types of case studies into five ones, while the latter, into six ones, by using different terminology with similar meanings. Their differences and similarities are well summarized in George, Op. cit., p. 66:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eckstein</th>
<th>Lijphart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Configurative-ideographic&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Atheoretical&quot; case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Disciplined-configurative&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Interpretative&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Heuristic&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Hypotheses-generating&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Plausibility probe&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Theory-confirming&quot; or &quot;Deviant&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Crucial case&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Theory-infirming&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Skeptic&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Positive case&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first type is the "configurative-ideographic" or "atheoretical" case study where researchers focus on a particular individual, institution, or event in great detail without paying little attention to theory-building. This is a classic type of case study.

Secondly, there is the "disciplined-configurative" or "interpretative" study that emphasizes a common research framework or available general hypotheses to examine many different cases. This is different from the idiosyncratic study in that cases are studied from general theoretical concepts.

The third type is the "heuristic" or "hypotheses-generating" case study in which more emphasis is put on developing or refining questions, puzzles, and hypotheses, i.e., "discerning important general problems and possible theoretical solutions." This is more than the disciplined-configurative study in that the former tests and refines a general law based on the latter.

The fourth type is the "plausibility probe" study where "the investigator employs a case study at a preliminary stage of inquiry before he is ready to undertake a more rigorous testing of general hypotheses." By using this study, researchers judge whether some hypotheses deserve rigorous testing.

The fifth type is the "crucial case" or "theory-confirming or infirming" study where a single case study could confirm or invalidate a theory if it is carefully chosen and properly carried out. In addition, Eckstein notes that such a case "must closely fit a theory

---

16. Ibid., p. 52.
if one is to have confidence in the theory's validity, or, conversely, must not fit equally well any rule contrary to that proposed.\textsuperscript{17} However, it is not easy for one case to confirm or disconfirm a theory that has been set up through the analysis of a large number of cases. It may be said that such a study could strengthen or weaken a proposition marginally.\textsuperscript{18}

Finally, there is the "deviant" case study in which researchers make a theoretical contribution by showing some relevant additional variables that were not considered previously, and thereby modifying the original proposition.

From studying various types of case studies, we may find out the importance of single case studies in theory-development in international relations as was shown in the deviant case study. It has great theoretical value. If cases are considered as deviant ones, they may help in refining some already set-up hypotheses by uncovering variables that were hidden. Additionally, disciplined-configurative case studies are profitable for this dissertation, because we have several hypotheses emerging from U.S. cases that can be applied to cases from other countries. Basically, from the various types of case studies, we will focus on disciplined-configurative and crucial case studies in this dissertation, because we will look at cases from a set of questions to see the differences and similarities. Each case is seen

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 118.
as if it were a deviant case to see if there are some neglected factors, and then we modify or refine our original propositions.

This is why we need a comparative case study methodology developed by George and Smoke, called a "structured, focused comparison" of cases. It is called structured because the data collection and their analysis are conditioned by general questions, and focused because it analyzes only certain aspects of historical cases.

The methodology of comparative case studies also makes up for the limitations of formal deductive theory in international relations. For example, deterrence theory is criticized by case analysts. George and Smoke argue that the abstract theory of deterrence fails to see the complexity in actual cases: "... it must be recognized that prudent and successful application of deterrence strategy to real-life situations is highly problematic without a clear grasp of precisely those complexities which deterrence theory simplifies or ignores."

The basic difference between case studies and deductive methodology in international relations lies in which aspects are focused on more, deductive power or historical concreteness. However, in order for any research to be policy-relevant, its idea should be based on empirical reality. The studies should be worked on from the bottom up. That is, we should make observations and

then see how they support or reject the general propositions. International relations theory should be drawn inductively rather than deductively if it would suggest some implications to policy-makers. Simplification is not always good enough.

By using structured-focused comparisons, the comparative case school develops contingent empirical generalizations that are derived empirically from many historical cases under certain specified conditions. It would be reasonable, from the analysis of single-multiple cases and relations between deductive methodology and case studies, for this dissertation to use the comparative case study method, especially structured, focused comparisons as its methodology.

C. The Selection of Cases

In order for the method of structured, focused comparisons to be effective and persuasive, it is important to choose appropriate cases directly dealing with the research objectives of this dissertation. More specifically, the main objective of this dissertation is to examine whether American attitudes of civilian and military leaders towards war initiation, as documented in the work of Richard Betts, are extendable to other countries' cases. In order for these comparisons to be more clear and specific, some criteria by which to select cases are needed among the many cases of war initiation during 1945-75.
First, we consider cases of war that involved conventional warfare between units of the regular armed forces, and therefore we exclude unconventional wars where one side uses irregular units and guerrilla tactics such as Indonesia-Malaysia, 1963-1965, internal or civil wars like civil war in Congo, 1960 and colonial wars like French-Morocco, 1952-1956. Second, we select cases that involved major armed conflicts with global security implications that might have caused major powers such as the United States and the Soviets to intervene in the crisis. Minor cases like the El Salvador-Honduras conflict (1969) are excluded. Third, only war initiation cases are considered. Thus, such topics as war termination and escalation are not the focus of this study. Additionally, the focus is placed only on a war initiated by a country, not a counter-attacked war and the like, because "the cases must all be instances of the same class or universe; one must not mix apples, oranges, and pears." Accordingly, such cases in which it is not clear to determine which side started the war, such as the Indo-Pakistani War of 1965, are excluded. Fourth, we deal with cases in which there existed conflicts between civilians and the military in dealing with war initiation, without which it would be undesirable or useless to compare U.S. cases with other countries' ones. Finally, we focuses on the accessibility of data for the cases. Although the cases may satisfy the former criteria, it is essential to obtain data by which we can analyze and compare cases. Basically, it is not the major concern of this study.

22. George, "Case studies........," p. 55.
to analyze the attitudes of civilians and the military from the perspective of different regime types.

To begin, the dissertation concerns countries from the communist world, Europe, the Middle East, and the Third World. Each category has its own characteristics of attitudes between civilians and the military on war initiation, which may be helpful in reassessing, refining and remodifying Betts' original findings.

There are five cases of military intervention that meet the criteria mentioned above: 1) China and the Korean War, 1950; 2) Britain and the Suez Crisis, 1956; 3) Israel and the Six-Day War, 1967; 4) India and Indo-Pakistan War, 1971; and 5) Egypt and the Ramadan War, 1973.

In each case, two basic hypotheses are examined: (1) are civilians more aggressive than military leaders when deciding war initiation? and (2) are the military leaders most influential on war initiation when recommending negative advice or least powerful when recommending positive advice? Each case is examined as if it were a deviant case.
Chapter III
China and the Korean War, 1950

A. The Background

According to George and Smoke on the Chinese intervention in Korea, it is said that ".... it led to war only because of misperceptions, miscalculations, and inept actions. It is sobering to reflect that the Chinese-American military confrontation in Korea was one which neither side wanted and both tried to avoid."1 If this is the case, we need to examine a fundamental question such to why the Chinese leaders decided to intervene in the Korean War although they did not prefer to do so. Many studies on the Chinese intervention in Korea have focused on this question.2 It should be noted, however, that not much relative attention has been paid to the topic of civil-military relations in the Chinese decision-making: who are responsible for the

2. The important major works are Allen S. Whiting, China crosses the Yalu: The decision to enter the Korean war (New York: MacMillan, 1960), and George and Smoke, Op. cit., pp. 184-234.
decision to intervene, civilians or military leaders? Accordingly, we need to answer some other questions, such as what attitudes did civilian and military leaders in China take toward war decisions? And to what extent did the military leaders have an impact on the decision?

The events that led to the Chinese intervention in the Korean War are well known. It is therefore enough to make a brief summary of it. When the war occurred on 25 June 1950, the U.S. response to North Korean aggression was surprisingly swift. On the same date, the U.N. guided by the U.S. called for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of the North Korean forces back to the 38th Parallel. From the start of the crisis, the actions by the North were perceived as a Soviet move with global implications by the U.S. Therefore, President Truman decided to send ground troops to join the sea and air forces already dispatched to support South Korea on 30 June, along with the dispatch of U.S. naval forces to the Formosa Strait to prevent a Chinese attack against Taiwan on 27 June.

At the initial stage of the crisis, the main concern for the Chinese leaders was the presence of the U.S. Seventh Fleet stationed in the Strait, not the development of events in the Korean peninsula. They blamed the U.S. for planning an attack against China.

---

3. A lot of scholars have been studying on the origins of the Korean war. For the well summarized review of literature, see Philip West, "Interpreting the Korean war," American Historical Review, Vol. 94, no. 1 (Feb., 1989), pp. 80-96.
In the meantime, the North Korean army continued to achieve its victories on the battlefield, even though the U.S./U.N. forces along with the South Korean troops resisted. The latter were finally forced to withdraw to the Pusan perimeter around the southeast extremity of the Korean peninsula by the end of July. But North Korea could not achieve its war objective to reunify the whole peninsula. Naturally, the resistance of the South Korean army supported strongly by the U.S. made it difficult for the North Koreans to get a quick and easy victory. Since then, there was a strategic deadlock between them, and events began to change in favor of the South by mid-August. The belief that North Korea would not succeed reached its peak when General MacArthur made a successful landing at Inchon, the port nearest Seoul, on 15 September 1950 and recaptured Seoul on 28 September. It was about this time that MacArthur obtained permission to extend the U.S. war objective to include the occupation of North Korea. The war aim of the U.S. changed from defending South Korea to overrunning the North and reunifying the Korean peninsula.

During this period, Chinese leaders not only made diplomatic efforts to prevent the U.S. from crossing into North Korea, but their military preparedness in Manchuria assumed the worst. Severe conflicts among the Chinese leaders had risen as to whether to intervene in the Korean War at the cost of economic rehabilitation and national reunification with Taiwan and Tibet.

---
The crossing of the 38th parallel was a critical moment for Washington because U.S. leaders were continuously receiving strong warnings from Peking that if the U.S. crossed it, the Chinese would intervene. However, the South Korean army crossed the 38th parallel on 1 October followed by the U.S. troops. It was about this time that the Chinese decided to intervene in the Korean War. Despite the fact that most of the Chinese leaders opposed it, Mao made a final decision of intervention in early October. The actual limited preemptive attack was carried out on late October.

B. Civilians, Military Leaders and War Decisions

During more than three months, late June-early October, the Chinese leaders continuously considered to fight the United States. For especially as the North Korean army retreated, Chinese security was increasingly threatened. The Chinese leaders were seriously considering whether to fight the U.S. even under a situation where it would be difficult for the Chinese to obtain victory.

We divide the whole duration into three parts on the basis of the extent to which the Chinese leaders perceived their security threatened. The first stage is the period of low threat when the North Koreans continued offensive operations to a deadlock (Late June-late July). At the second stage of medium threat (from late July to mid-

7. "... he (Mao) had paced up and down in his room for three days and nights before he came to the decision." Chow Ching-Wen, *Ten years of storm: The true story of the communist regime in china* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), p. 117.
September), the Chinese leaders worried about the fact that it became evident that North Korea would not unify the Korean peninsula and the U.S. would be offensive. The third stage covers the period when the North Korean forces were in full retreat and the U.S. had just crossed the 38th parallel. This is the stage of high threat where the Chinese leaders were seriously considering its entrance into the war and made that decision.

1) The first stage: a "low threat" period (late June-late July)

During the period when the North Korean army continued offensive operations successfully even though it did not complete the occupation of the whole Korean peninsula, the Chinese reaction was to consider the Korean problem as a civil war, which meant an avoidance of any intervention from foreign countries. The basic assumption was that Chinese security was not threatened as there was an increasing possibility that North Korea would succeed in fulfilling its war objective. This, in turn, made it possible for the Chinese leaders to focus on problems of attacking and unifying Taiwan. The only concern for them was that the U.S. sent its naval forces to the Taiwan Strait. It might not only delay the plan of a Chinese invasion of Taiwan, but it could make it possible for Taiwan with U.S. help to attack the mainland. The question was whether to aid Korea or to adhere to the policy of invading Taiwan.

The news of the occurrence of the Korean War was a surprise to the Chinese leaders, because they did not know the exact date of
it, and thus they failed to be prepared for it. Some evidence suggests that the Chinese leaders did not play a role in planning the initiation of the Korean War, even though Mao had been consulted in advance. First, there was a large demobilization of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) in early 1950. Second, there was not even a Chinese embassy in North Korea at the time when war occurred. And third, only a small number of soldiers were stationed around the Yalu River for the purpose of crop production, while major forces were preparing for the invasion of Taiwan.⁸

Accordingly, the initial response of the Chinese leaders was to give only moral support to Kim Il-Sung, and it could not be expected that the Chinese would send troops to Korea as the Korean situation became favorable to the North. But things changed on June 27 when Truman not only ordered American air and naval support to South Korea, but also dispatched the Seventh Fleet between the Chinese mainland and Taiwan to neutralize the Formosa Strait. On the basis that "Taiwan is part of China," Chinese leaders blamed the U.S. for "armed aggression against the territory of China in total violation of the United Nations Charter," according to Zhou Enlai's statement of June 28.⁹

Although Chinese leaders severely criticized the U.S. action in the Taiwan Strait, they were less interested in the Korean situation at

---


the early stage of the war. They referred to the Korean War as a "civil war" or "war of national liberation", which meant that the Korean people would decide the future of it. Thus, their responses were not extended beyond sympathy and moral support to North Korea.

As the U.S. decided to make a direct commitment to South Korea by sending ground troops to Korea, the Chinese began to prepare diplomatically and militarily. On the one hand, in mid-July, when India made a proposal that China would be invited to the U.N. as a part of move toward a settlement of the Korean War, China welcomed it.\(^{10}\) On the other hand, on 7 July when the U.N. Force Command was set up, Mao ordered troop redeployments from the south of China to the north.\(^ {11}\) The military reinforcement implied a change of strategy that the invasion of Taiwan would be delayed until the war ended, because it would bring about the PLA's reduction opposite Taiwan. The Korean War affected policy priorities in China, but the change was at a minimal level during the time when the Chinese security was not threatened.

In sum, it might be said that during the period when North Korea had still been dominating the Korean peninsula despite the fact that the U.S. had intervened in the war, the Chinese leaders did not consider the Korean situation seriously. They focused on invading Taiwan to unify China. The Korean question was a secondary


consideration to them. The attention to the Korean War was caused by the presence of the U.S. naval forces in the Taiwan Strait resulting from war itself. As the U.S. intervened in the war, it was certain that it would not be easy for North Korea to obtain victory, although the North Korean forces were still dominant over the Korean peninsula except in the extreme southeast area. They began to be interested in a diplomatic settlement through the U.N., along with the military preparedness for the worst case. The strategy priority changed from the Taiwan problem to the Korean question. For they had acknowledged the fact that North Korea would not obtain an easy victory as long as the U.S. entered the war. They had to send troops from the south to the north to prepare for the worst. This military movement showed that the objective of unifying China would be delayed. Some conflicts among civilian and military leaders in China occurred concerning on which side priority should be given, to invade Taiwan or to aid Korea. The two objectives were not compatible; one would sacrifice the other. It should be noted, however, that the military reinforcement was not substantial. It was too early for the Chinese leaders to change the policy priorities due to the Korean War, because North Korea still dominated the South. But it was certain that the Chinese leaders viewed the Korean War differently as soon as the U.S. entered it.
2) The second stage: A "medium threat" period (early Aug.-mid Sep.)

The Chinese began to worry about the Korean War as the situation became unfavorable to North Korea from the beginning of early August to mid-September. During this period, it was almost certain that North Korea would not achieve its objective of unifying the Korea peninsula, although there were not major counterattacks from the U.S. with the South Korean army. The battlefields were still staying in the south of the Korean peninsula, but North Korea's supply lines were extended and bombed by the superior U.S. air forces, while the South Korean army and the U.S. forces were regrouped and reinforced in manpower.

Faced with this stage of the shifting balance of military power, the Chinese leaders began to worry about developments in Korea. For North Korea, victory was a slim hope and defeat was an obvious possibility. For the Chinese leaders, there remained two alternatives. One was a direct military intervention in Korea, which could guarantee victory for North Korea, and the other was to seek a political settlement of the war. With respect to the first choice, the risks were considered too high at this stage without pursuing the second alternative.

12. Warren Austin, US delegate to the Security Council, stated on 10 August that the goal of UN action was to unify Korea and confirmed it on 17 August by saying that the U.S. would achieve total victory over the North Korea. See Whiting, *Op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.
The diplomatic measures to end the war had been originally taken by the Soviet Union when Jacob Malik, Soviet delegate to the U.N., returned to the Security Council to propose on 4 August that all foreign troops be withdrawn from Korea, because the Korean War was an internal civil war. Malik even warned that the war should stop at once by saying that any continuation of the Korean war would result in a widening of the conflict. However, Soviet efforts at the U.N. had been proven unsuccessful.15

As a Soviet diplomatic solution to the Korean War failed and the balance of military power on the battlefield became unfavorable to North Korea, the Chinese leaders played a more active role in searching for a diplomatic settlement. In a message on 20 August to the U.N. Security Council, Zhou Enlai expressed the view that "Since Korea is China's neighbor, the Chinese people cannot but be especially concerned about the solution of the Korean question, which must and can be settled peacefully."16 This is the first time that the Chinese leaders considered the Korean War as a pressing external concern, which also implied that they became less interested in the Taiwan question. The idea of the U.S. aim of total victory brought about the Chinese response that they had to act diplomatically to prevent the war from being extended to China before it was too late.

Along with diplomatic steps taken, the Chinese leaders made military preparations for the worst. Mao ordered the reinforcement of troops around the Yalu River when he heard the assessment of

General Deng Hua, the commander of the Northeastern Frontier Defence Army (NFDA), the predecessor to the Chinese People's Volunteers (CPV), of the developments in Korea; the North Korea army was in danger because its supply lines were extended so long to the south with the rear undefended that the U.S. might attack an amphibious landing near Seoul or Pyongyang. It should be noted that Mao was preparing for war against the U.S., even though the latter was still in a defensive position at this stage.

In sum, it might be said that the Chinese leaders began to worry about the possibility that the Korean War would be extended to China, as Soviet diplomatic efforts to end the war proved a failure and there was a slim chance of North Korea's victory. The Korean question replaced the Taiwan problem. The real concern for the Chinese leaders was not about whether to aid Korea by ignoring Taiwan, but how to aid North Korea so as to block the extension of the Korean War into China. They not only tried to settle the war diplomatically via the U.N., but they also prepared militarily for the worst case by reinforcing the troops in northeastern China.

3) The third stage: A "high threat" period (late Sep.-early Oct.)

From mid-September when General MacArthur made an amphibious landing at Inchon to early October when the U.S. decided

---

to cross the 38th Parallel to the North, the Chinese leaders seriously considered whether to send troops to Korea. It became evident that if the U.S. crossed the 38th parallel, it would reach the Yalu River without being challenged by the North Korean army in retreat, and then the possibility would be high that the U.S. would go ahead toward the Chinese mainland.

Accordingly, it was extremely important to the Chinese leaders whether the U.S. would seek a total victory over North Korea. The crossing of the 38th parallel was the crucial indicator of the real intention of the U.S. If it happened, there would be no other alternative but to challenge the U.S. directly. Thus, every diplomatic effort had been made to prevent or deter the U.S. crossing.

The diplomatic means had been accomplished through verbal warnings that if the U.S. crossed the 38th parallel, it would be challenged by Chinese military intervention. The first warning came on 25 September when General Nie Jung-chen, acting PLA Chief of Staff, mentioned through Panikkar, the Indian ambassador to the U.N., that "China would not sit back with folded hands and let the Americans come to the border."\(^1^9\) Another warning came from Zhou Enlai on 30 September when he said that "The Chinese people....will not supinely tolerate seeing their neighbors being savagely invaded by the imperialists," and Zhou specified the warning by saying

officially on 2 October that if the U.S. troops entered North Korea, China would intervene in the war.\textsuperscript{20}

The warnings failed to deter the U.S. crossing of the 38th parallel for several reasons.\textsuperscript{21} It should be noted, however, that military preparations had been ordered along with these diplomatic steps.

In sum, it might be said that the Chinese leaders considered war initiation more seriously as the security threat was perceived to be increasingly high. When it was low, Chinese leaders did not consider developments in Korea seriously. When it was medium, they tried to resolve the Korean War through diplomatic measures. And finally, as Chinese security was highly threatened, Chinese leaders made a decision to use military force.

C. Civilians, Military Leaders and Aggressiveness

The decision to enter the war was the most difficult one for the Chinese leaders since the new regime was established in 1949. They had to fight a war against a state as powerful as the United States. Furthermore, they had to decide whether to intervene before it was too late. The decision was not unanimous, and the pros and cons of it were expressed before it was finally decided on 7 October. The most


important factors concerning the Chinese were the Taiwan question and economic rehabilitation that had to be sacrificed if the decision was made to enter a war that they had little hope of winning.

1) Civilian and military leaders on the use of force

The first stage (late June-late July) is characterized by the relative indifference of the Chinese leaders to the Korean War. Although diplomatic and military measures were taken to deter further U.S. escalation, they were basically designed to show that the Chinese leaders were less interested in the Korean War than in the Taiwan Strait. Because North Korea still had a chance to win the war, they did not want to sacrifice the invasion of Taiwan by sending troops to Korea. Diplomatically, they tried to settle the war through the U.N., although they were not as active as the Soviet Union, and they prepared militarily for the worst case by redeploying the troops in the south to the north. The military movement was not large-scale; it stayed at a minimum level.

The transfer of the southern troops to Manchuria brought about a delay in the plan of attacking and reunifying Taiwan. It is therefore assumed that some military leaders in the south opposed the military regrouping on the basis of the idea that China should not give up the invasion of Taiwan under the situation where North Korea was still dominant over the peninsula, even though the U.S. intervened in the war.\(^{22}\) However, Mao believed that as long as the

U.S. entered the war, the Taiwan question could not be resolved until the war ended with North Korea's victory and thereby the U.S. was withdrawn from the Formosa Strait.\textsuperscript{23}

Considering the North Korea's victory on the battlefield and the Chinese objective of invading Taiwan, we might say that civilians and military leaders were basically opposed to entering the Korean War. At this stage of the war, there was no indication that civilian and military leaders favored the use of force to deal with the Korean War. Naturally, more efforts had been put on finding a political settlement of the war rather than a military one. And even the diplomatic steps taken were not active. Civilians like Zhou considered the Korean War as a civil war, in which the Chinese did not need to intervene, and tried to solve the Korean problem via the U.N.

Some explanations could be given. The first is that despite the U.S. intervention, the North Korean army achieved overwhelming victory except in the extreme south of the peninsula. The second is the fear that the Chinese should fight against the U.N., especially the powerful U.S., and the third is that the primary focus of the Chinese leaders had been, since the birth of the PRC, on occupying Taiwan.

At the second stage of war (early August-mid September), the Chinese leaders perceived the threat as relatively high as it became evident that North Korea would not succeed. Things changed surrounding the balance of military power in Korea. The Chinese seriously considered whether to enter the war, which meant that the Korean question would replace the Taiwan one.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
Civilian leaders continued a negotiated settlement of the war to inform the U.S. that the total war should not be its goal. They had to play a more active role in comparison with the previous stage, because Soviet efforts to end the war failed in the U.N. and the balance of power in Korean was not favorable to North Korea, and eventually to China. They argued that the Chinese delegate should be permitted to participate in the discussion of the Korean problem in the U.N. Security Council, all U.N. military operations should be halted and all foreign troops should be withdrawn.

On the other hand, military leaders had different approaches to dealing with the changing situation in Korea. With respect to Mao's order to intensify the military reinforcement in Manchuria for a possible fight against the U.S., disagreements among military leaders came from three points: from a pure militaristic perspective, postponing the Taiwan invasion and a possibility of U.S. use of nuclear weapons.

First, some generals like Nie Rongzhen, acting chief of the PLA General Staff, and Zhu De, the PLA commander in chief, favored military preparations for possible combat in Korea by ordering some selected PLA units in early August to prepare for war within one month. Others like Ye Jianying, the PLA's master strategist, opposed Mao's decision because of the time that it would take to move Chinese soldiers into Korea. General Ye Jianying recommended at least four months to move a sizable army into Korea, while Mao
thought that three weeks would be enough.24 Mao had already given the order to prepare for war by the end of September.25 In other words, the opposition came from the purely military perspective that they would not recommend to fight without assurance of victory. The possible enemy was the U.S. and they needed more time to prepare for it.

Secondly, a serious question was raised about entering the Korean War by General Su Yu, commander-designate of the proposed Taiwan invasion force. His idea was that as long as the U.S. threat to China was not so serious or direct, China should not intervene in the conflict but should stick to its original position to attack Taiwan. His words on General Nie's assessment that China should not ignore the developing threat to China caused by the Korean War were: "What threat? How serious is it?.... The only information is that the [North] Koreans are falling behind schedule."26

Thirdly, it was pointed out that China should not fight a war against the U.S. because of the latter's possessing atomic weapons. On this point, some generals like He Long worried about the use of atomic weapons by the United States in Korea if China entered the war, but the idea was rejected. Mao intensified the contingency plan for intervention in Korea under the assumption that it was a slim possibility because the U.S. no longer enjoyed a monopoly on nuclear

weapons. On the chance of the U.S. using nuclear weapons, General Nie responded to General Ho Long:

"They might use it. But remember that the United States no longer enjoys an atomic monopoly. The Soviet Union completed its first test explosion less than a year ago. So they may be less eager to use it nowadays." 27

Most generals opposed the idea of intervening in the war against the powerful nuclear armed U.S. because of the extremely limited possibility of victory. Two major exceptions were General Nie and Zhu who accepted Mao's decision to intervene in the Korean War. Even though the PLA capability was, as most generals asserted, militarily inferior to the U.S. capability to wage a war, Mao's decision was made on the political ground that, as Zhu De mentioned, "when the lips are destroyed, the teeth feel cold." 28

The third stage (mid September-early October) shows that Chinese security was highly threatened and it was quite clear that North Korea would be defeated. Unless the U.S. stopped at the 38th parallel, the U.S. would approach the Yalu River without difficulty. After the Inchon landing of 15 September followed by the recapture of Seoul with a high possibility of crossing the parallel, the Chinese leaders were forced to decide urgently whether to intervene in Korea. Mao was very eager to intervene early, but he was confronted with opposition from both civilian and military sectors.

27. Ibid., p. 62.
28. This classic Chinese saying means that if the U.S. assault North Korea ("the lips") successfully, China ("the teeth") would be defenseless. Ibid.
The main concern of civilian leaders came from the economic perspective that the war against the U.S. was a less urgent problem than economic construction in China, because it was an early stage of the birth of P.R.C. They argued that the top priority should be put on economic rehabilitation rather than on the war, because it would extremely damage the Chinese domestic economy to finance the war effort in Korea. Civilian leaders, especially those in charge of economic matters, mainly followed this view. For instance, Chen Yun, Minister of Finance, argued that "to fight the war of resistance against the Americans and to continue with economic construction was absolute incompatible." 29

Some military leaders like Liu Po-ch'en, Commander of the Second Field Army during the civil war, placed the primacy of Taiwan question above the Korean problem. 30 Throughout the periods of threat, this view had been continuously favored by some leaders, even after the U.S. approached the 38th parallel. They argued that for China the major threat came from Taiwan, not from Korea, since China was a newly liberated regime with the remnants of KMT still threatening the local government. 31 If China went to war against the U.S., it would divert resources originally committed to the invasion of Taiwan, which would indefinitely delay the latter operation.

The most powerful opposition came from the majority of military leaders like Gao Gang and Lin Biao who asserted that with the weak military capability, China should not send troops to Korea. They were basically pessimistic about the possibility of winning a war against the U.S.

In short, as Chinese security became increasingly threatened, both civilian and military leaders were seriously concerned about the possible war with the U.S., but the majority of them opposed intervention. Civilians were against it for economic reasons, while military leaders put top priority on invading Taiwan and hesitated to enter the war against a country as powerful as the U.S. because of the difficulty of winning it. Mao and some top military leaders favored military intervention for political reasons even though he agreed with the economic and military perspectives. Mao's words were: "... it would be shameful for us to stand by seeing our neighbors in perilous danger without offering any help.... if China stood by when North Korea was in peril; then the Soviet Union could also stand by when China was in peril; and internationalism would be empty talk." 33

2) The military influence on war decisions

The Chinese intervention in the Korean War was mainly decided by Mao himself, and both civilians and military leaders had not much impact on the war decisions. Throughout the crisis, a series of war decisions consisted of three parts: the movement of the southern troops to Manchuria, the reinforcement and intensification of them and the final decision to enter the war. Along with these military steps, a series of diplomatic measures were taken: a passive role in ending the war, an active participation in the U.N. discussion with warnings not to seek total victory over North Korea and a final decision to enter the war with the failure of strong warnings against crossing the parallel. It shows that as Chinese security was increasingly threatened, so were diplomatic and military preparations intensified.

First, some military leaders opposed the transfer of some southern troops to the north, because it would bring about the weakness of military power devoted to the invasion of Taiwan. Mao's decision was based on the idea that the Taiwan question was tied to the Korean problem, and that without solving the latter, the former could not be resolved. The military opposition was at a minimum level, because there was not a large-scale movement of troops, and the situation in Korea was not so unfavorable to North Korea, even though there was a slim chance to win the war, that the actual use of the Chinese troops to fight the U.S. was not predicted at that time.
Second, the decision to make a massive reinforcement of troops in Manchuria was clearly opposed by military leaders, because it assumed the actual use of military force in Korea as the Korean situation further deteriorated with the change of the U.S. into an offensive position. The military leaders were against intervention. Because of the superiority of the U.S. to China from the view of military capacity, the Chinese military leaders strongly opposed it, but their advice were not accepted. Instead, top military men like chief of PLA General Staff and the Commander in Chief favored intervention on political grounds that China should aid North Korea even with no military capacity to confront the U.S. Therefore, a small number of top military leaders predominated over the other generals on the decision to reinforce the forces around the Yalu River.

The final decision to enter the war was seriously challenged by most of the military leaders, because it was different from previous decisions in the sense that the latter was just preparation for possible combat, although it was large-scale, while the former was not a preparation but an actual sending of troops to Korea. The military leaders not only failed to change Mao's mind but they were even persuaded by him.\(^\text{34}\)

In sum, the impact of military leaders on the decision to go to war was basically minimal. They were worried about possible war against the U.S. Their opposition started from the assumption that China could not obtain a military victory. At each stage of the decision, there appeared to be disagreements between most of

military leaders, on the one hand, and Mao supported by a small number of top military men on the other. But the final decision was made by Mao, not by military leaders. Mao wanted intervention for political reasons, while military leaders hesitated to use force to settle the Korean War even where China's security was highly threatened. As long as military leaders were not certain of military victory in case of war, they would not recommend the use of force.

IV. Conclusion: Some Comparisons with Betts' Idea

The Chinese intervention case suggests that the Chinese leaders dealt with the Korean War in an incremental way; as China security was threatened increasingly, so were its preparations intensified in the same way. First, a low threat to China produced a minimum level of diplomatic and military preparation; second, a medium threat brought about an active role in the U.N. with intensified military preparations around the Yalu River; and, third, the decision to enter the war was finally made as the threat became high.

However, a series of war decisions were not made smoothly or unanimously by the Chinese leaders, especially in terms of civil-military attitudes toward the initiation of war. The decisions were severely confronted with opposition from civilian and military leaders. Broadly speaking, there were three perspectives among civilian and military leaders opposing intervention. The first was concerned that the Taiwan problem would be placed aside if China entered the Korean War; the second considered the incompetence of
the Chinese military capacity to fight against the U.S.; and the third focused on economic rehabilitation that would be devastated if China intervened in Korea. The first two concerns belonged mainly to military leaders, while the third was taken into consideration by civilian leaders.

With respect to Betts' idea that civilian leaders tend to be more aggressive on war initiation than military leaders, it might be said that China had different patterns in the case of its Korean War intervention. Most military leaders except the top military men like the Chief of Staff hesitated to suggest sending troops to Korea. Their main concern was the unpreparedness of the military to confront a country as powerful as the U.S., thus failing to guarantee the Chinese military victory. On the other hand, Zhou's diplomatic efforts assumed a political settlement of the war, not a military solution. A limited number of sources available demonstrated that civilian leaders also opposed the use of force for economic reasons related to the possible collapse of the Chinese economy if it entered the war.

Among military leaders, the top military decision-makers favored intervention as Mao asserted from the early stage of war. They not only agreed with Mao's political considerations that favored entering the war, but they also helped in persuading other military leaders to accept Mao's position.

On the issue of the military influence on war decisions, there were differences in views among military leaders. Top military men like the chief of staff and commander in chief favored intervention, while other generals opposed it. As long as Mao wanted to aid North
Korea for political reasons, there remained little that military leaders could do except accept his idea. In general, military leaders could express their views on intervention decisions, but it depended on Mao himself on whether they were accepted. In the case of the Korean War, the advice of military leaders was not influential.

There are some unique aspects of the Chinese case. First, most of the military leaders opposed the intervention decision throughout the crisis, even though China's security was highly threatened. Second, some top military men complied with Mao's decision and persuaded other generals to follow it. Third, the impact of military leaders on the decision to intervene was minimal because they disagreed with Mao. Fourth, civilian leaders were also negative on the use of force for economic reasons, and diplomatic efforts such as warnings not to cross the 38th parallel were useless when the U.S. disregarded them. Overall, as Mao controlled virtually every sector in China, the advice of civilian and military leaders was rejected and their impact was minimal as long as they disagreed with Mao.
Chapter IV
Britain and the Suez Crisis, 1956

A. The Background

British armed forces, along with French and Israeli forces, attacked Egypt in late November 1956. The final decision to intervene militarily in Egypt was not unanimously held among British leaders. Since Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal on 26 July 1956, the Eden government had heatedly debated whether to use military force to resolve the crisis. Some argued for it, while others stood against it.

The background of the Suez crisis has been studied by many scholars.1 Here, this chapter briefly summarizes the crisis.

---

When Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal was announced on 26 July 1956, the initial reaction of the British government was to strike Egypt immediately by military action to force it to give up the Canal. However, the Eden government had to engage in a series of negotiations, because military preparedness of the British army was not ready to fight and also because the U.S. opposed it. With respect to the latter reason, President Eisenhower stated that "We are of the earnest opinion that the maximum number of maritime nations affected by the Nasser action should be consulted quickly....."  

The Eden government accepted a U.S. proposal for the convening of a maritime conference of canal users on 1 August 1956 under the condition that British force would be used if negotiations failed within a measurable time. The conference, held between 16 and 23 August 1956 in London, was designed to create an "international authority" to ensure freedom of passage. It aimed at gaining a diplomatic victory for the maritime nations, who demanded Nasser's retreat from the Canal and wanted to make Nasser lose face. The 18 nations present of a total of 22 users agreed that the canal should be run by an international body and that it should not be closed for political reasons. If Nasser refused to accept this view, they would refuse to recognize the nationalization, withhold their dues payment, and refer the matter to the U.N. Security Council.

2. For the background of nationalization, see, for example, David, Carlton, Britain & the Suez crisis (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988), pp. 23-34.
Nasser did not accept these proposals and on 6 September 1956 he imposed the sovereignty of the Egyptian government on the Canal. He also observed that the U.S. did not back up its own resolution. The U.S. clearly opposed any military action or even a reference of the matter to the Security Council at this stage because the commitment of American troops to any military act would damage Eisenhower's re-election as President in November 1956. The U.S. strategy focused on delaying the immediate use of force at this stage. At any rate, the idea of the British government to use force did not win world opinion, even among a majority of the 24 nations invited to the conference.

Another diplomatic step taken by the British government was to accept Secretary of State Dulles' SCUA (the Suez Canal Users' Association) proposal or the Users' Club plan. Dulles recommended to the British on 4 September the convening of another international conference in London. The British needed the cooperation from the U.S. and world opinion who considered that it was too early to use force. Eighteen nations, including the U.S., met between 19 and 21 September in London under the premise that the Egyptians could not run the Canal themselves. The primary British strategy was to demand that Egypt accept other proposals such as, on the basis of


members' rights under the Convention of 1888, the SCUA might hire pilots, collect dues, and deal with Cairo on any disputed matters and refer this matter to the Security Council if Nasser would not accept them.

However, the U.S. repeated again that it would not use a threat of force to compel Nasser to cooperate, even if he ignored the SCUA plan. This provided Nasser with the immunity to reject the plan. Dulles said on 13 September that "We do not intend to shoot our way through. It may be that we have the right to do so, but we don't intend to do it as far as the United States concerned."7 Later, he attacked colonialism by the European powers and reinforced the U.S. independent role in the Suez crisis by stating on 2 October that "There is talk of teeth being pulled out of the plan, but I know of no teeth; there were no teeth in it, so far as I am aware."8 Considering that the SCUA plan was actually created and denied by the U.S. itself, the British concluded that it was another U.S. strategy to delay British military action against Egypt.

As the result of the conference showed, the Eden government found it difficult to obtain U.S. cooperation for using force against Egypt or even to refer the matter to the U.N. Security Council, the only options. If there could not be any peaceful solution by the Security Council, the British government thought it permissible to rely on force as an alternative. On 14 October, six principles were unanimously approved at the Security Council, but the second half of

the resolution, which called on Egypt to conform to them, was vetoed by the Russians.\textsuperscript{9} The eventual use of force without the strong support of the U.S. and the Russians required the nations concerned to begin detailed negotiations later in October, which meant another delay on the use of force.

With this kind of diplomatic solution, the Eden government could not solve the Suez crisis. Eden was doubtful of continuing to seek a negotiated settlement. The U.S. would not exercise any real pressure on Egypt. Thus, from the British perspective, another way to deal with this matter should be sought.

In the meantime, the French, who were eager to launch an attack against Egypt, made the proposal that if Israel would attack Egypt and move toward the Suez Canal, the British and French would then ask for a withdrawal of both sides from the Canal.\textsuperscript{10} In this case, if Nasser refused to accept this offer, the Anglo-French troops would start a war with Egypt under the assumption that he would not accept it, because he would not lose face.\textsuperscript{11}

The Eden government accepted the secret plan that: (1) on 29 October 1956, Israeli forces would launch an attack on Egypt, (2) the British and French would issue an ultimatum on the following day,

\textsuperscript{9} The six principles were: 1) Free and open passage through the Canal; 2) respect for Egyptian sovereignty; 3) its insulation from the politics of one country; 4) SCUA and Egypt to fix tolls; 5) allocation of a fair proportion of the dues to development; and 6) arbitration in any disputes between the Suez canal Company and the Egyptian government. See Richard Lamb, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 206.


\textsuperscript{11} Eden was thinking about a straightforward war by involving Israel even early in October when Dulles refused to cooperate the SCUA plan with the British government. See Carlton, \textit{Anthony Eden}, pp. 427-8.
and (3) Anglo-French troops would intervene in the Suez Canal.\textsuperscript{12} And the British military intervention against Egypt started as planned.

B. Civilians, military Leaders and War Decisions

The British decision to intervene in the Suez crisis was made on political and military grounds. Politically, Eden was looking for a pretext for war after diplomatic efforts proved ineffective. Militarily, the preparedness had been completed by mid-September. The whole duration (26 July 1956-29 October 1956) can be divided into three parts on the basis of the security threat to the British. The first period (26 July-2 August) was a low threat period with a high possibility of regaining the Canal company diplomatically or militarily. The second period (3 August-15 September) was a medium threat period when diplomacy might recover the British influence in the Suez Canal. The third period (16 September-29 October) was a high threat period in which diplomatic steps proved futile with only the military option left.

1) The first stage: A "low threat" period (late July-early Aug.)

This period was characterized by Eden's determination to use military force to solve the problem of Nasser's nationalization. When the British received the news of the nationalization, the initial

response of Eden was to attack Egypt immediately and he ordered military leaders to prepare for an early strike. Eden's immediate reaction was that military action should be used to force Nasser to give up the Canal. Eden stated in a telegram on 27 July 1956, the day following Nasser's announcement of the nationalization, that "My colleagues and I are convinced that we must be ready, in the last resort, to use force to bring Nasser to his sense." The British government basically favored a quick use of force against Nasser.

On the other hand, military leaders argued, when instructed to assess military options, that because of its military unpreparedness, it would take several weeks to attack Egypt. They insisted that the attack should be delayed in order that adequate preparations could be made. They needed more time to complete military preparedness; the military troops should be trained on the basis of adequately well-planned operations before being dispatched to Egypt. It was in this context that they mentioned the lesson of the failure of the Arnhem operation in September 1944.

The initial military assessment of an operation in the crisis appeared in the plan for 'Action against Egypt' that the Chiefs of Staff submitted to Eden on 1 August 1956. It said: "We wish to emphasize that the parachutists and assault forces must not be committed to operations inadequately trained. We consider that time must be allowed in the programme for adequate rehearsal for amphibious

---

and airborne assault forces."\textsuperscript{15} For military leaders, there existed no plan of a quick attack on Egypt at the early stage.

The negative advice of military leaders on the immediate use of force and the U.S. attitude that force should not be used first before all other alternatives were exhausted suggested that the first priority should be diplomatic negotiations. The Eden government had to choose diplomacy rather than war.

In short, although Eden favored a quick strike against Egypt to solve the problem of Nasser's nationalization, he was faced with the strong opposition of the British military and the United States. Accordingly, he had to start a diplomatic campaign by accepting the U.S. proposal of a maritime conference in early August. The underlying assumptions of Eden were that the U.S. did not exclude the possibility of war and also that military leaders would accept the eventual use of force if military preparedness was completed prior to war.

2) The second stage: A "medium threat" period (mid Aug.-mid Sep.)

This period was characterized by the eventual failure of British diplomatic efforts and the completion of the military plan to attack Egypt. During the period from the maritime conference to the SCUA proposal, the U.S. intention to delay military action was revealed by a series of conferences and the British gave up its diplomatic strategy in order to adopt the military plan.

Military leaders tried to set up a specific plan for invading Egypt after the initial stage. Their major dilemma was what the political objective would be: to destroy the Nasser government or to occupy the Suez Canal. If the former was the objective of invading Egypt, it would be better to land at Alexandria. If the latter was the goal, a landing at Port Said would be a better choice. It should be noted that Alexandria was more suitable than Port Said from the strategic and tactical point of view.

Accordingly, it was not surprising that the military plan, which was called "Musketeer," focused on landing at Alexandria and was submitted and approved by Eden on 10 August 1956. The military operation aimed at occupying the Suez Canal through the Cairo area after seizing the port and airfield. The earliest feasible date of attack was 15 September. But the invasion was postponed to 19 September, and later to 26 September, because it took more time to see whether the proposals of the London conference (16-22 August) would be accepted by the Egyptian government.

However, there was a change from "Musketeer" to "Musketeer Revised" during the first half of September, which meant that the landing place would be Port Said instead of Alexandria. The main reasons were political, not military, but the military motives had a

---

17. Alexandria was, from the military perspective, more favorable because it provided the best landing beaches and the shortest way to Cairo; while, Port Said was like a cork in a bottle with shallow beaches and much further than Alexandria from Malta and Cyprus. See James, *Op. cit.*, p. 487.
decisive impact on the change. Those focusing on the political side thought (1) that the landing at Alexandria would be considered as an act of aggression against Egypt by world opinion, and (2) that the landing at Port Said would reduce the civilian casualties.\textsuperscript{19}

But the new military recommendations suggested that the original plan was postponed so many times that the Egyptian army would be ready for it.\textsuperscript{20} The new military plan made the date of invasion feasible up to the end of October. The "Musketeer Revised," aimed at neutralizing the Egyptian Air Force and occupying the canal zone, even though military leaders worried about what would happen after the new plan was carried out.\textsuperscript{21} It is interesting that the military plans were ready except for the date of invasion, even before the convening of the SCUA conference in London.

In short, it might be said that Eden tried to resolve the crisis by diplomatic steps, which proved ineffective, while military leaders completed military plans to invade Egypt and waited for Eden's order to attack. But, as the diplomatic campaign continued, the military plan, especially the date of the invasion, changed.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 135; and Carlton, Anthony Eden, pp. 420-21.

\textsuperscript{20} Although Lloyd and Carlton mentioned above argued that political side had a major influence in changing the "Musketeer," it would be reasonable to think that it was caused by the military perspective in terms that the new plan was initiated by the Chiefs of Staff, because they estimated the chances of winning the war would be low after 26 September. See Lamb, \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. 212-13.

3) The third stage: A "high threat" period (late Sep.-late Oct.)

As the diplomatic campaign proved fruitless, the only alternative left for the British government was to go directly to war. Eden needed a pretext for war and planned to use the Israeli forces for it.

The new military plan also experienced a major variation when the French government made a proposal for a Franco-Israeli attack on Egypt. The offer was that Israel should be persuaded to attack Egypt, and then Britain and France would ask the two sides to withdraw from the Canal. If the Egyptians refused, the Anglo-French forces would invade Egypt to control the Canal.

This proposal provided Eden with a good excuse for starting a war against Egypt. Negotiations proceeded until Britain signed the treaty with France and Israel at the meeting of Sevres on 24 October 1956. Finally, Britain had a chance to use force against Egypt on 31 October.

In short, it might be said that the British government had specific military plans in mind even when it focused on a series of diplomatic solutions such as a maritime conference and the SCUA plan. The Eden government waited for the military preparedness to be completed. After the military was ready to attack Egypt, it wanted to show world opinion, especially the U.S., that the British

---

22. The summary of provisions were: 1) Israel would launch a strong attack against Egypt to reach the Canal zone on 29 October; 2) On 30 October, Britain and France would ask the two countries for withdrawal from the Canal; 3) If Egypt failed to accept it, the attack would be launched on 31 October by the Anglo-Franco forces, and ..... See Fullick and Powell, Op. cit., p. 85.
government had tried to do its best to secure a peaceful settlement on the Suez crisis at the same time that it began to involve itself in military intervention in the crisis.

C. Civilians, Military Leaders and Aggressiveness

The decision to intervene in the Suez crisis was not made unanimously. Before reaching the decision, the Eden government experienced serious debates between civilian and military leaders on whether to go to war. Some argued for a war against Egypt while others favored political resolution to the crisis.

1) Civilian and military leaders on the use of force

When Nasser announced the nationalization of the Canal on 26 July 1956, the Chiefs of Staff were instructed to assess military options. On the following day the Cabinet meeting agreed that "our essential interests in this area must, if necessary, be safeguarded by military action and that the necessary preparations to this end must be made."23 The Chiefs of Staff, led by the Chairman, Sir William Dickson, did not favor the quick use of force, maintaining that an attack against Egypt would take time and would be an amphibious assault, and therefore they could not do anything immediately. Politicians might have favored swift and decisive action against

Egypt, but the military refused because their concern was for their soldiers' lives at stake.\textsuperscript{24}

Eden accepted the military recommendation to wait until the military preparedness was completed, and thus agreed reluctantly with the U.S. proposal for convening the London conference under the assumption that the eventual use of force was not ruled out.

In the meantime, the military produced its plan for invading Egypt in order to regain control of the Canal. The Eden government approved the "Musketeer" plan on 10 August 1956 in which the Chiefs of Staff recommended landing at Alexandria rather than at Port Said. The military thought it inevitable for a war to occur in the foreseeable future.

From the start of the crisis, MacMillan, Chancellor of the Exchequer, favored the use of force from a political viewpoint. He connected the Suez matter to the future of British influence in the Middle East, and said that if Nasser were not challenged and checked in a swift way, the whole British position in the area would be undermined.\textsuperscript{25}

However, Richard Powell, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Defense, expressed the idea that such a massive invasion would produce opposition from world opinion as well as from inside Britain.\textsuperscript{26} The criticism did not stop here. Walter Monckton, Minister of Defense, attacked Eden for pressing the Cabinet to approve the

\textsuperscript{24} James, \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. 489-90.

\textsuperscript{25} Carlton, \textit{Britain & the Suez crisis}, p. 136.

\textsuperscript{26} This is expressed in Clark's diary on 13 August, 1956. See William Clark, \textit{From three worlds: Memoirs} (London: Sidwich & Jackson, 1986), p. 173.
immediate use of force in the Cabinet meeting on 28 August.

Opinions about the use of force were divided:

"..... the Cabinet should weigh the disadvantages of using force... Our action would be condemned by a substantial body of public opinion in countries overseas.... Within the United Kingdom itself opinion would be divided..... Moreover once we had sent military forces into Egypt it would not be easy to extricate them."\(^{27}\)

Among the civilian leaders, Sewlyn Lloyd, Foreign Secretary, agreed with the idea of Monckton that the use of force should be the last resort after all other methods were first exhausted.\(^{28}\) However, most of civilian leaders basically favored an early use of force to resolve the crisis. Those who favored military intervention were MacMillan, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Salisbury, Lord President of the Council, and Home, Commonwealth Secretary.\(^{29}\) Eden was also determined to use force on the political grounds that any delay of the military operations could encourage Nasser and increase the difficulties of any military action. In short, those favoring military intervention argued that there would be no alternative to the solution to the crisis. MacMillan especially expressed a strong view in

---


economic terms when he observed that without the oil from the Middle East, Britain and the whole Europe would not survive.\textsuperscript{30}

Some disagreements among the British Cabinet members continued during the diplomatic campaign. The SCUA plan proposed by the U.S. divided opinion within the Cabinet. Most civilian leaders continued to favor a quick use of military force by considering the SCUA plan as a means towards the ultimate use of force. On the other hand, Monckton, Defense Minister, argued that with effective international pressure, the Nasser regime might be overthrown, and that any premature use of force especially without the U.S. support would be against public opinion both outside and inside the British.\textsuperscript{31}

In the meanwhile, a series of negotiations did not succeed, and finally the Suez matter was sent to the U.N. where the Soviet veto and the insufficient support of the U.S. made the Eden government search for the tripartite conspiracy. MacMillan still opposed a negotiated settlement of the crisis by saying in late September that it might delay awhile to discuss the matter at the U.N., because the U.S. was clearly against the war at that time, and that it would make the whole economic structure collapse without using force.\textsuperscript{32}

As diplomatic steps proved ineffective, the Eden government was eager to use force and accepted the French proposal that if a war broke out between Israel and Egypt, Britain and France would ask both countries to withdraw from the Canal. And if Nasser refused,

they would intervene militarily in the Suez crisis. It provided the Eden government with a pretext for initiating a war against Egypt.

However, Eden's idea of the conspiracy faced opposition from Lloyd and the Foreign Office in that Israel might attack Jordan as well as or instead of Egypt, which would destroy British relations with the Arab countries. But Lloyd agreed with Eden that quick action should be taken to check Nasser under the condition that Israel would not attack Jordan. Military operations should not aim at occupying all of Egypt or setting up a pro-western regime in Cairo supported by the British troops, but should focus on regaining control of the Canal itself, which would be sufficient for Nasser's defeat.33 Because of the possibility, even if limited, that the British might be involved in a war against Israel, not against Egypt, should Israel attack Jordan, it is understandable that the Chiefs of Staff were also worried about the conspiracy.34

Other criticism of the conspiracy between France and Israel came from Butler and Monckton at the Cabinet meeting of 18 October where Butler was somewhat different from Lloyd in criticizing the tripartite conspiracy. The former favored a "straight bash" rather than an indirect strategy by holding that the conspiracy plan should end up with the internationalization of the Suez Canal, which would not meet the objective of the British government. Monckton made strong and severe reservations on this point. However, the plan was

not endorsed unanimously, but was approved at the Cabinet meeting of 18 October 1956.35

From the beginning of Nasser's nationalization, the Eden government wanted to use military force to regain control of the Canal, broadly speaking, to stop the weakening of British power in the Middle East. Its major concern was to obtain U.S. support in resorting to force, but the U.S. continued to urge the British to accept a series of international conferences, which were conceived as delaying the time to attack by the British politicians. Finally, the Eden government found a pretext of using force, even though it was indirect, by joining the tripartite conspiracy with France and Israel. It was revealed that most civilians attending Cabinet meetings favored the use of force against Egypt throughout these periods; the exceptions would be Monckton, Defense Minister, and Lloyd, Foreign Minister, who favored the negotiating process until they later agreed to the conspiracy plan.

The military leaders did not favor a quick attack on Egypt at the initial stage of the crisis because the military preparedness was not completed for invading Egypt, and recommended the postponement of attack until the British forces were ready to fight. They needed more time to prepare for it.

35 MacMillan, who favored military intervention from the start, was so eager to invade Egypt that he was even worried about that there would be no political justification for intervention, if Israel and Egypt should accept the ultimatum. See James, Op. cit., pp. 536-37.
2) The military influence on war decisions

Although Eden favored a quick military action against Egypt, he accepted the recommendations of Chiefs of Staff to wait until they were ready. In addition, when the military suggested the "Musketeer" operation, he did not oppose it, although the plan was produced from the military point of view. Gen. Hugh Stockwell, later Supreme Commander in the Suez Campaign, submitted a proposal that the military prepare a plan involving a landing at Alexandria rather than at Port Said with the date of attack on 15 September. Alexandria was chosen from the military perspective. Eden rejected it on the basis that "... the Canal was the political objective; a landing at Alexandria would be too indirect an approach and difficult to justify politically." However, there remained, for Eden, no alternative but to accept the military advice and the Eden government approved it on 10 August.

And later, the "Musketeer" plan was finally abandoned after the date of attack was postponed, and replaced by the "Musketeer Revised" plan in which the landing place was decided at Port Said. The Chiefs of Staff said that if the attack occurred up to 26 September, the "Musketeer" plan would have every chance of success, but after that, the chances would become worse. The change of military plan was made on purely military grounds that the primary factor in the military plan was how to win the war. Eden

had to accept the advice of Chiefs of Staff, even though he was angry about the rejection of the Alexandria plan. It showed the superiority of the military perspective on planning the military operations. The Cabinet meeting accepted the "Musketeer Revised" on 10 September.

The military plans were set up from the military perspective, which focused on how to win the war. Civilian leaders accepted them, but they did not put them into practice, and the plan was repeatedly delayed and finally abandoned with the rise of the tripartite conspiracy. The military advice played a secondary, not major, role in the British intervention decision. Military leaders did not urge civilian leaders to use force, and they just suggested the best feasible plan to regain control of the Canal. It depended upon civilian leaders whether the recommended military plan was implemented. Instead, the civilian leaders respected the military plan itself, but it did not control the civilian leaders on whether or how to fight.

D. Conclusion: Some Comparisons with Betts' Idea

Betts' findings in the U.S. cases showed that civilians were more aggressive than soldiers in intervention decisions. More specifically, it is said that with respect to the attitudes of the military on war initiation, they are reluctant to send soldiers, while civilians tend to hesitate less to initiate a war. When it comes to the impact of the

military on decisions of war initiation, they are most influential when opposing military intervention, but least powerful when asserting it.

The analysis of the Suez crisis of 1956 shows that the British military leaders opposed sending soldiers to Egypt when Nasser announced the nationalization of the Canal. Most civilian leaders wanted a quick attack on Egypt to regain the Canal. But the military wanted more time to complete the military preparedness, which showed the pure military perspective. Most civilians favored the use of force and accepted the proposal of the military. This meant that the military leadership was not more aggressive than civilians in sending soldiers, and that when the military opposed the use of force, they were powerful in shaping the decision. This is very similar to the U.S. cases that Betts studied.

Next, it should be noted that the "Musketeer" and "Musketeer Revised" operations were approved without any modifications by civilian leadership, but they were not implemented by politicians because of political reasons. This showed that even though the war plans were produced by the military, an actual war initiation was made by civilians on the basis of political considerations. The date of the attack was determined by civilians; thus the military had to revise the original plan repeatedly. It might be said that in comparison with the U.S. cases, when the British military was positive on war initiation, such as setting up complete military plans, they were not accepted as planned because the war decision was made on political grounds, not on military views. Accordingly, the military was less influential in intervention decision. We cannot find
out any fundamental difference between Betts' analysis and the British Suez crisis.

It is also interesting to note that on the one hand, among those civilians against the use of force, it is a common idea that the use of force should be the last resort after exhausting every other means available. In the Suez crisis, those opposing the use of force, such as Lloyd and Monckton, were not the same in that the Foreign Minister worried, from the political viewpoint, about the idea that the Arab world would stand in favor of Nasser, should a war occur with the help of the Israeli forces. On the other hand, the Defense Minister focused on the military perspective of the difficulties in the way in which the British troops would be maintained or pulled out after intervention. We can thus show two types of civilian viewpoints in favor of the use of force. One favors the limited use of force in that the objective is just to occupy the Canal, while the other emphasizes destroying Nasser's regime before occupying the Canal.

The military always served the civilian leadership except at the early stage of the crisis when they opposed the swift use of force against Nasser. Since then, they proposed the "Musketeer" plan, postponed the date of invasion again and again according to developments in the diplomatic campaign, and finally replaced it with the "Musketeer Revised" operation. They did not play a major role in the intervention decision and urged the Eden government to accept their plans.

The Suez crisis is a typical case of civilians' control over the military. On the one hand, the civilians' major concern in the crisis
was whether force would be used. One group focused on a quick use of force, while others urged negotiations with the use of force as the last resort. Civilians cared little about specific military plans, time schedules, etc. On the other hand, the military suggested the plans of how to win the war in case the civilians decided upon military intervention, with little concern of why the British should rely on the use of force in the Suez crisis.
Chapter V
Israel and the Six-Day War, 1967

A. The Background

Civilian and military leaders in Israel had not been unanimous in favor of the decision to go to war against Egypt at the initial stage when President Nasser challenged Israeli security in May 1967. There were serious conflicts of opinions among them. Some argued for the initiation of war, while others opposed it until the war decision was finally made on 4 June 1967. Their views were not consistent throughout the crisis in terms of aggressiveness on the use of military force. This 1967 case provides us with a situation where the Betts' idea can be tested. Furthermore, the military is not as consistent as the civilians. The aggressiveness of the military or civilian leaders can be broken down as the intensity of the threat became higher.
The Six-Day War has been, from various perspectives, studied by many scholars. Here we need to summarize briefly the background of the war. It is difficult to pinpoint any one event that made hostilities inevitable. I begin with the point that the approaching of Egyptian troops in the Sinai started the process of escalation and it continued until the final decision of the Israeli government was made to attack Egypt on 4 June 1967.

Before 14 May 1967 when Nasser began sending a large contingent of Egyptian troops to the Sinai peninsula, the years 1957 to 1966 had been a period of relative calm even though minor incidents had occurred. This peaceful period was due to the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) along with the withdrawal of Israel's troops from the Straits of Tiran, Gaza and Sharm el-Sheikh. Since 1957, the UNEF had been a buffer between Egypt and Israel.

On 18 May, Nasser asked the UN Secretary-General to remove the UNEF, which meant the possibility of direct confrontation between the two countries, and it was promptly accepted. The

---


Israeli government was surprised at Nasser's action and ordered a limited mobilization of reserves, but it was not considered serious at that moment.

Another more crucial event, which became the direct cause of the Six-Day War, occurred on 23 May when Nasser announced the closure of the Straits of Tiran to Israeli ships and any ships carrying strategic goods to Israel. This blockade was supported and acclaimed by the Arab world, while it was perceived as a de-facto declaration of war by the Israelis. Within the Israeli government, some argued for an immediate use of force, while others insisted on relying on diplomacy to solve the problem. It was finally decided to rely on diplomatic means before taking any military action. Therefore, Israel appealed for help from the Western powers to assure that they would guarantee the freedom of passage for the Israeli ships. Abba Eban, the Israeli Foreign Minister, flew to Paris, London and Washington where he was confronted with the idea that even though these Western Powers were sympathetic, they did not want to become involved and thus opposed the use of military force by Israel.

Diplomacy failed in lifting the blockade. Eshkol, Prime Minister, was forced to take a more belligerent measure. However, the external pressure from major powers, especially the U.S., not to start a war played an important role in delaying the decision to use force. Nothing was decided at the 28 May meeting where the Israeli Cabinet were divided on the issue of whether to go war. The votes
were equally divided, nine to nine, but Eshkol, the Prime Minister, refused to use his tie-breaker vote as Premier.

The inactivity of the Eshkol government and the growing threat from the Arab world intensified the argument to appoint General Dayan as Minister of Defense, which happened on 1 June. After the closure of the Straits, Nasser became more aggressive by asserting on 26 May that the Gulf of Aqaba was only part of the major problem. Furthermore, Egypt signed military agreements with both Syria and Jordan on 30 May. The signing of the UAR-Jordan Defense Agreement in which Egypt would control Jordan's armed forces was a great surprise to the Israelis. Israel was finally encircled. In this situation of great tension, a new national government was formed where an immediate war against Egypt was finally favored at the 4 June meeting. In the early morning of 5 June, the war began by the Israelis' launching air strikes on Egyptian air bases and continued until 11 June when Israel, Egypt and Jordan accepted a cease-fire, suggested by the U.N.

B. Civilians, Military Leaders and War Decisions

During the crisis, from 14 May to 4 June, Israeli civilian and military leaders considered seriously whether it was desirable to go to war against Egypt as the former's security was increasingly threatened. In order to determine the attitudes of civilian and military leaders on the use of military force, we need to divide the whole duration of the crisis into three parts on the basis of the extent
to which Israel was aware that its security was threatened. The first stage was a low degree of security threat when Nasser approached the Sinai before closing the Straits. The Israeli decision makers simply waited further development (17 May-22 May, the "low threat" period). The second stage showed a medium degree of threat during the period of diplomacy resulting from the closure of the Straits. Endeavors to solve the crisis by diplomatic measures were more powerful than the pressures to initiate a war for the duration (23 May-28 May, the "medium threat" period). During the third stage Israel experienced a high level of threat, because it not only failed to obtain international cooperation from the Western powers but it also had to fight three fronts if war occurred. Israel had no choice but to resort to war (29 May-4 June, the "high threat" period.)

1) The first stage: A "low threat" period (17 May-22 May)

From 17 May when the UNEF was withdrawn from the buffer zone between two countries to 22 May when the Straits were still open to Israeli shipping, civilian and military leaders did not consider the situation seriously. When receiving the news that the Egyptians had approached the Sinai, Israeli decision makers thought that it was designed to deter Israel's attack against Syria. Israeli-Syrian relations worsened after six Syrian air planes were destroyed by the Israel Air Force in April. Tensions on the border of the two countries sharply increased in early May when the Syrians blamed Israel for preparing an attack against Syria. Egypt was urged to deter
or defend Syria by the Soviets, while Israel expressed no designs of such an attack.

It was therefore perceived by the Israelis that the Egyptian action was designed to show politically, not militarily, the Egyptian willingness to join the Syrian side in case of war. It was for this reason that the Israelis considered the Egyptian action less seriously. Even more, Egypt was not in a situation to attack Israel. This assessment that the Egyptians were only interested in deterring the Israeli threat to Syria came from the military leaders. They believed that since the Egyptian forces were heavily committed in Yemen, it was impossible to wage a war against Israel. Rabin, the Chief of Staff, argued that with limited capabilities, the Egyptians would likely not attack, but that precautionary steps such as a limited mobilization should be taken.

On the other hand, civilian leaders were worried about unintentional escalation through miscalculation. They showed through various diplomatic channels that the Israelis had no intention of attacking Egypt or Syria, but they approved a limited mobilization recommended by the military leaders. Civilians leaders pointed out the escalating consequences that this mobilization could bring about; principally it might aggravate the situation. The delicate situation surrounding the mobilization is well explained in Rabin's words:

"We had to act to the military moves in Egypt, both to protect our security and keep up our deterrent posture. Had we failed to react-giving the Egyptians the impression that we were
either unaware of their moves or complacent about them—we might be inviting attack on grounds of vulnerability. On the other hand, an overreaction on our part might nourish the Arab’s fears that we had aggressive intentions and thus provoke a totally unwanted war.\textsuperscript{3}

However, Rabin urged Eshkol to mobilize reserves by recommending that Israel should prepare for an aggravated situation, that is, for the possibility that Nasser would not stop there but would increase Egyptian military power in Sinai. The acceptance of mobilization, even if partial, showed that Israeli security was considered more important than the political costs for Israel at that moment by the decision makers.

At the initial stage of crisis, the military leaders were more influential than their civilian counterparts. Civilian and military leaders did have in common the belief that the Egyptian intent was deterrence rather than offense. The information about the situation was provided mainly by the military. However, with the rapid withdrawal of the UNEF and the transfer of troops from Yemen, the Egyptians increased the likelihood of an attack. Israeli military leaders needed more time to complete an adequate defense and demanded that Israel request a meeting of the U.N. Security Council to earn additional time.\textsuperscript{4}

But at that time the military leaders were still not certain of the Egyptian intent. They suggested four options as Egypt’s purpose: (1) only to deter Israel’s attack against Syria; (2) to provoke Israel to

\textsuperscript{3} Yitzhak Rabin, \textit{The Rabin memoirs} (Boston, Mass: little, Brown, 1979), p. 53.

initiate a war; (3) to initiate an immediate surprise attack; and (4) to cause a long period of tension. Although the Egyptians had an uncertain objective, in the eyes of the Israelis, the military leaders paid significant attention to the increase of capabilities for an attack. They finally recommended a large-scale mobilization of reserves along with a preparation of a plan for a preemptive strike into Sinai. On the other hand, civilian leaders thought that it was still possible to avoid a war through diplomatic measures because the concentration of Egyptian troops in the Sinai did not mean the actual blockade of the Straits. Eban, the Foreign Secretary, said:

"The decisive question, of course, was whether Nasser would actually blockade the Straits of Tiran.... If the blockade was imposed, Israel would be challenged to defend or abandon a vital national interest.... And a blockade in the Straits and in the Gulf of Aqaba, unlike the troop concentrations, would take us to a point of no return. Troop movements, after all, could be ordered and later dispersed without loss of face or implication of retreat. But, if a blockade was imposed, its cancellation was inconceivable except under pressure or threat of physical force."

The Foreign Minister attempted to restrain Nasser through various international pressures, especially via the Soviet delegation by saying that "There will be no war unless the Egyptians attack our territory or violate our rights of free navigation." He emphasized that he was not aggravating Nasser to close the Straits. The important

---

5. Ibid., p. 147.
point for civilian leaders was that Israel should be careful not to escalate and thereby aggravate the situation. But Egypt ordered total mobilization of reserves and closed the Straits on 23 May.

It is interesting to note that at this early stage both civilian and military leaders did not want Israel to go to war, but their prescriptions to deal with the situation were different. Civilian leaders focused on showing Egypt via the U.N. and the Soviet Union that Israel had no intention to attack Syria, because Egypt's intention was perceived as deterring Israel from fighting Syria. They tried not to escalate the situation by responding to it militarily. Military leaders wanted at least to demonstrate Israel's military determination by calling up reserves, even though the Egyptian objective was not deemed offensive.

Throughout the first stage, there were some conflicts between civilian and military leaders on the way in which to prevent the situation from escalating. The former opposed any military measures because it might stimulate Nasser to take more offensive action even though he did not want to do so, while the latter favored doing at least something militarily rather than nothing in order to prevent escalation even though they agreed with the idea that any Israeli military action might produce the Egyptian response.

2) The second stage: A "medium threat" period (23 May-28 May)

This period (23-28 May) is characterized by Cabinet decisions to rely on diplomatic rather than military means to solve the crisis.
Heated debates continued among civilian and military leaders on whether to go to war, even though an official decision was made to wait and see the views of the Western powers, especially the United States. Unlike the previous period, the civilian leaders controlled the military during this stage.

The closure of the Straits was perceived as a *casus belli* by the Israelis. On the news of Nasser's closure of the Straits, there was initial disagreement among the military leaders on the question of striking Egypt at once. Yariv, and Weizman, the Chief of Operations Branch, emphasized the importance of time to attack by saying that "If Israel takes no action in response to the blockade of the Straits she will lose her credibility and the IDF its deterrent capacity. The Arab states will interpret Israel's weakness as an excellent opportunity to threaten her security and her very existence." This was the same line as in the previous stage in that Israel needed to respond to Nasser's action militarily. Because Egypt's intention became clearer, Israel should meet the challenge militarily by attacking Egypt at once.

By assessing the Egyptian capabilities as still defensive, Rabin, on the other hand, did not recommend an immediate use of force because it would not be easy as in 1956. He suggested a military plan of a preemptive air strike against the Egyptian air force and the occupation of Gaza as a "bargaining chip" by eliminating a strike at Sharm el-Shaykh alone. The views of the military leaders were

---

basically the same with the only differences focusing on a limited or full attack against Egypt.

But civilian leaders decided to wait and opt for diplomacy. Eban emphasized the attitudes of the Great Powers before taking any military action by saying that "The question was not whether we must resist, but whether we must resist alone or with the support and understanding of others."\textsuperscript{10} He argued that international pressure could solve the problem of the blockade, and that even more important, the possible Soviet reaction should be sought because the Russians were fully supportive of the Egyptians throughout the crisis, and American understanding was necessary to neutralize the Soviets in case of war. The decision was finally reached to opt for diplomacy for 48 hours during which Eban investigated the U.S. intentions. It cannot be denied that the military leaders agreed with that decision partly because it allowed them more time to complete military preparations.\textsuperscript{11} Civilian leaders had in common the idea that every other means should be spent before taking any military action, but the difference came in a situation where diplomacy would fail in lifting the Straits by international pressures.

Among the civilian leaders, there were different opinions on Israel's action to be taken after the expiration of the 48 hours. Some favored the extension of the 48 hours into several days or weeks because it would improve Israel's security and international position;

others opposed it on the ground that it would put additional pressure on Israel to refrain from military action.\textsuperscript{12}

Even though the decision was made not to attack Egypt until all political options were exhausted by 27 May, the military leaders continued to argue for an immediate preemption. On the basis of the new Egyptian deployments, the military leaders asserted that there was a high probability of an Egyptian attack and they needed an order of an immediate offensive, which Eshkol refused to give. Eager to launch an offensive, the military leaders asked Eban for more difficult jobs to accomplish. Eban originally went to Washington to explore what the U.S. would do to lift the blockade, but the military leaders wanted more than that. In case the U.S. failed to deter Egypt, Israel would attack Egypt. It was in fact difficult to obtain such a guarantee from the U.S. that the any attack on Israel would be regarded as that on the United States. Instead, it was confirmed that Israel should not launch a war without U.S. support. The military leaders expected Eshkol's permission to take military action on 27 May, or the day after.\textsuperscript{13} They favored an immediate attack because any delay would lose the tactical advantages.

It should be noted that the Israel army completed its preparation on 25 May. After that date, they just waited until diplomacy failed to resolve the conflict. The debate on whether to fight or to wait longer continued even after Eban returned with no assurance from the Western Powers, especially the United States.

Some civilian leaders leaned toward the military argument in favor of a preemptive strike, while others stuck to the policy of continued waiting. The former held that additional waiting lessened the chances for victory and limited the Israel's freedom to act, while the latter asserted that there was still time because Nasser would not attack. The pros and cons were divided evenly, but the decision was finally made to wait further for about two or three weeks. The U.S. was a major factor in delaying the Israel's offensive.\(^{14}\)

Throughout this stage civilian and military leaders experienced serious debates on whether to go to war. The latter insisted on the immediate use of force, while the former did not listen to the military leaders and emphasized the importance of diplomacy in solving the crisis. The only differences among civilian leaders came when diplomacy failed. Some still favored a diplomatic solution, while others changed their minds in favor of using military force.

3) The third stage: A "high threat" period (29 May-4 June)

It was a great disappointment to the military leaders that the civilian leaders decided to wait further despite the fact that Eban's contacts with the Western Powers proved a failure. For they thought that there remained no alternative except going to war.

But the decision was contrary to their estimation. Rabin's words were: "Two or three weeks! My reaction bordered on disbelief, and I could already anticipate the hue and cry when I broke the news to

the General Staff."¹⁵ The basic difference between civilian leaders and generals was that the former emphasized Ben Gurion's humiliating lesson from the 1956 war where Israel was urged to withdraw by the U.S., while the latter focused on the dangers involved in waiting despite the certainty of victory even without help from other countries.¹⁶

The civilians basically wanted to avert a war, while the military considered it inevitable. The argument for waiting further was based on three points. First, there was the Russian warning that if the Arabs were attacked, the Soviets would not give on them. Second, the U.S. would break the blockade by organizing an international flotilla along with the British, Dutch and Canadians, which meant more time was needed. And third and most important, any military action could be carried out after U.S. promises to reopen the Straits had failed. On the other hand, generals favoring a preemption pointed out that (1) any delay would cost more deaths of soldiers, and (2) Israel's security was protected by the Israeli Army, not by other countries. The civilian position of continued waiting was worn out at this time.

And as the situation became worse, the generals' view gained more support. Nasser's action was designed to question the legitimacy of the Jewish state itself, beyond the narrow issue of the Straits, when he said that "Just as we have been able to restore the

pre-1956 situation, we shall certainly, with God's help, be able to restore the pre-1948 situation.... We want the full and undiminished rights of the people of Palestine."17 It was far more grave and threatening to the Israelis than the Egyptian troops in the Sinai. Along with this statement, Egypt and Jordan signed a defense treaty that, according to Eban, meant that "Israel was now not only blockaded but also encircled... Hussein made it certain that war would break out and that it would not necessarily be limited to the Egyptian-Israeli front.... We would probably have to fight on three fronts...."18

The perception of urgency and threat was reaching its climax. The inability of the U.S. to fulfill promises to lift the blockade increased the perception that there could be no way of resolving the crisis but to go to war. Eban withdrew his opposition to the generals' idea of going to war. His main points were: (1) the Arab worlds encircled Israel; (2) even if Israel waged a war, the Western worlds would not blame it, because a substantial waiting period had passed; and (3) more important, the U.S. effort to reopen the Straits had a slim chance to succeed as time went by.19 Eban's idea was that the 1956 case where the world opposed Israel's initiation of war would not apply anymore, because Washington was increasingly aware of the idea that war would be the only means to resolve the crisis, and the possibility of Soviet military intervention would be minimized by

the U.S. support in case of a short war. Civilian leaders like Harman, Evron and Amit had a common opinion that there was no alternative to war after they tried to know the U.S. position regarding war initiation by Israel.

On the other hand, arguments in favor of war became more powerful when General Dayan was appointed as Minister of Defense and a national united government was formed on 1 June. As external constraints disappeared, civilian leaders lost the basis by which to oppose the preemption. Dayan emphasized the international constraints during the war, which he was definitely aware of regarding the 1956 crisis. Therefore, his military plan excluded any military action such as occupying the Suez Canal which could provoke international opinion. Occupying the Suez Canal was Allon's idea, which could be used as a political tool against the Egyptian threat to close the Straits, but Dayan opposed it. The war aim of military leaders was to destroy Egypt's military force by an offensive operation because a partial victory would be considered a setback for Israel. They opposed the stopping of military operations because of the intervention of external powers, who would urge them to agree a cease-fire. Therefore, they planned to complete the war operation within a relatively short time, three to five days. The plans was adopted at the 4 June meeting without any opposition from civilian leaders.

During this "high threat" stage civilian leaders gave up their original position to avert war, because every other means except going to war had been exhausted, while the military leaders insisted on the use of force. Interestingly, the latter considered international opinion as an important restricting factor in waging a war. Thus they tried to avoid any excuse by which the Western powers could intervene and stop the war.

C. Civilians, Military Leaders and Aggressiveness

The attitudes of civilian and military leaders were not consistent throughout the crisis. Thus we need to examine them at each stage of threat. How did each group react to the changing situations surrounding Israel's security in terms of aggressiveness? And to what degree was the advice of the military leaders influential? The first decision was on mobilization when the threat perception was low, the second one was on the diplomacy when it became medium, and the final one was on war initiation when the threat perception proved high.

1) Civilian and military leaders on the use of force

At the initial stage when Egypt made the decision to move troops into the Sinai and occupied it by asking the UNEF to be withdrawn, it can be said that civilian leaders were less aggressive than the military ones. The former thought that the crisis could be
solved by diplomatic measures, while the latter argued that Israel should confront Egypt militarily. Although it was agreed by both civilian and military leaders that Nasser was just putting on a political show aimed at diverting Israel's attention from Syria, both had shown different ways to deal with the situation.

The former employed the Soviet Union, the U.N. and the Western powers to inform the principal parties that Israel had no intention of attacking Syria, thus providing Egypt with a circumstance to withdraw from it without losing face.23 On the other hand, the latter wanted to demonstrate to Egypt militarily that Israel could fight against Egypt in case of war, thereby causing Egypt's withdrawal.

At that point, the only concern for civilian leaders like Eban was to prevent Nasser's troops from going one step further toward the blockade of the Straits, because they were certain that it was difficult for Nasser with limited capabilities to go to war against Israel. They just wanted the situation not to worsen due to the escalation. Even though the UNEF was withdrawn and there was the possibility of an Israeli-Arab military confrontation, Eban did not give up seeking a diplomatic solution to the crisis. Eban's words were: "Our intention to regard the closing of the Straits as a casus belli was communicated in similar terms to the foreign ministers of those states..... There can be no doubt that these warnings reached Cairo."24

The point was that before the closure of the Straits, the possibility of

war occurrence was dim. For Nasser could withdraw its force without losing face.\textsuperscript{25}

Eban focused on diplomatic steps to inform Nasser via Paris, London, and the U.S. that unless Egypt attempted to close the Straits, Israel would not attack it.\textsuperscript{26} Possible escalation of the situation was a major concern for civilian leaders and its problem was considered to be solved by international diplomacy.\textsuperscript{27}

The military leaders, on the other hand, responded to Nasser's challenge militarily from the initial stage of the crisis, even though they accepted the idea that Egypt was not in a position to attack Israel due to the lack of military capabilities. Their recommendation was to mobilize the reserves partially when the Egyptian troops moved into the Sinai and to act on a large scale when the UNEF was completely withdrawn. Their responses emphasized military preparedness to the changing situation, even though it might in turn make it worsen. Rabin wrote:

"Yariv's new assessment was that the Egyptians would continue their build-up and choose one of four options: (1) undertaking no further action....; (2) instigating a provocation.....; (3) initiating an attack.....; (4) opting for a long period of tension..... It was clear to me that whichever option Egypt adopted, Israel would stand alone in its forthcoming struggle. I ordered all commanding officers to make it clear to their men that we were heading for war..... I agreed with our political leadership that we must not attack as long as the Egyptians had not undertaken some bluntly warlike act-such as blockading the Straits of Tiran..... But deep inside I was convinced that this was

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 326.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 327.
only a matter of time; I naturally assumed that, given a casus belli, the IDF would be ordered to attack."\textsuperscript{28}

It should be noted that military leaders were preparing for a possible war and particularly for a worst case where there would be no help from the Western powers in such a war. However, they agreed with the idea that any immediate attack without a concrete justification to launch a full-scale war would produce severe political drawbacks.\textsuperscript{29}

The interesting point is that during this initial stage, there existed differences even among the military leaders. Rabin, the top military leader, was blamed for reinforcing the doubts of the civilian leaders about what to do next by other General Staff members. Rabin was not aggressive on the immediate military action even though he was confident of the ultimate victory. His main concern was the unpreparedness of the military in the south because every effort had been made during the previous ten years on the north and eastern fronts, and he needed time to complete it; thus he suggested that it would not be easy this time unlike in the 1956 crisis.\textsuperscript{30} His thinking was that, in the absence of Israel's determination to wage a war, actions and words that made situations worse should not be used. Weizman mentioned on this point: "Any attempt to attach the blame for the confusion to the top political echelon, the government alone, and to absolve the top military echelon, the General Staff, would be

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Ibid.}  
misleading..... On the one hand, the government..... appeared to be a fear-stricken, timorous lot..... There were, indeed, doubts among the political echelon, but it was the top military echelon that nourished them."31

Military leaders were basically aggressive toward the use of military force, but there was a tendency that the top military decision maker would accept the political perspectives of civilian leaders. The common point among military leaders was that it was difficult to initiate a war before the military preparedness was completed. Until the military readiness, military leaders were not so aggressive, which led partly to the indecision of civilian leaders. It goes without saying that the other factor that could make military leaders more aggressive would be the offensive acts of the enemy such as the possibility of an enemy attack. But Egypt was not considered to be an offensive force at that time.

The two factors, military preparedness and serious offensive threats from Egypt, were not satisfied so that the aggressiveness of military leaders did not fully appear. Therefore, even though they wanted to initiate a war, the only action they could take was to mobilize on a large scale and wait for a casus belli. In addition, they needed more time to complete the military preparedness.

At the second stage when Nasser closed the Straits, civilian and military leaders expressed conflicting views on using force to lift the blockade. Military leaders were very eager to use force, while the

civilian leadership hesitated and relied on international pressures to do so. The former regarded the two restraining factors satisfied enough to initiate a war and prepared a plan of war. It assumed that the main aim was to reopen the Straits within the time limitations of two days before the cease-fire due to the intervention of the major powers.\textsuperscript{32} The timing of the attack was originally set for 25 June. The military believed that it would be better to attack earlier as long as war was no longer unavoidable. It would minimize the causalities.\textsuperscript{33} For example, Weizman and Yariv insisted on the immediate use of force by arguing for a total mobilization.\textsuperscript{34} Their idea was that it would be better to attack before diplomacy was completed, which the Cabinet decided earlier.

The differences among military leaders occurred again on the issue of which side favored the use of force more. The top military decision maker like Rabin waited for Eshkol and his Cabinet to make a decision about that, while other military leaders focused only on the use of force. Rabin considered many views of the civilians, but other military leaders ignored most of them. Rabin mentioned: "... for it is an iron-clad rule in democracies that the nation places its welfare in the hands of its freely elected political leaders and, only through them, of its generals. As long as the government believed that the political process had yet to run its full course, the army would not be sent into action."\textsuperscript{35} The top military leader basically

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., p. 215.
\textsuperscript{34} Rabin, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 66.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p. 68.
agreed with the dominant military views, but he did not force the civilian leaders to accept them. This was seen as a lukewarm position by other military leaders. In Weizman's words: "I sensed that the chief of staff, Yitzhak Rabin, was progressively losing his balance..... Rabin created insecurity all around him-in his talks with the prime minister and at General Staff meetings."36

Military leaders were basically pessimistic about the possibility of a political settlement of the crisis. They just waited until diplomacy would end and military action could be ordered. The top military leader, the Chief of Staff, was especially most reluctant to assert the immediate use of force than were other military men. The latter insisted on initiating a war by blaming the Chief of Staff for not recommending the use of force strongly.

The civilian leaders, on the other hand, opposed the use of force before any political effort had been tried and hesitated to accept the idea of the military on the basis that even military activity by Israel required prior diplomatic measures for several reasons. First, they needed to explore Soviet intentions, which had been supporting Egypt. Second, Israel had to test the willingness of friendly nations to support military action; otherwise, it would be isolated and lose what was gained in a war even if it achieved victory. Third, U.S. support was essential for arms delivery in case of a war.37

37. Brecher, Op. cit., p. 120.
Their arguments were based on the assumption that Israel would gain an ultimate military victory if war occurred, but their main concern was not to say whether to fight, but whether to do it alone or with the help of others.\textsuperscript{38} The important point for civilian leaders was that they wanted a political victory rather than a military one.

The prime factor that divided military and civilian leaders was whether the political objective would be compatible with the military one. The political aim was to diffuse the crisis by diplomatic steps without using military force, while the military aimed at destroying the Egyptian army without which the crisis could not be solved. It was difficult to think that civilian leaders would accept a preemptive attack before any diplomatic measure should be taken. Civilian leaders like Sapir, Minister of Finance, and Warhaftig, Minister of Religious Affairs, supported diplomatic steps and made the additional point that delaying the use of force would improve Israel's security and damage Nasser. The only action that the military leaders could take at that point was to assure that Israel could and would launch an attack immediately after diplomatic measures ended, because the latter, as Dayan insisted, were doomed to failure.\textsuperscript{39}

Most civilian leaders favored delay of the military preemption until specific diplomatic steps like Eban's visit to Paris, London and Washington had been taken. Military leaders were somewhat divided between the Chief of Staff, who asserted that the military wait until

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.

every political option was exhausted, and the the general staff members, who insisted on the immediate use of force even before Eban's trip started.

However, things changed radically when Eban's diplomatic measures proved a failure and the Egyptian troops became more offensive by surrounding Israel on three fronts along with Jordan and Syria. The military leaders were unanimous on the use of force, while the civilian leaders were divided between some who favored it and others who still hoped that diplomatic steps would work. But most civilian leaders came at last to approve the preemptive attack as nothing could not be obtained from just delaying the use of force.

The military leaders viewed a war as inevitable when the U.S. could not fulfill its commitment to lift the blockade of the Straits. The Chief of Staff took a more aggressive position on the use of force. Rabin mentioned: "If political moves were merely a charade, why had we attached our hopes to promises? What had been the point of postponing military action? When Nasser learned that American involvement did not extend beyond noncommittal statements, how far would his presumption take him?" He argued that Israel had to attack and destroy the Egyptian forces immediately. This was different from his earlier position to wait until all diplomatic steps had been taken. He thought that there remained no way of resolving the crisis except by war. Weizman adopted a aggressive position with respect to a preemptive strike by saying to Eshkol that "The armed forces are ready and prepared for war. If you give the order, Jewish

history will remember you as a great leader. If you don't, it will never forgive you!"\textsuperscript{41} Military leaders agreed with the war plan; the only concern was to avoid international pressure by making the duration of war operations as short as possible.

For civilian leaders, there remained only two choices: to preempt immediately or to allow more time to the United States. The former dominated the discussion until political options were exhausted. Eban pointed out: "I believed the waiting period had achieved its political purpose; ..... that there was nothing now for which to wait; ....; and that any decision on methods and timing should now be reached on military grounds alone."\textsuperscript{42} The underlying assumption was that the two superpowers would not cooperate in action against Israel; instead, they would neutralize each other in the event of war.\textsuperscript{43}

As long as international cooperation could not be expected to lift the blockade of the Straits and there would not be at least some external constraints, civilian leaders could do nothing to avoid the aggressiveness of the military leaders, even though some of them like Amit still hoped that the U.S. would open the Straits.\textsuperscript{44} The important question became not whether to fight any more, but when to do so.

\textsuperscript{44} Eban, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 384.
Throughout the crisis, civilian leaders showed a clear distinction in terms of their aggressiveness on the use of force when diplomacy failed. Before that, they were consistently hesitant to accept the idea of preemption, but after that, they did not oppose it. On the other hand, military leaders were always favoring the use of force to settle the crisis with some reservation that the Chief of Staff was not so aggressive as other military men before every political option was exhausted. But the degree of aggressiveness changed after they completed military preparedness. After that, they became more aggressive. On this military point, let me be more specific.

The relation between one's intent and capability was the primary factor by which one action was interpreted as hostile or non-hostile by military leaders at the initial stage of the crisis. The basic idea was that without one's capabilities, one cannot attack another country although he may be extremely eager to do so. Considering the pace of development of the Egyptian Army, the Israeli military thought that Egypt was not considered to be able to fight a major war until 1970 at the earliest time. Any attempt by Nasser to fight before 1970 would be suicidal for him with his limited capabilities. Moreover, Egypt committed itself heavily to the civil war in Yemen. It was therefore reasonable for military leaders to perceive the probability of war occurrence to be low when they received the news that the Egyptian Army was moving into the Sinai Peninsula. It was perceived as just a political gesture. Rabin's recommendation was that "In this page, the Egyptians wanted to
deter Israel, to demonstrate the deterrence of Israel before Syria and not to initiate or create conditions that would lead to war."\(^{45}\)

His advice was based on an analogy to 1960 in which Egyptian President Nasser had massed his troops along the frontier with Israel to help Syria in January 1960, and Israel responded by massing its troops. The situation continued for two months when the two countries then withdrew their forces. It was a victory for Nasser throughout the Arab world because Egypt stood up to Israel's army and deterred an attack on Syria. The only apprehension of the military leaders was to a balance between defense and deterrence. Rabin stated:

"It was a very delicate situation. We had to react the military moves in Egypt, both to protect our security and keep up our deterrent posture. Had we failed to react-giving the Egyptians the impression that we were either unaware of their moves or complacent about them-we might be inviting attack on grounds of vulnerability. On the other hand, an overreaction on our part might nourish the Arabs' fear that we had aggressive intentions and thus provoke a totally unwanted war."\(^{46}\)

The military did not worry about Nasser's action. But they had to show Egypt that Israel was responding to Egypt's buildup without massing troops on its own initiative. They just wanted to make sure that Israel had no aggressive intentions against any Arab state. But things changed; military leaders became serious about the possibility of an Egyptian attack when Nasser asked the U.N. to withdraw the


UNEF. However, they still did not want the situation to worsen. Rabin pointed out: "I asked the prime minister to approve the mobilization of additional reserves...... Yet I still felt bound to act cautiously since any mobilization exceeding our vital needs was liable to lead to further escalation, which we were anxious to prevent."47

It should be noted, however, that military leaders needed more time to complete military preparedness in the south. Their reluctance for an immediate use of force was partly due to the fact that they would not favor a war without having confidence in victory. It is, in this respect, understood that Rabin asked Eban to initiate a meeting of the Security Council to gain time. They desperately wanted more time.48

The attitudes of military leaders, on the one hand, were clearly distinguished between the stage when the military preparedness was completed so that they were confident enough to attack Egypt, and the time when it was not enough to do so. It was shown that at the former stage they were more aggressive than at the latter stage, even though they were basically aggressive throughout the entire crisis. They favored a preemptive strike when they were militarily ready regardless of the political conditions that they faced.

On the other hand, civilian leaders thought about more than just a victory in a war, because they might even lose what they gained from the war without permission from the Western Powers, as was the case in the 1956 crisis. They relied heavily on diplomatic

47. Ibid., pp. 54-5.
measures to obtain international cooperation, especially from the U.S. in initiating war. When they failed in getting permission from the U.S., there remained no other choice but to accept the views of the military leaders. Civilian leaders focused on winning a war politically, not militarily, which meant that the best policy was to avert a war, and if it occurred, to go to war with some understanding from the British and French as well as the Americans. Civilian acceptance of war initiation was heavily related to the extent that every political measure to prevent war was exhausted. As diplomatic solutions became diluted, there was an increasing tendency for civilian leaders to accept the idea of using force to solve the crisis.

2) The military influence on war decisions

Military leaders had not much impact on crisis decisions until diplomatic measures had been fully exhausted. Broadly speaking, there were three kinds of decisions throughout the crisis: the decision to mobilize, to delay and to preempt. Except for the decision to delay the use of force and rely on diplomacy, military advice was effective. Their advice were influential when action well short of the immediate use of force was decided purely on military grounds, and when diplomatic efforts proved a failure. Civilian leaders did not accept the view of the military on the use of force when all political options had not yet been spent. The exhaustion of diplomatic steps played a major role in determining the influence of the military on the decision-making process to go to war.
First, a series of partial mobilization decisions was approved by civilian leaders even if there might be some possibility that these would stimulate Egypt and escalate the situation. Civilian leaders' main concerns were not to respond aggressively to Nasser's action in a situation where his object was not offensive, that is, before the closure of the Straits was announced, and to obtain international cooperation from the Western Powers to reopen the Straits when Nasser's behavior was perceived to be offensive.

It should be noted, however, that a partial mobilization was suggested at the stage when Nasser created no immediate military threat and it was approved without opposition by the Cabinet. For civilian leaders agreed with the fact that it was the responsibility of the military to prepare for the worst possible case under the condition that it should be limited to a minimum so that it could avoid a war. For the decision of mobilization was not directly related to a decision to go to war.

Military advice was influential if it remained defensive in nature within the restriction of avoiding the actual use of military force. Eshkol approved Rabin's proposal of mobilization by assuming that it was taken as a precautionary step and it would be better to do so than not to react at all.

After the blockade of the Straits, military leaders advocated the immediate use of force, but were confronted with severe opposition from civilian leaders. The latter favored diplomatic measures in advance. Military advice could not be effective until the completion of diplomatic efforts. They tried to attain the decision to
use force even during the time when diplomatic action was still underway, but it failed. In order for the advice of military leaders to be effective, no alternative except going to war had to be shown.

As soon as diplomacy to lift the blockade of the Straits did not work and war could no longer be avoided, military leaders dominated the decision-making process of Israel. The timing and date were determined solely by the military leaders, because there remained nothing that civilian leaders could do to avoid a war.

Eban's trip to the Western Powers to explore the current relevance of their commitments made in 1957 to keep the Straits open and their view of a possible preemptive attack was a major breakpoint to the military leaders. The insistence of the military on the use of force depended on whether it would succeed or fail.

**D. Conclusion: Some Comparisons with Betts' Idea**

It is not easy to apply Betts' findings to the case of Israel's Six-Day War. Betts' idea was that civilian leaders are more aggressive than military leaders when it comes to war initiation. The latter hesitates to send soldiers, while the former tends to initiate a war. With respect to the impact of the military on war decisions, military leaders are most powerful when they oppose military intervention, but least influential when they assert it.

The study of Six-Day War case shows that military leaders were consistently aggressive about the use of force, while civilian leaders opposed it until diplomacy failed. When there was no
alternative but to accept the position of the military, civilian leaders did approve the preemption.

The major difference between Betts' findings and the Six-Day War lies in the fact that civilian leaders were not so aggressive while military leaders became more eager to use force as Israel's security became more threatened. These are not compatible with Betts' idea on the use of force. Even more, civilian leaders changed the idea of opposing it when political options had been spent with no fruitful result. The decision to use force was made almost unanimously after diplomacy failed.

In addition, military advice were most influential when decisions were minor, such as a partial mobilization, or in a situation where civilian leaders could do nothing but agree with the military advice, as diplomacy proved a failure; the advice of the military were least powerful earlier when decisions of adopting diplomatic measures to explore the Western powers were made.

In the case of the Six-Day War, the impact of military leaders was determined not by whether they consented to or opposed the use of force, but by whether political options had been exhausted. Overall, their advice were not influential in that they did not lead to the decisions of the civilian leaders.

Some interesting points are unique to this case: First, before diplomatic efforts failed, civilian leaders had been opposing the use of force advocated by the military, and after that, they changed into accepting the military advice. And second, the aggressiveness of the military increased as they came to complete military preparedness.
Before military readiness, they were less eager to use force than after it was complete.
A. The Background

The war between India and Pakistan was usually thought to have begun on 3 December 1971 when the Pakistani air force attacked a number of military bases in the northwestern region of India. However, it would be fair to say that it started realistically on 21 November 1971 when Indian forces attacked and occupied some Pakistan territories as part of preliminary steps to an offensive aimed at liberating Dhaka.1 Before reaching the decision to attack Pakistan, India experienced serious debates about its desirability, especially in terms of civil-military relations.

---

The Indo-Pakistan War of 1971, often called the Bangladesh War, has been widely studied by many scholars. Here, we make a brief summary of its background.

The war between India and Pakistan started with the refugee problem. The enormous influx of refugees caused by the 25 March 1971 crackdown of the East Bengalis by the Pakistan army brought about serious problems for India. At the initial stage of the crisis, India blamed the Pakistan government for the refugee problem. By the end of April, the Pakistan army predominated over the entire territory of East Pakistan. In the meantime, along with some assistance to a resistance movement in East Pakistan, India tried to solve the problem at the international level, hoping that the international community would pressure Pakistan for a political solution, which would satisfy the East Pakistani demands. Most nations like the U.S., the U.S.S.R. and China expressed humanitarian concerns sympathetically, but considered it to be a civil war and avoided any external intervention.

By the end of May, New Delhi was pessimistic about the role of the major powers in resolving the crisis associated with the refugee

---


4. For refugees problem in India's political, economic and strategic terms, see Hasan-Askari Rizvi, *International strife and external intervention: India's role in the civil war in East Pakistan (Bangladesh)* (Lahore: Progressive Publishers, 1981), pp. 141-45.
problem, because their responses were perceived as slow and inadequate by India.\(^5\) The alternatives remaining for India were to expand its support to the Bangladesh resistance forces, or to consider a direct military intervention in East Pakistan. With the increasing numbers of refugees, India changed its attitude by describing the refugee situation as an "indirect aggression", which implied that a civil war in Pakistan was escalating into a possible conflict between India and Pakistan. However, Indian leaders felt strongly that all diplomatic measures should be exhausted before any military action was used, because without it, there was a growing possibility that India would be condemned as the aggressor by the international community.\(^6\) The Indian government intensified its diplomatic campaign designed to pressure Pakistan to accept a political solution in East Pakistan.

By mid-July, diplomatic measures proved a failure and the government of Mrs. Gandhi made several basic decisions on the East Pakistani problem.\(^7\) There was a broad consensus that India should resort to armed force to intervene in East Pakistan unless a satisfactory political settlement in the Pakistani civil war was achieved, because the Chinese and the Americans were pressing India via the U.N. to either choose to give up trying to influence the


\(^{7}\) The decisions made were: 1) to return of all refugees; 2) to transfer of power to the moderate Awami League leadership in East Pakistan; 3) to use force directly or indirectly at an appropriate time; and 4) to mobilize international community to support Indian objectives or to neutralize their capacity to counter Indian policy. See, Sisson and Rose, *Op. cit.*, p. 187.
conflict in East Pakistan or to go to war. It was in this context that India concluded the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation, which was signed on 9 August 1971. From India's view, the treaty was a diplomatic victory against the growing collusion among the U.S., China and Pakistan.

The refugees continuously crossed the border between India and East Pakistan, representing an impossible burden for India. Mrs. Gandhi could not put up with the refugees indefinitely. India needed to know the reaction of the major powers to a possible confrontation between India and Pakistan before taking any military action. It was confirmed in October that the U.S. and China were not prepared to support Pakistan to the extent that the Soviets supported India. Mrs. Gandhi's diplomatic trip (6 October-13 November) aimed at the exhaustion of diplomatic means before the eventual military intervention in Pakistan to avoid being labeled the aggressor by the international community. It demonstrated that the U.S. and China would not intervene militarily against India if war occurred, while the Soviets speeded up the delivery of arms and equipment.

On this international situation, India was encouraged to use force, because no compromise could be expected from Pakistan and no political solution would satisfy India in the foreseeable future. The order to intervene in East Pakistan was made by late November.

---

when Indian army reservists were called up on 22 October to cross over into East Pakistan.

B. Civilians, Military Leaders and War Decisions

It was India's national security interests as well as economic and humanitarian concerns that Mrs. Gandhi was seriously worried about with the influx of the refugees in East Pakistan. Indian concerns started with the refugee problem, but ended with a security problem as time went by. If it were only the problem of refugees, India would not necessary decide to intervene in East Pakistan. According to Sisson and Rose, it is said that "The refugee issue was certainly important, but probably not decisive.... Of great importance to New Delhi was the potentially destabilizing influence of the conflict in Eastern Pakistan.... The problem for India was not just the "existence" of refugees, but where they existed."10 The whole duration (late March-late November) needs to be divided into three parts on the basis of the degree of the security threat to India.

1) The first phase: A "low threat" period (March-May)

This stage is characterized by the inability to reach a negotiated settlement between the Awami League and the Pakistani government, which required strong international pressure to obtain a political solution to the East Pakistan problem. During this period, the

10. Ibid., p. 206.
Indian government wanted a political rather than a military solution to the crisis in East Pakistan.

The first Indian response to the crisis in East Pakistan was hesitant and cautious. Although there was some pressure from some Cabinet members to resort to armed force, Mrs. Gandhi opposed the use of force to solve the problem in East Pakistan. The main reason came from military leaders, especially the Chief of Staffs, General Manekshaw, who stood against an intervention decision from the military perspective that the military preparedness was not complete.\textsuperscript{11} Some civilian leaders like D. P. Dhar opposed the early use of force for the political reason that even if India won the war against Pakistan, Bangladesh would not be recognized by the international community due to its external and domestic political viability.\textsuperscript{12}

Although India opposed the early use of force, it gradually built up its military forces around the border area between India and Pakistan. In the meanwhile, the Pakistan army had expanded substantially around that area by mid-May. But during this period the major concern for India was not on security, but on the refugee problem. India wanted a political settlement from late March 1971 that included the return of all refugees, which Pakistan opposed. The Indian methods to deal with the situation, accordingly, were indirect in two senses: (1) to strengthen the resistance of the Awami group in

\textsuperscript{12} Chopra, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 79.
East Pakistan; and (2) to pressure the international community to solve the problem.

In early April, India permitted the Awami League leaders to establish a Bangladesh "government in exile" in Indian territory, which resulted in issuing a declaration of independence, and supported them in the training of their forces. However, by mid-May, the Pakistan army regained almost the entire border area between India and East Pakistan, which had been controlled by the Awami League. There remained a slim possibility that the crisis in East Pakistan could be resolved by direct negotiations between the Pakistan government and the Awami league. But it appeared inevitable for India to take military action. But the Indian army was not prepared for a direct intervention in East Pakistan.

Along with supporting a Muslim-led East Pakistan liberation movement, India was looking for international support for a political solution, prior to military action, in the form of pressure on Pakistan by the major powers to accept the demands of the East Pakistanis. India achieved some success in this diplomatic measure, but the only positive response from the international community was on humanitarian relief assistance, not on economic and military aid to the Awami League leadership. Although the Indian government had, in fact, little hope that international pressures would lead to

---

having all refugees returned, there remained little else to do except rely on diplomatic measures for India during that situation.\textsuperscript{14}

By the end of May, as the influx of refugees intensified, India concluded that (1) the major powers were going to play a limited role in a political settlement of the crisis in East Pakistan, and (2) that Indian support of the Awami league could not overcome the opposition in Pakistan government.

2) The second phase: A "medium threat" period (June-Sep.)

This stage is characterized by the intensive Indian diplomatic campaign along with the threat of direct Indian military intervention in a situation of intensified threat of security to India. It was the monsoon period when an actual military operation by both sides was hard to accomplish, but the threat to India was more intensified than in the pre-monsoon period. It was more than just the problem of refugees; Indian security was also directly involved.

Diplomatically, India continued its efforts to obtain international pressure on Pakistan with little success. Indian Cabinet members visited the major powers to find out their real attitudes toward the crisis in East Pakistan. The responses were the same as in the previous period. They were sympathetic about it, but could not persuade Pakistan to accept a political solution. By early July when these diplomatic missions failed, India's prospect of a possible resolution of the crisis without resorting to armed force

disappeared. It became clear to India that international pressure alone could not be relied upon to produce a result that could meet the political demands of the Awami League leadership. As time went by, the international situation became more unfavorable to India and the threat to India was intensified. In Horn's words:

"From India's point of view, dangers were increasing all around. The U.S.-China rapprochement boded ill and China had proved unreceptive to Indian overtures. Second, the possibility of war with Pakistan was growing in light of Yahya's recent statements warning of total war with India. Moreover, Islamabad, with Washington's help, seemed to be making progress in obtaining U.N. involvement in East Pakistan, which was an interference India did not want."  

Under this circumstance, it was no longer beneficial to India to ask for international intervention, especially in the United Nations. India tended to oppose it unlike in the pre-monsoon period, while Pakistan welcomed it. The international situation showed that India should seek its own solution rather than wait for others to solve the problem. It was in this background that the Indo-Soviet treaty was concluded in early August.

On the other hand, the military preparedness had been intensified. The Indian regular army was moved into positions near the East Pakistan border. And the Indian military army was directly involved in Mukti Bahini activities, which caused a strong

15. Ibid., p. 188.  
apprehension in Pakistan about a possible military attack against it. Although the monsoon season with its heavy rains and cloudy weather was not the ideal period for a large scale military operation, Mrs. Gandhi's government made several verbal threats to use force in order to resolve the crisis, and the military movement began to provide substance to these verbal warnings. By signing the Indo-Soviet treaty on 6 August, India consolidated the military preparedness, and a diplomatic solution was no longer sought.

During this monsoon period, India could not carry out some of its military operations due to the weather. Instead, Mrs. Gandhi was certain of the failure of her diplomatic efforts to pressure Pakistan for a political solution because of the unfavorable international situation and prepared militarily for an inevitable military confrontation between India and Pakistan after the end of the monsoon period.

3) The third stage: A "high threat" period (Oct.-Nov.)

This stage is characterized by India's determination to use military force against Pakistan under the circumstance that India's diplomatic campaign would no longer yield useful results. Before reaching this stage, India had been focusing on the strategy of indirect military intervention for several reasons. The first was that if the Mukti Bahini was properly trained and equipped, it would defeat the Pakistan army or at least achieve a negotiated settlement

\[18. \textit{Ibid.}\]
of the crisis in East Pakistan. However, it was confirmed by September that without India's direct intervention, the Awami League could not liberate Bangladesh. Secondly, the Indian army needed more time to make complete preparations for a military operation, but the end of the monsoon period solved this problem. And when the military preparedness was complete, the international situation became unfavorable to India. Thus, the only alternative was to break the no peace-no war situation by military force. After the monsoon period ended, it was inevitable that the Indian government would resort to military force, because its security was increasingly threatened with no alternative but to resort to such force. Furthermore, civilian leaders like K. Subrahmanayam, Director of the Indian Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses, argued for military intervention for economic reasons, because India's economy was so devastated by the refugee burden that it would cost less to start a war than to maintain the refugees.

Civilian and military leaders in India had a common view that if war occurred between India and Pakistan, the best timing of an attack would be November-December 1971. The military preparedness would be complete by that time to launch a military attack on East Pakistan; as the monsoon period ended, it would be possible to move heavy equipments swiftly. The most important consideration was a slim probability of Chinese intervention in an Indo-Pakistani war, because the northern passes were covered with

The Indo-Soviet treaty was thought to have prevented China politically from entering the war, while the timing of a November-December attack was thought to block the Chinese intervention military.  

As there was a broad consensus among Indian leaders that it was inevitable for India to initiate a war against Pakistan in November-December, India needed some understanding by the international community that India had exhausted every diplomatic means before taking military intervention in East Pakistan. It was in this context that Mrs. Gandhi made several trips to Western Europe and the U.S. to demonstrate that she was still seeking a peaceful solution. When India confirmed a negative response from the U.S., it concluded that no political solution would be possible in the foreseeable future, and the order to initiate a war went out immediately.

Once the decision to initiate a war against Pakistan was made, civilian and military leaders in India were divided on the issue of what the war aims were to be, a total or limited liberation of Bangladesh. Civilian leaders sought a large-scale war to make up for political losses obtained from the failure of the diplomatic campaign, while military leaders favored a more limited war based on military grounds. From the military's viewpoint, a large war would cause lots of casualties; and, moreover, after the war, it would be more difficult to protect Bangladesh from Pakistan. Accordingly, military leaders

---

sought a limited warfare in which India trained more guerrillas and placed them in East Pakistan without having the direct participation of the Indian army in a partial liberation plan. However, the first priority for Indian leaders was that India should not be the aggressor because the Indo-Soviet treaty assumed that India would not get assistance from the Soviets as long as India was an initiator of hostilities. Problems concerned with military strategy were solved without difficulty when Pakistan retaliated militarily against India's limited warfare in East Pakistan on 3 December 1971, resulting in total warfare.

In short, it might be said that India adopted two strategies to resolve the crisis in East Pakistan. One was an indirect strategy in that Mrs. Gandhi avoided direct military intervention by supporting the Awami League to liberate Bangladesh and by providing the international community with a chance to pressure Pakistan to accept a political solution. The second strategy was direct in that India used military force against Pakistan when indirect methods proved unsuccessful. As India's security was threatened increasingly, India tended to consider the use of force more strongly.

C. Civilians, Military Leaders and Aggressiveness

The decision to initiate a war against Pakistan was made in late November 1971 by Mrs. Gandhi. However, Indian leaders had many heated debates on whether to use force before reaching agreement.

When the crisis initially started, civilian and military leaders were widely divided on the issue, but as time went by with the increasing security threat to India, they came to the conclusion that there remained no alternative but to resort to armed force.

1) Civilian and military leaders on the use of force

There were pros and cons of India's military intervention when the refugee problem arose with the outbreak of the crisis in East Pakistan. Civilian leaders like Chavan, the Finance Minister, and Jagjivan Ram, the Defense Minister, argued for India's immediate military action. For example, K. Subrahmanyam, Director of the Indian Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses, argued for war initiation on the basis that "What India must realize is the fact that the breakup of Pakistan is in our interest, an opportunity the like of which will never come again."24

Unlike civilian leaders, most of the military leaders like General Manekshaw, Chief of Staffs, opposed it on the basis that military readiness was not yet complete. Some considerations that Gen. Manekshaw pointed out were: (1) it would take several weeks to regroup and move the military units into the East Pakistan area; (2) during the coming monsoon period, the military operations could not be carried out until after at least October when the rains diminished; and (3) any possible Chinese intervention in an Indo-Pakistan war

24. Ibid., p. 93.
could be neutralized only after November when the snowfall in the Himalaya Mountains would likely prevent a Chinese intervention.\textsuperscript{25}

It should be noted, however, that it was not all military leaders who opposed the early use of military force. Some retired generals like Harbaksh Singh and Kaul favored an early intervention for tactical reasons; the more time India allowed Pakistan, the more costly it would be to intervene.\textsuperscript{26} These military leaders supported the efforts of some civilian leaders to pressure Mrs. Gandhi to adopt an intervention decision, but she chose to wait until military preparedness was complete and started a diplomatic campaign.

Civilian leaders were not always aggressive toward war initiation. Unlike most of the civilian leaders, some also agreed with military leaders who argued against an early intervention by saying that India would be called an aggressor if it engaged in early intervention before exhausting every diplomatic measure. For example, D. P. Dhar, Mrs. Gandhi's civilian adviser, argued that "If India intervened before the necessity for doing so was clearly established in the eyes of the world, Bangladesh would be regarded as an Indian invention and refused recognition by almost all countries."\textsuperscript{27}

It might be said that those opposing immediate intervention had a common view that the time was not yet mature for India politically or militarily. Politically, it meant that whenever every


\textsuperscript{27} Chopra, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 79.
political means had been exhausted, India could go to war anytime regardless of the level of military preparedness; additionally, India could initiate a war against Pakistan at any time, regardless of the stage of diplomatic activity, if the conditions mentioned above—completion of military preparedness and a guarantee of the Chinese staying away from the Indo-Pakistan war—were satisfied. The underlying assumption of military leaders was that without assurance of victory, India should not initiate a war against Pakistan, while civilian leaders assumed that war should be initiated as a last resort when a diplomatic solution could no longer be achieved.

Since then, political steps were taken to pressure Pakistan for a negotiated settlement of the crisis between the Pakistan government and the Awami League. Military leaders adhered to the original plan that the best timing of a war initiation would be November-December when the Chinese intervention could be blocked by snow along with the completion of military readiness. Accordingly, military leaders paid little attention to whether diplomatic means were exhausted. The important thing for them was to ask whether the best timing of an attack could be arranged for a possible war against Pakistan.

However, civilian leaders worried about the availability of diplomatic options, because they could argue for war initiation as the only alternative once diplomacy proved ineffective. Among civilian leaders, those like Singh, the Foreign Minister, who had opposed an early military intervention, intensified diplomatic efforts to find a political solution in which war would no longer be needed to resolve
the crisis in East Pakistan. Diplomacy was a useful waste of time to those who favored intervention for a possible Indo-Pakistan war.

When diplomatic means had been exhausted, the only alternative remaining was to go to a war that had been already planned by military leaders. Civilian leaders also accepted the idea of war initiation on economic grounds, because even without solving the refugee problem, India's economy could not survive the refugee burden and the latter could be solved only by using military force. It was thus more economical to fight a war than bear the refugee burden. Those who stood against military intervention became aware of the fact that there remained no alternative but to go to war as diplomatic efforts proved fruitless.

Military leaders were, on the other hand, less aggressive toward war initiation than civilian leaders when war was inevitable. The former favored a limited warfare whose objective was to seek what was attainable from the war, while the latter argued for an all-out war against Pakistan.

In short, it might be said that at the early stage of the crisis, most military leaders opposed an early use of force to resolve the East Pakistan crisis on military grounds; military preparedness would not be complete until November-December. Some civilian leaders favored war against Pakistan for the economic reason that India's economy would be devastated if the refugee problem continued; others opposed the immediate use of force for political reasons, believing that war should be initiated only after diplomatic means

---

had been exhausted. However, as the diplomatic effort proved ineffective, military preparedness was almost complete and economic cost to maintain the refugees became too high, the argument opposing military action waned and Indian leaders acknowledged that war was inevitable. Basically, military leaders became aggressive after the military preparedness was complete, while civilians leaders acknowledged the inevitability of a war against Pakistan after diplomatic measures had been spent. However, they were different in terms of aggressiveness in that even though both civilian and military leaders agreed with the idea that war should be initiated to resolve the crisis, military leaders were less aggressive than civilian ones toward the war aims.

2) The military influence on war decisions

Military leaders had a tremendous impact on war decisions throughout the crisis. The first was when they opposed an immediate use of force favored by most civilian leaders, and secondly, when India decided the timing of attack, military leaders were influential. And thirdly, military leaders played a major role in deciding the war aims, even though severe disagreements on defining war objectives existed between civilian and military leaders.

At the earliest time of the crisis when several Cabinet members favoring early intervention recommended to Mrs. Gandhi that she replace the Chief of Staffs, Mrs. Gandhi would not accept their advice. Rather, she postponed the intervention decision on the basis of Gen.
Manekshaw's recommendation on the issue.\textsuperscript{29} The advice of military leaders that war should not be initiated until November-December because of military unpreparedness had more impact on Mrs. Gandhi's decision to initiate a diplomatic campaign rather than war.

There remained no place where military leaders could have had an influence on diplomatic measures taken during the monsoon period. They simply prepared military plans step by step for an attack by late November. Civilian leaders dominated this diplomatic stage. However, the more international pressure became ineffective, the more India thought about war.

As diplomatic steps proved ineffective, however, military leaders dominated the following period until the Indo-Pakistan War started in late November. When it came to the timing of attack, the advice of military leaders was accepted by Mrs. Gandhi's government. Since the outbreak of the crisis, military leaders favored the start of war in November-December when military preparedness would be completed and Chinese military intervention would be effectively prohibited by the snow. The decision to intervene in East Pakistan was made only by military considerations, even though diplomatic means were exhausted by mid-November.

With respect to setting up war aims, military leaders were less influential than civilian ones. Military leaders favored limited warfare in which the combined Indian-Mukti Bahini forces would liberate a section of East Pakistan to establish its own government. However, civilian leaders supported the idea of an all-out war whose

objective was to liberate the entire area of Bangladesh. What Mrs. Gandhi wanted was a "quite" war for the liberation of Bangladesh rather than a limited objective to occupy a section of East Pakistan to establish a Bangladesh government. A limited warfare possibility contributed to keep Pakistan uncertain about the real intention of the Indian government throughout the crisis. It showed that war objectives were not based on military capability, but on political considerations, which made military leaders less influential in this instance.

In sum, it should be said that when military leaders recommended negative advice toward war initiation Mrs. Gandhi accepted them, and that after military leaders accepted the inevitability of war, the only influence they could have was on deciding the timing of the attack, not on determining the war aims.

D. Conclusion: Some Comparisons with Betts' Idea

The Indo-Pakistan War of 1971 began with the refugee problem and was followed by the crisis of East Pakistan. As the refugees were pouring into Indian territory, Mrs. Gandhi had to decide from one of two alternatives: direct military intervention or diplomacy to resolve the crisis. Indian diplomatic efforts were made to pressure Pakistan into accepting a political solution between the Awami League and Pakistan government, but at last proved ineffective, while military intervention was delayed until military preparedness was ready by November-December. Civilian and
military leaders had heated debates on this issue. Since diplomacy failed, both civilian and military leaders agreed about the inevitability of war against Pakistan. They induced Pakistan to attack first in late November, because India would then not be considered as an aggressor. The strategy worked; Pakistan retaliated against India in an all-out war in early December. The Indo-Pakistan War of 1971 was a typical case in which every diplomatic means had been exhausted before military action was taken. Also, early in the crisis, civilian and military leaders had different views of how to resolve the crisis, but as time went by with the increasing security threat to India, the leaders in India considered it inevitable for a war to occur.

The comparison of Betts' research findings with the Indo-Pakistan War of 1971 showed that unlike his findings that civilians were more aggressive than military leaders in war initiation, the 1971 case showed that civilians were not always in agreement during the early stage of the crisis in favoring the use of force to resolve the crisis. Some favored it for economic reasons, while others opposed it for political reasons. On the other hand, military leaders stood against using force for military reasons.

However, after diplomacy proved ineffective, most civilian and military leaders agreed with the inevitability of war, but civilians were more aggressive than military leaders. The former favored an all-out war, while the latter argued for limited warfare.

With respect to military influence on war decisions, it might be said that overall, the advice of military leaders was influential. The negative views of military leaders on the early use of force played a
major role in postponing the date of the decision and the actual date of the attack, and their recommendation for the attack date was accepted by Mrs. Gandhi. However, their desire for a limited war failed to dominate the idea of a large-scale war favored by civilian leaders.

Some unique aspects of the Indo-Pakistan War of 1971 were as follows. First, civilian leaders were not in agreement on whether to use force before diplomatic steps had been exhausted, but they did agree with the inevitability of war after diplomacy had failed to solve the crisis in East Pakistan. Second, military leaders were consistent in that they opposed the intervention decision before military preparedness was ready but favored it after they completed its readiness. Third, in the initial stage, the Defense Minister agreed with the civilians' belief in the immediate use of military force, while the Chief of Staffs differed on this point. And fourth, even after military readiness was finished, military leaders opposed an all-out war whose victory could not be guaranteed with assurance, but instead favored a limited warfare in which they could achieve what was militarily attainable.
A. The Background

The Ramadan War, which is more popularly known as the Yom Kippur War or October War of 1973, actually began on 6 October 1973 when the Egyptian and Syrian troops initiated large-scaled military action against Israeli forces. The previous wars (1948, 1956 and 1967) were characterized by the defensive postures of Arab countries, especially Egypt and, therefore, they failed to respond successfully to the Israeli's initiation of war. In this fourth round of warfare, the former initiated a war and forced the Israelis to deal with a two-front war. The decision to initiate the Ramadan War was not made unanimously by Egyptian decision makers and, accordingly, there were severe conflicts among Egyptian civilian and military leaders on whether to use military force against Israel.
The Ramadan War is already well known and well researched by many scholars. Here, we will briefly summarize the war's background.

The origins of the Ramadan War can be traced back to the end of the Six-Day war. Since the conclusion of the Six-Day War when Israel successfully defeated a numerically superior Arab coalition, Israel became the dominant force in the Middle East, consolidating its borders which had been already secure and safe from the previous wars. On the other hand, Arab leaders were demoralized and humiliated, but they still refused to negotiate peace with Israel. The Ramadan War was a desperate effort by the Arab countries, especially Egyptian leaders, to regain their prestige and the lost territory of the Sinai Peninsula.

The period from the end of the Six-Day War to the beginning of the Ramadan War can be divided into four phases: defiance (June 1967-August 1968), active defense (September 1968-February 1969), war of attrition (March 1969-August 1970), and no peace, no

1. The "war of Ramadan" is called by the Arab countries, while the Israelis know it as the "Yom Kippur war". The "October war of 1973" is known to other nonpartisans in the West. See Edgar O'Ballance, No victor, no vanquished: The Yom Kippur war (San Rafael, Ca.: Presidio Press, 1978), p. 1. Most of studies on this subject were written from the Israel's viewpoints. For example, see John Bullock, The Yom Kippur war (London: Andre Denton, 1975); Moshe Davis, ed., The Yom Kippur war: Israel and the Jewish people (New York: Arno Press, 1974); and A. H. Farrar-Hockley, The Arab-Israeli war, 1973, Adelphi Papers no. 111 (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1975). The Egyptian views on this war were relatively neglected. See Mohamed Heikal, The road to Ramadan (London: William Collins Sons & Co., Ltd., 1975).

war (August 1970-October 1973). The first phase was characterized by Egyptian efforts to maintain a sense of calm and order in Egypt by focusing on the preparations of the Suez front line. Through the second phase, the Egyptian army took intense military action along the Canal front with some success, which resulted, however, in Israel's constructing a line of defensive fortifications along the eastern bank of the Canal, called the Bar Lev Line. With the completion of the Bar Lev Line, Nasser decided to conduct a war of attrition rather than an all-out war against Israel, but he failed to force Israel to withdraw from the territory occupied from the Six-Day War. In the meantime, some negotiations among major powers, especially the U.S. and the Soviet Union, showed some movement toward a peace agreement in the Middle East. The main focus was the Rogers Plan, initiated by the U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers. As Egypt and Israel accepted it, a cease-fire started from 8 August 1970 for a three-month period. After that, a state of "no peace, no war" continued until the outbreak of the Ramadan War.

The plan to regain the Sinai Peninsula continued during the "no peace, no war" period by Anwar Sadat, who succeeded Nasser when the latter died on 28 September 1970. Sadat even stated that the year of 1971 would not end "without making the decision for the battle with Israel being resolved either by war or peace." However,

---


Israel was convinced that Egypt would not initiate a war against it at least until the summer of 1975 because the Egyptian air force was almost completely destroyed during the Six-Day War. Accordingly, Israel continued to strengthen its defensive line to make certain that Egypt would be defeated by the Israeli ground forces alone without help from the air force.\(^6\)

In the meantime, Sadat developed plans of a surprise attack against Israel to break the political deadlock between Egypt and Israel. He worried about developments of detente between the two superpowers, which favored the status quo in the Middle East. The Soviet Union was not as cooperative of sending offensive military weapons to Egypt as it had been before detente. Egypt could not escape from the state of no war, no peace without starting a war. Sadat consequently made a decision on 18 July 1972 to expel the Soviet military advisors from Egypt in order to have freedom to make a military choice and continued the military plan to initiate a war.\(^7\) His main strategy was a deception plan that would not allow Israel to be prepared for the actual time of attack.\(^8\)

Sadat at first considered the date for an attack on Israel to be 15 November 1972, which brought about severe opposition from

---


\(^7\) Sadat's expulsion decision was misperceived by the West and Israelis that Egypt would not attack Israel and it was actually a part of Sadat's deception plan. Howard M. Sachar, *Egypt and Israel* (New York: Richard Marek Publishers, 1981), pp. 188-89; and Raymond Carroll, *Anwar Sadat* (New York: Franklin Watts, 1982), pp. 65-7.

\(^8\) For a detailed story of the plan, see, for example, Avi Shlaim, "Failures in national intelligence estimate: The case of the Yom Kippur war," *World Politics*, Vol. 28, no. 3 (April 1976), pp. 348-80.
most of his military leaders. On the basis of military unpreparedness, they disagreed with Sadat's idea that it would be better for the Egyptian people to fight a war and lose than not to fight at all. He then changed some military leaders and delayed his plan of war initiation. With newly appointed top military leaders, Sadat could overcome the challenges of military leaders and adhere to his plan of attack on 6 October 1973.

Before reaching an agreement with the military plan of initiating war against Israel proposed by Sadat, severe disputes between civilian and military leaders arose on whether to start a war. The case of the Ramadan War provides us with ample evidence by which to generate and test some civil-military patterns in war initiation.

B. Civilian, Military Leaders and War Decisions

Sadat's decision to attack Israel on 6 October 1973 was based on purely political grounds, not on military considerations. From October 1970 when Sadat succeeded Nasser to October 1973, we can divide the entire period into three parts on the basis of his approach to the Middle East problem. The first (October 1970-June 1971) consisted of his willingness to use diplomacy to solve it. During the second period (July 1971-April 1973), Sadat prepared for a war against Israel along with intensified diplomatic measures. And the third period (May 1973-October 1973) showed his determination toward war initiation. The lower the chances to regain the lost
territories become, the higher did Sadat feel a sense of a security threat to Egypt.

1) The first stage: A "low threat" period (Oct. 1970-June 1971)

This phase (October 1970-June 1971) was characterized by the fact that Sadat was very cautious of starting a war against Israel. Instead, he tried to solve the Middle East crisis through diplomatic means. After he was elected President of Egypt, his main focus was on regaining the Sinai to enhance his legitimacy among the Egyptian people. He not only used diplomatic measures toward the Soviets and the U.S., but he also demonstrated his willingness to fight. However, diplomacy was considered more important in recovering the Sinai than was war. Sadat's belief was that every diplomatic step should be exhausted before taking any military action.

At this time, Sadat felt that Egypt could not initiate a war with Israel. His idea was well expressed in the reasons given for taking the 4 February 1971 Peace Initiative: "I believed that as military action was ruled out at the time, a diplomatic offensive had to be launched."^9

First of all, Sadat relied on the Soviet Union to help him attain his goal of Israel's withdrawal from the occupying territory. This effort aimed at military preparedness for attacking Israel. After defeat in the Six-Day War, the Soviets had been continuously

---

supporting the Egyptian position on this point and resupplied weapons and advisors to Egypt. For the Soviet leaders did not want Egypt to be collapsed by Israel, which meant the loss of Soviet access to and influence in the Middle East. As long as Egypt would not start a war against Israel, the Soviets cooperated; but when Egypt asked for offensive weapons, the Soviet Union declined to provide them because it could cause another full-scale Arab-Israeli war and bring about another defeat of Egypt. Furthermore, there was a high possibility of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. confrontation. It was evident that Soviet leaders wanted to avoid the latter. Instead, Soviet efforts focused on supplying defensive weapons and economic aid to Egypt. Sadat thought that the Soviets were not ready to solve the Middle East problem by military means.

Second, Sadat's diplomatic steps were also taken toward the U.S., but this was in fact incompatible with his effort to obtain offensive weapons from the Soviets. General Shazly commented on Sadat's dual strategy:

"October 1970-May 1971. During this period .... He was trying to convince the Egyptian people and the Soviet Union that he was prepared and willing to go to war, while at the same time secretly trying to convince the Americans that he really wanted peace. He is a typical Machiavellian ruler."  


The underlying assumption in Sadat's approach to the U.S. lay in the idea that if the U.S. knew that Egypt was only interested in regaining the Sinai, not in destroying Israel, it would persuade Israel to withdraw from the Sinai. The U.S. became interested in Sadat's actions, but they produced nothing.\textsuperscript{12}

In short, during the early days of the Sadat presidency, Egyptian leaders tried to solve the Middle East crisis through diplomatic measures. By sending a message to the U.S. that Egypt wanted peace, not war, Sadat hoped indirectly that President Nixon would influence Israel to give up the Sinai Peninsula. It should be also noted that Sadat's approaching the U.S. resulted from some dissatisfaction with the Soviets' handling of his request for offensive capabilities.

2) The second stage: A "medium threat" period
(July 1971-Nov. 1972)

This phase was characterized by an increasing possibility that the Sinai would be a "de facto" territory of Israel. Sadat's diplomacy with the Soviets and Americans continued, but little progress was made toward overcoming the lost territory. Accordingly, he had no alternative but to make a decision to use military force to regain it.

Sadat announced 1971 as a "Year of Decision" in which he would regain the Sinai by diplomacy or war. It was certain that he

was optimistic about his approach to the Soviets and Americans. In May, Podgorny guaranteed the transfer of strategic offensive weapons, while the U.S. supported the idea of Egypt's acceptance of an indefinite cease-fire in exchange for Israel's withdrawal half-way across the Sinai.

But as the year 1971 went by, there remained no prospect of resolving the Middle East crisis by the superpowers. Brezhnev were reluctant to provide Egypt with strategic offensive weapons in spite of the promise made earlier. Sadat's words were: "I waited through June, July, August and most of September for what Podgorny himself had promised, but to no avail. I often summoned the Soviet Ambassador ... I wrote to the Soviet leaders frequently but all I could receive ... was that they were away in their Crimean summer resort." 13 With this dissatisfying response from the Soviets, Sadat received a similar reaction from the United States. The U.S. was not so active in peace negotiations with Israel as was promised in the Bergus-Sterner message of 6 July 1971. 14 This U.S. inaction occurred along with continued Israeli actions. Since nothing happened for several months, Sadat came to the conclusion that diplomatic measures could not resolve the crisis in the Middle East. His American approach proved unsuccessful.

With Sadat's blame on the U.S., two military plans were proposed by top military leaders in Egypt. The first was called Operation 41, recoded in 1972 as Granite Two. The second was the

High Minarets. Operation 41 required Soviet cooperation, because it aimed at a 30-40 mile thrust across the Canal to hold the Mitla and Gidi passes. It would be a dramatic victory for Egypt since she was defeated in the Six-Day War, if the operation could be completed successfully. On the other hand, the High Minarets could be waged within the limit of Egyptian capability, which made the Soviet help unnecessary. It had as its objective a five-six mile thrust across the Suez Canal and the establishment of a bridgehead there, even though it would be a less dramatic victory.

The question was, "on which side should Egypt put a priority, dramatic victory with Soviet support or a less dramatic victory with Egypt finding its own way?" For Sadat, it was evident that he favored the former, but military leaders supported the latter. Most military leaders opposed Operation 41 on the basis of unpreparedness of the capability of the Egyptian forces. General Shazly stated:

"It (Operation 41) was impossible because the resources were impossible. We would need vast quantities of equipment. Much of it was still under development; much of it the Soviet Union was not ready to give. Even if the Soviets did supply us, we would need several years to absorb, especially into the air force and air defense system."\(^{15}\)

It might be said that military leaders thought that Egypt should not go to war against Israel until April 1972, even if the new Soviet equipment arrived at once. It would take at least six months to

absorb it into service. However, Sadat's decision was based on the political grounds that war should start before the "year of decision" ended. His determination to go to war was well expressed in his order for mobilization, his assumption of the title of Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and his withdrawal of the February 4 peace initiative in early November.16

Sadat's bellicose action of November 1971 was a political bluff basically designed to force the U.S. to pressure Israel because of the Egyptian threat of war.17 However, Israel considered the series of Sadat's behaviors seriously and discussed the matter with the United States. Unlike Sadat's expectation, Israeli-U.S. relations became tighter militarily and politically.

The Egyptian objective of regaining the Sinai were not attained during the year of decision. Rather, it became clear that Operation 41 would completely fail without Soviet strategic offensive weapons and the High Minarets would not guarantee its success without Soviet support of electronic aircraft-jamming units.18 Furthermore, Egyptian diplomatic efforts to pressure the Israelis via the U.S. failed as U.S.-Israeli relations became closer. Accordingly, there existed a slim possibility to regain the Sinai. Because of the Soviets' reluctance to increase the Egyptian offensive capability due to detente between the two superpowers, there remained no other solution but to initiate

---

16. Ibid., p. 114.  
17. Ibid., p. 30.  
a war. The Soviets just did not want an American-Soviet confrontation.19

On this situation of "no peace, no war," the only alternative to break it was to rely on the High Minarets in which Egypt could fight with the military resources already in hand. In a July meeting with military leaders, Sadat favored war initiation on the basis that time was working against Egypt as long as the superpowers supported the existing status-quo in the Middle East, while military leaders opposed it because its war plan was contingent upon gaining air parity with Israel.20 The opposition from the military continued until Sadat dismissed top military leaders such as Sadiq, Hassan and Muhammad Ali at a 24 October 1972 meeting for the reason that they would not agree with him on the issue of war initiation. It was on 30 November 1972 that Sadat made a firm decision to use military power.21 His belief was that Egypt could not escape from the prolonged state of "no peace, no war" without recourse to armed force.

In sum, conflicts among civilians and military leaders became intensified on the issue of whether to go to war. Those favoring war initiation argued that as the Middle East situation became more unfavorable to Egypt (due to detente between two superpowers, the Soviet reluctance to send weapons and the close link between the U.S. and Israel), Egypt should give up searching for a diplomatic

---

solution and resort to an immediate war because time was not working in Egypt's favor. Military leaders opposed it on the grounds that Egypt could not win the war without Soviet weapons. Sadat dismissed several military leaders who opposed going to war and made a decision to use military force.


The period (December 1972-October 1973) was characterized by gradual steps toward war taken by Sadat with a supply of Soviet weapons. Soviet attitudes towards Egypt had changed since the start of 1973 by signing a new arms agreement with Egypt in March 1973. The Soviets promised to send offensive weapons desperately needed by Egypt. The Soviets worried about the possible loss of Soviet influence in the Middle East as the U.S. obtained peaceful relations with China and North Vietnam in early 1973. The U.S. came to the widening of its sphere of influence throughout the world, which was not compatible with the Soviet interests.

Along with this deterrent power in hand, Sadat made an official announcement of going to war on April 1973 on the basis that there remained no alternative but to start a war against Israel to break the "no peace, no war" situation. Based on Sadat's instruction to the new Egyptian Chief of Staff, Gen. Shazly, in January 1973 on the preparation of the crossing of the Canal, Sadat made a final decision

\[22. \text{For the details of a list of arms, see Shazly, } \textit{Op. cit.}, \text{ p. 198.}\]
to attack on May 1973, but it was postponed until October 1973. The reasons for the delay were stated by Sadat:

"I planned in fact to launch the operation in May, but then the Russians set the date for the Second Summit Conference with Nixon in Washington for the month of May, and political reasons which need not be revealed at this point I decided to postpone the date to the group of days in September or to the third group of days in October."23

It should be noted that it was a part of the whole deception plan carried out by Sadat. He had continuously threatened a war against Israel with no actual military action to weaken the fighting spirit of the Israelis until Egypt finally succeeded in carrying out a surprise attack against Israel on 6 October 1973.

The war decision of October was not favored unanimously by Egyptian leaders. At the 30 September 1973 meeting of the National Defense Council, some civilian leaders favored it, while others stood against it. Those opposing the use of force were pessimistic about the lack of money, material shortage, insufficient training, lack of food stockpiles and the disasters that might occur if things went wrong.24 Basically most opponents focused on economic problems concerned with war initiation. The Minister of Supply particularly opposed it for economic reasons; available food supplies were not enough for a long

drawn-out battle. But economic factors did not play a major role in postponing or cancelling the war initiation decision. Sadat adhered to his original position by arguing:

"Now You've said this, let me tell you that our economy has fallen below zero. We have commitments (to the banks, and so on) which we should but cannot meet by the end of year. In three months' time, by say, 1974, we shan't have enough bread in the pantry! I cannot ask the Arabs for a single dollar more; they say they have been paying us an aid in lieu of the lost Canal revenue, although we didn't, or wouldn't, fight."

The most urgent concern for Sadat was his perception of time; as time went by, the chance to break the situation of "no peace, no war" became more difficult. His decision was a purely political consideration without regarding the military capacity of Egypt. He later thought that he would have gone to war even if the Soviet arms did not arrive on time.

In short, Sadat's determination to use force was reinforced by the Soviet transfer of strategic offensive weapons. There came no serious challenges from the military leaders for two reasons. First, there had already been a shakeup of top military leaders and, second, the military capacity was greatly increased; thus there remained no reason for military leaders to oppose war initiation. Instead, major challenges came from civilian leaders, but they could not change Sadat's war decision.

Throughout the crisis (October 1970-October 1973), Sadat efforts to regain the Sinai started with diplomatic steps to force the U.S. to pressure the withdrawal of Israel along with preparing military plans, which desperately needed Soviet offensive weapons. When these efforts proved a failure with the coming of detente in which the U.S. and Soviets wanted to maintain the status-quo in the Middle East, Sadat had no alternative but to resort to war. Military leaders opposed Sadat's political war just to break the "no peace, no war" situation because of military unpreparedness of the Egyptian army. When military preparedness was obtained with the signing of the arms agreement with the Soviets, it was the civilian leadership who stood against Sadat's war initiation for economic reasons. Sadat urged them to accept his position and war started as planned on 6 October 1973.

C. Civilians, Military Leaders and Aggressiveness

The decision to initiate a war against Israel on 6 October 1973 was not made unanimously. The pros and cons of it continued in serious debate throughout the crisis. It was clear that Sadat himself was responsible for war decisions, however; civilian and military leaders in Egypt played a major, if not crucial, role in the decision-making process of the Ramadan War.
1) Civilian and military leaders on the use of force

In the early presidency of Sadat, his belief was that the crisis in the Middle East could be resolved by diplomatic measures. He approached the U.S. and hoped that the Americans would induce Israel to give up the Egyptian territories in the Sinai Peninsula that had been lost in the 1967 war. There were severe conflicts among Egyptian leaders, especially civilian leaders, on whether to use diplomatic steps or return to the war of attrition without any extension of the cease-fire.

Sadat's diplomatic actions were supported and favored by Fawzi and Haykel in that if Egypt was isolated from the West, its foreign policy options would be reduced. The Sabri group stood against Egypt's diplomatic opening to the West by arguing that Egypt should not expect American diplomatic help; instead, they argued for an immediate resumption of the war of attrition.\(^{27}\) Sadat rejected the demand of the Sabri group and extended the cease-fire with Israel.

As diplomacy with the U.S. failed, Sadat was determined to use force to obtain his objective of regaining the Sinai. The crucial question was whether the Soviets would send offensive weapons. However, the U.S.-Soviet detente prevented the Soviets from taking an active role in the settlement of the Middle East crisis. With respect to this situation, the Egyptian military leaders were not unanimous

on the question of whether to fight only with the Soviet help or even without it. Those favoring the latter argued for Operation 41 and those supporting the former preferred the High Minarets.

There were serious conflicts among military leaders on the way in which military operations were to be carried out. General Shazly, Chief of Staff, favored a limited operation like the High Minarets on the basis of four factors: (1) the weakness of the Egyptian air force; (2) the offensive limitations of the Egyptian SAMs; (3) the need to force Israel to fight under unfavorable conditions; and (4) the need to give battle experiences to the Egyptian soldiers. On the other hand, General Sadek, War Minister and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, opposed General Shazly's idea by arguing that Egypt should launch a unlimited attack to regain the whole Sinai. For Egypt would gain nothing politically if it failed to occupy the entire Sinai.

The Shazly-Sadek conflict came from different assumptions that Sadek thought it possible to launch an attack within less than a year if the Soviets supplied offensive weapons. Shazly believed that an all-out war against Israel would be impossible because Egypt had a limited means by which to fight and even if the Soviet sent weapons that Egypt needed, it would take several years to absorb it. Sadek assumed it from the political perspective of why Egypt should go to war, i.e., regaining the lost territories, while Shazly focused on it from the military perspective that war should be won, if Egypt went to war.

29. Ibid., pp. 27-8.
Even if Sadek considered war politically, it did not necessarily mean that he was completely in harmony with Sadat, who was eager to use force to break the "no peace, no war" situation. Sadek strongly opposed war against Israel until Soviet offensive weapons arrived. His concern was the military unpreparedness of the Egyptian forces in comparison with the Israeli troops.

Comparing the Egyptian top leaders on their aggressiveness toward war initiation, we might say that Sadat, as President, wanted a war for the purely political reason that Egypt needed to break the stalemated situation regardless of war preparedness. Sadek, as War Minister, considered war less politically than Sadat, but more politically than Shazly in that Egypt should wait to initiate war until military preparedness was complete, but when it was done, Egypt should launch an unlimited attack against Israel. And Shazly, as Chief of Staff, argued for a limited attack even if the Soviets supplied weapons for some military reasons.

Military opposition had its peak during the 28 October 1972 meeting of the Supreme Council of the armed forces when most of military leaders challenged Sadat's idea of war initiation. Military leaders like Sadek, Wasil, Commander of the Third Army, and Mamun, Commander of the Second Army, maintained that the Egyptian forces were not ready for war and more efforts should focus on military preparations before going to war. Sadat dismissed them after the meeting.

---
After the signing of the arms deal between the Soviets and Egypt in May 1973, Sadat wanted a full-scale war against Israel. However, Shazly, and Ismail, the new War Minister, still favored a limited attack even though they knew that a large-scale war was Sadat's political strategy to induce Syria to participate in the war. Even in a situation where the military preparedness became almost finished, military leaders were still less aggressive than Sadat. The interesting point was that most of the military leaders at least did not oppose war initiation itself: their differences with Sadat were still the degree to which war should be carried out, i.e., a limited or full-scale war. For there was a possibility of limited military success, but within the limits of military capability, military leaders would not favor a unlimited war.31

While military leaders challenged Sadat by favoring a limited attack against Israel, civilian leaders focused on economic reasons to question whether to fight. Sadat's answer was that even if the Egyptian economy was devastated from the start of war, it would be offset by the probability that the war would change dramatically the world.32 He believed that it would be more honorable to die in battle than to continue in the "no peace, no war" situation.

In sum, throughout the crisis most of the military leaders were reluctant to favor an all-out war plan against Israel to regain the

whole Sinai proposed by Sadat, because they thought the Egyptian military capability far inferior to that of Israel. Even after Egypt obtained the weapons that it needed, they still favored a limited war which could provide Egypt with a tactical military victory. In the case of the War Ministers (Sadek and Ismail) vs. other military leaders like the Chief of Staff (Shazly), the former tended to understand the political considerations of going to war, while the latter stuck to a military perspective for going to war. On the other hand, some civilian leaders basically favored war initiation before diplomatic measures had been taken, and others opposed it even after diplomatic steps were exhausted and military plans were ready. Civilian leaders were not as consistent as military leaders.

2) The military influence on war decisions

There were big differences on war initiation among the Egyptian military leaders before and after military preparedness was completed. Military leaders were basically pessimistic about war initiation against Israel before the Soviet strategic weapons arrived. Most of them opposed Sadat's idea of starting a war on the basis that Egypt could not win it. The negative attitudes of military leaders toward war initiation led Sadat to dismiss them. In a situation in which Sadat desperately needed to break the stalemate, the opposition of military leaders could not play a role in changing
Sadat's mind. However, it was certain that the military advice at any rate postponed the date of attack, even if it did not cancel it.\footnote{Originally Sadat selected the date of attack on 15 November, 1972; but, as the military were not ready, he could not but to postpone it. The only thing he could do was to dismiss some of military leaders. See, for example, Sadat, \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. 234-236; and Israeli, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 80.}

After the signing of the arms deal agreement, military leaders favored a limited war plan rather than a full-scale one on the basis of their estimation of military capacity. It was certain that the military advice took a positive attitude towards war initiation favored by Sadat, but it failed to meet his idea of a unlimited war. However, the final decision to go to war was based on a limited war concept (the High Minarets) that military leaders had continuously asserted.

With respect to the timing of attack, it might be said that the first was set on 15 November 1972 by Sadat for political reasons. After the early November election in the U.S., Sadat hoped that President Nixon would take an active role in peace negotiations in the Middle East. This date of the attack failed to consider the military perspective; the other times were set on the second half of May, September or October 1973 by General Gamasi, Chief of Operations.\footnote{Israeli, \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. 82-4.} The dates of May and September were used as parts of the deception plan, while the actual time was chosen as 6 October 1973. The attacking date, if it was set on political grounds, had little impact on the decision of the actual date. Military leaders were powerful in
deciding an actual date of attack. The only thing Sadat could do was to choose one of the dates recommended by military leaders.

In sum, the military had a major impact on war decisions. Their attitudes toward war initiation depended on whether military preparedness was ready. When they opposed the use of military force, it did have little impact on the war decision itself, but much impact on delaying the war initiation. When they favored it, their advice was completely accepted. They determined a limited warfare strategy rather than an unlimited one. They were also influential in suggesting a series of dates for the attack from which Sadat selected an actual war date. On the other hand, when they disagreed with Sadat, they were faced with Sadat's order of dismissal of them.

D. Conclusion: Some Comparisons with Betts' Idea

The Ramadan War was a typical case in that diplomatic steps were taken before the decision to go to war was made. As time went by, Egyptian chances to regain the lost Sinai Peninsula became reduced. The territory had been increasingly absorbed into Israel, which meant that Egypt's security was increasingly threatened.

At an early stage, Sadat used diplomatic means to try to resolve the crisis in the Middle East. He wanted the U.S. to pressure Israel's withdrawal and hoped for a Soviet transfer of strategic offensive weapons to prepare for a possible assault against Israel. Neither superpower satisfied Sadat. The superpowers wanted detente between them, which brought about the avoidance of any
change in the Middle East as long as the U.S. and U.S.S.R. favored the status-quo in the area. There remained no alternative for Sadat but to resort to armed force to break the "no peace, no war" situation. Most military leaders opposed the war initiation because of the lack of military unpreparedness, while Sadat thought that time was not working in Egypt's favor. He dismissed several military leaders who stood against his idea.

On May 1973, the Soviets supplied the strategic weapons that Egypt needed, and military leaders then did not oppose war. But they favored a limited war rather than a unlimited one on the basis of Egyptian military capability. Sadat favored the latter, but he had to accept the idea of his military leaders and war started on 6 October 1973.

If we compare the Ramadan War with Betts' findings that civilian leaders tend to be more aggressive on war initiation than military leaders, it might be said that in the case of the Ramadan War, military leaders were more aggressive than civilian leaders. Military leaders opposed war when the military preparedness was not ready, and they were less aggressive than Sadat and more aggressive than civilian leaders when military preparedness was completed. Civilian leaders opposed the war initiation for the economic reason that Egypt would be devastated if things went wrong. Sadat was consistently more aggressive after diplomatic measures failed than civilian and military leaders; military leaders were more aggressive than civilian leaders.
Among military leaders, top military decision makers like the War Minister tended to understand Sadat's views on war initiation, which led to the conclusion that the War Minister was more aggressive than other military leaders.

With respect to Betts' idea of the military influence on war decisions, we might say that in the Ramadan War case, military leaders were, in general, powerful in that their negative advice postponed the actual date of attack, even though it failed to cancel the war initiation plan, while their positive recommendation of a limited war was accepted, even though it was not compatible with Sadat's idea of a unlimited war. Furthermore, the date of the actual attack was influenced by military leaders. When Sadat set the date for political reasons, it was not accepted by military leaders.

Some unique aspects of the case of the Ramadan war exist. First, the views of military leaders on war initiation depended on whether military preparedness was completed, not on the intensity of the threat to Egyptian security. Second, there were some conflicts between top military men like the War Minister and other military leaders. The former tried to accept the political views of Sadat on war initiation, while the latter considered it on military grounds. But top military men at last accepted the view of other military leaders in deciding the type of warfare, i.e., the objective of war initiation. And third, Sadat dominated war decisions on which military leaders had a major impact, while civilian leaders had little influence.
Chapter VIII
Conclusion: Toward a New Theory of Civil-Military Decision-Making in War Initiation

This dissertation examined five cases of war initiation involving countries other than the United States—the Chinese intervention in the Korean War (1950), the British intervention in the Suez crisis (1956), Israel's Six-Day War (1967), India's Indo-Pakistan War (1971) and Egypt's Ramadan War (1973). Its main objective was to find out whether the findings of Richard Betts in his analysis of U.S. military intervention cases during 1945-1975 were applicable to similar cases of war intervention by countries other than the United States.

Betts' research focused on two areas of inquiry. The first area relates to the relative aggressiveness between civilian and military leaders with respect to recommending war intervention. His research revealed that civilian leaders were more aggressive than their military counterparts in recommending a decision to go to war.
The second area relates to the relative influence of the military leadership when advocating a "war-no war" decision toward war initiation. Betts found that military leaders were most influential when they recommended negative advice to the top decision maker and least powerful when they advocated war initiation.

This showed that even if civilian leaders wanted to go to war, they were unlikely to do so when military preparedness was not complete; on the other hand, civilian leaders did not accept a military recommendation for war initiation unless the civilian leadership was also predisposed. The point is that war decisions were always controlled by political considerations rather than made on military grounds alone. Military advice for war was a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for a decision to go to war.

A. Aggressiveness of Civilian and Military Leadership

With respect to Betts' findings that civilian leaders were more aggressive than military leaders in war initiation, it might be said that some cases confirmed his findings, while others do not agree with his view. Table 1 summarizes our analysis of this first research question.
As Table 1 shows, one cannot generalize Betts' findings about civilian aggressiveness to the non-American cases. Only two of the five cases, Britain (1956) and India (1971), show a clearly similar pattern to Betts' cases. Let us summarize these cases.

An analysis of the Suez crisis of 1956 showed that civilians were not consistent throughout the crisis. Some argued for a quick strike of Egypt, while others favored a negotiated settlement. But, in general, civilian leaders were more aggressive than military leaders. The military opposed sending soldiers in the beginning when
military preparedness was not ready, but once complete, they did not oppose an invasion of Egypt. Rather, they prepared and submitted the invasion plans to Eden. Military recommendations were clearly distinguishable between before and after the military readiness was complete. After that, they did not oppose war initiation, and they submitted the military plan most feasible to win the war within British military capability. British military superiority assured military leaders of victory against Egypt and they did not hesitate to initiate a war.

The second case that confirmed Betts' findings was India (1971). Military leaders opposed an early use of military force against Pakistan to resolve the refugee problem because of the military unpreparedness. Some civilian leaders were basically aggressive from the start of the crisis on economic grounds and others called for a diplomatic campaign before taking any military action.

But as diplomacy failed, virtually all civilian leaders favored an attack. By this time, military leaders had completed their preparedness for a war and did not oppose it. However, military leaders were less aggressive than civilians, even after they completed military preparations. They sought a limited war objective, while civilians wanted an all-out war against Pakistan. The Indian case confirmed Betts' findings in that civilians were more aggressive than military leaders on war initiation.

Although two cases clearly confirmed Betts' findings about civilian aggressiveness vis-a-vis the military, the three remaining
case studies reveal a different pattern. The Chinese intervention case (1950) showed that most of the Chinese military and civilian leaders were opposed to sending Chinese soldiers to aid North Korea. The primary reason for the military leaders' hesitation to advocate military intervention was based on military grounds that the Chinese army could not obtain a military victory against the United States. The Chinese civilian leaders also opposed war for economic reasons; the Chinese economy would be devastated should China intervene in Korea.

But Mao, with strong support of a small number of top military men like his Chief of Staff, argued for war initiation on the political grounds that China should go to war because it should not sit idly by when its neighbor was attacked, even though there were military and economic difficulties.

In the next case, Israel and the Six-Day War (1967), military leaders were basically aggressive from the start of the crisis. But when they completed military preparedness for a war, they became more aggressive than before. The completion of military readiness to fight assured the military leaders of victory. On the other hand, civilians opposed the use of force throughout the crisis and emphasized diplomatic measures. The point of civilian leaders was that war should not be initiated before exhausting every political option. This is the traditional view of civil-military relations on war initiation, which is not compatible with Betts' findings.

The final case is Egypt and the Ramadan War (1973). It is similar to the case of the Chinese intervention in Korea. Civilians
opposed the use of military force for economic reasons throughout the crisis. Most military men except the War Minister opposed it. It was only the top decision maker who made the final decision to intervene in the crisis. As was said before in the Chinese case where Mao himself and a small number of top military men favored war initiation, Sadat was determined to use force and the Soviets supported Egypt militarily. Sadat wanted to break the political stalemate in the Middle East.

In sum, when examining Betts' idea that civilian leaders tended to be more aggressive than military leaders in war initiation, the five case studies showed that Betts' findings were confirmed in the Suez crisis (Britain 1956) and Indo-Pakistan War (India 1971). The cases of the Six-Day War (Israel 1967) and the Ramadan War (Egypt 1973) demonstrated that military leaders were more aggressive than civilians and in the Ramadan case the top military leader was more aggressive. And the study of the Korean War case (China 1950) concluded that both civilian and military leaders were hostile to war initiation. Thus our study provides a mixed pattern of similarity to Betts' findings.

B. Relative Impact of Military "War-No War" Recommendation

The second area of Betts' research considered in this dissertation is the extent to which the top civilian decision maker is more likely to accept a military positive recommendation with
respect to war initiation than a negative recommendation. Table 2 summarizes our findings from the five case studies.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Military Advice Against War</th>
<th>Military Advice Favoring War</th>
<th>Confirmation Betts' Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existed</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Existed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (1950)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Existed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain (1956)</td>
<td>yes (before m-p)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (after m-p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel (1967)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>little impact</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (1971)</td>
<td>yes (before m-p)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (only for limited war after m-p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (1973)</td>
<td>yes (before m-p)</td>
<td>yes (delayed attack)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* m-p means military preparedness
As Table 2 shows, there is more evidence found for the second hypothesis, the relative merits of a military "war-no war" recommendation. Thus this hypothesis is more generalizable to the non-American cases than was the first hypothesis about relative civilian/military aggressiveness. We can observe that the hypothesis was either totally or somewhat confirmed in four of the five cases. The lone case where it was not applicable was China (1950).

Let us consider the Chinese case first. Military leaders opposed intervention on the military grounds that China could not win the war. The military unpreparedness for a possible war led them to conclude that they should not go to war. Military leaders wanted to avoid a military confrontation with the U.S. When they recommended this negative advice to Mao, it was not accepted, which is not compatible with Betts' findings. The final decision was made by Mao himself, even though most of the Chinese leaders did not favor it. As long as Mao was determined to use military force from the early stage of the crisis, the only influential advice was to support his favoring war initiation. There remained no other room where a negative recommendation could change his mind.

The remaining four case studies reveal either total or part confirmation of Betts' analysis. In the British case (1956) it can be said that the negative advice of military leaders toward war initiation played a major role in postponing a British early attack against Egypt, but their later positive recommendation based on military readiness had little impact on the war decision. This is very
similar to Betts' view of war initiation in terms of military influence on war decisions.

Why were China (1950) and Britain (1956) different in terms of the military influence on the war decision? A reason would be that in case of the British leader, Eden, who was a pure civilian leader without having much knowledge of military operations, he had no alternative but to accept the negative advice of the military leaders. On the other hand, Mao had substantial military knowledge before he became the top leader in China and was not influenced by military recommendations, whether they were positive or negative. Another explanation would be the role of external powers. The U.S. played a major role in preventing the Eden government from going to war, while Mao's decision to intervene in Korea was supported directly or indirectly by the Soviet Union. China could go to war despite opposition of its military leaders because of strong support from the Soviets. Britain, on the other hand, delayed the military plan because of U.S. opposition.

The fact that Mao was more determined to use force than Eden might be another part of the explanation as to why Chinese military negative advice had little impact on the war decision and why the British military negative recommendation was effective in the early stage of Nasser's nationalization.

The third case was Israel (1967). It should be noted that aggressive military advice did not have much impact on the actual decision of war. The positive recommendation of war initiation failed to persuade Eshkol to start a war against Egypt. The reasons why the
positive advice of the military toward war initiation did not have much impact on Eshkol's decision would be partly explained from both Eshkol's indecisive attitude and the role of the external powers. The U.S. urged the Eshkol government to resolve the crisis via diplomatic means rather than by going to war. Overall, the Israeli case confirmed Betts' findings in that the positive advice of the military leaders had little impact on war initiation.

The fourth case study is India (1971). Throughout this crisis, the advice of Indian military leaders had a major impact on delaying war initiation. Because of the military unpreparedness, they recommended against war, which was accepted by Mrs. Gandhi government. When they recommended war initiation after the completion of military readiness, Mrs. Gandhi also followed the military advice, especially about when to start war. But they did not have an influence on deciding the war objective. In general, the military leaders had a significant influence on the war decision of delaying the attack. But their role became minor after the exhaustion of diplomatic options, which confirmed Betts' findings that negative advice of military leaders was most influential and positive recommendations were least powerful.

The final case study is Egypt and the Ramadan War (1973). During the early stage when the military preparedness was not ready, Egyptian military leaders opposed the use of force. But after it was complete with the strong help of the Soviets, they became more aggressive in recommending war initiation. These military leaders had a significant impact on delaying the attack at the initial stage of
the crisis. Once the military preparedness was ready, military leaders favored a limited attack rather than an all-out war against Israel that Sadat asserted. In general, military advice was influential in war decisions whether it was positive or negative. The Egyptian case thus partially confirmed Betts' findings. The military negative advice was influential but the positive advice was also powerful in the decisions about the timing and the nature of the war.

In sum, Betts' findings on the impact of military recommendations regarding the initiation of war were basically confirmed. In all cases but one (China 1950) when the military advised against war, the top decision maker took the advice, at least in delaying the decision to go to war. In all cases where war was either originally or eventually favored by the military, other events, principally political considerations, carried more weight than did the military recommendation for war.

C. Theoretical Implications

This dissertation should not stop at comparing Betts' findings with those of our five cases studies. It is important for the development of a theory of war initiation that theoretically interesting conditions should be examined, which could bring about "contingent generalizations" on war initiation.1 To this end, we shall

1. On the role of independent or intervening variables in developing or constructing explanatory theory. See George and Smoke, Deterrence in American foreign policy, pp. 512-15.
treat each case as if it were a deviant case in order to uncover interesting causal patterns of war initiation.

By arguing that military leaders tended to be less aggressive than civilians in recommending war, Betts challenged the conventional wisdom that the military was eager to use military force in war decisions. But our five case studies showed that Betts' findings were not always applicable to other countries' cases. It is not enough to show the differences between Betts' findings and our case studies. Here, we need to focus on explanations of the various conditions that brought about the outcome of war initiation in order to develop a new theory on war initiation.

We challenged Betts' idea that civilian leaders are more aggressive than civilian leaders in war initiation by simply saying that the idea cannot always be applied to other countries' cases. How can we account for the differences between Betts' findings and ours? And what conclusions can we draw from them? Let us examine two questions from (1) the attitudes of civilian and military leaders, and (2) the impact of military leaders on war initiation.

With respect to the first point, we hypothesize that it is reasonable to find differences between Betts' findings and our cases if we assume that there exist fundamental differences in dealing with war initiation between civilian and military leaders. The former analyzes the situation from a broad or underlying sense of the military balance of power between the two countries, that is, a perspective that one's relative strength is, in a general sense, more or less powerful than the potential adversary. The latter's advice,
however, is based on an immediate or case-by-case sense that military plans are set up to wage a specific war. Therefore, civilian leaders express their ideas more quickly than military leaders, because civilian leaders usually have some idea of the relative strength with respect to the potential adversary that rarely changes even after they examine concrete military plans submitted by military leaders. When they are optimistic about relative strength they become aggressive, and when pessimistic they are hesitant to use force.

On the other hand, military leaders are usually hesitant before specific plans of war initiation are ready. Unlike civilians who rely on a broad knowledge of military balance, military leaders consider primarily specific military problems such as logistical problems, mobilization and so forth in case of war occurrence, because these are directly related to military victory in war. It is, in this regard, possible for some friction on intervention decision to occur between civilian and military leaders. Military leaders recommend different types of war plans depending on their evaluation of military strength alone vis-a-vis the potential adversary's.

Table 3 outlines three power relationships between the two adversaries as perceived by civilian leadership who are contemplating war initiation.
It may be said, broadly speaking, that civilian leaders in a country with superior military power tend to become aggressive toward war initiation against a relatively weak country. In this respect, we argue that the U.S. intervention cases are included in this category in a sense that civilians are more aggressive than military leaders. But military leaders are not always aggressive even in the U.S. cases because there are certain difficulties in waging a war such as extensive geographical distances. We see differences between civilian and military leaders in that the latter emphasizes only military aspects in a specific situation, while the former sees the military balance between two countries more broadly. Two out of our five cases (Britain 1956 and India 1971) are clearly similar to the
American cases in Betts' analysis in a sense that the initiator's military strength was superior to the adversary's. Another two cases (China 1950 and Egypt 1973) show the absence of superiority of the initiator with respect to the adversary. The remaining case (Israel 1967) demonstrates limited superiority of the initiator vis-a-vis the adversary. Our five cases indicate that war might occur regardless of superiority in military balance of power between two countries. It is interesting to study civilian aggressiveness from this perspective. Are civilian leaders aggressive if they enjoy superiority in military strength with respect to the adversary's? Or are they hesitant to use force when military strength is not favorable to them?

Let us consider the cases where civilians are aggressive due to the relatively superior strength with respect to the potential adversary. First, the British case of 1956 clearly shows that civilians, including a top decision maker, asked for a quick strike of Egypt when they heard the nationalization news in the initial stage of the Suez crisis on the basis that the British military strength was superior to that of the Egyptian. They considered it to be harmful to the British interests and prestige in the Middle East if the British military intervention did not stop Nasser's action as quickly as possible. When British civilian leaders heard the military recommendation that it was impossible to attack Egypt quickly for military reasons, they had no alternative but to wait until military leaders submitted military plans even though they were eager to use force; later they were disappointed to hear that the British military leaders advocated a limited warfare. The British civilian leaders, on
the one hand, thought that the British were overwhelmingly superior to the Egyptians militarily and wanted an all-out war to destroy Nasser's regime, not a limited warfare to recover the Suez Canal. On the other hand, military leaders basically considered their military capabilities to fight and opposed an early intervention. Here we see differences between civilian and military leaders. The former would not hesitate to use military force when they possessed superior strength. The only concern for the British civilian leaders was how to justify the British intervention to the world community, especially the United States. The British civilian leaders were more interested in obtaining U.S. approval of intervention or in keeping other powers at least neutral rather than in carrying out military plans submitted by the British military leaders once military leaders approved intervention even though it was a minimal level. Hence, military considerations were ignored at the actual war decision-making stage.

Second, the Indian civilian leaders were similar to those in the British case when the refugee problem occurred with East Pakistan in 1971. The civilian leaders were aggressive toward war initiation because the Indian military strength was more powerful than Pakistan, but they accepted the military advice at the early stage of the crisis to postpone war initiation. The Indian military leaders were concerned that the Chinese would intervene to help Pakistan militarily and submitted military plans to delay war initiation until winter made it difficult for China to support Pakistan militarily. Moreover, the Indian civilian leaders were not happy with the military advice, which advocated a limited warfare against East
Pakistan. They favored an all-out war against Pakistan in order to demonstrate India's regional status of power. As long as military leaders supported war initiation even though it was a limited war plan, civilian leaders were free to use force. The main concern for the Indian civilian leaders was to justify their action against Pakistan to the international community. India tried to neutralize the Chinese threat to intervene in case of war by diplomacy aimed at drawing support from the Soviets and keeping other Western powers at least neutral.

In sum, it might be said that when the military balance of power is favorable to the initiator vis-a-vis the adversary, civilian leaders in the initiator nation become aggressive toward war initiation; moreover, if military leaders support war initiation although it would not satisfy civilian leaders' expectation of what they wanted military leaders to do, civilian leaders would not care about military recommendation any longer. Civilian leaders focus on preventing the third party from intervening in the crisis as long as they are superior in military strength against the adversary.

Let us examine the cases where civilian leaders are hesitant to use military force because of the lack of military superiority vis-a-vis that of the potential adversary. First, the Chinese civilian leaders opposed military intervention in Korea due to their evaluation of the weak Chinese military power vis-a-vis the United States. Military leaders also opposed sending troops to Korea for the military reason that its purpose would have been to obtain victory against the U.S. The Chinese civilian and military leaders agreed with non-
intervention in Korea, but it was Mao, a top decision maker who pushed China into a war. Military considerations were completely ignored in the Chinese decision to enter the Korean War. When civilian leaders were forced to enter the Korean War, they had no alternative but to send warnings to the U.S. in order to avoid war, and later felt that the only country on which they could rely militarily was the Soviet Union.

Second, the Egyptian case of 1973 is similar to the Chinese case. The Egyptian civilians opposed war due to a weak military position vis-a-vis the Israeli's and military leaders hesitated to use force because of lack of offensive military weapons, but a top decision maker decided on war initiation. The difference with the Chinese case is that the Egyptian military leaders accepted Sadat's war initiation by recommending a limited war plan as soon as the Soviets delivered such weapons. The Chinese military leaders were forced to go to war in Korea regardless of their reluctance, while military leaders in Egypt partially accepted Sadat's idea: a limited warfare different from an all-out war advocated by Sadat.

As we have seen, civilian leaders in both cases did not favor war initiation in a situation where the military balance of power was unfavorable to them. Thus, they were less aggressive toward war initiation. China and Egypt would not try to justify their actions to the world community as long as their military strength was not superior to that of the adversary. Their attention was paid to obtaining direct military assistance from the Soviets in order to neutralize the superior military capabilities of the adversary. They
focused on how to use their limited force efficiently such as a blitzkrieg.

In sum, we might say that if war occurs on purely political grounds in a situation where the military balance of power is not favorable to the potential initiator, civilian leaders become less aggressive and do not play an important role in the decision for war initiation. A top decision maker forced civilian leaders to accept the idea of war initiation. Civilian leaders' recommendations were basically ignored when war initiation is decided on political grounds and where military victory is difficult to obtain.

The Israeli case of 1967 is interesting in that military leaders were aggressive from the start of the crisis, while civilians continually opposed war initiation. In a situation where Israel enjoyed a limited superiority in military strength to the Egyptian's, the Israeli civilian leaders could not be aggressive. They relied on diplomacy aimed at having the world community, especially the Americans and Soviets, pressure Egypt in order to avoid war. As long as Israel had limited military superiority, civilian leaders could not be aggressive toward war initiation. They needed military aid or at least positive diplomatic support from the Western powers, especially the U.S., in preparation for war against the Arabs. It was not Israel's aim that focused on keeping other countries neutral, because Israel's military strength was not enough to obtain military victory should war occur. In a situation where the U.S. was not fully supporting the Israelis, Israel needed a blitzkrieg to use its military power efficiently if war initiation was decided. It should be noted,
however, that civilian leaders became continually less aggressive and tried to obtain the approval of the United States until they were urged to accept the idea of military leaders.

In sum, it might be said that civilian leaders' aggressiveness depends on their perception of their relative strength with respect to the potential adversary's. When civilian leaders consider their relative strength vis-a-vis the adversary's as superior, they become aggressive toward war initiation, while they are hesitant to use force when they see the relative strength as even or inferior.

Let us deal with the aggressiveness and impact of military leaders in war initiation. We hypothesize that military aggressiveness depends on the degree of military preparedness for waging a specific war. When they are ready to fight, they become aggressive. The aggressiveness of military leaders is different from that of civilian leaders in that military leaders usually need more time to determine whether they will become aggressive enough to make military plans even in a most powerful country like the United States. Our cases demonstrated that military leaders needed more time to recommend specific military plans in case of war occurrence and thus were reluctant to use military force at the initial stage.

It might be said that with respect to the military preparedness, the five cases revealed that military leaders opposed intervention decisions before military preparedness was ready. It was only when they were certain of winning a possible war that they favored war initiation. They became more aggressive than before when they were
ready to fight. But even after the completion of military preparedness, the data are mixed. Military leaders were less aggressive than civilian leaders in the cases of the Suez crisis, the Indo-Pakistan War and the Ramadan War, and more aggressive than civilian leaders in the Six-Day War case. In the case of the Korean War, the Chinese military leaders were not aggressive because of the lack of military preparedness. There were certain points in the first four cases when military leaders thought that they were ready to fight. Military leaders' recommendations, which were based on minimum damage to their own country and maximum damage to the adversary, favored preemptive attack. Military leaders wanted a surprise attack for military advantages. But the timing of the attack was not always decided by military leaders. Political considerations played a major role in deciding the timing, such as in the Suez crisis, the Indo-Pakistan War and the Six-Day War, where it was clear that they should win the war if it were to occur. When it was unclear that a country could win a war such as in the Ramadan War, a top decision-maker accepted the idea of the military leaders on the timing of war and even the war aims. When it was evident that a war could not be won, as in the Korean War, military leaders did not favor war initiation nor even suggested war plans. A top decision-maker controlled the timing and objectives of war in the Korean War case. It was clear that the completion of military plans for initiating war makes military leaders more aggressive than before, but it does not necessarily mean that military leaders would be more aggressive than civilian leaders.
In short, it might be argued that in a comparison of war initiation with the degree of military preparedness: 1) when it was clearly understood by a top decision-maker that a war could be won militarily, military leaders had little impact on war initiation and even the decision of the timing of attack; 2) when it was unclear on the likelihood of victory, military leaders dominated the timing of the war and even the war objectives when war initiation was decided; and 3) when it was clear that a war could not be won, a top decision-maker dominated the whole war plans. This demonstrates that war could be initiated regardless of military preparedness. The completion of military preparedness did not always become a necessary condition for an actual war decision. When a top decision-maker was uncertain of victory, military leaders were most influential on war plans. Military leaders were least powerful when it was clear that a war could be won.

Ironically, in a situation where military leaders were certain of a military victory and prepared clear military plans to win the war, civilians dominated the war plans, while the latter gave up their dominance to military leaders when victory was uncertain. Recommendations of military leaders tended to be least powerful when they asserted war initiation on the basis of military readiness and most influential when they opposed it for the military unpreparedness.

Let us examine the relations between specific war types and the aggressiveness of civilian and military leaders. According to our
five case studies, military leaders' aggressiveness depends principally on military readiness to wage a war. When military leaders submit military plans for war initiation, it is assumed that military leaders are ready to fight whether their plans aim at a limited warfare or an all-out war. Types of warfare are related to the concerns of military leaders about a military victory. If military leaders are not certain of winning the war, they advocate a limited warfare strategy (Britain 1956, India 1971 and Egypt 1973). If they prefer all-out warfare when military victory is obtainable (Israel 1976) or if it is difficult to obtain a military victory, they hesitate even to draw military plans for war initiation (China 1950).

With respect to limited warfare, British and Indian military leaders, on the one hand, were certain of victory in the initial attacks on the enemy, but they felt that it would be, from the military viewpoint, difficult to maintain territory after it was occupied. That is why they favored a limited warfare rather than an all-out warfare favored by civilian leaders. On the other hand, Egyptian military leaders were forced politically to initiate war in a situation where the Egyptian military forces were not superior to the Israelis and where success in the initial attack was not even guaranteed. In a military sense, the Egyptian army was not ready to initiate war. Even though Sadat asserted an all-out war, military leaders had to resist it in favor of a limited attack.

Interestingly, there were mixed influences on the actual war initiation of military leaders advocating limited warfare. Both the nature of warfare and the timing of the attack in an actual war
initiation decision were controlled by civilian leaders in the case of Britain 1956, both by military leaders in the case of Egypt 1973 and only the timing of attack by military leaders in the case of India 1971. In order to clarify differences in limited warfare, we need to examine the recommendations of military leaders from the political-military context, because war initiation is made by political considerations of the potential risks and gains of military intervention.

War initiations were made when both civilian and military leaders were less aggressive (China 1950), when the former was more aggressive than the latter (Britain 1956 and India 1970) and when the latter was more aggressive than the former (Israel 1970 and Egypt 1973).

In a situation where military leaders are aggressive enough to make military plans to initiate war, (1) civilian leaders dominate the military if civilians are more aggressive on war initiation than military leaders; and (2) if civilians are less aggressive than military leaders, either a top decision maker or the military leaders control an actual decision of war initiation.

Let us examine the first hypothesis. In the British case, both "Musketeer" and "Musketeer Revised" operations advocated by military leaders were not reflected in an actual 'tripartite conspiracy' plan, and both the nature and timing of warfare were completely controlled by civilian leaders. The Indian case shows that the Indian military leaders had an influence only on the timing of the attack
because of unique territorial characteristics like climate in northern India; a limited warfare advocated by the Indian generals did not have influence on war initiation decision-making. It may accordingly be said that when civilian leaders are more aggressive than military leaders in a situation where military leaders do not at least oppose military intervention, war initiation is controlled by civilian leaders. As long as military leaders agree with the civilian idea of military intervention, there remains little room for military leaders' views to be considered crucial by civilian leaders. Civilians consider military views important when military leaders oppose war initiation because without military support, it would be impossible to initiate war.

Let us consider the second hypothesis. In a situation where military leaders favor war initiation and civilians oppose it, military leaders control both the nature and timing of war. It goes without saying that military leaders' recommendations favoring war initiation would not lead to an actual war initiation without a top decision maker's favoring a resort to force. In this case, the opposition of civilian leaders plays a role in only delaying an actual decision. This happens when a top leader forces the military to initiate war for political reasons such as breaking up the status quo even though it is hard to obtain military victory (Egypt 1973). Sadat desperately needed a momentum to break up the existing status quo to recover the Egyptian status in the Middle East. It is a case where just starting a war guarantees political gains although it ends up with a military defeat. Civilian leaders opposed the idea and military leaders were not easy to accept the idea of war initiation without
assurance of a military victory. Military leaders waited until war initiation was possible with the Soviet military support even though it would be a minimum level to initiate war. They then rejected the idea of an all-out war favored by Sadat for political reasons. It was inevitable for military leaders to dominate both the nature and the timing of the attack of war in the Egyptian case.

In the political-military context, as Mearsheimer argues, we may divide the cases of war initiation into two broad categories. First, there are cases where political considerations to go to war are not affected by military ones because military leaders would not oppose war initiation. Once military leaders support war initiation even if it was a limited war, military considerations do not deter war initiation any longer. Political considerations would then decide whether to go to war. The cases of Britain 1956, Israel 1967 and India 1971 belong to this category. Second, we may see the cases in which a political rationale to initiate war exists, but a military plan to carry out a specific war does not. In this case, it is difficult to obtain a military victory, which makes war initiation risky. Military considerations dominate political ones as in Egypt 1973.

In conclusion, it might be said that war could be initiated on political reasons regardless of military conditions. As Clausewitz says, it is politics that make war occur. Military considerations are a necessary but not sufficient condition for war occurrence. It is, however, interesting to note that unlike the idea that military

---

leaders control specific war plans while civilian leaders decide whether to go to war, it is civilians, not military leaders, who control even the types of war and the timing of war initiation if the military balance of power is favorable to the initiator. And if politics decide war in a situation where military victory is difficult to obtain, military leaders dominate war plans, including both the type and timing of war as long as they advocate war initiation even if it is a limited warfare.

D. Concluding Remarks

Betts' findings were an important step toward reformulating a new concept of civil-military decision-making in war initiation. Betts contributed to a reassessment of the traditional concept of civil-military relations on war initiation. He challenged the idea that military leaders were more aggressive than civilians and put his view to the test by studying U.S. intervention decisions during 1945-1975. His findings concluded that unlike the traditional view of civil-military relations, civilians were more aggressive on war initiation than the military.

3. By adding new case studies (1976-1991) to his previous research (1945-1976) on the U.S. foreign policy, Betts argued that "..... data from recently declassified sources do not substantially alter my interpretations of earlier cases...... New case studies from the intervening years, in turn, have struck me as remarkably consistent with the main thesis of the first edition—that military leaders are generally more cautious about the use of force than prevalent stereotypes suggest." See Richard K. Betts, Soldiers, statesmen, and the Cold War crises, Morningside Edition with new preface and epilogue (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), Preface to the Morningside edition, p. x.
However, this dissertation showed that it was not easy to
generalize civil-military relations on war initiation in terms of the
relative aggressiveness of civilian and military leaders. First, every
country has its own history, culture and way of thinking, which make
it difficult to make generalizations. Second, even within a country, it
is difficult to generalize about civil-military relations on war
initiation, because each regime has its own type of civil-military
relations on the basis of the personality of the top decision-maker.
Accordingly, a few cases of a country may not necessarily represent
the country. Furthermore, unlike a major power like the U.S., a
typical country does not engage in enough episodes of war initiation
to provide a high degree of confidence that the particular case under
study is typical. Finally, it is hard to obtain primary source materials
concerned with each case of war initiation. Some reliable sources
include autobiographies and diaries of decision makers who had
participated in the war initiation.

Although there are some weaknesses and difficulties in
studying civil-military decision-making in war initiation, we could
identify several conditions that would be most critical in decision of
war initiation by treating each historical case as a deviant case.
"Contingent generalizations" based on these variables or conditions
could contribute to the development of theory-building in civil-
military decision making in war initiation by identifying several
causal patterns in war initiation.

With respect to the selection of cases in this dissertation, it
might be said that our five selected cases would not be enough to
confirm or negate Betts' findings completely because his analysis was based on all U.S. intervention cases during 1945-1975. The question could be raised regarding whether five cases would represent the entire range or type of historical cases during the same period that Betts studied, although some criteria were provided to select appropriate cases. It would be almost impossible to study every historical case of war initiation throughout the world within a limited time period and resources. Rather, our efforts to compare Betts' findings with five cases were designed to uncover some important conditions that could help in the development of theory-building in civil-military decision making in war initiation as well as to test his findings. We hope that we have succeeded.

Now, let us look to the future. If one were to continue the research, which direction might we go? We focused on variables such as military balance of power between the two potential adversaries and military preparedness in order to uncover the differences and similarities between cases involving the United States and those of other countries in terms of civilian/military aggressiveness. Quite persuasively, the two conditions worked in our five cases.

Here, we need to answer two fundamental questions. First, how would it look if we were to research additional cases to five cases we already studied? And second, what other variables or conditions in addition to military balance of power and military preparedness can we expect to help us explain the differences in civilian/military aggressiveness? For the first question, we need to research historical cases as many as possible, which means a macro study of civil-
military relations on war initiation; for the second one, we need more
detailed case studies implying a micro study of civilian/military
aggressiveness on the use of force in order to uncover some causal
relations unidentified in recent studies.

First, we need to examine the relationship between type of
regime and civilian/military aggressiveness on war initiation,
because, at a first look, regime type is likely to be more influential in
war decisions. For example, civilian leaders in an authoritarian type
of regime are not likely to oppose a top decision maker when the
latter favors war initiation. On the contrary, decision makers in a
democratic regime tend to express their views relatively freely. For
example, civilian leaders in the Chinese and Egyptian cases might not
oppose Mao's and Sadat's desire to go to war. But our case study
showed that civilian leaders in these two countries demonstrated
their opposition clearly even though they did not have much
influence on the actual decision for war initiation. It may be said that
variables like the military balance of power rather than the regime
types would be more powerful in explaining civilian/military
aggressiveness. However, we need to study additional cases to see
which variable or condition would be more effective, the military
balance of power or the regime types. The former emphasizes the
military strength, while the latter focuses on the political nature of
government.

Second, we focused on military preparedness when examining
the aggressiveness of the military leaders. But we need to consider
the historical role of the military when looking at civilian/military
aggressiveness. Some countries might emphasize the role of the military and respect their opinions, while other countries might not consider the historical role of the military politically important. The impact of the military leaders on the war initiation decision might be influenced by the historical role of the military as well as negative or positive advice based on military preparedness.

Third, we need to consider the way civilian and military leaders view risk assessment when deciding war initiation. Civilians tend not to consider the military perspective emphasizing the potential level of military casualties in case of war. Military leaders think that war itself might even affect the survival of the military as an organization, which usually makes them cautious on a positive recommendation for war as well as and favor strategies such as a blitzkrieg or a limited warfare. On the other hand, civilian leaders consider war initiation on political grounds, thus making military advice advocating a preemption often ignored. When examining civilian/military aggressiveness in a country, one should be aware that civilian/military risk assessment might affect an actual war initiation decision.

Finally, it should be noted that civilians may change in terms of their level of aggressiveness, which makes it often difficult to place any particular value of aggressiveness for the entire pre-war period at any given moment. On the other hand, the military position tends to be consistent. The question is how to deal with the change in the attitudes of the civilian leaders when studying civilian/military attitudes toward war initiation. This dilemma might lead to
difficulties and challenges for those who study civil-military relations on war initiation. These are in addition to the conceptual problem of defining the set of civilian leaders, particularly when they had military backgrounds before taking their civilian positions. In our research, the change of civilian leaders' attitudes has been dealt with in a relative sense in comparison with the military counterparts, and the conceptual problem with defining civilian/military leaders has been answered in the sense that if one occupies a civilian position, he is considered as a civilian regardless of his military background.
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