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ABSTRACT

This research is an inquiry into the phenomenon of weaker states attacking stronger powers. Power-determinist and other traditional approaches to the study of war initiation have difficulty accounting for this puzzling behavior because of their singular focus on capability distribution as the explanatory variable. In an attempt to explain this phenomena an additional variable is considered, the perceived cultural sophistication of the adversary, that exerts its influence through the mechanism of a state's net assessment process. It is contended that in the assessment process appraisals of objective capability combine with evaluations of an adversary's cultural sophistication in a systematic manner, with the latter either confirming or discounting the objective appraisal of the adversary's capability. Specifically, when objective capability appraisals are combined with judgments of equal cultural sophistication, the objective measures of the adversary's strength are confirmed as accurate.

Alternatively, when objective appraisals are combined with judgements of inferior cultural sophistication, the objective capability of the adversary is discounted. It is this latter combination that encourages a power-maximizing weaker power to adopt an aggressive, imperialist strategy against what appears, by objective measures, to be a much stronger state.
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CHAPTER 1
DAVID VERSUS GOLIATH:
CULTURAL JUDGMENTS AND STRATEGIC PREFERENCE

Weaker powers have initiated conflicts against stronger rivals more often than
major powers have among themselves. This claim seems incredible, yet it stands up
to empirical scrutiny.\(^1\) Over the period 1816-1976, fifty-four percent of all conflicts
involving major powers have been classified as those in which a minor power was the
aggressor.\(^2\) In terms of absolute numbers, 60 conflicts were initiated by weaker
powers against stronger states in the post-WW II period alone.\(^3\) The sheer number of
these conflicts is staggering. Considering that many of these cases were asymmetric
wars, not simply disputes, is even more so.\(^4\) In fact, the number of asymmetric wars

---


\(^3\) Ibid.; Stuart Bremer, "Dangerous Dyads," op. cit.

\(^4\) Conflicts are categorized based upon the commonly used 1,000 battle deaths threshhold. A conflict is classified as a war if the number of battle deaths exceeds 1,000 and a dispute if it does not.
in the 1815-1976 period is equal to that of great power wars in the same period.\textsuperscript{5} Nine such wars have occurred since 1815 including the Russo-Japanese War (1904-5), the First Balkan War (1912-13), the Polish-Russian War (1919-1920), and the Indo-Pakistani War (1965). Not only is the absolute number of such wars considerable, their relative frequency has increased with respect to great power wars in the post-World War II period.\textsuperscript{6} Without question, asymmetric wars are a growing phenomenon that should seize the attention of international relations scholars not only because they are increasing in number, but also because the behavior of the weaker state challenges conventional international relations wisdom.

The aggressive behavior of the weaker power in these asymmetric wars is incongruous with our basic understanding of balance-of-power politics. Stated differently, weaker states should not attack stronger ones but rather balance against them by forming or joining a countervailing coalition or, when that is not an alternative, bandwagon with the most dangerous threat.\textsuperscript{7} The empirical regularity of weak states waging wars against stronger adversaries suggests that something contrary to Realist propositions is going on. What conditions encourage weaker states to initiate wars against stronger rivals?

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{5} Charles Gochman and Zeev Maoz, "Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816-1976," op. cit., p. 596.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Ibid. For a review of asymmetric relationships that are forecasted to erupt into major crises, see Michael Brecher, "International Crises: Reflections on the Future," \textit{Security Studies}, 3, 4 (Summer 1994), pp. 650-77.
\end{itemize}
This dissertation is an inquiry into this phenomenon. While there are many factors at the individual, bureaucratic, state, and system levels that interact in the process of grand strategy, this dissertation focuses on the role that cultural judgments, acting through the mechanism of the net assessment process, may play in encouraging particular strategic preferences. States are assumed to behave as rational actors, who, *inter alia*, estimate the strength of others and only initiate wars of conquest against those deemed weaker than themselves. My main argument is that net assessments are based on more than 'bean counting,' *viz.*, objectively quantifiable capability measures. Unfortunately, most analysts of international politics rely on 'bean counts' to explain or forecast foreign-policy behavior. This effort claims, instead, that net assessments result from an interaction of two judgments: an estimate of the target's capability based upon *objective*, quantifiable measures and a *subjective* cultural judgment of the target. The basic proposition is that the weaker state's subjective

---

8 Since the goal of this thesis is to determine if and how the variables under investigation affect the strategic preferences of the subjects under review, it must be assumed that their strategic calculations are based upon an explicit and internally consistent value system. By assuming this consistency, alternative courses of strategic behavior can be hypothesized based upon variation in the variables examined. See Thomas Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 3.

judgment of the target as culturally inferior results in a discounted capability evaluation of the objectively stronger enemy. Viewing itself as culturally superior to its rival, the weaker state is encouraged to sound the trumpets for war when its objective capability inferiority seems to call for a more cautious policy. Hence, what appears to be irrational behavior based upon objective capability judgments alone is quite rational when net assessment is viewed as the interaction of capability and cultural judgments.

Existing Approaches

While there is a long tradition of international relations theory that seeks to explain war initiation in general, some scholarship has recently emerged in an effort to explain wars initiated by weaker states against strong powers in particular. These theories can be broadly categorized into three schools: Realist, domestic factors, and risk propensity. This section offers a review and critique of each of these theoretical orientations’ efforts to account for asymmetric wars to illustrate both their strengths and weaknesses. This is followed by a brief introduction to my net assessment approach which incorporates the strengths and overcomes the weaknesses of these other efforts to account for asymmetric war initiation.

\[10 \text{ On war initiation by weaker powers, see T.V. Paul, } \textit{Asymmetric Conflicts: War Initiations by Weaker Powers}, \textit{(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).} \]
Realism

Balance of power theory is predicated on the assumption that an aggressor will not go to war if it perceives that its power (or that of its coalition) is less than that of the target. States are rational actors and use cost-benefit calculations when formulating their foreign policy. Political realism considers a rational foreign policy to be good foreign policy; for only a rational foreign policy minimizes risks and maximizes benefits and, hence, complies both with the moral precept of prudence and the political requirement of success. Thus, Realism implies that states only initiate wars when they have superior capability, which, in turn, enhances their chance for success. Stated differently, if their relative capability does not assure victory in a conflict, states will not engage in conflict initiation. More specifically with regard to weaker states, structural realism argues that as states form coalitions in the international system, weaker states flock to the weaker side in order to form alliances that may achieve defensive or deterrent strength sufficient to dissuade stronger adversaries. When this alternative is not available, however, weaker states bandwagon with the greatest threat.


12 Kenneth Waltz, Theory of International Politics, op. cit., p. 127.

The aggregate data concerning asymmetric war initiation by weaker powers presents a direct challenge to some of these Realist propositions. For example, the weaker states in these cases are clearly not bandwagoning with the stronger adversary. The balancing hypothesis is also subject to scrutiny, a task taken up in the case studies presented in this thesis. The success of Realism in accounting for the behavior of near-equal powers in symmetric wars is impressive, however. This success, in conjunction with its difficulties in explaining asymmetric wars, presents a puzzle that my net assessment approach may resolve.

**Domestic Factors**

T.V. Paul has offered the most recent effort to explain war initiation by weaker powers that emphasizes the influence of domestic factors. Paul has synthesized theoretical arguments from the literature on strategy, arms races, alliances, and domestic politics and deduced that the following four variables are the most important in explaining asymmetric war initiations. As they pertain to the initiator, they are the politico-military strategy, the possession of offensive weapons systems, great power defensive support, and changing domestic power structure.

---

14 It may be the case, however, that a weak state facing a conflict may be unable to attract the support of others and may eschew bandwagoning with the threatening power. In such cases the weak state, expecting to be attacked by the stronger adversary, may initiate a pre-emptive war in the hopes of inflicting as much damage as possible before accepting defeat.


16 Ibid., p. 20.
A review of Paul’s research is revealing in that the expectation of great power support is present in each of his six cases. If we aggregate the capabilities of the stronger alliance partners with the weaker power, just as Realists and others do, we find that most of his cases are actually not asymmetric wars. The weaker powers initiated these wars with the understanding that there was a near-equal or preponderant coalition willing to support them if strategic expectations went awry. This suggests that Paul’s framework confounds the study of both symmetric and asymmetric conflicts. Paul admits that these four factors are important to symmetric conflicts as well, but, through ignoring the contribution that alliance commitments make to the capability base of the weaker powers there is a lack of discrimination between strong and weak powers in his case selection. This is not to say that his framework or his propositions are unsound, simply that his research design does not offer the opportunity to adequately test those propositions.

What is most important from Paul’s framework that is related to this effort is that which he recognizes as important but does not include. Paul admits "It is recognized that intangible and subjective factors such as leadership, morale, resolve, etc. can form significant determinants of national power ... and can play an important

---

17 For example, Bruce Bueno De Mesquita includes three of Paul’s six cases in his expected utility analyses. In each of these three cases, Bueno De Mesquita calculates that the weak power initiator had a positive expected utility for initiating war. The positive value results from the inclusion of the expectation of alliance assistance. Bruce Bueno De Mesquita, The War Trap, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981).
role in the calculation of initiators, weaker in overall capability." In Chapter 2 it is argued that these factors are indicative of the substance of cultural judgments that leaders make of adversaries.

Risk Propensity

Bruce Bueno De Mesquita takes us one step beyond capability distribution in his effort to explain war initiation. In addition to the balance of capabilities, Bueno De Mesquita considers the risk propensity of the leader to be an important explanatory variable. For example, if a leader is risk seeking, the expected utility of initiating a war is not assumed to be a linear function, rather utility is assumed to be a concave function, thereby inflating the value of the utility of initiating a conflict. Conversely, if a leader is risk averse, the expected utility function is convex, thereby deflating the value of the utility of conflict initiation.

Risk propensity is operationalized as a function of the security concerns inherent in a nation’s foreign policies. For example, if a weak power is in alliance

---

18 T.V. Paul, Asymmetric Conflicts, op. cit., p. 22.


with a strong power, Bueno De Mesquita argues that they are risk averse because their foreign policy protects their security interests. Alternatively, if a weak power is not in an alliance with a great power, then they are risk seeking since they are putting their security at risk. As Bueno De Mesquita states, "Depending, then, on whether more nations can expect to gain from attacking A than A can expect to gain against, or vice versa, A’s risk orientation is assumed to be risk acceptant or risk averse." 21

The expected utility approach is a rigorous framework which moves beyond the single-variable focus of Realism in an attempt to account for war. Toward this end, the introduction of risk propensity as an explanatory variable represents a novel contribution. There are, however, several difficulties in applying Bueno De Mesquita’s variation of this framework specifically to the study of asymmetric conflicts. If we apply his arguments to conflicts initiated by weaker powers, we are forced to draw the conclusion that all leaders in these conflicts had a propensity to be risk seeking. A comparison of relative capabilities alone in all of these asymmetric cases, after all, would result in a negative expected utility of initiating war with the stronger power. This utility is not modified in a positive direction by a risk-averse alliance portfolio since these actors are ’going it alone.’ That is, they do not expect contributions from others. In such scenarios, therefore, these leaders must have been risk seeking to initiate a conflict. This argument is tautological, that is, the weaker power attacked the stronger, therefore, the leader of the weaker power must have been risk seeking.


9
Another concern arises when applying this expected utility framework to the understanding of asymmetric conflicts. If the sample size of asymmetric conflicts was small, the conclusion that all leaders in these conflicts were risk seeking might be plausible. However, the sample size is quite large, larger than the number of conflict dyads between major powers. Given this substantial number, it is reasonable to assume that there is some distribution of risk propensities across the leaders in these cases. That is, risk propensity should be considered a variable, not a constant, across this population.

Summary

In reviewing these three approaches to explaining conflict initiation by weaker powers the following conclusions can be reached. First, international relations theorists must look beyond capability distribution to account for asymmetric conflict behavior. Second, a basic knowledge of statistics tells us that it is very unlikely that all of the leaders in weak states that have initiated wars were risk-seeking. And lastly, we must be careful in our case selection strategy when studying this phenomenon. Wars in which a weak power spearheaded a countervailing coalition in war against a stronger power should not be classified as asymmetric wars.

A review of these theories also offers counter hypotheses to my thesis which will be tested in the case studies. Specifically, with regard to Realist theory the following questions will be investigated in an effort to test its asymmetric conflict hypotheses:
1. Did the leaders in the weaker state expect military contributions from one or more great powers when they chose to attack the stronger adversary?

2. Did the leaders in the weaker state initiate a pre-emptive war? Stated differently, were their actions motivated by an imminent threat to their survival?

Given these questions, Realism will find support in the case studies if one of two findings are discovered: 1) the leaders of the weaker state considered themselves the spearhead of a countervailing coalition that was challenging the adversary's perceived aggressive policies; or 2) the leaders in the weaker state attacked the stronger adversary because it perceived an imminent attack from the same and was acting in an effort to ensure its very survival.

In order to test Bueno De Mesquita's proposition regarding the risk propensity of leaders in the weaker state, the leaders' perceived risks of initiating a conflict with the stronger power are explored. That is:

3. Is there evidence that the leaders in the weaker state perceived that launching a war would likely result in defeat?

If evidence is discovered that the leaders in the weaker state did not expect to win the war but considered the potential gains to be so enticing they initiated the war anyway, the risk propensity approach to understanding these wars will be supported.
Should it be discovered that leaders did not expect great power contributions, were not motivated by threat, and did not expect to lose in their war effort, it can be argued that these theoretical approaches fail to explain the phenomenon under investigation.

In light of the preceding critical review, in the next section a brief introduction to my theory is presented, with a complete explication offered in Chapter 2. This is followed by a detail of the research design, case selection strategy, methods, and variables comprising the backbone of this effort.

Cultural Judgments in Net Assessment

The role that cultural judgments of others have played in international relations has been discussed extensively in historical literature spotlighting imperial and colonial relationships. This scholarship has focused on the cultural contempt that the imperial powers had for the inhabitants of current or prospective colonies and the colonial behaviors through which that contempt was manifested, that is, the role that cultural judgments played in influencing the adoption of the imperial strategy of long-term intervention.22 The influence of such cultural judgments in these cases can be considered two-fold. First, judgments of cultural inferiority provided a justification for imperial intervention. For example, the "white man's burden" of engaging in a

---

'civilizing mission' was an oft professed rationale for colonial behaviors. Second, judgments of cultural inferiority, through the imperial power's net assessment of the target state's strength, helped to define the degree and substance of the intervention strategy. Specifically, judgments of cultural inferiority led to a discounting of objective estimates of the target's current strength and even potential power, thus encouraging long-term interventionist strategies.

This research investigates another manner in which a judgment of cultural inferiority may influence strategic preferences. While a discounting of power occurred in the net assessment processes of the great powers in the colonial period as a result of judgments of cultural inferiority, isolating the effect of such judgments on actual state behavior in these cases is difficult since the interventionist behavior is also consistent with that proposed by power-determinist theories of international relations. That is, the imperial powers had preponderant objective capability over the weaker states thus facilitating the adoption of a long-term interventionist strategy. These cases, therefore, while suggesting that judgments of cultural inferiority may have led to a discounting of power, offer neither strong support nor a strong test of the cultural discounting hypothesis. If we take imperial cases and turn them on their head, however, we have a much more demanding test of the discounting proposition. That is, in cases where a state is inferior in objective capability on the order of 2:1, 3:1, or even 4:1, and this state attacks one that is stronger, we have something going on that is quite contrary to power-determinist propositions.
A factor that may help explain war initiation by weaker powers is the cultural judgments that they make of their objectively stronger targets. Toward this end, the operational definition of net assessment is expanded from one that is based solely on objective capability judgments to one which also includes a subjective cultural judgment of the target. This effort proposes that in the net assessment process cultural judgments interact with capability judgments in a systematic manner, either confirming or discounting objective capability measures. The relationships between capability and cultural judgments can be summarized in the following two propositions:

**Proposition 1:** where a target is perceived as possessing superior, similar, or inferior objective capability and judged to be equal in terms of subjective cultural sophistication, the objective capability judgment will be confirmed as accurate. This, in turn, will be representative of the overall net assessment of the target.

**Proposition 2:** where a target is perceived as possessing superior, similar or inferior objective capability and judged to be inferior in terms of subjective cultural sophistication, the objective capability judgment will be discounted. This, in turn, will be represented in a net assessment that paints the target as much weaker than objective capability measures suggest.

The goal of this research is to explain what conditions encourage weaker powers to attack stronger states. **Proposition 2** is the first step in this direction. As **Proposition 1** indicates, however, I assert that cultural judgments play an important role in the net assessments of weaker and stronger powers alike. Before advancing behavioral hypotheses based upon these propositions, it is important to also put forth
my assumption of state motivation. Only through a consideration of both motivation and propositions 1 and 2 can a deductive logic be applied to arrive at behavioral hypotheses.

As these behaviors by weak powers challenge that proposed by power-determinist theories, the motivational assumption of those theories is adopted, that is, that states seek either to maintain power or increase power. In not challenging the core assumption of power-determinists, my theory can be considered complementary, rather than opposed, to this school. From this motivational assumption and the above propositions, then, three strategic behavioral hypotheses are deduced:

**Hypothesis 1:** where an adversary is perceived as possessing superior objective capability and judged to be equal in cultural sophistication, the perceiving power is encouraged to adopt a defensive, independent fortress strategy.

**Hypothesis 2:** where an adversary is perceived as possessing equal objective capability and judged to be equal in cultural sophistication, the perceiving power is encouraged to adopt a defensive, containment strategy.

**Hypothesis 3:** where an adversary is perceived as possessing superior or equal objective capability and judged to be inferior in cultural sophistication, the perceiving power is encouraged to adopt an aggressive, imperialist strategy.

---


24 Hypotheses regarding targets possessing inferior capability are excluded since, when combined with a judgment of equal or inferior cultural sophistication, the proposed behavior is the same.
To determine whether a strategy has been *encouraged* in the empirical sections of this thesis, the strategy hypothesized must actually be adopted by the state under investigation. This is the toughest test from a theoretical perspective because it suggests that cultural judgments dominate over other factors that influence states' adoptions of their strategies, a suggestion that is much stronger than that put forth in this thesis.

Propositions 1 and 2 along with hypotheses 1-3 constitute a parsimonious and progressive theory linking net assessment to strategic preference. These hypotheses offer possible explanations for weaker power aggression (hypothesis 3), for the *lack of aggression* by weak powers, and for the behaviors of near-equal defensive and imperialist powers (hypotheses 1 and 2, respectively).

In the previous discussion of Realism, its success in explaining relations among near-equal powers and its concomitant difficulties in accounting for war initiation by weaker states against stronger targets was underscored. Hypotheses 1 and 2 maintain that weaker or near-equal powers will balance if they judge the target state to be both capability superior (or equal) and possessing equal cultural sophistication. This accords with the capability-based behavioral propositions which follow from Realism's focus on capability distribution. Hypothesis 3, however, through the additional consideration of cultural *inferiority*, offers a progressive theoretical shift by increasing our explanatory power in accounting for war initiation by weaker powers against stronger states.
Research Design and Method

This puzzle is investigated in two stages. First, the experimental method is used to test the internal validity of the theory and is detailed in Chapter 3. The goal of the experiment was to determine the nature of the relationship between judgments of capability and cultural sophistication and one's subsequent strategic preferences, thus, the experimental design facilitated a test of the soundness of the theory presented in Chapter 2.25

In the second stage of this research, the same theory was tested for external validity in three cases of war or dispute initiation by a weaker power. The case study method is a structured focused comparison.26 This method focuses on controlled comparison by systematically differentiating a number of critical factors in the cases under examination. The critical factors in the three cases under investigation are cultural diversity within the conflict dyads and war versus dispute initiation in the outcome. In an effort to determine the degree to which all three theoretical approaches put forth can account for the asymmetric wars under investigation, the Realist, risk propensity, and cultural discounting hypotheses are considered in turn in each case study.


Case Selection Criteria

A process involving four criteria drove the selection of cases. The first and most obvious was that the cases had to be cases of asymmetric conflict. That is, the objective capability measure for the weaker power had to be less than that of the stronger power against which the weaker aggressed. The population of cases satisfying this criterion was determined in the following manner.

To broadly assess the degree to which pairs of states were unequal in measures of objective power, the Correlates of War material capabilities data set which covers the period 1816-1985 was used. This data set records the military personnel, military expenditures, iron and steel production, energy consumption (after 1859), urban population, and total population for state system members. Indices were derived for military, economic, and demographic capability by computing each state's average share of system-wide capability across the two variables within each of these three dimensions. These values were averaged to arrive at a Composite Index of National Capability (CINC). Based on these CINC values, capability ratios were computed for all dyad years. Objective capability was measured using data available for the year preceding conflict initiation. This process resulted in a list of 132 conflicts consisting of dyadic asymmetries ranging from 2:1 to 10:1.

The second criterion was that cases vary on strategic behavior. That is, cases were selected that resulted in both dispute and war initiation by the weaker power. The weaker power in each of the 132 conflicts resulting from the first Correlates of War analysis used either threats or displays of military force or actual military force.
If a case reflected one or both of the first two criteria, it was classified as a dispute. If a case exhibited the actual use of military force, it was classified as a war only if the number of battle deaths exceeded 1,000, a common threshold in international politics research, otherwise the case was classified as a dispute. Given these guidelines, the 132 cases were divided into two subsets of nine wars and 123 disputes.

A third criterion was then applied to these two subsets: cases had to be selected from different time periods. This criterion was chosen to investigate whether cultural bias patterns are temporally consistent across the cases. Asymmetric conflicts, after all, populate the entire collection of conflict data covering the 1816-1976 period.

The final criterion addressed concerns for data availability. Taking these criteria into account resulted in the selection of the three cases presented in figure 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Dyad</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Force Ratio</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria-Turkey</td>
<td>1912-13</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan-India</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China-Russia</td>
<td>1927-29</td>
<td>1 to 10</td>
<td>Dispute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1: Case Studies
The Bulgaria-Turkey war, more commonly called the First Balkan War, arose from Bulgarian grievances regarding the treatment of Bulgars in Turk-controlled Macedonia. Following the Young Turk coup of 1908 the treatment of the Bulgars declined precipitously thus providing an excuse for a long-contemplated desire by Bulgarian leadership to 'liberate' Macedonia and realize the 'Greater Bulgaria' outlined in the Treaty of San Stefano.

As a second example of asymmetric war, the 1971 Indo-Pakistan War is examined. This war was the third conflict between these antagonists since 1948. In response to Indian subversive activities in East Pakistan to establish an independent Bangladesh, leaders in West Pakistan launched an offensive to both compel the Indians to desist in East Pakistan and to gain control over disputed territory in Kashmir and the Punjab.

The final case offers variation on the dependent variable. That is, this case never escalated beyond crisis to war. The Sino-Russian Eastern Railway Crisis of 1927-29 resulted from increased Chinese nationalist sentiment to gain control of the predominantly Russian-controlled Chinese Eastern Railway. Chinese government raids of Railway offices in 1927 resulted in incriminating documentation detailing the role of the Soviet Railway officers in disseminating communist propaganda and planning for the toppling of the Chinese nationalist government. Using this as an excuse, the nationalists expelled suspected communists and Russian political
representatives and Chinese authorities seized control of the Railway. After Russian coercive diplomacy, the Chinese capitulated in their demands to maintain control and railway administration reverted back into Russian hands.

Measurement

The measurement strategies for the two variables that are the focus of investigation in the case studies are presented below.27

Objective Capability: Objective capability of the target was determined through a three-stage process. First, the Correlates of War material capabilities data set was again used with a focus on the military personnel, military expenditures, iron and steel production, energy consumption (after 1859), urban population, and total population for the states under investigation. Second, to bolster these data, information regarding the military balance between the antagonists was collected from such sources as the Military Balance, when available. Lastly, these data were further supported by weaker power quantitative assessments of their adversaries.28

Cultural Sophistication: To determine the judgment of cultural sophistication that one actor has made of another, a content analysis scheme is employed. Archival documents of net assessments, ministry of war reports, and professional army journals are reviewed for the presence of qualitative force comparisons. Specifically, cultural

27 The variables and measurement strategies used in the experiment are detailed in Chapter 3.

28 One should expect, of course, a congruence between these three sources.
descriptors most often employed by 'backward' and 'advanced' groups to describe each other are sought out. Horowitz compiled such a list, which is based upon the distal antecedents of subjective cultural judgments, and grouped the adjectives into categories describing 'backward' and 'advanced' cultures. These category labels translate well into my concepts of 'inferior' and 'similar' cultural sophistication respectively. The list is presented in figure 1.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backward</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Cunning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>Resourceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorant</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisurley</td>
<td>Thrifty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indolent</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docile</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easygoing</td>
<td>Clever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feudal</td>
<td>Clannish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>Nepotistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking</td>
<td>Crafty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiative</td>
<td>Frugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>Avaricious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Pushy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spendthrift</td>
<td>Efficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.2: 'Backward' and 'Advanced' Attributes


This compilation was useful as a first cut on what to look for in net assessments that reveals a cultural judgment of the adversary. The stereotype literature from which it is drawn, however, generally failed to consider power relationships when soliciting group attributes from subjects. That is, the relative power of the 'advanced' or 'backward' groups was not controlled for in this research. I believe this would have a significant impact on ascribed group attributes.

For example, a group perceived as more powerful and equally culturally sophisticated would be described using attributes from the 'advanced' list. Indeed, these attributes would likely apply to most groups perceived as possessing similar cultural sophistication and similar or inferior capability as well. As an example of the former, consider US assessments of Germany before World War II where "German efficiency, unity, and organization became racial maxims in American minds."³¹

Alternatively, an adversary perceived as possessing inferior cultural sophistication and inferior capability would likely be described using attributes from the 'backward' list. The American and British assessments of the Japanese prior to World War II serve as examples of this combination. In American military circles it was believed that the national characteristics of the Japanese condemned that nation to perpetual weakness. The Japanese were said to be lacking in originality and creativity.

and poorly educated. The British made similar assessments claiming the Japanese were unimaginative, deferential, imitative, and lacking in initiative.

An adversary perceived as more powerful and culturally inferior, the combination most relevant to this study, would likely be described using attributes from both the 'advanced' and 'backward' lists. A list of attributes describing such an adversary is presented in figure 1.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From the 'Backward' List</th>
<th>From the 'Advanced' List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>Feudal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>Lacking Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorant</td>
<td>Proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money-hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrogant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clannish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nepotistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pushy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.3: Attributes of a Capability Superior, Culturally Inferior Adversary

These attributes are broad descriptors of an adversary perceived as capability superior and culturally inferior. The archival data which serves as evidence in this dissertation's case studies likely offers detail at many levels in the assessments that the weaker powers made of their adversaries. It is useful, then, to consider how these broad attributes might manifest themselves in more specific descriptions of the

---

32 Ibid.

adversary's society, government, armed forces, officers, and soldiers. Continuing
with the example of a capability superior, culturally inferior adversary, an abbreviated
list of what is anticipated is presented in figure 1.4.\textsuperscript{35}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Society & Government & Armed Forces & Officers & Soldiers \\
\hline
Traditional & Traditional & Traditional & Traditional & Poor Military \\
Inefficient & Poor Organization & Inefficient & Poor Military & Training \\
Clannish & Poor Political & Clannish & Education & Lacking \\
& Education & & Arrogant & Initiative \\
& Arrogant & & Ruthless & Lazy \\
& Coercive & & Money-hungry & Pushy \\
& Ruthless & & Lacking & \\
& Money-hungry & & Initiative & \\
& Nepotistic & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Figure 1.4: Content Analysis Coding Scheme

The descriptors in figure 1.4 serve as the qualitative basis for coding a net
assessment as manifesting judgments of capability superiority and cultural inferiority.
Similar tables can be constructed based upon the logic of the interaction of different

\textsuperscript{34} Archival research of great power net assessments before the two world wars
demonstrates that when a nation as a whole is judged to be culturally inferior, these
attributes of inferiority filter down into judgements at each of these levels. See Chapter
2 for numerous examples of this phenomena.

\textsuperscript{35} The list is abbreviated because the degree of literary creativity one might find in
net assessments cannot be anticipated. The number of synonyms that could be derived
from the original attribute inventory is enormous, therefore, this list is offered as an
attributional guide rather than the basis for a rigid coding scheme.
combinations of the two judgments. That task is deferred, however, since many of those combinations do not apply to the research question driving this dissertation.

Format of the Dissertation

As presented in this chapter, the puzzle of asymmetric wars is the focus of this research effort. Both the number of wars and the unconventional behavior of the weaker powers in these wars encourages an investigation of this phenomenon. This particular investigation consists of seven chapters. In Chapter 2 the argument is made that cultural judgments play an important role in the net assessments that actors make of one another. While the importance of culture is just now being incorporated into theories of international politics, it is demonstrated that the influence of cultural judgments in the net assessment process, and the subsequent effect on strategic preferences, has long been present in the actual practice of foreign policy. Chapter 2 also includes a full, substantive explication of my theory. Chapter 3 presents the experiment’s research design, method, measurement strategies, and results which speak to the internal validity of the theory.

Chapters 4 through 6 are the case studies examining the relationship between capability and cultural judgments, and strategic preference. The cases are presented in the following order: the Bulgarian-Turkish war in Chapter 4, the Indo-Pakistan war in Chapter 5, and the Sino-Russian Eastern Railway Crisis in Chapter 6. The dissertation concludes with chapter 7 where the overall performance of this and other approaches to explaining conflict initiation by weaker powers is discussed.
CHAPTER 2

CAPABILITY, CULTURE, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY

In the war in Asia - and in general - considerations of race and power are inseparable.¹

The concept of power or capability is central to most theories of interstate conflict. And yet, as argued in Chapter 1, theories based upon it do not provide a sufficient explanation for the initiation of wars by weaker powers. Indeed, the oft cited necessary condition that an aggressor possess equal or preponderant power before attacking is completely counter to the behavior manifested in this class of wars. I am not suggesting that power plays no role in these conflicts. My approach shares in two areas with Classical Realism a common regard for power. First, it is assumed that states are motivated to either maintain the power they currently possess or acquire more power. Second, it is assumed that the capability of other states plays an important role in the calculations of statesmen. Concerning the latter, however, the central argument of this effort is that leaders' assessments of adversaries are the

result of the interaction of both objective capability and subjective cultural judgments. In this regard, my theory differs significantly from Classical Realist theory, diverging from its very first principle. Where Realist theory believes in the "possibility of distinguishing between truth and opinion - between what is objectively and rationally supported by evidence ... and what is only a subjective judgment, divorced from the facts as they are and informed by prejudice and wishful thinking," this effort argues that net assessments leaders make of their adversaries represent the interaction of objective and subjective judgments whose separation by a theorist places him in peril of deducing incorrect behavioral propositions.²

As the opening citation asserts, the interaction of capability and cultural judgments in the net assessment process should be considered a general phenomenon that pervades all classes of conflict, not merely the asymmetric interstate wars which are the focus of this research. In this chapter a theory of asymmetric war is offered based on this principle which may also help explain many other classes of conflict. The substantive investigative effort of this research, of course, will test only those hypotheses relating to asymmetric conflicts. This is not to suggest that culture plays a more important role in these conflicts. As argued in Chapter 1, inferior or similar cultural judgments lead to a discounting or confirmation of capability, respectively, in any dyadic relationship, asymmetric or otherwise.

There is no need to recount here the literature which emphasizes the important role that power plays in the calculations of statesmen, nor is there reason to repeat my arguments regarding the effectiveness of the theories which rely upon this concept alone to account for asymmetric wars. Rather, in this chapter an argument for the development of a theory which emphasizes capability and cultural judgments equally is put forth. Toward this end, it is first demonstrated that the security studies literature focusing on the assessments that statesmen make of adversaries has, in theory, emphasized the importance of both capability and cultural judgments in operational measures. Second, evidence is presented from the archives of the participants in both world wars to illustrate that, in practice, net assessments of adversaries have historically consisted of both capability and cultural judgments that interacted in a systematic manner, where judgments of cultural sophistication either confirmed or discounted objective capability measures. Third, further evidence is offered that demonstrates this cultural discounting or confirmation affected the strategic preferences of the great powers. Fourth, the recent scholarship in international relations discourse which has suggested that culture plays an important role in strategic decision making is reviewed. This is followed by a complete explication of my thesis which emphasizes the important role of both capability and cultural judgments in strategic choice. Finally, the insights this new approach may

offer to longstanding and current international relations puzzles and issues including asymmetric wars and cultural dissimilarity as a potential source of conflict are considered.

**Net Assessment Theory**

Classical Realist theory rests upon the assumption that statesmen think and act in terms of interest defined as power.4 This and other capability-based theories of international politics must, therefore, ultimately face the task of operationalizing capability in the determination of their explanatory power. Theoretical scholarship concerning the operationalization of power, or capability, does exist, albeit with little common ground between much of the work.5 The security studies literature has been the most prolific in advancing the scholarship regarding the operational measure of capability as conceived of by those responsible for the task in policy making circles.6

---


These practitioners often refer to this operational task as net assessment. Net assessment "attempts to do what the policy maker in fact often does for himself in his broader responsibilities as a top-level decision maker: concern itself with the long-term U.S. military situation, how that compares to potential opponents, and what actions should be considered to improve the situation in the future." This description of the function of the net assessment process squares nicely with Realism's assumption. That is, the net assessment process represents the operational means by which decision makers think and act in terms of interest defined as power.

A major contributor to the net assessment literature has been Eliot Cohen, who defines net assessment as "the appraisal of military balances." Much of the empirical research generated from the Realist perspective has measured capability in a manner amenable to Cohen's definition. The Correlates of War Project has

---


9 See, for example, Bruce Bueno De Mesquita, The War Trap, op. cit. Bruce Bueno De Mesquita and David Lalman, War and Reason, op. cit.
presented international relations scholars with a quantitative mecca from which to calculate capability ratios, systemic distributions, and the like. Each of these measures satisfies Realism's concern for "what is true objectively." As argued previously, however, scholars looking at the military balance alone are unable to explain the central question of this dissertation. Not all security scholars who focus on net assessment are satisfied with Cohen's rather terse, narrow definition, however.

Net assessment has been described as a much more sophisticated process by others including George Pickett and Stephen Rosen. Pickett, for example, defines net assessment as "the comparative analysis of military, technological, political, economic, and other factors governing the military capabilities of the United States (or some other military power) and its potential competitors (including enemies, neutrals, and friends)." Whereas, Stephen Rosen defines it as "the interaction of national security establishments in peacetime and in war. The interaction of opposed establishments is the central concept, and the 'net' in net assessment is the focus on

---


11 George E. Pickett, James G. Roche, and Barry D. Watts, "Net Assessment," op. cit., my emphasis.
the resultant of the interaction of these establishments." A review of the work of these and other net assessment scholars resulted in the compilation of factors which appears in figure 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Military Balance</th>
<th>Qualitative Balance</th>
<th>Interaction Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weapon and force comparisons</td>
<td>Quality of leadership</td>
<td>Exchange rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force-to-space ratio</td>
<td>Initiative and flexibility</td>
<td>Attrition rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-up rates</td>
<td>of commanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firepower</td>
<td>Quality of operational reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Mental and physical characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivability</td>
<td>of troops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of reinforcement</td>
<td>National morale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1: Net Assessment Categories

As figure 2.1 illustrates, operationally net assessment has been defined as consisting of three categories of measurement. They are the quantitative military balance, the qualitative balance, and interaction effects. It is not my purpose to quibble with the operationalization of power by Realist scholars seeking to test their theories. Clearly, their measures fall within the first category of *Quantitative Military Balance* and are representative of these measures. Nor am I arguing that these

---

scholars should consider *Interaction Effects*. State-centered realism does not portend to explain the specific outcomes of particular dyadic interactions. It is my objective, however, to argue with Realist’s and other’s lack of consideration for the *Qualitative Balance*, for it is in the consideration of this balance that many 'anomalous' behaviors, such as asymmetric wars, can be explained. A review of the operational measures of the qualitative balance reveals that they are what is often described as 'intangible' analytic concepts which, by their nature, are subject to evaluative, as opposed to objective or 'bean counting' assessment. The intangible nature of these concepts should not encourage their exclusion from the theory building process, however. While this category is labelled the *Qualitative Balance* in figure 2.1, the judgments which it represents are part and parcel of what others consider to be representative of cultural judgments.

Where net assessment scholars raise the importance of both capability and cultural judgments when sizing up a potential adversary, they tend to emphasize the former, perhaps due to the operational difficulties often associated with the latter. This emphasis is not a true representation of the net assessment process, however, as net assessment practitioners have historically integrated both judgments in their
evaluations of adversaries. This is demonstrated in the next section along with data confirming that the interaction of these judgments affected great power strategic choices in important ways.

Net Assessment in Practice

In a recent report prepared for the United States’ Director of Net Assessment, assessment practitioners concluded that the human factor does indeed play a critical role in the development of military effectiveness and that "social and cultural trends influence the supply [and talent ... of humans] ... which ultimately determines the capability of military forces ...."\(^\text{13}\) This is a clear statement revealing that in the contemporary world, cultural judgments play an important role in the assessment processes in place in the United States intelligence community. This is not just a contemporary phenomenon, however, nor is it present only in the net assessment processes of the United States.

Net assessment archival research has focused on two historical periods, those before the First and Second world wars. Scholars have performed extensive analyses of the net assessments that many of the great powers made of one another in these

---

\(^{13}\) Anthony Pascal, Michael Kennedy, and Steven Rosen with Paul Jabber, Margaret Krahenbuhl, Joseph Large, and David Ronfeldt, *Men and Arms in the Middle East: The Human Factor in Military Modernization*, R-2460-NA, June 1979, (Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1979), pp. v-viii.
periods. In this section, some of the conclusions of their efforts are presented to illustrate the importance of both capability and cultural judgments in the net assessment processes of these powers.

Pre-World War I

Great Britain

In his study of British assessment of the other great powers, Paul Kennedy concludes that qualitative assessments by British generals were all too obviously influenced by cultural and political prejudices. In support of this statement, he offers the following examples:

Witness, for example, Henry Wilson's devotion to all things French. Judgments about the 'smart bearing' of the troops or the 'keen-ness' of foreign officers were used more often than not to buttress an argument or to counter skeptics. When Lloyd George expressed surprise in August 1911 at the General Staff's low estimate of Russian strength, he was informed that this conclusion was based upon the relative lack of trained military leaders in the Tsar's army. On the whole, no real effort was made within the CID or any other body to debate or to challenge statements about the quality of potential enemies', or allies', forces. Nor is there much indication that such testimony affected attitudes at the top. Henry Wilson had made up his mind long before and was not likely to be swayed, especially by reports from his old rival, Repington; and Kitchener remained unshaken in his view that the German

---


army could drive through the French 'like partridges,' a view not based upon study of secret reports or published articles, but simply upon years of experience and, to be blunt, accumulated prejudice.  

Ernest May also offers evidence supporting the prevalence of cultural judgments in his study of British assessments of the Russian army. For example, General Sir Alfred Knox, Britain's expert on the Russian army, explained his doubts about the tsarist officer corps by writing

Unlike our officers, they had no taste for outdoor amusements ... In Termuz, for instance, on the frontier of Afghanistan, there was not a single tennis-court, though the Garrison numbered from 150 to 200 officers. It is small wonder that there were suicides among the officers of the garrison every year.

Italy, Imperial Germany, and Austria-Hungary

The influence of cultural stereotypes on overall power assessments is also evident in appraisals by the Italian, German, and Austro-Hungarian general staffs. John Gooch argues that

---


Even in regard to capabilities, judgments in Rome were sometimes clouded by assumptions about national morale and willpower which rested on questionable foundations. The line most frequently taken was that Italian poverty bred hard soldiers, in contrast to the French, whose military efficiency was weakened by an easier life. Dreyfus' retrial provided the opportunity to reinforce national stereotypes and to suggest that the dirty military consciences being paraded at Rennes were indicative of the moral degeneration of the greater part of the French race.

Similarly, the German General Staff questioned the tenacity of the French infantrymen, observing "the Frenchman is nervous; his voice easily rises." Men in Vienna also responded to national stereotypes - Germans efficient, Russians sloppy, Italians frivolous, and so on - when judging the strength of foreign forces.

Pre-World War II

United States

Cultural stereotypes played an equally important role in the assessments of the great powers before the onset of World War II. Calvin L. Christman observes that

---


Western racial perceptions of the Japanese colored the assessment of Japanese strength, especially regarding their aviation capabilities. National characteristics condemned that nation, so the United States believed, to perpetual weakness, since Japan depended on copies of Western designs, technology, and facilities. The Japanese 'lack of originality is a national trait,' the Army War Plans Division study confidently observed.\(^{23}\)

This judgment of cultural inferiority significantly affected U.S. estimates of Japanese aircraft production. For example, a 1941 projection determined that Japan was producing aircraft at a current rate of barely two thousand a year; in reality, the actual production rate was then exceeding five thousand.\(^ {24}\) Other American analysts expressed similar conclusions, claiming that the Japanese as a race lacked creativity; thus, as a nation Japan had no choice but to copy Western aviation designs and to accept perpetual inferiority. "Japanese aviation and industrial development," the American naval attache in Tokyo concluded, "will remain from two to three years behind that of the United States."\(^ {25}\)


David Kahn has also uncovered evidence supporting the important role cultural judgments played in American assessments of the Japanese fighting force. Kahn contends that American racism and rationalism kept the United States from thinking that Japan would attack it ... And disbelief in a Japanese attack was reinforced by belief in the superiority of the white race. Americans looked upon the Japanese as bucktoothed, bespectacled little yellow men, forever photographing things with their omnipresent cameras so that they could copy them.26

In support of this claim, Kahn cites the work of the widely known writer on naval subjects, Fletcher Pratt. Pratt illustrates the role that cultural judgments play in the net assessment process quite nicely in summarizing the views of "every observer" of Japanese aviation. It was agreed that Japanese aviators were daring but incompetent. The reasons behind this assessment differ, however, ranging from medical and religious explanations to psychological and educational factors. Regarding the first the Japanese were said to have poor vision and defects in the tubes of the inner ear giving them a defective sense of balance, the one physical sense in which an aviator is not permitted to be deficient.27 Regarding the latter it was


argued that Japanese children received fewer mechanical toys and less mechanical training than those of any other race, thus making them poor aviators.\textsuperscript{28}

Cultural stereotyping also played a significant role in American assessments of German strength, although in a manner converse to that seen in assessments of the Japanese.

[German] efficiency, unity, and organization became racial maxims in American minds. Germany could do almost anything militarily, and partially for the same racial reasoning the American leaders suspected that Japan could do almost nothing. This assessment of the Japanese went all the way to the White House, for as late as 1942 Roosevelt optimistically believed that 'defeat of Germany means the defeat of Japan, probably without firing a shot or losing a life.'\textsuperscript{29}

Christman argues further that racial bias played both ways in American assessment, and it helps to explain why the United States consistently overestimated Germany and underestimated Japan.\textsuperscript{30} For example, when Japan took steps to ensure secrecy, the United States interpreted this action as Japan's dubious effort to hide its inferiority. The pages of the \textit{United States Naval Institute Proceedings}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{30} Calvin L. Christman, "Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Craft of Strategic Assessment," in \textit{Calculations}, op. cit., p. 235.
\end{itemize}
asserted that the Japanese, bereft of originality, were imitators by nature. Aware of their national failings, the Japanese "seek to hide them from the world by every means in their power." At the same time, however, military reports concerning Germany did not draw the same conclusion that the Third Reich's efforts toward secrecy had to represent an attempt to hide its inferiority.

These polar cultural judgments of the Germans and Japanese intersected in intelligence reports following the bombing of Pearl Harbor. In the days following the bombing several American officers seemed unable to believe that the Japanese alone were responsible for Japan's success and wondered if Germany had provided help. In the early evening of December 7, 1941, Chief of Naval Operations Stark talked by telephone with Rear Admiral Claude Bloch at Pearl Harbor. When chronicling the damage, Bloch mentioned that a submarine had penetrated into the harbor and then had been sunk. Stark's first reaction was to ask if it were a German submarine.

In his original communication to the Atlantic Fleet and to SPENAVO (U.S. Special Naval Observer, London), Stark reported that two of the attacking aircraft at Pearl

---


Harbor had swastikas on their side. A two days later General Marshall relayed to
the White House General Douglas MacArthur's report that white pilots had flown
some of the Japanese planes that bombed Clark Field. A later intelligence report
forwarded to Roosevelt identified German pilots as operating Japanese aircraft in the
Java area.

**Great Britain**

Wesley Wark has detailed the British assessment of the Japanese prior to
World War II. For example, the British Naval attache, Captain Vivian, offered a
view of the Japanese character - unimaginative, deferential, imitative, lacking
initiative - which then permitted the Admiralty to regard Japan as a 'less than first-
class' power. Paul Kennedy also asserts that, above all, those responsible for
assessment fell back upon their own cultural, racial, and ideological prejudices.

---
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Although individual observers caught glimpses of Japan's fighting efficiency, such insights were never brought together, and racial prejudice all too frequently played a role in suggesting that the Japanese military institutions were not as effective as those of the West. If Japanese personnel were disciplined and brave, they were also 'fanatical,' unable to react to unforeseen events, and unimaginative. Their ship designs were curious ... their generals and admirals somewhat inferior.  

Kennedy concludes that against this general set of cultural and racial stereotypes, the British easily downgraded specific reports about the excellent coordination of the Japanese naval force.

**Fascist Italy**

Italian assessments of other powers also illustrate the influence that cultural judgments have had historically. MacGregor Knox maintains that

*In assessing quality and morale, the army tended to snap judgments based on ethnic stereotypes. In September 1938, an Italian staff colonel visiting the German army maneuvers commented to his superiors that the 'intelligence, presence of mind, and spirit of initiative' of officers and NCOs was 'decisively inferior' to those of their Italian counterparts.*

---


Cultural stereotypes also pervaded assessments of lesser powers. On the eve of Mussolini's attack on Greece in October 1940, SIM [Servizio Informazioni Militari] produced and distributed a country book which proclaimed that the Greek officer was incapable of maintaining "cohesion of will and spirit." The troops were "difficult to command," since they reflected "the characteristics of the Greek people, which are for the most part negative from the military point of view; impatience with discipline, small desire to work, easily roused to enthusiasm, but equally easily inclined to despondency."^41

National Socialist Germany

Perhaps the example that offers the most archival evidence is that of National Socialist Germany. Hitler's predispositions toward racial and cultural arguments have been widely discussed by scholars. Gerhard Weinberg, for example, contends that Hitler concluded

the United States was a racial mixture after all - a mixture from all over, including Negroes and Jews, and what were undoubtably the inferior exiles from every country except Germany. This mongrel society, in which the scum naturally floated to the top, could not possibly construct a sound economy, create an indigenous culture, or operate a successful political system.^42


This assessment of the United States led Hitler to draw the conclusion that the America was deprived by its racial composition of the ability to produce an effective military force and that it was incapable of waging war and would not dare go beyond empty gestures in international affairs.43

Michael Geyer presents evidence that cultural stereotypes were pervasive outside of Hitler's personal viewpoint as well. In a review of Germany's Army Intelligence operations, the only group responsible for overall assessments of adversaries, he discovered that a highly sophisticated analysis of French command practices and of difficult questions of French military doctrine and its implementation could stand side by side with the notion that French soldiers would fight only after a good meal.44

Capability, Culture, and Strategic Preference

The net assessment records of the great powers illustrates both that cultural judgments were prevalent and played an important role in the net assessment processes of these states. The argument in this dissertation goes further, however,


proposing that the interaction is systematic and subsequently encourages strategic preferences in a predictable manner. More specifically, it is claimed that the presence of judgments of cultural inferiority in net assessments of adversaries encourages aggressive, offensive strategies to increase one’s power whereas the presence of judgments of equal cultural sophistication and objective or superior capability encourages a more cautious, defensive strategy to maintain one’s power. The great power policies in these pre-war periods support some of these propositions.

For example, prior to World War I Kitchener's assessment of the "partridge-like" quality of the French forces along with General Knox’s culturally-based assessments of Tsarist officers played a major role in persuading a reluctant Liberal government to accept the possibility of the BEF [British Expeditionary Force] being sent to the Continent under certain circumstances. That is, British assessments of French and Russian weakness, fundamentally based on judgments of cultural inferiority, in the face of a growing German threat encouraged a more aggressive British strategy. No longer could she rely on passive defense to maintain her relative power standing, rather Britain felt the need to alter her doctrine to include tactical offensive operations on the continent.

Previous to World War II the United States did not perceive a significant threat from the "inferior" Japanese air force which led to a discounting of the likelihood of a Pearl Harbor scenario; Hitler's grand strategy was predicated upon the

---

belief that the "degenerate" United States was "not dangerous to us;" and Italy's assessment of the "inferior" Greek character resulted in the sending of a relatively small force which experienced an unpleasant shock when the Greek army offered a resistance that had not been foreseen. In each case, judgments of cultural inferiority affected strategic preferences in significant ways.

The historical record provides a powerful argument for a theory of net assessment and strategic preference that considers both capability and cultural judgments equally. As stated previously, capability-based theories dominate international relations scholarship. In the next section some recent efforts to incorporate judgments of culture into theories of interstate behavior are reviewed.

Culture in International Relations

Much of the recent scholarship on the role of cultural judgments in international politics focuses on culture as a source of conflict between actors, both national and sub-national. This focus differs from that of the net assessment literature, although it could be characterized as 'threat assessment.' The two concepts differ significantly, of course, with net assessment stressing the evaluation of an adversary's (or potential adversary's) capabilities, whereas 'threat assessment' seeks to determine who may be the next adversary. While the concepts differ, however,

---

46 Hitler speech of Nov. 23, 1939, Trial of the Major War Criminals, XXVI, p. 331; Soddu (Commander in Chief, Albania) to subordinates and Army Staff, 1155, Nov. 27, 1940, NARS T-821/127/000482, cited in MacGregor Knox, "Fascist Italy Assesses Its Enemies, 1935-40," in Knowing One's Enemies, op. cit., p. 356.
they are not divorced from one another. The net assessment of a potential adversary's strength is one of several factors taken into account in threat assessment calculations. Furthermore, while it has been argued that cultural judgments are important in the net assessment process, recent scholarship suggests that they are paramount in threat assessment processes also.

Perhaps the most controversial statement regarding culture as a source of conflict between nations has been made by Samuel Huntington. Huntington has recently argued that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic, rather, the great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. There is some historical evidence which speaks to the potential merit of this speculation. Consider Germany before World War I as an example. Holger Herwig notes that during the last two years before the Great War there surfaced once again in Germany paranoid fear of encirclement underpinned by an assumption that there were natural antagonisms among races. To Kiderlan-Wachter, Wilhelm II had predicted that in the "final life and death struggle" the Germans in Europe (Austria, Germany) would be pitted against the "Romans (Gauls) supported by the Slavs (Russia)" and the "Anglo-Saxons." Bethmann Hollweg spoke in the Reichstag of a destiny "which pits Teutons against Slavs," adding that "an acute vitalization of racial instincts" among the Slavs had introduced a totally new element into foreign relations. As Klaus Wernecke has

shown, terms such as 'race,' 'racial question,' and 'racial doctrine' found their way into diplomatic documents with ever greater frequency.  

Conversely, where cultural norms are perceived as similar, Huntington asserts that culture has facilitated the rapid expansion of economic relations. Consider, for example, the People's Republic of China and Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore. This has also occurred in the formation of the Economic Cooperation Organization, which consists of ten, non-Arab Muslim countries including Iran, Pakistan, Turkey, Azerbaijan, and Afghanistan. Similarly, Caricom, the Central American Common Market, rests on common cultural foundations. Huntington summarizes his overall argument by stating that "Differences in power and struggles for military, economic, and institutional power are thus one source of conflict ... Differences in culture, that is basic values and beliefs, are a second source of conflict."
Robert Jackson also emphasizes the importance of cultural judgments in his recent effort on imperialism, decolonization, and ideas.\textsuperscript{51} Jackson argues that cultural judgments affect an actor's assumption about what norms will be relevant and what types of reciprocity are likely to prevail. In his discussion of colonial policy, he contends that states were considered independent only if the government was capable of enforcing its authority according to Western standards of 'civilized' conduct. If a political system was not 'civilized' it had no claim to recognition. Indeed, the Western powers had a right to intervene in such countries to establish a tutelary regime. Not only was it a right, it was a duty to bring 'civilized' norms to these 'barbarous' societies.\textsuperscript{52} Colonialists believed that race (and in some cases ethnicity) was an accurate predictor of democratic competence - whites being competent and nonwhites being incompetent. Racial distinctions thus served as a brake on the extension of democratic rights to people of non-European descent within Western countries as well as in Western colonies.\textsuperscript{53} Stated differently, the perceived cultural inferiority of these peoples prompted a strategy of intervention and colonization. Jackson emphasizes the importance of cultural judgments nicely when he asserts that the "entire colonial enterprise was deeply normative: to view it exclusively from a utilitarian perspective of costs and benefits is to overlook everything else about it,\textsuperscript{51}


\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., pp. 117-18.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., p. 135.
which amounts to a good deal. ... Pure interest and pure power are no less exceptions in human relations than pure morality and legality. The real world is usually some combination of the two."

In the intra-state domain, Mark Juergensmeyer has recently argued that nationalism has a cultural dimension and that a fundamental cleavage has emerged between religious nationalism and secular nationalism. The foundations of both nationalisms rest on significantly different cultural norms, and each nationalist group perceives itself to be equally legitimate, if not superior to the other. These clashing perceptions lead to conflicts based on the perceived cultural achievements of the other nationalist group.

The sub-national studies of Jurgensmeyer parallel what has long been the center of attention in studies of intra-state conflict in sociology, social psychology, and other disciplines. Donald Horowitz, for example, refers to subjective relative cultural sophistication as an ever-present influence on group relations, because it is so obviously central to conceptions of group worth. Furthermore, he claims that the cutting edge of comparison and conflict is the juxtaposition of backward and advanced groups.

54 Ibid., pp. 119.


57 Ibid., p. 166.
Discussion

The argument that culture is important in threat assessments and may be the basis of future conflict is a notable contention. The theoretician's task is to consider more completely how and through what means this cultural judgment impacts policy. Some have claimed that cultural norms manifest themselves in foreign policy behaviors and expectations. Different cultural norms, then, can give rise to conflicts when behaviors are not acknowledged and expectations not fulfilled by the other, culturally dissimilar party. The conflict does not arise because the other is challenging those behaviors and ignoring expectations, rather simply because it is not its 'way of doing things.'

Others, such as Huntington, argue that the mere existence of cultural dissimilarity will be the basis of future conflict given the threat that one culture may pose to another's dissimilar cultural values and beliefs. This claim should be subjected to some scrutiny. For example, are strategies toward a culturally dissimilar target merely a function of the dissimilarity, or is the affective evaluation of the cultural divergence important? In other words, is dissimilarity important or is how that dissimilarity is perceived in terms of relative sophistication what matters? That is, are states that are judged to be equally culturally sophisticated the targets of the same strategies as states judged to be culturally inferior? Furthermore, what of a consideration of the 'objective' capability of others? Will this not also in some way affect one's strategic preferences? This factor is strangely absent in much of the work on culture and threat assessment. Huntington, Jurgensmeyer, and Horowitz, for
example, emphasize cultural judgments as a basis for conflict outside of a consideration of an adversary's relative strength. Do states perceive threats from others simply because they are culturally dissimilar or must the other also possess similar or superior capability? And, should relative capability matter as well, would a state prefer the same strategy in different capability conditions? What if we consider relative cultural sophistication and relative capability together. For example, would states perceive threats from stronger targets perceived as culturally inferior? And would they implement the same strategy toward one perceived as stronger but equally culturally sophisticated? Finally, we should focus on where these cultural judgments manifest themselves in the policy-making process. That is, in what part of the process do they play an important role? What is the mechanism through which they exert their influence? The experiment and case studies presented in this thesis offer an opportunity to address some of these questions. They will be returned to in the concluding chapter.

I contend that one should not, in a consideration of the relationship between statesmen's power calculations and strategic preference in international relations, separate the study of capability judgments from cultural evaluations when estimating those calculations. This approach assumes that the two judgments interact in a systematic manner and exert their influence through the net assessment process which ultimately informs a state's strategic preference. Robert Jackson makes this point elegantly in his discussion of colonial policy, arguing that strategies usually result from some combination of an assessment of the relative power and cultural
sophistication of the adversary. The specific relationships between assessment and strategy I hypothesize are put forth in the next section.

Cultural Judgments and Net Assessment

A number of relationships can be selected out of the preceding reviews of the net assessment and cultural-based international relations literature which suggest a series of hypotheses associating net assessment and strategic orientation. These are presented in figure 2.2 which follows the definitions of these orientations.

(Status Quo: an orientation where states seek to maintain power and protect the values they already possess. The potential gains from nonsecurity expansion are outweighed by the costs of war.)

(Imperialist: an orientation where states value what they covet more than what they currently possess, although this ratio may vary considerably. These states will employ military force to extend their values and seek a reversal of the power relations between two or more nations. The gains from nonsecurity expansion exceed the costs of war.)

---

Figure 2.2: Net Assessment and Strategic Orientation

Figure 2.2 is a two dimensional table representing a state's perception of a potential adversary as broken down into the components of net assessment, objective capability and subjective cultural judgments, and the strategic orientations encouraged by the interaction of those judgments. Capability is considered relative and can assume one of three values: superior, equal, or inferior. Culture is considered in terms of relative sophistication and is defined as either equal or inferior to one's own.

The cell contents of figure 2.2 represent the strategic orientations proposed to be encouraged by particular net assessments. For example, when an adversary is perceived as capability superior and culturally equal, one is encouraged to adopt a status quo or defensive strategy toward the target (cell 1 of figure 2.2). Conversely, when an adversary is perceived as capability superior and culturally inferior, one is encouraged to adopt an imperialist or offensive strategy toward the target (cell 4 of figure 2.2). Note that variation on strategic orientation in conditions of capability superiority and similarity are fundamentally based upon variation in judgments of cultural sophistication (cells 4 and 5). These two hypotheses in particular are counter
to power-determinist propositions in that they assert a weaker or near-equal power is encouraged to attack a stronger adversary perceived as culturally inferior. The logic behind all of these hypotheses is as follows.

Cells 1 and 2 represent net assessments where the judgments of equal cultural sophistication act to confirm as accurate the superior or similar objective measures of the adversary's strength. This is as stated in Proposition 1 of Chapter 1. Assuming that states are motivated to either maintain their power or acquire even greater assets, when faced with a stronger adversary the predominant concern will be the former, i.e. the maintenance of one's current power base. Expansion is not a rational option when faced with a stronger adversary. These hypotheses are consistent with Realist behavioral propositions. In cell 3 the adversary is objectively weaker and possesses equal cultural sophistication. The objective weakness of the adversary encourages imperialist behavior by a power-maximizing perceiver, that is, it perceives an opportunity to increase its assets.

Cells 4 through 6 represent net assessments where the judgments of inferior culture act to discount the objective measures of strength of the adversary. That is, while the adversary may possess objective assets in superior numbers, it is perceived that the 'backward' adversary does not have the ability to use those assets effectively. The resulting assessments encourage a power-maximizing state to exploit the weaker target, thus encouraging an imperialist strategy. The hypotheses in cells 4 and 5 contrast with Classical Realist reasoning, since they argue that weaker states will aggress against objectively stronger or equally strong states.
Consider the following examples from the previous review of historical great power net assessments as modal types for particular cells. French, British, and American assessments of Germany before World War II indicate that they all perceived the Germans as possessing similar capability and equal cultural sophistication. As stated previously, German efficiency, unity, and organization became racial maxims in their minds. This combination of judgments accords with cell 2 of figure 2.2. The power-maintenance, defensive, status quo strategy proposed in this cell is consistent with the allies' behavior towards Germany. German net assessments painting the French as degenerate in the same period are better represented by the combination of similar capability and inferior culture. The resulting assessment is associated with an imperialist orientation (cell 5 of figure 1) which accords with Germany's invasion of France. The Italian assessments describing the Greeks as impatient with discipline, lacking a desire to work, and inclined toward despondency in the pre-World War II period are best represented by the combination of inferior capability and culture (cell 6 of figure 2.2). The net assessment resulting from the interaction of these judgments encourages an imperialist orientation which is consistent with Mussolini's strategy toward Greece. Finally, Japanese records in the same period support the contention that the United States was perceived as capability superior and culturally inferior. In cell 4 of figure 2.2 it is hypothesized that an imperialist orientation follows from these judgments. Pearl Harbor is a testament to the Japanese adoption of just such an orientation.
Further consideration of the interaction of capability and cultural judgments in the net assessment process leads to a series of more fine-grained hypotheses regarding strategic preferences. Specifically, from the broad-based orientations of status quo and imperialist particular strategic metaphors have been distilled which describe the strategy encouraged by each net assessment. These hypotheses are presented in figure 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Similar</td>
<td>(1) Independent</td>
<td>(2) Containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Independent</td>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturaly</td>
<td>(4) Limited-aims</td>
<td>(5) Revisionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>Revisionism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3: Net Assessment and Strategic Preference

The dimensions of figure 2.3 are the same as those of figure 2.2, judgments of relative capability and cultural sophistication. The cell contents are more specific strategies encouraged by the net assessments resulting from the interaction of these two judgments.

---

In the top row of figure 2.3, cells 1 through 3, the cultural judgment confirms the objective capability measures of the adversary's strength. In cell 1 the \textit{Independent Fortress} strategy is proposed because of the superior capability of the adversary. The perceiving power-maximizing state does not have countervailing power and must, therefore, focus on protecting its capability base through securing its borders. The \textit{Containment} strategy is proposed in cell 2 because the perceiving state possesses countervailing power to offset challenges by the adversary extending beyond its own borders. This assessment, therefore, encourages an extended defense of the perceiver's capability base. In cell 3 a \textit{Long-term Intervention} strategy is proposed. The perceiving power sees an opportunity to increase its assets through domination of this weaker state. Since states are assumed to be motivated to maintain or increase their power, this assessment encourages the perceiver to take advantage of the opportunity presented through a strategy of intervention and occupation.

In the second row of figure 2.3, cells 4 through 6, the judgment of cultural inferiority discounts the objective capability measures of the adversary's strength. All of these assessments encourage imperialist behavior by a power-maximizing state. A \textit{Limited-aims Revisionism} strategy is proposed for cell 4. While the net assessment paints the adversary as weak, thereby encouraging imperialist behavior, the perceiver recognizes that certain objective measures of the adversary's strength cannot be overcome. Consider, for example, the geographic assets of the enemy. It is likely that an objectively stronger adversary possesses greater land assets than does the weaker actor. This poses a significant problem for the attacking weaker power since
it will be unable to occupy and control a vast amount of conquered land. Factors such as these constrain the imperialist strategy of the weaker actor to one of limited aims. In cell 5 it is proposed that a Revisionism strategy is encouraged by an assessment of similar capability and inferior cultural sophistication. In these cases the perceiving actor does have the resources to overcome all objective measures of an adversary’s strength, including geographic size. This results in a strategy where the goal is to destroy the enemy’s forces and subsequently annex or absorb the assets of the vanquished adversary. Finally, in cell 6 a Long-term Intervention strategy is proposed. The engagement requires fewer resources than the Limited-aims and Revisionism strategies due to the inferior capability of the target. The long-term aspect of the strategy is supported by the perceived cultural inferiority of the adversary and is often justified through the phrases 'civilizing mission' or 'manifest destiny' so that occupation and control are legitimized. This strategy is epitomized by 19th and 20th century colonial policies.

---

60 This reasoning is similar to Mearsheimer's definition of a limited-aims strategy. Mearsheimer argues that the goal of the attacking force is to capture a piece of enemy territory and establish the defense, thus transferring the burden of altering the status quo to the adversary. See John J. Mearsheimer, Conventional Deterrence, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), pp. 53-6.

61 Ibid., pp. 33-53.
Puzzles Addressed

The theory introduced in this chapter speaks to the puzzle of asymmetric conflicts as well as the more current issue of cultural dissimilarity as a potential source of conflict between states. The specific manners in which the theory addresses these topics are detailed below.

Asymmetric Conflicts

The central task of this dissertation is to explain conflict initiation by weaker powers against stronger states. Toward this end, a theory of strategic preference predicated on the net assessments that states make of one another has been offered. It has been argued that net assessment represent the interaction of two judgments; the first being an objective measure of an adversary’s strength and the second being a subjective judgment regarding the relative cultural sophistication of the target.

Figures 2.2 and 2.3 offer a series of hypotheses associating net assessment with strategic orientation and preference given the assumption that states are power maximizers. The fourth hypothesis, cell 4 of figures 2.2 and 2.3, offers one possible explanation for asymmetric war initiation by a weaker power. This hypothesis states that the superior objective capability of the adversary is discounted due to a judgment of cultural inferiority. The resulting net assessment paints the adversary as weak, thus encouraging an imperialist strategy on the part of the perceiver. More
specifically, the imperialist strategy is one of limited aims since the perceiver calculates that it cannot surmount certain tangible characteristics of the adversary, including but not limited to its geographic assets.

**Culture as a Source of Conflict**

While Huntington argues that cultural dissimilarity will be the source of conflict in the future, the relationship between culture and conflict proposed in this thesis is far less direct. As stated previously, others have argued that culture can advance conflict through a clashing of culture-based expectations and norms. The historical record presented in this chapter demonstrates that culture can advance conflict in another manner as well, as a filter through which states assess the strength of their adversaries. Through cultural discounting states may conclude that they have the capability to expand given net assessments that paint their adversaries as inferior. If we assume states are power maximizers, the presence of these judgments of cultural inferiority in the assessment of an adversary may encourage aggressive action in support of that motivation.

**Conclusion**

The goal of this chapter was to build an argument supporting the development of a theory of asymmetric war which maintains as its most crucial variables leaders' judgments of the objective capability and subjective cultural sophistication of an adversary. A review of the net assessment scholarship as well as the historical record
of great power assessments provided support for the validity of this approach.

Greater validity in and of itself, however, is no reason to adopt this theory. It should also offer a progressive shift in explanatory power.

The central puzzle of this dissertation is the aggressive behavior that weaker states have directed at stronger adversaries. The theory proposed argues that objective measures of the adversary's superior capability are discounted due to a concomitant judgment of cultural inferiority. The resulting net assessment depicts the adversary as a barbarian - possessing no morals or values to speak of and lacking intelligence, organization, and group cohesion. This image of an impotent adversary encourages imperialist behavior on the part of the perceiving actor which may result in an aggressive, expansionist policy.

My hypotheses were derived inductively, deductively, and through experimentation. The historical record of great power net assessments suggested several relationships between cultural judgments, net assessment, and strategic orientation. The relationships hypothesized between assessment and strategic preference were deduced from a consideration of the interaction of capability and cultural judgments. In order to test these hypotheses an experimental format was utilized. In Chapter 3 the experiment design and results are presented. This chapter is followed by three case studies in which the external validity of the theory is tested along with hypotheses from the Realist and risk-propensity schools.
CHAPTER 3
TESTING THE INTERNAL VALIDITY OF THE THEORY

Much of the archival evidence presented in Chapter 2 suggested the hypotheses in cells 2 and 4 of figure 3.1 below. For example, US assessments regarding German efficiency, unity, and organization accorded with its policy of German containment in World War II (cell 2) whereas German assessments of Frenchman as nervous and degenerate accorded with its imperialist strategy in the same period (cell 4).

The remaining hypotheses in figure 3.1 were deduced based on the proposed relationship between capability and cultural judgments of an adversary.¹ In this chapter the goal is to test in an experimental format my claims that capability and cultural judgments interact in a systematic manner that subsequently encourages both the strategic

¹ The two cells in figure 3.1 representing judgements of inferior capability were not investigated in this research for two reasons. First, these hypotheses are not counterintuitive since they propose that a stronger power aggresses against a weaker adversary, that is, this behavior does not challenge the conventional wisdom of power-determinist international relations theory. Second, these cells represent judgements most often associated with colonial behavior and much scholarship has already been devoted to a discussion of the role cultural judgements played in such behavior. See, for example, Richard Cottam, Foreign Policy Motivation, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977).
orientations (status quo or imperialist) proposed previously as well as the more specific hypotheses presented in figure 3.1. This effort will determine the internal validity of the theory from which these hypotheses are derived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturally Similar</th>
<th>Capability Superior</th>
<th>Capability Similar</th>
<th>Capability Inferior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Independent</td>
<td>(2) Containment</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>[Enemy]</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Imperialist]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Limited-aims</td>
<td>(4) Revisionism</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisionism</td>
<td>[Degenerate]</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Barbarian]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1: Capability, Culture, and Strategic Preference

The experimental method offers an opportunity to test the theory in an ideal-type environment, one in which other potential influences on strategic orientation and preference can be controlled. In this dissertation the focus is on the role that cultural judgments play in the net assessment processes of states. Net assessments, along with many other factors at the individual, bureaucratic, organizational, state, and system level interact in the process of grand strategy in very complex and often idiosyncratic ways. Thus, it is important to determine the role of cultural judgments in the assessment
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process in an environment that is isolated from these other potential influences. Should the proposed relationships between capability and cultural judgments be present and the hypotheses be supported in this controlled environment, one can have some confidence that the hypotheses will find support in actual case studies. In the first half of this chapter the experiment design and materials used in the experiment are presented. The second half includes the results of the experiment and a discussion of how these findings speak to the internal validity of the theory.

Experimental Design

The experimental design was a 2x2 matrix with each of the four conditions in cells 1-4 in figure 3.1 represented in the design. For the purpose of discussion, each of the conditions in these four cells has been assigned a metaphor. For example, the combination of capability superior and culturally inferior judgments (cell 3) has been assigned the metaphor Barbarian. Subjects were Ohio State University undergraduates participating in order to receive extra credit in their class. There were 15 subjects in each of the four conditions.

Scenario

Broadly speaking, the purpose of the experiment was to engage subjects in a strategic decision-making task in an environment resembling the international system as defined by the Realist school, that is, anarchic and self-help. Toward this end, subjects
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3 See Kenneth Waltz, Theory of International Politics, op. cit.
were told they were the leaders of one of two significant groups in a state that is now
dissolving. The state was formerly responsible for distributing resources to both groups
but now the group leaders had to make those decisions. Subjects were told they were
responsible for the well-being of their group members and that the overall distribution
of resources their group received at the end of the experiment was a function of not only
their distribution strategy but also that selected by the leaders of the other group. Group
leaders were also told that their distribution strategies were to be made independent of
discussion and interaction with the other groups' leaders.

With this environment established, the first goal in the experiment was to instill
an assessment of the other group in the minds of the subjects. The second goal was to
collect data that measured the subjects' strategic preferences regarding the distribution
of resources to the leaders of both their group and the other group.

**Independent Variables**

Toward realizing the first goal, the initial task of the experiment was to separate
subjects into two groups, where each group represented one of the two groups in the
dissolving state. This was accomplished by explaining to each subject at the outset of
the experiment that he/she had already been assigned to a leadership position in one of
two groups, A or Z, based on a combination of his/her class standing and telephone
exchange.\(^4\)

\(^4\) While this separation scheme may seem innocuous, it is effective in promoting
group identity. Henri Tajfel has argued that it does not matter if groups are "defined by
flimsy and unimportant criteria." It only matters that the subjects in each group assume
The second task was to instill in the minds of the subjects an assessment of the other group that accorded with one of the four conditions under investigation. This was accomplished by feeding the subjects intelligence information about the other group that focused on the two dimensions under investigation, relative capability and cultural sophistication. All four net assessment conditions were conditions of threat, that is, the other significant group was always described as being motivated by expansionist aims. This motivation was ascribed to the adversary since it is what many international relations scholars argue states must assume to ensure their own survival: if another state is not actively seeking to expand you have no guarantees that it may not in the future, therefore, you must adopt a strategy based upon the possibility that it may choose to expand in the future. The materials given to the subjects in the Enemy condition are presented in figure 3.2. In this condition the other group is described as equal in both capability and cultural sophistication. The information set given to subjects was altered accordingly in each of the four net assessment conditions under investigation.

that there are similarities between fellow group members and themselves and differences between themselves and the members of the other group. See Henri Tajfel, "Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination," Scientific American, 223, 2 (1970), pp. 96-102.

5 Motivation of the target was held constant in all conditions to control for possible variations in subjects interpretations of the same. This control also offers another advantage: it allows me to investigate the proposition that some states, while offering security-based justifications for their aggressive policies, are in fact greedy states motivated by profit. I hypothesize that this is the case when the target state is perceived as culturally inferior.
The first assessment presented by your intelligence service is of the other group's capability (Group Z) and your own group's capability (Group A).

Your Group’s (Group A) and Other Group’s (Group Z) Capability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Your Group (Group A)</th>
<th>Other Group (Group Z)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanks</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Power</td>
<td>3 fighters</td>
<td>3 fighters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-aircraft</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Deposits</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary</td>
<td>$4.5 million</td>
<td>$4.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above data, how would you rate the other group’s capability (Group Z) relative to that of your own group (Group A)? Please circle your answer from the list of options below as well as write it in the space provided below.

The other group's capability (Group Z) is:

a. Superior
b. Similar
c. Inferior

to my group's capability (Group A).

Answer: ____________________

Figure 3.2: Materials for the 'Enemy' Net Assessment Condition
Figure 3.2 (continued)

The second assessment presented by your intelligence service is of the other group's cultural sophistication (Group Z) and your own group's cultural sophistication (Group A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Group's (Group A)</th>
<th>Other Group's (Group Z)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Population that is Literate</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Population with College Degree</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Population that is Politically Active</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Economic Output Services (Banking)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Tech</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactures</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above data, how would you rate the other group's culture (Group Z) relative to that of your own group (Group A)? Please circle your answer from the list of options below as well as write it in the space provided below.

The other group's culture (Group Z) is:

a. Superior
b. Similar
c. Inferior

to my group's culture (Group A).

Answer: ____________________

Your intelligence service has reported that recent actions of the other group (Group Z) are jeopardizing your group's well-being. They have recently occupied the territory of a neighbor and want to continue expanding. Your intelligence service describes the other group's leaders as powerful, aggressive, highly belligerent, and bound by a common cause that puts your group in peril.
The data included in these materials was selected based upon a review of net assessment theory and the sociology/social-psychology literature on subjective culture.\(^6\) In the capability intelligence report the data reflect the 'bean counting' approach which tends to dominate net assessment scholarship. The numbers of infantry, tanks, etc. can be directly translated into a measure of strength of the adversary. In the cultural sophistication report the data reflect factors proposed by sociologists and social psychologists to be associated with cultural judgments of another. Note that the qualitative factors found in the net assessment literature, i.e. quality of leadership, quality of troops, etc., were not used in this report. This is because these qualitative assessments of military strength are to be based on subjects' judgments regarding the cultural sophistication of the adversary.

Both Horowitz and Triandis argue that judgments regarding economic, educational, and political progressiveness are central to judgments of relative cultural sophistication.\(^7\) These factors are captured in the intelligence data through the distribution of economic output, percent literate or with a college degree, and percent of politically active citizens, respectively. While these factors describe the adversary's


\(^7\) See Harry Triandis, The Analysis of Subjective Culture, op. cit., p. 22. Triandis proposes that these are the distal antecedents of subjective culture. Also see Donald L. Horowitz, Ethnic Groups in Conflict, op. cit., p. 148 for a similar argument.
society in general, it is assumed that subjects will use these factors as a filter through which to assess the quality of the adversary's military establishment in particular. Thus, the cultural data do not translate directly into measures of strength as do the capability data, its impact on overall assessment is indirect. How, then, does the percentage of literate citizens, percentage with a college degree, and percentage of politically active citizens translate into such qualitative net assessment factors as national character, national morale, mental characteristics of troops, quality of operational reserves, and quality of leadership?

The historical record suggests that such data do imply values for these latter variables. Specifically, judgments of equality in these 'cultural' areas tend to lead to assessments that the adversary's national character is rugged and its military leaders and infantry are qualitatively sophisticated, whereas judgments of inferiority in these areas lead to assessments that the adversary's national character is frail and its leaders and troops are qualitatively inferior. This latter combination, in turn, leads to a discounting of the adversary's objective strength. Consider the American assessments of Japanese pilots, Germany's assessment of the United States, and Italy's assessment of the Greeks as examples of the latter. In the first, the Japanese were judged to be poor pilots "because they received fewer mechanical toys and less mechanical training than those of any other race." Here the relationship between poor education and the inferior quality of Japanese pilots is clearly stated. Regarding Germany and Italy, Hitler believed that the United States was a "mongrel society" that was deprived by its racial composition of the ability to construct a sound economy, create an indigenous culture, operate a
successful political system, or produce an effective military force, and Italy’s military intelligence service concluded that Greek troops were difficult to command since they reflected "the characteristics of the Greek people, which are for the most part negative from a military point of view." In these examples the perceived characteristics of American and Greek society and its citizens are clearly affecting judgments of the quality of their military forces.

Dependent Variable

Once the subjects were primed with an assessment of the adversary, they were asked to make choices regarding the distribution of resources between the leaders of both their group and the target group and told that the leaders of the target group were also making distribution choices.

The strategies in figure 3.1 are framed in common security studies language, i.e. independent fortress, containment, intervention, and revisionism. These strategies had to be conceptualized in a manner that offered the opportunity for measurement of a subject's strategic orientations and preferences in the experiment. This was accomplished through a consideration of subjects' concerns for absolute and relative gains. This conceptualization accords well with strategic definitions offered by several international
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relations scholars. For example, *Containment* being conceived of as a state's concern for relative gains follows from the absolute/relative gains debate as it relates to the American Cold War strategy. Also, both revisionist strategies are conceived of as a state's willingness to incur costs to satisfy nonsecurity-based expansionist aims. Charles Glaser refers to these states as *greedy* states in contrast to *non-greedy* states who are unwilling to run risks or incur costs for non-security expansion. Listed below are the strategies in figure 3.1 as conceptualized in terms of concerns for absolute and relative gains in resource distribution situations.

*Independent Fortress:* Maximize Both Absolute and Relative Gains - a concern with being relatively stronger than the adversary but not to the point where you are willing to sacrifice maximizing your absolute gains.

*Containment:* Maximize Relative Gains - a concern with being relatively stronger than the adversary to the point where you are willing to sacrifice maximizing your absolute gains.

*Limited-Aims Revisionism:* Inflict Losses on Target - a concern with reducing the current assets of the adversary to the point where you are willing to sacrifice maximizing your absolute gains.

*Revisionism:* Maximize Losses of Target - a concern with reducing the current assets of the adversary to the point where you are willing to sacrifice all of your absolute gains.

---


Figure 3.1 has been reconstructed to illustrate the relationship between capability and cultural judgments and strategic preference as operationalized in absolute and relative gains concerns. This is presented in figure 3.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturally Similar</th>
<th>Capability Superior</th>
<th>Capability Similar</th>
<th>Capability Inferior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Independent</td>
<td><strong>Fortress = maximize both absolute and relative gains</strong></td>
<td>(2) <strong>Containment = maximize relative gains</strong> [Enemy]</td>
<td><strong>Long-term Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress</td>
<td>[Imperialist]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Inferior</td>
<td>(3) <strong>Limited-aims Revisionism = inflict losses on the target's</strong> at the cost of not maximizing own absolute gains [Barbarian]</td>
<td>(4) <strong>Revisionism = maximize target's losses at cost of sacrificing all absolute gains</strong> [Degenerate]</td>
<td><strong>Long-term Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.3: Strategic Preferences in Absolute and Relative Gains Concerns**

With the framing of the strategies in absolute and relative gains concerns a measurement strategy advanced in social psychology was used to determine a subject's strategic orientation and preferences. This measurement scheme was adopted from Henri Tajfel's social-psychological research on intergroup relations.\(^\text{12}\) The operational

measure is often referred to in the social-psychological literature as the Tajfel matrices. The next section illustrates how the Tajfel matrices were used to measure the strength of a subject’s preferences for different strategies.

**Measuring the Dependent Variable**

Subjects were presented with a series of matrices from which to choose their preferred distribution strategies (i.e. absolute and relative gains strategies). As an example, consider the $MIP+MD$ (maximizing both absolute and relative gains or *Independent Fortress* strategy) versus $MJP$ (maximizing joint gains) matrix below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values in each cell of the matrix basically represent payoffs. This matrix was presented to each subject twice, once with the resources to be distributed to Group A on the top row and those to be distributed to Group Z on the bottom row (the A/Z form), and once with the resources to be distributed to Group A on the bottom row and those to be distributed to Group Z on the top row (the Z/A form). Presented with both the A/Z and Z/A forms, subjects were prompted to select the cell pair containing the payoffs they preferred. Consider the following matrix in the Z/A form as the basis for an example.

---
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In this matrix, the extreme right-hand cell pair is the optimal choice for maximizing joint gains from the perspective of Group A because the total of the payoffs in the cell pair, 25 + 7 = 32, is the maximum possible total in any single cell pair. This cell pair is also optimal from Group A's perspective for maximizing a combination of both its own absolute and relative gains, (i.e. 25 is the maximum absolute gains for Group A and 25 - 7 = 18 is greater than any difference between A's and Z's payoffs in any other cell pair). In the A/Z form below, the optimal choice for maximizing joint gains from Group A's perspective is still the far-right cell pair, (i.e. 7 + 25 = 32), but the optimal choice for maximizing a combination of absolute and relative gains for Group A is now the extreme-left cell pair, (i.e. 19 - 1 = 18).
To measure the strength of preference for one strategy over another, (in this example it is the strength of $MIP+MD$ vs. $MJP$), a subject’s responses on the $Z/A$ and $A/Z$ forms of the matrix are compared. This is done in the following manner.

The cell pairs in the matrix are ranked from 0 to 12. In the above matrix, optimal $MJP$ is ranked as zero, as in the following examples:

### MIP+MD vs. MJP in Z/A Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $x$'s represent hypothetical choices by a subject. The strength with which the strategy $MIP+MD$ is preferred over $MJP$ is the extent to which moving $MIP+MD$ and $MJP$ from the same pole of the matrix as $MJP$ to the opposite pole from $MJP$ has shifted the subject’s response away from optimal $MJP$. In the above example, the strength with which $MIP+MD$ is preferred over $MJP$ for Group A is the $A/Z$ choice minus the $Z/A$ choice or 10-2, i.e. $+8$. The strength of a strategic preference has a theoretical range
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of +12 to -12. The more extreme the strength of preference in the positive direction, the more a subject favors one strategy over the other.

Each subject made a distribution choice from seven different matrices. Six of those matrices were the Z/A and A/Z forms of three matrices used in the experiment and the other offered the opportunity to measure aggressive behavior, that is, the willingness to sacrifice one's own absolute gains in part or in total in an effort to inflict losses on the adversary. This number of matrices allowed the exploration of numerous combinations of competing strategic preferences, thus allowing a test of every hypothesis in figure 3.3.

Figure 3.4 below lists the specific sets of competing strategic pairs which were included in the experiment. Due to constraints inherent in the Tajfel matrix scheme, it is not possible to test all possible pairs of strategies against one another in direct competition to determine a subject's preference for one over another. For example, a Containment (MD) strategy could not be pitted against an Independent Fortress (MIP+MD) strategy. This is due to the mathematics behind the construction of the matrix. This constrained lack of direct competition, however, in no way detracts from the measurement of subjects' overall strategic orientations.

Overall strategic orientation is determined by reviewing the consistency of strategic preferences across all of the distribution matrices. The matrices are constructed such that an analysis of the results not only illustrates which of the strategies in the competing pair is preferred, but, if neither strategy is preferred very strongly it also informs as to what other strategy is actually being followed. For example, in a Maximizing Joint Gains (MJP) vs. Independent Fortress (MIP+MD) strategic pair, a
subject's choices can reveal that he prefers neither and, in fact, is following an overall strategic orientation of *Containment (MD)*. The means for determining overall strategic orientations outside of direct competition are detailed in a subsequent section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tajfel Representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing a combination of absolute and relative gains vs. maximizing joint gains <em>Independent Fortress vs. Maximizing Joint Gains</em></td>
<td>MIP+MD vs. MJP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing a combination of absolute and joint gains vs. maximizing relative gains <em>Maximizing absolute and joint gains vs. Containment</em></td>
<td>MIP+MJP vs. MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity vs. maximizing a combination of absolute and relative gains <em>Parity vs. Independent Fortress</em></td>
<td>P vs. MIP+MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing the adversary's loss vs. maximizing a combination of absolute and joint gains <em>Limited-aims Revisionism or Revisionism vs. Maximizing absolute and joint gains</em></td>
<td>MOL vs. MIP+MJP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.4: Competing Strategic Pairs
Analyses and Results

The results of the experiment are presented in the next two sections. First, an across-conditions analysis is undertaken to uncover the nature of the relationship between capability and cultural judgments in subjects' preferences for particular strategies. This analysis addresses the central propositions of my theory by determining whether capability and culture combine in a systematic manner, in turn leading to predictable patterns of strategic preference.

In the second section, the findings within each net assessment condition are presented. These findings reveal two things. First, they demonstrate a subject's overall strategic orientation thus offering a test of my broader hypotheses addressing defensive, status quo orientations as opposed to offensive, imperialist orientations. Second, they reveal a subject's specific strategic preferences within each net assessment condition, for example, strategic preferences when the other group was described as an Enemy as opposed to a Degenerate. This offers a test of the more specific hypotheses presented in figure 3.3.

The results of both analyses will speak to the internal validity of the theory. The first investigation will reveal the soundness of my initial propositions, that is, that capability and cultural judgments interact in a systematic manner, and the second analysis will determine the strength of both my broad and specific behavioral hypotheses.
Manipulation Check

The materials given to the subjects during the experiment offered a means to examine the success rate of the manipulation. After reviewing the intelligence reports, subjects were asked to complete two multiple choice questions regarding the relative capability and cultural sophistication of the adversary. Subjects' response rates to this question (100% correct) indicate that in all cases the manipulation was successful.

The Interaction of Capability and Cultural Judgments

This thesis proposes that objective capability and subjective cultural judgments of an adversary interact in a systematic manner. More specifically, that judgments of similar cultural sophistication act to confirm objective measures of capability whereas judgments of cultural inferiority act to discount these measures. The resulting net assessment, in turn, contributes to the determination of the strategy the perceiving state adopts toward its adversary. The purpose of this section is to test the validity of these propositions. That is, to determine the role that capability and cultural judgments played in subjects' preferences for strategies in each competing strategy pair. For example, was the capability judgment the main effect behind a preference for MD in the MD vs. MIP+MJP pair? Or was it the cultural judgment? Or was there an additive effect from both judgments?

The role played by capability and cultural judgments was determined through a MANOVA (multiple analysis of variance) analysis of the subjects' strategic preferences in each matrix pair across the four net assessment conditions. Two sets of results are
presented from the MANOVA analysis: the $F$ values and their significance as well as the means for each condition. These findings are reviewed one matrix at a time, beginning with the $Containment \ (MD)$ vs. $MIP+MJP$ matrix in figure 3.5.

$Containment \ (MD)$ vs. $MIP+MJP$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP x CULT</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Sophistication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.5: Capability, Culture, and Containment

A review of the $F$ values and their levels of significance indicates that there was a statistically significant main effect of the capability judgment on a preference for the $Containment \ (MD)$ strategy over $MIP+MJP$. Stated differently, these values demonstrate that in each condition judgments of capability affected subjects’ preferences for the $Containment$ strategy without much regard for the associated cultural judgments. An interaction effect was not statistically supported in this analysis. However, a comparison
of the means in the Enemy and Degenerate conditions indicates that the effect was present and in the proposed direction (moving from 9.33 to 6.40), although not statistically significant. This indicates that when subjects reviewed the judgment of inferior cultural Sophistication in the intelligence report describing the Degenerate, their preference for a defensive strategy did decrease. This suggests that the judgment of cultural inferiority discounted objective capability measures in the "Similar" capability condition.

**Independent Fortress (MIP+MD) vs. MJP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP x CULT</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural Sophistication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Inferior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperialist</td>
<td>Barbarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.40)</td>
<td>(4.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>Degenerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.10)</td>
<td>(4.60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.6: Capability, Culture, and Independent Fortress**

The MANOVA analysis of subjects' strategic preferences in this matrix pair indicates that capability judgments had a main effect on preferences for the Independent Fortress strategy over MJP (F=3.84, p < .05). These findings also show that capability
and cultural judgments interacted to affect preferences for the *Independent Fortress* strategy (*F*=4.82, *p* < .05). A review of the means demonstrates the interaction when comparing the *Enemy* to the *Degenerate* condition (from 9.10 to 4.60). As in the previous matrix, this finding demonstrates that subjects were less concerned with defensive strategies when the adversary was described as culturally inferior, even though capability was held constant.

**Revisionism (MOL) vs. MIP+MJP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP x CULT</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Sophistication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Inferior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Imperialist <em>(3.20)</em></td>
<td>Barbarian <em>(6.73)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enemy <em>(3.27)</em></td>
<td>Degenerate <em>(3.47)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.7: Capability, Culture, and Revisionism**

The cultural judgment of the adversary had a main effect on subjects' preferences for a *Revisionist* strategy in this matrix (*F*=4.77, *p* < .05). Stated differently, these values demonstrate that in each condition cultural judgments affected subjects'
preferences for the Revisionism strategy without much regard for the associated capability judgments. There is also a marginally statistically significant interaction effect. This can be seen in the means which moved in the hypothesized direction in both the Imperialist- Barbarian (from 3.20 to 6.73) and Enemy-Degenerate (from 3.27 to 3.47) net assessment pairs. That is, as the cultural sophistication of the adversary was depreciated in the intelligence reports, subjects' preferences for an offensive, Revisionist strategy appreciated.

**Parity vs. Independent Fortress (MIP+MD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP x CULT</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Sophistication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Inferior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Imperialist</td>
<td>Barbarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.93)</td>
<td>(5.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>Degenerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.93)</td>
<td>(6.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.8: Capability, Culture, and Parity**

The F test results from this matrix indicate no main or interaction effects from or between capability and cultural judgments. None of the F-value results approach
statistical significance nor does an analysis of the means offer any insight into the roles played by capability and cultural judgments in the strategic preference for Parity. This indicates that subjects' preferences for a Parity strategy are not systematically conditioned by these judgments.

Discussion: The Interaction of Capability and Cultural Judgments

While not all of these results are statistically significant, they offer some support for the theoretical propositions. Specifically, some degree of interaction is occurring between capability and cultural judgments of the adversary and the result of this interaction does, in a fairly consistent manner, encourage particular strategic preferences. For example, in a review of subjects' preferences for the Independent Fortress strategy the MANOVA analysis revealed that there was indeed a statistically significant interaction effect between capability and cultural judgments. Subjects' mean preferences for the Revisionist strategy also indicate the presence of an interaction effect where keeping capability constant while discounting cultural sophistication increased mean preferences for this offensive strategy, e.g. moving from the Imperialist to the Barbarian condition. Finally, the movement of the means in the Containment matrix was also as proposed in the similar-capability conditions (Enemy and Degenerate), with the concern for Containment decreasing as cultural sophistication was discounted in the Degenerate condition.
In the next section the relationship between capability and cultural judgments and strategic preference are explored in greater detail with analyses of subjects' strategic orientations and specific preferences within each experimental condition.

Net Assessment, Strategic Orientation, and Strategic Preference

The subjects' responses to the strategic choices in each matrix were analyzed using two methods. The first was a Wilcoxon Matched Pairs statistical analysis. This method computes the differences between the variables (the A/Z and Z/A scores on each strategy matrix), ranks the absolute differences across all subjects' responses, sums the positive and negative ranks, and computes the Z statistic from the positive and negative rank sums. In other words, it informs as to whether or not there is a statistically significant difference in the preference for one strategy over another within each strategy pair. The Wilcoxon Matched Pairs test was performed on data within each net assessment condition, thus providing the means to discover the strategic preference patterns associated with each condition. This offers a test of the specific hypotheses in figure 3.3.

While the Wilcoxon analysis reveals subjects' preferences within specific matrix pairs, the second method looks at the preferences across all of the matrices within each condition. This examination reveals the subjects' overall strategic orientation. Such data are valuable for two reasons. First, as mentioned above, the individual matrices may offer only one pure test of a strategic preference under investigation. An investigation into overall strategic orientation augments this singular test. Second, if a subject does
not prefer a strategy very strongly in a particular matrix pair, this analysis will reveal which strategy is actually being followed, i.e. a strategy which is not directly represented in that matrix pair. This analysis offers a test of the broader hypotheses regarding defensive, status quo orientations as opposed to offensive, imperialist orientations. Table 3.9 below offers the means by which one can determine the overall strategic orientation.
### Figure 3.9: Measuring Strategic Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy\footnote{These are the hypothetical strategic choices for each matrix that are associated ideal-type strategies. It is assumed that strategies are pursued to the maximal extent possible.}</th>
<th>MIP+MD vs. MJP</th>
<th>MJP vs. MD vs. MIP+MJP</th>
<th>MIP+MD vs. MJP</th>
<th>MIP+MD vs. P</th>
<th>MIP+MD vs. MOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Absolute Gains)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relative Gains = Containment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Joint Gains)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Parity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIP+MD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Independent Fortress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIP+MJP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIP+P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD+MJP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD+P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJP+P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIP+MD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+MJP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIP+MD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIP)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+MJP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD+MJP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIP+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MIP+MJP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Revisionism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.9 lists the ideal-type values associated with overall strategic orientations. The values in the first row of the table illustrate what subjects would select from each specific strategy matrix if their overall strategic orientation was one of maximizing absolute gains (MIP). Using this resource, it is clear that you need not have a pure competitive test of the maximize absolute gains (MIP) strategy to determine whether that strategy is being followed, you need only look at subjects' responses across the six strategy matrices. Given these methods of analysis, the strategic orientation findings are presented and discussed along with the more specific strategic preference results from the Wilcoxon Matched Pairs test. The Wilcoxon test results are presented in figure 3.10 below.

---

14 The seventh matrix, that consisting of MOL vs. MIP+MJP, is included in this table but does not apply to certain overall strategic preferences given the nature of its design. For example, it does not apply to the MD preference because MD is held constant across the MOL vs. MIP+MJP matrix, therefore, no measure of strength of preference for MD is possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cap=</th>
<th>Cap=</th>
<th>Cap&gt;</th>
<th>Cap&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cult=</td>
<td>Cult&lt;</td>
<td>Cult=</td>
<td>Cult&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>Degen.</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>Barbarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Fortress</td>
<td>9.1**</td>
<td>4.6**</td>
<td>6.3**</td>
<td>4.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Maximize Joint Gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize Joint Gains</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Independent Fortress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containment</td>
<td>9.1**</td>
<td>6.4**</td>
<td>5.4**</td>
<td>3.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Maximize Absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Joint Gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize Absolute</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Joint Gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Containment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Fortress</td>
<td>8.4**</td>
<td>5.6**</td>
<td>5.4**</td>
<td>4.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>6.3*</td>
<td>5.7**</td>
<td>5.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Independent Fortress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisionism</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. Maximize Joint Gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* revisionist behavior cannot be tested for statistical significance due to the nature of the measurement. That is, matrices containing negative values cannot be inverted, therefore, a Wilcoxon Matched Pairs test could not be applied.

Figure 3.10: Net Assessment and Strategic Preference Findings
Figure 3.10 lists each of the four net assessment conditions as column headings and each possible strategy matrix choice as a row. The set of values associated with each row represents the results of the Wilcoxon analysis for that strategy matrix in each of the four conditions. For example, in the first row of the table (Independent Fortress vs. Maximize Joint Gains), the Wilcoxon analysis returned the values of 9.1, 4.6, 6.3, and 4.9 for the Enemy, Degenerate, Imperialist, and Barbarian conditions, respectively. These values represent the strength of preference for the Independent Fortress strategy in each of the four conditions. The analysis also illustrates that these values are each statistically significant at the $p < .001$ level. The second row of figure 3.10 presents the results of the analysis of subjects' choices in the flipped form of the same strategy matrix, that is, the Maximize Joint Gains vs. Independent Fortress form. These values illustrate two things. First, in only one condition, Barbarian, was a preference for the Maximize Joint Gains strategy statistically significant. And second, the strength of this preference was not very substantial (1.3 where the maximum possible is 12). With these results in hand, each net assessment condition is now reviewed in turn.

**Enemy**

The results for this condition support the hypothesis that subjects faced with an adversary described as similar in capability and cultural sophistication prefer a Containment strategy, that is, one which maximizes their relative gains with respect to the adversary. In the one pure test of a preference for the relative gains (MD or Containment) strategy, when it was paired against the maximizing absolute and joint
gains (MJP) strategy, the relative gains strategy was strongly preferred (9.1 where the maximum possible is 12) and this preference was statistically significant (p < .01).

Matching the Enemy condition findings across each matrix pair reported in figure 3.10 with a pattern appearing in figure 3.9 results in the conclusion that the relative gains Containment (MD) strategy was also the overall strategic orientation followed by the subjects. That is, the findings in the experiment most closely approximate the ideal-type values in the MD row of figure 3.9. Thus, the overall strategic orientation preferred in this experimental condition was a defensive, status quo orientation.

Degenerate

In the Degenerate net assessment condition the results somewhat support the hypothesis that when faced with an adversary described as similar in capability and culturally inferior subjects adopt an aggressive revisionist strategy, preferring to sacrifice maximizing their own absolute gains to ensure the adversary incurs losses. An analysis of specific strategic preferences reveals that subjects were willing to sacrifice absolute gains to ensure losses for the adversary, i.e. subjects preferred an offensive strategy when faced with a Degenerate. As figure 3.10 shows, the strength of preference for MOL is comparable to other preferences in the Degenerate condition. The stronger this preference, the more subjects prefer to sacrifice all absolute gains to ensure the adversary incurs losses. This indicates that the aggressive strategy was almost as strongly preferred
as the others in this net assessment condition. As a means to illustrate the significance of the closeness of these measures, consider a comparison with those in the *Enemy* condition.

In the *Enemy* condition the strength of preference for the *MOL* strategy is also 3.5, however, the relative difference between it and the strength of other strategic preferences in the *Enemy* condition is quite large. For example, the difference between the strength of preference for the *MD* strategy in the *Containment (MD)* vs. *MIP+MJP* matrix and that of the preference for *MOL* is 5.6. The same calculation in the *Degenerate* condition results in a difference of 2.9. Clearly, the *MD* strategic preference dominates in the *Enemy* condition whereas in the *Degenerate* condition the *MOL* strategy is almost as strongly preferred as *MD* and other strategies.

Regarding overall strategic orientation, the pattern of responses across all matrices does not precisely match any pattern in figure 3.9. It fits best between two ideal-type patterns, *MD+P* and *MOL (Limited-aims Revisionism)*. This overall preference combines a concern for sacrificing absolute gains to maintain a relative advantage along with maximizing the others' losses. Thus, the overall strategic orientation preferred in this experimental condition leans toward an aggressive, imperialist orientation.

*Imperialist*

In the *Imperialist* net assessment condition the results support the hypothesis that when faced with an adversary described as superior in capability and similar in cultural
sophistication subjects prefer to maximize both absolute and relative gains, that is, pursue an *Independent Fortress* strategy. This is evident in the pure test where the *Independent Fortress* strategy was competing against the *Maximize Joint Gains* strategy. In this competition the *Independent Fortress* strategy was preferred (6.3) in a statistically significant manner.

Concerning overall strategic orientation, there is no single pattern in figure 3.9 that matches extremely well with the *Imperialist* strategic preferences. Rather, the results from the Wilcoxon analysis are in a range between two of the ideal-type patterns presented in figure 3.9, *MD+P* and *(MIP+MD)+P*. The first combines a concern for maximizing relative gains while maintaining a degree of parity in distribution. Both of these ideal-types approximate the strategic orientation hypothesized in this condition, that is, a defensive, status quo orientation.

**Barbarian**

In the *Barbarian* net assessment condition the results support the hypothesis that when faced with an adversary described as superior in capability and culturally inferior subjects prefer a revisionist strategy, choosing to sacrifice absolute gains to ensure the adversary incurs losses. The strength of preference for *MOL* presented in figure 3.10 is very high relative to other preferences in the *Barbarian* condition. The stronger this preference, the more subjects prefer to sacrifice all absolute gains to ensure the adversary incurs losses. Note that the strength of preference for this strategy is greater than for any other strategy in this condition. This indicates that this aggressive strategy was more
strongly preferred than any other in this net assessment condition. In the Imperialist condition, for example, the strength of preference for the MOL strategy is not nearly as high at 4.3, and the relative difference between it and the strength of other preferences in the Imperialist condition is relatively small. Clearly, the MOL strategy does not dominate in the Imperialist condition to the degree that it does in the Barbarian condition.

Regarding overall strategic orientation, the pattern of responses across all matrices does not precisely match any pattern in figure 3.9. It fits best between two ideal-type patterns, MD+P and MOL (Limited-aims Revisionism). This overall preference combines a concern for sacrificing absolute gains to maintain a relative advantage along with maximizing the others' losses. Thus, the overall strategic orientation preferred in this experimental condition leans toward an aggressive, imperialist orientation.

Discussion: Net Assessment, Strategic Orientation, and Strategic Preference

The results of the within-condition analysis support the strategic preference hypotheses presented in figure 3.3, although some qualifications are in order. In the Enemy net assessment condition the strategy overwhelmingly preferred by subjects was that hypothesized, i.e. the Containment (MD) strategy. Preferences in the Imperialist condition also support that postulated. In the Degenerate and Barbarian conditions, offensive strategies were preferred but the specific strategies proposed in figure 3.3 were reversed in subjects' preferences. That is, in both conditions subjects did prefer an
aggressive, offensive strategy (MOL) but were more aggressive in the Barbarian condition, adopting the Revisionism strategy, than in the Degenerate condition where they adopted a Limited-aims Revisionism strategy.\textsuperscript{15}

The results of the overall strategic orientation analysis were also supported. In all four net assessment conditions tested in the experiment the overall strategic orientations were representative of the broad strategic orientations hypothesized. That is, in the Enemy and Imperialist conditions subjects evidenced a preference for status quo, defensive orientations. In the Degenerate and Barbarian conditions, however, subjects revealed imperialist, offensive orientations as hypothesized, albeit also demonstrating some concerns for defense through maximizing relative gains.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to test the internal validity of my theoretical propositions and hypotheses using the experimental method. The results are encouraging. The MANOVA analysis of strategic preferences across net assessment conditions indicated that there was an interaction effect between capability and cultural judgments, albeit in varying degrees. Furthermore, the results illustrate that capability was a main effect on preferences for defensive strategies and culture was a main effect on

\textsuperscript{15} This is evident in reviewing the strength of preference for MOL in both conditions. The strength of preference in the Barbarian condition is nearly twice that in the Degenerate condition. The greater the strength, the more subjects were willing to sacrifice all of their absolute gains. This behavior is, by definition, evidence of the Revisionism strategy. The Limited-aims Revisionism strategy, on the other hand, only requires evidence of a willingness to sacrifice some absolute gains.
preferences for aggressive strategies. These results demonstrate that combinations of capability and culture systematically influenced subjects' preferences for Containment, Independent Fortress, and Revisionist strategies. In considering these findings a strong argument can be made for the internal validity of the theory.

The puzzle driving this research is the often evidenced aggressive behavior of weaker powers in asymmetric wars. The two net assessment conditions in this experiment examining asymmetric relationships were the Imperialist and Barbarian conditions. In both conditions the adversary was described as capability superior. However, the cultural sophistication of the Imperialist was described as similar while the Barbarian was portrayed as culturally inferior. In the Imperialist condition subjects preferred the defensive, Independent Fortress strategy whereas the offensive, Revisionism strategy was strongly favored in the Barbarian condition. This suggests that the weaker power did not perceive much of a threat from the objectively superior Barbarian due to its cultural inferiority and, in fact, may have perceived an opportunity to increase its own assets at the expense of that adversary. In light of the experimental findings, then, it certainly seems that cultural judgments played an important role in subjects' net assessments and subsequent strategic preferences.

At the outset of this chapter it was argued that should the findings of an experiment which isolated the effects of capability and cultural judgments on strategic preferences support my hypotheses, one could have some confidence that the same hypotheses would be supported in actual case studies. It was also noted that net assessment was but one element that influences the grand strategy process in international
politics. Other influences include individual, state, and system level variables. In the next two chapters the hypothesis concerning weaker power aggression in asymmetric wars is put to the test in two case studies: the First Balkan War and the Indo-Pakistan War of 1971. This is followed by a test of the Imperialist hypothesis in the Sino-Russian Eastern Railway dispute of 1927-29.

The influence of cultural judgments on the weaker powers net assessments and strategic preferences is investigated in each of the three cases as is the role that other variables, specifically the risk propensities of the leaders and the systemic imperative to survive, may have played. This competitive format permits a test of which of these factors played a more important role in the weaker states adoption of its strategy. If my experimental findings have external validity, the net assessments in the first two cases should describe the adversary as uncultured, uneducated, disorganized, and inefficient, thus discounting its objective superiority and encouraging a Limited-aims Revisionism strategy. In the latter case the adversary should be described as educated, organized, and efficient, hence confirming its objective superiority and prompting an Independent Fortress strategy. If the risk propensity hypothesis is correct, leaders should manifest a concern that their strategy is not likely to succeed in the first two cases. Finally, should the systemic imperative to survive be the most supported of the three theories under investigation, leaders in the first two cases will reveal concerns that they fear an imminent attack from the adversary and are striking out in a desperate effort to ensure their survival.
CHAPTER 4
THE FIRST BALKAN WAR

In the next two case studies evidence is presented in support of or in opposition to the hypotheses of each of the three perspectives under review in this dissertation that seek to explain asymmetric wars. The questions from the Realist and risk-propensity schools that must be answered to determine the strength of their hypotheses are as follows:

1. Did the leaders in the weaker state expect military contributions from one or more great powers when they chose to attack the stronger adversary?

2. Did the leaders in the weaker state initiate a pre-emptive war? Stated differently, were their actions motivated by an imminent threat to their survival?

3. Is there evidence that the leaders in the weaker state perceived that launching a war would likely result in defeat?

The first two questions follow from the Realist school. In addressing the first, it is determined whether these cases were true cases of asymmetric war, that is, cases where an objectively weaker power expecting no great power assistance attacked an objectively stronger power. Should evidence be uncovered demonstrating that the
leaders in the weaker state expected great power contributions to their war effort, this Realist hypothesis will be supported. To test the pre-emptive war argument, data focusing on the motive of the weaker power is explored. Specifically, I investigate whether the weaker power was motivated by threat and, therefore, struck out in an effort to ensure its survival by delivering an unexpected first blow. If the data demonstrates that the leaders were acting out of fear of imminent attack from the adversary, this second Realist hypothesis will receive support. Finally, to test the risk-propensity argument the weaker power's estimate of its likelihood of winning a war against the stronger power is documented. Should the data demonstrate that leaders in the weaker state believed the chances of winning were low but the payoff high, then this argument will have some merit. Should it be discovered that the leaders were confident they would win, however, then an investigation of the weaker power's net assessment of the adversary may reveal that a cultural judgment of the adversary as inferior played a role in stoking their confidence and encouraging an aggressive strategy. Evidence of a cultural judgment will be revealed in the qualitative assessments made by the weaker power. To review, if the weaker power perceives a stronger adversary as culturally inferior the following attributes should be present in qualitative assessments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Armed Forces</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Soldiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Poor Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>Poor Organization</td>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>Poor Military</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clannish</td>
<td>Poor Political</td>
<td>Clannish</td>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>Lacking Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Nepotistic</td>
<td>Ruthless</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Money-hungry</td>
<td>Pushy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruthless</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money-hungry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nepotistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: Attributes of a Capability Superior, Culturally Inferior Adversary

Background

In 1878, after five centuries of Turkish domination, an autonomous Bulgarian state was established. Prior to this date the Turks ruled the Bulgarians in essentially the same manner that they did the Serbians and the Greeks, dividing the country into sanjaks and applying laissez-fair principals in matters of religion, language, and local administration with the important exception that they were more direct and controlling.¹

The late awakening of the Bulgarian people can be explained in large part by their location close to the center of Turkish power in Constantinople. One result of this location was that more Turks and other Moslem peoples settled in the Bulgarian lands than in the more distant Greek and Serbian provinces. Another result was that Turkish forces were able to reach Bulgarian lands quickly along the roads leading

north and west from Constantinople. Finally, the location of the Bulgarians in the Eastern part of the Balkans isolated them from the countries of Central and Western Europe. Thus, the Bulgarians not only were subject more directly to Turkish power but were also deprived of the stimulating effects of Western contacts.\(^2\)

Of all foreign countries Russia had the greatest influence on Bulgarian national revival. Before the 19th century Russo-Bulgarian ties were restricted largely to the sphere of religion. Russian influence in Bulgaria became more strong and direct when the Russians began to take an interest in their Slavic Bulgarian brothers following the Crimean War.\(^3\) This interest manifested itself vividly in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877 and the subsequent Treaty of San Stefano. The Russians demanded that Bulgaria be established as an autonomous principality with an elected prince. The most significant provision of the treaty had to do with the territorial extent of the new principality. With the exception of Constantinople, Andrianople, and Saloniki, it included virtually all of the territory between the Danube in the north, the Black Sea in the east, the Aegean Sea in the south, and Lake Ohrid and beyond in the West.\(^4\)

It is less well known that this proposed Bulgarian principality was preceded in 1878 by an indigenous national movement. In addition to the peaceful struggle carried on by the exarchate against the Phanariot Greeks there was a revolutionary

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 364.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 369.
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 408-9.
movement whose aim was the independence of Bulgaria. The Macedonian Bulgarians as well as the Bulgarians of Bulgaria proper shared in this movement. The close of the Russo-Turkish War saw the arising of the idea of an "undivided Bulgaria," conceived within the limits of the Treaty of San Stefano and including all of the populations inside Turkey who regarded themselves as Bulgarian.

The life of the Treaty of San Stefano was short, however, because European leaders opposed the settlement. Austria-Hungary argued it violated previously agreed upon limits to great power territorial assets in the Balkans and Disraeli objected to the direct access it permitted Russia to the Aegean Sea. Following another round of negotiations the Treaty of Berlin was signed on July 13, 1878. The essential difference between the Treaty of Berlin and that of San Stefano had to do with Bulgaria. The large autonomous principality originally established was now divided into three parts: Bulgaria proper, north of the Balkan Mountains, to be autonomous with its own elected prince though tributary to Constantinople; Eastern Rumelia, south of the Balkan Mountains, to be under a Christian governor appointed by Constantinople but approved by the powers; and Macedonia, which was to remain under direct Turkish administration.

---


6 The Other Balkan Wars, op. cit., p. 31.


8 Ibid., p. 411.
Hence, the initially proposed principality of Bulgaria was dismembered and Macedonia remained in the hands of the Turks. This was the origin and cause of all subsequent conflicts between "lesser" Bulgaria and Turkey. "Undivided Bulgaria" became the future goal and the ideal of Bulgarian national policy. An internal conflict in European Turkey soon followed and gradually escalated. By the end of 1904 the number of political assassinations in Macedonia had reached an average of 100 per month. The Bulgarians had the strongest and most numerous bands in Macedonia with their militant organization, the IMRO, possessing the most extensive roots in the population of the country.

Following the Young Turk revolution of 1908 the initial reaction in Macedonia was one of euphoria. The Young Turk leader, Enver Bey, for example, appeared in public with IMRO leader Sandanski. The warring factions suspended their mutual hostilities for a time, although this proved to be a brief period.

Despite initial hopes the condition of the Christian population in Macedonia was not much improved and in some cases had worsened. Furthermore, the Young Turks had disarmed all the Macedonians. Exarchist schools and publications were being closed thus fueling fears in Bulgaria that their intelligentsia in Macedonia was being systematically destroyed. The Young Turks also allowed Moslem refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina to immigrate into Macedonia. This was in stark

---

9 The Other Balkan Wars, op. cit., p. 32.

10 Ibid., p. 31.

contrast to their policy toward Bulgarian-speaking emigres in America who wished to return and purchase vacant land. The Young Turk regime refused them entry and often bought the land to give to the Moslem refugees from Bosnia. The continuing deterioration of conditions in Macedonia brought forth intense protest in Bulgaria. This protest, of course, culminated in an attack on Turkey itself even though Bulgaria, by objective measures of strength, was a weaker state. The remainder of this chapter is dedicated to the investigation of the theories under review that seek to explain this puzzling behavior.

Objective Capability Measures

Two measures were used to determine the objective balance of strength between the weaker and stronger powers examined in the case studies. The first was constructed from data available in the Correlates of War data set. This measure is presented in figures 4.2 and 4.3 below.

\[ \text{Objective Capability Measures} \]

\[ \text{Two measures were used to determine the objective balance of strength between the weaker and stronger powers examined in the case studies. The first was constructed from data available in the Correlates of War data set. This measure is presented in figures 4.2 and 4.3 below.} \]

\[ \text{---} \]

\[ 12 \text{ Ibid., p. 404.} \]

\[ 13 \text{ Ibid., p. 405.} \]
Turkey  | Bulgaria  | Other League Members
--- | --- | ---
**Ml.** | **Per.** | **Exp.** | **Cap.** | **Ml.** | **Per.** | **Exp.** | **Cap.** | **Ml.** | **Per.** | **Exp.** | **Cap.**
241 | 9203 | 70% | 58 | 1620 | 12% | 60 | 2386 | 18% | 734 | 734 | 734 | 734

* Ml. Per. - number of soldiers in active army (in thousands). Does not include the size of mobilized armies.
* Ml. Exp. - expenditures in thousands of pounds (sterling).
* Tot. Cap. - average proportion of military capabilities (personnel and expenditures) expressed as a total percentage of states in the table. This method of computation has been used by various authors.14

**Figure 4.2: Balance of Military Forces in the Balkans, 1912**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Bulgaria</th>
<th>Other League Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC</strong></td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UP</strong></td>
<td>963</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TP</strong></td>
<td>21914</td>
<td>4369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EC - energy consumption (thousands of coal-ton equivalents).
* UP - urban population (in cities with a population greater than 100,000; thousands).
* TP - total population (thousands).

**Figure 4.3: Balance of Military Forces in the Balkans, 1912**

The Bulgarian troop strength listed in the Correlates of War data set was found to be in agreement with another source focusing on the military strength of the Balkan League.\textsuperscript{15} A review of figures 4.2 and 4.3 reveals that by commonly used measures of objective military strength, the Bulgarians, in concert with their allies, were at a distinct disadvantage approaching the order of 3:1. This evidence satisfies the first criterion for classifying this conflict as truly asymmetric. In the next section I investigate whether Bulgaria expected great power military assistance, thus addressing the second criterion.

**Great Power Assistance**

There is remarkable evidence to support the argument that Bulgaria did not expect assistance from her closest great power ally Russia in any adventure directed at Turkey. Furthermore, there is evidence suggesting that she also did not expect assistance from any of the European great powers.

**Russia**

In his first diplomatic probe for a Russian reaction to a Bulgarian-led offensive against Turkey, President of the Subranje Stoyan Danev embarked on a mission to St. Petersburg in the Spring of 1912. Bulgaria had just concluded her alliance with Serbia and Greece's partnership was imminent. Allegedly, Danev was to convey an

invitation from King Ferdinand to Nicholas II to attend the consecration of the
Alexander Nevsky in Sofia.\textsuperscript{16} The genuine reason for his journey, however, was to
seek formal Russian approval for the Serbo-Bulgarian alliance and to determine the
Russian attitude toward an offensive into Turkey that would liberate Macedonia.\textsuperscript{17}

Upon his arrival in Livadia, the Russian tsar's vacation home in the Crimea,
Danev met with Russian Foreign Minister Sazanov. He did not conceal from Sazanov
that Bulgaria intended to act against Turkey.\textsuperscript{18} On this occasion, however, Sazanov
warned Danev against a war with the Turks stating that "every challenge you give the
Turks we consider madness."\textsuperscript{19} He told Danev not to expect help from Russia
against Turkey.

In the early Autumn of 1912, Sazanov engaged another Bulgarian diplomat,
Mikhail Madzharov, the Bulgarian minister in London, conveying that in the event of

\textsuperscript{16} See Stoyan Danev, "Moyata misiya v Krim prez 1912 god." Rodina, III, 2 (1940),
pp. 123-33 and A. P. Bolshemennikov, A. S. Erusalimskii, A. A. Mogilevich, and F.
A. Rothstein, eds., Mezhduunarodnye otnoosheniya v epokhu imperializma. Dokumenty
iz arkhivov tsarskogo i vremennogo pravitelstv, 1878-1917, (Moscow: Gospolizdat,
1938-40), 2nd ser., vol. 3, p. 790, both cited in Richard C. Hall, "The Crisis in
Bulgarian Foreign Policy, 1911-13," unpublished dissertation, (Ohio State University,
1986), p. 82.

\textsuperscript{17} Ivan Gueshoff, The Balkan League, (London: 1915), p. 43; Prilozhenie kum tom
purvi ot doklada na parlamentarnata izpitatelna komisiya, (Sofia: Durzhavna pechatnitsa,
1918), I (Danev), pp. 18-19 cited in Richard C. Hall, "The Crisis in Bulgarian Foreign
Policy, 1911-13," op. cit., p. 82.

\textsuperscript{18} Ivan Gueshoff, The Balkan League, op. cit., p. 45.

\textsuperscript{19} Stoyan Danev, "Moyata misiya ...," op. cit., p. 125 cited in Richard C. Hall,
"The Crisis in ...," op. cit., p. 83.
war Bulgaria would be alone.\(^{20}\) Again in mid-September of that year Foreign
Minister Sazanov declared to all of the governments in the Balkan Alliance that he
declared all responsibility if war broke out and that in no case could they rely on
Russia.\(^{21}\)

Sazanov met with each member of the Alliance, presenting arguments against
an offensive and even threatening sanctions should the Alliance initiate war.
Montenegro was threatened with the cessation of subsidies should she continue in her
agitation for war. Bulgaria was warned of the conclusion of peace between Turkey
and Italy, of the danger of a Rumanian attack, and of the likelihood of being deserted
by her allies.\(^{22}\) In Belgrade, Sazanov attempted to persuade Serbian leaders to
withhold action. He used the same arguments which he employed in Sofia, and in
addition warned "that in case Serbia should attempt to cooperate with Bulgaria,
Austria-Hungary would not lose the opportunity of occupying Serbian territory and
Belgrade."\(^{23}\) In such an eventuality Sazanov stated that Russia would leave Serbia to

\(^{20}\) M. I. Madzharov, Diplomaticheska podgotovka na nashite voyini. Spomeni,
chastni pismi. shifrovani telegrami i poveritelni dokladi, (Sofia: Mir, 1932), pp. 57-61;
Archive of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia. Fond 58, Diary of former Minister
of Justice Petur Abrashev, 51-1-17-39 cited in Richard C. Hall, "The Crisis ...," op. cit.,
p. 86.

\(^{21}\) Ernst C. Helmreich, The Diplomacy of the Balkan Wars, 1912-13, (Cambridge:

\(^{22}\) Eleutherios Venezilos, Vindication of Greek National Policy, 1912-17, (London:
George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1918), p. 66.

112; G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperly, eds., British Documents on the Origins of the
War, 1898-1914, (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1926-38), vol. 11, IX, i,
nos. 732, 736, 737, 743.
her fate. As an illustration of the consistency of Sazanov's messages and the persistence with which he delivered them, consider the statement of exasperation to former Bulgarian Minister of Foreign Affairs General Paprikov where Sazanov insists "I tell you for the twenty fifth time that you cannot count on us."24

Russia continued to express these views to Bulgarian leaders up to the first stages of Bulgarian mobilization. Chief of Staff Ivan Fitchev recounts the words of Russian military attache Lt. Col. Romanovski who told him that a declaration of war on Turkey was against Russia's wishes due to the fact that Russia would not be interested in Bulgaria's success. Moreover, in the case of failure, Bulgaria would not be able to rely on Russian help. Fitchev's comment on this statement is very revealing of the Bulgarian leadership's attitudes toward the great power, expressing that "We, as usual, paid no attention whatsoever to Russian concerns."25


Other Great Powers

Russia did not rely upon its own efforts to dissuade Bulgaria from launching an offensive. On October 10, eleven days after the Balkan allies began to mobilize she, in concert with the European great powers (Austria-Hungary, Great Britain, France, and Germany) issued a note to the Balkan Alliance worded as follows:

The Russian and Austro-Hungarian governments declare to the Balkan states:

1. That the great powers strongly deprecate all measures that are likely to cause a disturbance of peace;
2. That basing themselves on article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin and acting in the interests of the populations, they take in their hands the execution of reforms in the government of European Turkey, it being understood that the reforms do not infringe the sovereignty of H. M. the Sultan nor the integrity of the Turkish Empire. The declaration reserves for the powers the liberty of examining in common these reforms;
3. That if, notwithstanding all this, war should break out between the Balkan states and the Ottoman Empire, they will tolerate at the end of the conflict no modifications of the present territorial status quo in European Turkey. 26

This diplomatic note had no effect on Bulgarian aspirations or anticipations of great power intervention. On October 4, Danev explained to Fitchev his expectations regarding great power behavior should Bulgaria attack Turkey.

We can hope for moral support from the two major European blocs, the Entente and the Central Powers. European intervention in the war would be avoided in order to prevent the outbreak of a bigger war but Europe would

intervene and stop the war at first success of our arms against Turks. Our high command must take care to defeat the Turkish army as soon as possible and once we reach the River Erkene line to stop our advance since Russia has given an indication that it would not like to see the Bulgarian army march on Constantinople. 27

Prime Minister Gueshoff also contacted Italy regarding the formation of an alliance. In this case as well, the proposals for a concerted attack on Turkey were given a cool reception. 28

This body of evidence conveys a singular theme: Bulgaria did not expect great power assistance should it attack Turkey. Threatened sanctions from her traditional great power ally along with concerted measures from the European powers did not dissuade Bulgarian aspirations, however.

Summary

The above evidence in conjunction with the previously illustrated objective capability asymmetry satisfies the two criteria put forth as conditions that must be satisfied should this conflict be classified as a true asymmetric war. Bulgaria and her allies were outnumbered, outgunned, and in general at a distinct disadvantage from an objective capability perspective.


The Realist school proposes that when faced with a stronger adversaries, weaker states should balance against those adversaries by forming or joining countervailing coalitions. The data in the above section presents a significant challenge to this proposition. As Realists might predict, Bulgaria was indeed the architect of a coalition, the Balkan League, but the aggregate capabilities of the League members pale in comparison to the same measures of Turkish strength. Countervailing power, therefore, was not achieved as the end result of the alliance. The League was still at a 3:1 disadvantage. While there is evidence that the leaders in Sofia sought support from other powers, that support was not forthcoming. And yet, in the end in the absence of this support Bulgaria still sounded the trumpets for war against Turkey. In the next section the second Realist hypothesis is considered, that is, did Bulgaria lash out at Turkey to ensure her survival because she perceived an attack from Constantinople was imminent?

Pre-emptive War

The argument that a pre-emptive war was initiated by the Bulgarians and other members of the Balkan League is predicated on the assumption that the leaders of these countries perceived an impending threat from Turkey and acted in national defense to ensure their survival. A review of Sofia's foreign and domestic maneuvers prior to the conflict suggests that this was not the case.
Foreign Policy

In the previous section it was argued that Bulgaria did not expect a positive contribution from the great powers should it initiate a war with Turkey. In fact, it can be argued that the only threat from another country perceived by Bulgaria was not one from Turkey, rather from the great powers. Following the collapse of political order in Albania in 1910, for the Bulgarian government the most disturbing feature in international life was the danger that one or more of the great powers would intervene and establish itself in that area. Should this occur it would surely mean the beginning of the end of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. Since this collapse would be facilitated by great power intervention, Bulgarian leaders feared that the great powers would divide the booty, thus making it very difficult for Bulgaria to achieve its national aspiration, i.e., the accession of Macedonia. Thus, the Albanian collapse urged upon the Balkan governments the need to divide Turkey-in-Europe before the powers became directly involved.29

While Prime Minister Gueshoff initiated a diplomatic campaign regarding the status of Macedonia with the Young Turk regime, this policy of peaceful pragmatism with Turkey ended in the Summer of 1911. From that point on, the Bulgarian government set in motion a plan to initiate an offensive war against Turkey with the goal of liberating Macedonia.

Sofia broadened its foreign policy in August 1911 from the bilateral track because of the obvious disinterest of the Ottoman Empire in an accord with Bulgaria.

This disinterest was compounded by the worsening condition of the Bulgarian population in Turkey. Gueshoff had concluded that the Bulgarian population there was beginning to decline, therefore, the ethnic basis for the Bulgarian claim to Macedonia was eroding.\textsuperscript{30} If this trend continued Bulgaria risked failure in the achievement of its national aspiration in Macedonia. This realization introduced a second note of urgency into Bulgarian policy.

In the Autumn of 1911, Bulgaria assumed the role of architect of a Balkan alliance whose goal was to dismember European Turkey and divide the spoils. Serbia was the first to be approached. Finance Minister Teodor Teodorov was the accelerant behind discussions with Serbia. The offensive nature of the alliance was revealed early in discussions when Teodorov conveyed Bulgaria’s intentions to the Serbian Minister in Sofia, M. Miloevich. Teodorov stated:

\begin{quote}
We do not need to fight over what is debatable, but we must consider what is definitely due us and what we are prepared to give to each other voluntarily. We shall cede to you Skopie, you to us Salonika, Bitola and I think also Veles.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

This was the first time a Bulgarian official had discussed a partition of Macedonia. Later that same month in Beograd a Bulgarian representative met with

\textsuperscript{30} Ivan Gueshoff, \textit{The Balkan League}, op. cit., pp. 8-9; Central State Historical Archive, Fond 568 (Papers of Ivan E. Gueshoff), opus 1 a. e. 704, 9 and \textit{Prilozenie...}, op. cit., 1 (Geshov), p. 111 cited in Richard C. Hall, "The Crisis ...," op. cit., p. 32.

Serbian Prime Minister Milan Milovanovich and Nikola Pashich (former Prime Minister). Once again, the main point of discussion was the territorial settlement for the disposal of the European provinces of the Ottoman Empire. As Gueshoff read to King Ferdinand on October 11, the purpose of the meeting was to form an offensive alliance against Turkey with the object: (a) of liberating Macedonia and Old Serbia in circumstances deemed favourable to both countries; (b) of putting an end to the anarchy or massacres in the Turkish provinces where the vital interests of either contracting party are at stake.\(^{32}\)

The Serbs wanted Kosovo and the Sanjak of Novi Bazar and agreed to Bulgarian designs on Andrianople.\(^{33}\) In Macedonia the Serbs wanted a line along the Bregalinitza River to a border east of the Vardar River, and west along a line from Lake Ohrid including the towns of Ohrid, Struga, and Prilep.\(^{34}\) As these negotiations stalled in mid-winter, however, Milovanovich and Gueshoff finally

\(^{32}\) Ivan E. Gueshoff, *The Balkan League*, op. cit., p. 16.


agreed that they would ask Russia to partition Macedonia once it was liberated by the Alliance's forces. The treaty was signed in March 1912 in Sofia by Gueshoff and King Ferdinand.

The Bulgarians had also contacted Greece, initially in October 1911 and then more aggressively in the opening months of 1912. The Greek-Bulgarian treaty was cited as a "defensive alliance" and contained an appended declaration which excused Bulgaria from any obligations arising from complications involving a change in the status of Crete. This provision was intended to allay Russian fears. In reality, the alliance was much more offensive than defensive in nature. Its intent was to prepare for war against the Turks.

The final piece of the alliance puzzle was Montenegro. King Nicholas was eager to initiate hostilities against Turkey and, indeed, offered to do so. The Bulgarian minister in Cetinje, A. Kolushev, was called to Sofia where the terms for an agreement with Montenegro were settled. Kolushev remained in Sofia briefly for further negotiations.

---


36 Ernst C. Helmreich, *The Diplomacy of the Balkan Wars, 1912-13*, op. cit., pp. 76-77; George Young (Diplomatist), *Nationalism and War in the Near East*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1915), p. 184. Diplomatist noted that the treaty contained the obligation to fight together on any treaty violations of the rights of Greeks or Bulgarians by the Turks, or of the violation of the 'law of nations' by the Turks, "The whole existence of the (Ottoman) Empire in Europe being at this time a systematic violation of treaty rights and any joint representation being in the then temper of the Young Turks tantamount to a challenge, the elaborately 'defensive' drafting could not conceal the offensive object of the arrangement."

and, after returning on August 15, 1912, quickly concluded an oral accord with Montenegro. This agreement provided for an offensive war against Turkey. 38

**Domestic Revelations**

The above foreign policies paint a picture of a Bulgaria on the offensive, seeking to strike while the opportunity presented itself. Domestic maneuvering at home also reflected the desire to realize a Greater Bulgaria. For example, in Vienna in the Spring of 1912 Geushoff and his government colleagues appointed General M. Savov deputy commander in chief of the Bulgarian army.39 Because of Savov’s ties to King Ferdinand and the opposition this could have been a conciliatory gesture. But Geushoff insisted that Savov was selected for his military abilities.40 The selection was not confirmed by the government until September but the March appointment, nonetheless, indicates that the government in late Spring of 1912 strongly considered a military solution to the Macedonian question.

Gueshoff’s intentions are also revealed in a letter he wrote to M. Madzharov, the Bulgarian Minister in London, on July 23. The text reflected the Prime

---


Minister’s encouraging view of recent events in the Balkans and the opportunity they presented. Geushoff wrote:

you must keep in mind the great change that has occurred among us in recent months. We are both encouraged and discouraged by everything that happens in our southern neighbor, and all our friends and both coalition party circles insist that we do not miss this opportunity.41

One final bit of evidence exposing Bulgaria’s aggressive designs on Turkey is offered by the Bulgarian Chief of Staff, Ivan Fitchev, in his discussion of the operative idea behind the war. The general staff supported an ‘offensive war’ and adopted an offense/offense doctrine. Such a doctrine represents a campaign of complete aggression with the goal of invading and capturing the target’s resources.42

This is evident in the details of the operational planning. The 2nd army was to form an enveloping force around the Edirne fortifications. The 1st army would advance in the space between Edirne and Lozengrad in order to explore enemy dislocation and eventually engage the enemy should they try a counter-offensive. Together with the 3rd army, the 1st would deliver a crushing blow to the enemy’s flank should it actually only defend itself and not attack. The armies would then storm Lozengrad


and after breaching the enemy front, continue the advance of the 1st and 3rd armies to the east seeking a decisive battle with the bulk of the enemy forces.\footnote{Ivan Fitchev, Balkanskata Voina, 1912-13: prezhevilitsi, belezhki i documenti, op. cit., p. 89.}

Summary

The second Realist hypothesis is that weaker states may initiate pre-emptive wars against stronger adversaries in efforts to ensure their survival. The evidence uncovered in this investigation does not support this hypothesis. The offensive nature of the alliances, Sofia’s domestic political shifts, and the military’s offensive doctrine and operative plan all support an alternative contention that Bulgaria was acting as an aggressive, expansionist state. The fear that drove Bulgarian policy was not one of Turkish military prowess or aggressive intentions, rather a fear that their 'window of opportunity' for expansion may soon disappear.\footnote{Note that the use of this phrase is not the same as Lebow’s. Lebow defines a 'window of opportunity' as "a period when a state possesses a significant military advantage over an adversary," a definition which focuses on comparative military advantage in general. While I argue that the Bulgarians did perceive they had a military advantage, they did not perceive of a trend in Turkish military policy that would affect that advantage adversely. That is, the military balance was not the basis of their perceived 'window.' See Richard Ned Lebow, "Windows of Opportunity: Do States Jump Through Them?,” International Security, 9, 1 (Summer 1984).} Two factors were threatening to close this 'window of opportunity.' First, the collapse in Albania and fear of great power intervention in the Balkans. And second, the eroding Bulgarian population in Macedonia which placed in jeopardy their national claim to that area.
The remainder of this chapter presents the Bulgarian General Staff’s estimates of the likelihood of victory in war and net assessments of Turkish forces prior to the outbreak of the war. This information offers the final pieces of evidence needed to adjudicate between the risk-propensity proposition offered by Bueno De Mesquita to explain Bulgarian aggressiveness and the cultural-discounting theory proposed in this thesis.

**Risk Propensity**

The risk propensity school hypothesizes that weaker powers initiate wars against stronger adversaries because their leaders have a high propensity for risk taking. Evidence in support of or in opposition to this can be found in leaders’ estimates of their likelihood of success should they initiate a war.

On two occasions prior to the outbreak of hostilities the Bulgarian Chief of Staff along with his colleagues reported that the "chances for a Bulgarian victory in a war were favorable." These statements imply that initiating a war against Turkey was not a risky proposition, thus, Bueno De Mesquita’s claims regarding the risk propensity of the Bulgarian leaders in this conflict are questionable. Perhaps one of the calculations behind the Chief of Staff’s favorable estimate of success was based on the General Staff’s assessments of the Turkish forces. These assessments are presented in the next section.

---

Net Assessment

The Bulgarian General Staff's net assessment of Turkish military strength can be broken down into quantitative and qualitative indicators. In fact, by doing so one can see how the qualitative assessment ultimately led to a change in initial 'bean count' estimates of Turkish military might.

In preparing for the war against Turkey, defense intelligence reports initially placed Turkish strength in the European theatre at approximately 450,000 troops. Even though the Turkish military had undergone reforms in recent years, the Bulgarian General Staff used the old military organization of the Turkish empire as the basis for its calculations. Relying upon that data, the general staff calculated that the Turkish army's composition in the Eastern theatre would be as follows:\(^{46}\)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>435,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalry</td>
<td>13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery pieces</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 4.4: Edirne and Macedonia Defense Forces (1st-4th army corps), Istanbul Defense Forces, and Imperial border guards

\(^{46}\) Ivan Fitchev, Izbrani Proizvedeniia (selections from Ivan Fitchev), (Sofia, 1988), p. 135.
These figures were confirmed as accurate with supporting data offered by the Serbian military attache who reported that Turkey had between 450-500,000 troops in the European part of Turkey.\(^7\) The same attache also argued that Turkey would send its main forces against the Bulgarians in order to defeat the allies one-by-one.\(^8\) By October 10, 1912, the first day of hostilities, estimates of relative troop strength had changed dramatically, however. Figure 4.5 presents the Bulgarian General Staff's quantitative assessment at that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulgarian 1st and 2nd army; Cavalry division; and 10th border guards brigade.</th>
<th>Turkish Eastern Thrace army, 1st-4th corps; Cavalry division, Cavalry brigade, Edirne defense forces.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,882 officers</td>
<td>4,091 officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176,470 NCO's and soldiers</td>
<td>192,598 NCO's and soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 clerks</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,109 horses</td>
<td>36,381 horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124,201 rifles</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 machine guns</td>
<td>112 machine guns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372 artillery pieces</td>
<td>368 artillery pieces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 4.5: Bulgarian and Turkish Troops, October 10, 1912

\(^7\) Ivan Fitchev, Balkanskata Voyna, 1912-13: prezhviliitse, belezhki i dokumenti, op. cit., pp. 86-88.

\(^8\) Ibid.
The difference between the two assessments of Turkish military might is significant, with the initial estimate of troop strength in the European theatre being discounted 56% just before the outbreak of hostilities. Why this drastic alteration?

A further review of Bulgarian assessments points to two factors, both of which are centered around Turkish mobilization. The first factor was the extension of the projected date of complete Turkish mobilization. The second was a discounting of the number of troops Turkey was expected to mobilize by that date.

**Turkish Mobilization**

Having analyzed the Greco-Turkish war of 1897, the Bulgarian General Staff was initially of the opinion that under the most propitious of circumstances the Turkish army would be able to mobilize and begin hostilities in no less than a month. The general staff was aware that at the beginning of September Turkey had ordered all units that had been sent to Albania and the Dardanelles to take positions in Eastern Thrace. Furthermore, intelligence had determined that Turkey had mobilized forces in Macedonia on September 10 and Eastern Thrace on September 12.49

From the foreign intelligence service the general staff also knew that Turkish mobilization was to end by September 29 while the transportation of their troops would begin on September 30. The troops from the Eastern army would take their places using regular roads while the Anatolia divisions would be carried on using the railroads from Anatolia to Istanbul to Edirne. The Anatolia Division would be ferried

---

by ship using the Black Sea up to Rodosto and from there they would move north using regular roads. The intention of the Turks from the beginning was to fight while retreating in the southeastern direction and then meet the Bulgarians at a prepared defense line.\textsuperscript{50}

The general staff agreed with all the intelligence information gathered except the September 29 date that was proposed as the date of completed Turk mobilization. This date was in accord with previous expectations gathered from an analysis of the Greco-Turkish war, yet the general staff thought it would take an additional 17 days for the Turks to complete mobilization.\textsuperscript{51} This projected delay represents an increase of more than 50\% over the initial estimate. Why the notable change?

A review of the general staff's calculations regarding Turkish troop strength that could be mobilized by October 1912 offers some insights. The initial figure of 449,000 troops in the European theatre did not represent the general staff's assessment of overall Turkish military might, although it did reflect their estimate of the forces they would be facing. The entire reorganized Turkish army, including forces from European Turkey as well as Asia-minor, was estimated to consist of 884,848 troops, of which 408,000 soldiers would be in the nizam forces with another 476,848 troops in the redif units.\textsuperscript{52} Upon further consideration of the 1910 Turkish reorganization, however, the general staff concluded that the entire Turkish army

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{51} Ivan Fitchev, Balkanskata Voina, 1912-13: prezhevilitsi, belezhki i documenti, op. cit., pp. 98-100.

\textsuperscript{52} Voinata mezhdu Bulgariia Tursija, 1912-13 god, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 311-13.
could not be mobilized until 1914, the target date for the completion of their organizational reforms.\textsuperscript{53} Hence, they altered their calculations of troop strength.

It was estimated that beginning in 1910, the first year that Turkish reforms were instituted rigorously, 140,000 draftees would be inducted each year into the nizam forces. However, the general staff expected that only 43\% would serve their entire term, 10\% would demobilize early, 22\% would be declared unfit or no-shows, and the remaining 25\% would obtain a release from all military service.\textsuperscript{54}

Calculating, then, from the period 1910-12 a 43\% retention rate of draftees results in a total of 180,600 troops for the nizam forces.\textsuperscript{55} The Bulgarian General Staff also speculated that the redif units were not at full strength (476,848), consisting only of 404,000 troops, although they expected the Turks to call up reserves to fill the gap.\textsuperscript{56}

Considering the target date of reorganization, then, Turkish strength was reduced from a projected force in 1914 of 888,848 troops to a projected force in October 1912 of 584,600 troops. Given that this estimate represents the strength of the entire Turkish army, the figure of approximately 200,000 troops in the European theatre seems more reasonable considering that the 584,600 would be divided between

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{55} The period 1910-12 is used to calculate Turkish troop strength since the Turks did not have to defend against a Bulgarian attack until October 1912.

\textsuperscript{56} Voinata mezhdu Bulgariia Tursiiia, 1912-13 god, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 311-13.
both European Turkey and Asia-minor.\textsuperscript{57} Thus, on the face of it, it appears that the final figures presented by the Bulgarian General Staff, those that appear in figure 4.5, are based on estimates that Turkey could not mobilize all of its forces by the projected date of hostilities. There is confounding information, however, which suggests this would be a premature conclusion.

Following the Young Turk coup of 1908, the general staff received information that the Turks had implemented emergency measures aimed at \textit{speeding up} mobilization. These measures included three steps, each of which was also designed to address possible shortfalls in troop strength. The Turks were to take all reserves drawn from European Turkey and man first the nizam units while the redif divisions would be strengthened by reserves arriving from more remote corners of the empire. Reserves were to join their units directly rather than arrive at central locations from which they were previously distributed to their units. And finally, more ships were made available to transport reserves from Asia-minor to ports on the Aegean and the Sea of Marmara.\textsuperscript{58}

This information leads one to question, once again, the final estimates appearing in figure 4.5. This intelligence was more current than the mobilization data gathered from the 1897 Greco-Turkish war and, more importantly, suggested that the Turks had shortened their previous mobilization time as well as accounted for possible

\textsuperscript{57} Exact calculations regarding Bulgarian assessments of the nature of this division were not available.

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Voinata mezhdu Bulgariia Tursiia, 1912-13 god}, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 311-13.
Why did the general staff persist in both extending the projected date of completed Turkish mobilization and discounting initial estimates of Turkish troop strength? That is, what was the basis for their calculations that mobilization would take an additional 17 days and that the Bulgarian army would be facing just 43% of the nizam forces along with only 85% of the Turkish redif units? Can an explanation be found in Bulgarian judgments of Turkish cultural sophistication?

In the next section it is asserted that this discounting of capability was, indeed, at least partially based upon the Bulgarian view that the Turks were an uncultured society that was perceived as rotten to the core, and that these societal characteristics played out at multiple levels including the nature of the government and armed forces (from officers to infantry) to the point where it severely hampered Turkey’s ability to both prepare for and fight a war against Bulgaria.

The Uncultured Turks

Documents from the Bulgarian Ministry of War provide a thorough analysis of the Turkish army from its first period of reorganization (1886) to the outbreak of the First Balkan War. It is instructive to note that this analysis begins by painting a striking picture of an uncultured, undisciplined, and poorly educated Turkish society. The Turkish Empire was described as born through the force of arms and unable to consolidate internally under a government which was "rotten to its foundation."59 Documents state that under pressure from European public opinion, Turkish efforts to

59 Ibid., p. 1.
implement reforms had an adverse affect on the state body since the "uncultured and unprepared conquerors" had poor political education and were simply unable to replace their obsolescent system of "yesterday's rule" with a system which provided for the maintenance of a multinational empire. The Turkish state's need for revenue was great but its poor tax system did not provide sufficient resources. It was at this point that the "world's worst administration" resorted to coercion against the "more highly cultured Christian nations" which were the most productive element of the empire. Bulgarian leaders believed that Turkish statesmen saved all of their energies for efforts of constantly attempting to buttress their uncertain domination and to stifle the aspirations of captive peoples.

These themes centering on the uncultured Turkish society manifested themselves in Bulgarian analyses of Turkish efforts to reorganize their armed forces. Detailed presentations of Turkish exercises are fused with comments regarding the uneducated, undisciplined, insubordinate, and poorly trained officer and soldier. In the next two sections it is illustrated how these judgments led to a consistent discounting of conclusions from sophisticated analyses of Turkish strength.

60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.
Turkish Reorganization - Phase 1

In estimating late-19th century Turkish military might the Bulgarian general staff displayed a great deal of respect for the martial qualities of the Turks. The Turkish people were said to have valuable military qualities. The Turkish soldier, in particular, was perceived as physically strong, resistant to deprivation and discomforts, scornful of danger, respectful of seniors, and averse to alcohol. The general staff believed it was because of poor organization and lack of education and training that these admirable qualities were left unused.

In an effort to address these problems, Baron Kolmar Von Der Golz was charged with the task of restructuring the Turkish army in 1886. By 1894 the Bulgarian General Staff concluded that the Turkish army consisted of 7 corps and 3 independent divisions at full strength, or 382 battalions altogether, in addition to 6 cavalry divisions, or 197 squadrons altogether, and 15 artillery brigades consisting of 169 field artillery batteries, 44 mountain artillery batteries, and 18 cavalry batteries. In addition to that, the army included 4 battalions and 4 companies of engineers, 39 fortification artillery companies, 5 communications companies, 18 reconnaissance squadrons, 15 construction companies, 1 cavalry regiment, 352 rifle battalions, and 48 Kurdish cavalry regiments each consisting of 4-6 squadrons. This impressive

---

62 Ibid., p. 224.

63 Ibid., p. 265-70.

64 Ibid., pp. 69-74. These figures approximate the 449,000 total appearing in table 2.
quantitative assessment was impregnated, however, with qualitative assessments following from a judgment of Turkish cultural inferiority.

Many analyses focused on the quality of the Turkish officer, often emphasizing nepotistic and clannish promotion procedures and the unwillingness of officers to break with traditional methods of warfare. For example, the Bulgarian Ministry of War judged that 75-80% of Turkish officers had insufficient theoretical training and that a significant portion of these officers were being promoted without scrutiny from the rank of NCO. Indeed, they thought there was no established order in rank promotions. In order to become familiar with progress in military affairs, many Turkish officers were sent to study in the officer academies of European states. But upon their return, they again succumbed to the habits of the old military tradition.

The general staff also believed that the Turkish army paid more attention to ceremony than to military training. They claimed that target practicing was uncommon, tactical games were few in number while maneuvers never took place, and higher ranking officers were unable to practice command of their units because army units in the European part of Turkey were widely dispersed.

Even the most appreciative statement by the general staff regarding Turkish reforms was qualified with perceptions that the Turkish officer lacked that capacity or desire to learn new ideas. Thanks to the German military mission, they argued, an
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65 Ibid., pp. 69-74.
66 Ibid., pp. 69-74.
67 Ibid.
increase in Turkish military might was noticeable but many new military reformers were needed because the old officers had difficulty or were unwilling to grasp the ideas behind the German military system. Nonetheless, the general staff agreed that Turkish military might was slowly improving. Thus, in 1885 Turkey did not dare oppose the reunification of Eastern Rumelia and Bulgaria but in 1897 it acted decisively against Greece, in a short time raising a large army which imposed its demands on the Greeks. This victory uplifted the spirit of Turkish people and strengthened trust in the reforms.

While this assessment of Turkey's military strength following the first reorganization begins with a respectful portrait of the Turkish soldier followed by an impressive quantitative analysis of superior Turkish might, this potent image of the adversary's forces is severely tainted with critical qualitative assessments of the Turkish officer. Officers are described as having insufficient theoretical training, lacking the capacity and willingness to grasp new ideas, and demonstrating a greater concern for ceremony than actual battle preparedness. All of these descriptors are in accord with the indicators of cultural inferiority summarized in figure 4.1 presented at the opening of this chapter.
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68 Ibid.
69 Ibid.
Turkish Reorganization - Phase 2

According to Bulgarian foreign intelligence, Turkish junior officers based in European Turkey realized that these initial reforms were more superficial than substantive. Thus, they conspired in secret with the view to introduce profound reforms in administrative and military affairs.

The Bulgarian foreign intelligence service reported that the July 1908 coup was carried out by the Young Turk Committee for Unity and Progress whose leaders were European educated officers. Because they regarded the army as the most important factor in international relations they carried out a succession of reforms aimed at Europeanizing the army. Baron Von Der Golz and 16 other German officers were again summoned and many officers were sent for training with the German and Austro-Hungarian armies. The German military mission began reforms aiming at A) to equip the army with everything it needed B) to harness all officers to work on military preparedness. The reforms under this plan began as early as 1909 but were more intensively carried out after the plan was approved by Sultanate decree in 1910.

Administrative reforms were significant and promptly implemented. First, the supreme army command was fundamentally renewed. The chairmanship of the War Council was entrusted to the Minister of Defense to whom the military administration was also subordinated. Army administration was reorganized in German fashion with many regular officers attached to the army staffs. The Ministry of War was

---

70 Ibid., p. 247.
reorganized into 10 departments with 2-4 sections each, 5 inspection offices, and a
War Council and the Army General Staff was made independent of the Ministry of
Defense.

Once again, this impressive intelligence effort was suffused with qualitative
assessments painting the Turkish officers and soldiers as uneducated, poorly trained,
and more concerned with ceremonial than actual battle preparation. For example, the
general staff asserted that: in the infantry there was a tendency to emphasize the
ceremonial handling of rifles while in the cavalry the emphasis was on ceremonial
horse riding; in bayonet training soldiers were educated to lunge the bayonet without
studying other necessary hand-to-hand techniques; target practice was carried out from
distances no longer than 500 feet; an active duty soldier would fire his rifle only 20-30
times a year; and crouching, crawling and firing were carried out under orders
without tactical explanation.\textsuperscript{71}

These perceptions by the Bulgarian General Staff correlate well with the
culturally inferior indicators presented at the beginning of this chapter, thus
suggesting that perceptions of Turkish cultural inferiority are manifesting themselves
in critical assessments of their armed forces. The most damning criticism of the
forces, however, is found in the general staff's assessment following the second
reorganization.

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
Final Assessment

While a series of measures had been undertaken to step up officer training, the general staff concluded that theoretical and practical training did not go well due to the insufficient capacity of officers, the existing routine, apathy regarding work in the army, and the absence of well-trained leaders. Previous perceptions of the Turkish soldier as physically strong and respectful of senior officers were now replaced with images of the same soldier as weak and insubordinate.

These new views were based on numerous impressions. For example, when reserve troops were summoned for exercises less than two-thirds answered the summons. The general staff assumed that the remainder bribed authorities, deserted, or simply refused to show up. Those who did report were said to have displayed signs of considerable unrest, sometimes taking the form of open offense of their superiors and scorn of the current regime. The Bulgarian Ministry of War concluded that enthusiasm for work quickly and noticeably declined by 1912, being replaced by apathy and indifference.

The officer corps, it was argued, showed signs of turmoil. An officer’s standing with the Young Turk party rather than his abilities and career work were perceived as the major condition for his promotion, demotion, or firing. Moreover, because the majority of officers were said to have joined the Young Turk organization
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72 Ibid., pp. 266-67.
73 Ibid.
74 Ibid.
with the singular goal of obtaining material benefits, it was assumed that the officer corps was teeming with intrigues, plots, and slander.\textsuperscript{75}

The general staff concluded that instances of insubordination and disrespect by lower ranking officers \textit{vis a vis} their superiors, as well as cases of abuse by high ranking officers, were not uncommon. The lower ranks formed their own community called the Young Officer League which held public lectures containing virile attacks on the actions of the higher ranks. It was believed that discipline was sagging with previous grumbling turning into demonstrations of insubordination, disrespect, and violence regarding the superior ranks.\textsuperscript{76} The Bulgarian General Staff summarized the state of Turkish society and its representative army in stating that

\begin{quote}
The societal discipline whose strength consisted of an instinctive obedience by all lower ranks - and which was the product of Turkey's political and social order, and which is solely capable of maintaining order in a uncultured society - was shaken and destroyed without being replaced by another based on conscientious obedience.\textsuperscript{77}
\end{quote}

The Ministry of War argued that "the political gangrene had gone so deep into the body of the officer corps that no efforts to restore cohesion and discipline would be successful."\textsuperscript{78}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
Given this bounty of information collected from the Bulgarian Ministry of War and the Chief of Staff, the revelations it has provided are now considered in light of the cultural discounting arguments which seek to account for Bulgarian aggressiveness.

**Cultural Discounting**

The distal antecedents of subjective cultural judgments, economic, educational, and political progressiveness, all appear repeatedly throughout these assessments and all paint a picture of an inferior Turkish society and, as argued, by extension, a qualitatively inferior military establishment. This investigation uncovered qualitative assessments of Turkish society, government, the armed forces in general, and its officers and soldiers in particular. These assessments revealed Bulgarian contempt and disrespect for all. Most of the descriptors applied to these subjects appear in figure 4.1 at the beginning of this chapter. This figure lists the phraseology proposed previously that one would encounter should judgments of cultural inferiority be present and have an effect on the net assessment of a quantitatively superior adversary. A summary of descriptors extracted from this investigation of Bulgarian net assessments is presented in figure 4.6.
The correlation between these attributes and the descriptors presented in figure 4.1 is very high and, where direct matches do not occur, synonyms tend to account for the difference. My theory proposes that in conditions where the adversary is seen as quantitatively superior in strength, a subjective judgment of cultural inferiority will lead to a discounting of its military might. The evidence above lends empirical support to this proposition. The two puzzles presented previously, one regarding the Bulgarian General Staff's extension of the projected date of completed Turkish mobilization and the other concerning the discounting of troop strength, may be less puzzling when approached from this theoretical perspective. The Bulgarians' views of the "uncultured" Turks appears to have led to a significant discounting of their objective capability, thus making a limited-aims revisionist strategy the favored strategy in dealing with the adversary.

It is constructive to consider the assessments made by the European great powers at the outbreak of this war. Colonel Lamouche, a member of the French
section of the international mission for the reorganization of the Ottoman
Gendarmerie, states that

The most widely diffused opinion, especially in western circles, was that Turkey would gain the upper hand. The French Military Attache, Lieutenant-Colonel Maucorps of the Artillery, was convinced of Ottoman superiority and sent reports to that effect to Paris. Appearances certainly seemed to confirm this impression. The disparity between the two camps, in population, military effectives, resources of every kind, was considerable, almost in the proportion of one to two.  

Clearly, the great powers expected Turkey to prevail in this conflict. Note the emphasis on quantifiable factors as the basis for their conclusions, population and resources, for example. The data presented in this chapter demonstrates that the Bulgarians calculated the same relative disparity in these areas. However, the data also shows that concomitant judgments of Turkish cultural inferiority discounted these asymmetries to the point where the Bulgarians perceived they actually had an advantage.

Conclusion

By conventional measures of capability, at the outset of the First Balkan War Bulgarian forces were outnumbered three-to-one by the Turkish army. The fact that Greece, Serbia, and Montenegro, as fellow members of the Balkan League, were also

---

employing their troops against Turkish forces did not alter this asymmetry in terms of objective capability nor did it alter the calculations in Sofia since Bulgarian leaders expected Turkey to attack the League members in sequence, thus allowing the Turks to employ their full might in succeeding engagements.

In efforts to complement their strength, Bulgarian leaders sought assistance from their strongest patron, Russia. On numerous occasions, however, the Russians refused to aid Bulgaria and even threatened her and her League allies with sanctions should they initiate a war with Turkey. Furthermore, Russia informed Bulgarian leaders that if their expansionist policies met with failure, they should not expect Russia to save them from Turkish reprisals. Russia did not stand alone in her disapproval of Bulgarian offensive plans. In concert with other European great powers a note was issued to League members informing them that no modifications to the territorial status quo would occur should a conflict break out in the Balkans.

The evidence presented above in conjunction with the fact that Bulgaria chose to launch her attack in spite of great power remonstrations challenges the Realist proposition that weaker powers will balance against stronger adversaries. Realist theory also proposes that when the balancing option is not available, weak states will initiate a pre-emptive war. This proposition also received little support in this case. Diplomatic memoranda between Bulgarian leaders and other League members as well as between Bulgarian leaders themselves emphasized the liberation of Macedonia and realization of Greater Bulgaria, thus revealing her opportunity-based, as opposed to security-based, motivation.

143
The risk-propensity proposition offered by Bueno De Mesquita also received little support from this investigation. Specifically, on two occasions prior to the implementation of the offensive the Bulgarian Chief of Staff and his colleagues reported that the chances for victory were favorable. These statements do not support the risk-seeking hypothesis. In fact, they imply that the Bulgarian's perceived an advantage, i.e. the odds were in their favor, and expected to realize their expansionist aims. The intriguing question is why did they perceive an advantage when by objective standards they were so obviously outnumbered?

This question is, of course, the very one driving this dissertation. The investigation of Bulgarian net assessments may have revealed the answer. It is through a process of cultural discounting that estimates of the strength of Turkish forces may have been significantly reduced from that which objective measures suggested. Perceptions of Turkish cultural inferiority are evident in descriptions of Turkish society as uncultured and undisciplined; of the Turkish government as lawless and nepotistic; and of the armed forces as poorly organized where the officers were apathetic and insubordinate and the soldiers weak and indifferent pervaded Bulgarian assessments also reporting the quantitative superiority of the adversary. These attributes match well those hypothesized to appear in assessments of a culturally inferior adversary (see figure 4.1). These qualitative assessments may have interacted with Bulgarian quantitative analyses in a manner that resulted in the discounting of the quantitative summaries. The result of this discounting process was the perception that Bulgaria actually had the advantage in any military confrontation. The result of this
perception, of course, was manifest in her effort to realize a Greater Bulgaria.
CHAPTER 5
THE INDO-PAKISTAN WAR OF 1971

Background

The state of Pakistan that came into existence in 1947 was the expression of the particular historical experience of the Indian Muslims. Pakistan’s disintegration in 1971 was also the product of that experience.¹ Under Indian rule, the population in Eastern Bengal never adopted the Hindu culture and gradually converted to Islam beginning in the 13th century. The Muslim aristocracy driving this conversion had its origins and affinities outside of Bengal, however. It was this set of circumstances, one that did not change through 1971, that established the necessary condition for the Muslim civil war in 1971 out of which grew the Indo-Pakistan War of the same year.

The idea of Pakistan was conceived as an expression of the religious and cultural nationality of the Muslims of India. In the post-World War II independence negotiations the Muslim League attempted to keep its grip on the undivided whole of those provinces where Muslims were a majority - including Bengal. At the Delhi convention of the League in April, 1946, a resolution was put forth demanding a

sovereign state of Pakistan comprised of Bengal and Assam in the north-east, and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind, and Baluchistan in the north-west. After the failure of the British Cabinet Mission in July, 1946, it was clear that the creation of a sovereign Pakistan entailed the partition of the historic provinces of Bengal and the Punjab. On August 14, 1947, Pakistan came into existence as two parts separated by thousands of miles of Indian territory: East Bengal in the distant east and West Punjab, the NW Frontier Province, Sind, and Baluchistan in the west. The year between the Cabinet Mission and Pakistani independence was barbarous and turbulent. At least half a million people had been killed in communal violence. Most of the Sikhs and Hindus in West Pakistan fled or were driven to India and hundreds of thousands of Muslims fled or were driven to Pakistan. The wanton brutality of these days had a profound effect on the national consciousness of both countries.

The enmity in Indo-Pakistani relations was first manifested on a grand scale in their first war over the status of Kashmir, a predominantly Muslim state in Hindu India, in the years 1947-49. This dispute was halted, but not resolved, by the United Nations. Once again, in 1965 Pakistani forces sought to liberate Kashmir from the Indian yoke. The results were a stalemate on the battlefield and another

---


cease-fire. It is the third and most recent conflict between the antagonists which serves as the basis for this chapter.

While the animosity and culture of distrust between India and Pakistan were underlying causes for the 1971 War, the proximate cause can be traced to the 1970 Pakistan elections. The Awami League, a party based in East Pakistan won a majority of National Assembly seats much to the surprise and dismay of the leaders in the West. Sheikh Rahman, the leader of the League, immediately committed to the national adoption of the League's "Six Point" program. In the subsequent months Mujib urged President Yahya on numerous occasions to convene the National Assembly for the purposes of advancing the six point legislation. The government's worst fear was that convening the assembly would severely diminish its control and place the armed forces in a precarious position. Given the Awami League's absolute majority, East Pakistan for all practical purposes would be under "alien" control, thus threatening the integrity and unity of the state.

After the postponement of the National Assembly, negotiations between the Awami League and the government commenced. Significant progress was realized in many areas of contention, nevertheless, the government prepared for military action in East Pakistan. There was still serious concern over the security of the armed forces

---

6 The "Six Point" program was representative of the various Bengali claims and frustrations over East Pakistan's perceived mistreatment in national and economic affairs. See Richard Sisson and Leo E. Rose, War and Secession: Pakistan, India, and the Creation of Bangladesh, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), p. 20.

7 Ibid., p. 81.
and the League’s commitment to a united Pakistan. Yahya called on his military leaders and instructed them to draft orders for an operational plan to reinstate public order and central authority in East Pakistan. Three provisions were given priority: the Awami League and its supporters were to be treated as rebels; East Pakistani military units along with police were to be disarmed; and, the leaders of the Awami League were to be arrested. Pakistan’s civil war began the night of March 25, 1971.

The initial Indian response to the crackdown in East Bengal was highly vocal, but ambiguous. The suppression was unanimously condemned but statements of support for the Awami League were carefully worded to avoid Pakistani charges of material assistance to the rebels. However, the Indian’s did allow the establishment of an Awami League headquarters on Indian soil and, in late April, training camps for "liberation forces" were established with Indian assistance on Indian territory close to the East Pakistan border. Moreover, a gradual, but substantial, buildup of India’s Border Security Force in West Bengal, Assam, and Tripura was initiated in April. As a consequence of these actions, tensions escalated between India and Pakistan throughout the Summer and Autumn of 1971.

The most recent war between India and Pakistan is commonly thought to have begun on December 3, 1971, with a Pakistani air strike in India’s northwest
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8 Ibid., p. 132.
9 Ibid., p. 145.
region. That date refers to the 'declared' war by Pakistan, as opposed to October 21 when India significantly increased its military pressure on East Pakistan in support of the indigenous Bengali population. This increase in direct Indian pressure has been attributed to three different sources. First, it has been argued that the Indian's could no longer continue to shoulder the economic burden of refugees pouring out of East Bengal. Second, since these refugees were arriving in such politically explosive provinces as Assam, their continued presence increasingly threatened the cohesiveness of the patchwork of states constituting India itself. Finally, many Pakistanis believe that India had long been waiting for such an opportunity to dismember Pakistan and simply jumped at the chance, using the refugee issue as a weak justification for her aggression.

While Indian motivation is not clear, it is clear that the full-scale Indo-Pakistani war which broke out on December 3 arose out of the pressure on Pakistan's increasingly vulnerable military and political position in East Bengal. Despite the apparent dangers in the overall objective strategic outlook in both the East and the West, it was the Pakistani authorities in Islamabad who took the fateful decision to launch the attack in the West which unleashed the full weight of Indian military resources. It is this decision that I seek to explain in this chapter.
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11 Robert Jackson, South Asian Crisis, op. cit., p. 106.

12 Ibid, p. 111.
The format of this chapter is the same as the previous. First, it is determined whether this war was truly asymmetric by reviewing comparative data based upon common, objective measures of military strength and follow up by ascertaining if Pakistan expected great power assistance in this war with India. Second, data is reviewed in support of or in opposition to the argument that Pakistani decision making was being driven be pre-emptive war motives. These two investigations will aid in determining the vitality of the Realist asymmetric war hypotheses under review, that is, that weaker states either join a countervailing coalition to address a stronger adversary or they initiate a pre-emptive war in an effort to ensure their own survival. Should it be discovered that Pakistani leaders understood they were 'going it alone' and were motivated by expansionist aims, these Realist hypotheses will not be supported.

Third is an exploration of whether Pakistan perceived its offensive military plans as risky given that objective measures of comparative strength suggest significant odds in favor of India. Should this perception be discovered the risk-propensity hypothesis put forth previously will receive support since Pakistan chose to open the Western front on December 3rd.

Finally, Pakistani assessments of Indian strength are reviewed to determine if they perceived the Indians as culturally inferior and subsequently discounted objective measures of superior capability, thereby encouraging the offensive in the West. The recency of this case offers additional measures of perceived relative cultural sophistication, outside of military assessments. Specifically, several social
psychologists have conducted studies of Pakistani stereotypes of Indians in the pre-war period. These findings will be presented along with the military assessment data to provide a more complete picture of the Pakistani psychocultural mindset. A review of these measures in combination offers evidence from which to determine the soundness of the cultural discounting hypothesis being offered in this thesis. Should this data indicate that the Pakistani’s perceived the Indians as culturally inferior, this hypothesis will be supported.

**Objective Capability Measures**

Two measures were used to determine the objective balance of strength between Pakistan and India. The first was constructed from data available in the Correlates of War data set. These measures are presented in figures 5.1 and 5.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mil. a</td>
<td>Mil. b</td>
<td>Tot. c</td>
<td>Mil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>1924810</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mil. Per. - number of soldiers in active army (in thousands). Does not include the size of mobilized armies.
* Mil. Exp. - expenditures in thousands of dollars (U.S.).
* Tot. Cap. - average proportion of military capabilities (personnel and expenditures) expressed as a total percentage of states in the table.

**Figure 5.1: Balance of Military Forces in South Asia, 1971**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC d</td>
<td>80776</td>
<td></td>
<td>9765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;S e</td>
<td>6376</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP f</td>
<td>53353</td>
<td></td>
<td>9565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP g</td>
<td>551231</td>
<td></td>
<td>61880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EC - energy consumption (thousands of coal-ton equivalents).
* I&S - iron and steel production (thousands of tons).
* UP - urban population (in cities with populations greater than 100,000; thousands).
* TP - total population (thousands).
A "-" indicates missing data.

**Figure 5.2: Balance of Military Forces in South Asia, 1971**
These measures correlated with other sources summarizing the military strength of both countries. A review of figures 5.1 and 5.2 reveals that by commonly used measures of objective military strength the Pakistanis were at a distinct disadvantage approaching the order of 3:1. This evidence satisfies the first criterion for classifying this conflict as truly asymmetric. In the next section Pakistan's great power diplomacy leading up to the war is reviewed in an effort to determine whether it did or did not expect great power military assistance.

Great Power Assistance

China, the Soviet Union, and the United States all played important roles in the unfolding of this conflict. While it is abundantly clear that the Pakistanis expected no military assistance from the Soviets, Pakistani expectations regarding Chinese military intervention and American military support have been the subject of much debate. The evidence, however, suggests Pakistan expected no more than limited political support from both countries when it launched the western offensive.

China

China's commitment to Pakistan was very slow in coming and although it was as firm as delicately phrased, the phrasing did not fully measure up to Pakistan's expectations. In an April 13 letter the Chinese Prime Minister, Chou En-lai,

supported President Yahya's efforts to uphold the "unification of Pakistan and to prevent it from moving toward a split;" referred to the on-going conflict within East Pakistan as a struggle by a handful of people; criticized India for gross interference in the internal matters of a neighboring country and pledged full support for "their just struggle to safeguard State Sovereignty and national independence." However, the type of support was not indicated. Although the tone of this and later Chinese interventions was not totally unsatisfactory to Pakistan, over the succeeding months the exactness of the phrase setting out China's position was a cause for growing concern in Islamabad. The formula preferred by the Pakistanis was that which was accepted in June by the Conference of Muslim Foreign Ministers, and which was reaffirmed by President Yahya in his speech of June 28 when he referred to "our friends abroad" who "have given complete support to the action taken by the government to maintain the unity and integrity of Pakistan." In spite of persistent pressure from Pakistan for a broadening of the terms of their commitment, the Chinese refused to be drawn in.

Chou-En-Lai met Pakistan's military attache quite often and conveyed through him, to the government of Pakistan, that General Yahya could count on China's friendship short of getting directly involved in an Indo-Pakistani war. In accordance with this stance Chou-En-Lai continued to advise General Yahya to seek a political

---


15 Robert Jackson, South Asian Crisis, op. cit., p. 41.
solution to the problem in East Pakistan. Pakistani Information Minister G.W. Choudhury claims that China acted in the Bangladesh crisis like any other power in the same circumstances: "I had read the Chinese messages to Yahya," he states, "they were all pleas for restraint and not for war." Indeed, the Chinese Foreign Minister publicly told Bhutto when he went as Yahya's emissary to Peking to secure Chinese support, that Pakistan should try to find a "rational" solution to the crisis - "which, by implication, was a condemnation of the policy of Pakistan's military regime." However, in a meeting with US Secretary of State Kissinger following his secret trip to China, President Yahya noted on his personal pad dated July 14, 1971 that he was expecting China to pose a threat to India in the event of an Indo-Pakistani conflict. He wrote "Chou-En-Lai indicated to Kissinger [sic]. In case India invaded Pakistan China would not be an idle spectator but will support Pakistan [sic]." The text of this note is no less ambiguous than pledges received directly from China. This ambiguity may have encouraged Yahya to be optimistic regarding Chinese military intervention at that time.

Any optimism on Yahya's part was surely dampened, however, as tensions with India escalated. According to Brigadier Baqir Siddiqui, chief of staff of the

18 Ibid.
19 Taken from General Yahya's personal notes. Cited in Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Tragedy of Errors, op. cit., p. 319.
Eastern Command, the Chinese consul general met Commander Eastern Forces Lt. General A.K. Niazi several times and informed him that China was not planning any physical intervention and that Pakistan should avoid a war with India. Subsequent reports from a delegation sent to China reinforced this stance.

A high level Pakistani delegation headed by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, who had been nominated vice premier designate and President Yahya's special representative, visited Peking on November 6-8, 1971. The delegation also included Air Marshal Rahim Khan, commander-in-chief of the Pakistan air force, Major General Gul Hasan Khan, chief of the general staff, Rear Admiral Rashid Ahmad, chief of staff of the Pakistan Navy and Foreign Secretary Sultan Ahmad Khan assisted by the director general of the foreign office Dr. M.A. Bhatti and Air Marshal Tabarak Hussein. Bhutto had a separate meeting with the Chinese premier while parallel talks were held between the military leaders of the two countries.

Acting Chinese Foreign Minister Chi-Peng-Fi told Bhutto that should Pakistan be subjected to foreign aggression the government and people of China would resolutely support them in their struggle to defend their sovereignty and national independence. He did not mince his words in condemning India. Chou-En-Lai supported these statements. While accepting the agitation in East Pakistan as a secessionist movement, however, at no stage did the Chinese indicate to Bhutto they would engage India in a military conflict in support of Pakistan. Those who

---

20 Ibid., p. 310.

21 Ibid., p. 321.
accompanied Bhutto also contend that at no occasion did Chou-En-Lai or any other Chinese leader promise to intervene militarily in an Indo-Pakistani conflict.²²

Indeed, Pakistan’s Chief of General Staff claims that the question of seeking Chinese military intervention never arose.²³ Chou-En-Lai repeated on several occasions that President Yahya should solve the problem politically and not by military means.²⁴ The message he wanted to convey to Pakistan should have been quite clear. He made it clearer by telling the delegation that China would not be able to come to the aid of Pakistan as it had in 1965.²⁵

At the military meeting between the chiefs of the armed forces which took place in the war room, the Chinese authorities indicated their own precarious military position by means of maps showing the deployment of Soviet forces around China. They, according to their military experts, were not only heavily outnumbered by the Soviets but were also outmatched in sophisticated weapons systems. Their advice to the Pakistani delegation was to not enlarge the conflict. "Keep it confined to East

²² Ibid., p. 322.


²⁴ Ibid., p. 281-2. Chou-En-Lai sent a film to Bhutto on the Japanese Admiral Yamamoto. The theme of the movie was to not use military force to solve political disputes. Chou-En-Lai later asked Bhutto at a banquet whether he had seen the film he sent him a night earlier. Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Tragedy of Errors, op. cit., p. 322.

²⁵ Interview with Rear Admiral Rashid Ahmad and Dr. M.A. Bhatti. Ibid., p. 320.
Pakistan" was their final comment.\textsuperscript{26} The Chinese ambassador in Islamabad repeated this to Yahya on numerous occasions, always imploring him not to open the western front.\textsuperscript{27}

On November 8 the delegation returned to report to President Yahya. Sultan Muhammed Khan, who was present when Bhutto briefed President Yahya about his visit to China, states "General Yahya was told quite clearly that China would not intervene militarily in an Indo-Pakistani conflict."\textsuperscript{28}

United States

Given the strength of the US-Pakistani relationship established in the 1950s, Pakistani expectations of US support may have played a considerable role in this war. After all, Pakistan considered herself a strong American ally and an important player in Washington's global containment strategy.

This investigation reveals that there was considerable disagreement within the United States government regarding support for India and/or Pakistan following the implementation of martial law in East Pakistan. The Executive did not want to strain or pressure Yahya Khan at this time as he was the principle intermediary behind

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 321.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{28} Letter from Sultan Muhammad Khan to Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin. Ibid., p. 322.
Kissinger's July, 1971, visit to China. The claim that this attitude was accurately perceived by Pakistani officials finds support in Pakistani sources which refer to a Nixon memorandum to members of his administration urging "To all hands. Do not squeeze Yahya at this time." Moreover, Agha Hilaly, the Pakistani ambassador to the United States, asserts that Nixon had ordered the administration to maintain an attitude of "absolute correctness" towards East Pakistani affairs. Hilaly also claims that Nixon told him he would see to it that the United States did nothing to embarrass President Yahya's government. While Nixon was "tilting" toward Pakistan, the State Department and Congress were very troubled by the suppression of the Bengalis, arguing for and implementing economic and military sanctions against the Pakistani regime.

For example, in April 1971, the International Monetary Fund refused Pakistan any special credit facilities to ease the foreign exchange strain owing to the East Pakistan crisis. And in May 1971, the United States-led Aid-to-Pakistan consortium resorted to dilatory tactics to postpone consideration of Pakistan's aid requirements.

---


31 Top Secret telegram 2114, dated April 29, 1971 from Mr. Agha Hilaly, ambassador of Pakistan in Washington addressed to General Agha Muhammed Yahya Khan. Ibid.
Furthermore, on June 11, 1971, the eleven member countries of the International Aid Consortium agreed to postpone any new economic aid to Pakistan.  

At the same time economic pressures on India were minimal. On March 30, 1971, the United States declared it intended to increase its rupee holdings in India from Rs. 758 crore to Rs. 3750 crore in 2001. Whereas the Aid-to-Pakistan consortium had postponed the question of aid, in June the World Bank was recommending to the Aid-to-India consortium that it provide India with $1.2 billion in foreign aid for fiscal year 1971-72.  

After the first armed clashes between Pakistan and India along the borders of East Pakistan (April 7), the United States announced it would cut off military aid to both countries. President Nixon, in his Report to Congress in February 1972, claimed the United States discontinued shipping military supplies to Pakistan as soon as the civil war began. He told Congress: "Immediately, in early April, we ceased new commitments for economic development. This shut off $35 million worth of arms. Less than $5 million worth of spare parts, already in the pipeline under earlier license, was shipped before the pipeline dried up completely by the beginning of November."  

Moreover, in addressing the fungibility of US economic aid,


33 Ibid., p. 8.

34 President Nixon's Report to the United States Congress, February 9, 1972, pp. 50-51. This claim was challenged by Senator Edward M. Kennedy based on his investigation initiated in October 1971. Kennedy argues that the United States offered weapons to Pakistan as late as June. Indeed, President Nixon supplied Pakistan with 10 F-104’s from Jordan shortly after December 8, 1971. Jack Anderson with George
Information Minister G.W. Choudhury asserted that "As regards American economic aid to Pakistan in 1971, the bulk of it went to east Bengal ... The US economic assistance did not help the military operations of the Pakistani Army, but was utilized for humanitarian relief operations for the Bengalis, both inside East Bengal and outside, i.e. those who fled to the refugee camps of West Bengal." Conversely, in general, Pakistanis interpreted the massive American economic aid program to India starting in the mid-1950s as a threat, since they believe it allowed New Delhi to divert its own financial and other resources to rearmament. Pakistanis claim, for example, as early as April 26, 1971, the United States A.I.D. permitted India to divert $8.6 million in economic development funds to buy truck components and parts for the Indian Defence Ministry. Thus, as far as Rawalpindi was concerned, while the United States had provided direct military aid to Pakistan up to 1965, it had been providing indirect military aid to India up to the current day. To aggravate the Pakistani perspective further, the limitations imposed by the United States on the use


36 Ibid., p. 9.

37 US military aid to Pakistan was canceled following the initiation of hostilities in the 1965 Indo-Pakistan War.
of arms provided to Pakistan were considered too restrictive. Under the terms of the US-Pakistan agreement, arms aid received by Pakistan was to be used only against communist aggressors. 38

Following the flare-ups in April and the US pledge to halt military aid, with the option of military assistance removed Nixon pressured Yahya to find a political solution to the East Pakistan crisis. In his letter to the Pakistani president of May 28, 1971, he impressed on General Yahya the need to seek a political solution as soon as possible. 39 During a meeting with Kissinger, following his visit to China, President Yahya's handwritten notes at the government house Nathiagali on July 9, 1971, included Kissinger's impressions and confirmation of US diplomatic support. While in New Delhi just a day earlier "Kissinger found a mood of bitterness, hostility and hawkishness and he came away with an impression that India was likely to start a war against Pakistan. ... USA has conveyed a strong warning to India against starting hostilities but she may not pay heed thinking that the present hostile attitude of the press and Senate against Pakistan offers her a good opportunity." 40

After India committed her troops into East Pakistan on November 21, Yahya sent a letter to Nixon a day later in which he requested personal intervention. 41

38 Richard Sisson and Leo E. Rose, War and Secession: Pakistan, India, and the Creation of Bangladesh, op. cit.


40 Taken from General Yahya's personal notes made at Nathiagali, dated July 9, 1971. Ibid.

41 Ibid., p. 310.
After receiving Yahya's appeal Nixon sent letters to Gandhi and Prime Minister Kosygin advising them "not to widen the conflict but to cooperate in finding a political solution." He also "warned" Yahya not to attack from the West.42

Following the December 3 offensive by West Pakistani troops, Nixon nevertheless increased his efforts to safeguard the Pakistani leadership. In a December 6 meeting in the White House, Kissinger addressed US policy makers stating "We are not trying to be even-handed. There can be no doubt what the President wants. The President does not want to be even-handed. The President believes that India is the attacker ... We cannot afford to ease India's state of mind."43 Kissinger worked on India's fear that America would openly supply Pakistan. US Ambassador Kenneth Keating reported from New Delhi that Indian officials were querying the Iranian envoy regarding US arms going from Iran to Pakistan. The envoy flatly denied the idea. Under-Secretary of State John Irwin, following Kissinger's orders, admonished Keating in a return message: "In view intelligence reports spelling out Indian military objectives in West Pakistan, we do not want in any way to ease Government of India's concern regarding help Pakistan might receive from outside sources. Consequently, embassy should henceforth give GOI no repeat no assurances regarding third country transfers." Copies were also sent to Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iran, and Pakistan.44

42 Ibid., p. 311.


44 Ibid., p. 228.
While this represents a significant increase in diplomatic support for Pakistan, it is important to note that this activity did not occur until after Pakistani troops opened the offensive on the western front. Furthermore, this offensive followed a warning from President Nixon on November 22 to not open that front. In fact, the sparse support offered by the United States before December 3 appears to have had no affect on the calculations of the COGS during his planning of the offensive.

Hassan Khan claims that

It was not until much later when I read Dr. Henry Kissinger’s book, The White House Years, that I discovered that President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger were more anxious about our good health than we ourselves appeared to be, though their motive was entirely selfish. We in the General Staff Branch were under the impression that our government was tackling the dilemma in total isolation -- that is, that Pakistan was all alone ... 

Thus, the political leadership in the end paid no heed to the warning given by the United States regarding the western front and the military leadership expected no US military assistance in the conflict with India.

Soviet Union

The Soviet Union also played an important role in this conflict, although not in support of Pakistan. Information Minister G.W. Choudhury notes that Soviet policy

---

hardened towards Pakistan in the preceding two years (1969-70). With the signing of the Treaty of Friendship between India and the USSR in August, 1971, Choudhury argues that

Indo-Soviet collaboration on the Bangladesh crisis became palpable. The Soviet Government began to adopt a partisan attitude in contrast to its neutrality during the 1965 Indo-Pakistan war. There were exchanges of visits between the Soviet and Indian foreign ministers; Mrs. Gandhi also went to Moscow in September 1971. The flow of Soviet arms to India increased; India was assured of Soviet help if China were to intervene in any Indo-Pakistani armed conflict. The Soviet press, in tune with official policy, joined in a chorus of condemnation of Pakistan.

This perspective was also shared by the Chief of General Staff who maintained that "She had Moscow solidly behind her ..."

Summary

Throughout the development of the crisis between India and Pakistan, numerous Pakistani officials interacted with Chinese representatives in efforts to determine the scope of Chinese support. On no occasion was a Pakistani delegate told that China would intervene militarily on Pakistan's behalf. This message was


conveyed from the ambassadorial level through the highest offices of each country. Moreover, China repeatedly urged Pakistan to confine the conflict to the east and resolve it through political means. Comparable warnings were also conveyed by the United States. Similar to Chinese efforts, US support was also limited to diplomatic interventions. The above evidence suggests that the political leadership in Islamabad understood the limits of Chinese and American support, although they may not have passed their perceptions on to military leaders. COGS Gul Hassan Khan contends, for example, that "We had no clues if our Government, or rather the omnipotent HQ CMLA (Chief Martial Law Administrator), was involved in any serious parleys with anyone ... should events in East Pakistan slip out of our grasp." This lack of communication is negligible from the perspective of this research, however, since the military leadership seems to have possessed a similar understanding to that of the political leadership. Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Director General Joint Staff at Joint Staff Headquarters 1976-81, and General Aslam Beg both claim that Pakistani operational plans have never included expectations of military assistance from China nor the United States.

This data challenges the Realist asymmetric war hypothesis that when faced with a stronger adversary, weaker states will engage in balancing behavior. While

49 Ibid., p. 288.

50 Personal interviews, Islamabad, Pakistan, November 28-December 1, 1996. Matinuddin also stated that indications of support may have been given to lower command, but upper command devised operations based upon an expectation of no support.
the Pakistanis did ask both the Chinese and Americans if support could be expected, on repeated occasions they were told that it could not. And yet, in contradiction to pleas from both governments Islamabad still chose to open the Western front. In the next section the second Realist hypothesis under review, that based upon pre-emptive war motives, is considered.

Pre-emptive War

While the Indian's moved into East Pakistan on November 21, 1971, and can arguably be branded the initial covert aggressor in this case, the question still remains regarding Pakistan's massive overt offensive in the West on December 3rd. After all, it was this attack in the West that unleashed the full weight of Indian military resources against East Pakistan. Pakistani forces were significantly outnumbered in the West just as they were in the East.

The motive behind Pakistan's offensive from the west is a topic of considerable debate. Scholars as well as participants themselves have offered different explanations of Pakistani strategy which can be grouped into three categories. The first group argues that Pakistan's strategy was to play up the danger of war in the West and hope for UN intervention to stop a full-scale international war from occurring. The second group argues that the offensive from the West was influenced by the logic of Pakistan's established grand strategy which

---


52 Ibid.
was based on the proposition that if the East wing was attacked it could only be
secured by a Pakistani offensive in the West. That is, if the policy of deterrence
failed and war occurred, it was assumed that captured Indian territory along the
Western front (Kashmir and the Punjab) could be exchanged against any Indian
advances in East Pakistan. The third, and perhaps most controversial stance, is that
the leaders of Pakistan were willing to accept the loss of East Pakistan and make up
for it by securing an extension of Pakistani territory in the West - specifically in the
disputed territory of Kashmir.

The first explanation of Pakistani strategy can be classified as a political pre­
emptive strategy, since its purpose was to avoid war altogether. The second most
closely resembles a pre-emptive war strategy if we include the assumption that
Pakistani leaders anticipated an attack by India on the West shortly after she attacked
the East. The third suggests a revisionist, albeit compensatory offensive strategy
which would be in accordance with my hypothesis. There was a significant degree of
divergence between the goals of Pakistani political and military leaders at this time,
therefore, it could be argued that no single explanation fully accounts for Pakistani
strategy in this case. However, I contend that the first explanation is clearly not
representative of the strategy followed by Pakistani leaders in this crisis. We know
that Islamabad’s actions went well beyond securing political support. Thus, this
focuses the investigation of Pakistan’s motive on the latter two explanations.
Therefore, the question is whether or not Pakistani leaders feared an imminent attack
on the West once hostilities broke in the East. If they did, the strike into Jammu and
Kashmir can be considered a pre-emptive strike, otherwise their offensive behavior lends some support to the revisionist explanation. Each of these three possible explanations is considered in turn.

(1) Threaten War in the West and Hope for UN Intervention

This explanation of Pakistani strategy does not find much support in the available evidence. The most obvious testimony that this strategy was not followed by the Pakistani leadership is the fact that they launched the offensive from the West. Obviously this exceeds the act of merely threatening international war. There is also other evidence associated with two particular incidents which paints a picture of a leadership unwilling to go to the United Nations for assistance even after India moved into East Pakistan in late November.

When the news of Indian troops having crossed the border into East Pakistan was received at the United Nations, the Third Committee of the General Assembly was in session and the delegates at the UN expected that Pakistan would bring the matter to the Security Council. Indeed, Turkish representatives and other Pakistani sympathizers prompted Agha Shahi, Pakistan's Permanent Representative to the UN, to ask the government of Pakistan to take the issue of Indian aggression to the United Nations. Shahi subsequently sent a cable to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs informing them of the wave of sympathy that Pakistan was now receiving because of the India's aggression. The reply from Islamabad was "You will not go to the Security Council
unless specifically directed." The vice premier-designate Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto was of the same view saying "Let us not be in a hurry to go to the Security Council."

Thus, after initial Indian hostilities the Pakistani government did not take the issue to the United Nations, rather, Pakistan assumed a posture different from that of a victim of aggression. The effect on friendly countries of this 'no anxiety' stance produced the impression that Islamabad was either detached from reality or she was so militarily strong and so confident of making decisive gains in the western theatre that she did not wish her freedom of action to be restricted by the Security Council. The invasion of East Pakistan by India is perhaps the only instance of an armed attack by one member state of the United Nations upon the territory of another where the victim did not immediately pursue the auspices of the Security Council.

In a second incident some 20 days later (December 10), as the conflict in the East progressed in India's favor, there was considerable confusion for the Chief of General Staff because Dacca had asked the United Nations for a cease-fire but this request was subsequently countermanded by the political leadership in Rawalpindi.

---

53 Interview with Agha Shahi. Cited in Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Tragedy of Errors, op. cit. p. 444. The Chief of General Staff recalls another version of what may have been the same episode. He claims that on November 22 the President instructed a representative of the Foreign Office to send a message to Agha Shahi at the UN that India had aggressed against East Pakistan and that this should be brought to the notice of the Secretary-General. In either case, however, the outcome was the same, i.e. no message was sent to the Secretary-General. See Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Gul Hassan Khan, Memoirs, op. cit., p. 322.
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Late in the afternoon of December 10, Major General Rao Farman Ali Khan, the commander of the Pakistani forces in Dacca, delivered a note to UN Assistant-Secretary General Paul Marc Henry asking the UN to arrange an immediate cease fire and a transfer of power to the "elected representatives of East Pakistan." General Farman said the request had been authorized by Yahya. That evening, Henry and two of his assistants met with East Pakistan Governor A.M. Malik and a Pakistani officer to receive the draft of the cease-fire offer from Farman. Lt. General A.K. Niazi, Commander Eastern Command and Farman's superior, was not present at this meeting.

Having sent the cease-fire draft to the UN, Assistant-Secretary General Henry claimed that "Later, two colonels visited me and said that the surrender was no longer approved. Yahya had changed his mind." Certain diplomats stationed in Islamabad had an explanation for Yahya's intransigence. They insisted that after Yahya had given his permission for the cease-fire, he was told of Nixon's decision to

56 On December 9 the Governor of East Pakistan received a FLASH message from HQ CMLA telling him that any decision regarding East Pakistan was entirely up to him. For the complete text of the message, see Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Tragedy of Errors, p. 502.


58 In a TOPSECRET FLASH message from PAK ARMY on Dec 10, Niazi was informed of the Dec 9 message sent to the Governor of East Pakistan. For the text of the message, see Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Tragedy of Errors, op. cit., pp. 503-4.

send part of the Seventh Fleet into the Bay of Bengal. It was only then, the
diplomats assert, that Yahya changed his mind.

The message traffic between East and West Pakistan supports the claim that
Yahya changed his mind regarding UN intervention based on his knowledge of recent
"military moves" by "friends." The text of a December 11 message from Yahya to
the Governor of East Pakistan is presented below.

Dec 11
President to Governor East Pakistan signal 11 0430 Dec

Do not repeat not take any action on my last message to you(.)
important diplomatic and military moves are taking place by our friends
(.) It is essential that we hold for another 36 hours at all costs (.).
please also pass this message to General Niazi and General Farman.

Thus, the United Nations was again intentionally removed from involvement in
the conflict and the war in the East, and now also in the West, continued. The
initiation of the offensive in the West along with these two incidents where UN
intervention was specifically rejected by the leadership in Rawalpindi offers a strong
criticism of the argument that Pakistani leaders were playing up the threat of
international war with the hope of UN intervention.

60 For the text of the cease-fire agreement sent on December 10 from the President
to the Governor, see Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Tragedy of Errors, op. cit.,
p. 504.


Defense of the East Lay in the West

The second explanation of Pakistani strategy argues that the decision to launch the offensive in the West was influenced by the logic of Pakistan's established grand strategy, which was based on the proposition that the East could only be defended in the West. If one is to interpret this strategy as pre-emptive, it must be established that Pakistani leaders perceived an imminent Indian attack in the West. This argument finds some support in a superficial review of Pakistani military doctrine. However, it is weakened when the implementation of that doctrine during the pre-war period is investigated in detail.

Military Doctrine

Given Pakistan's size, location, and the terrain along its eastern border with India, its strategists have been attracted to the doctrine of 'offensive defense.' This is defined as "fighting offensively in strategic terms to invade and then hold territory to enable one to adopt the tactical defensive." That is, in time of heightening crisis Pakistan would not hesitate to be the first to employ the heavy use of force in order to gain an initial advantage. As one of the founders of the doctrine argued

---


The defensive plans for West Pakistan must begin with offensive actions at the outset of aggression by India against East Pakistan. These actions should envisage improving the defensive posture of our formations and seizing ground of tactical advantage across the border. ... The idea underlying these preliminary operations was to give the impression of a massive offensive into India, to create uncertainty in the enemy's mind, and to provide cover for our main counter-offensive.65

This doctrine was drawn out of Hassan Khan's experience as the Director of Military Operations during the 1965 war with India.66 He claims that "Wherever we had attacked, we had the Indians on the run" and, therefore, "concluded that any offensive was bound to succeed and impose caution on the enemy."67 This is not to say, however, that the Pakistani military made no efforts in East Pakistan proper to protect its assets there. The instructions issued by the military, specifically the GHQ Operation Instructions for Eastern Command, were designed to defend against an Indian invasion of East Pakistan. The plan called for the protection of Dacca at all costs. It was assumed that following an Indian move in the East the Pakistani offensive in the West would relieve the pressure on Dacca by forcing India to redirect her forces west, thereby effectively maintaining the integrity of Pakistan. Thus, the defense of the East lay in the West.


66 For an argument that this doctrine was adopted prior to the 1965 Indo-Pakistani War, see Brig. (Retd.) Amjad Chaudhry, September '65: Before and After, (Lahore: Feruzsons Ltd., 1977), p. 24.

67 Ibid.
The strategy in 1971 then, in the event of an Indian attack on East Pakistan, was that Pakistani forces in the East would establish a fortress defense around Dacca and the forces in the west would seize the initiative and launch an offensive with a view of capturing the maximum possible Indian territory of strategic and political significance.\(^{68}\) For the latter operation the objectives had already been chosen. The troops available were the reserve located south of the Ravi river, consisting of one armored and two infantry divisions. This force would form the spearhead of the attack: once gains were made, the second reserve, north of Ravi, would augment it.\(^{69}\) With this formidable array set in motion, Pakistani military authorities were confident they would impose caution on the enemy operating against East Pakistan. In addition, the seizure of territory would enhance their bargaining position after the cessation of hostilities.

**Implementation**

In the end, Pakistan did not fully implement the doctrine adopted by her military elite. The reasons for this are, as yet, unclear. However, it is clear that significantly divergent views emerged between the COGS and the President and his principal advisors on how to respond to the Indian moves in the East.


\(^{69}\) Ibid, p. 307.
This divergence can be seen in a review of Pakistani strategy in East Pakistan proper. As mentioned above, the GHQ Operation Instruction for Eastern Command was designed for an Indian invasion of East Pakistan. This operational instruction was from the Army. Conversely, HQ CMLA’s directive was to not allow the Awami League to get an inch of territory in East Pakistan. HQ CMLA’s director was General Peerzada who also served as one of President Yahya’s principal advisors. Therefore, this directive was a political one. The problem was that the directives were at odds with each other. The first could only be accomplished by troops operating in a concentrated manner while the latter could only be achieved by the troops operating in a dispersed manner.™ The consequences of this dual-directive were, of course, disastrous for the defense of the East.

The second major politico-military divergence occurred in the implementation of the strategy in the West. The success of the 'defense of the East lay in the West' doctrine was fundamentally based on timing: the chronological proximity of the limited offensive and the major counter-offensive, the operations which constituted the strategy in the West; and the timing of the overall operation in the West with respect to Indian advances in the East.

As early as mid-September 1971, both the President and the COS argued that the preliminary operations should be launched first and, when their objectives had been secured, the main counter-offensive should then be set in motion. The COGS argued that the two operations were co-dependent and, if they were not activated

---
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simultaneously, the operation as a whole would collapse. The COGS’s frustration is evident in the following statement:

However much I argued for simultaneous launching of our preliminary operations and the counter-offensive, I detected that the COS and the President did not wish to be convinced.

Thus, the strategy of "imposing caution" on Indian forces in the East by simultaneously launching the limited and main counter-offensives in the West was severely hampered by divergent political and military positions.

Regarding the initial response date, given the increase in Indian activity in East Pakistan on the evening of November 21, the Pakistani General Staff wanted to launch the limited offensive on November 22. The COGS Gul Hassan Khan met with President Yahya on that day and with the COS on the 24th urging both to implement the limited offensive immediately. The President and COS did not approve the limited offensive until December 3, however. Moreover, the main counter-offensive was not scheduled to be launched until the morning of December 16. This is quite odd because on December 13 the Indians were already on the threshold of Dacca, thus the purpose of the counter-offensive (to relieve pressure from the East) was no

---

71 Ibid., p. 308.
72 Ibid., p. 310.
73 Ibid., p. 330.
74 Ibid., p. 336.
longer relevant. Furthermore, the counter-offensive was postponed another 24 hours and on the evening of December 16th, during a normal briefing the COS abruptly said: "Freeze Tikka." In the end the counter-offensive was never launched.

This information is particularly damaging to the pre-emptive war argument. It was clear to Pakistani officials that Indian forces were engaged in the East on November 21 and yet the President and COS held off launching the offensive in the West until December 3rd. If Pakistani leaders assumed that Indian aggressiveness in the East would soon be followed by moves in the West, why give the Indian forces so much time to mobilize and organize on the western front? After all, it was understood in Islamabad that the Indians with their striking force committed in East Pakistan would not launch an attack in the West at the same time.

It is clear that a major politico-military cleavage existed regarding the implementation of Pakistan’s military doctrine. That is, Pakistan’s grand strategy was fragmented. An analysis of her military doctrine reveals clear offensive intentions with the goal of capturing as much politically and strategically important territory from India in the West. The above review, however, illustrates the discordant views regarding implementation which emerged between the military and political leaders as the eve of the war approached. While the military promoted early major offensive

75 The COS was referring to Tikka Khan, the officer assigned to lead the main counter-offensive in the West.

76 Maj. Genl. (Retd.) Fazal Muqueem Khan, Pakistan’s Crisis in Leadership, op. cit., p. 217.

actions to impose caution on the enemy operating in the East, the political leadership
deviated from the grand strategy and approved only limited actions late into the war.
As a result, at the conclusion of the engagements on the western front India held
some 5,000 square miles of Pakistan's territory while Pakistan held approximately
100 square miles of Indian territory, mainly in Kashmir.78

(3) Accept the Loss of East Pakistan

This is certainly the most controversial interpretation of Pakistani motives
during the 1971 War for two reasons: (1) it imputes highly aggressive motives to
Pakistani leaders; and (2), it implies that Pakistani leaders were little concerned with
the unity and integrity of their state. The evidence behind this interpretation can be
grouped into three categories: the military's preference for ceding land to the Awami
League in the East; the lack of communication between the West and East once the
battle erupted; and the disruption of troops and material to the East by leaders in the
West.

In September of 1971, COGS Gul Hassan Khan suggested to COS Hamid that
he request the President abandon the idea of denying the Awami League rebels
control over some territory "which they could call whatever they wished."79 This
suggestion was in contradiction to the political perspective of HQ CMLA which gave

orders to Eastern Command to not give up an inch of land to the rebels. The COGS argued for a change in the HQ CMLA directive because he believed the situation as a whole had changed as had Indian intentions.⁸⁰ That is, he now understood that India was planning a large-scale invasion into East Pakistan, one which Pakistani defense forces could not withstand. For this reason, he strongly advocated ceding a portion of East Pakistan to the rebels based on the prospect that it would avert the anticipated Indian invasion. Furthermore, any losses in the East could be compensated for by gains resulting from the offensive in the West.

The argument that a lack of communication existed between the West and East once the fighting began is primarily based upon claims that GHQ did not retain any control over the conduct of battle in East Pakistan: "They seemed to have written it off the day the war started" is a common sentiment⁸¹. It is believed that directives could still have been given to Lt. General Niazi (Commander Eastern Command) during the battle to pull in his reins and concentrate his troops in and around Dacca. Indeed, Lt. General Niazi's Eastern Command was not informed by Islamabad of its decision to open up the front in the West on December 3rd.⁸² Had this been the

---


⁸¹ For example, see Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Tragedy of Errors, op. cit., p. 432, 467 and Robert Jackson, South Asian Crisis, op. cit., p. 108.


181
case, Niazi could have concentrated his troops in a fortress manner around Dacca much sooner, thereby increasing the prospects of denying any Indian efforts to advance on the city.

The last pieces of evidence in support of this interpretation are found in Islamabad's reactions to requests by Eastern Command for additional troops and material aid. On two occasions Lt. General Niazi asked for additional troops with which to defend Dacca. Initially he asked for eight battalions and only received two. Again, during an October, 1971, meeting which included Major-General Jamshed (charged with defending Dacca), Commander Eastern Command asked for two additional divisions for the defense of Dacca. In response to this request, Islamabad only sent five infantry battalions. On another occasion material aid was redirected from the East to Karachi. A supply ship from China was carrying a consignment consisting of tanks and ammunition to Chittagong on November 21 just as the Indians began advancing on East Pakistan. Some of the ammunition was to be unloaded at Chittagong for Eastern Command. When the COGS learned of the Indian moves, he called the Defense Secretary and told him to redirect the ship from Chittagong to Karachi. In his mind Eastern Command had sufficient ammunition and

---


it did not have a "hope in hell of stemming an enemy attack when it came." It was thought that the additional ammunition would be looted by the rebels or appropriated by the Indians later.\(^{85}\)

The totality of this data offers support for the argument that leaders in the West abandoned the East, certainly from a military standpoint. Considering the comments and actions of the COGS, it seems that he recognized the futility of defending the East and, instead, focused on achieving gains from the offensive in the West. Furthermore, my previous discussion of a lack of interest and political effort in involving the United Nations supports the argument that the East was abandoned from a political perspective as well. A striking comment strengthening this argument is offered by Brig. (Retd.) Ahmad Chaudry who states "I am inclined to think that he (President Yahya Khan) ... could see that it was no longer feasible to prevent the fall of East Pakistan and he wanted to disown the responsibility for it and shift it to Lt. Gen. Niazi."\(^{86}\) If the East was abandoned both militarily and politically, what, then, was the motivation behind the December 3rd offensive in the West? Was it to compensate for the anticipated loss of the East?

Perhaps not by coincidence, it was around December 3rd that President Yahya accepted that East Pakistan would be lost.\(^{87}\) Up to this point he seemed to believe

\(^{85}\) Ibid., p. 323.


\(^{87}\) Maj. Genl. (Retd.) Fazal Muqueem Khan, Pakistan's Crisis in Leadership, op. cit., p. 174.
that the Indian advances were designed to capture some land for the East Pakistani rebels, but not all of East Pakistan. This, in conjunction with mounting public pressure could have encouraged the decision to launch an aggressive operation with the goal of conquering Kashmir to compensate for the loss of East Pakistan.88

Summary

Of the three explanations for Pakistani strategy, each of which includes an assumption of motivation, the 'UN strategy' receives the least support. Given that the primary instrument in this strategy was promoting UN intervention before a war began and the fact that the UN was intentionally excluded until very late in the war, one can conclude that this strategy was not followed. The second theory of Pakistan's western offensive secured some empirical support but is severely challenged by the delayed timing of the strike. The western offensive was not implemented until 13 days after Indian incursions into East Pakistan. This does not accord well with ideal-type pre-emptive operations.

The final interpretation of Pakistan's strategy receives the most support. While the politico-military divergence evident in the government severely constrained the full implementation of the offensive strategy, its timing (correlated with the President's realization that the East was lost), strong advocation by the military elite

88 Public pressure played an important role in encouraging the President to act. It did not, however, influence the actual course of action. Personal interviews: Air Marshall Rahim Khan, Commander-in-Chief Air Force, 1971; and Lt. Genl. Kamal Matinuddin, Director General Joint Staff at Joint Staff Headquarters, 1976-81, Islamabad, Pakistan, November 28-December 1, 1996.
(concomitant with the same's lesser regard for the defense of the East), and even stronger public pressure for action support the theory that the offensive was revisionist, albeit compensatory in nature.

As stated previously, this explanation was the most controversial because it implied that Pakistani leaders both possessed highly aggressive motives and were not concerned with the fate of East Pakistan. The empirical investigation suggests there are other similar, yet, less extreme interpretations of Pakistani motives. That is, it can be argued that Pakistani political leaders may not have initially held the goal of conquering Kashmir, and that they may not have willingly abandoned the East. The significant delay in launching the offensive in the West may have been due to Yahya's belief that all of East Pakistan was not threatened by initial Indian moves. His miscalculation regarding Indian intentions became clear, however, as December approached and the number of Indian forces engaged increased along with the intensity and breadth of the fighting. At this point, realizing the East was lost and, with mounting public pressure for action, perhaps he decided that an offensive into Kashmir with the goal of capturing land to compensate for the loss of the East was a reasonable strategy. In no interpretation of the definition could this be considered a pre-emptive strategy, therefore, the second Realist asymmetric war hypothesis predicated upon pre-emptive war motives is not supported in this case.

---

89 This explanation would be controversial to most, if not all, of the retired members of the Pakistani armed forces who have written on the 1971 war. Many of these authors are cited in this chapter.
We are still left with another puzzle regarding Islamabad’s calculations. If the above argument concerning Yahya’s decision making is true, before authorizing the offensive into Kashmir he still had to consider that the balance of forces in the West significantly favored India. Given this asymmetry, was this a desperate act of a man merely seeking to save political face? Or, was the offensive approved because he and the military genuinely believed they would be successful? If the latter is true, why did they believe they would win the war for Kashmir? These questions are addressed in the next two sections on risk propensity and net assessment.

Risk Propensity

The disparity between Pakistan’s military might and that of India suggests that Pakistani leaders were engaging in risky behavior by implementing the offensive in the West. Statements by Pakistani authorities to the contrary abound, however.

As mentioned previously, the COGS, one of the architects of the offensive, believed that “any offensive was bound to succeed ...”\(^{90}\) This sentiment was widespread throughout the officer corps, many of whom believed that the offensive would succeed “if launched on time and as a whole.”\(^{91}\) Specifically, Pakistani generals along with senior civilian officials believed the army would be able to inflict a severe blow on Indian forces in the West, overrun a large chunk of Indian territory,


and force India to "give up its evil designs." Furthermore, Pakistan's Information Minister claims that the regime "professed confidence" in facing simultaneously both the Indian threat in the West and the secessionist challenge in the East believing that the Pakistani forces would be able to achieve their objectives in an all-out war of limited duration. These statements do not support the argument that Pakistani leaders perceived the attack in the West as risky. Indeed, some explicitly assert that the offensive operation would certainly be a success. Thus, the risk-propensity hypothesis under investigation in this thesis does not receive support in this case.

Net Assessment

As in the previous chapter the weaker power's estimates of the adversary's military might are divided into two categories, quantitative and qualitative. Furthermore, given the geographic peculiarities of this case it is instructive to look at the assessments of the leaders in both East and West Pakistan since the objective disposition of Indian forces differs across both theatres. The relative strength of Pakistani forces in the both theatres is presented in figures 5.3 and 5.4 below.

### Figure 5.3: Relative Strength in the Eastern Theatre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corps Headquarters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infantry Divisions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infantry Brigades</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para Brigades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infantry Battalions</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor Regiments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Armored Squadrons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery Regiments</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Regiments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramilitary Brigades</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhti Bahini</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Squadrons</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Aircraft Carrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destroyers/Frigates</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 5.4: Relative Strength in the Western Theatre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infantry divisions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13-15,000 per division)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armored divisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Data gathered at the National Defence College, Islamabad, Pakistan.
Eastern Theatre

As the data in figure 5.3 illustrates, on average the Pakistani forces were outnumbered 4:1 in the Eastern theatre. As discussed previously, it was the Indians who were the aggressors in the Eastern theatre so a focus on this striking imbalance may seem impertinent to an analysis of this case. My thesis, after all, concerns aggression by the weaker powers in asymmetric conflicts. A look at the assessments made by the Commander Eastern Command, Lt. General Niazi, is quite revealing, however. Even though in the end he adopted a defensive posture, he had devised and forwarded plans to GHQ for a strategic offensive into India as late as August 1971. Moreover, these offensive plans were approved and amended by GHQ to include even deeper operations into Indian territory.

Eastern Command forwarded a new plan for the defense of East Pakistan to GHQ in August, 1971. In addition to the development of major towns as fortresses and a commitment to defend Dacca at all costs, the plan included offensive actions against Tripura in the east, Siliguri in the north, and Krishannagar in the west. The operation was approved by GHQ and then amended with directions to Eastern Command to devise operations that would present a threat to Calcutta and facilitate the capture of Farrakha barrage.\(^4\) These offensive operations would have been far

\(^4\) Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, \textit{Tragedy of Errors}, op. cit., p. 343. These operations were subsequently revised in a September directive from GHQ to defend East Pakistan by "mobile defense." Ibid., p. 344.
beyond the range of Pakistani guns and without air support. The air force and the navy were particularly nonexistent in East Pakistan. When questioned on this count, Niazi stated

I have planned to fight the war without the Air Force and Navy. You seem to go by numbers. *In war, it is not the numbers but generalship that counts.*

This statement offers some insight into the importance of qualitative factors in the assessment process of Niazi. Greater insight is provided when this statement is considered in conjunction with his copious quoting of the Quran, the Sunnah, and the history of Islam, where he often declared that

As Muslims we have always fought against an enemy who was numerically and materially superior. The enemy never deterred us. It was the spirit of jihad and dedication to Islam that the strongest adversaries were mauled and defeated by a handful of Muslims. " ... Our history is replete with instances to prove that spirited and dedicated Muslims can defeat an enemy many times their size ..."

Lt. General Niazi's oft repeated beliefs in the superiority of the Pakistani forces (or, conversely, the inferiority of the Indian forces,) goes a long way in explaining his preference for major offensive operations in the face of objectively

---

95 Siddiq Salik, *Witness to Surrender*, op. cit., pp. 116-17, my emphasis.

96 Brig. Abdul Rahman Siddiqi (Retired Public Relations Officer), unpublished manuscript, pp. 216-17.

significant odds. The actual planning of these operations also suggests that his statements were more than mere rhetoric. Such beliefs were not limited to Eastern Command.

Western Theatre

The numbers in figure 5.4 illustrate the relative quantitative inferiority of the Pakistani forces in the West. The offensive nature of the operations to be launched from this theatre has already been detailed. The similarities in the offensive operational preferences of both Eastern and Western Command are not surprising given the similarities in their beliefs regarding the cultural sophistication of India. In looking at this case it is instructive to consider the views of the two generations of Pakistani officers that constituted its forces since the partition of 1948: the Sandhurst trained officers (pre-1950) and the American-trained officers (1950-65).

First Generation

By all accounts, the Sandhurst-trained officers were not especially communal minded. Those who went into the army tended to be both secular and conservative in outlook, but Partition was a profound and determinative experience for most of them precisely because they all regarded themselves as above crude religious communalism. In the Indian Army they had willingly commanded Hindu troops of all castes and regions as well as Sikh and Muslim troops. Even though the ethos of the army encouraged competition between such units, all officers were taught that ultimately it
was the soldier-like qualities of a particular class that counted, not its religion or territorial origin. This belief was critically challenged by the killing, bloodletting, and random cruelty that these officers witnessed during the process of partition.98

As a result, these officers disassociated themselves from their former comrades and constructed a history of Pakistan that was traced to Muslim dominance in South Asia where Pakistanis were portrayed as the natural conquerors of the region by virtue of their purer religion and their martial characteristics. The British had repressed this religious spirit and these martial races but they were once again liberated in Pakistan, and best expressed in the military.99 In retrospect, many senior Pakistani officers now claimed that during their tenure in India the non-Muslim troops over which they presided were less competent.100

At the extreme, these assumptions led to the grotesquely inflated belief of the martial superiority of Pakistan over 'Hindu India.' Pakistan Army officers, especially those from West Pakistan, literally fantasized about their army's superiority on a man-to-man basis. The worth of one Pakistani soldier was variously rated at five, ten, fifteen, or more Hindus. For example, it was claimed that even though in past campaigns Muslims were inferior in strength by as much as 1:20, they always


emerged successful "due only to their moral qualities." According to many West Pakistani officers, even the 'best' martial classes of India were unfortunately led by debauched and non-martial officers from such unlikely places as Gujerat, Bombay, Madras -- and even Bengal.  

In sum, as a consequence of partition there developed a linkage of region, religion, and martial character. Those who held such beliefs felt quite sincerely that martial traditions -- usually found in particular regions of South Asia - were of prime importance in estimating military worth; religion could enhance (as in the case of the Muslim) or corrupt (as in the case of the Hindu) a genuine martial race or class.  

Warlords of Bharat

This perspective is evident in the descriptions and evaluations this generation of officers made of their cross-border adversary and is exemplified by Brig. (Retd.) Gulzar Ahmed. In his descriptions of India prior to the 1965 War he characterizes Indian society as


103 Ibid., p. 27.
the most arrogant form of social exclusiveness. This attitude of the Caste Hindus reflects in all of their dealings with non-Hindus. They have, as a result of centuries of slavish life, become close-fisted, miserly, short-sighted, jealous, mean and intriguing in the extreme.  

Indian society consists of

nothing more than a narrow minded and fanatically caste ridden Bharat who ... engage in incessant efforts to create chaotic conditions in this subcontinent and seek to bring about that same state of affairs of anarchy and disruption which existed in this land before the arrival of Muslims on the scene.  

Indian leaders were also viewed as intolerant and aggressive rulers who "have shown both before and after independence that they are too narrow minded to be able to live with any other people in peace. ... The petty minded politicians of the Indian National Congress turned into power-hungry warlords of Bharat ... It [Partition] was not the first time they decided to annihilate the people of another faith. Buddhism was exterminated by them in the very land of its birth."  

These beliefs trickled down into evaluations of Indian officers as luxury-loving and debauched military commanders.

---


105 Ibid., p. 11.

106 Ibid., pp. 3-4.

107 Ibid., p. 10.
Plans [for the 1965 Indo-Pakistan War] were made in the air-conditioned rooms and comfortable atmosphere of the Army Headquarters but they have to be implemented on rough and demanding battlefields. The high spirits resulting from cocktail parties in the charming social circles of Delhi were of no avail to the thirsty soldiers in the waterless plains of the Rann of Kutch.  

Given these beliefs it stands to reason that Pakistani leaders of this generation were not concerned with their inferior numbers. Indeed, it was believed that "A small force with greater moral strength will always be superior to its opponent, and should invariably be preferred to any force whose ranks are swollen by weaklings; a cause of weakness and not of strength."  

Second Generation

The belief in the inferiority of the Hindu people was particularly strong in the American-educated generation of Pakistani officers (1950-65). These officers had no direct experience with the Indian Army and came to have an exaggerated view of the weakness of both India and the Indian military. Officers of the American generation came to acquire an overblown estimate of their own and Pakistan’s martial qualities, and some came to believe implicitly the myth that one Pakistani soldier was equal to five, ten, or more Indians.  

108 Ibid., p. 47.


Two experiences of the American generation were of crucial importance in shaping attitudes and beliefs. One was the success enjoyed by the military in its attempt to structure and control Pakistani politics. The other was the self-delusion of the military and the belief that it not only had mastered Pakistani politics but could master the Indians as well, despite India's size and increasing military preparedness after 1963. Pakistanis were told that the 1965 war demonstrated their martial superiority over Hindu India. This was accompanied by "some of the worst racism and cultural arrogance seen since Partition [which] emerged under official sponsorship in a number of articles and books."\(^{111}\)

This self-delusion was fostered by a powerful public-relations apparatus under the control of the commander-in-chief. This PR machine was aimed at the outside world but it also influenced the military's judgment of its own competence. When the military faltered in 1965, the PR programs were merely intensified. A senior PR official in the Pakistani government has written of both General Ayub's and General Yahya's rule, arguing that

After the seizure (of power) military image-building became more blatant and intensive. A sort of image-craze gripped the top military echelons and they sought to gratify it by any means, by persuasion if possible, and force if necessary ... PR, towards the end of the Ayub era, seemed to have badly affected Ayub's perceptions and sober judgment. He appears to have become a hopeless addict to the allurement of his tailor-made publicity and its remarkable capacity for making the black look white ... In a country such as Pakistan, where for many years the armed forces have been at the helm of civil affairs, the influence of adulatory publicity on them cannot be

\(^{111}\) Ibid., p. 69.
overlooked. It appears to have affected them deeply, enough to change their professional attitudes and standards and to breed in them the unfortunate belief that the armed forces could do no wrong.\textsuperscript{112}

\textit{Assessments Following the 1965 War}

It was in this atmosphere that Pakistani assessments of Indian military strength were made prior to the 1971 War. Themes focusing on the Pakistani soldier's qualitative superiority relative to the Indian soldier's weak educational and environmental background are found in assessments offered by diverse sources ranging from the highest office in Pakistan to the officers on the front line.

President Ayub's view of the Indian forces are revealed through his assessment of Pakistan's own East Bengali troops. Ayub often lamented the lack of martial character among East Bengalis and expressed disappointment at their inability to come up to the Pakistan Army's military standards. This was partly because they were 'downtrodden' and 'under considerable cultural and linguistic influence.' By that he meant the influence of the Hindus, who constituted 10\% of the East Bengal population. As a consequence, he and his successors believed that Bengalis were by tradition unsuited for the military.\textsuperscript{113} As an exercise in contrast, consider President Yahya's attitude toward West Pakistani forces. Prior to the outbreak of the 1971

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., pp. 69-70. A similar claim was made by Maj. Genl. Salim Ummah, Director General, Inter Services Public Relations Directorate. Personal interview, Islamabad, Pakistan, November 30, 1996.

\textsuperscript{113} Stephen P. Cohen, "Arms and Politics in Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan," \textit{Special Studies}, op. cit., p. 29.
War, Yahya had "faith that the fighting spirit of his troops might prevail (in the West), though they were outnumbered and outgunned." These troops, of course, were not tainted by Hindu culture. Thus, in the minds of both the pre-war and wartime presidents of Pakistan, the influence of the Hindu culture significantly reduced the fighting capability of troops. In this instance it was their own troops in the East.

This perceived cultural inferiority of the Hindu profoundly influenced Pakistani assessments of Indian forces. Pakistani leaders believed it manifested itself in the Indian officer corps where, in the words of Major A.R. Siddiqi, following the 1965 war Indian officers were characterized as "luxury loving drinkers, over-confident and incompetent, especially when facing a tough Pakistani soldier ..." where "... the lack of fighting spirit of the Indians was especially marked in the Hindu Jeb and Rajputs."¹¹⁵

Indian soldiers were also considered afflicted with this cultural plague and thus described as "cowards, raised in an atmosphere of non-violence and neutralism, expecting an easy victory, booty, and captured Muslim girls."¹¹⁶ Conversely, the Pakistani soldier was painted as a pillar of moral and military might. For example,


Indians were foiled by the character of the Pakistani soldiers, especially the tradition of "terfiyet" (a sound moral education based on the principles and tenets of Islam) which develops invaluable qualities of heart and head. Terfiyet had not been quashed by the British, thrives in Pakistani homes, schools, religious instruction, and the army.\textsuperscript{117}

and

In the [1965] war, the real motivating force for the superb performance of the [Pakistani] armed forces was their spirit of Jihad. In the final analysis, Islam and the concept of 'Ghazi' or 'Shaheed' provides the motivation, the esprit de corps, the elan and the fighting spirit for the Pakistani soldier. ... The inherent ruggedness of the Pakistani soldier and his immunity to difficulties of adverse climatic and terrain conditions is a priceless gift.\textsuperscript{118}

Perhaps the best statement illustrating the association between Pakistani net assessments of Indian forces and their perception of the inferiority of Indian culture is offered by Lt. Genl. M. Attiquur Rahman who states that

... when we speak of our own wonderful soldiery and equate this to religious emotion, in that one Mussalman can beat ten hindus, we must not forget that we are talking in relative terms. The past showing of the Indian army, perhaps because of emotional makeup, education, and environmental background, was certainly not up to a high standard ...\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{118} Genl. (Retd.) Mohammed Musa, My Version, (Lahore: Wajidalis, 1983), p. 111.

\textsuperscript{119} Lt. Genl. M. Attiquur Rahman, Our Defence Cause, op cit., p. 24, my emphasis.
Quality vs. Quantity

The combination of these negative Indian and positive Pakistani evaluations resulted in the adoption of the age-old cliche of the advantages of 'quality over quantity.' The quantitative superiority of the Indian forces was of little concern to Pakistani leaders given their belief in the qualitative supremacy of their own forces. This sentiment is echoed by the Pakistani Commander-in-Chief during the 1965 war as well as others in high government positions. General (Retd.) Mohammed Musa argues that in the 1965 war, "The great disparity, in men and material, between the opposing forces was made up by our Services with their superior professional skill, better equipment and spirit of defiance. In other words, it was quality versus quantity." Similarly, Brig. (Retd.) A.R. Siddiqi argues that

Psychologically, the '65 war created in Pakistan a sense of achievement and pride which, though not unjustified, was out of proportion to the real achievement. ... Much was made of Pakistan quality neutralizing Indian quantity ... An image or myth of military invincibility was thus born.  

Similarly,

A military stalemate was blown up to the size of a decisive victory in terms of superior morale, motivation, training, and orientation of the Pakistanis ...  

120 Ibid., p. 100.


As the 1965 Commander-in-Chief Mohammed Musa professes, based upon these beliefs, following the 1965 War "the emotional myth that we [Pakistani forces] could defeat ten times as many Indians as ourselves was thus born."  

In sum, Pakistani military leaders commonly believed that the armies of 'Hindu India,' as they were referred to in common parlance, were no match for those of 'Islamic Pakistan.' Pakistan had been created in the face of Hindu opposition; its independence had been successfully defended against Indian 'machinations;' and the larger Indian armies had been unable to defeat the smaller ones of Pakistan in battle.  

Stereotype Research in Pakistan  

As a final bit of evidence to demonstrate Pakistani views of Indian sophistication, some results from stereotype research conducted in Pakistan over the period 1965-71 are presented. While the subject's of this research were university students and members of several professional groups, as opposed to military and political leaders, the correlation between these findings and those presented above are striking, suggesting that the image of a culturally inferior India dominated not only the beliefs of political and military officials, but also prevailed throughout the populace.

\[124\] Richard Sisson and Leo E. Rose, War and Secession, op. cit., p. 5.
In surveys throughout the 1965-71 period subjects were asked to select the five most suitable traits from a list of 68 adjectives characterizing national groups. The traits were arranged in alphabetical order. The results demonstrate a consistency over time, where Pakistani's labelled the Indians as cowards, cruel, inefficient, lazy, and dishonest. Figure 5.5 presents the results of one such research project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits Assigned</th>
<th>October, 1965</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Traits Assigned</th>
<th>October, 1971</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coward</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coward</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crooked</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow-minded</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treacherous</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheat</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liar</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Runaway</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.5: Percentage of Traits Most Frequently Assigned to Indians


126 Abdul Haque and M. Sabir, "Stereotype Persistence during the Two Wars between India and Pakistan," op. cit., p. 32. This was a study of 125 subjects, including university teachers, students, clerks, and other professionals, drawn from Hyderabad city and its suburbs.
It has been proposed that the attribution of "coward" by Pakistanis may be due to Indian military defeats at the hands of Muslims; "runaway" may stem from stories of Indian behavior on the battlefield; "communal" and "narrow-minded" may result from beliefs in a Hindu philosophy of rigid class discrimination; "superstitious" might follow from an understanding that Hindus believe in many gods; and "crooked" likely comes from a belief in the strong impact of Chanakia philosophy (Machiavellianism) on Hindu rulers.\textsuperscript{127}

\textbf{Cultural Discounting}

As in the First Balkan War discussed in the previous chapter, this investigation uncovered qualitative assessments of Indian society, government, and the officers and soldiers comprising the Indian military. These assessments illustrate the contempt and disrespect that Pakistani authorities had for India on all of these levels of analysis. The subjective culture distal antecedents, i.e. economic, educational, and political progressiveness, were prevalent throughout Pakistani assessments. The associated attributes are presented once again in figure 5.6 as a reminder of what was proposed would be present in net assessments by weaker powers perceiving adversaries as capability superior and culturally inferior.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., p. 37.}
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Armed Forces</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Soldiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Poor Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>Poor Organization</td>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td>Poor Military</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clannish</td>
<td>Poor Political</td>
<td>Clannish</td>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Nepotistic</td>
<td>Ruthless</td>
<td>Pushy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Money-hungry</td>
<td>Lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking Initiative</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money-hungry</td>
<td>Nepalitic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.6: Attributes of a Capability Superior, Culturally Inferior Adversary**

For the purpose of comparison, the descriptors found in Pakistani assessments of India are listed in figure 5.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Armed Forces</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Soldiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>Power-hungry</td>
<td>Clannish</td>
<td>Luxury-loving</td>
<td>Cowards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchic</td>
<td>Petty-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debauched</td>
<td>Expected an easy victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste-ridden</td>
<td>Intolerant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Over-confident</td>
<td>Booty-hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavish</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanatic</td>
<td>Narrow-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td></td>
<td>fighting spirit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.7: Pakistani Net Assessments**

The similarities in the contents of both tables is impressive. Where absolute matches are not found synonyms abound. These findings support my hypothesis concerning weaker powers attacking stronger ones. While the objective measures in
figures 5.1-5.4 clearly illustrate the comparative inferiority of Pakistani military might, when coupled with the qualitative assessments of cultural inferiority presented above such 'bean counts' are invariably discounted, thereby encouraging offensive strategies.

Conclusion

By conventional measures of capability, at the outset of the 1971 Indo-Pakistan War Pakistani forces in the West were outnumbered two-to-one by Indian forces. When the prospect of war over East Pakistan arose, leaders in Islamabad were aware of this objective asymmetry. In efforts to complement their strength, Pakistani leaders sought assistance from their strongest regional ally, China. On numerous occasions and at multiple levels of government the Chinese offered only diplomatic support, however. The United States, Pakistan's great power ally, could only do the same given significant policy disagreements between the White House and Congress. Most importantly, both China and Washington on repeated occasions implored President Yahya to not attack from the West in his effort to resolve the East Pakistani situation. Thus, it should have been clear to the political leaders in Islamabad that an offensive from the west would not be supported politically nor militarily by their two strongest allies. The information presented in this chapter clearly demonstrates that this understanding was shared by the military leaders. Furthermore, the fact that Pakistan also intentionally excluded the United Nations from intervening early in the
conflict challenges the Realist proposition that weak powers will balance against stronger adversaries. Excluding the UN excluded the formation of a countervailing coalition.

Realist theory also proposes that when the balancing option is not available, although in this case sympathy in the UN suggests that it was, weak states will initiate a pre-emptive war. The investigation of this proposition was the greatest challenge in researching this case. Three theories regarding Pakistani motives have dominated the literature on this war: threaten war and hope for UN intervention; defend the East by attacking in the West; and abandon the East and compensate for this loss by capturing Kashmir with an offensive in the West. Of these three, only the second could lend some support to the pre-emptive war argument if Islamabad perceived an imminent threat of attack from India in the West pursuant to Indian advances in the East. No evidence was found to support this conditional. The latter theory proposing an aggressive, albeit compensatory motivation garnered the most support.

Early in December Yahya accepted that the East was lost. Why it was lost is the subject of some controversy. Evidence regarding troop allocations suggests that the military perceived the defense of the East as a lost cause even before India moved on November 21. Information concerning the redirection of material from the East to the West just after India's move lends further support to this argument. However, evidence regarding Yahya's perception of India's intentions supports an argument that he expected India to pursue a limited-aims strategy of capturing only a small amount of land for the rebels. Thus, he allowed the conflict to progress, excluding the UN,
thinking it may end quickly. The conflict increased in size and intensity, however, and Yahya soon realized the aims of Indian actions were much grander than he initially believed. While it is interesting to speculate as to the reasons why the East was lost, in the end one's conclusion matters little in relation to the question regarding an aggressive, compensatory strategy. What does matter is that this realization, regardless of its genesis, in conjunction with cries for action from the public may have prompted Yahya's approval of the western offensive in an effort to save political face.

The risk-propensity proposition offered by Bueno De Mesquita also received little support from this investigation. Statements by Pakistani military leaders support the opposite argument that the chances of success were perceived as high. The COGS claimed that "any offensive was bound to succeed ..." and many Pakistani generals along with senior civilian officials believed the army would be able to inflict a severe blow on Indian forces in the West and overrun a large chunk of Indian territory. The regime "professed confidence" that the Pakistani forces would be able to achieve their objectives in an all-out war of limited duration. These statements do not support the argument that Pakistani leaders perceived the attack in the West as risky. Indeed, some explicitly assert that the offensive operation would certainly be a success. As in the First Balkan War, the intriguing question is why did they perceive an advantage when by objective standards they were so obviously outnumbered?

The investigation of Pakistani net assessments may reveal the answer. It may have been through a process of cultural discounting that estimates of the strength of
Indian forces were significantly reduced from that which objective measures suggested. Perceptions of Indian society as anarchic, arrogant, caste-ridden, and slavish; of the Indian government as intolerant, narrow-minded, and immoral; and of the armed forces as clannish where the officers were debauched and incompetent and the soldiers cowardly and "booty-hungry" pervaded Pakistani assessments also reporting the quantitative superiority of the adversary. These qualitative assessments may have interacted with the quantitative analyses in a manner that resulted in the discounting of the quantitative summaries. The result of this discounting process was the perception that Pakistan actually had the advantage in any military confrontation. Pakistan's Muslim heritage and 'martial spirit' gave her an immeasurable advantage over Indian forces, regardless of what quantitative reports claimed. This had been the case historically, they believed, and was still the case now. The result of this perception, of course, was manifest in the offensive launched in the West against an Indian force twice as large.
CHAPTER 6
THE SINO-RUSSIAN EASTERN RAILWAY CRISIS, 1929

This final case differs from the previous two in that it did not result in an offensive war by the objectively weaker power when challenged by the stronger adversary. Rather, when faced with the Soviet challenge China gathered her forces in a defensive formation at the border and rode out repeated Red Army incursions. This case was selected because it offers variation on the dependent variable of my theory, i.e. the strategy adopted by the challenged state. Given the independent fortress strategy adopted by China, a new set of criteria are adopted to test a second hypotheses argued to encourage the adoption of this strategy in asymmetric conflicts. This was presented as Hypothesis 1 in the Chapter 1 as well as Cell 1 in figure 2.3 of Chapter 2, and is offered for review below.

Hypothesis 1: Where an adversary is perceived as possessing superior objective capability and judged to be equal in cultural sophistication, the perceiving power is encouraged to adopt a defensive, independent fortress strategy.

Since this hypothesis differs from that which was tested in the previous two cases, the format of this chapter deviates from the previous two. Specifically, the hypotheses
tested in those chapters, those offered by the Realist and risk propensity schools, are not considered in totality in this chapter. This is because those hypotheses seek to explain offensive wars by weaker powers. Since this case did not escalate to offensive war by the weaker power, these are not relevant and are thus excluded from this investigation.

The two hypotheses tested in this chapter are: 1) the Realist proposition that weak states will join or form coalitions against stronger adversaries; and 2) my own Hypothesis 1 presented above. As a reminder of the attributes most often assigned to groups perceived as capability superior and equally culturally sophisticated, a reproduction of the initial attribute list presented in the Chapter 1 is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Cunning</th>
<th>Clannish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterprising</td>
<td>Cunning</td>
<td>Clannish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Nepotistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthless</td>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Tribalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money-hungry</td>
<td>Resourceful</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrious</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Crafty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewd</td>
<td>Thrifty</td>
<td>Frugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Avaricious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stingy</td>
<td>Coarse</td>
<td>Pushy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogant</td>
<td>Clever</td>
<td>Efficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1: Attributes of a Capability Superior, Culturally Sophisticated Adversary
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Figure 6.2 offers a list of descriptors resulting from a consideration of the way in which the attributes in figure 6.1 may manifest themselves in net assessments of the adversary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Armed Forces</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Soldiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>High Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>High Military</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Political</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Politically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>High Political</td>
<td>Conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monolithic</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selfless</td>
<td>Selfless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In sights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Untrustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intriguing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2: Coding Scheme for an 'Imperialist' Target

With these adjustments in mind, the chapter proceeds as follows. First, the asymmetric nature of this relationship is established through the objective measures of strength used in previous chapters. Second, it is determined whether China was motivated by threat or opportunity in this dispute with Soviet Russia. Third, it is explored whether or not China sought great power assistance in its effort to resolve the crisis. The evidence accrued through these three investigations will speak to the validity of the Realist proposition put forth above. That is, if this is an asymmetric relationship where China was threatened by Russia and sought great power assistance, the
"balancing" hypothesis is supported. Should the findings support this hypothesis, if an analysis of the substance of Chinese net assessments reveals judgments of Soviet cultural sophistication, the validity of my own hypothesis will also be demonstrated.

Background

After the 1911 overthrow of the Manchu dynasty, which Sun Yat-sen - leader of the Nationalist party - argued was at the root of the degeneration of China, Sun sought to modernize and unify China. One important element that was necessary was foreign assistance.¹ Given poor relations with countries in the West,² a number of leaders of the cultural movement in China formerly fascinated with western liberalism began to turn their eyes to the East, in particular toward Russia.³ While the Japanese victory in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 had exerted tremendous influence on Chinese intellectuals, that influence was superseded by the impact of the Soviet success in the Bolshevik revolution and the subsequent friendly attitude of the new government toward China.⁴

---


² It should be recalled that the Boxer Rebellion had recently occurred.


From the Soviet perspective, there was a coincidence of interests. While Sun Yat-sen recognized the need for foreign assistance, Russia's motive for cooperating with China was to get Chinese recognition of certain rights in Mongolia and the Chinese Eastern Railway and also to build up militarily a China strong enough to counter-balance Japan. This cooperative relationship was formally initiated through a statement by the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs M. Chicherin in July of 1918, where it was announced that

We have notified China that we relinquish the conquests of the Tsarist government in Manchuria, and that we recognize Chinese rights in this territory, where the principal trade route runs, namely the Eastern-Siberian Railroad.

In an effort to capitalize on the 1919 May Fourth Movement, which opposed the Versailles Peace Treaty's apparent decision to uphold the Twenty-one Demands Japan had forced on China in 1915, in July of 1919 hundreds of thousands of copies of a manifesto authored by Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs Lev Karakhan were distributed throughout China. The Karakhan Manifesto offered to grant China everything that the Versailles Peace Treaty had appeared to reject, including the abolition of extraterritorial rights, return of territorial concessions, abolition of all unequal treaties,

---


and cancellation of the Boxer indemnity. Karakhan’s most important promise, however, was the return of the Chinese Eastern Railway to China free of charge:

The Soviet government restores to the Chinese people without exacting any kind of compensation, the Chinese Eastern Railway, as well as all concessions of minerals, forests, gold, and others which were seized from them by the government of the Tsars, the government of Kerensky, and the brigands of Horvath, Semenov, Kolchak, the former generals, merchants, and capitalists of Russia.¹

In Chiang Kai-shek’s words Karakhan’s July 25, 1919, manifesto “led the Chinese people to believe that the Russian Revolution had marked the end of an old rapacious imperialist regime characterized by aggression and totalitarianism and the establishment of a new regime of equality and good will.”² Thus began the brief era of Sino-Soviet cooperation in Sun’s efforts to unify China.

The details of many of the initial cooperative arrangements between the two are presented later in this chapter as they speak directly to Chinese net assessments of Soviet strength during the 1929 Eastern Railway crisis. The focus in the remainder of this background section will be on the gradual deterioration of the Sino-Soviet relationship in the 1919-29 period and, more specifically, the continual reemergence of the Chinese Eastern Railway as a central issue of contention leading up to the 1929 crisis.
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In March 1924, a draft for the provisional management of the Chinese Eastern Railway was drawn and signed by Karakhan and C.T. Wang, the representative of the Chinese Government. In May the final draft was approved which provided in part the legal basis for Sino-Soviet joint management of the CER for the next five years.\(^9\) A second agreement, known as the Mukden Agreement, was signed by Karakhan and Chang Tso-lin, Military Governor of Manchuria since 1911. This agreement reiterated the substance of the Peking agreement but added other conditions more favorable to Soviet interests. The Mukden Agreement was subsequently approved by Peking on March 15, 1925.\(^{10}\) In accordance with the contract, Sino-Soviet joint management of the CER was inaugurated on October 3, 1924. It wasn't long after until significant disagreements emerged in the implementation of the settlement.

One of the initial incidents concerned the actions of the Soviet general manager of the Railway, Ivanov, a man described by the Chinese as the "practical dictator of the railway."\(^{11}\) On November 10, 1925, Ivanov issued an order to the effect that commencing on December 1 Chinese troops and railway guards should not be transported by the railway unless an advance payment was made. In response, Chang Tso-lin's agent, Chang Huan-hsiang, arrested Ivanov and three Russian directors and for a short time administered the railway. The Soviets responded on January 22 with a strong


\(^{10}\) Ibid., p. 153. For a review of the articles comprising the agreement, see pp. 156-62.
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protest and an ultimatum to China to release Ivanov and restore order in the CER in three days.\textsuperscript{12} The near-crisis was resolved with the replacement of Ivanov, the restoration of normal rail traffic, and a military transport payment agreement.

A second dispute grew out of the persistent Soviet claim to the right of navigation in the Sungari (a river in north Manchuria), which led to Chang Tso-lin’s seizure of the CER flotilla in August 1926. Chang Tso-lin argued that Soviet actions were in violation of Chinese sovereignty and that no rights of inland water navigation were granted to the Soviets in the Mukden Agreement.\textsuperscript{13} Once again, the Soviets protested the action.\textsuperscript{14}

Sino-Soviet relations were further strained by Chang Tso-lin’s search of the Soviet Embassy in Peking on April 6, 1927, for the purpose of arresting a number of Communist leaders (over 60 in total) in order to "clean the home front."\textsuperscript{15} This was followed up by a second event involving the expulsion of Soviet consular representatives from leading Chinese cities. On December 14, subsequent to the Communist uprising in Canton on December 11, the National Government in Nanking withdrew recognition


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 199.
of Soviet consuls in the territory it controlled. Accordingly, Soviet consular staffs in Canton, Shanghai, Nanking, Chinkiang, and Hankow returned to Moscow.  

A third, and perhaps more direct, precipitant to the 1929 crisis was the search of the Soviet Consulate General in Harbin by Chinese police on May 27, 1929. Having received word that a regional conference of the Communist International would be held in Harbin on that date, Chinese authorities arrested 42 persons, including the Soviet consul general and vice consul at Harbin, the consul general at Mukden, and a number of Chinese Eastern Railway staff at various locations. Furthermore, on July 10 the Chinese authorities, acting on information seized in the Harbin raid, charged various Soviet CER officials with complicity in the spread of propaganda and instigation of the recent rebellion of Feng Yu-hsiang in northwest China. Simultaneously they ordered the closing of four Soviet commercial organs, the dissolution of all Soviet trade unions, and the deportation of 59 communists to the frontier. On the following day, the Chinese director-general of the railway took the fateful action of suspending from office the Soviet general manager and appointing the Chinese assistant manager in his place.

In response, the Soviets issued an ultimatum dated July 13 in which they set forth three demands: 1) the immediate calling of a conference regarding the CER; 2) the

---

16 Ibid.


immediate cancellation of all arbitrary orders regarding the CER; and 3) the immediate release of all arrested Soviet citizens. The Soviets insisted that China respond in three days or the Soviet Government would "resort to other means for the protection of the lawful rights of the USSR."^{20}

The Chinese government wired its reply from Nanking on July 16:

According to repeated reports received by the Chinese Government, the Soviet General Manager and other important Soviet officers of the railway have from the very beginning failed to fulfill the terms of the Sino-Soviet agreement of 1924 concerning the provisional management of the railway. During the last few years Soviet railway officers have so often violated the agreement that it would not be possible to count the number of violations ... For these reasons the authorities of the Northeastern Provinces were obliged to take this necessary action against the Chinese Eastern Railway.^{21}

On July 17, 1929, the Soviet government stated that the Chinese reply was "unsatisfactory in content and hypocritical in tone" and recalled its diplomatic, consular, and commercial representatives as well as persons appointed by the Soviet Government on the CER, from the territory of China and demanded the departure of Chinese representatives and consular officers from the USSR. By this action and the declaration

---

^{20} For the complete text of the ultimatum, see *The Sino-Russian Crisis: The Actual Facts Brought to Light*, (Nanking: The International Relations Committee), pp. 35-39.

^{21} Ibid., pp. 28-9.
that railway communications between the two countries would be blocked, the relations between the two were entirely severed. It was at this time that Russia initiated its undeclared war against Northern China.

The first recorded act of Soviet militancy was on July 20, 1929, where Russian troops crossed into Pogranichnaya. At first the National Government was steadfast in its position as presented by the Minister of Railways:

China's irreducible minimum in her forthcoming negotiations with Russia over the CER was indicated by Mr. San Fo, Minister of Railways ... while complete recovery should be the ultimate goal of the National Government, the greatest possible concession which China would make, if that could not be attained in the near future, would be to admit the joint ownership of the line, but insist on China's sole control and administration.

Russia refused both mediation and direct negotiations unless China first restored the status quo ante. Russia's understanding of the status quo ante was threefold: 1) cancellation of the dismissal of the Soviet general manager and Russian employees; 2) 

---

22 Peter S. Tang, Russian and Soviet Policy in Manchuria and Outer Mongolia, 1911-1931, op. cit., p. 199.


24 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/161:Telegram, The Minister in China (MacMurray) to the Secretary of State, August 1, 1929, p. 263.

25 FRUS, 800.51W89 France/608:Telegram, The Charge in France (Armour) to the Secretary of State, July 24, 1929, p. 239.
release of Russian employees arrested or detained; and 3) restoration of property belonging to the CER arbitrarily taken by the Chinese.26

Soviet military actions escalated significantly in October and November while Chinese forces were ordered to hold defensive positions only. The Nanking Government directed Chang Hseuh-liang27 to go no further than the self defense actually required and assured foreign governments that under no circumstances would they take the offensive.28

The crisis was subsequently resolved with a near complete capitulation by the Chinese government. On December 31 Soviet prisoners were released, including those arrested at the Soviet Consulate General in May and a new Soviet General Manager and Assistant Manager took charge of the administration of the Chinese Eastern Railway.29 Furthermore, in the following week the new Soviet General Manager Rudy reappointed as chiefs of the principal departments of the administration those former Soviet chiefs

26 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/127, Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State (Johnson), July 25, 1929, pp. 240-1.

27 Chang Hseuh-liang was the son of Chang Tso-lin. After Chang Tso-lin's assassination in 1928, Chang Hseuh-liang assumed command as the Military Governor of the Manchuria region.

28 See FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/230, Memorandum by the Secretary of State, August 20, 1929, p. 293 and FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/414, The British Ambassador (Howard) to the Secretary of State, August 30, 1929, p. 308. The Ambassador states that "... His Majesty's Government have received repeated assurances from the Chinese Government that they will in no circumstances take the offensive ..."

29 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/772: Telegram, The Charge in China (Perkins) to the Secretary of State, January 2, 1930, p. 432.
who were discharged by Chinese authorities. The U.S. Charge summarized Chinese actions by claiming that the "latter [Chinese] are very depressed and appear to have yielded and to be yielding to all Soviet demands."

The Chinese Eastern Railway Crisis presents the puzzle of the significant variation between China's initial action, where the goal was to assume control of the Railway, and its subsequent actions, i.e. near total capitulation and abandonment of that goal when faced with stern Russian opposition. This puzzle is addressed in the remainder of this chapter.

**Objective Capability Measures**

Two measures were used to determine the objective balance of strength between the weaker and stronger powers examined in this case. The first was constructed from data available in the Correlates of War data set. These measures are presented in figures 6.3 and 6.4 below.

---


31 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mil.¹</td>
<td>Mil.⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>2044459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>2372196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>2798721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Mil. Per. - number of soldiers in active army (in thousands). Does not include the size of mobilized armies.
² Mil. Exp. - expenditures in thousands of dollars (U.S.).
³ Tot. Cap. - average proportion of military capabilities (personnel and expenditures) expressed as a total percentage of states in the table.

Figure 6.3: Balance of Military Forces in China and Russia, 1927-29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I&amp;S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43230</td>
<td>3592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46812</td>
<td>4253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52080</td>
<td>4878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>d</sup> EC - energy consumption (thousands of coal-foo equivalents).
<sup>e</sup> I&S - iron and steel production (thousands of tons).
<sup>f</sup> UP - urban population (in cities with greater than 100,000; thousands).
<sup>g</sup> TP - total population (thousands).
A '-' indicates missing data.

Figure 6.4: Balance of Military Forces in China and Russia, 1927-29
The relative difference between China and Russia is significant, perhaps even more so since the numbers in these figures are actually quite liberal. This is so because these figures are based upon the assumption of a unified command of the armed forces in China during this period. While the Northern Expedition went a long way toward unifying China politically under the Nationalist banner, this is not the case militarily. Chiang Kai-shek sought to unify the warlord armies subsequent to the completion of the Expedition but found little support amongst the warlords themselves. A report from Ernest B. Price, the American consul at Nanking, indicates this lack of support and offers a more factionalized picture of the Chinese armed forces in 1929. The figures from this report are presented in figure 6.5 below.\(^{32}\)

Considering that this conflict was centered in Manchuria, a region under the control of the warlord Chang Hseuh-liang during this period, it can be argued that China only had at most 120,000 troops available to face the Soviet challenge. In either case, the objective asymmetry is overwhelming in this case, somewhere on the order of 10:1 in Russia’s favor. In the next section China’s motivation behind seizing control of the Railway in the face of this overwhelming asymmetry is investigated.

First Army Group (loyal to Chiang Kai-shek) 240,000
Second Army Group (loyal to Feng Yu-hsiang) 220,000
Third Army Group (loyal to Yen Hsi-shan) 200,000
Fourth Army Group (loyal to Li Tsung-jen, Li Chi-sen, and Pai Ch'ung-hsi) 230,000
Fengtien (loyal to Chang Hseuh-liang) 120,000
Kirin (loyal to Chang Tso-hsiang, but in Fengtien group) 40,000
Yunnan (loyal to Lung Yun) 30,000
Szechwan (control divided among about 7 warlords) 180,000
Kweichow 20,000
Miscellaneous units 340,000

Approximate Total 1,620,000 men

Figure 6.5: Factionalization of China's Armed Forces, 1929

Motivation

The motivation behind Chinese decision making in this case is best considered in two stages. First, the National Government's decision to take control of the Railway, the action which was the immediate catalyst of the crisis, is reviewed. Second, the motivation behind China's behavior once Soviet Russia challenged the seizure of the CER with a significant military response is explored.

Decision to Seize the Railway

One of the goals of Sun Yat-sen's revolution was the abolition of all unequal treaties with foreign powers. The 1924 Chinese Eastern Railway Agreements with Russia were no exception in this regard. These agreements represented another instance
of a foreign power realizing gains at China's expense. Thus, when the opportunity to resolve this injustice presented itself, in this case that opportunity being the success of the Northern Expedition, Chinese decision maker's moved into action.

The Chinese had planned the operations for Harbin in the months prior to July 1929. Most accounts focus on two meetings; the first on June 3 and the second on June 10th. The chairmen of the Three Eastern Provisional Governments, including Chang Hseuh-liang, met in Mukden on June 3rd. This date is significant in that it was the anniversary of the assassination of Chang Hsueh-liang's father, Chang Tso-lin. It was at this meeting that action regarding the railroad was decided upon by these local leaders. Telegrams were subsequently exchanged with the Foreign Office of the National Government at Nanking, whereupon Chang Hseuh-liang was invited to confer with Chiang Kai-shek.

These telegrams encouraged a second meeting which took place on the afternoon of June 10 in Peking between Chiang Kai-shek, Chang Hseuh-liang, and C.T. Wang. At this meeting, it was established that the objective "in ousting the Russian staff ... was ... to obtain possession and control of [the] property and revenues of the Chinese Eastern Railway." It is apparent that two groups with differing perspectives were present at this meeting. While both were in favor of seizing the Railway, they differed in the

---

33 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/285, The Naval Attache in China (Powell) to the Minister in China (MacMurray), July 27, 1929, pp. 252-53.

34 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/31 : Telegram, The Minister in China (MacMurray) to the Secretary of State, July 17, 1929, p. 207.

35 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/113 : Telegram, The Minister in China (MacMurray) to the Secretary of State, July 25, 1929, p. 246.
perceived risks involved. One group argued for the takeover where "their assurance of success and nonresistance by the Soviet [was based] on the acceptance by the Russians of the previous assumptions of control by China of the land development, the telephones, the Navigation service, etc."^36 The second group, however, envisaged the possible failure of efforts to settle the expected resulting controversy by negotiations.^37 This second group may account for the July 8 and 10 dispatch of several divisions of troops under Generals Chang Tso-hsiang and Wan Fu-lin, of Kirin and Heilungkiang, respectively, toward the Russian frontier.^38 While disagreements regarding risks were not resolved, after the meeting telegrams were immediately dispatched to General Chang Ching-hui and Lu Yung-huan ordering the execution of the operations at Harbin.^39

As presented previously, the Soviet reaction to the seizure of the railway was swift and gradually escalated from military threats to military incursions over the July-December period. The next section offers the Chinese reaction to the Soviet response.

^36 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/285, The Naval Attache in China (Powell) to the Minister in China (MacMurray), July 27, 1929, pp. 252-53.

^37 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/53 : Telegram, The Minister in China (MacMurray) to the Secretary of State, July 21, 1929, p. 221.

^38 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/31 : Telegram, The Minister in China (MacMurray) to the Secretary of State, July 17, 1929, p. 207.

^39 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/53 : Telegram, The Minister in China (MacMurray) to the Secretary of State, July 21, 1929, p. 221.
Soviet Russia Challenges the Seizure

As early as two weeks after taking control of the Railway, when faced with a menacing Soviet attitude, the National Government renounced its claims for total control of the Railway and replaced them with demands for strict adherence to the Agreements of 1924. Moreover, official statements from Nanking defended the action taken at Harbin but, "in order to retain a loop-hole, officials personally ... encourag[ed] the dissemination of the idea that the action was hasty, unforeseen and unauthorized."^40 Perhaps in anticipation of a threatening Soviet attitude, in an effort to avert responsibility, Chiang Kai-shek, Chang Hseuh-liang, and C.T. Wang dispersed into the shadows following the fateful July 10 meeting which set the stage for the seizure and action in Harbin the next day. The absence of Chang Hseuh-liang and C.T. Wang from their posts following the ensuing crisis supports this speculation.^41

As the Soviet challenge to the Chinese seizure escalated to include limited military engagements in Chinese territory, rather than force the issue of control of the Railway through military acquisition, Nanking ordered its armed forces to adopt a defensive posture. This is clear in diplomatic communications between the Chinese and other foreign powers as well as between Nanking and Chang Hseuh-liang. For example, as early as July 26, the Chinese claimed that they would not fight Russian forces, and, if

^40 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/325, The Military Attache in China (Magruder) to the Legation in China, July 26, 1929, p. 251.

^41 Ibid.
challenged by Russian advances they would withdraw. Furthermore, on August 2
National Government spokesman Yao Lin spoke to the American Naval Attache of
the well known desire of China for peace and that in the event of trouble her
troops would fall back rather than oppose the invading force; strict orders have
been received from the Government that not a single shot was to be fired.

Reports from the American Minister in China support this statement where
MacMurray informs the Secretary of State that the "Absence of military preparations
with official assertions of determined passive attitude here convince me local government
has no intention of accepting possible Russian challenge." When the National
Government dispatched 60,000 troops to the Eastern Railway in mid-August, Chinese
officials quickly communicated that their purpose was to "police the line" and that "this
did not mean they wanted war." Finally, in late August the U.S. Secretary of State
was informed by Nanking that "Chang Hseuh-liang [was told] to go no further than [the]
self defense actually required" and the British Ambassador reported that "... His

42 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/131 : Telegram, The Minister in China
(MacMurray) to the Secretary of State, July 26, 1929, p. 249.
43 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/330, The Naval Attache in China (Powell) to the
Minister in China (MacMurray), August 2, 1929, p. 268.
44 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/101 : Telegram, The Minister in China
(MacMurray) to the Secretary of State, July 24, 1929, p. 237.
45 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/245, Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of
State (Johnson), August 19, 1929, p. 287.
46 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/230, Memorandum by the Secretary of State,
August 20, 1929, p. 293.
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Majesty’s Government have [sic] received repeated assurances from the Chinese Government that they will in no circumstances take the offensive …

Summary

The preceding evidence indicates that Nanking was first motivated by a perceived opportunity to seize the Railway, perhaps due to increased confidence following the successes of the Northern Expedition or possibly due to certain Chinese decision makers’ perceptions that Soviet Russia would not challenge such a move. Another interpretation, one in which the Chinese seized the railroad out of perceived threat of Soviet expansion via the same, receives less support. One of Sun Yat-sen’s goals was the abolition of all unequal treaties with foreign powers and the CER was no exception. While fear of Soviet propaganda was an argument used by Chinese authorities as a justification for the seizure of the Railroad, it appears that motives such as national prestige and expansion of influence were paramount.

When the Soviets protested the seizure it is clear that China quickly backtracked from her initial demands, adopted a defensive, independent fortress military posture, and ultimately capitulated to Soviet demands for a return to the pre-crisis status quo ante. The adoption of this strategy is that which is to be explained in the remainder of this chapter.

47 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/414, The British Ambassador (Howard) to the Secretary of State, August 30, 1929, p. 308.
Great Power Assistance

China wrested control of the Eastern Railway without great power assistance. As the previous section details, some in Nanking did not expect a Soviet challenge to China's assumption of railway control, therefore, no great power assistance was sought before the action. When faced with the Soviet challenge of that control, however, China did seek out great power intervention in the conflict. The initial strategy was to involve one or more individual powers in an arbitration process. After repeated efforts failed, however, China directed her requests for intervention to the League of Nations.

On or about July 24, 1929, Chinese representatives called on M. Briand, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, and expressed their willingness to arbitrate the disagreement with Russia. Briand conveyed this message to a Russian representative, but Moscow refused to accept arbitration unless the status quo ante was first restored.\(^{48}\) Russia's interpretation of the status quo ante was the following: 1) cancellation of the dismissal of the Soviet general manager and Russian employees; 2) release of the Russian employees arrested or detained; and 3), restoration of property belonging to Chinese Eastern Railway arbitrarily taken by the Chinese.\(^{49}\)

Soviet military action increased in both intensity and frequency as the crisis continued, leading to further efforts by the Chinese to seek great power intervention. On

---

\(^{48}\) **FRUS.** 800.51W89 France/608:Telegram, *The Charge in France (Armour) to the Secretary of State*, July 24, 1929, p. 239.

\(^{49}\) **FRUS.** 861.77 Chinese Eastern/127, *Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State (Johnson)*, July 25, 1929, pp. 240-1.
August 12, a Chinese representative sought assistance from the German Foreign Office.

As reported by the U.S. Ambassador to Germany

Contrary to custom, the Chinese Minister yesterday asked the German Foreign Office official charged with Far Eastern affairs to give him 'advice in finding a face-saving formula' to solve the conflict over the Chinese Eastern Railway, saying he was acting under his government's instructions. In keeping with the Foreign Office conviction that no Western power can usefully intervene, the response will be given the Chinese Minister this afternoon that, inasmuch as Germany represents the interests of each power in the other's territory and therefore desires to be kept informed fully, it is unable to give the advice requested; but the Foreign Office would be ready to acquaint the Soviet Government with the fact that such an inquiry had been made by the Chinese.  

After the failure of repeated efforts to involve individual countries in the resolution of the dispute, Nanking changed her strategy in late November to one which sought to engage the League of Nations. First on November 25, and then again 2 days hence, Chinese representatives approached the Italian government and the Secretary General of the League of Nations, respectively, informing them that China was considering an appeal to the League of Nations and inquiring as to what steps the League could or would take if China were to present a formal request for intervention.

---

50 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/199: Telegram, The Ambassador in Germany (Schurman) to the Secretary of State, August 13, 1929, p. 275.

51 See FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/773, Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State (Johnson), November 25, 1929, p. 348 and FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/482: Telegram, The Charge in Switzerland (Moffat) to the Secretary of State, November 27, 1929, p. 355.
Pursuant to these conversations, the Chinese Minister C.C. Wu communicated to League of Nations members that

... The Chinese government has thus continually and consistently demonstrated its faithful and scrupulous adherence to the Treaty for the Renunciation of War. Nevertheless the Soviet Government seems to persist in its policy of waging undeclared but actual war on China. On November 17 an armed invasion in greater force than hitherto took place resulting in the Soviet occupation of Manchuli and Chalainor.

Under these circumstances, the Chinese Government considers it its duty to communicate with the Governments of the Co-Signatories of the Treaty for the Renunciation of War, for the purposes of drawing their attention to the acts and attitude of the Soviet Government which are contrary to the provisions of the Treaty and requesting that such measures be adopted as may be necessary and appropriate in view of Article II of the Treaty.”

Summary

As this chronological presentation demonstrates, China did not initially seek out foreign assistance in her efforts to resolve the Chinese Eastern Railway crisis. As Soviet coercive diplomacy steadily increased, however, Nanking looked first to individual countries to arbitrate the dispute and then, when faced with repeated failures, sought intervention by the League of Nations. This behavior is in accord with Realist hypotheses proposing that weak states will seek to join or form a countervailing coalition when threatened by a stronger power. In the next section it is determined whether this behavior supports my hypothesis as well.

---

52 FRUS, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/571, The Chinese Minister (C.C. Wu) to the Secretary of State, December 3, 1929, p. 284, my emphasis.
**Net Assessment**

On July 26, shortly after the ultimatum was delivered by the Soviets, Chinese authorities reported that Russian troops numbered 50,000 in Irkutsk and areas east. This was the theatre in which this drama was being played out and, therefore, was the focus of Chinese quantitative assessments. As the crisis progressed, however, quantitative assessments reflected significant increases in Soviet relative troop strength in the area. These numbers are presented in figure 6.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Soviet Troops</th>
<th>Chinese Troops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 26</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.6: Balance of Military Forces in Northeast China, 1929**

The quantitative assessment presented above is complemented by a review of Sun Yat-sen's and Chiang Kai-shek's perceptions of the Soviet party and military organizations. These two agents are the focus because of their important roles in Sino-Soviet relations in the period under investigation. Sun Yat-sen, as presented previously, actively pursued cooperation with the Soviets on the political front as a means of realizing his goal of national unification. His agent, Chiang Kai-shek, was charged with
forging Kuomintang-Russian military cooperation. Furthermore, Chiang replaced Sun at the helm of political affairs upon the former’s death.

After Sun Yat-sen was banished from Canton on June 15, 1922, by the warlord Chen Chiung-ming, he actively solicited Soviet assistance. On August 9 he spoke approvingly of both Russia and Germany to his lieutenants in his new headquarters on the gunboat Yung-feng. He asserted that the Soviet government shared China’s interests and was eager to extend a friendly hand to the Chinese people. In his speech at the inauguration of the Whampoa Military Academy in May, 1924, Sun revealed his admiration for Russia in stating that

Six years ago, Russia began a revolution and simultaneously created a revolutionary army. While gradually developing its army, Russia was able to destroy the powers of reaction, to vanquish external enemies, and to achieve great gains. On opening our school, we are following the example of Soviet Russia.53

Prior to this speech, Sun Yat-sen had briefly discussed with Chiang Kai-shek the possibility of sending him to Moscow.54 He was aware of Chiang’s enthusiastic interest in Russia given a March 5, 1921, letter from Chiang in which he expressed, among other things, his views of the soundness of the Soviet policy of internal unity before external resistance and his admiration for the Russian spirit of self-reliance in international


Thus, shortly after arrangements were made, Chiang was assigned to Moscow to study the art of war as practiced by the Red army.

**Chiang's Visit to Russia**

Sun Yat-sen sent a letter to Lev Karakhan in September 1923 in which he informed the Russian that

General Chiang is to take up with your government and military experts a proposal for military action by my forces in and about the regions lying to the northwest of Peking and beyond.

At Sun's request a Soviet military representative went to Shanghai to initially confer with Chiang Kai-shek. In October 1923 Chiang headed for Moscow. He was received by Trotsky and Stalin and turned over to Sklyansky, then Trotsky's right hand man in the Commissariat. Arrangements were made for assistance to the Kuomintang and material aid was assured by the Kremlin. [The first step was taken with the sending of a small mission of selected military advisers to Canton.] As Chiang states:

---


During the three months in Russia (September-December 1923) we studied its party, the military and political organizations, inspected various installations and listened to briefings by responsible officials. In military affairs we inspected the Red Army, military schools of various services at different levels and army party organizations in Moscow. ... My impression was that the Military Academy and the troops in Moscow were well organized and looked neat and trim.

By many accounts, Chiang reported very favorably on the Russian system. He was most impressed by visits to the Red Army headquarters and military schools in Moscow, where the cadets were so strictly disciplined that they resembled machines. He was also fascinated by the "smooth-running, well-oiled, splendidly manipulated machine of the Soviet empire." When Chiang reported his findings to Dr. Sun Yat-sen in Canton at the end of the year, he described the "monolithic" nature of the Communist Party machinery and suggested that the Kuomintang should be organized on the same principles. All in all, there was no doubt that he was impressed with the efficiency of the Soviet organization.


60 Ibid., p. 20.


63 Ibid., p. 94.

64 Ibid., p. 95.
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On his return journey from Moscow in December 1923, passing through Vladivostok on his way back to China Chiang met the famous Russian commander Vasily L. Bluecher, also known as General Galen. Chiang requested that Moscow assign Bluecher as an advisor to the Kuomintang. For a time, Bluecher was the head of Russia's military and technical advisory effort. Between Chiang and Bluecher there developed mutual respect and a valuable rapport. Chiang held Bluecher in high esteem stating that "In my opinion he was an outstanding Russian general ..." This relationship is particularly important in Chiang's assessment of Soviet strength during the Eastern Railway Crisis since Bluecher was assigned to lead the Special Far Eastern Army in 1928. It was this same army that Soviet Russia employed in its coercive efforts to regain control of the Railway after Nanking seized it in 1929.

When Chiang visited Soviet Russia in 1923, one of the most conspicuous events he recorded in his diary was his meeting with General D.A. Petrovskii, director of military training for the Red Army. With him Chiang discussed the methods of the Soviet system, and upon his return to China he joined the Soviet advisors in Canton in their plea for the immediate adoption of these methods by the Kuomintang.

---


69 *FRUS*, 861.77 Chinese Eastern/573, *Memorandum by the Chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs (Kelley)*, November 26, 1929.

In January 1924 the First National Congress of the Kuomintang accepted Chiang Kai-shek's proposal of reorganizing the army, resolving on immediate reorganization along Russian lines. The Kuomintang also created political and military councils along the lines of the Russian model. But the chief move in the KMT's extensive reorganization program, the chief work of Chiang, and the chief evidence of Soviet influence, was the establishment of the Whampoa Military Academy.\footnote{Ibid., p. 7.}

The Whampoa Military Academy

In 1924 Sun Yat-sen inaugurated the Whampoa Military Academy, whose curriculum aimed at developing an officer corps loyal to Kuomintang principles and whose political commissar system was of Russian origin.\footnote{Edward L. Dreyer, China at War, 1901-1949, (London: Longman, 1995), p. 122.} While China's revolutionary conditions developed in their own distinctive way, the impetus for the organization and programs of the Whampoa Academy evolved from the earlier Russian experience during the civil war of 1918-21.\footnote{Richard B. Landis, "Training and Indoctrination at the Whampoa Academy," pp. 73-93, p. 74, in F. Gilbert Chan and Thomas H. Etzold, eds., China in the 1920s: Nationalism and Revolution, (London: New Viewpoints, 1976).}

The basic policy infusing all of Whampoa's training was, in essence, the application of Leninism to the solution of politico-military problems. The curriculum of the academy was modeled along the lines laid down by Trotsky for Red Army training

\footnote{Ibid., p. 7.}
following the October Revolution. Therefore, Soviet influence played an important part in Whampoa's early life. The academy had been founded essentially to accomplish the same ends as the Soviet's own military schools: to create the military cadre of the revolution. The importance of Whampoa's Soviet advisers became particularly significant after the first Russian shipment of war material to Canton on October 7, 1924. On that date a Soviet vessel slipped into Whampoa to deliver 8,000 rifles with 500 rounds of ammunition for each. Later another 15,000 rifles, machine guns, and pieces of artillery were obtained from the Soviets through cash purchase or other transactions.

Chiang Kai-shek, by now Sun's most trusted military adviser, became Whampoa's first superintendent. Chou En-lai, already a prominent communist, became chief political commissar of Whampoa, and the Russian advisers Michael Borodin and General Bluecher were very visible at Canton. In fact, it was estimated that in 1925 1,000 military and political personnel represented the Soviet in China. In that year a nucleus of 24 key military advisers was stationed in Canton to assist the Kuomintang. In their capacity as advisors and instructors at the Whampoa Academy, Bluecher and these other Russians undoubtably raised the military standards of both the academy and the

---

75 Ibid., pp. 14-5.
77 Ibid., pp. 124-5.
expanding Kuomintang military establishment. Bluecher's methods, in particular, were put into practice at Whampoa by the Soviet adviser he assigned to the academy, Cherapanoff, an experienced soldier and seasoned diplomat.

Bluecher brought two theories to the Whampoa Academy in 1924 and contributed to their application during the Northern Expedition. The 'unified strategy' theory very quickly found adherents in the Chinese high command. The strategy focused on a unified political-military defensive strategy of mass mobilization. Bluecher's 'integral strategy,' where military forces are permitted to organize, train, and perform in a sphere largely separate from the masses, also found adherents.

Both Soviet and Kuomintang advisers rejected warlord practices of organization and recruitment and training of officers and soldiers. The promotion criteria was simple: the 'party soldier' was to be a politically conscious fighter, zealous for reform. According to the Russian experience, it was expected that the leadership would come from the proletariat. Russian advisers took an active part in the dialogue about strategy, especially in the Northern campaign. The notion of 'political warfare' was

---


82 Ibid., p. 17.
introduced, i.e. the use of propaganda campaigns and fifth-column intelligence to mobilize peasants and workers in villages and cities along the route of advance.\(^8^3\)

**Praise for the Soviets**

In his tenure as superintendent of the Whampoa Academy, Chiang Kai-shek praised the Soviets on numerous occasions.\(^8^4\) Chiang cited four sources of inspiration and guidance for the cadets of Whampoa, one of which was the Russian revolution.\(^8^5\) Moreover, the phenomenon of decentralized political and military leadership which characterized early 20th century China threatened to destroy Chiang’s theory of military organization and discipline. For this reason he felt that the Russian success in this area offered a valuable example to the Kuomintang and its Whampoa Academy and he lauded this Soviet quality.\(^8^6\)

---

\(^8^3\) Ibid., p. 18.

\(^8^4\) Apparently, several warlords also held the Soviet armed forces in high esteem. Some warlords, like Chang Tso-lin who, it should be recalled was the military governor of the provinces containing the Chinese Eastern Railway, spent considerable money and time training troops and officers. In such cases, Russian and Japanese advisers indoctrinated cadets at provincial military academies with Western standards of staff planning and operational discipline. See Ibid., p. 13.

\(^8^5\) Richard B. Landis, "Training and Indoctrination at the Whampoa Academy," op. cit., p. 85.

\(^8^6\) Ibid., pp. 87-8.
Chiang claimed that all Red Army officers "supplied fuel to the Russian people, who thus respected and honored the party." 87 In three other speeches he praised the Soviet Communist qualities of "dedication to duty" and "sacrifice of personal desire for the benefit of both the party and the people." 88

In the first of his speeches delivered in the Summer of 1924 to Whampoa cadets, Chiang stated that the Russian Communists planned only for the happiness of the people. They secured the trust of the proletariat and peasantry and fulfilled their duties more completely than other men. The Communist successes often evolved from the cooperation of a few earnest party members who brought a larger group under their influence. As a result, the Red Army often did not have to fight its enemy, who preferred to surrender "in all sincerity." 89 In April 1925, Chiang mentioned "action with dispatch" as another Soviet quality that he considered desirable. 90 In September of that same year he continued to praise Russian organization. 91

In one of Chiang's political-military analyses comparing the success and failure of the revolutions in Russia and China he contended that propaganda alone had not won the revolution and civil war in Russia. He attributed the success of the Soviet


88 Ibid.

89 Ibid., p. 86.

90 Ibid., p. 63.

91 Ibid., p. 88.
Communists to a variety of factors including the strength of their party organization, the willingness of their comrades to assume responsibility, and their ability to implement their revolutionary slogans. Many of these views are present in Chiang’s address to the representatives of the merchants upon being appointed garrison commander of Canton in 1925.

When, in 1923, we were unable to clear up the small rebel army of Chen Chiung-ming so that the people of Canton suffered terribly, I used to suggest to Generalissimo Sun that we reorganize our army completely. We also used to study the reasons why the Soviet army showed such bravery and was willing to sacrifice for the welfare of the people. ... I saw [in Moscow] that the Soviet Army had wonderful discipline. ... The soldiers and the people were on friendly terms with one another. If an army and the people can live so peacefully together and can be so united, that army can know no defeat. That is the reason why, when I returned to China, I resolved that if we want our army now to fight for the freedom and happiness of our people ... we must reorganize our army and adopt the Soviet system.

Soviet Influence on the National Government

Soviet influence was not limited to the Whampoa Academy, it pervaded the structure and institutions of the National Government as well. The National Government was established in 1925 where the entire operation of the system of government until 1927 was based entirely upon the Soviet principle of 'democratic centralism.' The political council made all policy decisions of major military importance as well as all of

---


a purely civil or political nature. The dictates of the political council were put into
operation by a military council, which was modeled after Soviet Russia's Revolutionary
Military Council.\textsuperscript{94}

Through all the levels of administration the Soviet advisors exerted profound
influence. The Kuomintang's very plan in introducing all the changes into its army
system came from the original design of the Bolshevik party. The political commissar,
the party cell system, the political control and indoctrination of the armed forces - all
owed their existence to Russian models.\textsuperscript{95}

\textbf{Criticism of the Soviets}

While the preceding sections illustrate the strong, positive impression that the
Soviet system and its emissaries had on Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek, they fail to
present the total picture. Chiang, in particular, while having significant respect for the
Soviet system, had serious misgivings regarding the leaders of that system. As presented
previously, following his extended visit to Russia in Autumn, 1923, he reported
favorably to Sun on the strong organization and discipline in the Red Army. However,
he also expressed serious concerns about Soviet Russia in that same report as well as in
others that followed.

\textsuperscript{94} F.F. Liu, \textit{A Military History of China, 1924-1949}, op. cit., p. 17.

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., p. 18.
For example, upon his return Chiang reported that

I became more convinced then [sic] ever that Soviet political institutions were instruments of tyranny and terror ... 

and that

... whenever I mentioned the Outer Mongolia problem in my talks with responsible Russian party and political leaders, I discovered that they had not given up their aggressive designs on it. This came not only as a great disappointment to me, but also enabled me to assess the degree of Soviet Russia's sincerity in her effort to assist China to achieve independence and freedom. 

Moreover, Chiang emphasized Russia's vast territorial ambitions.

Out of the impressions received during my visit in Russia, there crept into my mind the notion that once the Russian Communists consolidated their regime, the possibility of the revival of the political ambitions entertained by the Czarist regime certainly could not be ruled out ...

In his report to Sun Yat-sen he also stressed the Soviets' capacity for intrigue, their use of misleading slogans and their absolute ruthlessness.

---


97 Ibid., p. 21.

98 Ibid., p. 23.

From what I have observed the Russian Communist Party has absolutely no sincerity. ... The Russians are clever enough to change slogans for the purpose of bewildering the public. (into believing they are not imperialistic as the Czars were).\textsuperscript{100}

These themes remained constant in future reports from Chiang. For example, in his subsequent March 14, 1924, report to Sun Yat-sen, Chiang stated that

... According to my observation, the Russian Communist Party is not to be trusted. I told you before that only 30 percent of what the Russians say may be believed. ... It is the policy of the Russian Communist Party to turn the lands inhabited by the Manchus, Mongols, Moslems and Tibetans into parts of the Soviet domain; it may harbor sinister designs even on China proper.\textsuperscript{101}

Cultural Confirmation

The preceding sections paint a picture of a Nanking government that was very impressed with both the Soviet military and political system. Favorable impressions abound when looking at judgments addressing the three distal antecedents of subjective cultural assessment: economic, educational, and political progressiveness. So favorable, in fact, that China adopted Russia's military and political systems for application in their own country. The Whampoa Military Academy and the curriculum presented therein was the military manifestation of China's favorable impression of Soviet military organization, training, and doctrine. Furthermore, the structure of the National

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., pp. 97-8.

\textsuperscript{101} Chiang Kai-shek, \textit{Soviet Russia in China}, op. cit., p. 23.
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Government was based upon the Soviet system of government, thus illustrating Nanking's positive evaluation of that system as well. If imitation is the ultimate form of flattery, then China's adoption of Soviet systems in both the political and military spheres are a testament to its respect and admiration for the cultural sophistication of the Soviets.

However, while the data presented in this chapter indicates that Chiang Kai-shek held a respectful picture of the Soviets, it also demonstrates that he believed their government harbored aggressive territorial ambitions in the East and could not be trusted. He perceived the Soviets as untrustworthy, ruthless, and sinister in their motives and designs. The intersection of these sets of beliefs results in a picture of a strong, capable adversary seeking to expand at China's expense. In figures 6.7 and 6.8 below, the qualitative attributes hypothesized to be present in net assessments of adversaries perceived as capability superior and equally culturally sophisticated as well as those found to be present in Sun Yat-sen's and Chiang Kai-shek's assessments of Soviet Russia are displayed.
A comparison of the two figures demonstrates a striking similarity. This thesis proposes that in conditions where an adversary is perceived as objectively superior in quantitative strength, a subjective judgment of equal cultural sophistication leads to a
confirmation of the adversary’s superior military might thereby encouraging an independent fortress strategy. Thus, the initial Chinese move to take control of the Railway was based upon a belief that Russia would not intervene given her generous concessions in other matters, not on a belief that Russia was culturally inferior and, therefore, would not present much of a military challenge. Shortly after Russia demonstrated her displeasure with the Chinese seizure by implementing coercive diplomacy tactics, however, Chinese forces were ordered to adopt a passive defense strategy, i.e. an independent fortress strategy. After continual pressure from the Soviets, China eventually capitulated to all demands and returned the Railway to Russian control.

Conclusion

By conventional measures of capability, the balance of forces throughout this crisis significantly favored Russia. Once Chinese leaders received the Soviet ultimatum regarding the Railway they sought great power support in their effort to resolve the crisis. Chinese authorities called on the French first to express their willingness to arbitrate the disagreement with Russia. Russia refused arbitration at this point following which China sought the assistance of the German Foreign Office in the same regard. After repeated efforts to involve individual countries in the resolution of this crisis all resulted in failure, Chinese representatives changed their strategy in November to one which sought to engage the League of Nations. These behaviors accord with the Realist hypothesis stating that when weaker states are challenged by stronger adversaries they engage in balancing behavior. The more interesting question from the perspective of this
dissertation is why they chose to do so? In the two cases presented previously objective asymmetry did not discourage aggressive behavior on the part of the weaker power. Why did it do so in this case?

The investigation of Chinese net assessments may provide the answer. It may have been through a process of cultural confirmation that estimates of superior Russian military strength were reinforced. Perceptions of Soviet society as progressive and efficient; of the Soviet government as monolithic, highly organized, coercive, untrustworthy, and insincere; and of the armed forces as efficient, organized, and disciplined where both the officers and infantry were highly educated and dedicated to duty pervaded Chinese assessments of the quantitatively superior Russian army. These qualitative assessments may have interacted with the quantitative analyses in a manner that resulted in a confirmation of the quantitative summaries. The result of this confirmation process was the perception that China had placed herself in a very dangerous situation against a vastly superior adversary. The result of this perception was the implementation of an independent fortress strategy and, ultimately, the total capitulation of China to Russian demands.
CONCLUSION

This inquiry was an investigation into the role that cultural judgments may play in an explanation of asymmetric wars. As argued in Chapter 1 the aggressive behavior of the weaker powers in these wars is counter to conventional power-determinist wisdom. Weaker states should not, it is proposed, attack a stronger adversary with a goal of conquest. These states should balance against, bandwagon with, or pre-empt the adversary in an effort to ensure their survival.

Explaining Asymmetric War

In this effort it was proposed that a factor which may encourage this aggressive behavior is the inferior cultural judgment that the leaders of the weaker state make of the stronger adversary. More specifically, it was advanced that a judgment of cultural inferiority would exercise a discounting effect on overall assessments of the adversary's capability and that the mechanism through which this would occur was the net assessment process. This relationship is as stated in Chapter 1 as Proposition 2 and is presented below.
Proposition 2: where a target is perceived as possessing superior, similar or inferior objective capability and judged to be inferior in terms of subjective cultural sophistication, the objective capability judgment is discounted which is represented in a net assessment that paints the target as much weaker than objective capability measures suggest.

This proposition, in conjunction with the assumption that states are power-maximizers, generated three behavioral hypotheses. The third hypothesis directly addressed asymmetric relationships and was the focal point of this research effort. That hypothesis, Hypothesis 3 as presented in Chapter 1, is restated for review below.

Hypothesis 3: where an adversary is perceived as possessing superior or equal objective capability and judged to be inferior in cultural sophistication, the perceiving power is encouraged to adopt an aggressive, imperialist strategy.

The strength of Proposition 2 and Hypothesis 3 in accounting for asymmetric wars will now be considered given the results of both the experiment and case studies presented in this dissertation. That is, did both Bulgaria and Pakistan perceive their adversaries as culturally inferior? And did this perception then, in turn, lead to a discounting of objective measures of asymmetry? Further, did the resulting net assessment, painting the adversary as weaker than other measures might suggest, contribute to the adoption of an aggressive imperialist strategy?
The First Balkan War

The investigation of Bulgarian assessments of Turkish strength revealed a change in estimates over time. In the 1890s the Turkish soldier was perceived to be physically strong, scornful of danger, and respectful of seniors. Moreover, in the same period estimates of Turkey's overwhelming quantitative superiority are clearly documented by the Bulgarian General Staff. Turkish society, on the other hand, was perceived as "rotten to its foundation;" a system of "yesterday's rule" run by "uncultured and unprepared conquerors." As argued in Chapter 1, judgments such as these at the societal level will trickle down into judgments of the government, armed forces in general, and officers and soldiers in particular. In this first period of analysis, these societal judgments had not yet impacted assessments of the Turkish soldier. As the above statement reveals, however, they were already manifesting themselves in evaluations of the Turkish government, armed forces, and officer corps.

The Turkish government was defined as the "world's worst administration" that had to resort to coercion to control the "more highly cultured Christian nations" in the Ottoman Empire. Its armed forces were described as "poorly organized," run by officers who lacked education and training as well as the capacity and willingness to improve.

Cultural Discounting

In Proposition 2 above it is stated that when an adversary is perceived as capability superior, based upon estimates of objective measures, and culturally inferior the objective superiority is discounted thereby painting the target as much weaker than
objective measures suggest. As advanced above, the quantitative superiority of the Turkish forces was understood in this initial assessment. However, this assessment also reveals that judgments of cultural inferiority were present. That the effect of these judgments may have been a pronounced discounting of Turkey's objective superiority is supported by a consideration of a second Bulgarian assessment made before the outbreak of war in 1912.

In the final assessment of Turkish strength before the war the Bulgarian General Staff had both extended the initial estimated Turkish mobilization time by 56% and discounted initial estimates of Turkish strength by approximately 60%. Why did this discounting occur? Was there new intelligence pointing to slower mobilization procedures and fewer available men to fight? The evidence did not suggest this was the case. Following the Young Turk coup of 1908 the Bulgarian General Staff updated their assessments of Turkish mobilization schedules to indicate the Turks had adopted new procedures that decreased their mobilization time. Regarding estimates of the number of men available to fight, this number was significantly discounted but not for the reason of lack of availability, rather for the reason of lack of willingness or capability.

The prevalence of judgments of cultural inferiority in this final assessment suggests that these judgments led to a discounting that affected estimates of both Turkish mobilization time and available troop strength. In this assessment, evaluations of Turkish society as "uncultured" and "undisciplined" had now trickled down through every level of analysis present in the content analysis scheme employed in this research. That is, the Turkish government was described as "lawless" and "nepotistic" and the "poorly
organized" armed forces were populated with "poorly educated" and "apathetic" officers and "insubordinate" and "indifferent" soldiers. These evaluations appear to have significantly discounted initial assessments of Turkish quantitative superiority thus lending support to Proposition 2.

Less direct support for Proposition 2 can be found in Bulgarian estimates of the likely success of an offensive war against Turkey. Sofia believed her troops would win this war against Turkey, in other words, the perceived probability of success was very high. Assuming that Bulgarian leaders were rational decision makers, a simple probabilistic calculation regarding the likelihood of success in this war would be based on a comparison of estimates of Bulgarian and Turkish power. Should the difference between the two estimates be positive in Bulgaria's favor, the probability of success would be high. Alternatively, should there be no difference or one that favors Turkey, the probabilities for success would be 50/50 or low, respectively. The evidence clearly demonstrates that Bulgarian leaders thought the probability of success to be high. Therefore, it is likely they discounted initial estimates of Turkish strength to such a degree that they were less than those of Bulgaria.

In sum, the abundance of judgments of cultural inferiority in Bulgarian assessments, the concomitant discounting of quantitative measures of Turkish strength, and the perceived high likelihood of success in a war with Turkey all lend support to the soundness of Proposition 2.
Preference for an Offensive Strategy

In Hypothesis 3 above it is stated that when a power-maximizing state perceives an adversary as capability superior and culturally inferior an aggressive, offensive strategy will be encouraged. This hypothesis was first tested using the experimental method.

There were two conditions in the experiment where the adversary was described in the intelligence reports as culturally inferior: the Degenerate (capability equal and culturally inferior) and the Barbarian (capability superior and culturally inferior). In the former, subjects revealed an equally strong preference for the aggressive, revisionist strategy as they did for the defensive, containment and independent fortress strategies. In the latter, the revisionist strategy was strongly preferred to all other strategies available.

The latter experimental condition accords with the assessment that the Bulgarians made of the Turks. As argued in the previous section, quantitative assessments of superiority were infused with judgments of cultural inferiority. The preferences revealed in this experimental condition also accord with those of the Bulgarian leadership in September of 1912. As early as the autumn of 1911, diplomats in Sofia were discussing the partition of European Turkey with her Balkan League allies. Internal memoranda also shed light on the opportunity perceived and the desire to adopt an offensive posture toward the Macedonian question. "Both coalition and party circles insist," wrote Prime
Minister Geushoff, "that we do not miss this opportunity." Moreover, the operational plan of the Bulgarian Chief of Staff was clearly designed to destroy the Turkish army and capture, or 'liberate,' Macedonian territory.

This case study findings in conjunction with those of the experiment lend support to Hypothesis 3, that is, when a power-maximizing state perceives an adversary as capability superior and culturally inferior an aggressive, offensive strategy will be encouraged.

The Indo-Pakistan War

The review of Pakistani evaluations of the cultural sophistication of the Indians was presented in a generational format to illustrate that the cultural contempt bred from the experience of partition was magnified in the American-trained second generation of officers and soldiers.

The first generation of Pakistani military leaders believed that the Hindu religion was the strongest corrupting force in India. This belief influenced evaluations of India from the societal to the officer level of content analysis. In their minds Hinduism contaminated all of "Hindu Indian" society which was described as "the most arrogant form of social exclusiveness." The Hindus were perceived as "slavish," "close-fisted," "short-sighted," and "mean and intriguing in the extreme" seeking only to spread their

---

anarchic character across the subcontinent. The government was described as intolerant, aggressive, power-hungry, and petty-minded and the officers were consider luxury-loving and debauched.

The American-educated generation of Pakistani officers and soldiers (1950-65), having had no direct experience with India adopted these views and exaggerated them further. Assessments following the 1965 Indo-Pakistan War reveal extensive cultural contempt crossing all level of analysis under review in the case studies. Thus, this evaluation of cultural inferiority reveals itself more extensively in evaluations of the Indian military than it did in the first generation. For example, Indian officers were described as "luxury loving drinkers, over-confident, and incompetent" and the soldiers they led were said to be "cowards" that were "expecting an easy victory and booty."

Cultural Discounting

Did this judgment of cultural inferiority lead to a discounting of Indian objective strength as proposed in Proposition 2? While the evidence in this case is of a different nature than that presented in the First Balkan War analysis, that is, assessments over time were not available in this case, statements by leading members of the Pakistani army focusing on the relative inferiority of Indian forces suggest that Proposition 2 has some merit. For example, Lt. Genl. M. Attiqur Rahman claimed that "one Mussalman can beat ten hindus" because the "emotional makeup, education, and environmental background [of the Hindu], was certainly not up to a high standard ..."2 This statement

reveals a discounting reasoning based upon the distal antecedents of subjective cultural evaluation discussed in this thesis. Even stronger evidence is found in a statement by the Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistani armed forces both during and after the 1965 war, in which he asserts that following the 1965 war "the emotional myth that we [Pakistani forces] could defeat ten times as many Indians as ourselves was thus born."\textsuperscript{3}

As in the above review of the First Balkan War, less direct evidence for discounting is found in Pakistani estimates of the likelihood of winning a war against India. Pakistani leaders believed that success was a certainty. Following the same logic presented previously, assuming that Pakistani leaders were rational decision makers, a simple probabilistic calculation regarding the likelihood of success in this war would be based on a comparison of estimates of Pakistani and Indian power. Should the difference between the two estimates be positive in Pakistan's favor, the probability of success would be high. Given that Pakistani quantitative assessments of Indian strength demonstrated Indian superiority and Islamabad's beliefs in the high probability of success, it is likely Pakistani leaders discounted these estimates of Indian strength to such a degree that they were less than those of Pakistan.

In sum, the prevalence of judgments of cultural inferiority in Pakistani estimates of Indian strength, the asserted ratios comparing one Pakistani soldier to 10 or more Indian soldiers, and the perceived high likelihood of success in a war with India all lend support to the credibility of Proposition 2.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., pp. 37-8.
Preference for an Offensive Strategy

In *Hypothesis 3* it is stated that when a power-maximizing state perceives an adversary as capability superior and culturally inferior an aggressive, offensive strategy will be encouraged. As presented in the discussion of the First Balkan War, this hypothesis received empirical support in the experiment. This description of an adversary accords with Pakistani assessments of India prior to the outbreak of the 1971 war. A review of the military leadership’s accounts of the initial stages of the war demonstrated their strong preference for an offensive strategy to capture as much politically and strategically important territory from India once India increased pressure on East Pakistan. While the case study demonstrates that this was the military’s preference, it also illustrates the significant divergence between the aims of the military and the political leaders. Thus, while the net assessment of Indian strength painted it as weaker than objective measures suggest and encouraged an offensive strategy, Islamabad’s political aims constrained the full implementation of that strategy.
Performance of the Other Theories

In addition to exploring the cultural discounting proposition and Hypothesis 3 of my theory, hypotheses from the Realist and risk propensity schools were also tested in the case studies. Specifically, the investigation of the cases also focused on answering the following questions:

1. Did the leaders in the weaker state expect military contributions from one or more great powers when they chose to attack the stronger adversary?

2. Did the leaders in the weaker state initiate a pre-emptive war? Stated differently, were their actions motivated by an imminent threat to their survival?

3. Is there evidence that the leaders in the weaker state perceived that launching a war would likely result in defeat?

The first two questions address the asymmetric war hypotheses of the power-determinist school of Realism whereas the third is from the risk propensity approach to explaining war advanced by Bruce Bueno DeMesquita.4

In the investigations of the First Balkan War and the Indo-Pakistan War of 1971, questions 1-3 were explored. Regarding question 1, in both cases the weaker power was well aware that no great power intervention would be forthcoming. Indeed, in the First

4 A fourth question addressing an hypothesis of the neorealist school as represented by Kenneth Waltz is not included in this list. Waltz argues that weaker powers in asymmetric conflicts will bandwagon with the stronger adversary. This hypothesis was not explored because the weaker powers in these wars clearly did not bandwagon with the stronger adversary. Thus, Waltz's hypothesis was challenged by the mere classification of these cases as asymmetric wars prior to any investigation of the specifics of the cases.
Balkan War Bulgaria and her allies were threatened with sanctions by Russia, their great power patron, should they attack Turkey. The European Powers also expressed significant concerns to Sofia regarding Bulgarian aspirations. In the Indo-Pakistan War on numerous occasions and at various levels of government China informed Pakistani leaders that no Chinese military assistance would be forthcoming should she open the Western front with India. This was followed by repeated communications from both the United States and China urging Pakistan to not open the western front. And yet in both cases the weaker power engaged the stronger.

The behavior of Bulgaria and China in these cases is instructive for both the power-determinist school and my approach to understanding these conflicts. As hypothesized by power-determinists, these weaker powers did indeed seek out great power assistance in support of their impending battles. However, in opposition to the same, when denied such assistance the weaker powers were not deterred from launching their attacks. This puzzle, of course, drove the investigations further to a consideration of pre-emptive war motives.

Concerning pre-emptive war, in both cases the data do not support the argument that the weaker powers perceived a threat of imminent attack from the stronger adversary. Bulgaria did perceive a threat, however, that threat was one of losing the window of opportunity for invading Turkey currently presented by the international environment. Diplomatic memoranda also indicated that Bulgaria’s intentions were purely offensive and expansionist in nature and design. The conclusion regarding Pakistan’s motive was not as clear cut but the pre-emptive war proposition received
significantly less empirical support than one contending her offensive in the West was imperialist, albeit compensatory in nature.

These findings spurred even further investigation. After all, given the findings above we have two states, Bulgaria and Pakistan, each at a distinct disadvantage by common measures of capability, and yet each adopting an aggressive, imperialist strategy at a stronger target. Could the explanation for this behavior be found in the risk propensities of the leaders?

Considering this question, did the leaders in these two cases feel the odds were against success but chose to launch a war anyway given the significant potential payoff? Once again, the data do not support this risk-propensity based contention. Before both wars the military leadership in Bulgaria and Pakistan pronounced that the chances of success were "very high" or "certain." These estimates of success do not reveal a high propensity for risk taking.

Note that these descriptive case studies draw opposite conclusions from Bueno DeMesquita regarding the risk propensities of the Bulgarian and Pakistani leaders in these two wars. If we follow Bueno DeMesquita's approach to understanding these wars, we would indeed draw the conclusion that the leaders were risk seeking. Recall that his measure of risk propensity is fundamentally based upon the systemic measure of the alliance portfolio of the attacking state. Bulgaria and Pakistan, by virtue of their lack of great power alliance support, would be exemplars of risk-seeking states in his framework. The more in-depth investigation of these cases offered in this thesis revealed just the opposite, however. This points to the potential inadequacies mentioned in
Chapter 1 regarding the operationalization of an individual-level concept such as risk propensity with systemic indicators.

**Generalizability to a Theory of Asymmetric War**

As stated previously, there have been an equal number of asymmetric wars as great power wars over the past 200 years. Does the support for my theory found in these two case studies encourage a generalization that cultural discounting plays an important role in the other seven cases of asymmetric war not researched?

Preliminary research of two other cases, the Indo-Pakistan War of 1965 and the Russo-Japanese War indicate that cultural judgments played an important role in the discounting of estimates of the adversary. The data offered in the presentation of the 1971 Indo-Pakistan War in this thesis demonstrated that judgments of Indian cultural inferiority were a by-product of partition and were held very strongly by the first generation of Pakistan officers. The Indian humiliation at the hands of the Chinese in 1963 followed by the success of Pakistan's probe into the Rann of Kutch in early 1965 reinforced these perceptions of Indian weakness and encouraged the offensive into Kashmir. Japanese perceptions of Russian cultural inferiority were equally abundant prior to their attack on Port Arthur.

---

5 Personal interview, Lt. Genl. (Retd.) Kamal Matinuddin, Islamabad, Pakistan, November 28-December 1, 1996.

Should a more in-depth investigation of these two cases demonstrate that the cultural discounting hypothesis receives greater empirical support than the Realist and risk propensity hypotheses under review in this thesis, the cultural discounting hypothesis will be more strongly supported than the others in nearly 50% of those wars that have been categorized as asymmetric. This degree of correlation encourages a generalization to the remaining cases of asymmetric war. However, such a claim for generalization should only be made with great caution for one fundamental reason. As reiterated at several points in this dissertation, there are many factors that influence the adoption of a strategy. While I have explored four potential factors in these asymmetric wars - the expectation of great power support, pre-emptive war motives, risk-seeking leaders, and cultural discounting - this does not come close to addressing the total number of possible influences. Therefore, the relationship I have discovered could be spurious.

Generalizability to a Theory of Asymmetric Conflict

A distinction was made in the case selection strategy presented in Chapter 1 between asymmetric war and conflict. The former was distinguished from the latter by the commonly used threshold of 1,000 battle deaths. In the latter cases, the weaker power acquiesced to the demands of the stronger power. These cases constitute the significant majority of cases classified as asymmetric, i.e. 123 of 132 overall. In considering the above discussion of asymmetric war, one is led to query whether an explanation based upon cultural judgments can account for the behavior of the weaker powers in these asymmetric conflicts that did not escalate to war.
The theory offered in this dissertation includes both a proposition and hypothesis that may account for these behaviors. They are listed below as presented in Chapter 1 as Proposition 1 and Hypothesis 1.

**Proposition 1:** where a target is perceived as possessing superior, similar, or inferior objective capability and judged to be equal in terms of subjective cultural sophistication, the objective capability judgment will be confirmed as accurate. This, in turn, will be representative of the overall net assessment of the target.

**Hypothesis 1:** where an adversary is perceived as possessing superior objective capability and judged to be equal in cultural sophistication, the perceiving power is encouraged to adopt a defensive, independent fortress strategy.

The plausibility of this proposition and utility of this hypothesis were explored in two formats in this thesis: an experiment and a case study. The findings are reviewed below in the discussion of the Sino-Russian Eastern Railway Crisis of 1929.

**The Sino-Russian Eastern Railway Crisis**

The purpose of including this crisis was to determine if variation on the dependent variable, war or crisis, was correlated with variation on the independent variable, judgments of inferior or equal cultural sophistication, respectively. Specifically, an investigation of this case permitted a test of Proposition 1 and Hypothesis 1 listed above. The former claims that when an objectively superior adversary is viewed as equally culturally sophisticated, its objective superiority is confirmed as accurate. This, in turn according to Hypothesis 1, encourages a defensive, independent fortress strategy.
The investigation of Sun Yat-sen's and Chiang Kai-shek's evaluations of Soviet Russia’s cultural sophistication revealed overwhelming evidence that demonstrated an eminent respect for Russia’s society, government, armed forces, officers, and soldiers. The Soviet government was considered to be a strong party organization with leaders "willing to assume responsibility." The Red Army was described as "disciplined," populated with officers and soldiers who were "respectful," "honorable," and "dedicated to duty." It was believed that officers and soldiers would not hesitate to "sacrifice personal desire for the benefit of both the party and the people."

Cultural Confirmation

In contrast to assessments preceding the First Balkan and Indo-Pakistan wars, on no occasion was discounting evident in Chinese estimates of Soviet strength as the crisis escalated. Chinese reports that described Russian objective superiority accord well with estimates available from other sources. The evident lack of cultural discounting, or act of cultural confirmation, lends support to Proposition 1. That is, judgments of equal cultural sophistication may have promoted a confirmation of Soviet objective superiority.

Preference for a Defensive Strategy

In Hypothesis 1 it is stated that when a power-maximizing state perceives an adversary as capability superior and equally culturally sophisticated a defensive, independent fortress strategy will be encouraged. This hypothesis was first tested using the experimental method.
There were two conditions in the experiment where the adversary was described in the intelligence reports as equally culturally sophisticated: the *Enemy* (capability equal and equally culturally sophisticated) and the *Imperialist* (capability superior and equally culturally sophisticated). In the former, subjects revealed an overwhelming preference for the defensive, containment strategy. In the latter, the independent fortress strategy was the most strongly preferred.

The latter, or *Imperialist*, experimental condition accords with the assessment that the Chinese made of the Russians after the Eastern Railway crisis erupted in 1929. As argued in the previous section, China's leaders held the Soviet political and military systems in high esteem. They were also well aware of Russia's superior numbers in both hardware and manpower. When the same systems challenged China's seizure of the railway with swift and escalating coercive diplomacy, then, Nanking's orders to the Chairman of the Manchurian Provisional Government were clear: Chinese troops were to "police the line" and "to go no further [than] the self defense actually required." Rather than force the issue of control of the Railway through military acquisition, Nanking ordered its armed forces to adopt a defensive posture.

This case study in conjunction with the results of the experiment lend support to *Hypothesis 1*, that is, when a power-maximizing state perceives an adversary as capability superior and equally culturally sophisticated a defensive, independent fortress strategy will be encouraged.
Other Asymmetric Conflicts

While the results of the experiment and case study are suggestive, the case that was explored is only one of 123 such asymmetric conflicts. The minimal degree of research into these conflicts inspires little confidence in generalizing to the remaining 122 cases, although it does encourage an exploration of those cases. How might one go about this exploration?

Given the large N in this category of phenomena, a statistics-based approach seems the most reasonable. Unfortunately, to date no data set is available that would allow such an approach to studying the relationship between cultural judgments and strategic preference. The Eurobarometer series is the only data set I am aware of that includes questions regarding the perceived cultural sophistication of other groups and/or countries. There are several inherent constraints in the Eurobarometer studies, however, which discourage its use in a study of asymmetric conflicts. First, as the data set name implies these data are for European countries only. This excludes a significant number of the countries involved in the overall category of asymmetric conflicts. Second, these data cover the contemporary period of international relations only, thus excluding any analysis of pre-World War II asymmetric conflicts. Third, and perhaps most important, the respondents to the Eurobarometer surveys are representative samples of each country’s population. That is, the surveys do not measure the perceptions of the military and political elite who are the focus of my research. That is not to say that such perceptions are not shared among the masses and the elite. That is an empirical question for possible future research.
Other data sets such as the World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators also include measures of cultural sophistication, i.e. measures of political, educational, and economic progressiveness. However, these measures do not represent perceptions that the leaders of one state have of another. Rather, they are measures cumulated by analysts. Perception of cultural sophistication is, of course, critical to my approach to explaining these conflicts.

This brief review is not to suggest that a statistical approach to investigating the remaining 122 asymmetric conflicts is not possible, rather, its purpose is to illustrate the challenges faced in finding direct or surrogate measures of perceived cultural sophistication from which to proceed. Without such a study and a consideration of its results, any claims regarding the generalizability of my theory to all asymmetric conflicts are premature.

Generalizability to a Theory of General War and Conflict

After presenting evidence in Chapter 2 that judgments of cultural sophistication pervaded great power net assessments prior to both world wars, the comprehensive theory of cultural judgments and strategic preference was offered. While the case studies focused on the hypotheses addressing the central puzzle of this dissertation, i.e. asymmetric wars, the presence of cultural judgments in great power net assessments stimulated the development of a theory that offered hypotheses for a number of other capability-culture relationships. For purposes of review and discussion, these hypotheses are displayed once again in figure 7.1 below.
The hypotheses tested in the case studies are represented by cells one and four respectively. Can this theory be generalized to account for the state behaviors hypothesized in the remaining cells? That is, do cultural judgments play a role in near-equal power wars and conflicts as well as asymmetric wars and conflicts in which the stronger power was the aggressor?

The great power net assessments and strategic preferences reviewed in Chapter 2 lend some face validity to these other hypotheses as do the experiment results presented in Chapter 3. However, without a systematic study of wars and conflicts that fall into each of these other cells, a study based upon my own case study design, any conclusions regarding the applicability of my theory to explaining war and conflict in general are exceedingly premature.

Implications for IR Theory

The previous paragraph illustrates the first of a few things I believe this approach offers to the study and understanding of international relations. Since my theory offers
a possible explanation of, or contributing factor to, the behavior of weaker powers in both these asymmetric wars and crisis, and the power-determinist Realist school is only supported in the latter, I can claim that my theory is progressive in nature. That is, not only does it account for the case that power-determinist theory does, it also accounts for those that it does not. Furthermore, this benefit was accrued with little additional cost, that being the consideration of a second variable in state calculations. Thus, parsimony was maintained while greater explanatory power was achieved.

Net Assessment

As presented in Chapter 2, the net assessment literature has, in theory, considered the importance of such qualitative factors as national character, quality of troops and the like. In application, however, debates have tended to center around quantitative factors, the 3:1 rule being an exemplar of such discussions. The case studies and historical review in Chapter 2 demonstrate that qualitative judgments play an equally important confirming or discounting role in the assessment process. It may be that these factors are often excluded from debates due to their intangible, non-quantifiable nature. If this is indeed the reason, this dissertation contributes to net assessment scholarship by detailing an operational scheme for both measuring these factors in others’ assessments and discovering them in one’s own.

There is agreement across disciplines that subjective cultural judgments have three primary distal antecedents; economic, educational, and political progressiveness; and that judgments of inferiority or progressiveness on these dimensions exert considerable
influence on the broad classification of another group as 'backward' or 'advanced,' respectively. Moreover, there is substantial scholarship focusing on the attributions that follow from these antecedents, attributions that populate the stereotypes that groups, nations, or states hold of one another. In Chapter 1 I discussed the division of these attributes into categories that describe 'sophisticated' and 'inferior' groups. Furthermore, it was considered how these attributes might be applied to adversaries possessing quantifiable military assets in varying relative power relationships. For example, it was proposed that a group perceived as capability superior and equally culturally sophisticated would be described in a different manner than one perceived as capability superior and culturally inferior. The former would likely be described using attributes from the 'advanced' list whereas the latter would be described using a combination of attributes from both the 'advanced' and 'backward' lists.

A review of the case studies as well as the great power net assessments before the two world wars illustrated that subjective cultural judgments of a nation or state in general, trickle down into judgments of more particular aspects of that nation or state, the military establishment being the most important for this research. For example, a

judgment that a nation was "hard working" and "efficient" was found to be associated with judgments that the armed forces were "highly organized" with officers and soldiers "dedicated to duty." Alternatively, where a nation was perceived as "anarchic" and "immoral" its military establishment was described as "disorganized" with "debauched" officers and "lazy" soldiers. When considered in interaction with objective capability measures, these attributes systematically either confirmed the 'sophisticated' adversary's objective superiority or discounted the strength of the culturally 'inferior' antagonist. In the former, states adopted defensive, status quo strategies toward the target whereas in the latter they adopted aggressive, imperialist strategies.

The case studies also prompted a number of questions that should be considered in future research on net assessment. The first, and most important, focuses on the nature of the net assessment process within states. What is the process within one state and can you generalize to others? It is reasonable to assume that there are numerous levels of analyses that occur. For example, a state's military likely has its own assessment organ. This can be complemented or supplemented by analyses in political institutions, however. Understanding the process is important because it allows an investigation of at what level cultural judgments might invade the assessment process. For example, are such judgments more likely to come from military or political personnel?

Based upon the three cases reviewed in this thesis no definitive answer to this question can be offered. This is primarily due to the nature of two of the three governments investigated. In both the Indo-Pakistan and Sino-Russian cases the political
leaders were military personnel. This confounding of military personnel and political leadership did not allow a consideration of the strength of the possible cultural biases emanating from one or the other. In the First Balkan War, however, there was a separation of military and political leadership and a significant majority of the cultural bias uncovered in that case originated in military assessments. Given these findings, it is clear that more case studies are required before any relationship, or lack thereof, between the type of analyst (military or political) and the propensity toward cultural bias can be stated with confidence.

Culture in International Relations

In Chapter 2 the recent scholarship regarding culture in international relations was reviewed prompting a discussion of the theoretician's task of considering more completely how and through what means culture impacts policy. Toward this end, I put forth a number of questions to consider. Based upon what has been discovered in this research, four of those questions can be addressed. It is important to note, however, that the following claims are based upon few case studies and results from an experiment which controlled for other potential factors that may influence strategic preferences.

(1) Are strategies toward a culturally dissimilar target merely a function of the dissimilarity, or is the affective evaluation of the cultural divergence important? Historical records of US assessments of the Japanese and German forces suggest that cultural dissimilarity does not necessarily directly affect strategic preference toward an
adversary. German and Japanese cultures are both dissimilar from American culture, yet initial American strategies toward these two adversaries differed appreciably. While both cultures were different from American culture, German culture was viewed as sophisticated whereas Japanese culture was considered inferior. Dissimilarity, then, seemed less important in encouraging strategic preferences than did the affective evaluation of that dissimilarity, i.e. sophisticated versus inferior.

(2) Are states judged to be equally culturally sophisticated the targets of the same strategies as states judged to be culturally inferior? The results of the experiment suggest that the answer to this question is 'No.' When holding capability constant and controlling for other potential factors that may influence strategic preferences, states perceived to be culturally inferior were more likely to be at the receiving end of aggressive as opposed to defensive behavior. A comparison of the strategic preferences across the Enemy-Degenerate and Imperialist-Barbarian condition pairs in the experiment supports this contention. Subjects faced with an equally culturally sophisticated adversary (the Enemy and Imperialist conditions) evidenced a preference for defensive strategies whereas subjects faced with a culturally inferior adversary (the Degenerate and Barbarian conditions) revealed a decrease in concern for defensive strategies and an increase in preference for offensive strategies.

---

8 This is not to say that cultural similarity does not affect strategic preference as some democratic peace theorists argue. See, for example, Bruce Russett, Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World, (Princeton: Princeton University, 1993).
(3) Do states perceive threats from stronger targets perceived as culturally inferior? And would they implement the same strategy toward one perceived as stronger but equally culturally sophisticated? As mentioned above, in the experiment preferences for defensive strategies decreased and those for offense increased in all conditions where the adversary was described as culturally inferior. This suggests two possibilities: 1) that subject’s perceived an intense threat to their survival and preferred offensive strategies as a desperate means to ensure survival, or 2), that subjects perceived an opportunity to expand by attacking the culturally inferior adversary. When the experiment results are considered in conjunction with the two case studies of asymmetric war, the latter possibility receives greater support. That is, in neither case of asymmetric war did the weaker power reveal a perceived threat from the adversary. Considering these findings in conjunction, then, supports the contention that states are not likely to perceive threats from adversaries judged to be both objectively superior and culturally inferior. The experiment results in combination with the Sino-Russian Railway Crisis also help in answering the second question. Should a stronger adversary be judged as equally culturally sophisticated, a threat to the maintenance of one’s power is likely to be perceived and a defensive strategy encouraged.

(4) Finally, what is the mechanism through which cultural judgments exert their influence on strategic preference? As discussed in Chapter 2, some have argued that culture has an affect on perceived international norms and, when these norms are not reciprocated by others, the cultural differences behind them can be considered a source of conflict. This macro approach to understanding the relationship between culture and
conflict differs from the micro approach presented in this thesis. This research has a much more narrow focus in arguing that the net assessment process of states is one mechanism through which cultural judgments exert an influence on strategic preference. However, it should be noted that it is through this process that states estimate the strength of their adversaries and that these estimates of strength, or power, are a central component of most theories of international relations. Therefore, it is essential that we focus on the outcomes of the net assessment process in any effort to judge the utility of these power-based theories. Further, in testing these theories we should be careful to not reify the concept of 'the state.' While 'states' engage in the net assessment process, in the end it is the analysts who review information and, as William Fuller states:

> Information by itself is useless; it acquires value only through arrangement and interpretation. And interpretation is conditioned in many instances by the prejudices and attitudes of the analyst.⁹

For this very reason, I have argued that one should not, in a consideration of the relationship between statesmen's power calculations and strategic preference in international relations, separate the study of capability judgments from cultural evaluations when estimating those calculations.

---

Implications for the 'Real World'

The overall and dynamic frequency of asymmetric wars along with great power involvement should have placed these phenomena on the center stage of international politics research long ago. In many cases the outcomes have altered great power relations significantly. For example, great power reactions to the outcome of the First Balkan war served to substantially increase tensions in Europe. Luigi Albertini argues that it is not possible to understand the behavior of Austria-Hungary regarding the crime committed by the Kingdom of Serbia in 1914 without a proper consideration of the reactions produced by the vicissitudes of the Balkan Wars and the repercussions on the Monarchy’s internal life, international position, and future prospects.10

It is not unreasonable, then, to argue that the First Balkan War went a long way in setting the stage for the First World War. The Indo-Pakistan War serves as another example of an asymmetric war engaging the interests of the great powers. In this case, of course, US-Soviet tensions rose appreciably with the sending of the Seventh Fleet into the Bay of Bengal. While the import of these asymmetric wars on great power relations is clear, wars such as these have, nonetheless, received scant scholarly attention.

This research has demonstrated that a focus on cultural judgments in the net assessment process of states offers advantages over traditional quantitative approaches in efforts to understand these asymmetric wars. It has been established that judgments of

cultural inferiority lead to a discounting of quantitative measures. Two suggestions for policy makers follow from this insight.

First, the historical record confirms that this discounting can have disastrous effects for the perceiving powers. For example, it is clear that the cultural discounting evident in American assessments, where the Japanese were described as 'imitative' and 'unimaginative,' led to a depreciation of Japanese air prowess and consequently a belittling of a Pearl Harbor scenario. Similar judgments by the Italians of the Greeks resulted in an unexpected setback which ultimately altered the Italian war plan. Likewise, the British discounting of Japanese naval power led to unexpected defeats resulting from inadequate preparations which were, in turn, based upon culturally-biased assessments. These cases strongly suggest that the intelligence community adopt a procedure calling for the review of their own net assessments with the specific purpose of seeking out cultural prejudices and their potential influence on net assessments.

Second, the asymmetric wars explored in this thesis should also encourage the intelligence community to look for judgments of cultural inferiority in an adversary's assessments. The presence of such judgments may indicate that a state perceives more options for expansion than an analysis based on quantitative measures might suggest.
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