The Restructuring of Civil - Military Relations in Poland, Ukraine and Russia - a Comparative Study.

Agnieszka GOGOLEWSK

WARSAW, 20 JUNE 1998.

With the collapse of totalitarian regimes in the Central Eastern Europe and the demise of Soviet Union post - communist countries in the region almost simultaneously embarked on the path to democracy. Numerous reforms were initiated in almost all fields of state systems and it was popularly expected that after a certain period of hardships and sacrifices the reforms will bear fruits of democracy and prosperity.

Nearly a decade later it became plain to see that some of the reforms were not such a success, to put it mildly, as they were expected to be, and that the communist residue is not be easy to erase, as it had been hoped for. The transitions to democracy and free market economy are under way everywhere in the post communist world, but their pace and particular priorities differ considerably from one country to another. It is a challenging and tempting task to a political scientist to observe the twists and turns of the post-communist transitions, to analyse their outcomes and to attempt making forecasts for the future.

Management of civil - military relations represented a serious challenge to the new and fragile democracies. Neither new nor old political elite were prepared to cope with these delicate matters, their knowledge on the subject was very limited and therefore civil - military relations soon grew to a real problem. They also appeared to be among the most troublesome and poorly managed reforms carried out in many of those countries. Yet, in order to understand the reasons for such developments the author believes it necessary to put those transitions into perspective and to analyse starting points of reforms

as well as and the nature of previous regime. The brief analysis of the civil - military relations under communism will shed the light on current problems and maybe help to foresee the future trends in the countries under transition.

CASE STUDIES.

The three countries selected for the case studies in this project have very little in common in terms of military traditions, recent history or political culture. Russia was a dominant part of the Soviet empire and sees itself as a heir of the mighty traditions. Ukraine represented a conquered and enslaved part of Soviet Union, but following the ruthless Stalinist repression in 1920s it became assimilated to a great degree in the USSR and had a fair share of power in the Soviet system, particularly in the military officer corps.[1] The loyalist traditions of Ukrainian service in the Russian bureaucracy and military go back to 18th and 19th centuries and are mixed with historical records of heroic fights for independence, so Ukrainian national identity is still in the process of forming.

Poland represents yet another case in the history of Soviet empire. As a Central European satellite country it belonged to the 'outer' circle of the Soviet empire[2]. Here national identity is well formed and military traditions strong. The Soviet system, doubtlessly superimposed from above, was contradicting the most cherished national traditions. Moreover, Poland and Russia had long record of wars and persecution and if anything, the communist period only deepened Polish distrust and hatred of Russia.

---

[1] Teresa Rakowska - Harmstone lists Western estimates of the 1970s that approximately 90% of senior officers were of Slavic origin and that some 26.3% of the senior commanders were of Ukrainian origin. See Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone Christopher D.Jones, Ivan Sylvain, *Warsaw Pact: The Question of Cohesion*, (ORA Extra-Mural Paper No 33,Ottawa: Department of National Defence, vol. I and II, 1981, 1984, p. 54.

[2] See Mette Skak, *Post-Communist Foreign Policy and International Relations*, (London: Hurst&Company, 1996), pp.1 - 77. Skak in her book analysed the post communist transitions as a post-colonial processes and divided the Soviet empir

Finally, political culture in the selected countries were at variance as well. A detailed analysis is a subject for a separate study, however it seems necessary to stress a tremendous gap between authoritarian, autocratic and highly centralised traditional nature of power in Russia, only enforced by communist rule and individualistic, anti-authoritarian and often close to anarchic traditions of Polish political culture, with intervals of strong authority.[3] As for Ukraine, its traditions are mixed again - the Cossacks culture valued freedom and individuality and has recently been hailed as 'truly Ukrainian', yet the culture of the society at large seems closer to Soviet type than to any other.

What is interesting feature of the reforms in those three selected countries is the fact that although they had so little in common in terms of size, population, tradition, history and geopolitics, nevertheless many problems emerging in the course of transitions are strikingly similar.

The answer to this, in the author's opinion, lies in the nature of power system and civil - military relations under previous, totalitarian regime. Communism was the only experience which the three countries shared. Now they also share the experience of the transitions from communist regime to representative democracy and free market economy, which never occurred anywhere in the world before.[4]

---

into internal, i.e. the USSR and external, that is satellite countries. Although th author of this project disagrees with this concept, she finds this distinction useful.

[3] For an excellent analysis of traditional political culture in Poland see Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone, Christopher D.Jones, Ivan Sylvain, *Warsaw Pact: The Question of Cohesion*, pp. 175 - 207.

[4] Among those who appreciated the uniqueness of the post communist transitions are: Karen Dawisha, Bruce Parrot, *The Consolidation of Democracy in East Central Europe*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Sarah Terry, 'Thinking About Post-Communist Transitions: How Different Are They 1995?' *Slavic Revie* 52, No 2 (Summer 1993); Juan J.Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problem of Democratic Transitions and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America and Post - Communis Europe* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996).

INTRODUCTION TO POST-COMMUNIST TRANSITIONS

Leslie Holmes, having performed a thorough comparative examinations of post communist reforms, discerned three major factors which are common to the countries in question. Each of those factors can be found separately elsewhere, but taken together they well illustrate the uniqueness of the reforms undertaken by post - communist states. They also account for the similarities of the transitional processes in the countries of very distinct traditions and character. These are: 'a similar starting point and legacy; the comprehensiveness of (..) attempts at transition, and the global context in which the attempts have been made'.[5]

By the 'global context' she meant the fact that all the transitions began in a rather unfavourable period for the world economy when Western states experienced deep recession and were unable to quickly grant a considerable financial help to the post - communist world. But the world economy was not a driving force behind the liberating movements in the communist world. From the author's point of view much more interesting is the point on the comprehensiveness of the reforms. Some western scholars observed and appreciated the fact that, unlike Spain or Greece for example, countries of Central and Eastern Europe took to and at least partially succeeded in implementing legal, political, administrative, military and economic reforms simultaneously, without waiting for the economic conditions to improve. This sweeping, catch-all program of the reforms was not so much a matter of conscious choice made by the reformers but was rather dictated by the circumstances, nevertheless post -communist countries merit the credit for the attempt to carry out all major reforms at the same time.[6]

---

[5] Leslie Holmes, *Post Communism - An Introduction*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997), p.15.

[6] Marina Caparini, *Conceptual and Practical Approaches to the Role of Expertise in Civil Control*, in: *Conference in Civil - Military Relations in the Context of an evolving NATO*, (Budapest, MOD/MOFA, Hungary, 15 - 17 September 1997), p.183 - 184; James Gow, Carole Birch, *Security and Democracy: Civil Military Relations in Central*

Many scholars studying transitional processes appreciated the importance of the starting point for reforms, or 'the context for transitional openings'.[7] But rarely in the world history the transitions encompassed such a great number of countries with so similar a political order.[8] The totalising character of the system was reflected in the general rule that every single issue, no matter how insignificant, private or distinct from politics it might have seemed, could become political and subject to ideological purview. No sphere of public life could be self-governable and preserve or establish its own, autonomous criteria. Every single type of social activity, each public organisation, every walk of life had a potential political dimension.

MILITARY UNDER COMMUNIST RULE

The institution in communist countries were modelled in such ideological premises. The main aspects of this design were identical. Perhaps the most striking feature was a so called 'dual hierarchy' in the party states - that is, that everything had a double subordination, one to the state institutions and other. more important, to the Party. Needless to say, the separation between state and Party was only a fiction.

Such an institutional design had a strong impact on the communist armed forces. Their traditional national function was suppressed and superseded by the Soviet sponsored internationalism, duty of loyalty to the political regime and defence of communist system. The system of political indoctrination of the military, invigilation of the service personnel by the political officers, the near obligatory party membership for the high ranking officers were all set

---

and Eastern Europe. (London Center for Defence Studies: Brasseys, Septembe 1997), pp. 7 - 8.

[7] Guillermo O'Donell, Philippe C.Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions About Uncertain Democracies*, (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1993), 4th edition.

to ensure the performance of the internationalist function of the armies. What was characteristic to the armed forces in the countries of Eastern Europe was their double subordination as an army, first to their own national commanders, secondly to the Soviet Union. And the function of the defenders of the political system resulted in yet another distortion of the traditional role of the armed forces. The national armies became an ultimate guarantor of the power for the ruling caste and guarantors of the existing order.

The earlier Western analyses of the organisation and the socialisation system in the communist armed forces largely overappreciated the success of the communist methods.[9] Recently, however, this view was revisited. There is still much disagreement regarding the role of the political officers in the communist armies and the Main Political Administrations. The models range from presenting a conflictual relationship through institutional congruence to participatory[10], but the problem with all of them is that they were modelled on Soviet army and are not readily applicable to the Eastern European cases. What was more important (and more neglected) however is the nationalist factor. Most authors agree now that the system of socialisation to the ideologically determined goals by and large failed and that the communist authorities did not manage to

---

[8] An excellent characteristic of the communist regimes in Central Eastern Europe is in the book of George Schöpflin, *Politics in Eastern Europe 1945 - 1992*, (Oxford UK&Cambridge USA: Blackwell, 1993).

[9] See for example Amos Perlmutter, 'Civil - Military Relations in Socialist, Authoritarian and Praetorian States: Prospects and Retrospects', in Roman Kolkowicz, Andrzej Korbonski (eds.) *Soldiers, Peasants and Bureaucrats. Civil Military Relations in Communist and Modernising Societies*. (London: George Allen&Unwin, 1982); Jacques van Doorn, 'The Military and the Crisis of Legitimacy', in Gwyn Herries - Jenkins, Jacques van Doorn (eds.) *The Military and the Problem of Legitimacy* (London: SAGE, 1976), p.26.

[10] See Roman Kolkowicz, 'Interest Groups in Soviet Politics: The Case of the Military'; William E.Odom, 'The Party - Military Connection: A Critique'; Timothy J.Colton, 'The Party Military Connection; A Participatory Model', all in Dal R.Herspring, Ivan Volgyes (eds.), *Civil - Military Relations in Communist Systems* (Boulder CO: Westview Press, 1978). Also in Timothy J.Colton, *Commissars, Commanders and Civilian Authority: The Structure of Soviet Military Politics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979).

suppress national consciousness even in the ranks of the Soviet Army, not to mention its Eastern European allies.

Teresa Rakowska-Harmstone at the beginning of 1980s argued convincingly that the neglect of the national factor led in fact to the weakening of the Warsaw Pact cohesion and impinged on its military capabilities. She noted the revival of Russian nationalism in 1980s in the ranks of officer corps in the Soviet Armed Forces and the near complete lack of integration of other nationalities, save Slavs, in the Soviet Army.[11] Similar, but stronger nationalist currents were observed in many Eastern European armies.[12] Alex Alexiev made a point, observing that: 'It is quite significant (...) that the Soviet Union has never been able to use the East European military establishments to resolve conflicts, crises, or anti-Soviet upheavals in their respective countries'.[13] Moreover, the passive stance of the majority of the armies witnessing the collapse of the communism systems as well as the speed with which the Eastern European armies adopted their national character and the role of the defenders of the national sovereignty and integrity confirm the failure of communist efforts to create the loyalty to the political system rather than nation.

One principle however which seemed to hold firmly throughout the communist world was the party supremacy and control over the armed forces. The majority of academics believed that in spite of all the problems communist parties performed an *effective* control over the military. Yet, this turned out to be illusory as well. In practice in many party states the military enjoyed higher-than-prescribed degree of influence on the current politics. Contrary to conventional wisdom, the armed forces were by-and large ideologically apathetic, but not at

---

[11] Teresa Rakowska - Harmstone, *Warsaw Pact..*, pp. 24 - 27; 53 - 54.
[12] See discussion during the workshop on *Civil - Military Relations in Central and Eastern Europe, Transcript of Proceedings,* (Luxemburg: Luxemburg Institute for Europe and International Studies, 21 - 22 April) , pp.8 - 25.
[13] Alex Alexiev, 'Party - Military Relations in Eastern Europe: the Case of Romania', in Roman Kolkowicz, Andrzej Korbonski (eds.), *Soldiers, Peasants and Bureaucrats. Civil - Military Relations in Communist and Modernizing Societies.*(London: George Allen&Unwin, 1982), p.201.

all reluctant to actively participate in political decisions. There were instances when the military even went so far as to attempt a coup (Bulgaria 1965, Czechoslovakia 1969, Romania 1987). Under communist realities sometimes those attempts took grotesque turn as for example a 1984 plan of putsch in Romania which misfired when the troops involved in the plot were sent off to harvest works.[14] But if one believes an anonymous interview given to Andrzej Korbonski in June 1976, Polish military, when faced with the crisis situation during strikes in Radom did not hesitate to openly blackmail the party authorities and thus tip the balance towards outcome favoured by the army, that is non - intervention.[15] So from among the available levels of political intervention identified by Finer[16] communist military in Eastern Europe reached for formal and informal influence, blackmail, and only stopped short of displacement of civilian government.[17] As Zoltan Barany succinctly out it:

> In spite of the political doctrination, socialisation, and generally better-than-average living standards, the majority of armed forces personnel did not feel sufficiently allied with the regime to fight for it. Perhaps the most important reason for this notion was that the army was ultimately controlled by supranational military and ideological interests. Still, in crisis situations the military seemed reluctant to carry out its obligations and

---

[14] Zoltan D.Barany, *Soldiers and Politics in Eastern Europe, 1945 - 90. The Case of Hungar* , (New York: St.Martin Press, 1993), p.152.

[15] Andrzej Korbonski, Sarah Terry, 'The Military as a Political Actor', in Kolkowicz, Korbonski (eds.), *Soldiers, Peasants and Bureaucrats,* p. 172 and footnote 41. According to an anonymous intervee, the Minister of Defence declared in the face of Central Committee official that 'the soldiers would not shoot at the workers' and thus forces the government to call off the rise of prices which had caused strikes.

[16] Samuel E.Finer, *The Man On Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics*, (London: Pall Mall Press, 1967).

[17] Although some scholars expressed opinions that Polish introduction of martial law in fact represented a case of coup d'etat. See for example Remington's introduction to Jerzy J.Wiatr, *The Soldier and the Nation: the Role of the Military in Polish Politics, 1918 - 1985* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988). Also Michta was of opinion that Polish martial law was in fact the first defection of the principle of party supremacy in the communist camp. See Andrew Michta, *Red Eagle - The Army in Polish Politics 1944 - 1988*, (Hoover Institution Press 1990), p.12.

nationalist values turned out to be stronger than internationalist ones. [18]

The military *desinteresment* in the maintenance of communist regimes, demonstrated in the days of the 'Autumn of the People', was a final confirmation that the system devised by Soviet communist party and imposed on satellite countries after the Second World War did not work properly. Only in two countries did the General Staff consider the intervention (Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany), in the remaining states the military were either passive or went so far as to actively help to overthrow the regime, as was the case in Romania. The communist system of control over the military, no matter how ineffective it was, did, however, leave a negative legacy of distrust of the military towards civilians. 'The resentment of the political penetration of the forces under the system of Military Political Administration (MPA) - now phased out - remains however in the legacy of the reluctance within the military establishments to submit to civilian control, and "to be used" by the politicians'.[19] In the long run this particular legacy may prove to be tone of he most serious and harmful factors hampering the building of democratic model of civil - military relations.

IN SEARCH OF DEFINITION OF DEMOCRATIC CIVIL - MILITARY RELATIONS

Here, however, the question arises what exactly a 'democratic model of civil - military relations' means. The new political elite of post communist countries found themselves unprepared to answer it. They lacked an understanding of the nature of civilian supremacy over the military in mature democracies, partly because civil military relations did not exist in such a shape under communist regimes, partly because it is difficult to give a precise definition at all.

---

[18] Barany, *Soldiers and Politics* , p.165.

It seems impossible to define one proper model of democratic civil - military relations. In each of the today's mature democracies civil - military relations had evolved with the state and their final shape was conditioned by the state's particular history and tradition. A serious academic discussion on theoretical model of such relations did not start until after the Second World War. The ground was broken by Samuel Huntington who in the famous book *The Soldier and the State* undertook an attempt to devise a comprehensive theory of civil - military relations.[20]

Huntington started off with the definition of military professionalism, with which most academics has agreed and repeated it in academic works following Huntington's *opus magnum*.[21] According to his definition, military professionalism depended on the presence of three components: expertise, responsibility (which Perlmutter more precisely termed it 'clientship orientation' of the military towards the state) and corporatism.

While this definition met with general approval of the academics, Huntington's prescription for the maintenance of proper balance between the civilians and the military proved extremely controversial. He insisted that the maximisation of military professionalism would render officers corps politically neutral. For this a sharp separation of civilian and military spheres was necessary. According to Huntington, a clear division of spheres of responsibility between the civilians and the military, the delegation of autonomy and the maximum emphasis on professional values would result in

---

[19] By Teresa Rakowska - Harmstone, workshop on *Civil - Military Relations*, p. 8.
[20] Samuel P.Huntington, *The Theory and Politics of Civil - Military Relations*. 5th edition. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972).
[21] See for example Amos Perlmutter, *The Military and Politics in Modern Times - on Professionals, Praetorians and Revolutionary Soldiers*. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1977); Herries-Jenkins, van Doorn, *The Military and the Problem of Legitimacy*; Sam C.Sarkesian, *The Professional Army Officer in a Changing Society*, (Chicago: Nelson - Hall Publishers, 1975), pp. 9 - 21.

military interest in technical aspects of their expert knowledge and training and would bring about their non-involvement in politics.[22]

Many scholars criticised this theory and its conclusions as too much value-based, static, presenting an ideal-type soldier and the division of labour that cannot be found in the real world.[23] Finer argued that the increase of military professionalism as Huntington had it may give an adverse effect - that an increased political awareness of better educated, more aware of their role and function soldiers will consequently augment their presence in politics.[24] Janowitz, another prominent military sociologist remarked that the increased autonomy of the military, so desirable for the achievement of their professionalism, may lead to the creation of an extremely powerful pressure group, the interests of which would not always conform with those of the state's.[25] Finally, a younger generation of scholars attempted to undermine in general the necessity of separation between the civilians and the military. They argued that this theory is too much based on American experience and that in other societies, having different traditions and distinct history (for example India or Israel) such separation between civilian authority and the military is not necessary to keep the military from unlawful intervention in politics.[26]

Briefly, there is no consensus on theoretical model of democratic civil - military relations among the western scholarly community. Yet, if one studies the shape of civil - military relations in today's mature democracies, one will find that they have a lot in common. In the absence of theoretical model it is possible to work out a set of principles which consist ground rules governing civil - military

---

[22] Marina Caparini, *Conference on Civil - Military Relations..*, p.186 - 187.
[23] Peter D.Feaver, ' New Theory on Civil - Military Relations', *Armed Forces and Society*, Winter 1996, p.165.
[24] .Finer, *The Man on Horseback..*, p. 21.
[25] Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier. A Social and Political Portrait.*(New York: Illinois Free Press, 1960), pp. 7 - 16.
[26] Rebecca L.Schift, 'Civil - Military Relations Reconsidered: A Theory of Concordance', *Armed Forces and Society*, Fall 1995, Vol.22, No 1.

relations and should not be broken by any party. An it was such a 'common sense', practical model of democratic civil - military relations that the reforms in the post - communist countries adopted as a target model.

In all western democracies the separation of the military and political spheres is a fact. Civilians who are in control of the military perform four general tasks: preventing the military from direct intervention in politics, keeping the partisan politics away from the army, ensuring the maintenance of discipline in the armed forces and finally managing the 'expert problem', that is striking the right balance between the ministerial power and the expert advise.[27]

Basic principles of democratic civil - military relations were laid out in concise manner in the study of Hungarian MOD conducted by Consultancy Services of British MOD. They consider a useful presentation of what the author refers to as a 'practical model of democratic civil - military relations'.[28] Rule no 1 is that the armed forces are part of the *governed* and under no circumstances they can become the governing. The military constitute an instrument of the state policy, they should have no independent role of their own in politics and should be strictly separated from the partisan interests.

One condition that should never be violated in democracy is that all the civilian decision - makers have been democratically elected and enjoy popular legitimacy which enables them to take difficult and often unpopular decisions. So any decision to deploy the armed forces abroad, to commit the country to a state of war or to send the troops to defend the interests of the country as defined by the politicians must be taken with the consent of people's representatives in parliament.

---

[27] Douglas Bland, 'Managing the Expert Problem in Civil - Military Relations', in *Conference on Civil - Military Relations*, p.107.

[28] *Review of Parliamentary Oversight of the Hungarian MOD and Democratic Control of the Hungarian Defence Forces*. Study No 810, dir.by M.Holmes, (UK MOD: Directorate of Management & Consultancy Services, February 1996), pp. 3 - 7.

Because the maintenance of proper security and defence policy is always expensive and the military have a tendency to spend more than has been appropriated to them, there is a need for the close scrutiny of military expenditure. In democratic countries the power of the purse is the main role of parliament and also the main instrument of macro control over the army.[29] However, it should be kept in mind that in order to achieve an effective system of democratic control of the military a degree of social interest in security and defence policy is a must. Thus there is a need for something which is often called ' security communities' or 'defence villages'[30]. In the long run this is the society at large which will prevent the abuse of power on any part, civilians or military.

Obviously, these are only most general principles that should be followed in democratic states. There are also more detailed rules. There is a need for good constitutional and legal framework governing the role of the military and the scope of prerogatives and responsibilities of civilian politicians.[31] This law should forbid the military from taking part in partisan politics and representing particular interests in the armed forces. This usually means the ban on military membership in political parties and in most countries from creating the trade unions.[32] The goals of national security and defence policy should be worked out by the civilians (in most countries by the parliament) and their fulfilment should be controlled by the parliament and the government.

As a rule, the defence minister is a civilian and it is his responsibility to integrate civilian and military personnel working in the ministry. This is also his task to ensure workable relations with

---

[29] For the concise history of parliamentary 'power of the purse' see William C.Banks, Peter Raven-Hansen, *National Security and the Power of the Purse*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
[30] Gow, Birch, *Security and Democracy..*, p. 37.
[31] Jeffrey Simon has elaborated this subject in numerous speeches and publishings. See for example Jeffrey Simon *Polish Civil-Military Relations and Nato Expansion*, (Warszawa: Biuro Parlamentarne MON, 1995), pp. 28-29.

the General Staff which is a military body. Relations between Minister of Defence and the military commanders are often an indicator of the overall state of civil - military relations in the country and crucial to their balance.

CONCISE COMPARISON OF MILITARY POSITION IN DEMOCRACY AND UNDER COMMUNIST RULE

In this extremely brief survey of theoretical concepts and practical approaches to the problem of civil - military relations under communism and in democratic systems the author has attempted to present the starting point for the reforms of the military in the countries under transitions as well as broadly outline the targets of these reforms. However, in order to emphasise the enormity of differences between the two systems - totalitarian and democratic - in their approach to the problems of the military and to better illustrate the enormous challenge that these transitions pose, below the author will compare certain aspects of civil - military relations under the two systems:

1. In representative democracies procedures for power transfer and conflict resolution are firmly established, institutionalised and popularly recognised; there is also a strict division of prerogatives between executive, legislative and judiciary branches and means of control of the military have long tradition; none of these factor is in place in communist systems.

2. Democratic regimes enjoy full legitimacy, therefore armed forces never perform a function of an ultimate guarantor of any party's or executive's power; in brief, they do not have internal functions; in

---

[32] The creation of trade unions in however not universally banned. It is for exampl

communist regimes not only are the armed forces guardians and upholders of internal order but in case of Eastern European countries Soviet troops were yet another potential 'arbiter' of the conflict, the situation unheard of in democratic systems.

3. In democratic systems there exists a clear division between civilian and military elite; such division is only theoretical and very blurred in communist systems. A part of officer corps belongs to the highest echelons of the Party, the party membership is virtually obligatory (although rarely in a form of formalised requirement) among highest ranking officers and conflicts within the system have intra-party character due to an inherent lack of extraneous, institutionalised rival groups. This creation of dual, partisan-military elite was one of the methods of indirect control of the military used by the party leadership.

4. Attitudes towards military presence in politics fundamentally differ: political neutrality of the military is a principle firmly established in democratic states, while people's soldiers of communist states were the instruments of Party and expected to be engaged in politics to a degree required by the part leadership, as well as subjected to heavy indoctrination through the course of their entire service.[33] Active participation in political work and expression of political attitude was actually encouraged, not discouraged by the system.[34]

---

allowed in the Netherlands.

[33] Amos Perlmutter, Willam LeoGrande 'The Party in Uniform: Towards a Theory of Civil-Military Relations in Communist Political Systems', *American Political Science Revie* , Vol. 76, No. 4 (December 1982), pp. 778 - 790, quoted by Barany, *Soldiers and Politics*, p.9.

[34] As the quality of 'political work' in the armed forces was very far from being perfect, the methods of indoctrination employed in relation to rank and file soldiers were sometimes very brutal and primitive, guided by the rul *divide et impera*. For example a former NCO recalled that during the Marshal Law in Poland soldiers were repetitiously told that Solidarity is responsible for their one year longer military service because the activities of the Worker's Union resulted in the 13 of December decision. It is worth mentioning that this propaganda was intensified directly before the pacification of the strike in Szczecin shipyards. Agnieszka Kuchcińska, 'Nowa twarz', *Wprost*, 6 April 1997, No. 14.

5. The mechanisms of civilian control of the armed forces were essentially different in both systems. In case of democratic states this control is institutionalised and exercised by legitimate bodies and in accordance with approved procedures. In Party-state systems the Main Political Administration with its hordes of political officers and direct subordination to the Politburo was the chief controlling device of the Party. At crisis periods a system of dual command was also employed when political officers had the right to counter-sign or override the decision of the military commanders. Inevitably it impinged on military efficiency and was gradually abandoned. In some instances in Eastern Europe the control was in fact threefold, if one counted the presence of omnipotent Soviet 'advisers'. Another, already mentioned method was a co-optation of officers into high party bodies, although a deeply rooted fear of Caesarism prevented the party officials from appointing many military to elevated positions.

6. The levels of acceptable military participation in political decision-making processes were different. Democratic countries expect their military to perform advisory roles; only a degree of influence from the military as a pressure group is acceptable; communist regimes theoretically banned the military from any official role in policy making in accordance with the principle of political supremacy of the party, but in fact intra-party conflicts often left an arbitrating role to the military - the case of Khrushchov and Beria's rivalry for appointment to the post of the First Secretary being perhaps the best known example.

9. Finally, it is worth mentioning that democratic and communist types of military corporatism were at variance as well. Democratic armies strove for the achievement and maintenance of 'classical' autonomy, related to standards of training, promotion, military planning and performance. By definition such freedom had to be

denied to communist armies, where those standards were set and monitored by the party and represented one channel of control. Of course, the standards set by the ruling party varied according to changing policy goals. Korbonski observed that 'class origin, which in the early post-war period served as the main criterion for officer recruitment, gave way to the level of educational achievement which, beginning in the mid-1950s, became the main criterion for entry into the Polish army officer corps'.[35] Anyway, the autonomy of the military under communism was of 'social' type, with their exclusive and morbidly redundant military schools, shops (in the economy of chronic shortages!), surgeries and hospitals, recreational centres, even military orchestras. The military generally enjoyed better salaries, more comfortable accommodation, more favourable retirement conditions compared to civilian employees. All these factors, combined with physical seclusion of barracks and the secrecy of military affairs, created the visible 'autonomy' of the armed forces, but the one which resulted in mutual lack of trust and understanding between the military and civil society and facilitated the political indoctrination of officer corps. Moreover, the suppression of national function and character of the Warsaw Pact armed forces, combined with the falsification of military traditions, resulted in dramatic decline of military prestige in the countries of Central Eastern Europe .

AIMS AND METHODOLOGY OF THE PROJECT

The processes of building democratic model of civil - military relations in post communist countries have many similarities. Certain features, social phenomena and general tendencies repeat themselves throughout the region with a frequency sufficient to identify them as characteristic to the post communist transitions. The identity of the problems encountered in the building of democratic civil - military relations is only partially due to the identical point of departure for the

[35]Korbonski, Terry, 'The Military as a Political Actor in Poland' , p. 166.

post communist countries; more often, however, it is the result of what the author would call a 'totalitarian residue', which manifests itself in the lack of political culture of compromise, ruthless competition for power, hostility towards politicians with other views, lack of fixed agenda for the reforms, general instability and weakness of state institutions and an inherent lack of consensus-building attitude in the post - communist political elite. These factors by and large account for the relative failure of the reforms of civil - military relations in many post communist countries and together with acute economic crisis continue to impede the reforms.

After half a century of Soviet-imposed uniformization the time came when the countries of Central Eastern Europe began to differ between themselves. Each of the post - communist countries started to evolve at its own pace and with time will acquire more individual features. The aim of this study is not to find a model of post-communist transition in the field of civil - military relations which would hold for all the countries (or not even for the three selected countries). In the author's opinion, such an effort would be futile because i) it would necessarily be a very general model and therefore would not accommodate the specific features of post - communist transitions in individual countries, ii) its validity would be almost certainly limited to the short period of time and would expire the way that most models of communist civil - military relations expired with altered nature of regime and increased knowledge about them.

In this project the author intended to discern the specific features of an early stage of transitions and more specifically, of reforms in civil - military relations in the three selected countries. Having introduced a general theory of civil - military relation in the first part of the study, the author will follow with case studies. The analysis will be broken by issues, not by countries in order to present the findings in a comparative way. This has not been an intention of the author to consider technical aspects of the military reforms, its restructuring or disarmament. Instead, I concentrated on the

problems connected with the state building processes, establishment of the armed forces or human relations in it. Due to the fact that post - communist transformations lack a clear landmark to end the research work, the author took the adoption of the Polish constitution in 1997 (the last one to be adopted from among the post - communist country) as the end date. However, in some instances more recent events and data were allowed in order to emphasise the continuity of certain trends.

Broadly, the author has selected the following issues which are in her opinion crucial to the reforms of civil - military relations in the early stage of transformations in the post - communist countries:

1. Building of constitutional and institutional framework in the post - communist countries.
2. Conflicts related to division of powers.
3. Restructuring of the Ministries of Defence.
4. Worsening economic conditions and its impact on the military.
5. Political neutrality of the military.
6. Problems related to human factor: prestige, self-satisfaction of the military from the service, standards of service, crime rate, social attitudes towards the military.

POST-COMMUNIST CONSTITUTIONS

A prompt adoption of new constitutions seemed to be a logical precondition for the creation of fully democratic order in post - communist states. But despite the general political consensus in this respect, in none of the countries selected for this project was this process quick or smooth.

Russia adopted its new constitution in 1993, Ukraine in 1996 and Poland in 1997. There is a degree of historical irony to the fact that from all the countries in the region Poland which was the first to break free from the communist camp was the last one to adopt the new constitution. But from the countries included in the project, only in Poland the process of parliamentary works on the constitutional

law and its subsequent adoption fully deserved to be called democratic. In the remaining cases the adoptions of the constitutions testified to the serious deficiencies of democracy in the systems and in case of Russia was its outright abuse.

In Russia, after the prolonged political conflict with the parliament president Yeltzin put an end to its term in office and resolved the conflict with the use of military troops. Having settled that problem, he then submitted his project of new constitution to popular vote in referendum. The referendum was organised at the time of elections for a new parliament. The presidential project was adopted in the referendum and in this way Russia acquired a new constitution with extensive presidential prerogatives and power in some aspects virtually unchecked. The constitution was amended on 10 February 1996, but the amendment has not brought significant changes in the fields interesting from the point of view of this study.

Ukrainian constitution was adopted by the Parliament on 28 June 1996, but the constitutional debate and the parliamentary vote were - to put it mildly - strongly influenced by President Kuchma. In order to ensure that the final shape of the Constitution would be to his liking, in the course of parliamentary debate Kuchma blackmailed MPs with the dissolution of the parliament and the adoption of the constitution in the referendum instead. The threat made an expected effect and the Parliament passed the law in the shape desired by presidential camp.[36]

These practices suggest that political elite in post - Soviet and more generally post - communist states find it difficult to accept democratic procedures and are inclined to use more reliable methods instead. To this effect a long lasting of provisional constitutional law in the post - communist states had been a grave factor. First, the gap between the regulations of the old, totalitarian constitutions which were amended regularly and dynamically changing reality of new,

democratic systems was ever growing. Poland and Ukraine tried to cope with the situation by adopting 'small' constitutions, but they were much delayed as well and proved conflictual. Secondly, the absence of 'big' constitutions prevented or delayed adoption of some important acts of lower order, among them on the military, because they could be contradicting the future constitutional law. Thirdly, this situation had a corrupting influence on politicians and encouraged them to stretching the law to their favour because it allowed them to hope that future constitution will simply sanction *status quo* rather than change it decisively. Under such circumstances the habit of thinking in terms of long - term building of stable state institutions was discouraged. Many military reforms, together with many others, became the victims to this unclear legislative situation.

RUSSIAN CONSTITUTION

The political system in Russia is strictly presidential. The 1993 constitution approved extensive presidential powers, including powers over the army. The President is in fact supreme to the Prime Minister, although this is not identical to the American system where the President forms the governments and is the only head of the executive. The Russian system comfortably puts the President above the government and allows his to intervene whenever he finds it necessary or desirable.

According to art. 83 of the Constitution the President chooses the candidate for the Prime Minister and State Duma (the lower house of the parliament) has the right to approve or reject him. However, if the Parliament rejects presidential candidate three times in a row (and the law does not prevent the President from choosing the same candidate), then the President dissolves the Parliament and installs his candidate as the Prime Minister anyway (art. 111 p.4). This is also the exclusive right of the President to chair the council of ministers, to

---

[36] Tadeusz Olszański, 'Uchwalenie Konstytucji Ukrainy', *Biuletyn Ukrainski*, No 3

dismiss the government and to withdraw his directives it they are not in concordance with the existing law.

It has become a common feature of many post - communist countries, including the three cases under study here, that the presidents strove to achieve the greatest possible share of power over the security and defence issues and the military. Russian journalists observed that the building of military institutions in some Slav countries is considerably slower than the comparable processes in non-military spheres. In their opinion the fact that in those countries between 1992 and 1995 the process of establishment of national armed forces became subject to political conflicts explains the slow pace of those processes. The presidents played a decisive role in countering the influence of the parliaments on military affairs and using any available means to subordinate the armed forces directly to themselves. 'And until now they have been winning' - added the journalists.[37]

Without double in Russia the President won his power contest. He appoints and dismisses all the ministers (art. 83 p.d), forms and chairs Russian Security Council (art. 83 point ż), approves the military doctrine of the Russian Federation (art.83 point z) as well as appoints and dismisses higher military commanders of the Russian Armed Forces (art.83 point l). According to the art. 87 Russian President is also the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces. This in many countries is only a titular prerogative, but not in Russia because in addition to all the right enumerated above the Russian President has the right to issue decrees which have the binding force on all the Russian territory (art.90). Taken together, it gives the Russian president powers in security an defence policy which are near equal to the legislative bodies in law - making and far surpass Duma's prerogatives in personnel policy. The only decisions which require the

---

(27), (Warszawa: Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich, 1996), pp. 2 - 6.

approval by the Federation Council (the upper house of the Parliament) are the decisions on the introduction of the marshal law or emergency state anywhere on the Russian territory. And, of course, the state budget is approved by parliamentary decision. The Federation Council also decides on the deployment of the Russian troops outside the country's territory and it is by the decision of Duma and with the consent of Federal Council that state of war or conclusion of peace are approved.

Compared to the articles on the powers of the legislative, executive and judiciary bodies there is relatively few and very general articles directly related to other military and security issues. Article 72 makes an important restriction that such issues are exclusively federal prerogatives. Article 59 states that every citizen of the Russian Federation is obliged to military service, but also offers the possibility of the alternative, civil service under certain circumstances. Russian constitutional law does not restrict in any way the citizen rights of the military, neither suffrage rights. And contrary to the remaining two constitutions under study, it does not define in the Constitution the role of the Russian Armed Forces neither does it place any restrictions on its use. This fact additionally increases already nearly unchecked presidential power over the armed forces.

The Constitutions of Russian Federation places only very feeble foundations for the realisation of democratic model of civil - military relations in this country. The internal relations between the branches of government are so dramatically unbalanced in favour of presidential office that the abuse of power is easily conceivable. In fact, it has already taken place in some instances and Chechen war was the best (and most appalling) example. Moreover, the existing political order does nor enable legislative to take control of the armed forces, because its decisions on most military and defence issues can

---

[37] The article compares the military reforms in Russia, Belarus and Ukraine. F.Bielousov, V.Georgiev, 'Zaochnoye Sorievnovanie Brat'iev Slavian',*Niezavisimaya Gazieta - Niezavisimoye Vojennoe Obozrienye*, 11 April 1996.

be overruled by the President. Under such circumstances, the power of the President eliminated the development of the remaining channels of control over the army.

UKRAINIAN CONSTITUTION

Ukrainian political system is presidential as well, but compared to Russia the powers of the Ukrainian President are more limited. The constitution puts an emphasis on the role of the President in national security. According to the art. 102 the Ukrainian President is the head and the representative of the state and guarantor of its sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as the guardian of the Constitution. He is the Supreme Commander of the Ukrainian Armed Forces (art. 106 p.17) and this is his duty to ensure the national safety (art.106). Similarly to the Russian President he has the right to nominate and dismiss higher military commanders in the Ukrainian Armed Forces and well as in other military formations. In case of Ukraine it is important to include other military formations since their joint number is nearly equivalent to that of the army.[38]

The Ukrainian President also chairs the Council of National Security and Defence of Ukraine (art. 106 p.18) and has discretionary right to decide on the membership in this body. The President has the power to cancel directives issued by the Cabinet of Ministers or by the government of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. His influence on the creation of the government is however more limited than the prerogatives of the Russian President. His nomination of the Prime Minister requires the consent of the Parliament and the appointment of the ministers is conditional on the motion of the Prime Minister. Therefore the Ukrainian President is forced to cooperate and compromise with the Parliament to a greater degree than it is the case in Russia. Still, the government is accountable to the President in the first place and only to a limited degree to the Parliament. The

President has full powers to dismiss selected ministers or the whole cabinet, while the Parliament can only vote no confidence to the whole Cabinet and recall the government by qualified majority.

Ukrainian President enjoys near exclusive powers regarding other issues of defence and security policy. He has the right to submit the motion to the Parliament to use the Ukrainian forces in case of armed aggression on Ukrainian territory and to introduce the state of war (art. 106 p.19). He is further entitled to take decisions regarding military mobilisation and state of war in case of threat of aggression on the whole or part of Ukrainian territory. Since Ukrainian President has the right to issue decrees and has legislative initiative, his law - making powers are considerable. But contrary to the Russian Constitution, Ukrainian law restricts certain matters to legislative acts only. These are the principles of national security, social order and organisational structure of the Armed Forces, changes to the state borders, introduction of the martial law and emergency state and the deployment of the Ukrainian Armed Forces abroad (art. 92 p. 17, 18, 19 and 2).

The prerogatives of the Ukrainian Parliament regarding security issues are very limited although surpass those of Russian parliament. According to the article 85 of the Constitution the Supreme Council of Ukraine (which is the official name of the Ukrainian parliament) has the standard budgetary powers, sets the principles of the internal and foreign policy of the state. On the motion of the President the parliament declares the war and concludes peace, gives the President its consent to use the Armed Forces in case of the armed aggression against Ukraine, has the power to decide on the internal structure, size and function of the Armed Forces, Security Services and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine. Furthermore, the Parliament has a final say in case of granting foreign military assistance, deployment of Ukrainian Armed Forces abroad and permission of

---

[38] Interview with the Ukrainian Minister of Defence gen. Aleksandr Kuz'muk,

access of foreign troops to Ukrainian territory. Presidential decisions on the mobilisation or introduction of the martial law and emergency state also require parliamentary consent.

Contrary to Russian Constitution, the Ukrainian constitutional law defined the role of the Armed Forces and basic military duties of the citizens. There is a very strong emphasis on the security function of the state. Article 17 states that the protection of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, of its economic and informational safety are the most important functions of the state and the duty of the whole Ukrainian nation.

The law forbids the use of the armed forces or other military formations for internal purposes such as limitation of human and citizen rights, change of constitutional order and removal of constitutional governing bodies. Although such ban seems obvious enough even without the constitutional article, in case of post-Soviet republic it serves to emphasise the breach with past practices when the internal function of the armed forces grew to become almost the most important one. Also, some sociological data testify to the fact that not all Ukrainian citizens thought such internal military function was wrong. The poll conducted 1994 among Ukrainian cadets in Kiev's leading military college gave rather astonishing results. Most cadets believed that there was no immediate enemy or threat to Ukraine from any direction. 90% of those polled favoured co-operation with NATO armies and *regarded internal police functions a major Army responsibility!* (italics by author).[39] Considering that these are statements from the people who will compose the future officers corps of the Ukrainian Army, it seems that at least some part of the military in the national armed forces of Ukraine does not see the purpose or understand the role of the army in the same way as it is understood in the western countries. But it should be hoped that the results cited by

---

'Voyenniye poka yeshcho dovier'iat', *Zierkalo Niedieli*, No 49 (166), 6 Dec. 1997.

the authors of the article are not representative to the Ukrainian officer corps. In another sociological research, conducted with 1003 officers, 72% of those surveyed did not allow the use of the army in internal political conflicts under any circumstance.[40] Still, it is probably better that the Constitution prohibited the use of the Armed Forces outside the limits set by law. And, to dot the 'i', the Constitution defines the function of the Armed Forces as a protection of Ukraine, its integrity and inviolability of its borders, being clearly the external functions of the army. Moreover, article 65 states that the protection of independence and territorial integrity of the state and of its symbols is also a duty of all the citizens of Ukraine and the military service is compulsory in accordance with legal acts of lower order.

Creation of military formations outside the existing law is strictly forbidden. The same constitutional article bans the establishment of foreign bases on the Ukrainian territory. This regulation was a subject of dispute between the President and the Parliament. The President wanted to avoid the adoption of such an article at all costs because it would severely limit his flexibility during the negotiations with Russia regarding the division of Black Sea Fleet. The Parliament, however, showed little understanding to the presidential objections and used such a procedure of parliamentary vote that it allowed to pass most controversial articles, including the ban of foreign bases in Ukraine. This provoked the presidential response in the form of threat to dissolve the Supreme Council and adoption of the Constitution by referendum. In the end the Parliament withdrew from most controversial articles and in case of foreign

---

[39] S.Makeyev, O.Manachynsky, E.Lysytsyn, H.Perepelytsya, O.Bodruk, V.Krotykov, V.Haleyev, S.Vlasov, V.Halynovsky, 'Does Ukraine Have a Military Elite?', *Political Thought - Ukrainian Political Science Journal* No 1 (5) 1995, p. 129.

[40] Research programme carried by Center 'Social Monitoring' and Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research under joint theme 'Social Problems and Reform of the Armed Forces of Ukraine' in 1996. Copy courtesy of Tadeusz Olszański, chief Ukrainian expert of the Center for Eastern Studies, Warsaw.

military bases MPs allowed the prolongation of lease of the already existing bases, thus making a concession to the President.[41]

There is a very strong emphasis in the Ukrainian constitutional law on the separation of politics from the military. Article 37 forbids any political or social organisation from creating its military formations. The same article bans a creation or activity of political parties inside any military structures. In Poland or Russian such legal restrictions were also introduced, but they are of lower order. Of course, the inclusion of such clause to Ukrainian Constitution does not automatically entail full obedience on the part of the politicians or the military and the political engagement of many senior officers is a secret to nobody. Similarly, there are military bands which openly cooperate with nationalist parties, such as UNA - UNSO (Ukrainian National Assembly - Ukrainian National Self-Defence) and which actively look to have influence in the Armed Forces. Allegedly the leaders of those organisations nurtured plans to form three purely Ukrainian divisions in Kiev, Charkov and Lviv which would be manned mostly by the members of the above mentioned organisations.[42] The members of this organisation were also accused by some journalists of planning to establish trade unions in the military sites.[43] In any case, the activity of many quasi-military organisations are certainly balancing on the thin line between law-stretching and outright breach of the legal regulations, not to mention the fact that such an official military formation as the National Guards, directly subordinated to the President, became famous for its anti-Russian, sometimes violent demonstrations and escaping punishment.[44]

---

[41] T.Olaszański, 'Uchwalenie..', p.4.
[42] Yuriy Borisov, 'Ultra-nacyonalisti predlagayut sformirovat' novuyu armiyu', *Siegodnia*, No 169, 7.09.1995.
[43] Vladimir Skachko, 'UNA-UNSO hociet' opierat'ca na ukrainskih voyennyh', *Siegodnia*, No 136, 1.08.1996.
[44] According to Russian journalist's account, members of National Guards wer involved in beatings of Russian seamen in Sewastopol. A.Nadiezdin, 'Voysko

The Ukrainian constitutional system is presidential. The position of the President as a head of executive is very strong and his powers in the field of defence and security policy extensive. Still, compared to the Russian constitutional law, the Ukrainian system is closer to standard democratic solutions and the powers relations more balanced. The Parliament plays little role in the security and defence policies, but it should be remembered that the limited role is also a result of faulty electoral law, due to which in many constituencies the election of the Members of Parliament became impossible, and of very low preside of this body in the society. These obstacles restrict the influence and the monitoring powers of the Parliament more than constitutional regulations do. The regulations of the Ukrainian Constitution are not the best possible basis for the creation of democratic civil - military relations in the state, yet they do not exclude its establishment if political will to do so appeared.

POLISH CONSTITUTION

The political system which formed in Poland under the presidency of Lech Wałęsa (1991 - 1995) could be described as semi - presidential. This hybrid form of political system is believed by some scholars to be best suited to transitional periods. Yet, this system has serious flaws as well and in case of Poland they certainly manifested themselves before long. Leslie Holmes in her book on post - communist transitions was warning:

> Since the government is more or less equally answerable to both the president and the parliament, it can be caught in the crossfire between the two, if there is a major conflict which in turn can result in policy - making stalemate. (..) Moreover, .. the personality of the incumbent of senior offices can dramatically affect the efficacy of a particular arrangement no matter how carefully the designers of that arrangement - the constitutional

---

Kravchukovo dejstvuyet v Krymu', *Obszczaya Gazieta* No 35, 2 - 8 September

architects - attempt to overcome or limit the impact of the individuals.[45]

In case of Poland every word of the above warning came true. The process of building constitutional and legal framework proved exceptionally complex and wrought with political quibbles. This was in part due to unclear division of powers and responsibility between the executive and legislative and inside the executive, but by and large the conflicting personalities of the main political actors were to be blamed . The reform of the military and the restructuring of civil - military relations fell victims to these circumstances.

Relations between legislative and executive powers in the Republic of Poland were not comprehensively regulated until 17 October 1992 when so called Little Constitution was adopted. This interim constitutional bill sanctioned a semi-presidential system with very unclear division of prerogatives between the President and the government. It provoked a prolonged feud between the two highest executive offices and proved fatal to the reform of the defence sector.

The Little Constitution theoretically granted the President with extensive powers in the field of foreign and security policy. Constitution sanctioned the election of President by popular vote, something that gave him a strong feeling of legitimacy and it charged him with a duty of the general oversight of the foreign and security policy. But according to the same Constitution both foreign and security policy were to be realised by the government, so the factual meaning of presidential oversight became unclear. Moreover, the President had a right to be consulted upon the election of the Ministries of Defence, Internal Affairs and Foreign Affairs (hence those ministries were called 'presidential'). President Walesa pushed his powers to extreme in this point by demanding that he has a decisive voice over the choice of ministers and insisted that he has a privileged

---

1994.

relation with them after their appointment. In 1994 Prime Minister Pawlak in fact accepted presidential claims in this respect by leaving the selection of the three ministers for his cabinet entirely to Lech Walesa. From then on presidential lawyers could claim the right of appointing the ministers based on 'constitutional practice'. It led to a weird situation of three ministries being partly excluded from Prime Minister's authority.

The constitutional regulations giving the President a special position in the realm of defence, internal and foreign policies were envisaged as stabilisers[46] for Polish politics. The legislative intention was such that the fields of such importance as security or foreign policy should not fluctuate with changing governments. Theoretically this put fundaments for a very strong position of the President in Polish politics. The problem was, the prerogatives bestowed upon the President were accompanied by only rudimentary executive instruments to enable him to exert pressures on the government or parliament, such as veto or legislative initiative. Among those instruments was also a right to appoint the Chief of the General Staff practically independently, with only the duty to consult the Minister of Defence. Again, the intention of the legislative was good - to protect the army from the changing governments, so that the change of the Minister would not always entail the change of the Chief of General Staff. This article, however, proved most detrimental to Polish civil - military relations.

The corollary of the Little Constitution was a bizarre situation of the political system where the President was theoretically very strong and practically weak. Furthermore, the passing of interim constitutional bill created the impression among the politicians that the table was still open for negotiations.

---

[45] L.Holmes, *Post-Communism..*, p.174.
[46] For discussion on the meaning of stabilisers in the policies of the state s M.Skak, *From Empire to Anarchy. Post-Communist Foreign Policy and International Relations*, (London: Hurst&Company, 1996), pp. 21 - 26.

The high - handed, authoritarian and sometimes demagogic style of policy-making by president Wałęsa only worsened the situation. And as far as the civil - military relations were concerned, it meant the wrong person in the wrong place. Walesa was determined to make maximum use of his prerogatives and to exert very strong influence over political scene, among other things through the alliance of a kind with the military. On many occasions, including the parliamentary defence debate in 1994, he used to say that 'military affairs should be run by military' and that 'civilians are useless' which did not make the task of civilian ministers of defence any easier.

The appointment of general Tadeusz Wilecki is unfortunately a very illustrative example of handling military matters by presidential office at that time. General Stelmaszuk, the Chief of General Staff until 1992 claims that Wilecki was selected for his replacement by Walesa's personnel a year before his actual appointment in April 1992. General Stelmaszuk also recalls that Walesa in fact undermined the authority of the General Staff and overrode his decisions whenever he believed it necessary. For example he would summoned general Wilecki, then commander of Silesian Military District, for consultations to Warsaw. According to military regulations each time a commander was leaving his district, he was obliged to inform the Chief of General Staff and have his permission. In this case, however, Wilecki never bothered to inform general Stelmaszuk and only when caught red-handed, he would mutter some ad hoc explanation.[47] Similarly, the selection of admiral Kolodziejczyk, then already a civilian, for the second time for the post of the Minister of Defence was a private arrangement between him and Wałęsa and was not proceeded by any parliamentary or governmental consultations.[48]

The new constitution, finally adopted in March 1997, reaffirmed the election of the President by popular vote, but it clarified many

---

[47] Personal interview with gen. Stelmaszuk, 12 September 1997, Warsaw.

legal dilemmas regarding the division of power in the executive. Briefly, it put an end to the 'double-head' executive in favour of government's authority. The President's function according to Article 126 is to guard the compliance with the Constitution, sovereignty and safety of the state and the integrity of its territory. He remained (art.134) the Supreme Commander of the Polish Armed Forces, but it is now clearly a titular prerogative. The same article precisely states that in peacetime the President carries out his duties through the Minister of Defence and in case of war he appoints the Highest Commander of the Armed Forces on the motion of the Prime Minister. He can recall the Highest Commander also only on the motion of the Prime Minister, so the President is in no way independent in this respect. Presidential competence regarding the army involves investing military ranks on the motion of the Minister of Defence[49] and independent selection of the members of the National Security Council which is supposed to serve as presidential advisory body (art. 135 and 144 point 26). In the event of direct external threat to the state the President, acting on the motion of the Prime Minister will call a partial or general mobilisation and decide on the use of Armed Forces for the defence of the Republic of Poland (art.136).

However, the scope of presidential discretion in the realm of foreign and security policy as well as in domestic affairs has been dramatically curtailed. So called 'presidential ministries' disappeared, thus guaranteeing full integrity of the government and Prime Minister's authority over all of the cabinet members. The Constitution defines the President's role as a representative of the state in foreign relations with carefully specified prerogatives, but the same article obliges the President to cooperate with the Prime Minister and the respective minister in matters of foreign policy (art.133 p.3). At the

---

[48] Personal interview with admiral Piotr Kolodziejczyk, 22 Sept. 1997, Gdynia.
[49] During Walesa's term in office this prerogative was also turned into weapon. After famous 'Drawsko dinner' in 1994 Walesa rejected ministerial motions of promotion and instead promoted officers innvolved in alleged voting down of minister Kolodziejczyk.

same time the Constitution specifies that it is a duty of a government to carry out domestic and foreign policy of the state, to assure the internal and external security of the state and public order, to direct general state defence policy and to specify annual number of conscripts to be called into service.

In one instance, however, the new Constitution has preserved and even widened presidential prerogatives. Article 134 point 3 states that the President has the right to nominate the Chief of General Staff and his deputies independently. The article does not oblige the President even to consult the choice of person with the Minister of Defence which is a weird regulation considering that those will be the closest collaborators of the Minister. MOD representatives pointed to this regulation as holding a potential for the relapse of the situation when President and Chief of GS could form a close alliance with an exclusion of the government representatives.[50]

Constitutional law included a new definition of the role of Polish Armed Forces in the state and that is 'protecting the independence of the state, the integrity of its territory and securing safety and inviolability of its borders' (art.26). This is an interesting change in the definition compared to one in Little Constitution. According to the article 8 of the amended Constitution of 1952 (which was upheld by the Little Constitution) Polish Armed Forces were to 'stand on guard to protect sovereignty and independence of the Polish Nation and her security and peace'. This strong emphasis put on the armed forces' service for the Polish nation rather that the state was probably a reaction to the years of subordination to the Soviet rule when the national affiliation was suppressed. 8 years after the end of *ancien regime* the need for emphasis on military service for nation is not so strong and the time came when it became possible to define the role of the military as the service to the state, guarding it first of all from external threats. In any case such formulation of the role of PAF

provides good basis for the development of fully professional 'clientship orientation' of the military in the way characteristic of democratic states.

Article 26 point 2 refers specifically to the civil - military relations and it obliges the military to political neutrality and subordination to the democratic civilian control, thus fully embracing the principles of democratic model of civil - military relations. But, similarly to Russian or Ukrainian constitutions, Polish law does not restrict the suffrage or any other citizen rights of the military.

The new Constitution does not specify who is authorised to take a decision to send Polish troops abroad. Article 117 rules that it will be specified in a ratified international agreement or in a parliamentary bill. And it was not until the second Gulf crisis in 1997 that the government hastily prepared and the Parliament passed the bill deciding that this is the government's prerogative to take such a decision. On that occasion the President protested, arguing that this should be his decision, but his project was rejected.

The new Polish Constitution was a much needed and extremely delayed document. Its final ratification in the popular referendum after the parliamentary vote ended the provisional character of Polish law.

The Constitution very much sanctioned the existing realities and only corrected some unfortunate regulations which had caused so many conflicts. It has put solid basis for systemic regulations of the defence management and for democratic institutionalisation of the civil - military relations. The constitutional law contains all the standard democratic safeguards against potential abuse of power, among them article 175 which states that court - martial may be established only in case of war. This is particularly important in view of recent Polish history when under martial law court-martials were

---

[50] Minister Andrzej Karkoszka, the main architect of internal reform of the MOD was among persons who turned my critical attention to this constitutional article.

widely used to quell riots and eliminate troublesome individuals from public life on petty charges.

Comparative Appraisal of the Constitutions.

A univocal judgement of the Russian, Ukrainian and Polish constitutions is difficult. In general they meet basic democratic standards, such as provisions for free, competitive elections, principle of popular legitimacy, safeguards for human and citizen rights. However, the institutional design of the presidential system in Ukraine and Russian and semi-presidential in Poland under Little Constitution provided for very unbalanced relations between the legislative and the executive bodies and provoked many conflicts around power division inside the executive. In Russia and Ukraine presidents, right or wrong, won a dominant positions for themselves. In Poland, however, the corollary of the Little Constitution was a two-headed executive where President Wałęsa and subsequent Prime Ministers were engaged in an endless power contests. This situation proved particularly detrimental to the national defence and security policy and practically stalled military reforms between 1992 and 1996.

POST-COMMUNIST CONSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

In Russia and Ukraine the scope of presidential prerogatives in issuing decrees seems alarming because it gives the presidents law-making powers generally not acceptable for executive bodies. And, to be sure, these are not titular or emergency prerogatives, but both Ukrainian and Russian presidents make full use of them. Yet, it would be hard to judge whether parliamentary systems with more balanced division of powers between the three branches of government, perhaps more desirable from the point of view of democratic standards, would work fine in those countries. The authoritarian traditions of power and immaturity of the civil society in those two post-Soviet states might lead to chaos under purely parliamentary systems. The problem is, with such extensive powers of the Presidents and restricted influence

of the remaining bodies the building of democratic civil - military relations is impossible.

Poland has gone a long way over the last few years and the new, 'big' Constitution seemed to provide for more mature form of democracy. It changed the system to parliamentary with the president acting as an arbiter which seems to work better. However, similar solutions applied to Ukraine or Russia would very likely render them ungovernable. In any case, the adoption of the post - communist constitutions in any of those countries ended an important stage of transitions and significant changes to the political systems are not likely in the near future.

BUILDING OF NATIONAL ARMIES.

After the break up of the Soviet Union, dissolution of Warsaw Pact and withdrawal of Soviet troops from foreign bases Poland, Ukraine and Russia alike faced the necessity to establish its own, sovereign, national armies. The scale of this task differed, but in many cases the problems involved were similar.

The post-communist armies inherited by the countries in question were large and offensive. They were also deeply politicised. The task which post - communist countries faced was to restructure those armies into smaller, lighter, mobile force, of defensive character and politically neutral. An in case of Ukraine it was additionally complicated by the need to 'create' suitable tradition for the new, national army, which process was closely related to the building of national identity to the new state.

The necessary reductions of the size of the armed forces were opposed not only by the military, which was perfectly understandable, but also by nationalist politicians of the right-wing parties in all the countries, who against all economic, political and common sense arguments favoured large forces armed to teeth and were defended every little piece of weapons sold or destroyed in the course of reforms.

RUSSIAN MILITARY REFORM

Reductions.

In comparative perspective, the reforms are least advanced in Russia. Most domestic and foreign analysts agree that so called reforms did not progress beyond random reductions in the armed forces.[51] Economic, geopolitical as well as demographic factors forced the reductions. Russian population is two times smaller than was the population of Soviet Union - 150 million people (with downright tendency) compared to 290 million of the former USSR. This means among other things that mobilisation resources of Russia have twice reduced. From the economic point of view the specialists estimate that Russia would be able to maintain the force of 300 - 400 thousand men. This, however, is unacceptable for political reasons. Russian authorities decided to aim towards the army of 1,700 thousand military and 600 civilian personnel.[52] Towards this end serious reductions were initiated in the Russian army. Interestingly, however, such reductions were not only opposed by the political parties[53], but also met with obstruction from the highest MOD representatives. Minister Pawel Grachov himself opted for the army of 2,100 thousand men.[54] One of the most appalling ideas of this minister was to create 'military sovchozes', modelled on well known examples from the USSR and to man them with people wishing to obtain alternative service. In this way Grachov hope to alleviate food problems which are indeed severe in Russian army cope with those citizens whose consciousness

---

[51] S.Rogov, 'Vooruzenniye Sily Rossiyi poslie priezidentskih vyborov', *Niezavisimaya Gazieta - Niezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozriennye*, No 12, 27 June 1996, pp. 1 - 4; V.Borisienko, 'Kto naraszczivaet muskuly', *Moskovskiye Novosti*, No 6, 11 - 18 February 1996, p.9; F.Bielousov, V.Gieorgiyev, 'Sosiedi..'.

[52] S.Rogov, 'Vooruzenniye Sily Rossiyi..'.

[53] V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii*, (Moscow: Institute for Sociological and Political Research of Russian Academy of Science, 1996), pp. 135 - 140.

[54] Y.Bronskiy, 'Nam nuzna malienkaya silnaya armiya...', *Litieraturnaya Gazieta*, No 25, 19 June 1996.

does not allow them to serve with arms. The human rights aspect of this idea does not even deserve discussion.

Yet, in spite of the opposition, the reduction was carried out. The size of infantry troops for example was reduced six times. But the state budget waited for savings in vain. The money were used elsewhere. As one journalist indicated: 'In the Soviet Union there were 8 million people under arms. Today in Russian power ministries there is more than 7.5 million people, regardless of the fact that mobilisation resources of Russia compared to the Soviet Union are two times smaller'.[55] This phenomenon is understandable if one remembers that in the Soviet Union regular army was only a part of overall armed forces. Internal troops, special tasks forces and all kinds of militias were in many cases more important and better equipped than the military. This tradition has been preserved and continued in Russia. Today only 65% of conscripts go to serve in the army, the rest goes to internal troops, border troops and military formations of 17 other ministries![56] And, contrary to the regular armed forces, other military formations not only avoided reductions, but in many instances increased in size. Internal troops consist of 29 divisions and 15 brigades and already outnumber infantry troops of the regular army. The war in Chechnia proved that they are superior to the army not only in size, but also in weapons and training. According to the same author, from 1991 the police force rose in number by 1.5 times compared to the size of Soviet militia. The official explanation points to the necessity of sending additional forces to fight with organised crime. This explanation, however, does not hold against the fact that only 1/6th of the total police force today works in the crime - related sphere (compared to the 2/3rds in the Soviet Union), while the remaining troops are engaged in various ways in tasks related to the security of Russian authorities.[57]

---

[55] V.Borisienko, 'Kto naraszczivaet..'.
[56] S.Rogov, 'Vooruzenniye Sily Rossiyi..'.
[57] V.Borisienko, 'Kto...'.

The results of such policy were grave, but easily foreseeable. The reduction of the regular army did not result in any significant savings since funds were directed elsewhere. The exact appropriations within the military or other ministry's budget are held secret so the exact cash flows are not known even to the Parliament. As the head of the Main Directorate for the Military Budget and Finances said, the disclosure of such information would ' bereave the Minister of Defence of the possibility to manage the funds and in emergency to swap between them freely'.[58] This statement is quite illustrative as to where the democratic civilian control of the armed forces is in Russia.

Apart from the reduction of size, Russian army did not undergo any significant reforms of its structure or command. Russian Armed Forces operate in the same structure and in the same military districts-based command system as it was in the Soviet Union. What is perhaps more detrimental to the morale of the military, Russian authorities did not satisfactorily define the tasks for the national Russian army, neither did they bring the structure and tasks of the armed forces in line with the actual economic potential of Russia. Russia lacks definition of its vital national interests in short-, medium- and long term, the protection of which would be the task for the Armed Forces. Yet, Western analysts observed that in Russia, despite all the economic hardships there existed a strong civil - military consensus regarding the future war, with a 'disproportionate emphasis on military power as the linchpin of Russian status in the international arena'.[59] Same author concluded that the 1993 Russian doctrine prepares the troops to 'both defensive and offensive operations with massive use of existing and future weapons irrespective of how the war starts and is conducted'.[60] This approach to security and defence policy reflects the slow pace and difficulty with which Russian disposes of the traditions of imperial past.

---

[58] S.Rogov, 'Vooruzenniye Sily Rossiyi..'.
[59] Mary C.Fitzgerald, *The New Revolution in Russian Military Affairs*, RUSI Whitehall Paper Series, 1994, p. 77.

Economic Crisis

The reality, however, is the oversized, underfunded and unreformed army, looking to the past with nostalgia.[61] Constant lack of funds brought about a decline in the levels of combat readiness. According to Siergiey Rogov, the director of the Institute of the USA and Canada in Moscow, only 1/3 of infantry divisions has satisfactory levels of military preparedness. Similarly, only 50% of the warships is combat ready. Some 40% of the war planes requires an immediate overhaul.[62] Despite the officially declared policy of professionalisation of the Russian Army by stages the economic shortages forced the Minister of Defence to issue in 1996 a directive, demanding to cut the number of contract officers serving in the Russian Armed Forces by 3 times, that is from 350 thousand men to around 120 thousand. The reason is obvious - the military serving on contracts cost the budget 3 times more than non-contract ones. That ended plans (or dreams) for quick professionalisation of the Russian army.

The same financial difficulties resulted in decrease in the officers' salary to the level of average national salary. The army suffers from many negative socio-economic phenomena. The military organisation worsened, discipline plummeted, ominous *diedowszczina* (hazing of young soldiers) is widespread, and the prestige of the military died in Chechnia war. In the opinion poll conducted by the Institute for Socio-Political Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences 31% of the surveyed stated that they began to perceive the Armed Forces in a negative way after their participation in the Chechen war.[63]To make matters worse, Russian authorities were completely unprepared for the massive withdrawal of the Russian

---

[60] M.C.Fitzgerald, *The New Revolution..*, p.73.
[61] Christoph Bluth, 'Russian Military Forces: Ambitions, Capabilities and Constraints', paper for the conference on the Security Dilemmsa in the CIS Region, London, Chatham House, 28 - 29 September 1995.
[62] S.Rogov, 'Vooruzenniye Sily Rossiyi..'.
[63] V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii..*, p.138 - 139 and 204.

troops from the Central - Eastern Europe and Germany. This only aggravated the housing problems of the officer corps, not to mention constant, aimless but expensive re-deployments of the troops which could not be accommodated in the existing military bases. The estimated number of homeless officers in spring 1996 reached 125 thousand men.[64]

Personnel Problems. Military Crime.

For these and other reasons the prospects of military service became utmostly unattractive in the popular opinion. Young people avoid military service at all available means. It resulted in the rapid deterioration of the quality of recruits. Increasingly only poor or uneducated conscripts go to the army, others manage to bribe or cheat their way out. In 1995 only 27% of the soldiers had high schools completed, the remaining only completed job training or primary schools. Every year an average 30% to 40% of the conscripts called into service does not meet the standards for military service due to physical or mental deficiencies.[65] The low levels of education, morale and discipline in the troops, combined with fatal living standards (reports of dystrophy among the soldiers are not uncommon) result in increased statistics of suicides, accidents and crime. The numbers illustrating the crime rate among the Russian military are appalling. According to gen. Aleksandr Bieznasiukov, the chairman of the Moscow Military District Court (supreme to other military courts), in 1996 compared to previous year the military crime rate increased four times. What is even more frightening, number of serious crimes increased by 76.3%. Increasingly widespread is munitions theft, its frequency rose by 78.3%. And the tendency is towards further increasing rather than decreasing of the crime rates.

The Russian army has a shortage of young officers. This is partly due to the fact that young, educated officers quit the army as

---

[64] S.Rogov, 'Vooruzenniye Sily Rossiyi..'.

soon as possible and look for better jobs in the civilian market. However, large part of this is a heritage of the Soviet Armed Forces structure which abounded in senior officers. In spring 1995 the total level of unmanned positions of junior officers in the armed forces reached 38%. The situation became so serious that at the end of 1994 President Yeltzin issue a decree calling the reserve officers into service. This, however, has not alleviated the problem to a sufficient degree.[66]

Appraisal of the Russian Military Refor

Briefly, the reform of Russian Army did not advance beyond random reductions. Political and military elite in Russia are not free from nostalgia for the imperial past. It manifests itself in the constant referring to the great traditions of the Red Army and Soviet Army, frequent, negative comparisons of the present situation to the Soviet Armed Forces, but most importantly it shows in the strong emphasis on the military aspect of state security and civil - military consensus on maintenance of the largest possible army with latest available technology. At the same time the present Russian army lacks clear definition of its function and place in the state structure, keeps the outdated system of command and operation, and feels used and abused by politicians in wars like Chechnia. The army suffers from a number of very negative socio-economic phenomena, such as lowering of discipline and military prestige, hazing, desertion, massive avoiding of military service, increasing crime rate, corruption, which affect the armed forced deeply. The success of military reform in Russia would require great resources, yet the present way of its realisation would only guarantee further waste of funds if they were appropriated through the existing channels. Moreover, in order to carry out the reform the radical change of thinking about the army is a must. At present, however, the existing civil - military coalition of power people

---

[65] S.Rogov, 'Vooruzenniye Sily Rossiyi..'.

guarantees that the reforms will not be very effective in the near future.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ARMY

'Nationalisation' of the Soviet troops.

The process of building the national army in Ukraine was more complicated than in Poland or Russia. Ukrainian Republic as an independent, sovereign entity was a brand new state. In that sense this post Soviet republic had to create its own, new army. Yet, the case of Ukraine was not identical to Baltic republics which had to build their national armies from scratch.

The size, population and geopolitical location as well as historical traditions of liaison with Russia ensured a special status for Ukraine in the Soviet military machine. With 2.7% of the Soviet Union territory and 18% of the total population Ukraine had a disproportionately large share of the Soviet armed forces of all services. Ukraine possessed nuclear installations; large troops stationed permanently there; the republic developed a very strong military industry and an extensive network of military training grounds, schools and academies; furthermore, Crimean Peninsula provided bases for the Black Sea Fleet and a favourable place of settlement for high ranking army officers on pension. The exact number of the troops based on Ukrainian territory in 1991 is not known, but reliable estimates indicate that on 30 December 1991 there were about 750,000 military men stationed there, divided into three military districts and possessing all kinds of weapons.[67] Additionally, there were about 500,000 KGB troops as well as railway and construction troops. This large mass of armed men, however, on the eve of military coup in Moscow in August 1991 did not represent a cohesive military force. Soldiers and officers alike were demoralised,

---

[66] S.Rogov, 'Vooruzenniye Sily Rossiyi..'.
[67] N.Plotnikov, 'Ukrainska armiya pierezivayet nie luczsziye wriemiena', *Niazawisimaya Gazieta*, No 220,

unsure of their loyalties and anxious for their own future. Some negative economic and social trends which were to plague post-Soviet armies later, were already discernible. The officers' salary fell to slightly beyond average, the number of houses was insufficient to accommodate all the officers entitled to that, internal conflicts between senior and junior officers were becoming dangerously acute. Still, the army and military installations on the Ukrainian territory were of great value.[68]

The Ukrainian authorities decided not to dispose of the Soviet troops, but to establish its own army through the seizure of the armed forces on its territory and its subsequent ukrainisation and socialisation to the service to the nation. The plans to establish Ukrainian armed forces were not new, for example the 1990 declaration of sovereignty contained the right of Ukraine to its own army and in August 1990 Parliament passed a resolution demanding that Ukrainian conscripts should serve only on its territory. Despite the fact that this resolution had a very moderate effect on recruitment authorities and Ukrainian conscripts were continuously sent to various distant parts of the Soviet Union as it was a habit in the defunct USSR, yet this indicated the will of Ukrainian authorities to establish national armed forces.

So when a suitable time came, it was not very surprising that Ukraine used this one-off opportunity and seized the largest possible piece of Soviet troops and military installations on its territory. What was surprising, however, was the intended size of the army of 420,000 men which would be second in Europe only to Russia's. Moreover, despite the earlier political declaration until 1994 and signing of Non-Proliferation Treaty there were strong pressures from radical nationalists and from some military circles to keep Ukraine nuclear. There were even allegations that Ukrainian scientists were working to break access codes to the installation. The most common arguments

---

17 November 1994.

were that a nuclear Ukraine would be a modern superpower, while disarmament would be a sign of weakness and would reduce the country to a second - rate state on international agenda.[69]

The observers of Ukrainian political scene explained this militarised approach to the state security and prestige by several factors:

- perception of immediate military and political threat from Russia, reinforced by abortive military coup in August 1991
- possibility of internal instability
- isolation of Ukraine on international scene
- reluctant support from Ukrainian Diaspora
- historical perception that Ukrainian independence in 1917 - 1920 was lost because its then leaders did not defend it militarily.[70]

This heavy emphasis on national security and its defence by military means was fuelled by some high ranking military who in the course of next few years continuously warned against the lingering threat from Ukraine's neighbours. The statement from gen. Anatoliy Łopata, former Chief of Defence Staff, is very representative to this perception of international relations:

> We have no neighbouring country that would not hold some border claims against us. It is just that not all of them make it public. Russia, and Romania. There are problems with Belarus, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary. And even Turkey has certain claims, particularly concerning sea and air border space, which should be settled.[71]

On 9 October 1991 Ukrainian Parliament adopted several bills, among them 'Bill On the Ukrainian Armed Forces' and 'On Ukrainian Defence' which created the legal foundations for the existence of the

---

[68] E.Krzemień, 'Komu będą służyć', *Gazeta Wyborcza* 28 August 1991.
[69] Andrew Wilson, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1990s. A minority faith.* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994) p.189.
[70] Wilson, *Ukrainian Nationalism ..*, p.182.
[71] Testimony of gen. A.Łopata, 'Sud i Osud. Ministr Oboroni proti Wiczirnowo Kieva, Wiczirnyi Kiev proti Szmarowszcziny', *Wiczirnyi Kiev*, special issue 1996, p.71.

national armed forces. Parliamentary acts ruled that Ukrainian President would be the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces and that the Ukrainian Security and Defence Council would be the highest body responsible for the state defence and security. The establishment of the army was to be done based on the three existing districts: Kievian, Carpatian and Odessa's. The UAF would consist of infantry troops, air force, sea fleet, special formations, railway troops and (based on separate act) and National Guards.[72] On 12 December 1991 President Kravchuk issued several decrees on the basis of which he took over the command of the Ukrainian Armed Forces which consisted of all the troops stationed on the state territory with the sole exception of the Strategic Strike Forces. The presidential decrees also confirmed the principles of organisation of the Ukrainian Army set by the parliamentary acts.

The operation of 'nationalisation' of the substantial part of the Soviet army proved to be relatively successful. Moreover, it was doubtlessly an effective and quick way to create large Ukrainian armed forces. Yet, this seizure had considerable disadvantages. It reinforced ardent nationalists in their opinions that Ukraine is in the position to possess large army. Consequently, when the economic strictures forced the hand of the President and serious personnel reductions, army restructuring as well as sales of the surplus weapons were effectuated, the majority of senior military officers and nationalist politicians opposed it violently and remained unpersuaded.[73] Secondly, it soon became obvious that Ukraine is not self-sufficient in arms industry and future procurements for the army of such size could not be guaranteed. Neither was Ukraine able to secure ongoing repairs and overhauls of the military equipment which dramatically affected combat readiness of the troops before long.

---

[72] J.Kowalczyk, 'Ukraina i jej siły zbrojne', *Biuletyn Polityczny* No 1, January 1993, p. 23.

[73] See testimony of Ewgienij Łupakov, Jarosław Illiasievicz, Olieksieja Ławrieniuka i Stiepana Hmary, all memebrs of the parliamentary comission for defence and security issues, 'Sud i Osud..', pp.81 - 104.

Yet, perhaps the most serious disadvantage of the seizure of the Soviet army 'as it goes' was the preservations of the armed forces in its old and outdated form, with all the negative economic, social and human trends which had undermined its cohesiveness and levels of military preparedness. One of the journalists reported the words of an officer serving in the Ukrainian army:

> The thing is, the majority of those who went to the Ukrainian army or fleet counted that Ukrainian army should be a new model army, that in the first few months military reforms would be carried out, that everything will be established on new fundaments and the illnesses of the old Soviet army would be the thing of the past. But it did not happen. (The military told us that) as all too familiar symptoms of the old, rotten system, went into Ukrainian army diedowszczina, and abuses of hierarchy, and theft, and lack of proper discipline, and impunity of senior ranks towards the juniors.[74]

Economic Crisis and Its Social Consequences.

The worsening economic and social conditions of the military service as well as lowering of the prestige of the military profession resulted in general negative attitude of the conscripts towards the army. Similarly to Russia, young men avoid the service at all available means. Bribery and forging of medical certificates are widespread.[75] Consequently, the quality of conscripts worsened dramatically. According to the survey carried out by the Center for the Research of Regional Problems "Eurazja" 73.4% of the conscripts has a negative attitude towards the military service in the Ukrainian Armed Forces, and 60% - towards the military service in general. When asked about the reasons of their ill disposition towards the service, among many factors 40% pointed to the lack of personal freedom, 32% - hazing

---

[74] N.Siemiena, 'Oborona Ukrainy: aplodismienty priezdiewriemienny', *Zierkalo Niedzieli*, No 4, March 1997.

(dziedowszczina), 20% - poor financial and accommodation conditions. As a result, those who are better educated or richer, do not go to the army. Only about 25% of the 1997 pool of conscripts had at least completed high schools, from which 1.3% had higher education; the remaining soldiers completed either primary schools or job training only. More troublesome still, every 10th of the conscripts had had a case in the court or at least once had run away from home. In 1997 49% of all criminal cases in the military courts were desertions.[76]

Military statistics justify negative opinions of the conscripts on the military service. Official sources revealed that for example in 1995 there were 139 casualties in the armed forces, of which 40% were suicides. According to the head of the Main Directorate of the Educational Works of MOD gen. Sitnik, the suicides were due to 'worsening of the social and material conditions of the military service'.[77] The Organisation of the Officers of Ukraine named one main reason for the suicides of the young soldiers - diedowszczina. They also gave figures differing from the official data - 300 casualties, of which 64 soldiers killed themselves. Yet, in spite of the appalling statistics only 12% of the officer corps regards the hazing as dangerous and only 11% thinks that it has negative impact on the combat readiness of the army![78]

But hazing is not the only enemy of the young soldier. The accommodation and food are so bad that the cases of dystrophy are reported every year among the conscripts in each military district. The wave of military crimes is getting out of control. Contradicting official military statements, President Kravchuk himself reported during the press conference that the rate of crime among the military increased in 1996. During 10 months of that year the total number of the crimes committed by the men in uniforms rose by 14% and reached 3000

---

[75] See S.Kisieliev, 'Jesli zavtra vajna, jesli snova v pohod, to proszczaytie, rodniye piehota i flot!', *Kievskiye Viedomosti*, 3 July 1997.
[76] *Niezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozrienyie* No 6, 15 - 21 February 1997.
[77] *Kievskiye Wiedomosti*, No 24, 7 February 1996.
[78] 'Obnarodowanniye cifry - eto tolko aysberg', *Nowost Donieckiyei*, No 43 / 1997.

cases. The most common is the munitions theft which is literally out of control. The press services of the MOD admitted to the journalist that they do not even keep statistics of this sort of petty crime.[79] In 1996 in only one logistics service the total losses from such theft were estimated on 2.5 million USD.[80] The criminal activities of the officers also become increasingly widespread. Compared to 1995, in 1996 the rate of officers' criminal activities rose by 21%. Only as a result of financial controls 150 officers were arrested under criminal charges. A real sensation became the announcement that in 1996 Ukrainian Security Services arrested 49 bands of organised crime, which included 15 generals and 85 senior officers of the MOD.[81] This is very likely that the rate of crime committed by the military will be increasing as long as the financial conditions of the service do not improve considerably.

The economic situation of the army is indeed dramatic. Salaries are not paid for many months in some regions. Social prestige of the army lowered. About 70,000 officers do not have homes. As a result, in years 1992 - 1995 great numbers of junior officers quit the service. According to data revealed by President Kravchuk, in 1994 junior officers represented 20% of the total number of officers released to reserve; in 1995 they constituted 35% and this tendency was upheld in 1996.[82] Gen. Łopata contradicted this statement saying that unemployment on the civilian job market stopped the junior officers from leaving the army in 1997, but the impoverishment of the corps resulted in their demoralisation and undermined feeling of professional solidarity which is the backbone of the cohesiveness of

---

[79] O.Panczenko, 'Obyknoviennoye czriezwyczajnoye proissziestwiye', *Dzien'*, 27.10.1997.
[80] G.Kliucznikov, Wooruziennymi silami komanduyut "Dwoyeczniki'", *Niezawisimaya Gazieta - Niezawisimiye Woyennoye Obozriennye*, No 7, 8 February 1997.
[81] G.Kliucznikov, 'Wooruziennymi silami komanduyut..'
[82] G.Kliucznikov, 'Wooruziennymi silami komanduyut..'

every armed force. [83] Interesting enough, at the same time Ministry of National Defence literally swelled in size to the number of military specialists employed there three times bigger than the government's directive of 15 August 1992 had it. Specifically, instead of 1500 specialists provided for in the directive in 1997 there was 3500 military specialists employed in 1996.

Personnel Shortages

Another problem of the armed forces is that due to the structure inherited from the Soviet army as well as to a massive leaving of the army by younger generation of officers the Ukrainian AF abound in generals and senior officers while it wants junior officers and NCOs. The number of serving generals, already too high in 1993, rose from 240 in 1993 to 370 in 1996 and fell to 281 in 1997. Yet, one of the most important units in the General Staff, the Operational Directorate, remained underemployed and had only 30% of the required staffs.[84] The already observable ageing of the officers corps is a serious problem. The military statistics recorded that in 1995 the officers up to 25 years old represented 18% of the officers corps; 26 to 30 years - 25%; 31 to 40 years - 22%; 40 to 45 - 19.6% and the remaining 15.4% are the officers beyond 45 years of age. The loopholes in the existing law enabled young graduates from military academies to quit the service before the statutory 5 years of military service, thus the reversal of the ageing trends in the army became difficult.[85]

Reductions.

Economic conditions forced the authorities to reduce the size of the army. According to the governmental plan of the development of the Armed Forces until year 2005, the target level of the Ukrainian

---

[83] A.Łopata, 'Biez poddzierzki obszcziestwa rieformy w armii niewozmozny', *Zierkało Niedzieli*, No 50 / 1997.
[84] G.Kliucznikov, Wooruziennymi silami komanduyut..'

army is 350,000 men. The considerable reductions were already carried out in the years prior to governmental plan, but in a very unstructured way. What is worse, they were not supported by the comprehensive reforms of the structures of the military, which, according to the present Minister of Defence gen. Oleksandr Kuz'muk, remained intact since Soviet times.[86]

Policy of 'Ukrainization'.

Problems such as increased crime rate, ageing of officers corps, avoidance of military service and desertions or economic crisis seem to be common to post-communist armies. Yet, the unprecedented way of establishing national armed forces through the 'nationalisation' of the part of the Soviet army, resulted in the creation of the army which was not reliable as a protector of integrity and sovereignty of the new-born state. The Ukrainian authorities saw the solution in rapid 'ukrainization' of the armed forces. The ukrainization was relatively easily achievable in case of conscripts soldiers. It was enough to ensure that all Ukrainian conscripts would serve locally. Such postulates had been formulated back in the first stage of Ukrainian way to independence 1990 - 1991[87] and gradually carried out after the declaration of independence in December 1991. What represented a real challenge to the authorities was the ukrainization of the officer corps. On 1 December 1992 according to the official statistics the officer corps consisted of 48% of Russian officers, 45% - Ukrainian and 7% - other nationalities.[88] The initial composition in 1991 is not known[89], but most likely the number of Russian officers was still

---

[85] E.Bogacka, 'Pro ukrainizaciyu zbroynih sił Ukraini', *Gomin Ukraini* No 35 / 1995.
[86] 'Wiadomości', *Biuletyn Ukra ński* (Warszawa: Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich) No 20, 30 January 1998, p.7.
[87] Taras Kuzio, 'Civil - Military Relations in Ukraine, 1989 - 1991', *Armed Forces & Society*, Fall 1995, Vol.22, No1, pp.29 - 31.
[88] 'Nacionalniy skład Zbroynih Sił Ukraini', *Nowiy Szliah*, No 40 / 1995.
[89] Polish Press Agency PAP quoted former Organisation and Recruitment directorate of the Soviet General Staff, according to which at the end of 1991 ther were 44.5% of Russian, 40.5% of Ukrainian and 15.2% other nationalities in th trooops stationed in Ukraine. These numbers, however, include conscripts, thus

higher. The 'simplest' solution, that is replacement of Russian officers by Ukrainians was not possible because there were not enough available Ukrainians to replace the Russians.

Nationalist politicians were convinced that such process is necessary. The reasoning of Levko Luk'ianienko is quite representative of this trend: '(In 1992) among the 500 officers attached to the ministry of defence, 202 are Ukrainian and 264 Russian. How can we be sure that such a ministry of defence and such an officer corps can build an army that is capable of waging a war against an invasion from the east?'[90]

The process of ukrainization of the armed forces focused on several targets. First, the authorities wanted to change the national composition of the officer corps. Data published in subsequent years seem to confirm that they succeeded. The proportion gradually altered in favour of Ukrainians: on 1 December 1993 there was already a majority of Ukrainian officers, that is 52.9% Ukrainians and 41% Russian officers (the remaining percentage represents other nationalities); on 1 December 1994 - 55.3% Ukrainians and 38.7% Russian; on 1 Dec. 1995 - 59% Ukrainian officers and 36% only Russian. In 1995 already all the heads of the main directorates in the central structures of the Ministry of Defence were Ukrainians as well as all deputy ministers of defence were of Ukrainian nationality.[91]

This change in national composition in a relatively short period was achieved mostly through the promotion of Ukrainian officers at the expense of Russian. As a result, many Russians quit the service and left Ukraine. Yet, the forecast that Ukrainian officers serving elsewhere in the former Soviet Union (the estimated 200,000 to 300,000 men) would come back to Ukraine in great numbers failed and only about 33,000 of them came back.[92] Many were probably put

---

they are nor reliable as indicators of the nationalist mozaic in the Ukrainian Armed Forces. *PAP, Foreign Division,* News No 154, 3 January 1992.

[90] Wilson, *Ukrainian Nationalism..* , p.185.

[91] 'Nacionalniy skład..'.

[92] 'Druga potęga Europy', (ptsz) *Myśl Polska*, 1 - 15 October 1993, p.8.

off from return by the ardent nationalism of the Union of Officers of Ukraine, the members of which were the stubborn proponents of the policy of ukrainization.

The Union of Officers of Ukraine, founded in 1991 as a consequence of two congresses in July and November 1991 in Kiev, had its roots in the Ukrainian Popular Movement and other civil organisations which before 1991 had campaigned hard for the Ukrainian independence and the establishment of the separate armed forces. Between 1991 and 1992 it was an extremely influential organisation. Its members were the serving officers, reserve officers, representatives of the military administration, even employees of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and MPs from the Committee for State Security. At the end of 1991 the UOU was the largest civic group in Ukraine. According to its founder and chairman, gen. Vilen Martyrosian, 15% of the serving officers were its members and some 40% sympathised with its activities.[93] At its peak the UOU had 20,000 members.

The radicalism of this organisation, however, soon put off many Ukrainians from it and its popularity quickly declined. The UOU was extremely anti-Russian and abhorred ANY compromise with the Russian Federation. Ukrainization of the national army was the main target of its activities among the military. Most high - ranking appointment between 1991 and 1993 went to the UOU members, thus 'ukrainizing' the highest echelons of the armed forces. The first Ukrainian Minister of Defence, Konstantin Morozov (1991 to October 1993) had close relations with the organisation and under its influence began the policy of 'attestation' in the Armed Forces in January 1992. All servicemen were expected to take a Ukrainian oath or leave the Ukrainian Armed Forces. All officers were sent a questionnaire where, among other things, was a question 'Are you

[93] Taras Kuzio, 'Civil - Military Relations..', p.41.

ready to fight against Russians'?[94] Considering that many officers had relatives in Russian who were often members of Russian Armed Forces, such a question could not be received with sympathy.

Having experienced an initial resistance to an oath, the MOD took 'extraordinary' measures. For example it was announced that only those officers who take an oath would keep full pension rights. Moreover, in many units commanders opposed to the official policy of ukrainization were removed. As a result, with the exception of the Black Sea Fleet (where only 5% of officers took an oath while there was at least 30% Ukrainians) the vast majority of the military was persuaded to take an oath.[95] Yet, the motives for this step were in most cases far from patriotic zeal. Only 30% of the officers took an oath from patriotic motives, 65% were motivated by the hope for better economic conditions (the remaining 5% represent other motives).[96]

The MOD together with the Union of Officers of Ukraine made every effort to foster a patriotic zeal through national education. One of the methods was to glorify the Ukrainian military past at the expense of the Soviet army traditions. Publications in the national newspapers as well lectures at military academies[97] glorified ancient traditions of the Ukrainian military, having its roots in the military formations of local rulers (kniaz'), in Zaporozian Cossacks traditions, in heroic fights for the Ukrainian freedom and independence of the fighters from UNP, Ukrainian Galitian Army, as well as to the controversial UPA (Ukrainian Insurection Army), which according to these sources struggled with totalitarian rule between 1942 and 1956.[98] Yet, these efforts proved mostly futile. As one journalist put it, an idea to form the Ukrainian army 'in a way of mechanical

---

[94] Interview with Galina Starovoytova, *Stolica*, No 23 (185), June 1994.
[95] 'Druga potęga..', p.8.
[96] 'Czom ti, armie, biezboronna?', *Narodna Gazieta*, No 36, September 1992.
[97] The main sponsor of 'patriotic education' cirriculum in the military academies was Volodymyr Muliava, the founder and first head of Socio-Psychological Service set up in 1992 at the MOD.
[98] S.Marczenko, 'Na storozi doli Ukraini', *Ukrainskie Słowo*, No 48, 1997.

replacement of internationalism into nationalism' collapsed. 'Stories about the heroic uprisings of the insurgents did not manage to replace the war history of the Soviet Army from which the absolute majority of the officers derives its position'.[99] According to the data published in *Siegodnia* newspaper, in 1997 41% of the officers in the Ukrainian army regarded Soviet military traditions to be supreme and only 18% allows that Ukrainian national military traditions should be partially included.[100]

The continuous attempts of nationalist indoctrination had a reverse effect on the officer corps and arose popular resentment towards the authors of the policy of ukrainization. Consequently, minister Morozov was forced to leave the office in October 1993 and his successors, Vitalii Radets'kyi and Valeriy Szmarov, adopted a much lower-key policy in this respect. The Union of the Officers of Ukraine lost popularity and its membership gradually fell down to some 400 members, mainly reserve officers.[101]

The policy of ukrainization of the Armed Forces had one more aspect which should not be neglected. That was a language problem. It goes without saying that in the post-Soviet army, which in reality the Ukrainian army was, the Russian language, and not Ukrainian was in use. The Ukrainian constitution in article 10 states that 'Ukrainian language is the official language in Ukraine'. The MOD under minister Morozov made intense efforts to ensure the use of Ukrainian language in the Armed Forces. Morozov issued several directives. First of the series of documents on the subject was issued in March 1993, but the most important was a decree published in August 1993 in order to enforce the use of Ukrainian in the army and military administration by the end of 1995. In this document the

---

[99] G.Kliucznikov, 'Soyuz Sovietskih Oficerov z'diot vriemieni 'CZ', *Niezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozrienniye* No 22, 28 November 1998.
[100] Y.Borisov, 'Ultra-nacyonalisti..'. These statistics, however, should be treated with caution. The journal does not quote the source of the data, and *Siegodnia* is known to be very critical towards any form of Ukrainian nationalism.
[101] G.Kliucznikov, 'Soyuz Sovietskih..'.

Minister himself admitted that the progress in this field is extremely slow and blamed the commanders in many instances.[102] The unpopularity of this language policy was one of the key factors in Morozov's departure from office.

The problem of language, however, remained and continued to divide military and society. Ukrainian nationalist papers reported with pride for example that 5 years after independence 'the division of general A.Zatinayl', (..) introduced full use of Ukrainian language 'in commanding, drills, training and private time'.[103] An event from the court during the trial in the case of Szmarov versus journal 'Viczirniy Kiev' was even more telling about the deep division in the society and the military related to the language problem. Szmarov, then minister of defence, wrote his litigation in Russian. The journalists of Viczirnyi Kiev, of very nationalist orientation, answered to this that they did not understand foreign language and on the basis of Ukrainian law they demanded translation and the conduction of the trial in Ukrainian. These demands were finally satisfied, but not without reluctance on the part of the judge and several witnesses.[104]

Appraisal of Ukrainian Reforms

In general, Ukraine used the opportunity to seize the substantial part of the Soviet army and to establish its national armed forces on this basis to its benefit. Yet, following this success the Ukrainian authorities failed to foresee the consequences of inheriting post-Soviet armed forces. Politicians and some military could not accept the fact that they inherited a multi-national army with a substantial majority of Russian officers as well as that this was a one-off opportunity and Ukraine does not have resources comparable to the former Soviet Union and therefore will not be capable of maintaining such a large army.

---

[102] 'Kak po - ukrainiski Rawniejs', Smirno!', *Kuranty*, No 166, 2 September 1993, p.3.
[103] 'Nareszti po ukrainski', *Ykrainskie Slow* , No 24, 31 March 1996.

On the impact of the revolutionary political changes, Ukraine should have concentrated on prompt and thorough reforming of the army and other military formations in order to form a modern, smaller but mobile forces, capable of performing national defence functions. Instead, political elite gave absolute priority to the policy of so called ukrainisation. The official declarations indicated that the aim of this policy was to eliminate anti-Ukrainian elements from the army and turn the Ukrainian troops into a reliable force. Yet, the short-sighted, administrative approach to the ukrainization issues achieved little more than antaginisations of the military society and creating atmosphere of witch-hunting. The relative success of the campaign for taking an Ukrainian oath was the result of opportunistic attitudes of the military who hoped for better wages and conditions of service in Ukraine than in Russia. When the economic conditions worsened, part of the officer corps began to quit the Ukrainian service and left for Russia. It was doubtful from the beginning if such broad-brush approach to national issues could be effective in fostering patriotic feelings in the ranks of the Ukrainian Armed Forces. The negative aspect of the policy of ukrainization was its anti-Russian and anti-Turkish edge which fostered hostilities rather than co-operation with the neighbours.

Seven years of the existence of the Ukrainian Armed Forces were largely wasted from the point of view of the military reform. The only restructuring that took was organisation of the Ministry of Defence on the basis of structures of the Kiev Military District, if one does not count irregular and unstructured reductions in the size of the army, forced by economic conditions. The army remained in Soviet form, it even kept former names and codes. The Ukrainian authorities did not create a new model army, failed to exclude the military from politics and failed to establish democratic civilian control of the armed forces.

---

[104] 'Sud i Osud..', pp. 33 - 37.

The result is the army of lowered combat readiness and deeply frustrated which tables 7 - 9 illustrate.

REFORM OF THE POLISH ARMY

Polish Advantages

In Poland military reforms took somewhat different course. Similarly to its neighbours, after the dissolution of Warsaw Pact Poland inherited the army which was too big (400,000 men), expensive and offensive in character. It also suffered from familiar illnesses: hazing, beating of young recruits, abuses of power and hierarchy, lack of clear lines of responsibility, bad human relations. Polish authorities faced the task to re-define the function of the armed forces, restructure it, change internal organisation and human relations inside the army. But compared to Russia or Ukraine the Polish military reform was easier. First, the scale of reform was much smaller and therefore the whole process more easily manageable. Second, Poland has had strong national traditions of the military thanks to which, contrary to Ukrainian or Soviet/Russian case, Polish military after 1989 became (rather unjustifiably) one of the most trusted public institutions.

Plan 'Army 2012'.

The plans of personnel reductions naturally met with opposition from the military as well as from some right - wing politicians. General Tadeusz Wilecki, the Chief of General Staff from 1992 to 1996 in one of the interviews said that 'for the last 8 years the army has been constantly bleeding'.[105] But the economic crisis forced

[105] Interview with general Tadeusz Wilecki, *Polityka*, Nr 36 of 9 Sept. 1995, by Janina Paradowska and Jerzy Baczynski.

the government to carry out the reductions and reform the military structures.

After the series of mostly failed reforms, the most comprehensive plan of the military reforms was adopted by the government in 1997 and named *Army 2012*. According to this plan, the target level of Polish army will be 180,000 men. At the same time the structure of the officer corps will be changed. At present the senior officers represent 48% of the total number of the corps, junior officers - 33% and NCOs - 19%. This 'pyramid' will be turned upside down to reach the levels of 30% senior officers, 30% junior and 40% NCOs.[106] Similarly, the structure of budgetary expenses is due to change in favour of R&D, to which 37% of the military budget will be appropriated in future.

Military Resettlement.

Some of the reforms have already been initiated. The army is reduced to the level of 230,000 men. Modernisation plans of the selected armaments were started. What is perhaps most worth mentioning is that Poland, contrary to Russia or Ukraine, has a working system of military resettlement. The Bureau for Military Resettlement, attached to the MOD has only 10 people and its activity is heavily dependant on the co-operation of the military units outside the MOD, among which the commanders of military districts and of military services are bound to cooperate with the Bureau by law. The program of resettlement has been worked out based on NATO countries experience[107] as well as probatory programmes in Poland and uses latest instruments available for this kind of activities, such as Canadian system of psychological profiling of an individual or latest methods in language teaching. In 1997 it was the only WORKING

---

[106] M.Vero, 'Jakie Wojska Lądowe?', *Polska Zbrojna* No 36, September 1997, p.12.

office of this type in the entire Central Eastern Europe. One of the assets of this program is its considerable flexibility. Each year the Minister of Defence sets the limit of money that can be spent on each soldier leaving the army[108]. Within this limit, everyone can decide individually which kind of assistance is most suitable for him. Consequently, if he chooses for example a language or job training course outside the military, MOD will finance it up to the set limits. The MOD itself offers the following forms of assistance:

- psychological and professional assessment,
- one off job training (for instance for joining bodyguards agency);
- courses enhancing professional qualifications;
- language training;
- support in changing job or professional profile.

Many of these activities are organised in co-operation with civilian structures, helping the military to enter civilian job market. The importance of the relative success of this activity for the delicate balance of civil - military relations also cannot be overestimated. The army of former military personnel, civilianised, unemployed and full of grievances, could easily upset this balance and additionally complicate already complex task of reducing the size of the army.

Polish Military and Consensus - Building.

Yet, the military reform in Poland was not all together a success story. Until 1996 hardly any progress was made beyond the necessary reductions of personnel, armaments and closing of military schools. The restructuring of the defence sector was hampered due to factors very similar to those in Russian and Ukraine: faulty institutional design, undemocratic practices of politicians, competitions for power

---

[107] French, American and Canadian support were of great value here. Personal interview with col. Sowa, head of the Bureau for Military Ressetlement, 26 September 1997.

[108] One of controversial decisions is that the MOD helps both those who were mad redundant and those who left the PAF voluntarily.

and prerogatives among civilian authorities, lack of resources and beyond all lack of civil - military consensus on the necessity of the reform. And according to Douglas Bland, 'experience suggests that consensus building is a key characteristic of successful defence ministers and workable civil - military relations'.[109]

One of the principles of democratic civilian control over the armed forces is that the minister of defence is a civilian politician. This, however, is not just a simple replacement of the man in uniform by civilian (as Ukraine has painfully learned on Szmarov's case), but it requires a comprehensive re-organisation of the institutional patters and introduction of democratic principles of delegation of power and of accountability of democratically elected politicians. It is quite striking that Russia is the only country where serious conflicts around a division of power and prerogatives between the minister of defence, chief of general staff, prime minister and president did not occur. It can be credited to the fact that the minister of defence there was always a military person. This allowed President Yeltzin to act along the lines of military hierarchy and subordination and to avoid the complexities of the democratic mechanisms of power and accountability which come to play with the appointment of civilian minister. Such situation doubtlessly facilitated direct managing of the armed forces and other military formations to President Yeltzin, but as a result Russian military elite seven years after the collapse of the Soviet Union are not one step closer to the co-operation with civilian politicians on defence and security matters and are just as alarmed at any civilian intrusion into their affairs (save the President) as they used to be in Soviet times. The unimaginable corruption of the highest ranks of the military only adds one more reason to keep civilians out.

Wherever a post-communist country did take an attempt to nominate a civilian politician to a post of the minister of defence, as a rule an inevitable conflict between the civilian minister and his

---

[109] Bland, 'Managing the Expert Problem..', p.114.

military chief of general staff took place. This was both Polish and Ukrainian experience. The difference is, while Poland after prolonged crisis in civil - military relations worked out a compromise between the Ministry and the General Staff, in Ukraine President Kuchma in fact backed off from the civilianisation of the Ministry (which in itself was very shallow[110]) and appointed gen. Kuz'muk for the post.

In Poland the first attempts to reform the defence sector were undertaken in 1991, by the so called Zabinski Commission, formed upon the Prime Minister directive. The commission worked out proposals to divide the functions of the Ministry, which would be an administrative body, and of the General Staff, which would be in charge of purely military tasks. This system proved faulty. As late Jerzy Milewski, one of the highest-ranking civilians at various posts in the defence and security sector between 1991 - 1996 explained in the press interview:

> we have approved a faulty model. The civil-military part of the MOD was supposed to manage the armed forces, provide them, oversee them, take care of the defence policy, social affairs, education etc. The military part of the ministry is a General Staff to which the whole of the army has been subordinated. Those two structures were supposed to cooperate. But this model, in spite of the good will of the subsequent ministers could not function properly and with time it has led to the increasing alienation of the civilian part of the ministry. Ministerial departments which do not have an independent access to the army must work through the respective directorates (which are parallel of ministerial departments) in the General Staff. Necessarily the General Staff has grown, the respective directorates has doubled the ministerial structures and became

[110] In 1996 under Minister Szmarov there were only three more civilians employed in the Ministry at key positions. Personal interview with general Vadim Grechaninov, President of the Ukrainian Atlantic Council of Europe, Kiev, September 1996.

independent. So they no longer need the co-operation from the partner civilian departments.[111]

This faulty system, combined with the personal ambitions of President Wałęsa and then Chief of General Staff gen. Wilecki, gave a dangerous effect of alliance of a kind between those two officials which effectively eliminated civilian Minister of Defence from play. Such a situation was unacceptable from the point of view of democratic civil - military relations. But reforms became possible only after President Wałęsa lost presidential elections in 1995 and his successor, Aleksander Kwaśniewski, stopped vetoing all parliamentary bills regarding military reforms.

The Bill on the Ministry on National Defence[112], adopted by the parliament in December 1995, finally clarified the division of powers inside the defence sector and its management in peacetime. Articles 1 and 2 points 1 through 23 made it clear that defence minister is answerable directly to the Prime Minister and has no side-connections to the office of the President.[113] The Bill put and end to the superficial division of defence management into civilian-military ministry and military General Staff and unified the functions. It unequivocally subordinated Chief of General Staff to the Minister of National Defence (art.7) and determined that the Minister's directive in relation to the Chief of GS has a power of order. The Bill also specified that military attaches matters, Military Intelligence Services and Academy of National Defence (the main military academy in Poland) are placed under direct supervision of the Minister.[114] These institutions had previously been a subject of controversy between the MOD and GS.

The Bill obliged the executive authorities to work out detailed regulations and issues directives on the following subjects:

---

[111] Interview with Jerzy Milewski, *Polityk* Nr 25, 24.06.1995, by Janina Paradowska.
[112] *Bill on the Minister of National Defence*, Dziennik Ustaw No 10/1996, title 56.
[113] Article 1 states: 'The Minister of National Defence is the chief agency of the public administration in the field of defence of the state'.
[114] Articles 2 p.14, art. 5 p.1&2 respectively.

- detailed scope of responsibilities of the Minister of National Defence;
- status of the Ministry of National Defence;
- internal regulations for the Ministry of National Defence.

Works of Karkoszka's Commission.

In short, it required issuing executive regulations complementing the legislative Bill. For this purpose the Commission of minister Andrzej Karkoszka, the Secretary of State for Defence was set up.[115] The works of this commission were perhaps the most comprehensive undertaking in the reform of defence management since 1989. The group comprised of about 25 persons (its composition was flexible and changed several times in the course of works) and in principle included the same number of representatives from the Ministry and General Staff, both civilians and military. These were heads of main departments and directorates, such as financial, legal, controlling, personnel and others. The main General Staff representative was general Bielecki who presided over the works jointly with minister Karkoszka.

The works were concluded with considerable delay, but with success. The Commission worked out the document on the Status of the Ministry, which was approved together with the Directive on the Detailed Tasks and Responsibilities of the Minster of National Defence. The government approved of considerable reductions. The number of all ministerial structures was reduced from 52 to 32 and the number of full-time positions cut down by 1000, with the brunt of reductions carried by General Staff. Some of the impact of the redundancies was diminished by immediate transfer of 200 positions to the Ground Troops Headquarters in the making, but it was still a reduction unheard of on such levels of military establishment. Among those made redundant were several general's positions. This particular

[115] The following paragraphs are largely based on personal interview with minister Andrzej Karkoszka on 12 September 1997 to whom I am also indebted for

reform was complemented by the amendment of the Bill on the Professional Military Service made on 31 July 1997 which introduced the principle of the limited term of office for all the military positions.[116] According to this amendment officers up to the rank of colonel may hold their positions for the period from 2 to 5 years, while generals (or corresponding navy ranks) are nominated for 3 years only. The successful conclusion of the works of Karkoszka's Commission marked the turning point in the Polish civil - military relations. It was a first big scale compromise between the civilian officials and high ranking military representative which was worked out in a democratic way, where both sides accepted the necessity of reforms but neither felt humiliated, antagonised or forced to carry them out. The fact that the settlements of the Commission were upheld and reform continued after the change of government is the best confirmation of its success.

The reforms of the military in Poland are by no means complete. There are many legal and executive regulations that still await its turn. Among them the regulations of the defence management in case of war are missing. Yet, it seems that the critical point has been passed and that both civilians and military accept the principles of democratic civil - military relations.

Ukrainian Experience of MOD Civilianization.

It was not the case in Ukraine where the civilianization of the MOD ended with failure. Out of four successive Ministers of Defence only the third nominee, Valeriy Szmarov, was a civilian person. But in spite of his former government experience (he was a Deputy Prime Minister) his time in the MOD was judged as a complete failure both by the opponents and proponents of the reform of the defence sector. More importantly, his nomination to the ministerial post was never

---

numerous insights into specific problems of reforming the management of defence sector.

[116] Dziennik Ustaw No 107 of 15 Sept. 1997, title 688.

really accepted by the military elite and received with such a distrust that made any co-operation impossible. The result was a deep conflict of the Minister with his own Chief of the General Staff, gen. A. Łopata who was eventually dismissed by President Kuchma.

Numerous publications in various newspapers, critically judging minister Szmarov and his activities, only confirmed that Ukraine was not ready to accept a civilian minister of defence. It is striking that his plans of reform and his decisions were always compared to opinions and plans of the so called 'military specialists' (thus suggesting his civilian incompetence) and 'patriotically minded officers' (thus suggesting his anti-Ukrainian attitude).[117] Szmarov tried to find a middle-of-the-road way between Soviet heritage and Ukrainian national traditions cherished by the nationalists but this compromised satisfied nobody and those 'patriotically - minded' accused him of making conscious efforts to stop and reverse the process of ukrainization of the army.[118]

Szmarov planed the thorough reform of the army. His plans provided for an army much smaller, mobile, with changed system of command and operation not based on military districts. This would mean massive dismissals of the officers, predominantly senior officers, and near - revolution in the military organisation and procedures. Hence it was certain to provoke a stern opposition from the caste of officers whose interests were endangered. They eventually united their forces with nationalist politicians, accusing Szmarov of corruption, incompetence, anti-Ukrainian activities, unjustified concessions to Russia in matters of the Black Sea Fleet, creation of the secret, underground general staff team to work out the reform and finally of the treason of the state. Eventually, the conflict between the minister

---

[117] See for example Witaliy Karpienko, 'Dzierzawniy pierieworot', in 'Sud i Osud..', pp. 7 - 8.
[118] S. Lisniy, 'Z Ukrainskoy Armii wiganiayut usie ukrain'skie', *Szliah Peremohi,* 29/95.

and the military became so deep that his position became impossible to hold and the President was forced to dismiss him.[119]

There was, however, more to Szmarov's case than just military opposition to reform. The protest of the military represented a vote of no confidence to the civilian leadership in general. The strained relations between the Ministry under Szmarov and the General Staff further deteriorated after two civilian inspections of the armed forces had been established in August 1995. One of them was the Main Military Inspection created within the structure of the MOD and superior to the General Staff, the other one - the General Inspection of the Armed Forces, included in the office of President Kuchma and in charge of control of all power ministries. The opposition with which those inspectorates met only illustrates the continuous resentment of the military towards any civilian intrusion.

The civil- military conflict was additionally fuelled by the fact that until August 1997 the functions of the Ministry and the General Staff were not precisely divided. This allowed the General Staff for 'flexible' approach to their prerogatives and responsibilities. Szmarov's attempt to define and separate the functions was vehemently opposed by the General Staff. In the end the precise legal regulation of the structure and function of the Ministry of Defence and the General Staff proved necessary for effective co-operation of those two bodies so President Kuchma on 21 August 1997 signed two decrees. One of them regulated the above discussed issue. The General Staff was univocally subordinated to the Minister of Defence, but the Chief of General Staff is also responsible to the President and his Council of the National Security and Defence. The other decree gave the General Staff powers to co-ordinate activities of all power structures, that is National Guards, Internal Troops and others.[120] This decision met with

---

[119] T.Olszański, 'Wokół dymisji szefa Sztabu Generalnego Ukrainy', *Biuletyn Ukraiński* (Warszawa: Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich) No 1(25), , January - February 1996, pp. 4 - 6.

[120] G.Niesmianovich, 'Ob'iedinienie pod vidom rozdielienia: rieforma v VS Ukraini poluchila novyi stimul', *Krasnaya Zwiezda*, No 210, 9 September 1997;

opposition from the commanders of those troops as their competition with the regular army is nobody's secret[121], yet they eventually subordinated to the President's will. These changes apparently smoothened the co-operation between MOD and GS because Szmarov's and Lopata's successors seem to work together well.

In general, the process of civilianisation of the military management has been reversed in Ukraine. The Ukrainian military are not prepared to accept the civilian leadership. Szmarov's dismissal, among other things, only confirmed the lack of political consensus on military reform and of political will to proceed with the civilianization of the defence sector. The process of legal regulations which should create a framework for civilian control of the armed forces has hardly began. As one journalist has dryly summed up the problem of Ukrainian civil - military relations: 'Democratic control of power structures by the legislative and judiciary branches in Ukraine has hardly been initiated. Instead the executive branch has in fact already constructed an authoritarian, no-alternative system of daily civilian control of the power structures which goes only one - way: President (CNSD apparatus) - power ministries'.[122] That this system has not much in common with the principles of democratic civil - military relations seems only obvious.

DEPOLITICISATION OF POST - COMMUNIST MILITARY.

The collapse of communist regimes in Central Eastern Europe and the demise of the Soviet Union brought universal calls for thorough depoliticization of the military. This slogan seemed to be common to all the post - communist countries in the region. Yet, the exact meaning of this 'depoliticization' varied. While in Central Eastern Europe the Main Political Administration, party cells and political officers in the armed forces were universally despised and

---

G.Niesmianovich, 'Noviy status Giensztaba Ukraini', *Krasnaya Zwiezda*, No 170, 24 January 1997.

[121] S.Zguriec, 'Hochiesz mira - gotov'sia..', *Dzien'*, 30 July 1997.

perceived (rightly) as purely Soviet model of party control over the military, in the armies formed from the former Soviet armed forces nostalgia for the past, including political activity of the military, was not uncommon among the officer corps.

Polish Regulations.

The post-communist states of Central Eastern Europe accepted the Western model of strict military separation from direct political activities as their target model. Poland disposed of the Main Political Administration (Główny Zarząd Polityczny) and political officers by 1992. The parliament amended relatively quickly the Bill on Professional Military Service.[123] Its regulations conform with principles of military participation in public life governing in most democratic states.

Chapter 5 of the Bill prohibits professional soldiers from participation in any political party or organisation or to be actively engaged in activities of political character. This includes participation in meetings (with exception of electoral meetings) and dissemination of publications on political issues. Accession to professional military service automatically cancels membership in any political organisation. If a professional soldier belongs to any organisation of non-political character which is placed outside the army, he is obliged to inform the commander-in-chief of his military unit on this fact. The law forbids organisation of labour unions in the military services. The Bill specifically emphasises the fact the restrictions do not refer to the church affiliation and do not forbid participation in religious ceremonies.

According to constitutional law, soldiers in active service cannot be members of the parliament. Otherwise there are no constitutional restrictions of citizen rights of the military. Thus

---

[122] W.Grechaninov, 'Kak kontrolirowat' armiyu', *Dzien'*, No 107, 16 October 1997.
[123] *Bill on Professional Military Service of 1970 with amendments,* Dziennik Ustaw No 8/1992, title 31.

soldiers, both professional and conscript, enjoy FULL suffrage rights. The importance of suffrage rights for the military has been reiterated in the Code of Honour of the PAF Officer which says that 'An officer, as the citizen of the Republic of Poland retains the right to actively participate in social life within the framework of existing legal system'.[124]

The military can vote and run as candidates in general elections but more importantly, they have the same active and passive rights in local governments elections. Now, this can pose certain problems for the military units commanders[125]. The electoral law determines that military sites will not be turned into closed constituencies. This does not pose any problems in case of general elections as voting regulations are relatively flexible and it is easy to obtain a document entitling to voting outside its own constituency. Obviously, this is not the case with local elections when votes may be cast only in the place of living. Whereas the majority of officers live and serve in the same constituency, conscript soldiers very often are placed in military units away from their homes and must travel to their local constituencies. Under law they are entitled to do so. However, one can imagine a situation when a majority of conscript soldiers in a majority of military units request leave from the commander in chief in order to vote in local elections. If all the commanders complied with the law and granted leaves to the conscript soldiers, then the majority of units would rapidly become understaffed for two days and its military readiness would fall under safety levels. For a potential aggressor this situation would make the day of local elections as good for an attack on Poland as Yom Kippur in Israel proved to be for president Sadat. If, on the other hand, commanders of military units used common sense and would grant leaves only to such number of soldiers that would not put military readiness in jeopardy (as they do), they could fall

---

[124]. *Kodeks Honorowy Oficera Wojska Polskiego* (Code of Honour of the Officer of the Polish Army), (Warszawa: Bellona, 1995), p.13.

under charge of breaking the law and restricting citizen rights of the soldiers. In practice the situation is not so drastic only because local elections are not extremely popular among conscript soldiers, and running for local government even less so, but this problem should be legally resolved.

According to law[126] a professional soldier who runs for parliament or president is entitled and obliged to go on temporary leave. No electoral posters or campaigning is allowed on military sites. Any use of military uniform or badges for election purposes is strictly forbidden. In case of election of the soldier for member of parliament he is automatically removed from active service. After the term in office ends the soldier is also automatically restored to active service.

Electoral Abuses.

The reality of political life in the early years of post-communist transition in Poland proved that even the best regulations can not prevent breaches of political neutrality of the military. The military in Poland, contrary to the Ukrainian or Russian servicemen, rather refrained from taking an active part in the affairs of political parties or from running for the parliament. There were only few exceptions to general political non-engagement of the military. There was only one case of military organisation *Viritim* formed in early 1990s, which had a political profile. It did not live long, however and failed to gain considerable support. In case of Poland the general rule was that it was the civilian politicians who abused the political neutrality of the military in their search for electorate and for military support. Former Chief of General Staff, gen. T.Wilecki, was the only military who acted as a politician and even at times as a person superior to the politicians (with presidential support), but his dismissal in 1996 put an end to this activity inside the Armed Forces.

---

[125] My attention was drawn to this particular problem by colonel Nalaskowski, Head of Legal Office of the MOD during personal interview, September 1995.
[126] *Bill on Professional Military Service...* art. 71-72 and 21 p.1&3.

Before every election, be it parliamentary of presidential, the Minster of Defence felt obliged to issue special guidelines concerning military participation in the campaigns.[127] It did not help to stop the unlawful activities of some politicians, mainly those close to the former president Lech Wałęsa. Perhaps the best known example is the case from presidential elections of 1995 when the signatures supporting the candidature of Lech Walesa for re-election were collected 'by order' in Vistula Military Units. This eventually led to the dismissal of Vice Admiral Marek Toczek and was the only case when the high ranking officer was dismissed due to abuse of electoral law. However, media reported on several other cases of canvassing inside military establishment, as lobbying for Aleksander Kwasniewski, Walesa's counter-candidate in Warsaw Military District Units or alleged Deputy Chief's of GS gen.Komornicki exhorting service personnel in Szczecin to vote for Wałęsa.[128] Wałęsa himself and his closest collaborators were believed to be directly involved in lobbying for support of president-backed electoral bloc BBWR in 1993 among the military, although this has never been proved.[129] Yet, the outcomes of the elections proved that with the exception of few high-ranking officers the absolute majority of the military personnel despises involvement in politics and that their vote cannot be easily won by populist promises and demonstrations of support for the

---

[127] 1. *Wytyczne Ministra Obrony Narodowej z dn. 11 czerwca 1993 r. w sprawie przestrzegania w kampanii wyborczej do Sejmu i Senatu ustawowo okreslonych zasad apolitycznosci Sil Zbrojnych i apartyjnosci zolnierzy*. (Ministry of National Defence Directive of 11 June 1993 on Observance during the Parliamentary Election Campaign of the Statutory Principles af the Political Neutrality an th Armed Forces and the Non-Partisanship of Servicemen). Completed by additional guidelines issued on 22 July 1993by Janusz Onyszkiewicz.
2. *Wytyczne Ministra Obrony Narodowej z dn. 27 maja 1994 w sprawie wyborow do rad gmin oraz uzupelniajacych wyborow do Senatu RP*. (Ministry of National Defenc Directive of 24 May 1994 in the election to local governments and complimentary elections to Senate. (by Piotr Kolodziejczyk)
3. *Wytyczne Ministar Obrony Narodowej w sprawie udzialu zolnierzy w wyborach Prezydenta Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej 5 listopada 1995*.(Ministry of National Defenc Directive on the participation of the soldiers in presidential elections)by Zbigniew Okonski.
[128] *Gazeta Wyborcza*, August 16, 1995.

military reform. Both sides seemed to learn the lesson and during parliamentary elections of 1995 no electoral abuses of political neutrality of the military were reported.

Military and Political Parties in Russia and Ukraine.

The matters took a different course in Russian or Ukraine. There the idea of political neutrality of the armed forces was approached differently. The politicians and military tended to criticise the wrong practices of last years of MPAs existence rather than condemn the whole idea. In many publications the very principle of political neutrality of the military is treated with caution (or simply misunderstood) and it is argued that the military as an organisation is inseparable from politics and in itself a political body, so it cannot be neutral.[130] Military sociologists as well as officers in the 1990s often look at the 'educational work' in the Soviet army as a traditions going back to the Tsarist army and teaching such virtues an patriotism, officer's honour and responsibility and tend to forget its function of political indoctrination. According to some authors, in 1950s and 1960s the military political education and socialisation were very successful, so 'mothers without fright, and often with joy sent sons to military service, because after the service in the Armed Forces young people were coming back better organised, self-sufficient, with hard will and health. A soldier of the Soviet Army knew that he was called to protect his country, his Fatherland, his nation'.[131] There is a certain irony to the fact that some ardent nationalists in Ukraine also look at Soviet system of political indoctrination with nostalgia and think it most fit as a model to carry out patriotic education of the conscripts.[132]

---

[129] Information from col. Krzysztof Pommes, then deputy director of MOD Public Relations Office, personal interview, October 1995.
[130] See for example V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii..*,pp. 33 - 53.
[131] V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii*, p.225.
[132] Testimony of gen. Volodimir Muliava, 'Sud i Osud..', pp. 127 - 128.

Nevertheless legal regulations concerning the political neutrality of the military in general are similar to Polish law analysed above. The Ukrainian Constitution enshrined the principle of political neutrality of the armed forces. Those principles were further reinforced in the parliamentary bills regarding Armed Forces, forbidding them to take active part in political parties or organisations as military men in active service.

In Russia, the parliamentary Bill on the Status of Service Personnel allows the military to belong and actively work in social organisations which do not have political aims. This in fact is tantamount to the right of creating labour unions. Both in Ukraine and Russian electoral law forbids the military to take part in electoral campaign in a character of active duty soldiers, although it does not restrict suffrage rights.

Despite the reasonable regulations the political neutrality of the military in Russia and Ukraine is a fiction. Practically all political parties compete between themselves to win military votes. To this aim each of the parties took care to include some military figures in the leadership. It is often the case that extremist organisations are the ones most interested in military electorate. In Ukraine, the two organisations most active in search of votes 'of khaki colour' are the Communist Party of Ukraine and Ukrainian National Army.[133] Two active service generals: former Minister of Defence Vitaliy Radet'sky and head of logistics gen. Dmitriy Rukovodsky were engaged in the elections of 1998. They both had permissions granted by the Minister of Defence gen. Kuz'muk.[134]

There is also a visible increase in direct political activity of the military in Ukraine and Russia. In 1997 there was over 30 various 'social' organizations of the military in Ukraine and their number was still going up. Recently, these organisations were uniting their forces

---

[133] G.Kliuchnikov, V.Larciev, 'Elliektorat <cvieta khaki>, s kiem ty?', *Kievskiye Viedomosti*, 5 September 1997.

which may lead in the future to the establishment of powerful lobby representing corporate interests of the military. In the mid-1996 fifteen various organisations united in Kiev to establish an All-Ukrainian Union *Vitchizna*, under the leadership of gen. Vilen Martyrosyan (founder and former head of the Union of the Officers of Ukraine). In the spring of 1997 five other military organisations united in the National- Patriotic Union of Service Personnel *Honour and Fatherland* which aim is to protect exclusively the interests of the officer corps.[135]

Similarly in Russia, numerous representatives of the officer corps, both active service and reserve, are very active in numerous political parties. Most of them are senior officers of highest ranks, generals and colonels. There are also many professional representative organisation of the military which take on a high political profile (with breach of the law), such as *Soyuz Oficierov* (Assiociation of Officers), *Voyenniye za Diemokracyiu* (The Military for Democracy), *Oficiery za Vozrozieniye Rossiyi* (Officers for the Rebirth of Russia) and others.[136]

Military in Parliamentary Elections.

But most importantly, both in Ukraine and Russia the military decided to take the matters in their own hands and to run in great numbers for the parliament, in most cases with the blessing of the Ministries of Defence. The argument of the military that they want to win the greatest possible number of seats in the parliament in order to ensure the creation of own, reliable and powerful lobby in the parliament was in fact another vote of no-confidence for the civilian decision-makers and expression of the military lack of faith in the civilian's ability to resolve military problems. It is also a sign of predominant Soviet mentality of the military in Russia and Ukraine, who want to have their share of power and direct influence on political

---

[134] Interview with gen. Kuz'muk, 'Voyenniye poka jeszczio vieriat', *Zierkalo Niedzieli,* No 49 (166), 6 December 1997.
[135] G.Kliuchnikov, V.Larciev, 'Eliektorat..'.

affairs and do not appear ready to wait for decisions of those to whom this power has been delegated through democratic procedures.

But the societies in both countries obviously rejected the idea of powerful military representation in the legislative body and the run of the military candidates for the parliaments ended with failure.

In Russia a substantial number of military MPs sat in the last parliament of the USSR and the first Russian *Duma* which was shot down by President Yeltzin on 4 October 1993. This experience was not encouraging, therefore the MOD decided not to put the official military candidates in the elections of 1993. Regrettably, this lesson was forgotten and subsequent parliamentary elections already witnessed a wave of military candidates, running for the parliament with the official support of the MOD. This 'army operation' was a disaster. Out of 123 candidate officers backed by military authorities only two were elected. At the same time 8 military candidates who ran without the support of the MOD or in some instances were even criticised for this decision made it to the parliament. At the the elections an actual party affiliation of the 10 military representatives in the parliament was so differentiated that the creation of joint military fraction proved impossible.[137]

Ukrainian experience was not very different from the Russian. In the elections of 1998 an unprecedented number of military men ran for parliamentary seats - 70 senior officers, among them 19 generals and 26 colonels. Newspapers headlines read: 'Bad is a colonel who does not want to run for parliament'.[138] The official argument of the MOD was similar to the Russian reasoning: to create own, reliable lobby in the parliament and to take military matters in responsible hands. And the disaster was even greater than in Russia: all the military candidates lost. Not one made it to the parliament.

---

[136] V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii*, p.120.
[137] V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii*, pp. 86 - 87.
[138] S.Zguriec, 'Ploh tot polkovnik, kotoriy nie hochiet stat' dieputatom',*Dzien'*, 10 March 1998.

What was striking in case of Russian and Ukrainian waves of military would-be MPs was that they were not only predominantly highest ranking officers, but also the absolute majority of the candidates represented educational structures within the MOD or teachers from military academies, not commanders of military units. And very many of them were former political officers. Journalists speculated that in view of inevitable reductions in the ministerial and general staff structures some of the officers tried to secure a place for themselves in the Parliament in case they were made redundant.

The presence of many former political officers or current representatives of these structure in the Ukrainian and Russian politics suggests that senior officers who were politically involved under previous regime and kept high positions in the military structures after the collapse of Soviet Union are 'unreformable' and their continuos presence in the power structures of the armed forces can hamper reforms and slow down democratisation processes of the military and civil - military relations, even if they do not act against existing order openly.

CLOSING REMARKS

The reforms of civil - military relations constitute an important part of the overall transitions in post-communist countries. Without this reform transitions will not be completed. Yet, neither in Russia, nor in Ukraine or Poland the experience of restructuring defence management have not been fully satisfactory and many aspects of restructuring civil - military relations represent an outright failure.

The comparison of Polish, Ukrainian and Russian experiences in building national armies of now independent and sovereign states and in democratisation of the civil - military relations confirmed the importance of existing traditions. All the three countries experienced similar problems, yet of the three only Poland, after a few years of acute political conflicts and complete stalemate in military reforms

overcame the obstacles and entered the right path. In the author's opinion, the previous democratic experience and strong national military traditions free from Russian or Ukrainian type dilemmas helped a great deal in overcoming the crisis. Regardless of political instability and weak institutions Polish political elite accepted in general democratic principles and proved that they were willing to learn. The changes that took place in Polish parliament in the relations between the branches of the government confirm this thesis. Naturally the reforms are far from being completed yet, but the perspective of membership in NATO and the influence of European Union and the emphasis on democratic rules put by both institutions I think guarantees the progress of the reforms.

Ukraine and Russia are different cases. Neither of those countries had any meaningful experience of democracy and in case of Ukraine there is also lack of experience in state-building that can additionally complicate the situation. The processes of building/reforming national armies was closely interconnected to the processes of building new national identity. Some political developments discussed earlier in this report suggest the presence of strong authoritarian tendencies in those countries. The post-communist political systems in Russia and Ukraine, sanctioned by constitutions, are characterised by heavy executive bias (in the person of the president) and unbalanced relations between the branches of power. This alone is an impediment to democratic control of the military and to the development of representative democracy in general.

In Russia and Ukraine political priorities regarding the military were different from Poland. In Russia political elite put power over democracy: they were determined to rebuild powerful army or at least to keep the appearances of its power rather than democratise defence and security policies. Such processes of democratisation would inevitably bring about disorder and weakening of the armed forces in its first stage, so Russian authorities refrained from any such

experiments. They did not even attempt to take the risk of nominating a civilian to the post of the Minister of Defence. Moreover, the introduction of the democratic model of civil - military relations, if it was successful, would mean a weakening of the presidential power. If one adds to this the unpreparedness of the Russian military to accept civilian leadership, it becomes obvious that in Russia nobody has political interest in it. On the contrary, the most powerful people in Russia have the stake in keeping the army unreformed and their interests untouched. Therefore substantial changes to the existing situation should not be expected in the near future.

The situation in Ukraine is similar. The authorities of newly independent state gave priority to so called 'ukrainization' of the armed forces in their drive to establish truly national army. This operation was not successful and resulted in deep conflicts inside the army and in the society at large regarding the national issue. The attempt to establish civilian leadership in the MOD failed as well and the dismissal of the civilian minister Szmarov following his conflict with the military proved that Ukrainian military are just as unprepared to civilian leadership as the Russians are.

Yet, the Ukrainian geopolitical situation is different to Russia. The example of Polish reforms and an increasing military co-operation with Poland, active participation in PfP programmes, finally signing of NATO-Ukraine Charter can exert a positive influence on the reforms of the military and the overall state of civil - military relations. However, such positive influence will be possible only if Ukrainian political elite have a stake in these reforms for example increased financial assistance, or promise of closer economic and military co-operation. The perception of such advantages, namely the prospects of NATO membership, was the driving force behind the progress of reforms in Poland.

The economic crisis and lack of resources to carry out major military reforms is a common feature in all the three countries. All post-communist armies are dramatically under-funded, although the

scale is different. In Poland the main visible effect of the financial shortages is lack of resources for the modernisation of the armed forces and the cutting of social privileges. In case of Russia or Ukraine the shortage of economic resources has a different dimension. The crisis is so acute that funds do not cover even the maintenance expenses. The officers do not receive their wages for month, conscripts are underfed, military manoeuvres of scale are a history, the levels of combat readiness of many military units fell below emergency levels.

The side effects of the deteriorating economic conditions and political disturbances are such phenomena as increased criminal statistics of conscripts and officers, widespread corruption of inconceivable dimension, worsening of human relations inside the armed forces and bad conditions of military service. It resulted in avoiding of military service by young people and falling quality of recruits. The prestige of the military in Ukraine and Russia lowered compared to the Soviet Union, although in Ukraine it is still relatively high . Poland is an exception here because the prestige of the military increased, but this refers to the military as an institution and does not influence positively the attitudes of conscripts.

The economic crisis forms a vicious circle of necessity and inability: the reforms are necessary, but the lack of funds makes their realisations partial or impossible. Yet, the armies in the present form are wasteful and extremely expensive institutions. The simple increase in funds appropriated to the defence and security in any of those countries would only guarantee greater waste. Armies need to be reformed into smaller, mobile forces with modern weapons, the proportion of senior officers to junior officers reversed, training and education patterns changed fundamentally and only then the increase of funds could have a positive impact. In Russia and Ukraine there also needs to be established a working system of independent monitoring of spending. Such a system is already in place in Poland, although not free from imperfections and rumours of corruption in the military are recurrent.

The post-Soviet military found it hard to accept the civilian leadership. The example of Poland shows that if there is a political will (even motivated by the external factors, such as NATO membership), then the restructuring of civil - military relations becomes possible. But all post-communist countries suffer from a dramatic shortage of civilian experts capable to manage the security issues. This is a corollary of the Soviet order when security issues were as a rule top secret and only a narrow circle of people had access to them. What is needed now is a public debate on security issues in all the countries concerned. This would help to work out popular consensus on those matters and greatly facilitate the reforms. Regrettably, however, in many post-communist countries the issues of security and defence policy are still treated in accordance with Soviet patterns and military affairs constitute forbidden sphere. In Russia and in some instances even in Ukraine and Poland those matters were kept secret even from the parliament. Such practices are unacceptable from the point of view of democratic civil - military relations and as long as they don't change (as it already took place in Poland), the civilian experts on security will not appear and this will only justify military arguments about the incompetence of the civilians. Without those 'defence villages' the civil - military relations will not be fully democratic.

Table 1.

DECREASE OF SOCIAL TRUST AND INCREASE OF DISTRUST IN THE RUSSIAN ARMY (IN %)

Years	Trust	Distrust
1992, August	55 - 60	12
1993, November	48 - 53	18 - 20
1994, May	38	28
1995, January	35	40
1995, November	27	49

Source: V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii*, p.20.

Table 2.

DYNAMICS OF THE CHANGES IN THE ATTITUDES OF POPULATION TOWARDS THE INSTITUTIONS OF POWER (IN % OF THOSE SURVEYED).

	TRUST			DO NOT TRUS		
	MAY 1994 (N=1375)	MAY 1995 (N=1431)	NOV. 1995 (N=1420)	MAY 1994 (N=1375)	MAY 1995 (N=1431)	NOV. 1995 (N=1420)
President of RF	20	12	9	50	76	75
Government	14	12	8	50	74	73
Council of Federation (Upper House of Parliament)	11	9	5	41	65	71
State Duma (Lower House)	16	13	9	41	66	70
Local Governors	13	16	11	43	60	65
Police	13	15	10	55	71	71
Orthodox Church	-	33	27	-	42	47
Parties and political movements	5	7	8	52	67	65
I do not believe anyone	-	-	-	22	28	36

Source: V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii*, p.21.

Table 3.

PROPORTION OF CONSCRIPT TO CONTRACT SOLDIERS IN FEDERAL FORCES IN RUSSIA.

DECEMBER 1994	FEBRUARY 1995	BEGINNING OF 1996

conscript	contract	conscript	contract	conscript	contract
90%	10%	50%	50%	65%-70%	35%-30%

Source: V.Sieriebriannikov, Yu. Dieriugin, *Sociologia armii*, p.194.

Table 4.

STRUCTURE OF MILITARY SPENDING IN THE USSR AND RUSSIA (IN MLD US$)

	1990		1995		1996
BUDGET POSITIONS	%	MLD US$	%	MLD US$	MLD US$
Maintenance of army and fleet	27	80	51	35	20
Purchase of armaments and military technology	44	132	21	14	8
Military constructions	5	15	12	8	5
R&D	19	57	10	7	4
Military pensions	3	9	8	6	3.8
MINATOM	2	6	2	1.4	0.8
Total	100	300	100	70	40

Source: Siergiey Rogov, 'Vooruzieniye sily..', p.4.

The following tables below containing data on Ukrainian Armed Forces present selected results of the series of surveys carried out in the Ukrainian military by the Center 'Social Monitoring' and Ukrainian Center for Economic and Political Research under joint theme 'Social Problems and Reform of the Armed Forces Ukraine' in 1996. Copy courtesy of Tadeusz Olszański, chief

Ukrainian expert of the Center for Eastern Studies, Warsaw to whom Iwould like to express gratitude.

Table 5.

DECREASE OF PRESTIGE OF MILITARY SERVICE BETWEEN 1992 AND 1996 IN THE EYES OF THE MILITARY
(IN % OF THOSE SURVEYED)

	1992	1996
Very high prestige	1	0.4
High	3	0.7
Medium	35	8
Low	42	35
Very low	19	52

Table 6.

SATISFACTION OF THE MILITARY FROM THE SERVICE
(IN % OF THOSE SURVEYED)

'Are you satisfied with your service?'	% of the surveyed
Yes, to some degree	5
Rather satisfied	19
Rather not satisfied	45
Deeply unsatisfied	24
Hard to say	7

Table 7.

'HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH...?'
(IN % OF THOSE SURVEYED)

	Fully satisfied	More satisfied than not	Rather unsatisfied	Completely unsatisfied	Hard to say
The overall material situation	1	6	24	67	2
Wages	1	3	23	71	2
Material Remuneration other than money	2	18	31	47	2
Conditions of accommodation	7	15	23	53	2
Social position	1	7	31	56	5

Table 8.

ATTITUDES OF RESPONDENTS TO THE HIGHEST INSTITUTIONS OF MILITARY COMMANDING.
SCALE: "1" - fully negative; "10" - fully positive.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Supreme Commander of the AF (President)	19.4	11.4	16.6	10.4	18.2	5.3	6.0	2.4	0.9	4.6
Minister of Defence	23.0	13.6	15.3	10.6	15.3	6.2	5.2	2.7	1.0	3.7
General Staff of Ukrainian Armed Forces	13.8	9.6	16.7	10.6	20.2	8.6	6.2	4.7	1.3	4.2

AVERAGE OUTCOME

Supreme Commander of AF (President)	3.67
Minister of Defence	3.52
General Staff	3.67

Table 9.

OFFICERS' OPINIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF UKRAINIAN ARMY
(IN % OF THOSE SURVEYED)

Oriented towards integration with NATO	12
Favours creation of the bloc Russia-Ukraine-Belarus	37
Favours non-alignment with any military pact	41
Oriented towards accession to Taszkient Defence Agreement	8
Did not answer	2

Table 10

RANKING OF SOCIAL TRUST IN UKRAINIAN PUBLIC INSTITUCTION - SELECTED DATA.
(Scale 1 to 5: 1 - complete lack of trust; 5 - fully trusted).

Trust in:	Average	Lviv	Kiev	Doniec k	Symferop ol
God	4.02	4.53	3.71	3.88	3.97
compatriots	3.63	3.57	3.57	3.85	3.52
Orthodox Chuch and clergy	3.60	4.03	3.34	3.55	3.47
army	3.24	3.30	3.30	3.30	3.10
Security Service	3.02	3.00	3.34	3.55	3.47
president Kuchma	2.88	3.50	3.11	2.70	2.20
police	2.34	2.15	2.68	2.17	2.35
government	2.21	2.26	2.17	2.25	2.16
political parties	2.08	2.08	2.03	2.01	2.05

Source: *Post - Postup*, No 23 / 1995.

Table 11.

OPINIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL OFFICER CORPS IN POLAND ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE MAIN PUBLIC INSTITUTION BETWEEN YEARS 1993 - 1995.

Institution	Net Approval (Difference Bewteen Opinions Positive and Negative.		
	1993	1994	1995
Government	4	37	31
President L.Wałęsa	-20	-38	-45
Lower House of Parliament	-63	38	31
Army	73	73	70
Police	63	65	64
Church	-44	-25	-44

Source: col. Czesław Ochenduszka, *Świadomość obywatelska i orientacje społeczno - polityczne środowisk wojskowych. Dynamika przemian i cechy szczególne.* (Warszawa: Wojskowyc Instytut Badań Socjologicznych, 1997), p. 32.

Table 12

HIERARCHY OF SELECTED ISSUES FOR THE POLISH OFFICER CORPS.
Scale 1 to 7: 1 = This is completely unimportant to me;
7 = this is very important to me

The officers were asked the following question: 'Everybody has a concept which governs his behaviour. How imprtant are the following issues in your life?'	Average result	
	Feb. 1995	Oct. 1995
Respect for law and order	6.47	6.52
Safety	6.43	6.46
High living standards	5.94	5.87
Living and acting at its own responsibility	5.74	5.86
Fully enjoying life	5.65	5.51
Showing hard work and ambition	5.43	5.34

Winning respect for yourself and your needs	5.31	5.23
Making of your own image	5.35	4.96
Helping the poorer and more vulnerable social classes	4.93	4.67
Engaging in politics	2.96	3.13
Power and influential connections	3.81	2.68

Source: col. Henryk Dziewulski, *Stan apolityczności wojska i kadry zawodowej w świetle opinii żołnierzy zawodowych WP*, (Warszawa: Wojskowy Instytut Badań Socjologicznych, 1995), p.7.