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THIS RESEARCH HAS BEEN DEVELOPED THANKS TO NATO. HAVING BEEN AWARDED A NATO RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMME, THE AUTHOR HAS HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO VISIT THE COUNTRIES SUBJECT TO RESEARCH AND GET FAMILIARIZED WITH THE REFORMS IN THEIR ARMED FORCES

I.

NATO members are not armies, but states with their total economic, military, cultural etc. potential, with their historical heritage and national specifics. In its turn, Bulgaria first declared and in 1997 proved its strong determination to join the North Atlantic Alliance.

After 1989 the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland carried out a successful transition to a market economy, a democratic society and a state of law and order by reforming their armed forces in a pragmatic, concerted and relatively conflict-free manner, traversed an accelerated stage of joining the Alliance, and become full members of NATO.

An initially vicious formula of transition from communism to democracy underlay the changes in Bulgaria, which resulted in a failure in the beginning of 1997, and still continues to cause trouble to the nation. Disunited, impoverished and fallen into anomie, the Bulgarian society cannot yet face and analyze its problems soberly, nor can it solve the rending conflicts on its own.

Prior to 1997, the changes in the Bulgarian Armed Forces, unjustifiably titled reforms, were inconsistent, cosmetic and often interrupted. Thorough and essential reforms, though charged with contradictions, have been carried out in the Bulgarian Army since 1997. However these reforms have not been defended in a national debate and their resource support is partial. During and after the crisis in Kosovo the country proved that it could be a reliable partner of NATO.

II.

This research traces the background of reforms, the ideas and decisions of political and military leaders from the four states after the Berlin wall collapse. It points out the measures of removing the communist parties from the armies, cutting the military budgets and army strength, and of reorganizing the armed forces.

The research views the ways of establishing civil control on the armed forces and analyzes the documents tracing the reforms and mapping out the way to NATO, as well as the changes in military education.

It discusses the Partnership for Peace Program role for speeding up the military reforms and bringing nearer the NATO standards and structures.

In its content the concept “military reforms” (as well as the reforms in any social sphere) stands for the aggregate of quantitative and qualitative changes in the
military organization of the state, aimed to bring it into harmony with the changed internal and external conditions. The armed forces reforms are conditioned by factors of political, social and historical importance, which have bearing on the geopolitical and military-strategic situation of the state. These factors change or are able to change its role and place in international life. They sharpen the problems of achieving and defending the national interests, of guaranteeing the security of citizens, society and the state.

Military reforms are preceded and accompanied by breaking up of established military and political standards and stereotypes so far considered as unwavering, by liquidation or radical transformation of obsolete systems, bodies and structures that have already fulfilled their functions, by a partial or full replacement of the military doctrine and the strategic concepts, of the approaches to organizing the army support and completion, etc.

It is namely for this reason that military reforms require consolidation and high concentration of society’s material and intellectual resources, thus solving the whole aggregate of intellectual, political, organizational and technical, socio-economic, military-strategic and moral tasks.

As a social phenomenon, military reforms comprise regularities confirmed by own historical experience and by the practice of similar reforms in other countries, and are subject to them. The regularities below can be considered as part of them:

- Bring the military organization’s major parameters, i.e. strength, composition and structure to values equivalent to the probable threats and risks faced by the state.
- Reject, specify or change the state military organization’s obsolete tasks and determine new tasks stemming from the essence of existing or probable threats.
- Increase the military organization’s capacity for effective accomplishment of these new tasks, mostly by improving the system and structure of rule, proper staffing, operative and military preparation and all-round support.
- Secure a prestigious socio-political and economic status of the state military organization in order to stimulate its proper and stable completion.
- Active information policy during the course of reforms, which is to guarantee broad social support.
- Consistent advance towards the military organization professionalization.

III.
SPECIFICS OF THE REFORM IN THE CZECH ARMED FORCES

TENDER FIRMNESS

“The velvet revolution waged by Czechs and Slovaks, which swept away the communist regime in numbered hours, is related to Vaclav Havel and to the 1968 Czechoslovak reformers and dissidents. All attempts to lend the then existing social order a human image and to declare openly that the absence of market mechanisms, an effective economy and social justice would precipitate the bankruptcy of the socialist block fostered in public awareness the ideas of democracy and belonging to European democracy.

Throughout the centuries the Czech ethnos has devised norms and stereotypes of social behaviour as a strategy of survival and presence in history. Consequently, these fashioned the well-known Czech temperance, steadiness, historical pragmatism and ability for self-assessment and a sober view of dissimilarities. Vaclav Havel is quoted as saying that hardly has any other nation been so consistent in untying the knots of its century-old experience while searching for its identity. Philosopher Tomasz Masarik – the founder of the first Czechoslovak state is among the organizers and proponents of the centennial-long argument about the significance of the Czech history.

The architects of Czech statehood are looking for the roots of their state founding strategy in the philosophical rationalization and moral re-assessment of the historical experience of the ethnos. The sense of historical reflection is inbred in Czech mentality. Vaclav Havel who carried on this tendency, is prone to self-reflection and is keen on identifying the significant problems of the life of the nation in the context of the philosophy and ethics of history. The speeches and articles of the president attest to him as a humanist and moralist. The reforms that he conducted publicly with all fairness and transparency to avoid speculations evolved into a national cause.

Significantly, under powerful public pressure a president democrat was elected in Czechoslovakia in 1989. He formed a federal government of national accord and appointed democrats and reformers to key positions.

“About that time the Bulgarian Communist Party had the whole power in its hands and was resolved to keep it. The Bulgarian opposition was slowly and with a great deal of effort capturing the passes to the bastion of the Bulgarian Communist Party until the first democratic elections in 1990 while the ruling top was stubbornly refusing to disband its party organizations in the industrial enterprises. In the meantime Parliament in Czechoslovakia adopted over sixty laws, twelve of which reflected in the constitution. In substance, the basis of the economic reforms was then prepared…

“Both the Czech Republic and Bulgaria are typical examples of parliamentary republics. The essential difference between them is that in the former case the mechanism of parliamentarism works while in the latter it mills the wind”
Zhelyu Zhelev, the first democratically elected president of Bulgaria wrote in the introduction to the selected speeches, addresses and interviews of Václav Havel.

(1)

Being an outcome of World War One, the Czechoslovak republic was founded as one of Europe’s most democratic states and as the only democratic state in Central Europe. The armed forces of Czechoslovakia were formed even before Czechoslovakia appeared on the map out of the Czechoslovak volunteer legions in Russia, Italy and France where around 150 000 Czechs and Slovaks were at war. The military of the newly fledged state inherited part of the traditions of Austria-Hungary and were under strong French influence after 1919.

The capitulation enjoined by the 1938 Munich treaty and the country’s occupation by nazi Germany dealt a heavy blow on generations of servicemen. Nonetheless, the Czechoslovak military had always been on a high technical and organizational level and had well-trained personnel. Thousands of Czechs and Slovaks fought in the battle of Britannia as servicemen in air squadrons 311 and 312, in the operations for the defense of France, on the Eastern Front, in Africa, in the Yugoslav guerilla war and even in the air warfare over the Pacific. Again Czech and Slovak military men joined action in Italy and on the Western Front in 1944. They lent strength to the underground resistance movement and guerilla units, to the Slovak uprising in 1944 and the 1945 May revolution in Prague. During World War II almost one quarter of the available personnel of the Czechoslovak military perished or lay in prisons and concentration camps.

The histories of the Czech republic and Bulgaria interface in an interesting way. In the 18th and 19th century Bulgarians fled to Bohemia to escape Ottoman domination. Upon settling they started growing vegetables to make a living. Their laboriousness impressed the Czechs who devised the proverb “Hardworking as a Bulgarian”. Today this proverb is no longer in common use.

After Bulgaria’s liberation in 1878 Czech scholars, musicians, artists and architects arrived to the country. Konstantin Ireçek wrote a history of Bulgaria, which presented a true picture of the people’s mentality, the pictures of Ivan Markvička ranked him among the classics of Bulgarian art of painting. Czechs formed the first military bands, created masterpieces of architecture and had villages and streets named after them by the grateful population.

After World War II, officers who had served before 1939 rejoined the military forces. They were the first to fall a victim to the repression launched by the Communist Party in 1948 against those who dared oppose the foundation of a totalitarian state and Soviet type military forces. Units of the Czechoslovak people’s military joined in the debacle of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 and of rioting in Poland in 1957 (2).

In 1968 the country was hit hard for the third time when former coalition troops invaded it. Under totalitarianism, servicemen were under constant surveillance by the military counter-intelligence, which had ten times more agents than the state security. Five percent of the officers were agents of the military counter-
intelligence and its establishment accounted for three percent of the officers’ corps (3).

In March 1989 Colonel-General Miroslav Vacek, Chief-of-staff, was appointed defense minister in the new cabinet of the Czechoslovak Republic. He kept in regular contact with President Vaclav Havel, ordered the disbandment of the party structures in the armed forces and started removing from office the corrupt generals. Fifty percent of them were transferred to the reserve. The new minister pledged to guarantee the loyalty of the armed forces to the legitimate government, approved and implemented some of the proposals advanced by the association for military renovation whose members had been released after 1948. 1023 officers and 112 non-commissioned officers discharged between 1948 and 1989 were reinstated and rehabilitated by Act 119/1990 “On judicial rehabilitations” and Act 87/1991. (4).

The public and the press, the meetings and petitions of the newly formed parties and civic associations exerted strong pressure in favour of reforms insisting for personnel changes among the top brass, for humanization and reduction of the army service from 24 to 12 months. Also, they called for the initiation of civil service (as an alternative to military service), for the rehabilitation of the politically repressed officers, speedy professionalisation, the disbandment of the party organizations in the armed forces and their substitution with independent associations. Some radically minded politicians even suggested the liquidation of the armed forces.

The 1990 defense law cancelled the political party membership of servicemen, which essentially amounted to decommunisation of the armed forces. Even before the adoption of the law almost 70% of the Communist Party members in the airforce units left the party. The law allowed over 2000 young officers and sergeants to demobilize. By September 1990, 15,3% or 9 380 servicemen had demobilized and 92% of them were under 30 years of age. Their argument had been the disadvantageous social conditions and the wider vistas provided by the civic professions. Furthermore, the law stipulated that the demobilizing servicemen were not expected to reimburse the funds spent on their training. Consequently, 32% of the battalions of the Czechoslovak armed forces remained without commanders (5).

The law on civil service made it possible for young people to decide for themselves whether they would continue doing service or demobilize. The populist resolution of Parliament imperiled the replenishment of the military forces. Fortunately, only 20 000 young men said “Farewell to arms” but nonetheless, their unforeseen demobilization cause serious trouble among the senior staff and all military formations.

The decision to attest servicemen was an important stage of the incipient period of reforms. The employment of professional criteria was conducive to the appointment of highly qualified command personnel and to the enhancement of trust in the new democratic regime. Officers of the counter-intelligence service and top
brass who had discredited themselves as communist regime activists, were removed from office by order of Minister Vacek.

During the period preceding the first democratic elections in 1990, President Havel defended the prestige of the armed forces. He personified civic control which Parliament failed to guarantee due to the presence of nomenclatura staff.

Politicians maintaining radical views, representatives of the civic forum in Czechia and the public reprimanded the officers’ corps for violence in Slovakia. They emerged as the driving force of the “velvet revolution”. The prevalent part of the public (60%) was found distrustful of the officers’ corps. During the 1991-1992 academic year 66% of the places in the military academies remained unoccupied. The officers themselves were well aware of the level of their training and leader’s abilities. 62% of the respondents in a poll conducted in 1990 said that the military academy had not trained them to be efficient leaders and had not made them capable of managing the processes in the military branches.

The line officers, sergeants and NCOs most of whom supported the ideas of the democratic revolution made a great deal to accelerate the renovation processes. Seeking to speed up reforms, a small part of the young officers united into the “Free Legion” organization. However, their actions were often extremist and had a negative impact.

The association for military renovation played a significant part in the moral rehabilitation of the repressed in terms of rank and distinctions and in easing tensions among the categories of servicemen during the crisis period.

The military initiative group at the Coordinating center of the civic forum contributed significantly either as a mediator of the association for military renovation or by influencing directly the subjects of reforms.

General Vacek steered the elaboration of the groundwork of the military doctrine as well as a system of short-, medium- and long-term objectives of the armed forces until 2005. They provided a basis on which MOD and GS stepped to work out programs of qualification, reorganization, relocation, the social program, etc. This constructive approach enhanced public trust in the armed forces and already in 1991 two thirds of the population considered them indispensable.

Most importantly, the new doctrine initiated the redeployment and even distribution of the military along the whole territory of the country. Until then the armed forces had been stationed asymmetrically and mostly along the western border as the Warsaw Treaty strategy enjoined. The redeployment scheduled to complete by late 1993 was the largest ever moving up of troops in the 70-year long history of the Czechoslovak armed forces (ACR).

Three years after the “velvet revolution” in 1989, Czechs and Slovaks set an example of a “velvet” and civilized divorce between two kindred and culturally accomplished nations. Hard and labor-consuming as it was, the division of the weaponry, equipment and property of the former Czechoslovak army completed in the shortest possible time (6).
The fulfillment of the short-term perspective of the concept for the structuring of ACR triggered changes outlined in the medium-term perspective. The concept represented a strategy and a plan of reforms aimed at:

- gradual transition to a three-level system of management and a brigade organizational structure;
- reduction of the personnel strength;
- stabilization of the garrisons;
- resolution of personnel issues regarding the appointment of competent and non-discredited servicemen to leading positions;
- introduction of an integrated logistics system;
- introduction of a system of planning, programming and budgeting system (PPBS)

For 1993:

- effecting reforms in MOD and ACR GS;
- opening headquarters of Third corps of the tactical air force, headquarters of Fourth corps for air defense and logistics command;
- reorganizing Second mechanized division into Second mechanized brigade;
- disbanding the headquarters of the air force and the air defense and of First mixed air force corps.

For 1994:

- opening headquarters of First and Second army corps, a rapid reaction brigade, 11 territorial defense brigades and 6 air bases.

The reform envisaged the reduction of the personnel strength of the armed forces and an increase in civic personnel because most of the positions in MOD, GS, army logistics and military education did not require special military education.

The reduction of the personnel, weaponry and equipment is shown in the table (Fig. I/1). From March 1993 to January 1995 the ACR personnel was reduced from 105 994 to 67 702. The number of tanks and armoured vehicles was cut down by half and of the artillery systems by 2.5 times.

The concept envisaged three levels of competence: strategic, operational and tactical. The strategic and operational levels were established by July 1, 1994 and the strategic level was represented by MOD, which had ACR GS as a constituent component. Its reorganization completed by October 1, 1993 (Fig.I/2)

The operational level comprised the headquarters of First and Second army corps, Third corps of the tactical air force, Fourth corps for air defense and the army logistics headquarters. This level was reformed about April 1, 1994.
The tactical level represented by the headquarters of the combined brigades, regiments and battalions of the land forces, the troops for air defense and army logistics, the headquarters of the air bases and the troops for air defense, the depots and equipment was reformed in 1994 and 1995. Also, the division and regiment organization of the military forces was changed into brigade (9).

In April 1994, MOD adopted a concept of personnel management in ACR, which provided for a uniform system of human resources management at all levels of management. The concept promoted a new qualitative and structural idea of activities in the sphere of personnel, social affairs and education. It sought to establish unison between motivation of the human factor as the greatest value in ACR and the requirements set by military service. The personnel management directorates were reorganized too.

Non-discredited and highly qualified generals and officers were appointed to the key positions at the strategic and operational levels. Dozens of officers were sent to foreign military academies to receive training as commanders of brigades and battalions.

Between 1993 and 1995 a significant number of the commander’s positions in the technical sections remained vacant. Only 60% of the positions of battalion commanders were occupied (10).

Military education was reorganized, high military schools were opened in Brno, Vyškov and Hradec Králové. The faculties of Brno Military Academy were reorganized and subjects that had been taught in the Slovak Military Academies were introduced. The Czech cadets, who had attended Slovak pedagogical and transport high schools, completed their education in civilian universities.

The number of people employed in military science education was reduced. Some departments of the military academies were closed down. The closing down of high military schools continues.

About 1996 the ACR research and development base was made up of military academies, military technical institutes and other specialized establishments involved in the accomplishment of R&D programs. The outstanding research centers are the Military Academy in Brno, the Military Academy of Land Forces in Vyškov, the Military Medical Academy of Jan Evangelist Purkinje in Hradec Králové, the ACR Institute of Defense Studies in Prague, the ACR Institute of History in Prague, the Technical Institute of Land Forces in Vyškov, the Air Force Military Technical Institute in Prague, the Military Technical Institute of Electronics in Prague, the Military Technical Institute of Protection in Brno and the Military Technical Institute of Weapons and Ammunition in Slavičín (11).

MILITARY EDUCATION

A new system of military training was introduced early in 1993 parallel with the reduction of the army service duration. The academic year coincided with the calendar and military training was organized in quarters. The first period encom-
passed the basic training of every soldier and military specialist, the second – joint training of all specialists in the military unit, the third and fourth – joint education of the organizational units in concerted action in crews, squads, platoons and companies.

A new concept of training reservists was elaborated and it divided them into three categories: up to 40 years of age, from 41 to 50 and a reserve group.

The purchase of modern equipment and the sale of decommissioned or unserviceable equipment went under the terms of the Trade law in the form of selection procedures and public tenders. Foreign contractors were expected to coordinate their deliveries with the Czech industry. This was, in essence, the selection procedure for purchasing the short wave radio *Quart*. The German Rohde-Schwarz provided a license for its production in the Dicom works in *Uherske Gradishte* (12).

The system of planning, programming and budgeting system in ACR was borrowed from the experience of the NATO countries. The defined risks and threats to state security determined the objectives of defense and the programs for attaining them. The contribution of each military unit was assessed in terms of quantity. The programs comprised elements (parts) and provided for a systematic assessment of the effectiveness of the expended human, material and financial resources. The budget funds were allocated among the programs by way of a qualitative assessment of their contribution to the elimination of risks and threats to state security. The stable Czech industry provided a sound basis for the reforming ACR.

The former Czechoslovakia gradually developed a modern defense industry, which employed mostly designs and projects of its own and which was capable of satisfying the needs of the ACR and foreign customers in the following fields:

- Systems of pilot training and light combat aircraft derived from it;
- Airport radars;
- Radar searchers;
- Radiocommunication and telecommunication systems;
- Portable VHF radio sets and airborne radio stations;
- Small arms and ammunition;
- Portable and semiautomatic ATGMs;
- Aircraft and anti-aircraft guns of 30 mm caliber;
- Combat engineer and aircraft ammunition (mines, bombs);
- Mortars of caliber up to 100 mm;
- Off-road vehicles;
- Application of systems using vehicle undercarriages;
- Mine laying and mine clearing mechanical and explosive devices;
- Means of protection of personnel against the effects of nuclear and chemical weapons;
- Parachutes;
- Data encoding and encoded data transmission equipment (13).
A FORCED MARCH TO NATO

Upon establishing stable legal, economic, political and military foundations for integration into the Euro-Atlantic structures, the Czech Republic declared categorically its desire to become a full NATO member. The Czech politicians, scientists and military experts were positive that the country’s rapid integration into the Western economic and military-political structures was one of the vehicles of reforms.

Before applying for NATO membership the Czech Republic resolved basic tasks – the democratic reforms were gathering speed; the armed forces were placed under civic control; interaction, consultations and consensus prevailed in relationships with the neighbor NATO applicants; relations with all neighbor countries were improved; defense planning and the military budgeting system were made transparent; the large-scale reduction of the armed forces was combined with the fulfillment of a plan for interoperability with NATO.

In its stand (Aide-memoire) on “Study of NATO’s enlargement” proclaimed in 1995, the Czech government expressed its attitude towards all its paragraphs. Also, it welcomed the resolution of the North-Atlantic Council ministers’ session on 5 December, 1996 which called upon the participating countries to start a dialogue about NATO membership on the basis of the discussion documents (14).

PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE – A USEFUL LABORATORY

The Czech Republic joined the “Partnership for Peace” with the firm conviction that the program was the antechamber to NATO and a training school for accession.

The country streamlined its cooperation with the armed forces of the member-states towards:

• mastering the processes of planning and decision making in NATO;
• mastering the operational art;
• introducing interoperability including the establishment of compatible organizational structures;
• language and professional training of the personnel.

In May 1996 the Czech republic joined in six rounds of negotiations which focused on NATO’s enlargement, the relations between the alliance and the Russian federation, adaptation to NATO, the command structures, the policy-making strategy, security and military construction, the civil aspects of membership, the defense programs and budgets, intelligence, protection of information, the experience of ACR in peace-making operations, the structure of ACR, the country’s economic development, the “Partnership for peace” program, cooperation with the neighbor states and, above all, with Poland, Slovakia and Germany (15).
The resolution of the Madrid summit was followed by an official invitation for accession talks, which started in 1997. While sitting at the negotiating table, the Czech delegation kept in contact with the representatives of Poland and Hungary. Discussions were held at the level of experts to tackle specific issues: compiling the defense planning questionnaire (DPQ), consultations with NATO’s Security Committee, legal consultations, etc.

The delegation of the Czech republic assumed a number of commitments on behalf of the cabinet to incorporate the country to the values, structures, responsibilities, expenditure and benefits of the alliance. The Czech republic suggested that the MOD training center in Komorní Hradiště should be used as a NATO defense college and proposed to assist in the organizing of international courses with an analogical orientation.

Resolution No. 478 dated 18 September, 1996 with which the government of the Czech republic pledged to increase the GDP share of military expenses by 0.1% annually and make it around 2% in 2000 was an important step which evinced serious intentions. Later the military expenses came up to 2.2% of GDP. The Czech Republic undertook to pay a membership fee of 0.9% of the NATO budget.

The government of the Czech Republic defined nine areas in which the country failed to comply with the NATO members’ standards: interoperability, legislation, defense planning, crises management, co-ordination of military production, civil infrastructure, investment program in the field of security, protection of information and public support.

The ministries were asked to analyze the shortcomings and propose measures to ensure compliance with the NATO standards. NATO experts visited Czech military airports and made recommendations regarding repair works and enhancement of control over air traffic. Pentagon officials and representatives of the Supreme Allied Command in Europe met with Czech MOD leaders and generals to identify the priorities in the country’s preparation for membership: additional effort in training the servicemen and enhancing their fighting capacity, improving the computer skills and foreign language command of the personnel, attaining compatibility between the means of intercommunication and management.

In January 1998 the government summed up the proposals and elaborated a program comprising the areas of priority, which was fulfilled until the Czech Republic was admitted into NATO. The premier took the lead of the newly formed Committee of coordinating NATO accession and one of the deputy foreign ministers led the working committee. A coordinating commission headed by the first deputy defense minister was set up at MOD in September 1996.

MOD worked out a schedule for the conclusive activities of the preparation for NATO integration, which encompassed 16 areas and 54 undertakings with 7 priority fields:

- larger defense budget;
• second cycle of the planning process and a review of the defense policy;
• “Partnership for peace” program;
• defense legislation;
• preparation of the personnel, of the Czech representatives in NATO’s civil and military structures included;
• active approach to public opinion.

In October 1997 the Czech Republic submitted to the alliance the first defense planning questionnaire. According to it the country placed up to 100% of its operative forces at the disposal of the collective defense system and other NATO missions. The defense minister held trilateral and multilateral consultations to coordinate the final report with the Defense planning committee (DPC). Future allies like Great Britain, USA and Holland lent support. The target force goals were adopted and announced in the spring of 1998 (17).

During the second PARP cycle MOD outlined a larger number of goals for interoperability – 31, during the first cycle they were 12. The number and scope of the units defined within the PARP framework for cooperation with NATO in the PFP program were increased. The goals were accomplished according to a special schedule, which contained a plan of drawing funds to the amount of DM 450 million until 2000.

Defense legislation was improved between 1997 and 1999. Specifically, some inadequate laws were amended or new articles were added according to the NATO standards. MOD developed and submitted for approval by the cabinet 8 laws some of which were discussed and adopted by Parliament. (18).

The loyalty of all officers, sergeants and servicemen who had access to secret documents of the alliance, was subject of re-assessment in compliance with NATO’s requirements for the protection of secret information. GS officers reported that the secret services of USA and the Czech republic had reached an agreement on cooperation.

Considering public support for NATO accession not strong enough (in December 1997 it was 53%, in February 1999 – 56%) MOD and the Foreign Ministry developed a media strategy targeted at the national audience and the military public. The strategy was coordinated with the press and information departments of the alliance and with the British Defense Ministry (19).

The personnel and armament of the Czech armed forces in 1999 are shown in figures I/3 and I/4 (20).

Some lapses identified during the period preceding NATO accession were duly recorded by the alliance and discussed at the level of experts:
• Some officers who had received training in Western countries considered their self-fulfillment in ACR impossible and were positive that the older senior officers impeded their development. 11 of the 75 Czech officers who had attended military academies in USA and Canada demobilized to start a private business.
• Parliament was not expedient enough in adopting some of the laws, which caused trouble for the commanders.
• Training in most land forces units does not happen below the company level.
• Pilot training was inadequate due to the insufficient number of flying hours. The MIG-21 aircraft did not come up to the NATO standards.
• Inadequate knowledge of the English language.

Leaning on the developing economy and growing GDP, on the consolidating society on the road to EU, on the deepening democratic processes, the support of the NATO allies and the professionalism of its servicemen, ACR is gathering momentum to reach the level of the modern European armed forces.
IV.

SPECIFICS OF THE REFORMS IN THE HUNGARIAN ARMED FORCES

THE “LOST” HUNGARY

In 1988 few clairvoyants could predict the pending disintegration of the Warsaw Pact. For the first time on 8 September 1988, Hungarian Foreign Ministry State Secretary Dyula Horn demanded explicitly the radical reduction or withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Hungary. A year later Premier Miklosh Nemet raised the same issue before Mikhail Gorbachov.

Both Hungary and Poland insisted for a non-confrontation approach to the West, for radical reformation of socialism to the point of adoption of the pluralistic parliamentary democracy (21).

Todor Zhivkov, the dictator with the longest term in office among the countries of the communist bloc, praised with his habitual hypocrisy the perestroika and glasnost but in letters and talks lashed the “ceding of power” and the “inadmissible retreat”. At his talks with Hungarian leader Károly Gros, Zhivkov compared the situation in Hungary to events in 1956 and advised his guest: “If energetic measures are not taken, including bold and risky action, the situation will slip out of control”. However, the year was 1989 and foreign interference was unthinkable. In top-secret information to Politburo of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee Zhivkov underscored: “I was left with the impression that we are going to lose Hungary and we must be clear about that” (22). The information was delivered in Moscow by the Soviet ambassador.

In late May 1989 Zhivkov wrote “Thesis considerations” about the forthcoming talks with Gorbachov expressing apprehensions about the “alarming situation” in Hungary and Poland which threatened to destabilize the whole system: “We should better walk out of the Warsaw Pact and disband CMEA. At the best, we should opt for the so called Finnish or Austrian model” (23).

At the following sessions of groups of experts and at other levels Hungary and Poland advanced a mechanism of “contact and interaction” with NATO. In June 1990 Czechoslovakia joined them by making some radical proposals. At the Sofia session on 18 and 19 September 1990, the three Central European states demanded explicitly the ultimate liquidation of the Warsaw Pact military structures.

Just like in the preceding decades, the political, state and military leaders of Bulgaria bid their time to see what a turn events would take. To the last before the Warsaw Pact disintegrated, the Bulgarian leadership tried to preserve its priority economic and military-political contacts with the Soviet Union in an attempt to prolong the life of the regime. Bulgaria terminated its Warsaw Pact membership in July 1991 in the same way it joined it – without any disagreement or indecision and without any specific initiatives or alternative projects either (24).
Hungary’s strive to leave the Warsaw Pact with the shortest possible delay carried the charge of the 1956 events. Back then the popular uprising was crushed down by Soviet troops. Genetically, however, this strive is rooted in the times of the adoption of Christianity, of the first independent Hungarian state, of the fight against the incursions of the Ottoman Empire, of the century-old and lasting deposition of the West European values in the mentality of the Hungarian people.

The forefathers of the present-day Hungarian soldiers are the participants in the 1848-1849 Revolution – the volunteers of the National Guard; honveds of the revolutionary army; the hussars and infantrymen of the Austro-Hungarian army.

After decades of limited sovereignty the amendment of the Constitution and the adoption of laws to provide for changes in the armed forces (AF) emerged as a necessity. Despite the divergent views of the parliamentarian parties and of the different social strata, the idea of reducing the numerical strength of the armed forces and of effecting reforms met with a high degree of approval. (25). The constitutional amendments were the first changes, which Parliament endorsed by Law XXXI in 1989 but more than two years had to pass before laws on the national security policy, on the general principles of defense and on defense were adopted.

In the autumn of 1991, an amendment to the 1976 law on defense reduced the age limit for the national services from 55 to 50 years and the term of military service from 18 months to one year.

The main principles approved on 2 March 1973 set the goals of Hungary’s policy and determined the conditions to achieve state sovereignty, defense of territorial integrity, maintenance of internal stability, normal functioning of the market economy, guarantees for human and political rights, the security and life of the population, conditions for good international relations and the country’s contribution to peace and stability in Europe.

Economic retardation, the difficulties of the transition, the outstanding issues between neighbour countries, the pendent status of the national, ethnic and religious minorities and ensuing political instability were identified as the main sources of threat.

The general principles of defense adopted on 14 April 1993 to define the action and functions of the state in building the armed forces, conformed to the security policy. The Hungarian defense policy stepped on the principles of co-operation and refraining from the use of force. The principle of co-operation made the security of the Hungarian republic directly dependent on the development of bilateral and regional relations and especially on enhancing the contribution of the European security structures.

The principle of refraining from the use of force stipulated that the fighting capacity of the Hungarian armed forces should be such as to inflict on the enemy in the event of an armed aggression considerable and inadmissible losses.
The preparation of the law on defense (CX from 17 September, 1993) stirred polemics as to what armed forces Hungary actually needed. Several small parties insisted for professional armed forces and some went to extremes by claiming that a state like Hungary did not need armed forces at all. The state of the national economy did not allow the immediate formation of professional armed forces. After parliamentary debates the law spread over the principles of building defense and armed forces: management and control over defense in time of peace and in cases of emergency, structure of the national defense, operations in a state of emergency (26).

The law on defense and the law on the legal status of servicemen removed the barriers between military men and civilians. Also, it provided for servicemen to become “citizens in uniform” after the pattern of the West European armed forces. Under the provisions of the law servicemen on regular duty could found law-defending and law-representing organizations. The Constitutional court rescinded the military statute paragraph, which banned the foundation of professional organizations in the armed forces. Servicemen on regular duty and conscripts founded an officers’ trade union to defend their professional and social interests. The standing personnel established their own union – NADTARCHA. A military committee was set up at the initiative of the military unions and with the participation of MOD. It aimed to coordinate interests, take part in decision-making with regard to living conditions and the conditions for military service, bring different stands in line when important documents are drafted.

The officers’ trade-union in Hungary was eligible to function within the framework of the armed forces; use the premises gratis during office and out-of-office hours; demand from commanders to provide information on the material, social and cultural interests of servicemen; submit its own remarks, stands and proposals and ask for consultations about orders and instructions of commanders; control the observation of the regulations for work and for doing military service; arrest commanders’ attention on mistakes and omissions and refer the matter to a higher authority if commanders do not take due measures; organize qualification courses for their members.

Commanders were obliged to assist the military trade unions, inform them of their intention to issue orders concerning the material, social and cultural interests of more than 25% of the personnel; answer in 5 workdays’ time objections submitted by the military trade union in writing or refer them to a higher authority for coordination. Commanders did not have the right to transfer or discharge regular servicemen without the consent of the trade union.

For ten years now the Hungarian officers’ trade union has been a member of Euromil. It has always aspired to affiliate servicemen to the Euro-Atlantic values and make them citizens in uniform (27).
MOD and GS were restructured after the adoption of the law in the beginning of 1994. The civil defense minister controlled directly the Hungarian defense forces (HDF) through the GS, which was, in turn, headed by the HDF commander.

In 1990 Hungary had armed forces raised in compliance with the Warsaw Pact doctrine. However, their numerical strength was too big for the country and neither it nor the stationing of the troops conformed to the national interests. The personnel, armament and equipment were reduced and the number of servicemen was brought down by 35%. Also, the funds allocated for equipment were cut down from 20% to 40%.

Although corresponding to the planned budget restrictions, the proportions of personnel reduction yielded negative results. Mostly young and promising officers quit and being capable enough, they quickly adapted themselves to civic life. The real salary of servicemen dropped and in 1993 accounted for 83% of its 1989 value.

However, the reduction of personnel and equipment did not affect the fighting capacity and operability of the HDF. The leading bodies became independent structures within the MOD system. The establishment of control bodies at an operational level followed the formation of the HDF high command: the headquarters of the land forces and the air defense and the headquarters of the military districts: Tata, Kaposhvar, Seged and Budapest.

The changes in the principles of work and the approach to the personnel were the second important field of restructuring. In compliance with the laws, the training of troops and the military exercises became rehearsals of defense operations. Significant changes were introduced in the directives for the fighting trim and mobilization of the military to comply with the new policy of security and defense. Some of the units were relocated.

With the end of the Warsaw Pact, Hungary was able to reduce the size of its army, relocate many units and deploy them across the country. Meanwhile it closed many unnecessary bases and not just those previously occupied by the Soviet units. According to recent plans, the country will be divided into only three military districts, including Budapest. (Fig.II/2 and Fig.II/3)

Most of the relocated units, previously stationed in the western part of the country were transferred to the lowlands.

Changes in the HDF system of planning and economic management became indispensable and threatened to have an adverse effect on the budget, deteriorating as it was. Budget restrictions and the collapse of the trade network in Eastern Europe reduced to a minimum the possibilities for arm supplies for the former Warsaw Pact members. Over that period the Hungarian military received only two deliveries of arms and equipment independent of the shrinking MOD budget. In 1993, the former Soviet Union procured 28 MiG-29 aircraft to the value of USD 800 million to clear part of its debt to Hungary. Consequently, the country’s air de-
fense capabilities were significantly consolidated. Germany donated spare parts to the value of DM 150 million from the reserves of the former GDR (29).

THE MAIN EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Equipping of the HDF with up-to-date systems will take place in two steps. It began in the medium-term period ending in 1998 and will be completed during the long-term period ending in 2005. This entails a number of development programs primarily in the areas listed below:

- signals and control equipment
- air defense (aircraft, radars, air defense missiles and the automated control and signals systems of air defense)
- reconnaissance
- air mobility
- anti-armour capability
- barrier/obstacle engineering

Sources for the Development Programs:

- Budgetary sources guaranteed for the governmental target programs accepted by the NA in the course of which favourable credit arrangements may be negotiated;
- The regrouping of the current equipment park of the HDF, the withdrawing of the most obsolete equipment from service, their sale, resulting in monetary sources available for modernization;
- Equipment arriving in compensation for the Russian (Soviet) state debt, possibilities provided by aid programs.

Utilizing these sources we are modernizing:

- field and anti-tank artillery (semiautomatic loaders, fire control systems)
- fighter aircraft avionics (and new IFF for the MiG-29s)
- battle tanks and infantry fighting vehicles (primarily the fire control systems)
- small unit anti-tank equipment
• other supply and support equipment

These tasks are solved mainly by domestic industry, helping the formation and strengthening of the domestic defense industry.

While keeping present armament, the HDF procured some new and up-to-date equipment. The developments have already begun, keeping in mind the long-term change and the basics of the upgrading process. The National Assembly of the Republic of Hungary has passed the programs targeting the development of the radar, I.T and control systems as well as the maintenance of air defense capability.

A governmental target program was launched envisioning:

• the procurement of new types of anti-tank missiles to strengthen the anti-armour capability of the mechanized battalions;
• the modernization of the air defense radar, I.T. and control systems by acquiring up-to-date control elements, including three dimensional radars;
• the procurement of different types of vehicles primarily for peacetime operations;
• the replacement of radar reconnaissance and jamming equipment (during the second half of the period)
• the procurement of equipment for close-in air defense of combined arms units (30).

A reassessment of the state of the military prompted a decision taken on 12 January 1995 to speed up reforms. Parliament approved a government program and a plan for the development of the armed forces till 2005. The cabinet issued resolution No. 2037 of 1995 to initiate the restructuring of MOD, GS of every military service, the corps and units of the land troops and air force. Military intelligence and military counterintelligence were reorganized into national services and placed under the supervision of a cabinet member. The demilitarization of their staff began (31).

Military education came under the provisions of the law on higher education.

Officer training and education was basically carried out at the Miklós Zrínyi National Defense University (MZNDU) and János Bólyai Military Technical College, however, many young people aspiring for carrier officer status received their degrees at national universities and colleges as well as at civilian or military educational institutions abroad.

The Miklós Zrínyi National Defense University, after two successfully implemented reorganizations, runs its educational program at two university faculties; at the faculty of military sciences and that of command and management services.
The majority of the future officer corps receives its military training in a four plus two-year educational system. After a comprehensive four-year officer-training period the graduates start their professional service in the units of the Hungarian Defense Forces and Border Guard of the Ministry of Interior with a college degree in hand. Following a certain period of troop service graduate officers participate in a two-year regular educational training program to receive a university degree. Special military educational and training programs are also conducted on the educational basis of the Miklós Zrínyi National Defense University. Moreover, the ten-month military college training for senior military leadership is organized at NDU. This kind of general staff training provides an opportunity for graduates of civilian or military universities and military academies to be trained for senior military positions and joint assignments upon acquiring the necessary leadership skills.

The Hungarian National Defense University also hosts a three-year doctoral training, which provides Ph.D. for officers and fellows mastering military sciences.

At the Faculty of Military Sciences of NDU (located in Szentendre), officers are trained in a four-year program to fulfill command assignments in army and air force units after their graduation. The fields of study for command assignments are: general command positions, command positions for border safety and security, and defense and security policy. The branch of defense and security policy, which is basically organized for civilian defense experts has a training period of five years.

The officer training programs at the Faculty of Command and Management Sciences of MZNDU (located in Budapest) are as follows: civil engineering, mechanical engineering and electric engineering with a period of four years; military logistics command and military science management with a regular training period of two to three years, and specialized correspondence training programs of different duration. In the field of defense management a five-year regular comprehensive training and a three-year correspondence training programs are organized.

The future members of the air force receive their degrees at both faculties, and their training is implemented at Szolnok Air Force Officer School, subordinated to NDU.

In addition to officer training at the Miklós Zrínyi National Defense University young people who intend to obtain university degrees in science fields different from military, such as medical doctors, special engineers, lawyers, economists, etc. have the opportunity to study at national universities and colleges with MOD scholarship.

Cadets of the János Bólyai Military Technical College acquire basic technical and command skills necessary for service in a four-year basic educational program. The following study fields are available at the college: economics, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, information science, and finance. After a couple of years of unit service necessary for practical skills, college graduates may
continue their educational training at MZNDU to obtain university degrees in a two-year complementary training program.

In addition to graduate and postgraduate training programs the officers of the Hungarian Defense Forces participate in educational programs abroad.

Between 1990 and 1998, 790 officers attended courses and prestigious military academies abroad.

For recruitment of professional staff of the Hungarian military, and a more comprehensive preparation of future attendees of high military educational institutions and vocational schools the Armed Forces have opened high military schools in Eger, Szolnok and Győr and vocational high schools in Budapest and Szentendre.

The NCO has been also modernized. NCO training is implemented in accordance with the provisions of International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) in the above-mentioned high military vocational schools. These high schools – in close co-operation with the faculties of NDU and János Bólyai Military Technical College as well as with existing military bases – also provide the background for command training of reserve officers graduating from civilian universities and colleges.

The PfP Language Training Centre at Miklós Zrínyi National Defense University runs refreshment language courses for 140 officers with intermediate level language skills.

Researches in military sciences are basically conducted at the National Defense University, which organizationally comprises the Institute for Strategic and Defense Studies and the Center for Civil-Military Relations. Additionally, the Institute and Museum of Military History, the Institute of Military Technology and the Research Institute of Public Health and Military Medicine provide an outstanding background high level education and training activity.

Parliament and the cabinet issued resolutions aimed at measures to promote HDF logistics, improve living conditions for servicemen and make military service more attractive.

Experts and politicians discussed the military doctrine, numerical strength, structure and armament of the military and agreed that the democratic constitution of Hungary demanded the formation of well trained and well managed armed forces equipped in accordance with the nature of the present-day military operations. Also, they were unanimous that the problems of Hungary’s security would be resolved ultimately only after the country’s admission as a full NATO member.

The Hungarian military experts classified the changes in the armed forces as three reforms: the first one (1992 – 1996) turned the former people’s armed forces into HDF; the second restructured HDF and developed military legislation; the third reform started after Hungary’s accession into NATO and will continue in three stages till 2010 (32).
THE WAY TO NATO

On November 15, 1994 the first yearly Individual Partnership Program (IPP) was adopted – this has since become an annually-repeated practice – which contained the concrete areas and events for participation in PfP co-operation.

Right from the start Hungary has made it clear: it considers participation in Partnership for Peace as an extremely valuable but not exclusive element of its preparation for accession. At the same time it wishes in an active and engaged manner to contribute to the further development of mutual confidence and bi- and multilateral co-operation among the countries participating in PfP. The country is therefore present in the most varied PfP programs such as expert visits, seminars, conferences, courses and exercises. The latter have turned out to be a particularly useful and impressive form of co-operation. Hungary has to date hosted two such exercises: between October 14-20, 1995 the Hungarian-German-British-led staff exercise “Co-operative Light 95” was conducted at Újdörögd, while the city of Szolnok hosted exercise “Co-operative chance” on July 25-26, 1996. Hungarian soldiers regularly participate in similar events organized by NATO as well as by PfP countries. Within the framework of the “Co-operative Nugget” exercise held in Louisiana (USA), a Hungarian troop contingent set foot on American soil for the first time in history. Participation in such joint military programs has been a great help to Hungary in progressing towards the fulfillment of the military requirements of membership. There is, first and foremost, a need to ensure compatibility between structures, procedures and operational principles applied in Hungary and NATO, that is, compatibility among the armed forces allowing them to co-operate for interoperability. In this context, particular importance is attached to the Planning and Review Process (PARP) launched in the framework of Partnership for Peace in the beginning of 1995. Co-operation in the program enables the country to fulfill interoperability objectives according to previously set parameters so that NATO may regularly assess its efforts. In addition, Hungary designated those of its units, which it could make available for exercises and concrete operations in the framework of Partnership for Peace. Participation also offers an opportunity to gradually approximate Hungary’s defense planning practice to NATO-planning, making use of the experience accumulated within the Alliance (33).

Co-operation pursued in the framework of the IFOR/SFOR operation in order to bring about a settlement of the crisis in the former Yugoslavia was a specific and extremely important dimension of relations between Hungary and NATO. Following the conclusion of the Dayton Peace Agreement, Hungary reacted positively to the request of the Alliance to provide bases and logistic support on Hungarian soil to the U.S. forces taking part in the IFOR operation and the multinational Nordic Brigade, and to enable the international contingents participating in the “Joint Endeavor” operation to transit through Hungarian territory as well as to take part in the efforts aiming at the settlement of the crisis in Bosnia with an engineering battalion. Having obtained the necessary authorization of the National Assembly, the Hungarian government replied to the request as soon as it was able, and has con-
tinued its participation in the SFOR mission, which replaced the IFOR operation, thus reconfirming its commitment to take an active part aiming at the resolution of the crisis.

Statements made by the NATO member countries coincided with Hungary’s assessment: with its multifold participation in the IFOR operation, Hungary has proved that it is ready and able to take part in NATO’s joint efforts not only with words but also with deeds. It was thus able to contribute to the fact that the first “live” military operation in the history of the Alliance turned out to be a success, and helped prove NATO’s raison d’être under the changed circumstances in Europe.

Successful co-operation in IFOR including Hungary’s participation was based on the experience and skills gathered in the framework of Partnership for Peace; at the same time, the IFOR/SFOR operation already pointed beyond the former frameworks and goals of PfP in many aspects and provided a new impetus for the further development of co-operation in the PfP-framework. It was also for that purpose that Foreign Minister László Kovács made the proposal for a “rolling evaluation” of the experience gathered in IFOR, that is, for the continuous utilization of this experience in the framework of PfP co-operation.

Since 1988, the HDF has been involved in 11 UN or CSCE/OSCE missions, sending small numbers of unarmed officers as observers. Four of these are still underway: UNIKOM (Iraq-Kuwait), OSCETG (Georgia), UNAVEM II (Angola), and UNOMIG (Georgia). Therefore, the Hungarian army has some experience of the difficulties involved in peacekeeping missions (34).

Hungary is the pioneer of the establishment, the development and the integration of the former members of the Warsaw Pact to NATO. It was yet on July 18, 1990 that the Prime Minister Jozsef Antall visited the Headquarters of NATO and informed the Secretary General Manfred Wörner that there has been recomman-dated to the ambassador of Hungary in Brussels to have permanent contacts with the Alliance.

In the end of May 1995 a session of the Euro-Atlantic Assembly took place in Budapest. It was the first time that the Parliament of NATO was in session in a non-member country of the Alliance.

From July 20 to July 26, 1996 under the rule of NATO and with the participation of many countries an exercise of the Air Forces named “Cooperative Chance – 96” was held in Hungary. Such an event is the first of the kind in a country non-member of NATO (35).

In November 1997 a referendum on NATO membership was held there. Such an event was held only in Hungary. The ratio of “yes” votes was 85,33 percent. The support for NATO left behind most of NATO countries - founders or members. The result of the referendum enabled the Parliament on February 9, 1998 to ratify the Law for the Membership of the country in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (36).
NATO based air sovereignty and air defense are a priority topic of NATO accession preparations. The establishment of the Air Sovereignty Operations Centre (ASOC) initiated in 1997, serves this objective. By the beginning of 1998, the system of core functions was enhanced further to full capabilities. The full implementation of the system allows control of the air space over Hungary, alongside with co-operation between the country and NATO or similar systems of neighboring states.

A further step in the modernization of air defense shall be the procurement of the air defense missile complexes started in 1997 and extending over several years. The public procurement process selected and approved the mobile version of the French MATRA made Atlas system using Mistral-type missiles. The command system of the missile system (the radar system) has been selected with a view to NATO compatibility. The introduction of the system shall provide an adequate efficiency and modern status in intercepting and defeating low attitude air targets. The tactical parameters of the missile used (target acquisition, manoeuvrability, protection against jamming) comply with requirements of the time and the long-term demands of the armed forces.

The National Assembly has reinforced the program for the modernization of the radar, information and the command system in order to develop and modernize air surveillance. This program, however, necessitates the procurement of long-range three dimensional radar equipment that comply with ICAO and NATO standards and cater for modern air surveillance on the long term.

An important factor of compatibility nowadays is the interoperability of the force, which is rooted in modern signals and command systems. The development of the communications, command and information technology of the Hungarian Defense Forces has started.

The main assets of the Hungarian air force are the Russian origin MIG-29 fighters, which can provide for the protection of national air space. Requirements of NATO accession necessitate further interoperability (radar guidance) in order to achieve full compatibility. One of the outstanding tasks of modernization within the armed forces is the substitution of old aircraft with new types. A government decision will enable the selection of new generation fighter aircraft to come up to modern requirements.

The present and future deployment of the military necessitates a high level of fire-power, mobility and armoured protection. The most important asset to this extent – even in the long run – is the T 72 tank. Co-operation with NATO necessitates numerous developments and the change of several subsystems (communications) of these tanks.

Like the other countries, which are modernizing their armed forces, Hungary too agrees to NATO’s views of the operational structure of the armed forces. Depending on their functions, the Hungarian armed forces are divided into two categories: reaction forces and main defense forces.
Reaction forces with a relatively short period of response are maintained to carry out peacetime military tasks and are ready to react to arising conflict situations. The mission of reaction forces can be among others to carry out reconnaissance and tasks related to readiness, to participate in crisis management, to fend off attacks by external armed groups, to fulfill obligations related to international treaties, in case of natural disasters participate in emergency assistance activities. Reaction forces naturally participate in military operations aimed at the defense of the country(37).

The reaction forces are composed of immediate and rapid reaction units of both services that are highly manned, and are capable of carrying out military operations at home or abroad under national or NATO command.

The tasks of defense of the country fall upon the main defense forces. The ranks of the main defense forces contain such – partially manned or mobilized peacetime – combat, combat support, territorial defense and reserve units which are primarily destined for deployment domestically abroad under national or NATO command. Their tasks include the provision of conditions necessary to host NATO troops, with the name of such forces being national support units.

In order to provide a timelier implementation and better command over the execution of Allied missions, troops are put under NATO command or assigned to it. Reaction forces are professional or contract soldiers, while the conscript force is maintained over a longer period to carry out basic duties and to provide host nation support tasks.

Following its NATO accession, Hungary prepared and contributed to the alliance the following military formations:

**Land forces:**

Two mechanized brigades, a light (mixed) infantry regiment and an engineer brigade for Alliance non-Article 5 crisis response operations but, because only regulars and short-term volunteers can be employed on such missions, it is envisaged that the maximum Hungarian contribution would be one battalion-size combat unit and one engineer battalion for a single deployment, or one company-size combat unit and one engineer company for extended operations. Rotation during extended operations would take place every six months.

**Air forces:**

Hungary could make four Mi-8/Mi-17 helicopters (for SAR, transport and aeromedical evacuation) available for short duration Alliance non-Article 5 crisis response operations. In addition, from 2003 onwards, four Mi-24 helicopters (for escort and patrol missions) and, from 2004 onwards, two Mi-8/Mi-17 helicopters
and one An-26 light transport aircraft (for aeromedical evacuation) will also be available. Contributions to long duration operations are currently not envisaged.

V.

SPECIFICS OF THE REFORMS IN THE POLISH ARMED FORCES

“HOW MANY DIVISIONS DOES THE POPE HAVE?”

Sometimes history must have its little joke by answering questions raised decades ago. When doing so, however, it changes the meaning and confutes the authors of seemingly irrefutable arguments. At the end of World War II when Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill were discussing the destiny of Poland, the Soviet dictator asked spitefully: “How many divisions does the Pope have?” (38).

When in 1979 Pope John Paul II, formerly Cardinal Karol Wojtla visited his homeland, millions of exalted Poles assembled to welcome Christ’s vicar, the first non-Italian to take the Holy See after 455 years. His champions were much more than all enthusiasts who would be willing to go for soldiers. 1 million and 200 thousand people made a pilgrimage to the Jasnogursk monastery. This biggest ever crowd of people in the history of mankind entered the Guinness Book of records. (39) “You’re not a slave, you don’t have the right to be a slave, you’re God’s son”, the Pole-born Pope said. None of the phrases of his speech carried a political connotation, yet all realized the message of His Holiness.

The Polish history, which is pregnant with changes of fortune, shattered hopes and tragic events, modeled the psychology of a nation of unparalleled love of freedom, enterprise, and sense of newness. Evil-starred to lie between Germany and Russia, the country has on many occasions been the target of invasion and division. The Poles made up for this unmerciful fate with talent, zeal and solidarity. Seven Polish citizens are Nobel Prize holders, Nikolaj Kopernik changed radically mankind’s concept of the universe, Maria Sklodovska Cury initiated the era of the atom. The names of writer Stanislaw Lem, film directors Andjej Vaida and Kshishtow Zanus, political analyst Zbignew Bzhezinski speak for themselves. For over two centuries the intelligentsia has played an important part in history by setting models of values and behaviour for the nation.

From Napoleon’s wars to date the Poles have been famed as “soldiers of the world”. Hardly had there been a war or a revolution without Poles taking part as prominent commanders or regulars. Generals Tadeucz Kostyushko and Kazhimesh Pulaski are national heroes of America. Marshal Yusef Ponyatovski and General Jan-Henrik Dombrovski ranked among Napoleon’s outstanding military commanders. Jaroslav Dombrowski led the troops of the Paris commune. Kshishtov Archishevski is a celebrated 17th c. Dutch admiral, General Jan-Zigmunt Skshinecki was one of the organizers of the Belgian armed forces in the 19th c. Generals Yusef Bem and Henrik Dembinski conducted the 1848 revolutions in Vienna and Hungary. Marshal Yuzef Pulsudski inflicted the first international defeat on the Red Army in 1920 and checked the westward advance of the Bolsheviks.
Polish revolutionaries had influence over Bulgarian national hero and poet Hristo Botev. Henrik Dembicki, the artist of the newspaper issued by Botev, is the acknowledged founder of the Bulgarian political caricature. The Apostle of the 1876 April uprising Gavril Hlatov adopted the name Benkovski from the passport, which a Polish revolutionary had ceded him. Every third or fourth soldier of the Russian Army who perished in the Russo-Turkish War for the liberation of Bulgaria (1877-1878) had a Polish family name.

Names and events of the Bulgarian and Polish history intertwine in a strange way. The grateful population in Bulgaria named streets and squares after Russian generals who fought for the country’s liberation from Turkish domination in 1878 and erected monuments in their honour. These same generals were ill famed as executioners during the 1863 uprising in Poland.

Torn and divided between Germany and the Soviet Union in 1939 and abandoned by its Western allies, Poland suffered its most serious tragedy in World War II. 220 of every 1 000 citizens became war victims. The Soviet Union came next (116 victims per 1 000) followed by the other warring states. Near the village of Katin in Byelorussia, Stalin ordered the execution of 15 000 regular Polish officers and reservists who were the elite of the intelligentsia (40).

The Poles fought valiantly against nazi Germany. The losses, which the Wermacht sustained in Poland, equaled its losses in Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, Yugoslavia and North America. Polish military units joined the armed forces of France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, USA and Canada. Polish servicemen excelled in the air warfare for England, in the naval battles in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, in the anti-Japanese guerilla movement in the Far East, in the resistance movement in most of the occupied European states. In all, 600 000 Poles fought in the war.

Under communism Poland was the pioneer of changes, which swept Eastern Europe thanks to the great authority of the church, the solid and patriotically minded emigration, private farming and well-developed informal organizations.

The first independent trade union in the communist world “Solidarity” (founded way back in 1980) and journalists dissidents like Adam Mihnik whose articles and analyses were secretly taken out of the prison where he was lying to be published by prestigious newspapers in Western Europe, contributed a great deal to the irreversibility of the processes in Polish society. The Committee for the protection of workers set up in 1976 became a school for opposition functionaries and future democratic leaders. Intellectuals, Krajova army veterans, former Marxists, Catholic theologians whose powerful political life emerged as an alternative to communist phraseology, became its members.

“We can hardly speak of “communism with a human image”. It was rather “communism whose teeth have been knocked out and it could no longer bite nor defend itself from the attacks of the organized public”, Adam Mihnik wrote. (41)
The first non-communist government in Eastern Europe headed by Mazowiecki opted for a careful approach to the Ministry of National Defense (MoND). In an attempt to set it free of the influence of the Communist Party and establish control over the armed forces, the Council of Ministers appointed two of its officials, deputy defense ministers.

MoND declared that by early 1990 the armed forces had been reduced by 30,000 servicemen. Until the end of the year 14,000 more were relieved of duty among whom 1,500 political officers. 68 military units were closed and 147 were reorganized; 400 tanks, 700 artillery systems, 600 armoured vehicles and 80 aircraft were removed from armament. In 1990 plans were made envisioning the closure of 57 units and the reorganization of 70 and the removal from armament of 450 tanks, 200 artillery systems and 100 armoured vehicles (42).

Within two years the government reduced the numerical strength of the armed forces by 4 divisions. The armament and equipment of 2 more was conserved. According to plan, all divisions were to become universal (module) and their armament for offensive military operations had to be reduced. 30 units of the territorial defense and of the engineering and transport troops were transformed into civil formations and tasked to provide industrial output and services for the national economy.

The anti-air defense merged with the airforce in conformity with the defense strategy and the national military traditions.

Naval service was reduced to two years. The small numerical strength and restricted combat potential of the Polish Navy did not worry the neighbouring states. The Polish Navy was expected to join the Baltic countries’ defense navy. (43).

Expectedly, the Polish armed forces were to have the following composition after the initial changes: the land troops had to include 9 universal (module) divisions, two of them equipped with light armament; one anti-air defense brigade and one coastal defense brigade. The air force had to include one fighter air force division; two fighter-bomber divisions; one air reconnaissance regiment; two regiments of combat helicopters and one regiment of transport helicopters. Apart from these, the Polish military included five training regiments and educational combat regiments. The Navy preserved its composition of three flotillas and one sea coastal brigade.

The changes aimed at creating armed forces of smaller numerical strength but of better organization and enhanced capability of fulfilling their defense mission. Combat training was determined to entail less expenditure and to apply relevant methods of organization and conducting defensive military operations. (44).

Political training, which was held in the spirit of national traditions and duty to the fatherland, specified the role of servicemen in consolidating national independence. The Polish leaders restored the influence of the church over life in the army. Most of the military men joined in church activities and thereby helped intensify public support for the armed forces.
In July 1990 reformist Vice Admiral Piotr Kołodziejezyk was appointed defense minister and General Zdislaw Stelmazuk became Chief-of-Staff (CoS).

Reforms in the Polish army evoked dissent, tensions and clash of views on the course that civil-military relations should follow and specifically on how the powers of legislation and the executive towards the armed forces should be balanced. Upon winning in the presidential election in December 1990, Lech Wałęsa transferred powers from the communists-dominated Sejm to the presidential institution. (45). He took the lead of the Polish Defense Council (PDC), which reformed and controlled the armed forces and the police. The president tried to transform PDC into National Security Council (NSC) by separating it from MoND and placing it under presidential financial control. Lech Wałęsa extended his influence over the National Security Bureau, which advanced the Polish military doctrine, analyzed threats, and planned reforms in MoND and the restructuring of the GS.

The attempts to design a new constitution were aborted by the communists-dominated Sejm and President Wałęsa had to call early parliamentary election – two and a half years before Polish Parliament completed its mandate.

In an effort to expand presidential authority in security affairs in February 1991 Lech Wałęsa announced plans to appoint a civilian defense minister (46). Lech Wałęsa and Jan Bielecki also announced a significant defense reform. They tasked Krzysztof Zabinski to set up an inter-ministerial reform commission comprised of four teams to: (1) transform the defense ministry into a civilian body of state administration; (2) restructure the armed forces; (3) rationalize the defense industry; and (4) establish parliamentary oversight organizations. According to Prime Minister Bielecki, the aims of the reform were to improve the armed forces’ image and credibility, to put the defense ministry under civil control and to make the armed forces a separate, apolitical organization. (47).

On 11 March 1991, Deputy Defense Minister Onyszkiewicz outlined the defense reform concept to the inter-ministerial commission. To turn the defense ministry into a civil organ of state administration, a civilian had to stand in the head of the ministry, three civil deputy ministers would handle administrative matters, and the Armed Forces would concentrate on combat readiness.

The president would appoint the military Inspector General/Chief of the General Staff (CoS) who reports directly to the defense minister. One intended result of the reform was that the separate administrative and command functions should stabilize the defense ministry, because the CoS would not necessarily change with each new government as would the defense minister. Also, the reform sought to reduce the 3,000 career servicemen employed in headquarters to 1,500-2,000 and redistribute the excess among military units, thereby increasing the percentage of professionals in the forces (48).

The 22 April 1991 session of the inter-ministerial commission for reforms agreed that the Polish CoS – General Inspector of the Armed Forces – would become the supreme commander of the armed forces in wartime. In early June CoS
Stelmaszuk announced the new organization of the general staff. In peacetime, the Polish CoS would have three deputies. The General Staff consisted of 1,700 people, 1,200 career military and 500 civilians. On 5 July 1991, Lech Wałęsa announced that he would appoint Piotr Kołodziejczyk the new General Inspector of the Armed Forces (49).

According to the defense reform, the defense ministry would have the following three civil deputy defense ministers: (1) deputy minister for educational affairs (formerly for social relations and education), responsible for promoting educational and cultural policy within the armed forces and for organizing cooperation with the military chaplains’ service; (2) deputy for defense policy and planning, responsible for drafting a defense policy and a long-range concept for developing the Armed Forces to deal with Poland’s external threats; and (3) deputy minister for armaments and military infrastructure, responsible for the defense industry and for delivery, repair, and upgrading of weaponry and materiel.

After the October 1991 parliamentary elections Poland’s legislative and executive institutions were already fully legitimate in democratic political terms. The heavily fragmented, weak coalition government, and the absence of a Constitution became its Achilles heel. Debates over a new Constitution escalated tensions and triggered a political showdown between Parliament (Sejm and Senate) and the president.

In the absence of a new constitution, Lech Wałęsa continued to press his executive powers to the limit. When Jan Parys became the first civil defense minister in late December 1991, he fired the government’s opening salvo challenging Wałęsa’s authority as constitutional head of the Armed Forces. Parys announced major defense ministry house cleaning and reform adding that he would retire Piotr Kołodziejczyk rather than make him the new Inspector General as Wałęsa had announced earlier. In the beginning of February, Parys added that he would not appoint an Inspector General unless “Parliament amended the Constitution” (50).

As 1992 opened, it was clear that the presidential authority over defense and security affairs was running on collision course with the government. These different views rapidly came to a head. The crisis arose over different interpretations of presidential and defense ministerial authority as well as over policy and personality differences. It ended with the resignation of the new (and first) civil defense minister, exacerbated Polish civil-military relations, and brought the collapse of the new but weak government coalition.

On 7 April 1992, Prime Minister Olszewski placed Parys on extended leave and Romuald Szeremietiew became acting defense minister. On 25 April the Sejm established an eight-member commission to examine Jan Parys’ allegations. After the Sejm commission concluded that Parys’ allegations about politicians involving the Armed Forces in party games were “unfounded and detrimental to the state’s interests”, Parys resigned. President Wałęsa then asked Parliament to replace Olszewski (on 26 May) and the Olszewski government fell.
Ambiguity in authority and differences in interpretation over command and control of the military caused the downfall of Poland’s first civil defense minister Jan Parys, and then of Prime Minister Olszewski and his government. When the Sejm commission examined Parys’ allegations that Wałęsa had been planning martial law contingencies and offered Silesian Military District commander Tadeusz Wileccki the position of Chief of Staff (CoS) for his support, it exonerated the President (51).

The government of Hanna Suchocka and the defense minister co-operated with the presidential administration, reformed MoND and made effort to establish civil control over the military. Their success was limited by the moves of Chief-of-Staff General Tadeusz Wilecki who enrolled in the GS commanders of his military district, preserved its independency of the defense ministry, and confronted it with the presidency.

In November 1992, the Small Constitution rescinded the 1952 Stalinist Constitution, distributed the powers between president and government giving the latter higher authority. In the meantime the National Defense Council (NDC) approved two fundamental documents about Polish security: “Guidelines of the Polish Security Policy” signed by the president of the Republic of Poland, and “Security Policy and Defense Strategy in the Republic of Poland”, which elaborated in more detail on the guidelines. The main goal of the security policy was to ensure conditions for the country’s peaceful development on the basis of the above-stated principles, under the international law, and under the provisions of the United Nations Charter in particular, as well as in compliance with other international treaties, both bilateral and multilateral. It was possible to guarantee Poland’s security by:

- the country joining European security structures and, in particular, NATO and the Western European Union;
- initiatory action at the forum of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;
- mutually advantageous, bilateral and multilateral regional co-operation based on equality, including military co-operation;
- good relations with neighbouring countries;
- further reduction of armaments in Europe and in the world, as well as efficient monitoring of adopted restrictions;
- active participation in peace operations of the UN and the OSCE and, in future, of NATO and the WEU;
- integration with West-European political and economic structures (the European Union);
- improvement of the country’s defense system (52).
In 1993 the post-communist Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) – Polish Agrarian Party (PSL) won the parliamentary elections. The newly appointed Defense Minister Piotr Kołodziejczyk restructured and reduced the MoND personnel, vested the GS with more authority and proposed amendments to the law on defense. At a meeting in Dravsko Pomorskie tensions between military and service-men escalated once again when the CoS commander supported President Wałęsa against the defense minister and the defense commission in the Sejm did not take up a categorical stand.

In a statement Deputy Defense Minister Milewski identified the problem as follows: “The military ought to be an instrument of policy; it cannot itself conduct policy adding that the autonomy of the military is dangerous for democracy and could lead to the deletion of civil control over the military”. He added that the chief of staff must be subordinate to a democratically elected civil political power, stressing that “the logic of our constitutional solutions indicates that this ought to be the defense minister”. (53) Also, Milewski added that there ought to be rotation of personnel on military command posts.

The crisis in civil-military relations resulted from the uneven distribution of power between the president and the government and from the incapability of the Sejm to establish and exercise effective control over the military. The crisis manifested the incapacity of the MoND civil leadership to have control over the top brass. Consequently, the GS remained independent of the defense minister, and the armed forces politicised and disunited. Poland’s orientation to NATO and its requirements, the 1996 law on the department of the national defense minister, the new constitution of 1997, the experience and enhanced political culture of all participants in the complicated process of building democratic society and armed forces to serve it faithfully, were instrumental to the establishment of effective civic control and to the resolution of the conflict between military and civilians.

THE INTEGRATION INTO NATO

The strife for achieving interoperability between the Polish armed forces and NATO has been underway for 6 years. In February 1994, the Polish government responded to NAC invitation to take part in the PfP program and accepted the criteria about defense planning and budgeting transparency, democratic control over the military, readiness to contribute to peacekeeping operations and military cooperation. Poland’s participation in the program since 1995 has been conducive to reforms in the Polish Armed Forces.

The PfP program operates on the basis of the Partnership Working Program (PWP), which represents a kind of a menu of offers by NATO agencies and commands, and of national offers for events organized both by NATO member states and partner countries. Individual partner countries select the PWP events in which they intend to participate. Moreover, bilaterally or multilaterally Poland agrees to
the participation of its Armed Forces in events (mostly command post and field exercises) organized “in the spirit of PfP”.

The events selected from the PWP menu and agreed in the spirit of PfP provide a basis for the preparation of the annual Individual Partnership Program (IPP). Every year partner countries submit to the NATO HQ their IPP’s for the next year, together with a report on the implementation of last year’s IPP.

Since the inception of the PfP, the number of events planned within the framework of IPP, has been growing: starting from 40 in 1994, 260 in 1995 and 242 in 1996 up to 457 in 1997. The most complex IPP events are the command post exercises and field exercises. They have the highest training value both for the command and staff elements and the exercising units. Also, they create the best possible conditions and opportunities for developing interoperability. In 1994 Poland actively participated in PfP taking part in three exercises. In 1995 the Polish Armed Forces took part in 8 exercises conducted in Europe and 1 in the United States - “Cooperative Nugget”. In 1996 the number of exercises within the PfP framework and “in the spirit of PfP” with the participation of Polish servicemen increased to 21.

58 exercises were planned for 1997 including 25 exercises conducted in the framework of PfP, 1 NATO exercise with access for partner countries – “Strong resolve” and 31 exercises in the spirit of PfP. In 1998 Poland organized or co-organized 40 events within the framework of the program including 9 in the spirit of PfP.

The main directions of integration and interoperability, were:

- adaptation of the system of training to NATO standards, including personnel training (professional and language skills);
- adaptation of the combat readiness regime and C4I (Command, Control, Communication, Computers, Information) systems to NATO standards;
- reorganization of the military education system;
- enhancing professionalism;
- reducing conscript service;
- improving the quality of RRF units armament and equipment;
- establishing HNS;
- improving logistics. (54).

Poland’s intensive preparations to operate within the framework of the alliance were focused on three areas: organizational transformation and changes, personnel training and accomplishment of indispensable technical initiatives in preparation for membership.
The process of NATO integration was conducted in close co-operation with the neighbour states. For example, Poland coordinated its work on the Target Force Goal or Strategic Concept with the armed forces of the Czech republic and Hungary.

The country followed the same pattern when organizing multinational military structures. Together with German and Danish counterparts, it initiated the organization of Multinational North-East Corps in accordance with NATO standards. These standards were also applied to the formation of other multinational units with the participation of the Polish Armed Forces – Polish-Lithuanian and Polish-Ukrainian battalions.

In order to perform tasks under Article 5, Poland launched activities aimed at readiness to provide Host Nation Support for the reception of augmentation forces. It attained interoperability first in 6 areas.

The foreign language learning programs, basically English, have been intensified. In 1998 and 1999, over 8 thousand servicemen attended English language courses. A major problem of PAF is that only few NCOs and WOs can communicate in English. Poland still prioritizes on achieving capability for co-operation with the Alliance. That is why the participation of Polish servicemen in peacekeeping missions has always been of crucial importance.

The UNPROFOR mission in Bosnia from April 1992 to May 1995 marked a new stage in Poland’s participation in international peacekeeping operations. For the first time the Polish Armed Forces were asked to provide a 900-strong battalion for a UN peacekeeping operation. Following numerous changes in the mandate of the missions and composition of the forces, the battalion was included in the North Polish brigade of the NATO-led IFOR North multinational division. The successful performance of Poland in IFOR and SFOR demonstrated the country’s preparedness to perform its obligations as a NATO member and confirmed that its participation in the PfP program had brought it closer to integration into the European security structures (55).

Poland contributed an infantry battalion to SFOR and two infantry battalions to KFOR. This experience proved very useful at a later stage when the country was preparing its participation in the Rapid Reaction Forces.

For Polish servicemen, the country’s participation in NATO peacekeeping operations was a matter of course. Poland has gained vast experience in peacekeeping missions. Since 1953 the Polish Armed Forces have taken part in 40 peace operations in 28 countries. More than 40,000 servicemen and civil personnel members have contributed to the preservation of peace.

Since 1994 the Polish Armed forces have been playing an active part in the planning and evaluation process within the framework of PfP. Its performance in PARP constituted a good starting point for the large-scale participation of the Polish Armed Forces in the defense planning process of the alliance.
An account of Poland’s achievements in the planning process was included in the Defense Planning Questionnaire. The next stage was the Annual Defense Review, which served as a basis for NATO’s approval of the future Target Force Goals of the Polish Armed Forces. It defined the fields of preparation of the Polish military for effective co-operation with NATO forces.

**In the field of legislation** All basic legal documents, which regulate the functions of the state during the integration process were adopted or ratified by the Polish legislative bodies.

**In the field of security of information** The necessary number of personnel having NATO security clearance was trained including military and civil staff of the Polish Defense Ministry. Also, registry offices received certificates to keep the above-mentioned documents.

**In the field of personnel and armed forces training** The training of commanders and staff officers emerged as an important task. The training of the Polish Armed Forces, especially of units to join the Rapid Reaction Forces was conformed to NATO regulations and standards.

**In the field of NATINADS (NATO integrated Air Defense System)** A civil-military air traffic control system was established and the exploitation of ASOC started. Between 1997 and 1998 the Polish air defense system was gradually incorporated into the NATO Integrated Air Defence System. The training of ASOC and Air Rapid Reaction Forces units was conducted. Surveillance and control teams were trained to employ NATO formal procedures and documents.

**In the field of modernization of armament and military equipment** The replacement of obsolete equipment with a new generation, especially for units assigned to the Rapid Reaction forces continued.

**In the field of infrastructure (Host Nation Support)** Poland prepared information about possibilities to use the facilities of available airports and seaports, classification of roads and bridges and about maintenance and storage facilities.

Many activities were carried out within the interoperability sphere:
- the structure of units and the command chain was changed;
- over 1 000 officers attended courses organized in different NATO countries;
- over 5 000 servicemen and civil staff attended English language courses every year;
- all exercises were organized and conducted according to the NATO doctrine;
- IRF and RRF were equipped with new communication and identification facilities.
Poland’s philosophy was to come up to NATO level of training especially with regard to pilots and warship crews. The main effort was focused on IRF and RRF units.

Poland made every endeavour to resolve the problems, which surfaced while negotiations for NATO accession were prepared.

- Already from the very first day of membership Poland could not equip all command bodies with facilities to secure an exchange of information with NATO command bodies;
- Pilots could not have 180 flight hours of training each yearly;
- The implementation of the Host Nation tasks was a matter of some difficulty;
- There were problems with personnel education, especially with regard to foreign language learning. Language teaching at level II and III was intensified to meet NATO requirements.

Field training was organized on the level of battalions and more often of garrisons and not in the open. Due to the insufficient number of units, it could not be conducted at the level of brigades to secure interaction with support subdivisions.

A Ministerial Council decree of 9 June 1999 initiated the new structure of MoND and GS of the Polish Armed Forces in pursuance of the government program for Poland’s NATO accession and modernization of the Armed forces over the period 1998-2012.

The Ministry of National Defense (MoND) (Fig.III/1) implements the state policy in the field of defense and the armed forces. The minister of defense is a civilian. He runs the ministry directly and through the state secretary (first deputy minister), two deputy ministers, the director general and the chief-of-staff. The minister is responsible for the overall activity of the armed forces; drafting of guidelines about national defense including the development and structure of the armed forces; implementation of the directives and resolutions of the Ministerial Council about defense, control over all state bodies and institutions with regard to defense matters; management of mobilization resources; management of combat training and personnel policy; organization and control over procurement of equipment, financial and social matters; the country’s participation in military operations conducted by the international organizations, obligations under international treaties, etc.

The General Staff (GS) of the Polish Armed Forces (Fig.III/2) is a planning and consultative body at the Ministry of National Defense. The chief-of-staff is directly subordinate to the defense minister and is the sovereign military man on active service. He is in charge of overall mobilization planning, setting of goals and tasks, management and control over troops training and sports activities in the armed forces, financial matters and supplies, etc. The chief-of-staff has two deputies: first deputy who co-ordinates activities with NATO and a deputy who organ-
izes work in the general staff. The GS structure consists of six levels – chief, deput-ies, chief directorates, directorates, departments and sections.

As a result of the reform, the number of posts in the new establishment of MoND and GS of the Polish Armed Forces has been brought down by around 30%. Generalship has been reduced by 40% (from 47 to 28), colonelship and lieutenant-colonelship – by 65%.

Late in 1998 the numerical strength of the Polish Armed Forces was 240 645, of whom 100 285 on regular duty and 140 360 conscripts. There were 39 937 officers, 26 675 NCOs, 16 483 sergeants. Personnel reduction continues. According to estimates, in 2001 the number of servicemen will be 180 000 and in 2006 – 150 000. Essentially, the number of conscripts is reduced and the relative share of professional soldiers, sergeants and officers is increased. Polish experts believe that due to inadequate payment the recruitment and training of officers is an outstanding issue. The upcoming adoption of a concept for the training of sergeants is expected to resolve the problem.

The changes in the military budget and its relation to the state budget from 1991 to 1999 are shown on Fig.III/3.

The Polish Armed Forces entered NATO with 1 727 tanks, 1 440 armoured vehicles, 1 580 artillery units of 100 mm and more, 306 aircraft and 105 war helicopters. (56).

The Land Forces are the principal part of the Polish Armed Forces and constitute up to two thirds of their combat capacity.

The command of the Land Forces is the operational command authority. (Fig.III/4) It commands the troops subordinate to it, their training for the implementa-tion of strategic-operational tasks, and the maintenance of combat and mobilization readiness. Among the command’s most important tasks is also the planning and realization of PfP initiatives, maintenance of readiness for the formation of peacekeeping forces and participation in multinational forces, as well as coparticipation in planning the technical modernization of the subordinate forces.

It follows from the provisions contained in basic documents about the Na-tional Defense system that the Land Forces are the backbone of the Republic of Pol-land, intended to repel air and ground strikes by a potential aggressor through de-fensive actions. These shall be carried out in close co-operation with the Air Force and the Navy.

The formation, organization and level of training of the Land Forces should ensure their capability of acting in any part of the country, in every direction and against any form of a military threat. The National Defense doctrine also envisages their participation in the implementation of tasks stemming from Poland’s interna-tional commitments, related to maintaining security, conducting peacekeeping and humanitarian missions as well as actions connected with the liquidation of the ef-
fects of natural calamities. In accordance with the principles of the Polish art of war, both operational and Territorial Defense troops fulfill the defense tasks. These tasks are executed in wide-ranging co-operation with the non-military elements of the defense system.

The Armed Forces consist of various operational and territorial defense units arranged in two military districts (Pomeranian and Silesian) and the Airborne-Mechanized Corps. Essentially, the operational troops are responsible to: conduct defensive and offensive operations in wartime; train soldiers and implement peacekeeping and humanitarian missions in peacetime. The core of the operational forces includes eight divisions (including six mechanized divisions, one armoured cavalry division and one coast defense division), 25th Air Cavalry Division, one Airborne Assault Brigade and various other units.

According to “Assumptions for the Program for the Armed Forces Modernization”, the land component of the military will be profoundly transformed by the year 2012. This modernization aims to adapt the army potential to the national defense requirements, to ensure the compatibility of their command structures to NATO standards, to increase their mobility and airmobility, and enhance their general combat capabilities and anti-tank and AA capabilities, and to introduce modern training programs based on a 12-month conscription service. According to this modernization program, the army’s numerical strength will be reduced to 107 500 officers and soldiers. The share of soldiers on regular service will be increased up to 60%. Accordingly, the basic operational potential of the army will consist of six divisions and independent infantry and airmobile brigades (57).

The Air and Air Defense Forces are assigned to provide the air defense of Poland’s territory and to support land forces operations as well as the operations of Polish Navy. The tasks are to be performed by assault and reconnaissance aviation. The forces comprise aviation units, air defense missile units, and communication units. Apart from their basic tasks, such as: to repulse an attack; to weaken the enemy’s potential; to gain superiority in the air and assist the defensive operation of the land forces, the Air and Air Defense Forces are also responsible of warning and informing of imminent threats and air attacks and of providing air reconnaissance, air traffic control and air rescue service.

Currently the Air and Air Defense Forces are made up of 180 military units, 248 combat aircraft, 42 missile systems, and 360 tracking radar stations.

Two Air Defense Corps are the foundation of Poland’s air defense. (Second ADC in Bydgoszcz and Third ADC in Wroslaw) In 1998 they had seven fighter groups of two fighter squadrons each. The First “Warszawa” Fighter Group (PLM) is equipped with modern MiG-29 fighter planes. The Twenty-eighth Slupsk Fighter Group stationed in Slupsk is equipped with MiG-23 aircraft. The oldest MiG-21 PFM aircraft belonging to the Poznań Group complemented by the reconnaissance “21R” versions were scrapped in 1998. The newest MiG-21bis aircraft from Zegrze Pomorskie will remain in service until the year 2010.
The Air and Air Defense Forces also comprise missile units, which are subordinated to an element of the A&ADF known as the Air Defense Corps. These units are equipped with long-range S-200 “Wega” (SA-5) missile systems, medium range S-75M “Wołchoń” (SA-2) and “Krug” (SA-4) missiles, short range S-125M “Nowa” (SA-3) and “Kub” (SA-6) missiles, portable “Strzala-2M” (SA-7) anti-aircraft systems, as well as 37 mm and 57 mm anti-aircraft guns. The “Striela” systems will be gradually replaced by the Polish “GROM” systems.

At the present moment Poland has five Air Defense and Anti-Aircraft Missile Brigades as well as two Air Defense Regiments. The Fourth Air Corps, stationed in Poznań, is the assault force of the Polish Air and Air Defense Forces. The communications intelligence units are responsible, among other things, for radar surveillance of the whole territory of Poland, radar reconnaissance of the air space on the approaches to its borders, and the securing of the command structure of the troops.

Most of the equipment of the communications intelligence sub-units is produced in Poland. Recently they received three modern co-ordinate long-range radars TRD-1211 “Edyta”. The communications intelligence troops are grouped in three communications intelligence brigades.

Pilots and flight navigators for all of the air units of the Polish Armed Forces are trained at the Higher Air Force Officers School in Dęblin. Communications intelligence experts, as well as Air Defense Forces experts, are educated in training centers in Jelenia Góra and Koszalin, which were transformed from Higher Officers Schools, whereas the engineering maintenance personnel is trained in the Engineering Maintenance Personnel training Center in Oleśnica (58).

**Poland’s Radar System** is currently formed of three Radio-Electronic Brigades based in Warsaw, Bydgoszcz and Wrocław. Their task is to provide radar reconnaissance of the air space over Poland, to supply radio-electronic intelligence necessary for the effective command, combat duties and training of the remaining Air and Air Defense Forces units. Other duties involve air traffic control and control of transit flights over Poland. The Command and Control Services have a network of permanent posts supported by mobile posts, which might be activated when needed. C&C units remain on duty 24 hours a day. Their command posts are equipped with automatic command systems, which reduce the time needed to process data about the efficiency of the national defense system.

The modernization program of the Command & Control Forces provides for a new “Friend or Foe Identification” system. Some elements of the new system were already installed on most of the sophisticated combat aircraft (MiG-29 and Su-22), on some of the helicopters and individual MiG-21s as well as on Iskra aircraft. Including foreign made transponders, over half of the Polish military aircraft have been equipped with navigation systems compatible with ICAO regulations that are standard for the NATO forces (59).
The Polish Navy is an independent service of the Polish Armed Forces, which guards Poland’s territorial waters, shores, the shipping and maritime economy. The Navy enforces the Polish law on the internal and territorial waters and within the Polish maritime economy zone. To this end the Polish Navy co-operates with other services of the Polish Armed Forces, namely with the Air and Air Defence Forces and also with the Border Guards and maritime authorities (Fig.III/5).

The Polish Navy command is based in Gdynia. Its departments are subordinated either directly to the Navy Commander or indirectly through his three Deputy Commanders. The Navy Command responsibilities include planning, organization and day-to-day management of naval activities. Its training department is responsible for teaching officers and sailors from naval commands and units for supervision of training at sea, in particular. The logistic department is responsible for the introduction of new technologies, for supplies, repair works, etc.

The Navy is composed of three flotillas and one tactical union – the Naval Air Wing. The units are stationed in bases – military ports, the most important of which are:

- Gdynia with Third Flotilla named after Commander Bolesław Romanowski. It is regarded as the strongest flotilla and is commonly referred to as the “strike flotilla”. It is composed of squadrons of missile ships with the missile destroyer “Warszawa”, a squadron of submarines as well as an electronic reconnaissance group.

- Hel with Ninth Coastal Defense Flotilla named after Rear-Admiral Włodzimierz Steyer, made up of antisubmarine warfare ships and minesweepers.

- Świnoujście with Eighth Coastal Defense Flotilla named after Vice-Admiral Kazimierz Porębski. Among its vessels the flotilla has the most modern fleet minesweepers with nonmagnetic hulls made of polyester plastics. The Naval Air Wing named after Lieutenant Commander Pilot Karol Trzaski-Durski has been operating since 1995. It is composed of three air squadrons, a technical squadron and service support battalions. The Wing is intended to support any possible marine operation in the vicinity of the Polish Coastal Region, conduct air reconnaissance missions, provide cover for the bases and conduct antisubmarine as well as rescue missions. The Wing is stationed in three garrisons: in Gdynia, at Siemirowice and Darłowo (60).

The most important naval bases are in Gdynia, Oksywie, Hel, Świnoujście and Kolobrzeg. Eight Coastal Defense Flotilla, Ninth Coastal Defense Flotilla, Third Flotilla and some naval support units are stationed there. The most important warships are: ORP “Warszawa” destroyer, ORP “Kaszub” fregate, four Tarantula
class corvettes, three anti-submarines, seven Missile Craft Osa class and three submarines (1-Kilo class, 2-Foxtrot class). There are also eight anti-submarine torpedoboats and twenty-seven mineweepers. Poland’s Navy keeps in contact with Standing Naval Force Channel, French Command Anti-Submarine Boats, US Navy Command Europe and the German Flotilla of Missile Speed Boats (61).

The Polish Navy has 17,000 officers, warrant officers, NCOs and sailors including 7,500 regulars. 41% of the regular Navy personnel are officers, about 30% are warrant officers and 29% NCOs. Every year 250 cadets study at the Gdynia Naval Academy. 60 students attend the Naval Warrant Officers’ College and 30 students enroll in the NCOs school in Ustka yearly. The Polish Navy has 1,300 extended service sailors and about 200 contract sailors.

The Polish Navy has 158 warships and support vessels, 80 aircraft, including fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters.

The Polish Naval Air Wing includes:

- 22 MiG-21bis fighter aircraft;
- 5 MiG-21UM trainer/combat aircraft;
- 12 TS-11 Iskra bis D/DDF trainer aircraft;
- 6 TS-11R Iskra bis DF reconnaissance aircraft;
- 5 An-2 multipurpose aircraft;
- 3 An-28 transport/passenger aircraft;
- 2 An-28RM patrol/rescue aircraft;
- 6 multipurpose Mi-2 helicopters;
- 10 Mi-14PŁ antisubmarine warfare helicopters;
- 3 Mi-14PS rescue helicopters;
- 2 W-3 Sokół transport/passenger helicopters;
- 4 W-3RM Anakonda rescue helicopters. (62).

Military academic Training just like the whole of the Polish Armed Forces undergoes dynamic changes. At present it is composed of four Military Academies, four Higher Officers Schools, eleven Warrant Officers Schools and fifteen Non-commissioned Officers Professional Schools.

The Academies and Officers Schools are autonomous organizational units. The Warrant Officers and Noncommissioned Officers Schools are located in seven independent specialized training centers and at the Military Academies and Officers Schools. Various levels of studies are envisaged in the new model of education. They are conformed with the requirements that will be set to the Armed Forces in future and are based on the psychological, physical and intellectual quali-
ties of the candidates for officers. The Military Academies provide two types of education. Five-year Master’s Degree Courses in selected subjects are intended for officer candidates interested in theoretical work or research & development as well as for students who will occupy service posts for which a master’s degree is needed. Higher professional studies (engineering) take four years. There are two forms of academic training at the Higher Officers Schools: four-year higher professional studies where graduates receive a Master of Science degree in Engineering or Bachelor of Science in a given specialty, and higher three-year professional studies where candidates graduate as Engineer-Commanders. At present the higher military schools aim at educating officers-commanders with managerial skills capable of resolving successfully any problem that may arise within a sub-unit (63).

Experts studying the three newly fledged NATO members assert that as compared to the other two countries Poland has so far achieved the greatest success in integrating its armed forces into the alliance. Poland has the largest GDP, the most numerous population, a 15-year long program for the modernization of the armed forces and 80% public support for membership of the alliance. The Polish Armed Forces are already compared to the armed forces of long-standing NATO members like Greece and Turkey. In Kosovo Poland has a contingent almost matching that of Spain.

Today Polish servicemen have good reason to be self-confident because they lean on century-old traditions and on loyalty to the motto “God, Honour, and Country”.

VI.

COMMON FACTORS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF MILITARY REFORMS IN THE CZECK REPUBLIC, HUNGARY AND POLAND

The three countries have made a synchronized, joint and speeded-up advancement to NATO, meanwhile reforming their armies according the Alliance standards. They retained and developed the good aspects of the previous epoch heritage: military industry, military education and social security of servicemen.

Common factors and similar characteristics of the military reforms:

A. Historical preconditions:
   − Age-long belonging to the West European culture;
   − Powerful role of the Catholic Church;
- Long-standing and vehement resistance against the communist regime imposed from the outside, which found a most vivid expression in 1956, 1968 and 1980;
- Military traditions and national mentality comprising love of freedom, enterprising spirit, organization, industriousness, democratic attitudes, long shaped and structured civil society.

B. Economic factors:
- Considerable industrial basis and market mechanisms built up long before 1989, joint ventures with West European companies; access to western technologies;
- Private business and agriculture developed under the communist regime;
- Rapid and successful transition to market economy after 1989; effective economy ensuring a growing GDP and a higher living standard of population (Fig.IV);
- Clear programs and actions for integration in EU;
- Sizable foreign investments. The West European states increase sharply their investments (from 30 to 150%) in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland which are already called “the new tiger states” by financiers such as the Hipoverains Bank boss (Germany) (64).

- Comparatively successful privatization which provided conditions for development of private initiative and economic growth;
- Highly-skilled labor reoriented fast enough after the labor market restructuring;

C: Political factors:
- Historically formed political culture of the societies and high civil awareness;
- Dissident movements with a powerful impact on the societies over the past two – three decades;
- Reform political forces (parties) which, having united against the communist parties, overthrew them from power already at the first elections, and which contributed to reaching consensus on key issues and formed highly efficient governments;
- Political leaders who rose and asserted themselves in the struggle against communism, who united, convinced and led their nations to taking the risks and suffering the difficulties of transition;
- Competent and active intelligentsia which, having carried out intellectual preparation for the transition prior to 1989, stood at the head of processes and imposed Euro-Atlantic values in open debates in the societies;
– Powerful and organized emigration lobbying for the mother-land before the western institutions and providing moral and material support for the three countries;
– Patriotically-minded and reforming figures in the communist parties, who oppose the Soviet model, look at and stand up for national priorities, join the democratic forces or contribute to the former communist parties conversion in modern social democratic formations, some of them winning elections and taking part in the constructive processes;
– Socio-political activity and high moral authority of the church;
– Rapid and comparatively conflict-free attainment of a civil control over the armed forces.

D. Military and social factors, and distinctive features:
– Social debate and consensus on the issue of reforms in the armed forces as early as the first 1 – 2 years after the collapse of communism;
– Development of theoretically substantiated, definitive and resource-supported plans and programs for military reforms;
– Follow closely adopted course and execute plans;
– Place uncorrupted, authoritative and competent leaders;
– Generation change in the officer corps, immediate removing from office of communist-related military personnel;
– High performing military staff selected by professional criteria;
– Achieve an early stage of consensus on the issue of integration in NATO and on subjecting the strategic course reforming processes to the Alliance;
– Active participation in the PfP Program;
– Coordinate efforts between the three governments, the defense ministries and the general headquarters. For example, after the invitation for negotiations on membership in NATO, the three states institutionalized the meetings of defense ministers and general headquarters bosses. These meetings facilitate exchange of information on execution of plans for joining NATO and for the armed forces development; plan defense; devise command and liaison systems; computerize information; anti-aircraft defense; logistics; human resources management;
– Negotiations and preparation for joining NATO facilitate activities in legislation; in classified information defense; participation in the Enhanced Partnership for Peace Program as one of the ways to reach certain compatibility in NATO; in infrastructure improvement;
– The countries carry out a broad explanatory activity and provide a high level of public support for reforms and membership in NATO;
The three countries support the ‘open doors’ policy, share their experience and offer help to the countries that have remained outside the first wave of joining the Alliance;

Set up structures in legislative power, which coordinate government institutions’ efforts to reform the armed forces and join NATO;

Set up own missions in NATO Headquarters aimed to maintain permanent relation with the Alliance command structures;

Provide reasonable social conditions and living standard for servicemen released from the army;

Establish non-government military professional organizations which work actively to defend the rights of uniformed citizens and draw them closer to democratic society’s values;

Stand up for national priorities, traditions and specifics.

E. NATO’s support.

Insofar as the experience of former Warsaw Pact member nations’ joining NATO is unique and valuable, the Alliance supports the three candidates in different areas and generalizes experience of their preparation in the following:

Develop military doctrines, concepts and plans for armed forces reforming and development;

Plan and budget defense as per NATO standards and practices;

Target forces goals and meet NATO standards according to STANAG;

Language training;

Develop also documents for classified information defense procedures;

Amend the laws guaranteeing the reforms and membership in NATO;

Develop defense planning questionnaire and provide an answer key;

Organize and carry out PfP exercises in “the spirit” of PfP;

Develop and deploy communication and computer systems, AAD, navigation and connection devices; IFF radars;

Improve infrastructure. According to Poland’s Defense Minister, Yanush Onishkiewic, within eight years NATO will invest $650 million in the development of Polish military infrastructure, where funds will be used mainly to adapt Polish airports, naval and ground bases to NATO logistic standards. (65).

Leading NATO nations such as the US, Great Britain, Germany and Holland provide individual support for the three NATO membership candidates in the form of experts and funds;
As a sign of trust, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland were invited to attend sessions of a number of committees and other bodies in NATO Council, with the exception of the nuclear planning group, prior to their being accepted as real members.

VII.

REFORMS IN THE BULGARIAN ARMY

“THE SEVEN WASTED YEARS”

Known and often quoted in Bulgaria is Jeffrey Simon D.Sc.’s view of the discrepancy between Bulgaria and NATO: Bulgaria is still trying to understand what is expected from it to do and is not yet ready in terms of its aspirations for NATO membership. An important part of the problem is that NATO information programs do not reach their audience. This contributes to the insufficient knowledge and understanding of what NATO really is among the politicians and the Bulgarian public at large” (66). Actually these seven years have been lost not only with regard to the country’s integration in NATO, but also with regard to whatever changes towards filling the BA with new content. The 1990 – 1997 period could safely be skipped in this paper since its was not used for reforms in defense. However it can be seen as a chain of scandals in the defense department, as wasted resources and national energy, as missed opportunity for a public debate and for seeking consensus, for scientific and practical clarification of the question “what kind of army does Bulgaria need in the new century?”. Two parliaments and three governments used their office for irrelevant activities, failing to fulfill their pre-election promises or respond to the pressure exerted by the more active part of commissioned officers who required legal, financial and technical support to complete their professional duties.

In 1990 the United Democratic Forces (UDF) leader, Zhelyu Zhelev, Ph.D., was elected president of the republic and leader of opposition. Overcome with euphoria that yet another bastion of communism had been won, the newly elected president literally started from the ground up to get familiarized with his duties of a
supreme commander-in-chief. The red generals from the Ministry of People’s De-
fense (MPD) treated mockingly the newly elected head of state, refused to pay him
honors, set his military (in)competence at defiance and tried to misinform him on a
number of important issues.

The leadership of the Bulgarian Officers’ Legion ‘Rakovski’ decided to help
the president of the Republic of Bulgaria and his newly appointed advisers. Objec-
tive and genuine information about the feelings and expectations of commissioned
officers from the power departments started flowing to them from the Ministry of
the Interior structures and the special services. Legion ‘Rakovski’ gathered civil
and military scientists, politicians and officers who developed the first, quite im-
perfect, project of national security doctrine. The project was introduced in parlia-
ment and handed in to the president. The word combination “military reform” be-
came a permanent expression in the vocabulary of politicians, military men and
journalists.

The opposition democratic forces insisted on dissolving the party organiza-
tions in the army, which was actually the first serious step towards change. The so-
cialist party (BSP) in power and the MPD leadership it had appointed adopted their
favorite wait-and-see tactics. The UDF exerted pressure from parliament and from
the street. The Officers’ Legion ‘Rakovski’ called upon its members and all ser-
vicemen to give up their party membership so that the military forces unity would
not be put to risk. The parliament passed a supplement to the law on political par-
ties. Council of Ministers’ Order No 126 of 2 November 1990 declared dissolution
of the former communist party organizations in the Bulgarian Army and a ban on
officers and sergeants’ membership in political parties (67).

Despite the communist agitators’ apocalyptic prophecies, the officers and ser-
geants easily renounced their BCP membership that had forcibly been imposed on
them. With a BCP Central Committee’s decision of the 1950s, officers who did not
belong to the communist party could not be promoted to senior positions than
company commanders. Similar measures taken in armaments from the CPSU re-
sulted in some 93-97% BCP membership among the BA’s commissioned officers
by 1989.

At the end of 1990 the above ministerial order served to disband the political
bodies in the military units and set up structures for educational work, which were
not allowed to deal with party or political activities. Nearly 85% of the political of-
ficers who were not of retirement age joined the educational work structures. The
younger ones entered the University of Sofia or the Military Academy where they
majored in sociology, pedagogics, journalism and other civil disciplines. The
communist ruling top’s close associates were provided with command positions or
with jobs in logistics.

78 generals of retirement age were transferred to the reserve. The ground
force, air force and naval force’s commanders who, according to the rules, had
been BCP Central Committee members were replaced. New commanders were
placed at the head of two thirds of the armies and 44% of the BNA formations.
35% of the MPD and HQ department chiefs were replaced. 1700 officers altogether left the army in 1990. (68)

Using the amendments to the law and the ban on membership in political parties, more than 500 young officers refused to sign declarations of depoliticizing and left the army. Sixty percent of them were platoon commanders expecting to find better jobs as civilians.

In October 1991 the Union of Democratic Forces won the parliamentary elections and formed a government. The first civilian minister of defense was appointed. He formed a team of civilian and military experts. Only six months later the defense minister, Mr. Dimitar Ludjev, was removed from office at the request of the prime-minister because of a shady deal in weapons (69). He was also remembered with the act of refusing 40% of the military budget planned for 1992, referring to the country’s economic and social difficulties. 1991 marked the beginning of the Bulgarian Army’s financial, technical and organizational collapse. Budget cutbacks led to resource inadequacy and to permanent cutting down on field, flight and naval training exercises. The economic crisis caused reduction in the state budget revenues, hence in the money transfers to the ministry and the military units. Apart from being drastically lower, these funds always came late. The army suppliers did not receive their due payments for months and stopped the food, fuel, water and electricity supply. The events of private companies’ going bankrupt due to Ministry of Defense’s unpaid debts were not rare. (70).

The decreasing percentage share of funds for the army in the shrinking gross domestic product (GDP) was further melted away by the growing inflation. Defense expenditures were decreasing as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of the GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ex-communist dominated parliaments voted less than 50% of the requested military budgets: according to 1993 MD estimates, only BGN 9 billion were allocated out of the requested 19 billion; in 1994 the parliament voted only BGN 13 billion, the draft budget being BGN 37 billion; out of the requested BGN 52 billion for 1995, 24 billion were allocated and in 1996 the deputies voted only BGN 33.5 billion out of the planned 92 billion. Budget execution of the above military budgets never exceeded 80% (72).

The decreasing military budget was used for nearly the same Bulgarian Army strength. In 1990 the number of officers fell by 14.5%, of sergeants by 4.6% and of soldiers by 22%, which was caused mainly by shortening the service length and the by the falling population growth. The number of young men applying for the ground force military schools was 2.5 times less than that in 1986. (73).
The lack of spare parts and food for soldiers, the depreciating equipment and the danger of remaining without accommodation in case of an expected price jump made officers, sergeants and their wives go on street demonstration in the Stara Zagora garrison (74). Pursuant to the laws and statutes adopted by the communist regime, officers and sergeants were not entitled to buying a flat until completion of 45 years of age and 10 years of military service. After the unrest the MD undertook a summary procedure of selling out the military housing fund. Generals and chiefs took advantage of that process for profiteering by illegal purchase of 2 or 3 flats at attractive prices (75).

According to the general headquarters’ boss, general Tsvetan Totomirov, half of the ordered central supplies for the BA were not delivered, there was lack of staple food products in the military units and soldiers were more and more often given “unvaried, unsuitable and not healthy enough” food (76).

Commanders were made to reach for the wartime reserves. By 10 December 1996, prior to the government transfer of BGN 5.3 billion – more than 15% of the entire military budget – the BA owed over BGN 6 billion to supplier companies (77). To economize food, commanders let soldiers go on leave from Friday to Sunday. Cadets from military schools followed a shortened curriculum in order to go on holiday in December and January.

Resource restrictions made commanders and headquarters cut the insufficient number of exercises as it was, plan them again or simply not carry them out. According to the general headquarters, brigade and division size tactical exercises were not conducted within the ground force during the 1991 – 1994 period, which resulted in weakened cohesion between the headquarters and the troops. Not a single battalion tactical exercise was conducted of those planned and only 54% of planned company exercises were covered in the winter of 1994. Due to resource inadequacy, the annual ammunition limit was expended by 20 – 27% for small arms and by 21 – 28% for tanks. The only shooting battles waged were those of detachments and platoons. Only 42% of the resources necessary for military and tank drivers training were allocated, which caused a larger number of accidents.

Compared with 1991, the flying hours planned for the air force for 1994 were 57% less and of these 75% were covered as daytime flights in simple meteorological conditions. No battle shootings with fighter aviation were organized. The AF commander expressed concern about the alarming increase of “aviation cannibalism”, i.e. taking parts and aggregates off one plane to service another (78).

Naval force training went down, too. Of the tactical exercises planned for a single ship for 1994 only 56% were covered. Compared with 1992, single ship shootings decreased 5 fold. From 1992 to 1994 ship divisions cut their shootings three fold. The indisputable conclusion is: reduced field, flight and naval training trim.

BETWEEN RULERS’ OPTIMISM AND OPPOSITION’S SCEPTICISM
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The absence of constructive changes in the economy, of laws and political intrigues between the major opposing forces, BSP and UDF, had an unfavorable effect on the army. The establishment of civil-military relations was obstructed by contradictions, clashes and shady moves. Even a most uniting issue such as the Bulgarian Army Holiday was politicized in parliament. (79).

Three centers of power – the Ministry of Defense, the General Headquarters and the president of the republic – more and more rarely coordinated their relations and more often fought for superiority in their influence on the army. Through its National Security Commission the parliament gravitated between them, depending on its political bias.

The relations which were not based on a modern law led to an odd paradox – General Headquarters laying claims for a military budget; national assembly voting the defense expenditure, thus determining the nature of activities in the army; a president appointing the people to manage these activities and; a government submitting a report on their performance. (80).

As a supreme commander-in-chief, the president approves plans and scenarios, appoints and dismisses the high rank military, but cannot make a professional assessment of the documents and people quality. This makes his acts a mere formality and he is forced to rely on the MD and HQ.

In terms of the requirements for democratic and competent control, the parliament stays even farther. The deputies’ attitude to the army and MD is shaped by the minister’s political affiliation. The assessments and debates on key issues such as budget, control, adoption of laws and amendments to them, are sharply politicized. Through the MD and HQ the dominating political force would prepare the respective documents, announce its position using the channels of the government media subject to it and set the voting machine going. The opposition most often would make statements that turn the military problems incompetent and politicized. It is for 11 years now that the Bulgarian parliament has lacked politicians of authority who are competent enough in the military sphere and have to will to oppose the party line in favor of the army’s actual needs (81).

The National Security Commission of the last, 38th, National Assembly consisted of 5 diplomed engineers, 4 lawyers, 5 researches, 2 pensioners, 1 pedagogue, 1 journalist and 3 officers of the reserve. For four years neither these nor the chairman, a lawyer by profession, made moves to be kept in mind like bills, interpellations, investigations or publications. The documents brought forward by the government are usually polished up by the commission and introduced in the plenary hall where the ‘IFF’ system is at work. Politologists and journalists have repeatedly pointed out that in case of a one-party government the parliament would be an appendix, a service mechanism of the legislature.

Samuel P. Huntington points out that already in the 1940s the US Congress thoroughly analyzed the army activity, planned and oversaw the spending of every single dollar, discussed in detail the programs for development of the different branches of troops, for training and for construction of new bases (82).
Experts from Britain’s Defense Department are of the opinion that many of the deputies in Bulgaria are newcomers in the National Assembly and they need time to go deep in the problems of defense before being fully efficient in their role. It is obvious, the experts state, that an educational and training process will be necessary so that information-backed and profound parliamentary debates can be conducted (83).

However, while this “educational and training process” lasts the parliament’s term of office is usually over and, if elected again, the average statistic deputy who has landed in the National Security Commission by chance will most often find himself in a different commission.

The strict British have observed that the General Headquarters’ response to these changes is taking a pragmatic and positive stand and fully supporting the reform program goals and tasks. As a matter of fact, it is a leading force to change in a number of fields. One of the areas of pressure, which is often to be seen in organizations evolving from a situation of predominant military control, is the view that civilians who have been attracted to work there lack the training and experience they need to do their jobs (84).

During the first years (prior to 1997) the MD was fully dominated by generals who blocked politicians’ timid attempts to change something in the army mechanism’s essence and structure. After 1997 and after a significant political, legal and personnel offensive undertaken by civilian politicians and experts, the Ministry of Defense made up for its fall behind by developing a series of important documents, trying to introduce clear rules of the game.

For lack of sufficient number of trained and quality people, the good intentions still make just a theoretical part of the visions and plans. Except for a few experts at the level of office directors and department heads, MD appointed a number of incompetent civilian specialists with no sense of mission or attitude of permanent stay in the system. The concept of democratic control is sometimes confused with the appointment of civil government officials, Britain’s Defense Department experts hint discreetly (85). They have felt the level of tension and the implied mistrust between civilians and military men in the MD and HQ umbrella, the discrepancy between political leaders’ and the pragmatically-minded military. The Ministry of Defense and the General HQ do not yet work coordinated enough, or often work just for themselves, full of ups and downs of mutual mistrust and doubts.

The MD’s structure formative rules was recast several times during the past few years. The incessant structural changes, shrinking, closing down and merging of departments, offices and divisions hinder the civilian experts’ stabilization in the MD. The Law on Defense and the Armed Forces, developed for four years and adopted in December 1995, underwent seven amendments and supplements. Some of its ideas and articles are either antinomic or contradictory to other documents. After January 2001 the MD officials’ work activity sharply dropped. Most of them expect to part with their ministerial seats after the elections on 17 June 2001. How to be creative reformers?
Utterly unhappy was the selection of the first civilian ministers and deputy ministers of defense after 1990. Some of them had problems with alcohol. One turned out a State Security (the Bulgarian KGB) agent. Seventy percent of them were obviously incompetent. They did not have serious teams of civilian and military experts; tried to exercise aggressive civil control. In 2000 and 2001 three of totally four deputy ministers were and two still are an object of judicial inquiry for misappropriation of funds and corruption (86).

The HQ boss reminded in the press to one of the ex-ministers that he had had to take a psycho test before assuming such a responsible position (87).

Most of the ministers were involved in financial deals and unlawful distributing of flats. The corps of officers are hostile to them and to the politicians deciding their fate. According to a sociological survey by military sociologists, in February this year the officers, sergeants and professional soldiers displayed 80% disapproval of parliament, 68.8% of the government and 77% of the judiciary (88). It was only the president of the republic who enjoyed 67.7% trust.

In another survey (of 1998) approval of MD is 43.4% and disapproval, 39.5%. The General Headquarters received 51.7% approval and 35.5% disapproval by career status servicemen (89).

**GENERALS, POLICIES AND PRIVILEGES**

“Sometimes great deformations start with innocent looking mistakes in personnel employment”, says Parkinson in one of his aphorisms. “Instead of beginning to sweep the stairs from top to bottom”, the way Suvorov once recommended, Bulgarian political and military government officials started rearrangement of the military ruling establishment in their typical slow, illogical, compromising and taking into consideration the class and friendly oriented manner. The generals were the first to be preserved, namely those who declared loyalty to the ruling ex-Communist Party. Supreme officers succeeded in remaining in hiding as reserve staff for reappointment for some two or three years. The above had no intention of occupying key positions.

The newly appointed Chief of General Staff General Ljuben Petrov appointed at key positions in Bulgarian Army his personally loyal friends, ex-classmates and born in his region chums from the Pirin region. Most of these were sons of active communist functionaries and aired in public their party preferences. The General Staff was freed from the presence of generals, who were not part of the friend escort of Ljuben Petrov. Concept for the development of Bulgarian Army was worked out under his conduct till the year of 2000. However, it was neither founded on scientific grounds nor was it approved by Bulgarian President or Bulgarian Parliament. Nor was it supported by a law, military doctrine or concept on national security. For almost three years General Petrov pretended to be carry-
ing out reforms, he close down important structure bodies such as the supervisory body of Bulgarian Army and he worked faithfully for the ex-Communist party.

In the summer of 1992 General Ljuben Petrov stepped into conflict with the Minister of Defence and refused to sign an order of the latter, thus preventing the staff renewal processes in Bulgarian Army and denounced the function of the Minister of Defence.

Shortly afterwards the Chief of the General Staff took part in a plot aimed against the Government headed by Philip Dimitrov. At a sensational press conference in the presence of the chief executives of Police, Intelligence and other special services General Ljuben Petrov declared support of the accusations against the Prime Minister which led to the Government’s resignation (90). For two years Bulgaria was governed by the “dummy” like Government headed by Prof. Ljuben Berov, which was conducted by the Bulgarian Socialist Party.

The Chief of the General Staff was not sanctioned and continued working for the ex-Communist Party, instead of for Bulgarian Army. In the summer of 1993, following an initiative of General Ljuben Petrov, with the assistance of Members of Parliament from the Bulgarian Socialist Party and with the assistance of the post-communist press, the most dangerous scandal in Bulgarian Army for the whole transition period after 1990 was provoked. Without presenting any evidence, deliberate publications accused the Commander of Infantry units General-Lieutenant Ljutzkanov of preparing a military plot. Being provoked by General Ljuben Petrov the Minister of Defence asked the Commander of Infantry units to resign. The latter was declared to be suspected by ex-Communist Party of having relations with the party in opposition (the Union of Democratic Forces).

The officers from the Army Headquarters declared support for their chief executive in a letter sent to the President of Bulgaria. However President Zhelev denied to sign decree for the general’s dismissal without any evidence to be submitted. The dangerous conflict continued for forty days, in which period the conspiracy instigators seriously endangered the peace in the country (91). The falsely accused General Ljutzkanov, having been asked by the President, submitted his resignation.

In the summer of 1994 General Ljuben Petrov was dismissed from the executive bodies of the General Staff, but he was not dismissed from actual military service. Without being dismissed he ran in the parliamentary elections for the Bulgarian Socialist Party, thus breaking the law forbidding political involvement within Bulgarian Army. General Ljuben Petrov was dismissed through President’s decree and became the first four-pip general to be dismissed because of political activities performed.

In December 1994 General Ljuben Petrov was elected Member of Parliament from the major political group, he was member of the Commission on National Security and for several months was its chairman. He also ran in the Parliamentary elections in June 2001 from the Bulgarian Socialist Party.
Following General Ljuben Petrov’s dismissal the General Staff was headed by the Commander of Infantry units General-Colonel Tzvetan Totomirov. It was namely his deserve that the scandals in the supreme management of Bulgarian Army were put an end to. Among his other contributions we might list the reached work balance with the Ministry of Defence and the guaranteed neutrality of Bulgarian Army in January 1997 when hundreds of citizens broke into the Parliament, erected barricades in some towns and villages and did not stop their citizens’ disobedience and unrest till the Bulgarian Socialist Party denied forming new Government.

At that crucial moment the then ruling Bulgarian Socialist Party checked the probable position of the General Staff several times in case it declared civil emergency and tried to suppress eventual mutinies and manifestations of disobedience by using force. The Chief Executive of the General Staff unambiguously declared that Bulgarian Army will by no means undertake any home political functions. He announced loyalty before law and personally conducted the inauguration ceremony of newly elected President Petar Stoyanov. Forced by street mutinies and unrest, as well as received denial for support on behalf of Bulgarian Army, ex-communists were removed from power in February 1997 (92).

Only four months after that the events with General Totomirov became a real practical example for the lack of gratitude concerning Bulgarian politicians. Following a proposal by the Minister of Defence the Bulgarian Government decided to demand the removal of the Chief Executive of the General Staff. In the middle of a meeting, without being informed of any grounds and without being prepared, the general was urgently called to visit the President’s office. Bulgarian National Radio announced the intended change of posts, prior to the General’s being made aware of the fact. Thus the Prime Minister humiliated a respected military commander, as well as demonstrated both power and disregard for the army.

The hardest burden fell on the general from the Air Force Miho Mihov. As Chief Executive of General Staff he was in a position to take unpopular measures, to curtail military officials, to cut down on military weapons and equipment, to establish a balance between volitional and incompetent political pressure and the reactions of military professionals. It was not only once that General Mihov was left alone against the Government and the media to defend his views and the interests of the army (93). In the conditions of suppressed public debating over the military doctrine the general alone aired the position of the General Staff that Bulgaria needed an army of 65 000 people. The board of generals did not declare in public any support for its leader through announcements, reports, as well as through the means of silent diplomacy at unofficial meetings with politicians.

“It is much more difficult to show citizen’s courage than soldier’s bravery”, says a French proverb. Having been formed as personalities till 1990, the majority of Bulgarian generals have not broken away from the mentality characteristic of the communist period when the main factors for personal survival were silence and obedience. The demonstrative dismissals of two generals who shared their opinions
in public were a serious enough warning. Obedience paid off. In July 2000 74 generals received new pips, while their ranks were made equal to NATO ones (94). Thus prior to Bulgaria’s incorporation in NATO Bulgarian generals’ body made the main step in the Alliance. However, its deserves are subject to debate.

Most of the generals keep being silent only because they are unwilling to spoil their career. This phenomena is confirmed by the fact that following their going into military reserve almost 70% of them are becoming members of parties, public organizations or unions of officers in reserve and they are announcing critical remarks against policies in whose implementation they have soon taken part.

Generals in Western Europe are people of wide humanitarian and technical knowledge, they have scientific degrees and have graduated from prestigious universities, as well as have excellent command of foreign languages. Among the presently operating Bulgarian generals there is not even a single person with a scientific degree. Less than half of them speak English. For some, who have been sent on language training trips abroad in Western Europe, their stays in Europe turn out to be just a farewell excursion prior to their going into retirement.

While the law and the regulations are being applied strictly in reference to the ordinary officers, the generals are perpetually made exceptions for. There are cases when some are exempted from the requirement to have served as basic commanders prior to their taking the desired position. Others are still doing their professional duties at an older age than the maximum allowed is and it is not before that moment that the rank of the military unit they are responsible for is matched to “Plan 2004”. For serious financial and discipline violations generals are being imposed administrative sanctions. The most frequent cases of going to prestigious western academies apply to aides-de-camp and favoured by generals and civil managing executives persons.

The privileges of the generals have a bearing on the reputation of Bulgarian Army, they also exert negative influence on the motivation of the officers, they break their faith in social justice. The reform, which started only with criticism for privileges, has so far made only personal changes among the privileged persons.

It is becoming more frequent that the generals are subject to severe criticism in the press. “Unfortunately, Bulgarian military commanders turned out to be unable to behave responsibly …In this dramatic public and social environment the militaries proved unable or did not dare show better public performance than politicians, when the subject of national security and the fate of the whole nation is in question”, are the concluding remarks in “Monitor” newspaper (95).

In July 2000 Prime Minister Kostov announced that 64 generals appeared too many for the constantly decreasing number of military staff. 20 general positions were planned to be curtailed in April 2001. However, this reduction was postponed for the autumn of 2001. No postponement was planned for the curtailment of the hundreds of officers, who are to be dismissed in 2001.
The problems of the reform in Bulgaria are not so much of financial nature as because of the still underway, recently based upon regulations, lacking tradition and conducted by poorly trained military staff, civil-military relations.

EFFORTS TO CATCH UP

It was for the first time following 1989 that the Bulgarian Government completed its first mandate (1997-2001) and reported achievements in the field of national security, defence and armed forces.

In the course of the four year period a number of important management regulations were adopted; restructuring and modernization of Bulgarian Army was started, active policy for collaboration and integration in European and Euro-Atlantic structures for security was accomplished. Concept for national security, military doctrine, amendments to the Law on Defence and Armed Forces were adopted, as well as the Law on Alternative Military Service, concept for crisis management, regulation for mandatory military service, establishing regulations of the Ministry of Defence, methodology for developing of programs in the Ministry of Defence and Armed Forces, regulations of construction of communication-information systems, operational doctrines. The first annual reports on the state of national security, defence and armed forces, which places solid grounds for conducted aimed policies in the field of defence and guarantees the civil democratic control over armed forces.

Through the adopted plans for organization, construction and development of the Ministry of Defence and Armed Forces, operational plan for gaining NATO membership, as well as concepts for developing the basic elements for defence systems, through developing for the first time twenty-one middle term programs until 2006, fully synchronized with the planning system in NATO, the beginning of restructuring of the defence system was set in compliance with the new political, military strategic and social realities, of removing the responsibility from the army to perform inappropriate activities, infrastructure and property, of creating really able to perform fighting units, having potential in the whole spectre of traditionally new missions for the army (96).

Other new adopted issues were: military strategy of the Republic of Bulgaria; concept for the rapid reaction forces; concept for logistic maintenance of armed forces; doctrine for combined joint operations; doctrine for MOOTW; doctrine for preparation of arms and forces; doctrine for the types of armed forces; rear (logistic) doctrine; directive for military readiness (97).

The regulations adopted became the scientific, legal and organizational grounds for the reform conducted in Bulgarian Army and for preparing its integration in NATO. The strategy for reform of armed forces is conceptually supported
by the military doctrine and plans for organizational construction of armed forces until 2004, according to which Bulgarian Army shall consist of General Staff and military units to provide service and to secure the armed forces, infantry units, air force units and navy forces, incorporating military units and special units (98).

The General Staff (Fig.V/1) is a basic body for strategic command of the Bulgarian Army in times of peace, as well as of armed forces in the in times of war. In times of war the General Staff conducts the preparation of armed forces for military reaction, the creation of defence units, the preparation and conducting of operations, as well as of territorial defence. The structure of the General Staff and the other establishments in Bulgarian Army has taken into consideration the adopted by NATO countries unified structure of establishments (99).

Army units are a basic type of Bulgarian Armed Forces. As a result of the conducted reform they incorporate types of military units, interoperable with those of NATO, prepared to perform tasks both alone and together with multinational task forces in peacekeeping operations. Special accent in the army is put on training activities and drills, conducted by the rapid reaction forces, which are preparing for classic tactical activities, participation in peacekeeping missions, and disaster relief missions. Accounting for the changing nature and characteristics of threats, army units are constantly improving their preparation with readiness to take part in activities dealing with crisis management, conflict prevention, their taking part in already occurred of the above, as well as in post-conflict activities. The military units are being trained to perform counter terrorist tasks. Under these conditions the role of interoperability will be growing, as well as that of tactical mobility, information operations and reliable logistic procurement of the troops.

The Army structure includes Headquarters, a RRF Command, Special Operations Command, Service support units (Fig.V/2).

The Air Force units consist of Headquarters, Air Defence Command, tactical aviation and their service support units. The Air Force units also include five air bases and three air defense brigades which maintain constant readiness (Fig.V/3).

The training of Air Force is aimed at performing the basic specific tasks, as well as at procurement of constant inter-relation with the infantry units and the navy forces. Following the Kosovo crisis experts evaluate the growing importance of aviation in the whole spectrum of operations, including operations other than war.

The Navy Forces are intended to protect the sovereignty of Bulgaria in its sea territories, as well as for participation in operations other from war, for procuring the safety of ships in the economic zone of the state (100). The Navy Forces include a Headquarters, two navy bases and service support units (Fig.V/4).
The functional structure. In compliance with the military doctrine the forces and armies of Bulgarian military are functionally reduced to rapid reaction forces, defence forces, forces for territorial defence and reserve (Fig.V/5).

The Rapid Reaction Forces (RRF) are junctions, parts and units of the types of armed forces, which provide for supporting staff of no less than 70% and armament of no less than 100%. They are intended to react on crises and war conflicts of different intensity and characteristics, for covering the strategic deployment of the defence units, destruction of forces of military or para-military forces on the territory of the state, participation in humanitarian missions, in international peacekeeping missions and rendering help to population in liquidating the consequences of natural disasters and industrial accidents. They are earmarked for participation in CJTF operations, for solving crises of military and not military nature, as well as for collective defence.

The RRF have infantry, air force and navy force components.

The Defence units are units of the different services of different level of equipment and military readiness, intended to create defence groups in theater. They are constructed and are prepared to be operationally compatible with the defence forces of NATO and to be able to conduct mutual operations in case of crisis. A major organization unit in the defence forces are the mechanized brigades of infantry units, aviation bases, missile air defense brigades of Air Forces and the units of the navy forces.

The forces of territorial defence are formations of infantry units, which are combined with the military staff on the territorial principle. It includes nine covering and providing territorial defence regiments, as well as three separate regiments, to be developed in times of war.

The reserve of Bulgarian Army is both permanent and mobilization and it is formed with the intention to provide the recruitment of the armed forces with qualified military personnel to fill the positions in war and in peace ones (101).

The national military training system is entitled to provide qualified military staff, to develop the military science, to perform scientific and applied research of defence, as well as to promote the proficiency level of the military staff of the Ministry of Defence and Bulgarian Army.

Communication-information systems are an important component of the efficient armed forces. They focus the creation and development of systems for command, management, communication, computers and intelligence of C4I, which are supposed to match the strict requirements of modern combat; to provide information superiority over the enemy, as well as operational compatibility with the armed forces of the allies. The construction and implementation of new systems of C41 are leading programs in “Plan 2004”. The systems of C41 represent a mass of functionally related and constantly ready bodies, command posts, as well as communication-information systems.
In 1999 and 2000 a Bulgarian-American research studied the opportunities and the degree of compatibility between the systems of C41 of Bulgarian Army and those of NATO. The opportunities and the architecture of communication-information systems were studied, together with the framework for providing interoperability and recommendations for their development, including those in the line foreign military assistance by the USA were issued. Transition from analogue to digital standards was specified as a requirement (102).

The Ministry of Defence approved of the following organization structures, supporting the development of the C41 systems:

State bodies for providing support and developing the systems for C2, communication, information systems and systems for monitoring in the Ministry of Defence and the General Staff are “Defense Planning” directorate (J-5), the Institute for Advanced Research of Defence at the War College, “Communication and Information Systems” directorate at the General Staff, the executive agency of “Central Military Provisioning, Shipping and Codification”, “Information Support” directorate at the Ministry of Defence, the Centre of Information Support at the General Staff, program teams dealing with the projects.

The senior information manager of the Ministry of Defence has the major task to exert control over and to coordinate the activities dealing with execution of the life cycle of C41 systems.

The following priorities already been identified:, communication-information systems of 61st mechanized brigade; such of multinational peacekeeping forces for South Eastern Europe; standard communication-information systems of commanding staff with the subsystems and elements of SIM; systems for support of Air Force - construction of ASOC and updating of the system for Air Defence, updating the navigation systems; systems for support of navy – on-shore radar systems for control over ship traffic and patrolling the sea borders; “Ekran”; training systems - construction of centre for computer assisted exercises within the “Georgy S. Rakovski” War College; centre for management of the resources of defence - language laboratories, construction of research-demonstration centre with training centre following contemporary communication-information technologies (CISCO and Microsoft Academies).

The defined in this manner fields and the included in them projects cover the main recommendations for updating the C41 systems of the Ministry of Defence and Bulgarian Army in the period prior to Bulgaria’s incorporation in NATO, as well as the execution of important partnership goals. The senior information manager is supposed to report each month before the Defence Council on the state and the execution pace of the main projects concerning the specified priorities.

The National Military Academy of “Vassil Levski” provides education for getting BSc degree, for promoting the qualification, as well as scientific research. The education forms of study are regular, extramural and distance. The military education is performed at training centres, parallel with education for get-
ting university degrees. The military students are provided military, leadership and physical training. The graduates get diploma for completed education which is equivalent to the bachelor degree. The National Military Academy of “Vassil Levski” also provides education courses for getting higher university and scientific degrees.

At a specially created study centre at the National Military Academy post-graduate courses are also organized. They are aimed at providing degrees for taking command positions in battalions, as well as for extra language studies both for persons doing their regular military service and for civil persons.

The National Military Academy presently incorporates the Artillery Military Academy and Air Defence Academy (town of Shoumen) and the Air Force Academy (town of Dolna Mitropolia).

The Navy Academy has the status of an independent higher school (103).

The War College of “Georgy S. Rakovski” in Sofia provides education to officers for getting Masters degree, as well as Phd degree. The War College also provides courses to officers and civilians for getting higher qualification. This refers to persons employed at the structures of the Ministry of Defence, the General Staff and the different types of armed forces. It is here that the education of managers from the state and local administration is performed.

The structure of the War College includes an operational-tactics faculty, “national security and defence” department, “interoperability” department, postgraduate study centre, as well as institute for advanced studies of defence. The concept for developing the war college, the military academy education and the scientific researches determines as a major function of the academy the preparation of highly qualified military staff and civil persons in compliance with contemporary world standards.

In the consortium of war colleges and the institutes for research of security Bulgaria is represented by the “Georgy S. Rakovski” War College.

The training of military staff abroad is performed according to the open slots for education in the countries members of NATO and following the “Partnership for Peace” program for the period between 1997 and 2001. A total of five 584 officers, sergeants and civil persons are provided education in different study fields comprising different in reference to length and intensity seminars and courses.

The long-term education in colleges and academies abroad comprises a total of 89 militaries. Long-term and short-term specialized courses abroad have been attended by a total of 320 officers, sergeants and civil persons.

175 militaries and civil persons have attended language courses abroad. A total of 23 officers from the General Staff of BUAF for the period between 1999 and May 2001 attended English language courses in the Air Force Base of “Lackland”, Texas state, in reference to the LOA BU-B-TAB agreement within the framework of the foreign aid rendered by USA to Bulgaria.
The allocation of the subject to education regular military staff and civil persons from the Ministry of Defence and BUAF for the period between 1997 and May 2001 is shown on Fig.V/6.

**Language training** courses are performed in compliance with the agreement for standardization in NATO called STANAG 6001. So far 1 543 regular militaries and civil persons have been educated and have been issued certificates for command of a foreign language following STANAG 6001. For the period between 1997 and May 2001 1 657 regular militaries and civil persons have attended English language courses, funded by the Ministry of Defence (104).

**THE PARTICIPATION IN PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE**

On 14 February 1994 the President of Bulgaria signed the Framework Document with which Bulgaria joined the PfP Initiative. On 17 February 1997 the Government declared its decision for application for full membership in NATO. It gave a decisive impetus to Bulgaria’s active cooperation with NATO and participation in Partnership for Peace (PfP).

On 17 March a National Program for the Republic of Bulgaria’s Preparation for and Accession to NATO was approved by a decree of the Council of Ministers. The implementation of the program was tasked to an Interdepartmental Committee for Integration in NATO. Members of the Committee are the Chief of General Staff of the Bulgarian Armed Forces and the Deputy Ministers of 15 Ministries and Departments that participate in the cooperation with NATO. The President’s Secretaries on the Foreign Political Matters and on the National Defence are permanently invited to the meetings of the Committee.

Since June 1999 Council for Integration has been functioning in the MoD with the purpose of coordination of the activities within the Ministry.

From 1994 to 2000 the Bulgarian Armed Forces participated in exercises with officers, NCOs and units as follows:

-1994 – 2 exercises and 2 seminars;
-1995 – 70 events and 7 exercises;
-1996 – 128 events and 12 exercises;
-1997 – 124 events and 16 exercises;
-1998 – 300 events and 34 exercises;
-1999 – 345 events and 34 exercises;

The Bulgarian Armed Forces’ participation in the PfP exercises contributed to gaining experience in the establishment of the new normative basis, to the introduction of the NATO operational standards, to the organizational establishment
and manning and equipping of the PfP forces and assets. The practical work was subordinate to the necessity of a maximum assistance to the process of reforms within the Armed Forces. The participation in the exercises improved the command staff’s training to work in a multinational environment. The formed skills and habits of the PfP forces personnel give an opportunity for active participation of Bulgaria in Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF). In 2000 Bulgaria participated in 16 NATO PfP exercises opened for participation of Partners as well as in 10 national exercises with international participation, “in the spirit of” PfP exercises and exercises of multinational formations (with units and staff officers) as follows:

- 14 within the framework of PfP exercises;
- 8 “in the spirit of” PfP exercises;
- 1 NATO exercise – LINKED SEAS 2000;
- 1 national exercise with international participation – BREEZE 2000;
- 1 exercise of the Multinational Peace Force South Eastern Europe (MPFSEE) – SEVEN STARS 2000;

It is planned for Bulgaria to participate in 26 exercises in 2001. Bulgaria will be the host nation of the exercises COOPERATIVE KEY 2001, COOPERATIVE SUPPORT 2001 and COOPERATIVE POSEIDON 2001.

It is the opinion of experts from the MoD and General Staff of the Bulgarian Armed Forces that the PfP activities serve directly the perspective of Bulgaria’s accession to NATO through the achievement of the necessary level of the Bulgarian Armed Forces’ interoperability with the NATO forces and contribute significantly to the implementation of the Membership Action Plan (MAP) and the other Washington initiatives.

Within the framework of the PfP mechanisms specific for Bulgaria prices for partnership were coordinated, priority areas in the adapted Individual Partnership Program (IPP) were selected and recommendations for coordination of the bilateral cooperation were given (in the context of CLEARING HOUSE). The accomplishment of the objectives and tasks from the second section of the Annual National Program with respect to the MAP will contribute to the development of the capabilities envisaged in the Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) and in the Operational Capabilities Concept (OCC). The curricula and syllabuses are being wholly revised and harmonized with the NATO TEEP program that is impending for introduction by adopting modern and perspective forms and methods of training.

**SHORTFALLS**

The lack of enough resources, the considerable number of management papers, sometimes worked out in too short terms, the frequent change in plans and the lack of determination to conduct changes led to registering the fact that there
are mismatches between the Law on Defence and Armed Forces, the Military Doctrine and 2004 Plan. A letter was supposed to be received addressed by the General Secretary of NATO to Bulgarian Prime Minister, which was to start the accelerated review of the structures and 2004 Plan so that some hard to hear but actual truths be told, which had been previously connived at and hardly brought to discussion before the professional audience.

“Your plans for creating smaller but more efficient armed forces are going in the right direction, but more efforts are needed so that the experts here be convinced, and the way I feel some doubts, in the capitals of the countries members of NATO, these plans are realistic from the point of view of the available resources and execution terms”, is said in the letter (106) signed by Lord Robertson, published in a Bulgarian newspaper, since it had been carefully hidden by the Government from the mass audience for almost a month. “The bare fact that you have failed in reporting progress in most of the previously set tasks accounts for the difficulties you have come across”, continues the General Secretary of NATO in dissonance with the optimistic tone and lack of any criticism in the annual report on national security, enthusiastically adopted by the Government (107).

It was still with the adoption of the military doctrine (1999), a fact that was effected following a not-performed debate neither in society nor in scientific circles, that it became clear that facing the 45 000 military staff in times of peace, Bulgarian Army cannot possibly organize 250 000 military staff to act in times of war, because the mobilization tension rate is 5.5:1 and more, while for the NATO armies it is from 3:1 to 4:1, which appears to be the realistic ratio.

The theoretical model of functional structuring of Bulgarian Armed Forces is considered a giant step in theory and practice, during which the experience of the newly adopted in NATO countries was considered and applied. However, the accomplishment of this idea has been slow and having flaws. According to Prof. Emil Alexandrov only the forces for rapid reaction (a total of 17 200 people) are manned at 100%, they are performing military training and are able to take part in conflicts of medium intensity. However, they are virtually the only potential of the military staff of Bulgarian Army for times of peace (108).

The rest of the military staff are dissipated into a number of units, of decreased personnel strength and staff structures. They are still performing their duty, technical equipment and property are being maintained, but regular training is not done. In this way the major bulk of regular military staff is not being properly trained and it can hardly be relied on in times of mobilization. The problems have become even more complex because of the circumstance that due to the financial limitations following the year 1990 there was sharp curtailment in the number of mobilization totals concerning retraining of militaries from reserve.

The defence forces, which in times of peace include a considerable percentage of military staff have not been recruited enough so that they can be considered able to perform combat missions. In most of them the personnel strength hardly
exceeds 50% and is being used for doing military duties and performing household chores, without any training process to be conducted.

“Military exercises should be more both in number and in reference to intensity rate. Otherwise the minimum level of skills cannot be possibly maintained, neither can the required by NATO operation indexes be covered”, says Dr Edgar Buckly, General Secretary Assistant of NATO, who recently paid visit to Bulgaria and performed supervision over the military reform (109).

The same inference was drawn by the Chief of the General Staff of Bulgarian Armed Forces General Miho Mihov in an interview for the same newspaper (110).

The efforts of the senior instances in Bulgarian Army are directed at preparation and training of the quick reaction forces and those of immediate reaction, as a result of which the organization of the defence military units has been ignored. However, it is exactly in this component of the army that resources are available for promoting the fighting potential.

A considerable proportion of the officers who are doing their military service in the units for territorial defence have not been performing command of integrated units, neither are they conducting field exercises with their subordinates, nor are they taking part in exercises of the higher headquarters which lowers their proficiency and their motivation (111).

In the defence military units there has not been introduced yet the NATO structure, there are no headquarters units, the headquarters of the corps for quick reaction and the headquarters of army corps are not sufficiently manned with officers, the armed forces for defence engage a considerable portion of the military staff without being able to perform combat missions, thereby violating the requirement of military studies providing for compatibility between structure, number and fighting potential.

The role, structure, in times of peace and in times of war assignments of the forces for territorial defence are underway.

**The major problem facing Air Force** is the inadequate funds for restoring and repairing aircraft and helicopters. The percentage of flawed equipment is rather high. The flying hours of the pilots are falling below the critical minimum of 40-50 hours per year, which worries them and lowers their motivation. They hardly cover 15-16 hours of flying per year - the duration which is covered by American pilots for a mere two week period. The simulated flying equipment helps to practise safety elements, provides training and professional self-confidence for cases of technical failures and work with doubling devices, but it can hardly replace actual flying (112). A year prior their graduation students at the Air Force Academy share the fact they have flown for some mere four or five hours (113).
In the helicopter fleet the pilots are classified into two categories “flying” and “not-flying” ones. Only 20% of the pilots are performing flights. The rest are attending theoretical studies, learning English or practising sports. (114).

The Commander of “Tactical Aviation” corps -Major General Ivan Dotchev thinks that one of the possible solutions lies in importing training planes, whose exploitation is cheaper and entails less expenses so that the total of 250-300 flying hour time be covered. Such an approach is in action in helicopter aviation, where through flying a single BEL-206 young pilots perform a total of 60-80 hours of flying time per year. A total of 60 to 80 hours per year are provided for pilots who have been chosen to take part in drills.

The solution to the problem is both beyond the competence of the Air Force units and Bulgarian Army. Experts claim that it is needed that the state and perspectives before Air Force be brought to discussion at a national level and a national target program for development be adopted (to be more precise for preserving) the Air Force. Approximate calculations show that the reconstruction of Bulgarian Military Aviation will entail about 1.5 billion USD - which sum exceeds the provided military budget for two years (115).

Due to the their low number staff the Navy Forces were the first to alter their structures and discard the unnecessary equipment. At the end of the year 2000 the Chief of Navy Headquarters was the only one among his colleagues from the other Headquarters who announced that the Navy Forces are in possession of two combat ready units: a brigade of light forces and an on-shore missile brigade.

However, the available ships and the other navy equipment is rather old. The program for construction and purchasing of new navy equipment has been so far neglected by the Government. It has turned into a tradition that since the beginning of the twentieth century Bulgarian politicians are not aware of and underestimate the problems of Navy Forces.

The percentage of the Navy staff which is involved in the structures of inter communication and logistics, is considerably high, which does not match the NATO standards. These team sections also need too much funding but the rate of return of adequate potential is very low.

CONCLUSIONS

First: Between 1990 and 1998 the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland advanced towards a market economy, pluralist democracy and legal state taking advantage of the historical preconditions, proximity to the West European culture, the influence of the Catholic church, their vast political and civic experience in the long-year resistance against communism. The three countries promptly reached consensus about the direction of their future development and effected a fast and uneventful transition to a qualitatively new organization.
Elites and leaders with a high moral profile who had made a name for themselves already during the dissident period, took the lead of the transition. Their gross domestic product being sufficiently high, the countries could spend as much on defence as necessary. Before that the reformist governments and acknowledged military leaders had reduced, restructured and reorganized the armed forces and had placed them under civic control to meet NATO standards and had fulfilled the science-based and funds-secured plans.

Enjoying a high percentage of public support, politicians, servicemen, state administration and others effected with a great deal of determination a fast process of integration into NATO, which entailed large-scale qualitative changes. The process was monitored, assisted and directed by the NATO leadership, as well as by leading members of the alliance like USA, Great Britain and Germany.

The Czech republic, Hungary and Poland coordinated their efforts towards NATO accession, share experience and assist the states, which have remained outside the first wave of applicants.

**Second:** The start of real reforms in Bulgaria was delayed beyond measure and, moreover, the halfway moves of two governments dominated by ex-communists wasted time and national energy.

Even before 1989, the most aggressive and unscrupulous representatives of the ruling communist nomenclature together with KGB trained state security aces had prepared the processes in Bulgaria. As soon as the changes began, they lost no time establishing powerful economic groupings and infiltrating representatives in all major political parties and civil movements, dictated and still dictate the Bulgarian transition. Since 1989 the parliamentary group of the state security agents has invariably held the majority in four national assemblies.

The selective declassification of state security dossiers in the past few months provided evidence that state security collaborators (agents) had occupied the premier’s post and posts of ministers. This belated process directed by the ruling party in aid of the political situation, further destabilized society, fanned up mistrust and suspicion and almost deleted the demarcating line between state security collaborators and honest people. Experts put the number of state security collaborators until 1989 at 300 000, or almost 3.3% of the population.

The newly fledged political elite turned a deaf ear to the problems of the people, imposed a client-like model in life, devised procedures and developed skills to reproduce itself in power.

Bulgaria is struggling under unprecedented unemployment, outburst of crimes, long suppressed minority issues and mounting corruption. The country ranks fist in Europe in number of cardiac patients and infant mortality rate and is ahead only of Albania in per capita average income. Forty percent of the young people have emigrated or have made arrangements to leave their homeland.
The unsolved problems of transition, hyperinflation, which in January 1997 depleted the savings of three generations of Bulgarians, headlong impoverishment, the absence of prospects and the collapse of the patriarchal moral principles deprived servicemen of motives and obstructed the implementation of reforms in the armed forces.

The ideologists and strategists, the political and military chiefs of the totalitarian regime who had perpetrated or created conditions for perpetrating crimes against mankind (concentration camps up to 1961 and political prisons up to 1989), had organized repression against citizens depriving them of freedom of thought and speech, were neither legally nor morally sentenced. Politicians and generals who had forced officers to join the BCP organizations were not indicted either.

A catharsis would have preserved the system of values of the Bulgarian and would have armed him with moral landmarks and a national ideal.

The political power employs continuously double standards before the European institutions and towards society. To eyewash EU officials, it demonstrates good intentions, “embroidered” success and plans for fast integration into the European structures. Society and the officer corps are paid in empty verbiage, the truth is covered up and moral and material sanctions are used against dissidents. People who oppose the allegedly only possible government policy are often labeled secret enemies and are denied access to the state media.

Foreign observers estimated privatization as inconsistent, non-transparent and unfair and the liberalization of the economy much delayed. Serious foreign investors lost interest, the rigid administration, diffuse corruption, high tide of crimes and insufficient protection of property impeded the development of medium sized business and retail trade. The few Bulgarian enterprises that are still operating, work with only 30% of their full capacity.

As a result, society, which has for eleven years been directed by unreformed communists and half-educated liberals is moving in a vicious circle of illusions, pains and failures.

Third: Seven years were wasted on reforming the Bulgarian armed forces. Significant and irreversible changes were carried out between 1997 and 2001. Basic and science-grounded documents were worked out, the political and military leaderships agreed to the direction of changes.

However, the reform is charged with contradictions, the national security concept does not say anything about the mission of the Bulgarian Armed Forces. Events in Kosovo and Macedonia have proven that the vision of a “15-year long strategic window of security” with no pending serious risks and threats for Bulgaria as described in the military doctrine is too optimistic. When the military doctrine was put on the agenda in 1999, the government suppressed attempts to initiate a national debate on the problems of defence and even GS experts were not allowed to express their opinion. The premeditated decision was brought to the
knowledge of the officers’ corps and was widely publicized. Those who disagreed were asked to resign.

From 1999 to date the posts of ministers and deputy-ministers of defence have not been held by the right people because they were selected according to party criteria, had a hostile attitude towards officers and discredited the underlying idea of the reform. The number of civil experts in the problems of national defence is not sufficient.

Fourth: The military budget is comparatively high in percentage as compared to the gross domestic product but is modest in terms of absolute value – USD 380 million, as much as a frigate costs. Under normal conditions this sum is not enough for the maintenance and combat training of the Bulgarian Armed Forces, let alone for conducting reforms. The fighting efficiency of the servicemen is much below the requirements.

The war industry collapsed and in 1998 reduced over 20-fold its produce as compared to the output of USD 1,5-2 thousand million in 1990.

The possibility of an accurate selection of officers, who would stay in service, was missed. The imperfect system of making a testimonial made many young and promising officers resign. In 1999 80% of the military budget was spent on food and salaries. The state of the sergeants’ corps is unsatisfactory. Nobody has ever thought of them for whole ten years.

In 1999, a sociological survey of the Defence ministry, which sought to identify “The public image of the armed forces”, established that the prevalent sentiments among the personnel were disappointment and pessimism. 86,5% of the officers and sergeants were found ready to quit for a better payment; 64,8% would not recommend their profession to a friend or relative. Servicemen manifest a negative attitude to Parliament and the cabinet; the relative share of officers and sergeants who commit suicide due to stress, uncertainty and absence of prospects, is growing.

The deplorable financial state of pensioners and the three-fold decrease of personal incomes (from USD 250 to USD 80) of reservists make servicemen of a pension age reluctant to retire and this generates conflicts between the generations. Since until 1995 most of the generals were not appointed according to criteria for professionalism, they may be rightfully considered the product of the socialist armed forces and cannot be true leaders of the military reform.

Poverty-stricken layers of the population, among whom intellectuals and reservists, exert psychological pressure on officers on active duty urging them to “seize power” and “save the Fatherland” making an analogy with events in 1923 and 1934 and with the regimes of general Pinochet and the “black” colonels in Greece.

The politicians restricted *de jure* and revoked *de facto* the freedom of setting up professional trade unions by servicemen on active duty. In 1995 the BCP par-
liamentary majority restricted drastically the law on defence in its part about the right of officers and sergeants of the Bulgarian Armed Forces to create trade unions. In 1999 the new majority /of the Union of Democratic Forces/ corroborated this discriminatory measure by attempting to eliminate from public space the “Rakovski” officers legion”.

Fifth: Despite their deplorable state, the Bulgarian Armed Forces are the institution where large-scale changes are underway. Also, it enjoys the highest public prestige among all other institutions.

The Bulgarian Armed Forces have a residual potential of good professionals, which can serve as a bridge to the next generations. It is the only factor which public can lean on in its stride towards the North-Atlantic Alliance.

VASSIL DANOV
Captain /N/, retired
M. Sc. in political science
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Changes in numbers of personnel, armament and equipment of the army of the Czech Republic during the period of their reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Tanks</th>
<th>Armored Combat Vehicles</th>
<th>Artillery Systems</th>
<th>Attack Helicopters</th>
<th>Combat Aircraft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Jul 1992</td>
<td>106,101</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mar 1993</td>
<td>105,994</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1994</td>
<td>92,893</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1995</td>
<td>67,702</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## MAIN KINDS OF COMBAT EQUIPMENT AND ARMAMENT OF THE ACR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Equipment</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tanks</strong></td>
<td>T - 72</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T - 54</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T - 55</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combat fighting Vehicles and Armored Personnel carriers</strong></td>
<td>BMP – 1</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMP – 1K</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMP – 2</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRM -1K</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OT – 90</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OT – 64A</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arty Guns, Rocket Launchers, Mortars (Caliber: over 100 mm)</strong></td>
<td>122 SPG 2S1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guns</strong></td>
<td>122 H D-30</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152 SPGH M77</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Rocket Launchers</strong></td>
<td>122 RM-70</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mortars</strong></td>
<td>120 SPM 85</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120 M 82</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AIR FORCES OF THE ACR – AIRCRAFT AND HELICOPTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Equipment</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combat aircraft</strong> (Including combat training aircraft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighters</td>
<td>MIG-21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIG-23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighter Bombers</td>
<td>Su-22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Support</td>
<td>Su-25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combat A/C In total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING AIRCRAFT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L–29</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-142</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L–410</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An-24, 26,30</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu-154</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenger</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jak-40</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HELICOPTERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat Hel.</td>
<td>Mi-24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hel.</td>
<td>Mi-8, 9, 17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mi-2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W-3A Sokol</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes in the Staffing of the HDF 1989-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>NCO-s</th>
<th>Conscripts</th>
<th>Civilian employees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>91,900</td>
<td>33,300</td>
<td>155,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>143,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>65,300</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>121,600*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>51,100</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>52,340</td>
<td>25,660</td>
<td>97,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>51,640</td>
<td>24,060</td>
<td>93,155*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>13,308</td>
<td>9,603</td>
<td>46,350</td>
<td>23,894</td>
<td>81,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11,983</td>
<td>9,433</td>
<td>35,932</td>
<td>17,115</td>
<td>74,463*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Peacetime tasks

2nd mechanized division

- "Boconadi Szabo" Logistics Regiment
- "Alfold" Training center
- "Dunantulit" Training center

3rd mechanized division

- Rapid reaction battalion
- "Klapka Gy" "Bocskai I." "Bercsenyi M." mechanized infantry brigades
- "Szigetvary Zrinyi Miklos" mixed artillery brigade
- "Rakoczi F. II." Engineer brigade
- "Petofi S." NBC defense
- "Kiskun"EW Regiment
- "Vay Adam"logistics regiment
- "Gabor Aron" anti-tank regiment
- "Air defense artillery regiment"

Army Staff subordinates

- Immediate and rapid reaction in case of threat
- Cooperation
- Carrying out comprehensive tasks of armed service
- SFOR-cooperation
- River in Flotilla
- Explosive ordnance disposal battalion
- "Nagyasandor Lozsef" signal regiment battalion
- Fejer repair battalion
- Alba regia military police and commandant battalion
- Central command for exercise and fire ranges
- Material depots
- Hungarian engineer contingent
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MoND Budget Expenditures as a Share of GDP and of State Budget over the Years 1991-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>GDP</th>
<th>State budget expenditures</th>
<th>Part 29 – MoND Budget</th>
<th>As % of GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount in MPLN (current prices)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Expenditures in Section 98 “National Defense”</td>
<td>Part 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>80,882.9</td>
<td>24,185.8</td>
<td>1,821.2</td>
<td>1,807.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>114,944.2</td>
<td>38,789.0</td>
<td>2,564.4</td>
<td>2,536.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>155,780.0</td>
<td>50,242.8</td>
<td>3,846.5</td>
<td>3,309.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>210,407.3</td>
<td>68,865.0</td>
<td>5,117.0</td>
<td>4,127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>306,318.3</td>
<td>91,169.7</td>
<td>6,594.4</td>
<td>5,249.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>385,449.1</td>
<td>108,661.3</td>
<td>8,313.2</td>
<td>6,003.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>469,372.1</td>
<td>127,919.8</td>
<td>10,076.7</td>
<td>7,275.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>550,405.6</td>
<td>139,751.5</td>
<td>11,686.9</td>
<td>8,358.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>611,576.2</td>
<td>138,425.2</td>
<td>12,242.3</td>
<td>9,209.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Main indicators

| Year | Czech Republic | | | | | Hungary | | | | | | Poland | | | | Bulgaria | | |
|------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|      | GDP (bln.$)    |   |   |   |   |   | GDP (bln. $) |   |   |   |   | GDP (bln $) |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1995 | 50.04          | 56.2 | 49.0 | 52.0 | 57.0 | 44.7 | 48.8 | 45.0 | 47.0 | 50.0 | 119.3 | 134.4 | 133.5 | 145.0 | 155.0 |
| 1996 |                |     |     |     |     | 2.9  | 3.5  | 4.5  | 5.8  | 5.8  | 10.4  | 10.5  | 10.4  | 10.2  | 9.8  |
| 1997 |                |     |     |     |     | Direct foreign investments (mln. $) |   |   |   |   |   | 8.8 | 13.3 | 16.3 | 18.5 | 18.5 |
| 1998 |                |     |     |     |     | Unemployment (% of the population) |   |   |   |   |   | 14.9 | 13.2 | 11.5 | 10.4 | 10.0 |
| 1999 |                |     |     |     |     | Direct foreign investments (mln. $) |   |   |   |   |   | 8.5 | 13.7 | 20.3 | 25.0 | 28.0 |
|      |                |     |     |     |     | Unemployment (% of the population) |   |   |   |   |   | 13.0 | 9.2  | 9.0  | 9.8  | 12.0 |
|      |                |     |     |     |     | Direct foreign investments (mln. $) |   |   |   |   |   | 12.5 | 11.1 | 14.0 | 14.5 | 14.0 |
|      |                |     |     |     |     | Direct foreign investments (mln. $) |   |   |   |   |   | 0.5 | 0.7  | 1.3  | 2.0  | 3.1 |
Remarks: 1. The structure of Services HQs is identical to that of GS excluding National Command Center and Inspection “Control of armaments”
   2. The structures of Services HQs include G/A/N-7 “Training Directorate”
Fig.V/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main indicators/years</th>
<th>Year 2000</th>
<th>Year 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>43 000</td>
<td>21 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanks</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armoured combat vehicles</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery systems</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antitank systems</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air defense systems</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and combat helicopters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Staff of Air Forces**

- Corps Air Defense
  - Air corps
  - Air defense brigade
  - Radio engineering brigade

- Corps tactical aviation
  - Staff
  - Helicopter base
  - Training aviation base
  - Transportation base

- Supporting base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main indicators</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>18 300</td>
<td>11 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat aircrafts</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat helicopters</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air defense means</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main indicators/years</td>
<td>Year 2000</td>
<td>Year 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>5260</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat ships</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting ships</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submarines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Functional Structure of the Bulgarian Armed Forces

- **Active Forces**
  - Rapid Reaction Forces
  - Defense Forces
  - Immediate Reaction Forces
  - RT 3-5 days
  - RT 10 days

- **Reserve Forces**
  - Reinforcement Forces
  - Territorial Defense Forces
  - Strategic Reserve
  - RT-70-90 days
  - RT-20-30 days
  - RT-25-30 days

**BAF**

- 80% Active Forces
- 20% Reserve Forces

**RT-readiness time**
# Training of military staff abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Persons Trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“G. Marshall” – Germany</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>584</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>