

The Republican Idea in the History of the Czech Lands

Joseph Hess

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in International Studies: Russia, EEurope, & C Asia

University of Washington

2013

Committee:

Prof. Christopher Jones

Prof. James Felak

Program Authorized to Offer Degree: Jackson School of International Studies

©Copyright 2013

Joseph Hess

University of Washington

Abstract

The idea of a republican structured political order has been around for millennia. In human history, republics have existed in various forms and sizes with varying degrees of success. The examples from history are numerous: Plato's Republic, Venice, Genoa, and the Dutch Republic. In this monograph, however, I focus on two other examples: the American Republic and the republican idea in the Czech lands. I analyze both through a security lens. I assert that by looking at these two examples, it provides one with a clear understanding of how the U.S. founding has shaped the security order in the last century. Second, it provides the Czech perspective on the European political order and security, which is sometimes overlooked. Through these two perspectives, I aim to provide the reader with a means for a more thorough understanding of the Atlantic security order.

The Republican Idea in the History of the Czech Lands

Joseph Hess

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Prof. Christopher Jones

Russia, East European, Central Asia Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW:	Page 5
INTRODUCTION:	Page 7
CHAPTER 1: Theoretical Framework Part A & B	Page 8 & 21
CHAPTER 2: Masaryk and the First Republic	Page 29
CHAPTER 3: Czech Republic in the NATO Security Community	Page 41
WORKS CITED	Page 59

Overview:

Chapter 1: In this chapter, I outline my theoretical framework by asking whether America an anomaly or a model for a future political order? In the first chapter, I analyze political scientist Daniel Deudney's relatively new security theory, republican security theory. He claims that the American founding set forth a new political order of the ages or *novus ordo seclorum*. He presents the U.S. as the Philadelphian system, both a new security arrangement and a new political order replacing the Westphalian system. In this chapter, I explain the Philadelphia system and its accompanying republican security theory. In contrast, I show how Realism and Liberalism fail to provide a stable framework for understanding the Atlantic order.

Chapter 2: Looking at the person of Tomáš G. Masaryk, I examine his writings and philosophy and show how his thinking aligns with Deudney's. Masaryk was an early advocate of federated security arrangements and he recognized that the American model was relevant to a rearranged and federalized "New Europe". I contrast the ideas of Masaryk with the actual failures of the First of Republic of Czechoslovakia. I conclude that without an Atlantic security connection, namely the U.S., security on the European continent during the 20th century could not work.

Chapter 3: In the last section, I examine the foreign policy of the former Czechoslovakia 1989- 1992 and of the Czech Republic from 1993-present. I primarily look through the security lens using Deudney's republican security theory. I seek to determine whether his theory is helpful in explaining Czech foreign policy during these time periods. First, I show how the Czechs are keen to have a strong link with the United States, as historically European allies have been unreliable. Second, I show how Czechoslovakia took significant steps to reform its military, to align itself with democratic traditions, and to address the civil-military question. In

the end, I conclude and provide evidence to show that the Czech Republic is firmly established in the Atlantic security community and within the European Union.

Introduction:

In the first chapter, I analyze political scientist Daniel Deudney's relatively new security theory, republican security theory and how the American founding held implications for the global order, and thereby introducing the Philadelphian system. This chapter seeks to reframe America, by showing the prominent and all important role the *meaning* of the U.S. founding has for all. Drawing from my theoretical framework, I will examine the role and influence of the American founding on the European continent, specifically focusing on the Czech lands. First, I look closely at the writings and philosophy of Tomáš G. Masaryk and argue that he was a man ahead of his time as he advocated for a federated “New Europe”, but failed to create a federated republic with the First Czechoslovak Republic. From there, I look at the security binding relationship between the Czech Republic, NATO, and the U.S. and assess their participation in the NATO security community based on republican security theory.

CHAPTER ONE: Theoretical Framework Part A

Political scientist Daniel Deudney made a bold claim: the founding of the United States of America was the most important political event in the last 500 years.¹ Such a bold claim requires critical scrutiny. He argued that the U.S. founding introduced to the world what he called the Philadelphian system, which represented a new political order. His general premise is that a reframing and reexamination of how the United States was formed and why it is different from the Westphalian nation-state construct, radically alters how one understands the contemporary Atlantic community. In this section, I examine the Philadelphian system juxtaposed to the Westphalian nation-state system and show the major differences between the two systems. Second, I show how Realism and Liberalism, as competing international relations theories, fail to explain the Atlantic order. Last, I explain the Philadelphia system and Deudney's accompanying republican security theory as the theoretical framework for subsequent chapters.

Like it or not, the actors in the current global political structure are primarily nation-states and this has a European origin. In 1648, the Peace at Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years War, brought with it a new international political structure which eventually become known as Westphalian sovereignty. This concept of sovereignty was based on two main principles: sovereign territory and the agreement among sovereigns not to meddle in each other's domestic affairs, namely, religious minorities. The ramifications of the Treaty at Westphalia were two-fold. One, the head of each political domain had the liberty to determine the religion within their territory.² This had the effect of fastening the concept of sovereignty tightly to territory and fixing it in place. This connection between territory and sovereignty is important to remember as

¹ Daniel H. Deudney, *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village* (Princeton University Press, 2008).

² There is considerable debate whether it was a religious conflict. Some scholars have argued it was about state building and personal drives of various political leaders. I only point out that the belligerents divided along religious lines: Catholic and Protestant.

Westphalia cemented the relationship, whereas the Philadelphian tradition holds this connection more loosely. It also introduced the Latin concept of *cuius regio, eius religio*, which the sovereigns agreed upon. This gave the political sovereign the ability to choose the state religion and Westphalia marked the beginning of a Europe divided into territorially and integrated units at the expense of imperial and religious hierarchy.³ The Treaty of Westphalia did not separate religion from the state, but rather contributed to the intertwined nature of the secular and religious hierarchy. It did, however, constitute political legitimacy for religious minorities and from this treaty beginning of religious pluralism in Europe started.⁴ But the most important consequence was the development of codified nation-states.

The Treaty of Westphalia created a global political order of nation-states and this eventually led to nationalism. The 20th century is replete with examples of the danger unfettered nationalism brings and it was the most deadly century in the history of humankind.⁵ As point of consideration for the reader, a subordinate theoretical framework is how concepts of nationalism are formed. Scholar Leah Greenfield has written on the two main types of nationalism relevant to my argument; mainly the ‘blood and soil’ nationalism based on claims of primordial identity and ‘civic nationalism’ based on common commitment to a constitutional system.⁶ The Philadelphia system today adheres to a civic nationalism as a plurality of peoples can acquire citizenship in the republic. This is in contrast to national identities which create truncated thinking where people see themselves solely in terms of ethnicity and territory, notwithstanding their common identity in humanity or even as a citizen. Early twentieth century thinker Clarence

³ Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 150.

⁴ *Ibid*, 36.

⁵ According the 2005 UN Human Development Report, the twentieth century had an estimated 109.7 million conflict related deaths, which was approximately 4.35% of the world population. The 19th century was a distant second with an estimated 19.7 million, which was approximately 1.65% of the world population. Accessed 15 Feb, 2013, http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR05_complete.pdf, p.153.

⁶ Leah Greenfield, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 11, 12.

Streit advanced the concept of the “Atlantic Union” modeled on the U.S. founding, which he hoped would dispel the “fog over sovereignty” and competed against the “nationalism” of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.⁷ In conclusion, the long-term consequence of Westphalia was that it codified the nation-state construct and this nation-state construct became the foundation and hallmark of the Realist tradition.

Before we can explore this new theory and its accompanying implications, it is necessary to provide a survey of the landscape of international relations theory. I limit my examination to the two most prevalent theories: Realism and Liberalism. For those who hold to the Realist tradition, the political world is organized and arranged in nation-states and these actors are independent and self-interested.

Political realism is a view of politics that centers on power and conflict. The term goes back to the British historian E. H. Carr, who argued in 1939 that fact-driven “realism” needed to replace “utopian” trust in legal arrangements to preserve peace among nations. Unfamiliar to the liberal elites of America at the time, this view had a long tradition in European statecraft. Since the nineteenth-century, Germans had spoken of Realpolitik (realistic policy) and Machtpolitik (whose translation gave us “power politics”) in reference to a foreign policy that recognizes self-interest and power as the driving forces of international reality.⁸

There are three main “poles” which support the Realist tent. First is the problem of the anarchy in the international order. As I explained previously, various nation-states are the actors in the international order. How they arrange themselves on the global “stage” is dependent on those who are able to organize, to exert power, and to influence others. Since there are no defined rules to how states must behave and moreover, no power structure to enforce any arbitrary rules, this creates unpredictability or anarchy in the system. Realists argue that nation-states will protect their interests and therefore, states must compete for power and resources. This creates a

⁷ Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 335.

⁸ William A. Darity, ed., “Realism, Political,” in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 7, 2nd ed. (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2008), 96.

global competition for resources and power which can create conflict. The previous point leads to the second pole. Anarchy cannot be escaped, only mitigated. Deudney coins the anarchic arrangements of nation states as the second anarchy.⁹ In an age of globalization and increased cross-border movement, migration, and commerce, the potential for weapons of mass destruction¹⁰ makes the problem of anarchy inescapable and deadly. For the Realist, the security threat remains salient and national military power is the primary means to reduce insecurity. This then leads to the third pole which attempts to address this problem through a balance of power. As the global order is comprised of a society of states interacting together, it is through these relations they find a natural homeostasis between their respective powers. A salient example from recent history is the global order defined by a balance of power between the West, led by the United States, and the Soviet bloc during the Cold War. With the Cold War behind us, it is now hard to accept that the Realist tradition is the best way to understand the global order. Borders between states have become less secure and more fluid, and there are more non-state actors that specifically affect the security dilemma. Additionally, Realism fails to explain the cohesion and endurance of the western alliances, NATO in Europe and the US-Pacific bi-lateral alliances in East Asia. Moreover these multi-national institutions have shown interdependencies well beyond the security dimension.i.e. economic, monetary, cyber, energy and trade.

The inherent problem with the Realist tradition is that it focuses primarily on the security dynamic, while ignoring the important and related aspects of commercial interdependence and shared values and norms of the Liberal tradition. Nations interact with each other outside the

⁹ Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 33.

¹⁰ Les Paldy, "Weapons of Mass Destruction," in *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Terrorism*, ed. Gus Martin, 2nd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Reference, 2011), 623. The term *weapons of mass destruction* (or "WMD") refers to those weapons whose destructive capacity far exceeds that of conventional weaponry. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, whether used by organized military units or by terrorist and paramilitary groups, could inflict large numbers of casualties. The suggestion that terrorists might use weapons of mass destruction to achieve their purposes instills great concern and fear.

realm of security and these factors play an important role in securing the peace. Author Vojtech Mastný argued cogently that the Helsinki process in 1975 and specifically the third basket¹¹ of diplomatic negotiations regarding human rights, did much for breaking down the barriers during the Cold War and redefining an evolving definition of what can be discussed alongside security.¹² Moreover, the Realist theory assumes that anarchy is inescapable from time immemorial.¹³ Deudney argues the opposite. The material context of our world has changed the security dynamic from total war to low level conflict and asymmetric warfare. This change has greatly broadened the security agenda.¹⁴ A germane question is whether total interstate anarchy as a structure still exists or have the material contexts shifted as to make anarchy less likely. This question seems more relevant when considered solely among NATO members. Also as one surveys the world, the political structure is beyond just nation-state actors. While nation-states still exist and act primarily on the global scene, other factors are relevant and therefore as a theory it is left wanting. Institutions such as NATO, UN, World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, and various multi-national corporation, do provide supra-national structures that surely have an effect on the current global order. This leads to the conclusion that nation-states are not the only actors on the global stage, and the Realist tradition fails to account for this fundamental shift in political arrangement.

In the same way that the Realist tradition fails to consider the commercial and non-security inputs, the Liberal tradition cannot adequately explain the global order as it fails to address the security question. The three main ideas within the Liberal tradition are democratic

¹¹The Helsinki Accords were an important step in changing the discourse between the West and the Soviet Bloc. There were three main categories or “baskets” for negotiation: security, economic, and human rights. It was the introduction of common human rights that helped humanize the discourse between the nations and broaden what type of topics would be considered part of the security process.

¹²Mastný and Institute for East-West Security Studies, *The Helsinki Process and the Reintegration of Europe, 1986-1991*, Forward.

¹³Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 86.

¹⁴Deudney, *Bounding Power*, Introduction.

peace, commercial peace, and international unions.¹⁵ First let us examine the claim of democratic peace. The foundation of this assertion is that democratic nations will avoid war and conflict with each other due to their economic ties. The keystone of this argument is that war would upset the normal trade relations and therefore democratic nations will avoid conflict to maintain normal trade relations. The problem with this argument is that it assumes peaceful times are economically better. We have seen different assumptions in the past. While, there is evidence to show that international trade and cooperation has contributed to a more peaceful and prosperous world, author Smedley Butler wrote *War is a Racket* after World War I to illustrate the economic benefits of distant wars. He argued that war is a boon to the economy and history is replete with examples of war used to stimulate the economy. A more contemporary author and panelist at the U.S. Army War College, Andrew Bacevich has argued that the constant and persistent state of war has fundamentally changed the American economy.¹⁶ *Cui bono* is always important to ask. This leads to the conclusion that security and a lasting peace between multiple nation-states requires more than just shared values and strong commercial ties between democratic states. Deudney writes,

*Looking at the overall pattern of world politics during the era of contending states, it is difficult to imagine how any liberal democracy would have survived had it not been for the fact that the American Union was large and strong enough to prevail against aggressive anti-democracies and to protect and nurture smaller national democratic states.*¹⁷

While cooperation and commercial interdependence play an important role in securing the peace, this Liberal tradition fails to adequately address the security dilemma.

¹⁵ Ibid, 87.

¹⁶ Andrew J Bacevich, *Washington Rules: America's Path to Permanent War* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2010). He exposes the preconceptions, biases, and habits that underlie our pervasive faith in military might, especially the notion that overwhelming superiority will oblige others to accommodate America's needs and desires—whether for cheap oil, cheap credit, or cheap consumer goods.

¹⁷ Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 184.

Rather than ascribing to either the Realist or Liberal tradition or departing completely from them, Deudney recognizes both Realism and Liberalism as relevant theories, but he sees them as descendent traditions of a super ordinate, unifying theory which he calls republican security theory. Deudney documents, “Viewing the American Union as a structural alternative to the European state system and a prototype for new Atlantic or global institutions was once widespread but largely disappeared from international theory in the wake of the postwar debate between Realism and Liberalism”.¹⁸ Lastly, G. John Ikenberry’s security binding concept seems to blend the two theories as the means of violence production are intertwined through common interests and economics.¹⁹

Deudney introduced the Philadelphian system as a replacement for Westphalia. He challenged us to abandon the concept of nation-state and instead to think in terms of federated republics structured in compound manner as in the Philadelphian system. I do not argue that national identity must be eradicated, but rather it must be held subordinate to a shared human identity. To explain this system, he focused on the founding of the U.S. as the object of research and argues that the U.S. is more strongly connected with the history of republics rather than nation-states. Expressed historically, although the U.S. was seen as the immigration destination for Europe, it is not a continuous line of development from Europeans, but rather it is the most recent dot on a dotted line of republics from jumping from Athens, Rome, Venice, and Dutch Republic culminating in the United States.²⁰ The primary difference between the U.S. and the other republics from history is that it was a contiguous continental power, whereas the other republics lacked a command of such a large land mass and resources. In history, this type of

¹⁸ Ibid, 162.

¹⁹ G. John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011), Introduction.

²⁰ Deudney, *Bounding Power*.

control and power had only been attained through system of empires and despotic rule.²¹ In this way, the U.S. founding represented the first time the values of a republic were married to a continent, and could check the power of empire and despotic rule. Montesquieu wrote what is considered the iron law of polis republicanism, “If a republic be small, it is destroyed by a foreign force; if it be large, it is ruined by an internal imperfection”.²² Thus republics of different sizes have to address different types of threats and different responsibilities.

The formation of the United States of America can help illuminate the field. Historian David C. Hendrickson broadens the analysis on the writing and ratification of the U.S. federal constitution and reveals a new perspective. He argues that most historians have analyzed the writing and ratification of the U.S. constitution with a focus on the dramatic four months of deliberation in Philadelphia. While this story is compelling, he asserts this short period of history came with inherent consequences, most notably, it seldom examined the “bitter sectarian strife that had pitted easterners against southerners in the previous decade”.²³ He concluded that this focus on the formation and then forward in time, lends itself to an understanding of American constitutional history with the denouement being Lincoln's victory in the Civil War or the New Deal. Whereas, he argues, the focus should be on what it prevented. He advocated examining the preceding years to know what occurred before 1790, and to recognize America was a fragile and experimental state. It is here where one discovers the value of the U.S. founding as a political structure. The potential for war between the states was high, and the fact they were able to come to a peaceful solution is a testament to the founding fathers and the

²¹ Some have argued that America has turned into an empire, and others argue that Russia still is. I am not interested in addressing the current state of any political structure, rather I am seeking to highlight positive qualities of the U.S. political structure, not assess foreign policy.

²² Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 91.

²³ David C. Hendrickson, *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding (American Political Thought* (University Press of Kansas, 2006), 281.

structure of the federated system. Hendrickson writes, “The idea of the American Constitution as a template to assess the contemporary tasks of international order entered broadly into American reflection from 1914-1920”.²⁴ Following World War One, Hamilton Holt echoed Thomas Paine’s prescient call for a special role for America,

*The United States is the world in miniature. The United States is the greatest league of peace known to history. The United States is a demonstration to the world that all the races and peoples of the earth can live in peace under one form of government, and its chief value to civilization is a demonstrating of what this form of government is.*²⁵

A simple thought experiment can help illuminate the topic. When you think of a map of the United States what do you envision? Is it an outline of the coastlines including the borders with Canada and Mexico? Or is it the outline which includes state boundaries where Colorado and Tennessee are clearly discernable? This may seem like an arbitrary exercise, but *the United States* is used to be *these United States* are. Historian James McPherson documents that before the American Civil War, the words United States were used with a plural noun e.g. the United States are a republic.²⁶ Although this is a seemingly small distinction, one which many may dismiss, it has significant implications. He writes that after the war, the “loose union of states became a nation in the singular”.²⁷ When one considers the fractured nature of the European peoples, the European Union is making an effort to develop a common European identity. And this is why I conclude, there are lessons in the American founding for the future of the political structure in Europe. One of the many reasons for this monograph.

Historian William McNeil has argued that one of the fundamental consequences of the First World War was that fighting a war as a nation-state was untenable.²⁸ In the context of full

²⁴Ibid, 286.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶ Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 334.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ William H. McNeill, *The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force, and Society Since A.D. 1000* (ACLS

scale war, each side needed the control of and access to a continent's resources and human capital to secure the victory. This was the dilemma Hitler found himself when the territorial limitations necessitated the invasion of the Sudetenland, Poland, and Ukraine and eventually most of Europe.²⁹ In contrast to the megalomania and evil pursuits of the eugenics programs employed by the Nazis, total control and subjection of other peoples is not part of the Philadelphian system. In the Philadelphian system, sub-units of the federation need have a shared tradition with respect to life and liberty, and from these commonalities, they can make security arrangements which then facilitates general cooperation. This is an example of how the historical material context can shape the political order.

The Philadelphian system at the founding of the U.S. rejected the old order of empire and despotism. The goal of the Philadelphia system is to create a political structure where one can have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness while being secured at the individual and collective level.³⁰ The largest enemy to this goal is unbridled arbitrary power and by design, the compound republic ensures that power is diffuse and the structure mitigates against power consolidation. This was the genius of the Philadelphia system: people could be secured in their individual villages, while maintaining security on the continent. While fear of anarchy dominated the time of Hobbes, today I argue the opposite is true. That is, the primary fear is the consolidation of power in one state which forms a system of hierarchy and imposes despotic rule. Furthermore, a federated security arrangement keeps powerful states from being too aggressive. We can compare the Iraq conflict and the Afghanistan conflict to see two different European

Humanities E-Book Project, 2009).

²⁹ William Ralph Inge, *Mysticism in Religion*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948).

³⁰ The American system has its stains on its reputation, namely the mistreatment of the Native Americans and African-Americans. I acknowledge these wrongs. My focus is however, on the *idea* not the *manifestation* of the United States.

responses to American foreign policy leadership. In Iraq, many traditional NATO allies did not to support the American invasion or liberation.³¹ Whereas, in the Afghanistan, NATO has led the effort since 2006 and it is one of the best examples of a multi-lateral effort. Thus like America helped prevent Germany from consolidating power on the European continent during and after WWII, the Europeans can be a force against aggressive go it alone foreign policy.

Despite the more pronounced nation-state structure in Europe, there have been attempts to promulgate the republican idea. Deudney highlighted that some early European writers began to refer to Europe as a whole “republic”. He documents the Venetian diplomat Giovanni Botero who in 1605 spoke of Europa as a “republic, composed of other different states” as the earliest version of this formulation.³² But Deudney misses what those who study Bohemia have known for years. In fact, the first conception of a federated European system actually originated from Bohemia as a way to stop the "abominable Turk" who had conquered Constantinople in 1453. Jiří z Poděbrad (George of Podebrady), a Hussite and the King of Bohemia from 1458–1471, designed a treaty advocating for a federated structure for all of Europe.³³ He advocated for a supranational organization with a parliament and institutions as a means to protect Christian Europe against the exogenous force of the Muslim Turks around 1464. His treaty failed, but it was the first of its kind, and it was approached multi-laterally. Here we see a Czech and a moderate Hussite who has a vision for a different European political structure, who preceded Giovanni Botero by almost 150 years.

The general premise of this monograph is that the founding the United States held implications for the rest of the world by introducing the Philadelphian system as a replacement

³¹ Schwarz, “Iraq War Splits NATO,” *World Socialist Web Site*, February 13, 2003, 1, <http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2003/02/nato-f13.html>. (accessed Feb. 15, 2013).

³² Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 140.

³³ Frederick Gotthold Heymann, *George of Bohemia, King of Heretics*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965).

for the old Westphalian order. The Realist tradition would treat the U.S. as any other nation, despite its eventual composition of 50 states, and the liberal tradition does not provide an adequate explanation for the U.S. as the security monolith it has become. This sets up the general question, what is unique about the U.S. founding and is there an international theory that would explain its implications to the rest of the world? Rather than thinking of the U.S. system as an anomaly among a global order of nation-states, I argue that the U.S. is the model for some-type of a global confederated republic in the future. It was Thomas Paine who wrote, “What Athens was in miniature, America will be in magnitude”.³⁴

If I accept Deudney’s premise, it then follows to inquire if any other European states or statesman recognized what Deudney saw. This question led me to examine the Czech Republic. Did establishment of the Czechoslovak state in 1918 have a larger meaning? Did any Czech leader reject a purely Westphalian nation-state conception and adopt of some concepts and principles of the American system? Was the Czechoslovak Republic a first step in long-term plan to reorganize the political structure of Europe? How did the First Republic fail to answer the Slovak and German questions and not make accommodation for minorities? Does republican security theory best explain the relationship between the Czech Republic and the United States? I attempt to answer these questions in last two chapters, but first an explanation of republic security theory is required.

³⁴ Thomas Paine and Philip Sheldon Foner, *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine* (New York: Citadel Press, 1945).

CHAPTER ONE: Theoretical Framework Part B

In this next section, I provide a brief description of republican security theory and I introduce the terms violence interdependence, security community, and security binding which are auxiliary concepts which support the theory. cursory explanations of these terms are essential for a comprehensive understanding of this security theory.

As with the examination of any concept, a brief focus on the ancillary concepts can aid in bringing the larger concept into focus. In this way, to better understand republican security theory, we can analyze the threats which this theory seeks to mitigate. This theory asserts that achieving security entails the simultaneous avoidance of the extremes of anarchy and hierarchy, meaning the two main threats to security are anarchy and hierarchy.³⁵ A lawless and wild society is just as pernicious towards life and liberty as a despotic hierarchical tyrannical regime and therefore, both anarchy and hierarchy must be addressed.

Historically, both the Liberal and Realist traditions adhered to a Hobbesian worldview in which the state of anarchy had to be escaped, but anarchy is not the sole threat to life and liberty. On the contrary, we should learn from the twentieth century that hierarchy, specifically from despotic and tyrannical regimes, threatens life and liberty as it is empowered by the legitimacy of the state. The lesson herein is that command of autocratic political structures have the ability to amass great strength. Historically, we have examples of the great power potential of despotic hierarchical political structures in Nazi Germany, in the Soviet Union and communist China. Through tyrannical rule, they can harness immense human potential as their power machinations can be absolute.

This fact presents a dilemma, how can the liberal democratic order mitigate this threat?

³⁵ Deudney, *Bounding Power*, Jacket Cover.

Despite its status as a liberal democracy in 1938, Czechoslovakia could not match the German power. It took the leadership of the American command economy to lead the Allies in WWII to defeat both the Germans and the Japanese, and the Cold War required a similar American leadership. Republican security theory outlines how this is possible. The collective norms and values of separate nations serves as the binding force whereas the combined economic power of separate states undergirds the security community. Talk about values becomes meaningless, without a means to protect and defend those values. Republican security theory posits that specifically tailored political structures can be designed and implemented to counter threats from rampant anarchy and hierarchy. Deudney argues that the compound structure of layered republics, the hallmark of the U.S. founding, created a political structure that kept power diffuse by means of checks and balances, but also unified the republic. He coined the phrase negarchy,³⁶ to demonstrate the capacity of institutions and political structure to lock a polity in a position that neither tends too far toward anarchy or hierarchy. Thus on an international stage, some political structures are necessary to preserve peace and stability. He advocates some level of global governance because we now face global threats which has put all of humanity into a violence independence relationship, which I explain next.

One of the most critical terms to republican security theory is the concept of violence interdependence. Let us start with the more commonly used term in commercial peace theory: complex interdependency. The basic premise of complex interdependency is that nation-states create complex multi-directional economic ties which has a positive effect of lowering the

³⁶ Deudney argues that the compound structure of layered republics, the hallmark of the U.S. founding, created a political structure that kept power diffuse by means of checks and balances, but also unified the republic. He coined the phrase negarchy, to demonstrate the capacity of institutions and political structure to lock a polity in a position that neither tends too far toward anarchy or hierarchy. Thus on an international stage, some political structures are necessary to preserve peace, create stability and unity. The best contemporary examples are nuclear arms treaties which help mitigate nuclear proliferation.

likelihood of violence between states. Deudney modified this traditional liberal theory and recast it in terms of violence. He introduced the concept of violence interdependence defined as the capacity of actors to do violent harm to one another.³⁷ He writes that “once some violence interdependence is present, the way in which this reality is dealt with becomes an inescapable political issue”.³⁸ In this way, the shared vulnerability becomes the impetus for some degree of cooperation between perceived foes and allies.

He continues and demonstrates there are different degrees of violence interdependence. For example, if one is threatened with a knife, the person who owns a spear has a spatial advantage. Obviously, weapons technology has greatly improved since the time of the spear, but the principle of weapons superiority and who has the power advantage is still relevant. Through history we can see technological improvements applied to military hardware and strategy, and author William McNeill in *Pursuit of Power*, tells how the commercialization of violence in the industrial era fundamentally changed the world of weapons through the introduction of deliberate invention.³⁹ We can then follow the escalation of violence interdependence, tracing the pattern of weapon improvements that makes the previous obsolete: from the knife, to the spear, the bow, the rifle, the machine gun, the tank, the bomber, to intercontinental nuclear ballistic missiles. Nuclear weapons, however, have fundamentally changed the security situation.

Deudney asserts that with the arrival of thermonuclear weapons, the whole world has created a dynamic relationship of violence that merits some system of governance, which is

³⁷ Ibid, 35.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ The concept of deliberate invention was when states started to produce weapons to meet a threat that had not materialized yet. If a threat could be conceptually considered then it had to be produced. This created a mutual vulnerability among different nations and thus they competed to develop the weapon first. A prime example is the weaponization of splitting the atom, compelled the United States to develop the Manhattan Project before the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany.

currently arms control treaties.⁴⁰ The threat of nuclear war changed the material context of both space and time, as the whole earth is threatened, and the speed at which lives can be destroyed is beyond historical comparison.⁴¹ This begs the question, how do political entities deal with this violence interdependence? Currently, the institution of arms control, namely, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and Nuclear Weapon Free Zones (NWFZ) serve as examples of a negarchic institution working to mitigate the nuclear security dilemma. And a shared nuclear deterrent from NATO serves as the means by which the Atlantic nations defend themselves.

Violence interdependence is also the impetus for binding structures across increasing geo-spatial boundaries for perceived enemies and allies. For example, the threat of thermo-nuclear war causes nations to take action to mitigate the risk of this type of event from occurring, for example there is a long history of arms control agreements between the U.S. and Soviet Union/Russia, with the latest reductions of the START Treaty signed in Prague in 2010.⁴² In this way, the mutual vulnerability caused by the violence interdependence undergirds some type of relationship, thus vulnerability becomes a means to create security binding structures. Deudney challenges the conventional wisdom of most political scientists, that violence is something to be avoided and he recognizes that the material context of violence interdependence creates a shared vulnerability which can become the motivation for arms control. Experts agree that the current arms control regime is a vast improvement from the previous arms race and the policy of mutually assured destruction.⁴³ This shared vulnerability allows for agreement to mitigate the

⁴⁰ Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 244.

⁴¹ "NUKEMAP," *Restricted Data*, <http://nuclearsecrecy.com/nukemap/>. (accessed Feb.18, 2013)

⁴² Peter Baker and Dan Bilefsky, "Russia and U.S. Sign Nuclear Arms Reduction Pact," *The New York Times*, April 8, 2010, sec. World / Europe, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/09/world/europe/09prexy.html>. (accessed Feb.5, 2013)

⁴³ George P. Shultz et al., "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2007, http://disarmament.nropa.no/wp-content/uploads/2008/02/A_WORLD_FREE.pdf. (accessed Feb 18, 2013).

capacity for violence which creates an inherent negarchic and thus a more stable political structure.

This violence independence relationship engenders more security binding among allies. The common threat of nuclear conflagration creates a violence interdependence relationship between the countries of Europe and North America as most countries are members of NATO. Furthermore, the common NATO nuclear umbrella, creates a strategic security binding relationship. The United States and the Soviet Union were the only two countries to ever extend a nuclear umbrella to other states. The difference was the Soviet Union would only extend it to countries controlled by communist parties, whereas the U.S. is committed to the country regardless of what party is in charge. This is a unique nuclear position of the United States which benefits its allies and mitigates against nuclear proliferation. This strategic binding creates a line of commitment between countries on which other and lower levels operational, tactical security binding can occur. In this way, the security community can develop at all different levels, from strategic defense with a common nuclear deterrent to operational binding e.g. NATO member nations sending troops to Afghanistan.

NATO is often described as an alliance among nations. But I argue that because of the violence interdependence relationship derived from the common threat of thermonuclear war and the proliferation of nuclear weapons, this common vulnerability and subsequent nuclear security agreements have fundamentally altered the relationship between nations with regard to state sovereignty. Upon their arrival at the waning moments of World War II,⁴⁴ nuclear explosive technology has fundamentally altered and raised the stakes of politics and political science to

⁴⁴ Although nuclear weapons did not materialize until after World War II, they were conceptualized years prior and appeared in scientific journals in 1914.

include the fate of civilization and potentially the fate of humankind.⁴⁵ In a post-nuclear world, each European member nation has forfeited a portion of national sovereignty to NATO in exchange for a common nuclear deterrent. The author does not desire to speculate on the degree of sovereignty which is forfeited, only to highlight that a common nuclear deterrent has ramification on national sovereignty. With the exception of France, all NATO allies share the nuclear deterrent. France maintains their own independent nuclear deterrent, as a way to protect national sovereignty. In the late 1960s, there was a growing understanding that true power within NATO would exist among those countries that possessed nuclear weapons.⁴⁶ In 1968, President Charles de Gaulle defended his decision to pursue a French nuclear weapons program, declaring that, "No country without an atomic bomb.....can consider itself independent".⁴⁷ France realized this aspect early and decided to go it alone and was the fourth nation to join the nuclear club.⁴⁸ In 2008, France decided to reintegrate with NATO militarily, but it still maintains an independent nuclear program. I highlight the French case to show that relationship between a country's nuclear capability and perceived sovereignty. For the Czech Republic, however, they have allocated a portion of their national sovereignty to NATO.

Deudney's concept of violence interdependence and Ikenberry's security binding are related and examining them together helps illuminate their inherent relationship. First, Deudney defines violence interdependence as the capacity of actors to do violent harm to one another. With the threat of global thermal nuclear war, the whole world is now bound in a violence relationship. This means the violence interdependence is an impetus for action or it is a material

⁴⁵ Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 245.

⁴⁶ Hans Born, Bates Gill, and Heiner Hänggi, eds., *Governing the Bomb: Civilian Control and Democratic Accountability of Nuclear Weapons* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2010), 105.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Thomas C Reed and Danny B Stillman, *The Nuclear Express: a Political History of the Bomb and its Proliferation* (Minneapolis: Zenith Press, 2009), 68.

contextual force that cannot be escaped, and therefore must be dealt with. Consequently, if we accept Deudney's claim, then G. John Ikenberry's concept of security binding helps illuminate the field and explain how violence interdependence affects the security relationship at a lower levels. He defines security binding as a strategy in which states tie themselves together in economic and security institutions that mutually constrain one another.⁴⁹ Rather than pursuing a policy of balancing by aggregating power to match a powerful state, insecurities can be overcome by creating a common security institution(s).⁵⁰ Security binding is a significant improvement on commercial peace theory as it specifically incorporates binding the violence capacity of individual polities. One of the best famous examples is the integration and combining of the German and French steel and coal industries into the European Coal and Steel Community. This was an attempt to bind together the German and French critical industries of war thereby making war very difficult to execute. This was the foundational precursor to the modern European Union, a fact author Charles Kupchan explained in his book *How Enemies Become Friends*.⁵¹ This is an important strategic overview to understand. It forced both Germany and France to consider national defense in a supranational institution. Thus membership and further integration of security related institutions into NATO is a critical force that facilitates cooperation between nations. It begins at the highest level of violence interdependence, the nuclear threat, and it is through this relationship that lower, less dangerous levels of security cooperation can take place.

It is important to add that security binding also has a positive effect beyond mutual restraint. It provides a marketplace of ideas and designs specifically relevant to the security

⁴⁹ Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan*, 183.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 183–184.

⁵¹ Charles Kupchan, *How Enemies Become Friends: The Sources of Stable Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

community in the arms and defense industries. In this way it stimulates design, growth and improvement in the economy in general. It has helped NATO maintain an advantage by harnessing the research, development, scientific knowledge, and economic strength of each of its members. A good example is how the technical expertise of the Czech Army and armaments industry had allowed the Czechs to play a lead role in the refurbishment of Soviet Mi-17 & Mi-24 helicopters.⁵² The joint development of weapon platforms like the Joint Strike Fighter JSF-35 is another good example of the benefits of security binding as the program is a combined effort of 9 countries.⁵³

In conclusion, the author asserts that republican security theory is the most accurate theory to understand the current security environment among the Atlantic countries. The levels of interdependency in fiscal policy, economic policy, but most importantly nuclear security and general defense has fundamentally altered the political landscape between the U.S. and Europe; thus republican security theory offers an excellent framework to understand the complex relationship.

⁵² Lom Praha Seeks to Repair US Helicopters, <http://www.lompraha.cz/en/news/e15-lom-praha-seeks-to-repair-u-s-helicopters>. (accessed 3 March, 2013).

⁵³ "F-35 Lightning: The Joint Strike Fighter Program, 2012 – 2013," *Defense Industry Daily*, <https://www.defenseindustrydaily.com/f-35-lightning-the-joint-strike-fighter-program-2012-07501/>. (accessed March 13, 2013).

CHAPTER 2: Masaryk and the First Republic

American Catholic philosopher, journalist, novelist, and diplomat Michael Novak notes “It has been said that there has long been a profound moral drive in Czech culture, seeking an ever larger view of the human”.⁵⁴ My claim is simple or as the Czechs and Slovaks would say *jednoduché*. As one example from Czech history, Masaryk had incredible vision for the First Republic and Europe as a whole—one that had many similarities with Duedney’s republican security theory. Ultimately, the Czech leadership of the First Republic accepted a Prague-centric hierarchy and thus dominated the Slovaks and Germans. In this section, I explore the Masaryk’ idealistic notions of identity, foreign relations and his deeper understanding of the Czech part in history. Secondly, I examine the reality of what the First Republic manifested and why it ultimately failed.

Masaryk is one of the few European national leaders of his time, who held a cosmopolitan worldview. Masaryk wrote, “The idea of humanity is the whole meaning of national life. The programme (sic) of humanity gives sense to all our national striving and legitimizes it. Humanity is our final national and historical objective; it is our Czech programme”.⁵⁵ In this statement, the essence of Masaryk’s idea is expressed. Although the world population is organized by means of different nationalities, his understanding of the Czech identity is not held solely in opposition to another nation. For Masaryk, he strove to find the unifying factor, which for him was the common human identity. He could value his national identity without forsaking his superordinate identity as part of the human race. The conclusion of World War I cemented his beliefs and reinforced his perspective for liberty for others,

⁵⁴ Tomáš Sedláček, *Economics of Good and Evil: the Quest for Economic Meaning from Gilgamesh to Wall Street* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), Jacket Cover.

⁵⁵H. Gordon Skilling, *T.G. Masaryk: Against the Current, 1882-1914*, 1St ed. (Pennsylvania State Univ Pr, 1994), 6.

“During the war it was evident to me that if we were to gain our freedom, all the suppressed nations must gain theirs”.⁵⁶ In this way, Masaryk held three critical characteristics of identity: a tempered national identity with an understanding of his human identity, and a concern for those nations who were still oppressed and a willingness to do something about it.

As a student of Johann Herder, Masaryk recognized that “nations are the natural organs of humanity”.⁵⁷ Herder posited that each nation has a unique “soul” and it lives within the language, customs, and culture of the common folk. In this way, Herder influenced Masaryk to see the world as a patchwork of diverse peoples. Masaryk held that the liberation of the nations was just a “prerequisite.....the new cornerstone for a new and better political foundation—for the unity of the Europe and the world. He wrote,

*History shows that the strengthening of national feeling does not prevent the growth of internationalism and internationalization. True nationalism is not opposed to internationalism, but, we abhor those nationalist jingoes who in the name of nationalism oppress other nations.*⁵⁸

In this way, Masaryk saw nations as the essential building blocks for a new political order which should follow the pattern of the American founding. Like in the Philadelphian system, Masaryk saw that in a supra-national federated political structure, the states become the subordinate federal political units. The various sizes and characteristics of the nations represents the essential diversity, similarly important in all orders of biological life. He presciently wrote, “Humanity does not tend to uniformity, but to unity”. He clarifies this unity further, it is “not a unity built on the cemetery of nations, whether large or small”. And this point is paramount, the unique character of the diverse people groups is preserved through distinct nations, and unity is

⁵⁶ Petr Zenkl, *T. G. Masaryk and the Idea of European and World Federation*. (Chicago: Distributed by Czechoslovak National Council of America, 1955), 27.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Czech Slovak Protective Society, “Orgán Bratrstva Brotherhood Organ,” 18, <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/api/volumes/oclc/12780131.html>. (accessed Feb. 01, 2013).

achieved and sustained, as long as national identity does not supersede the common human identity.

He saw broader meaning of the founding of the republic as a first step toward a new political order and arrangement in the region. The Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence states that “the new free nations of Central and Eastern Europe may easily federate should they find it necessary”.⁵⁹ And the document continues, “The foreign policy of the Czechoslovak nation will accept its full share of responsibility in the reorganization of Eastern Europe”. Here one can see the Czech cosmopolitan outlook was ahead of its time, having concern for the reorganization of its neighbors as part of its foreign policy. Masaryk recognized that, “if we were to gain our freedom, all the suppressed nations must gain theirs”.⁶⁰ Masaryk saw a federated Europe as the best way to accomplish this goal.

Masaryk wrote in the first few chapters of *Making of a State*, that his ideal would have been a federated Austria.⁶¹ Along with Czech historian Frantíšek Palacký, he initially shared the view that an Austrian federation could serve as a counterbalance to both Pan-German (Prussian) and Pan-Russian imperialism.⁶² But he concluded that an Austrian federation would have been too small and he had already determined, Europe as a whole needed to be unified. Furthermore, Masaryk questioned the sincerity of the Austrian offer to federalize in 1918.⁶³ He wrote, “Europe emphatically tends toward continental organization”.⁶⁴ In this way, Masaryk recognized that Europe, as a whole not a divided continent, needed to be federated.

⁵⁹ Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence, http://dspace.library.cornell.edu/bitstream/1813/2139/1/Founding_of_Czechoslovakia_1918-1924.pdf (accessed Jan. 10, 2013)

⁶⁰ Zenkl, *T. G. Masaryk and the Idea of European and World Federation*, 28.

⁶¹ T. G. Masaryk and Henry Wickham Steed, *The Making of a State; Memories and Observations, 1914-1918*, (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1927).

⁶² Petr Zenkl, *T. G. Masaryk and the Idea of European and World Federation*, 1955, 16.

⁶³ Masaryk and Steed, *The Making of a State; Memories and Observations, 1914-1918*, 294.

⁶⁴ Czech Slovak Protective Society, “Orgán Bratrstva Brotherhood Organ.”

Masaryk was more than an idealist and he took political and diplomatic action toward a more unified Europe. As the new and first president of Czechoslovakia, he alongside Eduard Beneš inspired and constructed an alliance of Danubian States called the Little Entente. He accurately predicted the potential reemerging threat from Germany as “he envisioned a Danubian block that could counter a resurgent Germany”.⁶⁵ This alliance, ultimately a failure, was a way that France could ally with Czechoslovakia to establish a second front should war break out with Germany and to check Hungary’s revanchist actions.

Western powers, including Masaryk, envisioned a *cordon sanitaire* of the newly formed states stretching from the Baltic to Adriatic as a more comprehensive way to abet Pan-German *Mittleuropa* and Soviet communism from the east.⁶⁶ Historian Lonnie Johnson documents that the *cordon sanitaire* did not work. The various states had distinct economies, at different stages of development with weak or non-existent middle classes, and, in most cases, there was a tendency towards political polarization given the overall atmosphere created by competing ideologies: Fascism and Bolshevism.⁶⁷ Despite good relations with the UK, France and the United States, Czechoslovakia had poor relations with its proximate neighbors. It had sizable German and Hungarian minorities which caused contention. They also had territorial disputes with Poland causing tension between the central European neighbors.⁶⁸

It is here that you see that main failure of the First Republic and with European security arrangements at the time. Despite the alliances, the League of Nations, and *cordon sanitaire* these agreements did not create a material deterrent or an integrated common defense which

⁶⁵ Petr Zenkl, *T. G. Masaryk and the Idea of European and World Federation*. (Chicago: Distributed by Czechoslovak National Council of America, 1955), 29.

⁶⁶ Lonnie Johnson, *Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbors, Friends* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 197.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, 198.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 200.

could check German resurgence. This aspect demonstrates the validity of republican security theory and the importance of the trans-Atlantic link. It was not until after WWII when the United States committed to European security. Prior to WWII, notably absent was a European wide security arrangement and a trans-Atlantic link, namely the U.S. This came after WWII for Western Europe and after 1989 for Central Europe. This supports the main theme of this thesis that the European-Atlantic relationship is critical to answering the security question.

Masaryk recognized the important role America played in Europe. He envisioned a Europeanization and Americanization reciprocity. He wrote, “The fact that so called Americanism is invading Europe does not matter. We have been ‘Europeanizing’ America for several centuries, and they have the right to do the same”.⁶⁹ It should be noted the Masaryk stated this fact long before the Second World War and the U.S. Marshall Plan. Unlike many of his European contemporaries, he realized Europe could not get along without America. His perspective was confirmed correct with World War II. He hoped that a European federation would eventually lead to the closest alliance between America and Europe. Masaryk realized that the cradle of any supra-national federation or organization was America and he considered the League of Nations as a continuation of the American Revolution in the international field and a step toward the realization of a United States of the World.⁷⁰ Clearly, Masaryk’s views were prescient preceding the expansion of Fascism, Nazism, and Bolshevism into Europe.⁷¹

Masaryk’s model for a new Europe was based on his understanding of America. At the conclusion of World War I, U.S. president Woodrow Wilson, the consummate idealist, presented his vision for a newly arranged world in the League of Nations. Masaryk knew that such an

⁶⁹ Zenkl, *T. G. Masaryk and the Idea of European and World Federation*, 17.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 35.

⁷¹ *Ibid*, 17.

organization was essential to secure a small state. Masaryk agreed with Wilson's 14th point in the planned League of Nations that, "a general association of nations must be created securing material and political independence and territorial integrity for great and small states alike".⁷² But the League of Nations failed. First, it became an instrument for the Allies to punish the losers of the war. Second, it did not include the United States or Soviet Union, who were the only powers that could check Germany's imperial aims. But the U.S. did not want to embroil themselves in European conflicts and without U.S. involvement the League was doomed to fail.⁷³

A federated view of Europe required a different view toward national sovereignty and Masaryk held a more progressive view toward sovereignty. Masaryk knew that the sovereignty of a small state was already in decline. Masaryk wrote, "Sovereignty is relative, since the economic and cultural interdependency of nations is growing. Even the great states are dependent on the other states".⁷⁴ Masaryk felt that small nations in a federated structure will have a veto against power politics, and thus he sought federation as a form of protection. Conversely, it would protect the more powerful states from being overly ambitious and aggressive. Masaryk felt that only absolute states can be completely sovereign and he did not regret the decline of absolute state sovereignty as he recognized it produced unbridled hierarchal power. He recognized the interdependency of states as a step toward democratizing and supra-state organization. This was contrary to German political philosophy of power politics of his day.

In the end, Masaryk had an incredible vision for a new Europe. The First Republic of Czechoslovakia was just that, a *first* somewhat poor attempt at a democracy in a continent

⁷² Ibid, 35.

⁷³ The political cartoon at the conclusion of this section captures this sentiment.

⁷⁴ Zenkl, *T. G. Masaryk and the Idea of European and World Federation*, 1955, 34.

tending toward National Socialism and fascism. My aim is to highlight the congruency of Masaryk's political philosophy and foreign policy with Deudney's Philadelphian system and republican security theory. Masaryk's ideas sound familiar to a modern day liberal idealist. Despite Masaryk's recognition for a need for a continental federated security arrangement, he could not make it happen. Europe still had WWII and the Cold War in its future, and the United States was not interested in making commitments to Europe. On the international scene, the small republic of Czechoslovakia and the notional alliances could not check the pending autocratic power structure of a resurgent Germany. This fact supports Deudney's assertion that liberal democracies must be unified in a federated security structure to secure themselves. In this way, the shared virtues can create cooperation that can be translated into material assets that can be used to enforce and uphold common values. Despite his for a federated Europe, Masaryk's First Republic turned into a Prague-dominated centralized state. He felt, in post war conflict, autonomy for the Germans and Slovaks would have threatened the integrity of the republic. This fact supports Deudney's theory because threats to liberty come from both anarchy and hierarchy. In a hypothetical federated structure, the Slovaks and the Germans would have had true political representation. In the next section, I examine the failure of the First Republic.

Those already familiar with the history of the region are well aware that the nature of the First Republic was *manifestly* not a federated structure. Historian, James Felak, writes, “It was a centralized state run from Prague, which created huge amounts of animosity”. In this next section, I depart from the previously section where I focused on the international aspect of Masaryk and the First Republic and I focus on the domestic aspects of the First Republic. I arrive at four main conclusions. Masaryk refused to recognize the Slovak nation and instead insisted that the true national identity was Czechoslovak. Second, the Slovak economy suffered as it was forced to compete with the Bohemian economy. Third, there were religious differences that manifested in major different political understandings. Lastly, the failure to provide true autonomy and adhere to the Pittsburgh Agreement made it difficult for Slovaks to trust Czech intentions.

The Czech economy was more advanced and this complicated the new republic. First, an influx of Czechs complicated the labor force in Slovakia. By 1930, over 100,000 Czech “immigrants” had come to Slovakia.⁷⁵ Tensions began to arise as they secured stable jobs such as postman or a rail worker, positions which many capable Slovaks could fill. Moreover, as the administration of Slovakia changed from Budapest to Prague, it required trained personnel to establish an orderly rule and thus Czechs dominated these positions as well. Felak documents that, “Prague-based political parties were awarding these posts to their supporters as patronage” and approximately 21,828 Czechs were employed for the state apparatus.⁷⁶

There were further differences between the Czechs and the Slovaks. The Czechs had benefited from years of Austrian capital investment in Bohemia, and had developed an advanced

⁷⁵ James Ramon Felak, *At the Price of the Republic: Hlinka's Slovak People's Party, 1929-1938* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1994), 20.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

economy and industry, whereas in pre-war Hungary the government subsidized and protected the less developed Slovak economy. This made it difficult for the Slovaks to compete against the highly developed, efficient, and more profitable Czech industry.⁷⁷

There were pronounced religious differences. Although both majorities of Czechs and Slovaks were Catholic, anticlerical ideas were practically nonexistent in Slovakia, while the opposite was true in the Czech lands.⁷⁸ The Hussite tradition and Czech Reformation played a major role in the shaping Czech national identity, specifically the beliefs of Masaryk. Felak writes, “Nationalistic and historical factors helped create a particularly sharp form of anticlericalism among Czechs”.⁷⁹ In Slovakia, the Catholic identity also had a strong nationalistic relationship and was used to organize people politically. Furthermore, the majority of the Slovak intelligentsia came from the minority religion, the Slovak Lutherans, and this fact further complicated the situation.⁸⁰ This created a perception that the Slovak intelligentsia were actually in collusion with the Prague-based authority structure. In general, the Catholic and Protestant distinction was significant.

The most salient contention between Masaryk and the Slovaks was the failure to adhere to the Pittsburgh Agreement. The Pittsburgh Agreement was a nonbinding agreement signed by Masaryk and the Slovak League of America, the Czech National Alliance, and the Federation of Czech Catholics. The Slovak nationalists considered the agreement as a promise of good-faith by Masaryk that they would enjoy autonomy in the Czechoslovak state.⁸¹ The agreement helped Masaryk demonstrate to Western leaders that his attempts to create a Czechoslovak state had the

⁷⁷ Ibid, 23.

⁷⁸ Ibid, 22.

⁷⁹ Ibid, 21.

⁸⁰ Ibid, 22.

⁸¹ Ibid, 40.

support of the Slovaks.⁸² Masaryk needed to present the Czechs and Slovaks to the Allied powers as one nation, because otherwise they might not accept their claim to independence.

One of the main potential problems of the new state were the approximately 3 million Sudeten Germans in the Czech lands who made up almost a quarter of the population.⁸³ These Germans represented a political problem as they were a consolidated voting bloc. In some areas, they formed almost the entire population. Masaryk counted on the 15% Slovak population to counter balance the German minority, while in return the Czechs supported Slovaks against Magyars. Masaryk succeed in getting Slovak support, but failed to hold to the spirit of the Pittsburgh Agreement and did not push for complete autonomy for Slovakia. He argued it was agreement between ethnic groups in the United States, so it was not binding on the new state in Europe.⁸⁴

It could be argued that since the Czech history is one of being dominated by outside powers, the interwar period offered the situation in reverse.

*It is no surprise that the Czechs, who were in the past the greatest proponents of autonomy, are not interested in this issue any more—the reasons are obvious. Now they themselves are at the heart of the country, they control the central institutions and have almost the entire legislative and executive power in their hands.*⁸⁵

The fact that the most common demand of Slovak autonomists was parity of representation of Czechs and Slovaks in the central administration and in the organs of the government in Prague

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Jan Bazant, Nina Bazantová, and Frances Starn, *The Czech Reader: History, Culture, Politics* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 242.

⁸⁴ *At the price of the Republic*, 40.

⁸⁵ Jirí Musil and Central European University, *The End of Czechoslovakia* (Budapest; New York; New York: Central European University Press; Distributed in the U.S. by Oxford University Press, 1995), 173.

supports this claim. As late as 1938, only 123 out of 10,825 state official positions were occupied by Slovak nationals.⁸⁶

When we consider Prague domination, economic and religious factors, and the collective tension caused by the Pittsburgh Agreement, these aspects of the relationship created an animosity that did not resolve until 1993 with the Velvet Divorce. Many of Masaryk's ideas parallel the ideas of Deudney's republican security theory, and show his contribution as a thinker. But in the design of the First Republic it was different. Masaryk's decided against a federated structure in the First Republic. The example of the First Republic demonstrates the need for negarchic and compound structures to check even the milder forms of hierarchy. In the end, the Czechs and the Slovaks belonged in a European-North American federation just not a Czech and Slovak one.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

APPENDIX B



THE GAP IN THE BRIDGE.

CHAPTER 3: Czech Republic in the NATO Security Community

In the last section, I examine the foreign policy of the former Czechoslovakia 1989- 1992 and of the Czech Republic from 1993-present. I primarily look through the security lens using Deudney's republican security theory and Ikenberry's security binding. I seek to determine whether these theories are helpful in explaining Czech foreign policy during these time periods. First, I show how the Czechs are keen to have a strong link with the United States, as historically European allies have been unreliable. This supports both Deudney's and Ikenberry's claim of U.S. importance in the global order, and more specifically in the Atlantic order. Second, I show how Czechoslovakia took significant steps to reform its military, to align itself with democratic traditions, and to address the civil-military question. This part fits with Deudney's theoretical framework because it emphasizes federated security arrangements and Ikenberry's security binding structures. In the end, I conclude and provide evidence to show that the Czech Republic is firmly established in the Atlantic security community and within the European Union.

The Czechs felt betrayed by the decision at Munich. This betrayal reinforced the idea that European security is inadequate and, therefore, outside support was necessary. I examine two quotes from two different British statesman to illuminate my point. First, following the Allied victory of World War I, the British prime minister expressed his appreciation for the Czech contribution to the war effort. He specifically mentioned the contributions of the Czechoslovak Legions and assured Masaryk, the president of the new state, that their sacrifice would not be forgotten. He wrote on September 11, 1918,

On behalf of the British War Cabinet I send you our heartiest congratulations on the striking successes won by the Czechoslovak forces against armies of Germans and Austrian troops in Siberia. The story of the adventures and triumphs of this small army is, indeed, one of the greatest epics of history....Your nation has rendered inestimable

*service to Russia and to the Allies in their struggle to free the world from despotism; we shall never forget it.*⁸⁷

But when you compare future Prime Minister Neville Chamberlin's comments regarding Germany's desire to annex the Sudetenland in 1938, it reveals a collective political amnesia of the Czech and Slovak sacrifices. To secure what he called "peace in our time", Chamberlin sought to distance himself from the problem.

*How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas-masks here because of a quarrel in a far-away country between people of whom we know nothing. It seems still more impossible that a quarrel that has already been settled in principle should be the subject of war.*⁸⁸

When one considers the Soviet invasion in 1968 by Warsaw Pact allies, it is reasonable to understand why the Czechs desired to have a close security relationship with the United States. There are numerous examples in the 20th century where the Czechs learned to not fully trust European collective security guarantees. The League of Nations and the corresponding policies of the United Kingdom and France—and the United Nations at the present time, were essentially collective security—seeking common interest among democracies and non-democracies. They failed because they lacked the means by which action could be taken to secure common values, resist an aggressor, or enforce the collective will. Without a system to intervene, collective security was reduced to ideological lip service.

Common defense, which is the policy of NATO, is of an entirely different order, namely an attack on one is an attack on all. The institution of NATO has evolved beyond just a treaty and has fundamentally transformed into a security community united by values and material security binding structures. Moreover, NATO has the capacity to successfully manage, organize, and effect military assets from 28 member countries. With the capability to act, NATO member

⁸⁷ Masaryk and Steed, *The Making of a State; Memories and Observations, 1914-1918*, 276.

⁸⁸ Johnson, *Central Europe*, 210.

countries have to be able to discuss interests and prioritize, which is the current challenge. Peter Beinart writes,

*“Talking about threats makes us feel tough and talking about values make us feel virtuous, but only talking about interests’ forces us to acknowledge the limits of our ability to be either tough or virtuous. This discomfort with the language of interest is a symptom of America’s post-Cold War inability to prioritize”.*⁸⁹

Thus, the Czechs desired NATO membership to guarantee a federated common security agreement with their proximate European neighbors, but most importantly it was a critical link to the United States. Ikenberry writes that, “America’s commitment to NATO carries with it the power of supreme command over the combined alliance forces—and within the organization, the United States is ‘first among equals’.”⁹⁰ The Czechs recognized that American leadership was important, and NATO was and is the means to secure themselves.

Following the Velvet Revolution in 1989, Czechoslovakia set out to solve the security question. With the collapse of the totalitarian regime and the subsequent collapse of the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) in 1991, Czechoslovakia was keen to *return to Europe*⁹¹ and sought integration with European institutions, namely, NATO and the European Economic Community.⁹² Prague was anxious to reunite with the West, but it was not without challenges.

One of the legacies of the WTO military structure was prepositioning of Soviet troops and equipment in Warsaw Pact countries. This was the case with Czechoslovakia. As part of the WTO, Czechoslovakia was key terrain in the Soviet defense strategy. From the Soviet perspective, Czechoslovakia represented a “corridor running from Germany straight into the

⁸⁹ Peter Beinart, “The Beautiful Lie of American Omnipotence,” *National Journal* (2010): 8.

⁹⁰ Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan*, 111.

⁹¹ There is debate on whether Central Europeans were ever really part of Europe. I will not address this topic in this thesis, rather I will assume they were.

⁹² The European Economic Community and European Community were both pre-cursors the European Union.

Soviet Union”.⁹³ In 1968, after the Prague Spring had sought to humanize communism, the Soviet Union invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia with five divisions and support troops. After the revolution, the Czechoslovak government wanted to deal with and remove the Soviet troops still stationed on Czechoslovak soil. The two sides came to a solution and in February of 1990, they signed the Treaty on the Withdrawal of Soviet Troops from Czechoslovakia.⁹⁴ The last trainload of 1,653 soldiers, civilian personnel and dependents chugged across the border crossing on 25 June 1991.⁹⁵

Another legacy effect of communism was a tainted relationship between the military and civil society. In comparison to western political thought, Lenin had a different doctrine of war. William Odom shows how Lenin inverted military theorist Carl von Clausewitz in order to achieve his aim. Military professionals understand Clausewitz’s theory of war as an extension of politics. It is the violent means to accomplish a political goal. Lenin saw the inverse, writes Odom,

*“In borrowing from Clausewitz, Lenin actually inverted Clausewitz’s theory—turned him on his head, just as Marx claimed to have done to Hegel, by basing politics on war (revolution) instead of war on politics. War, for Lenin, was not just the continuation of politics by other means, it was the essence of politics, domestic and international”.*⁹⁶

In this way, war and revolution were essential for setting up the perfect political state, namely, a communist one. Thus under communism in Czechoslovakia, the military had a pronounced role in all of society. The Marxist-Leninist ideology had to be removed from the Czechoslovak army.

⁹³ Andrew A. Michta, *East Central Europe after the Warsaw Pact: Security Dilemmas in the 1990s* (Greenwood Press, 1992), 58.

⁹⁴ Eduard Stehlik, *The Heart of the Army* (Ministry of Defense of the Czech Republic, 2009), 84.

⁹⁵ Charles T. Powers, “Czechs Keep Chins Up as Soviets Leave: Pullout: Men Are Shorn of Beards They Began Growing 23 Years Ago to Protest the Invasion,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 25, 1991, http://articles.latimes.com/1991-06-25/news/mn-1335_1_soviet-union. (accessed Jan. 12, 2013).

⁹⁶ William E Odom, *The Collapse of the Soviet Military* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 14, 15.

The communist regime in Czechoslovakia was one of the most brutal regimes in East Central Europe. The close association between the army and the communist party apparatus created a substantial trust deficit in society. Restoring the civil-military relationship was critical as it is a hallmark of a modern democratic society and would restore trust in the military. Led by Vaclav Havel, the Civic Forum⁹⁷ demanded for the restructuring of the Czechoslovak military and that the military be placed under legitimate democratic civilian control.⁹⁸ Then Prime Minister Ladislav Adamec agreed to meet those demands and he began to implement reforms for the army.

The desire to join NATO served as the motivation to reform the military. The membership process for accession into NATO helped the Czechs resolve the civil-military relationship and make other changes. The membership process forced the Czech government to restructure their civil-military relationship based on five principles.

1. Willingness to settle international, ethnic or external territorial disputes by peaceful means, commitment to the rule of law and human rights, and democratic control of armed forces.
2. Elected civilian government's ability to contribute to the organization's defense and missions
3. Devotion of sufficient resources to armed forces to be able to meet the commitments of membership
4. Security of sensitive information, and safeguards ensuring it
5. Compatibility of domestic legislation with NATO cooperation.

NATO used a specifically tailored Membership Action Plan (MAP) as the mechanism for the Czech Republic to make changes to their political and military structures in order to meet the standards of a prospective NATO member.

As Czechoslovakia transitioned to democracy, it included a comprehensive defense reform for the national Czechoslovak army. At this time, the Czechoslovak army was the second

⁹⁷ The Civic Forum was a political movement in the Czech part of Czechoslovakia, established during the Velvet Revolution in 1989. Vaclav Havel founded and led the organization, whose purpose was to unify the anti-authoritarian forces in Czechoslovakia and to overthrow the communist regime.

⁹⁸ Michta, *East Central Europe after the Warsaw Pact*, 119.

largest in East Central Europe.⁹⁹ A major objective of military reform was the reduction of personnel and equipment. During 1990-1993, they reduced personnel from 200,000 to 140,000.¹⁰⁰ Right away, Czechoslovaks decreased their defense spending (1989-11.3 billion USD, 1990-9.8 billion USD, 1991- 6.5 billion). They jettisoned old equipment and started to work toward building a smaller, highly mobile army. Presently, the ACR has reduced itself from a force of over 200,000 to a much smaller force of 26,000. Today, the ACR are a 100% professional force with the last conscripts leaving the service in 2004.¹⁰¹

As the former communist army made the transition to democracy, it required dismissing of communist ideology along with certain positions, and lustration of certain leaders. The army had to be depoliticized; for example, they eliminated all political instruction and replaced political officers with priests.¹⁰² Odom documents that political officers in the communist armies were some of the sharpest and were highly conscious of the control and sway of the party's ideology.¹⁰³ From personal experience working with the Czech army, former political officers still hold an intangible essence of power within the organization. In contrast to Poland, the Czechs did not ban outright all political activity, but military personnel were not allowed to campaign directly for political parties. Seeking a complete break from communism, the Czechoslovak federal parliament voted to rename the "Czechoslovak People's Army" simply "the Czechoslovak Army".¹⁰⁴

By 1991, Czechoslovakia's foreign policy moved away from antiquated bloc structures and was redirected toward principles of common security and pan-Europeanism. Under the

⁹⁹ Ibid, 121.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Stehlik, *The Heart of the Army*, 94.

¹⁰² Michta, *East Central Europe After the Warsaw Pact*, 118.

¹⁰³ Odom, *The Collapse of the Soviet military*, 15.

¹⁰⁴ Michta, *East Central Europe After the Warsaw Pact*, 118.

leadership of Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier, Prague was able to articulate their position in a future European security system. Dienstbier was a former dissident, signatory of Charter 77, and the founder of an underground newspaper Lidové Noviny (People's News)—now an important Czech Daily.¹⁰⁵ Dienstbier wanted to “transfer security on the Continent from a bloc basis to an all-European one”¹⁰⁶ and this included the long-term goal of creating a ‘confederated Europe, a Europe of regions’ bound together by common economic and security interests. He was initially cool to NATO, calling it and the Warsaw Pact “vestiges of the old confrontation” and instead he advocated “a new security structure based on the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), embracing everybody in Europe, and the United States.”¹⁰⁷

As the president of the newly formed and liberated Czechoslovak Republic, Vaclav Havel initially envisioned a strictly European security arrangement. He envisaged a pan-European collective security arrangement based on the model of the Office of Security Cooperation Europe (OSCE) and undergirded by common values for human rights as outlined in the Helsinki Accords. Havel had deemed that with the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, it would mean a similar dissolution of NATO. Havel changed his mind in 1991 and adopted a policy that emphasized NATO membership first, while still retaining the OSCE. Havel capitulated recognizing that NATO would stay on, “progress toward this vision will probably be more complicated than it originally seemed to be”.¹⁰⁸ He concluded, “his nation attached great significance...to its cooperation with the North Atlantic Alliance,’ while recognizing that it

¹⁰⁵ “Jiri Dienstbier: A Czech’s Career,” *The Economist*, <http://www.economist.com/node/17911256>. (accessed Jan. 13, 2011)

¹⁰⁶ Michta, *East Central Europe after the Warsaw Pact*, 111.

¹⁰⁷ David S Yost, *NATO Transformed: The Alliance’s New Roles in International Security* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998), 48.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 49.

could not ‘become a regular member of NATO for the time being’”.¹⁰⁹ OSCE also remained and Prague became the location of the OSCE secretariat.

In 1993, Czechoslovakia split into two independent nations the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. From the Slovak point of view, they were often underestimated, discriminated against, underused in state administration and generally treated as a junior partner by the Czechs.¹¹⁰ Moreover, their first independent state was acquired in 1939, when Father Jozef Tiso met and came to an agreement with Adolf Hitler for independence in March 1939, months after the decision at Munich. Thus, as a nation, their first “independent” status came from an agreement with Hitler, a historical fact that complicated their relationship with the Czechs. After the revolution, some Slovak nationalists continued to cling to the Tiso regime to legitimate their demands for independence, which complicated the situation more.¹¹¹ Slovakia achieved its independence on Jan 1, 1993 as both prime ministers Václav Klaus and Vladimir Mečiar agreed to the dissolution of the two republics in what is called the Velvet Divorce.

In the end, Slovaks had to experience the consequences of nationalism under the leadership of Vladimir Mečiar, who led them through a turbulent 1990s. However, under international pressure, a massive 84% of Slovakia’s population turned out to vote and soundly defeat Mečiar in 1998.¹¹² This election turned the page on nationalism and moved Slovakia toward greater European integration. But the split helped the Czechs distance themselves from the Slovaks, and focus on Czech reforms.

Thus for the Czechs, the 1990s, even after the split in 1993, were a decade of hard work in which they took steps toward NATO membership and further European integration. To date

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Musil and Central European University, *The End of Czechoslovakia*, 2.

¹¹¹ Robin H. E Shepherd, *Czechoslovakia: the Velvet Revolution and Beyond* (Houndsmills; New York: Macmillan Press; St. Martin’s Press, 2000), 132.

¹¹² Ibid., 149.

there has been a certain pattern to how post-communist states integrate into the broader European community. As I outlined in the theoretical framework, both Deudney and Ikenberry agree that the security solution precedes all other dimensions. The evidence supports their claim. When I compare the dates of accession of numerous countries into the two premier European institutions, we see that NATO membership precedes the EU membership. This fact finds confluence with republican security theory as the important violence interdependence relationship must be addressed first.

Country	NATO	EU
Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary	1999	2004
Romania, Bulgaria	2004	2007
Croatia, Albania	2009	2013

On March 1999, the Czech Republic took the historic step and became a NATO member country. Since 1999-present, the Czech Republic has proved themselves as capable and willing partners in the Alliance—see appendix A for a list of the foreign missions of ACR. Furthermore, the Czech Republic has contributed to expeditionary missions under the leadership of the EU and the United Nations—also see Appendix A.

A successful aspect of NATO membership is the benefit of division of labor and burden sharing. One of the most expensive aspects of defense are the creation, storage, and maintenance of nuclear weapons systems. In this way, along with its role as a common deterrent, the shared NATO nuclear umbrella is an economic benefit to all members. When the Czech Republic acquired membership into NATO in 1999, their membership guaranteed them the security of the NATO nuclear deterrent.¹¹³ Furthermore, the 26th Command, Control and Surveillance Brigade of the ACR is integrated into NATO’s air defense system providing air space radar surveillance

¹¹³ It should be noted that the same day the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary joined NATO, the Atlantic alliance went to war for the first time against Serbia.

over the territory of the Czech Republic and beyond. In 2008, the Czech political leadership expended considerable political capital to convince the population to support the Bush Administration's plan for a ballistic missile defense (BMD) radar facility in the Czech Republic. This system was subsequently cancelled in 2010, but it still demonstrated the Czech desire for integrated security structures, specifically with the United States. In republican security theory, solving the nuclear question is paramount, and the Czechs see their participation within NATO security structures as their solution. I highlight the Czechs' willingness to participate on nuclear related issues as not all European allies are willing to host nuclear weapons or even host supporting systems, i.e radar or BMD on their territory.¹¹⁴

NATO membership offers nations the opportunity to contribute a niche capability which benefits the whole Alliance. For the Czechs, they provide NATO with a handful of critical niche capabilities. The Czech Republic is home to the Chemical Biological Radiological Nuclear Centre of Excellence. This center is dedicated to improving the professional competency of officers of the ACR, NATO, Partnership for Peace (PfP), and other domestic and integration emergency responders responsible for the planning and managing of Nuclear Biological Chemical protective and decontamination measures.¹¹⁵

Another niche capability of the ACR is expertise in training Joint Tactical Air Combat Controllers (JTAC). The JTAC serves as the "eyes and ears" on the ground directing fire support. The Czechs have developed this tactical expertise and they have military training areas which allow low level flight and the use of various types of munitions. All members of the alliance can benefit from these resources and capabilities through coordination and training

¹¹⁴ Oliver Meier, "Germany Pushes for Changes in NATO's Nuclear Posture," *Arms Control Now: The Blog of the Arms Control Association*, <http://armscontrolnow.org/2012/03/14/germany-pushes-for-changes-in-natos-nuclear-posture/>. (accessed June 1, 2012).

¹¹⁵ *The Czech Republic and Its Professional Armed Forces*, First English Edition (Ministry of Defense of the Czech Republic, 2006), 123.

exercises. These niche capabilities allow a small nation to contribute their expertise to the Alliance. When you consider that each NATO country provides various niche capabilities, one can begin to understand the tremendous advantages of the NATO security community. Furthermore, NATO helps bridge the gap and integrate national systems through standardization and provides command and control systems that can manage multi-national components.

The Czechs provide the NATO security community with legacy expertise from when they were integrated into the Soviet security system. During the communist era, member countries of the Warsaw Pact used Soviet designed equipment. Some of that equipment is still in use today. Probably the most salient example is the AK-47, but a close second and my focus are the Mi. series helicopters. Their good flight characteristics, durable construction, easy maintenance, variability and affordable price make them historically the most popular helicopter. The Mi-17 and Mi-24 helicopters are still in active service in the Czech Republic's army and in many other NATO member countries, specifically former Warsaw Pact members. In addition, the United States maintains a sizeable fleet of Mi-series helicopters.¹¹⁶

The Czech Republic has taken a lead role in the refurbishing the helicopters and training of the personnel. Since 2009, it has been the lead nation of the NATO Hip Helicopter Task Force initiative, which is tasked with directing the cooperation of countries equipped with Mi-family helicopters. Since August 2011, the Czechs have been training and preparing Afghan pilots at the Air Training Centre in Pardubice, Czech Republic. At the NATO summit in Chicago, NATO agreed that members will not create their own isolated helicopter capacities, but rather will affiliate and cooperate to find a common solution. Beneficial for the Czechs, NATO is considering revamping the existing Air Training Centre to become a multinational aviation

¹¹⁶ <http://www.defense.gov/contracts/contract.aspx?contractid=4547>, (accessed Mar. 6, 2013).

training center for NATO. Such a decision would mean an enhanced role for the Czech Republic.

This is a prime example of security binding. It brings numerous nations to one table to discuss and find a solution for rotary wing support in the Alliance. Interestingly enough, it brings Russia to the table too. The Russians designed these aircraft and there are licensing agreements that must be honored with regard to repair parts. Given that the relationship between Russia and NATO can be tense, even a small level of cooperation can be beneficial. Lastly, there are also simple economic benefits. The construction of a new facility will be a significant boost to the local economy, creating a regular influx of soldiers through the training facility needing basic services.

Probably one of the clearest signs that the Czech Republic is fully rooted in NATO is the integration of the Czech Special Forces at the newly established NATO Special Operations Force (SOF) Headquarters. Given the nature of their training and capabilities, special operations forces are typically the type of units that most nations are reluctant to share. In the past, the Czechs and the U.S. had cooperated mostly in a bilateral relationship with regard to SOF exchanges. For example, the 601st Special Force Group served three rotations assigned to Operation Enduring Freedom under U.S. leadership in Afghanistan. However in 2011, the Czechs deployed two 100-man rotations to Afghanistan under the leadership of the newly created NATO SOF Command. This example is telling. It shows a greater willingness on the Czech part to trust the NATO security community for command leadership, even over its prized SOF community.

<i>ENDURING FREEDOM</i>	<i>612</i>	<i>ACR</i>	<i>3/2002 - 6/2003</i>
<i>Anti-terrorist operation</i>			<i>Afghanistan</i>
<i>ENDURING FREEDOM</i>	<i>120</i>	<i>ACR</i>	<i>3 - 8/2004</i>
<i>601st Special Forces Group</i>			<i>Afghanistan</i>
<i>ISAF</i>	<i>2 x 100</i>	<i>ACR</i>	<i>6/2011 - 6/2012</i>
<i>Special Forces</i>			<i>Afghanistan</i>

The NATO SOF command structure has been successful in unifying NATO's SOF community for a more effective fight against terrorism. Prior to the establishment of NATO SOF Headquarters, there was a lack of consistency of training and capability among the unconventional forces deployed to Afghanistan. I believe the creation of the NATO SOF headquarters has significant meaning.

First, let's consider the end of the Second World War. Given the nature of the war, the idea of linking France's and Germany's steel industry was perfectly relevant. The idea of binding the two nations' ability to create the materials of warfare served its purpose and it laid the foundation for the European Union. Deudney argued, among others, however, that the fundamental nature of warfare and national military power has shifted away from conventional threats and capabilities towards unconventional threats and unconventional capabilities. This is why the establishment of the NATO SOF Headquarters and its successful deployment in Afghanistan is so important. It created a security binding structure which unites national unconventional warfare assets under the NATO umbrella. Given the asymmetrical nature of the threats we face, NATO SOF Headquarters may be critical success, which in time may belong among the rank of European Steel and Coal Community.

In conclusion, the Czech Republic has firmly planted themselves in the European security and economic community. Despite a historical distrust of European allies, the Czechs continue to move forward with trust and participation in European institutions. It seems Masaryk's vision of a secure Europe and America has come closer to fruition. The undergirding security relationship of NATO has created a common defense and strong economic and other institutional ties among the member states. In comparison, the failed attempts of European collective defense

i.e. Little Entente, League of Nations, the failure at Munich, and the Soviet military sinew of the Warsaw Pact holding up their imperial tissue¹¹⁷ have all found their way to the trash bin of history. However, NATO has transformed itself, and as a member of NATO, the Czechs have successfully transformed their Army from a bloc-centered bureaucratic jobs program to a modern, professional, expeditionary force. Although there are still issues of corruption,¹¹⁸ they have addressed the often troublesome civil-military relationship. Accession into NATO and the EU has created the impetus for a successful military transformation and greater economic blossoming for the Czech nation. These conclusions demonstrate substantial linkages which indicates that republican security theory is an excellent theory for analysis of the Czech Republic. Maybe one small difference, it's the Philadelphian system masquerading as the Brussels's system.

Throughout this monograph, I have jumped back and forth from the Czech lands to America. In conclusion, it seems fitting to bring the two together and connect a philosophical line from Prague to Philadelphia. Thomas Jefferson claimed that the U.S. Declaration of Independence was not just a gift to the U.S. but a gift to mankind. Deudney has carried the torch to give us the Philadelphia system and republican security theory which helped tie Europe to North America together. Perhaps Thomas *Garrigue*¹¹⁹ Masaryk is the great place to end, for Masaryk said, "*Humanity tends toward Unity, not uniformity*".

¹¹⁷ Christopher D. Jones, *Soviet Influence in Eastern Europe: Political Autonomy and the Warsaw Pact* (Praeger Publishers Inc, 1981), ix.

¹¹⁸<http://www.transparency.cz/hodnoceni-ceske-republiky-indexu-vnimani-korupce-cpi-2012-od/>, (accessed Mar. 10, 2013).

¹¹⁹ Masaryk loved to sit and discuss everything with his beautiful wife Charlotte Garrigue. He took his wife's name. She was American.

APPENDIX A

	NAME	NUMBER	WHO	WHEN
First	<u>DESERT STORM</u> liberation operations	200	CSLA	1990 – 1991 Kuwait
Second	<u>UNGCI</u> relief operation	320	ACR	1991 – 2003 Iraq
Third	<u>UNPROFOR</u> peacekeeping mission	2,250	CSLA Army	1992 – 1995 Country of the former Yugoslavia
4 th	<u>UNCRO</u> Peacekeeping mission	750	ACR	3/1995 – 1/1996 Croatia – Landscape
5 th	<u>UNTAES</u> Mission – field hospital	100	ACR	1/1996 – 1/1998 Croatia – Def.Slavonia
6 th	<u>IFOR , SFOR SFOR II</u> Peacekeeping Operations	6,300	ACR	1996 – 12/2001 , Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia
7 th	<u>AFOR</u> 6th field hospital	100	ACR	1999 + Albania Turkey (earthquake)
8 th	<u>KFOR</u> peacekeeping operations	3,070	ACR	1999 – 2/2002 Kosovo
9 th	<u>ESSENTIAL HARVEST (TFH)</u> Peace Operations	120	ACR	8 – 10/2001 Macedonia
10 th	<u>KFOR</u> Czech–Slovak battalion	2,400	ACR	2/2002 – 7/2005 Kosovo
11 th	<u>KFOR</u> Brigade and Task Force Center	3,070	ACR	from the 2005 Kosovo
12 th	<u>SFOR</u> Command + civilian cooperation	42	ACR	2002 – 12/2004 Bosnia and Herzegovina

	NAME	NUMBER	WHO	WHEN
13 th	<u>ENDURING FREEDOM</u> Counterterrorism Operations	612	ACR	3/2002 – 6/2003 Kuwait
14 th	<u>ISAF</u> peacekeeping operations – (6th and 11th Field Hospital)	269	ACR	4/2002 – 1/2003 Afghanistan
15 th	ISAF Field Surgical Team	11	ACR	1/2003 – 4/2003 Afghanistan
16 th	IZ SFOR contingent 7th field hospital	526	ACR	4/2003 – 12/2003 Iraq, Basra
17 th	<u>IZ SFOR (MNF – I)</u> A contingent of Military Police	1,273	ACR	12/2003 – 12/2006 Iraq, Shaibah
18 th	<u>CONCORDIA</u> EU Operation	2	ACR	4/2003 – 12/2003 Macedonia
19 th	<u>ISAF EOD + weather</u> Kabul Airport	350	ACR	from 3/2004 – 3/2007 Afghanistan
20 th	ENDURING FREEDOM – 2004 six hundred and first SFG	120	ACR	3 – 8/2004 Afghanistan
21 st	<u>WINTER RACE</u> NATO humanitarian operation in Pakistan	29	ACR	Pakistan
22 nd	<u>ENDURING FREEDOM – 2006</u> NATO operation in Afghanistan	120	ACR	Afghanistan
23 rd	<u>ALTHEA</u> EU operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina	400	ACR	Bosnia and Herzegovina 2.12.2004–26.6.2008
24 th	<u>MNF I</u> Multinational Coalition Operations Forces – Iraq	423	ACR	–12/2008 Iraq

	NAME	NUMBER	WHO	WHEN
25th	<u>KAIA – ISAF</u> Field Hospital at Kabul International Airport KAIA	658	ACR	4/2007–12/2008 Afghanistan
26th	<u>NATO Training Mission in Iraq – NTM – I</u>	4	ACR	finished 28th Second 2,009
26th	<u>ISAF Uruzgan</u> Protection and defense perimeter Dutch base Camp Hadrian	200	ACR	finished 20th Third 2,009
27th	<u>EU operation "EUFOR" Chad</u> (Http://consilium.europa.eu)	2	ACR	finished 15th Third 2,009
28th	<u>AIR BALTIC Policing 2009</u> Lithuania	2 x 75	ACR	completed the first 9th 2,009
29th	<u>ENDURING FREEDOM – 2008–2009</u> Afghanistan	3 x 100	ACR	2008 – 2009
30th	<u>Helicopter unit HELI UNIT ISAF</u> Afghanistan	7 x 100	ACR	2009 – 2011
31st	<u>Task forces six hundred and first SFG in ISAF</u> Afghanistan, Nangarhar	2 x 100	Six hundred and first SFG	6/2011 – 6/2012
32nd	<u>AIR BALTIC Policing 2012</u> Lithuania	2 x 64	ACR	finished fourth First 2,013

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources:

- Baker, Peter, and Dan Bilefsky. "Russia and U.S. Sign Nuclear Arms Reduction Pact." *The New York Times*, April 8, 2010, sec. World / Europe.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/09/world/europe/09prexy.html>. (accessed Feb. 5, 2013).
- Czech Slovak Protective Society. "Orgán Bratrstva Brotherhood Organ," 18.
<http://catalog.hathitrust.org/api/volumes/oclc/12780131.html>. (accessed Feb. 01, 2013).
- Deudney, Daniel H. *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village*. Princeton University Press, 2008.
- "F-35 Lightning: The Joint Strike Fighter Program, 2012 – 2013." *Defense Industry Daily*. Accessed March 13, 2013. <https://www.defenseindustrydaily.com/f-35-lightning-the-joint-strike-fighter-program-2012-07501/>. (accessed Mar. 13, 2013).
- "Jiri Dienstbier: A Czech's Career." *The Economist*, January 13, 2011.
<http://www.economist.com/node/17911256>. (accessed Jan. 13, 2013).
- Masaryk, T. G, and Henry Wickham Steed. *The Making of a State; Memories and Observations, 1914-1918*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1927.
- Meier, Oliver. "Germany Pushes for Changes in NATO's Nuclear Posture." *Arms Control Now: The Blog of the Arms Control Association*.
<http://armscontrolnow.org/2012/03/14/germany-pushes-for-changes-in-natos-nuclear-posture/>. (accessed Jun. 01, 2012).
- "NUKEMAP." *Restricted Data*. <http://nuclearsecrecy.com/nukemap/>. (accessed Feb. 18, 2013).
- Powers, Charles T. "Czechs Keep Chins Up as Soviets Leave: Pullout: Men Are Shorn of Beards They Began Growing 23 Years Ago to Protest the Invasion." *Los Angeles Times*, June 25, 1991. http://articles.latimes.com/1991-06-25/news/mn-1335_1_soviet-union. (accessed Jan. 12, 2013).
- Schwarz. "Iraq War Splits NATO." *World Socialist Web Site*, February 13, 2003.
<http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2003/02/nato-f13.html>. (accessed Feb. 15, 2013).
- Shultz, George P., William J. Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn. "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons." *The Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2007. http://disarmament.nrpa.no/wp-content/uploads/2008/02/A_WORLD_FREE.pdf. (accessed Feb. 18, 2013).

Secondary Sources:

- Bazant, Jan, Nina Bazantová, and Frances Starn. *The Czech Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Bacevich, Andrew J. *Washington Rules: America's Path to Permanent War*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2010.
- Beinart, Peter. "The Beautiful Lie Of American Omnipotence." *National Journal* (2010).
- Born, Hans, Bates Gill, and Heiner Hänggi, eds. *Governing the Bomb: Civilian Control and Democratic Accountability of Nuclear Weapons*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2010.
- Darity, William A., ed. "Realism, Political." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 7:96–97. 2nd ed. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2008.
- Felak, James Ramon. *At the Price of the Republic: Hlinka's Slovak People's Party, 1929-1938*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1994.
- Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Hendrickson, David C. *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding (American Political Thought)*. University Press of Kansas, 2006.
- Heymann, Frederick Gotthold. *George of Bohemia, King of Heretics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Ikenberry, G. John. *Liberal Leviathan: the origins, crisis, and transformation of the American world order*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Johnson, Lonnie. *Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbors, Friends*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Jones, Christopher D. *Soviet Influence in Eastern Europe: Political Autonomy and the Warsaw Pact*. Praeger Publishers Inc, 1981.
- Kupchan, Charles. *How Enemies Become Friends: the Sources of Stable Peace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- McNeill, William H. *The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force, and Society since A.D. 1000*. ACLS Humanities E-Book Project, 2009.
- Michta, Andrew A. *East Central Europe after the Warsaw Pact: Security Dilemmas in the 1990s*. Greenwood Press, 1992.

- Musil, Jirí, and Central European University. *The End of Czechoslovakia*. Budapest; New York; New York: Central European University Press; Distributed in the U.S. by Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Odom, William E. *The Collapse of the Soviet military*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Paldy, Les. "Weapons of Mass Destruction." In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Terrorism*, edited by Gus Martin, 623–625. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Reference, 2011.
- Reed, Thomas C, and Danny B Stillman. *The Nuclear Express: a Political History of the Bomb and its Proliferation*. Minneapolis: Zenith Press, 2009.
- Sedláček, Tomáš. *Economics of Good and Evil: the Quest for Economic Meaning from Gilgamesh to Wall Street*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Shepherd, Robin H. E. *Czechoslovakia: the Velvet Revolution and Beyond*. Houndsmills; New York: Macmillan Press; St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Stehlik, Eduard. *The Heart of the Army*. Ministry of Defense of the Czech Republic, 2009. *The Czech Republic and Its Professional Armed Forces*. First English Edition. Ministry of Defense of the Czech Republic, 2006.
- Yost, David S. *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998.
- Zenkl, Petr. *T. G. Masaryk and the Idea of European and World Federation*. Chicago: Distributed by Czechoslovak National Council of America, 1955.