Stephen Van Evera
July 2001
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

CHAPTER 2: MILITARISM

H6. War is more likely when professional militaries have large influence on national security policy and on civilian perceptions of foreign affairs.

I. MILITARIES AND WAR

This chapter argues that professional militaries foster policies and misperceptions that raise the risk of war. The classic anti-military argument that "militaries live by war, hence they prefer war, hence they start wars" is wrong. However, militaries do cause war as an unwanted side-effect of their efforts to protect their organizational interests. For organizational reasons militaries favor military doctrines and force postures that raise the risk of war; hence war is more likely if militaries shape defense policies, even if they prefer peace. More importantly, militaries also infuse society with organizationally self-serving myths that have the unwanted effect of persuading society that war is expedient. Militaries purvey these myths to persuade society to grant them size, wealth, autonomy, and prestige--not to provoke war. Yet these myths also support arguments for war; hence societies infused with military propaganda will be warlike, even if their militaries prefer peace.

Thus militaries are both unwarlike and war-causing. They have no innate preference for war, but they create conditions for war by the policies they back and the ideas they purvey.

In this view militaries are governed by the laws of organizational survival. Like all organizations they must sell themselves to their environment if they hope to endure and prosper. They cause war because they have large influence on national security policies and perceptions, and because their organizational interests are served if civilians adopt policies and perceptions that harm peace. War is not their goal, but it is their result.

Militaries purvey eight principal war-causing misperceptions. They exaggerate other states' hostility, painting a world of hostile adversaries and unreliable allies. They exaggerate the tendency of states to bandwagon with threatening powers and underestimate states' tendency to balance against threats; hence they underestimate the self-defeating nature of belligerent policies. They portray a world of easy conquest, understating the obstacles to aggression; hence they exaggerate the insecurity of their own state and the feasibility of gaining security by aggressive action. They exaggerate the size of first-move advantages and windows of opportunity and vulnerability; hence they

exaggerate the benefits of starting preemptive or preventive wars. They exaggerate the benefits of conquest--the strategic and economic value of empire--while underestimating the problems that come with victory. They underestimate the economic, political, and psychological costs of war. In peacetime they tend toward pessimism about the likely results of possible future wars, but in wartime they tend toward false optimism, leading them to favor prolonging lost or stalemated wars.

These ideas all exaggerate the importance or usefulness of military force. Militaries produce force; hence their organizational sales pitch stresses the need for force, the utility of force, the cheapness of force, and the benefits of using force. It exaggerates both the number of problems that only military force can solve, and the ability of force to solve them. It also understates the costs and risks of using force.

Militaries seek to persuade civilians to buy force, not to use it. But selling force to civilians requires persuading them that they can use force, or might need to use it. This creates a climate for civilians to decide that they can or must use it. As a result, states come to believe that incentives to fight are larger than in fact they are.

Militaries cause war in three ways. Most importantly, the military's message can persuade civilians that war or war-risking policies are expedient, leading the civilians to risk or launch war. Wilhelmine Germany illustrates this scenario. Secondly, a military can come to believe its own arguments after hearing them repeated to civilians, persuading itself to advocate war.[1] This is the "blowback" scenario: the military's arguments blow back into the organization, making it victim of its own propaganda. Wilhelmine Germany and imperial Japan both illustrate.[2] Thirdly, militaries can persuade their governments to adopt offensive and preemptive military doctrines and force postures. Militaries prefer such doctrines and postures but they raise the risk of war. The continental European powers before 1914 illustrate; the Soviet

---

[1] In this scenario the military becomes a war lobby, but only after imbibing its own myths. Since myths are the taproot cause at work, not an innate military interest in war, this scenario does not fit the classical anti-military argument, outlined below, which posits a military interest in war.

[2] Another path to war is also possible: militaries might infuse a younger generation with militarist myths, leading it to start wars after it assumes power in later years. Nazi Germany illustrates if we believe that Wilhelmine-era militarist propaganda shaped the thinking of Nazi leaders and their supporters.

military also illustrates.[3]

Hence undue military influence causes both dangerous perceptions and dangerous policies, although the perception dangers seem the larger of the two types.

What states are prone to militarism?[4] States whose militaries live apart from society as a separate culture are more prone, since mutual isolation fosters sour civil-military relations that animate militaries to purvey militarism. States that grant their militaries broad autonomy are more prone, since autonomous militaries are more likely to develop separate cultures. Societies that are unimbued with the dangers of militarism are more prone, since knowledge of the danger can inoculate both military and civilian against it. Societies with norms and legal barriers that proscribe military involvement in politics are less prone to militarism. Democracies are less prone to militarism because militarist myths can be challenged and weeded out in a democracy's free marketplace of ideas. Great powers and isolated powers are more prone, since the militaries of lesser powers and powers with strong allies gain less by purveying militarist myths. States that face large security threats are more prone to militarism, since they will have larger, more prestigious militaries that are better able to dominate the civilian sphere. States whose civilian publics are ignorant of military affairs are more prone to militarism because their civilians more quickly accept militarist myths.

Virulent militarism is rare because these conditions are rare. Many societies have been touched by low-grade militarism, including pre-1914 Austria-Hungary, Russia, Turkey, Serbia, and France; and interwar Hungary. Other possible cases include interwar Poland; modern South Africa,

---

[3] I outline the dangers of such doctrines and postures in Stephen Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), chapters 3 and 6.

[4] I use "militarism" to denote situations where militaries play a large role in shaping civilian ideas about security policy, and use this role to imbue society with ideas that emphasize the necessity and utility of military force. This combines common usages, which denote ideas that glorify the utility of force, or the predominance of the military in politics or public mind. On definitions of militarism see Volker R. Berghahn, Militarism: The History of An International Debate, 1861-1979 (New York: St. Martin's, 1982): 2-3. Surveying writings on militarism is ibid. A review of other issues in civil-military relations is Peter Feaver, "Civil-Military Relations," in Nelson W. Polsby, ed., Annual Review of Political Science, vol. 2, 1999 (Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, 1999): 211-242.

Chile, Brazil, Argentina, and Pakistan; and Paraguay in the 1860s. The United States arguably suffered mildly from militarism in the early Cold War. But only Wilhelmine Germany and imperial Japan have suffered full-blown cases of militarism.

Hence militarism theory explains only a few cases. It cannot explain most wars through the ages. It says little about warfare before the industrial revolution, since professional militaries with distinct organizational interests only appeared when the industrial age arrived, bringing a far sharper division of labor. And it says little about the many modern conflicts involving states that suffer little or no militarism.

But the theory explains a great deal about the behavior of Wilhelmine Germany and imperial Japan, so it says a great deal about the origins of World War I and the Pacific half of World War II. Thus the theory has good explanatory power. It covers few cases but it explains a lot about those cases. Two of these cases--the world wars--are of great historical importance. If militarism theory holds water it also holds the key to these wars and thus to much recent history.

An older anti-military argument has claimed that militaries favor war because war serves their organizational interests. In this view militaries have an innate preference for war even without ingesting their own propaganda; hence they often lobby for war. For example, Alexis de Tocqueville argued in 1835 that militaries want war because war satisfies their organizational impulse to grow. Officers seek promotions, he said; promotions come when the military grows; the military grows when wars occur; hence military officers favor war.[5] Joseph Schumpeter similarly argued in a much-read 1919 essay that professional militaries favor war because warfare justifies their existence and supports their budgets.[6] Warfare was made largely obsolete by the coming of capitalism, he claimed, and only self-serving pressure for war by professional militaries kept war going. "Created by wars that required it, the [military] machine now created the wars it required."[7] And in 1934 Ascher Henkin echoed Schumpeter,

---

[5] Alexis de Tocqueville, "On War, Society, and the Military," in Leon Bramson and George W. Goethals, eds., War: Studies from Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, rev. ed. (New York: Basic Books, 1968): 329-344 at 331-332.

[6] Joseph Schumpeter, Imperialism and Social Classes (New York: New American Library, 1974): 23-54.

[7] Schumpeter, Imperialism: 25. Schumpeter also claimed that militaries have warlike instincts and habits that remain from a precapitalist age when war served more purpose. Ibid.: 24, 33, 38, 64-65.

noting that enduring peace would make militaries useless and claiming that this triggered a "clamor for war on the part of the military man."[8]

This classical anti-military argument was sometimes heard before 1914 (*vis* Tocqueville), but it flourished especially after World War I because many postwar observers saw that Europe's militaries had a role of some kind in causing the war. The classical anti-military argument seemed to explain this role so it won wide support.

Yet it fails on two points. First, there is no evidence that militaries profit as organizations from war or believe they profit from war. More typical is the Russian Czarist officer who complained that war "spoils the armies," and the U.S. naval officers who thought the U.S. Civil War "ruined the navy."[9] The motive that the classical argument posits is absent.

Second, there is no clear evidence that militaries in most countries are more hawkish than civilians. No worldwide survey of military input to decisions for war has been done, so we cannot be sure on this point. But my back-of-the-envelope accounting suggests that modern militaries are not the consistent hawks that the classical anti-military view suggests. Militaries have been somewhat more hawkish than civilians,[10] but this greater hawkishness seems explained by

---

[8] Ascher Henkin, Must We Have War? An Inquiry into the Causes of War and the Methods of its Prevention (Boston: Bruce Humphries Inc., 1934): 25, 103. David Gibbs recently restated this view, arguing that warfare "justifies the continued existence of the military" and so "creates a bureaucratic pressure for conflict and even war." David N. Gibbs, "The Military-Industrial Complex, Sectoral Conflict, and the Study of U.S. Foreign Policy," in Ronald W. Cox, ed., Business and the State in International Relations (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996): 41-56 at 46. Bernard Brodie has framed a related argument, suggesting that militaries are biased toward using force because force-prone people self-select into military careers, and because the training and promotion of military officers stresses martial virtues. Bernard Brodie, War and Politics (New York: Macmillan, 1973): 479-81, 486-7, 490-93.

[9] Samuel P. Huntington, The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957): 69.

[10] Samuel Huntington oppositely claims that militaries have been more dovish than civilians. Huntington, Soldier and the State: 68-70, 113-124. Neither of us rest our claim on a complete survey of military inputs to national decision-making, and such a survey would be useful.

cases where militaries in militarized states imbibed and acted on their own propaganda--that is, by cases of blowback. These cases include Wilhelmine Germany, Austria-Hungary, Serbia, Russia, Turkey and perhaps France before 1914; and imperial Japan before 1941.[11] In all these cases the military pressed

[11] Specifically, Prussian and German officers pushed Bismarck almost continually for preventive wars during his tenure as Chancellor (1862-1890). Jack Snyder, The Ideology of the Offensive: Military Decision Making and the Disasters of 1914 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984): 122. After Bismarck's ouster German officers pushed German civilians for war in 1905, 1909, 1912, and finally with success in 1914. Richard Ned Lebow, "Windows of Opportunity: Do States Jump Through Them?" International Security, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Summer 1984): 147-186 at 160. From 1906 to 1914 Austrian officers steadily pressed for war against Serbia and perhaps Italy. Samuel R. Williamson, Jr., Austria-Hungary and the Origins of the First World War (New York: St. Martin's, 1991): 131, 133, 137, 152, 155, 208; Gerhard Ritter, The Sword and the Scepter: The Problem of Militarism in Germany, 4 vols. (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1969-1973): 2:227-239; and Norman Stone, "Austria-Hungary," in Ernest R. May, ed., Knowing One's Enemies: Intelligence Assessment Before the Two World Wars (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986): 37-61 at 39. Russian officers pushed Russian civilians for war in 1912 and 1914. On 1912 see Ernest R. May, "Cabinet, Tsar, Kaiser: Three Approaches to Assessment," in May, Knowing One's Enemies: 11-36 at 20. On 1914 see, e.g., Bernadotte E. Schmitt, The Coming of the War, 1914, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930), 2:31n: the American charge in Moscow reported the Russian army "clamoring for war" in the midst of the 1914 July crisis. French officers viewed war with favor before 1914, one declaring that "it will be a beautiful war that will deliver all the captives of Germanism." L.C.F. Turner, Origins of the First World War (London: Edward Arnold, 1970): 53, quoting *La France Militaire*. The insubordinate head of Serbian military intelligence, Col. Dragutin Dimitrevi , helped organize the June 1914 assassination of Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand, triggering a war that Dimitrevi believed inevitable and desirable. James Joll, The Origins of the First World War (London: Longman, 1984): 72-75. The Panturkist officer Enver Pasha led the Ottoman empire into World War I with dreams of uniting the whole Turkish east under Ottoman rule. Efraim Karsch and Inari Karsch, Empires of the Sand: The Struggle for Mastery in the Middle East, 1789-1923 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999): 105-112. Japanese officers pushed civilians for war against China in 1894, against Russia in 1904, against China in the 1930s, and against the United States in the 1940s. Huntington, Soldier and the State: 130;

civilians for war, but in all the military was unusually active in shaping civilian perceptions and may well have imbibed its own message. If so, these cases offer no evidence of an innate military preference for war; instead they only show that militaries can taint their own perceptions. Hence these cases should be set aside. And if they are, the greater hawkishness of militaries disappears. The remaining cases show civilians and militaries thinking in similar ways about decisions for war. Some cases show militaries pressing civilians for war, as in Israel before the 1956 and 1967 wars, and in Egypt and Jordan before 1967.[12] But these are balanced by cases where military leaders sought to restrain more hawkish civilians, as in Nazi Germany, Mussolini's Italy, and interwar Finland.[13] And the U.S. military has been no more hawkish than U.S. civilians in the years since World War II.[14]

---

and on 1904, Ian Nish, The Origins of the Russo-Japanese War (London: Longman, 1985): 193-94; also 11, 156, 176.

[12] The Israeli military was markedly more hawkish than Israeli civilians before the 1956 and 1967 wars. Donald Neff, Warriors for Jerusalem: The Six Days That Changed the Middle East (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984): 183; Michael Handel, Israel's Political-Military Doctrine (Cambridge: Harvard University, Center for International Affairs, Occasional Papers No. 30, 1973): 28, 32; and Walter Laqueur, The Road to War 1967 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968): 124, 126, 141. The Egyptian and Jordanian militaries likewise pressed reluctant civilians for war in 1967. Laqueur, Road to War: 101; Neff, Warriors for Jerusalem : 139; and David Kimche and Dan Bawley, The Six-Day War (New York: Stein & Day, 1971): 105, 111.

[13] The German military was strikingly more dovish than Germany's Nazi civilian leaders during the run-up to World War II. Robert J. O'Neill, The German Army and the Nazi Party, 1933-1939 (New York: James H. Heineman, 1966): 134-35, 156-59, 162-63; and Huntington, Soldier and the State, pp. 114-116. Finland's Marshall Mannerheim struggled to pull Finnish civilians back from war in 1939. William H. Trotter, A Frozen Hell: The Russo-Finnish Winter War of 1939-1940 (Chapel Hill, NC: Algonquin, 1991): 20-21. Italy's Chief of the General Staff, General Badoglio, fruitlessly advised Mussolini against war in 1940. P.M.H. Bell, The Origins of the Second World War in Europe (London: Longman, 1986): 187. And the Soviet military leadership opposed the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. Greg Cashman, What Causes War? An Introduction to Theories of International Conflict (New York: Lexington Books, 1993): 96.

[14] On the period 1945-1972 see Richard K. Betts, Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises (Cambridge: Harvard University

Overall, no clear pattern of innate military hawkishness emerges.

This evidence refutes the specific causal claims of the classical argument. But the classical argument's general claim--that militaries deserve large blame for causing several major modern wars--is correct. Militaries cause war not because war serves their interests, but because the postures and doctrines they favor and the ideas they purvey raise the risk of war.

In sum, then, militarism theory identifies three paths to war: militaries can persuade civilians to favor war; they can persuade themselves to favor war; and they can favor military force postures and doctrines that cause war. A fourth path, in which militaries outright favor war without any self-persuasion, is often alleged but seems invalid.

The theory of militarism suggests a general theory of war and imperialism. This theory turns Schumpeter on his head. Schumpeter argued that capitalism is peaceful; war and imperialism are sustained under capitalism by militaries that survive as anachronisms from former times. But organization theory suggests that militarism is a new problem that arrived with capitalism.[15] Capitalism created industrialism (goes the argument); industrialism created the division of labor; and the division of labor created specialized bureaucratic organizations, including specialized professional militaries and attending dangers that arise from their relations to civilian society. Schumpeter suggests that capitalism and industrialism cure militarism, but organization theory suggests they create it.

In this view the risk of militarism is inherent in industrial societies. Industrialism inexorably creates the division of labor that creates the danger of militarism.

Can militarism be prevented? I argue that militarism is very dangerous if allowed to flourish, yet easy to control. Modest measures to remove the conditions that it requires can prevent its return. These conditions have already abated sharply since the early twentieth century, creating a world largely free of even low-grade great power militarism. A small amount of preventive action can sustain this situation. But vigilance is necessary because the root causes of militarism--industrialism and the division of labor--are

---

Press, 1977): 4, 215-219. And if anything, U.S. military advice has grown more dovish relative to civilian thinking since 1972.

[15] As Alfred Vagts noted, the "separation of the toga and the sword" is "part and parcel of the inevitable process of division and specialization of labor." Alfred Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: The Soldier and the Conduct of Foreign Relations (New York: King's Crown Press, 1956): 470.

permanent facts of life.

The next section outlines reasons why militaries often have disproportionate influence over civilian ideas and policies. The following sections outline the effects of military influence, test militarism theory with two brief case studies, and suggest ways to control militarism.

II. WHY MILITARIES AFFECT NATIONAL PERCEPTIONS AND POLICIES

National perceptions of foreign affairs are shaped by government agencies, most of all by the military. Government agencies can dominate national perceptions because they supply officials and the public with most of their information on world affairs. Often there is no competing source to provide a different view. Militaries are the most influential official agencies because they have the greatest will and ability to shape national ideas.

All government organizations supply, withhold or distort information to further their parochial interests and perspectives.[16] As a result, top government leaders often find themselves at the mercy of selective and biased information provided by subordinate agencies. Lacking objective anaysis on which to rely, leaders are often duped by the biased information they receive.[17] Thus President John Kennedy once told aides that he "could not believe a word the military was telling him, that he had to read the newspapers to find out what was going on" in Vietnam.[18] Likewise Francis Rourke notes "the striking illustrations of situations in which staff members of [U.S. government] executive agencies have substantially reshaped the views of political leaders in both Congress and the executive."[19]

Official agencies can also shape public opinion, by shaping press coverage in their issue area. This is

---

[16] As Alexander George observes, "each [bureaucratic] unit tends to produce 'partisan analysis' of the issues and seeks to discredit by fair means or foul the analysis produced by its rivals." Alexander L. George, Presidential Decisionmaking in Foreign Policy: The Effective Use of Information and Advice (Boulder: Westview, 1980): 112.

[17] Concurring on the United States is George, Presidential Decisionmaking: 112.

[18] David Halberstam's paraphrase of Kennedy; from David Halberstam, The Best and the Brightest (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Crest, 1973): 345. For more examples from the Indochina War, see ibid.: 221-3, 247-55, 303-10, 314-17, 327, 338-45, 374-5, 426, 492-92, 509-10, 609, 616, 660-61, 705.

[19] Francis E. Rourke, Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972): 23.

accomplished by flooding the press with selective information that supports the agency viewpoint, and by using rewards and punishments to induce the press to write favorable stories. Journalists who reflect the official view are graced with inside information; those who deviate are disciplined by exclusion from information.[20]

Bureaucratic manipulation of information is especially pronounced in the areas of foreign and defense policy.[21] Government agencies that deal with domestic issues often have no special information advantage over private organizations, since private groups often have access to abundant information from non-government sources. But on foreign and defense issues government agencies control most--often nearly all--relevant information.[22] Even in the United States, most press coverage on foreign policy and military matters originates from official agencies. Studies from the 1970s showed that three-quarters of news stories by Pentagon and State Department reporters originated from government sources, not from enterprise reporting.[23] Official foreign policy and military agencies not only make policy; they also serve as the

---

[20] Concurring is Rourke, Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: 34. Also stressing the capacity of government to influence news coverage in the United States is Leon V. Sigal, Reporters and Officials (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1973). For more on official influence of news coverage see titles noted in Herbert J. Gans, Deciding What's News (New York: Vintage, 1980), especially p. 357 note 18.

[21] Concurring is Francis Rourke, Secrecy and Publicity (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972): vii; and Rourke, Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: 32-33.

[22] Rourke observes:

> In most areas of domestic policy it is not hard to find private organizations which control as much if not more information than the government. In foreign affairs, on the other hand, there are many issues on which the bureaucratic apparatus stands virtually alone as a source of intelligence. By withholding certain kinds of data over which they have control, or on occasion by manufacturing and distributing false information, executive agencies can in fact lead the public to form wholly erroneous impressions of events taking place outside the United States. Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: 32-33.

[23] Juergen Arthur Heise, Minimum Disclosure: How the Pentagon Manipulates the News (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979): 174, quoting studies by Brit Hume and Mark McIntyre, and Leon Sigal.

national "eyes" through which the state and society see the world. This gives them large influence over the national mind.

Among government agencies, the military has far the largest impact on public opinion about foreign and defense matters in most countries.[24] Militaries have far more resources for public relations than do other agencies concerned with foreign affairs. This gives them a dominant role in defining the facts that shape official and public views. As a result, as S.E. Finer notes, "deference to the military in the fields of foreign policy and even domestic politics is a commonplace."[25]

The notion that militaries strongly influence national perceptions is wholly consistent with scholarship on large organizations. Indeed, it would contradict most organization theory if things were otherwise. As I argue below, their organizational character and situation gives militaries strong reason to intervene in their political environment. Their organizational capabilities make them unusually able to affect national perceptions. In most societies they are proscribed from direct political action, such as forming or supporting political parties, so persuasion is their only available political weapon. As a result militaries are strongly predisposed to tell their story, and they are well-equipped to get their point across.

A. Political Will: Why Militaries Care.[26] Four factors most influence the energy with which foreign policy agencies state their case in the public arena. On each dimension the military has an extra incentive to speak with a loud voice. First, the organization speaks louder the more its members depend on the organization for successful careers. If members of the organization could not find similar work elsewhere they have more incentive to help their organization flourish and grow. The contrast is between a profession--a group that

---

[24] Concurring on the United States is Rourke, Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: 28-9. See also ibid.: 18-40 passim.

[25] S.E. Finer, The Man on Horseback: The Role of the Military in Politics, 2d ed. enl. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976): 66.

[26] May 18, 2000: In making the 9 points below, instead of first framing the theory and then matching the military situation to it, just state these nine arguments directly. "Military officers have only one buyer for their services. This heightens their concern for the health of that buyer ... Military officers have very competetive career paths ... Militaries face strong pressures to innovate ... Militaries have an unusually large number of domestic political enemies..." I think that works.

sells its skills to many buyers (e.g., doctors or lawyers)--and an establishment, whose members have only one buyer for their skills (e.g., the military). Organizations composed of members of a profession have a weaker growth impulse than do establishments, because members of a profession can find work even if their organization falls on hard times, while members of an establishment starve or prosper with their organization.

The military is an establishment, not a profession, so the careers of its members depend on its political health.[27] As a result its members' welfare is more dependent on the welfare of the organization. Government lawyers can also work for private law firms; but many members of the military have only one potential employer, because the work of their organization is sharply specialized. Moreover, if they can work elsewhere, it is often in defense industries that supply the military and depend for their business on a well-funded military. Thus members of the military promote and protect it partly because their own welfare depends on the welfare of the organization.

Second, the organization has more impulse to grow if its members face more competitive career paths. The members of an organization that promotes its people rapidly and seldom fires them can enjoy job security and career advancement even if the organization fails to grow. But if promotions are scarce and firings are common the members of the organization benefit more from organizational growth, since many will not be retained or promoted without it. Growth creates more high-level jobs; these may be filled by employees who would otherwise be dropped. Organizational growth and personal survival are more closely intertwined.

Military careers are very competitive in most countries. Unlike other government workers, most military officers face retirement in mid-life, since few are promoted to top command positions. This harsh system fuels a strong growth impulse by closely tying the career prospects of military officers to the growth of the military itself. For military officers organizational growth can mean career salvation.

The establishmentarian character of militaries and the competitive structure of military careers give militaries an exceptionally powerful organizational impulse to grow, and lead militaries to strongly advocate policies and purvey perceptions that fuel military organizational expansion. They always want larger budgets: a 1971 study found that the U.S. military had requested 25 to 35 percent more than the budget

---

[27] As Finer notes, the military are sharply functionally specialized: "designed, indoctrinated and trained to perform a special task, quite different from that of the rest of the community." Finer, Man on Horseback: 41.

deemed adequate by the President and Congress in every year since World War II.[28] The study authors, Alain Enthoven and Wayne Smith, note "a sort of Parkinson's law of military requirements: they will always expand to use up the supply estimated to be available."[29] One high-ranking U.S. officer confessed to them: "I'll ask for all I think I can get."[30] In retirement Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev likewise complained that Soviet officers often refused reasonable budget limits, concluding that soldiers "always want a bigger and stronger army."[31] Such budget-seeking can sometimes dominate all else in the minds of officers. Thus Japan's Admiral Suetsugu Nobumasa declared in 1934 that for Japan's navy even war with the United States was acceptable "if it will get us a budget."[32]

Each service also endorses policies that favors its own growth against the other services. In the 1930s the U.S. Navy favored a forward strategy in East Asia that required large naval forces, while the U.S. Army favored a continental defense strategy that required large ground forces.[33] In the

---

[28] Alain C. Enthoven and K. Wayne Smith, How Much Is Enough? Shaping the Defense Program, 1961-1969 (New York: Harper & Row, 1971): 201.

[29] How Much Is Enough?: 201. Enthoven and Smith explain:

> The military experts--the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in particular--are regularly subjected to massive institutional pressures for setting ever higher requirements. They have thousands of officers working for them whose very careers are bound up in getting more forces (and whose promotional possibilities vary directly with the expansion or contraction of their parent Service). These are men who have devoted their lives to military service and have associated mainly with other military officers. They are not intimately acquainted with the other needs of society or in a good position to balance them against military needs. Ibid.: 202.

[30] Enthoven and Smith, How Much Is Enough?: 201.

[31] Nikita Khrushchev, Khrushchev Remembers: The Last Testament, Foreword by Edward Crankshaw, trans. and ed. Strobe Talbott (New York: Bantam, 1974): 617, see also 14n, 262.

[32] Michael A. Barnhardt, Japan Prepares for Total War: The Search for Economic Security, 1919-1941 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987): 39.

[33] Michael S. Sherry, Preparing for the Next War: American Plans for Postwar Defense, 1941-45 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977): 29.

1950s the U.S. Air Force favored a counterforce nuclear strategy that required large strategic nuclear forces, while the U.S. Army and Navy accepted a minimum deterrence strategy that required far smaller strategic forces.[34] In that period the U.S. Army also looked toward nuclear disarmament, which would have expanded its importance relative to the Air Force.[35] In general the Cold War Army was less receptive than the other services to proposals to limit ballistic missile defense systems or reduce tactical nuclear weapon stockpiles (which were army systems), and more receptive to limits on offensive strategic nuclear forces (which were Air Force and Navy systems).[36] The Army was also the most receptive service to evidence showing the limits of bombing.[37] The Air Force was more hostile than other services to strategic arms limitations.[38] In the late 1950s Air Force intelligence thought the "missile gap," which justified Air Force budget claims, was larger than Army and Navy intelligence.[39] Within the Air Force, Tactical Air Command officers were more interested in graduated deterrence ideas, which called for large tactical air forces, than Strategic Air Command (SAC) officers.[40] In each case the organization chose views that best justified its own size and wealth.

Elsewhere the same interservice battle-lines dominate defense debates. Before World War I Germany's navy chief, Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, relentlessly sought huge sums to build a large battle fleet, which he claimed could prevent British intervention against Germany in a future continental war. Oppositely, Chief of the General Staff General Alfred von Schlieffen, author of Germany's plan for war in 1914, made no plans even to use the German navy in such a war.[41] In

---

[34] Edgar M. Bottome, The Balance of Terror: A Guide to the Arms Race (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971): 59.

[35] Betts, Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises: 111.

[36] Betts, Soldiers, Statesment, and Cold War Crises: 111-112.

[37] Betts, Soldiers, Statesment, and Cold War Crises: 204.

[38] Betts, Soldiers, Statesment, and Cold War Crises: 112.

[39] Bottome, Balance of Terror: 53.

[40] Betts, Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises: 128.

[41] Assessing Tirpitz's program is Paul Kennedy, Strategy and Diplomacy 1870-1945 (Aylesbury: Fontana, 1984): 127-160. For Schlieffen's views see Gerhard Ritter, The Schlieffen Plan: Critique of a Myth (London: Oswald Wolff, 1958; reprint ed., Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979): 71-72.

Britain navy chief Admiral John Fisher favored British defense strategies that would best justify the navy budget.[42] Later, in interwar Britain each military service argued for the military doctrine that gave it the biggest budget and the most autonomy.[43] In interwar Japan the army favored a northern confrontation with the Soviet Union while the navy favored a southern advance that risked confrontation with the United States.[44] Thus each service endorsed the foreign policy that best justified its own budget.

Third, the more external demands that are made on an organization to innovate, the greater will be its impulse to dominate its political environment, in order to suppress these demands. Or, to put the proposition differently, the more turbulent the organization's environment--the greater the tendency of the organization's environment to change in ways that demand organizational changes--the stronger the organizational motive to take political action. Organizations normally resist external demands to innovate, because innovation threatens the careers of the members of the organization. Changes in procedures and tasks imply changes in the distribution of power within the organization, and changes in personnel. As a result, those organizations that normally would be most required to innovate will try harder to dominate the political institutions that otherwise would force them to change. By dominating its political environment, the organization can stifle the demand to innovate; or it can

---

[42] Paul M. Kennedy, "Great Britain Before 1914," in May, Knowing One's Enemies: 172-204 at 184; and Avner Offer, The First World War: An Agrarian Interepretation (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991): 287. On service parochalism see also Offer, First World War: 285-299.

[43] Barry R. Posen, The Sources of Military Strategy: France, Britain, and Germany Between the Wars (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984): 159.

[44] Asada Sadao, "The Japanese Navy and the United States," in Dorothy Borg and Shumpei Okamoto with Dale K.A. Finlayson, eds., Pearl Harbor as History: Japanese-American Relations 1931-1941 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1973): 225-259 at 249-51; Fujiwara Akira, "The Role of the Japanese Army," in Borg and Okamoto, Pearl Harbor as History: 189-195 at 190; Barnhardt, Japan Prepares for Total War: 34, 44, 174, 209, 214; Stephen E. Pelz, Race to Pear Harbor: The Failure of the London Naval Conference and the Onset of World War II (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974): 178, 212, 214, 223; and Tsunoda Jun, "The Navy's Role in the Southern Strategy," in James William Morley, ed., The Fateful Choice: Japan's Advance into Southeast Asia, 1939-1941 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980): 241-295 at 252.

shape the demand to the needs of the organization, so that innovation does less organizational damage.

The task environment of the military is unusually turbulent. Military technology and adversary military programs change constantly. International political conditions and national foreign policies also change. This creates ceaseless demands that the military innovate to keep abreast of new developments. The tasks and appropriate instruments of national militaries change more rapidly than those of most organizations, which makes the military's organizational environment exceptionally turbulent, and raises exceptional external demands for innovation.

Moreover, militaries resist innovation even more than most organizations because they are establishments with highly competitive career structures, so their members are more threatened by change. Demands to innovate are resisted even more fiercely when incumbents members of the organization already face precarious careers, and cannot change jobs or employers. Innovation threatens greater-than-average damage to their lives; this helps explain why militaries resist innovation so resolutely.[45]

Thus in the 1930s the R.A.F. strongly resisted civilian demands that it shift resources from bombers to the fighter-interceptors that eventually won the Battle of Britain. Remarkably, as late as May 1940 the Air Staff tried to shut down the production lines building Spitfires and Hurricanes.[46] In most Western countries the military resisted civilian demands to phase out the cavalry many decades after this arm became obsolete.[47] During World War I the British Navy

---

[45] Concurring is L.L. Bernard, who notes that the military officer "nearly always blocks new defense and offense measures and tactical innovations until they are forced upon him by their use by the enemy. ... The officers love their horses and cling to their spurs." L.L. Bernard, War and its Causes (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1944): 113.

[46] Williamson Murray, "British and German Air Doctrine Between the Wars," Air University Review, Vol. 31, No. 3 (March-April 1980): 39-58 at 48.

[47] See Edward Katzenbach, "The Horse Cavalry in the Twentieth Century," in Robert J. Art and Kenneth N. Waltz, eds., The Use of Force: International Politics and Foreign Policy (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971): 277-297. Even in 1926 Britain's General Douglas Haig declared that "aeroplanes and tanks are only accessories to the man and the horse, and I feel sure that as time goes on you will find just as much use for the horse--the well-bred horse--as you have ever done in the past." John Ellis, The Social History of the Machine Gun (New York: Pantheon, 1975): 56.

resisted civilian efforts to institute the convoy system that eventually saved British shipping, and then resisted innovations to meet the growing German submarine threat before World War II.[48] The U.S. Navy resisted efforts to force it to shift resources from battleships to aircraft carriers in the interwar years. Later, U.S. military leaders strongly resisted the shift toward strategic nuclear forces mandated by President Eisenhower's "New Look" strategy.[49] The Soviet military then failed to build an intercontinental strategic nuclear force to counter these powerful U.S. strategic forces, instead pouring resources into expanding their already-large tank armies. This negligence left the Soviet Union with no secure nuclear deterrent for years, and finally compelled Khrushchev to try to restore Soviet nuclear strength by moving medium-range missiles to Cuba in 1962.

This deeply-rooted impulse to resist innovation drives militaries to preserve their institutional autonomy by political action. Autonomy buffers the organization against civilian demands for change. Autonomy also protects the size and wealth of the organization, by denying civilians the knowledge and authority to impose cuts and set limits. Autonomy enhances the organization's monopoly of information, which then strengthens it in other ways.

For these reasons militaries almost obsessively pursue political autonomy and resist outside control.[50] As S.E. Finer notes, "anxiety to preserve its autonomy provides one of the most widespread and powerful of the motives for [military intervention in politics]."[51] This drive for autonomy can lead

---

[48] Harvey A. DeWeerd, "Churchill, Lloyd George, Clemenceau: The Emergence of the Civilian," in Edward Mead Earle, ed., Makers of Modern Strategy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943): 287-305 at 298-98; Dan van der Vat, The Atlantic Campaign: The Great Struggle at Sea 1939-1945 (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1988): 26-40; and John Costello and Terry Hughes, The Battle of the Atlantic (London: Collins, 1977): 31-34.

[49] Stephen E. Ambrose, Eisenhower, 2 vols. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984), 2:225.

[50] Thus British General Sir Henry Wilson opined that the "whole idea of governing the army by a civilian, whose training has been political expediency ... is vicious in theory and hopeless in practice." In 1901, quoted in Alfred Vagts, A History of Militarism: Civilian and Military, rev. ed. (New York: Free Press, 1959): 300.

[51] Finer, Man on Horseback: 41. Alfred Vagts likewise notes "the natural tendency of armies ... toward a self-government brooking no outside influences." Vagts, History of Militarism: 296. CHK99.

militaries to demand that only the military should decide internal military matters, including training, force levels, and weapons procurement. In extremes it has led militaries to demand a role in wider policymaking, to include foreign and economic policy and national education policy, since these domains also affect the armed forces.[52]

The German, Spanish and French armies each interfered in politics before and after World War I less to control national policies *per se* than to defend their own autonomy. Finer notes that before the war the German military's itch for political power stemmed from its "determination to safeguard, to win back, even partly extend its autonomous position in politics and society."[53] After the war the German army collaborated with the Nazis largely to recover its prewar size, status and autonomy.[54] The notorious Dreyfus affair in France had the same origins: the military saw the Dreyfus trial as a test of its right to self-governing autonomy in its own sphere, so it dug in its heels.[55]

The American military strongly resisted the firming of civilian control of military programs during the 1960s. The Chair of the House Armed Services Committee, a friend of the military, called for abolishing the civilian program analysis office in the Pentagon that provides the Secretary of Defense with independent analysis.[56] The memoirs of top U.S. military commanders warned of the dangers of civilian control over national security programs. Former SAC commander Nathan Twining criticized the "ineffectual and detailed control of military operations by political officials."[57] Vice-Admiral Hyman Rickover, father of the nuclear submarine fleet, compared civilian force planners to "spiritualists" and "sociologists," accusing them of "playing God while neglecting the responsibility of being human."[58]

---

[52] Finer, Man on Horseback: 41.

[53] Finer, Man on Horseback: 42.

[54] Finer, Man on Horseback: 44.

[55] Finer, Man on Horseback: 47-48.

[56] Enthoven and Smith, How Much Is Enough?: 4, 79.

[57] General Nathan F. Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966): 168; see also 246, 296.

[58] Quoted in Enthoven and Smith, How Much is Enough?: 78. General Thomas D. White, former U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, wrote in wrote in 1963:

"I am profoundly apprehensive of the pipe-smoking,

Fourth, the number and power of the organization's natural enemies in the national polity affects its impulse to jump into national politics. The stronger its enemies, the more it must intrude in politics in self-defense.

Militaries have more natural enemies than most government agencies. These enemies include pacifists and anti-war religious groups, potential draftees, and taxpayers. Militaries require a heavy sacrifice of money and perhaps time from citizens. This makes them inherently intrusive and obnoxious unless they sell themselves effective. Moreover, dominant Western Liberal values conflict with military values--the violent function of the military, and its stress on hierarchy and restriction of individual freedom for its members--so the military always swims in a hostile social sea, at least in liberal industrial societies. If the military does not keep a hand in politics it can be attacked, as the American military-industrial complex was attacked in the 1930s for its imagined role in causing World War I. This supplies another reason why the military feels it must speak with a strong voice.

To summarize: the establishmentarian character of the military, combined with the competitive nature of military careers, the turbulent nature of the military task-environment, and the natural antagonism of society toward militaries, together cause a strong military impulse toward

---

tree-full-of-owls type of so-called professional "defense intellectuals" who have been brought into this nation's capitol. I don't believe a lot of these often over-confident, sometimes arrogant young professors, mathematicians and other theorists have sufficient worldliness or motivation to stand up to the kind of enemy we face" (Enthoven and Smith, How Much Is Enough?: 78).

U.S. Air Force General Curtis LeMay expressed similar views in 1968:

> "The military profession has been invaded by pundits who set themselves up as popular oracles on military strategy. These "defense intellectuals" go unchallenged simply because the experienced professional active duty officers are officially prohibited from entering into public debate. The end result is that the military is often saddled with unprofessional strategies. ... My quarrel is with those who usurp the military professional's position--those who step in front of him and who volunteer and enforce strictly *military* advice and guidance with little knowledge of or experience in such matters. These are the men who have endangered America" (General Curtis E. LeMay with Major General Dale O. Smith, America Is in Danger [New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968]: viii, 1, emphasis in original).

growth and autonomy. This in turn causes defensive military political intrusion into its environment. In short, militaries are inherently and exceptionally control-resisting and domain-expanding, for reasons rooted in both their organizational character and their political environment. Thus military interference in politics is largely defensive. Because militaries cannot safely coexist with the larger society, they intrude into it to forestall intrusions against themselves.

Military political action focuses on affecting national perceptions because direct military interference in politics is usually considered illegitimate. As S.E. Finer notes, militaries suffer a "lack of moral title to rule,"[59] hence they must defend their interests by persuasion rather than coercion. They must exert political influence by shaping national beliefs, not by directly controlling national policies. They cannot participate openly in politics without raising objections of impropriety, and they cannot claim legitimacy to rule if they seize power by force. Moreover, professional militaries would damage their organizational essence if they assumed administrative responsibility, since war machines and governments are different organizations, so they prefer not to govern directly.[60] Hence the threat of militarism is not the threat of a coup, but of the infusion of society with self-serving militarist beliefs. Militarism is less dangerous to national political institutions than to national perceptions.

Moreover, the military must cloak its political efforts in secrecy--which in turn conceals militarism itself from view. Since military political action is illegitimate, military propagandizing is also illegitimate, so militaries must spread their views covertly. Hence military manipulation of opinion is a self-concealing phenomenon. Its invisibility is a condition for its success. Journalists are cultivated, news stories are planted, friendly civilian strategists are assisted, and quasi-civilian "think tanks" are created to launder military views. As a result militarism is hard to study and tends to be underestimated.[61]

---

[59] Finer, Man on Horseback: 12.

[60] A distinction should be drawn between truly professional militaries that are imbued with a war-fighting ethos, and the police forces that masquerade as national militaries in many Third World states. These police-force militaries are seldom "militaristic" in the manner described in this chapter, while they are prone to seize direct power, since acting as the national government does less damage to their organizational essence.

[61] Thus Alfred Vagts complained that "political scientists have neglected to treat, at length or in depth, the

B. Political Capability: Sources of Military Power. Government organizations can most affect public and elite perceptions if they have five attributes: symbolic appeal, large workforce, organizational superiority, monopoly of information, and large public relations resources. Militaries rate high in all five.

First, organizations with strong symbolic appeal have greater ability to shape public and elite perceptions. Some organizations have far more symbolic appeal than others, because they are identified with patriotism, national pride, or other national values.

Militaries have powerful symbolic appeal. As Finer notes, militaries often acquire "a moral halo which is politically of profound importance," and enjoy "a highly emotional symbolic status."[62] Rourke notes that "the military role exerts a symbolic appeal that is as rare among bureaucratic organizations in the United States as it is in other societies. ... [This appeal] is a quite extraordinary bureaucratic resource--setting the Defense Department apart from all other executive agencies in the country."[63] Militaries are identified by the public with national honor, patriotism, courage, discipline and self-sacrifice by the public, which enhances their prestige and credibility.

Militaries also have more credibility on military matters than civilian experts. Thus McGeorge Bundy, national security advisor to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, complained that the U.S. Congress reflexively defers to military views: "their position is that the generals and admirals are right simply because they are professionals."[64] And Soviet Premier Khrushchev complained of Communist officials who "regard the defense establishment as a higher caste."[65]

---

influences, pernicious or otherwise, exercised by the military on governments and politics," and referred to a "secret history (secret largely because unwritten) of the relations between heads of states and army chiefs." Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 496.

[62] Finer, Man on Horseback: 9, 5. Finer notes that "an atmosphere of candor, self-sacrifice and vigor clings to the armed forces, and of all among the 'powers that be' there is a tendency to esteem them as the most noble." Ibid.: 10.

[63] Rourke, Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: 30.

[64] Bundy commenting on a clash between Defense Secretary McNamara and top military leaders before the U.S. Senate, quoted in Enthoven and Smith, How Much is Enough?: 310.

[65] Khrushchev, Khrushchev Remembers: The Last Testament: 618.

Second, organizations with a large workforce have the advantage, if this workforce can be socialized to support and purvey the aims and values of the organization in national politics. A large workforce gives an organization a large audience for its views and direct control over votes.

Militaries have a vast workforce, to include at some point most male citizens in states with conscription. This gives the military a large audience for its views. Ludwid Quidde observed in 1893 that German militarism "is rooted in the fact that the largest part of the male population is drafted into the Army for a number of years," with the effect that military values seep into civilian life.[66] Thus Max Weber reportedly was militarized by reserve officer duty: his widow wrote that "the final result of his military training was a tremendous respect for the 'machine,' in addition a warlike and patriotic attitude which made him hope that one day he would be able to go into the field at the head of his company."[67] Likewise Francis Rourke notes that U.S. veterans' organizations, which attract large memberships, "indoctrinate [their members] on the virtues of supporting the goals and policies of the military."[68]

Third, organizations have greater power if authority in the organization is highly centralized; if members are tightly disciplined; if communication among members is good; and if the organization's *esprit de corps* is high. These attributes provide organizational superiority--an ability to act with decisive effect in politics or elsewhere.[69] An organization with these attributes can act as a unit in politics, can better plan and coordinate its political actions, and can better discipline dissenters. It also can create a cohesive ideology among its membership; hence its members are more loyal and effective agents for its programs. And the organization can better achieve a monopoly of information in

---

[66] Berghahn, Militarism: 17. Gerhard Ritter concurs that "military patterns of thinking came to invade the ideology of the middle class" in Wilhelmine Germany, and that this happened "primarily by way of the reserve officer corps." Ritter, Sword and Scepter: 2:101.

[67] Martin Kitchen, The German Officer Corps, 1890-1914 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968): 121-22. Thus a founder of organization theory paradoxically became the pawn of one of the world's more pernicious organizations.

[68] Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: 30.

[69] Suggestive on this topic is Philip Selznick, The Organizational Weapon: A Study of Bolshevik Strategy and Tactics (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960).

its issue areas, through tight control of the activities of its membership.

Modern militaries possess all the elements of organizational superiority: centralized command, discipline of members, close communication among members, *esprit de corps*, and a corresponding isolation and self-sufficiency.[70] These characteristics follow from the nature of the military task. Centralized command, strong discipline, and close intercommunication among members of the military enable the military to respond as a unit to command. *Esprit de corps* and close intercommunication enable the military to act as a unit without constant direction when the chaos of battle disrupts command channels.

Most armies are far more structured than civilian agencies.[71] This makes the military more capable, not only on the battlefield, but also in politics. The characteristics of military structure--centralized command, internal discipline, internal intercommunication, and *esprit de corps*--make militaries highly capable of domestic political action and enhance their capacity to infuse society with their message.[72] These characteristics allow militaries to develop a common ideology and to take coordinated action to purvey it. Moreover, this ideology is reinforced within the organization by the military system of promotion, under which each officer is promoted by his immediate superiors, weeding out non-conformists; and by the social separation of the military, which encloses officers in a military social milieu.

In short, military organizations can act as a unit in politics precisely because they are designed for unitary action on the battlefield.

The cohesive and monolithic character of militaries gives them a special advantage in wars of ideas by inhibiting "whistle blowers" from defecting. This starves outside critics of information. For example, in the 1960s many

---

[70] Finer, Man on Horseback: 5-9.

[71] Finer, Man on Horseback: 8.

[72] Finer notes that modern militaries usually are far more highly organized than any civilian bodies. Only the Communist parties of communist-ruled states can match the degree of organization that militaries achieve. The Roman Catholic church also displays the five features of military structure, but its member can join or leave at will and it is less segregated from the laity than most officer corps from civilians. Firms and public agencies can also have the five features, but again are voluntary bodies, are not segregated from society, have weak sanctions for indiscipline, and few special codes or rules to follow. Man on Horseback: 8.

individual U.S. Air Force officers recognized the large shortcomings of the proposed RS-70 reconnaissance/strike aircraft but they kept silent because, as Enthoven and Smith note, "it would have cost an officer his career to speak out, even within the confines of the Defense Department, against the views of his Chief of Staff."[73] As a result Congress was oversold on the RS-70 and almost forced the administration to build it.

Fourth, organizations that enjoy a monopoly of information in their issue area have the advantage. Outsiders cannot assess or effectively criticize the organization's claims. Superiors cannot challenge the organization's judgement. Members of the press are more dependent on the organization for stories and information, so the organization can manipulate the press more easily. The organization can leak or withhold stories as it wishes. It can reward friendly reporters with scoops or sanction unfriendly reporters by cutting off access. "Information is power," and a monopoly of information is an important political asset for a public organization.

The degree of dominion of an organization over information in its issue-area is a function of organizational superiority, and three other factors in addition. The more secrecy that surrounds an issue, the more pronounced the monopoly of information that the organization enjoys, since outsiders are prevented by classification from knowing enough to judge what they are told. Thus the military in every country can affect official judgements and the public climate by classifying or releasing information as they see fit. Other organizations with a plausible claim to classify their data, such as the F.B.I. in the U.S., can do the same.

The more technically complex and arcane the subject, the more pronounced the monopoly, since non-expert outsiders must rely on the judgments of experts within the organization. Finally, the more unanimous the organization on the issues with which it deals, the more pronounced the monopoly, since outsiders cannot find dissenters within the organization to give them information or explain complex questions.[74] This in turn is a function of the organizational superiority of the bureaucracy--that is, its degree of hierarchy, scope of discipline of members and intercommunication among them, and *esprit de corps*.

Militaries usually enjoy a near monopoly of information in the defense area. Secrecy surrounds most military questions, so national militaries can guide the defense debate by classifying or releasing information. Civilian managers

---

[73] Enthoven and Smith, How Much is Enough?: 251.

[74] See Rourke, Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: 23-4.

are left with only the data that the military lets them see. As a result they cannot exert effective control on policy. Thus the Soviet military allowed Soviet civilians analysts so little defense information during the Cold War that they had to use Western military data for a long period.[75] This information advantage helped the military to dominate defense policy making.

Moreover, many military issues are technically complex. This compels civilians to rely on military experts. As Finer notes, the influence of militaries has grown in modern times as military arts have grown more specialized and arcane, leaving civilians less able to assess military question.[76] Thus U.S. Senator Karl Mundt once argued that Congress could not oversee details of defense policy "because we are not the experts in defense, and we are not the economists and the engineers."[77] Instead Congress members often defer to military expertise.

Finally, the organizational superiority of the defense establishment enhances its monopoly of information, as noted above.

Naturally the information monopoly of militaries varies across time and space. Where military secrecy is tight and civilian military analysts are lacking, e.g., in Wilhelmine Germany or the Soviet Union, the advantage of the military is greater. Where information is more open and civilian experts are more numerous, e.g., in the United States, the military lacks a full monopoly of expertise. But as a general matter national militaries enjoy far more control over information relevant to their issue-area than other government agencies.

Fifth, some organizations control more public relations resources than others. Public agencies usually make their case to the public by creating news and manipulating press coverage. But they also make their case directly, through public relations campaigns organized by client industries or interest groups, or which they organize themselves.[78] The

---

[75] Georgi Arbatov, The System: An Insider's Life in Soviet Politics (New York: Times Books, 1992): 303. Arbatov, who headed the main Soviet civilian foreign policy think-tank, notes that Soviet defense policy was "shaped and executed under the cloak of secrecy" and so "ceased being an instrument of our foreign policy and acquired a life of its own." Ibid.: 189.

[76] Finer, Man on Horseback: 66.

[77] Enthoven and Smith, How Much is Enough: 42.

[78] On this subject is Francis E. Rourke, "Bureaucracy and Public Opinion," in Francis E. Rourke, ed., Bureaucratic Power in National Politics (Boston: Little, Brown, 1965): 187-199.

superior organization and prestige of the military gives the military control over large public relations resources, which militaries can use to infuse the polity with their ideas. This, in combination with their near-monopoly of information in their issue-area, magnifies their ability to manipulate the press and affect the public debate.

Thus before World War I the German Navy played a major role in shaping German public views by exploiting its public relations assets. The Tirpitz press operation planted thousands of article in the German press. The "fleet professors," including many of the great names at German universities, were organized to tour Germany giving talks for the big Navy. The Colonial Society was induced to print and distribute thousands of pro-Navy pamphlets and books, and to organize hundreds of lectures. By 1906 the German Navy League had more than a million members, and its journal Die Flotte was selling 300,000 copies.[79]

The American military also maintains a major public relations program.[80] A 1979 survey of Defense Department PR activities found that the Pentagon spent tens of millions of dollars annually on a public relations operations[81] that

---

[79] J.C.G. Röhl, Germany Without Bismarck: The Crisis of Government in the Second Reich, 1890-1900 (London: B.T. Batsford, 1967): 253-55; and Oron James Hale, Publicity and Diplomacy, with Special Reference to England and Germany, 1890-1914 (New York: D. Appleton Century, 1940): 162-64; see also 158-161, 217-220. Likewise, in interwar Japan the military's large propaganda machine helped engineer a sharp turnabout in Japan's mass media and public opinion from internationalism to a bellicose expansionism and a hostility to arms control between 1930 and 1934. Pelz, Race to Pearl Harbor: 41-45.

[80] Works on the scope and character of the Pentagon public relations effort include Juergen A. Heise, Minimum Disclosure: How the Pentagon Manipulates the News (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979); Derek Shearer, "The Pentagon Propaganda Machine," in Leonard S. Rodberg and Derek Shearer, The Pentagon Watchers (Garden City, New York: Anchor, 1970): 99-142; J. William Fulbright, The Pentagon Propaganda Machine (New York: Vintage, 1971); John M. Swomley, The Military Establishment (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964): 113-128; Adam Yarmolinsky, The Military Establishment: Its Impacts on American Society (New York: Harper & Row, 1971): 187-213; Gene M. Lyons, "PR and the Pentagon," The New Leader, Oct. 17, 1960: 10-12; Morris Janowitz, The Professional Soldier, 2nd ed. (New York: Free Press, 1971): 395-414; and Brit Hume and Mark McIntyre, "Polishing Up the Brass," More, June 1973.

[81] During the 1970s the Pentagon variously estimated its own annual PR budget at $24 million and at $44

employed thousands of workers, provided the Washington press corps with hundreds of press releases each year, produced films, helped Hollywood produce films congenial to Pentagon views, arranged public speeches by members of the military, organized VIP tours for Congressmen and important civilians, and arranged interviews and background briefings. It operated a school for public relations officers, with 85 faculty and 1500 students, whose handbook explained that "favorable public opinion is considered the key-stone of the successful accomplishment of the Department of Defense Mission."[82] The purpose of this activity is "to develop our program so that we can lay down mass PR fire when and as we need it."[83]

The Pentagon can use its control of information to induce the press coverage it prefers, rewarding friendly reporters with inside data while denying data to those who provide critical coverage. Journalists are tempted to tailor their coverage accordingly.

Clients and political allies can help the military make its case. Thus the German Navy League was organized by Krupp, the steel maker,[84] and newspapers owned by Krupp and by other defense-related interests helped promote the big-navy program.[85] Likewise Richard Cobden thought the British naval panic of 1847 was caused partly by a "Mr. Pigou, the gunpowder maker," who claimed the French were planning to attack England,[86] while another observer thought the panic was engineered by half-pay military officers.[87]

---

million--amounts then equivalent to the money spent on news programming by the three U.S. television networks. Heise, Minimum Disclosure: 51, 54; and Rourke, Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy: 29. Others made higher estimates, e.g., CBS News, which estimated the total Defense PR effort at $190 million in 1971. Heise, Minimum Disclosure: 49.

[82] Heise, Minimum Disclosure: 138.

[83] An army memo on public affairs, quoted by Heise, Minimum Disclosure: 141. See also James A. Donovan, Militarism, U.S.A. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970): 55-61; and, on military-industrial associations and leagues in Europe and the United States before World War II, Vagts, History of Militarism: 355-359.

[84] Rohl, Germany Without Bismarck: 254.

[85] Hale, Publicity and Diplomacy: 218.

[86] Quoted in Vagts, History of Militarism: 364.

[87] Richard Cobden, "The Three Panics", in The Political Writings of Richard Cobden (London: Cassell & Co., 1886): 537-704 at 567, quoting Joseph Hume.

In sum, nine factors promote strong military influence over national perceptions in most states. Militaries have strong symbolic appeal; they have a chance to acquaint the millions who serve in the military with the military perspective; in many countries they have substantial resources available for public relations programs; they are hierarchical and tightly disciplined, making them better able to take focused political action; and most important, they enjoy an unusual monopoly on information in their issue-area.[88] These assets give the military an enlarged ability to influence national perceptions. Their impulse to use this influence is strong because the economic welfare of members of the military is tightly tied to the welfare of the organization; the competitive promotional system in most militaries tightens this tie further, by attaching the career success of members of the organization to the growth of the organization; the political environment of the military will make frequent demands that it innovate, unless the military controls that environment; and this political environment contains natural enemies against which the military must defend itself.

Militarism is not universal. Rather, military influence varies sharply from one country and period to another. Germany and Japan were far more militarized before than after the two world wars, and they were markedly more militarized than most other states before the wars. Many industrial states are almost completely unmilitarized. My point is that militarism can appear in industrial states under the right conditions.

What states are prone to militarism? Seven conditions increase their vulnerability. None are sufficient but several are necessary to produce militarism, which is why full-blown militarism is blessedly rare.

States whose *militaries live apart from society* as a separate culture are more prone to militarism. Social separation breeds fear and loathing on both sides of the civil-military divide. Officers with few ties to civilians more often view them with suspicion and disrespect. These feelings fuel the impulse to intervene in politics. Civilians with no knowledge of the military are likewise prone to view

---

[88] Thus Finer summarized the unusual power-assets that national militaries control:

> The armed forces then are not only the most highly organized association in the state. They are a continuing corporation with an intense sentiment of solidarity, enjoying, in many cases, considerable favor. This formidable corporate body is more lethally and heavily armed than any other organization in the state, and indeed enjoys a near-monopoly of all effective weapons. Finer, Man on Horseback: 10.

it as alien, which in turn feeds military suspicion of civilians. Social integration of officers and civilians goes far to dampen this spiral of alienation. Militarism is far less likely, perhaps even impossible, if officers are educated with civilians and later live in some contact with civilian society. It grows best where militaries are educated apart from an early age and then live apart as a wholly separate social community, as in Germany and Russia before 1914 and Japan before 1945.[89]

It follows that militarism is more likely if militaries have broad political autonomy, since this will likely foster social separation. Like all organizations the military tends to seek autonomy in all things; hence it will likely use political autonomy to achieve social autonomy. Samuel Huntington has argued that things are best when civilians grant militaries broad autonomy to run their own affairs.[90] But if autonomy leads to a wider social gap between civilian and military, as seems likely, it will also strengthen the military impulse to intervene in politics.[91]

Societies that are *unaware of the possible dangers of militarism* are more prone to it. Awareness of the danger is a self-denying prophecy. It inoculates civilians against military propaganda. It also leads militaries to curb their political conduct, since they realize that they serve poorly if they act without self-restraint. Europe was militarized before World War I partly because Europeans had never witnessed the disasters that rampant militarism brings. After World War I militarism abated partly because the war revealed these disasters. Germany today has no militarism partly

---

[89] On the isolation of the Wilhelmine German military see below at notes 534-538. On imperial Japan see below at notes 578-582. In pre-1914 Russia the military "was a little world apart, its members often even living physically removed from the civilian population in isolated garrisons." Officers often spent their whole adolescence in special military schools. Dominic Lieven, Russia's Rulers Under the Old Regime (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989): 173. Oppositely, the markedly unmilitaristic U.S. General George Marshall spent so much time with civilians from 1927 to 1937 that "he became familiar with the civilian point of view in a way rare among military men." Forrest Pogue, quoted in Mark A. Stoler, George C. Marshall: Soldier-Statesman of the American Century (Boston: Twayne, 1989): 60.

[90] Huntington, Soldier and the State: 83-85.

[91] Moreover, civilian influence over military promotions is a barrier to militarism, but military autonomy limits such influence.

because German officer training includes the history and the results of the German military's past political activism.

States with national ideologies that proscribe military involvement in politics are less prone to militarism. Militarism needs *a permissive political environment*. Bolshevism dampened militarism in the Soviet Union by its insistence that the Communist Party alone could speak about politics, and by its tenet that the military must be tightly controlled to prevent Bonapartism. Together these dogmas fostered a strong taboo against military involvement in political discourse. American and British liberal ideology, suspicious of military influence in politics, also acts as an inhibition on militarism.[92] Wilhelmine Germany and imperial Japan had no such ideological inhibitions on militarism.

Only *great powers and isolated powers* are prone to militarism, for two reasons. First, great powers cannot free ride for security on other states (rather, others free ride on them); hence their militaries are larger and more influential in society. Second, the militaries of great powers get more budget payoff by purveying militarist ideas than the militaries of lesser powers. Great power governments respond to threats by military buildup; hence their militaries can gain budget by painting a threatening world. On the other hand, governments of lesser powers with access to allies address security threats by reaching for allies, not by building up their forces, since building up will rarely solve the problem--a Belgium can not stop a Germany no matter how much it builds--while reliance on allies often will. Hence the militaries of medium and lesser power (except those that are isolated) have little incentive to sow militarist myths.

Insecure states are more prone to militarism. They are bound to have larger, more prestigious militaries that are better able to shape civilian perceptions. Thus Wilhelmine Germany was the most militarized state in pre-1914 Europe partly because was the least secure--surrounded by strong neighbors and cursed with borders that provided little natural protection. Thus militarism is partly grounded in international reality. A harsh security climate breeds militarism.[93]

---

[92] Descring this Liberal tradition but oppositely arguing that it failed to stem the growth of military influence in the United States is Arthur A. Ekirch, Jr., The Civilian and the Military: A History of the American Antimilitarist Tradition (Colorado Springs: Ralph Myles, 1972).

[93] Making this argument is Otto Hintze, summarized in Berghahn, Militarism: 14-15. Barry Posen and Michael Desch oppositely argue that civilians more tightly control militaries when large security threats loom. Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 75-79; and Michael C. Desch, Civilian

Authoritarian regimes are more prone to militarism than democracies, because militarist myths can be challenged and weeded out in a democracy's free marketplace of ideas. The marketplace of ideas is hardly a perfect filter for fallacies. It often fails to catch them. But it catches some, so democracies are less prone to misperceptions of all kinds, including those sown by the military.

Societies whose *publics are ignorant of military affairs* are more prone to militarism, because they know too little to reject bogus security arguments. Public education about security matters inhibits public acceptance of militarist myths. Also, ignorant civilians can encourage military resistance to civilian control by imposing poorly conceived military policies. Militaries more willingly accept skilled than unskilled civilian control.[94]

Some of these conditions are merely helpful to militarism--it can appear without them--but the first four seem necessary for full-blown militarism to arise. It is hard to imagine full-blown militarism where the military is integrated into society; or where civilians and militaries are imbued with the dangers of militarism; or where the national ideology strongly proscribes military involvement in politics; or among lesser powers that are not isolated. Full-blown militarism seldom appears because these conditions rarely appear together.

A mutation of full-blown militarism--what might be called *contained militarism*--appears when conditions that move

---

Control of the Military (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999): 13-14, 115. This seems a strong possibility when civilians also are highly alert to the danger of undue military influence on policy, but this is seldom the case, so under most conditions insecurity should make militarism worse. During the 1930s external threats led European civilians to tighten their grip on their militaries, as Posen explains. But the 1930s were anomalous because Europe's civilians were unusually alert to the dangers of military dominance over policy due to their World War I experience.

[94] Jack Snyder further argues that oligarchies with *cartelized politics* are more prone to militarism because militaries can logroll with other members of the ruling cartel to get them to back the military's message. Such logrolling benefits all cartel members, including the military. Thus Wilhelmine Germany saw the logroll of "iron and rye"--the alliance of the conservative agrarians and the modern military-industrial complex, each echoing the other's agenda. Jack Snyder, Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991): 31-32, 43-49 and passim.

the military to intervene in politics are present, but conditions that let it shape public views are absent. This produces an active military eager to purvey its views, but hemmed in by a resistant society that compels it to keep silent or ignores what it says. This occurs, for example, if the military of a great power lives as a separate society and is unimbued with the dangers of militarism, but faces a society with an ideology impermissive to militarism. The Cold War Soviet Union illustrates. Its military chafed at its political confinement, and it loudly argued a highly militaristic worldview to any who would listen. But its bellicose noise fell largely on its own ears because Bolshevik authorities forbade it to broadcast its views to the wider public.

Another mutation--what might be called *denatured militarism*--occurs when when conditions that move the military to intervene in politics are absent, but conditions that empower it to persuade are present. This produces a military with little will to bend society to serve its interests but large capacity to do so. Military influence on policy and ideas will be large but less pernicious than under full-blown militarism, because the ideas that the military purveys will be less militaristic. This occurs, for example, if the military lives in close integration with society in an insecure and isolated state that, due to its insecurity, requires a large military. Israel illustrates. The Israeli military has large influence on Israeli public and elite opinion,[95] but it has not used this power to militarize Israeli society.

III. THE WEB OF MILITARIST MISPERCEPTIONS

What misperceptions do militaries purvey?

The content of military propaganda reflects military organizational interests. These interests in turn reflect the basic goals of all organizations. These goals, which overlap somewhat, include:[96]

---

[95] Noting the military's monopoly over security planning in Israel is Yehuda Ben Meir, Civil-Military Relations in Israel (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995): 144-45, 156.

[96] Summarizing relevant ideas from organization theory are Morton H. Halperin, Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1974): 26-62; Morton H. Halperin, "Why Bureaucrats Play Games," Foreign Policy, No. 2 (Spring 1971): 70-90; Leon V. Sigal, Fighting to a Finish: The Politics of War Termination in the United States and Japan, 1945 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988): 21-22; Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 41-46; George, Presidential Decisionmaking: 112-114; and Graham T. Allison, Essence of

Size and wealth. Most organizations seek to grow. Organizational growth confers job security, higher salaries, and personal prestige on members of the organization. As a result organizations search for larger budgets, new jurisdictions, and new missions, as long as these new missions and jurisdictions do not threaten the organization's essence or autonomy (see below).[97]

Conservation of organizational essence. Organizations seek to preserve their "essence"--their missions and methods--in order to protect the jobs and status of incumbents in the organization. A shift in missions or methods often requires new expertise while making old expertise obsolete. Hence a shift in missions or methods can make incumbent members of the organization expendable, to be replaced by newcomers with skills that better suit the new mission. To avert this threat, organizations resist changing missions whenever the change would devalue the expertise of organization incumbents.[98]

If forced to choose between essence and size, organizations will choose essence. Big budgets are much desired but conservation of essence is even more highly prized.

Uncertainty reduction. Organizations develop routines to accomplish their tasks. Without these routines the elements of the organization would improvise at chaotic cross-purposes. But uncertainty in the organization's task-environment--changes in the nature of the problem that the organization addresses, or external demands to change missions or methods--disrupts these routines. Hence organizations try to reduce uncertainty by dominating their environment--that is, by imposing their programs on the world, rather than vice-versa. Instead of adapting the organization to the

---

Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971): 67-78. More general surveys of organization theory include Donald F. Kettl, "Public Administration: The State of the Field," in Ada W. Finifter, Political Science: The State of the Discipline II (Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, 1993), pp. 407-428; James G. March and Herbert A. Simon with Harold Guetzkow, Organizations, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1993); and James G. March, ed., Handbook of Organizations (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965).

[97] Discussing organizational budget-seeking are Halperin, Bureaucratic Politics: 56-58; and Halperin, "Why Bureaucrats Play Games": 85-88.

[98] On conservation of essence see Halperin, Bureaucratic Politics: 28-40; and Halperin, "Why Bureaucrats Play Games": 78-81.

milieu, the organization seeks to adapt the milieu to the organization. This helps the organization preserve its routines from disruptive pressure to innovate.

Control of the task-environment also helps the organization to plan. Organizations dislike un-plannable tasks, and structure their relations with their environment to make planning easier. They often prefer tasks that are easier to plan even if these tasks are harder to perform.[99]

Autonomy from external authority. Organizations resist outside control or interference. If outsiders control the organization they can interfere with its plans and procedures. They can threaten its essence by imposing new missions and methods. They can force innovation. These actions can redistribute power within the organization, threatening the careers of top managers, and they create planning uncertainty.

Outsiders also can better limit the size and wealth of the organization if they control its operation. Control gives outsiders the authority to impose limits and the expertise to know where to impose cuts and efficiencies that threaten organizational incumbents. As a result, organizations are autonomy-seeking and control-resisting.[100]

Organizations also suffer myopias that distort the advice they give, even when this advice is not meant to be organizationally self-serving. Thus organization theory suggests that organizations purvey misperception both to serve the interests of the organization and because the organization is myopic--it simply does not know how things really work. First, organizations suffer "bounded rationality." They tend to know only what they must know to manage their tasks.[101] They do not know what other organizations must know to achieve their assigned tasks, so if they seize another organization's jurisdiction they may lack the expertise to cope. Thus the military often mishandles diplomacy and foreign affairs when it assumes responsibility for foreign policy, since its organizational experience does not prepare it for this task. Where matters of statecraft and diplomacy are concerned, the military rationality is bounded.

Yet public organizations still intrude beyond their

---

[99] On uncertainty reduction by organizations see Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 44-47.

[100] On autonomy-seeking by organizations see Halperin, Bureaucratic Politics: 51-54; and Halperin, "Why Bureaucrats Play Games": 76-77.

[101] On this topic see Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, 2d ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1957): xxiv-xxvii, 38-41, 68-70, 80-84, 240-244; Herbert A. Simon, Models of Man, Social and Rational (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1957); and March and Simon, Organizations: 157-192.

area of expertise, partly because they do not know the limits of their own understanding.[102]

Second, organizations only poorly evaluate their own perceptions and performance. As a result they cannot easily improve performance, correct misperceptions or learn new things.[103] I comment more on this idea in chapter 4, below, as it applies to state conduct. But it also applies here. Poor self-evaluation lowers the quality of military perceptions; this in turn distorts the nature of military advice.

These interests and myopias lead the militaries to purvey eight misperceptions that raise the risk of war.

A. "Others Are Hostile." Militaries tend to exaggerate the hostility of other states. Budget-seeking is their prime motive: the case for big military budgets is stronger if others appear hostile. Thus before World War I a colleague advised British Admiral John Fisher that "an invasion scare is the mill of God that grinds you out a Navy of Dreadnoughts."[104] Asada Sadao likewise notes that overblown Japanese fears of foreign encirclement in the 1930s were "cultivated by Japanese naval planners as a pretext for naval expansion. ... Behind the navy's special emphasis on the prospect of war with the United States one can detect, as usual, its desire for a larger share of the nation's resources."[105]

The belief that others are hostile also supports arguments for the offensive military doctrines that militaries prefer (see below).[106] Enemies that are blindly hostile cannot

---

[102] Thus Bernard Brodie noted the "common tendency among the military to give without hesitation assurances that are well beyond their qualifications and knowledge." Brodie, War and Politics: 487.

[103] Aaron Wildavsky, "The Self-Evaluating Organization," Public Administration Review, Vol. 32, No. 5 (September-October 1972): 509-520.

[104] Second Viscount Esher, quoted in W. Mark Hamilton, The Nation and the Navy: Methods and Organization of British Navalist Propaganda, 1889-1914 (New York: Garland, 1986): 173. In the same era German Foreign Office Counsellor Friedrich von Holstein observed that fears of British naval attack were "the most effective argument in favor of ... increasing our fleet," imputing this motive to German navy leaders who warned of British attack. Quoted in Jonathan Steinberg, "The Copenhagen Complex," in Walter Lacqueur and George L. Mosse, eds., 1914: The Coming of the First World War (New York: Harper & Row, 1966): 21-44 at 40.

[105] Asada, "Japanese Navy": 243-244, 251.

[106] Suggesting this is Jack Snyder, "Perceptions of the Security Dilemma in 1914," in Robert Jervis, Richard Ned

be accommodated and so must be crushed. The only sensible wartime strategy is total victory--which calls for offensive forces and doctrine.

Moreover, the military's purview of international politics is over-weighted with evidence of others' hostility. Militaries study each other to anticipate each other's strategies. Then they infer other states' intentions from their military's postures and doctrines. This often makes other states seem more hostile than in fact they are, since military postures and doctrines are often more aggressive than the foreign policies they support.[107]

Finally, militaries are quick to detect signs of others' aggressiveness and slow to notice benign behavior because they are responsible for alerting the state to danger. Their job is to find threats, not to find the absence of threat.

The pre-1914 German military imagined Germany surrounded by rapacious enemies ready to pounce. In the late 1880s and early 1890s General Alfred von Waldersee's military attaché in Paris "filled his reports with hair raising accounts of the imminence of a French attack."[108] He told Berlin that "the present peaceful exterior is only a thin covering over France, a slight puff of wind and the bayonets are through,"[109] although French leaders actually had no belligerent plans. In 1904 the German naval attache in London so alarmed Berlin with his reports that the Kaiser became persuaded that Britain might attack the next spring--a groundless fear.[110] In 1909 former Chief of the General Staff Schlieffen wrongly imagined that Germany and Austria-Hungary faced sudden attack by Britain, France, Russia and even Italy, then Germany's ally:[111]

Lebow, and Janice Gross Stein, Psychology and Deterrence (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985): 153-179 at 163.

[107] See, for example, Asada, "Japanese Navy": 243, noting that imperial Japanese officers' fears of U.S. intentions were intensified by their reading of provocative statements by U.S. admirals.

[108] Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 73, summarizing Huene. Waldersee was German Chief of General Staff during 1888-1891.

[109] Quoted in Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 73.

[110] Steinberg, "Copenhagen Complex": 33.

[111] Ritter, Schlieffen Plan: 102. Schlieffen added that England was an "implacable enemy" animated by "hatred of a once-despised competitor," and Russia was guided by the "inherited antipathy of Slavs for Germanic people." Ibid.:

> An endeavor is afoot to bring all these Powers together for a concentrated attack on the Central Powers. At the given moment the doors are to be opened, the drawbridges let down, and the million-strong armies let loose, ravaging and destroying, across the Vosges, the Meuse, the Königsau, the Niemen, the Bug and even the Isonzo and the Tyrolean Alps. The danger seems gigantic.

In 1911 General Friedrich von Bernhardi, the German army's top publicist, echoed Schlieffen, writing that "France aims solely at crushing Germany by an aggressive war," and that Germany's eastern territories were "menaced" by "Slavonic waves." "Our German nation is beset on all sides."[112] And in 1912 Admiral Tirpitz wrongly claimed that the Anglo-French Entente "has the character of an offensive alliance."[113]

Russian officers of the era viewed the world with a parallel paranoia, finding enemies everywhere. Russian war

---

100-101. Jonathan Steinberg notes that Schlieffen's writings "are filled with an almost paranoid preoccupation with 'the revengeful enemy'" waiting for the best moment to strike. "A German Plan for the Invasion of Holland and Belgium, 1897," The Historical Journal, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1963): 107-115 at 114n.

[112] Friedrich von Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War, trans. Allen H. Powles (London: Edward Arnold, 1914, first published in Germany in 1912): 93, 76, 13. Forgetting Europe's benign tolerance of Bismarck's wars of expansion during 1864-1870, Bernhardi added that Germany was a "mutilated torso" that had been "robbed of her natural frontiers" by her neighbors. Ibid.: 76.

[113] Fritz Fischer, War of Illusions: German Policies from 1911 to 1914, trans. Marian Jackson (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975): 125. Noting that Germany's neighbors actually had quite benign intentions--far less threatening than Germany's--are Harmut Pogge von Strandmann, "Germany and the Coming of the War," in R.J.W. Evans and Harmut Pogge von Strandmann, eds., The Coming of the First World War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990): 87-123 at 97-98; and Imanuel Geiss, "Origins of the First World War," in Imanuel Geiss, ed., July 1914 (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967): 17-53 at 26-28. Geiss notes that "the Triple Entente was not conceived as an offensive alliance. None of the three Powers pursued expansionist aims, over which they would or could have gone to war: British 'envy of the German economy,' French 'Revanchism' and Russian 'Pan-Slavism' were, and still are, grossly exaggerated in Germany." Ibid.: 26-27. Specifically arguing that Russia was a satiated power with the possible exception of the Turkish Straits is D.C.B. Lieven, Russia and the Origins of the First World War (New York: St. Martin's, 1983): 136, 153; also 141-143.

plans from 1908 to 1914 wrongly assumed that Sweden and Rumania would join Germany against Russia in a general war. General Iurii Danilov, Russia's Deputy Chief of Staff, thought that China and Japan might also join the war as enemies, even though the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs advised otherwise.[114] A critic complained that Danilov "left out only the Martians" from his enemies list.[115]

Imperial Japanese officers had frightful fantasies about the United States. In 1918 an officer of the Naval General Staff urged a Japanese deployment to Russian Siberia, since otherwise the United States might seize Siberia and then close in on Japan from all directions--the north, south (Philippines), east (Hawaii and Guam) and west (China).[116] In 1920 a former army officer published a popular book urging his fellow citizens to prepare for air attack and invasion by U.S. forces.[117]

Around the same time some U.S. military writers warned of far-fetched combinations against the United States. In the midst of World War I, as Britain and Germany were locked in battle, General Francis Vinton Greene feared an aggressive British-German alliance against the United States, "allies as they were under Chatham and under his great son, the younger Pitt."[118]

> In that event we should be hopelessly outclassed. The allies would have no trouble in crossing the ocean and selecting such a point for landing as the General Staffs of the two countries should decide to be most favorable.

American military reports from Europe in the late 1940s

---

[114] William C. Fuller, "The Russian Empire," in May, Knowing One's Enemies: 98-126 at 110. Noting that Russian diplomats generally saw a less threatening world is ibid.: 123.

[115] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 168.

[116] Akira Iriye, Across the Pacific: An Inner History of American-East Asian Relations (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967): 131.

[117] General Kojiro Sato, summarized in William L. Neumann, America Encounters Japan: From Perry to MacArthur (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969): 162. Kojiro was one of several military propagandists of the 1920s who iterated that Japan was surrounded by dangerous enemies who might attack at any time. Robert J.C. Butow, Tojo and the Coming of the War (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969): 23.

[118] Francis Vinton Greene, The Present Military Situation in the United States (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915): 64.

warned of imminent war. At one point in 1948, before the Berlin blockade, the U.S. Air Force refused to endorse an intelligence estimate that war was "not probable within sixty days."[119] General Lucius Clay in March 1948 wrote that "within the last few weeks, I have felt a subtle change in Soviet attitude which I cannot define but which now gives me a feeling that [war] may come with dramatic suddenness."[120] Later, U.S. military commanders drew alarming pictures of Soviet and Chinese intentions. Former SAC commander Thomas Power forecast in 1964 that Soviet leaders would resort to "all-out military action" if they could not subdue the United States by other means. "They have long prepared for such a contingency."[121] General Twining likewise argued that "coexistence to any Communist leader means 'coexistence on my terms after surrendering your freedom.'"[122] He also dubiously divined that "the ultimate objectives of China's leaders are certainly the subjugation and communization of all Southeast Asia, the Indonesian area, the Philippines, and Australia" and described a "Hitler-like mentality which now dominates Red China."[123] Cold War-era polls showed that U.S. military officers had darker views of Soviet intentions than their civilian counterparts.[124]

Militaries exaggerate the hostility of friends as well as adversaries. Allies are pictured as unreliable or even malicious; hence enemies must be faced largely alone. In 1968 NATO had a long and bright future, but General LeMay wrote that "NATO is breaking up and I am saddened to witness the demise of thegreatest of all peacetime alliances and one which I helped build."[125]

The image of hostile neighbors is fashioned both directly--in simple claims of neighbors' hostility--and as a mosaic of lesser misperceptions that add up to an image of

---

[119] George F. Kennan, Memoirs, 1925-1950 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967): 400.

[120] Kennan, Memoirs, 1925-1950: 400.

[121] General Thomas S. Power with Albert A. Arnhym, Design For Survival (New York: Coward-McCann, 1964): 44.

[122] Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 244.

[123] Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 273, 293.

[124] Ole R. Holsti, "A Widening Gap between the U.S. Military and Civilian Society? Some Evidence, 1976-96," International Security, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Winter 1998/99): 5-42 at 18, question B.

[125] LeMay, America Is in Danger: 327.

neighborly malevolence.

Militaries exaggerate the degree of cooperation among adversaries, so the hostile actions of each are imputed to the other, and the hostility of all is thereby exaggerated. Before World War I Germany's General Bernhardi preposterously claimed that the Balkan states fought the Balkan wars of 1912-13 at Britain's instigation, and that Britain "directs" the Triple Entente.[126] In 1966 General Twining likewise spoke of the Communist world as "the enemy bloc," although China and the Soviet Union then were deeply hostile to one another.[127] He also claimed that "behind the North Vietnamese invasion of the territory and the sovereign rights of the South Vietnamese lies Red Communist China,"[128] despite the indigenous roots of the Vietnam conflict and the deep and ancient antagonism between China and Vietnam.

Militaries exaggerate the likelihood of war, a belief that imputes dark intentions to others.[129] Before World War I many European generals held the view that "the great war" was inevitable--and helped bring it on by giving advice shaped by this view. British Adjutant-General Wolseley said in 1890 that "the world must have a great upheaval before long."[130] Lectures at the Russian staff academy stressed that war between Russia and the Central Powers (Germany and Austria-Hungary) was unavoidable.[131] In Germany Colonel Colmar von der Goltz wrote that "modern wars have become the nations' way of doing business,"[132] and as 1914 approached General Moltke declared that "a European war must come sooner or later."[133]

---

[126] General Friedrich von Bernhardi, Britain as Germany's Vassal (New York: George H. Doran, n.d.; first pub. in Germany in 1913): 55, 158-60.

[127] Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 63.

[128] Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 293.

[129] Concurring are Scott D. Sagan, "The Perils of Proliferation: Organization Theory, Deterrence Theory, and the Spread of Nuclear Weapons," International Security, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Spring 1994): 66-107 at 75-76, and sources cited there.

[130] Quoted in Caroline E. Playne, The Pre-War Mind in Britain (London: George, Allen & Unwin, 1928): 127.

[131] Fuller, "Russian Empire": 109.

[132] Theodore Ropp, War in the Modern World, rev. ed., (New York: Collier Books, 1962): 204.

[133] In February 1913, quoted in Turner, Origins of the First World War: 49. Moltke's uncle, General Helmuth von Moltke (the Elder), the Prussian/German Chief of the General

In the interwar years both Japanese and American naval officers widely assumed that war against the other was almost unavoidable.[134]

Militaries exaggerate others' hostility by understating the threat their own state poses to others. This makes the other's provoked hostility seem unprovoked, hence unwarranted. I.F. Clarke reports that before 1914 a flood of military-authored popular novels painted their characters in black and white, "the polar opposites of the unspeakable enemy and the glorious nation. Since the nation is an object of worship in these stories, the enemy must equally be an object of detestation. ... Complete virtue faces total wickedness."[135] Later, former U.S. SAC commander Thomas Power wrote that the world was "well aware of our peaceful intentions toward Russia,"[136] although elsewhere in the same volume he spoke open-mindedly of preventive war against Russia.[137]

One's own threat to others is downplayed by understating one's own military effort. In 1964, for example, General Twining warned that the United States was conducting "a creeping disarmament" although the U.S. then had far the largest defense budget in the world, exceeding the Soviet defense budget by 40 percent, and NATO outspent the Warsaw Pact by 70 percent.[138] In 1968 the United States still had the

---

Staff from 1857-1887, also was quick to assume that war was unavoidable. As early as 1860 he thought war with France was inevitable, and he forecast war with Russia in 1871, although German-Russian relations then were quite good. Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 127-28.

[134] Asada, "Japanese Navy": 234; and Waldo H. Heinrichs, "The Role of thee United States Navy," in Borg and Okamoto, Pearl Harbor as History: 197-223 at 202-203. Insurrectionary Japanese army officers likewise declared in 1936 that "our country is on the verge of war with Russia, China, Britain, and America, who wish to crush our ancestral land." Butow, Tojo and the Coming of the War: 64.

[135] I.F. Clarke, Voices Prophesying War, 1763-1984 (London: Oxford University Press, 1966): 122.

[136] Power, Design For Survival: 50.

[137] Power, Design for Survival: 79-84, esp. 82-83.

[138] Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 286. Defense spending ratios are read from charts 2-2 and C-12 in Harold Brown, Department of Defense Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1982 (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, 1981): 17 and C-12. U.S.-Soviet ratios are for 1964, NATO-Pact ratios are for 1965.

world's largest defense budget, exceeding the Soviet defense budget by 29 percent, yet General Curtis LeMay lamented:[139]

> It is disheartening to have lived through a period of history when the great United States has dwindled from the first power in the world to a questionable military entity. For so many years we held the biggest stick but through inattention and far out national defense philosophies we have let our big stick be whittled down to a lathe.

The image of national inaction is created two ways: by understating what is being done, or by assuming a too-demanding national military strategy, leaving the national defense effort looking pallid when measured against its missions.[140] Thus during the Cold War the U.S. Air Force included very demanding strategic nuclear counterforce operations among its missions,[141] and the U.S. Navy sometimes included the imposing task of attacking heavily defended Soviet bases on Soviet home territory with carrier-based airpower.[142] The strongest military would look weak measured against such daunting assignments.

---

[139] LeMay, America Is in Danger: 151. Defense spending ratios are calculated from U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers 1968-1977 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 1979): 61, 65. Enthoven and Smith likewise note that U.S. military leaders routinely compared U.S. and Soviet divisions on a 1 for 1 basis in the early 1960s, although mobilized U.S. divisions had triple the manpower and triple the effectiveness of Soviet divisions. Enthoven and Smith, How Much is Enough?: 136, 140; see also 142.

[140] Of course, the strategy cannot be too demanding or civilians will abandon the mission. To support a persuasive budget claim the mission should be demanding but not impossible.

[141] Arguing the futility of U.S. counterforce programs in the later Cold War is Michael Salman, Kevin J. Sullivan and Stephen Van Evera, "Analysis or Propaganda? Measuring American Strategic Nuclear Capability, 1969-1988," in Lynn Eden and Steven E. Miller, eds., Nuclear Arguments: Understanding the Strategic Nuclear Arms and Arms Control Debates (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989): 172-263 at 221-235.

[142] On offensive ideas in U.S. Navy strategy during the 1980s see John J. Mearsheimer, "A Strategic Misstep: The Maritime Strategy and Deterrence in Europe," International Security, Vol. 11, No. 2 (Fall 1986): 3-57 at 11-13, 20-26, 35-39.

No doubt militaries understate their own programs chiefly to strengthen their case for a bigger budget. But this also makes other states appear more hostile by obscuring the military programs to which other states are responding when they build their forces, thereby making this response appear unprovoked. Militaries themselves are prone to this misperception. Thus before World War I Germany's General Bernhardi found British hostility toward Germany "not very comprehensible" and speculated at length on its causes, but devoted only one sentence to the possibility that German naval building--a prime cause of British enmity--was a factor.[143]

Militaries tend to exaggerate others' capabilities and military programs, which also makes their intentions appear hostile. Enthoven and Smith note "the persistent bias of the military and intelligence bureaucracies toward overestimating one's enemy by making 'conservative assumptions.'"[144] This bias is endemic among national military establishments. For example, before World War I U.S. military leaders often painted a stark picture--absurd in retrospect--of powerful enemies poised to invade and conquer the United States. In 1893 Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan warned that Hawaii, if not annexed by the U.S., might become "an outpost of a Chinese barbarism which might soon burst the barriers which contained it, and bury civilization under a wave of invasion."[145] In 1908 General J.P. Storey warned that in only three months Japan could "land on the Pacific Coast four hundred thousand troops, and seize, with only insignificant resistance, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles." Then Japan could exploit the western mountains and deserts to hold the west coast against U.S. recapture. "Never has there been on this earth so rich a prize, now so helpless to defend itself."[146] In 1915 Major General Greene suggested that either

---

[143] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 94 and following.

[144] Enthoven and Smith, How Much is Enough: 160. Lord Salisbury likewise complained in 1877 that "if you believe the doctors nothing is wholesome; if you believe the theologians nothing is innocent; if you believe the soldiers nothing is safe." Brodie, War and Politics: 433.

[145] David Healy, U.S. Expansionism: The Imperialist Urge in the 1890s (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970): 129, paraphrasing Mahan.

[146] From his introduction to Homer Lea, The Valor of Ignorance (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1909), intro. J.P. Storey, not paginated. Story echoed U.S. Navy Captain Albert Barker, who in 1897 likewise warned that Japan could conquer the American west. Neumann, America Encounters Japan: 115-16. Neumann, not Lea

the British or the Germans could cross the Atlantic and land where they wished in the United States even without allied assistance.[147]

In 1957 U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff Thomas D. White warned that the Soviet Union would soon surpass the United States in strategic bombers; in fact the U.S. strategic bomber force outnumbered the Soviet force by over 11:1 in 1960, and by over 4:1 in 1965.[148] In 1968 General Curtis LeMay wrote that the Soviets "have already deployed an anti-ballistic missile system and are rapidly improving and expanding it," and "lead us in numbers of strategic bombers,"[149] although the Soviets then had no effective anti-ballistic missile system and U.S. strategic bombers outnumbered Soviet bombers by over 3:1.[150] And during the great SALT II debate of 1979-80 Admiral

---

[147] Greene, Present Military Situation: 64-66. Greene framed a scenario in which 240,000 fully-equipped German infantry landed on Long Island and then overran Manhattan. Ibid.: 64-71.

[148] White quoted in Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, U.S.A.--Second-Class Power? (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958): 44; bomber force data are from Robert P. Berman and John C. Baker, Soviet Strategic Forces (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1982): 42-43. U.S. strategic superiority was so great in 1959 that President Eisenhower said privately that if the U.S. attacked the Soviet Union "the main danger would arise not from retaliation but from fallout in the earth's atmosphere." Quoted in Marc Trachtenberg, History and Strategy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991): 193.

[149] LeMay, America Is in Danger: vii. Likewise General Thomas Power wrote in 1964 that "the Soviets now have the capability to launch a surprise attack on the United States. They appear confident that, with continued advances in their weapon systems, especially those operating in or from space, such an attack can gain them a quick, decisive and none-too-costly victory, leaving the Eurasian complex at the mercy of their powerful ground forces." Power, Design for Survival: 45. Note that Power's claim of Soviet strength is insinuated without making false statements. Power claims that the Soviets can launch a surprise attack--but anyone can. Instead we should ask: will the attack succeed? Power also claims that the Soviets appear confident of victory without showing that this Soviet confidence, if real, is well placed. In fact a competent assessment of the military balance in 1964 would surely show marked U.S. superiority over the Soviet Union in most areas, and marked NATO superiority over the Warsaw Pact.

[150] In 1968 the U.S. had 520 strategic bombers to 150 for the Soviet Union. See International Institute for Strategic

Hayward Thomas Hayward, Chief of Naval Operations, warned Congress that "the Soviets will attain a first-strike capability in the next few years," a forecast that proved egregiously wrong.[151]

Threat inflation also infected U.S. conventional military planning in the 1950s and early 1960s. Military briefers warned the incoming Kennedy administration defense team that Soviet ground forces in Europe had more than 7-1 superiority against NATO ground forces and that Soviet tactical air forces in Europe could win air superiority over NATO tactical air forces in a mere three days. But careful review revealed that NATO actually had material equality with the Soviets on the ground and had 4-1 superiority in tactical air power.[152] The military assessment was far too pessimistic, and the Soviet conventional superiority it described was illusory.

Such threat inflation makes other states seem aggressive as well as strong. If a case is made that adversary programs are larger than needed for defense, this suggests that the adversary plans aggression. Thus General Power warned that "the tremendous expansion of the Soviet's military power can serve but one purpose--aggression."[153]

States then overbuild because they exaggerate the other's power and aggressiveness.[154] War also becomes more likely, because the case for expansionist foreign policies and for preemptive and preventive war is stronger when others are assumed to be hostile.

The opposite error--understating threats--can also occur when this serves organizational interests. Speaking generally, threats are understated when their recognition would cause civilians to force innovations on the military that threatened organizational essence; or to force a shift of resources from offensive to defensive missions; or when to acknowledge the threat would reflect poorly on past military performance, or on the military generally. In Germany before

---

Studies, The Military Balance 1967-1968 (London: Institute for Strategic Studies, 1968): 45.

[151] Quoted in Salman, Sullivan, and Van Evera, "Analysis or Propaganda?": 172. Noting that the Soviets came nowhere near a first strike capability in the 1980s is ibid.: 214-215.

[152] Enthoven and Smith, How Much is Enough?: 133-34, 143-146.

[153] Power, Design For Survival: 49.

[154] Moreover, illusions of hostility can become reality as views on both sides harden and each side acts in ways that confirm the other's suspicions.

1914 General Schlieffen failed to consider threats to his offensive war plan posed by France's excellent quick-firing artillery (the famous "75s"), or by possible French demolitions of transport infrastructure, or by a British naval blockade.[155] To acknowledge these threats might stir calls for a more defensive plan, which Schlieffen axiomatically opposed, so he neglected them. And the French Army preserved its offensive doctrine before 1914 by badly understating the strength of Germany's planned attack through Belgium;[156] this deflected arguments for a more defensive strategy focused on meeting the German attack.

In the 1930s the British Navy preserved its essence and its offensive mission by ignoring the German submarine threat.[157] If the submarine threat were acknowledged, it followed that the Navy should shift its emphasis from battleships to anti-submarine forces (to counter the submarine threat) and also to submarines (to exploit their power). The British battleship admirals resisted this. Also in the 1930s the Japanese Navy understated the future submarine threat to the sea lanes within the empire it aimed to conquer. If it acknowledged the submarine threat, this would undermine its claims that an overseas empire could give Japan economic independence, which would undermine its arguments for empire, which would undermine its claim to a large budget. Similarly, during the early Cold War the Soviet military downplayed the American strategic nuclear menace, instead defining neighboring states as the main threat. This allowed the Soviet military to avoid a painful shift from large armored ground forces to strategic rocket forces, thus preserving the essence of the Soviet military--but leaving the Soviet Union woefully vulnerable.

Later the U.S. strategic nuclear command-and-control apparatus grew vulnerable to Soviet attack.[158] Yet military

---

[155] Ritter, Schlieffen Plan: 10, 71. Germany's Admiral Tirpitz likewise assumed that the British navy would foolishly fail to concentrate its forces in home waters, instead recklessly imposing a close blockade of German ports and thus putting its fleet at risk of German attack. These assumptions bolstered his arguments for the German naval buildup. Kennedy, History and Strategy: 122, 134.

[156] Christopher M. Andrew, "France and the German Menace," in May, Knowing One's Enemies: 127-149 at 128, 141-42, 145.

[157] Costello and Hughes, Battle of the Atlantic: 9, 31-34.

[158] Concurring is Bruce G. Blair, Strategic Command and Control: Redefining the Nuclear Threat (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1985), especially 75, 208, 210, 282-3. More optimistic was Ashton B. Carter, "Assessing Command System Vulnerability," in Ashton B. Carter, John D. Steinbruner, and

writers seldom raised this problem, perhaps because it cast doubt on the feasibility of second-strike counterforce operations, and so undercut the more general case for counterforce, which the Air Force strongly preferred to more defensive alternatives.

During the Indochina War U.S. military intelligence badly underestimated Viet Cong troop strength. Military figures showed Viet Cong strength at 270,000 while the CIA put the Viet Cong at 600,000.[159] The military figures were too low, but had the virtue--from a military viewpoint--of showing the military making good progress.

This suggests some general axioms on threat perception. Threats are exaggerated when they provide justification for (1) expansion of current forces, and/or (2) more offensive forces and doctrine. Threats are downplayed when they justify (1) larger but different forces, with cuts in current forces, and/or (2) a shift of resources from offense to defense, and/or (3) they reflect poorly on the performance of the military, or on the military as an institution. This pattern of threat perception best serves military organizational interests; national threat perception will follow the same pattern if militaries shape national perceptions.

B. "Force is Useful, States Bandwagon with Threats."[160] The possession, threat, and use of force has important self-limiting and self-defeating aspects. Great powers usually resist the strongest, most threatening state in the neighborhood, by building up their own arms or by forming countering coalitions. They seldom "bandwagon"--that is, align with or submit to the strong and threatening state. Hence strong and bellicose states are often enmeshed in arms races and are contained or even crushed by strong countering coalitions. The threat of force often evokes answering threats, and the use of force often evokes answering force, leaving those who threaten or use force without gains. Wars often develop their own momentum, outliving their original rationales or escalating out of control, and trapping the belligerents in fruitless spirals of violence. Menacing offensive military capabilities can trigger defensive attacks by others that seek to remove the threat.

Charles A. Zraket, eds., Managing Nuclear Operations (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1987): 555-610, especially 576, 607.

[159] Sam Adams, "Vietnam Cover-Up: Playing War With Numbers," Harper's, May 1975: 41-73 at 62, 66; and Thomas Powers, The Man Who Kept the Secrets: Richard Helms and the CIA (New York: Pocket Books, 1979): 235-49.

[160] May 8, 2000: SECTION B ON BANDWAGONING COULD BE CONDENSED SOME.

Militaries underestimate these dynamics. They discount balancing behavior and exaggerate bandwagoning.[161] Specifically, they expect states to align with power and comply with threats more often than in fact they do. They underestimate the possibility that others will answer power and threats with counter-threats, arms racing, and countering alliances. They downplay the tendency of war to get out of control, and the tendency of wartime adversaries to counter-escalate. They underestimate the risk that aggressive military postures will provoke defensive or preemptive violence by others.[162]

Of course sometimes states do align with power and comply with threats. Sometimes wartime enemies concede to force without counter-escalating. Even offensive force sometimes dissuades.[163] But militaries take these arguments too far. They resist the notion that possessing, threatening, or using force can be counterproductive. They doubt that there could be capabilities that one does not want to possess.

These misperceptions serve the military's organizational interests. Military force is more useful if states submit to it instead of arming and aligning against it. Aggressors could then use force to cow others into submission, and could use these gains to cow still others into submission. Their potential victims would need more force to address the greater threat that aggressors pose. Hence all states' appetites for military power would expand. This would expand the size, wealth, and prestige of the military.

Force is more useful if wars have little propensity to develop momentum or to escalate. Solving problems by threatening or using force is then more expedient, hence possessing force is also more expedient. And force is more useful if it seldom triggers defensive or preemptive violence by others. States will buy more force if leaders assume these facts.

Military writings are ridden with notions of bandwagoning. Before 1914 the German navy premised the case for the High Seas fleet on the false notion--embodied in Admiral Tirpitz's "risk theory"--that a big German fleet could intimidate Britain into remaining neutral in a future

---

[161] On bandwagoning and balancing, and the prevalence of the latter over the former, see Stephen M. Walt, The Origins of Alliances (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987): 17-33, 147-180, 263-266, 274-280.

[162] On this last danger see Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: chapters 3 and 6.

[163] See Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 152-160.

continental war.[164] The German army similarly hoped that a swift German victory over France would cow Britain into leaving the war if it did intervene,[165] and that crude threats would scare Belgium into neutrality.[166]

In 1940 the Japanese army pushed Japan to ally with Germany and Italy in hopes of intimidating the U.S. to remain neutral; the alliance had the opposite effect, energizing the U.S. against both Germany and Japan.[167] Japanese military

---

[164] Kennedy, Strategy and Diplomacy: 132-135. The risk theory held that Britain would not risk even a victorious war against Germany if its naval combat losses would leave its fleet without naval dominance over France and Russia. Robert K. Massie, Dreadnought: Britain, Germany, and the Coming of the Great War (New York: Random House, 1991): 181.

[165] Ritter, Schlieffen Plan: 163; and Hajo Holborn, "Moltke and Schlieffen: The Prussian-German School," in Edward Mead Earle, ed., Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971): 172-205 at 188-89, 203. In contrast, German civilians doubted that Britain could be scared into neutrality. Chancellor Bernhard von Bülow realized in 1908-09 that the German naval buildup was merely provoking a British buildup and unsuccessfully sought to restrain it. Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg largely held to a balancing view of the world, arguing that "England follows a policy of balance of power and therefore will stand up for France if the latter is in danger of being annihilated by us." Snyder, Myths of Empire: 86-87, 60.

[166] John C.G. Röhl, "Germany," in Keith Wilson, ed., Decisions for War 1914 (New York: St. Martin's, 1995): 27-54 at 44; Luigi Albertini, The Origins of the War of 1914, 3 vols., trans and ed. Isabella M. Massey (London: Oxford University Press, 1952-1957; reprint ed., Westport: Greenwood Press, 1980): 441; Bernadotte E. Schmitt, The Coming of the War, 1914, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930): 2:390n; and Barbara W. Tuchman, The Guns of August (New York: Dell, 1962): 39-40, 147. For his part France's General Joseph Joffre advised in 1912 that France plan to invade Belgium to forestall Germany's invasion, blind to the backlash that a French invasion would cause in Belgium and Britain. Joll, Origins of the First World War: 81-82.

[167] Ronald H. Spector, Eagle Against the Sun: The American War with Japan (New York: Random House, 1985): 64-65; and Pelz, Race to Pearl Harbor: 216. Japanese civilians were more skeptical of the rewards of such intimidation. See, e.g., the views of President of the Privy Council Hara Yoshimichi, who feared that Japan's alignment with Germany and Italy would evoke a U.S. backlash against Japan. Nobutaka Ike, ed.,

officers also reasoned that if the U.S. fought Japan, U.S. fighting morale would collapse if Britain collapsed, or if Japan won a major military victory early in the war. Then, Japanese officers argued, the U.S. would make a compromise with Japan.[168] But the U.S. defeat at Pearl Harbor only stiffened U.S. resolve to defeat Japan.

Historians now think China joined the Korean war because it feared American power on its doorstep in North Korea.[169] But at the time General Douglas MacArthur, U.N. commander in Korea, thought China would not intervene precisely because U.N. power in Korea was so great. Shortly before the Chinese attack MacArthur boasted that his command possessed "vastly greater [military] potential in the air, on the ground and on the sea"; therefore, he deduced, Chinese threats to intervene were "just blackmail."[170] Then after

---

Japan's Decision for War: Records of the 1941 Policy Conferences (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967): 9, 12.

[168] Ike, Japan's Decision for War: 153, 207; Asada, "Japanese Navy": 236, 256; and Fujiwara, "Japanese Army": 195. Before invading China in 1937 Japanese officers likewise hoped to intimidate China into surrendering without a fight. Colonel Nagatsu, a China specialist in the General Staff intelligence section, wrote that "if Japan mobilizes we won't even have to debark on the continent" to get China to concede. Michael A. Barnhardt, Japan Prepares for Total War: The Search for Economic Security, 1919-1941 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987): 85.

[169] China's General Wu explained that China attacked the U.S. intervention force in Korea because "an aggressor who invades Korea today will certainly invade China tomorrow." Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 350. China's Marshall Peng Dehuai likewise stressed that "if Korea is occupied by the imperialists, the safety of our own country will be directly threatened." Shuguang Zhang and Jian Chen, eds., Chinese Communist Foreign Policy and the New Cold War in Asia: New Documentary Evidence, 1944-1950 (Chicago: Imprint, 1996): 176. See also ibid.: 187-188; Chen Jian, China's Road to the Korean War: The Making of the Sino-American Confrontation (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994): 159, 183-184, 202, 206; Thomas J. Christensen, Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996): 156-166; and Alan Whiting, China Crosses the Yalu (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960): 32, 105-106, 127-130, 158-160.

[170] MacArthur on October 3 1950, paraphrased by Alvary Gascoigne, quoted in Rosemary Foot, The Wrong War: American

China's devastating intervention MacArthur denied that his rush to the Yalu had provoked it, instead blaming "Chinese imperialistic aspirations."[171]

General LeMay claimed that American use of nuclear weapons could persuade neutrals to jump on the U.S. bandwagon:[172]

> In our recent limited wars we have unilaterally avoided the use of nuclear weapons. One reason for this is our decision-makers' belief that a nuclear explosion would cause escalation of political problems, solidifying loose enemy alliances against us and alienating our friends. They seldom contemplate that the opposite effect is considerably more likely. Against a winner, enemy alliances break up. Friends grow more ardent as victory approaches.

Germany's General Bernhardi also thought power-balancing was a weak tendency in international affairs. Discussing the prospects for German expansion, he admitted that balancing may occur but claimed that bandwagoning was the ultimate tendency:[173]

> Several weak nations [may] unite and form a superior combination in order to defeat a nation which in itself is stronger. This attempt will succeed for a time, but in the end the more intensive vitality will prevail. The allied opponents have the seeds of corruption in them, while the powerful nation gains from a temporary reverse a new strength which procures for it an ultimate victory over numerical superiority.

Militaries have a blindness for the notion that one's own military capabilities can provoke others to attack. They underestimate the risk that by acquiring a capacity to preempt others, they give others an incentive to preempt them. Thus in the interwar years British air force officers argued that others could best be deterred by a devastating British first-

---

Policy and the Dimensions of the Korean Conflict, 1950-1953 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985): 85. Most Pentagon planners also saw little danger of Chinese intervention, but some civilians feared that China would intervene. Michael Schaller, Douglas MacArthur: The Far Eastern General (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989): 200.

[171] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950, vol. 7: Korea (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976): 1149. See also John W. Spanier, The Truman-MacArthur Controversy and the Korean War (New York: W.W. Norton, 1965): 149.

[172] LeMay, America Is in Danger: 123, italics added.

[173] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 21; see also 109.

strike capability, slighting the notion that this might provoke others to strike first instead.[174] And General LeMay bridled at warnings that preemptive U.S. forces could provoke Soviet attack:[175]

> At a White House meeting with President John F. Kennedy in 1962, I recall being lectured by an articulate defense intellectual who had served briefly in World War II as a bombardier, but whose background was essentially legal and journalistic. For the listening President's benefit he told me how "provocative" Strategic Air Command bombers were, how their "first strike" characteristics were "destabilizing" and liable to result in a "miscalculated" or "spasm" war. ... After this dramatic and erudite discourse, which left me almost speechless, I began to wonder if my military education had been complete.

General Twining had similar disregard for the notion that preemptive war posed a risk. When a scientist argued that peace was stronger when Soviet nuclear forces were more survivable, Twining thought this was "upside down" reasoning.[176]

Militaries discount arms race dynamics, sometimes claiming that action-reaction theories are false, or suggesting that arms limitation is achieved by military superiority. Thus a spokesman for the British aircraft industry once explained how arms control is achieved:[177]

> Disarmament in fact is not negotiated; it is dictated by the strongest Powers. Once we have the strongest Air Force we shall be able to call a halt in competition and then only shall we of the [aircraft] industry be able to turn our activities to the genuine development of aircraft for purposes of peace.

Likewise Japanese naval officers argued in 1934 that Japan would not suffer if the 1930 London naval agreement were not renewed, since a naval arms race would entail no increase in naval spending.[178] And in 1979 U.S. General Alexander Haig claimed that the United States could have maintained nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union after 1962 for a mere $2-3 billion per year[179]--a plausible scenario only if the Soviet

---

[174] See Paul Bracken, "Unintended Consequences of Strategic Gaming," Simulation and Games, Vol. 8, No. 3 (September 1977): 283-318 at 307-8.

[175] LeMay, America Is in Danger: xii.

[176] Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 164-5.

[177] Quoted in Vagts, History of Militarism: 361.

[178] Asada, "Japanese Navy": 242.

[179] U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Armed Services,

Union had passively watched U.S. programs without reacting.

Similar thinking often prevails in military writings on war limitation and escalation control. "War is limited if we are strong--the other side won't dare escalate." Militaries generally downplay the risk of pre-emptive or preventive escalation in wartime--that is, the risk that strengths on one side may provoke the other to escalate to eliminate these strengths. General LeMay's view is typical:[180]

> The military base for successful deterrence at any level is over-all force superiority; that is, a capability to fight successfully at whatever level of intensity to win our objectives. ... If we have a war-winning ability to disarm the enemy we can put such a high penalty on escalation that the enemy will seek other than military means to attain his objectives.

In line with this view LeMay urged President Kennedy to invade Cuba during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, assuring him that the Soviet Union would not react.[181] He had believed that "there wasn't a chance that we would have gone to war with Russia because we had overwhelming strategic capability and the Russians knew it."[182] And during the Vietnam War U.S. military and civilian leaders saw opposite paths to escalation: civilians feared that U.S. strikes on North Vietnam could provoke Chinese intervention, while military leaders feared that U.S. restraint could lead China to sense U.S. weakness and intervene.[183]

Militaries underestimate the risk that wartime opponents will refuse to concede even a lost war. Thus in 1937 Japanese officers thought China would concede once Japan conquered north China, giving Japan a quick victory.[184]

Military Implications of the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto (SALT II Treaty): Hearings Before the Committee on Armed Services: Part 1 (hereafter Armed Services Committee, SALT II Hearings) 96th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979): 368.

[180] LeMay, America Is In Danger: 155.

[181] Robert F. Kennedy, Thirteen Days (New York: W.W. Norton, 1971): 14.

[182] Quoted in Richard Rhodes, "The General and World War III," The New Yorker, June 19, 1995: 47-59 at 58.

[183] Leslie H. Gelb with Richard K. Betts, The Irony of Vietnam: The System Worked (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1979): 269-70.

[184] Barnhardt, Japan Prepares for Total War: 98.

Instead China stubbornly resisted and was still unsubdued when Japan surrendered to the United States in 1945.

In short: militaries exaggerate how easily others can be cowed into submission by displays of strength or threats of force. They also understate their own state's role in provoking others' hostility, understate war's propensity to persist and escalate, and understate the possibility that posing a menace to others can provoke their attack. Militaries purvey these illusions because they serve military organizational interests.

These misperceptions, in turn, lead states to overcommit themselves in crises, because leaders exaggerate the chances that blustering will make the other side back down. They also lead to reckless uses of force because states underestimate the risks that forceful policies raise.

C. "Conquest Is Easy." Conquest has been hard through most of history, especially in modern times. Since 1815 great powers have been conquered on only eight occasions. On six of these eight occasions--France in 1815, Germany in 1918 and 1945, Austria-Hungary in 1918, Japan in 1945, and Italy in 1945--the defeated great power lost to an overwhelming coalition that it conjured up by its own belligerent conduct. Only France in 1870 and France in 1940 were conquered by a solitary opponent. And both times France was soon freed by other states that sought to preserve Europe's balance of power. Thus *no* state has been durably conquered in recent years except by an overwhelming coalition. This striking result reflects the dominance of the defense on the battlefield and the strong tendency of great powers to coalesce against aggressors.

Militaries paint an opposite world of easy conquest and scarce security, exaggerating the strength of the offense against the defense in all aspects of war. They inflate the ease of offensive military operations on the battlefield. They misread military technology, seeing defensive technology as offensive. They claim--wrongly--that attacking lifts morale, giving attackers the advantage even when other factors favor the defense. They claim that civilian morale can be broken and regimes can be collapsed by attacking civilian society. They exaggerate bandwagoning and downplay balancing, as noted above; this leads them to understate the political resistance that forms to check aggressors and protect their targets. They exaggerate the finality of victory and understate the problems of ruling beaten states. Each argument leads militaries to overstate the feasibility of conquest.

Military claims for the offense are sometimes correct. Sometimes conquest is easy, security is scarce, and offensive doctrines are appropriate. But militaries axiomatically laud the offense, as a general and broadly applicable postulate of war. They may adopt defensive strategies if civilians demand

them, but without civilian direction they nearly always purvey offensive ideas and favor offensive force postures and doctrines.

Military thinking abounds with offense-minded assertions and warnings against defensive strategies. As Bernard Brodie observed, military doctrine has been "universally ... imbued with the 'spirit of the offensive'" since the time of Napoleon.[185] During the American Civil War a typical Union tactics manual declared that "offensive wars ... have many advantages; purely defensive ones will always end in submission. There is one great maxim ... *to encounter an advancing enemy by our own advance*."[186] Union General Henry Halleck argued that defenders should always try to move to the offense even if they were defending entrenched positions.[187] Confederate commander Robert E. Lee was a dogmatic believer in the offensive who decimated his armies by repeated attacks.[188] One author notes that Lee "never defended when he could attack."[189] Another Confederate officer announced in November 1862, after entrenched defenders had repeatedly massacred attackers in previous battles, that defensive entrenchments "never paid anywhere" and "will ruin our cause if adopted here."[190] The war's heavy toll stemmed in part from the repeated marching of troops into murderous fire from defenders protected by breastworks or trenches.

Offensive ideas also shaped more recent American military thinking. SAC's General Curtis LeMay explained in 1956 that "it is one of the principles of war that the

---

[185] Bernard Brodie, Strategy in the Missile Age (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965): 42.

[186] Grady McWhiney and Perry D. Jamieson, Attack and Die: Civil War Military Tactics and Southern Heritage (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1982): 144, emphasis in original; see also ibid.: 41-43, 49-50, 101-102.

[187] McWhiney and Jamieson, Attack and Die: 42. Confederate General John Bell Hood still argued against using field works even after the war. Ibid.: 164.

[188] McWhiney and Jamieson, Attack and Die: 73-89; Alan T. Nolan, Lee Considered: General Robert E. Lee and Civil War History (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991); 98-105.

[189] Marshall Fishwick, quoted in Nolan, Lee Considered: 104.

[190] E. John Ellis, quoted in McWhiney and Jamieson, Attack and Die: 145.

advantage lies with the offense," and warned that "history is full of examples of people who put all their blue chips on defense and they are no longer with us."[191] A top U.S. Army Air Corps commander declared in 1946: "I don't like the word 'defense.'"[192] A U.S. naval officer warned in 1981 against a "defensive mind-set" that would "hamstring us in the event of [war]. We must subdue this defensive attitude."[193] The Joint Chiefs of Staff repeatedly chafed at the defensive strictures of America's Cold War containment policy, at one point declaring that American basic national security policy "should reflect ... offensive spirit, if the United States is to survive and prosper."[194] In the early Cold War the Air Force focused so exclusively on preparing an offensive against the Soviet Union, and thereby so neglected its own defenses, that it left itself vulnerable to Soviet surprise attack.[195] Opinion polls taken in the 1990s showed that U.S. military officers were markedly more offense-minded than U.S. civilians.[196]

In Europe and elsewhere we see the same pattern. Before 1914 European officers argued that "one cannot defeat the enemy without attacking,"[197] and claimed that all

---

[191] U.S. Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Study of Airpower, Part 2 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956): 155, 157.

[192] General H.H. Arnold, quoted in Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 330.

[193] Lieutenant Commander T. Wood Parker, "Thinking Offensively," Proceedings (April 1981): 26-31 at 26. Parker echoed Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, America's foremost naval strategist, who before World War I argued that "defense is insured only by offense" and that war "must be waged offensively." Marion Boggs, Attempts to Define and Limit "Aggressive" Armament in Diplomacy and Strategy (Columbia: University of Missouri Studies XVI, No. 1, 1941): 70n; and Holger H. Herwig, "The Failure of German Sea Power, 1914-1945: Mahan, Tirpitz, and Raeder Reconsidered," International History Review, Vol. 10, No. 1 (February 1988): 68-105 at 73.

[194] FRUS 1961-63, Vol. 8, p. 122.

[195] Fred Kaplan, The Wizards of Armageddon (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983): 99, 103, 133, 148-51.

[196] Holsti, "A Widening Gap": 19, question G2.

[197] General Schlieffen, quoted in Jack Snyder, The Ideology of the Offensive: Military Decision Making and the Disasters of 1914 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984): 139.

victorious armies have "an unmitigated offensive spirit."[198] In France General Joseph Joffre declared that defensive strategy ideas should be "rejected as contrary to the very nature of war."[199] Colonel Loyzeaux de Grandmaison taught that almost any offensive plan was better than a defensive plan, and that any who criticized the army's offensive concepts thereby showed their moral weakness and unfitness for high command.[200] Other French officers proclaimed it necessary that "the concept of the offensive penetrate the soul of our nation"; that "defeat is inevitable as soon as the hope of conquering ceases to exist"; and that "there is only one way of defending ourselves--to attack as soon as we are ready."[201] British officers declared that "the defensive is never an acceptable role to the Briton, and he makes little or no study of it," and that the offensive "will win as sure as there is a sun in the heavens."[202] Italian officers were dogmatic believers in the offensive and embraced offensive tactics that cost Italy dearly in the war.[203] Samuel Williamson writes that Austrian Chief of Staff General Franz Conrad von Hötzendorff had a "fanatical faith in the offensive" and a corresponding belief in a short war.[204] German officers also celebrated offensive ideas. A 1902 German General Staff study explained that Germany could defend itself "only when we take the offensive."[205] A German officer

---

[198] Colonel Loyzeaux de Grandmaison, quoted in Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 91.

[199] General Joseph Joffre, quoted in Ellis, Social History of the Machine Gun: 53-54.

[200] Ropp, War in the Modern World: 222.

[201] Major Emile Driant, quoted in Vagts, History of Militarism: 350; the 1913 French Field Regulations, quoted in Barbara W. Tuchman, The Guns of August (New York: Dell, 1962): 51; and Marshall Ferdinand Foch, quoted in ibid.: 264.

[202] General W.G. Knox in 1914 and General R.C.B. Haking in 1913, quoted in T.H.E. Travers, "Technology, Tactics, and Morale: Jean de Bloch, the Boer War, and British Military Theory, 1900-1914," Journal of Modern History, Vol. 51 (June 1979): 264-286 at 271, 275.

[203] John Gooch, "Clausewitz Disregarded: Italian Military Thought and Doctrine, 1815-1943," Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 9, Nos. 2-3 (June/September 1986): 303-324 at 303, 312-15, 322.

[204] Williamson, Austria-Hungary and the Origins of the First World War: 118.

claimed in 1914 that "the superiority of offensive warfare under modern conditions is greater than formerly," despite the appearance of new technology--such as the machine gun--that strongly favored the defense.[206] Even after the war Germany's General Erich von Ludendorff wrongly claimed that "the offensive makes less demands on the men and gives no higher losses" than the defensive.[207] Martin Kitchen notes an "obsession in the [Wilhelmine German] army with attack at all costs."[208]

Most other militaries have also embraced offensive ideas. Before World War II imperial Japanese military cadets were taught that offense was the best tactic under all circumstances.[209] The modern Soviet military embraced highly offensive tactical and strategic doctrines, and Soviet officers extolled the virtues of the offensive in strident terms: one officer claimed that "the offensive has incontestible advantages over the defense"; another warned that "defensive strategy should be decisively rejected as being extremely dangerous to the country."[210] Many modern militaries, including those of China, Israel, Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union, teach that the offensive--but not the defensive--is a prime principle of

---

[205] Ritter, Sword and Scepter: 2:117.

[206] General Friedrich von Bernhardi, How Germany Makes War (New York: H. Doran Co., 1914): 153.

[207] Quoted in Winston S. Churchill, The World Crisis 1916-1918, Part I (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1927): 49.

[208] Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 102. The German navy was also infused with offensive ideas. See, for example, Holger Herwig, Politics of Frustration: The United States in German Naval Planning, 1889-1941 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976): 42-66, outlining the navy's far-fetched pre-war schemes for invading the United States. Germany's chief of admiralty staff, Admiral Otto von Diederichs, explained that "our only means of defense lies in an offense." Ibid.: 52. For more examples of military offense-mindedness from before 1914 see Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 194-198.

[209] Fujiwara, "Role of the Japanese Army": 193.

[210] Colonel A.A. Sidorenko, The Offensive, trans. U.S. Air Force (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970): 1; and Marshall V.D. Sokolovskiy, Soviet Military Strategy, 3d ed., trans. Harriet Fast Scott (New York: Crane, Russak, 1968): 283-84.

war.[211]

Officers have often argued that international conflicts are eventually decided by final victory or defeat. The preamble to a pre-World War I U.S. naval war plan explained that "the three great competitors for the world's trade are now the United States, Great Britain, and Germany. Following the teachings of all history, two of these three must in the sequel be practically subordinated to the third."[212] This faith in the offense fuels dreams of easy conquest and fear of sudden defeat. In the military image of war, attacking armies penetrate far into enemy territory and quickly smash their opponents. One side or the other soon overruns the opponent's capital. Before World War I leading officers almost unanimously believed that a general war would end in a matter of months.[213] A German general thought the German army could sweep through Europe like a bus full of tourists, forecasting that "in two weeks we shall defeat France, then we shall turn round, defeat Russia and then we shall march to the Balkans and establish order there."[214] A British general thought "the Germans would be crushed in no time."[215] In the U.S., General Story feared that Japan could quickly conquer the American West Coast in 1908, and General Greene thought Germany and Britain could conquer the U.S. from the East in 1915 (as quoted above). And in 1918 British generals had frightening visions of German forces sweeping clear to the north-west frontier of India, and deployed troops in the Caucuses and TransCaspia as a precaution.[216] In the 1930's Japanese officers boasted they could defeat China in three months.[217] And before Germany's 1941

---

[211] Zvi Lanir, "The 'Principles of War' and Military Thinking," Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 16, No. 1 (March 1993): 1-17 at 3.

[212] Richard D. Challener, Admirals, Generals and American Foreign Policy 1898-1914 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973): 15-16.

[213] De Weerd, "Churchill, Lloyd George, Clemenceau": 290. Britain's Lord Kitchener was the only prominent exception. Ibid.

[214] von Loebell, quoted in Fischer, War of Illusions: 543.

[215] General James M. Grierson, quoted in Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 366.

[216] Brian Bond, British Military Policy Between the Two World Wars (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980): 13.

[217] Butow, Tojo and the Coming of the War: 109.

invasion of the Soviet Union, the German army commander thought German forces could beat the Soviets in four weeks.[218]

In 1940 British and French Air Force officers argued for a Franco-British air strike against Soviet oil fields at Baku, British officers claiming that a single 177-plane attack would induce "sooner or later the total collapse of the war potential of the U.S.S.R.," and so deny this war potential to the Germans.[219] Likewise Sir John Slessor wrongly claimed that strategic bombing "on anything approaching an intensive scale ... even at irregular intervals for any length of time" could conquer states by destroying their war industry.[220]

In 1964 General Thomas Power wrote of Castro's Cuba--a country with two-thirds the land area of South Vietnam--that the U.S. "could have eradicated this festering cancer in our hemisphere without risk and without working up a sweat,"[221] and claimed that the U.S. could have conquered both Russia and China in the early 1950's: "we could have crushed Communism at its root, despite the vast inroads it had made all over the world."[222] General Douglas MacArthur claimed the U.S. could have destroyed Chinese military power during the Korean War, "probably for all time. My plan was a cinch."[223]

This bias toward offense creates an unwillingness to take defense seriously. Thus British entrenchments during World War I were primitive because British officers preferred to invest in preparing attacks. The British officer's Field Service Pocket Book enjoined its readers: "The choice of a [defensive] position and its preparation must be made with a view to economizing the power expended on defense in order

---

[218] General Walther von Brauchitsch, quoted in Rich, Hitler's War Aims: 211.

[219] Fred Charles Iklé, Every War Must End, rev. ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991): 57-58.

[220] Quoted in Murray, "British and German Air Doctrine": 44. In 1934 Sir Edward Ellington likewise thought a war would be won in three or four weeks by a "knock out blow" from the air. Quoted in N.H. Gibbs, Grand Strategy, vol. 1: Rearmament Policy (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1976): 590. (Murray only but forget Gibbs).

[221] Power, Design for Survival: 50.

[222] Power, Design for Survival: 106. Power's optimistic assessment of the East-West military balance contrasts interestingly with Paul Nitze's gloomy judgments in NSC 68 and with pessimistic discussions in the press at that time.

[223] Quoted in Robert H. Ferrell, American Diplomacy: A History, 3d ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975): 718.

that the power of offense may be increased."[224] A British soldier later explained why British trenches were shabby:[225]

> The whole conduct of our trench warfare seemed to be based on the concept that we, the British, were not stopping in the trenches for long, but were tarrying awhile on the way to Berlin and that very soon we would be chasing Jerry across the country. The result, in the long term, meant that we lived a mean and impoverished sort of existence in lousy scratch holes.

Ingredients of offensive illusions. The illusion of easy conquest is has several ingredients. Militaries misread new technology, seeing offensive implications even in defensive military innovations. Before World War I French officers argued that the machine gun and other improvements in firearms strengthened the attacker, not the defender. Marshall Ferdinand Foch explained this bizarre conclusion: "Any improvement of firearms is ultimately bound to add strength to the offensive. ... Nothing is easier than to give a mathematical demonstration of that truth."[226] If two thousand troops attacked one thousand troops, each firing their rifles once a minute, he explained, the "balance in favor of the attack" would be one thousand bullets per minute. But if troops on both sides could fire ten times a minute, the balance favoring the attackers would increase to ten thousand bullets per minute, giving the attack a larger advantage.[227] What he missed, of course, was that both attacker and defender would have to take cover against such a storm of steel, making advance by the attacker impossible.[228]

---

[224] Quoted in Paul Fussell, The Great War and Modern Memory (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975): 43.

[225] George Coppard, quoted in Fussell, Great War and Modern Memory: 44.

[226] Ropp, War in the Modern World: 218.

[227] Ropp, War in the Modern World: 218.

[228] General Bernhardi likewise wrote in 1914 that larger armies would need longer to take defensive measures, owing to "the difficulties of moving masses." Hence, he reasoned, Europe's large armies bolstered the offense. Friedrich von Bernhardi, How Germany Makes War (New York: George H. Doran, 1914): 153-54. He failed to consider that large armies could cover an entire frontier, making themselves impossible to outflank, hence impossible to defeat. And he claimed in 1912 that railroads bolstered the offensive by affording "great freedom of movement," overlooking that their main effect was to help defenders rush reserves to any spot where an attacker threatened to break through. Jehuda L. Wallach,

U.S. military officers likewise overlooked the power that nuclear weapons confer on defenders.[229] The U.S. Air Force Association argued that nuclear weapons make conquest easier: "Given modern weapons ... one nation can paralyze and conquer other nations without undue risk to itself."[230] General Twining wrote that "there is no question that a nuclear war can be 'won,' as wars of the past have been won--by the side which is best prepared to fight it."[231] And many Soviet military officers argued that nuclear weapons strengthen the offense.

Officers allege--without evidence--that attackers have better morale than defenders. U.S. Civil War general Henry Halleck wrote that "offensive war ... adds to the moral courage of its own army, while it disheartens its opponents."[232] Germany's Colonel Colmar von der Goltz wrote in 1887 that "all impediments in his way will awaken in the assailant new ideas and new vigor, will sharpen his mind, and enhance his love of enterprise. ... Happy the belligerent who is by fate destined to play the part of the assailant!"[233] French Captain Georges Gilbert contended in 1890 that "the offensive doubles the energy of the troops."[234] Later Marshall Foch glorified "the moral superiority" generated by fighting on the offense.[235]

"Misperceptions of Clausewitz' *On War* by the German Military," Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 9, Nos. 2 and 3 (June/September 1986): 213-239 at 222.

[229] On the advantage that nuclear weapons give defenders see Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 246.

[230] In 1955, quoted in Lawrence Freedman, The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy (New York: St. Martin's, 1981): 129.

[231] In 1966, in Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 112. See also General Daniel Graham, quoted below at note 510.

[232] Quoted in LeMay, America Is in Danger: 302.

[233] Lieutenant-Colonel Colmar von der Goltz, The Nation In Arms (London: W.H. Allen & Co., 1887): 216.

[234] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 64. In 1882 a French military journal likewise decried the defensive as "a timorous tactic that softens our soldiers and takes away all their élan." Ibid.: 63.

[235] Ropp, War in the Modern World: 203. For more examples see Bernhardi, How Germany Makes War: 151; and Gooch, "Clausewitz Disregarded": 313.

When technology weighs heavily against the offense, soldiers use mystical psychological arguments to explain why conquest is still possible. What might be called the "psychic shock" theory of victory--holding that armies or regimes will collapse under the psychic shock of attack--is trotted out. Before 1914 Russian officers claimed the Austro-Hungarian regime would disintegrate under Russian attack: "On the occasion of the first great defeats all this multinational and artificially united mass ought to disintegrate."[236] In the 1920s Italy's General Giulio Douhet, a founding airpower theorist, thought bombing would "stampede the population into panic."[237] (In fact bombing has repeatedly stampeded populations into supporting their wartime governments.)[238] In 1939 France's General Maurice Gamelin thought a French attack on the Soviet Union in the Black Sea area perhaps could "lead to the collapse of the entire Soviet system."[239] In 1940 Germany's General Alfred Jodl thought German attacks on Britain would "break the will of the people to resist, and thereby force its government to capitulate."[240] And in 1941 Japan's Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto hoped that American morale would "sink to the extent that it could not be recovered" if he destroyed the U.S. main fleet at Pearl Harbor.[241] (In fact the Pearl Harbor attack greatly energized the American public for war.)

Conquest is made to appear easier by developing a contemptuous image of the enemy--a cowardly bully, dangerous but prone to panic and collapse when its homeland is invaded. John Stoessinger notes that General MacArthur's false optimism in 1950 was based partly on "a curious contempt for

---

[236] Sbornik, in June 1913, quoted in Fuller, "Russian Empire": 113.

[237] Giulio Douhet, The Command of the Air, trans. Dino Ferrari (New York: Coward-McCann, 1942): 58.

[238] On the failure of counter-population bombing to coerce governments see Robert Pape, Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

[239] Max Jakobson, The Diplomacy of the Winter War: An Account of the Russo-Finnish Conflict, 1939-1940 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961): 203.

[240] William L. Shirer, The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1960): 760.

[241] Gordon W. Prange, At Dawn We Slept: The Untold Story of Pearl Harbor (New York: Penguin Books, 1982): 16; see also 17, 21.

the Chinese soldier."[242] Robert Butow observes that Japanese military planners' hopes for success against the U.S. were based partly on "the mind-over-matter factor"--the Japanese believed they had better spirit than the Americans, who they thought were ridden by personal selfishness and an absence of patriotism.[243]

Finally, some soldiers equate tactical success with strategic victory and exaggerate the permanence of military triumph. Before World War I Germany's General Bernhardi wrote that Germany should "finally get rid" of the French threat, as if this were possible.[244] "France must be so completely crushed that she can never again come cross our path,"[245] he wrote, and "must be annihilated once and for all as a great power."[246] By expanding, Bernhardi thought, Germany could "so amply [secure] our position in Europe that it can never again be questioned."[247] Colonel von der Goltz spoke of the next war as "a final struggle" for Germany, as if German victory would being international politics to an end.[248] Germany's General Wilhelm Groener believed a German victory would give Germany a hundred years of peace.[249] More recently General Twining wrote that the United States could have eliminated Russian power "for generations to come" by attacking in the late 1940s.[250] In 1967 Israel's General Ariel Sharon thought the Arabs so weakened by the 1967 war that he would be too old to fight in the next war. But Arab power soon recovered and Sharon quickly served in two more Arab-Israeli wars.[251]

Militaries tend to assume that enemies are beaten when their main force units are defeated, and confuse the winning

---

[242] John G. Stoessinger, Nations at Dawn: China, Russia, and America, 6th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994): 51.

[243] Butow, Tojo and the Coming of the War: 418.

[244] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 105.

[245] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 106.

[246] Quoted in Tuchman, Guns of August: 26.

[247] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 81.

[248] Quoted in Michael Howard, Studies in War and Peace (New York: Viking Press, 1959): 103.

[249] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 149.

[250] Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 19.

[251] Nadav Safran, Israel: The Embattled Ally (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978): 257.

of battles with winning the war.[252] Thus von der Goltz spoke of "the object of all war, the crushing of the enemy's forces."[253] They underestimate the risk that others will form countervailing coalitions to limit or reverse their conquests. They overlook guerilla resistance. They underestimate the harm to national morale caused by empire-building, and the harm to army morale caused by counterinsurgency and police operations in conquered territories.

Motives for military offense-mindedness. Militaries exaggerate the ease of conquest because this strengthens the case for larger and more offensive military forces.

States buy larger forces when conquest seems easy because they feel less secure. Arguments that national defenses are too weak and more forces are needed are more persuasive. Conversely, if conquest seems difficult civilians will feel safe enough to give priority to other claims on the budget. Force also seems more useful when conquest seems easy; it can conquer empires and destroy opponents, so having more force seems more expedient.

States buy more offensive forces when conquest seems easy because offensive strategies promise more success. The claim that "we should buy what works, and offense works best" carries more weight. Conversely, if conquest seems difficult civilians will more likely choose defensive postures and doctrines on grounds that defense works best.

Militaries prefer offensive military postures and doctrines for three reasons. First, offensive strategies enhance military autonomy.[254] A defensive strategy envisions a war settled by compromise. Force is used to support a diplomatic solution. Hence political considerations must shape military operations; hence politicians must have a say in military decisions. In contrast an offensive strategy requires little civilian control of wartime operations, since the purpose of fighting is to attain victory. Civilians take the reins only after victory is won. In the meantime the military enjoys autonomy.

Second, offensive doctrines let militaries impose their programs on the enemy, rather than vice versa.[255] The attacker

---

[252] B.H. Liddell Hart, The British Way of Warfare (London: Faber & Faber, 1932): 20-22.

[253] von der Goltz, Nation In Arms: 216.

[254] Offering this argument are Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 49-50, 58; and Snyder, "Perceptions of the Security Dilemma": 162-63.

[255] Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 46-48, 58; and Snyder, "Perceptions of the Security Dilemma": 163.

structures the battle, while the defender reacts. Hence the attacker can follow its organizational routines while the defender must improvise. This satisfies the organization's desire to minimize uncertainty--even if, as in this case, the organization now must perform more difficult tasks. Thus U.S. General William Tecumseh Sherman declared: "Instead of being on the defensive, I would [prefer to] be on the offensive; instead of guessing at what he means to do, he would have to guess at my plans."[256] General Foch argued for offensive action because "we must always seek to create events, not merely to suffer them"; and General Joffre favored the offensive to "prevent our maneuver from being dominated from the start by the enemy's decision."[257] Israel's General Avigdor Kahalani warned that "the defensive is very dangerous" because "we, the defender, are forced to react to all the actions that the attacker makes."[258] General Curtis LeMay explained:[259]

> The offensive doctrine gives the power of initiative to the attacker. He can plan and carry out his campaign with precision. The defender is never sure which way to turn until it may be too late. His reaction is fraught with indecision.

Third, an offensive strategy enhances the size and wealth of the military.[260] Offense is a demanding mission. An offensive strategy gives the military a greater claim on national resources, once civilian leaders endorse it, because offense is usually harder than defense. This means that militaries must dissemble when they estimate the offense-defense balance: offense is easy if national strategy is being debated, but hard when budgeting forces for an agreed offensive strategy. (In fact militaries often claim that offense is easy in the abstract, while complaining that they have too little to carry out specific assigned offensive missions.)

Evidence from World War I. The "cult of the offensive" before World War I illustrates the strength of the military

---

[256] B.H. Liddell-Hart, Sherman: Soldier, Realist, American (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1929): 321.

[257] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 50, 97.

[258] Yoav Ben-Horin and Barry Posen, Israel's Strategic Doctrine (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, report R-2845-NA, 1981): 32.

[259] LeMay, America Is in Danger: 302.

[260] Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 49, 58; and Snyder, "Perceptions of the Security Dilemma": 162.

bias toward the offensive.[261] During the several decades before 1914 Europeans widely came to believe that the offense had the advantage in war, and the next war would quickly end with a decisive attack. This illusion was heavily promoted by European militaries, who purveyed it widely to European leaders and publics. Moreover, these militaries were engaged in a deliberate deception, not an honest mistake. We know this because the case they made for the offense shows telltale signs of willful bias.

Long before the war, abundant evidence showed that new technology--accurate rapid-fire rifles, machine guns, barbed wire, railroads, and developed entrenchments--vastly enhanced the strength of the defense. European militaries saw this evidence and grasped its meaning. In private they puzzled how to overcome these enormous new defensive obstacles. But in public they obscured these new realities and glorified the offensive. Tortured logic was used to support claims that the offense remained strong. Far-fetched notions of the alleged morale advantages of operating on the offense were invented. Militaries also ridiculed or silenced writers who criticized offensive ideas. In short, what militaries knew to be the situation, and the image of war they conveyed to civilians, were starkly different. Militaries saw the new power of the defense but they still insisted on offensive doctrines and strategies, and they assured European leaders and publics that the offensive was supreme.

In Britain, for instance, many officers saw the growing power of the defense, and military insiders discussed possible tactical responses, but this never shook their devotion to the offense. Tim Travers shows that British officers widely

---

[261] Works on this cult include Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive; Tim Travers, The Killing Ground: The British Army, the Western Front and the Emergence of Modern Warfare 1900-1918 (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987): 37-61; Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale"; Brodie, Strategy in the Missile Age: 42-52; Michael Howard, "Men Against Fire: Expectations of War in 1914," International Security, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Summer 1984): 41-57; Stephen Van Evera, "The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War," in ibid.: 58-107; and idem, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 193-239. The notion of a "cult" is from General Joseph Joffre, who spoke in his memoirs of "the cult of the offensive" and "a mystique of the offensive" of "a somewhat irrational kind." Joseph Joffre, Mémoires du Maréchal Joffre (Paris: Librarie Plon, 1932): 33, my translation. Jay Luvaas also quotes a French Captain de Thomasson who, writing in 1920, discussed the "passionate cult of the offensive" that arose before 1914. Jay Luvaas, The Military Legacy of the Civil War: The European Inheritance (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959): 165.

perceived the rising strength of the defense during 1900-1914 but refused to face up to its tactical implications.[262] Their writing on offensive versus defensive tactics reveals "an army fighting a rear-guard action against the full implications of firepower."[263] They accepted that new weapons were far more lethal but dismissed the conclusion that strategy must change accordingly.

British officers made tortured arguments to evade the defensive lessons of the Boer War. These arguments included claims that conditions in South Africa were unique and would not be repeated, and professions that new technology would not change the essential principles of war.[264]

The German and French militaries twisted or ignored historical evidence showing the greater power of the defense, purged advocates of the defense, and publicly endorsed offensive strategies that they privately knew faced enormous obstacles. Germany's General Schlieffen dogmatically endorsed his highly offensive war plan--envisioning sequential attacks on Belgium, France, and Russia--in policy discussions, but his private papers reveal that he doubted it would succeed. It was, he wrote, "an enterprise for which we are too weak."[265]

In France Marshall Foch issued a remarkable dictum: "All improvements in firearms add to the strength of an offensive intelligently planned because the attackers, choosing their ground, can concentrate on it so much greater a volume of fire."[266] He supported his case by deceptive use of history, e.g., twisting the record of the Battle of Wagram (1809) to show the resilient power of infantry on the offense, although it did not show this. He also advanced the strange claim that attacking lifts the morale of attackers.[267]

---

[262] Travers, "Technology, Tactics, and Morale"; and Travers, Killing Ground: 37-55.

[263] Travers, "Technology, Tactics, and Morale": 276.

[264] Travers, "Technology, Tactics, and Morale": 269-70.

[265] Ritter, Schlieffen Plan: 66; see also 60-61. Germany's Chief of Staff, General Moltke (the younger), and the head of German rail operations, General Wilhelm Groener, privately shared both Schlieffen's insistence on an offensive strategy and his pessimism about the obstacles that it faced. Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 147-48, 150-51. As Groener's biographer, Helmut Haeussler, summarized: "German strategists understood their problem and sailed right into it." Ibid.: 147.

[266] Ferdinand Foch, The Principles of War, trans. de Morinni (New York: Fly, 1918): 33.

[267] Brodie, Strategy in the Missile Age: 49-50. Brodie

Lessons from the U.S. Civil War were resolutely ignored by European officers. The European militaries sent many observers to study the American war, but they learned selectively. Lee's losses at Malvern Hill, Pickett's disastrous charge at Gettysburg, and the massacres of Union attackers at Fredericksburg and Cold Harbor showed the enormous power of entrenched troops equipped with modern small arms. Yet, as Jay Luvaas details, while these European observers duly noted and applied new American developments in military technology, they ignored the war's defensive tactical lessons. "Most of those who studied the Civil War after 1870 were in reality seeking to confirm accepted principles," so that "the tactical lessons of the Civil War went unheeded."[268] Luvaas explains:[269]

> There were ample observers and military visitors in America at all times; scarcely a campaign in Virginia and Maryland did not come under the scrutiny of some foreign officer accompanying one or the other of the armies. ... The necessary information was available--it simply was ignored or misinterpreted.

Prussian officers were aware of the Civil War, but no high-ranking Prussian officers thought it held important military lessons.[270] French military writings all but ignored the Civil War during the decade before 1914, and French official doctrine was untouched by tactical lessons from the American war.[271]

Fatuous arguments were offered to explain why the lessons of the Civil War did not apply to Europe. Moltke the elder claimed the conditions of the war were too different from Europe: the American war was only "two armed mobs chasing each other around the country, from which nothing could be

---

adds that the use of history has "seldom ... resulted in such brazen and portentous distortions as it did in the hands of Foch and his followers." Ibid.: 50.

[268] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 233. For details see ibid., passim.

[269] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 227.

[270] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 124.

[271] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 166, 150. Even the scholarly Major Colin spent only three pages on the Civil War in his suvey of nineteenth century warfare. Ibid.: 166. On the evolution of French doctrine see also Basil Liddell Hart, "French Military Ideas Before the First World War," in Martin Gilbert, ed., A Century of Conflict, 1850-1950 (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966): 135-148; and Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 41-106.

learned."[272] Others argued that entrenchments were chiefly of value to raw troops and militia, not to the well-trained armies of Europe.[273] Still others, such as General Bernhardi, cited examples from the war that appeared to show the power of the offense (the battle of Chattanooga), while ignoring much more numerous counter-examples (Fredericksburg, Gettysburg, Cold Harbor, Nashville, Malvern Hill, and Second Bull Run).[274]

More candidly, another German officer rejected the demonstrated value of entrenchments because this lesson led logically to a defensive strategy: "A carry-over of this method of fighting [to Europe] ... would imply a want of appreciation for the purposes of every battle--the overthrow of the enemy."[275] In short, the Civil War was to be dismissed not because its lessons were false, but because a defensive strategy was unacceptable, so evidence supporting it should be ignored.

After the Civil War scores of battles in Europe and Asia taught the same lessons again. During the Russo-Turkish war of 1877 entrenched Turkish troops inflicted huge losses on Russian attackers at Plevna. The several major battles of the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5 saw the first use of the machine gun, and showed again that attackers could not carry entrenchments without great superiority and heavy losses. In the Boer War, Boer defenders held far larger attacking British forces at bay.

But European militaries would not learn defensive lessons from these episodes. Instead they twisted history to obscure the weakness of the offensive. The Russian failure at Plevna was blamed on insufficient Russian *elan*,[276] and the facts of the Russo-Japanese war were tortured to salvage the overall doctrine of the offensive. The official French observers reported the Russo-Japanese war as "a resounding confirmation of the superiority of the offensive ... and of the powerlessness of the defensive."[277]

The real lessons of even the 1870 Franco-Prussian war were essentially defensive. The French lost the war by attacking too often, which put them on the tactical offensive,

---

[272] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 126.

[273] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 131.

[274] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 139.

[275] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 131.

[276] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 66.

[277] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 80.

although they stood on the strategic defensive.[278] Yet later French military officers concealed this lesson simply by claiming that the losing French tactics had in fact been defensive![279] As Jack Snyder notes, "preferred doctrine ruled history, not vice versa."[280]

The lessons of the Boer war were obscured by twisting the facts to suit the argument. Before the war, as Ivan Bloch notes, the British military dismissed evidence favoring the defense derived from maneuvers on grounds that maneuvers differed from the actual battlefield; defenders in real battle would panic and fire wildly, they argued, so attackers would suffer fewer casualties than they lost in maneuvers. Then the Boer war disproved this, so the army argued that Boer soldiers were exceptional marksmen and European defenders would never shoot as well.[281] British military leaders also claimed that British junior officers in South Africa had lacked the true spirit of the offensive and been too cautious.[282] A French analyst claimed that the Boers had done well against the numerically superior British because of their superior morale, but lost in the end because they adopted a defensive strategy.[283] Another argued that Boer rifle fire was so effective because Boers had better eyesight than Europeans, and South African air was exceptionally clear.[284]

Authorities were misquoted as advocates of the offense,

---

[278] The French military historian Jean Colin later wrote that the 1870 campaign showed that "well-chosen and well-arranged defensive positions, even when very weakly held, could not be carried." Quoted in Liddell Hart, "French Military Ideas Before the First War": 141.

[279] Liddell Hart, "French Military Ideas Before the First World War": 140-41. Thus Marshall Joffre later wrote that the war of 1870 "amply proved that a passive defense is the forerunner of defeat." Joseph Joffre, The Personal Memoirs of Joffre, Field Marshall of the French Army, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932): 1:26.

[280] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 65.

[281] Jean De Bloch, "Militarism in Politics and Lord Roberts' Army Reorganization Scheme," Contemporary Review, No. 432 (December 1901): 761-793 at 787-88.

[282] Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale": 273-74.

[283] Georges Gilbert, summarized in Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 78.

[284] Frédéric Culmann, summarized in Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 79.

whether or not they were. In his classic On War, Carl von Clausewitz emphasized the greater power of the defense and the need to limit war, but in death he was reinvented as an apostle of the offense and total war. Dallas Irvine paraphrased a French war college professor's bogus version of Clausewitz:[285]

> War must be an utmost exertion of force, and especially of moral force, for the complete destruction of the enemy's armed resistance, and to this end the offensive should be undertaken whenever practicable and in its simplest, most direct, and most vigorous form.

Other officers simply ignored Clausewitz to focus instead on the shallower but more offense-minded Antoine Jomini. For example, no Russian translation of On War appeared until 1899-1900, sixty-seven years after its German publication.[286]

Military analysts cooked the books in favor of the offense by biasing their exercises and analyses. In Germany General Schlieffen made a string of dubious assumptions to conceal his plan's weakness. Specifically, he assumed that Britain would give no effective aid to France; that Germany could rapidly shift forces from one front to the other but France could not; that German infantry could sustain an unrealistic rate of advance; and that Germany would have 5-7 more corps available to invade France than were actually available in 1914.[287] He made no mention of machine guns, barbed wire entanglements, or the effect of demolitions of rail bridges by retreating French on German logistics.[288] And he failed to examine his ability to supply troops on his all-

---

[285] Irvine paraphrased Lucien Cardot. Quoted in Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 64.

[286] Bruce W. Menning, Bayonets before Bullets: The Imperial Russian Army, 1861-1914 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992): 124-25. The German military also rejected Clausewitz's claim that the defense was superior. See Wallach, "Misperceptions of Clausewitz' *On War* by the German Military": 220-24. On Jomini being more popular than Clausewitz see John Shy, "Jomini," in Peter Paret with Gordon A. Craig and Felix Gilbert, Makers of Modern Strategy: from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986): 143-185 at 159-60, 176-80.

[287] Ritter, Schlieffen Plan: 69-72; Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 137, 111; Martin Van Creveld, Supplying War: Logistics from Wallenstein to Patton (Cambrdige: Cambridge University Press, 1977): 116.

[288] B.H. Liddell Hart, "Foreword," in Ritter, Schlieffen Plan: 3-10 at 10.

important right wing.[289] Faced with a world where his plan would fail, he invented by assumption a world where it would work.

German planners gave little consideration to defensive alternatives to the Schlieffen plan after about 1894; and when such alternatives were evaluated, they were held to a tougher standard than was the Schlieffen plan.[290] In Russia analysts likewise downplayed logistics calculations in their estimates, a ploy that hid weaknesses in their planned offensive against Germany.[291]

Data from intelligence or exercises was ignored when it raised doubts about preferred offensive doctrines. Top French officers dismissed intelligence estimates that undermined arguments for an early French offensive.[292] Russian officers likewise discounted captured German war games that foretold Germany's smashing of Russia's offensive in East Prussia.[293]

Instead of examining hard evidence pro-offense officers referred to mystical morale concepts. Germany's Colonel Von der Goltz argued that being on the offense gave the attacker "new ideas and new vigor," and France's Captain Georges Gilbert claimed that being on the offensive "doubles the energy of the troops," as quoted above. General Foch argued that sheer will would propel the attacker to victory: "A battle won is a battle we will not acknowledge to be lost."[294] Britain's General Ian Hamilton wrote that "war is essentially the triumph ... not of a line of men entrenched behind wire entanglements and fireswept zones over men exposing themselves in the open, but of one will over another weaker will."[295]

The 1907 British Cavalry Training Manual preposterously claimed that intangible moral factors would sweep the mounted cavalry to victory against the rifle and machine gun: "The

---

[289] Van Creveld, Supplying War: 117.

[290] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 122. For more on the offensive bias in German military analysis see ibid.: 107-156.

[291] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 164, 190-94.

[292] Andrew, "France and the German Menace": 141-42; Jan Karl Tanenbaum, "French Estimates of Germany's Operational War Plans," in May, Knowing One's Enemies: 150-171 at 171; and Snyder, Defending the Offensive: 46-48, 86-87, 98.

[293] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 17.

[294] Liddell Hart, "French Military Ideas Before the First World War": 138.

[295] In 1910, quoted in Travers, Killing Ground: 45.

rifle, effective as it is, cannot replace the effect produced by the speed of the horse, the magnetism of the charge, and the terror of cold steel."[296] The French emphasized the superiority of the bayonet over rifle fire: the 1884 field regulations were inspired partly by the Russian tactician Dragomirov, famous for the maxim: "The bullet is a stupid fellow, but the bayonet is a true friend."[297]

The fallacies in these arguments were pointed out by contemporary critics. The most famous of these was Ivan Bloch, a Warsaw banker and author of The Future of War, a work that massively documented the power of the defense in modern war, and other works on military matters.[298] In 1901 Bloch noted that "entrenchments impart a power of resistance to the defence out of all seeming proportion to numbers," and described "the master-fact of the new situation, that defence is become more formidable than ever before." In the future, he wrote, "the attack cannot hope to strike a decisive blow or inflict a telling defeat."[299] He correctly explained that quick-firing rifles, smokeless powder, earthworks, and barbed wire entanglements gave the defense its new superiority.[300] He also foresaw that militaries would ignore these new conditions, and that their addiction to offense seems "destined to crop up one day in the form of dearly-bought object lessons like that of Plevna."[301] If the militaries applied their offensive theories in a war among the great powers, he feared, the "disaster and misery [would] ... stagger humanity. And to this we shall surely come unless the people themselves ... take the matter into their own hands."[302]

---

[296] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 197. Even after World War I Britain's General Haig still extolled the horse cavalry: "Aeroplanes and tanks are only accessories to the man and the horse, and I feel sure that as time goes on you will find just as much use for the horse--the well-bred horse--as you have ever done in the past." In 1924, quoted in Ellis, Social History of the Machine Gun: 56.

[297] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 63.

[298] (New York: Doubleday & McClure, 1899), published in England as Is War Now Impossible? (London: Grant Richards, 1899). His main points are summarized in Jean De Bloch, "The Wars of the Future," Contemporary Review, No. 429 (September 1901): 305-332.

[299] "Wars of the Future": 316-17.

[300] "Militarism in Politics": 775.

[301] "Wars of the Future": 317.

[302] "Militarism in Politics": 768. Bloch also noted that

Bloch even forecast in 1900 the opening slaughter of attacking French and German armies in August and September 1914 and the long and bloody siege that followed on the Western front:[303]

> At first there will be increased slaughter--increased slaughter on so terrible a scale as to render it impossible to get troops to push the battle to a decisive issue. They will try to, thinking that they are fighting under the old conditions, and they will learn such a lesson that they will abandon the attempt for ever. Then, instead of a war fought out to the bitter end in a series of decisive battles, we shall have as a substitute a long period of continually increasing strain upon the resources of the combatants. The war, instead of being a hand-to-hand contest in which the combatants measure their physical and moral superiority, will become a kind of stalemate, in which neither army being able to get at the other, both armies will be maintained in opposition to each other, threatening each other, but never being able to deliver a final and decisive attack.

Today historians describe Bloch as a brilliant prophet, but Bloch himself believed his arguments were obvious. His writing conveys cold fury that his message even needed saying, and bitter anger at the military for what he believed was their deliberately twisting and suppressing of evidence he presented. Bloch reiterated that evidence demonstrating the dominance of the defense was abundant and unambiguous, and that arguments to the contrary were patently frivolous and ridiculous. He made no claim for originality, noting that other experts agreed with his analysis. He found it "astonishing" that people "who had facts, figures and reasoning powers" could so badly misconstrue the situation. The military experts were "blind" and "incurably deaf."[304] The military forecasts of the Boer war had been "so utterly wrong as to stagger belief," and leaders showed "slipshod happy-go-lucky indifference" in continuing to respect such incompetent advice.[305]

In the military Bloch saw a "stubbornness which ... set itself to twist and distort the facts."[306] He wrote that the

---

excessive faith in the offense "is characteristic of the military spirit of all times and countries." "Wars of the Future": 315.

[303] Quoted in Clarke, Voices Prophesying War: 134.

[304] "Wars of the Future": 317.

[305] "Militarism in Politics": 774.

[306] "Wars of the Future": 305.

military belief in the strength of the offense grew from "an irrational faith in worthless tradition" and a "blameworthy shortsightedness and naive faith in fetishes."[307] He wondered how the military retained public esteem after being wrong so often, noting bitterly in 1901, after the British disasters in the Boer War, that the military profession is[308]

> implicitly trusted. ... But events now show that they erred, and not within the reasonable bounds which circumscribe error in all walks of life, but so wildly that the mere man in the street could not well have been so far astray as they. Again and again they repeat their prophecies, which are soon afterward belied by the vicissitudes of war. Then they turn to actual facts, and misconstrue them in the same wholesale manner.

And Bloch accused the military of knowing they were wrong, referring to opponents "who understand very well" the general defensive lessons of the Boer War while ascribing its results to unique local conditions.[309]

European militaries were familiar with Bloch's arguments. His work was widely published and translated into Russian, German, French and English. In 1901 he lectured to British officers at the Royal United Services Institute.[310] Britain's Colonel F.N. Maude credited Bloch with a wide reputation, even blaming him for contributing to the reverses in South Africa by undermining the offensive spirit of the army--Maude thought the timidity of British troops at Modder River and Paarde Kraal was "entirely traceable to the vicious teachings of that misguided school whose fallacies find their highest expression in the works of M. Bloch."[311]

Moreover, Bloch was not alone in his forecast. Around Europe maverick officers warned that the advertised power of the offense was an illusion. Thus the weakness of the offense was more politically than technically undiscoverable. The power of the defense was not recognized because European militaries preferred not to recognize it.

In Britain Major C.E. Calwell, Major B.F.S. Baden-Powell, Lieutenant-Colonel J.E. Edmonds and Colonel G.F. Henderson all recognized the increased power of the defense and suggested defensive innovations. In 1903 Baden-Powell wrote that machine guns would make some places "practically impassible" and thought long lines of defense might be

---

307 "Wars of the Future": 316.

308 "Militarism in Politics": 768.

309 Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale": 269.

310 Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale": 268.

311 Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale": 270.

impossible to turn.[312] Edmonds wrote that the Wilderness campaign in Northern Virginia in 1864 forecast the shape of wars to come, predicting "the universal use of the spade both in the attack and the defense, making the war one of what may be called siege operations in the field."[313] Henderson wrote that "good infantry, sufficiently covered ... is, if unshaken by artillery and attacked in front alone, absolutely invincible."[314] General E.A. Altham noted in 1914 that the crossing of the fire zone led to "punishing losses" and was a "stupendous task," perhaps "the most formidable enterprise known to war."[315]

In France Colonel Montaigne predicted a siege war decided by exhaustion.[316] J. Colin, Captain L. Auger, Emile Mayer and P. Poullet discussed the growing fire effect of arms and the power of entrenchments.[317] Lieutenant-Colonel Grouard warned that an offensive strategy for France was "absolutely impracticable," and General Victor Michel proposed a fairly defensive strategy to address a German invasion.[318] In 1895 Auger noted that the growing firepower of modern weapons made all movement in the open increasingly costly, and predicted a war of continuous trench lines. He concluded that the defensive was "the true mode of combat of the future," indeed "the only one possible in the presence of the probable hetatomb of future war." A future war would certainly "approximate to a certain extent the [Civil War] battles fought before Richmond, and ... the attack, instead of placing all confidence in numbers and elan, will have to proceed with slowness, gain ground gradually, and consolidate each step."[319]

---

[312] Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale": 271.

[313] Quoted in William McElwee, The Art of War: Waterloo to Mons (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974): 322.

[314] Quoted in Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 173.

[315] Quoted in Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale": 275.

[316] Vagts, History of Militarism: 352-53.

[317] Vagts, History of Militarism: 222, 352; McElwee, The Art of War: 319-20; and Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 153.

[318] Liddell Hart, "French Military Ideas Before the First World War": 145; and Tanenbaum, "French Estimates of Germany's Operational War Plans": 161.

[319] Quoted in Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 167.

In 1902 Mayer predicted the 1914-18 trench war in France, including even the "race to the sea"--the rush to extend the trench lines from the Alps to the English Channel once the first attacks failed. He imagined inviolable fronts[320]

> putting face to face two human walls, almost in contact, only separated by the depth of danger, and this double wall will remain almost inert, in spite of the will of either party to advance. ... Unable to succeed in front, one of these lines will try to outwing the other. The latter, in its turn, will prolong its front, and it will be a competition about who will be able to reach farthest. ... The line will stop at a *point d'appui*, at a sea, at mountains, at the frontier of a neutral nation. From this moment on, there will be so to speak no reason for the fight to stop, at least for one side. Exterior circumstances (the entrance of the United States into the European War!) will bring the end of the purely defensive war of the future.

In Germany General von Janson wrote that the "assailant can only hope to succeed if the defenders lose their heads."[321] Colonel F. von Meerheimb wrote in 1868 that "the combination of modern long-ranged, rapid firing weapons and prepared positions give the defensive such a great superiority that frontal attacks will succeed only on the rarest occasion."[322] A civilian, Karl Bleibtreu, wrote of the U.S. Civil War that "Lee's trenches, running for many miles along the river banks or through the forests, anticipate ... what can well make its appearance in the war of the future."[323] Baron von Freytag-Loringhoven wrote that entrenched infantry on the defensive, however outnumbered and exhausted, would always prevail.[324]

These critics of the offense were ignored, punished or slandered by their offense-minded parent organizations. Bloch was treated with great derision by Europe's militaries. Grouard and Michel were pushed out of the French army.[325]

---

[320] Quoted in Vagts, History of Militarism: 352.

[321] Quoted in Bloch, "Wars of the Future": 319.

[322] Quoted in Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 124.

[323] Luvaas, Military Legacy of the Civil War: 142.

[324] McElwee, Art of War: 321.

[325] Liddell Hart, "French Military Ideas Before the First World War": 144-45; and Tanenbaum, "French Estimates of Germany's Operational War Plans": 164.

Mayer was passed over for promotion and retired.[326] His articles were refused by the French military journals,[327] and he was forced to hide behind pseudonyms and in foreign publications.[328] His clairvoyant prediction of trench warfare and the "race to the sea" was published not in France but in the Swiss Military Review.[329]

Even as they dismissed their critics, advocates of the offense searched for new innovations to redress the growing power of the defense. In Britain some officers advanced the "suffer casualties" thesis--British troops should simply be instilled with greater willingness to die, so they would sustain the much greater casualties that would be suffered in the offense.[330] Other British officers thought more enthusiastic soldiers would neutralize the machine gun. Sir Ian Hamilton, for instance, accepted Bloch's arguments on the effectiveness of the magazine rifle and smokeless powder, but thought these weapons could be overcome by soldiers with more initiative, enthusiasm, and *esprit de corps*.[331]

This search for answers reveals that militaries knew that the offense faced large new obstacles. Yet all the while officers across Europe were telling publics how easily others might overrun their country, and how they could forestall this by overrunning others. The problem was not that militaries misunderstood the situation; rather, they did not want others to understand it.

In short, Europe's military establishments sold illusions of easy conquest and scarce security to Europe's leaders and publics despite abundant evidence to the contrary. They sustained their arguments by ignoring or suppressing contrary evidence, while acknowledging in private the strength of this evidence. Together this evidence suggests that Europe's militaries had a strong bias for the offense.

Two counter-arguments could be advanced against this claim; both hold that offensive strategies made sense for Europe's powers in 1914. First, some contend that the European powers could best defend exposed allies by attacking

---

[326] Liddell Hart, "French Military Ideas Before the First World War": 142-43.

[327] Liddell Hart, "French Military Ideas Before the First World War": 142.

[328] Vagts, History of Militarism: 222.

[329] Vagts, History of Militarism: 352. /note /342

[330] Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale": 272-73.

[331] Travers, "Technology, Tactics and Morale": 272.

their allies' attackers, and this required offensive forces and strategies.[332] If so, the offensive doctrines and force postures of 1914 stemmed not from the biases of European militaries, but from the harsh realities of power politics.

There is some truth in this argument, but far too little to explain the offensive extremes of 1914. Russia did need some offensive capability to save its French ally from the nightmare of fighting the entire German army alone, and to help its Serbian ally survive Austro-Hungarian attack; hence Russia was prudent to prepare offensives against Germany and Austria. And France needed the option to attack Germany to assist its Russian ally in the unlikely event that Germany concentrated its forces first against Russia, not France. But France was immensely unwise to exercise that option when Germany concentrated against France in 1914; instead, France should have entrenched its frontier and awaited the German attack.[333] And Germany was immensely unwise to embrace Schlieffen's extravagant offensive scheme, with its successive attacks on Belgium, France, and Russia. Instead, Germany would have been far better served by a defensive strategy in the west against Belgium and France, and a defensive or limited offensive strategy in the east, following the elder Moltke's earlier plan.[334] Such a strategy would have fully protected Germany's Austro-Hungarian ally. It also would have let Germany avoid war with Belgium and Britain; it would have reduced French popular support for war against Germany by leaving French soil unattacked; and, by keeping Britain out of the war, it would have greatly reduced the risk of American entry against Germany. Finally, turning to Britain, it had no political need for an offensive army; its main goal was the defense of France, which a defensive strategy could achieve.

A second counter-argument holds that the offense was

---

[332] Scott D. Sagan, "1914 Revisited: Allies, Offense, and Instability," International Security, Vol. 11, No. 2 (Fall 1986): 151-176 at 162-166.

[333] On the unwisdom of the French offensive see Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 44, 113-14; Jack Snyder, "Correspondence," International Security, Vol. 11, No. 3 (Winter 1986/87): 187-193 at 191; and Lieven, Russia and the Origins of the First World War: 106.

[334] Arguing the merits of this strategy is Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 116-119; and Snyder, "Correspondence": 190-91. In 1915 General Moltke himself admitted that Germany's attack on France was a mistake, arguing that "the larger part of our army ought first to have been sent East to smash the Russian steam roller" while Germany stood on the defensive in the west. Tuchman, Guns of August: 100.

fairly strong in 1914, so powers that chose offensive strategies were placing a prudent bet; offense had a fair chance of success. If so, once again, the offensives of 1914 were a pragmatic response to circumstance, not an outgrowth of the biases of European militaries. The offensives of 1914 failed but the decision to adopt them was not inexpedient.[335]

In this view the strength of the offense in 1914 is revealed by the near-success of the Schlieffen plan, which allegedly failed only through the blunders and bad luck of German commanders. In fact, however, the Schlieffen plan was very unlikely scheme that only approached success because of French mistakes. The French war plan nicely served Germany's needs. France concentrated its forces on the Franco-German border while leaving its northern frontier with Belgium only lightly defended; then France hurled its armies into Germany. This allowed German forces to sweep around France's northern flank, drive into France, and nearly encircle the French armies attacking Germany. Had France instead chosen to stand on the defensive its forces surely would have smashed the attacking German armies at or near the French border. Thus the folly of Germany's offensive was masked by the equal folly of France's offensive.[336]

In short, the French and German offensives of 1914 were strategic blunders of the first order. They cannot be explained as required or invited by circumstance. An explanation that points to the biases of the French and German militaries better fits the evidence.

Evidence from the Interwar Era. Officers in the British Royal Air Force, the United States air force, the British Royal Navy, the imperial Japanese Navy, and the German army continued to exalt the power of the offensive and to favor offensive strategies after World War I. Once again these arguments for the offense were much overdone, and often rested on twisted arguments and analysis--a telltale sign of willful bias.

The British Royal Air Force dogmatically pursued long-

---

[335] Sagan, "1914 Revisited": 159-61.

[336] Moreover, good evidence indicates that the Schlieffen plan did not even come close to success. Despite France's misbegotten offensive, German attackers were outnumbered by allied forces once they drove far into France, simply because the allies had more forces in the theater and could maneuver them more easily. This numerical weakness probably doomed Germany to defeat at the Battle of the Marne. And even if Germany had won at the Marne it seems likely that the weakness of German logistics would have later brought the German offensive to a halt. Arguing along these lines is Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 120.

range bombing and neglected air defenses throughout the interwar years.[337] It insisted that bomber forces now could quickly level great cities in a matter of days, and claimed that states could even be quickly conquered by a "knock out blow" from the air. The only defense against such attack, the RAF argued, was to be ready to launch even more devastating bombing raids against the attacker.[338] Hence all effort should go toward building up Britain's offensive long-range bomber force.

Air defenses against enemy bomber attack were a pointless waste of money, the RAF claimed, because they would surely fail to stop the enemy bombers. This view led the RAF to resist the development of British defenses, since this would divert resources that would otherwise go toward building bombers. Amazingly, as late as May 1940 the Air Staff tried to shut down the production lines building Spitfires and Hurricanes, the mainstay fighters that won the Battle of Britain.[339] Had the Air Staff gotten its way, that battle could well have been lost and with it the war. Fortunately, British civilian leaders and maverick RAF officer Hugh Dowding together build a strong air defense despite RAF resistance.[340] The RAF's claims for the power of bombing came to be widely believed by British leaders and the British public. This crippled British diplomacy in the late 1930s, since many British leaders shrank from risking a war that they feared

---

[337] On the RAF favoring offensive over defensive missions see Posen, Sources of Military Doctine: 142-43, 160-61, 167-69, 171-75; Tami Davis Biddle, "British and American Approaches to Strategic Bombing: Their Origins and Implementation in the World War II Combined Bomber Offensive," Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 18, No. 1 (March 1995): 91-144 at at 92-105, 127; and Allan D. English, "The RAF Staff College and the Evolution of British Strategic Bombing Policy, 1922-1929," Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 16, No. 3 (September 1993): 408-431 at 409-25.

[338] Murray, "British and German Air Doctrine": 46-47.

[339] Murray, "British and German Air Doctrine": 48. In the same spirit the RAF Chief of Staff, Lord Hugh Trenchard, declared in 1939 that Britain should not limit the development of its offensive air power by "devoting too large a proportion of the country's resources to defence work, like air raid shelters and fighter aircraft." Quoted in Elizabeth Kier, Imagining War: French and British Military Doctrine Between the Wars (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997): 99.

[340] On the origins of British air defense see Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 142-43, 161, 166-67, 169, 171-73.

would destroy much of Britain.[341]

Yet the RAF's claims were grossly mistaken, as the actualities of World War II revealed. Before the war RAF intelligence estimated that bombs would cause 50 casualties per ton dropped, while in fact they caused seven casualties per ton;[342] it grossly exaggerated the capacity of bombers to defend themselves against fighters; and it misconstrued the effect of bombing on civilian morale, suggesting that civilians would crack under attack, while the effect was quite the opposite, rousing civilian resistance.[343] The Air Staff estimated that aerial bombing would cause 150,000 casualties in London in a week, while in fact there were less than 147,000 casualties in the whole United Kingdom in the whole war.[344]

How could the RAF be so wrong? The answer is simple: it had almost no empirical basis for its claims. The RAF based its doctrine on strategic bombing from 1918 forward, yet it conducted no bomb effectiveness tests until 1937.[345] It also failed to reanalyze results from World War I, and it failed to dispatch an observer to the Spanish Civil War.[346] As

---

[341] As A.J.P. Taylor notes, Britons "expected that every great city would be levelled to the ground immediately on the outbreak of war." The Origins of the Second World War, 2d ed. (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1961): 114-15. Arguing that this fear helped cause Britain's appeasement policy are Bell, Origins of the Second World War in Europe: 242; and Benny Morris, The Roots of Appeasement: The British Weekly Press and Nazi Germany During the 1930s (London: Frank Cass, 1991): 48-66.

[342] Paul Bracken reports that casualties were estimated at 50 per ton. "Unintended Consequences of Strategic Gaming": 304. I calculate actual British casualties at seven per ton from Bracken's figures on p. 310 and from data in Roger Parkinson, Dawn on our Darkness: The Summer of 1940 (London: Granada Publishing, 1977): 302.

[343] On RAF morale arguments see Biddle, "British and American Approaches to Strategic Bombing": 92-101, 117, 126; and English, "The RAF Staff College": 414, 419.

[344] Uri Bialer, The Shadow of the Bomber: The Fear of Air Attack and British Politics 1932-1939 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1980): 130.

[345] Bracken, "Unintended Consequences of Strategic Gaming": 308-9.

[346] Bracken, "Unintended Consequences of Strategic Gaming": 312.

a result, as the British World War II Official History put it, the RAF had "no clear idea what was operationally possible, what targets could be reached, how far they could be hit, what would happen to them if they were hit, or what were likely to be the casualties incurred."[347]

The few empirical studies done by the RAF used assumptions and evidence chosen to favor the case for strategic bombing. For instance, the Air Staff estimated bomb damage by treating the sixteen most devastating German air raids of World War I as representative--in fact British casualties in these raids were triple the British average for the war--and extrapolating from this sample.[348] Sir John Slessor, Chief of Plans in the Air Ministry, admitted after the war that the Air Staff's belief in the bomber before the war had been "intuitive ... a matter of faith," not analysis.[349]

Thus Britain's interwar devotion to bombers, and the British public's extreme fear of bomber attack, were fueled by deceptive self-serving information purveyed by the RAF. The RAF sought an offensive long-range strategic bombing mission, in part to keep itself in the offense business.[350] To sell this mission the RAF stressed the capabilities of the long range bomber. The ineffectiveness of strategic bombing was discoverable, but the RAF was unwilling to discover it. Given the early wartime performance of the RAF bomber force this unwillingness is understandable: the British Official History recounts that when the war began, "Bomber Command was incapable of inflicting anything but insignificant damage on the enemy."[351]

The interwar U.S. Army Air Corps took a more reasonable view of long-range bombing than the RAF, but it, too, exaggerated the power of bombing while under-investing in

---

[347] Quoted in Brodie, War and Politics: 458. Moreover, the Air Staff held its calculations and assumptions in close secrecy, so that no one outside the RAF could review its assessment. Bracken, "Unintended Consequences of Strategic Gaming": 302-306.

[348] Bracken, "Unintended Consequences of Strategic Gaming": 302, 304. See also Biddle, "British and American Approaches to Strategic Bombing": 97, 127.

[349] Brodie, War and Politics: 458.

[350] The RAF also favored long-range bombing in order to escape the army control that came with other air missions (e.g., battlefield interdiction).

[351] B.H. Liddell Hart, History of the Second World War, 2 vols. (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1972): 2:593.

fighter aircraft. Not until 1944 did the Corps embrace the mission--tainted with an aura of defense--of fighter escort for its bombers.[352] In the meanwhile U.S. bomber crews suffered heavy losses that long-range fighter escorts could have prevented.

The interwar imperial Japanese Navy over-indulged in offensive forces and tactics while neglecting crucial defensive missions. Most important, the Navy utterly failed to prepare to defend Japan's commercial sea lanes, despite World War I experience that vividly showed the devastating effects of submarine attack on unprotected commercial shipping.[353] The Navy first gave serious attention to defending shipping from submarines, including the establishment of convoys, only in late 1943.[354] Other tasks that smacked of defense, such as equipping warships with anti-aircraft guns or designing rugged aircraft that could take punishment, were also neglected.[355] Instead, all effort went toward building up the offensive power of great main battle fleets.

Japan's false faith in the offensive arose in part because Japan's navy suppressed evidence showing it would fail. For example, the Navy doctored war games that it conducted in early 1942 to show that the offensive operations it planned for the coming summer would succeed. The game's umpire judged that Japan's aircraft carrier force had taken nine hits and lost two carriers during the simulated attack on Midway Island. The director of the game, Rear Admiral Ugaki, arbitrarily reduced the number of hits to three and the number of sunken carriers to one, and then allowed even the sunken carrier to play in the game's next engagement.[356]

---

[352] Phillip S. Meilenger, "Proselytiser and Prophet: Alexander P. de Seversky and American Air Power," Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 18, No. 1 (March 1995): 7-36 at 10-11.

[353] Arthur Marder, Mark Jacobsen, and John Horsfield, Old Friends New Enemies: The Royal Navy and the Imperial Japanese Navy, vol. 2: The Pacific War, 1942-1945 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990): 371-378; David C. Evans and Mark R. Peattie, Kaigun: Strategy, Tactics, and Technology in the Imperial Japanese Navy, 1887-1941 (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1997): 434-441; Spector, Eagle Against the Sun: 48; and John Costello, The Pacific War (New York: Quill, 1982): 453.

[354] Daniel Yergin, The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money, and Power (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992): 357.

[355] Marder, Jacobsen, and Horsfield, Pacific War: 560.

[356] F.J. McHugh, Fundamentals of War Gaming (Newport, Rhode Island: Naval War College, 1966): 2-19, quoted in Bracken, "Unintended Consequences of Strategic Gaming": 299.

The British Royal Navy made similar mistakes. During World War I it saw convoy tactics as essentially defensive, and therefore to be rejected. Instead, the Navy committed its ships to actively hunting German submarines along shipping lanes--a futile tactic that bore very meager results.[357] Ruinous British shipping losses resulted. Only pressure from civilian leaders finally brought the Navy to adopt a convoy system. British shipping losses then plummeted, from around fifteen percent to around one percent per sailing.[358]

This experience should have taught the Royal Navy the price of offensive excess and defensive neglect. But the Navy rejected the lesson. In fact it did not even bother to record its World War I experience, compiling no comprehensive history of the 1914-18 anti-submarine campaign after the war.[359] And so, again in World War II, the Royal Navy obstinately insisted that German submarines could best be killed by actively hunting them with groups of destroyers and aircraft carriers.[360] It did adopt convoy tactics faster than in 1914, but it also again devoted large resources to aggressively searching out German U-boats. And once again these hunting tactics were a failure. John Costello and Terry Hughes note that "these tactics suited the Navy's desire for aggressive action, but they flew in the face of First War experience."[361] A strategy of forcing German submarines to attack escorted convoys promised far better results. Many allied merchant seamen died because it was not pursued.

The U.S. Navy likewise resisted the introduction of convoys in U.S. coastal waters in the first months after Pearl Harbor, despite the vast evidence by then showing their value. As a result German submarines ran wild in what historian Samuel Eliot Morrison sardonically called a "merry massacre" of U.S. east coast merchant shipping.[362] With seldom more than a dozen submarines on station, Germany sank a spectacular 216 allied ships off the U.S. coast in the first quarter of 1942.[363]

The German army of the 1920s embraced an offensive

---

[357] van der Vat, Atlantic Campaign: 26.

[358] van der Vat, Atlantic Campaign: 36.

[359] van der Vat, Atlantic Campaign: 40.

[360] van der Vat, Atlantic Campaign: 81; and Costello and Hughes, Battle of the Atlantic: 9.

[361] Costello and Hughes, Battle of the Atlantic: 9.

[362] van der Vat, Atlantic Campaign: 239.

[363] van der Vat, Atlantic Campaign: 239.

strategy that made little more sense than the earlier Schlieffen plan. The German Chief of Staff, Hans von Seeckt, planned an attack brusquée: Germany would hurl its always-ready army on its opponent before the opponent could mobilize its forces.[364] What this overlooked was that the Versailles agreement imposed deep cuts on German forces, leaving Germany incapable of effective offensive action. Seekt's plan was a template offensive response and a recipe for disaster.

Two interwar military organizations stood aside from this offensive parade: the British and French armies. Both embraced largely defensive doctrines during most of the interwar period. These cases show that the offense-mindedness of militaries is not universal. However, they do not undermine the claim that professional militaries have a strong bias toward the offensive. Rather, they show that under some conditions, which are not very common, this bias can wane or disappear.

The French Army adopted a defensive approach in large part because the French parliament imposed a one-year term of service for conscripts on the Army in 1928.[365] The Army felt, probably with good reason,[366] that a one-year service term left too little time to prepare troops for training-intensive offensive missions. Much of the army would always be in training, leaving an inadequate ready force. Instead, the Army judged that a less training-intensive defensive strategy was necessary.

What does the French Army case indicate? It shows that militaries may adopt the defensive if they are denied the kind of personnel that the offensive requires. However, this is not a common problem. The French one-year service term was unique in the interwar years. Moreover, French conscripts served only 18 months during 1923-28,[367] yet the Army stuck with offense during this period. This suggests that only severe restrictions on personnel could dissuade the army from an offensive approach. The milder but still significant limitations of an 18-month service term were not enough.

We should also notice that the French Army's operations

---

[364] Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 185-88.

[365] Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 108, 118-119; and Kier, Imagining War: 7, 56-88.

[366] See Eugenia Kiesling's book, which supports the interepretation that an army of short-term conscripts was better adapted to defensive than offensive missions, and that France abandoned offense for that reason. Differing is Kier, Imagining War: 70-80, who argues that army culture, not expedience, led the French Army to adopt defense.

[367] Kier, Imagining War: 65.

during the 1940 Battle of France had a daring offensive element. Specifically, as the battle began the French Army tried to move all the way across Belgium and into the Netherlands, to forestall the German seizure of northern Belgium.[368] This bold offensive maneuver--which was undertaken against civilian opposition, and which brought disaster by exposing French forces to encirclement--shows that top French officers were still attached to offensive ideas.

The interwar British Army rested content with a defensive approach partly because it could not enhance its budget by embracing offense. In the context of the 1930s an offensive strategy required the development of armored and mechanized forces. However, armored forces would only be useful in a campaign on the European continent, and the British government had firmly decided against a continental commitment. Hence Army entreaties to civilians to support a new mechanized army surely would have been rejected, with no budget gain for the army. Militaries can usually gain budget growth by selling and adopting offense; the British army is a special case to the contrary.

The British Army also resisted offense to preserve its organizational essence. The 1930s Army retained a regimental system, an amateur culture, and constabulary roots. An offensive strategy meant armored and mechanized forces; and mechanization meant massive change that would threaten these quaint attributes. Offense seldom threatens the essence of military organizations, but in this instance it did.

In summary, the interwar years again find militaries exalting the offensive. As in the years before 1914 militaries had little basis for their claims, which they advanced despite the availability of strong evidence to the contrary. This again suggests that a willful bias for the offense was at work.

The French and British armies show that the offensive reflexes of militaries have their limits. When budgets are not enhanced by offense, and when organizational essence is threatened by offense, militaries may well adopt the defensive.

These conditions are fairly uncommon, however, and military offense-mindedness is correspondingly common. Most great power militaries have a strong proclivity to exalt the offensive and to embrace offensive doctrines and postures. A range of diverse militaries from a range of states have repeatedly demonstrated this proclivity. Elizabeth Kier's claim that "military organizations do not inherently prefer offensive doctrines" is refuted by abundant evidence of pervasive military offense-mindedness.[369]

---

[368] On French operations in 1940 see Posen, Sources of Military Doctrine: 86-94.

[369] Elizabeth Kier, "Culture and Military Doctrine: France

D. "It Pays To Strike First." States seldom gain much advantage by being the first side to mobilize or attack.[370] They may shift the balance of forces in their favor, but seldom by very much. Morover, any such gains are usually outweighed by the harm of arousing enemy publics and alienating neutral governments. Israel's 1967 first strike against Egypt, which proved a strategic success, was quite unusual. Even the tactically successful 1941 surprise attacks by Germany on the Soviet Union and by Japan on the United States failed to deliver strategic victory, and Japan's attack was politically self-ruinous. In fact, history yields no clear instance of a war whose outcome would have been reversed had the other side struck first.

Yet militaries often claim that moving first pays large rewards. Military thought warns against losing the initiative and asserts the need to strike the first blow. As Winston Churchill summarized, military leaders are "prone to emphasize the importance of forestalling the enemy in the beginning of great wars, and statesmen are at their mercy on such questions."[371] Before World War I a French officer declared that "the victorious army will be the one which ... will first jump at the throat of the enemy";[372] another stated that "an army which cannot be ready first cannot think of directing the war, but only of suffering it."[373] A leading French general proposed in 1912 that France forestall Germany by entering Belgium first in case of war, a folly that surely would have alienated Britain, Belgium, and the United States from

---

Between the Wars," International Security, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Spring 1995): 65-93 at 66. See also ibid.: 79, where Kier argues that militaries have "no *a priori* preference for an offensive or a defensive doctrine." A similar but softer claim is in Kier Imagining War: 15.

[370] Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 71-72.

[371] Winston S. Churchill, The Unknown War: The Eastern Front (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931): 89.

[372] Major Emile Driant, quoted in Vagts, History of Militarism: 350.

[373] General Victor-Bernard Derrécagaix, quoted in M.E. Howard, "The Armed Forces," in F.H. Hinsley, ed., New Cambridge Modern History vol. 11: Material Progress and World-Wide Problems, 1870-98 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 204-242 at 213.

France.[374] (French civilian leaders wisely demurred.) Germany's General Bernhardi declared that Germany must "act on the offensive and strike the first blow,"[375] and the German Chief of Staff, Hellmuth von Moltke the younger, warned that "we must forestall our principle adversary" if war seemed likely.[376] British naval officers imagined a huge first-strike advantage at sea, the Directorate of Naval intelligence warning in 1905 that the advantage of the initiative was "enormous" and that "if history is any guide, a sudden and dramatic outbreak would be distinctive of future wars, especially the war at sea."[377] Admiral Sir John Fisher argued that "suddenness is now the characteristic feature of sea fighting."[378] But naval operations in World War I actually revealed no first-move advantage.

After World War I, Italy's Giulio Douhet claimed that the "principle of the value of surprise attack is obvious,"[379] and argued that the initiative in aerial wars of the future would be decisive. After World War II, a U.S. officer pointed to "the tremendous advantages that accrue to the man who starts a war."[380] Another faulted deterrent doctrines because they required "yielding of the initiative to the adversary."[381]

---

[374] Joffre, quoted in L.C.F. Turner, "The Edge of the Precipice: A Comparison Between November 1912 and July 1914," RMC Historical Journal, Vol. 3 (1974): 3-20 at 6.

[375] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 175.

[376] In 1913, quoted in William Roscoe Thayer, ed., Out Of Their Own Mouths: Utterances of German Rulers, Statesmen, Savants, Publicists, Journalists, Business Men, Party Leaders, and Soldiers (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1917): 161.

[377] Leonard Wainstein, "The Dreadnought Gap," in Art and Waltz, Use of Force: 153-169 at 158.

[378] Wainstein, "Dreadnought Gap": 158. In 1904 he argued to King Edward VII that the British should pre-empt the German fleet. The King replied: "My God, Fisher, you must be mad!" Steinberg, "Copenhagen Complex": 36.

[379] Douhet, Command of the Air: 51.

[380] General Thomas Power, in 1959, in congressional testimony, quoted in "United States Defence," Survival, (May/June 1959): 55.

[381] Col. Richard L. Curl, in 1975, quoted in Bernard Brodie, "The Development of Nuclear Strategy," International Security, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Spring 1978): 65-83 at 67. In 1954 U.S. Air Force Col. Raymond Sleeper likewise urged that U.S. policymakers "perform a surgical operation on our national

Militaries can see advantage for the initiative even in new technologies that reduce it. Thus many U.S. military officers wrongly argued that nuclear weapons increase the advantage of striking first[382]--e.g., Colonel Jack D. Nicholas: "Conceding the initiative in the thermonuclear age is an enormous concession. At best it could produce a critical military situation for us. At worst it carries the seeds of a national disaster."[383] General Thomas Power likewise argued that "the nation which takes the initiative in nuclear war automatically assumes military superiority," and that "modern weapons have placed a fear greater premium on the initiative than ever before."[384] General Lemay opposed American Cold War plans to defend Europe with conventional forces, since this strategy might deprive the United States of the nuclear initiative.[385] The military leaders of the U.S. Strategic Air Command were oriented toward a preemptive doctrine from the mid-1950s forward.[386]

Four factors feed this military bias. First, the side striking first imposes its programs on the side under attack. Hence militaries can reduce uncertainty and ease planning by hitting first. They much prefer the initiative for this reason. Thus General Power explained why he sought the

---

grand strategy and quietly remove the stifling concept of retaliation." Tami Davis Biddle, "Handling the Soviet Threat: 'Project Control' and the Debate on American Strategy in the Early Cold War Years," Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 12, No. 3 (September 1989): 273-302 at 273.

[382] I argue that nuclear weapons reduce the first-move advantage in Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 244.

[383] In 1956, quoted in George E. Lowe, The Age of Deterrence (Boston: Little, Brown, 1964): 126.

[384] Power, Design for Survival: 39. Many Soviet officers have made the same claim: see below, p. *.

[385] LeMay warned that a conventional defense strategy "may find us with our arms down when the enemy is launching nuclear weapons. It may offer him the slight edge in time and surprise that would mean our national demise." LeMay, America Is in Danger: 25.

[386] Richard K. Betts, "Surprise Attack and Preemption," in Graham T. Allison, Albert Carnesale, and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., eds., Hawks, Doves, and Owls: An Agenda for Avoiding Nuclear War (New York: W.W. Norton, 1985): 54-79 at 66; see also Kaplan, Wizards of Armageddon: 108, 132-134, 148-150, 277.

initiative:[387]

> [If we strike first] I know exactly how much of this force I can generate, how many airplanes I would have, how many bombs would go in those airplanes, what targets they would hit, and about what damage they would do, and this is a tremendous capability under those conditions.
>
> But if you reverse this procedure and pass the initiative to the Soviets, then we can only be in a retaliatory role, and our capability will be greatly reduced.

Likewise Moshe Dayan argued that if Israel struck first "the course of the campaign would then follow our dictates. ... The enemy would be forced to fight according to the moves we made."[388]

A first strike is often harder to execute than to defend against; but planning a first strike is harder than planning the defense against it. Faced with this conundrum militaries choose ease of planning over ease of operations, and so choose the initiative. This bias then creeps into military estimates of the advantage of the initiative.

Second, militaries often underrate the political backlash that a first strike provokes because judging that backlash is not their job. A surprise attack often enrages and arouses the opponent's public. It has aggressive overtones that arouse neutral states against the first-striker. But militaries may overlook these problems because political issues are not their responsibility.[389]

Third, the advantage of the initiative seems larger when conquest seems easier, since more territory can then be conquered by exploiting the material advantage that a first move provides.[390] Hence the tendency of militaries to exaggerate the ease of conquest makes them exaggerate the advantage of the initiative.

Fourth, militaries exaggerate others' hostility, as noted above. This inflates the apparent risk of standing pat and the benefits of forestalling others by making it seem more likely that others will strike first.

E. "Windows Are Large, Preventive War Pays Off."

---

[387] Before congress in 1959, quoted in "United States Defence," Survival, (May-June 1959): 55.

[388] In 1967, quoted in Moshe Dayan, Story of My Life: An Autobiography (New York: Warner Books, 1976): 412.

[389] Militaries also underestimate these problems because they often believe that bellicose policies win more friends than enemies, as noted above.

[390] On this point see Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 70, 128-29.

Militaries often exaggerate the size of windows of opportunity and vulnerability, and overstate the advantage offered by launching preventive war.[391] Five causes contribute. First, militaries warn of national military decline to bolster the case for more military spending. "Our adversaries are growing stronger, while we grow weaker--we must do more!" Current trends are bad, they claim, putting the nation in later danger unless national defenses are strengthened now. Thus in 1895 Germany's Admiral Tirpitz warned that "Germany will, in the coming century, rapidly drop from her position as a great power unless we begin to develop our maritime interests energetically," and in 1979 U.S. Admiral Thomas Hayward warned that "the Soviets will attain a first-strike capability [against the U.S.] in the next few years."[392] Such calls are intended as an argument for more military spending, but also work as an argument for preventive war.

Second, militaries underestimate the political backlash that states trigger by starting preventive wars because, as noted above, judging political issues is not a military responsibility.[393] As a result militaries exaggerate the size of windows.

Third, windows seem larger when conquest seems easier, since more territority can then be conquered by striking at a time of relative material advantage.[394] Hence the tendency of militaries to exaggerate the ease of conquest also makes them exaggerate the size of windows. Thus General Moltke favored preventive war in 1914 partly because he thought German relative decline would leave Germany open to conquest. State Secretary Jagow summarized Moltke's views: "Russia will have completed her armaments in 2 to 3 years. The military

---

[391] Noting that militaries often recommend preventive war is Alfred Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 263-350. Vagts also notes that civilians advance such ideas less often. Ibid.: 263.

[392] Berghahn, Germany and the Approach of War: 29; and U.S. Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Military Implications of the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto (SALT II Treaty): Hearings Before the Committee on Armed Services: Part 2. 96th Cong., 1st sess., 1979: 177. In retrospect both forecasts seem very wide of the mark.

[393] Thus in 1868 or 1869 the elder Moltke blithely declared that Germans "must not be deterred by the fact that we may give the appearance of aggression." Ritter, Sword and Scepter, 1:218.

[394] See Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 104, 129-131.

superiority of our enemies would be so great then that he did not know how we might cope with them. ... There was no alternative to waging a preventive war" while Germany could still succeed.[395] To Moltke German decline meant more than disadvantage: it meant German ruin because he also believed that conquest was easy.[396]

Fourth, preventive war makes more sense if states exaggerate others hostility, since this narrows the choice toward "war now or war later" by making peace seem temporary. Hence the military tendency to exaggerate others' hostility supports arguments for preventive war. Thus Moltke explained in 1912: "I believe a war to be unavoidable and: the sooner the better."[397] Italy's Chief of Staff, General Pollio, endorsed preventive war by the same logic: "Is it not more logical for the Triplice to ... start a war, which will be forced upon us, in our own good time?"[398] U.S. Air Force Major General Orvil Anderson endorsed preventive war against the Soviet Union in 1950: "Since we're at war, damn it, I don't advocate preventive war. I advocate the shedding of illusions. ... [C]ivilization demands that we act. Give me the order to do it and I can break up Russia's five A-bomb nests in a week."[399]

Fifth, militaries often exaggerate the permanence of victory (as noted above) and the cumulativity of international resources (as noted below). This leads them to exaggerate the advantage they gain if they win a preventive war, and the size of the loss if a war foregone today is lost later.[400]

As a result militaries often lobby for preventive war. Calls for preventive war were a constant chorus from the military in Prussia/Germany after the mid-19th century.

---

[395] Quoted in Volker R. Berghahn, Germany and the Approach of War in 1914 (London: Macmillan, 1973): 172.

[396] May 18, 2000: The Moltke quote in the above para and the Pollio and Anderson quotes in the following para seem cuttable.

[397] Fischer, War of Illusions: 162.

[398] In April 1914, quoted in Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 305.

[399] Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 333.

[400] Thus the elder Moltke favored a preventive strike against France in the 1870's in order "at last to cap the volcano that has been shaking Europe for a century with its wars and revolutions," as if one victorious war would permanently solve Germany's French problem. Ritter, Sword and Scepter, 1:227.

Helmuth von Moltke the elder, Prussia/Germany's long-serving chief of staff (1857-1887), proposed preventive war against France in 1859, while France was diverted in Italy;[401] against Austria, France and Bavaria in 1862, shortly before Bismarck arranged an important Austro-Prussian alliance;[402] and against France in 1867[403] and 1870.[404] He believed Bismarck's policy of restraint in 1867 eventually "will cost us many lives."[405] In the 1870's he favored another preventive war against France,[406] and advised preventive war against Russia in 1887.[407]

Other German officers gave similar advice. Martin Kitchen notes that after 1870 the wish for preventive war with France was "an article of faith" among many German officers.[408] Every major German military figure also endorsed Moltke's notion of preventive war on Russia in 1887.[409] Generals Waldersee and Loe noted that Germany had just equipped its army with new magazine rifles, a new howitzer and better artillery shells; a golden moment for war with Russia had arrived.[410] (Instead Bismarck wisely arranged a German-Russian alliance.) In 1889, while serving as Chief of the General Staff, Waldersee opined that Bismarck's skill and reputation should be used until the German military advantage was at maximum; then the decisive war with France and Russia should be deliberately begun.[411]

British naval officers, joined by others, favored a

---

[401] Ritter, Sword and Scepter, 1:216.

[402] Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 339n.

[403] France was gaining power relative to Prussia, Moltke declared, so "the sooner we come to blows ... the better." Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 285.

[404] Howard, Franco-Prussian War: 54.

[405] Ritter, Sword and Scepter, 1:219.

[406] Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 287; Ritter, Sword and Scepter, 1:227.

[407] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 128..

[408] Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 97.

[409] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 128.

[410] Walter Goerlitz, A History of the German General Staff, 1657-1945, trans. Brian Battershaw (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1953): 113.

[411] Goerlitz, History of the German General Staff: 118.

preventive strike against France in 1898 on grounds that war was inevitable and could be won more easily sooner than later.[412] We can only wonder how such a blunder would have changed history. Later Admiral John Fisher talked up preventive war against Germany, seeing a "golden opportunity for fighting the Germans in alliance with the French" in 1905.[413] How he planned to defeat Germany without the Russian and American help that proved vital in 1914-18 is unclear.

These episodes sometimes offered the strange sight of two militaries advising preventive war against one another. Both Prussian and French generals proposed preventive war against one another in 1867 and 1870.[414] Both Russian and Austrian military officers proposed preventive war against one another in 1887.[415] Both British and German officers saw windows of opportunity in 1905, as noted above. Both sides cannot have a window at the same time, so at least one side was prey to illusions.

Leading German generals often favored preventive war in the decades before 1914. General Bernhardi advised it constantly from 1890 onward, explaining in 1890 that Germany should "bring about war" at a propitious moment, and declaring in 1912 that the government had a "moral duty" to "begin the struggle while the prospects of success ... are still tolerably favorable."[416] In 1905 General Schlieffen argued that Germany was "surrounded by an enormous coalition" but could still "escape from the noose" by striking before Russia recovered from the 1904-5 Russo-Japanese War. "It will be years before Russia can take action; now we can settle the account with [France]," he explained.[417] Moltke the younger thought the moment for war was suitable in 1909, "better than it is likely to be in a few years."[418] He advised war again in

---

[412] Arthur J. Marder, The Anatomy of British Sea Power: A History of British Naval Policy in the Pre-Dreadnought Era, 1880-1905 (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1964): 331-32.

[413] Paul M. Kennedy, The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism 1860-1914 (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1980): 279; and Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 299.

[414] On 1867 see Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 285; on 1870 see Howard, Franco-Prussian War: 45, 54, 56.

[415] Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 290.

[416] Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 97-100; Fischer, War of Illusions: 38; and Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 53.

[417] Fischer, War of Illusions: 55.

[418] Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 108.

1912, "the sooner the better."[419]

The German general staff saw another window in 1914, and greeted the June 28 murder of Austrian Archduke at Sarajevo as a golden opportunity for preventive war. Moltke declared that "we shall never hit it again so well as we do now with France's and Russia's expansion of their armies incomplete,"[420] and he warned that "to wait any longer meant a diminishing of our chances."[421] The leading German military periodical, Militärische Rundschau, argued in July that Germany faced eventual war under worse conditions if it stood pat, so "let us provoke [war] at once."[422] The Saxon Military Plenipotentiary reported from Berlin on July 3 that "the military are pressing for war now while Russia is not yet ready."[423] The German general staff was reportedly in high spirits when the war broke out: "Chances better than in two or three years hence and the General Staff is reported to be confidently awaiting events."[424] After war began Bethmann Hollweg, the German Chancellor, admitted candidly that "Lord yes, in a certain sense it was a preventive war," driven by "the military's claim: today war is still possible without defeat, but not in two years!"[425]

In Austria the Chief of Staff, Franz Conrad von

---

[419] Fischer, War of Illusions: 162.

[420] Berghahn, Germany and the Approach of War in 1914: 203; see also Fischer, War of Illusions: 493.

[421] Berghahn, Germany and the Approach of War: 171.

[422] M.S. Anderson, The Ascendancy of Europe: Aspects of European History, 1815-1914 London: Longman, 1972): 66.

[423] Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 110.

[424] General Gebsattel, reporting information from his brother, quoted in Fischer, War of Illusions: 403. The Bavarian Military Plenipotentiary in Berlin saw "everywhere beaming faces, shaking of hands in the corridors" at the Prussian War Ministry after Germany took the final step to war on July 31, 1914. Holger Herwig, "Imperial Germany," in May, Knowing One's Enemies: 62-97 at 94-95.

[425] Konrad H. Jarausch, "The Illusion of Limited War: Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg's Calculated Risk, July 1914," Central European History, Vol. 2, No. 1 (March 1969): 48-76 at 48. For more on preventive war thinking in the German military during 1890-1914 see Isabel V. Hull, The Entourage of Kaiser Wilhelm II 1888-1918 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982): 236-265; and Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 96-114.

Hötzendorff, repeatedly proposed preventive war against Austria's neighbors--against Italy (then formally an Austrian ally) in 1903-04, 1907 and 1911; against Serbia in 1909; and against Russia and Serbia in 1913 and 1914.[426] Speaking of the Austrian military he wrote: "What country today could permanently maintain so formidable a power? Hence create it only for a time--and use it!"[427]

Did German officers see real windows or apparitions in 1914? Germany then had the largest and fastest-growing economy in Europe. Germany's share of world manufacturing production rose by some 74 percent--climbing from 8.5 percent to 14.8 percent of the world total--between 1880 and 1913. Russia's share of world manufacturing grew by a far smaller eight percent during this period, to just 8.2 percent of the world total. The British and French shares of world manufacturing declined, to 13.6 percent and 6.1 percent of the world total, respectively. (Austria-Hungary's share was unchanged at 4.4 percent.) By 1913 Germany led all other European states in manufacturing production, and worldwide it trailed only the United States.[428] Clearly, European power-trends were running charply in Germany's favor, and were poising it to gain preponderance in Europe if it simply sat tight. Only by sparking a ruinous war that ranged most other powers against it could Germany forestall its own rise to dominance. Thus the windows that German officers saw were extraordinary illusions.

Japanese officers saw a window--also largely illusory--against the United States in the early 1940s. Vice Chief of the Navy General Staff Kond∩ Nobutake argued in late 1940 for war against the United States the next year, when Japan's relative power would peak.[429] Chief of the Navy General Staff Admiral Nagano Osami favored war in July 1941, arguing that "there is now a chance of achieving victory" against the United States, but "the chances will diminish as time goes on."[430] Prime Minister Hideki Tojo, an army general, called

---

[426] Ritter, Sword and Scepter, 2:229-234; and Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy, 301-303.

[427] Ritter, Sword and Scepter, 2:230. For more on preventive war thinking in the Austro-Hungarian military before World War I see Ritter, Sword and Scepter, 1:227-239.

[428] All data is calculated from Paul Kennedy, The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000 (New York: Random House, 1987): 202 (Table 18).

[429] Asada, "Japanese Navy": 252.

[430] Ike, Japan's Decision for War: 106.

for war in November 1941 by warning that otherwise "two years from now we will have no petroleum for military use. Ships will stop moving. ... I fear that we would become a third-class nation after two or three years if we just sat tight."[431] But Japan's disastrous defeat by the United States showed that its window was far too small to justify war.

German officers endorsed Hitler's disastrous 1941 invasion of the Soviet Union because they saw German power waning relative to Soviet power. General Alfred Jodl termed the attack "a purely preventive war."[432] General Erich von Manstein explained that war was "the only way out. The Soviet was a great potential threat even in 1940, and it would have become an active one as soon as we tied down our forces against Britain."[433]

In the 1940s and 1950s a good number of U.S. military officers called for preventive nuclear war with Russia and China. General Orvil Anderson, commander of the Air War College, posed the choice in 1950: "Which is the greater immorality--preventive war as a means to keep the U.S.S.R. from becoming a nuclear power; or, to allow a totalitarian dictatorial system to develop a means whereby the free world could be intimidated, blackmailed, and possibly destroyed?"[434] Around this time Generals George Kenney, Nathan Twining, Curtis LeMay, Thomas White, and Hoyt Vandenberg--each a major U.S. military figure--privately expressed sympathy for preventive war, and official Air Force manuals expressed preventive war ideas.[435] Twining also wrote a stark memorandum

---

[431] Ike, Japan's Decision: 238. Stephen Pelz likewise notes that Japan's pro-war admirals often contended that "Japan had to strike before the Americans tipped the naval balance back against the empire." Pelz, Race to Pearl Harbor: 212. For other examples see ibid.: 223; and Ike, Japan's Decision: 130-131, 139, 142, 148, 200, 207.

[432] Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 319.

[433] Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 319.

[434] Quoted in Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 19. Several times Anderson gave his Air War College students a detailed exposition lasting several hours on how the Air Force might conduct a preventive war against the Soviet Union. Marc Trachtenberg, "A 'Wasting Asset': American Strategy and the Shifting Nuclear Balance, 1949-1954," International Security, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Winter 1988/89): 5-49 at 10.

[435] Sagan, "Perils of Proliferation": 78-79. Kenney was the first commander of the Strategic Air Command (1946-48); LeMay was his successor at SAC (1948-1957) and later Air Force Chief of Staff; Vandenberg was Air Force Chief of Staff (1948-1953); Twining was Air Force Chief of Staff (1953-1957) and

to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1953 on "The Coming National Crisis," arguing that the United States should "support such decisions as might involve general war" to forestall the Soviet Union from developing its nuclear forces.[436] His advice was echoed by an Air Force strategy study, "Project Control," that advised preventive war against the U.S.S.R. if necessary,[437] and by a 1954 Joint Chiefs of Staff study group report that favored "deliberately precipitating war with the USSR in the near future--that is before the USSR could achieve a large enough thermo-nuclear capability to be a real menace to the Continental U.S."[438]

At the end of the Cuban Missile Crisis, on the day the Russians agreed to withdraw their missiles from Cuba, General LeMay suggested that the United States attack Soviet forces in Cuba the next day in any case, presumably to exploit the fleeting nuclear superiority that the United States then enjoyed. Another JCS member felt that the U.S. had somehow been betrayed by the crisis settlement. A third once told Robert Kennedy that he believed in a preventive attack against the Soviet Union.[439]

General Twining maintained his vocal support for preventive war into the 1960s, arguing in 1966 that the U.S. should "face up to the Red Chinese leadership at places and times which are most favorable to the destiny of free men."[440] General Power also implied an approval of preventive war during this period.[441]

---

then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and White succeeded Twining as Air Force Chief of Staff. For more examples see Russell D. Buhite and Wm. Christopher Hamel, "War for Peace: The Question of an American Preventive War against the Soviet Union, 1945-1955," Diplomatic History, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Summer 1990): 367-384 at 372-74, 377.

[436] Sagan, "Perils of Proliferation": 80.

[437] Sagan, "Perils of Proliferation": 79; Biddle, "Handling the Soviet Threat."

[438] Sagan, "Perils of Proliferation": 79, quoting a memorandum for the record by Matthew Ridgway. See also Trachtenberg, "Wasting Asset": 41.

[439] Robert F. Kennedy, Thirteen Days: 97; and Raymond L. Garthoff, Reflections on the Cuban Missile Crisis, rev. ed. (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1989): 94n.

[440] Twining, Neither Liberty Nor Safety: 293.

[441] Power wrote in 1964 that "the concept of 'preventive war' is too complex to justify conclusive opinions either for or against it" and declared a wish to "correct the many

In contrast, civilians have been far more skeptical of preventive war in most countries. German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck (1862-1890) waged two wars with preventive aspects--in 1866 and 1870--but he later resisted military calls for more preventive wars, remarking dismissively that such wars resembled "a suicide for fear of death."[442] Before 1914 Germany's Kaiser Wilhelm II and Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg were markedly more skeptical of preventive war ideas than were German military officers.[443] In 1940-41 Imperial Japanese civilians doubted Japanese military arguments for preventive war against the United States.[444] During the early Cold War U.S. President Harry Truman ruled out preventive war in public statements and disciplined officers who publicly proposed it.[445] President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, also firmly rejected preventive war. Contemplating the possibility of a successful preventive strike on the Soviet Union, Eisenhower wondered: "Gain such a victory and what to do you do with it?"[446] He also quipped that "the only thing worse than losing a global war was winning one."[447] After hearing arguments for preventive war in 1954 Dulles declared that "no man should arrogate to himself the power to decide that the future of mankind would benefit by an action entailing the killing of tens of millions of people."[448]

Preventive wars are expedient if the window is large and the likelihood of war is great. Some unfought preventive

---

misconceptions that exist" about it. Power, Design for Survival: 79.

[442] Quoted in Berghahn, Germany and the Approach of War: 167; see also Vagts, Defense and Diplomacy: 290-292. Bismarck also declared in 1887: "My advice will ... never be to wage a war on the grounds that it may perhaps have to be waged later on." Lothar Gall, Bismarck: the White Revolutionary, 2 vols., trans. J.A. Underwood (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986), 2:156.

[443] On Bethmann see Jarausch, "Illusion of Limited War": 48-76.

[444] See, for example, the views of Finance Minister Kaya Okinori and Foreign Minister Togo Shigenori in November 1941, reported in Ike, Japan's Decision: 201-202.

[445] Sagan, "Perils of Proliferation": 77-78.

[446] Sagan, "Perils of Proliferation": 81.

[447] Trachtenberg, "Wasting Asset": 40.

[448] Trachtenberg, "Wasting Asset": 44.

wars would have made sense--for example, by the western powers against Hitler in 1936, or by the Soviet Union against Germany in May, 1940. But windows are fewer than they seem, and preventive wars are fought far more often than they should be. Militaries are prime causes of this error.

F. "Empires are Valuable, Resources are Cumulative." Modern empires have more often been millstones than assets. Some conquered industrial regions conferred power on their conquerors, but non-industrial empires absorbed vast resources while providing little strategic reward. Domino effects were often forecast but seldom observed, so control over a given domino was seldom necessary to keep other dominos from falling. Nor did modern empires provide economic or social rewards to their owners. Their economic costs have far outweight their economic benefits, and empires have never served their alleged social functions, such as absorbing surplus population. Thus the alleged value of modern empires has been largely fictional.

Yet militaries have often claimed that empires have great strategic, economic, or social value. They argued that national safety or national prosperity required holding current spheres of influence or gaining an even wider sphere. They did this by overstating the intrinsic value of territories and by advancing domino arguments connecting the defense of one territory to another.

These ideas serve military organizational needs. If empire provides security or prosperity, forces to seize or protect empire become necessary. Force requirements expand accordingly, allowing the military to lay claim to more resources.

Militaries also exaggerate the value of empire because they focus on the narrow military value of seizing a resource while overlooking the political backlash that a seizure might create.

Militaries are not the only actors that exaggerate the value of empire. Businesses with foreign operations may want to persuade their home governments to intervene on their behalf against difficult foreign host governments; this is easier if their government exaggerates the host country's strategically importance. Third World governments often want to persuade great power patrons to help them against domestic or foreign enemies; this is easier if their patron exaggerates their strategic or economic value. Officials who run empires want to persuade their governments to keep them employed. All these groups have an interest in exaggerating the value of empire. But militaries are a key part of the chorus that makes this argument.

Military writers most often stress the national security value of empire. The German Navy League's journal warned in 1900 that without colonies Germany would "suffocate in her small territory or else will be crushed by the great

world powers."[449] Shortly before World War I Germany's General Bernhardi likewise argued that "acquiring colonies ... is for Germany a question of life or death."[450] Germany could secure itself only by expanding: "we shall not be able to maintain our present position ... if we are contented to restrict ourselves to our present sphere of power, while the surrounding countries are busily extending their dominions."[451] Standing pat would bring ruin: "there can be no standing still, no being satisfied for us, but only progress or retrogression."[452]

Before World War II Imperial Japan's military leaders vastly exaggerated the security that wider empire could provide. First they believed that expansion into China would give Japan strategic independence. When China proved hard to subdue they thought the key to China's defeat lay in wider conquests on China's periphery, in Indochina and farther afield in Southeast Asia.[453] In fact each expansionist move created more problems than it solved. Expansion undertaken to make Japan self-suffient and secure left it less self-sufficient and far less secure than before.

American naval strategist Captain A.T. Mahan warned in 1890 that the U.S. was handicapped by lack of colonies,[454] and he later forecast that the global balance of power could be tilted by the outcome of a coming struggle for control of China between "Slavonic" and "Teutonic" peoples.[455]

During the Cold War General Douglas MacArthur often declared that the defense of each part of Asia required the defense of every other, and that the loss of a single territory--such as Taiwan or South Korea--would cause the loss of all Asia and perhaps the whole Pacific. Regarding Korea, he argued that "we win here or we lose everything."[456]

---

[449] Nauticus, quoted in Berghahn, Germany and the Approach of War: 29.

[450] Bernhardi, Britain as Germany's Vassal: 120.

[451] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 79.

[452] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 104-5.

[453] See the views of Colonel Ishiwara Kanji, General Tanaka Shin'ichi and others quoted in Snyder, Myths of Empire: 126-27.

[454] Margaret Tuttle Sprout, "Mahan: Evangelist of Sea Power," in Earle, Makers of Modern Strategy: 415-445 at 427.

[455] Mahan summarized in Healy, U.S. Expansionism: 130.

[456] In July 1950, quoted in Schaller, MacArthur: 194.

Regarding Taiwan, he warned that the U.S. would be forced back to "the west coast of the continental United States" if the mainland Communists took the island. "Our whole defensive position in the Far East" would be lost, including the Philippines and Japan.[457] The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff voiced similar views, warning from 1948 onward that communist victory in the Chinese civil war would cause "very grave long-range jeopardy to our national security interests"--surely an overstatement given China's then-tiny war potential.[458] In contrast top U.S. civilians, including George Marshall, Dean Acheson, and George Kennan, judged China a marginal prize in the Cold War.[459]

U.S. civilians and military officers differed sharply on the validity of the domino theory. Polls from the later Cold War showed that U.S. officers were markedly more inclined to endorse it than civilian elites.[460]

Military writings also stress the social and economic benefits of empire. We see inflated claims that new land is needed to supply food and to absorb surplus products and population. Bernhardi declared that Germany is "compelled to obtain space for our increasing population and markets for our growing industries."[461] A state without colonies risks "diminishing production and lessened profits," and may lose its population to emigration.[462] Hence "an intensive colonial policy is for us especially an absolute necessity."[463] Likewise the younger Moltke argued that "Germany [must] pursue offensive objectives. Its ever-growing population points inexorably to colonial expansion."[464] And Admiral Georg von Müller wrote that "surplus population" required colonies for settlement.[465]

---

[457] Schaller, MacArthur: 167.

[458] Ernest R. May, The Truman Administration and China, 1945-1949 (Philadelphia: J.P. Lippincott, 1975): 17.

[459] Schaller, MacArthur: 160.

[460] Holsti, "A Widening Gap": 18, question A1.

[461] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 103.

[462] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 24.

[463] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 108.

[464] In 1911, quoted in Fischer, War of Illusions: 118.

[465] In 1896, quoted in Imanuel Geiss, Germany Foreign Policy 1871-1914 (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976): 192.

France's General Ferdinand Foch voiced Marxist-style claims that capitalist states had to conquer new markets to absorb their surplus production. Modern states need "commercial outlets to an industrial system which produces more than it can sell, and therefore is constantly smothered by competition."[466] Force was the answer: "new markets are opened by force of arms."[467]

In the United States Captain Mahan argued the colonies would provide an imperial power "a new outlet for what it had to sell, a new sphere for its shipping, more employment for its people, more comfort and wealth for itself"[468]--claims that later American imperial experience disproved. Yet Japanese militarists later repeated many of the same ideas, claiming, for example, that "Japan's overpopulation grows more serious every year. Where should we find an outlet for these millions? ... The only remaining area is the Asian mainland."[469]

Not all officers express these views. Many can be found doubting the value of empire. Thus the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff argued in 1947 that Korea had little strategic value, and argued in 1954 that Indochina was "devoid of decisive military objecives."[470] But these are minority views. Dominant modern miltary opinion has overstated the value of empire.

G. "War Is Cheap" and "War is Beneficial": The Trivialization and Glorification of War. Militaries tend to downplay the costs and risks of using force. They underestimate the casualties and physical damage that war will cause. They downplay the tendency of war to get out of control, and of opponents to counter-escalate. They underestimate the propensity of war to outlast its purposes, and to be difficult to end. Thus Ivan Bloch noted the danger of military advisors who "beguile themselves and the people

---

[466] Foch, Principles of War: 37.

[467] Foch, Principles of War: 37.

[468] Sprout, "Mahan: Evangelist of Sea Power": 421.

[469] The military writer Ikezaki Tadakata, in 1929, quoted in Sabur∩ Ienaga, The Pacific War, 1931-1945: A Critical Perspective on Japan's Role in World War II (New York: Pantheon, 1978): 11.

[470] Ernest R. May, "Lessons" of the Past: The Use and Misuse of History in American Foreign Policy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973): 62; and Robert A. Divine, Eisenhower and the Cold War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981): 48.

into belittling the risks, the hindrances, the cost in men and money of a 'little expedition' or a big war."[471]

Militaries also understate the pychological horrors of combat and the cruelty war inflicts on enemies and innocents. Instead militaries tend to glorify and glamorize war: war is heroic, healthy, uplifting, beneficial.

The trivialization of war serves five organizational purposes for the military. First, if war seems cheap it seems more likely. This bolsters arguments for larger military forces and budgets. If war is unthinkably bad other states will shink from starting it, but if war is tolerable a decision for war is more plausible, so the danger of war is more real. Militaries trivialize war to emphasize its plausibility.

Second, force seems more useful when its use appears less risky and costly. If the use of force is relatively sanitary, governments can use force more safely to solve national problems, so buying more force makes more sense. The military also enjoys more prestige, since it fills a bigger social role, by claiming to help solve more problems. Thus Jack Snyder notes a military interest in preserving the image of "war as a beneficial social institution." This interest is protected by obscuring the costs of war: if "wars are expected to be long, costly, and indecisive, they are likely to be seen as aberrations that need to be stamped out--hardly a climate of opinion conducive to the prestige and health of military institutions."[472]

Third, conquest seems easy and security seems scarce when the costs of war seem low. If war is very destructive, both sides can inflict more harm than the other can accept. War then becomes a contest of pain-taking, won by the side that will suffer the most. Defenders have the advantage in such a world, because they prize their own country more highly than an aggressor prizes it, hence they can outlast the aggressor in a pain-taking contest.[473] These realities incline militaries--whose organizational interest lies in stressing the ease of conquest and the scarcity of security--to understate the costs of war.

Fourth, when civilian leaders expect a costly war they worry more about how to prevent or control war. This leads the civilians to intrude more in military matters, which in turn threatens the autonomy of the military. Instead militaries want civilian leaders who worry more about how to win war than how to prevent or control war. Such leaders will

---

[471] Bloch, "Militarism In Politics": 764.

[472] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 123.

[473] See Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 246.

give the military more resources and less oversight. Militaries can induce this attitude in civilians by trivializing the destruction of war and the risk of escalation.

Fifth, militaries discuss war in a manner consistent with their need to recruit personnel. They lose their appeal as an employer if they emphasize the nasty side of military life.

Militaries do not always understate the destructiveness of war. If such understatement clashes with their organizational interests militaries will do the opposite. In the 1930s the RAF and other air forces exaggerated the destructiveness of aerial bombardment, to advance the growth and autonomy of their services and to glorify the offensive generally. At that time a destructive aerial campaign was conceived to be an offensive instrument, so air forces stressed its destructiveness. Earlier Germany's General Schlieffen stressed that a long war would ruin the German economy; this bolstered the case for the quick-victory offensive strategy that Schlieffen favored.[474] But as a general matter militaries have an interest in trivializing and glorifying warfare.

Before World War I many military officers glorified war, claiming war itself was a good thing. Germany's General Hellmuth von Moltke the elder discussed the healthy side of war: "Perpetual peace is a dream--and not even a beautiful dream. ... War is an integral part of God's ordering of the Universe. In War, Man's noblest virtues come into play: courage and renunciation, fidelity to duty and a readiness for sacrifice. ... Without War the World would become swamped in materialism."[475] Likewise the magazine of a martial German youth organization explained the beauties of war to German youngsters in 1913:[476]

> For us as well the great and glorious hour of battle will one day strike. ... Yes, that will be a great and happy hour, which we all may secretly look forward to. ... [Q]uiet and deep in German hearts the joy of war and a longing for it must live, for we have had enough of the enemy, and victory will only be given to a people who go to war with joy in their hearts as if to a feast. ... [L]et us laugh as loud as we can at the old women in men's trousers who are afraid of war and therefore complain that

---

[474] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 108.

[475] In 1880, quoted in Arnold J. Toynbee, War and Civilization (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950): 16.

[476] The journal of the *Jungdeutschlandbund*, quoted in Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 141.

> it is ghastly or ugly. No, war is beautiful. Its greatness lifts a man's heart high above earthly things, above the daily round. Such an hour awaits us. We must wait for it with the manly knowledge that when it has struck it will be more beautiful and wonderful to live for ever among the heros on a war memorial in a church than to die an empty death in bed, nameless. ... [L]et that be heaven for young Germany. Thus we wish to knock at our God's door.

In the same spirit Germany's General Ludendorff concluded that "war is the highest expression of the racial will to life."[477] Bernhardi wrote that war "produces happy and permanent results in the national life. ... The brutal incidents inseparable from every war vanish completely before the idealism of the main result."[478] Without war, Bernhardi thought, "all real progress would soon be checked, and a moral and intellectual stagnation would ensue which must end in degradation."[479] He declared: "The inevitableness, the idealism, and the blessing of wars" should be "repeatedly emphasized to every citizen."[480]

To Bernhardi even a lost war could bring benefits:[481]

> Even defeat may bear a rich harvest. It often, indeed, passes an irrevocable sentence on weakness and misery, but often, too, it leads to a healthy revival, and lays the foundation of a new and vigorous constitution.

Bernhardi thought the Boer people benefitted from their bloody defeat by British arms in the Boer War: they had made "inestimable moral gains" and won "glorious victories" that gave them "a store of fame and national consciousness."[482]

Military writers have downplayed the damage that war inflicts on others and claimed that its results were both fair and inherently good for humankind. Bernhardi thought "might

---

[477] Hans Speier, Social Order and the Risks of War (New York: George W. Stewart, 1952): 291.

[478] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 27.

[479] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 34.

[480] Ropp, War in the Modern World: 204.

[481] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 28.

[482] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 44. General Hans von Wrochem, a figure in the German Army League, likewise claimed in 1913 that it was "better to fight and be beaten than never to have fought at all." Wallace Notestein and Elmer E. Stoll, eds., Conquest and Kultur: Aims of the Germans in their Own Words (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1917): 136.

is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war. War gives a biologically just decision."[483] He claimed that war was "a general progressive development" beneficial for all humankind, because "without war, inferior or decaying races would easily choke the growth of healthy budding elements, and a universal decadence would follow."[484] These and other positives made war "an indispensible instrument of civilization."[485] Absent war "there could be neither racial nor cultural progress."[486]

Russian military education before World War I likewise stressed that war could be a force for national purification, unity and development.[487] Britain's Field Marshall Lord Wolseley argued in 1903 that only war could restore "manliness" and "virility" to overcivilized nations.[488] And a Japanese Army pamphlet declared in 1934 that "war is the father of creation and the mother of culture."[489]

Before 1914 military leaders also grossly underestimated the losses and destruction of war. In 1906 France's General Bonnal forecast that "the outcome of the next war will be decided in less than a month after the opening of hostilities."[490] In 1912 his compatriot Commandant Mordaq thought that another war might last "about one year."[491] I.F. Clarke notes the "general view [before 1914] ... that a decisive battle or two would quickly end hostilities."[492]

---

[483] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 23.

[484] Bernhardi, Germany and the Next War: 20.

[485] Bernhardi, Britain as Germany's Vassal: 114.

[486] Bernhardi, Britain as Germany's Vassal: 111.

[487] Lieven, Russia and the Origins of the First World War: 115.

[488] Travers, Killing Ground: 39.

[489] Kakegawa Tomiko, "The Press and Public Opinion in Japan, 1931-1941," in Borg and Okamoto, Pearl Harbor as History: 533-558 at 543.

[490] Clarke, Voices Prophesying War: 131n.

[491] Clarke, Voices Prophesying War: 131.

[492] Clarke, Voices Prophesying War: 133. Some also forecast a quick recovery from war. Thus America's Captain A.T. Mahan declared that war was an occasional excess "from which recovery is easy." John M. Robertson, Patriotism and Empire (London: Grant Richards, 1899): 83-84.

Some German officers dismissed battle deaths as unimportant, be they many or few. Germany's General Alfred von Waldersee once acknowledged that many would die in a war he wanted with Russia, but declared that since no "man can die more than once, I am not inclined to regard death for the individual as a misfortune."[493]

In more recent times some military officers have trivialized nuclear war. General Daniel Graham, former director of the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency, estimated in 1979 that if U.S. ICBM fields and bomber bases were attacked by 2,500 Soviet nuclear warheads, the U.S. would lose "less than a quarter-million people--six years' traffic fatalities"[494]--an appraisal that was low by perhaps two orders of magnitude. Graham also claimed that "nuclear war cannot destroy the world, but may conquer it less damaged than Europe and Japan were damaged by World War II," at a time when a general war surely would have annihilated both sides.[495] Major Alexander de Seversky likewise declared in 1946 that the effect of the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki "had been wildly exaggerated" and that the same bombs dropped on New York or Chicago might have produced property damage limited to "broken window glass over a wide area."[496]

Not all officers voice these views. Many have warned of the costs and risks of war and spoken vividly of the horrors of war. General William Tecumseh Sherman famously

---

[493] In 1887, quoted in Gordon A. Craig, The Politics of the Prussian Army 1640-1945 (London: Oxford University Press, 1955): 268.

[494] Daniel O. Graham, Shall America Be Defended? Salt II and Beyond (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1979): 196. A contrasting study predicting at least 13-34 million U.S. deaths from a counterforce attack is William Daugherty, Barbara Levi, and Frank von Hippel, "The Consequences of 'Limited' Nuclear Attacks on the United States," International Security, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Spring 1986): 3-45 at 40-41.

[495] Graham, Shall America Be Defended?: 108.

[496] Scott D. Sagan, Moving Targets: Nuclear Strategy and National Security (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989): 13-14. Another military writer who understates the damage of nuclear war is Stefan Possony, Strategic Air Power: The Pattern of Dynamic Security (Washington: Infantry Journal Press, 1949). Possony concludes that "the atomic bomb is an evolutionary improvement of destructiveness rather than a revolutionary change," and that "defense against atomic bombs is not hopeless. ... [I]t should be possible to create the conditions wherein the destructiveness of the bomb would be at a minimum." (p. 16.)

declared that "war is hell." In Germany the younger Moltke forecast in 1905 that the the next war would be "a long, weary struggle" that would push even the winners "to the limits of exhaustion."[497] U.S. Air Force General Richard Ellis, commander of the U.S. Strategic Air Command, told the U.S. Senate in 1979 that nuclear war "would be a catastrophic event of such magnitude that I don't think the human mind could understand it. ... There is not going to be very much left. ... A desert perhaps."[498] Indeed, during the 1980s and 1990s a tone of realism and sobriety about the nature of war, at odds with the optimism depicted here, prevailed in American military discussions. But these are exceptions. If we look at the large picture, militaries in modern times have generally gilded the lily of war.

H. "We Will Lose/We Can Win": False Pessimism and False Optimism. On balance, militaries are pessimists in peacetime and optimists in wartime. Their peacetime pessimism is a force for peace, but their wartime optimism is a force for prolonging and escalating war.

In peacetime militaries generally understate national power and exaggerate the power of adversaries in order to lay claim to a larger budget, as noted above (pp. *-*). This has mixed effects on the probability of war. Pessimism about relative power *per se* inclines governments toward peace, since they avoid fights they expect to lose.[499] But governments are more inclined toward war if they exaggerate others' hostility, as they will if they exaggerate others' military programs. Hence pessimism has contradictory effects on the risk of war if it stems mainly from exaggerating others' military programs: the pessimistic state is discouraged from fighting from fear of defeat but provoked to fight by the hostile intentions it perceives in others. Also, peacetime pessimism strengthens peace only if it extends to offensive as well as defensive wars, but sometimes military faith in the offense confines military pessimism to defensive wars. Nevertheless, on balance military peacetime pessimism is probably a force for peace.

In wartime things are reversed. Militaries at war paint an unduly rosy picture of progress on the battlefield.

---

[497] Snyder, Ideology of the Offensive: 153.

[498] United States Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Military Implications of the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto (SALT II Treaty): Hearings Before the Committee on Armed Services: Part 2. 96th Cong., 1st sess., 1979: 779-780.

[499] See Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 14-34.

As a result governments at war wrongly believe that success is in sight--there is "light at the end of the tunnel." Hence they wrongly hope they can later make peace on better terms, or perhaps win a clean victory, if they persevere at war. As a result wars are prolonged. Geoffrey Blainey notes that "wars usually end when the fighting nations agree on their relative strength"--that is, when states estimate their relative capabilities correctly.[500] But militaries extend the fighting by sowing false optimism, which they foster by providing unduly optimistic wartime intelligence. In war the peacetime military tendency toward exaggerated pessimism reverses to become the opposite mistake.

Military wartime optimism is not undiluted. Before fighting begins militaries voice pessimism about the current situation, to give themselves room to show improvement.[501] Once action starts militaries are optimistic about past and present achievements, claiming that "we have done well, and we are doing well"; they are pessimistic about the future if they are not given more freedom and resources; and they are optimistic about the gains they can make with more freedom and resources.[502] Thus German navy analysts argued in 1917 that Britain would never make peace unless Germany moved to unlimited submarine warfare, but would certainly make peace if Germany did so, although they knew this move would reduce British shipping inventory only marginally.[503] Likewise General William Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, argued in 1967 that with 470,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam the war would continue as a "meatgrinder" for five years, or indefinitely; but with only 95,000 additional troops he could win the war in three years.[504]

Militaries have three aims in mind: to claim full

---

[500] Geoffrey Blainey, The Causes of War, 3rd ed. (New York: Free Press, 1988): 122.

[501] Richard Betts notes that in one part of Vietnam "American commanders were sometimes known to worsen hamlet evaluation statistics in their districts deliberately to allow room for improvement; initial pessimism was all right, as long as the trend was upward." Soldiers, Statesmen and Cold War Crises: 188-89.

[502] See Leslie H. Gelb with Richard K. Betts, The Irony of Vietnam: The System Worked (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1979): 308-9. On causes of military wartime optimism see also Betts, Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises: 184-208.

[503] Iklé, Every War Must End: 48.

[504] Betts, Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises: 27.

credit for achievements, to avoid blame for failures, and to gain more resources and freedom of action. These aims sometimes conflict. For example, claims of success will lead civilians to ask: "if you've done so well, why do you need more resources?" This tempts militaries picture the war differently depending on whether their past achievements or future needs are at issue. Thus Richard Betts notes that in Vietnam "pessimism drove military recommendations, [but] good news characterized military reports. The contrast between Westmoreland's caution about the future and boastful good cheer about past accomplishments was remarkable."[505]

The military tendency in wartime, then, is to foster false optimism by exaggerating past achievements, false pessimism by exaggerating the danger if more resources are not invested in the war, and false optimism by exaggerating what more investment can achieve.

Exaggerating past achievements is endemic among fighting units. Commanders exaggerate body counts and pilots claim doubtful kills to promote their careers and avoid blame for failure. And each military service overstates its wartime achievements to bolster its case for a big budget after the war is over. War is the proving ground for postwar budget debates. The services know this and report their wartime performance with a corresponding gloss. Aggregated, these rosy reports create false optimism at the top.

Far more British than German troops died during Britain's disastrous 1916 offensive on the Somme river. But during the battle the British commander told British leaders that German casualties were more than twice those of British forces, and speculated that a quick German collapse might catch Britain unprepared for peace.[506] The next year the story repeated: during Britain's horrendously failed offensive at Passchendaele the British commander reported German forces were "so near the breaking point" that they might collapse "at any moment."[507]

During World War II General Claire Chennault's Fourteenth Chinese Air Force claimed it had destroyed at least five times the Japanese shipping that it actually sank.[508]

---

[505] Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises: 27. Betts explains that "officers have reason to overstate threats in order to hedge against failure but also to overstate results in operations in order to prove their own competence" (p. 193).

[506] Brodie, War and Politics: 24-25.

[507] Brodie, War and Politics: 18.

[508] Betts, Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises: 205, from figure 3.

U.S. Army General Douglas MacArthur likewise boasted after his bloody campaign in New Guinea that "no campaign in history" had achieved such decisive results "with so low an expenditure of life and resources." In fact his forces suffered very large losses--triple those of U.S. forces in the notorious Guadalcanal campaign--making his victory among the costliest of the Pacific war for the U.S.[509]

Japanese officers made similar false claims. Japan's Navy admitted losing only one aircraft carrier and claimed victory after disastrously losing four carriers and the battle at Midway in 1942.[510] And Japanese pilots reported sinking eleven (!) U.S. aircraft carriers, two U.S. battleships, three U.S. cruisers, and one U.S. destroyer or light cruiser in an air-sea battle off Formosa in 1944. Emperor Hirohito declared a national holiday. In fact the Americans had routed the Japanese without losing a single ship.[511]

Britain's Fighter Command exaggerated its own success during the Battle of Britain. In 1940 the British government claimed 2432 German aircraft during the battle; but official German records later revealed that Germany lost only 1408 planes.[512] RAF accounting procedures were biased to inflate German losses: to count German planes killed the RAF might have counted wrecked German aircraft, since most German losses crashed on land, and the wrecks were then collected for scrap. But instead the RAF accepted the exaggerated reports of individual pilots, who were less reliable and more likely to inflate their achievements.[513]

During the Korean war the U.S. Eighth Army commander, General James Van Fleet, once told his corps commanders that

---

[509] Schaller, MacArthur: 72.

[510] Phillip Knightley, The First Casualty: The War Correspondent as Hero, Propagandist, and Myth Maker (New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1975): 292.

[511] William Manchester, American Caesar: Douglas MacArthur, 1880-1964 (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1978): 382.

[512] Len Deighton, Fighter: The True Story of the Battle of Britain (New York: Ballantine, 1979): 276, from figure 33.

[513] Deighton, Fighter: 275-78. Likewise the German Luftwaffe claimed that it downed 3,058 British planes during the Battle of Britain, while in fact it downed 915. And the Luftwaffe claimed it had permanently destroyed eleven British airfields by August 17, 1940, while in fact only one British airfield was out of action for any length of time during the battle. Liddell Hart, History of the Second World War: 1:108, 1:95.

if he believed their figures of enemy casualties "there wouldn't be a live Chinese or Korean opposing us."[514] Chinese officers likewise boasted of stunning success against the Americans in their reports to superiors. Nikita Khrushchev records that U.S. forces "were crushed and the war ended many times" in battle summaries that were sent to Beijing and then shared with Stalin.[515]

During the Vietnam War each U.S. service exaggerated its achievements, fostering false hopes of victory in Washington. As Gelb and Betts note, the U.S. military was often deliberately optimistic, "even to the point of falsification."[516] By one estimate U.S. Air Force bombing operations often accomplished less than half the damage the Air Force claimed.[517] The Air Force achieved this deception by highlighting exaggerated pilot reports to estimate the damage that its air strike inflicted, while downplaying more accurate photo intelligence.[518] The U.S. Army likewise relied on body counts to measure its progress instead of counting captured enemy weapons, even though captured weapons were a better index of success.[519] Army claims of success were correspondingly inflated. The Navy air arm and agencies involved in the pacification program (CIA, State Department and AID) also exaggerated their achievements. Gelb and Betts explain:[520]

---

[514] James Aronson, The Press and the Cold War (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973): 118.

[515] Nikita Khrushchev, Khrushchev Remembers, trans. and ed. Strobe Talbott (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970): 372.

[516] Gelb with Betts, Irony of Vietnam: 209. Also valuable on U.S. intelligence estimates in Vietnam are Adams, "Vietnam Cover-Up"; Powers, Man Who Kept the Secrets: 235-49; Morris J. Blachman, "The Stupidity of Intelligence," in Morton H. Halperin and Arnold Kanter, eds., Readings in American Foreign Policy: A Bureaucratic Perspective (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973): 328-334; and Halberstam, Best and the Brightest, passim.

[517] Blachman, "Stupidity of Intelligence": 329.

[518] Blachman, "Supidity of Intelligence": 329; and Gelb with Betts, Irony of Vietnam: 309.

[519] John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982): 257.

[520] Irony of Vietnam: 309-10. This point was emphasized in the bitter report of a U.S. Air Force intelligence officer: "The promotion system created exceptional pressures for

> Optimism in the assessments was part of the gamesmanship of Vietnam. Optimism had a purpose. Career services tacitly and sometimes explicitly pressured their professionals to impart good news, which was seen as a job well done; bad news represented a personal failure. ... Why did the Air Force [exaggerate its successes]? First, because of the intense competition among the services, and second, because of the pressures regarding promotion.

In short, false "light at the end of the tunnel" is inherent in the bureaucratic politics of war. Once the fighting starts each combat organization has an incentive to exaggerate its achievements. These exaggerations compile to create the illusion that victory is in sight. This illusion prolongs the war and supplies a large reason why wars continue once they begin.

IV. CASES: WILHELMINE GERMANY AND IMPERIAL JAPAN

Wilhelmine Germany and imperial Japan offer strong evidence for militarism theory. In both cases the causes of militarism--as identified by militarism theory--were present in abundance, and both cases saw the appearance of full-blown militarism. This matches our expectation that abundant causes will produce correspondingly large effects. We also can trace in each case the process by which these causes of militarism produced their effects. Specifically, we see that in both countries the military worked hard to infuse civilians with bellicist ideas. And in both countries observers widely blamed the military for stirring the extreme public bellicism that emerged.

Wilhelmine Germany, 1890-1914. Before 1914 the German military was isolated from society, and German political culture contained no normative or institutional barriers against military intrusion into civil life. The German state faced serious external threats. Germany had no national memory of injurious military involvement in German public affairs. German political life was more authoritarian than democratic. Other European societies had similar attributes, but none to the same degree on all dimensions. Thus Germany

---

conformity on career officers. Promotion depended heavily on the evaluation report of one's commanding officer; one unfavorable mention in the report could postpone promotion for many years and, perhaps, permanently blight a career. ... So it would have taken a certain amount of courage for the colonel to tell the general that the air strike the general had ordered--and for whose success the colonel felt he would be held responsible--was a failure. (One Air Force general who criticized the bombing was reportedly removed from command and booted upstairs)" (Blachman, "Stupidity of Intelligence": 332).

was primed for an eruption of militarism.

Wilhelmine German officers lived a cloistered life that left them without social ties to civilians. As Hans-Ulrich Wehler writes, they were "an almost separate, self-perpetuating caste."[521] This social segregation bred a contempt toward civilians that deepened as time passed after the 1870 Franco-Prussian war. Reflecting later on his own military experience, General Colmer von der Goltz wrote that Wilhelmine German officers "had isolated ourselves completely from the civilians" and "naturally" had nothing to do with them.[522] Another German observer described the "great gulf between the Officer Corps and the *bourgeoisie*" in the Wilhelmine era.[523] Philipp Eulenburg, a confidant of the Kaiser, wrote in 1903 that "the army will never look with anything but growing distaste on the 'civilian,' who was already sufficiently despised."[524] Gordon Craig, a historian of German civil-military relations, notes that much of the Wilhelmine officer corps viewed civilians with "a mixture of contempt and hostility."[525]

German political culture had no barrier against military participation in politics. Popular German political writings contained no warning against it. Instead Germans adulated the past role of the Prussian army in creating and protecting the Prussian state. This set Germany apart from other powers: the duty of the military to remain apart from politics was often argued in Britain and France and was embedded in the U.S. constitution.

Geography condemned Germany to military insecurity. Lying in the center of Europe, it faced powerful enemies across two frontiers. Moreover, both frontiers lacked imposing defensive barriers to invasion: the western border with France and Belgium had some river barriers but no mountains to speak of, and the Eastern border with Russia was even more open. Spain had the Pyrenees, Italy had the Alps, and Britain had the Channel; Germany was relatively naked.

---

[521] Hans-Ulrich Wehler, The German Empire, 1871-1918 (Dover, NH: Berg, 1985): 157. See also Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 115-117.

[522] In 1929, quoted in Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 115.

[523] A Dr. Herz, to an official commission on German army affairs, in 1926, quoted in Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 116.

[524] In 1903, quoted in Craig, Politics of the Prussian Army: 252n.

[525] Craig, Politics of the Prussian Army: 252.

Thus it faced far larger security problems than any other European power. These problems were magnified in the German mind by memories of great German suffering at the hands of invading European armies during pervious periods of German weakness and disunion--most notably during the Thirty Years war, the Seven Years' War, and the Napoleonic wars. Germany's felt insecurity ensured that its military would enjoy large budgets, large prestige, and comparably outsized influence in German society.

Germans saw no warning against militarism in their history. The disasters that an overbearing German military brought in World War I lay in the future. This did not set Wilhelmine Germany apart from other powers of the time, but distinguishes it from later powers that emerged after 1919 imbued with the danger of unbridled military influence.

Germany was democratizing during the decades before World War I but it remained markedly more autocratic than Britain, France, Italy, and the United States. And unlike Britain, Germany had no corps of civilian experts on military affairs that could challenge official interpretations of national security issues.[526] German civilians thus had no basis to question military arguments.

These conditions coincided with an extreme flowering of militarism in Germany. The German military became immensely willful and powerful, dominating German discourse about foreign affairs. The German public embraced a panoply of militaristic ideas, including the notion that conquest was easy and security was scarce, that empires were essential to national life, that neighboring states were violently aggressive toward Germany, that Germany faced a large window of vulnerability, and that war was a positive, healthy activity. The German military itself also embraced these views--perhaps because it imbibed its own propaganda--and became a powerful lobby for war.

Historians widely agree that the Wilhelmine German military had great influence on German elites and the German public mind.[527] Wilhelm Deist notes the "extraordinary predominance of the military over the civilian authorities" in the Wilhelmine era.[528] Adolf Gasser likewise stresses that the

---

[526] Herwig, "Imperial Germany": 67.

[527] Samuel Huntington argues that the Wilhelmine military largley confined itself to the military sphere. Soldier and the State: 100-102. However, the overwhelming consensus of historians holds that Wilhelmine German officers played a large role in shaping German ideas and policy before 1914.

[528] Wilhelm Deist, "Kaiser Wilhelm II in the Context of his Military and Naval Entourage," in John C.G. Röhl and Nicolaus Sombart, eds., Kaiser Wilhelm II: New Interpretations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982): 169-192 at

military, not the civilian leaders, dominated German public affairs.[529] Friedrich Meinecke notes the vast prestige that Wilhelmine German officers enjoyed, writing that the German "lieutenant moved through the world as a young god and the civilian reserve lieutenant as a demi-god."[530] Isabel Hull observes that the Wilhelmine German military had "enormous popular prestige" and "complete independence" from civilian rule, achieving "ascendancy vis-à-vis the civilian leadership" after around 1905-1906.[531] F.L. Carsten notes that the military had greater influence on political and cultural life in Germany than anywhere else in Europe: "its prestige cast a shadow over the country."[532] Louis Snyder observes that the German Navy League attained far greater power in German politics than most German political parties.[533] Gordon Craig summarizes that the German army became "a state within a state, claiming the right to define what was, or was not, to the national interest and to dispense with those who did not agree."[534]

The military's power and prestige is seen in the obsequious deference shown the military by German civilians. The German Kaiser idolized the officer corps, filling his entourage with officers and spending most of his time with

---

177..

[529] Gasser's views are summarized in John A. Moses, The Politics of Illusion: The Fischer Controversy in German Historiography (London: George Prior, 1975): 84, 87.

[530] Quoted in Huntington, Soldier and the State: 105.

[531] Hull, Entourage: 236-237.

[532] F.L. Carsten, The Reichswehr and Politics, 1918 to 1933 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973): 4.

[533] Louis L. Snyder, From Bismarck to Hitler: The Background of Modern German Nationalism (Williamsport, PA: Bayard Press, 1935): 121.

[534] Craig, Politics of the Prussian Army: 252. Concurring see Alfred Weber, quoted in ibid.: xvi. Many contemporary observers also saw the dominance of the military in German society. British journalist Wickham Steed warned in early 1914 that "in Prussia the army is supreme, and through Prussia the army rules Germany." This was the first lesson "for those who lightly imagine the German Empire to be even as other states." Quoted in Hans Kohn, The Mind of Germany: The Education of a Nation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960): 292.

them.[535] Other high German civilians lamely deferred to the military's often-misguided policy proposals with barely a question raised. Thus Baron Friedrich von Holstein, a top German diplomat, supinely accepted General Schlieffen's disastrous plan to invade Belgium in event of war, saying that "if the Chief of the Great General Staff, and particularly a strategic authority like Schlieffen, thought such a measure to be necessary, then it would be the duty of diplomacy to adjust itself to it and prepare for it in every possible way."[536] Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg also limply agreed to Schlieffen's unwise plan, writing that "political measures had to be shaped in accordance with the needs of the [military] campaign plan."[537]

Cabinet ministers that crossed the military were dismissed. Between 1871 and 1914 military pressure forced the resignations of two German War Ministers, a Minister of Foreign Affairs, a Minister of the Interior, and two Chancellors.[538] The Chief of Staff had the right of private personal access to the emperor.[539] The chief of the military cabinet saw the Kaiser privately three times a week, while the civilian secretary of war saw him only once.[540]

This military influence was accompanied by a rise of bellicist ideas in the German public mind. Hans-Ulrich Wehler notes the "spread of military values throughout German society" before the war.[541] Avner Offer notes the "pervasive militarism of the professional and upper-classes" in pre-war Germany.[542] Gerhard Ritter argues that "military patterns of thinking came to invade the ideology of the [German] middle class."[543] Fritz Stern summarizes that Germany was "a

---

[535] Lamar Cicil, Wilhelm II: Prince and Emperor, 1859-1900 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989): 58-59, 62, 66.

[536] In 1900, quoted in Ritter, Schlieffen Plan: 91.

[537] Jehuda L. Wallach, "Misperceptions of Clausewitz' *On War* by the German Military," Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 9, Nos. 2 and 3 (June/September 1986): 213-39 at 230..

[538] Finer, Man on Horseback: 42.

[539] Finer, Man On Horseback: 42.

[540] Speier, Social Order and the Risks of War: 283.

[541] Wehler, German Empire: 156.

[542] Offer, First World War: 323.

[543] Ritter, Sword and Scepter: 2:101.

thoroughly militaristic country" in the years before World War I.[544]

These judgments match those of contemporary observers, who often noted the militarization of German popular attitudes. Friedrich Meinecke, a German historian who witnessed firsthand the late Wilhelmine period, later wrote that the German army "produced a curiously penetrating militarism which affected the whole of civilian life and found no comparable expression in any of [Germany's] neighboring states."[545] A Frenchman travelling through Germany in 1913 found rampant militarism in the German universities and the German press.[546] On the eve of the war another observer wrote that "the microbe of militarism has been inoculated into the German people."[547] Yet another noted a "predominance of the military spirit" that was "more strongly developed in the German nation than in ... any other nation."[548] Still another contemporary described the German mood:[549]

> In Germany an army spirit distinct from, and sometimes antagonistic to, the civilian spirit of the average man and woman in England and France seems to pervade the whole reach of life. ... [Germany's] national life [was] permeated by the idea of war as an end, and the German people accepted it. ... Hence in conversation, newspapers, and popular writings, the constant references to strategy, mobilization, comparative strength of armies. The effect of all this on the national mind has been that there was

---

[544] Fritz Stern, The Failure of Illiberalism (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1972): 85. James Joll likewise notes "the general acceptance of military values by large sections of the German public" before World War I. Joll, Origins of the First World War: 61.

[545] Berghahn, Militarism: 50. Nahum Goldman likewise noted in 1915 that the "principles on which the Army is built have also become the principles of German national life in general." Ibid.: 32.

[546] Georges Bourdon, The German Enigma: Being An Inquiry Among Germans as to What They Think, What They Want, What They Can Do, trans. Beatrice Marshall (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1914): passim.

[547] Charles Sarolea, in 1914, in "Introduction," in Bourdon, German Enigma: viii.

[548] Otto Harnack, in 1908, quoted in Fischer, War of Illusions: 27.

[549] A.D. McLaren, Germanism From Within (London: Constable, 1916): 128-131, 137.

> no peace party in Germany corresponding to the leaders of the larger movement in England who claimed to stand for a higher culture. ... In Germany the military spirit has penetrated every fibre of the national resources, and the men who have done most to guide the people and control their destinies have had as their supreme aim the cultivation of this spirit, in order to strengthen the army.

German civilian leaders even complained that this militarized public climate narrowed their choices. Thus German Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg complained before the war that his hands were tied by extremist public opinion: "With these idiots one cannot conduct a foreign policy--on the contrary. Together with other factors they will eventually make any reasonable course impossible for us."[550]

How was this bellicose public climate created? German officers conducted a vast propaganda campaign aimed at German civil society, on a scale never before seen. The German Navy led the way. It planted thousands of articles in German newspapers and oversaw the printing and distribution of thousands of books and pamphlets that told the Navy story. It induced many university luminaries, including Max Weber, Hans Delbrück, Gustav Schmoller and many others, to tour the country giving pro-big-Navy talks. It created a Navy League in 1898 that had more than a million members by 1906.[551] At one point the Navy League journal had a circulation of 300,000. The German army started later, but by 1914 it had an Army League and two paramilitary youth organizations that gave it a vast ready audience for its views. Some five million Germans--a sixth of all adult German males and youths--were either in military service or were members of one of these leagues before 1914, forming a huge conduit for military arguments.[552]

These publicity campaigns were the first of their scope in history. They marked the invention of a new method of politics--the systematic and continuous manipulation of mass public opinion by the state--that was later mimicked by other regimes.

---

[550] In 1909, quoted in Konrad H. Jarausch, The Enigmatic Chancellor: Bethmann Hollweg and the Hubris of Imperial Germany (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973): 119. French diplomat Jules Cambon likewise remarked in 1911: "It is false that in Germany the nation is peaceful and the government bellicose--the exact opposite is true." Ibid.: 124. See also ibid.: 152; and Geiss, Germany Foreign Policy: 135-137.

[551] Röhl, Germany without Bismarck: 253-255.

[552] Wehler, German Empire: 163.

Contemporary observers widely blamed this propaganda for Germany's bellicose mood. Otfried Nippold, a German academic, ascribed German public militance to "our war-loving generals in the Pan-German League, the Defense Association (*Wehrverein*) and similar organizations" who engaged in "systematic stimulation of the war spirit" and stirred "ill feeling against other states and nations."[553] Admiral Georg von Müller, a top German official, likewise explained that the German government risked war in 1914 because it was "under pressure from a great part of the German people which had been whipped into a high-grade chauvinism by Navalists and Pan-Germans."[554] Price Collier, an American observer of Germany, wrote in 1913 that "the [German] press is so largely influenced by Admiral von Tirpitz and his corps of press-agents and writers, that it is even difficult to procure the publication of a protest or a reply." Collier further noted a "poisonous teaching of patriotism" that "produced wide-spread enmity of feeling ... but this enmity has built the navy."[555]

German civilians noted the role of army reserve service in stirring their own militance. The widow of sociologist Max Weber observed that his reserve training inspired in him "a warlike and patriotic attitude which made him hope one day he would be able to go into the field at the head of his company."[556]

Many ideas purveyed by the German military were internally inconsistent or patently incorrect. This casts doubt on the notion that the authors of these arguments believed them, suggesting instead--as militarism theory argues--that these were unbelieved propaganda arguments advanced to serve organizational interests. For example, Tirpitz's argument for a large offensive battle fleet was riddled with contradictions. It rested on claims that a strong German battle fleet could gain control of the seas through a decisive offensive; while also claiming that an inferior German fleet could win by exploiting the tactical advantage of the defensive; while further claiming that

---

[553] In 1913, quoted in Notestein and Stoll, Conquest and Kulter: 137, 139.

[554] Quoted in Stern, Failure of Illiberalism: 94.

[555] Price Collier, Germany and the Germans: from an American Point of View (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913): 529, 539-540. Historian Paul Kennedy likewise concludes that German public enthusiasm for Germany's naval buildup stemmed largely from "a carefully organized propaganda policy from above." Kennedy, Strategy and Diplomacy: 120.

[556] Kitchen, German Officer Corps: 121-122.

Britain would expose its fleet to defeat by taking the tactical offensive against Germany, eschewing for some reason the tactical advantage of the defensive.[557] German navalists also argued that Britain was so aggressive that it would use its naval superiority to strangle German trade, but so supine that it would not seriously contest a German move to close the gap at sea.[558] Such logical incoherence indicates that these arguments were propaganda, not belief, since any coherent mind that saw the whole case would quickly see its internal contraditions.[559] Only the audiences of these arguments, each hearing fragments of the whole but none hearing it all, would overlook the cacophany.

This audience included German officers themselves. We can not say for certain if their views were shaped by this propaganda, but this is suggested by the the shape of their thinking, which reproduced the belligerent worldview they purveyed to civilians. Reflecting this worldview, the German Army became a loud lobby for war and played a large role in pushing Germany toward war in 1914.[560]

Imperial Japan, 1900s-1941. Like the Wilhelmine German military, the imperial Japanese military lived in segregated seclusion from Japanese civilians. Imperial Japan had no national memory of injury stemming from military involvement in public life, and no cultural tradition that confined the role of military in public life. In retrospect it appears that imperial Japan did not face large security threats, but Japan's elite thought Japan was in peril. Japan's democratic institutions were frail and often failed to function. These conditions primed imperial Japan for an outbreak of militarism during the decades before World War II.

Many Japanese officers--25 to 30 percent--began

---

[557] Snyder, Myths of Empire: 79.

[558] Snyder, Myths of Empire: 5. See also ibid.: 71-72; and Paul Kennedy, Strategy and Diplomacy: 149.

[559] Many contemporary observers concluded that Tirpitz was driven by organizational motives. Bethmann-Hollweg remarked in 1914 that "for Tirpitz the Navy is an end in itself." Quoted in David E. Kaiser, "Germany and the Origins of the First World War," Journal of Modern History, Vol. 55, No. 3 (September 1983): 442-474 at 457n.

[560] Arguing that the Wilhelmine German military was quite dovish before 1914 is Huntington, Soldier and the State: 101, 105-106, 108. But Huntington is clearly wrong: evidence of the German military's extreme hawkishness in 1914 and earlier is overwhelming. See above, note 13 and text at notes 416, 422-433, 437-446.

military life at the age of twelve or thirteen with studies at official military preparatory schools, where they had no contact with civilian life. For the rest the isolation began at fifteen or sixteen with studies at a national military academy.[561] Their schooling stressed that they were members of a chosen group with a special social role.[562] Active officers had their time off base restricted and their reading material strictly censored.[563] This isolation bred an ingrown worldview and a disregard for civilian views and wishes.[564] Officers came to see themselves "apart from and indeed above the Japanese nation as a whole."[565]

Japanese culture offered no warning against undue military influence and no barriers against it. Europeans had learned to fear military control of policy in the fires of World War I, but Japan had escaped these disasters. Instead, Japan's samurai traditions and its military victories in the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars (1894-95 and 1904-5) fostered the veneration of military officers. Japan's constitution enshrined the independence of the military from the civil government.[566]

Japan had no strong neighbors aside from the Soviet Union, and the Soviets could project only limited power in Asia. Nor were any Western powers intent on colonizing Japan. In fact Western interest in Asian colonies waned soon after the turn of the century, and moved into reverse in the 1930s as decolonization began. Yet the international scene seemed ominous to contemporary Japanese elites. As the twentieth century dawned they saw that the European powers that had just carved up Africa and Southeast Asia and were moving to partition China. There seemed no limit to western colonial appetites, and Japan seemed a ripe and likely target for future Western predations if it remained weak. In Japanese

---

[561] Fujiwara, "Role of the Japanese Army": 191-192.

[562] Fujiwara, "Japanese Army": 191-92.

[563] Leonard A. Humphreys, The Way of the Heavenly Sword: The Japanese Army in the 1920s (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995): 14.

[564] Fujiwara, "Role of the Japanese Army": 192.

[565] Mark R. Peattie, Ishiwara Kanji and Japan's Confrontation with the West (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975): 6.

[566] Toshikazu Kase, Journey to the Missouri (Hamden, CT: Archon, 1969): 21. Kase notes that with this background the Japanese people "little suspected the evil consequences of military domination." Ibid.: 22.

eyes Japan's security seemed precarious. This fear ensured that Japan's military would have large budgets, large prestige, and correspondingly large social influence.

Japanese democracy was flawed and frail, as seen by the relative ease with which the military took control in the 1930s. Published civilian analysis of military questions was unknown, leaving the Japanese public with no basis to judge the claims of the military.

As these conditions developed Japan saw the burgeoning of militarism. The military came to dominate public debate and finally seized the reigns of government itself. It used its power to indoctrinate the public with a Darwinist view of international affairs that stressed the malevolence of other states, the insecurity of Japan, the necessity and feasibility of expansion, and the glories of war.

Scholars widely agree that the military came to dominate the Japanese public sphere before World War II. Volker Berghahn notes that by 1939 "Japan was for all practical purposes a highly militarized society in which the Army and the Navy called the tune."[567]

The power of the military was manifest in the deference that civilians gave to military wishes. During the 1930s Japan's political parties came to curb their words and deeds from fear of retaliation by the military, and the Japanese Diet faded into a mere rubber stamp.[568] Military officers were given top diplomatic posts, including Foreign Minister and Ambassador to the United States, Germany and the Soviet Union.[569] The professional diplomatic corps was bypassed. After around 1937 "the military's hold on the government was now complete: they could make or unmake a cabinet at their pleasure."[570]

As in Wilhelmine Germany the imperial Japanese military stirred public militarism through massive use of public relations. The military gained large control over the national press by intruding itself into the government press censorship process, using this control to turn coverage in its favor.[571] It created a host of public support organizations, comprised of retired and reserve officers as well as

---

[567] Berghahn, Militarism: 64.

[568] Misawa Shigeo and Ninomiya Sabur∩, "The Role of the Diet and Political Parties," in Borg and Okamoto, Pearl Harbor as History: 321-340 at 330-31.

[569] Kase, Journey to the Missouri: 17.

[570] Kase, Journey to the Missouri: 36.

[571] Pelz, Race to Pearl Harbor: 43-44.

civilians, as venues to purvey arguments for expanding Japanese military power.[572] A navalist Protection Society published a monthly magazine and a yearly naval review that pled the navy's case. The Navy Ministry ran a speakers bureau that arranged thousands of speeches against arms control and published a range of navalist pamphlets.[573]

The army developed a program for placing legions of former officers in public schools, where they conveyed the army message to students.[574] And the army pushed to militarize Japanese school textbooks, so that "pro-military sentiment became pervasive" in school texts before World War II.[575]

This propaganda infused the public with a militaristic spirit. It also blew back into the military, infecting junior officers with a belligerence that their superiors never intended. In this way the military was trapped by its own rhetoric: arguments made to persuade the public to support military spending also persuaded junior officers that war was necessary.[576] These officers then became a major lobby for war and helped push Japan over the brink in 1941.

What motivated this military propaganda? Protecting organizational size and budget was the key concern. Michael Barnhardt writes that Japan's navy was "ever mindful of the need to embellish the fleet's roles and missions in order to justify sharp increases in size."[577] This required an

---

[572] Pelz, Race to Pearl Harbor: 44-45; and Humphreys, Way of the Heavenly Sword: 15.

[573] Pelz, Race to Pearl Harbor: 44-45.

[574] Humphreys, Way of the Heavenly Sword: 91, 178-79.

[575] Sabur∩ Ienaga, "The Glorification of War in Japanese Education," International Security, Vol. 18, No. 33 (Winder 1993/94): 113-133 at 118. Ienaga writes of his own schooling in the 1920s: "all the textbooks we used were laced with accounts that glorified war and the military." Ibid.: 118.

[576] Admiral Nagano Osami, a future Navy Chief of Staff, stated in confidence in 1936: "It is for the sake of the morale and training of our forces that we make an outward pretense of some day conducting operations against America and Britain. But in reality I wish to guide the navy toward friendly relations with these powers." But as Asada Sadao notes, "middle- and lower-echelon officers, long trained by intensive drills to regard America as '*the* enemy,' had become obsessed with the idea of war with the United States." Asada, "Japanese Navy": 258. The military had unleashed a storm that it could not tame.

[577] Barnhardt, Japan Prepares for Total War: 81.

aggressive foreign policy that could justify a large navy. Accordingly, navy admirals advised an imperial advance to the south--despite the risk that this would trigger an unwanted war with the United States--"as much for internal budgetary and resource reasons as for any truly military ones."[578]

In unguarded moments Japanese officers sometimes even admitted that budget concerns underlay their bellicose policy advice. Admiral Suetsugu Nobumasa, asked in 1934 if the navy was seriously considering war with the United States, replied: "Certainly, even that is acceptable if it will get us a budget."[579]

The arguments of the Japanese military, like those of the Wilhelmine German military, were internally inconsistent or demonstrably wrong or both--further indicating that these arguments were organizationally self-serving propaganda, not belief.[580] For example, Japanese officers argued that the United States was so aggressive that Japan had to forestall its aggression by imperial expansion, and so meek that it would not fight seriously after Japan attacked it. They argued that industrial strength was so important in modern war that Japan required an independent industrial empire, and that Japan could gain this empire by warring against a United States with ten times Japan's industrial capacity. And they argued that Japan needed an empire to escape the threat of economic strangulation by enemy blockade, but pursued an overseas empire that could provide no security against a blockading enemy with a superior navy.

These notions clashed with one another but matched the organizational interests of Japan's military establishment. Each notion bolstered the claim that Japan faced serious security problems that could best be solved by offensive military operations. Thus each justified large military budgets and the offensive postures and doctrines that the military services preferred.[581]

---

[578] Barnhardt, Japan Prepares for Total War: 269.

[579] Barnhardt, Japan Prepares for Total War: 39.

[580] Stephen Walt summarizes that Japanese military thought was "a preposterous blend of wishful thinking, myths, and contradictory premises." Stephen M. Walt, "A Search for a Science of Strategy: A Review Essay on *Makers of Modern Strategy*," International Security, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Summer 1987): 140-165 at 146.

[581] Imperial Japanese officers sometimes admitted that budget concerns underlay their bellicose policy preferences. Admiral Suetsugu Nobumasa, asked in 1934 if the navy was seriously considering war with the United States, replied: "Certainly, even that is acceptable if it will get us a

How strong are the tests posed by the German and Japanese cases? The tests are strong because no competing explanations for patterns in the cases suggest themselves; hence the action of militarism theory must account for these patterns. Some aspects of both cases could have other explanations. For example, many authors have blamed German and Japanese culture for their belligerent public moods. Some have also blamed German bellicosity on Germany's social stratification, and blamed Japan's belligerence on its ancient Bushido code. But the whole picture outlined above--including evidence of military efforts to shape civilian opinion, testimony of contemporaries that blames the military for civilian bellicosity, and evidence of organizational motives for the military's political actions, including confessions by military officers admitting these motives--is not compatible with any other explanation. Accordingly, the tests are strong and their passage gives militarism theory strong support.

These tests also suggest that militarism theory points to strong causes. The conduct of Germany and Japan changed markedly, and went to extremes, as the causes of militarism appeared within. This suggests that the causes of militarism have large effects.

Still open is the question of how much militarism theory explains. It passes two strong tests, but are the conditions needed for its operation common or rare? If common it explains lots of politics and history; if rare it explains rather little. I turn to this question next.

VI. WHAT CAN MILITARISM THEORY EXPLAIN?

Military[582] establishments do not want war, but they support policies and purvey misperceptions that raise the risk of war to protect their organizational interests. Their internal nature and external environment make militaries politically effective and intrusive. Their political intrusions foster dangerous misperceptions and high-risk foreign and defense policies. Militaries also may come to believe their own arguments and press for war as a result. All organizations struggle to protect their organizational interests. In the case of the military war as an unintended byproduct of this struggle.

This is militarism theory in a nutshell. How much can it explain of the past? Of the present and future?

Militarism theory has fairly narrow applicability. It

---

budget." Barnhardt, Japan Prepares for Total War: 39.

[582] May 3, 2000: Cut this para and the first sentence of the next? I say cut, but I do like this summary. Can I use it elsewhere? Book introduction? Book conclusion? Somewhere else?

is a hot-house theory, needing special conditions to operate. These conditions are often missing, hence there are many cases that militarism theory does not cover. But the theory does explain some important events and offers answers to large questions about modern international affairs. It is worst at explaining pre-modern warfare, best at explaining industrial-era warfare.

To identify cases that militarism theory explains we look for cases where the causes of militarism were present; cases where we have evidence of military action to militarize civilian thinking; and cases where the product of militarism--state policies guided by a militaristic worldview--are observed. Using those criteria, militarism theory sheds light on both world wars and a select set of additional cases.

World War I. As I just explained, the Wilhelmine German military gained great influence on the mind of German civilians. It worked to militarize German society, with considerable success. Moreover, other European societies suffered milder symptoms of the same virus. The Russian, Austro-Hungarian and Serbian militaries all were willful and powerful social actors. All favored the same militarist ideas as the German military. The French military was less influential but not without social power. As a result militarism became a general European phenomenon, greatest in Germany but found elsewhere as well. Only Britain showed few signs of it.[583] Colonel Edward House generalized about the region when he wrote Woodrow Wilson from Berlin on May 29, 1914:[584]

> The situation is extraordinary. It is militarism run stark mad. Unless someone acting for you can bring about a

---

[583] Sidney Fay broadly concurs, writing that "militarism--the influence of the military upon the civilian authorities--was a serious matter in the three eastern monarchies of Germany, Austria, and Prussia. It was much less in France, and virtually non-existent in England." Sidney B. Fay, The Origins of the World War, 2 vols., 2d ed. (New York: Free Press, 1966): 1:43.

[584] Albertini, Origins of the War of 1914: 1:550. Caroline Playne likewise blamed the war in part on "the militarist mind which extended and intensified the surging impulses of European life in the years preceding the war." Even in England, she wrote, "the militarist mind had become too generally the mass mind." Playne, Pre-War Mind in Britain: 162. And David Herrmann writes that many of the leaders of 1914 "had themselves appropriated the strategic assumptions of the soldiers." David Gaius Herrmann, "Armies and the Balance of Military Power in Europe, 1904-1914," (Ph.D. dissertation. Yale University, 1992): 458.

different understanding, there is some day to be an awful cataclysm. No one in Europe can do it. There is too much hatred.

Thus throughout the European continent military influence was at an unusual high point before 1914.

What ideas did Europe's militaries purvey? Most important, as noted above they spread the notion that conquest was easy.[585] This belief, in turn, was the root cause of many other causes of war in 1914.[586] Specifically, it fostered both German and Austrian expansionism and fierce Entente resistance to this expansionism, setting up an powerful collision between the Central Powers and the Entente. It encouraged Russia to mobilize preemptively early in the 1914 July crisis, in a desperate effort to seize a slender military advantage, thereby pushing the crisis over the edge to war. It supported preventive war thinking in Germany, where such thinking fueled schemes to attack Russia. It led Germany and Austria to adopt risky *fait accompli* diplomatic tactics that made the July crisis far more dangerous. It led the German and Russian militaries to design inflexible military mobilization plans that required early action against every opponent in event of mobilization, leaving civilian leaders no room to defer or confine the war once mobilization began. It led the European powers to form essentially unconditional alliances with one another, which ensured that a minor conflagration anywhere in Europe would quickly spread to engulf the region. It led the powers to react quickly and violently to threatening moves by others, leaving civilian leaders no room for error and turning their small mistakes, reversible under normal conditions, into historical blunders. And it created a rapid cycle of action and reaction that allowed Germany to hide its responsibility for the war, instead casting blame onto others.

These dangers played an important role in triggering the war. If so, their common cause--the belief that conquest was easy--was a prime cause of the war. If militarism caused this belief then it, too, was a prime cause of the war.[587]

Militarism was also the likely cause of several other factors that impelled Europe toward war in 1914, and that intensified and prolonged the war once it began. These include Germany's tendency to exaggerate its neighbors' hostility; the German belief in bandwagoning and big stick diplomacy, which led Germany to discount the risk that Britain

---

[585] See above at notes 278-353.

[586] I argue this in Van Evera, "Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War."

[587] May 4, 2000: CUT this para or the summary para two paras down. 2 summaries is 1 too many.

would intervene against it, and to adopt a risky bullying diplomatic strategy; the general glorification of war throughout Europe; and the blind optimism on both sides that helped keep the war going once it began. Europe's militaries purveyed all these ideas, and historians widely agree that these ideas helped cause or sustain the war. Moreover, militaries were warhawks in many states, including Germany, Russia, France, and Austria and Serbia, perhaps after imbibing their own violent Darwinist propaganda. Their hawkishness pressure helped steer Europe's governments toward war.[588]

Thus militarism appears as a master-cause of World War I. It caused the belief that conquest was easy and the many dangers that flowed from it. It also caused other conditions that helped bring about the war. Many factors that helped trigger the war had militarism as their source.

A thumbnail explanation for the First World War that emphasized militarism, then, would be as follows. Militarism arose with industrialism in the nineteenth century: industrialism created the division of labor, creating specialized bureaucracies, creating a military with a separate identity and interest, creating militarism. The industrial world had no previous experience with militarism and was caught unawares. Militarism had not yet caused any disasters, so militaries enjoyed high prestige and enjoyed great credibility in debates over foreign policy and national security. As a result Europeans were predisposed to believe military arguments, even patently false and self-serving claims. Civilians saw little need to institutionalize civilian control and erected few political barriers to confine the role of the military in public affairs. Militarism was worse during 1890-1914 than earlier or later chiefly because the military was by then highly professionalized but the dangers of militarism were still unknown.[589] After the war militarism was better controlled in Europe because people learned--for a time at least--that militarism was dangerous, making them less susceptible to it.

During the Cold War, the argument would run, militarism was less acute among the superpowers than it was among the pre-World War I European powers for idiosyncratic reasons. Most of the top Soviet civilian leadership gained large

---

[588] See note 13, above, and the text at notes 416, 419-432, and 437-446.

[589] Jack Snyder offers a competing but not incompatible explanation, suggesting that militarism was intense in Europe before 1914 because special circumstances involved the European militaries in domestic political conflicts, in ways that gave them incentives to intrude into the domestic debate. Ideology of the Offensive: passim.

military experience during the Russian revolution, the Russian civil war, and World War II, so the Soviet military had no monopoly of military information that it could exploit to dominate debate. The Soviet state also installed strong barriers against undue military influence, in the form of close Communist Pary supervision over military decision making and a proscription on military public speech on political questions. In the U.S. militarism was (and is) dampened by the substantial integration of the military into civilian life, by strong traditions of civilian control, and by informed civilian input in security policy debates from thinktanks and universities.

In short, the exceptional events of 1914-18 were created by conditions that allowed an exceptional degree of militarism. This militarism was not the only cause of World War I: other factors, most notably the rabid nationalist mythmaking that infected Europe before 1914, also played a role. But militarism was a key cause.

The case for this explanation is bolstered by the lack of alternative explanations for the militarization of European ideas. No plausible competing explanation suggests itself. Its absence bolster the case for a militarism explanation.

Militarism theory sheds new light on the debate over responsibility for World War I. The theory blames Europe's militaries. It also supports arguments, advanced by the Fischer school of historians, that heavily blame Germany.[590] The Fischer school has long argued that Germany consciously risked war in 1914 and perhaps even sought to bring it about. Fischerites marshalled impressive evidence but their argument left many unpersuaded partly because they lacked an explanation for the conduct they alleged. Why would Germany behave so belligerently? Skeptics doubted the Fischer argument because Fischerites had no persuasive explanation for why Germany would behave so aggressively.[591] Militarism theory explains that Germany was so aggressive because it was highly militarized. In so doing it completes the Fischer school argument by answering the "why?" question about German conduct.

At the same time militarism theory lifts broad blame from the German people. It suggests that responsibility for

---

[590] The flagship work of the Fischer school is Fischer, War of Illusions. A summary of the Fischer view is Geiss, German Foreign Policy.

[591] The Fischer school has offered a social imperialism explanation, suggesting that German elites sought conflict with other states to bolster support for the conservative groups at home. Evidence for this explanation is thin, however. I think the social imperialism explanation has some validity but not much.

the war lies not with all Germans, but only with their malevolent, and now vanished, *ancien* security elites. This rather small band of elite predators carry the burden of guilt; they alone sowed the ideas that spawned the war; the wider society is not culpable. One could fault the German public for following these predators, but this is a high standard of conduct to demand. It seems unlikely that any other public would have behaved any better under the same conditions. The trouble lay with the specifics of German civil-military relations, not with the German public at large or the culture at large. And if so, militarism theory largely exculpates the broader German public for the violence their government began.

The Pacific War, 1941-45. The Pacific War stemmed from Japanese expansionism. Hard-line United States policies also played a role, but war is hard to imagine without Japan's extremist policies. These Japanese policies, in turn, were guided by arguments that the Japanese military had purveyed for decades: that other powers were out to get Japan, that Japan required a wider empire to survive against these powers, that conquering such an empire was feasible, and that a war triggered by a reach for empire would be glorious. As outlined above, Japan's military had great prestige and influence, and it purveyed these arguments with great energy and success. Japan's military also pushed for war, perhaps because many officers heard and believed its own propaganda.

The ideas behind Japanese policies make little sense as a national strategy; but they do make sense viewed as organizationally self-serving military myths. Historians should view Japanese national ideas of this period less as national than as organizational beliefs. Viewed as a national belief system, Japanese ideas are incoherent and irrational. As an organizationally self-serving belief system Japanese ideas are logical and coherent.

Others have explained Japan's conduct as stemming from Japanese culture, or have put prime blame for that conduct on civilian elements of the Japanese elite, especially the emperor. Militarism theory offers a stronger explanation because it better fits the whole pattern we see. Cultural explanations are unsatisfying because they cannot account for the large role of the military in shaping public opinion, or for the budgetary motives that underlay the military's action. Explanations that blame the emperor or other civilians misread the balance of power in imperial Japan: the emperor was clearly a weak player playing a weak hand during the slide to war. Factors aside from militarism were surely at work, but militarism theory offers the strongest explanation.

Who bears guilt for the Pacific War? Militarism theory puts blame narrowly on Japan's pre-war security institutions, and thus lifts blame from wider Japanese society. This should ease Japan's task in coming to terms with its past. Many

Japanese have resisted an admission because it implied blame for the whole nation, including their own ancestors and elements of their current culture. Militarism theory should make the pill less bitter. It narrowly blames arrogant, self-serving military leadership groups. The wider Japanese public were pawns and victims of the military elites, not independent actors. When Japan takes blame for the Pacific war, the blame flows not to the broad Japanese people but to small malevolent military elites that have long since disappeared.

Other cases. Ottoman officers infused with militaristic ideas foolishly led Turkey into World War I in 1914.[592] Imbued with the cult of the offensive, they dreamed of launching vast offensive maneuvers that would take their armies all the way through Afghanistan to the borders of India.[593] Instead they were vanquished after many bloody defeats and saw their state carved to pieces at war's end.

During 1918-22 Poland's military strongman Marshal Józef Pilsudski sought to conquer an empire including the whole Ukraine--a huge multiethnic area larger than the Poland of 1772.[594] He declared that Poland would either be "a state equal to the great powers of the world, or a small state that needed protection of the mighty."[595] He also expressed fondness for war, remarking in 1919 that he loved war "with all its horrors," and calling war "a mistress" in 1920.[596]

Later Hungary's military pressed for its suicidal 1941 attack on the Soviet Union, dreaming of restoring Hungary to its traditional borders.[597] Some observers have detected

---

[592] Grant and Temperley summarize that these officers "were actively preaching a doctrine of war in which even Bernhardi would have delighted." A.J. Grant and Harold Temperley, Europe in the Nineteenth Century (1789-1914) (New York: Longmans, Green, 1927): 34.

[593] M.S. Anderson, The Eastern Question, 1774-1923 (London: Macmillan, 1966): 315.

[594] Hugh Seton-Watson, Eastern Europe Between the Wars, 1918-1941 (New York: Archon Books, 1962): 332.

[595] Piotr S. Wandycz, Soviet-Polish Relations, 1917-1921 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969): 159.

[596] Wandycz, Soviet-Polish Relations: 159n-160n. He also remarked in 1920 that "I love this war which either crushes a man's character like glass or makes it strong like steel." Ibid.

[597] Thomas L. Sakmyster, "Army Officers and Foreign Policy in Hungary," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 10, No. 1 (January 1975): 19-40.

militarism in modern South Africa, Chile, Brazil, and Argentina.[598] Paraguay's suicidal rampage against Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay during 1864-1870 under military strongman Francisco Solano López may owe something to militarism; likewise Pakistan's belligerence toward India and Afghanistan since 1947. And militarism theory sheds some light on Naziism. Most Nazi leaders formed their political worldviews while steeped in the militarist propaganda of 1890-1918, and they carried these views forward into the 1930s. Hitler was an avid reader of right-wing literature and as a youth he almost surely imbibed the militarist propaganda of the era. His thinking tracks many of the more violent themes of Wilhelmine German military propaganda, including the notion that states must grow or die, that decisive war was inevitable, that Britain would not balance against a Germany that reached for control of Europe, and that war was essentially a good thing. Thus Nazi expansionism can be seen as an afterecho of Wilhelmine militarism.[599]

The wilder foreign policy ideas put forward in less militarized states often originate with the military. In 1940 British and French Air Force officers argued that the allies should attack the Soviet oil fields at Baku in hopes of inducing "sooner or later the total collapse of the war potential of the USSR," as British Air Force documents argued. The British officers thought this operation could "decide the course of the entire war," as it might have, by cementing the Nazi-Soviet Pact and thus making Hitler's defeat impossible.[600] During the Cold War the loudest calls in the United States for preventive war against the Soviet Union and China were military. In 1968 General LeMay complained that "we probably could have made Russia pull out of Eastern Europe, but the sensible policies of 'roll back' were never carried out."[601] During the Cuban Missile Crisis the U.S. military advised forceful solutions that the President wisely rejected.[602]

---

[598] On South Africa see Kenneth W. Grundy, The Militarization of South African Politics (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986): 58-67 and passim; and Philip H. Frankel, Pretoria's Praetorians: Civil-Military Relations in South Africa (London: Cambridge University Press, 1984): 29-34 and passim. On Chile, Brazil, and Argentina see Jack Child, Geopolitics and Conflict in South America: Quarrels Among Neighbors (New York: Praeger, 1985).

[599] Generally concurring is Snyder, Myths of Empire: 93.

[600] Iklé, Every War Must End: 58.

[601] LeMay, America Is In Danger: 151.

[602] Robert F. Kennedy, Thirteen Days: A Memoir of the Cuban Missile Crisis (New York: W.W. Norton, 1971): 14, 26,

Militarism theory may explain such suggestions.

Other phenomena explained. Why do states often exaggerage the size of first-move advantages, the size of windows of opportunity and vulnerability, the cumulativity of resources, and the ease of conquest and the scarcity of security? In Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict I argued that these misperceptions are common. Militarism theory accounts in part for their appearance. Professional militaries have an incentive to sow these misperceptions, and uncivilianized militaries have sown them in the past.

What explains the misperceptions identified by the cognitive psycholgy school of national misperception? The psychology school notes that states tend to exaggerate others' hostility, and to underestimate their own role in provoking others' hostility.[603] It warns of the risk of conflict spirals, in which states punish others hoping to make them behave better but actually provoke them to greater hostility.[604] It notes that states exaggerate the unity and coordination among adversaries, seeing monolithic hostility when others in fact are not coordinating against them.[605]

Cognitive psychology may explain these syndromes, but militarism theory also has plausible explanations, arguing that militaries purvey these misperceptions for organizationally self-seeking reasons. Specifically, it suggests that militaries exaggerate others' hostility in search of the larger military budgets that hostile neighbors justify, and sells this misperception to the wider society. It suggests that militaries conceal their own state's role in provoking others' hostility because they favor strong-arm policies, and are therefore slow to admit it when these policies backfire, instead interpreting such backfires as having other causes. It argues that conflict spirals arise because militaries exaggerate the benefits and underestimate the costs of brandishing force, so they advise belligerent policies even when such methods will provoke more than they deter. It claims that militaries exaggerate the scope and unity of the opposition in order to widen the range of threats

---

74-5, 95-7.

[603] Robert Jervis, "Hypotheses on Misperception," in George H. Quester, ed., Power, Action and Interaction: Readings on International Politics (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973): 104-137 at 127, 129.

[604] Jervis, "Hypotheses on Misperception": 129; Robert Jervis, Perception and Misperception in International Politics (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976): 62-76.

[605] Jervis, "Hypotheses on Misperception": 128.

the state must address, and sell this misperception to the wider society.[606] Thus Wilhelmine Germany and Imperial Japan exaggerated their neighbors' hostility under sway of relentless military propaganda that painted others' aims in the darkest terms. Wilhelmine Germany provoked British hostility by its vast naval building during 1898-1912, but forgot this after hearing the German Navy's constant (self-serving) claims that German naval building had not provoked Britain. Germany spiraled with the Entente states before 1914 by pursuing a policy of threat and belligerence--strongly endorsed by the German military--that aroused Entente hostility. And Soviet and American officers both exaggerated the unity of the opposing camp during the Cold War.

What causes expansionism and imperialism? A host of causes have been suggested: Marxists point to capitalism, others point to communism, and still others point to the insecurity of states and their resulting need to seek security by expansion. Militarism should join the list. In leading states to exaggerate their insecurity and to exaggerate the ease of conquering others militarism incites states toward expansionist policies.

Why are medium and small powers generally less belligerent than great powers? Why, in particular, are they generally less alarmed about their security, even though their relative weakness should leave them feeling more exposed? Militarism theory offers an answer, since it argues that militarism is a disease confined largely to great powers. Great powers are more secure than lesser powers, but they also have more powerful and willful security establishments that have a large interest in warning society of its insecurity.

What explains the persistance of interstate warfare after the industrial revolution removed many reasons for fighting? Carl Kaysen explains that the material causes of war have diminshed sharply over the past two centuries. Conquest no longer confers nearly the profit nor the power that it once did.[607] Why has warfare itself has not diminished? Some war-causing "Factor X" must be on the rise, replacing older causes as they fade. Militarism theory nominates the rise of professional militaries as a likely culprit.

Militarism theory in perspective. Militarism theory has strengths and weaknesses. Its main weakness is its narrow real-world applicability. Militarism requires uncommon

---

[606] Tests that competed cognitive psychological explanations for these mispercepetions against militarism explanations would be useful.

[607] Carl Kaysen, "Is War Obsolete? A Review Essay," International Security, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Spring 1990): 42-64.

conditions. As a result it is quite rare in history. Wilhelmine Germany and imperial Japan are the only cases of full-blown militarism that present themselves, and milder cases are not very common either. On the other hand, the theory points to a strong cause: when militarism appears it has a dramatic impact on state behavior. And the theory has wide explanatory range, explaining many phenomena. These include overestimates of others' hostility, overestimates of bandwagoning and the efficacy of belligerent political tactics, exaggeration of the ease of conquest, the embrace of unduly offensive military force postures and strategies, exaggeration of the size of first-move advantages and windows of opportunity and vulnerability, exaggeration of the value of empire, wartime false optimism, and underestimation of the costs of war.

Some of these phenomena explain still other phenomena. For example, exaggeration of the ease of conquest explains expansionism, *fait accompli* diplomatic tactics, secrecy, arms racing, and more. Exaggeration of first move advantage explains why states might conceal their grievances from one another, raising the risk of inadvertent war, and why they might launch preemptive war. Exaggeration of windows explains why states might force the pace of decision making, leading to war-causing mistakes.[608]

By explaining the causes of these phenomena, militarism theory encompasses them. So it explains only a small set of cases but it explains a good deal about them.

Militarism theory also serves a useful social purpose, by helping Germany and Japan to come to terms with their past. It suggests that blame for the world wars belongs not on all Germans and Japanese, but only on on their malevolent, and now vanished, *ancien* security institutions. This shift in blame lets today's Germans and Japanese more easily admit their country's crimes. Many have resisted an admission because it implied blame for the whole society, including their own ancestors and elements of their current culture. To their credit many Germans (but fewer Japanese) have nevertheless acknowledged their nation's crimes and aggressions, but they have not found it easy.

Militarism theory makes the pill less bitter. It narrowly blames arrogant, self-serving military leadership groups and their allies in industry. This rather small band of elite predators carry the burden of guilt; the wider society is not culpable. The German and Japanese publics can be faulted for following these predators, but this is a high standard of conduct to demand. It seems unlikely that the British, French, or America publics would have behaved any

---

[608] See Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 35-53, 73-86, 117-151.

better under the same conditions. The trouble lay with the specifics of civil-military relations, not with the public at large or the culture at large. And if so, militarism theory largely exculpates the broader German and Japanese public for the wars their governments launched.

VIII. DOES MILITARISM HAVE A FUTURE?

Full-blown militarism is nowhere on the world horizon. Today's Russia and China are not models of good civil-military relations,[609] but nothing like the militarism of Wilhelmine Germany or imperial Japan is evident there or elsewhere. Is this cessation permanent or temporary?

Many of the causes of militarism can be controlled or eliminated by states. States can choose to integrate their military officers into society; there is little advantage to secluding officers away from the people they serve, and little cost to close social integration.[610] States and societies can choose to remember the history that warns of the possible dangers of militarism; the record is there to read. States can choose to erect high legal and normative barriers to military intrusion into the political sphere. Societies can choose to be informed about national security and military affairs. These are choices that every nation can make if it wishes.

Other causes of militarism are hard to control by policy but are waning naturally. Authoritarian regimes are slowly pluralizing across the world, as the world economy grows and middle classes expand. And the insecurity of states has been sharply reduced by the nuclear revolution, which makes great powers essentially unconquerable.[611]

Thus the secular tides of global change are running against militarism, and governments can dampen it further.

On the other hand, the changes that brought militarism are permanent. Militarism was ushered by the sharpening of

---

[609] An ominous portrait of current Russian civil-military relations is Desch, Civilian Control of the Military: 39-66.

[610] Samuel Huntington recommends that militaries be controlled by what he calls "objective control," a prescription that includes granting the military large autonomy. Soldier and the State: 83-85. But autonomy seems likely to lead to social separation and a sense of separate civil and military cultures. These in turn are a recipe for militarism. To harmonize civil-military relations and minimize the risk of militarism, governments should integrate militaries into society, not grant them the autonomy that Huntington calls for.

[611] See Van Evera, Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict: 246.

the division of labor in the early industrial revolution. This division of labor will only sharpen in the future as military science becomes more arcane. Hence the laws of motion that govern organizations will continue to characterize the behavior of military organizations. They will always have a buried impulse to protect their organizational interest by purveying war-causing ideas. For this reason militarism can always recur when conditions for it are ripe. Its root cause--the division of labor--once having arisen will never abate. Half an eye should therefore be kept on this danger, and prudent steps taken to keep it at bay.