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ABSTRACT

Nations usually go to war to defend against a threat (balancing) or gain some profit (bandwagoning). However, they sometimes join war coalitions without such motivations – or refuse to join them despite great pressure from the coalition leader. For example, the US-led coalition against Iraq in 2003 was largely composed of states that were not traditional US allies, were not threatened by Iraq, and had little to gain from the invasion. Furthermore, the US surprisingly failed to enlist key allies in the coalition. Are coalition formation dynamics different now than during the Cold War? This is an important question because such war coalitions may be more common in the future.

This dissertation examines the impact of asymmetric security interdependence between minor states and a superpower vis-à-vis their war coalition choices. Shifts in the global balance of power, such as from bipolarity to unipolarity, can lead to shifts in security interdependence because the security motivations for the superpower and minor states can become ‘delinked’ from each other. Some minor states become less concerned about their relationship with the unipole (because they are no longer threatened by the other bipole) while others become more concerned with it because of long-term regional threats (they can no longer rely upon a bipolar ally to protect them). This shift, when combined with the fact that the superpower-as-coalition leader values the contributions of
some minor states more than others (due to its warplans) can lead to situations of asymmetric security interdependence.

Such interdependence is a source of power – thus it can determine which state is more likely to have greater bargaining leverage, which one pays for a coalition contribution, and how that contribution comes about. This explains many notable puzzles of coalition formation, including the failure of the US to enlist a Turkish contribution in 2003 and why states like Poland went to great lengths to contribute to US-led coalitions in 1990-91 and 2003. To test this, I examine three war coalitions (Operation Iraqi Freedom, The Korean War, and Desert Storm) and US efforts to enlist the support of four minor states (Turkey, Japan, Germany and Poland).
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Chapter one – Introduction

Typically, nations join together in warfighting coalitions because they perceive a mutual threat or because they want to profit in some way from the spoils of a war. Scholars have used such approaches to explain coalitions throughout human history, ranging from the wars between Sparta and Troy to the Napoleonic wars, to World War I and II.¹ And, of course, the two Cold War superpower ‘camps’ were primarily composed of allies who joined together to protect themselves from the threat of the other superpower camp.

But none of these approaches are fully satisfying when we look at the Coalition of the Willing against Iraq in 2003. Few, if any, of the Coalition member nations were threatened by Saddam Hussein. And it is hard to make the case that they stood to profit greatly. In fact, the economic risk that the oil supplies from Iraq might be disrupted would lead one to believe that an invasion would instead be opposed by many states that ultimately did join the Coalition.

Thus the Coalition of the Willing (CotW) seems unusual – it was composed of an unexpected mix of nations who provided widely varying contributions, many of whom were not clearly motivated by threat or profit. Although the support of some nations, such as Turkey, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia, was clearly highly sought after by the US, many more nations appear to have simply provided ‘moral support’ (Albania, Iceland, Columbia, et. al) which the US welcomed but was unwilling to go to any great lengths to

¹ Schweller, 1998, provides an recent adaptation of this approach as it applies to World War II.
attain. Still others such as Poland and Georgia put their own troops on the line despite the fact that what they and the US gained from this was not entirely clear.

Overall, the coalition was surprisingly ‘lopsided’. Of the forty-eight publicly declared members of the coalition the majority of them offered nothing but public statements of support. Finally, there were some notable cases, such as Turkey, that were traditionally friendly to the US, but which the US failed to enlist in the coalition despite their criticality to the war effort and the significant inducements the US offered. In other words, some states contributed while some appear to have ridden free on US efforts, even though it is not at all apparent what public good they stood to gain.\(^2\) And surprisingly some even rebuffed very compelling US overtures. There are both theoretical and practical concerns here. From a theoretical perspective, understanding the dynamics that lead nations to go to war in the absence of threat or potential profit is an intriguing puzzle. There is another aspect to this issue: does unipolarity matter for coalition formation? Are coalition formation dynamics different now than they were during the Cold War?

There are large theoretical gaps in our understanding of how unipolarity manifests itself.\(^3\) In terms of war coalitions, we would expect that all else being equal an unopposed

\(^2\) Free-riding is that behavior of a state when it values the goals of a coalition but does not contribute to attaining those goals. Many states in Europe or the Middle East who were antagonistic to the Saddam regime but unwilling to directly oppose it might fall into this category.

\(^3\) It should be noted that while structural realism outlines the fundamental constraints and motivations that govern international behavior, it has failed to address how these dynamics manifest themselves in a unipolar environment, instead assuming that unipolarity is simply a transitory phase. For example, Waltz claims that two powers are “the smallest possible number in a self-help system.” Waltz, 1979, p. 136. Clearly unipolarity is more than a passing phase - it is therefore critical to understand whether and how this new (and under-theorized) global structure affects the actions of states in the system.
superpower would be more able to create a broad military coalition than if it was one of two superpowers, for at least three reasons.

First, if a superpower has no global rival then it can act as it wishes against other powers.\(^4\) This means that an unrivaled global hegemon should have a better diplomatic bargaining position with other nations, because these other nations have no alternative powers to turn to for protection or counter-balancing against the hegemon.

Second, under unipolarity other nations (“minor states”) can no longer use superpower rivalries to gain concessions and leverage of their own. During the zero-sum bipolar structure of the Cold War, the US and USSR both had vital interests in protecting even their weakest allies to ensure they did not defect to, or fall prey to, the other camp.\(^5\) Thus, minor states allied with the US had some degree of leverage because they could always threaten to ally with the USSR or claim that they were on the verge of collapse. There are many examples of minor states using such tactics for their own gain during the Cold War. But with the demise of the USSR and the rise of a unipolar system, minor states no longer have these options. In other words, the bargaining position of smaller nations vis-à-vis the remaining superpower should be much weaker than it was during the Cold War.

Third, a global unipole such as the US has vast economic, political, and military influence, especially in the increasingly interdependent global economy. The practical

---

\(^4\) Many scholars have noted this. For example, Kenneth Waltz notes: “Through the long years of the Cold War the might of each superpower balanced the might of the other and moderated the behavior of both of them. Now the only superpower left in the field is free to act on its whims and follow its fancies.” Waltz, 2004.

\(^5\) In the next chapter I explore this notion in greater depth, and point out the contradictions in Waltz’ theory in this regard. See, for example, Christensen and Snyder, 1990 and Jervis, 1999, p. 118.
impact for coalition formation is that other states are not only more likely to fear the US but they are also likely to have a “...greater fear of abandonment and, all else being equal, are more likely to contribute preemptively to avoid it.”

Thus, the global influence of a hegemon increases other states dependence on it, and thereby increases the hegemons’ influence over them.

Because of all this, a unipole should have a stronger hand diplomatically not simply because it has more overall power, but because of the simple structural fact that it is unopposed. Therefore, we would expect that the US today would be more effective at organizing a military coalition against its enemies than it was during the Cold War. Yet it could not convince key longstanding partners such as Turkey to support it in 2003 against Iraq. Therefore, it is reasonable to ask: is there something about unipolarity that weakens, rather than empowers, a superpower’s bargaining capabilities?

This dissertation is thereby concerned with two overarching questions: first, why do some nations join a war coalition when they are not threatened and unlikely to profit? Second, are the dynamics that govern war coalitions different now that the global structure of power is unipolar rather than bipolar?

But do these questions really matter? Certainly. Although the Coalition of the Willing was successful in ousting Saddam Hussein in 2003 (an outcome that was never truly in doubt) it clearly could have been a more efficient coalition. The US shouldered the vast majority of the coalition burden, despite its best diplomatic efforts (and in stark contrast to the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition in 1990-91). And in the aftermath of

---

the war US prestige clearly suffered. Many observers have noted that the future may involve more ad hoc and temporary coalitions such as this one. Thus, it is important that we understand how and why the diplomatic efforts between the US and other states were plagued by critical failures and surprising successes. How can the US do better in the future if it needs to, or how can other superpower-led war coalitions manifest themselves?

**Asymmetric security valuations**

These questions can be answered if we first understand that shifts in polarity lead to shifts in superpower and minor state motivations and thus their security interdependence. In a bipolar world the presence of a global superpower rivalry is a long-term mutual existential threat for both the superpower and minor states. Hence both tend to place high value on their long-term security relationships so they can institutionalize power aggregation in the face of this long-term threat. For the minor state a tight security alliance with the bipole not only reduces the risk faced in the short-term, but it also provides a stable long-term security umbrella against the rival superpower camp. For the bipole this implicit bargain strengthens its long-term global alliance in competition with

---

7 For example, Andrew Krepenevich states that “It seems increasingly clear that, as Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld observed, the mission determines the coalition. The era of rigid alliances, if it ever truly existed, is clearly over, and the US must plan accordingly.” Krepenevich, 2003. Other scholars have made similar observations. For example, Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger note that “Because alliances will be looser and more ad hoc in the post-Cold War international system than they were between 1947 and 1991, findings based largely on one fixed, fairly tight alliance may not generalize to other kinds of security coalitions.” Bennett, Lepgold, Unger, 1997 p. 3. In terms of the security choices facing minor states, Simon Duke claims that “unlike the Cold War, smaller states may now choose to involve themselves on an a la carte basis in a wide range of security commitments with an emphasis upon their own security requirements and those in the immediate vicinity. Alliance membership or non-membership for smaller states now carries different costs and benefits than in the cold war era and this is in part because the very nature of security and alliance has changed.” Duke, 2001, p 50. See also Menon, 2007.
its superpower rival, and also provides it with the legitimacy to face any emerging lesser threats. In other words, under bipolarity, the alliance motivations for minor states and the superpowers are congruent. Both are inclined to ‘tighten’ their relationship.

In a unipolar world, however, many minor states may no longer have as clear a need for a long-term security relationship with the superpower since there is no long-term mutual threat. Thus, when the global balance of power shifts to a unipolar structure, security motivations for the superpower and minor states can become ‘delinked’ from each other. Some minor states become less concerned about their security because they are no longer threatened by the other bipole, while others become more concerned with long-term regional threats because they are more vulnerable to them since they cannot rely upon their bipolar ally to save them.

Those minor states that were “on the front lines” in the global bipolar rivalry may become liberated from the need to embrace a superpower security umbrella. Germany in 1950 relied greatly upon the security umbrella of the US due to the looming threat from the Communist bloc. In 2003, however, that threat is gone. Even if the US wanted the bilateral security relationship with Germany to remain as it had, Germany’s security depended on the US much less than it did previously. Germany in 2003 has far fewer existential security concerns that it did in 1950. It has become less threatened with the end of the Cold War, and less dependent on the US for its security.

---

8 This is a logical extension of the observation that “tight bipolar systems are likely to be characterized by highly cohesive alliances; as the international system moves towards a loose bipolar system, then the cohesion of the component alliances is likely to decline…the decline of bipolarity thus increases substantially the degree of uncertainty present in the international system…” Indicating that under a unipolar system, alliances or coalitions are likely to be very loose and those states that have the most to lose (minor states) will become more focused on long term threats. See Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan, p. 99-100.
However, other minor states that were allies of the US during the Cold War may still be faced with acute local threats that were unrelated to the bipolar confrontation. Thus, their security becomes *more* threatened by the end of the Cold War because the interest in the US in protecting them is likely to wane. Japan could rely upon the US security umbrella in 1950 when both it and the US were threatened by the USSR. Although the Soviet threat has largely gone, the threat from North Korea to Japan still remains – thus Japan remains more dependent on the US for its security. In such cases, minor states are likely to remain keenly focused on these threats because they can no longer unconditionally count on the security umbrella of the unipole. The ability of minor states to call upon the remaining superpower’s assistance is weakened because the unipole is no longer locked in a global struggle against their mutual enemy.  

Thus, the minor state is faced with a dilemma: how to ensure that any commitment by the unipole to its protection is actually reliable and credible. There is no guarantee that the unipole won’t change its mind later, thus the minor state in need of a security umbrella is more vulnerable. These ‘delinked’ motivations and commitment problems are even more evident when the unipole is fighting an ad hoc war because it is going to be concerned primarily with short-term warfighting goals rather than long term threats. It may thus be

---

9 Under bipolarity, a superpower is motivated by the presence of a superpower rival to come to the aid of its allies, since it is locked in a global struggle. This motivation is congruent with the desire of said allies to enhance their relationship with the bipole so as to enhance their security. Under unipolarity, there is no overriding structural reason why a unipole should become contractually bound to protect a minor state (although there may be other reasons). The consequence of a binding superpower commitment to protect a minor state is that it may encourage the minor state to engage in adventurism. Note, for example, that Georgia may have been more risk-averse vis-à-vis Russia and its actions in South Ossetia in 2008 if the US had not earlier stated that Georgia might be considered as a candidate for NATO membership.
willing to embrace former enemies or abandon long-standing norms or agreements all in
the interest of winning the current conflict.

Just as the security calculus of minor states shifts when the bipolar structure
disappears, so too does the outlook of the only remaining superpower. Because it is no
longer involved in a long-term struggle for global supremacy with another superpower,
the unipole will be more focused on short-term goals vice long-term ones. This is because
while the first and foremost goal of a bipole is to deal with the existential threat from its
rival bipole, that threat is gone under unipolarity. Thus, the primary goal for a unipole
becomes its need to protect its legitimacy as the hegemon because this enables it to
maintain its global power position and head off any potential counter-balancing
coalitions.\textsuperscript{10} For this reason a unipole will focus on immediate security threats because
they diminish its prestige if it fails to meet them. Of course, both a bipole and a unipole
will take great pains to ensure that they succeed in any local conflicts lest their position as
the legitimate hegemonic power be diminished. But while a bipole is motivated to
enhance both its long-term alliances and win in any immediate conflict, the unipole will
be focused on short term warfighting success more than anything else.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{10} As implied by Gilpin and others, superpowers are motivated to protect their position as a hegemonic
state. For this reason a superpower will be keenly focused on immediate threats and coalition success
because they matter for its prestige. Such a focus may come at the expense of addressing long term threats.
But superpowers must take great pains to ensure that they succeed in any immediate conflicts lest their
position as the legitimate hegemonic power be threatened or diminished. Thus, the primary motivation for a
superpower constructing an ad hoc warfighting coalition will be to attain a swift and sure victory since that
will protect or increases its prestige and hegemonic legitimacy. See Gilpin, 1981, pp. 30-33.

\textsuperscript{11} Under bipolarity, a superpower is motivated by the presence of a superpower rival to come to the aid of
its allies, since it is locked in a global struggle. This motivation is congruent with the desire of said allies to
enhance their relationship with the bipole so as to enhance their security. Under unipolarity, there is no
overriding structural reason why a unipole should become contractually bound to protect a minor state
(although there may be other reasons). The consequence of a binding superpower commitment to protect a
minor state is that it may encourage the minor state to engage in adventurism. Note, for example, that
This logic implies that a structural shift to unipolarity can alone have important effects on coalition bargaining behavior by altering the fundamental security calculus of both the superpower and minor states. Scholars have noted this dynamic before. For example, Snyder notes that “strategic interests are future-oriented, they vary according to the weight that policymakers impute to the future…strategic interests will also be affected by a states’ attitudes towards risk: risk-aversion will tend to inflate strategic values, risk-acceptance to reduce them.”12 In other words, at its core, the shift to unipolarity does not impugn the validity of balance of power dynamics. It merely shifts their impact in time because it shifts the strategic outlook of states: some minor states are now more concerned about long-term existential future threats and some are less concerned about them. At the same time the unipole is now more solely concerned about the present war it is preparing for because this threatens its prestige and short-term interests.13

This accounts for one aspect of the puzzle why minor states that are not faced with a threat from the target state or the promise of profit may still be motivated to support a superpower’s coalition in an ad hoc war: they hope to ‘curry favor’ with the superpower since they perceive a need for its future support against regional or

---

13 The observation that the US is today more focused on short-term than long-term concerns is not entirely new. The recent literature on multilateralism and unilateralism vis-à-vis the United States reflects this. Likewise, the implications are well noted. For example, Malone and Khoong noted that “even though recent instances of US unilateral action may provide short-term gains for the United States, they act to undermine its long-term interests.” Malone and Khong, 2003, p. 4.
longstanding enemies.\textsuperscript{14} Other minor states may have been longstanding allies of the superpower but not no longer rely upon their security umbrella. Thus, if the superpower needs to enlist their coalition contribution, it may find it has much less leverage than before.

These logics are straightforward, but they imply that the motivations of the unipole and minor states vis-à-vis warfighting coalitions are more likely to be asymmetric than they were under bipolarity – and such asymmetries can have important effects on coalition bargaining behavior and leverage. Thus, if we want to understand how coalition choices between states are affected by shifts in polarity, we need to first understand how such choices are likely to be influenced by the asymmetric security interdependence between states.

Such interdependence is a function of the different fundamental goals of coalition leaders and minor state coalition members. As a coalition leader, the superpower will value the contributions of some minor states more than others – some of them can provide more critical resources or fill more operational gaps than others. And the more a coalition leader values the short-term contribution of a minor state, the more likely it is to seek their support regardless of the impact of pre-existing arrangements, alliance dependence, ideology, clashing personalities, or other second- or first-image variables.

\textsuperscript{14} This may lead to a problem of credible commitment by the superpower to the minor state. Under a unipolar structure, the superpower has much less incentive to commit to a minor state’s defense, since they are not necessarily both faced with a mutual enemy. Thus, the minor state risks abandonment by the superpower, and will thus probably need to ensure that the commitment by the superpower is backed up in some way (this can happen through institutional arrangements that would be costly for the superpower to abrogate, tripwire arrangements, bases, arms sales, debt relief, favorable terms of trade, and so forth). Likewise, the superpower that has committed to protect a minor state’s security in the future risks that minor state may be emboldened to engage in foreign adventures, which may entrap the superpower in conflicts it has no desire to fight. Georgia in August 2008 may be an example of this.
This is because to the superpower, winning the war at hand is crucial to their legitimacy as a hegemon.

As potential coalition members, some minor states may be motivated more by their own long-term security threats that are unrelated to the goals of the coalition – joining a superpowers’ coalition may be an opportunity to enhance their standing with them, which can improve their overall long term security. That is why minor states that lack a threat or profit motive may nonetheless join a war-fighting coalition – because they are acting upon their perceived long-term threats, rather than the short-term goals of the warfighting coalition being formed. And the more a minor state is concerned with tightening its long-term relationship with the superpower in the face of existential threats, the more likely it is to work towards currying favor with the superpower regardless of countervailing second- or first-image pressures.

The more these motivations are asymmetric, the more likely they will be determinant of superpower and minor state behavior towards each other. However, it is critical to note that these dynamics model the impact of asymmetric security valuations between a superpower and potential minor state coalition partners, rather than directly modeling the impact of bipolarity or unipolarity per se. Polarity does manifest itself in this approach however in these dynamics because, all else being equal, minor states will tend to value their long-term security relationship with the superpower more highly under bipolarity than under unipolarity, due to the global threat posed by the rival superpower camp. But such interdependence is not solely a function of structural polarity. For

---

15 This latter dynamic is similar to the ‘identification effect’ and the ‘proving of loyalty’ that Snyder theorizes. See Snyder, 1997, p. 52-53.
example, the minor state may still see a unipole as a useful ‘offshore balancer’ against local persistent threats that are unrelated to the global distribution of power. For example, post-Cold War Poland may be motivated to seek a closer alliance with the US to offset the local threat of Russia.\footnote{Georgia and South Korea may have acted with similar motivations.} Thus, in either a bipolar or unipolar structure, these asymmetric motivations may manifest themselves.

In the following chapters, I will outline my research problem and review the current state of relevant literature. I will then discuss my theory of asymmetric security valuations and its impact on coalition formation in greater detail. To test my theory I will examine in detail three coalitions: the “Coalition of the Willing” against Iraq in 2003, the Korean War coalition, and the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition against Iraq in 1991.
Chapter Two: Polarity, Coalitions, and Security Interdependence

Although the logic of asymmetric interdependence is powerful, it has typically been used to understand and describe economic interdependence.¹ For that reason the term interdependence is often used derisively in security literature. For example, Kenneth Waltz claimed that the term asymmetric interdependence “does not illuminate” and that interdependence usually suggests simply that “everything affects everything else.”² Such a claim, however, fails to note that interdependence can be used also to effectively describe the security relations between states, rather than simply the economic relations.

For example, when a war fighting coalition is formed, whether it succeeds or fails is in large part a question of whether enough states provide enough military forces to the coalition for it to succeed. Some states have unique resources or geography that are required for the coalition to win. Thus, the success of the coalition depends on the cooperation of certain states. Likewise, those states may depend on the coalition leader for their own security. Thus a situation of asymmetric interdependence may result, wherein a coalition leader may require critical contributions from some states, but those states have little or no incentive to cooperate with the coalition. Likewise, some states may greatly desire to cooperate with the coalition leader to enhance their long term relationship with them, but the coalition leader may have little need for their contribution.

This dynamic simply reflects the different interests of states. However, it is critical to realize that asymmetric interdependence is a source of power. If we understand

¹ See, for example, the seminal work on interdependence by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, *Power and Interdependence*. Keohane and Nye, 1989.
² Waltz, 1979, p. 157.
power to be “the ability of an actor to get others to do something they otherwise would not do”\(^3\) then the utility of examining security relations through the lens of asymmetric interdependence becomes clear.

Thus, understanding the impact of asymmetric security valuations fills two gaps in the security literature. First, it helps us understand surprising coalition decisions. This is crucial because the existing body of literature on alliance and coalition choices rarely attribute alliance choices to anything other than a reaction to a shared threat or a desire to attain a profit of some sort.\(^4\) But the dynamics that govern bargaining between minor states and a superpower when the superpower is creating a warfighting coalition are often likely to be asymmetric. An asymmetric approach can therefore help explain why minor states join a coalition when they are not motivated by threat or profit, or why a superpower can sometimes fail to enlist help from longstanding allies or despite high inducements.

Secondly, an asymmetric approach can help us understand the impact of unipolarity on interstate behavior because as polarity changes so too does interdependence between the superpower and minor states, all else being equal. Under bipolarity, minor states are typically more dependent on the superpowers for their security. But under unipolarity minor states are typically less dependent on the unipole. Thus, while most examinations of unipolarity wrestle with the puzzle of how minor states cope with the now-overwhelming power of the unipole, they fail to consider that minor

---

\(^3\) Keohane and Nye, 1989, p. 11.

\(^4\) In the former the need for a credible commitment between allies is less, since they are responding to a *shared* threat. Clearly, threat and profit are two sides of the same coin. Response to threat is logical when a state’s values or resources are at risk. Actions for profit are logical when a state wishes to expand its’ values or gain more resources.
states may also be empowered by unipolarity. Furthermore, if a unipole is attempting to form a war coalition, then some minor states may be in a better bargaining position if their contribution to the coalition is critical. By focusing on asymmetric interdependence we should be able to understand how shifts in polarity empower minor states and thereby lead to surprising coalition outcomes.

Coalitions and Alliances

The existing literature on alliances and coalitions has suffered because the words ‘coalition’ and ‘alliance’ are sometimes used interchangeably. This, of course, makes theorizing about coalitions difficult because there are indeed some key differences between the two. Some scholars have differentiated them in ways that make them analytically tractable. Typically, they have emphasized that coalitions tend to be ad hoc,

---

5 The Merriam-Webster dictionary describes an alliance as “an association to further the common interests of the members; specifically: a confederation of nations by treaty” and a coalition as “a temporary alliance of distinct parties, persons, or states for joint action.” See http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary. There are, of course, other terms that refer to cooperation between sovereign states, and the boundaries between the terms are often vague and typically involves cross referencing. For example, a concord is an “agreement by stipulation, compact, or covenant,” a confederation is “a league or compact for mutual support or common action,” a league is “an association of nations or other political entities for a common purpose.” Other terms, such as pact, partnership, union, and federation are more clearly in a separate category, referring either to close integration between political entities, treaty and legal states, or exceedingly close cooperation.

6 Bergsmann has a lengthy explication of the different definitions of a military alliance as used by a variety of scholars See Bergsmann, 2001. where he lays out the various definitions that other scholars have used, noting that: Liska defines a military alliance as “a formal association between two or more states against the threat of a third,” Small and Singer only implicitly define it on a case by case basis, Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan define it as a “formal treaty between nation-states concerned with national security issues,” and Walt defines it as “arrangements for security cooperation among states.” Bergsmann eventually conclude that “there is no single definition that is accepted by all or most of the authors, not much energy has been spent up to now to develop a theoretically useful and practical definition of the concept of an alliance, [and] the existing definitions are only of limited use because most of them are too vague and too broad.” He goes on to use these guidelines to develop his own definition: an alliance is “an explicit agreement among states in the realm of national security in which the partners promise mutual assistance in the form of a substantial contribution of resources in the case of a certain contingency the arising of which is uncertain.” Bergsmann, 2001. Pp.31-36. Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan, also summarized similar definitional issues in their seminal work on alliances, and note that “The lack of an accepted definition of
informal and of limited duration and alliances are more formal and longer lasting.\footnote{One of the most useful definitions comes from Weitsman and Balkin who note that coalitions are “ad hoc multinational understandings that are forged to undertake a specific mission, and dissolve once that mission is complete. See Weitsman and Balkin, 2007, p. 4-5. Snyder defines alliances as “formal associations of states for the use (or non-use) of military force, in specified circumstances, against states outside their own membership.” See Snyder, 1997, p. 4. Krause and Singer explicitly differentiate between alignments, alliances and coalitions: “An alignment is usually understood as any general commitment to cooperation or collaboration. By implication, its objectives tend to be broad and vague rather than narrow and explicit…a coalition is characterized by the commitment of two or more states to coordinate their behavior and policies in order to perform particular functions or pursue specific goals. Unlike alignments, coalitions tend to focus on a single military or non-military issue…an alliance is based on a written, mostly voluntary, formal agreement, treaty, or convention among states pledging to coordinate their behavior and policies in the contingency of military conflict…unlike either alignments or coalitions, alliances are concerned primarily with issues limited to military security affairs.” Krause and Singer, 2001, p. 16.}

I will build upon this tradition in order to clearly differentiate alliances and coalitions and make them analytically distinct.

Although both alliances and coalitions can arise in response to some external stimuli, alliances appear to be more typically formed by states that share similar overarching interests, histories, and ideologies. For that reason their cooperation may continue after external stimuli have ceased to be a motivating factor in their cooperation. Coalitions, on the other hand, are formed solely to respond to some stimuli and coalition members are not necessarily bound together by any other shared values.

The goals of coalitions and alliances can vary greatly and both can be motivated by economic, military, diplomatic, ideological or any other goal that can bring sovereign states together in cooperation. But a coalition is oriented towards a very specific and discrete goal that is presumably attainable in the near future. It is formed by states to
solve a specific and usually narrowly defined problem. An alliance, however, is less
oriented towards a specific and identifiable problem and more towards a broad and
longer-term problem-set, is often only defined vaguely, and usually involves interlocking
institutions and operational agreements such as joint training and decision-making.\(^8\)

Finally, a third difference between a coalition and an alliance is their different life
spans. Because a coalition is formed by states bound together only by their desire to solve
a specific and discrete problem, it is typically disbanded after that problem has been
solved. An alliance however, being comprised of states with shared values and focused
on a broader problem-set, can endure long after the initial stimuli that brought it about
has been resolved.

Defined in this way, coalitions are almost always ‘ad hoc’ – that is, they are
“formed for specific or immediate problems or needs…and are fashioned from whatever
is immediately available.”\(^9\) And this is typically done in response to some stimuli, such as
an emergent military or economic threat. Alliances can originate as coalitions, but endure
long after the original stimuli is gone because of shared values and modalities amongst its
members.\(^10\)

These are important distinctions to make because they imply that the dynamics
governing ad hoc coalitions are likely to be different than those governing alliances. For

---

\(^8\) An alternate way of phrasing this difference is to say that alliances typically have a strategic focus, while
coalitions have an operational or tactical focus. It should also be noted that traditionally both alliances and
coalitions are seen as constructs to solve problems rather than to create value. As Liska put it originally:
“Alliances are against, and only derivatively for, someone or something.” Liska, 1962, p. 12.
\(^9\) This is Merriam-Webster’s definition. Typical antonyms of ad hoc are planned, prepared, permanent, and
rehearsed.
\(^10\) McCalla’s examination of NATO after the Cold War posits that organizational motivations also play a
role in alliance survival after it’s motivating threat has gone. McCalla, 1996. Wallander, 2000, presents a
related argument.
one, ad hoc military coalition formation is less likely to be influenced by variables that
are unrelated to the reason the coalition was formed in the first place. This is not to say
that exogenous variables have no role to play in the formation of ad hoc coalitions. History, prior cooperation, shared values, the global distribution of power, and various
other factors can certainly play a role in whether a state decides to join a coalition or not.
But they are not explicitly the cause for the creation of a coalition, and they are thus
likely to be much less important for coalitions than they are for alliances.

Another implied difference between military alliances and military coalitions is
the likelihood of war occurring. All military cooperation by definition involves the risk of
armed conflict, whether it is an alliance of a coalition.\footnote{Military cooperation amongst states can have defensive or offensive modalities. States can band together
to start or threaten a war, or deter a potential adversary, but the differences between the two are often a
matter of semantics. For example, the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition could be defined as defensive
(because its goal was to drive Iraqi forces out of Kuwait) or offensive (because it was a group of nations
committed to offensive action against Iraqi forces). Whether a coalition is termed offensive or defensive is
functionally irrelevant because both definitions necessarily involve the prosecution of military action.}
In a military alliance that risk is not likely to be known, especially in a defensive alliance which may seek to deter a
potential enemy from attacking. In a military coalition, however, the risk of war is much
greater simply because the coalition has arisen in response to specific stimuli – joining a
coalition entails an immediate risk.

The tables below summarize the important differences between ad hoc
warfighting coalitions and standing alliances as I have defined them here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warfighting coalitions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin: created in response to some stimuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: explicitly oriented towards a discrete operational or tactical goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifespan: ad hoc, temporary (probably disbanded after goal attained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entails clear risk of near-term war</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Military cooperation amongst states can have defensive or offensive modalities. States can band together
to start or threaten a war, or deter a potential adversary, but the differences between the two are often a
matter of semantics. For example, the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition could be defined as defensive
(because its goal was to drive Iraqi forces out of Kuwait) or offensive (because it was a group of nations
committed to offensive action against Iraqi forces). Whether a coalition is termed offensive or defensive is
functionally irrelevant because both definitions necessarily involve the prosecution of military action.
Examples: CotW, DS/DS, Korean War coalition

Military alliances:
Origin: created out of shared common and broadly defined interests (but may have initially been a coalition responding to a specific stimuli)
Purpose: broad, usually strategic, cooperation based on common interests
Lifespan: semi-permanent, long-term (disbanded only when broad interests are no longer shared)
Entails vague risk of future war
Examples: NATO, Warsaw pact

The definitions I have derived here are not absolute – clearly the level of security institutionalization between nations exists on a spectrum. Nonetheless, these definitions are useful for enabling theoretical and practical progress even if they are somewhat artificial. Coalitions and alliances are clearly distinct from each other – and in this study I am concerned with why and how states join a superpower led coalition, rather than why groups of states with shared values come together in alliances.

By focusing on coalitions as I have defined them, I am able to analytically separate the impact of pre-existing institutions from the security concerns of the superpower and minor states. This is important because it allows me to examine the security interdependence of states in relative isolation. Most states have an extensive array of interdependencies and bilateral concerns. When an ad hoc war coalition is formed, war is the certain result – thus the security concerns of states come to the fore, and overshadow other issues such as economic interdependence, ideology, and institutions. Thus, the study of ad hoc war coalitions provides a way to examine how security interdependence affects interstate relations in isolation from other influences.
In this study I will typically use the terms ‘unipole’, ‘bipole’ or ‘superpower’ but, where clarification is required, I will also use the term ‘coalition leader’ to refer to a superpower that is constructing and leading a coalition.\(^\text{12}\) Also, I will refer to all states that are potential allies of the coalition leader (i.e., potential members of its coalition) as ‘minor states’ regardless of their relative power compared to each other or the superpower. In other words, for coalition warfighting purposes, France as well as Haiti are both ‘minor states’ when compared to a superpower.\(^\text{13}\) Finally, I will refer to the state that is the target of the ad hoc military coalition as the ‘target state’. Thus, in my case studies, Iraq and North Korea are the target states.

The Study of Coalitions Under Unipolarity

It has been noted that “it is impossible to speak of international relations without referring to alliances; the two often merge in all but name.”\(^\text{14}\) Therefore, it should be no surprise that there are a wide variety of theories that discuss when and why nations join together in military endeavors. However, none are fully satisfying because they do not fully address the power dynamics inherent in inter-state bargaining between coalition partners under conditions of interdependence. Joining or refusing to join a coalition is a matter of bilateral bargaining between the coalition leader and potential coalition

\(^{12}\) Because I am concerned with the bilateral relations between the superpower and minor states, I define a unipole or bipole simply as those states that can protect minor states against all potential threats because they greatly exceed all other states in most categories of power. This definition is based upon the archetypical realist approach to defining power which ranks the position of one nation amongst others as a function of relative population, resource endowments, economic capability, military strength, and political capability and competence. This is useful for deriving a basic definition of a superpower as a nation that greatly exceeds all other states in all of these categories, and it is the one I use here. Waltz, 1993. See also Wohlforth, 1999; Layne, 1993; Mastanduno, 1997; Levy, 2004; Joffe, 2004; Wilkinson, 1999.

\(^{13}\) Clearly this is an oversimplification, but it is justified if we are to theorize about the impact of structure on coalition choices.

\(^{14}\) Liska, 1962, p. 3.
partners. Thus, understanding how their relative power during such bargaining is affected by their interdependence is important if we are to understand why states do or do not join a coalition. Yet interdependence remains unaddressed in the existing literature on coalitions or unipolarity. Instead, most alliance theories attribute coalition choices to the balance of power among states, the impact of threat, collective action dynamics, or alliance dependence - but not interdependence. And while second-image approaches detail the impact of domestic institutions and preferences on foreign policy decisions, they too tend to avoid security interdependence as a factor in coalition choices. Integrated theories that attempt to bridge the systemic and sub-systemic realms also fail to account for how security interdependence greatly affects the motivations and actions of superpowers and minor states.

**Externally driven theories**

Theories that look outside states for causation emphasize threats, the balance of power, and power aggregation to provide a basis for understanding how states make their coalition choices. Scholars who have attempted to construct systemic theories of alliance formation have concentrated on multipolar or bipolar dynamics and have relied on threats and the balance of power as primary motivations for states to ally with other states. Liska’s original formulation is archetypical and provides the basis for much subsequent theorizing:

“The dynamics of alignment is most apparent when two major core powers are surrounded by lesser allies. On the face of it, the core-powers have attracted the lesser countries into alliance; in fact, superior power does not attract...movement toward alignment sets in only when another state intervenes as a threat. The weaker state rallies then to one stronger
power as a reaction against the threat from another strong power. The stronger state assumes the role of a protective ally, interested mainly in keeping the resources of the potential victim out of the adversary’s control…the relation of alliances to the balance of power is simple enough…states enter into alliances with one another in order to supplement each other’s capability.”

Even attempts to create more comprehensive theories have still relied primarily on this threat motivation. For example, Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan’s expansive work compiles a wide variety of propositions regarding the motivations for alliance formation, yet threat clearly remains the primary determinant of alliances dynamics in their study.

Most of the early work which built upon these original approaches was not only mired in a reliance on threats but also focused on multipolar systems. A prime example is Snyder, who methodically tried to “fill the alliance theory void by deductive reasoning from certain essentials of the international system…” but still concentrated entirely on multipolar structures. He justified this by claiming that “multipolarity has been the structural norm during most of international history… [and]…deviations from this norm during bipolar and unipolar periods can be quite easily accommodated from a multipolar base, and…the international system in the foreseeable future is most likely to be multipolar.” He admits that “I make no claim for the theory’s applicability to the post-cold war world…” In other words, Snyder’s approach, while worthwhile, assumes either that his theory is not applicable to a unipolar world or that any dynamic that is determinant in multipolarity is certain to be valid under bi- or unipolarity. Such an assumption fails to account for the fact that in a unipolar world, the dynamics of security

---

15 Liska, 1962, p. 13
17 Snyder, 1997, p. 3. See also pp. 18-20.
interdependence are likely to be very different than under bi- or multi-polarity. Under bi or multi-polarity, a minor state’s security may be dependent upon many sources, giving it greater leverage in its relations with potential partners. In a unipolar world, only the unipole may be able to protect the minor state from regional threats. This change alone should give the unipole greater leverage over the minor state when it comes to coalition choices.

Other systems-level theories are more parsimonious, chief among which is Waltz’s structural realism. Such theories assess international relations based on the dynamics of relative power in an anarchic environment, where nations must rely upon self-help to ensure their security. The basic prediction that Waltz and other structural realists apply to coalition formation is that of balancing – states will balance against the more powerful states in order to protect themselves, rather than bandwagon with powerful states against others. Given that Waltz takes great pains to emphasize the importance of theorizing from structure, one assumes that neo-realism would explain alliance motivations equally well under multi-, bi, and unipolarity. But when applied to unipolarity, the clear implication of the Waltzian balance of power dynamic is that states

---

18 Waltz, 1979. Structural realism is also called ‘neo-realism’.
19 It goes without saying that the concept of the balance of power as a motivator for alliances did not originate with Waltz nor is it unique to him – but he provided the theory with a more rigorous theoretical foundation than had been done previously. Liska states that “Alliance is original an event in politics as is conflict; it associates like-minded actors in the hope of overcoming their rivals.” Liska 1962, p. 3. Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan recorded that: “Balance of power approaches thus locate the motivations for alliance formation primarily in the attributes of the international system and the situation – the distribution of power, threats to the balance of power, and the like. Conversely, they tend to deny that alliance policies are significantly affected by national characteristics; democratic and autocratic nations use alliances as instruments of statecraft, as do large and small ones, rich and poor ones.” Holsti, Hopmann, Sullivan, 1973. To Hans Morgenthau alliances are “the most important manifestation of the balance of power.” Quoted in Gartner, 2001.
would tend to balance against the unipole rather than join with it.\textsuperscript{20} Most other fundamental realist approaches make similar predictions, and are thus faced with a clear dilemma: no counter-balancing global alliance has yet formed to challenge the US since the end of the Cold War.\textsuperscript{21} This illustrates an anomaly for realism not only as it applies to the global balance of power, but also as it applies to military coalitions such as the Coalition of the Willing (CotW): why would regional powers ally with, and not balance together against, the hegemonic US, as it is the most powerful nation and the most likely threat to their existence? Furthermore, how is it that minor states have any leverage over a unipole? Waltz dismisses interdependence off-hand, but it seems hard to deny that the unipole does depend in some cases on minor states, and that this dependence should on those occasions empower minor states.

Some realist scholars, such as Mearsheimer, attempt to explain why minor states have not balanced against the US by resorting to the addition of variables such as geographic proximity.\textsuperscript{22} This is a variation of the concept of ‘offshore balancing’ wherein a distant but more powerful state can provide a useful counterbalance against a local and therefore more deadly state. Under Mearsheimer’s approach, as a distant power the US

\textsuperscript{20} Waltz unequivocally predicts that balancing against the more powerful state is much more likely than bandwagoning with them. Most systemic level realist theories, such as those types put forth by Waltz and Mearsheimer, suffer from two further problems vis-à-vis understanding military coalitions: they are concerned almost exclusively with major and unitary powers (vice small or third world states with internal threats) and they are high-level theories about tendencies, not necessarily about foreign policy. Both of these failings make them less useful for understanding the specifics of ad hoc coalitions under unipolarity. Waltz, in particular has noted many times that his theory is not useful for understanding the specific policy choices of states, but is instead an analytical tool to understand their aggregate behavior over time

\textsuperscript{21} See for example Ikenberry (Ed) 2002; Paul, Wirtz, Fortman eds., 2004; Stephen Walt, 2005. Wohlfforth 1999, 2002, and 2004. Harrison 2004 is an attempt to explain the lack of a counter-balancing coalition forming from a liberal/constructivist perspective. He also provides a good critique of realist theorists failures to account for the lack of a counter balancing coalition forming, and it particular Wohlforth’s arguments. See pages 4-8.

\textsuperscript{22} John Mearsheimer, 2003.
might not have been seen as a threat since it could not effectively dominate other states so far from its shores. However, this approach seems problematic when applied to modern unipolarity: the capability and willingness of US to exact regime change at great distance was aptly demonstrated in 2001 when the US quickly toppled the Taliban government in Afghanistan and installed one more friendly to it. It is hard to dismiss the global reach of the unipole given such evidence – and yet, the US was still stymied in its attempts to enlist aid against Iraq in 2003. With such overwhelming capabilities, the fact that minor states such as Turkey remained recalcitrant seems puzzling.

Other scholars, such as Walt and Paul, take a different tact by noting that although we do not observe ‘hard’ balancing under today’s unipolar structure, states do nonetheless defy the US even though they risk much when they do so. According to their approach, depending on the extent of the disagreement with the US and the risk that the US will discover the defiance of the weaker states and respond, minor states may engage in “soft balancing” or some other form of accommodation with the US that nonetheless still falls short of what the US desires of them. Soft balancing is the “conscious coordination of diplomatic action in order to obtain outcomes contrary to US preferences – outcomes that could not be gained if the balancers did not give each other some degree of mutual support.” In fact, Walt uses this theory to explain some aspects of the resistance to the Coalition of the Willing:

24 Walt, 2005, p. 126. Paul defines “Soft Balancing” as having a rivalry that is “submerged, non-zero-sum, relative gains of limited concern for now” and which displays strategies of limited arms buildup, informal, or tacit security understandings among states. It “involves tacit non-offensive coalition building to neutralize a rising or potentially threatening power.” See Paul 2004, p. 13-14.
“The antiwar coalition did not ‘balance’ in the classic sense…but its collective opposition made it safer for lesser powers such as Cameroon and Mexico to resist US pressure during the critical [UN] Security Council debate. The result was classic soft balancing: by adopting a unified position, these nations were able to deny the United States the legitimacy it had sought and thereby impose greater political and economic costs on Bush’s decision to go to war. Their actions also made it less costly for a state like Turkey to refuse US requests to use Turkish military bases during the war.”

In other words, there is some evidence that the US can, despite its overwhelming power, be opposed – just not directly.

Overall, the fundamental problem with these power-based approaches is that they fail to effectively account for the actual source of power of minor states. In some form or another, the unipole must be limited in its power over the minor states, or the minor states must be empowered vis-à-vis the superpower. Otherwise, the unipole would not need to countenance even ‘soft balancing’ or defiance in its coalition formation. As I argue later, this puzzle is answered by noting that, despite its overwhelming capabilities, the US remains dependent on minor states in some instances – and this dependence is a source of power for those minor states, enabling them to defy the unipole.

Aside from relying on the balance of power dynamic to explain the coalition (balancing) choices of states in general, Waltzian structural realism also specifically addresses the alliance behavior of superpowers themselves. However, in this regard Waltz’s theory appears self contradictory. On the one hand, he claims that superpowers in

25 Walt, 2005, p. 130-131. This dynamic could also be used to explain minor state actions to appease the unipole. Poland, for example, was one of the few states to contribute troops directly to the war in Iraq, and this can be explained in part as a desire to balance against a regional threat to Poland’s security by currying favor with the US: “…a desire to enhance their security against regional threats (including the long-term threat of a resurgent Russia) explains why Eastern European nations such as Poland, Hungary, and the Baltic states have been so eager to join NATO….there is no doubt that for such a country [as Poland], it’s good to be a close ally of the United States…” See Walt 188-89.
a bipolar system can ‘internally balance’ and that they have therefore little to gain from alliances with other smaller powers. But he also makes the point that each superpower must constantly compete with and block the other superpower across the globe. This is at least partially contradictory. As Jervis puts it:

“One strand of Waltz’s theory explains that bipolar worlds are peaceful because they superpowers rely on internal balancing and so can ignore allied quarrels that could drag them into war. But a second strand attributes stability to each superpower’s knowledge that because there are only two of them each must seek to block the other throughout the world. Either argument is plausible, but they do not fit well together. If the superpowers cannot be manipulated by allies because they can safeguard their security without assistance, then they do not need to meet all attempts by the adversary to expand.”26

Jervis notes that one way of addressing this apparent contradiction is to postulate that perhaps superpowers intervene around the world for non-security reasons such as ideology or to protect their images, reputation, or prestige. But if the superpower cared so much about its image then it would do whatever it took to ensure its coalition building efforts were broadly successful. This explanation is hard to square with the reality of recent history. The US failed to enlist all but a few significant allies in the Coalition of the Willing, and its efforts resulted in some notable failures such as Turkey. If the US is so powerful and unopposed, as it had so much at stake, such failures are unexpected.

26 Jervis, 1999, p. 118. Christensen and Snyder make the same observation. Christensen and Snyder, 1990, p. 142. Wirtz delves into this “balance of power paradox in a bipolar world” in much greater detail, stating that “When the great powers in a bipolar world face ‘wayward’ events in the periphery, Waltz’s theory leads to two opposing propositions about their response. First, the two superpowers will avoid involvement in unrewarding peripheral conflicts to husband their resources for the paramount great power competition. Second, faced with disagreeable, albeit relatively inconsequential, events in the periphery, the two superpowers will rush to intervene in less than vital regional disputes, to prevent even incremental gains by the rival superpower.” See Wirtz, 2004, p. 131
Thus neo-realism remains unable to show how minor states have influence over the superpower.

Even given these dynamics, a more fundamental problem exists with structural realism: its explicit failure to address how it can be applied to unipolarity *per se*. Although the existence of unipolarity has been acknowledged by Waltz, he has typically treated it as only a transition phase on the road to multi- or bi-polarity. However, a truly systemic level theory such as Waltz’ should be applicable to all configurations of a system, not simply ones that fit the theory best. In his original work, Waltz claimed that two powers are the “smallest possible number in a self-help system”\(^27\) thereby implying that a unipolar system is practically impossible. He later acknowledges that the world is different under unipolarity – that “the shifts from multi- to bi- to unipolarity during the past century well illustrate how strongly differences in polarity affect the behavior of states and alter international outcomes”\(^28\). Therefore, although the dynamics of structural realism remain in effect under unipolarity, it is not entirely clear how exactly they are different except that the unipole is now “free to act on its whims and follow its fancies.”\(^29\)

If the self help dynamic of structural realism remains in force under unipolarity, how is it that the unipole isn’t always successfully in attaining its goals? Only if we presume that the unipole is in some way dependent on minor states can we account for such failures.

Although Waltz is clear that structural realism cannot and should not make specific predictions about the foreign policy choices of states, Stephen Walt’s Balance of

\(^{27}\) Waltz, 1979, p. 136.

\(^{28}\) Waltz, 2004, p. 5

\(^{29}\) Waltz, 2004, P. 5
Threat Theory ("BOT") picks up where structural realism left off. BOT is a fundamental building block of most modern theories of alliance formation and remains quite useful as a foundation for understanding why nations come together in military endeavors.\textsuperscript{30}

Simply put, states respond to perceived threats, not simply the level of power of other states.\textsuperscript{31} The presence of a threat is, after all, a natural precursor to aligning with allies to meet that threat. In this way BOT comes close to explaining why some minor states joined the US in an alliance against Iraq.

Under BOT, states align with the side that they fear the least – that is, the side that is least dangerous to them. Prior to Desert Shield/Desert Storm in 1991, the Saddam regime had long been regarded as a menace by regional powers, and their fear of it meant that they would likely welcome its demise. Such motivations may have continued even after Saddam’s military was defanged in 1991 and during the decades-long sanctions that followed. For example, Kuwait strongly supported the invasion of Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Saudi Arabia provided indirect basing support. Turkey, however, was largely neutral despite facing conflicting motivations: on the one hand, it possessed a superior military to Iraq but on the other it was also concerned about the possibility of a Kurdish state emerging should Iraq collapse.

Nonetheless, although Walt’s approach comes close to explaining the level of support, it is not fully satisfying. Poland, for example, was not threatened by Iraq at all but still made direct troop contributions to the conflict. Why? Also, BOT does not fully

\textsuperscript{30} For one of many examples of building upon Walt to construct a theory of alliance formation, see Weitsman 2004. Weitsman’s work is addressed in more detail below.

\textsuperscript{31} See Walt, 1987.
explain the ability of regional powers to fully support the US in these conflicts. For example, there are indications that the Gulf States balked at providing anything more than basing rights to the US during OIF, while Jordan (which was a weaker and closer neighbor of Iraq and was thus more threatened) only provided limited air defense support.

Another difficulty for BOT is the fact that many regional allies of the US (Saudi Arabia, for instance) appear to have downplayed their support for military actions against Iraq. If a state is balancing against a threat, to conceal that balance makes little sense – for if the “balancee” does not know that a coalition has formed against them, they may not be deterred. Why would the US allow such hedging if it was trying to build an effective coalition?

Finally, there is a theoretical problem in Walt’s theory. As others have pointed out, BOT theory suffers from an over-correlation of its four dimensions of threat: aggregate power, geographic proximity, offensive power, and aggressive intentions. For example, Schweller notes that “the security literature has tended to over-generalize Walt’s findings by not specifying the conditions required for his theory to operate.”32 In other words, it is not clear how BOT theory can be falsified.

As an example, one could claim that BOT shows that the US would be perceived by regional powers as a greater threat than Iraq. Such an argument might go something like this: although Iraq was geographically closer and displayed aggressive intentions, the US clearly has greater aggregate and offensive power. Furthermore, US power projection capabilities and regional bases mean that although the US nation was farther away, the

32 Schweller, 1994, p. 84. See also Priess, 1996.
US military could project greater power than Iraq – calling into question the definition of geographic proximity. The US could also be perceived as exhibiting aggressive intentions as well, based upon its’ unilateral preparations for war, and its overthrow of the Afghanistan Taliban regime a year earlier. Such facts could be theorized to mean that regional governments might perceive the US as a more threatening power (especially when one considers that popular US media at the time occasionally advocated that the US “keep going” into Iran and Syria.) This is an extreme example but it does illustrate the point that BOT theory is, as it stands, difficult to falsify.

If BOT is to be applied to a unipolar structure, then understanding which of Walt’s factors carries the most causal weight is critical. Although BOT theory appears to account for much of the actions of the regional allies of the US during Desert Storm and OIF, it does not account for all of them, nor can it account for the support of non-regional allies such as Poland. In fact, all of these problems in BOT become much more tractable if we assume that both the minor state and the unipole have an asymmetrically interdependent relationship. If Poland needed the US for some purpose exogenous to the coalition, then its support of the US makes sense. The Gulf States, Jordan, and Turkey must have had some leverage over the US that enabled them to defy US entreaties or to limit their support of the US.

A number of scholars have used BOT theory as a strong foundation to build upon. Patricia Weitsman does this to directly address why allies are not always reliable, why states sometimes ally with their enemies, how alliances during wartime and peacetime operate differently, and how alliances serve to not only balance against threats but also to
manage allies. Weitzman’s analysis makes it clear that different levels of threat result in different alliance behaviors:

“At low levels of threat states have incentives to hedge their bets by forging low commitment level agreements with potential friends and enemies. States hedge with an eye to consolidating their power and blocking off avenues of expansion for their potential rivals, while simultaneously seeking to curry favor to ensure their actions are not overly provocative. As the level of threat from one state to another grows, states have incentives to come together in an alliance in order to manage or constrain their alliance partners. This behavior, tethering, entails reciprocal or symmetrical threats, it does not represent the capitulation of one state to another as bandwagoning behavior does. Yet if a threat from one state to another continues to grow, states will seek to secure themselves elsewhere, that is, they will balance against threats. If the level of threat grows to such an extent that a state’s survival is on the line, the state will indeed capitulate to the greater threat and ally with the source of danger, that is, it will bandwagon.”

Weitzman’s approach and case studies are explicitly focused on a multipolar world. While this does not mean her conclusions are not applicable to the current unipolar world, it is prudent to add the factor of global structure to her analysis. This is especially apparent when the Coalition of the Willing is examined. Hedging and tethering dynamics as Weitsman describes can explain the actions of many members of the CotW – but it cannot explain why so many states refused to join the coalition at all. If so many states regarded the US as a potential adversary to be tethered, why were so many more

33 Weitzman, 2004, p. 4. Weitzman also discusses alliance cohesion, that is, what happens to an alliance in the aftermath of a war. I am not concerned here with postwar cohesion, only with formation. The tethering and hedging behavior Weitzman describes appear very similar to the ‘soft balancing’ that others have described in the post Cold War world. See Walt, 2005, for example. When faced with an overwhelmingly powerful unipole that may or may not be a threat in the future, tethering and hedging are clearly rational responses.

unwilling to do so? For example, Turkey must have had some leverage that enabled it to defy the US.

Other scholars have addressed coalition choices under unipolarity in the context of a unilateralism versus multilateralism debate. Kreps asks the highly relevant question “why and under what conditions a state with a preponderance of power will seek allies to do what it has the material power to do alone.” 35 She argues that:

“structural factors [are] the best determinant of variation between unilateralism and multilateralism in post-Cold War interventions...[these factors are] imminence of threat, which shifts intertemporal tradeoffs in favor of the immediate gains of unilateralism, and operational payoffs, which may create greater incentives to share the burden, or conversely, discourage the incorporation of allies when the operation is not expected to impose high personnel, financial, or opportunity costs or would complicate the military efficiency and flexibility of the mission…” 36

To show this Kreps notes that in “7 out of the 11 interventions since the end of the Cold War, the US aggressively sought broad multilateral support” and asks why the US would act so, given the costs of cooperating and coordinating with allies, especially against significantly weaker adversaries. To make the multilateral case, Kreps analyzes US and allied cooperation in both the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. She notes that for the intervention of Afghanistan, the US adopted an

“ad hoc set of arrangements, such as the bilateral arrangements the US organized with specific allies [which] would enable the US to maintain military flexibility...[and that] the US adopted the approach that it would let the mission determine the coalition. The coalition is not going to determine the mission...rather than incur any inefficiencies of coalition warfare, the administration called for a strategy that would leverage only

35 Kreps, 2007, p. 1 (abstract)
36 Kreps, 2007, p. 1 (abstract)
its assets and to a lesser extent, those states with necessary or comparable assets and preferences.”37

She goes on to claim that “the only parties that the US integrated into its combat plans were the UK…the Northern Alliance [in Afghanistan]…and some western state’s Special Forces.”38 For the invasion of Iraq in 2003, she notes similarly that, according to one Army colonel who advised on the internationalization of the war with Iraq, “apart from the British, there is no single state whose participation is essential and without whom the mission could not be performed.”39

There are at least two fundamental problems with Kreps’ analysis. First, she defines support for a coalition in far too limited a manner – only those nations who contributed actual combat troops and put them in harms way are defined as coalition partners. But this ignores a key aspect of coalition operations: there are a wide variety of other and quite necessary supporting arrangements that go into successful military operations. These include, at a minimum, overflight rights, basing, access, and logistical support. While it is true that only US, UK, and Northern Alliance forces went into combat in Afghanistan, very little of the operation would have had a chance of succeeding had it not been for the air basing and logistical support from Pakistan and other neighboring countries.40 For the invasion of Iraq, the necessity of such support is

38 Kreps, p. 32
39 Quoted in Kreps, 2007, p. 5.
40 For a full listing of Operation Enduring Freedom foreign military and intelligence support from over 70 nations, see Gerelman, David J., Stevens, Jennifer E., and Hildreth, Steven A. “Operation Enduring Freedom: Foreign Pledges of Military and Intelligence Support.” CRS Report for Congress Order Code RL31152. Oct 17, 2001. That report notes that Pakistan “agreed to allow use of a commercial airport in Baluchistan province and a small military airfield in Sindh province. Other offered support includes the use of naval facilities, logistical and intelligence support, and use of airspace for missile assaults and aerial
even clearer: naval, land, and air basing and access from surrounding countries were absolutely crucial to the operation.41

This leads to a second flaw in Kreps argument: all of the coalitions she describes in the post-Cold War world are neither wholly unilateral nor multilateral, but more ‘purpose driven’. Kreps herself notes that the Bush administration asked for assistance only from those states “with necessary or comparable assets and preferences” for the invasion of Afghanistan. In other words, it appears that the unipole sought the assistance of only those states with specific and necessary contributions. Unilateralism or multilateralism may have been a modality of action, but they don’t appear to be motivations. Rather, the coalitions appear to have been built upon the level of support needed to ‘win’ rather than to serve a preference for unilateralism or multilateralism.42 What is needed is an understanding of why the US failed to enlist certain states, and why other states, such as Poland in 2003, supported the US when it clearly didn’t need their aid. An approach that unpacks the mutual interdependence of those involved can answer these questions.

bombardment of Afghanistan.” Pakistani overflight rights and air and naval logistics support for the OEF Operation were critical to US forces due to the long distances involved.41 It is hard to imagine how the US would have prosecuted the war in Iraq if Kuwait, Bahrain, and other neighboring countries had refused US access to their air, land, and naval facilities, or if many neighboring countries had refused overflight rights to the area. Furthermore, if that support was not crucial, it is hard to understand why the US put so much effort into securing, or attempting to secure, the support of key states like Turkey. It is worth noting that US warplans depended on the support of Turkey for the transit and logistical support of the 4th Infantry Division. When it was not forthcoming large portions of the operation had to be changed at the last minute with clear operational opportunity cost. See also “Operation Enduring Freedom Overview” from the White House, Oct 1 2001, which details more formal offers of assistance and support from foreign countries, including offers of logistical and other non-combat support from Japan and Pakistan, as well as noting that the US has “secured overflight and landing rights from 27 countries.” Also informative from a more Army-centric perspective is McDonnell and Novack, 2004 “Logistics Challenges in Support of Operation Enduring Freedom.”

42 In other words, they appear to resemble Riker’s construct of minimum winning coalitions. See Riker, 1962. Riker is discussed in detail under ‘formal approaches’.
An alternative to realist explanations of coalition choices can be found in Alliance Dependence theory, which is built upon the premise that as states become more dependent upon other states for their security, prosperity, or political well-being, they consequently become susceptible to that state’s influence. The causal mechanism in such susceptibility generally takes two forms: fear of abandonment by the ally, or fear of entrapment. In both, a state fears a costly change in an existing relationship – the ending of a beneficial arrangement, or the imposition of a new cost or risk.

Previous studies have explicitly examined the predictive power of Alliance Dependence theory in the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition (DS/DS), noting that

“Alliance dependence is helpful in capturing the coercive element of bargaining among allies… [its’ logic]…suggests that a state will support an ally that is demanding a contribution if dependence pressures outweigh fears of entrapment. In the Desert Storm episode, this implies that the greater a state’s dependence on the United States relative to entrapment concerns, the more it should have contributed. States that feared entrapment more than abandonment should have offered nonmilitary help, placed limits on military commitments, or contributed air or naval rather than ground forces as the former are more easily withdrawn.”

This logic should apply equally well to the CotW and OIF. We would expect that states which were dependent upon the US to have contributed more to the Coalition, perhaps under distinct ‘arm-twisting’ by the US. While disaggregating this dynamic from collective action or threat perception can be challenging, there are some examples that indicate that alliance dependence does not adequately explain CotW membership and contributions. Of these, Turkey stands out most clearly. Given US military aid to Turkey

43 Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger 1997, p. 13
and the longstanding military relationship between the two nations, one would expect to see the US using its leverage to ensure a Turkish contribution to the CotW. And, given existing alliance relationships with much of Western Europe, one would also have expected to see close US allies, such as Germany, supporting the CotW rather than risk rupturing their bilateral agreements with the US. Yet Turkey denied US access to its territory, and Germany opposed the coalition and its aims despite suffering US opprobrium for it. It is clear that while Alliance Dependence theory may provide explanatory power in some cases, it does not fully account for the CotW. Clearly, the dependence dynamic is a two-way street. The US must have been dependent on Turkey and Germany in some fashion that emboldened them to oppose the US. This is especially interesting when one considers that in a very similar situation just over a decade previously both Turkey and the Germany supported the US against Iraq. What changed in those intervening years? As I argue later, both Germany and Turkey were no longer dependent on the US for their long term security, while the US was dependent on them for political and material support of its coalition.

Another set of theories postulates that states would bandwagon with the unipole if they stood to “profit” from the relationship. If that were the case, however, where is the “profit” that states such as Poland, Nicaragua, and Palau stood to gain by joining the
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44 One could argue that by comparing Germany’s actions in 2003 to those it took in 1990-91 (when it provided substantial financial support to the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition) Germany was less dependent on the US in 2003 than it was in 1990, hence it provided less of a contribution. However, Germany remained dependent on the US in 2003 for its support vis-à-vis Russia. Furthermore, alliance dependence alone cannot explain why Germany did contribute to the US-coalition in 2001 (in Afghanistan) but not in 2003.

45 Schweller, 1994. See also Schweller, 1998 for an expansion of such an approach, but applied more specifically to a tri-polar system.
In those cases where the US itself made overtures (or, more cynically, “payoffs”) to gain military support, as it offered to do in Turkey, such actions met with failure. One could posit that Poland profited when it received $15 million in aid after the war begun. However, it is hard to imagine that such an amount of money alone would be sufficient for the Polish government to send their troops directly to support the war. One might say that in the case of Saudi Arabia the US ‘bought’ Saudi support by promising to reduce its military presence in that country after the war. However, such reductions had largely been planned before the war began. For most other nations it is not immediately clear what profit they stood to gain. In fact, the economic risk from disrupted oil supplies and war in the Middle East would be more of a loss rather than a profit. Furthermore, any possible profits for these states would have to be weighed against the domestic, economic, and military risks they faced by supporting the US. There must have been other reasons for these states to support the US. When these cases are examined for asymmetrical interdependence, it becomes clear that Poland and other countries were motivated to support the US not because they valued the goals of the coalition per se but because they desired to enhance their security relations with the US in the face of exogenous long term security concerns.

Conversely, states might be expected to align with the “winning wide” to ensure they do not suffer “losses” at their hands. Thus, profit and loss are essentially two sides of the same coin – allying with the stronger side to gain positive value or allying with the winning side to avoid punishment at their hands. Nonetheless, such supposed punishment is just as lacking as the theorized profit – note that Turkey suffered little despite refusing US access, and other states that most likely did not fully accede to US demands, such as Saudi Arabia, appear to have suffered little.

The Turkish government, despite being offered many concessions in the form of aid packages ultimately rejected US troop basing on its territory. I examine this episode in detail in chapter 5.


The most obvious one is the transfer of the US Central Command’s Combined Air Operations Command center (CAOC) from Prince Sultan Air base outside of Riyadh to Qatar. That transfer was already in process before the war began.
Finally, there are scholars who explain alliance nuances by examining whether offense or defense is advantaged.\textsuperscript{50} However, such theories are typically at a loss to explain why states would commit themselves to an ally with superior offensive capabilities, as the US clearly possesses. Such theories are further stymied by their inability to come to grips with how polarity intersects with the offense-defense variables. For example, Christensen and Snyder note simply that “Bipolar superpowers practice a policy of limited liability in intervening in defense of peripheral allies. That is, they should incur the costs of intervention only in proportion to the power assets that are at risk. In bipolarity, these assets will always, by definition, be of marginal importance, so superpower interventions in the periphery should be limited.” Under such an approach it is unclear why a unipolar power even needs to maintain a military alliance or construct a coalition. By definition, a unipole has overwhelming military superiority; therefore it would theoretically have no need for allies at all, no matter whether offense or defense is favored. Again, the dynamics of mutual interdependence are missing from most such analyses.

**Formal Approaches**

The two basic formal approaches to understanding coalition dynamics are the collective action thesis as outlined by Mancur Olson and the game-theoretic approach of William Riker.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{50} See, for example, Christensen and Snyder, 1990.
\textsuperscript{51} Another formal approach is by Starr, but he is concerned solely with the distributions and payoffs (spoils of war) from a war coalition. See Starr, 1972.
Collective Action arguments are fundamentally structural in nature, because they rely on the overall distribution of power amongst actors to explain outcomes, rather than the idiosyncratic characteristics of those actors per se. So when the issue in question is global in scope – such as when the US attempted to form a global coalition against Iraq in 2003 – then collective action is rightly defined as a systems-level theory. As such, sub-systemic variables, such as historical experience, alliance dependence, or domestic institutions, play no explanatory part in a pure collective action approach. A collective action approach to understanding military coalitions is limited to relying upon the variable of power (whether defined as economic power, military power, or some other type of power or combination thereof) and the nature of the good in question, and looks for causality in how much states contribute to an endeavor to get the benefit of the alliance.52

How well does collective action theory explain the CotW? For those nations who valued the overthrow of the Saddam regime, this would have been a ‘public’ not a ‘private’ good, meaning that there was little incentive for those individual nations to contribute to its supply. See, for example, Mancur Olson:

“…as [the collective action model indicates]…each ally gets only a fraction of the benefits of any collective good that is provided but each pays the full cost of any additional amounts of the collective good. This means that individual members of an alliance…have an incentive to stop providing the collective good long before the pareto-optimal output for the group has been provided. This is particularly true of the smaller members, who get smaller shares of the total benefits accruing from the good, and who find that they have little or no incentive to provide additional amounts

of the collective good once the larger members have provided the amounts they want for themselves, with the result that burdens are shared in a disproportionate way.”  

This is especially true in OIF given that the US was clearly prepared to act unilaterally, and other states had an opportunity to freely share in the collective good, while contributing little or nothing to its attainment. Indeed, that is largely what happened: the US, being the unequaled power, bore the overwhelming costs of the coalition, while many other nations ‘rode free’ on US efforts. OIF seems to be nearly a nearly textbook example of the collective action problem.

However, not all states rode free on US efforts, and not all states valued the overthrow of Saddam. But collective action theory has a hard time explaining why any nations would contribute troops, when the unipolar power was committed and had overwhelming capability. For example, 45,000 British, 2,000 Australian and 2,400 Polish troops took part in aspects of the initial invasion of Iraq, although without their participation it certainly appeared that the US would still have invaded. Furthermore, of those members who did support the Coalition, collective action theory would predict that the smaller nations would ‘free ride’ while more capable nations would contribute somewhat more, perhaps even only marginally so. Nonetheless, larger states such as Italy and Germany rode free on US efforts just as Palau, Tonga, and Costa Rica did, while some smaller states such as Poland contributed disproportionately.54 In other words,

53 Olson, 1966, p. 278
54 It should also be noted that collective action theory also has a problem explaining why a large number of states actively opposed the US-led Coalition. Opposing the superpower in such a manner runs risks of future penalties or sanctions, but with little clear gain. With only a few possible exceptions, no nations supported the Saddam regime in Iraq, and so few nations had little to lose by its overthrow. Yet many still vocally opposed the CotW, even while they stood to objectively gain from the overthrow of Saddam.
collective action theory alone has a difficult time explaining why some nations contributed while others did not. There must be some other reason why Poland and others contributed to the coalition when they apparently had little to gain. As I argue later, Poland contributed because it hoped to curry favor with the US, because their security depended on strong relations with a powerful ally. The dynamics of this dependence explains how and why Poland supported the US in the manner that it did.

While collective action dynamics are focused on how each state benefits from an alliance (i.e.: what the proportionate profits and costs of the alliance are, and how that affects coalition choices), Riker’s approach is concerned less with the rewards of an alliance and more with how the dynamics of interstate interaction lead to different types of coalitions. Specifically, his “Theory of Political Coalitions” uses a game theoretic approach to derive the size principle: “In social situations similar to n-person, zero-sum games with side-payments, participants create coalitions just as large as they believe will ensure winning and no larger.” A leader forms a coalition of followers for a particular issue by offering side payments which can range from actual money to promises on policy.

As with many formal theories, there are a number of key preconditions that need to be met for these derivations to be true. Chief among them for the purposes of military coalition formation is that each member of the coalition is indistinguishable from others, and each may adopt any role in the coalition. Another assumption that is hard to meet in
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55 Riker, 1962, p. 33-34.
56 Riker describes coalition building thus: “coalition building begins when a leader, who is defined simply and circularly as a member who manages the growth of a coalition, undertakes to form one on a particular issue for decision. In order to form a coalition a leader must attract followers, who are also defined simply and circularly as those members who join the association which the leader forms.” Riker 1962, p. 103, 105,
reality is that Riker’s political coalitions are *minimum winning coalitions* – which are defined as coalitions which are ineffective (i.e.: they will lose) if any single member is subtracted from the coalition – which presuppose foreknowledge of military outcomes.\(^{57}\)

Unfortunately, international military coalitions almost never satisfy these requirements, so applying Riker’s theory directly to the CotW is problematic. For example, some coalition partners were clearly more valuable to the US than others – basing and access in the Persian Gulf was key to the war effort, and could not have been provided by other states. Furthermore, the CotW was self evidently not a minimum winning coalition in terms of its membership – it is hard to make the case that the coalition was comprised of just the right number and mix of allies, and the loss of any one ally would have doomed the coalition to failure. If Poland hadn’t sent troops to Iraq, it is doubtful that would the coalition would have failed to overthrow Saddam.

Despite these shortcomings, Riker’s approach does intuitively appeal when applied to the CotW – there is a sense that the Bush administration did not seek, or unsuccessfully sought, more allies than it needed to in order to get the job done militarily as well as politically. The Bush administration created a coalition that was, if not minimal, certainly not broad – with a few exceptions, each of the nations appears to have contributed something key to the coalition and it is hard to think of what other powers the coalition needed to accomplish its mission. The Gulf States (Bahrain, Qatar, etc.)

\(^{57}\) Schweller neatly summarizes Riker’s arguments, and contrasts their dynamics with those of Caplow. Schweller 1998, p. 241-243. Not also that Schweller informatively points out that minimum winning coalitions are far more characteristic of revisionist state alliances, rather than status quo states: “The concept of a minimum winning coalition, which derives its logic from expectations of dividing the spoils of victory, is not operative for status quo alliances, whose raison d’etre is defense and/or deterrence, not conquest.” p. 243
provided the minimal amount of basing and access needed for the southern approach, other states around the world provided the minimal amount of political legitimacy to allow the US to act, and the UK provided the troops needed to fill a gap in the US warplan (the Basra assault). This comes quite close to Riker’s definition of a minimal winning coalition.

But there remain contrary cases. For example, Turkey was clearly required for the US warplan, and was strongly courted by the US, but in the end failed to support the coalition. What gave it the leverage to defy the US so strongly? Why would Turkey be willing to risk its relations with the hegemon in 2003, when it contributed to very similar efforts in 1990-91? Conversely, Poland, Georgia, and South Korean support were not likely required for the success of the US warplan, but they went out of their way to contribute troops. Why? Clearly, these states were acting upon a dynamic that Riker’s model does not fully take into consideration. As my analysis of interdependence shows, Turkey had greater leverage in 2003 because it was no longer dependent on the US for its long term security, while Poland in 2003 went out of its way to support the US because it desired a closer relationship with the US.

In a related work, Weitsman and Balkin take Riker head on and claim that ‘maximum’ rather than ‘minimum’ winning coalitions are favored in contemporary coalition warfare. To test this they look at the formation of wartime coalitions over the last two centuries using realist propositions that states would seek to partner with the most powerful states in the system and that wartime coalitions are likely to be relatively symmetrical in terms of power distribution. Examining trends in multistate conflicts they
find that “powerful states are not the most frequent partners of primary war initiators or responders… [and] wartime coalitions are becoming more asymmetrical in terms of their power distribution.” They further posit that:

“Instead of constructing minimal winning coalitions, states crafting coalitions to prosecute wars now seek to devise the largest coalition possible. This validates and legitimizes their foreign policy objectives and gives credibility to the rhetoric of multilateralism…coalitions are [now] forged for reasons other than capability aggregation. In hegemonic alliances in particular…the need to add the power of one’s allies to one’s own is not at all the most important function of a wartime coalition. Instead the principal role coalition member states play is to legitimize the goals of the central state…this tendency is borne out by the coalitions forged by the United States in the first Gulf War…Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and the 34 states that provided over 22,000 troops to support OIF in Iraq. In each of these cases, widespread participation was elicited by the United States in order to justify its mission and legitimize the operations.”

Their analysis is important for understanding that smaller states are motivated to align themselves with the unipole for side payments and to gain legitimacy and curry favor with the US. However, if “the principal role coalition member states play is to legitimize the goals of the central state” then we would expect to see the unipole put greater effort into gaining the support of larger and more politically crucial allies and institutions. As many have pointed out, the Coalition of the Willing was composed of a large number of ‘smaller’ powers not larger, traditional allies who could lend more political legitimacy. And when the US did attempt to enlist the support of more important allies such as Germany, it failed to do so, when it succeeded at that only a decade earlier for the DS/DS coalition in 1990-91. Conversely, Japan quickly provided political support
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58 Weitsman and Balkin, 2007. p. 19-20
in 2003 but had to be greatly pressured in 1990-91. Only be understanding that the interactions between the US and these states were clearly indicative of asymmetric interdependence can we explain their behavior.

**Second-image theories**

Only at the highest level of analysis can we assume that states are functionally indistinguishable. As Waltz notes, such an assumption can be easily made, but in so doing we typically lose the ability to make useful predictions. The idiosyncrasies, preferences and institutions of states must be addressed in some manner. The primary theories of interest for this study are those that deal with strong states versus weak states and those that assess negotiations as manifestations of two-level games.

Strong-state/weak-state theories are useful for understanding coalition contributions in cases where the executive decision makers of a state are forced to respond to external pressures (such as a foreign threat or alliance pressures) and countervailing domestic pressures (such as a populace, legislature, or national security apparatus that opposes contributing to a coalition). Accordingly, the more autonomous and insulated from domestic constituencies the executive decision makers are, the more likely they are to respond primarily to external rather than domestic pressures.

If this were the case, we would expect to see stronger states responding more to the Iraqi threat or US pressure than to any opposing domestic pressures, as well as weak states being more receptive to domestic concerns. A cursory examination of democratic states such as Turkey, Germany, and others seems to support this theory vis-à-vis the

---

59 For a recent example of this, see Baltrusaitis, 2008.
CotW. Nonetheless, there remain some anomalies, such as most of the Arab league states, whose populations were generally opposed to the US-led coalition, yet whose governments are both ‘strong’, threatened by Iraq, and under US pressure to contribute to the Coalition. Nonetheless, most of them did not support the US so or did so only in a constrained or muted manner.⁶⁰

The literature on two-level games may also provide some insight into the outcomes of bilateral negotiations under conditions of internal factionalism – as Putnam points out, understanding the motivations of negotiators on their domestic front can be vital to understanding the outcomes of their international negotiations.⁶¹ Under the two-level thesis, one would expect to see state leaders who are weak or internally divided able to strike better bargains with the US when it tried to enlist their support for a war coalition, while those who are strong would be faced with poorer bargains, all else being equal. However, a notable counter-example exists in Turkey – a relatively weak Turkish state should have been able to strike a bargain with the US that resulted in support for US actions but at some gain to the Turkish state. This bargaining dynamic failed to materialize. Furthermore, the CotW is notable for the overwhelming lack of bargains reached, as the wide variety of non-participating and opposing nations seems to indicate.

Another possible motivation for state support to a coalition is ideological and historical; if the coalition is engaged in an endeavor that the state or its people hold normatively dear, then other costs or risks may have less weight in their decision making.

⁶⁰ Arguably, Japan also would be a counter example, as its Prime Minister is relatively weak in relation to the executive and other political factions, yet appears to have been successfully pressured by the US to contribute non-combatant naval logistical forces to OIF.

processes. For example, if the invasion of Iraq was seen as a struggle against dictatorships or fascism, then a country with a particularly strong dislike of those governmental types might support such a coalition. Alternately, if it was seen as potentially inflaming domestic threats, then vulnerable countries would be less likely to support such an action. Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states, with their large and disgruntled Shi’a population might fall into just such a category. Similarly, if a nation was particularly motivated to fight global terrorism and viewed the CotW part of that struggle, it might support it. Poland seems to present a case like this – it was not dependent on US aid, its’ populace generally opposed the coalition, and it was not threatened by Iraq. Nonetheless, it was one of only three nations to send troops directly to support the coalition, and it did so apparently based on normative concerns. However, a normative explanation alone is misleading, for if historical and ideological experience against terrorism or dictatorships is a primary determinant of coalition support, then one might expect to see such support also from nations like Germany and others with similar experiences.

Normative theories can also be used to account for other coalition choices of states. Groups of states with shared values, especially when those values relate to security concerns, may be motivated to cooperate against other states. Norms can also engender non-cooperation: if a state is engaged in actions that are orthogonal to the values of other states, they are less likely to contribute to any cooperative endeavor, all else being equal. During the run up to OIF, there was a great amount of debate about the appropriateness
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62 The UK, with its previous experience with the IRA, may be a similar case.
of a pre-emptive attack on Iraq by the US. Many governments appear to have been wary of the right of the US to engage in such an attack given that no overt provocation appeared to exist. Diplomatic efforts to link Saddam Hussein to Al Qaeda or the attacks of 9/11 were generally met with skepticism in the UN. This skepticism may have provided a motivation, or justification, for many states to defy US efforts to gain their cooperation. One recent study concludes that the “United States undermines its own capacity to wield influence with its allies when it rejects constraints on its own behavior.”63 While an in-depth examination of normative concerns is beyond the scope of this study, it is nonetheless difficult to discern a broadly applicable and generalizable pattern between norms and state decisions regarding joining the CotW and other coalitions.

The fundamental problem with domestic level theories as they relate to coalition formation is that they fail to take into account the shifting strategic situation facing minor states. Clearly the strategic risks and rewards that face a minor state affect their decision making and their behavior towards the coalition-building superpower. For example, in 1950 and 1990-91, Turkey supported the US in Korea and Iraq. But in 2003, it rejected the US’ entreaties. It seems clear that Turkey was more dependent on the US in the earlier coalitions than it was in 2003. But only by assessing the mutual dependence of the US and Turkey can we assess bargaining leverage and understand the broad strategic considerations that Turkish decision makers were operating under.

**Integrated Approaches**
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63 For a recent example of such research, see Loomis, 2008, p. iv.
A continuing meta-theoretical theme in the above discussion is that there is a tradeoff between predictive ability and parsimony: theories which might explain interstate relations typically utilize fewer variables for their explanatory power. Thus, while they are parsimonious and generalizable, that comes at the expense of accuracy and predictive power. On the other hand, those theories that have more detailed configurations of variables can typically make more specific predictions but only for fewer and more limited cases.

In relation to ad hoc military coalitions this problem manifests itself as a scope problem between systemic versus sub-systemic variables. Systemic variables may provide a highly generalizable set of predictions (such as “minor states will tend to balance against the unipole over time”) but these are not useful for understanding the specifics of any given coalition. Sub-systemic variables, such as regional threats or domestic institutions can provide more specific but less generalizable answers.64

One way to address this issue is to utilized structured focused case studies to identify the conditions under which certain contingent outcomes are more likely than others, as well as the sub-types and causal processes that lead to these outcomes.65 In this manner, even unique cases can test competing explanations and contribute to theory development – if the researcher is careful in formulating the variables under investigation and capturing the critical, rather than non-critical, features of each unique case.66
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64 Thus, a more useful approach might integrate both systemic and sub-systemic variables. For a recent defense of this see Schweller, 2006, p. 130
65 See George and Bennett 2004.
66 George and Bennett 2004, p. 114
This is what Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger did when they examined the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition that was formed against Iraq in 1990-91. By explicitly combining systemic and sub-systemic variables with a structured focused case study methodology, their typological model illustrates how “collective action explains American and Iranian [DS/DS] behavior well, and a threat-based model accounts for Egypt, Syria, and Turkey. But neither France, Germany, nor Japan – all major powers – can be understood from these models…this anomaly points toward the importance of alliance dependence as part of coercive intra-alliance bargaining, as well as the key impact of domestic politics…”

George and Bennett later cautiously applied their theory beyond DS/DS and made some specific predictions about state behavior in OIF:

“In brief, the theory’s explanation for why the coalition for the 2003 invasion of Iraq was much narrower than that of the 1990-91 Persian Gulf War was that, in 2003, there was a much weaker consensus that removing the Iraqi regime was a public good; states were tempted to ride free and reduce the terrorist threat to themselves by not contributing; security dependence on the United States was much lower by 2003 because a resurgent Russian threat was less likely than in 1991; Iraq posed less of a conventional military threat to the region than in 1991; and the domestic politics in many countries made contributions less likely due to rising anti-Americanism.”

This indicates that while the Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger integrated model can be usefully applied to the formation of the CotW there are still some gaps in the approach:

“[according to the model]…It seems unlikely that a country whose contribution would be useful or even necessary for defeating Iraq, whose security was threatened by Iraq, and whose security depended on the United
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67 Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger, 1997, p. 29
68 George and Bennett, 2004, p. 259. For an expansion of their approach, see Baltrusaitis, 2008.
States would face significant domestic opposition to contributing to the coalition – yet this domestic opposition was strong in Turkey, so unusual domestic circumstances may have been omitted from the theory.⁶⁹

This implies not only that some domestic variables are insufficiently accounted for, but also that there are limits upon coercive intra-coalition bargaining, even for a unipolar power.

Omnibalancing theories are one of the few other theories to deal explicitly with how domestic dangers affect external alliance building – thereby integrating systemic variables (in the form of external alliance pressures) with sub-systemic variables (in the form of domestic threats).⁷⁰ Omnibalancing expects that states would ally with others in order to counterbalance against their internal threats. Therefore, we would expect to see those states that face domestic threats to join the CotW if it provided some leverage against their internal enemies. However, what happened seems to have been governed by a different dynamic. Some regimes, such as those in Pakistan and the Arab league states, appeared to oppose the Coalition in reaction to domestic constituencies (as one would expect based on strong state-weak state dynamics), while others, such as Saudi Arabia, allied with the US and in doing so risked strengthening their internal threats. Furthermore, many states that allied with the US did so in the face of rising anti-Americanism, thereby risking an exacerbation of domestic unrest, rather than a mitigation of it.

Although these integrated theories combine both systemic and sub-systemic variables to partially account for coalition formation, they remain reliant on idiosyncratic

⁶⁹ George and Bennett, 2004, p. 259. See also Baltrusaitis, 2008
characteristics of each state. Thus, unless such approaches can be combing with a more
generalizable model, they remain of limited usefulness. What is needed is a way of
assessing the motivations and mutual leverage of the superpower and minor states over
each other vis-à-vis coalition decisions. Once that is understood, how specific decisions
come about can be deduced. In other words, because joining (or refusing to join) a
colokition is a form of negotiation we need a way to predict the mutual leverage of each
party so we can better predict coalition decision-making. My asymmetric
interdependence approach provides just such an understanding.

Table 1 summarizes these various theories that speak to military alliance
dynamics and their anomalies vis-à-vis the Coalition of the Willing.

Table 1 – Existing scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Predictions</th>
<th>Casual Mechanism</th>
<th>Anomalies in OIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural realism (Waltz)</td>
<td>States ally to balance against power</td>
<td>Objective power</td>
<td>No counter-balancing coalition arose, furthermore, some states concealed their support. Fundamental lacuna in structural realism is its failure to explicitly address unipolarity. Also, there are inherent contradictions regarding why a superpower would care about smaller powers or intervene to protect them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive realism (Mearsheimer)</td>
<td>States act to gain power</td>
<td>Power + geography, profit</td>
<td>US demonstrated ability to dominate across distances, but no counter-balancing coalition arose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Soft Balancing” (Walt)</td>
<td>States coordinate to unthreateningly gain power relative to the unipole</td>
<td>Conscious coordination of diplomatic action in order to obtain outcomes contrary to US preferences – outcomes that could not be gained if the balancers did not give each other some degree of mutual support</td>
<td>No evidence of conscious coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Threat (Walt)</td>
<td>States ally against threats, with the least dangerous side</td>
<td>Perception of threat, fear</td>
<td>Cannot predict subtleties of variance or attempts to conceal support, or failure to support when threatened; over-correlated – Gulf States, Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curvilinear</td>
<td>Minor states tether</td>
<td>Different levels of threat</td>
<td>Multipolar not unipolar focus;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal theories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Game Theory (Riker)</strong></td>
<td>Minimum winning coalitions</td>
<td>CotW not a minimum winning coalition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong state – Weak state</td>
<td>Stronger states more likely to align with US, weaker more likely to align with domestic concerns</td>
<td>Empirical anomalies in many Arab league states, Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological (Norm of anti-terrorism specifically)</td>
<td>States ally with US to oppose terrorism/dictatorships</td>
<td>Seems to only apply to Poland – yet others have similar historical experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic institutions/Two-level games (Putnam)</td>
<td>Regime actors play domestic coalitions and external negotiations against each other for gain - State leaders who are weak or internally divided should be able to strike better bargains, while those who are strong should be able to drive poorer bargains</td>
<td>Coalition notable for lack of support and lack of bargains reached (many non-participating nations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally driven theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative (other idiosyncratic norms)</td>
<td>States and their leaders act in accordance with their normative beliefs</td>
<td>No clear discernible pattern that correlates with norms, difficult to operationalize and falsify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, it is clear that the existing scholarship on coalition building fails to explain how, why, and when minor states defy a superpower or, conversely, eagerly join with it, and how these motivations change over time. For example, in 1950, Turkey went to great lengths to convince US decision makers to allow it to join the Korean War coalition, even though US planners opposed Turkish involvement. Decades later, in 1990-91, Turkey eagerly acceded to US requests to join it against Iraq, at great economic cost to itself. Yet in 2003, the US was rebuffed by Turkey despite strenuous efforts to gain its support for the invasion of Iraq. Existing theories fail to account for these shifts in Turkey’s motivations and willingness to stand up to the unipole.

Secondly, existing theories have a hard time understanding why minor states join in wars when they are not likely motivated by threat or potential profit. In both 1990-91 and 2003, Poland went to great lengths to join the US in its actions against Iraq. It had little profit to gain, and was certainly not threatened by Saddam. Nor did the US appear to rely upon Polish contributions. Some other motivation must be active to explain these behaviors.

Finally, the literature also suffers from a more fundamental gap – scholars have not yet fully tackled the question of how unipolarity affects coalition building. In other words, current theories on coalition building are built upon assumptions that may not
hold in today’s world – meaning that their most fundamental conclusions and policy guidelines are questionable. By understanding how a change in polarity can by itself affect the motivations of the superpower and minor states, it is clear that what is missing from the existing literature is the dynamic of asymmetric interdependence between the superpower and the minor state.

**Polarity and Security Interdependence**

Shifts in polarity lead to shifts in superpower and minor state motivations and thereby to shifts in their security interdependence. In a bipolar world the presence of a global superpower rivalry is a long-term mutual existential threat for both the superpower and minor states. Hence both tend to place high value on their long-term security relationships so they can institutionalize power aggregation in the face of this long-term threat. For the minor state a tight security alliance with the bipole not only reduces the risk faced in the short-term, but it also provides a stable long-term security umbrella against the rival superpower camp. For the bipole this implicit bargain strengthens its long-term global alliance in competition with its superpower rival, and also provides it with the legitimacy to face any emerging lesser threats. In other words, under bipolarity, the alliance motivations for minor states and the superpowers are congruent.

In a unipolar world, however, many minor states may no longer have as clear a need for a long-term security relationship with the superpower since there is no long-term mutual threat. Thus, when the global balance of power shifts to a unipolar structure, security motivations for the superpower and minor states are allowed to “float more
freely” – which can lead to them becoming delinked from each other.\(^7^1\) Those minor states that were “on the front lines” in the global bipolar rivalry may become liberated from the need to embrace a superpower security umbrella. However, other minor states that were allies of the US during the Cold War may still be faced with acute, yet local, threats that were unrelated to the bipolar confrontation. Thus, their security becomes more threatened by the end of the Cold War because the interest in the US in protecting them is likely to wane. Such states are likely to remain keenly focused on these threats because they can no longer unconditionally count on the security umbrella of the unipole.\(^7^2\) And they are now more likely to act preemptively to tighten the relationship with the remaining superpower in hopes of ensuring their future security.

Just as the security calculus of minor states shifts when the bipolar structure disappeared, so too did the outlook of the only remaining superpower. Because it is no longer involved in a long-term struggle for global supremacy with another superpower, the unipole will be more focused on short-term goals vice long-term ones. This is because while the first and foremost goal of a bipole is to deal with the existential threat from its rival bipole, that threat is gone under unipolarity. Thus, the primary goal for a unipole becomes its need to protect its legitimacy as the hegemon because this enables it to maintain its global power position and head off any potential counter-balancing

\(^{71}\) This is a logical extension of the observation that “tight bipolar systems are likely to be characterized by highly cohesive alliances; as the international system moves towards a loose bipolar system, then the cohesion of the component alliances is likely to decline…the decline of bipolarity thus increases substantially the degree of uncertainty present in the international system…” Indicating that under a unipolar system, alliances or coalitions are likely to be very loose and those states that have the most to lose (minor states) will become more focused on long term threats. See Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan, p. 99-100.

\(^{72}\) See, for example, Ayoob, 1995.
coalitions. For this reason a unipole will focus on immediate threats to its prestige since if it fails to meet them its prestige can be greatly weakened. Of course, both a bipolar and a unipole will take great pains to ensure that they succeed in any local conflicts lest their position as the legitimate hegemonic power be diminished. But while a bipolar is motivated to enhance both its long-term alliances and win in any immediate conflict, the unipole will be focused on short term warfighting success more than anything else.

Thus, by altering the fundamental security calculus of both the superpower and minor states, a shift to unipolarity can alone have important effects on coalition bargaining behavior. Scholars have noted this dynamic before. For example, Snyder notes that “strategic interests are future-oriented, they vary according to the weight that policymakers impute to the future…strategic interests will also be affected by a states’ attitudes towards risk: risk-aversion will tend to inflate strategic values, risk-acceptance to reduce them.” In other words, at its core, the shift to unipolarity does not impugn the validity of balance of power dynamics. It merely shifts their impact in time because it shifts the strategic outlook of states: some minor states are now more concerned about long-term existential future threats and some are less concerned about them. At the same time the unipole is now more solely concerned about the present war it is preparing for because this threatens its prestige and short-term interests.

---

73 Gilpin outlines this argument on the role of prestige in maintaining a hegemon’s legitimacy. See Gilpin 1981.
75 The observation that the US is today more focused on short-term than long-term concerns is not entirely new. The recent literature on multilateralism and unilateralism vis-à-vis the United States reflects this. Likewise, the implications are well noted. For example, Malone and Khoong noted that “even though recent instances of US unilateral action may provide short-term gains for the United States, they act to undermine its long-term interests.” Malone and Khong, 2003, p. 4.
This accounts for one aspect of the puzzle why minor states that are not faced with a threat from the target state or the promise of profit may still be motivated to support a superpower’s coalition in an coalition war: because they perceive a need for the superpowers support in the future against regional or longstanding enemies, they may ‘curry favor’ with the superpower to increase the chances that the superpower will come to their aid if needed. Conversely, other minor states that were longstanding allies of the superpower may no longer need to rely upon their security umbrella.

Because of these shifts in security outlooks, coalition bargaining between the superpower and potential minor state coalition partners may be greatly affected by asymmetric security interdependence between them: the coalition leader values the contributions of some minor states more than others (based on its warplans, desire to wage its war most effectively, and protect its prestige and hegemonic legitimacy), while some minor states are more concerned about enhancing their relationship with the superpower while others are less concerned to do so.76

The more these motivations at odds with each other (the more they are asymmetric) the more they become a source of power between the superpower and minor power. In other words, the more a coalition leader values the short-term contribution of a certain minor state, the more likely it is to seek their support regardless of the impact of pre-existing arrangements, alliance dependence, ideology, clashing personalities, or other second- or first-image variables. This is because to the superpower, prestige is the all-important foundation of their hegemony. Thus, the minor state is empowered in its

76 This latter dynamic is similar to the ‘identification effect’ and the ‘proving of loyalty’ that Snyder theorizes. See Snyder, 1997, p. 52-53.
dealings with the superpower. Similarly, the more a minor state is concerned with
tightening its long-term relationship with the superpower in the face of existential threats,
the more likely it is to work towards currying favor with the superpower regardless of
countervailing second- or first-image pressures. Thus, in such instances, the superpower
is more empowered.

However, it is critical to note that these dynamics model the impact of asymmetric
security valuations between a superpower and potential minor state coalition partners,
rather than directly modeling the impact of bipolarity or unipolarity per se. Polarity does
manifest itself in this approach however in these dynamics because, all else being equal,
minor states will tend to value their long-term security relationship with the superpower
more highly under bipolarity than under unipolarity, due to the global threat posed by the
rival superpower camp.

Nonetheless, this approach focuses on asymmetric security valuations of the
superpower and minor states rather than polarity because security valuation dynamics are
universally applicable. Even during the bipolar Cold War, not all nations were members
of a superpower alliance. Nor are all nations today unconcerned about a long-term
relationship with the sole remaining superpower. Nonetheless, this approach illuminates
the fact that under any given situation involving a military coalition led by a superpower,
there are likely to be a set of minor states that are motivated by how much they value
their long-term relationship with the superpower, rather than threat nor profit.

In sum, the shift in the global balance of power that allowed a single,
unconstrained unipole to come to the fore not only affected its security calculus but also
the security outlook of minor states – liberating some of them from the need for a powerful security umbrella, and forcing others to seek such an umbrella even more. Because these shifts in the security concerns of the unipole and minor states often lead to situations of asymmetric security interdependence, their security decisions and power vis-à-vis each other can be affected in surprising ways.

**Scope of my approach**

In this study, I am concerned with what third-image dynamics affect relations between minor states and a superpower when the superpower is creating a war coalition and the minor state is not motivated by threat or profit. In other words, I treat states as like units, undifferentiated except in their relative power capabilities. Of course, structural issues are not the sole determinant of inter-state relations. However, by positing that the most important goal of a superpower is protecting and increasing its power-position and hegemonic rule, I surmise that constructing an effective coalition will be the primary goal for superpower behavior. Likewise, I posit that the uncontroversial goal of minor states is to safeguard their existence both currently and in the future. This means that where existential threats are a factor in their alliance choices, then they will be largely determinant of their behavior. Of course other factors are certainly influential as well in determining the value minor states place on whether or not they join a coalition.

---

77 This is uncontroversial, as I am simply saying that a coalition leader wishes to construct a coalition that wins. In cases where a coalition leader is a superpower (as I am examining here) the motivation for constructing a winning coalition is evenmore important because if the coalition does not win, or wins at great cost, then the hegemonic legitimacy of the superpower is weakened.
These could be second- and first-image factors such as the personal motivations of leaders, norms, domestic institutions and politics, and so forth.

The basic causal mechanism I am attributing minor state action to is simple balance-of-threat dynamics with the added variable of time. By attributing to minor states a changeable long-term security valuation of their relationship with the superpower, I have derived a model of asymmetric interdependence as applied to coalition bargaining. In the next chapter I derive testable hypotheses for my theory of war coalition formation under unipolarity and bipolarity.
Chapter Three – Asymmetric Security Interdependence and Coalition Formation

When it comes to war coalitions, those minor states who are not motivated by the threat of the target state or the promise of potential profit may nonetheless be faced with existential threats exogenous to the coalition at hand that only the superpower can protect them from. These minor states may seek to use their support to the superpower’s coalition ‘today’ to tighten their security relations with them ‘tomorrow’ so as to enhance their long-term security.\footnote{The most typical manifestation of this would be that they perceive a need for the coalition leaders’ support in the future against regional or longstanding enemies.} Thus, they are more willing to pay for supporting the superpower’s coalition. Other minor states, however, are not faced with such threats, and therefore have little interest in the coalition at hand because they are, ceteris paribus, less motivated to ensure that the superpower provides it with a security umbrella.\footnote{This claim runs counter to typical realist claims that states will balance against a unipole. However, the logic is straightforward: in a typical bipolar world the presence of a global superpower rivalry is a long term mutual existential threat, hence minor states tend to place high value on their long-term security relationships to help institutionalize power aggregation in the face of this long-term threat. In a unipolar world, however, minor states may not have as clear a need for a long term security relationship in the future, since there is no long term mutual threat.} The result is that they are less willing to pay to support the coalition. Thus, from the standpoint of asymmetric security interdependence, there are two types of minor states: those willing to pay for a coalition contribution and those unwilling to do so.

For its part, the superpowers motivations vis-à-vis minor states can be categorized similarly. The superpower’s overall motivation is to construct a successful coalition. Therefore, it will value the coalition support of minor states based upon what they contribute to its warplans. Some minor states will be the only source of crucial resources such as unique geography (perhaps needed for troop movements or basing), critical
political or ideological support (perhaps needed for important legitimizing votes in international for a), or specific military capabilities (that perhaps fill an operational gap in the superpowers’ own capabilities). The superpower is willing to pay for these types of contributions. The contributions of other minor states may be unimportant, or even burdensome, to the superpower and its coalition.\(^3\) The superpower is not willing to pay for these types of contributions.

Because of their inherent vulnerability, the strategic security concerns of minor states will be the primary determinant of how much they value a coalition contribution – while the superpower will almost always be motivated to construct a winning coalition.\(^4\) Of course, how much the superpower and minor state value a coalition contribution can vary based upon a variety of other factors as well. Minor states are rarely motivated *solely* by security concerns, and the superpower is not likely to be motivated *solely* by how valuable each coalition contribution is to its warplans. For example, if either or both states anticipate a weakening of their relationship in the future, that can lead to less willingness to pay for a coalition contribution. Domestic politics can also play a critical role in the willingness of states to pay for, or seek, a specific coalition contribution. Ideology, the personalities of national decision makers, and so forth can also all play a role.

The key point for understanding asymmetric security interdependence is this: no matter the exact motivations for states, the consequences of these motivations vis-à-vis a

---

\(^3\) Allies can be burdensome when they incur, among other things, interoperability costs, additional support or command and control requirements, and dilution of operational resources.

\(^4\) These are relatively uncontroversial claims because all I am stating here is that minor states are first and foremost motivated to protect their existence from threat (a fundamental assumption of all states) while a superpower is motivated to win whatever war it has chosen to fight.
coalition vary in two ways. Minor states will, or will not, be willing to pay for a coalition contribution, while a superpower will or will not value their specific coalition contribution. These are simple dichotomous categorizations of what are actually continuous variables, but they illustrate how the differing motivations of a superpower and minor states can lead to situations of asymmetric security interdependence vis-à-vis coalition formation. Figure 1 illustrates how the consequences of different motivations interact on two dimensions:

---

5 Obviously this is a simplification, because such motivations take on a variety of values, rather than simply being binary. But the simplification of these motivations enables a clearer understanding and analysis of how their asymmetries result in changes to the behavior of minor states and the superpower as coalition leader.
This table does not illustrate the motivations of the superpower and minor states, only the consequences of those motivations. By keeping motivations exogenous in this manner, the dynamics of asymmetric security interdependence across a wide variety of situations become apparent. No matter whether a state values a specific coalition’s goals, the political ramifications of the contribution, the future relationship with the other state, or for some other reason entirely, the consequences of these different motivations all boil down to the same issue: whether or not they are willing to pay for the specific coalition contribution.
By varying the consequences for each state in this manner, four situations result: both the coalition leader and the minor state can value a contribution (quadrant one); neither can value the contribution (quadrant three); the coalition leader can value a contribution while the minor state does not (quadrant two), or the reverse (quadrant four). These latter two situations are conditions of asymmetric security valuation.

We can use shorthand descriptions to understand these different quadrants, their likely manifestations, and implications for inter-state interactions. Quadrant 1 can be referred to as “Bargaining” since it would be similar to a “normal” bargaining situation between states: although both states have different motivations, they both value a mutual agreement. In such a situation, an agreement is highly likely, it is simply the details (who pays, how the support manifest itself) that remain to be decided. This situation is the ‘norm’ and has been extensively studied in the literature, and within this quadrant we find coalition choices based on alliance dependence and other well known theories.

Quadrant 2 can be referred to as “Enlisting help” because the coalition leader greatly values the coalition contribution of the minor state, while the minor state itself has less interest in a mutual agreement. In other words, because the coalition leader is acting to make sure that the coalition it constructs is efficient and successful it is therefore attempting to enlist the help of specific minor states – who are therefore in a superior bargaining position and may thereby demand large side payments.

Quadrant 3 can be referred to as “Disinterest” since neither the coalition leader nor the minor state have any strong feelings about a potential coalition agreement. In
such situations, any pre-existing agreements, institutional arrangements or historical lessons are likely to guide actions, rather than any explicit bargaining per se.

Quadrant 4 can be referred to as “Currying favor” since the minor state is more interested in reaching an agreement and contributing to the coalition than the superpower is. This is because it seeks to demonstrate its value to the coalition leader as a reliable ally. In other words, the minor state is acting on its beliefs regarding future or existing security threats or other concerns that the coalition leader can assist them with, or some other motivations that lead it to be willing to pay for a coalition contribution. The coalition leader, therefore, is in a privileged bargaining position, since it is the minor state that desires to contribute to the coalition.

These quadrants are therefore differentiated based upon who pays for a coalition contribution, who has leverage in negotiations, and how forthcoming minor states are with their contributions.

In a situation where a state is currying favor with a superpower, it will be willing to pay to enable that contribution – in other words, it will be more likely to take on whatever associated risks or material or political costs are inherent in that contribution. If a superpower is enlisting help, however, it will be the one that more likely assumes such costs and risks. In a more traditional bargaining situation, both the superpower and the minor state are willing to pay to enable a coalition contribution, while in a situation of disinterest, neither side is willing to incur significant costs.

These dynamics manifest themselves as well in assessments of leverage: a minor state currying favor has less leverage overall. Conversely, if a superpower is enlisting
help it will have less. Under a traditional bargaining situation, leverage depends on other idiosyncratic factors, such as alliance dependence, history, domestic politics, personalities, ideology, and so forth. Under disinterest, neither side has significant leverage.

How forthcoming contributions are is also likely to differ across quadrants. A minor state that is currying favor will be preemptive and forthright in its contributions and assumptions of costs, while a superpower that is enlisting help should behave similarly. In a traditional bargaining situation, costs and contributions will emerge as the result of back and forth interactions, rather than proactively by either side. In a situation of disinterest, pre-existing conditions, such as alliances or other institutions will determine the timing of contributions.

Quadrants 2 and 4 are the more interesting cases because they are instances of asymmetric motivations. These quadrants are less well studied than quadrants 1 and 3. Quadrants 2 and 4 are the focus of this research because if this asymmetric dynamic is in force, it would be critical to understand how it manifests itself, when it is more (or less) in effect, how it affects relations between states, and what coalition choices and overall outcomes it leads to. It is my intention to answer these questions in this dissertation.

---

6 Existing scholarship does not typically refer to “bargaining” or “disinterest” explicitly. However, they do correspond to well understood situations. As mentioned in the text, quadrant 1 – “Bargaining” would refer to those situations where security concerns or concerns over prestige are less important than issues of collective action, alliance dependence, or so forth. This quadrant is therefore the ‘typical’ situation wherein nations ally but for reasons other than security concerns, especially asymmetrical ones. Quadrant 3 would refer to those instances where interstate decision making is determined less by overriding security or other concerns, and more by pre-existing institutional arrangements (as neo-liberal institutional approaches would generally predict).
How would such a theory be tested? If the superpower and minor states really do act with the asymmetric security valuations as I have described, then we would expect to see this manifest in the bargaining between the superpower (whether they are a unipole or a bipole) and the minor states that it is trying to enlist in its war coalition. Specifically, because asymmetric interdependence is a source of power, such dynamics should be manifest in the success rates of such bargaining. They should also be manifest in the characteristics and outcomes of those negotiations.

I will test this in four hypotheses. My first hypothesis operationalizes the impact of asymmetric security valuation on bargaining leverage. My second and third hypotheses predict the characteristics of successful negotiations. My fourth hypothesis predicts the impact of substitutability on negotiations. I will also comment on the scope conditions of my theory, i.e. when these dynamics are most likely to determine state behavior.

**Bargaining leverage**

My first hypothesis is straightforward: if the superpower and minor states are negotiating based upon asymmetric security valuations, then we would expect to see bargaining leverage change over time as these security valuations become more important. Specifically, as the superpower coalition leader places more value on the coalition contribution of a minor state (i.e., as it become more dependent on the minor state’s coalition contribution), that minor state will have greater bargaining leverage over the superpower. Similarly, as the minor state is more concerned to tighten the long-term relationship with the coalition leader (i.e., as it becomes more dependent on the superpower), the more leverage the superpower-as-coalition leader will have. Obviously,
these dynamics will manifest themselves most clearly in the most asymmetric cases. In non-asymmetric cases, other motivations will become more dominant (i.e.: motivations for state behavior would be determined less by structural/security factors and more by second- and first-image variables). This implies that as motivations move towards quadrant 2 in the above table, the more bargaining leverage the minor state will have. Conversely, as motivations of the two states move towards quadrant 4 the more leverage the coalition leader will have. Quadrant 1 will be a more symmetric situation, leading to outcomes that are determined more by other factors such as alliance dependence. Quadrant 3 will be symmetric as well, but characterized by disinterest – leading to outcomes that are determined more by pre-existing institutions and historical learning.

Therefore:

---

7 Note that I am discussing bargaining leverage, not bargaining outcomes. As Keohane and Nye observed, “Asymmetrical interdependence by itself cannot explain bargaining outcomes...we do not expect a measure of potential power, such as asymmetrical interdependence, to predict perfectly actors’ successes or failures at influencing outcomes. It merely provides a first approximation of initial bargaining advantages available to either side.” Keohane and Nye, 1989, pp. 18-19.

8 This is where determinacy of state behavior gives way to non-structure variables. In other words, given the nature of social science theorizing, the scope of a structural theory such as mine will end at some point because structure clearly does not determine all state behavior. This dynamic can be used to illustrate the scope of my theory. As theorized in the previous chapter, although all states care value survival first and foremost, a superpower’s survival is not threatened. Thus, it cares most about its prestige, while minor states still care most about survival (and their survival is more at risk in a unipolar environment, because they are not by default part of an alliance). Thus, the primary interests of states (prestige or survival) are the primary factor determining their foreign policy choices. In quadrant 3 of my model, neither of these are at risk, so these factors drop out of the model and ‘disinterest’ prevails – and because both sides are disinterested, pre-existing arrangements become determinant (neither state has enough interest to change existing arrangements, because, in the words of Keohane and Nye, neither state is interdependent to the other – neither state is susceptible or vulnerable to the policies of the other). In quadrant 1, both states have symmetric motivations, so these factors of prestige and survival drop out of the model and other factors become determinant. In that case, since both sides still value a contribution (i.e.: they are both interdependent of each other) both ‘bargain’ to arrive at a satisfactory level of contribution.

9 Instances residing in quadrant three should be relatively rare, because if the superpower is interested in constructing a winning coalition, it will be interested in the contribution in question. However, exogenous situations may occur that lead to instances of disinterest. As I examine in the next chapter, Germany material contributions to the OIF coalition appear to reside in this quadrant.
H1: Bargaining leverage changes over time based upon asymmetric security valuations of the coalition leader and the minor state: the coalition leader is primarily concerned with the short-term coalition contribution of the minor state, and the minor state is concerned with its long-term threats and therefore its long-term security relationship with the coalition leader. Such asymmetries result in changes in bargaining leverage. In other words:

- **Cases that most resemble quadrant 1 (“Bargaining”)** should result in both the coalition leader and the minor state valuing a coalition contribution by the minor state. Therefore, 'standard’ bargaining occurs in order to secure a positive outcome and other concerns, such as alliance dependence, determine outcomes.
- **Cases that most resemble quadrant 2 (“Enlisting Help”)** should result in the coalition leader valuing a minor state coalition contribution. (and thus the minor state having greater overall bargaining success)
- **Cases that most resemble quadrant 3 (“Disinterest”)** should result in neither the coalition leader nor the minor state greatly valuing a coalition contribution by the minor state. Therefore, pre-existing institutions become more determinant of outcomes.
- **Cases that most resemble quadrant 4 (“Currying favor”)** should result in the minor state valuing a coalition contribution (and thus the coalition leader having greater overall bargaining success).

The most effective way to test this hypothesis is to compare bargaining outcomes and willingness to incur costs across different cases that exhibit asymmetric characteristics.

**Expected outcomes of successful negotiations**

If asymmetric security valuations that I have modeled are in force, then the outcomes of successful bargaining should be similarly asymmetric. In other words, the more value a minor state perceives regarding its long-term security relationship with the coalition leader the more it will attempt to demonstrate its commitment to the coalition leader during the negotiations and the more costs it will bear in doing so. Similarly, the

10 Note that asymmetric valuations are not solely tied to global polarity, however. For example, the minor state may see still a unipole as an 'offshore balancer' against local persistent threats. (ex: Poland in OIF).
more value a coalition leader places on the minor states short-term coalition contribution, the more it will try to obtain the minor states’ contribution, and the more costs it will bear to make that happen.

In other words, if the coalition leader needs a coalition contribution from the minor state, it will pay to obtain it. Alternately, if the minor state wants to demonstrate its commitment to the coalition leader through a coalition contribution, it will pay to do so. Quadrant 2 (“Enlisting Help”) corresponds to the former situation – the coalition leader attempts to enlist the help of the minor state, and is willing to pay to receive it. Quadrant 4 (“Currying Favor”) corresponds to the latter situation – the minor state attempts to contribute to the coalition, and is willing to pay do so. These are situations where asymmetric motivations lead to surprising outcomes. Quadrants 1 (“Bargaining”) and 3 (“Disinterest”) represent more symmetric situations (and less surprising outcomes). In other words, coalition contributions and “who pays for the coalition contribution” are linked. Therefore:

**H2: Given a successfully negotiated outcome we would expect to see:**
- As dynamics move towards quadrant 1 (“Bargaining”) the minor state contributes to the coalition, and ‘traditional’ bargaining (or other factors) determines who pays for it.
- As dynamics move towards quadrant 2 (“Enlisting help”) the minor state contributes to the coalition, and the coalition leader pays for it.
- As dynamics move towards quadrant 3 (“Disinterest”) the minor state contributes to coalition, but there is no significant exchange to attain that contribution.
- As dynamics move towards quadrant 4 (“Currying favor”) the minor state contributes to the coalition, and the minor state pays for it.

To test this hypothesis I will examine the negotiations between the superpower and minor state for evidence regarding negotiated outcomes and who pays for them.
Type of contribution

If a minor state does contribute to a coalition, its contributions should vary in part based on its valuation of its security relationship with the superpower coalition leader, regardless of the demands of the coalition leader. Thus, the more a minor state desires to tighten its long-term relationship with the superpower coalition leader, the more it will seek to demonstrate its reliability as a partner and willingness to risk its own resources in support of the coalition leaders’ interests. Such active demonstrations would take the form of offering its’ own resources, such as troops, materiel, or money to the coalition, and making such offers preemptively, and above and beyond what the superpower coalition leader desired.

Conversely, the less it values its long-term relationship with the coalition leader, the less risky its coalition contribution will be and the more it will resist demands from the coalition leader for risky or costly contributions. In other words, the more likely it will be to make passive rather than active contributions, such as providing basing or land access, overflight rights or political and moral support.

Therefore:

\[ H3: \text{If a minor state contributes to a coalition, its contributions should vary with how much it values its long-term relationship with the superpower. The more a minor state values its long-term relationship with the coalition leader, the more willing it is to pay to contribute (if } IV2 = \text{ high), and thus the more likely it will be to actively offer its own resources (i.e. its own troops, materiel, or money) to the coalition leader. Conversely, the less it values a long-term relationship with the coalition leader, the less willing it is to pay to contribute (if } IV2 = \text{ low) thus the less risky its contribution to the coalition leader will be (i.e.: basing or land access, overflight rights, or political/moral support).} \]
To test this, I will examine how actual contributions of minor states vary across different types of cases.

**Impact of substitutability on negotiations**

Negotiations can fail for a variety of reasons – the primary reason is obviously an inability for the minor state and coalition leader to agree on the costs of a contribution. Another common reason would be the involuntary defection of one or both of the parties, due to domestic exigencies or other unaccounted for sub-systemic variables. However, with all else being equal, beliefs about substitutability will greatly affect the outcomes of negotiations.11 This is true simply because the more a coalition leader believes that other states can substitute for the minor states’ coalition contribution, the less willing it will be to pay high costs for their contribution. Likewise, the more a minor state believes that another power can provide roughly similar future security guarantees that the coalition leader can, then the less willing they will be to pay high costs for their contribution.

Therefore:

*H4: Unsuccessful negotiations between the coalition leader and the minor state will exhibit some evidence of strategic perceptions regarding substitutability:*

- *As dynamics move towards quadrant 1 (“Bargaining”) Minor state does not contribute to coalition in part because the superpower-as-coalition-leader believes their contribution can be obtained elsewhere or Minor state believes that it can find a different long-term security partner to replace the superpower.*

---

11 For more on the impact of substitutability on bargaining, see Lax and Sebenius, 1986. As applied specifically to international relations, see Snyder, 1997, (esp. pp. 75-76) and Jervis 1997 (esp. pp. 197-204).
• As dynamics move towards quadrant 2 ("Enlisting help") Minor state does not contribute to coalition in part because the superpower-as-coalition-leader believes their contribution can be obtained elsewhere
• As dynamics move towards quadrant 3 ("Disinterest") Minor state does not contribute to coalition because neither it nor does the superpower-as-coalition-leader perceive much gain from it
• As dynamics move towards quadrant 4 ("Currying favor") Minor state does not contribute to coalition in part because it believes that it can find a different long-term security partner to replace the superpower-as-coalition-leader

To test this hypothesis I will trace negotiations and internal debates on each side to understand whether the minor state was looking to or anticipating another country to substitute for the superpower in the future, and whether the coalition leader anticipated having to use a different minor state to substitute for the sought after contribution.

It should be noted that the above four hypotheses are simple operationalizations of bargaining dynamics as they would apply to a situation of asymmetric security interdependence. Snyder’s description of these dynamics is useful here: “Bargaining power in alliance formation is largely a function of two broad determinants. The first is the parties inherent valuations of the prospective alliance…the second is the comparative availability and attractiveness of other alliance alternatives, valued similarly and of nonalliance alternatives…Thus, ceteris paribus, the party that values the alliance least or has the better alternatives will be able to demand and get terms advantageous to itself…other factors that may sometimes affect bargaining power include time preferences of the bargainers and their attitudes towards risk. Although it is not always possible to separate time preference from intensity of preference, a bargainer who wants an agreement soon will be at a disadvantage in dealing with someone who is in no hurry.
And a bargainer who is averse to risk…will usually lose out to a party who is more risk-acceptant.”

Relative influence of structural factors

My model is built upon two fundamental dynamics. First, that the coalition leader is motivated in its coalition choices primarily by how valuable it perceives the specific material and political support of minor states for its coalition – because these matter for the success of the coalition, which in turn affects the prestige and hegemonic legitimacy of the superpower. Second, the willingness of minor states to pay for a coalition contribution is based primarily by how valuable they perceive their long-term relationship with the coalition leader.

These logics carry within them implications about the scope conditions of my theory. Namely, that the more important a coalition leader or minor state perceives their security valuations to be, the more likely that other factors (second- and first-image idiosyncratic factors) will be less important to their coalition decision-making. In other words, the more critical a minor state’s contribution to the coalition leader’s coalition is, the more likely that those considerations will ‘count for more’ in the coalition leader’s decision making vis-à-vis the minor state in question. The same dynamic holds true for minor states: the more a minor state values its long-term relationship with the coalition leader…

---

12 Snyder, 1997, pp. 75-76. See also Jervis 1997 pp. 197-204.

13 Other motivations are clearly possible, and include not only idiosyncratic variables such as domestic politics and personalities, but also general preferences such as discount rates. I examine these other possible factors in my concluding chapter. But these additional motivations do not affect the basic model presented here. In other words, because this model is concerned with consequences rather than motivations (i.e.: willingness to pay, rather than the underlying reasons for such willingness) other motivations are easily accommodated in this approach.
leader, the more likely that it will outweigh second- and first-image factors in the minor state’s coalition decision making. This is because the coalition leader is concerned primarily with fighting and winning a war (and the prestige risk that entails). It will be less inclined to care about other issues as the need for a contribution from a minor state increases. Likewise, minor states, due to their inherent susceptibility in the face of threats, will value the protection of the coalition leader more than other influences such as pre-existing international agreements, domestic institutions, norms, the motivations of individual leaders, and other idiosyncratic factors.

However, these other factors are always present in state decision-making. No state, whether it is a superpower or a minor state, makes decisions based solely on its security valuations – domestic factors, at the least, are ever-present. Nonetheless, my model does not encompass any motivational factors per se. It merely assesses the consequences for interstate bargaining behavior when the coalition leader and the minor state value the coalition contribution differently. Although I attribute motivations to security concerns, because my model is concerned solely with consequences and not motivations it can also help to illuminate the impact of other motivations.

This is why a process-tracing methodology is necessary – by assessing the different motivations on the superpower and minor state vis-à-vis the minor state’s coalition contribution, the relative influence of security concerns, domestic politics, ideology, and so forth can also be assessed. Because these different motivations can all lead to different security valuations, the asymmetric security interdependence remains applicable.
Independent and dependent variables

It is helpful to clarify the variables that I am utilizing in the above hypotheses. My two primary independent variables have already been discussed:

*IV1: The value the superpower coalition leader places on the minor state’s coalition contribution (its willingness to pay for that contribution)*

*IV2: The value the minor state places on the coalition contribution (its willingness to pay for that contribution)*

I will measure IV1 by examining the warplans, political and military concerns of the superpower for each coalition. Some minor states contributions would be clearly and concretely more crucial to a coalition leader’s warplans. For example, some nations may possess unique resources, geography, political or moral support, or military forces they can provide to the coalition. Other minor states may be significantly less important to the coalition leader’s plans. By examining in detail the warplans and political and strategic considerations of the coalition leader, I should be able to measure IV1 with objective accuracy.

IV2 can be measured by examining the strategic concerns, perceptions, and domestic and leadership politics of each minor state vis-à-vis the coalition being formed. They key question to be answered in such an examination is what motivated the minor state to place value on a contribution to the coalition (such as threats that only the superpower could protect it from\(^\text{14}\), domestic political concerns, ideological, normative,

---
\(^\text{14}\) In such an assessment of threat it is, of course, critical to ensure that perceptions of threat are derived objectively and independently from the relationship with the superpower. To do so requires an in-depth examination of the threats that the minor state perceives, and whether and how their relationship to the superpower is linked to addressing them. Otherwise there is a risk that the “cart is put before the horse.” I.e.: it is likely to be possible that a tighter security relationship with the superpower could be based on a
or personality concerns, and so forth)? To understand these dynamics, the relationship with the superpower must unpacked and examined to assess what if any links existed between the minor state’s motivations and a contribution to the coalition.

My dependent variables have already been implicitly acknowledged in the above hypotheses. They are:

\[ DV1: \text{Bargaining outcomes (who values the coalition contribution more and is thus willing to pay for a positive outcome) (tested in H1)} \]
\[ DV2: \text{Who pays for a contribution in successful negotiations, and how that payment manifests itself (tested in H2)} \]
\[ DV3: \text{Type of contribution in successful negotiations (tested in H3)} \]
\[ DV4: \text{Impact of substitutability in unsuccessful negotiations (tested in H4)} \]

I will test my four hypotheses by examining negotiations between a superpower and the minor states it is trying to enlist in its ad hoc warfighting coalition. For this, I will trace the negotiations in three coalitions: the Coalition of the Willing in 2003, the Korean War coalition in 1950, and the Desert Shield/Desert Storm Coalition in 1991. I have chosen to look at these three coalitions for four compelling reasons. The first and most obvious reason is that they are the clearest examples of war coalitions in the modern era given the definition that I laid out earlier. They were formed largely in response to some external stimuli, they were explicitly oriented towards a discrete operational goal, and they were constructed in an ad hoc manner and originally envisioned as temporary arrangements to be disbanded after their goal was attained. Finally, they clearly entailed a risk of near-term war, meaning that security concerns would be of prime importance.\(^{15}\)

\(^{15}\) They are not perfect fits. It could be argued that the Coalition of the Willing was not constructed in response to some external stimuli. However, the original motivation and justification was in part to respond...
However, these coalitions are useful to examine for a second reason: the dynamics of my theory should be especially evident in periods of flux. That is, when the current balance of power is eroding or otherwise changing, long-term alliances and institutions are being called into question, and new alliance structures emerging. It is in those situations that minor states will be most keenly reacting to what they perceive to be future threats to their security. Obvious examples of this are the beginning of the Cold War when the bipolar structure was keenly manifest for the first time, at the end of the Cold War when a unipolar structure was emerging, and after the Cold War was clearly over and a unipolar structure was clearly in place.

Therefore, these three coalitions are the most suitable for testing my theory - the Korean War coalition is useful for examining the dynamics of a bipolar world; The DS/DS coalition is also interesting because it was at that time not entirely clear whether the world had become unipolar or not. Therefore the minor states involved can provide insight and variation based on whether they perceived the world as being still bipolar or becoming unipolar, and how that affected their bargaining and security valuations. Finally, the Coalition of the Willing is useful for studying a world that had clearly assumed a unipolar structure.

Third, these coalitions come close to representing “pure cases” of “ad hoc-ness.” When each coalition was constructed the nations that joined it were not typically bound to the superpower by security institutions or prior arrangements. Pre-existing security to the terrorist attacks of 9/11. However, the Korean War coalition and the DS/DS coalition were clearly formed in an ad hoc, reactive manner. Other cases that might fit these criteria would be the coalitions formed to fight in Vietnam, Kosovo, and Afghanistan.
agreements, such as exist amongst NATO countries, do not greatly factor into these coalitions. Therefore they represent cases wherein the motivations of the states involved can be tested in greater isolation than would otherwise be possible.

Fourth, many of the nations that joined these coalitions did so for reasons that are not clearly related to a sense of threat of potential profit. Recall that one of the original goals of this analysis is to examine why states will join a military coalition when they are not threatened by the target state or do not have a clear potential to profit from the conflict. These coalitions are composed of a mix of nations, many of which fulfill those requirements.

Within these coalitions, I will examine cases that best test my theory and the scope conditions I have laid out while providing the greatest amount of variation. The primary criteria for choosing my cases is that the minor states that joined or refused to join the warfighting coalition should be motivated by neither threat nor profit. In addition, because I am interested in achieving as much variation in my two independent variables as possible, I will examine, to the extent possible, the same countries across different coalitions. Specifically, I will examine Turkish, Japanese, Polish, and German support (or lack thereof) to the Coalition of the Willing in 2003, and to the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition in 1991.\textsuperscript{16} I will also examine their support to the Korean War Coalition in 1950, with the exception of Poland, which played no apparent role in the Korean War.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16} In addition to these countries, for Operation Iraq Freedom, Ukraine, Georgia, and South Korea may provide interesting confirming cases as well. These countries shall be examined in future research.

\textsuperscript{17} As I will describe in chapter six, examinations of Japanese and German contributions to the Korean War Coalition are somewhat problematic because those states were not clearly sovereign at that time,
Research and testing

I will dedicate one research chapter to each coalition (the Coalition of the Willing [or CotW], the Korea War Coalition [or KCW], and the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition [or DS/DS-C]). In each chapter I will discuss the broad outlines of the coalition being examined, and show why it is an important coalition to assess. I will then discuss why the case study countries I examine are useful for testing my theory. For each case study country I will postulate the values of the two independent variables by examining the superpower’s concerns vis-à-vis the minor state and the formation of its war coalition, and what the minor state’s leaders and polity perceived regarding security concerns and the potential security that could be gained from a closer relation with the coalition leader. I will also examine the impact of other factors on minor state motivations, such as domestic politics and leadership personalities. Then, based upon my model, I will make predictions about each of my dependent variables - the willingness of the superpower and minor state to pay for a coalition contribution.

By tracing the process, characteristics, and outcomes of the negotiations between the case study states and the superpower coalition leader, I will then determine what the values of the dependent variables actually were and whether or not my model is supported. I will also briefly conduct a cross-case comparison to draw further lessons about my model across time and situations.

nonetheless, if my theory is correct I should see some evidence for my theorized dynamics at play despite the fact that the German and Japanese governments had little freedom of action.
Process tracing is clearly the most applicable methodology for testing my theory. This is because there are a wide variety of factors that determine the coalition choices of my case study countries. Only by tracing out the interactions between them and the coalition leader can the influences of other motivating factors be disaggregated from the dynamics of my theory.18

A note on sources

The data available on the three coalitions I examine are all very different. For the Korean War coalition, there is a wide variety of declassified archival material. Furthermore, that conflict has been extensively studied. Therefore, I will rely upon archival material for primary source material and, to a lesser extent, existing secondary sources. Operation Iraqi Freedom lies on the other extreme: because it is a very recent conflict there are a number of direct participants that are available for interviews. There are also a number of relevant news reports that are useful. However, extensive and declassified archives of negotiations are as yet unavailable. For this reason, my primary sources are interviews and interpretations of existing news reports. The Desert Shield/Desert Storm Coalition falls between these two extremes. Because it took place nearly two decades ago, many of the direct participants are unavailable, and archival

For example, in 1950 Japan was an occupied country motivated by a desire to regain full sovereignty, a desire to recover economically and politically from World War II, and a desire to ensure its’ future (long-term) security in the face of a growing Soviet threat. Each of these motivations could affect its policy choices towards the United States at the time. Thus, in order to test whether my theory’s dynamics are determinantal, it is necessary to examine in detail the interactions between Japanese and US policy makers at the time. Only in this way can I hope to understand and disaggregate the various dynamics at play in order to examine their separate influence.
materials are yet to be declassified. Therefore, for that case research I must rely largely upon secondary sources with some personal memoirs and, where available, interviews.
Chapter Four: The Coalition of the Willing

In this chapter I will briefly describe the broad outlines of the Coalition of the Willing (henceforth, the CotW), why it is a key coalition for testing my model, and the general strategy the United States (as the coalition leader) used to enlist allies for its cause. I will then discuss specific cases to determine the motivations of the minor states and thereby the values of the independent variables for them. Finally, by examining how the US and each minor state interacted I will determine how and why their differing security valuations led to the minor states supporting, or failing to support, the CotW. ¹ This will allow me to test the predictive capability of my model.

The CotW has been extensively debated in popular and academic circles, due not just to its controversial beginnings but also because US forces remain engaged in Iraq as of 2008. Given that the invasion happened relatively recently, a complete archival analysis of the CotW is problematic. Nonetheless, examinations of the various bilateral interactions and domestic motivations and constraints of the actors involved can help to illuminate how and why states did, or did not, join the CotW and their reasons for doing so.

The basic facts of the CotW are these: the US began a political effort to assemble a broad coalition against Saddam Hussein in the run-up to the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Bush had condemned Iraq as part of an ‘Axis of Evil’ over a year earlier in January 2002. Some personal accounts indicate that the definitive decision to go to war occurred as early as a year or more prior to the invasion, while other observers maintain that the

¹ A full list of states that contributed to the Coalition of the Willing is given in Appendix A, along with the years they committed troops and where applicable the number of troops they provided.
decision to invade Iraq was never a foregone conclusion. In any case, the US attempted to gain allies for an invasion from across the political and geographic spectrum, in order to build not only material but also critically important political support in the UN.

While these efforts typically began as staff level discussions between governments, they usually came to be very personal in nature, and revolved around private discussions between President Bush and his counterparts, or between cabinet members and their counterparts. Such efforts were punctuated by highly public diplomacy, primarily through political speeches given in the US or at the UN Security Council. It is not entirely clear whether there was an overarching strategy for procuring

---

2 Paul O’Neil, President Bush’s secretary of the treasury, claims that a plan to attack Iraq was discussed as early as January 30, 2001. From Ron Suskind’s Price of Loyalty, quoted in Fawn, 2006, p. 1. Gordon and Shapiro note that Bush may have decided to go to war as early as Sept 17th and no later than January 2003. Gordon and Shapiro 2004, p. 95 and p. 9. Chilean Ambassador Munoz notes that “…It became particularly evident that a war with Iraq would prove inevitable once negotiations had failed in the UN Security Council on March 15th 2003, with the White House publicly rejecting a Chilean proposal that would have granted more time for the inspections of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq…but there were signs much earlier that it was coming…On Friday February 21st…I received an unexpected phone call…from Condoleezza Rice, the US national security advisor…our dialogue continued for about half and hour. The last moments of the conversation were most revealing: ‘Heraldo, I hope you can help us…we will go with, or, if needed, without the UN Security Council.’” Munoz, 2008, pp. 7-10. For a more detailed account of the decision making processes in the Bush administration, see Woodward 2004. As is well known, an invasion of Iraq was promoted far earlier in some political debates. The key speech by Bush on Iraq to the UN was given on Sept 12th, 2002, in which he laid out his case for war. See Appendix A for a full text of his speech. For a more in-depth examination of the proximate factors that led to the decision to go to war, see Pauly and Lansford 2005, esp. pp. 75-77. There have been a number of interpretations of much earlier ‘machinations’ to get the US to invade Iraq. See, for example, Packer 2005, esp. chapters 1 and 2. See also Hooker, 2005 (esp. timeline of key events, which places initial planning efforts at Nov 27 2001) and Collins, 2008. For a good summary of the internal US debate on whether or not to go to war against Iraq, see Gordon and Shapiro, 2004, pp. 96-99.

3 Key speeches and events leading up to war with Iraq were: January 29th, 2002, wherein President Bush used his State of the Union address in the US to describe Iran, Iraq and North Korea as an ‘Axis of Evil’; August 26th 2002, where Vice President Cheney defended the doctrine of pre-emptive war and described the return of weapons inspectors to Iraq as secondary to any US decision whether to go to war; Sept 12th 2002, where President Bush asked for a UN resolution to force Iraq to disarm or face serious consequences; November 8th 2002, the UN Security Council (UNSC) unanimously adopts Resolution 1441, that threatens Iraq with serious consequences if it does not comply; January 22nd, 2003, where French President Chirac and Germany Prime Minister Schroder declare that war with Iraq was a last resort and would require a second specific UNSC decision. US Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld pointedly calls France and Germany ‘Old Europe’; January 27th, 2003, UN Arms Inspector Hans Blix tells the UNSC that after 60 days of
such allies. However, many accounts indicate that the manner in which the US tried to gain coalition partners was motivated more by a utilitarian desire to gain enough political and material support to make the invasion relatively straightforward, rather than by a desire to gain overwhelming support from all possible allies.4

The specific reason given by the Bush administration for the invasion of Iraq on the eve of the war was that Iraq was a clear threat and must be disarmed of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).5 This case was made publicly in UN forums, and culminated in UN Resolution 1441 on November 8th, 2002 which stated that Iraq would “face serious inspections it is clear that Iraq is defying UN demands to disarm; January 30th 2003, the leaders of Britain, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Denmark, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic sign the ‘Letter of Eight’ supporting Bush; February 5th, 2003, US Secretary of State Colin Powell addresses the UNSC and provides what he describes as detailed proof that Iraq is hiding WMDs and maintaining links to Al Qaeda; February 6th 2003: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Croatia, Albania, Republic of Macedonia, Romania, and the then-member of the UN Security Council, Bulgaria sign the ‘Vilnius Letter’ supporting Bush. February 10th 2003: France, Belgium, and Germany block a NATO request that it prepare to aid Turkey in case it is attacked by Iraq; March 5th 2003, France, Germany, and Russia publicly vow to oppose a new UN resolution backing military action in Iraq; March 10th, 2003, French President Chirac publicly states that France will vote no on any second resolution authorizing war on Iraq; March 13th 2003, the US White House drops demands for a new UNSC resolution, and indicates that it may forgo UN approval for military action; March 19th, 2003, US and UK forces attack Iraq. Sources: Associate Press and Agence France-Presse reports, compiled and reprinted in Szabo, 2004, pp. 154-158.

4 When interviewed on this subject Douglas Feith (head of the Department of Defense effort to construct the CotW) indicates that the effort to build the CotW was not unilateral, but oriented around the idea that the US should do what it needed to do to maximize the international contributions that made sense. This was the idea of ‘Rolling Coalitions’ that Donald Rumsfeld emphasized, in which “the mission defined the coalition membership, rather than the other way around.” Rumsfeld believed that the CotW was but one coalition in a long war on terror, and that there would be future different coalitions with different missions and different member nations who would contribute as they see fit and felt comfortable. Rumsfeld further maintained that no coalition contribution was to be ‘judged’ – which was a useful ‘selling point’ during negotiations with potential CotW members. Given that, for the CotW itself, Feith stated that there were three categories of nations that the US attempted to enlist in the CotW, some more valuables than others. First, there were those countries that provided a clear geographic need, typically basing or overflight rights. These included Kuwait, Qatar, Turkey, Saudi Arabia and so forth. The second category of states was those that provided other resources that were non-geographic but still critical. These included combat ready expeditionary forces (such as from the UK), specific expertise (such as the chemical warfare capabilities of the Czech republic) and funding (such as from Japan). Finally, there were nations that provided similar but significantly smaller contributions, such as some personnel from Salvador and others. The debate within the administration on these nations’ contributions revolved around the question of ‘why bother?’ The consensus came to be that the war on terror was global in scope not just related to the US, so there was diplomatic and strategic value in bringing up the issue in as many nations. Interview with Douglas Feith, 2008.

5 For the full speech of Bush’s declaration on Iraq on March 17th See Appendix A.
consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations.” A second resolution that would unequivocally state the need for a military invasion of Iraq was pursued by the Bush administration, but such efforts were dropped in the face of opposition in the UN. This opposition came primarily from France, Germany, and Russia. Resolution 1441 was ultimately used by the US as the legal basis for the invasion.

On March 17, 2003, Bush gave Saddam Hussein and his sons 48 hours to leave Iraq, which they did not do. The war began on March 19, 2003 with a massive invasion of southern Iraq by both US and UK troops, accompanied by a variety of aerial and missile bombardment and efforts by special operations forces and some supporting allied forces. These efforts were supported by the CotW composed of forty-nine publicly declared members and other, non-declared but de facto members. Together they provided a wide variety of support, both materiel and political. The combat phase of the war lasted only a few months, and the Saddam regime was quickly overthrown (although an armed insurgency has since arisen).

---

6 Some sources place the beginning of the war on March 20th rather than March 19th. On March 19th, a missile strike was launched by US forces in a ‘surgical’ attempt to kill Saddam Hussein. The actual ground invasion of Iraq began in the early morning of March 20th, local Iraqi time.

7 The full list of declared members of the CotW is given in Appendix A. Of the officially declared members of the CotW, the vast majority of troops were provided by the US (approximately 250,000) and Britain (about 45,000). According to published reports at the time the Australian Navy participated as well by supporting coalition troops and clearing mines, Polish special forces defended an oil platform, a Danish submarine patrolled nearby waters in support, and special chemical and biological response forces from the Czech republic and Slovakia were standing by. National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice claimed that the other members provided “Supplies, logistical and intelligence support, basing and over-flight rights, and humanitarian and reconstruction aid.” Other nations were clearly supporting the war effort but were not publicly declared members of the CotW. For example, most of the Gulf States and Arab states bordering Iraq provided basing and overflight access to Coalition troops. See “What is the ‘Coalition of the Willing?’” New York Times, March 28,2003. See also “United States Puts a Spin on Coalition Numbers,” Glenn Kessler, Washington Post, March 21, 2003, Page A29. “ÚS Names ‘Coalition of the Willing’” Steve Schiffres, BBC News, March 18, 2003. “What Can Eritrea Possibly do to Help the US in Iraq?” Emma Brockes, The Guardian, March 20 2003.
This coalition is an important one to study because it provides a key test for my model under unipolar conditions. The US was perceived by almost all observers to be a full-blown global unipolar hegemon by 2003. Furthermore, although the US took more than a year to build the CotW, it can still be defined as coalition because the US sought allies independent of existing alliance considerations and on an ‘as-needed’ basis. Also, the US billed the CotW as a continuation of the war on terror – i.e. as a continuing response to the terrorist attacks of 9/11. Furthermore, the CotW was clearly oriented towards the goal of overthrowing Saddam Hussein and eliminating Iraq’s (claimed) weapons of mass destruction through military action.8

In order to fully test my theory, I must examine cases that provide the most explanatory power. My case study states (Japan, Turkey, Poland, and Germany) are useful in this regard for a variety of reasons. First, they are all significant nations with concrete material resources and/or political legitimacy that the US sought for the CotW. Secondly, they provide both key positive and key negative cases across the spectrum of relevant independent variables.9 Third, they were not threatened by the Saddam regime in

---

8 These characteristics bring it in line with my earlier definition of an ad hoc coalition. See Chapter 3.
9 Specifically, Turkey and Germany refused to clearly commit to the CotW.
any significant way. Finally, they appear to have little to gain or easily identifiable profit from an invasion of Iraq.

Because my theory should be tested by examining minor states that joined the CotW in the absence of threat and profit, it is important to note that much of US diplomacy to gain allies for the CotW rested on the claim that WMDs in the hands of Saddam Hussein posed a threat to all other nations. However, the claim that Saddam posed a threat to all other nations is clearly rhetorical, at least in part. Furthermore, this claim should not prevent me from using the above cases as viable tests of my theory for at least three other reasons. First, although many commentators and governments were convinced that Saddam did possess WMDs, there were always serious doubts regarding these claims. This invariably lessens the impact of a threat motivation. Secondly, it seems likely that had Saddam possessed WMDs, the primary target for their use would have been the US, rather than my case study countries. Finally, even if the countries I am studying did fear Saddam’s military capability, some of them were clearly not a target of Iraq yet nevertheless joined the Coalition – Poland is one such country – and for that reason alone are crucial to study.

10 Turkey, as the only state that borders Iraq, was the only one that might be physically threatened by geographical proximity to Saddam’s army. However, that army had been largely “de-fanged” and demoralized by a decade of sanctions, isolation, internal purges and lack of supplies since the first Gulf War in 1991. However, it could be argued that Turkey was ‘threatened’ by a potential breakup of Iraq, since that might encourage Kurds within Turkey to seek the creation of a Kurdish state. However, such a motivation would be in opposition to US actions, not Saddam per se. Gordon and Shapiro note that “The first and most basic transatlantic difference was that, especially after the shock of September 11, 2001, Americans genuinely perceived a threat from Iraq, and Europeans genuinely did not.” Gordon and Shapiro 2004, p. 83.

11 This is not to say that they might gain quid pro quos from the US for their cooperation, only to say that the invasion of Iraq per se held little promise of concrete profit for them in the traditional sense of the term (territory, power, and so forth). See Schweller 1994 for more on bandwagoning for profit.
Likewise one has to look hard at these countries to see any evidence that they looked to profit from a war in Iraq, especially given the costs and risks of that war. First, most of these countries economies were highly dependent on oil from the Middle East. A disruption of such oil supplies would have undoubtedly been of great concern to not only highly oil dependent countries such as Japan and Germany, but all other countries due to the globalization of the oil market. Second, given the nature of international terrorism and the belief by some that Saddam was connected to international terrorist organizations, supporting an invasion of Iraq would have entailed taking on the risk of military retribution. In other words, not only did these nations stand to gain little from supporting the Coalition, they in fact took on greater risk in so doing.

I will now examine each of these cases in greater detail, and summarize the results at the end of the chapter.

**Japan**

**Background (Independent Variables):**

Since the end of World War 2, Japanese strategic policy has revolved around the security alliance with the US, while the capabilities and posture of its military forces have been limited by domestic legal and normative constraints. Although Japan’s postwar ‘peace constitution’ was imposed by occupying US forces, the US-Japan security treaty

---

12 There is a weak case to be made that Coalition countries had hoped to gain some stake in control over Iraqi oil supplies after the invasion. Given the globalization and competitiveness of the oil market, it is hard to square this with the costs and risks that going to war entails. Furthermore, as will be shown, the desire for oil profits does not appear to have played a determinant role in the decision to support the coalition (see for example, the Poland case study, below).

13 For an overview of the constraints and norms surrounding Japanese foreign policy, see Cronin and Green, 1994; Hughes, 2005; Boyd and Samuels, 2005; Berger, 1999; and Jitsuo 2000.
was a mutual response to the perceived threat of the communist bloc. And, as the bipolar rivalry of the Cold War emerged, Japanese security and strategic choices came to rely almost entirely on the alliance with the US while Japan served as the linchpin of the US security strategy in the Asia-Pacific.\textsuperscript{14} However, the burden of deterring and potentially defending against Soviet aggression was borne disproportionately by the United States.\textsuperscript{15} A variety of well known historical and ideological factors tightly constrained the posture, policies, and capabilities of Japanese military forces. For example, the postwar constitution placed strict institutional limits on Japanese military capabilities while the ‘Yoshida Doctrine’ was a strategic choice made by the Japanese government to “rely on the United States for physical security while focusing on economic recovery.”\textsuperscript{16} Thus, during the Cold War, Japanese SDF forces were prevented from taking any independent action other than those that contributed to the defense of the Japanese home islands.\textsuperscript{17}

On the other hand, US forces operated out of bases in Japan largely at will, and provided the bulk of strategic deterrence in the area as well as a robust forward deployed US military capability.\textsuperscript{18} For the US, Japan provided an ‘unsinkable aircraft carrier’ and its extensive logistic and basing capability provided the foundation for US military power and strategy in the Asia Pacific region. This unbalanced arrangement suited US strategic

\textsuperscript{14} “The Cold War anchored Japanese politics for more than four decades, offering Japan ample time to adapt to its constraints and opportunities….the nations domestic political system was…intimately tied to its Cold War foreign policy…” Pyle, 2007, p. 290.
\textsuperscript{15} Many scholars have noted that Japan also benefited in economic ways from bipolarity. Pyle’s observation is typical: “Japan’s success in the Cold War had benefited from the unique conditions of the bipolar order, which had allowed it to profit from the free-trade order while flouting its’ liberal principles.” Pyle, 2007, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{16} Stone, 1999, p. 252.
\textsuperscript{17} See Hughes, 2005; Cronin and Green, 1994 as well as many other sources. It is also important to note the longstanding, albeit weakening, antimilitarist norm in Japan. See Berger, 1999.
\textsuperscript{18} See Hughes, 2005; Smith 1999; Giarra and Nagashima 1999; Giarra 1999.
posture in the early years of the Cold War, which called for economic growth and prosperity in Japan as a key factor in strengthening the bilateral security relationship and increasing stability in East Asia. However, as the Japanese economy recovered and trade relations with the US became more competitive, the United States began to pressure Japan to assume more of the shared security burden.\textsuperscript{19} Such pressures increased over time, and did result in some balancing adjustments to the security alliance.\textsuperscript{20}

Nonetheless, the security alliance was not fundamentally reevaluated until the collapse of the USSR in the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{21} From a realist perspective this was only natural, given that the threat of Soviet aggression had all but disappeared and China was focused on its economic development and was not yet perceived as a serious security

\textsuperscript{19} See Smith 1999; Giarra and Nagashima 1999; Giarra 1999. Shinoda notes that the Japan – “With the end of the Cold War, the security environment surrounding Japan changed drastically. Japan’s security is protected by the Japan-US security treaty, which is asymmetric by nature. The United States is obligated to protect Japan, and Japan provides bases for US forces, but has no obligation to protect them unless they are in its territory. During the Cold War, the arms race and ideological confrontation with the Soviet Union were justification enough for Americans to maintain such an arrangement with Japan. As the end of the Cold War virtually removed the Soviet military threat, the US Congress began questioning the value of the asymmetric alliance with Japan. Since security affairs in East Asia were no longer perceived as directly connected to the safety of the United States, the bases provided by Japan were not seen as significant as they had been.” Shinoda, 2007, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{20} In 1999, Smith described the role of Japan during the Cold War as being “transformed from a rear basing area for combat operations in the Korean and Vietnam wars to that of a participant in the regional military balance of forces between the United States and the former Soviet Union. Two major trends are visible throughout [four decades of the Cold War]. First, as the US military’s physical presence diminished on the main island, its composition changed coincident to the ebb and flow of the strategic competition between the Soviet Union and the United States. Second, Japan’s economic growth and the rehabilitation of its military increased Tokyo’s value to the United States in the effort to compete with the Soviet Union. Japan’s role in American strategy during the latter part of the Cold War reflected the growing capability of the SDF, as well as the need to respond to improvements in Soviet naval and air deployments in the Pacific…While the SDF joined the front line of the military competition between the United States and the USSR in the Pacific, Japan’s political leaders began to engage in security cooperation with the United States…” Smith, 1999, p. 74. Boyd and Samuels present a detailed chronology of shifts in Japanese SDF policy from 1980 to 2005. See Boyd and Samuels, 2005, appendix.

\textsuperscript{21} Many scholars have noted this. For example, Tow in 2001 observes that “Structural changes resulting from the end of the Cold War have led Japan to reconsider its security interests and postures. The Soviet threat no longer exists and the end of bipolarity has forced Tokyo to reassess its politico-strategic identity…the key question facing Japan after the Soviet Union’s demise is to what extent the US-Japan MST [mutual security treaty] will continue to facilitate Japan’s interest in maintaining regional and global stability without it needing to move away from its preferred image as a pacifist state.” Tow, 2001, p. 48.
threat. Thus, both the US and Japanese governments and a variety of scholars and defense analysts began to question the foundations of the alliance.\textsuperscript{22} While the utility of the alliance per se was rarely questioned, burden-sharing issues, such as host nation support, theater missile defense, procurement, joint interoperability, and the roles and missions of Japanese forces were hotly debated.\textsuperscript{23} In general, the US pushed for Japan to assume a greater share of the post Cold War alliance burden, while the Japanese government had to contend with countervailing domestic legal and normative pressures and a consensus oriented policy making apparatus – which delayed the adoption of a more activist national security policy or an expanded role for the SDF.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} For example, see Cronin and Green, 1994 and their edited volume \textit{The US – Japan Alliance: Past, Present, and Future}. Cronin and Green, 1999.

\textsuperscript{23} For in-depth historical examinations of US military cooperation and basing with Japan, see Giarra 1999 and Smith 1999. Giarra’s fundamental conclusion is that without a US military presence in Japan, the US – Japan alliance and Asian stability would not survive. Christensen has analyzed the US-Japan alliance as it stood in 2003 from the perspective of its impact on security dilemma dynamics in Asia, noting that “Most scholars, regardless of theoretical persuasion, seem to agree with US officials and local leaders that a major factor in containing potential tensions in East Asia is the continuing presence of the US military, particularly in Japan. The historically based mistrust among the actors in Northeast Asia is so intense that not only is the maintenance of a US presence in Japan critical, but the form the US – Japan alliance takes also has potentially important implications for regional stability. In particular, the sensitivity of China to almost all changes in the cold war version of the US – Japan alliance poses major challenges for leaders in Washington who want to shore up the alliance for the long haul by encouraging greater Japanese burden sharing, but still want the US presence in Japan to be a force for reassurance in the region.” Christensen, 2003, p. 26. He also notes, as many do, that “The US – Japan alliance had often been viewed in the United States as lopsided and unfair because the United States guarantees Japanese security without clear guarantees of even rudimentary assistance from Japan if US forces were to become embroiled in a regional armed conflict.” Ibid, p. 31. An extensive analysis of the impact of the end of the Cold War on the US-Japan alliance is given by Cronin and Green, 1994, who note that “In the past, the pressure of bipolar competition gave the US – Japan security relationship a linear simplicity. Each decision to expand defense capabilities or burden sharing drew Japan farther into the Western alliance. New roles and missions for the Japan Self-Defense Force (SDF) – such as the 1981 pledge to assume responsibility for sea-lane defense out to 1,000 nautical miles – were legitimized by US strategies to contain the Soviet Union…” p. 4. See also the Appendix A for a reprint of Prime Minister Hosokawa’s 1994 governmental report on the Modality of the Security and Defense Capability of Japan: the Outlook for the 21st Century. Especially p. 23 which details the end of the Cold War and qualitative changes in the Japanese security environment.

\textsuperscript{24} Pyle notes that the first post Cold War decade “offered no clear paradigm to which Japan might relate to reshape the character and purpose of its institutions. The ill-defined future was reflected in immobilism in Japanese politics. Uncertain what shape the new paradigm would ultimately take Japan’s conservative
A variety of events led to subtle but important changes in Japanese security posture and threat perceptions. As one consequence of the end of the Cold War, North Korea and China were increasingly viewed as strategic threats to Japan. Largely abandoned by its Russian and Chinese allies, the North Korean (DPRK) regime in the early 1990s was economically struggling and increasingly vulnerable. Therefore, it began to aggressively pursue an independent nuclear capability and engaged in a variety of assertive and confrontational actions. In 1993, the DPRK withdrew from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, leading to a showdown with the United States. And one of the most pivotal events for Japanese post-Cold War security concerns occurred in 1998 when the DPRK test fired a Taepodong ballistic missile over the main islands of Japan. This galvanized Japanese public opinion against the DPRK, and drove home the vulnerability of the Japanese home islands. By 2003 Japanese concerns over a threat from the DPRK leaders floundered, unable to discern from the indeterminate trends a clear new direction for the nation.”


25 The relations between Japan, the US, North Korea, and China are of course exceedingly complex. Here I present only the very broad outlines of their relationships in a structural context in order to establish the degree of threat that Japan perceives from these two countries, and the role the US plays in Japanese perceptions. For a comprehensive analysis of disputes and other issues between Japan, the DPRK, and China see, for example, Przystup, 1999.

26 Pyle notes the clear connection between bipolarity and the constraints that it entails, and unipolarity and the lack of constraint that it brings: “The end of superpower rivalry changed the context of the Korean problem. Issues dividing the peninsula were no longer tethered to the global conflict. Both states of the divided Korea, when they were fully integrated into the Cold War framework, lacked autonomy to pursue policies independent from their superpower patrons. Both states had enjoyed the protection and aid of their patrons. The end of great-power conflict, however, led directly to North Korea’s political isolation and economic decline. Russia terminated its strategic ties with the DPRK, and China made clear its disapproval of the DPRK’s autarkic path. Both Russia and China opened normal relations with the ROK and promoted a brisk trade with the South. To offset its growing vulnerabilities, North Korea increased its determination to develop nuclear weapons and missile technology as equalizers and bargaining chips.” Pyle, 2007, p. 295. See Matake 2000 p. 243-245.

27 See Matake, 2000, p 244 and Pyle, 2007, pp. 295-297. Another pivotal event was the violation of Japanese territorial waters by a DPRK vessel, which was widely presumed to be spying. See Pyle, 2007, p. 296-297.

28 See Matake 2000 for a detailed analysis of Japan’s policy towards and perceptions of the DPRK. Matake notes that “In order to confront the threat from the DPRK, Japan has no option but to depend upon the US
were significant. And, by extension, the need for the security guarantee of the US was brought into stark relief. Such a security guarantee was especially critical because only by cooperating with the US would Japan conceivably be able to field a ballistic missile defense capability.

Japan has also perceived a threat from China, albeit in a more long-term and less well defined manner. During the post-World War II era, Japan had engaged China on a variety of economic and cultural fronts in an effort to increase its relative economic interdependence so as to maintain peaceful relations and increase overall stability and mutual prosperity. At the same time, China typically regarded the US – Japan alliance as a useful check on potential Japanese military power. However, while the 1980s saw military protection. Consequently, Japan’s Korea policy still generally follows the basic movements of US policy.”

See Pyle, 2007, pp. 295-299. Also, from a theoretical perspective, the threat from the DPRK is clear. See Stephen Walt for an explication of the various factors that go into balance of threat (North Korea clearly satisfies the factors of geographic propinquity, offensive capability, aggressive intentions and, to a lesser extent, aggregate power)

31 See Cronin, Giarra, and Green, 1999 and Green, 2003, pp. 92-93.
32 For an extensive analysis of the Japanese perception of a Chinese threat see Green, 2003. In that work, Green assesses that the Japanese “traditional strategy of engagement [with China] is now tempered by a suspicion of Chinese motives, doubts about Japanese capabilities to effect change in China, and a desire to use multilateral and bilateral security networks to balance, and even contain, Chinese influence” p. 79. Green goes on to detail, for example, five episodes in post Cold War Sino-Japanese relations that have engendered a perception of Chinese threat within Japan (p. 79), and assesses that “Japanese planners now assume that Chinese military assets could post a potential long-term threat to Japanese interests” (p. 93) and that “Increasingly Japanese diplomacy has been energized by the effort to engage, constrain, and outmaneuver China in East Asia.” (p. 103). “Samuels notes (albeit in 2007, long after the invasion of Iraq) that “...Japan perceives new threats. Rather than the prospect of Russian-speaking foreign troops landing on the archipelago, Japan now faces Chinese submarines and stateless pirates who disrupt shipping. Global and regional competition with China for access to energy resources threatens to ignite territorial disputes and slow down economic growth...nor is the China threat as one-dimensional as the Soviet one was. Some Japanese feel as threatened by the nation’s growing dependence on Chinese industrial development as by the prospect of economic decline in the United States....Japan is now bandwagoning with the United States not to balance against Soviet expansion but to balance against Chinese coercion...” Samuels, 2007, p. 190. For a contrary view of this thesis, see Mochizuki, 2005. Mochizuki holds that “While China and Japan relations are now in a period of adjustment, these two major powers of East Asia are more likely to establish a new equilibrium than to slide into a downward spiral.” Mochizuki, 2005, p. 135.
33 For an extensive history of Japanese policy toward China see Matake, 2000.
China almost exclusively focused on economic reform and modernization, by the 1990s China was much more prosperous and emboldened to act more assertively nationalistic. Furthermore, the disintegration of the Soviet Union naturally led to a fundamental change in the alliance dynamics of the region. Relations between Japan and China slowly deteriorated, illustrated by growing disagreements over Chinese nuclear tests, growing Chinese wariness of the goals of the US – Japan alliance, and poor interpersonal relations between the leaders of both countries. Such factors have led Japan to modify its traditional strategy of economic engagement with China, to a nascent balancing strategy motivated by a desire to offset growing Chinese influence. By 2003 Japanese diplomacy had become increasingly focused on engaging, constraining, and outmaneuvering China in East Asia. A key part of this strategy has been a reaffirmation of the US – Japan alliance.

---

34 Pyle notes that “The post-Cold War environment introduced a new set of dynamics. The disintegration of the Soviet Union undermined the previous sense of common purpose…the order of the region was unstable, and its future unknown…relations among [Japan, China, and the US] became complex, intertwined, and interdependent. If Washington made any attempt to engage either Beijing or Tokyo in bilateral discussions, the effort was closely assessed and analyzed by the other. At the same time, Japan and the PRC had their own relations, which Washington had to monitor closely. Relative power in the 1990s was shifting. The position of the United States and China improved, whereas Japan’s deteriorated…modern Japan never had to deal with a strong China…the potential size of China’s economy, the uncertainty about its future power and purpose as a nation, the anti-Japanese nationalism of young Chinese, the potential magnitude of environmental degradation in China, the rising competition between the two countries for resources, and the potential political and social turmoil in China all alarmed the Chinese…at the end of the Cold War, the Japanese wanted the reassurance that the United States would continue to be involved in the region. But once that continued involvement was evident, they were ambivalent….they wanted China balanced, but they did not want a confrontation. Even so, it was clear that the post-Cold War era contained the seeds of a Sino-Japanese strategic competition for regional leadership.” Pyle, 2007, p. 312-313.

35 For details on all these events, see Green, 2003, chapter three.

36 Green has noted that after the end of the Cold War, “Japan’s foreign policy was tugged reluctantly toward a new realism…Japan grew more acutely sensitive to power balances in the region, particularly vis-à-vis China. In terms of the intellectual contest between realism and idealism, the sentimental, hopeful, and complacent aspects of Japan’s previous worldview lost ground to a somewhat more Hobbesian and self-interested perspective.” Green, 2003, p. 270.

37 Green, 2003, p. 103-105.

The Japanese reliance on the US as a counter-weight to the DPRK and China has in many ways only grown stronger since the end of the Cold War.\(^\text{39}\) This is because no other power can guarantee Japan’s security in the face of growing Chinese economic and military power and North Korean nuclear weapons – especially given that the DPRK has a proven ballistic missile capability. This concern is evidenced by increasing cooperation between Japan and the US on theater missile defense and a growing Japanese role in the US – Japan alliance. By itself Japan cannot likely deter these strategic threats, nor can it greatly increase its own military capabilities, due to continuing domestic institutional and normative constraints and economic limitations.\(^\text{40}\) Nor are there other regional alliance structures that could substitute for the critical security guarantees provided by the US.\(^\text{41}\) Furthermore, Japan and the US together possess the diplomatic and economic leverage to

\(^{39}\) In 2000, Tsuneo concluded that “The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union spelled the end of the ideologically inspired strategic rationale of the US - Japan alliance, and this has raised and continues to raise serious questions about the viability of the alliance, not to mention the costs and benefits, to the respective countries, of maintaining the security treaty. However, the changes in the strategic environment have not fundamentally altered the power relationship between the United States and Japan with respect to the bilateral security treaty system….clearly…Tokyo’s best alternative is to continue its alliance with the United States and, where the bilateral cooperation is inadequate to meet post-Cold War regional security challenges, to develop bilateral and multilateral security dialogues and consultations with other countries of the region. This indeed is the alternative Tokyo have decided to pursue towards the twenty-first century” Tsuneo, 2000, p. 190-191. In 2003, Green concluded that “Japan will continue to rely heavily on the US – Japan security relationship, precisely because of…uncertainty about China and North Korea...” Green, 2003, p. 273.

\(^{40}\) The Japanese defense budget is traditionally capped at around 1% of GDP. Given Japan’s continuing economic woes and strong symbolic constraints on this cap, it is unlikely to change. OSD officials have also made the point that, holding all else equal, the differential in the economic growth rates between China and Japan means that the defense budget of China will likely always be much greater. John Hill, interview, 2008.

\(^{41}\) This is not to claim that other options are ignored by Japan, but merely that they supplement the key security relationship with the US. For example, Tow notes that “A consensus presently exists among Japanese policy makers and most independent Japanese analysts that their country should pursue multilateral security politics in the Asia-Pacific as a ‘supplement’ to the US bilateral security treaty rather than as its replacement.” Tow, 2001, p. 76. While Green notes that “…because of competition with China, Japan has pursued rapprochement with its historical enemy, Russia; launched a new initiative toward Central Asia; proposed strategic dialogue with…ASEAN, New Zealand, and Australia; and, of course, reaffirmed the US – Japan alliance.” Green, 2003, p. 105.
engage the DPRK and China more successfully than Japan could alone.⁴² These factors draw the Japanese closer to the US. Japan also seeks to enhance the relationship with the US in order to reduce the risk that the US will abandon it (because the US also seeks closer engagement with China). All of these factors indicate that it is in Japan’s interests to continue to strengthen the US – Japan alliance.⁴³ Until the potential threat from the DPRK and China diminishes, Japan’s perception of the value of a long-term and ever-closer security relationship with the US will continue to be very high.

In addition to these geopolitical aspects, historical context is critical to understanding how Japan’s security dependence on the US had increased prior to 2003. The strategic pressures on Japan from the growing threat from the DPRK and China after the end of the Cold War certainly increased Japanese appreciation for the alliance with the US and the accompanying need to provide a more robust defensive capability, including ballistic missile defense and nascent power projection capabilities.⁴⁴ Furthermore, after the end of the Cold War, the SDF had been adopting a more activist

---

⁴² Vis-à-vis China, Green notes that: “There will…continue to be fluidity in the US and Japanese approaches to China, in spite of common strategic goals between Washington and Tokyo. Coordination would be easier if the United States and Japan had a simple policy of containment, but China has two possible futures, and Washington and Tokyo should not foreclose the more positive of these futures by crafting a strategy of containment just for simplicity’s sake. Instead, senior policymakers in both countries must recognize that the United States and Japan are engaged in a competition for power with Chinas as well as a game of engagement and integration. In that competition, the US – Japan alliance is a powerful asset, not only in the military role of deterring contingencies, but also as a diplomatic asset to enhance negotiating leverage.” Green, 2003, p. 108.

⁴³ These security concerns are, of course, largely shared by the US. Tsuneo noted in 2000 that “The United States, Japan, and other East Asian countries share security concerns regarding the political uncertainty in nuclear China and nuclear Russia and the tension on the divided Korean Peninsula. Beijing’s saber rattling against Taiwan during the latter’s presidential election in 1995 was very disconcerting to China’s neighbors. Beijing’s unsettled territorial disputes with its neighbors in the South China Sea are an additional concern to Tokyo, not to mention its own territorial dispute with Beijing over the Senkaku (Tiaoyu) Islands in the East China Sea…. [there is a] growing acceptance, among Southeast Asian leaders, of the need to maintain the US – Japan security alliance for regional stability.” Tsuneo, 2000, p. 186.

⁴⁴ Others also note that ideology no longer played a powerful role in the formulation of Japanese debate on the US – Japan alliance after the Cold War. See Tsuneo, 2000, p. 180.
national security posture and transitioning away from a force focused solely on strictly defined self-defense.\textsuperscript{45} This was due in part to increasing US pressure on the Japanese to take up more of the deterrence and operational burden since the 1970s.\textsuperscript{46} Thus, there were longstanding pressures from both outside and within the alliance to increase the roles and missions of the SDF and share the US-Japan defense burden being shared more equitably.

These new dynamics in the US – Japan relationship began to be tested in the early 1990s. Japan did not contribute its own personnel or materiel to the US Gulf War effort in 1990-91 due in large part to their domestic legal and normative constraints.\textsuperscript{47} Ultimately, after pressure from the US, Japan did provide $13 Billion to support the US in Kuwait (but no personnel, as the US requested).\textsuperscript{48} The Japanese expected this sum to result in some measure of international goodwill. Instead, “Tokyo found itself the subject of immense resentment in Western electorates that were dispatching and sacrificing their own troops… [while]…Japan abstained from both direct and indirect military

\textsuperscript{45} A useful chronology of Japan’s national security policy and events is given in Shinoda, 2007, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{46} See Pyle, 2007, pp. 295-299. See also Boyd and Samuels, 2005.
\textsuperscript{47} Pyle notes that the Gulf War experience was typical of post Cold War Japanese decision-making: “In a succession of crises throughout the decade, the Japanese system and its leader exhibited a peculiar pattern of passivity, indecisiveness, and incapacity to come to grips with the strategic issues facing the nation. In the Persian Gulf War of 1990-1991, in which a UN sanctioned coalition of nations was assembled to counter Saddam Hussein’s aggression against Kuwait, the Japanese government became paralyzed, unable to muster coherent policy. Asked to contribute to the coalition and return stability to the Gulf on which it was dependent for its energy needs, the Japanese floundered. Chagrined, the government could only write checks to support the coalition, and even though these together totaled $13 Billion, Japan received little thanks and much derision.” Pyle, 2007, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{48} Japanese contributions to Desert Shield/Desert Storm, and the details thereof, are dealt with in more detail in Chapter 6. Shinoda notes that “Officials of the George H.W. Bush administration had high expectations: Japan was to provide a substantial contribution to show Congress that it was a very reliable ally. Knowing Japan’s constitutional restriction on external use of its military forces, the United States nevertheless requested that Tokyo contribute personnel to the multinational forces in the region. The Toshiki Kaifu government failed to pass legislation that would have sent Self-Defense Forces (SDF) overseas, but provided $13 billion in financial support. Although Japan was one of the two largest donors, its effort was criticized as ‘checkbook diplomacy’” Shinoda, 2007, p. 5.
involvement…” Later, in 1993, a crisis over North Korean nuclear weapons development led to further tensions with the US over the roles and missions the SDF could be expected to undertake in the event of a regional contingency.\(^{50}\) It was clear that Japan needed to reexamine its security posture and the extent to which it might contribute to future conflicts.\(^{51}\)

This led the Japanese government to review its defense policies in 1994, under the planning assumption that “an invasion of Japan as part of a global war, which had been

\(^{49}\) Tow, 2001, p. 49. Jitsuo notes that “Japanese were puzzled by the critical US reaction to Japanese policy towards the Gulf. The Japanese government sent minesweepers to the Gulf in 1991 besides its contribution of US $13 Billion to the United States supporting the activities of multilateral forces. These acts were unprecedented and significant steps towards Japan’s more active defense policy. Again, however, Japan’s behavior during the crisis was severely criticized….With the sudden collapse of the Soviet Union toward the end of 1991, Japan’s defense policy lost one of its key rationales for the SDF and the US forces in Japan. Japan’s defense policy-making organizations were faced with the most fragile conditions in the early 1990s…Japan’s fear of abandonment reached a critical point. That was one of the very reasons why the Hosokawa Morihiro government…commissioned the Defense Problem Advisory Board…to draw up a report on Japan’s new defense policy. The board’s report, which came out in August 1994, cleared the way for the government to adopt a new NDPO [National Defense Policy Outline], which made possible for Japan to take crisis management measures outside Japan, and to strengthen the security relations with the United States.” Jitsuo, 2000, p. 146.

\(^{50}\) According to Shinoda, “In Spring 1993, the North Korean nuclear crisis created a serious concern for officials in Tokyo and Washington, DC….1992 legislation authorized the Japanese government to dispatch the SDF only for UN operations, and Tokyo still had no legal basis for taking action in a regional crisis near Japan. Washington had severely criticized Tokyo for not contributing forces for the Gulf War. If Japan could not offer more than bases for US forces in the event of a contingency on the Korean Peninsula, the US Congress would question the value of the US – Japan alliance and might demand termination of the bilateral security arrangement. This strong concern, shared by officials on both sides of the pacific, motivated the two governments to create new defense guidelines for regional crises.” Shinoda, 2007, p. 5.

\(^{51}\) Tow notes that “The Persian Gulf episode underscored Japan’s need to develop a more credible and forthright policy for future peacekeeping operations other than merely promising ‘appropriate international contributions’ on a case-by-case basis. It was clear from that even that its aspirations to become a global political power commensurate with its economic weight would remain unfulfilled if it continued to labour under its existing security policy frameworks. Furthermore, there was the prospect that the strains in its security relations with the United States over defence burden-sharing could intensify. Although support for a Japanese SDF role in future peacekeeping operations gradually increased (by early January 1994, nearly 49 percent of the Japanese polled supported such operations), Japan also made it clear that it would only participate in non-military contingencies. Although not precisely defining “non-military” the Japanese foreign ministry stated explicitly that it did not consider the ‘activities of the kind of multinational force that was organized at the time of the Gulf Crisis’ as falling under the category of UN peacekeeping operations.” Tow, 2001, p. 49. More details and analysis of Japan’s involvement in the Persian Gulf War of 1991 (Desert Shield/Desert Storm) is given in Chapter 7.
the dominant contingency in postwar Japanese planning, was no longer a valid scenario. Consequently, the country’s defence posture would need to pay more attention to an emerging regional and international security environment that would be dominated and shaped by US-managed military alliances and by multilateral security regimes working to underwrite global stability.” In the face of a growing DPRK threat and a steadily more capable Chinese navy, a second defense review was initiated in 1997. This review led to the enactment of “Guidelines for US-Japan Defense Cooperation” in 1999 which, although set in the context of the Japanese constitution and its limits on the SDF, now “provided for a modestly increased role for Japan in the event of a regional crisis and sought to draw Japan into a tighter, more integrated, and therefore more effective operational alliance” with the US. By 1999, the US-Japan alliance had essentially been transformed from one oriented primarily toward the narrow self-defense of Japan, toward one more balanced between self-defense and regional security.

Nonetheless, Japan still remained highly dependent on the US for its security, and the 1997 guidelines still placed some unrealistic limitations on Japan’s self defense.

---

52 For a detailed analysis of the revision of Japan-US Guidelines for defence cooperation, see also Hughes, 2005, pp. 98-105. Tow also provides a comprehensive analysis of the revised guidelines in Tow, 2001, pp. 53-61.
53 Tow, 2001, p. 50. See also Smith, 1999, p. 84-88.
54 The new guidelines, issued in 1997, were aimed at “creating a ‘solid basis for more effective and credible US - Japan cooperation under ‘normal’ circumstances,’ ‘in case of an armed attack against Japan.’ And ‘in situations in areas surrounding Japan that will have an important influence on Japan’s peace and security.’ The section on ‘Basic Premises and Principles’ states that the new guidelines will operate within the fundamental framework of the US – Japan alliance. It also states, ‘Japan will conduct all its actions within the limitations of its Constitution and in accordance with such basic positions as the maintenance of its exclusively defense-oriented policy and its three non-nuclear principles.’” Tsuneo, 2000, p. 187.
55 Pyle, 2007, p. 296. See also Shinoda, 2007, p. 5. Hughes goes into great detail on what the revised guidelines do and do not allow, and the shift from a geographical focus on SDF area of responsibility to a more situational one. See Hughes, pp. 100-105. For details on allowable SDF activities, see Hughes, table 7, pp. 102-104. See also Tsuneo, 2000, p. 186-191.
capabilities: they limited SDF actions to poorly defined “areas surrounding Japan” and limited other actions solely to the provision of “rear-area support.”

The limitations this placed on Japan’s security became all the more apparent in the period leading up to Japan’s involvement in the CotW. 1998 was a crucial year in this regard as the DPRK test-fired a ballistic missile over the Japanese home islands, driving home the threat from that nation and the need to cooperate on developing missile defense systems with the United States.

From the US perspective, the Japanese political support to Bush was useful as he worked to build a coalition against Saddam Hussein in 2002-2003. Koizumi had stated as early as February 2002 that he supported Bush in his war against terrorism and would support the US if it decided to invade Iraq. Given the close and longstanding alliance between Japan and the US and the high level of support that Japan enjoys in the UN and other international organizations, if Japan had not supported the US politically, it would have been a strong blow to the public US case for war. The US case for war already faced an uphill battle, especially in the final months leading up to the war, because France, Germany, Russia and others were strongly and quite publicly opposed to it. The refusal of Japan to support the US in the UN might have complicated any attempts to build international legitimacy for the US-led invasion. Furthermore, the Japanese provided a large amount of funding for the US coalition for Desert Shield/Desert Storm in 1991.

---

57 An extensive and comprehensive analysis of the 1997 defense guidelines is given by Tow, 2001, pp. 53-61. His analysis shows clearly the links between a growing North Korean threat and the revised guidelines.

58 Tow, 2001, p. 66. See also Hughes, 2005, p. 108-114 and Itsuo, 2000, p 147-149. Tsuneo noted in 2000 that “Most Japanese are resigned to the fact that they have no choice by to support many US foreign policy initiatives…Tokyo is determined to maintain a close alliance with the United States…” Tsuneo, 2000, p. 183.
That coalition was largely seen as an unmitigated success and, from the US perspective, with lower than expected material and monetary costs. At that time, the Japanese bore a large part of the monetary cost of the war and thus there may have been a hope that they would be willing to contribute monetarily as well as materially for the CotW.\footnote{For an examination of the Japanese role and motivations in the Desert Shield/Desert Storm Coalition in 1990-91, see Chapter Six.}

In sum, in 2003, Japan was motivated primarily by its dependence on the US for its long-term security. This was primarily due to the threat posed by North Korea and, from a more long-term strategic perspective, China. The alliance with the US provided Japan with an irreplaceable and critical security umbrella even after the end of the Cold War.\footnote{Green’s analysis concludes that “Sudden US economic contraction, US – Japan rivalry, or US withdrawal from Asia would obviously have a calamitous impact on Japan’s strategic situation and lead to wholesale change in Japanese foreign policy. In general, however, the US pillar in Japan’s foreign policy framework provides continuity and stability because the United States and Japan share an overlapping set of strategic objectives. Indeed there has probably been more convergence of strategic objectives than divergence since the end of the Cold War. These common strategic objectives include: maintaining US forward presence and the US – Japan alliance; balancing and integrating China; deterring and engaging North Korea; incorporating a more stable and democratic Russia into the Asia-Pacific Region; maintaining freedom of sea lines of communication and access to natural resources; enhancing stability and political cohesion within ASEAN; preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction; supporting open regional and global economic integration.” Green, 2003, pp. 277-278. Although he was commenting in 2007, Pyle’s conclusion is apt: “…the alliance remains of the greatest consequence to Japan’s future. There is no other potential ally with which Japan can join in the foreseeable future to fortify its security.” Pyle, 2007, p. 352.}

The US on the other hand valued Japanese support for the CotW because such support would provide important political legitimacy – especially in the UN. However, that support had already manifested itself long before the war had even begun. The US may also have hoped for material benefits from Japanese support for the CotW, but Japanese tanker support for US military actions in Afghanistan was also already in place – and thus already in de facto support of any operations in Iraq.
The above background indicates that Japan would be highly willing to pay for a coalition contribution because it greatly valued, indeed, was dependent on, the US for its long-term security. Thus, the value of IV2 in my model would be ‘high’. The US, on the other hand, was motivated primarily to obtain Japanese political support for the coalition, but it had already done that very early on. Thus, the value of IV1 would be ‘low’ because the US needed little else from Japan. These values mean that the case of Japan would lie in quadrant 4 in my model (“Currying Favor”).

Therefore, my model predicts that:

- **The US would have greater overall bargaining success in coalition negotiations with Japan...**
- **Japan would contribute to the coalition, and pay for that contribution itself.**
- **Japan would actively offer its own resources (i.e. its own troops, materiel, or money) to the US for the coalition.**

**Analysis:**

The interactions between the US and Japan that led to Japan contributing to the CotW appear at first to be largely a matter of personalities and relations between the leaders involved as well as the historical context in which Japanese decision-making took place.

When the newly elected Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi visited the US in June 2001 on his first official visit, he is said to have established a strong and trusting relationship with President Bush.61 A few months later the Sept 11 2001 terrorist attacks in New York and the subsequent US response in Afghanistan led to a rapid reevaluation of the operational limitations on the SDF and Japan’s role in supporting US-led military

---

61 Shinoda, 2007, p. 6
actions. Remembering how the international community had responded with disdain to their monetary support to the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition in 1991, the new Koizumi government in Japan moved quickly to provide firm political and substantive logistical support to the US, hoping to avoid a repeat of what happened in 1990-91. Koizumi had already strengthened his foreign policy making ability by centralizing it under the office of the Prime Minister, and this further allowed him to now quickly provide refueling vessels and transport aircraft to directly support US military operations in Afghanistan. He also provided assets to “backfill” missions in the Pacific.

This support was done under the rubric of “rear-area support” to US led forces, and was intended as a demonstration that the Japanese government had the ability to deploy SDF forces to areas not surrounding Japan despite heretofore strong domestic constraints and lingering doubts in the general populace.

---

62 Tow presciently noted in 2001 (prior to Sept 11, 2001) that such an event might be necessary for a reassessment of Japanese direct support to US power projection in times of conflict: “without directly confronting the collective self-defence issue, the revised Guidelines delayed what seemed to be inevitable – Japan gradually undertaking more comprehensive steps to support the repaid projection of American military power in a future regional contingency by directly assisting US forces in their combat missions. Such a contingency may have to occur before the Japanese domestic political constraints, which inhibit this type of force planning, will be overcome.” Tow, 2001, p. 61. Jitsuo also presciently observed in 2000 that “In order to deviate from the current defense policy line, the prevailing norms and institutions must perish and be replaced by others. However, such a wholesale revision of Japan’s domestic norms are not taking place at this point, though it may occur in the wake of a ‘big bang’ such as an unexpected US decision to terminate the US – Japan alliance, for example.” Jitsu, 2000, p. 147. Shinoda notes that Koizumi did rhetorically tie Japan’s security to US security when he “announced his intention to actively back American reprisals for the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington DC, referring to terrorism as ‘Japan’s own security issue.’” Shinoda, 2007, p. 86.


64 John Hill, senior OSD official in charge of East Asian affairs, makes this point, noting that there is an almost linear evolution of the Japanese ability, willingness, and institutional capability to send forces abroad. The reaction to their monetary contribution to Desert Shield/Desert Storm in 1991 taught the Japanese that they needed to support the US early on and decisively if they were to avoid international opprobrium. The 2001 operations in Afghanistan proved that they could deploy actual, if limited, SDF military forces in potentially dangerous areas to support US operations despite vague domestic constraints that had heretofore been interpreted to disallow such actions. John Hill, interview, 2008. To this day,
A heightened sense of threat from North Korea drove home the need to support the US as well.\textsuperscript{65} As one prominent Japan scholar notes:

\begin{quote}
“North Korean actions confirmed Japanese dependence on the US alliance…Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi reluctantly realized that it could only expect to rely on US support in dealing with the North Korean threat if Japan responded satisfactorily to US requests for assistance in the US war on terrorism. Memories of the Gulf War experience, together with the realization that Japan needed to bolster the alliance, led Japan into a further expansion of its SDF activities.”\textsuperscript{66}
\end{quote}

When President Bush visited Japan on February 18\textsuperscript{th} 2002, a few weeks after his “Axis of Evil” speech and after the initial combat phase in Afghanistan for “Operation Enduring Freedom” had ended, he praised the Japanese for their support of US efforts in Afghanistan. During his speech Bush did not mention Iraq, but in a private meeting later with Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi he did apparently state that the US intended to attack Iraq.\textsuperscript{67} At that time, Koizumi responded that Japan would “always stand with the US in the war against terrorism.”\textsuperscript{68} Thus, even before Bush began constructing the Coalition of the Willing, Japan was committed to supporting US actions in Iraq.

\begin{quote}
Japanese tankers still provide fuel to Coalition forces in the Indian Ocean area, although the law renewing such efforts is revisited annually in the Diet.
\end{quote}
\textsuperscript{65} On December 22, 2001, a North Korean ship entered Japanese waters and was destroyed by its own crew when it was pursued by Japanese coast guard forces. According to Shinoda “This incident convinced many in Japan that external threats to the nation existed and strengthened the public’s sense that national security must be increased. This, in turn, boosted support for establishing a legal framework for national emergency responses.” Shinoda, 2007, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{66} Pyle, 2007, p. 297.
\textsuperscript{67} In addition to Bush and Koizumi, this meeting was attended by only Bush’s national security advisor Condoleezza Rice and Japanese Foreign Deputy Minister Toshiyuki Takano. See “Bei daitoryo Iruku kogeki o meigen nigatsu no nichibei shuno kaidan de” [US President clearly mentioned the attack on Iraq at the February US-Japan summit meeting], \textit{Mainichi Shimbun}, June 9 2002. Cited in Shinoda, 2007, p. 114.
\textsuperscript{68} Shinoda, 2007, p. 114. See also “Bei daitoryo Iruku kogeki o meigen nigatsu no nichibei shuno kaidan de” [US President clearly mentioned the attack on Iraq at the February US-Japan summit meeting], \textit{Mainichi Shimbun}, June 9 2002.
When interviewed in 2008, US officials stated the belief that Koizumi’s decision to support the war had a strategic basis, and noted that although the Japanese don't really address international relations in strategic terms, Koizumi did in fact put his decision to support the US into a strategic framework. Essentially, Koizumi believed that Japan has only one ally and therefore needed to support them. This was especially true given that Korea and China were both seen as significant and growing threats. Relations with North Korea had become even more tense since 2001, with North Korean incursions into Japanese waters, new revelations about North Korean abductions of Japanese citizens, and a resumption of North Korean nuclear reprocessing. These issues gave renewed impetus to calls for legislation that would allow the SDF to use force in the event of an armed attack on Japan. This ‘emergency legislation’ was debated beginning in January 2002 (and later became law in June 2003). Critically, the process of the debate allowed Koizumi to further centralize decision making in his Cabinet. This in turn gave him greater ability to support Bush in Iraq later. In other words, while US efforts to enlist Japanese support for an attack on Iraq were made by Bush over a year before the war began, Koizumi was already strongly positioned and predisposed to support the US in

69 John Hill, senior OSD official in charge of East Asian affairs (interview, 2008).
70 Ibid.
72 See Shinoda, 2007, Ch. 5.
73 See Shinoda, 2007, pp. 108-109. Boyd and Samuels make a similar argument by assessing also that pacifist coalitions and norms in Japanese politics have been significantly weakened due to “…the failure of leftist parties to redefine themselves in a shifted political landscape; national and party-level institutional reforms that have strengthened the role of the prime minister within the LDP and in the policymaking process; and the leadership of the current prime minister Koizumi Junichiro. In short, changes in partisanship, institutions, and leadership have been critical drivers behind the rise of revisionism over the last decade…the rise of revisionism has enabled the Japanese government to undertake certain major policy changes as, for example, in the overseas dispatch of troops and in its Iraq policy, which is clearly a major turning point in Japan’s postwar security policy.” Boyd and Samuels, 2005, p. ix.
this effort, and this was due at least in part due to strategic calculations and the impact of the threat from North Korea.\(^7^4\)

After Koizumi’s pledge in February 2002, little changed in Japan’s support of Bush vis-à-vis Iraq until March 18 2003, when Bush gave a 48 hour ultimatum to Saddam Hussein. Immediately after Bush’s ultimatum, Koizumi declared to the Japanese public that he supported Bush’s decision to go to war.\(^7^5\) He publicly connected this decision to the need for a close relationship with the US in the face of the North Korean threat, and this resonated with members of the ruling parties and significant segments of the general public.\(^7^6\) Yukio Okamoto, foreign policy adviser to Koizumi, noted that the decision to fully support the war was still a difficult one for Koizumi because it was certain to hurt his popularity with the Japanese public. Nonetheless, once Koizumi

\(^7^4\) Even the opposition parties at the time noted the impact of the threat from North Korea on legislation. In relation to the passage of the emergency legislation, which would allow SDF forces to actively defend Japan in the case of an attack, the national security minister of the main opposition party noted that “The North Korean factor had great impact. An unidentified ship in fact came to Japan, and North Korea admitted to the kidnappings. In addition, there was the missile test-firing and the declaration of nuclear development. This international environment surrounding Japan would require a more realistic national security and foreign policy from not only the ruling parties but also the opposition parties.” See “Yuji hosei shusei kyogi kinkyu intabyu, Minshuto Maehara Seiji shi” [Emergency interview with Seiji Maehara of the DPJ on the conference to revise the emergency legislation], Asahi Shimbun, May 15, 2003. Cited in Shinoda, 2007, p. 112.


\(^7^6\) Koizumi stated that “Looking at the recent spate of provocative acts [by North Korea] concerning nuclear issues, the perception of threat by many Japanese people is understandable, but it is my belief that the Japan-US alliance is functioning effectively in regard to issues such as this.” Press conference by Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi on the issue of Iraq, March 20, 2003. Available at: [http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumispeech/2003/03/20kaiken_e.html](http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/koizumispeech/2003/03/20kaiken_e.html). Originally cited in Shinoda, 2007, p. 109. Shinoda goes on to note that “Since many in the three ruling parties shared Koizumi’s view on the linkage between the Iraq and North Korea issues, the coalition government united to support Koizumi’s decision. In a public opinion poll taken by Asahi Shimbun, however, only 39 percent approved of Koizumi’s support for American actions in Iraq, while 50 percent disapproved. Among those who approved, 67 percent responded that they took the North Korean issue into consideration.” See Shinoda, 2007, p. 109-110, citing Asahi Shimbun, March 23, 2003.
decided to support Bush “he did not waver thereafter.” And, despite the fact that there is little evidence that the US pressed Japan for anything other than political support, soon after his declaration, Koizumi began pressing for the dispatch of the SDF to support US forces by providing minesweeping, security support, and assistance in dismantling WMDs in Iraq (as well as a variety of reconstruction assistance). This required passing new legislation in the Diet, and Koizumi’s staff had the new bill prepared by early April. Deft politicking by Koizumi quickly garnered support for the new legislation from coalition parties and policy sub-committees. Furthermore, the issue of Iraq was linked to the threat from North Korea when the ruling coalition parties formed a “Government Parties Council for Iraq and North Korea.” This council was stood up explicitly to gain support amongst realists within the parties by linking Japanese support for the US in Iraq to US support for Japan against North Korea.

78 Shinoda, 2007, p. 118-120.
79 Shinoda has analyzed Koizumi’s ability to enact legislation in the traditionally slow Japanese legislative and bureaucratic process as a result of his ‘Kantei-led’ policymaking, wherein Koizumi concentrated his foreign policymaking power closer to him and was able to isolate dissenting factions within the government in order to get key legislation adopted. He was able to do this despite a “weak political base within the LDP and limited experience… [to] swiftly deliver important pieces of security legislation” Shinoda, 2007, p. 9. See also chapter 3 – 4.
80 Shinoda, 2007, p. 117.
81 According to Shinoda “the new Iraq legislation was spearheaded from [the Kantei core under Koizumi]…and the Koizumi cabinet followed its previous tactic of reaching agreement with coalition partners…bypassing the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)...While the three coalition partners announced their support for the government stance on the American attack on Iraq, a significant number of their members did not and were against sending the SDF...On March 10 2003, LDP Policy Research Council chairman Taro Aso suggested that LDP secretary-general Taku Yamasaki form a council to deal with both the Iraq and North Korean issues under the theme of weapons of mass destruction. Yamasaki liked Aso’s idea. The coalition parties formed the Government Parties Council for Iraq and North Korea...After North Korea returned several Japanese abductees in October 2002, many Japanese recognized the threat the secretive nation posed. The Japanese government needed to strengthen its alliance with the United States in order to gain American support on this issue. Party executives at the core found a way to appeal to many realists in the coalition parties...On March 12, the secretaries-general of the three parties held the first meeting of the council to discuss their policy on the new Iraq legislation.” Shinoda, 2007, pp. 116-117.
Although Koizumi was supported by the parties in his coalition government, large elements of Koizumi’s own LDP party still opposed the legislation because they had been insufficiently consulted and were resentful of the ‘top-down’ and “hasty and autocratic” decision-making style of Koizumi.\(^{82}\) Furthermore, the general public remained wary of extending SDF activities outside of Japan and under potentially dangerous combat situations.\(^{83}\) These intra-party conflicts had other strategic dimensions as well: the pro-Koizumi camp wanted the legislation enacted to “tighten Japan’s alliance with the United States.”\(^{84}\)

However, by this time initial combat operations in Iraq had ceased and the UN Security Council had passed Resolution 1483 requesting contributions for reconstruction from member countries. Both of these events strengthened the legislation’s prospects. Koizumi, in a visit to President Bush on May 23\(^{rd}\), noted that “it was good that combat operations in Iraq ended early, and that the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1483 led to the rebuilding of international solidarity.”\(^{85}\) The anti-Koizumi camp within the LDP however “wanted to take advantage of the public’s antiwar sentiments to cripple Koizumi” and was successful in removing from the legislation the clause indicating that SDF forces would assist in the removal of WMDs.\(^{86}\) Diet deliberations on the legislation began on June 24\(^{th}\), and it was passed on July 25\(^{th}\) despite fierce opposition.\(^{87}\) Koizumi,

\(^{82}\) Shinoda, p. 119. \\
\(^{83}\) Shinoda notes that “according to a Nihon Keizai Shimbun poll taken immediately after the US invasion, 49 percent of the respondents disapproved of Koizumi’s stance, while only 40 percent approved. Shinoda, 2007, p. 115. \\
\(^{84}\) Shinoda, 2007, p. 120. \\
\(^{85}\) Shinoda, 2007, p. 118. \\
\(^{86}\) Shinoda, 2007, p. 120. \\
\(^{87}\) Shinoda 2007, pp. 120-124.
who put much of his political capital on the line, “overrode opposition, a no-confidence motion and a late-night filibuster to ensure the passage of the legislation.” ⁸⁸ As a result, Japanese military forces were sent overseas to a combat zone in the largest numbers since World War II.⁸⁹

Japanese support to US efforts in 2003 was thus initiated in the context of an increasing willingness to deploy the SDF outside of Japan and in more active roles, and a desire to avoid the resentments that Japan’s poorly received financial contribution to the previous Iraqi conflict had engendered in the US.⁹⁰ Nonetheless, Japanese assistance in 2003 was groundbreaking, in that it was the first Japanese military deployment ever made in direct support of the US.⁹¹ These responses were in themselves also clearly a reaction to the growing threat of the DPRK (and to a lesser extent China) as well as pressure from the US on Japan to assume more of the overall defense burden of the longstanding alliance.⁹² And the US-led coalitions in Iraq 1991 and Afghanistan in 2001 put great

---

⁸⁹ Ibid.
⁹⁰ Smith noted in 1999 that “The US – Japan alliance has provided the framework within which Japan’s military has been rebuilt, and this framework has also allowed Japan to loosen restrictions on their use, albeit slowly and cautiously. The key to future success of US – Japan security cooperation lies in identifying missions that allow Japan to continue to subscribe to its policy of military restraint in keeping with the spirit of the constitution, while at the same time providing a visible and viable role for the SDF in providing for common security concerns.” Smith, 1999. P. 88. Giarra and Nagashima noted in 1999 that the new Japanese defence guidelines gave “Japan for the first time…the option of being counted ‘in’ if there were a serious crisis in East Asia. However, difficult as they have been to achieve, these are the easier aspects of alliance transformation. Now comes the hard part: translating sometimes subtle political guidance and tentative public legitimacy for additional Japanese responsibility into an objectively enhanced security relationship.” Giarra and Nagashima, 1999, p. 95. See also Boyd and Samuels, 2005, pp. 40-48.
⁹¹ Pyle 2007, p. 297. Pyle further notes that this illustrated that “The parameters of debate about security expanded. Issues of collective security, constitutional revision, rules of engagement for military units, power-projection capabilities, and even the nuclear option, which had long been taboo in the public arena, were now raised for debate.”
⁹² Hughes summarizes the pressures on Japan and the US alliance in the post Cold-War era in a similar manner: “In the early post-Cold War period, Japan and the US soon discovered that, despite the efforts of the past 40 years to strengthen bilateral military cooperation, they shared a security treaty that was largely
pressure on Japan to provide more military support to the US than it had in the past. These events in turn pushed the limits of what Japan could and could not provide given its domestic constraints. Thus, by the time Koizumi decided unequivocally to support Bush in Iraq in 2003, his options were much greater than they would have been even a few years earlier, and it was clear that increasing the roles and capabilities of the SDF was not only in the US strategic interest but also Japan’s.

The support given by Japan to the US in 2003 manifested itself in three distinct ways, all of them proactive and in ways that were risky for the Japanese leadership but beneficial to the US. First, and perhaps most importantly, Koizumi risked public outcry still masquerading as an alliance. Under the strategic bargain forged during the Cold War, Japan was very much the junior partner, acquiescing in reliance upon the US for military security. The US was content to take on the responsibility of Japan’s defence under this arrangement, because this allowed the US access to bases that were vital for power projection and the containment of communism in East Asia…As the Cold War progressed, Japan and the US developed a military division of labour, and by the 1980s, the security treaty began to take on the trappings of an ‘alliance’. Japan acquired defence capabilities to complement and provide a ‘shield’ for US forces based in Japan, which would act as the ‘sword’ for regional power projection against the USSR. Japan’s constitutional restrictions and its ongoing concerns about entrapment in US regional strategy prevented full commitment to military cooperation with the US. Nevertheless, the strategic bargain, with its asymmetric division of labour, was able to function during the Cold War, thanks to the overlap of Japanese and American strategic interests: the common Soviet threat blurred the distinction between Japan’s activities under the security treaty to provide for its own defence and those activities providing support for the US that could have been construed as providing for the defence of the US and East Asia region in a collective self-defence fashion. In the post-Cold War period, this strategic bargain threatened to come unstuck as a series of global and regional crises revealed its essential emptiness…In the early 1990s, Japan and the US faced the very real prospect that their efforts to construct a genuine alliance were unraveling – a concern most especially revealed by the alliance’s abject failure to respond to the first North Korean nuclear crisis. Since then, however, policymakers in both countries have concluded that the bilateral alliance is indispensable to their respective security interests. The US, for its part, views the alliance as crucial for inter-state security in the region, and thus has sought to preserve it – although making clear its desire for the alliance to be re-strengthened by reducing the asymmetries in military cooperation and by orienting it towards responding to [regional] contingencies. Japan, for its part sees the alliance as a means of securing its own interests in the region, and more equal bilateral cooperation as the pathway for its assumption of a ‘normal’ security role. The alliance partners have identified North Korea as a new common threat that variously serves both as a genuine rational and a pretext for strengthening the alliance over the short term, and China’s rise as a common threat that necessitates the upgrading of the alliance over the longer term.” Hughes, 2005, p. 97-98.

93 Pyle notes that the peacekeeping operations of the SDF in 2001 and 2002 “…quickly became accepted practice, causing little stir at home. In 2002, restrictions on the scope of these missions were quietly eased to permit more dangerous functions, including patrol of cease-fire zones and disposal of weapons.” Pyle, 2007, p. 366. Boyd and Samuels make essentially the same point. See Boyd and Samuels, 2005, p. 38-44.
by providing clear public *political* support to Bush starting as early as February 2002 – much earlier than the formal announcement of the CotW. Such support helped Bush to build a coalition against Iraq in the public forums of the UN and elsewhere. It was also critical that Japan, as a longstanding ally, did not abandon the US when Bush was later making his case for war. If support had not been forthcoming from such a quasi-permanent Cold War ally, Bush’s efforts would undoubtedly have been made much more difficult. When another longstanding ally, Germany, did refuse to support Bush it significantly weakened his efforts to build a political consensus in the UN and threatened the foundations of the US-German alliance (see below section on Germany). By extension, if Japan had been opposed to US efforts it would likely have made Bush’s case for a Coalition more difficult and may have threatened the foundations of the US-Japan alliance and US Asia-Pacific security arrangements.

Second, Japanese tankers continued to refuel Coalition naval forces in the Indian Ocean, an effort that had begun in 2001. While this effort was ostensibly ‘rear area’ support and originally intended to support US operations in Afghanistan, CotW naval forces in the area also supported operations in Iraq as well, even in the run up to the war. Japanese tankers, therefore, provided de facto assistance to the CotW even in the very earliest phases of the war – the US did not have to offer anything in return for that assistance.

Third, Koizumi passed legislation to support the CotW directly in the face of significant domestic opposition. In so doing, armed SDF forces were deployed into a potential conflict area – which was a monumental change in longstanding Japanese policy
and postwar norms. And, although the legislative process of sending the SDF overseas began when it was clear that war was inevitable, and was finalized only after the combat phase of the operation had ended and the UN had passed a resolution on the rebuilding of Iraq, Koizumi’s support of Bush still had to overcome a lack of public support. The Japanese public has historically been strongly opposed to the use of the SDF in anything other than a purely defensive role. Koizumi further lacked political support from large segments of his own and opposition parties. Nonetheless, he ‘pushed the envelope’ as much as possible under such constraints.

Even more telling is that Koizumi had already provided the political support Bush needed from him when he announced that Japan stood behind Bush and would support his efforts. And the tanker and other logistical support that had been in place since 2001 could continue since it was occurring under the rubric of rear-area support to operations in Afghanistan. Even so, Koizumi decided to support Bush further, and to enact new laws in the face of political opposition to do so. The only real aspect of Japan’s support to the CotW that was settled in a political arena (i.e.: whose outcome was ever in doubt) was the decision by Koizumi to send the SDF overseas into a de facto combat zone. This decision required new legislation to be passed by the Diet in the face of public and party opposition. Despite this opposition, Koizumi’s original legislation passed almost entirely unchanged, due largely to his centralization of the foreign policy making apparatus and his skillful politicking, which enabled him to isolate the political opposition.  

94 For a detailed analysis of the ‘Kantei’ approach to foreign policy as it applied to the Koizumi regime, see Shinoda, 2007. This Kantei style of centralized decision making was evident as well in Koizumi’s response to 9/11 wherein he quickly responded immediately after the attacks to place the response efforts entirely within the Cabinet. Shinoda notes that “this swift response was inspired largely by lessons learned during
the US would probably have been satisfied with Japanese political support and a continuation of pre-existing tanker support, the decision to push through deployment of the SDF overseas was a gamble that Koizumi did not need to take. Koizumi appears to have taken on political risks unnecessarily in order to demonstrate Japan’s importance to Bush and the US when other nations such as Germany had abandoned him.

Furthermore, it is important to note that Japanese foreign policy making has typically been characterized by consensus, incremental change and strong resistance to overseas military actions, while at the same time emphasizing the importance of the alliance with the US as the core guarantee of Japanese national security.\(^95\) In this instance, it seems clear that if Koizumi had lacked the political will, skill, and clout to deliver on his promises, then Japanese support may have stopped at a simple continuation of preexisting tanker refueling support coupled with Koizumi’s declared political support for Bush. However, Koizumi overcame domestic Japanese constraints to set a new precedence for deployment of Ground SDF forces overseas. Within the constraints of its institutions and laws Koizumi went out on a limb to have Japan support the US as much as it could.\(^96\) He did this in part due to a personal predilection for the alliance and Bush,

---

95 Pyle, quoting Kenneth Waltz, believes that Japanese security logic is historically based in “Realpolitik, whereby the ‘state’s interest provides the spring of action, the necessities of policy arise from the unregulated competition of states, calculation based on those necessities can discover the policies that will best serve a state’s interest, success is the ultimate test of policy, and success is defined as preserving and strengthening the state.” See Shinoda 2007, pp. 90-91.

96 Pyle assesses that “In the face of more insecure regional politics and the specter of terrorism, the government steadily abandoned many of the prohibitions on a proactive military that were in place throughout the Cold War. Japanese Self Defense Forces were deployed abroad, even to combat areas in the Middle East. The ability to project power abroad was broached.” Pyle, 2007, p. 17.
but also, it would appear, to increase Japan’s share of the US-Japan defense burden – which would invariably strengthen the relationship with the United States in the future. Although it is not clear whether a perception of a long-term threat from China played into this decision, the growing threat from North Korea was at least partly a factor, as indicated by the formation of the Government Parties Council which linked Japanese support to the US on Iraq to US support to Japan on North Korea.

From a broader perspective, the security alliance with the United States was, and remains, the single most important strategic relationship that Japan has. The importance of the alliance to Japan indicates clearly that to oppose the US politically would have endangered the fundamental security of Japan. In addition, the very fact that Koizumi committed additional Japanese personnel and resources in the face of countervailing domestic constraints and a pre-existing level of support that would probably have been sufficient for Bush, indicates that Koizumi considered the future of Japan’s strategic relationship with the US to be critical and support for Bush as one way to tighten that relationship.

97 Whether or not the Japanese perceive China as an immediate or long term security threat remains a matter of debate. In any case, the rise of China as a more active great power that has, at times, conflicting interests with the US, invariably forces Japan to manage its relations with China carefully and draws Japan closer to the US. This is especially true given the alliance with the US. Tow note that “Japanese policymakers do not regard China as an imminent danger, and are amenable to working with the current Chinese leadership to prevent or defuse regional crises that may arise from intensified Sin-American tensions or as a hedge against the decline of American strategic power and commitment to Asia.” Tow also notes that “By pursuing a nationalistic policy line so relentlessly in their security relations with Japan, Chinese leaders may well have generated a self-fulfilling prophecy – conditioning Japanese perceptions so that the ‘China Threat’ thesis is now gaining more acceptance in Japan…Based on…recent history, experts and the general public in Japan are beginning to grapple with the concept that China may indeed be a looming threat to Japanese security interests…[this]…underscores an evolving Japanese concern about future Chinese intentions and power, but one that is not immediately preoccupied with China as directly threatening Japan so long as the American alliance remains operative” Tow, 2001, pp. 67, 69-70. See also pp. 70-73.
Results (dependent variables):

How accurate are my predictions in the case of Japan? My first prediction was that Japan would value a contribution to the coalition, and thus the US would have greater bargaining leverage. This was largely accurate. It seems clear that Japan was willing to pay to reach a positive outcome. This was in part a result of the personality of Koizumi – his decision to support the war beyond providing merely public political support and passively allowing tanker support to continue was politically risky. But he was clearly willing to take that risk to show his support to the US. His choice seems to have been motivated primarily by an understanding that the US was the only strategic ally that Japan could rely upon in the face of regional threats, but was also influenced by the criticism that Japan had suffered from during the 1991 Gulf War.

And, while it does seem likely that Bush would have been willing to pay some costs to garner Japanese political support (especially in the face of French, German, and Russian opposition in the UN), there is little indication that the US did incur any significant costs in obtaining Japanese support, primarily because that support was provided long before the war began and quite publicly by Koizumi. Thus, my model’s prediction was accurate for DV1.

My second prediction was also partly accurate. My model predicted that if Japan did contribute to the coalition, this would come primarily at its own expense. Japan did contribute, and in so doing assumed a role that allowed it, now and in the future, to assume a larger portion of the US-Japan alliance security burden. By demonstrating that it could deploy the SDF in support of US actions in a combat zone far from the ‘areas
surrounding Japan’, Koizumi strengthened the bond between the US and Japan and paved the way for continued support to the US in the future. Japan took this step almost entirely at its own expense (despite the domestic political risk to Koizumi in so doing). Furthermore, the US did not take on any additional long-term commitments vis-à-vis Japan – rather all efforts and costs were borne by Japan.

Finally, my third prediction, that Japan will offer its own troops, materiel, or money, was fully accurate. Sending the SDF overseas to a combat zone was a monumental step in postwar Japanese history. And even though Japanese domestic and normative constraints had been steadily evolving to allow such deployments, the event was a critical step in Japanese overseas military policy.

**Turkey**

**Background (Independent Variables):**

From the earliest days of war planning, Turkey was considered by the US to be a critical member of the coalition. This was primarily because the US war plan had always envisioned a two-pronged invasion of Iraq: the bulk of US and UK forces were to invade from Kuwait in the south, with US forces advancing north on Baghdad and UK

98 Officially, the final war plan enacted was Operational Plan (OPLAN) 1003V. In other words, the ‘V’ version of the 1003 series of contingency plans (CONPLANs). These CONPLANs relied upon a division sized unit of US troops coming in from Turkey to open up a northern front. For a good overview of US OPLANS and CONPLANs and their relationship to each other see [http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan.htm](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan.htm); an overview of the history and evolution of the 1003V OPLAN is given at [http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-1003.htm](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/oplan-1003.htm). For information specifically on 1003V and its evolution, see Woodward 2004; Hooker, 2005; Murray and Seales, 2003, and Donnelly 2004 esp. pp. 29-51, Knights 2003, p. 54, Collins, 2008, and Delong 2004, p. 83.
forces taking Basra and its environs. At the same time, additional US forces would advance upon Baghdad from the north out of Turkey. In this manner, it was believed that Saddam’s forces would be easily pinned and quickly divided and routed. The 1003V plan relied on a northern front, and all initial planning efforts assumed that such a northern front would occur. This assumption was undoubtedly strengthened by a widespread belief among US planners that they could rely upon Turkey for support since it was such a historically reliable ally. Finally, there were no alternatives for this northern option – no other nation in the region had the geography, much less the infrastructure, to support large scale US troop movements and logistical support. It is clear, for the above reasons, that the value of IV1 (“The willingness of the US to pay for the Turkish contribution”) in the Turkish case would be high.

What of Turkish motivations? Turkish perceptions of the long-term security relationship with the United States are critical to understanding Turkish behavior. In the past, the value placed on the relationship with the US was clear: successive Turkish governments regarded the close security relationship with the US and NATO as a key pillar of their foreign security policy. During the Cold War, Turkey’s primary geopolitical security concern was the containment of the Soviet threat. Not only did

---

99 A second reason given by Donnelly and others is that by opening a Northern Front, the US could exert some influence over Kurds and potential Turkish forces in order to avoid a Turkish-Kurd conflict. See Donnelly, 2004, p. 41-42.
100 Many have noted the importance of the northern front option. Franks is typical: “We want simultaneous ground operations from Kuwait, Jordan, and Turkey if we can get them.” Franks, 2004, p. 352.
102 This assessment is also borne out by reactions of US planners and others when the Turkish parliament refused to support the US. The negotiations and other events leading up to the Turkish Parliament’s eventual decision are discussed in greater detail below. For a brief overview, see Keegan, 2004, pp. 135-139, and Purdum, 2003 pp. 100-102. More detailed analyses are given by Balstruaitis 2008 and Hale 2007.
Turkey and Russia have historically antagonistic relations, but Turkey was the only NATO country to share a direct border with the USSR, and regarded the USSR as a clear existential threat.\footnote{For a brief history of relations between Turkey and Russia, see Sezer 2001.} The motivation to contain the Soviet Union was also congruent with a longstanding desire to integrate further into Western European security and economic institutions. Overall, these dynamics led Turkey to follow a close and cooperative security relationship with the US in particular and with the Western powers more generally.\footnote{See Evin, 2004; Parris, 2007; Lesser notes that “the relationship with the United States has been a key dimension of Turkish foreign policy for six decades. It has also been a defining element in Turkish-Western relations as a whole. In the Cold War years, the relationship had an obvious geostrategic rationale for both countries [the US and Turkey].” Lesser, 2004, p. 83. US Congressman Bereuter called Turkey one of the US’ “long-term friends and strategic partners” Bereuter 2003. US Congressman Wexler called the US-Turkish relationship “an historic partnership that has remained steadfast over the past 50 years” Wexler 2003. Cagaptay states that: “The United States-Turkish partnership since the end of World War II, what was termed as a strategic partnership was a working relationship; it was based on mutual interests in the sense that the United States as a superpower took care of Turkey’s global interests, whether protecting Turkey against communism during the cold war or promoting Turkey’s EU accession in the 1990s, and supporting the idea of a Baku-Ceyhan pipeline in the Iggos and, in return, Turkey provided America with support in its neighborhood, from the Balkans to the Caucasuses and Middle East, both during the cold war and since then.” Cagaptay 2003.} This is not to say that Turkey’s security relations with the US and Western Europe were never in doubt or rocky. For example, it took until 1952 for Turkey to be fully admitted to NATO, and that only after Turkey’s President Bayar made it clear that Turkey should not be taken for granted in case a global bipolar conflict should erupt.\footnote{See Ahmad, 2004, pp. 31-34.} The 1964 “Johnson Letter” in which US President Johnson linked the US security guarantee to Turkish policies regarding Cyprus (and in 1974 an arms embargo by the US) also caused the Turkish people and government to question their reliance on the US during the Cold War.\footnote{See Ahmad, 2004 and Lesser 2004.} But these exceptions aside, serious questions about Turkey’s relationship with the US were not unfounded in the wake of the 1964 “Johnson Letter.”
commitment to the US or NATO during the Cold War were generally settled by all involved reaffirming their security and military commitments to each other.\textsuperscript{107} Thus, membership in NATO and the nuclear security umbrella provided by the US were viewed as critical to the defense of the Turkish state.\textsuperscript{108}

However, with the collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War in the 1990s the Turkish security calculus inevitably changed.\textsuperscript{109} While many issues remained between the two governments, Russia no longer figured in Turkish security policy as an existential threat to the Turkish state. In 2003, Turkey and Russia no longer shared a mutual border, the Russian military was much less threatening in capability and posture, and both powers appeared to be moving towards security cooperation and crisis management. The remaining outstanding issues in their bilateral relationship are related more to a

\textsuperscript{107} Cagaptay and others repeatedly note that US-Turkish relations during the Cold War were largely a matter of military-to-military relations. For example, Cagaptay states that “For many decades military relations formed the bedrock of the US-Turkish alliance. While economic and cultural links between American and Turkey hovered at a minimum...military relations flourished. Such rapport was not limited to ever-important defense cooperation. Rather, a strong human element lay at the core of the US-Turkish military partnership, with American and Turkish officers working as colleagues, studying at the same academies, and participating in joint military operations.” Cagaptay, 2003. It should be noted that Turkey sought membership in NATO because it felt threatened by the USSR, not because of US demands (although the US-Turkish-NATO relationship became mutually reinforcing as all involved realized the strategic importance of Turkey to NATO’s defense posture). Bulent Aliriza, 2007, Interview. In the next chapter I go into more detail regarding Turkey’s efforts to join NATO in the 1950s.

\textsuperscript{108} Note that the feeling was clearly reciprocal for the US re: Turkey: “During the Cold War, Turkey played a critical role in the containment of Soviet power. There was agreement between the United States and West Germany, in particular, on the central importance of Turkey in Western strategy. A similar recognition of the Turkish role generated support and assistance for Turkey on Capitol Hill. As a result, although there were episodic problems in US-Turkish relations, for much of the Cold War, Turkey was a major recipient of US economic and military assistance.” From Khalilzad et al, 2000 p. x.

\textsuperscript{109} Murat Yetkin claims that “the elephant in the living room of US Turkish relations is that the strategic relationship had really expired some time ago and that Turkish – US relations should have been redefined as soon as the USSR collapsed and they weren’t because of the 1st Gulf War.” Murat Yetkin, 2007, interview.
competition over economic resources and local influence in the Caucasus region rather than antagonism and strategic threat.\textsuperscript{110}

Thus, the fundamental reason for the close US-Turkish alliance seems to have changed with the collapse of the USSR. With little chance of a global superpower conflict, it became clear that the US and Turkish relationship had been based almost entirely on mutual security issues, rather than on overarching economic, cultural, or other factors.\textsuperscript{111} Others note that operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm in 1991 lent an air of institutional inertia to the US-Turkish relationship, and that the alliance might have

\textsuperscript{110} Sezer in 2001 characterized the Turkish-relationship with Russia as one of “virtual rapprochement...which refers to a state of bilateral relations in which public manifestations of state-level adversity and hostility have nearly completely disappeared; the importance of cooperation in a range of fields for furthering respective national interests in mutually perceived and publicly articulated; governments desist from using inflammatory rhetoric so as not to arouse public hostility; and officials keep the lines of communication open to safeguard relations against the impact of sudden crisis. On the other hand, a hard kernel of mutual fear, mistrust, and suspicion remains in the minds of the decision makers and elites.” Sezer, 2001, p. 154. Sezer goes on to list outstanding controversies and disagreements between Turkey and Russia including: “Mutual recriminations of support for ethnic separatism, with Russia charging Turkey with assisting Chechnya and Turkey accusing Russia of aiding Kurdish separatism and PKK terrorism; The competition over Caspian Sea oil pipelines, with Russia pressing for the bak-Novorossisk pipeline and Turkey for the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline; The Turkish sense of encirclement by Russian military bases in Georgia and Armenia; The implicit tension in their respective approaches to conflict resolution and peacekeeping in southern Eurasia...; Russian apprehensions over perceived Turkish naval superiority in the Black Sea at a time when the former Soviet Black Sea fleet is much weakened; Turkish discomfort with the Russian view of Iran as a counterweight to Turkey in the south Caucasus and Central Asia; The destabilizing nature, from the Turkish perspective, of Russian arms exports policies in the region, in particular the sale of S-300 air defense missiles to the Greek Cypriot government in Nicosia. Russian assistance to Iran’s nuclear program is also most troubling to Ankara; Russian objections to Turkish policy since 1994 to regulate the traffic of vessels in the Turkish Straits for environmental and safety reasons in view of the prospect of greatly increased tanker traffic carrying Caspian Sea oil to world markets.” Sezer, 2001, p. 155-156.

\textsuperscript{111} Baran notes that the US-Turkish relationship was “a partnership that was constructed within a Cold War framework and that continued into the undefined period immediately following the collapse of the Soviet Union. In the mid-1990s, many people began to question whether the partnership would retain its strategic significance in light of an expected decline in NATO’s importance. Though Turkey reassured its place on the United States strategic agenda with the advent of plans for the East-West Energy corridor, throughout the 1990s the Turkish side continued to note with displeasure that bilateral relations remained too closely tied to military cooperation, with not enough emphasis placed on economic cooperation that would deepen the partnership.” Baran 2005.
diminished in intensity earlier if that conflict had not occurred. Clearly, the disintegration of the Soviet Union led to other issues assuming relatively greater importance in the relationship than they had before and these other issues would not necessarily help strengthen the US-Turkish relationship.

112 In one sense, whereas Turkey and the US cooperated closely during the Cold War to contain the Soviet Union, this containment policy continued after 1991, but with a different target (Saddam). Therefore, while many other nations reevaluated their strategic relationships with the US after the fall of the Soviet Union, Turkey did not. Aliriza states that “it has become more apparent that the disappearance of the common Soviet foe had effectively removed the Cold War foundation of the strategic alliance between the two countries. Ironically, Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait and the immediate Turkish response under President Turgay Ozal had then helped carry the relationship into the post Cold War era. Incirlik was made available to US aircraft during the Gulf War in 1991 and for humanitarian assistance to beleaguered Iraqi Kurds as part of Operation Provide Comfort. During the following decade, the US was allowed to use Incirlik through Operation Northern Watch in the enforcement of the no fly zone in northern Iraq. Consequently, Ankara was able to provide Washington [with] a functioning cooperative arrangement, which encouraged the United States to argue that the alliance was intact and to seek to embellish it with additional cooperation in the Balkans, the Caucasus, Caspian Sea energy, and even Afghanistan.” Aliriza, 2003.

113 Ambassador Parris notes that the disintegration of the Soviet Union led to “a debate in both the US and Turkey as to whether each country would be as important to the other in the future as during the forty years when Turkey anchored NATO’s southern flank. In the absence of a Soviet threat, problematic issues relating to human rights, Cyprus and the Caucasus became more prominent on Washington’s agenda (particularly in Congress), America’s traditionally strong military relationship to Turkey was called into question, economic and military assistance programs were reduced and eventually zeroed out, and even case purchases of arms and equipment became subject to Congressional holds. Turks, still absorbing security and economic aftershocks of the first Gulf War, and smarting from the failure of America and Gulf Arab Coalition partners to make good on promises of post-conflict assistance, were disillusioned with their senior NATO ally…[nonetheless] the US and Turkey found more common ground than many in either country had anticipated.” Parris, 2003, p. 1. It should be noted that despite the absence of a mutual Russian threat, the relationship with Turkey remained important to the US primarily because of Turkeys’ geographic location and historical-cultural role in the region, both of which enabled them to act in ways that assisted and empowered US policies. From a security perspective, US interests in the region centered around the need since 1991 to enforce the ‘no-fly’ zone in northern Iraq from Incirlik airbase in Turkey. Turkey on the other hand had a keen interest in maintaining trade with Iraq while suppressing PKK terrorist enclaves there. These interests led to a de facto quid pro quo in which the US allowed Turkish forces to make incursions into northern Iraq and establish permanent contingents there, while maintaining an open border for trade. The result “by the late nineties was a stable modus vivendi in which the basic requirements of America, the Turks, and even the Iraqi Kurds were being met.” Parris, 2003, p. 2. Also, Turkish desires to end anti-Muslim violence in the former Yugoslavia and their active participation in US led peacekeeping efforts there and in other locations, as well as other policy congruence, reinforced the view in the US that Turkey was a stable ally and “security producing nation.” Parris, 2003, p. 2. Other observers note that: “With the end of the Cold War the geopolitical environment and strategic priorities changed. For much of the past decade it has been unclear what Turks, Americans, and Europeans, as one, have been for and against.” From Khalilzad et al, 2000.
If Russia was not viewed as a long-term existential threat, are there other threats that might motivate the Turkish government to seek out a long-term strategic alliance with the US? Of course, Turkey did have security concerns unrelated to the USSR during the Cold War, primarily Kurdish separatists and long-standing concerns over territorial integrity. After the end of the Cold War these issues assumed comparatively greater attention in Turkish foreign and domestic policymaking. Nevertheless, the underlying principles behind Turkey’s policies vis-à-vis these issues have remained largely unchanged. These principles include an overarching emphasis on national integrity and security, a western orientation, and a non-irredentist foreign policy.114

Is Iran a possible long-term existential threat to Turkey that would draw it closer to the US?115 When the US was constructing the Coalition of the Willing in 2003, the relationship between Iran and Turkey, albeit problematic, did not entail an existential threat to the Turkish state that Turkey could not, by itself, cope with.116 Turkey and Iran have economic and political interests that both ‘converge’ and ‘diverge’. For example,

114 In a typical example, Soysal claims that the “basic principles and tenets of Turkish diplomacy…seem to have resisted the changes, fluctuations, and temptations of more than three-quarters of a century.” To him, these principles are: a primordial emphasis on national defense and security due to the geostrategic location Turkey occupies and long-standing great power interest in the region; a Western, as opposed to Eastern, orientation; a non-irredentist policy vis-à-vis its neighbors; continuous vigilance towards ensuring relations with Russia do not become hostile; and insistence on the protection of Turkish treaty rights and vital interests in the eastern Mediterranean. Soysal also claims that bilateral talks are the preferred method of diplomacy for Turkey and that despite the temptations of irredentism that ‘rational realism’ is a cornerstone of Turkish foreign policy. Soysal, 2004.

115 It is also logical to ask also whether Iraq was regarded as a long-term threat by Turkey. Before the Gulf War of 1991, it seems clear that Turkey thought of the Iraqi military as some degree of threat. Even then, however, the Turkish military was generally regarded as more powerful than the Iraqi military, not only in terms of capability but also in terms of leadership, morale, and response options. Given the greatly reduced state of the Iraqi military after the post-Gulf War sanctions, it seems unlikely that the Turkish leadership felt much threat from Iraq.

116 Murat Yetkin makes this point, noting that Turkey didn’t want to be seen by the US as a ‘balancer’ to Iran. Murat Yetkin 2007, Interview.
they share an economic interest in cross border trade, especially in oil and gas. They also share a political interest in preventing Kurdish nationalist forces from mobilizing. Their economic interests diverge primarily due to competition over oil and gas transit from the Caucasus region. Their political divisions are, however, the most notable. Turkey and Iran present very different and competing models of development in the Middle East. Turkey has been an avowedly secular and pro-western government with a status quo foreign policy ever since the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. Iran has presented a revolutionary, and revolution-exporting foreign policy coupled with an avowedly anti-US theocratic government since 1979. These ideological and strategic differences have occasionally led to diplomatic flare-ups between the two states, but both governments have been careful to avoid escalation due to a shared geopolitical interest in avoiding the rise of an autonomous Kurdistan in the region, close economic links, and a generally pragmatic approach to their bilateral relations. Overall, Turkish relations with Iran have not been characterized by perceptions of Iran as an existential threat, but more of an economic and political rival that must be accommodated or occasionally confronted.

117 As noted by Martin, 2004, p. 38 (footnote 36): “Turkey’s trade with Iran in 2001 was approximately $1.2 billion of which approximately $360 million was exports to Iran. Most of the $840 million imports from Iran were oil and gas.”
119 See Ahmad, 2004, for a historical background on Turkish foreign policy.
120 It should be noted that, in fact, the differences between the two states go back further than the 1979 revolution in Iran to the rivalry between the Ottoman Empire and Persia since at least the Safavid Dynasty in 1486. See Aras, 2004, Chapter 4.
121 See Martin, 2004. Historically, the two nations have been able to head off serious crises in their bilateral relations, even in the face of domestic and international pressures, and have typically chosen pragmatic responses to ideological conflicts. See also Robins, 1991, pp. 53-58.
122 See again Robins, 1991, pp. 53-58. The alleged pursuit of WMDs by Iran does not seem to have altered this calculus by Turkey, although prior to the formation of the CotW, Iran’s nuclear enrichment program was much less newsworthy. It is certainly feasible that if Iran did acquire nuclear weapons in the future that the security perceptions of Turkey vis-à-vis Iran could change dramatically – in which case a US or NATO nuclear security umbrella would be a reasonable goal for the Turkish government to seek. Finally, it is
Given the greatly reduced threat of Russia and the longstanding pragmatic relationship with Iran, the Turkish government naturally placed less value on the long-term strategic and security relationship with the US in 2003 than it did during the Cold War.\textsuperscript{123} Interviews with experts and former government officials in both Turkey and the US confirm this outlook.\textsuperscript{124} Overall, by the time negotiations began regarding a potential US invasion of Iraq in 2003, the US-Turkey relationship was “a relationship that had for decades been one-dimensional and based on NATO security commitments [but had now] become multifaceted and dynamic.” \textsuperscript{125} By 2003 the fundamental geopolitical security foundation of the relationship had shifted – no longer were Turkish and US strategic policies necessarily in concert for geostrategic reasons. Instead, while both powers

\begin{flushleft}
worth noting that religious differences between the secular Turkish state and theocratic Iranian state would likely be reduced by the ascension of the AKP party in Turkey, which is arguably Islamist in outlook. Martin makes this point, noting that The “ideological rivalry [between Iran and Turkey] softened somewhat after the Turkish election in 2002 that brought the Islamist AKP party to power. The AKP was the successor to the Welfare Party, which was ousted by the Turkish military in 1997 in part because of its movement toward a closer relationship with Iran.” Martin, 2004, p. 172-173.

\textsuperscript{123} Bulent Aliriza notes that: “the US Turkish relationship is not one borne of geographic proximity, economic or cultural similarities, etc…it was, pure and simply, only strategic. Now that the strategic rationale is gone, what binds them together?” Aliriza, 2007, interview.

\textsuperscript{124} When interviewed on this point explicitly in 2007, former Turkish Ambassadors Seyfi Tashan, Resat Azum and Oktay Aksoy were clear in their opinion that since the end of the Cold War Turkey has more, not less, leverage in its relations with the US since Turkey is no longer reliant upon the US nuclear umbrella vis-à-vis Russia. Other observers have made the same point. For example, Bulent Aliriza noted that “Turks opposed US [re the CotW] because since the end of the Cold War in years prior, there was no reason for the Turks to set aside their own national interests for others.” Aliriza, 2007, interview. Although Turkey has gained greater freedom of action in relation to the US and its other allies it is now also forced to navigate the more loose constraints of alliance structures and adjust to a new unipolar order. Eralp notes that “During the Cold War years, for the Turkish governing elites, the West had largely meant Western Europe and the United States, undifferentiated as the Western Alliance. At the end of the Cold War, Turkish elites belatedly realized that the West was no longer an undifferentiated entity: cooperation with the United States no longer ensured an easy relationship with Western Europe. Turkey’s relationship with the United States was running smoothly, while relations with Western Europe, and primarily with the EU, were becoming increasingly conflictual.” Eralp 2004, p. 66. It is also telling that, in his account of Turkey’s negotiations with the US over the invasion of Iraq in 2003, Winrow doesn’t once mention Russia. Winrow 2006. This omission is replicated by many other accounts of those interactions. Ambassador Mark Parris notes that during the Cold War the Turks were ‘told’ what to do, and not necessarily consulted. Turkey was largely a follower of the US and NATO, and that is hard to find an example of dissonancy between Turkey and the US during the Cold War. Parris, 2007, interview.

\textsuperscript{125} Parris 2003, p. 2
\end{flushleft}
interests were more congruent than divergent, those congruencies were based more upon shared norms and political practicalities rather than being hostage to the demands of a possible global superpower conflict.

In addition to these shifts in strategic perceptions, recent elections made it clear that Turkish politics was undergoing a shakeup in the period leading up to the invasion of Iraq. Previous elections in April 1999 had resulted in a coalition government of three very different parties: the center-left Demokratik Sol Parti (DSP, or “Democratic Left Party” in English) the conservative nationalist Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (MHP, or “Nationalist Action Party” in English) and the center-right pro-business Anavatan Partisi (or “Motherland Party”). DSP led the coalition government under Bulent Ecevit, with 22 percent of the vote, while MHP had 18 percent and the Motherland party 13 percent. In February 2001 the Turkish financial markets had crashed, due in part to intra-governmental strife, and in 2001 alone the Turkish GDP had fallen nearly 9 percent. In 2002, with help from the IMF, the economy had begun to recover, but the Ecevit government had lost almost all public support. The DSP party fell apart, and general elections were called by the head of the MHP for November.

The elections of November 2002 resulted in a resounding win by a new party in Turkish politics, the Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AKP, or “Justice and Development Party” in English, and sometimes abbreviated JKP). Turkish voters, weary of economic mismanagement, coalition politics, and corruption, gave the AKP a landslide victory, meaning that Turkey had a single-party majority government for the first time since
The AKP was led by Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, a former mayor of Istanbul and high ranking member of the former Welfare Party. The Welfare party had been dismantled by the Army in 1997 and its head, Necmettin Erbakan, was forced to step down. Erbakan had been Turkey’s first avowedly Islamist Prime Minister, but the AKP campaign focused less on the party’s Islamic roots and more on economic, democratic, and governmental reform. Ironically, Erdoğan was not allowed to become Prime Minister because he had been barred from politics in 1998 when he was ‘convicted of stirring up hatred and enmity with regard to…religion.’ Changes in the law and a successful by-election campaign allowed Erdoğan to assume the Prime Ministerial

---

126 Aliriza: “The general elections of November 2002, which can rightly be characterized as a political earthquake, crushed the three political parties which had gone into the polls in coalition government, along with the main opposition party. None of these parties which had dominated Turkish politics for decades were able to gain parliamentary representation. The JDP [AKP], which had been established only in August 2001, swept into office as Turkey’s first single party government in over a decade on the back of a massive backlash against the chronic mismanagement of the economy, cronyism and corruption by gaining nearly two-thirds of the seats in the assembly.” Aliriza, 2003; Ergin: “The victory of the AKP party means political stability after a decade of ongoing instability stemming from the struggles of the coalition governments and widespread corruption charges.” Cagaptay: “The AKP was…successful in coalescing many different groups around a common goal of establishing an alternative to Turkey’s outgoing parties…” Congressman Bereuter: “…it appears the AKP leadership remains loyal to the vision of Ataturk that Turkey must retain a secular, moderate, democratic and tolerant, political orientation.” Bereuter, 2003. Aliriza: “The most important component of the JDP strategy in government is the pursuit of the linked goals of Turkish accession to the European Union (EU) and political reforms in accordance with the EU’s Copenhagen criteria.” Aliriza, 2003. Ergin: “The AKP in its platform today and in its discourse drastically deviates from that formerly espoused by the Welfare Party. It is trying to move to the center…the performance of the new government on many fronts suggests a transformation which would have been inconceivable in the 1980s for an Islamist political party in Turkey…they have pursued a steadfast agenda to expedite Turkey’s accession to the European Union. They have delivered two landmark democratization packages to comply with the EU political criteria, including a major amendment curbing the powers of the National Security Council…however…ongoing debate in Turkey still focus [es] on the sincerity of the changes which the AKP is going through…it would be fair to say that the party is still in a stage of transformation and represents a reinterpretation of the evolution of political Islam in Turkey.” Ergin, 2003. Cagaptay: “there are two takes on why the AKP is pursuing these [democratization and EU] reforms so vigorously. One is that the AKP sincerely sees this as a process that is in Turkey’s interests to reform and put the country on a new track and the other take is that AKP sees this whole process as a means to an end, as a means to circumvent or restructure the powers of the Turkish military, the traditional guardian of Turkey’s secularist democracy. And this, I think, if that is in fact the issues, AKP has done this very successfully because…there is tremendous momentum in Turkey toward the EU reforms.” Cagaptay, 2003.

127 As per Article 312 of the then Turkish Penal Code. See Hale, 2007, pp.82-122.
position only much later on 9 March, 2003 (prior to this his lieutenant Abdullah Gül was Prime Minister). Erdoğan was thus distrusted by the Turkish military and many other elements of the Turkish government who hewed closely to a secular line and were concerned about his Islamist roots.

Turkish motivations vis-à-vis a contribution to the US-led CotW were governed by two dynamics: first, because Turkey no longer faced an existential threat that it, by itself, could not deal with, its value of the long-term security relationship with the US was much less than it in prior years and perhaps even minimal. Second, a new and institutionally beleaguered party had just taken firm control of the Turkish executive branch. Without the support of the rest of the government, especially the military, the AKP party was weak in its dealings with the US – however it was quite popular publicly, and thus responsive to public opinion (which was largely opposed to any potential US action in Iraq).

Thus, the Turkish leadership at this time was not only less motivated by a strategic concern to preserve the security relationship with the US, they were also in a precarious political position back home – leading them, as I show below, to be cautious in regards to US demands. For these reasons, the willingness of Turkey to contribute to the coalition (IV2) would be low. At the same time, the US relied heavily on Turkish contributions (IV1 = high). Therefore, this case lies squarely in Quadrant 2 (“Enlisting Help”) of my model. My theory would therefore predict the following:

- That Turkey would have much greater bargaining leverage than the US (DV1)
- If negotiations were successful, I predict that Turkey would contribute to the coalition, but that the US would bear the costs for doing so (DV2).
If negotiations were successful, I predict that Turkey would provide a non-risky contribution (such as basing or land access, or overflight rights) (DV3)

If negotiations were not successful, then Turkey would not contribute to the coalition in part because the US believed their contribution could be obtained elsewhere (DV4)

If my theory is correct, these dynamics would be manifest in the negotiations and other interactions between the US and Turkey.

Analysis:

Negotiations between Turkey and the US took place formally and informally over a period of months.129 Lower-level military-to-military staff planning began much earlier than formal negotiations did, in the summer of 2002.130 This lower level planning was based on the assumption by the US and Turkish militaries that Turkey would support US actions in Iraq should they occur.131 These efforts were characterized by an emphasis on the ‘nuts and bolts’ of military cooperation – drawing up agreements for logistics contracts, addressing interoperability and tactical issues, and planning upgrades of...
Turkish roads, basing, and other infrastructure in anticipation of the need to house tens of thousands of additional US troops.\textsuperscript{132}

Higher level contacts between the US and Turkish governments regarding action in Iraq began as early as December 2001 when Colin Powell visited Ankara and was asked about proposals to invade Iraq.\textsuperscript{133} Then-Turkish president Ecevit was ambivalent and non-committal to any role in Iraq, in part because he was facing an impending tough election challenge.\textsuperscript{134} Despite the lack of commitment US military planners continued to assume that Turkey would support an invasion.\textsuperscript{135}

These early high-level interactions between the Turkish and US governments were not negotiations in the typical sense of the word, but more conversations in which the Bush administration ‘felt out’ the Turkish leadership’s position and attempted to ‘socialize’ them to accept the likelihood of action against Iraq. In mid-2002 negotiations began more formally, when Paul Wolfowitz made it clear that the US was determined to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The US military has had a large presence in Turkey since during the Cold War. Based around Incirlik air base, there are typically around 5000 US military personnel based there. However, the anticipated additional US troops (65,000 number, as well as over two hundred aircraft) and the logistical demands of the OPLAN would have required a much improved infrastructure and greater capability to move supplies through Turkey into northern Iraq.
\item Hale, 2007, p. 95
\item Hale, 2007, p. 98.
\item It is key to realize that during the Cold War and Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm and Northern Watch, the US and Turkish militaries worked very closely and constantly together. Furthermore, the Turkish military had a nearly unequalled amount of leverage and influence over Turkish politics, due to Kemalist doctrine, a history of popularly supported involvement in domestic politics, and an unwavering Western orientation. For these reasons, the US military had always operated with the belief that if the Turkish military supported a given course of action that meant that the Turkish government was de facto in support of it. However, many observers have noted that the relationship between the Turkish military and the Turkish government in 2003 was ‘different’ than it had been previously. The Turkish military was much less inclined in 2003 to intervene in Turkish politics, due in part to concerns over EU reactions, a stronger belief in professional civil-military relations and a professionalized military. This point was made in interviews with Gen Ralston (see Ralston, 2007) as well as former senior Turkish officials.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
intervene in Iraq.\textsuperscript{136} Turkish reticence to commit was related to two Turkish “red lines” – opposition to Kurdish independence and Kurdish control of Kirkuk, both of which they feared might come about if the US invaded Iraq.\textsuperscript{137} By August 2002, US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld told the Turkish foreign ministry that the US intended to put 75-80,000 troops into northern Iraq via Turkey and that roads, ports, airfields, and railways in Turkey would need to be improved months before to support them.\textsuperscript{138} The US plans ‘shocked’ the Turkish side not only because of their scale, but also the demanding manner in which they were made.\textsuperscript{139} Furthermore, the presence of such a large number of foreign troops on Turkish soil was an affront to Turkish notions of sovereignty.\textsuperscript{140}

For their part, the Turks insisted that any action be dependent on UN support. They also proposed that in the event of joint action that Turkish forces join US forces in Northern Iraq, in order to set up refugee camps in the border regions between the two countries. They also desired a Turkish military presence in the area to exercise some

\textsuperscript{136} See Hale, 2007, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{137} Gen. Ralston (present at this meeting in 2002) states that the primary concern of the Turkish leadership was the state of post-conflict Iraq, and that no acceptable answer could be given by the US side at that time. Ralston, 2007, interview. See also Hale, 2007. A former senior Turkish ministry official states that there were four ‘red lines’ in Iraq: The territorial integrity of Iraq as a whole, avoiding empowering the PKK in Iraq, Making sure the Kirkuk oil revenue was shared by all Iraqis (not just Kurds), and the protection of the Turcoman population in Iraq. Interview, 2007.
\textsuperscript{138} Hale recounts that: “At the end of September, General Charles Wald, deputy commander of US forces in Europe, filled in the details, confirming that if the plan went ahead 80,000 troops would be deployed via Turkey together with 250 aircraft, which would have the use not just of Incirlik, but also of eleven other air bases in Turkey.” Hale, 2007, p. 99
\textsuperscript{139} Former Turkish Ambassadors Seyfi Tashan, Resat Azum and Oktay Aksoy. They also make the case that there was a sense of betrayal inherent in Turkish attitudes towards the US ever since the first Gulf War in 1991, where the PKK was allowed to set up enclaves in Northern Iraq and the Turks were arm-twisted into supporting Operation Northern Watch – which helped protect the PKK enclaves. 2007, interview. Bulent Aliriza makes the point that: “Unipolarity has destroyed the basis for the US-Turkish relationship. During the Cold War, Turkey needed the US and vice versa, but now that there is no threat Turkey has no reason to get involved in wars such as OIF. Unipolarity gave Turkey the freedom to push ahead on its own interests.” Aliriza, 2007, interview.
\textsuperscript{140} Interview, Nihat Ali Ozcan, 2007. Many scholars of Turkish history and foreign relations also make this point.
influence on any nascent Kurdish nationalist motions and provide security. In October 2002, US military commanders Tommy Franks and Joe Ralston visited Ankara to discuss Turkish involvement with Turkish General Ozkok (the Chief of the Turkish General Staff). At that meeting Ozkok stated that the Turkish military could not promise anything on its own, since authorization for war would need to come from the Turkish parliament. The coming elections in Turkey meant that any decision had to be postponed.

Despite the political shakeup that the elections in November entailed, U.S. negotiators and defense planners maintained the presumption that Turkey under Erdoğan would support US action in Iraq. At the very least, US planners believed that the Turkish military would come to their support if the Erdoğan government balked. Perhaps based on that assumption, negotiations with Turkey were primarily conducted by Department of Defense officials, rather than high level Department of State officials. In December 2002 Wolfowitz returned to Ankara with detailed plans for the upgrading of Turkish infrastructure and the basing of US forces in eastern Turkey. Wolfowitz apparently

---

141 See Franks, 2004. Regarding Ozkok, Franks notes that Ozkok “was part of a new Turkish military that had relinquished its traditional role of political intervention through coups…these were new days in Turkey. If the country’s bid to join the European Union stood any chance of succeeding, he knew that the military must refrain from politics.” Franks, 2004, pp. 407-408. Taylor, 2007, p. 175. Ralston makes similar claims. Ralston, 2007, interview.

142 Hale, 2007, p. 100-101. Hale claims that at this time postponing the decision until after the election had a serious impact on US plans because “the perceived need to reach an agreement with Turkey meant that the planned date for the invasion, January 2003, had to be postponed until the second half of March.” Hale p. 101.

143 This is important because the Turkish military has, in the past, intervened in Turkish politics to replace elected governments when the national security of the country was perceived to be at risk. Given the Turkish General Staff’s self professed mission to protect the secular nature of the Turkish government, they were distrustful of the Islamist-origin Erdoğan government. Hence, US planners may have believed that, if push came to shove, the Turkish military would support the coalition against Erdoğan rather than allow the relationship with the US to be put at risk.

144 Douglas Feith states that Colin Powell didn’t visit Turkey in the 9 months prior to the war beginning, and that this was probably a mistake given Turkey’s importance. Feith interview, 2008.
believed that “Turkish support is assured.” In December Bush received Erdoğan at the White House (although Erdoğan was not yet the official Prime Minister). After this meeting, Erdoğan remained cautious about Turkish support to the US, although Bush apparently believed that Turkey would fully support the US.

Within the Turkish government, discussions and disagreements between Erdoğan and the Turkish general staff continued. The Turkish military itself remained ‘unenthusiastic’ about the US plan, but supported the idea of assisting the US in Iraq, partly because they believed that the US was going to invade Iraq whether or not Turkey supported them. This would also have allowed them to maintain a “security belt” in the border regions – which the US was opposed to but which would have benefited Turkey greatly by giving it a say in events in Kurdish Iraq. Erdoğan apparently was less inclined to believe that the US could launch such an attack without Turkish support. He also faced strong opposition from within his party. In February 2003:

---

145 Hale, 2007, p. 102. See also Taylor, 2007, p. 175-6. Winrow, 2006, p. 199. For their part, some Turkish observers felt that the US was ‘pushy’ or ‘arrogant’ in their demands of Turkey. For example, references to horse-trading had a negative connotation within the Turkish press. See interviews with former Turkish Ambassadors Seyfi Tashan, Resat Azum and Oktay Aksoy.
146 Aside from this, a continuing refrain by Turkish observers is that the US failed to send high enough officials to Turkey early on in the negotiating process. Murat Yetkin, 2007, interview.
147 Hale, 2007, p. 103.
148 There are also reports that the Turkish General Staff was not ‘lobbied’ effectively by US staff officers, in part because most of the US military officers who were involved in staff level negotiations were from US Central Command which was unfamiliar with Turkey and their Turkish counterparts. Historically, US military officials from US European Command dealt with and were stationed in Turkey. Murat Yetkin, 2007, interview. Also Nihat Ali Ozcan, 2007, interview.
149 This would not only have provided Turkish forces the ability to deal with any Kurdish incursions into Turkey, but also perhaps the opportunity to launch offensives against PKK strongholds in Iraq.
150 Winrow, 2006, p. 201. Murat Yetkin attributed this in part to statements by Donald Rumsfeld in which he seemed to claim that Turkey was absolutely necessary to the war and that if Turkey didn’t participate then there would be many ‘problems’. Murat Yetkin, 2007, interview.
151 Hale, 2007. p. 104
“AKP leaders as well as the generals had come around to the view that, like it or not, Turkey would do best to play its part in the US plan. Their difficulty was that they could not be sure that they could persuade their own party to support it in parliament. On 5 February Tayyip Erdoğan told the AKP’s parliamentary group that Turkey could not afford to stay out of the expected military operation if it were to have any influence over subsequent events….on the following day the government laid a resolution before parliament authorizing…US military personnel to upgrade Turkish ports, air bases and transport links…without definitely committing Turkey to support the expected US attack on Iraq.”

Thus, on February 6th, the Turkish government, for the first time, formally voted on whether or not to support the US. The results of the vote indicate the palpable concern of the Turks: the resolution passed, but only by 318 of the 517 deputies present in the parliament, with 193 opposing and 16 abstentions. Nonetheless, the Erdoğan government felt it had little choice but to go along with the US demands.

Negotiations continued after this point, but there remained serious areas of disagreement. The Turkish negotiators now demanded financial compensation in the face of expected economic losses should a war occur. In mid-February Turkish negotiators met with Colin Powell and others (including senior US Treasury officials) in

---

152 Hale, 2007, p. 106.
154 A former senior Turkish ministry official states that because the Turkish government was divided and ambivalent about supporting the US, this lead them to adopt a very tough bargaining position (almost ‘stubborn’). Unfortunately, this had the unintended consequence of giving the US negotiators an impression that Turkish negotiators were more reliable, serious, and empowered than they actually were. Ambassador Mark Parris characterizes these negotiations as “tough” but eventually successful. The formal negotiations between the US and Turkey took over two months but finally reached an agreement on economic and military cooperation. Under this agreement, Turkey would have supported the invasion and have a presence in Northern Iraq. Parris, 2007, interview.
155 In Desert Shield/Desert Storm, the Turkish economy had been severely impacted by the war in Iraq, and it was widely believed that the US had never followed through on promised aid at that time to avert such losses. See also Taylor, 2007, p. 175. Winrow, 2006, p. 200. This point was also made by many others such as former Turkish Ambassadors Seyfi Tashan, Resat Azum and Oktay Aksoy 2007 interview; Also Ralston, 2007, interview; Hale, 2007. See also Sedat Ergin series in Hurriyet.
Washington, DC with their demands: they asked for $92 billion in aid from the US.\textsuperscript{156} Negotiations continued for some time, and eventually the US raised its initial offers to $6 billion in grants and $10 billion in loans.\textsuperscript{157} The delays this ‘horse-trading’\textsuperscript{158} entailed meant that, despite the fact that nearly 35,000 US troops were enroute to Turkey already, February 25\textsuperscript{th} was the earliest the Turkish parliament could vote on whether to support the final aspects of the US plan.\textsuperscript{159}

As the resolution was presented to Parliament on 25 February Erdoğan stated that he would not invoke the ‘party-line’ vote rule, wherein party members must vote as their party whips decide. This meant that each MP could vote as they wished, with the result that the Erdoğan government could not convince enough MPs to support the plan.\textsuperscript{160} A vote was delayed until March 1, in the hopes that the Turkish military’s support of the US plan could be counted on to convince reluctant deputies.\textsuperscript{161} However, when the National Security Council met on February 28\textsuperscript{th} it failed to produce any strong recommendation that Erdoğan could use to convince his recalcitrant MPs.\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{156} See Taylor, 2007, 190-192.
\textsuperscript{157} See Taylor, 2007, p. 178-187. It is indicative of Turkish bargaining leverage that the US was forced to raise it’s initial offers. Keegan notes that “In the circumstances [given that the US had planned on and largely relied on Turkish cooperation] it was understandable that the American government should be willing to pay for Ankara’s co-operation.” See Keegan, 2004, p. 138.
\textsuperscript{158} There are conflicting accounts about who first used the phrase ‘horse-trading’ when discussing Turkey’s possible involvement in the war, but it was bandied about in the press by both sides, and there is little disagreement on the Turkish side that such a phrase was insulting to Turkish pride and damaged public opinion regarding the US demands. See Ozel, 2007 Interview. See also Ergin series in \textit{Hurriyet}.
\textsuperscript{159} Hale 2007, p. 106-7. Another area of disagreement was the opposition of Iraqi Kurds to any Turkish involvement in the area. For more on that, see Hale 2007, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{160} Cagaptay blames this lack of activism on Erdogan’s part for the result: “what happened on March 1…the process was left in the hands of bureaucracies. As sophisticated as they are, in the hands of bureaucracies, not taken over by political leadership which would have guided the public opinion in a more favorable way and spin it, if you will, when needed.” Cagaptay, 2005.
\textsuperscript{162} Observers have attributed to General Ozkok the view the military did not desire to be seen as meddling in domestic politics or influencing the parliament, especially in regards to a plan that was very unpopular.
Nonetheless, the vote went forward on March 1, apparently with the hope that a majority could still be obtained. In fact, 264 MPs supported the motion, while 250 opposed. However, there were 19 abstentions and 13 absentees. Under Turkish parliamentary rules, a majority of the deputies present are required to carry a vote – so the motion failed by only three votes.
US reaction was immediate, disappointed, and surprised – especially on the part of Defense Department officials who now had to modify the OPLAN to account for the lack of a northern front.\textsuperscript{166}

Results (dependent variables):

Ralston, 2007 interview. Lesser notes that there are three proximate reasons people claim the vote failed: the AKP party could have known it was to fail, the party could have lost control of the parliamentary dynamics due to bad management, or the party was truly surprised. But in the end, Lesser notes that as a newly robust democracy, the Turkish parliamentary system ‘worked’ in that Parliamentarians were asked to vote their conscience, and they did, and the vote failed. Less 2008, interview. Interviewed in 2008, Zeyno Baran makes similar points, while also noting that “no one in the Turkish government was willing to put more than minimum effort into the negotiations” and that the US ‘Turkish hands’ didn’t really understand the new dynamics in Turkey that required lobbying not only the military but also the Parliament. See also Hale 2007, p. 114. Taylor, 2007, 193-293. Winrow, 2006, p. 202. Parris also makes the point that part of the reason the negotiations failed was that the timelines of the two sides were quite different: the US was in more of a hurry due to the impending Iraqi summer weather. Parris, 2007, Interview. See also “Threats and Responses: Ankara; Turkish Deputies Refuse to Accept American Troops.” New York Times, March 2, 2003. And the 9-part series “Looks Like We Missed That Train” in Istanbul Hurriyet by Sedat Ergin. 17 Sept – 25 Sept. 2003. English translation provided at: FBIS document number FBIS-NEW-2003-0918. Ambassador Parriss notes that “There is a lingering sense that Turkey overplayed its hand in negotiations preceding the March 1\textsuperscript{st} vote...” Parris, 2003. Feith notes that the AKP party was unfamiliar with the long tradition of US-Turkish cooperation and had no experience running a government and they did not understand the intricacies of parliamentary procedure – which may have contributed to the failure of the motion. He notes that many people still believe that if the AKP government really wanted to pass the motion they could have, but there is no way at present to know for sure. Feith interview, 2008. Lesser notes the importance of two other issues: first, the requests by the US were a ‘bridge too far’ in any case and second, the US requested the support unilaterally rather than under a NATO umbrella, stating that the Turkish government and people would have perceived a NATO originated request in a much more favorable light. Lesser interview, 2008.

\textsuperscript{166} The operational adjustments that had to be made to accommodate this were significant. One analyst notes that “Turkey’s initial refusal to allow US forces to move through and fly through Turkish airspace constrained the ability of US planners to project conventional coalition forces into northern Iraq prior to the start of the war. With northward movement towards Baghdad from Kuwait as the sole overland axis of advance available to conventional coalition forces, planners developed a plan to infiltrate Special Forces into northern and western Iraq in their place...” Ramirez, 2004, p. 42. Aliriza notes that: “For over fifty years since the Truman Doctrine and Turkish entry into NATO, successive US administration had unfailing perceived Turkey as a strategically vital. Ally. Accordingly, Turkey received significant US military and economic assistance, along with diplomatic support and understanding for periodic lapses in its democratic system and human rights record. Consequently, the unwillingness of Turkey to allow the United States to send ground troops to attack Iraq or to use bombers based at Incirlik air base came as an unwelcome surprise, particularly as the United States had proceeded to modernize Turkish airports and ports in accordance with an earlier TGNA vote in February to pre-position military equipment. ‘The Big Disappointment,’ as Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz characterized the vote, was particularly galling to the Defense Department, Turkey’s most ardent defender in Washington.” Aliriza, 2003. As a postscript, on March 20, the Turkish government held and approved a second resolution that did allow the US and Britain the use of Turkish airspace (although not basing, and no Coalition troops were allowed in the country). This bill was, however, passed several hours after the invasion of Iraq had begun.
How accurate are my predictions regarding my dependent variables? My first prediction (DV1) was uncontroversial: that Turkey would have a greater degree of bargaining leverage in this situation based upon how much the US valued its coalition contribution. This prediction has largely been born out because it is clear that the Turkish government was behaving as if they had a great deal of bargaining leverage over the US. Erdoğan and others in the Turkish government appear to have believed that the US could not prosecute a war in Iraq without Turkey’s support. Their demands for over $90

\[167\] Bulent Aliriza is just one of many, some noted above, who observes that “In retrospect it is clear that the March 1 vote reflected the public opposition to the imminent conflict, the perceptible ambivalence of the powerful military establishment and its’ reluctance to provide an unambiguous recommendation – in particular at the National Security Council (NSC) meeting one day before the vote – and the attitude of President Ahmet Necdet Sezer. It also reflected the inability of the governing Justice and Development party (JDP, [AKP]) to overcome its deep misgivings about the war to give a sufficiently clear lead...However, despite the apparent consensus on the part of the unusual coalition of influential Turkish politicians, bureaucrats, soldiers, and commentators that the denial of Turkish territory would constitute a major handicap to American war plans and might even force the Bush administration to refrain from war, the United States proceeded to quickly defeat and overthrow Saddam Hussein’s regime.” Aliriza 2003. He also quotes Ambassador Marc Grossman as saying the “US mistake was to let the Turks believe that somehow they were so important to this operation that we could not do it alone, ultimately.” Aliriza, 2003. Baran notes that “Baran: “The legacy of the diplomatic train wreck of 2003 is well-known by now. The American side took Turkish support of the war against Iraq for granted, and did not send a cabinet secretary to obtain their assistance. American officials chose instead to listen only to those who promised a yes vote from the Turkish parliament, and ignored the warning signs of impending rejection. A majority of Turks simply did not want to be associated with a war next door, especially when neither the Americans nor their own government could make a solid case for the war itself—and when neither side could articulate a coherent vision for an Iraq without Saddam Hussein. While Turks were aware that Hussein was a criminal who had committed horrible acts, they recognized that a military campaign in Iraq was fraught with uncertainty. Turkish policymakers greatly feared the opening of a Pandora's box in Iraq, a country that was riven by deep-seated ethnic and religious rivalries, and which contained in its autonomous northern region the seed that could one day grow into an independent Kurdistan—a possibility that has been an anathema for Turkey….With a new and inexperienced government in office that clashed with the traditional Turkish establishment, Turks were too disorganized to spell out their real opposition to the war. They instead chose to go through the motions of negotiations, with the result of the pre-war period taken up by bureaucratic quibbles on both sides. Instead of strategic discussions, months of tactical squabbles took place. Throughout this process, Turkish decision-makers made one critical miscalculation: that in the end, if they did not allow the US to open a northern front against Iraq, they would be able to stop the war...”” Baran, 2005.
billion dollars and a troop presence in and a say in the future of Northern Iraq all indicate that they believed they had more bargaining leverage than the US.\textsuperscript{168}

Although the Turkish government did reject the motion to support the US, it is crucial to note also that the motion failed by only three votes. Clearly, this was a close call.\textsuperscript{169} Therefore, it is legitimate to counterfactually postulate what would have happened if any three parliamentarians had decided instead to vote yes instead of no. In other words, it is certainly reasonable to postulate what would have happened had three of the 282 possible votes switched.\textsuperscript{170} What would the values of DV2 and DV3 have been if any three MPs had changed their minds?\textsuperscript{171}

If the motion had been carried by the Turkish parliament then Turkish armed forces would have been sent to Iraq and up to 62,000 US military personnel, 255 aircraft and 65 helicopters would have been allowed in Turkey for up to six months. This means that Turkey would have had a military presence in Iraq, and perhaps even Kurdish Iraq, and hence some degree of influence over events there (i.e.: it would have been in Turkey’s benefit, but not necessarily the US’, which opposed a Turkish presence in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{168} It is indicative of Turkish bargaining leverage that, despite strongly opposing a Turkish military presence in Iraq, the US agreed to that Turkish demand.
\textsuperscript{169} Barkey makes essentially the same point: “…about the March 1, 2003 decision of the Turkish Parliament as a pre-ordained decision. I think it was a monumental miscalculation on the part of the parliamentary whips. I mean, you know sometimes whips don't know how to count or maybe they are not as good as they are here, but the fact of the matter is everybody went into that parliamentary meeting that morning assuming and convinced that the decision was going to be a positive one. It was a fluke and in fact, the vote was technically positive and the news reports immediately said it had been approved. Later on, the people realized that the people who voted, who abstained from voting, were counted as negatives. So I don't think that we should look at that decision necessarily as a categorical attempt by the government to say no. It was an accident and accidents happen…this was a mistake. It was not a pre-ordained decision…” Barkey, 2005.
\textsuperscript{170} In the vote, 250 MPs opposed, 19 abstained and 13 were absent. Any three of these votes switched to ‘yes’ would have changed the outcome.
\textsuperscript{171} This is a trivial alteration of the historical record to assess the counterfactual impact. See Tetlock and Belkin, 1996 for guidelines on reasonable criteria for historical counterfactual analysis.
\end{flushright}
Kurdish occupied areas in Iraq. Furthermore, Turkey would presumably have received the $16 billion in loans and grants offered by the US.

My prediction regarding alliance tightness (DV2) is based upon the observation that a minor state that values a long-term relationship with the coalition leader will demonstrate its reliability as an ally, probably in order to tighten that relationship to increase their security interdependence. Conversely, based upon the asymmetric security valuation dynamic, the more value a coalition leader places on the minor states’ coalition contribution, the more willing it will be to accede to the minor states’ demands and the more costs it will bear to get what it wants. Thus, in this case, Turkey would have contributed to the coalition, but at a high cost to the US. Given the amount of money that the US was willing to pay for Turkey’s contribution, it seems then that my prediction would have been a near-perfect fit had the Turkish parliament passed the motion to support the US.

What about the type of contribution expected from Turkey (DV3)? My third hypothesis holds that Turkey’s contributions would be less risky, such as basing or land access, or overflight rights. In this case, the motion in front of the Turkish parliament included two different sets of resource offers. First, it allowed basing, access, and overflight rights for US forces. This was what the US negotiators desired, and they would have gotten it had the parliament approved the measure. But the Turkish government also included contributions of their own troops in the motion. In that case, however, they did

---

172 Aliriza notes that:” If the TGNA vote had gone the other way, Turkey would have established a sizeable and deterrent military presence in a buffer zone in northern Iraq as part of the military, political, and economic agreements laboriously negotiated with the United States” Aliriza, 2003. I.e., from a rational actor point of view, Turkey would have been better off.
that not because the US wanted it, but rather for their own aims. Indeed, the US negotiators actually strongly opposed Turkish troop involvement in the war, due to the risks inherent in letting Turkish troops into Kurdish populated areas in Iraq. If the Turkish government had succeeded in getting its own troops into Iraq, much less northern Iraq, they would have benefited the Turkish state greatly at the likely expense of the US desire for more stability.\textsuperscript{173} It seems, therefore, that my prediction about DV3 is accurate.

DV4 is more problematic. As applied here my fourth hypothesis states that unsuccessful negotiations between the US and Turkey will exhibit some evidence of perceived strategic substitutability. Namely, the two powers would fail to reach an agreement that obtains Turkey’s contribution in part because the US believes their contribution can be obtained elsewhere. However, although no other state could substitute for Turkey in the 1003V war plan, US planners were still able to carry out the war against Iraq.\textsuperscript{174} Nonetheless, the fact remains that US planners had assumed that Turkey was going to support the war, and had 35,000 troops and related equipment en-route to Turkey when they Turkish parliament voted against the US on March 1 2003. Given that the US could, and did, successfully prosecute its war without Turkish support

\textsuperscript{173} Turkish troops in Iraq would have not only allowed the Turks some degree of influence over the situation there but also, had they been in Northern (Kurdish) Iraq, they could have potentially taken action (or had the latent ability to do so) against PKK forces in the area – a long term strategic security concern of Turkey.

\textsuperscript{174} One enduring puzzle in this episode is why the US did not punish Turkey in some way for its refusal to support it. Although beyond the scope of this study, the answer seems to rely upon security interdependence as well: even after the prosecution of the Iraq war, the US still needed Turkey more than Turkey needed the US. As a moderate and democratic Islamic nation, Turkey was often touted as a ‘model’ for Iraq and other Muslim nations. It is unlikely the Bush regime was willing to endanger their relations with Turkey when much of their post-war rhetoric was advocating the Turkish model. Turkey, on the other hand, had little reliance on the US anymore, diplomatically, politically, or economically. Prior efforts to enlist US support for EU membership had come to naught, US investment in Turkey was a fraction of what European investment was, and the threat from Russia was greatly diminished during this time.
lends credence to the prediction that the US did not perceive Turkish support to be irretrievable, but, rather, that it would enable the plan to be enacted more efficiently.175

**Germany**

**Background (Independent Variables):**

When the US sought the support of Turkey for the CotW, it was clearly focused on the material support it needed for its war plans. Their political support was a precondition for their material support, so from the US perspective they were one and the same. However, in the German case, the US appears to have valued their political support and material support differently. As one of the most powerful and influential European nations, Germany had the potential to greatly hinder or help the US make the case for war, especially to other members of the UN and NATO. This is especially important because UN debates were the main forum the Bush administration used to make its case publicly, and UN Security Council (UNSC) resolutions were the primary justification the

---

175 In any case, Turkey clearly did not contribute to the US because they believed they were replaceable (Erdogan in fact believed that if Turkey withheld its support that would amount to a veto over US war plans). Neither did they exhibit any indication that they saw a need for the US or another power as a long term security partner to protect them. It should be noted that Cagaptay does hold a slightly different account: “It is possible to say…that Turkey’s reluctance over the past winter to fully support the idea of a northern front in the Iraq campaign was at least in part a product of Ankara’s desire to align itself with European foreign policy. It may come as a surprise that this resonates even with Turkey’s AKP government, since many analysts regard the AKP as a party with an Islamist pedigree, so the pro-European bias brings questions to a lot of people’s minds. I would...suggest that AKP has not been a consistent supporter of America’s Iraq policy. Back in the winter, for example, when the Turkish Parliament was debating the idea of American troop deployment in Turkey, while some people in the AKP leadership were trying to muster support for that initiative, there were others in the leadership who were opposing it and a few of them even cited Muslim solidarity as the basis of their objection [to] an American campaign against Iraq. This was, of course, not the only reason why Turkey did not fully cooperate with the United States in the Iraq war. The perception that America’s campaign would in the end create a Kurdish state in northern Iraq I would say was one of the biggest concerns.” Cagaptay, 2003.
US used to legitimize the war.\textsuperscript{176} Therefore, early on in the diplomatic process, Bush and high-ranking members of his cabinet attempted to enlist German support. These attempts failed and were abandoned early on. Nonetheless, the political influence of Germany was clear and since Sept 2001 it was assumed that Germany would support the US politically against Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and also against terrorism more generally.

However, the US was comparatively less interested in German material support. There was little if anything that the US needed materially from Germany except for the ability to move a relatively small number of its own troops out of (and through) there. In fact, in keeping with Rumsfeld’s concept that “the mission determines the coalition,” there was a concern that German contributions could be ‘contributions for contributions sake’. In a key meeting on September 30\textsuperscript{th}, 2001, between National Security Advisor Rice, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, and CIA Director Tenet, Rice noted, with regard to US operations in Afghanistan, that:

“..allies…were clamoring to participate. Getting as many of them invested with military forces in the war was essential. The coalition had to have teeth. She did not want to leave them all dressed up with no place to go. ‘The Aussies, the French, the Canadians, the Germans want to help’…But Rumsfeld didn’t want other forces included for cosmetic purposes. Some German battalion or French frigate could get in the way of his operation. The coalition had to fit the conflict and not the other way around… [CIA Director] Tenet turned to Germany…” the best thing they can do is get their act together on their own internal terrorist problems…”\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{176} Gordon noted in 2002 that “More important than military assets would be the legitimacy that European backing would confer on the operation, which would prove most important if unexpected challenges were to arise, as they most certainly will.” Gordon, 2002, p. 19.

In other words, the US valued the potential political support of Germany highly, but the material support much lower. Therefore, in my model the value of IV1 is ‘high’ for political support, but for material support it is ‘low’.

Germany at this time had a much more benign strategic security situation than at any time in recent memory, meaning that it valued the long-term security relationship with the US much less than it had previously. The Cold War had ended over a decade ago and NATO had expanded eastward into many former Warsaw Pact nations. Germany’s traditional concern over a Russian threat had diminished greatly. Furthermore, the intrinsic capabilities and strategic posture of Russia in 2002 were the least threatening than they had been since World War II, while Germany was united and an economic powerhouse. The end of the Cold War thus altered the fundamental relationship of the US and Germany. No longer were they drawn together against the common existential threat of the Soviet Union. Germany no longer perceived a long-term alliance with the US as a necessary and sacrosanct pillar of their security. Furthermore, as I show below, the German public was quite skeptical of a US military action in Iraq, and a looming election in Germany caused the Schroder government to embrace such attitudes. For these

178 Many observers have made this point. See Gordon and Shapiro 2004, Chapters 1-3. Szabo states that the divergence in relations between the US and Germany after 9/11 were “manifestations of a deeper structural change that had begun with German unification and accelerated after September 11th. The strategic glue that held the alliance together is much weaker than it was during the cold war. Germany, and Berlin, are no longer divided. The US security tie is no longer existential to Germany.” Szabo, 2004, p. 77. Joffe phrases it this way: “Alliances die when they win: this truth is more enduring than this particular flare-up. No German chancellor would ever have dared to refuse a call from Washington, as Mr. Schroder did, while Moscow’s armies were still poised at the gates of Hamburg and West Berlin. Nor would any German chancellor have deliberately pushed the button of anti-Americanism and pacifism for electoral gain. That it was done in 2002 has structural rather than ideological or personal reasons. Germany no longer needs American strategic protection…” Joffe 2002.
reasons, Germany was generally unwilling to pay for a contribution to the coalition (IV2 = ‘low’).

Given the above, the German case lies in two different quadrants. In relation to the material support for the conflict, the German case lies in quadrant 3 (“Disinterest”). This is because the US didn’t overly value the material contribution of Germany. However, the US did value greatly the potential political support that Germany could give. Therefore, vis-à-vis political support the German case lies in quadrant 2 (“Enlisting Help”). For these reasons, in the German case I have two sets of predictions:

- **For the material aspect of this case, my model predicts that neither the US nor Germany would be willing to pay high costs to each other to secure a positive outcome (DV1).** Furthermore, if negotiations are successful Germany would contribute to the coalition, but there would be no significant exchange to attain that contribution (DV2), and that such contributions would be basing or land access, overflight rights, or other non-risky and costless contributions (DV3).

- **For the political aspect of this case, my model predicts that Germany would have a high amount of bargaining leverage vis-à-vis the US and that, if negotiations are unsuccessful, then Germany would not provide political support to the US because the US believes their contribution can be obtained elsewhere.**

**Analysis:**

Interactions between the US and Germany took place in two different arenas corresponding to the different goals of US policy vis-à-vis Germany at this time. President Bush and his cabinet members personally tried early on to gain the political support of Germany in the UN and NATO for potential action against Iraq. For material support, US efforts were much more low-key, and were primarily performed at the staff level in order to allow the US unhindered use of bases in Germany. These efforts by Bush
and his cabinet to gain German political support were abandoned very early on due in part to miscommunications, personality conflicts and election year politics in Germany. The efforts to gain base and overflight access, on the other hand, were successful. I will address these two sets of interactions in turn.

Discussions between the US and Germany regarding German political support for US action in Iraq may have begun as early as September 2001, soon after 9/11. At that time, US Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz meet with German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer at the Pentagon. Wolfowitz reportedly at this time mentioned that after the Taliban regime had been defeated, Saddam Hussein would be next.179 Soon after, on October 9th, German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and President Bush held a joint press conference in New York at which Bush stated that “there is no more steadfast friend in this coalition than Germany.”180

While the German public was sympathetic and supportive of US concerns after the events of 9/11,181 they were in general skeptical of an overly military response. Nonetheless, in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, Schröder risked his government to support the US in Afghanistan in a vote of confidence in November.182 He won this vote,

181 Gordon and Shapiro note that “Only 17 months prior to the Iraq war, when the United States used force in Afghanistan, France and Germany strongly supported the action, which was backed by 73 and 65 percent of their respective populations.” Gordon and Shapiro, 2004, p. 79.
182 Wahler describes this event as: “When the US became serious about Afghanistan and requested help from the Schröder government, sympathies still ran high enough to pass a resolution in parliament sending troops and equipment to assist in the war. However, as media coverage of the conflict went on and showed the collateral damage inflicted, internal party criticism grew to such levels that Schröder saw a vote of no confidence gamble as the only remaining chance to discipline the parties. On 16 November 2001 he remained chancellor by a very thin margin and had learned a lesson about the limits of what the parties would bear.” Wahler, 2004, p. 242 (referencing Schöllgen and Busse).
but only barely, which put him and his domestic political coalition in a precarious position.\footnote{Schroder held a vote of confidence on Nov 16th 2001 over the issue of German support to the US’ Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. His government carried the vote only by a slim margin, and later deployed over 2,500 ground troops to Afghanistan to support the coalition there after ground combat had ended (US actions in Afghanistan were almost entirely unilateral, and only after combat did non-US forces play a significant role). See Szabo, 2004, p. 17.} But while Schroder was willing to have Germany become involved, he held that Germany should be more assertive than it had during the Cold War, especially given its economic and political influence.\footnote{Szabo notes that “On the plane returning to Berlin from Washington, Schroder told his aides that Germany could not play the same nonassertive and limited military role that it had during the cold war. Now and in the future it had to make a military contribution. This was consistent with a fundamental belief that he had brought with him to the chancellorship – that Germany’s foreign role should match its economic power and its growing geopolitical importance. This new self assurance has been a leitmotiv of Schroder’s time in office. Germany was ready to take on more international responsibilities and expected in return to be taken more seriously by major international players.” See Szabo 2004, p. 19.} Therefore in early 2002 he told Bush that German support would require a UN mandate and a well reasoned case for war to support US military action in Iraq.\footnote{On January 31, 2002, Bush presented his State of the Union address to the US Congress in which he declared that Iran, Iraq, and North Korea were an ‘axis of evil’. In February 2001, a few days after this speech, Schroder met with President Bush and was told that there was no war plan for Iraq. Schroder responded with four issues of concern: “First, the alliance against terrorism should not be undermined. Second, there must be proof of an active link between al Qaeda and Iraq. Third, there needed to be an exist strategy. Fourth, there must be a UN mandate.” Szabo 2004, p. 18-19. Also reacting to the speech, German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer declared that alliance members are partners not ‘satellites’. See Gordon and Shapiro 2004, p. 67. The next month Schroder made the point again that Germany would participate in any military action only with a UN mandate. See Hogreber, Gerhard Schroder, pp. 211-12. Quoted in Szabo, 2004, p. 19.}

Some observers contend that Schroder failed to make it clear enough to Bush at this and other meetings in 2002 that this was his way of saying no to an intervention in Iraq.\footnote{Hofmann, “Der lange Weg zum launten Nein.” Quoted in Szabo, 2004, p. 19.} If true, he was therefore misunderstood by Bush, who took Schroders’ position to be that Germany would support a war so long as it was quick and collateral damage was low.\footnote{Gordon and Shapiro describe the interactions in this way: “According to senior administration officials, Schroder had told Bush after a long and friendly dinner in January 2002 that he ‘understood’ that Bush
“The American view of both this meeting and the February meeting in Washington was that the chancellor had explicitly told the president that he would support a war as long as it was quick and civilian casualties were kept to a minimum. Their sense of what Schroder said was: ‘if you lead I will not get in your way, but be decisive, move quickly, and win.’ One American present at the discussions stated that Schroder said that he did not have a problem with an engagement in Iraq as long as it did not interfere with the election. Bush assured him that nothing would happen before the election…the president had a clear sense that Schroder was with him…The German version of the meeting is less clear. Almost two years later when Schroder was asked about the May meeting…he said, ‘we did not enter into any commitments. We had talks. We met and talked.’…Schroder left the meeting with the feeling that not much had changed from his previous meeting with Bush…and that Bush would keep him posted.”188

After this meeting, a number of developments soured relations between Bush and Schroder. The election campaign in Germany was in full swing and Schroder was in a precarious position, and was trailing the opposition party by large margins.189 Public opinion strongly disapproved of any support to a war in Iraq, and this provided Schroder with an issue to unite his party and enhance his political fortune.190 As 2002 went on and Bush continued to try to make his case for an intervention in Iraq, Schroder became more and more critical of Bush and a potential war in his addresses to domestic audiences. Despite cautionary warnings from his national security advisors, Schroder was focused

---

190 Steven Erlanger noted in an interview with Stephen Szabo that Schroder “did not expect to win the election and admitted that his biggest problem was with his own party…to do this he pushed the peace button and it worked.” Szabo, 2004, p. 22.
on winning the election and criticizing the Bush administrations’ recklessness and adventurism. In speeches in August, Schroder stated unequivocally that there would be no German military contribution to an invasion of Iraq.\footnote{Gordon and Shapiro, 2004, p. 98; Szabo 2004, p. 22-24.}

Just as Schroder was escalating his anti-Bush rhetoric for electoral gain, Bush administration officials were ratcheting up their arguments for an intervention in Iraq. On August 26\textsuperscript{th}, Vice President Cheney gave a speech in Nashville, Tennessee that left observers with the strong impression that a preventive war was coming, with or without a UN mandate.\footnote{See “Vice President Speaks at VFW 103rd National Convention - Remarks by the Vice President to the Veterans of Foreign Wars 103rd National Convention” White House, Office of the Press Secretary, August 26, 2002. Available at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/08/20020826.html.} This speech, with its strong unilateralist bent, allowed Schroder to further play to domestic anti-war audiences and finally gave Schroder’s party a lead in Germany polls.\footnote{SPD officials commented that after Cheney’s speech that “We have a great campaigner for us sitting in the White House.” “Ich oder der,” Der Speigel No 38 (2002), P. 70. Quoted in Szabo 2004, p. 28. See also Gordon and Shapiro, 2004, p. 100.} Nonetheless, officials in the Bush administration still held out hope that Schroder’s position and rhetoric were campaign induced, and that substantive differences between the two regimes could still be worked out. However, near the end of the German election campaign in September 2002, Schroder’s Minister of Justice made an ill-timed remark at a campaign event in which she compared Bush to Hitler. A letter quickly sent by Schroder as an apology was ineffectual and the Minister’s remarks were widely seen as the last straw that ‘poisoned’ US – German relations and personally betrayed Bush.\footnote{According to Szabo a White House staffer stated that “Bush felt personally betrayed. Her [the Minister of Justice] comments did not come out of the blue. Schroder created the general atmosphere, which encouraged these sorts of comments…Schroder was riding the Iraq issue. His letter to the President was...} Schroder went on to win the election by only 6,000 votes, but the
relationship between Bush and Schroder was irreparably damaged. Furthermore, these events greatly weakened the argument for an intervention in Iraq, just as Bush was preparing to give a seminal speech on the subject at the UN on Sept 12th.

US diplomatic efforts at this time revolved around attempts to garner UN Security Council support for a resolution against Iraq. On November 8th, 2002, the UNSC approved Resolution 1441 which warned Iraq that it faced “serious consequences” for violating its obligations. But the US struggled with other UNSC members, primarily France, over the wording for this resolution. The US wanted a resolution that would authorize military action if Saddam “was found to be lying or cheating in regard to his WMD capabilities or if he failed to allow the UN inspectors free rein in looking for weapons,” while France, Russia, and China wanted to leave the consequences if Iraq did not comply to a second resolution. In the end Resolution 1441 was ambiguous. Germany, at this time, had a non-permanent seat at the UNSC – this meant that although

195 Szabo: “One clear result of the German election campaign of 2002 was that the personal relationship between the reelected chancellor and the US president was irreparably damaged. The damage was deeper in Washington than in Berlin, largely because of George W. Bush’s highly personalized approach to foreign policy. Bush believed that Schroder was a man of his word after he risked a vote of no confidence in November 2001 [to support the US in Afghanistan], but when Schroder turned against Bush in the summer of 2002, the president lost all confidence in Schroders’ trustworthiness. But the estrangement was also part of the foreign policy style of the Bush administration…The White House was also worried about domestic opposition to war in Iraq and feared that a concerted antiwar effort by the Europeans would undermine support at home. With congressional elections only a little over a month away, polls indicated that a majority of the US public at the time would support a war only if the United States had the support of its allies…the president’s speech to the UN on September 12th, which had become the focal point in the struggle within the administration and among its allies over Iraq policy, was designed in part to respond to such concerns.” Szabo, 2004, p. 32.
196 For the details of the negotiations between the US, France, and others on the wording of Resolution 1441, see Gordon and Shapiro 2004, pp. 108-114.
198 Szabo, 2004, p. 36. See also Gordon and Shapiro 2004, p. 113-114.
they could not veto any resolutions, they did have a great amount of influence. Schroder’s desire to avoid the appearance of backtracking on his election promises led him to support the French in Security Council meetings. At a press conference at the UN on January 20th, the French Foreign Minister Dominique De Villepin implied that France would use its veto power in the UNSC to block any authorization of a war and soon thereafter Germany publicly made their support of France’s antiwar position clear. The positions on both sides hardened, and US troop movements to the area increased. A bloc of eight European nations led by the UK and Spain released a letter on January 30th supporting Bush, followed soon thereafter by ten Baltic and eastern European states releasing a similar letter. France, Germany, Russia and others called for more time for UN inspectors to do their jobs. On February 10th France, Germany, and Belgium precipitated a crisis within NATO when they blocked it from providing support for Turkey in case it was attacked by Iraq, stating that such actions would imply NATO support for a war in Iraq. The Bush administration, having received political support from other nations aside from ‘old Europe’ now acted as if that was a sufficient substitute for the support of Germany and others in the UN. The US and UK began efforts to get

199 Gordon and Shapiro 2004 pp 120-125 discuss the January 20th meeting at length.
200 On January 22nd, Schroder and Chirac presented their common position in Paris. The same day, Donald Rumsfeld declared that he thought of Germany and France as ‘old Europe’. See Gordon and Shapiro, 2004, p. 125-128.
201 For a good discussion of the concern US troop movements engendered in Europe, see Gordon and Shapiro, 2004, pp. 118-120.
204 “…faced by a sharp trans-Atlantic rift that has split NATO, many officials here [in Washington DC] are wondering why the Bush administration has not tried harder to preserve [NATO]…in several comments,
a second resolution passed in the Security Council, but abandoned them when on March 10th French President Chirac declared he would veto any second resolution. On the eve of the war, Schroder remained steadfast in his support of continued UN efforts to disarm Iraq under Resolution 1441.

The efforts to gain the political support of Germany were not only highly public and futile but resulted in embarrassing diplomatic setbacks for the US, and a wellspring of anti-French and anti-German feeling in the US. Gordon and Shapiro summarize these dynamics as:

including one referring to France and Germany as ‘old Europe’ and another comparing Germany to Libya and Cuba, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has suggested that these countries now matter much less to America’s plans. Indeed it has been striking that the German-American rift has not been regarded as critical or important enough to resolve for several months now….Mr. Bush’s advisers advertised that the president was hunting for support, with a telephone call to Angola, for a strong position against Iraq in the United Nations Security Council.” Patrick Tyler, “Threats and Responses: Old Friends; As Cold War Link Itself Grows Cold, Europe Seems to Lose Value for Bush.” New York Times, Feb 12, 2003. Daalder notes that “Now that it has the power go it largely alone in the military field, few in the current [Bush] administration believe there is much to gain from constraining the use of that power by subordinating the planning and execution of a military campaign to the dictates of alliance considerations.” Daalder, 2003, p. 155.


On March 18, 2003, Gerhard Schroder addressed Germany, stating that “The world finds itself on the eve of a war. My question was and remains: does the extent of the threat that emanates from the Iraqi dictator justify the use of war, which will bring death to thousands of innocent children, men, and women? My answer in this case was and remains: No! Iraq is today a country that is controlled extensively by the UN. What the Security Council demanded in terms of steps toward disarmament is being increasingly accomplished. That is why there is no reason to interrupt the process now. My government, together with our partners, has worked hard toward the eve-greater success of Hans Blix and his colleagues. We have always understood this as our contribution to peace. I am deeply moved by the knowledge that my position matches that of the overwhelming majority of our people and also that of the majority of the Security Council and the peoples of this world. I doubt whether peace will still have a chance in the next few hours. As desirable as it may be for the dictator to lose his power, the aim of Resolution 1441 is to disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction.” “Die Schroder Rede im Wortlaut,” Die Taggesschau, March 18 2003. Quoted in Szabo 2004, p. 43-44.

See, for example, US Representative Pitts statement on February 25, 2003 in which he says, among other things, that “It is time for Germany and France to decide where they stand. Are they on the side of tyrants, or are they on the side of freedom? There is no other choice.” US House of Representatives “Germany and France Must Decide Where they Stand” Feb 25th, 2003. There was also speculation that later the realignment of US forces outside of Germany was in part retribution for Germany’s opposition to the US vis-à-vis Iraq. See, for example, statements by US Senator Smith: “I believe it is high time that we consider the merits of a limited redeployment of some US forces either on a permanent or rotating basis.
Facing difficult legislative elections in September 2002, German Chancellor Gerhard Schroder reversed the Atlanticism he had pursued during his first three years in office...[he] chose to campaign shamelessly and relentlessly against the United States and a possible war in Iraq. Bush’s unwillingness to forgive Schroder for doing so then drove the German chancellor increasingly into the arms of the French, which helped Jacques Chirac maintain his own antiwar position.

Despite the ill will this crisis engendered between the US and Germany, this did not appear to greatly affect the operational cooperation between the two countries and from Germany to alternative locations in Eastern and Southern Europe...we no longer expect Soviet tanks to come rolling over the Fulda Gap. Why are US forces therefore still on a cold war footing?...In particular I think the administration should strongly consider redeploying NATO forces to Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria...” Note that Poland, Bulgaria, and Romania were all supporters of the US in Iraq. From “Deployment of troops in Europe” Senate Record, Feb 13th, 2003. See also “Allied Support for War Against Iraq” House of Representatives Record, March 11, 2003. All of these are available at http://thomas.loc.gov.

Gordon and Shapiro, 2004, p. 10. The role of personality in the interactions between Germany and the US should not be underestimated, and many see that as a proximate “1st image” reason for the failure of negotiations. The New York Times reported that Bush “simply did not trust [Schroder]” and so was not willing to repair relations later. See “A Partner in Shaping an Assertive Foreign Policy,” New York Times, Jan. 7 2004. See also “Traces of Terrors: Perspectives; German Leader’s Warning: War Plan is a Huge Mistake.” New York Times, Sept 5, 2002. Daalder notes that “In the wake of the Iraq debate, Bush’s rankings of allies starts with Blair’s Britain (the ‘center of his universe’), followed by Poland (‘the most gung-ho member of NATO’). Next is Spain (whose leader, Prime Minister Aznar, is a particular favourite of Bush), followed by Australia, Italy, and Russia. Germany and France have fallen to the bottom of the list because, according to a senior Bush aide, both ‘failed the Bush loyal test’.” Daalder, 2003, p. 159-160.

Szabo notes that: “Both Bush and Schroder bear responsibility misunderstanding that emerged over Iraq. They often were vague, brief, and colloquial in their conversations on this important international issue. The German leader thought that he was clear in his reservations about going to war in Iraq, but he raised his concerns as questions rather than as clear reservations or objections. Bush, not surprisingly, thought that this meant that Schroder was on board or would at least go along. Bush was equally vague, telling the chancellor on at least two occasions that he had not made a decision about invading Iraq and that he would consult Schroder before he did. In none of these instances was there a clear decision reached or articulated. No one said, ‘all right, this is what we have agreed to do, and this is how we will do it.’ Subordinates had no directions on how to follow up, and things just languished. Both Bush and Schroder were gifted domestic politicians with little interest in foreign policy. They tended to follow their tactical instincts in their relationship with each other, and that led to a series of unpremeditated events whose consequences escalated beyond their control.” Szabo 2004, p. 135-136. Szabo does note that although personality played a role, there were deeper, structural reasons for these outcomes: “…the relationship between Germany and the United States changed not only because of the personal failings of their leaders but also because of changes in the international power structure and in domestic politics and political culture. The weakening of the strategic relationship between the United States and Germany and the greater fluidity of the international political system, especially in Europe, gave freer rein to personality and to domestic politics. The crisis over Iraq simply could not have happened in the bipolar era of the cold war...[it]...could not have happened while the United States was engaged in a global competition with a peer power like the Soviet Union.” Szabo, 2004, p. 137.
Germany did lend a great deal of passive and less publicized (but no less critical) material support to the war effort. It did this under NATO procedures and US-German Status of Forces Agreements, without any apparent public or high level discussion between the two countries. Instead, staff-level military to military discussions had been taking place for some time and as US forces flowed from their bases in Germany to Kuwait in preparation for the invasion, German forces provided security and logistical support in accordance with NATO procedures. US forces were provided with full basing access and overflight rights but aside from some localized German protests, this was largely unpublicized. US forces were not dependent upon German assistance – they could

---

209 Szabo 2008 interview.
210 Szabo claims that there were no per se negotiations regarding German material support. The US posture is more akin to treating German military support as 'nice to have, but not necessary.' Szabo 2008 interview.
211 German politician and member of the European Parliament (and anti-war activist) Tobias Pflüger noted years later to the European Parliament that “The German Federal Government did not send its own soldiers to Iraq, but did everything else to enable the USA, Great Britain and their allies to carry out the war against Iraq…It was vital, that the war could be carried out undisturbed from the British and US military bases situated in Germany. Important in this respect were the, in the meantime now closed, Rhine-Main airbases in Frankfurt, Ramstein and Spangdahlem, Rhineland-Palatinate. The Federal Republic of Germany was logistically a central and pivotal point in the Iraq war. Planes headed for the Middle East and stocked with soldiers, weapons, ammunition, and other supplies took off day and night from the US Air force base Ramstein in Rhineland-Palatinate. Supplies and troops were however also transported over sea. The British army utilised the East Friesian harbour Emden to ship its units. The EUCOM in Stuttgart-Vaihingen played a central role for the logistics of the US forces. The major part of the reinforcements for the forces in the Gulf were transferred at the airbases Ramstein and Frankfurt/Rhine-Main, and heavy military equipment, such as tanks, was transported by ship towards the North Seas via the Rheinau harbour in Mannheim…The SPD-Green Government [Schroder’s government] carried out a dual strategy in relation to the Iraq war. On the one hand, the Government spoke out against the war, and yet on the other, made it possible by supporting it extensively. The US military found the concept for it: "non-coalition, but co-operating." See “German Support of the War Against Iraq” Address to European Parliament hearing, 14 March 2006. Available at http://tobiaspflueger.twoday.net/stories/1704897/ It has also been reported that Germany provided some intel sharing and perhaps put one of their chemical response units on standby in Kuwait in case of a chemical warfare event in the area. Szabo 2008 interview.
212 Szabo 2008, interview. Note also that German police provided security for US bases in light of these protests. The New York Times noted over a year into the war that “Despite its criticisms of the Iraq war, Germany imposed no restrictions on the use of American bases during that conflict. It continues to deploy thousands of German soldiers to protect those bases, freeing American troops for other uses. Berlin also contributes $1Billion a year to the bases’ support [as part of NATO]…The American military hospital at Ramstein air base, the largest outside the United States, provides specialized care for battlefield casualties
have flowed through other bases in the area – but the cooperation of the German military certainly made it more convenient and cost-effective for US efforts.\textsuperscript{213} And the US deployed far fewer forces from German soil in 2003 than it did over a decade earlier for the First Gulf War.\textsuperscript{214}

Results (dependent variables):

The above analysis indicates strongly that my model was accurate in its predictions in terms of both material and political support. For material support, the US and Germany did not exhibit asymmetric valuations of their security relationship, and there is little indication that either side paid any significant costs to obtain the passive support that Germany eventually provided (DV1). Furthermore, US – German interactions were largely determined by other factors. In this case, pre-existing institutions such as NATO were a de facto agreement over base sharing and access. Thus, institutional inertia determined the broad outlines of their behavior vis-à-vis German material support – indeed when Germany did contribute to the coalition there was no

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item General James Jones, Commander of US European Command, noted on April 10 2003 that Germany’s passive support was substantial. “USEUCOM enjoys a robust and secure transportation network in Germany that provides a tremendous power projection capability. There exists no better combination of rail, road, inland river, and air infrastructure system from which to deploy combat forces. This superb network leads to the largest and most mature seaports in the world. For Operation IRAQI FREEDOM, this mature infrastructure was instrumental, and used substantially, in the deployment of 32,000 soldiers and their equipment to Kuwait, Turkey, Israel, Hungary, Romania and many other countries. The deployments continue as we speak. Additionally, the German government provides large numbers of soldiers, police and border guard forces to help secure our installations, housing areas and communities. Given the multiplicity of deployment infrastructure and nodes, Germany provides a more rapid deployment infrastructure than many of our best platforms in CONUS and also has the advantage of being an "Ocean Closer." See “Defending Freedom, Fostering Cooperation, and Promoting Stability” Statement of General James Jones USMC to Senate Armed Services Committee April 10 2003.
\item In the first Gulf War, over 100,000 US and UK soldiers were deployed from Germany to the Gulf. For the CotW, only 32,000 were deployed. For further information on this aspect of the DS/DS coalition see the section on Germany in Chapter Seven, especially footnote 130.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
significant exchange made (DV2). Neither did Germany or the US publicize these contributions. The proximate reason for this is that politicians on both sides had no desire to draw attention to the inconsistencies in their highly public stances and their operational actions. Thus my model is accurate in that it correctly predicted that Germany would support the US quietly and with no significant exchange given the structural and domestic factors at play in German motivations. My model was also accurate in postulating that such contributions would be basing or land access, overflight rights, or other non-risky and costless contributions (DV3).

However, political support from Germany was more highly valued by the US than material support. Thus the interactions for that support exhibited very different dynamics – the US publicly praised and counted on German political support in the very beginning of their efforts in 2001. Nonetheless, Schrøder’s opposition to the US greatly damaged US efforts to build broad political support for the Coalition by emboldening France and others to stand up to the US in the UN. As a result, the US was forced to abandon its efforts to enlist German support early on. My model predicted that Germany would have a high amount of bargaining leverage vis-à-vis the US, which appears accurate given that Schröder made his calculations largely based on an estimation of domestic political costs, rather than concern for the future relationship with the US (DV1). My model also predicted that the US would not expend a great amount of resources trying to enlist German political support if it could obtain political cover from other nations. In fact, once it became clear that Germany was not willing to support the US, rather than continuing to try to expend resources or change his position in order to enlist Germany, Bush turned to
other European nations such as Poland to counter-balance German and French influence in the UN (DV4).

**Poland**

**Background (Independent Variables):**

Poland was one of the earliest states to fully commit to contributing significant personnel and materiel to the war effort. In fact, Poland’s contribution of 2,500 troops to the CotW was the third largest after the US and the UK. This contribution included some special operations forces, but their primary role was in postwar reconstruction efforts. US planners did not require the presence of Polish forces in order to successfully prosecute the initial warfighting goals of OPLAN 1003V. However the Bush administration proudly trumpeted the Poles’ contribution as an example of the broad appeal of the Coalition against Saddam in domestic debates in the US. In other words, for the construction of the CotW the Polish contribution was useful politically, but was not crucial in that manner, nor operationally or materially. Nonetheless, the US was not likely willing to pay for that contribution since other nations could have easily substituted for Polish political support.

---

215 The UK, Australia, Denmark, the Czech republic, Georgia, Ukraine, Spain, South Korea and Slovakia also contributed. See footnote 4, above. After the war began, Poland’s involvement in Iraq grew due to its focus on reconstruction efforts. See Kulesa, 2005.

216 See Zaborowski, 2004, pp. 7-8. He notes that “During televised debates President Bush referred to Poland’s role in Iraq as proof of his ability to maintain international coalitions.”

217 Polish support was important also for Bush as a signal that he could generate a coalition despite the opposition of key Western European powers such as France and Germany. As Patrick Tyler noted “In the place of Germany and France, Mr. Bush has reached out to countries like Poland and Spain...” Patrick Tyler, “Threats and Responses: Old Friends; as Cold War Link Itself Grows Cold, Europe Seems to Lose Value for Bush.” *The New York Times*, Feb 12, 2003.

218 This is not to imply that the US did not highly value the long term relationship with Poland. See Zaborowski 2004.
However, to the Poles, the relationship with the US when the CotW was being constructed was of critical strategic importance. It has often been observed that Polish governments since the 1990s have sought closer ties with the United States.\textsuperscript{219} Poland’s position relative to the powerful and historically dangerous Russian state make the Polish desire for an ‘offshore balancer’ obvious and a commonly promoted policy in the Polish government.\textsuperscript{220} Thus, not only do Poland and the US enjoy a close relationship due in part to cultural, ethnic, and historical reasons\textsuperscript{221} but “Poland’s security policies remain strongly concerned with, if not fixated on, the issue of territorial defense [vis-à-vis the former Soviet Union].”\textsuperscript{222} These motivations strongly manifested themselves in relation to

\textsuperscript{219} For example, see Zaborowski 2004 who notes that” Since the early 1990s Poland has emerged as one of the United States’ closest allies, arguably its’ protégé, in Central and Eastern Europe. After Washington became dedicated to pursuing the Eastern enlargement of NATO, America became the security guarantor that the Poles had craved since the late eighteenth century.” P. 5. The Polish National Security Strategy of 2003 states that: “NATO and our bilateral political-military cooperation with the USA and other major Member States [of NATO] constitute the most important guarantee of external security and stable development of our country. Our bilateral relations with the USA also represent an essential link of the transatlantic relationship. Active and close political and military relations with the USA, reinforced by cooperation in the armed intervention and stabilization operation in Iraq, make up a significant achievement of the Polish security policy.”

\textsuperscript{220} Former Polish Prime Minister Bielecki, notes that “First of all, let us admit clearly and honestly that Poland is not and will not be a self-sufficient country in international politics. We need a security umbrella now just as we have in the past. We all know what happened when the umbrella of previous agreements failed to shelter us in September of 1939…it is worth remembering the reaction of other countries in a similar situation. Prime Minister Rasumussne of Denmark clearly stated recently: ‘France and Germany are not in a position to guarantee our country’s security. The United States provides such a guarantee. But security isn’t a free ticket.’ In this regard the positions of Poland and Denmark are identical. [emphasis added]” Bielecki, 2003, p. 31. It is worth noting that Denmark is one of the few other countries that sent its own personnel and materiel to assist the US led Coalition in 2003. Zaborowski’s observations are also typical: “For Poland, the US presence in Europe provides reassurances against its powerful neighbours…there is a strong sense in Poland…that a close alliance with the United States is both beneficial for its security and at the same time enhancing for its position vis-à-vis other European partners.” Zaborowski, 2004, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{221} According to Zaborowski, Poland also has a strategic culture that has led them to not only have a firm ‘Atlanticist’ outlook, but also very congruent interests with the US. This strategic culture includes “a preference for a strong US-led Alliance, a commitment to reforms in the Ukraine and Belarus and in turn a further eastward enlargement of NATO, a lack of faith in multilateral security institutions save for NATO and a proclivity to use force proactively.” Zaborowski, 2004, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{222} Zaborowski, 2004, p. 9. See also Szczerski, 2003; Buzek, 2002, pp. 22-23. As one might expect, diplomatic niceties sometime require this topic to be broached in more abstract terms. For example,
the CotW and Poland’s role in it. Poland joined the US-led coalition to enhance its’
long-term security relationship with the US:

“Poland was not targeted by terrorist networks and had traditionally good
relations with Arab countries, including Iraq. If anything, the decision to
join the US-led coalition only increased Poland’s vulnerability to
international terrorism…nor was the government’s decision driven
principally by the weapons of mass destruction issue…Finally…Poland
never had geopolitical or major economic interests in the area…On the
whole…there was no justification for Poland’s involvement in terms of
responding to a direct threat. Also, expectations of material and political
profit were initially rare…instead, the arguments that dominated the Polish
debate have been predominantly historical and moral in nature. There is,
for example, no doubt that the most important rationale driving Polish
policy on the matter was a demonstration of Poland’s loyalty and ability
to be ‘America’s Model Ally.’ Due to its past geopolitical vulnerability,
Poland has been keen to develop a relationship of reciprocal obligations
with the United States whereby both countries would support each other in
time of need. Seen in this context, Poland’s support for the United States
during the Iraqi crisis appears, in fact, aimed at developing a sense of
obligation and responsibility for Poland’s security in America.”[emphasis
added]

Kuzniar notes that “A crisis, which could involve the use of force is, however, possible in certain countries
neighboring Poland to the East.” See Kuzniar, 2002.

223 They also manifest themselves vis-à-vis NATO and Poland’s accession to it. Gvosdev noted that:
NATO is no longer America’s primary security partner, but one of many options…and that “This is a
critical development that the new members of NATO will need to comprehend. NATO is no longer
understood by Washington as a ‘pact’ directed against the threat of aggression from the east, but a security
‘toolbox’ – and the tools which make themselves most useful are the ones that will receive the lion’s share
of attention from the United States…the standing of both old and new members within the alliance will
depend on the extent that they can provide capabilities – military, technical, or diplomatic – that can
enhance US efforts in various parts of the world.” Gvosdev, 2003 p. 179.

224 Zaborowski, 2004, pp. 11-12. Zaborowski goes on to note that Poland joined the CotW also because it
“sees the continuing presence of the United States in Europe as a guarantor of it’s own security…[and]
would be prepared to go to great lengths to discourage the United States from withdrawing from Europe.
Hence, like the United Kingdom, Poland believed that its involvement in Iraq would achieve this.” He also
notes a concern over human rights abuses in Iraq, and the desire of Poland to show solidarity with the US
this way: “ Take the case of Italy and Spain…take the case of Turkey which is being led into war by
virtue…of its frontline status…take the case of Greece…take the case of Poland, another frontline state that
unable to overcome its unease of Russia and grateful for its membership in NATO. What do all these
countries have in common? Real security concerns which only the alliance (and the USA) can address if
push comes to shove. Where there is a more credible security alternative in place, the resistance to the
USA’s ultimatum would only have been more resolute to the point that it might never have occurred, given
Europe’s ability to stand steadfast to the view that Saddam does not present an imminent threat.”
Polish concerns regarding Germany are less problematic than those with Russia. This is due in part to the Polish accession to both NATO and the EU, and the normalization of relations between Poland and Germany after the end of the Cold War.\textsuperscript{225}

Because Poland’s contribution to the US’s war plans was minimal my model predicts that the US would not be willing to pay to obtain such contributions (IV1). However, because Poland was highly motivated to enhance the long-term security relationship with the US, they would be willing to pay for a coalition contribution as a demonstration of their reliability as an ally (IV2). Therefore this case lies squarely in Quadrant 4 (“Currying Favor”) of my model. My theory would therefore predict the following:

\textsuperscript{225} Polish accession to these organizations has institutionalized much of German and Polish relations and lessened what conflicts or threat perceptions might have otherwise occurred. Furthermore, relations between the two countries have changed greatly since the end of the Cold War. See, for example, “Consequences of the Treaty Between the Republic of Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany on Good Neighborliness, Friendship, and Cooperation of June 17, 1991.” See also Buzek, 2002 and Scheffel 2003. See, for example, “Consequences of the Treaty Between the Republic of Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany on Good Neighborliness, Friendship, and Cooperation of June 17, 1991.” An evaluation Prepared at the Polish Institute of International Affairs upon the Initiative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs June 2001. Wlodzimierz Borodziej, editor. See also Buzek, 2002, p. 22. Scheffel noted in 2003 that: comparing the state of relations between Germany and Poland since German reunification will “clearly show that the quality of German-Polish cooperation over the last twelve years has been utterly transformed. The level of co-operation between the two countries that has already been achieved is, in fact, impressive…” he goes on to note that there remain potentially explosive issues between the two countries, and lists them as: “the problem of reparations for Polish victims of forced labour; the expulsion of German people from the eastern territories of the former Third Reich along with the associated problem of reparations; the German desire for the return of lost cultural artifacts; the problem of free-sailing on Pomorska bay; and German-Polish border crossings.” None of these issues seem to rise to the level of strategic or security threats. Scheffel, 2003, p. 187.
• That Poland would have much less bargaining leverage than the US based upon the fact that the Poland needed the US (and valued contributing to the coalition) much more than the US needed Poland (DV1)
• If negotiations were successful, I predict that Poland would contribute to the coalition and that it would attempt to demonstrate its commitment to the US and at its own expense (DV2).
• Poland would provide its own men, materiel, or money to the coalition (DV3).

If my theory is correct, these dynamics would be apparent in the negotiations and other interactions between the US and Poland.

Analysis:

Rather than being concerned with questions of if Poland would support the US, the Polish media, public, and leadership seemed more concerned with questions of how much they could support the US. Soon after 9/11, United States embassy staff began discussions with the Polish government on how much the Poles would support a US military response to the attacks. In this early stage, the Polish public and leadership overwhelmingly supported the US, and did not hesitate to contribute to US post-conflict operations in Afghanistan. Subsequent debates in Poland regarding further

---

226 Note that if negotiations had not been successful, then my model would predict that this would be due in large part to the perception by Poland that some other power could substitute for the United States as a long-term security guarantor. While counterfactual speculation is not warranted in this case, a cursory analysis would indicate that Poland’s accession to the EU and NATO would provide an alternative security umbrella in lieu of that provided by the US.
227 This and much of the information in this section is derived from interviews with Polish government officials. The primary source for this information expressed a desire for anonymity in order to speak more freely.
228 Zaborowski notes that “There is no doubt that Polish-American relations have been close since the end of the Cold War and in particular since 9/11, when Poland emerged as one of the very few European countries prepared to unconditionally support American foreign policy.” P. 8.
229 Poland did not have the capability to contribute to the actual warfighting in Afghanistan, but given their enthusiastic support for the US at this time, we can speculate that if they had an expeditionary capability they would have provided it. Only the US and UK had the military capability to contribute to the actual invasion of Afghanistan in 2001. Other nations contributed through basing, overflight rights, or logistical
contributions to the US “war on terror” revolved around the question of what opportunities existed for Poland to further support the US.

This cooperation was not new – relations between the US and Poland had been growing closer ever since the end of the Cold War and contacts between the two governments tended to be based on personal and high level discussions between the two presidents and their immediate assistants, rather than between bureaucratic staffs. Even before 9/11 President Bush and President Kwasniewski had been in personal contact in the years prior to the invasion of Iraq. 230

After the invasion of Afghanistan and the subsequent calls by the Bush regime to deal with Saddam, Polish opinion strongly favored the US. 231 Polish motivations for this were centered on how they could best contribute to US efforts should further conflict occur. There was little, if any, perception that Iraq threatened Poland. 232 More importantly, they were keenly concerned with how such support could enhance the relationship with the US. Overall, there was a sense of expectation that the US would greatly appreciate Polish assistance if it invaded Iraq, and that Polish support for the US

and other access. Poland did contribute to post-conflict operations as soon as it was feasible through reconstruction and mine clearing efforts that did not require expeditionary combat forces. Poland’s contributions were made as a NATO member and authorized under the invocation of NATO Article V and President Kwasniewski was strongly and publicly committed to supporting the US in Afghanistan. After the Taliban were overthrown by US and UK forces, Polish combat engineers and logistics forces cleared mines for ISAF (the UN authorized and NATO-led International Security Assistance Force) and later, took an even more active role. See US Congressional Research Report RL31152. “Operation Enduring Freedom: Foreign Pledges of Military and Intelligence Support.” October 17, 2001. See also “Department of Defense Fact Sheet: International Contributions to the War Against Terrorism. May 22, 2002.”

230 Bush visited Poland in the summer of 2001, and Polish President Kwasniewski paid a state visit to the US in July 2002. During this second visit, the two leaders endorsed “the notion of a new regional security cooperation in Central and Eastern Europe, to be led by Poland – the so-called Riga Initiative.” See Zaborowski, 2004, p. 7.

231 According to Polish Embassy officials, opinion polls in Poland were supportive of the US by wide margins (around 80%).

232 Zaborowski 2004 notes that “There was no justification for Poland’s involvement in terms of responding to a direct threat.” P. 12.
would lead to a stronger bilateral security relationship. The Polish government and people also desired to improve their global political stature and become a strategic ally to the US “of the same stature as the UK or Turkey.”

It is clear that part of this motivation originated in the hope that the US could help balance against the influence of Russia and Germany. However, Polish officials also note that the Polish people thought the US and Poland had similar interests, culture, and a

---

233 Polish embassy official, interview. See also ibid. Arons notes that “...the crisis offered a golden opportunity [for Poland] to join the world’s inner circle of policy-makers. Instead of being a by-stander, Poland saw itself among the decision-makers who take world history into their hands. Poland seized that opportunity with an unprecedented – and for many disturbing – eagerness. The Polish desire to case off the years of impotence and return to national grandeur, resulting in a self-assertive and increasingly ambitious foreign policy, must be seen as one of the major driving forces in the decision to stand by the United States.” Arons, 2004, p. 305.

234 Arons notes that “The first and foremost force driving Poland’s foreign policy has traditionally been the question for credible security guarantees against any future invasions by its powerful neighbors, Russia and Germany. Having finally regained sovereignty, more than anything else Poland has been animated by the profound will to never lose it again.” Arons 2004, p. 301. Arons goes on to note that the Poles saw little threat from terrorism, but that “ever since the Cold War ended, Poles have feared a weakening of the American commitment to Europe and a consequent US troop withdrawal would expose Poland once again to its powerful eastern and western neighbors. It is their deep conviction that only a military alliance with the US offers the kind of security guarantees that Poland needs. Consequently, the decision to support the US in the war was driven by the wish to demonstrate loyalty in the face of a common challenge so as to ensure future American involvement in Europe.” Arons, 2004, p. 302-3. The Russian threat to Poland’s security, although diminished by 2002, was in no way eradicated. Some Polish commentators are unequivocal in the continued threat to Poland’s security from Russia and the hope that they hold out for an American counter-balance- although they phrase it more in terms of economic or cultural risk. Czabanski, 2002, is typical: “Poland’s ‘five minutes,’ which enabled it (rather than its own merits and efforts) to escape from the Soviet bloc, are over. Now Moscow is regaining strength. And it is trying to regain its empire. This constitutes a deadly serious threat to Poland...” Letowski noted at this time that: “The fundamental principle of our diplomacy says that Poland has to have better relations with Moscow than Moscow has. After President Bush’s visit to Warsaw last year, this was precisely the case. After September 11th, the about-turn in Russian policy potentially threatened Polish interests. From this perspective, President Kwasniewski’s visit to the US helped Poland regain a sense of security. Yes, it is true that Russia is America’s strategic partner, but Poland is its strategic friend. As long as we are one step ahead of Moscow, the situation is beneficial for us. [emphasis in original].” Letowski, 2002, p. 191-192. Many outside observers note the Polish concern over Russia. For example, Patrick Tyler a month before the war began noted that “…States, like Poland and Hungary, bring not only a greater diversity [to NATO], but an innate bias toward Washington because they still feel grateful to the United States for their freedom. They also see Washington as a hedge against the re-emergence of a hostile Russia.” Patrick Tyler, “Threats and Responses: Old Friends; as Cold War Link Itself Grows Cold, Europe Seems to Lose Value for Bush.” The New York Times, Feb 12, 2003.
historical affinity. The Poles believed that the US would want Poland as an ally as much as Poland wanted the US as an ally. The support Poland gave to the US was supposed to be the beginning of a long and more robust relationship with the US.

Further evidence of the priority the Polish government placed on its relationship with the US is indicated by the fact that Polish support for the US at this time was risky: it endangered Poland’s pending EU accession because of a rift it caused with France and Germany – who opposed US action against Iraq without further deliberation and resolutions in the UN. Nonetheless, the Poles believed they could bridge the US-EU gap, and pressed ahead, early and more unequivocally than almost all others.

235 Letowski notes that “One conviction that has been unquestionable in our policies for the last 12 years, namely that maintaining the closest possible relations with the US is a condition for the fulfillment of Polish interests. This belief is dictated both by sentiment (the multi-million community of Polish Americans), the history books (the services of President Wilson) as well as sheer pragmatism.” Letowski, 2002, p. 189.

236 Ibid.

237 In a visit to West Point in January 2003, Polish President Kwasniewski “applauded the United State’s leading role in the world, stating that it is both ‘unquestionable and that it should be exercised’, moreover he saw a role for Poland to act jointly with the United States to ensure that Europe and the United States work effective together in transatlantic security.” Zaborowski, p. 7.

238 This is well documented. See, for example, Szabo 2004, especially chapters 1-3 and the above case study section on Germany.

239 Polish President Kwasniewski on 14 January stated that “If after all the discussions and actions, and the exploitation of various possibilities, it comes to stand up to fight, then we will do this.” See “Polish President Stresses Loyalty of Poland as US Ally.” BBC Monitoring Europe, 14 Jan. 2003 (original source TV Polonia). Foreign Minister Cimoszewicz a also stated on Jan 21 that Poland was standing by to support the US even if it used force in Iraq without a second UN resolution, putting Poland squarely at odds with France and Germany. See “Poland to Support War against Iraq without UN Resolution, Minister Says” BBC Monitoring Europe, 21 Jan. 2003 (original source: Polish Radio 1). Both of these originally cited in Arons, 2004, p. 297. Stempłowski noted at the time that: “Our government can use its very good relations with America to explain in Washington the US administration is not faced with a wave of anti-Americanism by ungrateful Europeans but rather an increasing strong position of the EU states, and that our common goal should be mutual EU-USA accommodation. Development of a common position, or an EU-USA tandem, is the best long-term solution.” Stempłowski, 2003. p. 10. Soon after the invasion of Iraq began, Bielecki (a noted Polish politician and former Prime Minister of Poland) noted that the goals for Poland’s foreign policy were: “the war against terrorism, the prevention of local conflicts, requiring a basic level of responsibility from unpredictable countries, the maintenance of close co-operation between Europe and the United States...”. Bielecki, 2003, p. 32. Joffe noted also, in reference to Polish leverage vis-à-vis NATO, that “Poland and some of the other East European newcomers certainly like the Americans in the
January 30 2003 the Polish government issued a joint statement with EU members Britain, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Denmark and the EU candidate states of the Czech republic and Hungary that declared their support for the US against Saddam. Jacques Chirac stated that Poland and the other EU candidate states had “missed a great opportunity to keep quiet.”240 Despite this, the Poles were convinced that the risk of alienating their new European allies was worth it to improve their relations with the US.

Part of the Polish calculus revolved around their estimation of their operational worth to the US-led coalition. The Poles believed that their potential contributions to the US efforts would be unique, critical, and hard to replace in part because Poland had a previous relationship with Saddam and therefore possessed a large amount of on-the-ground experience in Iraq.241 Based on this belief, the Polish government hoped to provide reconstruction assistance, intelligence and local economic assistance to the US coalition and become closely integrated with US military efforts.242

240 Mowle notes that: “France, Germany, Belgium, and Luxembourg strongly opposed American action; the first two, members of the [UN] Security Council, opposed a UN authorization of force in March 2003. Their views were not publicly shared by the other members of the Union. On 30 January, eight European leaders, representing EU members Britain, Spain, Italy, Portugal, and Denmark, as well as [EU] candidates Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, issued a joint statement supporting the United States. They argued: ‘Today more than ever, the transatlantic bond is a guarantee of our freedom…the transatlantic relationship must not become a casualty of the current Iraqi regime’s persistent attempts to threaten world security.’ If disarmament does not proceed ‘the Security Council will lose its credibility and world peace will suffer as a result.’ Over the next few weeks, other EU candidates endorsed this letter, prompting Chirac to declare that the EU invitees had ‘missed a great opportunity to keep quiet’” Mowle, 2004, p. 142.

241 A large number of Polish experts had been in Iraq during the Cold War to help with agricultural and other development, and Polish officials felt that these people with their local expertise and information would be useful not only for reconstruction but also for intelligence and local liaisoning with Iraqis. Interview, Polish embassy official.

242 This form of assistance to America also manifests itself in Polish commentary explicitly as a means to bring the US and Poland closer together. Czabanski 2002 states that: “What should be done to prevent Poland from being perceived as a part of Western Europe…that is reluctant to work with America? What can we offer America? First of all, intelligence services in regions of interest to Washington that happen to
In addition to these strategic motivations, the Polish government also had more
prosaic motivations. Chief among these was the hope that the US would provide
assistance for Polish military modernization. In fact, the largest arms loan in Poland’s
history was approved by the US Congress in December 2002. This deal not only
enhanced Poland’s long-term military capabilities, but drew the US and Polish militaries
and military industries closer – to the annoyance of France and other European powers.
Furthermore, Polish officials also hoped that once the Saddam regime had been
overthrown then military sales to a new Iraqi regime could be quite profitable. There
were also other hopes that previous Iraqi debt to Poland might be repaid, Polish
companies would be favored in Iraqi reconstruction contracts, and that the US might
be reasonably well known to us, for example in Iraq, where we already assisted Americans once, or the
Middle East in general…furthermore, we can offer special military capabilities in areas of interest to the
Americans so that we become a cog in the US military machine which, although small, would be difficult
to replace. Clearly we should simultaneously arm our soldiers with goods [sic] American weapons and
equipment…”

---

243 “Warsaw announced in December 2002 that it was to accept a $3.8 billion loan from the US Congress to
purchase 48 F-16s from Lockheed-Martin. Not only was this development significant by virtue of it being
the largest military loan in memory, but importantly it demonstrated the unique closeness that has
transpired between the two states and illustrates too the likely path the relationship was set to follow. To
begin, Poland’s choice of procuring a US rather a European defence systems was a firm expression of
Warsaw’s Atlanticist credentials. Furthermore, as noted by the Polish Ambassador to the United States
Przemyslaw Grudzinski, the purchase signified Poland’s desire to become a ‘mature member of NATO’. In
the same interview Grudzinski commented that the United States needed partners in Europe and that
‘Poland emerges as an excellent ally of the United States.” Zaborowski, p. 7, quoting ‘Polish Pride,
American Profits’ from the New York Times, 12 January 2003. See also “US Dollars Wooed Ally in Iraq
Coalition” Baltimore Sun, Oct 17, 2004. In this article it is noted that the US helped “to negotiate Poland’s
$3.5 billion purchase of 48 F-16 fighter planes from Bethesda-based Lockheed Martin Corp…The Polish
deal also included more than $6 billion in U.S. business investment that Lockheed promised to channel into
Poland, an economic ‘offset’ that caused Polish officials to call the purchase ‘the deal of the century.’”

244 Arons notes that, when given a choice, Poland clearly chose the US as a more important ally than France
and others: “Like most European countries, Poland too, first tried to find a way of dealing with the
American policy towards Iraq that would leave intra-European unity intact. It did not adopt a clearly
confrontational course until December 2002 when it decided to buy American fighter planes rather than
French or Swedish-British ones. Despite heated reactions from the French, calling the Polish decision
‘scandalous’ Poland could not be swayed. It made clear that it considered friendly relations, economic as
well as political ones, with the US more important than harmonious relations within Europe.” Arons, 2004,
p. 296-297.

245 Anonymous Polish Embassy official. Arons makes similar claims, second in importance to national
remove visa requirements for Poles traveling to the US. However, these inducements were largely recognized to be unlikely (or fanciful) and, more importantly, complementary to and not determinant of the Polish decision to support the US. While the US did, in fact, provide Poland with a small amount of aid ($15 million) after the war, but there is little doubt that the Poles would have supported the US in Iraq, regardless of the likelihood of postwar economic or other gain.

It appears that Polish support for the US vis-à-vis Iraq was almost unconditional, and based largely on strategic and security concerns. It was strengthened by the faint hope of profit, but not determined by it. Zaborowski sums the relationship up as:

“Overall, there is no doubt that Polish-American relations have been close since the end of the Cold War, and in particular since 9/11…it is clear that strategic considerations play an essential role in this new intimacy…for Poland, the US presence in Europe provides reassurance against its powerful neighbors…these strategic considerations are bolstered by cultural and historical factors…In addition, there is also a strong sense in Poland…that a close alliance with the United States is both beneficial for its security and at the same time enhancing for its position vis-à-vis other European partners.”

---

247 Anonymous Polish Embassy official.
249 In April 2003, after the war begun, Polish President Kwasniewski noted that “I am convinced that we have taken a politically proper decision that Poland should be a member of this antiterrorist alliance and cooperate with the U.S…. In the long run, it will be beneficial to us, as this builds Poland's credibility and gives us a sense of security.... I am convinced that if, in this complex world not free of threats, Poland would have to count on someone apart from itself, then we could count on those allies with which we are together now.” See “Polish President has no Regrets About Sending Troops to Iraq.” PAP News Agency, 8 April 2003. Available from Radio Free Europe at http://www.hri.org/cgi-bin/brief?/news/balkans/rferl/2003/03-04-08.rferl.html#44.
250 Zaborowski, 2004, p. 8. He later notes that: “ On the whole…there was no justification for Poland’s involvement in terms of responding to a direct threat. Also, expectations of material and political profit were initially rare…instead the arguments that dominated the Polish debate have been predominantly historical and moral in nature. There is, for example, no doubt that the most important rationale driving Polish policy on the matter was a demonstration of Poland’s loyalty and ability to be ‘America’s model ally’. Due to its past geopolitical vulnerability, Poland has been keen to develop a relationship of reciprocal obligations with the United States whereby both countries would support each other in time of need. Seen
In other words, the Polish contribution of 2,500 troops to the CotW appears to have been made with the hope that it would bring the US and Poland closer together, which would benefit Poland’s long-term security and strategic interests.\textsuperscript{251}

Results (dependent variables):

Overall, the dynamics that my model predicted for the Poland case study are accurate, although in a mixed fashion. First and foremost, my prediction that Poland would have very little bargaining leverage vis-à-vis the US seems well borne out. However, in supporting the US in Iraq, Poland also received one of the largest arms deals in its history from the US. Does this indicate that Poland had more bargaining leverage than my model expected? Perhaps. A few questions need to be answered about the arms deal: first, did the Bush regime apply pressure on private businesses to close this deal at this time? It seems likely: the arms deal was finalized in Dec 2002 by Congress and possibly with pressure from the Bush White House.\textsuperscript{252} However, it is unclear whether this was a necessary quid pro quo for Polish support. Given Polish government statements and popular support at the time, it seems quite likely that Poland would have supported the US to a significant extent regardless of whether the arms deal went through or not. Furthermore, the arms deal also served the Polish government’s overall purpose of

\textsuperscript{251} Although this dissertation is concerned with the formation of the CotW and the period leading up to the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, it is worth noting that it is not clear whether Poland succeeded in enhancing the partnership with the US. Michalski notes in 2005 that “The Poles feel that the positive political atmosphere surrounding Poland in Washington [in 2004] has yet to be translated into tangible effects.” Michalski, 2005, p. 71.

increasing the security interdependence of the US and Poland via deepening their military and industrial relations. Finally, it improved Poland’s defense capabilities vis-à-vis its neighbors, of which Russia was clearly the most worrisome. In sum, although Poland did gain materially from the arrangement, it seems clear that Poland contributed to the CotW largely in order to demonstrate their commitment to the long-term relationship with the US as a bulwark against Russia, rather than for profit per se. And the US did not require, nor did it rely on, the Polish contribution (although President Bush trumpeted the support of Poland for domestic political advantage). Therefore, although the relative bargaining leverage of Poland (DV1) is difficult to discern, the fundamental dynamics of my model appear to be accurate.

The values of DV2 and DV3 are more straightforward and are accurately predicted by my model. Poland was one of the very few nations to put large numbers of their own troops into the war, despite the political risk to their existing alliances (especially to their relations with France).

Summary

Japan

In 2003, Japan was motivated primarily by its security dependence on the US due to the growing and unpredictable threat from North Korea and, from a more long-term strategic perspective, China. Combined with the predilection of Koizumi to support Bush, Japan was very willing to pay to support the US in Iraq. The US on the other hand valued Japanese support for the CotW because such support would provide political legitimacy, especially in the UN. However, the US gained that support long before the war even
began. Thus, the US was not willing to pay to gain any greater support from Japan. With such motivations, my model predicted that Japan would “curry favor” with the US, and this is indeed what happened.

The support given by Japan to the US in 2003 manifested itself in three distinct ways. First, and perhaps most importantly, Koizumi provided clear and critical public political support to Bush starting as early as February 2002. Second, Japanese tankers continued to refuel Coalition naval forces in the Indian Ocean, an effort that had begun in 2001 to support US operations in Afghanistan. This tanker support was de facto support for the CotW as well. Third (and most groundbreaking) Koizumi shepherded through new legislation that supported the CotW directly by overseas Self-Defense Force (SDF) deployments. Koizumi took great political risks to have Japan support the US to this extent because of the importance of the alliance for Japan’s security, as well as a desire to ‘make up for’ Japan’s much criticized contribution during the first Gulf War in 1991.

My predictions for Japan were accurate. Although it seems likely that Bush would have been willing to pay some costs to garner Japanese political support if it had been in doubt, there is little indication that the US needed to do so. My model also predicted that if Japan did contribute to the coalition, it would do so primarily at its own expense – and that the US would prefer that those costs manifest themselves as short-term exchanges rather than long-term commitments. In fact, Japan did take steps to support the US almost entirely at its own expense, even in the face of domestic political risk. My final prediction, that Japan will offer its own troops, materiel, or money, was fully accurate.
Sending the SDF overseas to a combat zone was a monumental, highly visible, and proactive step in postwar Japanese history.

**Turkey**

Turkey was considered critical to US war planning. US planners assumed that Turkey would support the US fully and wrote the war plans accordingly. However, a survey of Turkey’s strategic concerns indicates that Turkey did not value the future security relationship with the US nearly as much as it had during the Cold War (when it relied on the US for nuclear security against the USSR). In fact, the risk that Iraq would be broken up by a US invasion was of concern to Turkey. Erdoğan government in Turkey was willing to hedge its support for the US, due to its popular support. The refusal of the Turkish military to get involved further strengthened the hand of the Erdoğan regime. Negotiations between the two nations were not fruitful: Erdoğan rejected a “party-line” vote, and thus Turkey’s parliament very narrowly rejected the motion to support the US. This forced the US to abandon the northern front option just weeks before the war.

Most of the predictions of my model were accurate. My first prediction, that Turkey would have greater bargaining leverage, has largely been born out: in their demands of the US the Turkish government behaved as if they had a great deal of bargaining leverage, to the extent that they acted as if they had a veto over the US warplan. As for the characteristics of the negotiations, since Turkey came within three votes of supporting the US a counterfactual analysis is justified. Such an analysis makes it clear that my second prediction is also supported. Based on the amount of money that the US was willing to pay to Turkey, and the fact that the US increased that amount over
time to try to influence Turkey’s decision, it seems clear that the US was willing to pay to obtain Turkey’s coalition support. In other words, as predicted, Turkey (almost) contributed to the coalition at the expense of the US. My third hypothesis predicted that Turkey would provide less risky contributions to the US (such as basing, access, or overflight rights). This was indeed what they would have provided had the motion passed, but they also would have contributed their own troops to Iraq – a move which the US opposed and which would have strongly benefited the Turkish state. Given these relationships, my prediction about the type of contribution seems accurate. However, my fourth hypothesis is problematic. I claim that unsuccessful negotiations should have exhibited some evidence that the US believed the Turkish contribution could be obtained elsewhere. This is at least partially true: the US could, and did, successfully prosecute its war without Turkish support. However, the war plan did rely upon Turkish support materializing.253

Germany

253 Despite the problematic nature of my prediction for DV4, the basic causal analysis of my thesis remain valid since Turkey clearly did not contribute to the US because they believed they were replaceable (Erdogan believed that Turkish support amounted to a veto over US war plans). Neither did they exhibit any indication that they saw a need for the US or another power as a long term security partner to protect them. It should be noted that Cagaptay does hold a slightly different account when he claims that: “It is possible to say...that Turkey’s reluctance over the past winter to fully support the idea of a northern front in the Iraq campaign was at least in part a product of Ankara’s desire to align itself with European foreign policy. It may come as a surprise that this resonates even with Turkey’s AKP government, since many analysts regard the AKP as a party with an Islamist pedigree, so the pro-European bias brings questions to a lot of people’s minds. I would...suggest that AKP has not been a consistent supporter of America’s Iraq policy. Back in the winter, for example, when the Turkish Parliament was debating the idea of American troop deployment in Turkey, while some people in the AKP leadership were trying to muster support for that initiative, there were others in the leadership who were opposing it and a few of them even cited Muslim solidarity as the basis of their objection [to] an American campaign against Iraq. This was, of course, not the only reason why Turkey did not fully cooperate with the United States in the Iraq war. The perception that America’s campaign would in the end create a Kurdish state in northern Iraq I would say was one of the biggest concerns.” Cagaptay, 2003.
The US valued the political support from Germany more than it did the material support. Germany had the potential to greatly hinder or help the US make the case for war, especially to other members of the UN and NATO. But there was little if anything that the US needed materially from Germany except for the ability to move a relatively small number of troops out of (and through) their country. Thus, my model has two sets of predictions: one for political support and one for material support from Germany.

My model accurately predicted the manner in which material support from Germany would manifest itself. Neither the US nor Germany had much bargaining leverage over each other and Germany contributed to the coalition without any significant exchange to attain that contribution. These contributions were relatively unpublicized basing access and overflight rights. My model is also accurate regarding German political support for the U.S. Namely, it predicted that Germany would have a high amount of bargaining leverage vis-à-vis the US, and indeed the US was unable to convince Germany to support it politically. It also accurately predicted that the US would not expend great efforts trying to enlist German political support, and indeed once it became clear that Germany was not willing to support the US, Bush turned to other nations such as Poland rather than continuing to try to enlist German support.

Poland

US warplans did not rely upon a Polish contribution but Poland strongly valued the long-term security relationship with the US. Under those conditions, my model predicts that Poland would “Curry Favor” and would have little bargaining leverage and that, if negotiations were successful, Poland would demonstrate its reliability as an ally to
the US, and this would come largely at Poland’s expense and with its own men and materiel. These things did occur. However, it also appears that the US may have shepherded a large arms deal for Poland.

However, the Polish contribution of 2,500 troops (the third largest after the US and the UK) would likely have occurred regardless of US aid, due to the intense Polish desire to tighten their relationship with the US. Therefore, although the relative bargaining leverage of Poland is difficult to discern, the fundamental dynamics of my model appear accurate. Poland was one of the very few nations to put large numbers of their own troops into the war and demonstrated their commitment to the relationship with the US.
Chapter Five: The Korean War

Background

In this chapter I will briefly describe the broad outlines of the Korean War and the Korean War Coalition (hereafter KWC), explain why it is a key coalition for testing my model, and discuss the general strategy the United States (as the coalition leader) used to enlist allies for it.¹

The factors leading to the Korean War, and the personalities (and personality clashes) involved in the conduct of the war have been studied, and debated, at great length.² The Korean conflict had elements of both a civil war as well as a reflection of the Cold War bipolar rivalry between the US and the USSR and its allies in communist China. Korea had been de facto divided into two countries since the end of WW2 when US and USSR forces occupied the Korean peninsula and accepted the surrender of colonial Japanese troops there. The Northern portion of Korea came under the influence of the USSR (and, by 1949, its allies in revolutionary Maoist China). The South came under the influence of the US. The 38th parallel was the de facto border between the two zones. A UN mandate had been formed in 1947 with the goal of unifying Korea under one freely elected government. However, election results from North Korea were rejected by the UN because the Russians had not allowed the UN to observe the election. South

¹ A list of contributors to the Korean War Coalition, and the amount of troops they provided, is given in Appendix B, as well as a variety of relevant UN declarations.
Korea came under the leadership of Syngman Rhee, while North Korea was led by Kim Il-Sung. Relations between the two regimes were tense, and armed clashes were frequent. On June 25\textsuperscript{th}, 1950, North Korean forces invaded South Korea across the 38\textsuperscript{th} parallel.

For the purposes of this dissertation, it is enough to note that the few US forces present in Korea were distinctly unready for the conflict. North Korean forces quickly overran South Korean border forces and occupied Seoul on June 28\textsuperscript{th}. When North Korean forces invaded on June 25\textsuperscript{th}, the United Nations Security Council quickly passed a resolution, with US urging, that demanded North Korean forces withdraw back behind the 38\textsuperscript{th} parallel.\textsuperscript{3} North Korean forces rebuffed this resolution, and pressed their attack. MacArthur was ordered by Truman to use US Navy and Air forces available in the area to assist the South Koreans.\textsuperscript{4} Two days later the UNSC asked UN members to also assist South Korea in repulsing the North Koreans. Russia, a UN Security Council member that was boycotting the UNSC at this time, and so could not veto either of these votes. On June 30\textsuperscript{th}, Truman ordered US ground forces to South Korea. On July 7\textsuperscript{th}, The UN agreed that these forces would operate under the UN flag, but that US General Douglas MacArthur would command all UN troops in Korea. The Korean War Coalition (henceforth, KWC) was de jure a UN operation, but de facto a US led and organized coalition, and the US provided the vast majority of forces involved.\textsuperscript{5} The US government also began to assemble a coalition of allied forces to meet the threat.

---

\textsuperscript{3} See FRUS 1950 Vol. 7, pp. 126-212 for an extensive timeline of communiqués and notes over this two day period. See also Acheson, 1971, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{4} MacArthur, 1964, p. 331.

\textsuperscript{5} In this way, it satisfies the criteria laid out in Chapter 3 for an Ad Hoc Warfighting coalition. The relevant UN Security Council Resolution is reproduced in Appendix B, and indicates clearly that this was a US-led and organized military coalition.
There were both strategic political and material aspects to the formation of the KWC. Strategically, the US felt it important to present a unified front in the face of what was perceived as blatant Communist bloc aggression. The invasion was perceived by many as engineered and led by Moscow, and perhaps the first shot in a global communist invasion of Western Europe, Formosa (Taiwan) and the rest of the free world. It was also seen as a way to strengthen security relationships between the US and its allies, including Germany and Japan.6

The strategic threat seemed clear: this was the first blatant military move by the Communist Bloc, and followed quickly on the heels of other Communist victories, including the overthrow of the Nationalist government in China in 1949, the detonation of the first Soviet atomic weapon a few years earlier, and the Berlin blockade, all of which had all greatly increased tensions in the West. The US and its allies, still recovering from World War II, found themselves in a position of extreme vulnerability on a number of fronts around the world. US strategy to confront the Soviet threat was still

---

6 Schaller’s archival research indicates that “Within seventy-two hours of the attack, intelligence planners in both the State Department and the army reached nearly identical evaluations of the situation. The North Korean assault, they concluded, had been planned by Moscow to destabilize anti-Communist governments throughout Europe and Asia. By destroying an American-sponsored regime the Soviets hoped to shock the Japanese out of signing a military pact with Washington, weaken KMT [Guomingdang] resolve on Formosa, boost the prospects of the Vietminh in Indochina, and undermine faith among the NATO allies. The US Army intelligence staff provided several justifications for a counteroffensive that matched perfectly the fears voiced by State Department analysts. By successfully repulsing North Korea, Washington would enhance its own prestige, bolster Japanese resolve to accept American bases, stiffen West Germany’s bond to the West, make NATO a more effective alliance, possibly drive a wedge between the British and the Chinese Communists, and inspire the French to fight harder in Indochina.” Schaller, 1985, p. 281, drawing on Army and State department archives.
nascent, defense budgets remained low, and US forces were at a fraction of their previous WWII strength.\(^7\)

Nowhere was this more apparent than in Korea, where US forces, under strength, under-equipped, and demoralized, were rapidly overrun by North Korean forces.\(^8\) By September, US and South Korean troops had been pushed back to a small portion of the country around the city of Pusan, and North Korea occupied almost the entirety of the Korean peninsula. From a military point of view, the situation was dire, and the US sought support from a wide variety of countries. In early August, General MacArthur (the supreme commander of all allied forces in the region) was desperate for more troops. He was reported to have sought “…Maximum UN ground forces possible, as many as 30,000 or 40,000. He [MacArthur] will take battalions (1,000 men) just as fast as they can come, with only their small arms. Actually, heavier artillery would be welcome, but the need is so great that he would take them with their small arms only…”\(^9\) This underlines the fact that the KWC was clearly an ad hoc military coalition: the US sought allies in a quick and urgent basis, and was focused on responding to and ameliorating the rapidly deteriorating military situation in Korea.

---

\(^7\) In fact, the Korean War was one of the primary catalysts that put US Cold War policy toward the Communist Bloc in force. NSC-68, still a draft at that time, was to become the foundational document at the heart of US strategy. NSC-68 was the embodiment of the containment doctrine, but required a massive growth in US forces, interests overseas, and, perhaps most importantly, a tripling of US defense. However, before the Korean War erupted, NSC-68 was un-budgeted and unapproved. Many scholars note that the Korean War empowered NSC-68 and propelled it into formal and widely accepted policy. Yonosuke observes that “the outbreak of war in Korea provided the perfect opportunity for the [Truman] administration to make real the plans of NSC 68.” Yonosuke, 1977, p. 59. See also Leffler, 1992, ch. 9, especially pp. 382-385.

\(^8\) For a good, albeit colorful, overview of the state of US and North Korean forces in Korea and the first months of the war, see Halberstam, 2007, Ch. 10.

\(^9\) Memorandum from Averell Harriman, as replicated in Truman, 1956, p. 351. See also Leffler, 1992, p. 366.
Importance of this coalition and cases

This coalition is an important one to study because it provides a key test for my model under bipolar conditions. The Cold War was a recognized fact in 1950, and tensions between the US and its Western Allies and the USSR and its allies (including mainland China) were high. The Berlin airlift in 1948 had made clear the division of the postwar world into two competing blocs, and the US commitment to the defense of non-Communist regimes in Asia (such as Chiang Kai-Shek’s regime on Taiwan, Japan, and others) was a key pillar of US policy. In his memoirs, President Truman recalls that:

“There was now no doubt! The Republic of Korea needed help at once if it was not to be overrun. More seriously, a Communist success in Korea would put Red troops and planes within easy striking distance of Japan, and Okinawa and Formosa would be open to attack from two sides. I told my advisers that what was developing in Korea seemed to me like a repetition on a larger scale of what had happened in Berlin. The Reds were probing for weaknesses in our armor; we had to meet their thrust without getting embroiled in a world-wide war.”

Clearly, the invasion of South Korea by North Korean forces was seen by many to be yet another shot fired in the global bipolar Cold War rivalry.\footnote{Truman, 1956, p. 337. In a display of the global nature of this conflict, Truman goes on to note that he told MacArthur (head of all US forces in Asia at that time) to “use air and naval forces to support the Republic of Korea with air and naval elements of his command, but only south of the 38th parallel. He was also instructed to dispatch the Seventh Fleet to the Formosa Strait. The purpose of this move was to prevent attacks by the Communists on Formosa as well as forays by Chiang Kai-Shek against the mainland, this last to avoid reprisal actions by the Reds that might enlarge the area of conflict. I also approved recommendations for strengthening of our forces in the Philippines and for increased aid to the French in Indo-China.”}

\footnote{Truman notes that “Our allies and friends abroad were informed through our diplomatic representatives that it was our feeling that it was essential to the maintenance of peace that this armed aggression against a free nation be met firmly. We let it be known that we considered the Korean situation vital as a symbol of the strength and determination of the West. Firmness now would be the only way to deter new actions in other portions of the world. Not only in Asia but in Europe, the Middle East, and elsewhere the confidence of peoples in countries adjacent to Soviet Union [sic] would be very adversely affected, in our judgment, if}
In this chapter, I will examine the interactions between the US and three case study nations: Japan, Turkey, and Germany. These states are important ones to study because they allow me to test my model’s predictions in relation to the same case study nations examined in my previous chapter, where I analyzed the interactions between the US and Turkey, Japan, and Germany as they related to the US-led and organized Coalition of the Willing. By examining these three countries again in relation to the KWC, I hope to draw important lessons based on the variation of their security valuations and strategic situation.

Note that I do not examine Poland in this chapter because it was not, apparently, pressured by the USSR to become involved in the Korean conflict. Furthermore, it was a client state of the Soviet Union at the time of the Korean war and therefore unlikely to effectively operate its own foreign policy. While the same might be alleged with regards to Japan and Germany (which in 1950 were both still largely under the control of occupying US and Allied forces) the US clearly did not operate the same level of control over their foreign policy that the Soviets did over Poland.

Lastly, it is important to note that the German case study is interesting because it also provides a useful comparison to Japan in 1950. Both Japan and Germany lacked full sovereignty at the time of the Korean war. And both were faced with a looming Soviet

---

12 Most scholarly accounts hold also that the USSR itself was not involved in the operational aspects of the Korean War to any great extent.
threat, both were seeking restoration of their full independence and economic recovery and both were being urged by the US to contribute more to the nascent Cold War struggle through rearmament. In other words, the German and Japan cases are parallel. However, there is one difference that is key for testing my model: in the Japan case, the US clearly desired a contribution from Japan for the KWC so that it could best prosecute the Korean war. In the case of Germany though, there was little that the US wanted from Germany for the Korean War per se. In other words, these two cases are nearly identical except for one independent variable in my model. Thus, examining these two cases allows for a comparison in which all major variables are held equal except for the variable of interest.

Potential Pitfalls

Admittedly the KWC is a somewhat problematic coalition to study. Although Japan, Germany, and Turkey were not directly threatened by North Korean forces at that time and did not appear to expect direct profit from any involvement in the war, they were all still under the threat of Soviet aggression. The Soviets were largely perceived as “pulling the strings” behind the North Korean invasion of South Korea. In fact scholars have made strong case that the coalition choices of Turkey vis-à-vis the KWC were in large part a reaction to the perception of Soviet-led Communist threat. This is, in fact, a logical extension of Walt’s balance of threat theory, which predicts that states align with the side that they fear the least (based upon aggregate power, geographic proximity, offensive power, and aggressive intentions). Under BOT, it makes sense that Turkey

---

13 After the end of the Cold War, previously classified Soviet archives became (briefly) available to Korean War scholars, although debate about the extent of direct Soviet involvement in the Korean War continues. See, for example, Brune, 1996.
would ally with the US. However, an important question remains unanswered: under what conditions would a highly vulnerable member of one allied camp risk their own destruction by escalating their involvement in a distant conflict in order to demonstrate their usefulness to the alliance leader? Which is more important – the long-term tightness of the alliance, or the short-term avoidance of direct conflict? These are the choices that faced Turkey in 1950, which was vulnerable to potential Soviet aggression yet still sent forces to fight with the US in the distant Korean conflict. An examination of the Turkish decision should thus provide some insight into how they valued their relationship with the US.

The cases of Japan and Germany are also problematic when examining the KWC for the obvious reason that both countries were still under the occupation and control of Allied forces, and had been since the end of World War Two in 1945. They lacked the most basic measure of statehood: full or complete sovereignty. It is hard to draw lessons about their coalition choices if they are fundamentally unable to make such choices. Therefore, any conclusions about their participation (or refusal to participate) in the Korean War Coalition must be made with caution.

Despite this, the dynamics described in my model are still relevant in these cases, for at least two reasons. First, though occupied, both Germany and Japan were still partially sovereign. Both of them had some measure of negotiating power vis-à-vis the occupying Allied powers.¹⁴ In Germany, the Adenauer government was continually involved in the day-to-day efforts of the occupying powers, and issues of internal and

external security and commitment to the nascent NATO alliance were key topics of debate between Adenauer and the occupying US, UK, and French governments. In Japan, the Yoshida government was consulted by Supreme Commander, Allied Powers (SCAP) in matters related to internal security and future security arrangements. Both Germany and Japan were on the path to sovereignty when the Korean War broke out and, as will be shown below, the war itself had a large impact on their security relations with the US.

Secondly, the dynamics of my model should still be evident even under conditions of limited sovereignty because my model’s predictions are based upon the overarching power relationships between the coalition leader, the minor states, and the threats the minor states perceive not domestic idiosyncratic factors. Thus, even given the constrained sovereignty of Germany and Japan (and the nearly unconstrained influence of the US), there should be evidence of my model’s predictions, albeit within the limited range of action available to German and Japanese leaders. In other words, although the freedom of action of German and Japanese leaders was highly constrained in this time period, it was not total. Thus, within their respective constraints Japanese and German leaders could still respond to their threat perceptions, interests, and, if I am correct, their long-term asymmetric security valuations vis-à-vis the United States.

Additionally, it must be noted that in such cases as these, the factors influencing minor state policy choices are likely to be intertwined with many other factors. While both Germany and Japan may have been motivated by their long-term threat perceptions, they were also likely motivated by a desire to rebuild economically after WW2 and a desire to regain their full sovereignty. Because these other factors are very likely to have
influenced their policy choices vis-à-vis the United States, care must be taken to
disaggregate their security perceptions as much as possible.

This is why process tracing is the most applicable methodology to test my theory
with regard to the KWC. As noted in Chapter 3, there will always be a variety of factors
that influence the coalition choices of countries: pre-existing institutionalized
relationships, economic or other interdependencies, perceptions of the future and future
threats, and so forth. Only by carefully tracing out the interactions between the coalition
leader and the minor states can the influences of such other factors be disaggregated from
each other and the dynamics of my theory.

Japan

Background (Independent Variables):

As noted above, when North Korean forces came across the 38th parallel on June
25, 1950, what few US and allied South Korean forces were present were rapidly
overrun. The tactical and strategic situation was extremely urgent, and MacArthur was
soon requesting any and all available forces to repulse the attack. However, not only were
ready forces in very short supply, but so were transportation, supply, and other supporting
capabilities. One obvious source of such potential forces was in Japan – four US
divisions were there at the time of the invasion, and these were the closest significant
forces available to the US.

---

15 For a good account of the reaction of President Truman and the White House staff to the invasion, and
the critical need to find and transport combat troops to the front lines in Korea, see Truman, 1956, Memoirs
16 These divisions were the first US troops sent to Korea. See Schonberger, 1989, p. 251-2.
Furthermore, the invasion lent urgency to US strategic planning efforts related to Japan. There was already a consensus within the State Department and among key policymakers in Washington that the occupation needed to be brought to an end. MacArthur had felt that way for some time, and the State Department and Defense Department had recently come around to this view as well in part due to concern in Washington over the mounting cost of the Occupation. Furthermore, by 1948 Washington had become more cognizant of the growing need to contain Soviet power, and by 1950 it was recognized that the US needed a bulwark in Asia. The original goal of the Occupation was a demilitarized Japan with a decentralized economy and limited industry - goals which were now incongruent with the reality of the Cold War.\footnote{See, for example, Memorandum by the Consultant to the Secretary of State (Dulles) to the Secretary of State June 7 1950 (FRUS, 1950, vol. 6, p. 1207). Initial Occupation policies were concerned with limiting the role of the corporations that comprised the Japanese war making industries (the Zaibatsu) and so limited and controlled heavy industry, encouraged a free labor movement, and sought “wide distribution of income and the ownership of the means of production” as well as purging business leaders, dismantling large conglomerates, and resisting any significant assistance to Japan for its rebuilding. See Schaller 1985, p. 25.}

After intense debates between MacArthur, George Kennan, John Foster Dulles, and others, the US altered its policies.\footnote{A useful overview of the roles and actions the various personalities and organizations involved in the Occupation of Japan is given in Schaller, 1985. See especially Ch. 2. Many scholars have examined the personality conflicts, politics, and disagreements over strategy and policy between MacArthur, Truman, and others during the war. See, for example, Halberstam, 2007, MacDonald, 1986, Nitta, 2002, and, for a more personal account, Acheson, 1971.} This shift became known as the ‘reverse course’ - economic recovery and political stability now became the primary objectives of the Occupation.\footnote{For more details, see Schaller 1985, p. 132. See also Jitsuo, 2000, Nitta, 2002.} Japanese labor union activities previously tolerated and even encouraged, were now limited. The growth of former wartime industries was now encouraged, purges of former militarist leaders subsided, and priority was now given to Japanese economic
recovery. All of this was done in the hope that Japan could eventually provide the US with a reliable capitalist ally in the region.

Occupation forces were seen as ultimately incongruent with the now recognized need for a strong and allied Japan, and although there was still some debate about whether US forces should remain in Japan to deter and respond to any future Soviet aggression, Japanese rearmament was on its way to becoming a goal of US policy. Due to the Soviet threat, MacArthur was unequivocal in his support of basing rights in Japan: on June 23rd 1950, two days before the Korean War began, he wrote that “the entire land mass [of Japan] must be regarded as a potential area for maneuver with adequate provision made to insure complete freedom of strategic planning and tactical disposition…” And on the eve of the Korean War, John Foster Dulles was in Japan urging the Yoshida government to begin rearming Japan.

The US also saw the Korean War as a critical and clarifying moment for future relations with Japan. An intelligence estimate prepared on the day of the North Korean invasion noted that

“The consequences of the invasion will be most important in Japan. The Japanese will unhesitatingly assume that the invasion is Soviet directed and forms part of an over-all strategy which, at some point, includes Japan. Japanese reactions to the invasion will depend almost entirely upon

---

22 See Memorandum by the Director of the Office of Northeast Asian Affairs (Allison) to the Acting United States Political Adviser for Japan (Sebald) June 14, 1950 (FRUS 1950 Vol. 6, p. 1212)
23 Memorandum by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Forces (MacArthur), 23 June 1950. FRUS Vol. 5, p. 1227.
the course of action pursued by the United States since they will regard the position taken by the United States as presaging US action should Japan be threatened with invasion. Failure of the United states to take any action in Korea would strengthen widespread desire for neutrality…rapid and unhesitating US support for the ROK, on the other hand, would reassure the Japanese as to their own fate and, since Soviet aggressions in the Far East will be underlined for the Japanese by the invasion, would enhance their willingness to accept US protection and its implications, though not the indefinite continuance of US direction of internal affairs…”

The view from Japan was complex. In June of 1950, Japan was not only an occupied country but a domestically divided one. Defeat, occupation, and the end of militarism ushered in a period of rapid social, economic, and ideological change as well as economic privation and widespread scarcity of food and other basic necessities. Large segments of the population were sympathetic to Communist ideology, and were motivated by a desire to see Japan become wholly pacifist, permanently neutral, and unarmed. The trauma of the war and defeat led many to strongly oppose any statements or policies that even hinted at a return of a military, intervention abroad, or involvement in the power politics between the US and the USSR. Such sentiments manifested themselves in the rise of the Socialist Party and the Communist party in Japan, and general strikes, riots, and other disturbances were not uncommon. The US State Department believed that the “internal striking potential” of the Communists in Japan numbered in the hundreds of thousands. Although the Japanese people as a whole may not have shared Communist ideologies, they were united in their opposition to militarism

25 Yoshida gives his account of these times in Yoshida, 1961, see especially Ch. 8. He notes on page 79 that in 1946 “the food situation at that time was so serious that the Government was advised that ten million persons could be expected to die of starvation.” A compelling account is also given in Yoshida, 1967.
26 See, for example, Yoshida 1961, p. 76, 81, 91-92, and 180.
and any hint of foreign adventurism. Under such conditions, there was little desire to have any part of the war in Korea.

Japan was split ideologically - on the other side of the equation lay the Liberal and Progressive parties, which were the postwar manifestations of the prewar conservative parties.\(^{28}\) In fact, the bureaucratic elite in wartime Japan was largely conservative. Because US authorities left the Japanese bureaucracy intact in order to maintain the day-to-day affairs of government, the conservatives still yielded a great amount of influence over the government and had effective political parties.\(^{29}\) Yoshida Shigeru, the head of the Liberal Party, became Prime Minister when, together with the Progressive party, it won a majority of Diet seats in the first postwar election in 1946. Shigeru’s cabinet lasted a year, before the Socialists took a plurality of seats in 1947. But the Socialist party soon collapsed due to factionalism, and by 1948 Yoshida had organized all conservative elements into a new Democratic-Liberal party, which again took control of the government. By February 1950 all conservative factions had been organized by Yoshida under a single Liberal Party.\(^{30}\) Yoshida remained the Prime Minister of Japan throughout the rest of the Occupation.\(^{31}\)

Yoshida was a staunch conservative and anti-communist who had opposed (and been imprisoned by) militarist elements during the war (which is why he was acceptable

---

\(^{28}\) Yoshida makes this point explicitly when he notes that in 1946 he came to realize “as never before that there existed within each of our political parties traditional trends and characteristics which are far more deeply rooted than anyone not on the inside would imagine. A party may call itself the Liberal Party, but it is still, in fact the old pre-war Seiyukai Party. The postwar Progressive Party was to all intents and purposes the old Minseito Party. And so on…” Yoshida, 1961, p. 79.

\(^{29}\) Pyle, 2007, p. 225. See also Schaller 1985, Ch. 2 for the influence of Japanese bureaucrats on modifying US Occupation policies they disapproved of.

\(^{30}\) Yoshida, 1961, p. 91.

\(^{31}\) For a detailed recounting of postwar election politics in this time period, see Schaller, 1985, esp. pp. 48-51.
to the occupying US authorities). He was also greatly concerned about the possibility of a socialist revolution in Japan, and saw economic improvement as the key to avoiding that. But he was a realist and nationalist, and was “determined to preserve as much as possible of the old imperial order and to set Japan on a path that would restore the nation as a great power.” When he formed the first elected cabinet in 1946, he noted that “history provides examples of winning by diplomacy after losing in a war.”

His relations with MacArthur and his attitudes towards Occupation policies were clearly undertaken to promote Japan’s interests, both strategic and domestic. And his interactions with US authorities reflect a certain amount of pragmatism regarding his leverage with the US, and illustrate his understanding not only of the general populace’s attitudes towards foreign affairs but also Japan’s long-term interests. He also appears to have had a keen appreciation of US strategic interests. For example one US diplomat recalled in April 1950:

“[Yoshida] spoke along the lines of his recent replies to various interpellations to the Diet, in which he has maintained consistently that Japan should not abandon its renunciation of war, as Japanese disarmament provides the best means of ensuring the country’s future

---

35 Yoshida’s memoirs are filled with episodes wherein he negotiated with US Occupation authorities, typically MacArthur, to get US policies towards Japan modified or to reduce their impact. In other words, despite the fact that Japan was an occupied country, Yoshida was often successful in exerting leverage over US authorities. See, for example, Yoshida 1961, p. 66, p. 155, 158, 161-162 (where, it is noteworthy that Yoshida intervened to help exonerate over 10,000 purged Japanese)
36 It was not only Yoshida that attempted, and often succeeded in changing or ameliorating US occupation policies. Schaller notes that “the actual course of reform in Japan involved a convoluted interplay between MacArthur (who followed an agenda developed in Washington) and the Japanese elites who maintained control of political and economic life through the Occupation. Each sought to preserve and change selected aspects of the system to achieve specific goals.” Schaller, 1985, p. 29.
security, and that...in the post-treaty period...Japan must rely upon the United States for protection as it will possess no armaments of its own..."I tell our people...that when it is objected that Japan will become a colony of the United States...just as the United States was once a colony of Great Britain but now is the stronger of the two, if Japan becomes a colony of the United States, it will also eventually become the stronger!' Then, speaking more seriously, he said that naturally the United States did not wish Japan to become a colony or a satellite, but that the Soviet Union would be a great danger to Japan if left unprotected [sic]. He then continued to speak quite volubly on the general subject, avoiding any specific commitments, but always allowing the inference that he would be favorably disposed toward whatever practical arrangements the United States might consider necessary in order to assist Japan in the maintenance of her security in the post-treaty period. He definitely avoided any flat statement, however, that he would favor American military bases in Japan after the treaty."

Given his background Yoshida was, unsurprisingly, motivated by a strong desire to bring the Occupation to an end and restore full Japanese sovereignty. Nonetheless, he understood the utility of US protection, given the well recognized threat from the Soviet Union. In an interview with the Chief of the Japanese Foreign Ministry Treaty Bureau from that time, one scholar notes that Yoshida believed that “The Soviet threat from the north was still the primary external threat, and it still seemed to [him]…that an American

---

37 FRUS, 1950, Vol. 6, pp. 1166-1167.
38 It is illuminating to note how Yoshida exerted influence over the US vis-à-vis Japanese sovereignty. For example, in his memoirs, Yoshida noted that “It was clear...that there existed little hope of a peace acceptable to Japan unless the United States spoke for us during the preliminary talks among the Allied Powers concerning the convening of a peace conference. For the United States to assume this role, however, it was necessary for her leaders to be put in possession of all the facts concerning post-war Japan, and for those facts to be presented in a form that would make them comprehensible to the United States authorities in Washington…we therefore began in the Autumn of 1946 compiling such data in English, starting with a review of economic and political conditions in the country at that time. Special pains were taken in compiling data concerning our territories: we set forth the facts concerning such integral parts of Japan as Okinawa and the Bonin islands, the Kuriles and Sakhalien, alike from the historical, geographical, racial, and economic points of view and – in the case of the Kuriles – explained in detail the circumstances that made them an integral part of Japanese territory…” Yoshida, 1961, p. 247. One scholar regards this passage as indicating that Yoshida “Seems to have considered his dealings with Occupation officials as an extended negotiation in preparation for a peace settlement, and he was intent on regaining his country’s sovereignty and rebuilding its self-respect.” Weinstein, 1971, p. 15. Yoshida gives his own view on whether or not he modified or opposed US Occupation policies in Yoshida, 1967, p. 49.
guarantee, American forces around Japan, and emergency-use bases in the country would neutralize the Soviet threat.”39 He also knew that the US itself regarded access to bases in Japan as vital to its own long-term interests in Asia vis-à-vis the Communist bloc. But while he clearly felt that it was in Japan’s long-term interest to be a part of the US camp, he was nonetheless ambivalent when it came to US basing in Japan due to the sovereignty issues they entailed. Finally, given the general attitudes towards militarism at the time, he expressed strong reluctance to rearm Japan despite US urgings, preferring instead to try and rely upon the US security umbrella.40 Nonetheless, because the United States was not likely to back down on the need for basing in Japan, Yoshida began negotiations with the US in May 1950 (just prior to the outbreak of the Korean war) in which he essentially offered basing to US forces in exchange for Japan’s independence.41

In summary, the US was motivated by its dire need for armed forces to repulse the North Korean advance down the Korean peninsula. This implies that in my model the value of IV1 would be ‘very high’ because the US would be very willing to pay for a coalition contribution. For Japan, however, the willingness to pay for a coalition contribution was more ambivalent. On the one hand, it is clear that Yoshida perceived a long-term threat from the Soviet Union and that the security umbrella of the US was the only way to counter that threat. However he also wanted to see Japanese sovereignty restored while minimizing US military presence in Japan. He was also greatly concerned with economic recovery. The Japanese people had similar concerns, but were even more

39 Weinstein, 1971, p. 49. Drawing on his interviews with Nishimura Kumao, the Chief of Japan’s Foreign Ministry Treaty Bureau from 1950-51.
ambivalent about rearmament and US protection. Clearly there were a variety of factors influencing Yoshida’s decision-making at the time, and his strong personality played its own role in these dynamics. Yoshida did value the long-term security relationship with the US, but primarily because it was the best way to restore Japan’s greatness and preserve its security in the face of the Soviet threat. Yoshida’s willingness to negotiate the relationship with the US implies that he believed the Soviet threat was dire, but not yet a critical existential danger. In other words, because the Soviet threat was not seen as a looming existential threat to Japan, Yoshida was more able to push back on US demands for basing despite Japan’s semi-sovereign status.

These dynamics mean that the willingness of Japan to pay for a coalition contribution (IV2) is ‘low’ in this case, while the willingness of the US to pay for the contribution (IV1) would be ‘high’. This places the Japan case in Quadrant 2 (“Enlisting Help”) of my model.

This illustrates the problem of applying my model to a country that is not fully sovereign. However, it does not impinge the validity of the model per se. Instead, to test its predictions accurately, I must take care to examine Japanese actions in the context of their status as an ‘occupied power’ – in other words, such an occupied power would have little to no freedom of action or leverage over the US, and my theory must take that into account. Also, US actions must be examined in the context of their status as an

42 Schonberger notes that “[John Foster] Dulles summed up the ‘general opinion’ of the Japanese on security matters before the Korean war this way: ‘Japan should not rearm but should nevertheless continue to be protected by the United States, preferably from long range.’ Original quote from FRUS, 1950, p. 1232-33, cited in Schonberger, 1989, p. 249

43 Recall that IV2 is a measure of the minor states’s willingness to pay for a coalition contribution in relation to the coalition leader’s willingness for the same.
‘occupying power’ – as such the US would have nearly absolute leverage and influence over Japanese actions.

Given that Japan was not fully sovereign and the US was ‘pulling all the strings’, what would my model predict if the US and Japan were indeed acting upon their asymmetric security valuations? Most importantly, it cannot make predictions about the type of contributions that Japan would or would not make. Being an occupied country, Japan would be subject to US whim. Nonetheless, although Japan was an occupied country, the wartime Japanese bureaucracy was kept largely in place by US authorities when they occupied Japan. This was done in order to ensure that the US could govern Japan effectively – in effect the US governed Japan indirectly, by making policy which the Japanese bureaucracy implemented. But this also meant that Japanese politicians and bureaucrats had some degree of influence over how US policies were manifested. Furthermore, US authorities came to rely upon Japanese bureaucrats for policy input and feedback. Therefore, although Japan was an occupied country, there was still some de facto negotiation between the US and Japan over policy issues. 44 Thus, my model should still be able to make and test predictions about bargaining leverage, costs, and so forth.

Given the above caveats, since this case resides in quadrant 2 (“Enlisting Help”) of my model, it would predict the following:

- The US would be willing to pay high costs to obtain support from Japan, and thus Japan would have greater overall bargaining success than might otherwise be expected of an occupied country. In other words, I predict that Japanese

---

44 In his extensive study of the US Occupation of Japan, Schaller notes many instances of the influence of Japanese bureaucrats. See Schaller, 1985, especially ch. 2.
bureaucrats should be able to modify US demands of Japan in their favor because the US values their contribution to the KWC so highly.

- **My model can make no predictions about the type of contribution from Japan, given that Japan is an occupied power (the US, as an occupying power, can be expected to force Japan to contribute as much as physically possible and as it saw fit). However, my model does predict that Japanese contributions would come at a higher cost to the US than might otherwise be expected. In other words, I predict that Japan should be able to exact some form of quid pro quo from the US, even though Japan was occupied and not sovereign at the time.**

**Analysis:**

Given the highly asymmetric power relationship between the US and Japan at the time, and the intense need by the US for help in Korea, it is logical to expect that the US would urge, or even compel, Japan to assist US efforts in Korea. Given how much Yoshida clearly wanted a fully sovereign Japan that was protected by the US, and the pressing need to rebuild the country and rejuvenate the economy, it would be unsurprising if Yoshida saw this as an opportunity. It could be expected that Yoshida would attempt to use the US need for assistance in Korea as a bargaining chip to move Japan more towards full sovereignty. This would not only help Japan but also Yoshida’s political future. However, given the general populace’s attitudes towards war and militarism, Yoshida and his regime would be in a difficult position. On the one hand, they would have to mollify US demands in same way, but they would also need to be very cognizant of how their actions would be perceived by the Japanese people.

In this situation, clearly the urgent operational needs of the war would determine how much the US values the specific contributions of minor states. Thus, if a minor state can provide some critical geography, capability, or political or military contribution, then
the coalition leader would value that contribution that much more. In this case the US would have welcomed Japanese aid provided it did not hinder operations - in other words, provided that it yielded an operational benefit that outweighed the likely operational costs. Furthermore, as the benefit from Japanese contributions increased, the US value of such contributions would likewise increase. Most importantly, if the Japanese could act as “gap fillers” to plug some operational hole that US forces could not, then we can expect that the US would have gone to great lengths to obtain that critical contribution. Given all of these political and operational constraints and opportunities, is there any evidence for Japanese assistance to the US in Korea, and if so, how did it manifest itself?

There does not appear to have been any serious consideration by MacArthur or the Japanese to commit Japanese military personnel directly on the ground in Korea. This is unsurprising because, first, World War Two had ended only recently. The thought of Japanese armed forces abroad was anathema to most Americans and Japanese alike. Second, the animosity of the Koreans towards the Japanese would have probably been perceived as an operational risk or hindrance to US operations there. Just as the US did not seek Israeli support during the Persian Gulf War in 1991 because of Arab sensitivities, the US would not have sought Japanese troops on the ground in Korea during the Korean war. The political and operational cost of such contributions would certainly have outweighed their benefit. And, given popular Japanese attitudes at the

45 See Chapter 3, above. As stated there this dynamic is intricately related to the coalition leaders need, as a superpower, to protect it’s prestige. It’s prestige, in turn, is largely dependent on how it prevails in wars or other material, ideological, or political conflicts.
46 Weinstein, 1971, p. 51.
time, it is likely that Yoshida would have strenuously objected to any attempt by the US to send Japanese government troops (such as they were) to Korea.

However, since its forces were struggling mightily in Korea, it would not be surprising if the US looked to Japan for assistance in less obvious ways. According to the State Department’s Officer in Charge of Japanese Affairs at the time, under the post-surrender policy, the Japanese were prevented from having “gendarmerie or para-military organizations and cannot have any weapons except the use of small arms by the police. The Japanese cannot develop, manufacture, import or export arms, ammunition and implements of war. The construction or conversion of any vessels for military purposes is prohibited.” Despite these prohibitions, it was clear that Japanese logistical and other support to US forces in Korea could be quite helpful. Thus, it is not surprising that US authorities examined these limitations closely for loopholes. On July 19th 1950 the Department of State interpreted existing arrangements to mean that there were “no restriction[s] on…strengthening the Japanese police and coast guard…[and] the procurement of civilian type items from Japanese sources for the defense of South Korea.” The issue of developing Japanese military strength was also examined from a strategic Cold War perspective:

“From the standpoint of general war and who wins it, Germany and Japan are of prime importance…it is prudent to assume that there will be increasing Soviet effort to get these two assets [Germany and Japan]. Indeed, the Korean attack may be the beginning of such an effort as regards Japan. I have not been following closely the German situation. As

---

47 Memorandum by the Officer in Charge of Japanese Affairs (Green) to the Director of the Office of Northeast Asian Affairs (Allison), July 19 1950. FRUS, vol. 6, pp. 1244-45.
48 Memorandum by the Officer in Charge of Japanese Affairs (Green) to the Director of the Office of Northeast Asian Affairs (Allison), July 19 1950. FRUS, vol. 6, pp. 1245.
regards Japan, far distant from us and close to the Soviet Union, the United States would assume an almost impossible burden in attempting its defense without any help from the Japanese themselves. National rearmament by the Japanese government at this time would encounter serious and understandable objections on the part of former victims of the Japanese and, indeed, from the Japanese themselves. A solution might be found in a combination of (1) recreating a strong federal police force and coastal patrol, and (2) recruiting Japanese individually as part of an international force."

On July 21st 1950 the Department of State commented that it was “…more than ever convinced that the time has come to take positive steps looking toward a real strengthening of the Japanese police and coast guard organizations. Events in the Far East, including the diversion of troop strength from Japan to Korea, underline the necessity for prompt as well as definitive action.” Five days later, the State Department Policy Planning Staff circulated a memo on the “Assumption by Japan of a Greater Measure of Responsibility for its own Security, both Internal and External” which made it clear that the US anticipated a much stronger Japanese military in the future, one that was able to contribute greatly, if not entirely, to the defense of the Japanese home islands. That memo made it clear that the Korean War was a primary motivating factor for this modification of policy:

“It is our conviction, in view of the current crisis in Northeast Asia, that the centralization and augmentation of Japanese internal security forces is of greater importance than ever before…The Korean Conflict and the deep uncertainties regarding the future now make it imperative…that we proceed forthwith to create Japanese forces designed to contribute to the defense of the islands…we must recognize that all peoples of good will, including the Japanese, are through no fault of their own confronted with a

---

49 Memorandum by the Consultant to the Secretary (Dulles) to the Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Nitze). FRUS, vol. 6, p. 1247.
new situation radically different from that envisaged in the Potsdam Proclamation and the Post-Surrender Policy. On this basis we are justified in resorting to extraordinary measures to enable Japan to contribute to its own defense.”

Given this, it is not surprising that the Japanese were pressured to become involved in the KWC. This involvement appears to have manifested itself in at least three ways. First, both Yoshida and the US authorities agreed to (and promoted) the use of Japanese production facilities to help supply US forces in Korea, ports and airfield to transport them, and medical and other facilities to assist them. Yoshida and MacArthur both suggested to Dulles in June 1950 that “harnessing Japan’s industrial potential rather than its soldiers would make the greatest contribution to America’s aims in East Asia. In drawing on Japanese industry for a host of military supplies, the United States both solved its own logistics problems and gave a tremendous boost to the stalled recovery program [in Japan]. During 1951-52, American military orders known as off-shore procurements reached nearly $800 million per year…nearly $3 billion flowed into Japan by the end of 1954.” This provided quite a boost to the ailing Japanese economy at the moment when it was well positioned to take advantage of the sudden increase in demand

52 Weinstein notes that “in order to fight in Korea…the Unified Command staffed principally by Americans, would require an extensive network of support and logistical bases in Japan. American and other United Nations forces would pass through Japan en route to Korea, would train in Japan, be supplied from depots in Japan, and receive medical care in military hospitals in Japan.” Weinstein, 1971, p. 51-52.
for durable goods.\footnote{Schaller assesses that “The Korean Conflict and the militarization of [US] Asia policy cleared away the bureaucratic roadblocks hampering a settlement with Japan and helped fund that nation’s economic recovery. In a very real sense, Japan arose from the ashes of the Second World War largely on the crest of an expanded American military crusade in Asia.” Schaller 1985, p. 279.} Yoshida himself noted that the Korean War transformed “Japan’s situation so far as economic depression was concerned, because of the sudden upsurge of order for war materials...”\footnote{Yoshida, 1961, p. 93.} More importantly, it was explicitly recognized at the time that supplying US forces would not only benefit ailing Japanese businesses, but would also serve the strategic purpose of enhancing ties to the US and, through economic growth, reduce the risk of a Communist revolution. Even as early as August 1950, the State Department’s Office of Northeast Asian Affairs examined “what effect the Korean war and stepped up US and European re-armament is likely to have on Japanese economic prospects and probable date of self-support...” and noted specifically that “Japan is being paid considerable dollar sums for the Korean support operation. According to one estimate, materials have already been contracted for to the amount of 50 million dollars, and a total of 200-300 million dollars may be spent in Japan during the present US fiscal year. When the fighting is over, Japan expects to derive further earnings from Korean rehabilitations.”\footnote{Memorandum by Mr. Robert A. Fearey of the Office of Northeast Asian Affairs to the Director of That Office (Allison). August 8, 1950. FRUS, Vol. 6, p. 1266.}

Japan also supported the US war effort in at two material ways, both of which were a direct result of the needs of US forces in Korea. First, MacArthur directed Yoshida to strengthen Japan’s own internal police forces so they could act as para-military security forces – and thereby allow US Occupation forces in Japan to move to the Korean front. Second, remaining Japanese naval capability was expanded and used to
fill a critical operational gap in US Naval force structure. Yoshida understood the opportunity such directives provided:

“In July 1950, shortly after the outbreak of the Korean war, I received a communication from General MacArthur; it was urgent official business, with orders for measures to be taken to assure the maintenance of order in the Japanese islands, including the establishment of a National Police Reserve force to consist of 75,000 men, and an increase in the size of the Maritime Safety Force by 8,000 men..I had long felt grave concern over the inefficient state of our police under the post-war reform set-up and had been seeking means of remedying the situation, so that this directive from SCAP seemed to me the opportunity. I therefore immediately called together the officials concerned and began discussions regarding the measures to be taken. The purpose of the directive was clear enough: it was to strengthen our police force in a manner that would fill the gap left by the transfer of US troops from Occupation duty in Japan to the Korean battlefronts… [emphasis added].”

One of the first military responses of the US to the North Korean invasion was the movement of US personnel in Japan to shore up crumbling US defenses in Korea. Due to the seriousness of the situation, US forces were dispatched as rapidly as possible. It was clear to both MacArthur and Japanese authorities that soon there would not be enough US forces in Japan to maintain order. In light of previous labor violence and strikes, the threat of internal disorder was quite real and Japan lacked any internal security police force (and had since the end of WW2), even though Leftist elements in Japan disrupted domestic order frequently with riots and violent demonstrations. Given the extensive internal Communist threat that Japan faced in these years, US forces prior

---

57 Yoshida, 1961, p. 182. This is clearly Telegram 77 dated July 9th (a letter from General MacArthur to Prime Minister Yoshida). See footnote at FRUS, Vol. 6, p. 1251.
59 See, for example, Schaller 1985, pp. 49-51, which also goes into detail on how MacArthur and US policies viewed and dealt with Leftist elements.
to this were not free to leave Japan for fear of a Communist uprising. A new Japanese police force could take up this burden.  

Although MacArthur directed Japan to create a new Japanese National Police Force to assume internal security duties, this was also an opportunity for Yoshida to enhance Japanese capabilities and regain some measure of sovereignty for the government. SCAP recognized the internal danger to Japan from the Communists, and directed that the new force would take orders directly from the Japanese Cabinet rather than from local authorities. In addition, it also had a distinctly military character. Yoshida notes that “there was some talk at the time among Cabinet members of making the new force a national police under the control of the Government, but GHQ regarded it more in the light of an embryonic army, and it continued to expand along those lines…”  

This entailed a greater centralization of police forces and provisioning them with rigorous military training. Indeed, the new police force was interpreted by US personnel involved in training the new Japanese recruits as “a disguise for the organization of a new Japanese army made necessary by the transfer of [US] Occupation forces to the Korean battlefield.” In spite of the Japanese public’s virulent opposition to militarism and rearmament, Yoshida did not balk at the military character of this new police force. But neither did he, or MacArthur, publicize it. When confronted in the Diet, he noted bluntly that: “As a result of talks at headquarters [GHQ], we were able to state, in reply to

---

60 See also Berger, 1998, p.35; Jitsuo, 2000, p. 138-139.  
61 Yoshida, 1961, p. 180-185  
questions in the Diet, that the new force was to be organized separately from the ordinary police and under the direct orders of the Government…”

In addition to these changes in the police force, surviving elements of the Japanese Imperial fleet were ordered by MacArthur on July 8th 1950 to be re-mobilized as well as increased.65 In this regard, Yoshida only notes that:

“The personnel of the Maritime Safety Board (Japan’s embryo coastguard) also had to be expanded by 8,000 additional men. To accomplish this, ships were necessary, and we had none worth speaking of at the time apart from a few patrol boats used by the Maritime Safety Board to assist vessels in distress, the largest of which was only 700 tons. However, as it was out of the question to build new ships at such short notice, it was decided to make shift with what patrol vessels were available for the time being and begin by recruiting the additional men, which was done…”66

Furthermore, although the ostensible purpose of these expanded maritime capabilities was to maintain order in the Japanese islands, these forces actually supported US Navy forces in Korea.67 Although the Imperial Navy had been deactivated in 1945, over 100 minesweepers had remained active in order to clear mines left over from the war. The US

64 Yoshida, 1961, 182-183. Note that he also states in the same section that “in reply to questions whether the creation of the National Police Reserve did not constitute a step in the direction of rearmament, we stressed the fact that the new force was designed purely for the purpose of maintaining order within Japanese territory and bore no relation to anything in the nature of rearmament. This particular point, however, came up for discussion more and more as plans for the gradual strengthening of Japan’s means of self-defence progressed.”


66 Yoshida, 1961, p. 186. Yoshida goes on to note that years later he sent: “…a letter to General Matthew Ridgway, who had succeeded MacArthur [by that time] as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in April 1952, requesting the loan of American vessels, and stating that Japan possessed at that time only three patrol boats of 700 tons each, twenty-two of 450 tons, and twenty others of 270 tons, a total quite inadequate to guard a coastline extending over some nine thousand miles in length; and that, to remedy this situation, we would appreciate the loan of at least ten frigates and fifty landing craft.” See Yoshida, 1961, pp. 187-188.

Navy, on the other hand, had retired nearly all of its minesweepers at the end of World War II.\(^{68}\) This was critical because in Sept-Oct 1950 MacArthur had begun his counterattack against North Korean forces using amphibious landings first at Inchon and then at Wonsan harbors. While the Inchon harbor was free of mines (due to the tides there) the harbor at Wonsan was heavily mined. Japanese minesweepers, manned by Japanese naval personnel, were the only option available to US forces to fill this operational gap.\(^{69}\) US naval personnel requested that the Japanese Maritime Safety Board [MSB] to support US operations, and Yoshida reluctantly agreed.\(^{70}\) By all accounts, the Japanese vessels performed well in the operation, and US authorities expressed their profound gratitude.\(^{71}\) The MSB detachment to Korea was formally disbanded in December 1950.\(^{72}\)

---

\(^{68}\) Auer, 1973, p. 64.

\(^{69}\) Auer, 1973, Ch. 4. Also based on email exchange with Jim Auer. An extremely detailed examination of the use of Japanese Maritime Safety Board forces in the Korean War is given in Auer, 1973, especially Ch. 4. For a discussion of the Wonsan landing, see Halberstam, 2007, p. 313.

\(^{70}\) Auer reports that “[Rear Admiral] Arleigh Burke knew that the US Navy lacked minesweeping forces capable of handling significant opposition…there was only one expertly trained and large minesweeping force in the world qualified to do the job, the forces of the [Japanese] Maritime Safety Agency, still sweeping the Japanese coastal approaches and Inland Sea area. After the landing [at Wonsan] was decided on, Burke called Okubo [Director of the MSA at the time] …[and] explained the necessity of UN forces conducting an amphibious operation off Wonsan, and expressed fear of Soviet mines in the area…Burke asked him to assemble all Japanese minesweepers in the Tsushima Straits area and to help in sweeping at Wonsan and in residual work at Inchon. Okubo stated that the decision was too important to be made by the Director General of MSA but that he would ask Prime Minister Yoshida for a decision. Yoshida was reluctant to decide, for there was no law permitting minesweeping as there was for convoysing troops and cargo. Furthermore, minesweeping was a combat operation, and article 25 of the MSA law made it very clear that this was a nonmilitary force. For Japanese former naval personnel to risk their lives in combat in support of Americans would be very hard to explain. Still, Japan was under Occupation and subject to SCAP authorities. Yoshida finally authorized Okubo to send MSA sweepers as desired by the US Navy.” Auer, 1973, p. 64.

\(^{71}\) See Auer, 1973, pp. 65-67 for details on the operation and its aftermath.

\(^{72}\) Auer, 1973, p. 66.
Needless to say, none of this was made public at the time – MSB vessels did not fly Japanese flags but rather “International” or UN flags.73 One officer on MacArthur’s staff at the time recalled much later that “the Japanese became a valued resource because they had the industrial manpower. They were often used illegally; they not only built the minesweepers, but they manned them in Korean ports, which was contrary to the [occupation statute] treaty.”74 Given the explicit military nature of this operation, it would undoubtedly have been opposed by the Japanese public. But it is just as clear that these forces formed the core of what was to later become the Japanese Maritime Self Defence Force.75 This appears to have been an intentional choice on the part of the US authorities: “…from the start, the MSB was an organized, trained, uniformed, armed force and did provide a training cadre for later naval expansion.”76 Further…it was, from the outset,

73 Auer, 1973, p. 65. In fact, this problem had been anticipated even before the need for Japanese minesweeping was apparent. The policy planning staff at the US Department of State noted in July that the Japanese government “might turn over to SCAP destroyers and smaller patrol craft, over and above those now being activated, to be manned wholly by Japanese crews and to be employed in preventing infiltration of the Japanese coast. To maintain the position that these vessels are controlled and operated by the occupation forces, each ship would be commanded by an American officer and fly the American flag.” See Memo on “Assumption by Japan of a Greater Measure of Responsibility for its own Security, both Internal and External” July 26, 1950. FRUS, vol. 6, p. 1257.


75 The MSB was also staffed by a large number of former Imperial Navy Officers who, according to official policy, should have been purged at the end of the war but were not. This was due to the Korean War and the need to reenergize the nascent maritime capabilities of Japan, and a conscious effort by the Japanese to “remain flexible and to deal with any situation that might come up” as early as 1946. See Auer, 1973, p. 69. There is also a good deal of evidence that camaraderie between US and Japanese naval officers may have led to a less vindictive attitude towards the Japanese officers. See Auer 1973, p. 70-73.

76 The Japanese Admiral Nomura Kichisaburo was in de facto charge of rearmament within the Japanese navy, and the MSA provided the core of his early efforts in this regard. This was encouraged by US Admiral Arleigh Burke at the time as well. See Auer, 1973, p. 70-77. For a detailed history of early Japanese Naval and other rearmament see Auer, Ch. 5. A useful chronology exists in the same work, running from 1941 to 1971 (Auer, p 311-315).
under Japanese centralized authority, it was paid for by the Japanese government, and it participated in naval operations.”

The outbreak of the Korean War also clarified the ongoing debate over Japanese rearmament and whether US forces would be based in Japan after relations between the two countries became normalized. Just prior to the invasion of South Korea, the two governments were not making any progress on issues of an eventual peace treaty or Japanese rearmament in the face of the Communist threat. After the outbreak of the Korean War, the Japanese people did appear to have had more appreciation for the US security umbrella – but at the same time they still longed for their independence and generally opposed the idea of US bases. Yoshida’s attitudes are similar: he clearly recognized the need to defend Japan against the strategic threats it faced, and was thus more amenable to a de facto rearmament and US basing in Japan:

---

79 John Foster Dulles wrote on July 3rd 1950 that: “Prior to the attack by North Korean forces on South Korea, Sunday, June 15th, the one thing which could be said with certainty was that...[there was] a strong Japanese expectancy that the United States would take positive action towards expediting a total peace settlement. Failure to have moved in this direction would have caused great disillusionment and resentment. With the North Korean attack and successes and the consequent increasing Communist menace, the Japanese began to see that there is no simple solution of their security problem...after the North Korean attack there was more open admission than had previously been obtained of the continuing need of United State military forces remaining in Japan. The Jiji Shimpo said editorially, for example...’and if Japan wants herself defended by the United States, she should voluntarily offer the strategic parts of her territory as American military bases.’ Summary report by the Consultant to the Secretary (Dulles) July 3rd 1950. FRUS, Vol. 6, p. 1231. In the same report, Dulles discusses Baron Shidehara’s perspective on the issues (Shidehara was a prominent Japanese politician, and was at the time the President of the Japanese House of Councilors). Shidehara “wanted American forces to remain under some arrangement or other for he said that the Communists had been allowed too much liberty and that is American forces were withdrawn at once the Japanese would not be able to contain possible Communist activity...he claimed there was strong sentiment against Russia among the Japanese..." P. 1232. See also Schonberger, 1989, p. 251-52. Berger notes that “only after the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 made a public debate on self-defense possible.” Berger, 1998, p. 33. He also notes that a Japanese poll in November 1950 showed that “a solid majority (53.8 percent) of those surveyed supported rearmament, but the public exhibited ambivalent feelings about the prospect of the continued stationing of US troops in Japan, with 29.9 percent in favor and 37.5 percent opposed.” Berger, 1998, p. 36.
“The proposal that Japan should rearm was first advanced in earnest immediately before the outbreak of the Korean War. The American government had begun seriously to consider the question of concluding peace with Japan, and that fact gave rise to the problem of the defence of the country after a peace had been concluded and the Allied forces had been withdrawn. The international situation made it out of the question to leave Japan sovereign and naked – and without defence – and it was in that way that the subject of Japanese rearmament first came to be discussed. I objected to the suggestion…and we compromised, and least at that juncture, by arranging that the disused facilities of the former Imperial Army and Navy be restored to operation, to co-operate with US Forces. Soon after this decision the Japanese Government received General MacArthurs’ directive to establish a National Police Reserve (with the outbreak of the Korean war), and thus the first step towards the provision of some means of defence for Japan by the Japanese was taken at the instance of the Occupation authorities...”

Yoshida’s goals at this juncture seem clear: to maintain and tighten the relationship with the US and thereby attain Japanese security, and sovereignty, in the face of the Communist threat. But Yoshida did not believe that the establishment of a nascent Army and Navy were the solution to Japan’s defense needs, and he was eager to shift the burden of Japan’s defense to the US. He made the case that, despite the formation of the National Police Force and MSB, Japan’s defense could only be ensured by the US – and he understood that this required US forces to be based in Japan. Yoshida recalls that:

---

81 Weinstein shows that at this time conservative Japanese Prime Ministers (Yoshida) and his ministers were “unusually quick to perceive the bipolar pattern of military power...they understood very early that...a United States Soviet rivalry in the Far East offered them an opportunity to reestablish Japan as a viable political entity.” Weinstein, 1971, p. 2.
82 Based on interviews with Japanese ministers, Weinstein attributes Yoshida’s attitude change to a belief that “South Korea must not be permitted to fall into the hands of a hostile power.” (Weinstein 1971, p. 50) He also notes that “For Prime Minister Yoshida, the Korean War settled the question of whether it would be necessary to have United States force stationed in the country after the conclusion of the peace treaty. He concluded that it would be in order to prevent South Korea from falling under Soviet control. On this basis he resumed planning for the security treaty.” Weinstein, 1971, p. 52-53. Jitsuo notes that: “The Japanese strategy was clear: Japan wanted a US security guarantee after it regained sovereignty in exchange for its acceptance of US military bases in Japan, which could be used not only to defend Japan,
“The establishment of the National Police Reserve and the increase in the personnel of the Maritime Safety Board contributed to the strengthening of Japan’s police forces, but it remained obvious that, once a peace treaty was signed with the Allied Powers and the nation regained its independence, such forces would be far from adequate for the defence of the country. Recognition of this fact led to the decision to invite the US Forces to remain in Japan after the signing of the peace treaty, and to the signing, at the same time as the treaty itself...of a US-Japan Security Treaty. Although thus named, in fact the burden of the defence of the Japanese homeland was actually laid entirely on the shoulders of the Americans...”

Given the state of the Japanese economy and attitudes towards militarism, it is not surprising that Yoshida would hesitate at Japanese rearmament. Yoshida noted years later that “To questions as to what we would do if the United States demanded that Japan rearm, I myself answered that we must obey the constitutional ban on rearmament, and would decline to take such a step, even if such a demand were received. This was, in my view, common-sense policy and, given the position in which Japan was placed, the obvious and sensible next step was to make common cause with the United States for the defence of the country.”

Despite the fact that Yoshida “consistently opposed... but also for the protection of US strategic interests in East Asia....In return for the US commitment, the United States retained their military bases in Japan.” Jitsuo, 2000, p. 140.

83 Yoshida, 1961, p. 186-187. It is interesting to note that the burden-sharing problem between the US and Japan was telling even then. Yoshida continues on:”...the United States naturally did not desire that this [the US assumption of the burden for defending Japan] should be a permanent arrangement any more than we did. The question therefore arose, early in the talks between the two nations to decide on the wording on the pact, of the desirability of Japan’s gradually increasing its defensive power in order to assume a share of responsibility for the security and defence of our country...” He goes on to detail how the National Police Reserve and the Maritime Safety Board became the Self Defence Forces with the Maritime Forces being composed of a loan to Japan by the US of eighteen 1,500 ton frigates and fifty landing craft of 250 tons each in November 1952. Yoshida, 1961, pp. 187-188.

rearmament”85 he also consistently sought an end to the Occupation and resumption of full sovereignty for Japan.86

In retrospect, it is clear that Yoshida gained significant leverage in his negotiations with the US due to the Korean conflict. One scholar notes that Dulles “recognized that because of the heightened importance of Japan to American security in the wake of the Chinese intervention in Korea, concessions which once he could have obtained from the Japanese ‘merely by suggesting them [had now] to be negotiated for and obtained as fully as possible.’”87 Eventually, in exchange for allowing the US to base its troops in Japan, Japan gained security from the Russian threat, its full sovereignty, and the kernel of an army and a navy - not to mention a start down the path to economic recovery on the backs of US orders for war materiel. It has often been observed that the Korean War was a great boon to the then-struggling Japanese economy. But it also enabled a security arrangement that protected and enriched Japan throughout the entire postwar era.

This arrangement may not have been possible had US strategic attitudes not also been clarified by the Korean War.88 It has been noted by many scholars that the invasion of South Korea transformed US strategic policies in Asia.89 In relation to Japan, the US

85 Yoshida, 1961, p. 191. See also p. 192 on his explication for why rearmament was anathema to the Japanese.
88 For a detailed examination of the changes in Pentagon attitudes towards Japan due to the outbreak of the Korean War, see Schonberger, 1989, p. 249-52.
89 Schonberger notes that “Within five days of the onset of the Korean War on 25 June, the Truman administration created the conditions under which Dulles was able to finally gain Pentagon support for an early peace treaty and reluctant Japanese acceptance of a ‘separate peace’ that required both US bases in Japan and Japanese rearmament.” Schonberger, 1989, p. 249. See also p. 256-259. Schaller states it this
timetable for moving towards a peace treaty with Japan, and the creation of US military bases there, became much more urgent (which gave Yoshida that much more bargaining leverage). Dulles noted on July 19th 1950 that “the Korean attack makes it more important, rather than less important, to act [on a peace treaty with Japan]. The Japanese people have been in somewhat of a postwar stupor. The Korean attack is awakening them and I think that their mood for a long time may be determined by whether we take advantage of this awakening to bring them an insight into the possibilities of the free world and their responsibilities as a member of it.” Later, on August 14 he made it clear that the issue of US basing in Japan after a peace treaty had been concluded was of even greater importance due to the Korean War. Commenting on the draft articles of a peace treaty with Japan, he noted that they were “designed to give the US, in a form as inoffensive as possible to the Japanese, the broad power to place military forces wherever in Japan the US may determine to be desirable from the standpoint of the maintenance of international peace and security in the area…the importance of the nature of these security arrangements has, of course, been highlighted by the present situation in way: “The North Korean assault across the thirty-eight parallel...became the catalyst transforming American policy throughout Asia. It provided the momentum that carried the United States more fully into the Chinese civil war, into the Indochina war, and toward a separate peace with Japan...” Schaller 1985, p. 278-279. Yonosuke assess that “the Korean War is more pertinently interpreted as an event that had a strong ‘catalyzing effect’ on the formation of a ‘Cold War Consensus’ rather than as ‘one that marked the true ‘turning point’ in America’s foreign policy.” Yonosuke, 1977, p. 17. Jitsuo notes that “the Korean War became a catalyst for making the US security system in East Asia in which Japan was embedded. It was not only a derivative of the US security policy in East Asia; it was also a result of Japan’s calculations. Ever since, Japan’s reliance on the United States became the first condition of Japan’s defense policy.” Jitsuo, 2000, p. 141.

90 See, for example, Outline of Procedural Steps for a Japanese Peace Treaty July 7, 1950 which states that within less than two months a plenary conference should be convened in Tokyo of all nations formally still at war with Japan that would consider drafts for a peace treaty.

91 Memorandum by the Consultant to the Secretary (Dulles) to the Secretary of State, July 19th 1950. FRUS Vol. 6, p. 1243.
The US Joint Chiefs of Staff, heretofore opposed to an early peace treaty with Japan, also became more amenable to quickly granting Japan independence due to the Korean War.  

There are other episodes that indicate that the Korean War empowered Yoshida in his dealings with the US and also compelled US occupation forces to alter their own priorities. For instance, Yoshida was able to greatly ameliorate the purges of Japanese militarists, businessmen, and young Army and Navy officers after the Korean War began. Prior to the war the Yoshida government had set up a Japanese Public Office Qualifications Appeal Board in order to “take up cases of those who considered themselves unjustly purged [by the US] and furnished evidence supporting that fact.” This board was to arrange for such persons to be re-screened by SCAP Authorities, with the hope that they would be taken off the list of purgees. Before the Korean War began, of the 1,000 names the Appeal Board sent to SCAP, only 150 people were exonerated. Later, after the outbreak of the Korean War, a new board submitted over 32,000 names to SCAP, and over 10,000 were exonerated. Yoshida attributes this change directly to the Korean War.

---

92 Unsigned Memorandum Prepared in the Department of State, August 14, 1950. FRUS Vol. 6, p. 1273-1274.
93 See Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense transmitted to the State Department in Memorandum by the Secretary of State to the Ambassador at large (Jessup), August 22, 1950. FRUS Vol. 6, p. 1278-1282.
95 Yoshida: “It is possible to imagine several reasons why GHQ…showed such a complete change of heart at the last minute. The patient efforts of the Japanese government to secure consideration of our case probably had some effect…but the changes then taking place in the international situation – and particularly the outbreak of the war in Korea – also played their part. The Korean War, especially, completely transformed the scene in the Far East. The basic policy of the Occupation of Japan was abruptly switched from having the demilitarization and democratization of the country as its main objectives to the relaxation of controls placed, until then, upon the Japanese nation. In my view, one is also justified in assuming that this fact also influenced GHQ’s attitude towards the purges. After the departure of a
The terms of the eventual peace treaty with Japan were also clearly influenced by the Korean War and the sudden interest by the US in a stable, strong, and re-armed Japan that could house US forces and contribute to collective security against the Communist bloc. Yoshida recalls that John Foster Dulles believed in June 1950 that “if a peace treaty had been signed three years earlier, its terms would have been much more unfavourable to Japan, but that now the aim of the United States was to frame a treaty which would not be a document to be signed between victors and vanquished, but a peace signed between friendly nations.” This peace treaty was eventually adopted in 1951 finally giving Yoshida and the Japanese people their “prime objective…the regaining of our national independence.”

It also appears that Yoshida knew well that he had a great deal of bargaining leverage due to the demands of the Korean War and the nascent Cold War. And he

---

96 Schonberger notes that “While [John Foster] Dulles believed the Korean attack had shocked the Japanese people into accepting United States forces in Japan, he also was aware that the longer the war continued the more opportunity the Japanese gained for bargaining on the bases issue.” Schonberger, 1989, p. 251


99 Nitta notes that Yoshida used “Japan’s strategic importance [vis-à-vis the Soviet Union] for bargaining leverage with the United States. He was convinced that the cold war would require the United States to maintain it’s presence in Japan, which alone would be sufficient to deter a Soviet attack. He would therefore give exclusive priority to pursuing Japanese economic recovery and maintaining political stability. The doctrine had three main tenets: Japan’s economic rehabilitation must be the prime national goal. Political economic cooperation with the United States was necessary for this purpose. Japan should remain lightly armed and avoid involvement in international political-strategic issues. Not only would this low posture free the energies of its people for productive industrial development, it would avoid divisive
seemed more than willing to engage in risky brinksmanship with the US – which usually paid off. In one key instance, on July 29 1950, he told the Japanese Upper House Foreign Affairs Committee that “I am against leasing military bases to any foreign country” and denied reports that the US had requested or desired such bases. The State Department officer in Charge of Japanese Affairs at the time noted that:

“‘It is difficult to determine what Yoshida had in mind in making [that] statement. He has previously implied in many public statements, and privately through his emissary…that he did not believe neutrality answered Japan’s security problem which required protective US bases in Japan in the post-treaty period…a possible explanation of why Yoshida made the…statement at this time is…that the Prime Minister and the Foreign Office ‘appear to be laying the groundwork for future bargaining.’ The war in Korea has pointed up the need for US bases in Japan. Just as US bases in Japan made it possible for the US to go to the defense of South Korea, so it is now clear that US bases in Japan will prove a critical factor in protecting the whole US position in the Far East. Japanese leaders must be fully aware of this fact, and it would be logical for the Japanese…to intimate that the price for these all important bases in Japan is greater than the US had perhaps reckoned. Certainly the Japanese are in a position to refuse a treaty imposing any disabilities on Japan…because acceptance of US bases is the price Japan knows she must pay for an early treaty, Mr. Yoshida is probably prepared to accept them at least for a defined short period of time…’”

All of these factors worked to Yoshida’s benefit - his negotiations with the US, which continued over several years, eventually resulted in a comprehensive treaty and formal military alliance, as well as what came to be known as the ‘Yoshida Doctrine’. This doctrine essentially allowed Japan to “remain in the Western camp, make the minimal military effort necessary to secure a defense relationship with the United States, internal struggles…to gain a long term guarantee for its own security, Japan would provide bases for the US Army, Navy, and Air Force.” …” Nitta, 2002, p. 75-76.

100 Memorandum by the Office in Charge of Japanese Affairs (Green) to the Director of the Office of Northeast Asian Affairs (Allison). August 2, 1950. FRUS, Vol. 6, p. 1263-1264.
and leave the hard security problems to Washington as Japan focused on economic recovery.”

101 Yoshida got nearly everything he wished for. Given his stated motivations, it seems that Yoshida skillfully struck a bargain with the US that was singularly beneficial for Japan and in large part enabled by the outbreak of the Korean War.

Results (dependent variables):

My predictions for Japan appear to be accurate, even given the subservient nature of the Japanese government at the time, and the undue leverage of the US as an occupying power. First, Yoshida was able to take advantage of his suddenly increased bargaining leverage in his dealings with the US. The US clearly desired Japanese assistance in Korea, and was willing to alter its longstanding policies in ways that benefited Japan to obtain it. US policy shifts seem closely related to the need to encourage Japanese support in Korea. The re-creation of a embryonic army and navy, progress on peace treaty talks and the eventual terms of the peace treaty (quite lopsided in favor of Japan) and the ‘Yoshida doctrine’ are the prime examples of Japanese leaders working to modify US demands of Japan in their favor using the opportunity provided by the Korean War.

Japanese contributions to the US did come at a higher cost to the US than might otherwise be expected. Seen solely from the perspective of an occupying power, the US should have had the ability to gain all the Japanese support it wanted at little to no cost. It could have ‘forced’ Japan to support the US. Instead, the Korean War altered the bargaining calculus, and led the US to alter longstanding policies towards Japan, exonerate former Japanese war criminals, and accept peace treaty terms that were very

lopsided in favor of Japan. Despite the fact that the Japanese were occupied and semi-sovereign, they were nonetheless able to exact a number of beneficial quid pro quos from the US.

**Turkey**

**Background (Independent Variables):**

The North Korean invasion led the US to look for assistance in multiple quarters. For both political and material reasons, the US desired to create a broad coalition against North Korea and, by extension, the Soviet Union. If the US could create broad political support for the KWC, then it could demonstrate to the USSR that the West stood in concert against blatant Soviet aggression. This was a logical consequence of the Cold War turning hot and the US was able, as noted above, to quickly secure a broad UN resolution condemning the North Korean invasion and authorizing international forces to repel it.\(^{102}\)

However, the even more pressing need was material: US forces in Korea needed all the help they could get. Of course, this led the US to move what troops it had available (primarily from Japan) to the Korean front as fast as possible, but it also caused the US to consider troop contributions from other states. When it became clear that North Korean forces were executing a full scale invasion and US forces were being overrun, the US sought material support from a broad array of other states. However, the desirability of such military assistance was tempered by the realization that not all allied military forces would be useful, or able to be integrated into US military operations in Korea without

\(^{102}\) See Appendix B for relevant UN Security Council Resolutions.
“creating problems greater than their military contribution.” The Joint Chiefs of Staff feared that “Either the army of a particular country is already committed under other defense arrangements… [or]…the qualities of the troops or difficulties related to logistic support, standardization of weapons, language barrier, etc, would render particular national units unsuitable or a positive hindrance.”

Turkey was considered especially problematic in this regard, perhaps because they were deemed necessary to defend their country against potential Soviet aggressions, but more likely because they were considered too far away, too under equipped, too ill trained, or too hard to integrate into existing forces to have a positive impact on battlefield operations. The Joint Chiefs actively pursued contributions from the UK and Pakistan, and gauged the potential contributions of other states as either “wants” “considering” or “don’t want.” Turkey fell into the latter category. As such, it was US policy to not pursue a Turkish contribution.

This is not to say that the US regarded its relations with Turkey as unimportant, quite the contrary. Turkey was considered a key nation in the struggle against Communism. The Truman Doctrine clearly indicates that the US considered the Soviet threat to Turkey, and the threat of Communist revolution there, to be of high

---

103 Memo 795b.5/7-1950 “Memorandum by the Deputy Ass’t Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs (Merchant) to the Ass’t Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs (Rusk)” July 19, 1950. FRUS, Vol. 7, p. 432-433.
104 Memo 795b.5/7-1950 “Memorandum by the Deputy Ass’t Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs (Merchant) to the Ass’Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs (Rusk)” July 19, 1950. FRUS, Vol. 7, p. 434. The full list is: “Want: UK, Canada, Pakistan, New Zealand, Australia; Considering: India, Argentina, Lebanon, France, Benelux; Don’t want: Italy, Turkey, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, China, Bolivia.”
105 This is stated explicitly in memo 795b.5/7-1950 (Ibid) p. 433 which states that “It is not believed that the Department should actively press another government to offer ground or other units when it is known in advance that on the military basis an offer would be unacceptable, unless it has been determined in advance that political consideration should control.”
importance.\textsuperscript{106} The Truman doctrine provided $100 million in aid to Turkey for modernization and economic assistance. The point of this assistance was to turn Turkey into a reliable and strong ally, by allaying their fears of isolation and building up their military strength.\textsuperscript{107} The CIA at the time considered the status of Turkish military forces to be of paramount importance, and “recommended that the $100 million allocated to Turkey be devoted to modernizing and training the Turkish armed forces and to alleviating the heavy financial burden of maintaining those forces.”\textsuperscript{108} Furthermore, the geostrategic importance of Turkey, with its’ control of the Straits of Bosporus and border with the USSR, was clear to the US.\textsuperscript{109} US military aid to Turkey began to rapidly increase the strategic and deterrent capabilities of the Turkish armed forces vis-à-vis the USSR.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{106} Declared by President Truman to the US Congress on March 12, 1947, pledged $400 million in economic, reconstruction, and military to Greece and Turkey in order to rebuild their economies after World War Two, help modernize their militaries in order to prevent a rise in the influence of the USSR and Communist ideals. $100 million went to Turkey, the rest to Greece. A copy of Truman’s speech to Congress can be found at www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/trudoc.htm. The actual law enacting the aid can be found at: Public Law 75 – 80\textsuperscript{th} Congress, Chapter 81, 1\textsuperscript{st} Session, S. 938. “An Act to Provide for Assistance to Greece and Turkey.”

\textsuperscript{107} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 61-63.

\textsuperscript{108} Declassified CIA paper. Project NLT 81-19, “Turkey SR-1/1.” Dec 22, 1948 p. 1. For details on how the monies should be allocated, see pp. 4-7. Available at http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/doctrine/large/index.php. Athanassopoulou notes that “Of the $100 million dollars that Turkey was to be given for the 1948 fiscal year, 48.5 percent would be allocated to the army, 26.75 percent to the air force, 14.75 percent to the navy. The remaining 10 percent would be spent on highway and arsenal improvements.” Athanassopoulou. 1999., P. 64-65.

\textsuperscript{109} See Ahmad, 2004, pp. 26-28. Ahmad tries to make the case that the US, not the USSR or Turkey, exacerbated the tensions between the USSR and Turkey due to its belief in the geopolitical importance of the Straits and Turkish location close to the Soviet heartland. Declassified CIA reports from the time note that “The fall of Turkey to Soviet domination would make the strategic communications and oil resources of the Near and Middle East far more vulnerable than they are now to Soviet aggression.” Declassified CIA paper. Project NLT 81-19, “Turkey SR-1/1.” Dec 22, 1948, p. 2. Available at http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/doctrine/large/index.php

\textsuperscript{110} Ahmad notes that, as a result of the Truman Doctrine, “US army advisers sought to reorganize and modernize the Turkish army, augment its mobility and firepower, improve its communication and transportation infrastructure, and bolster its logistical capabilities. They wanted the Turkish army to retard the Soviet land offensive, thereby affording them time for the United States and Great Britain to launch the
Overall then the US regarded Turkey as an important ally in the global struggle against Communism, and the Truman doctrine had essentially enlisted Turkey’s position in the anti-Soviet camp.\textsuperscript{111} However, despite this division of the world into two competing blocs, the US had yet to provide any formal security guarantee to Turkey. Furthermore, the US certainly had little desire for Turkish support vis-à-vis the Korean conflict.

Turkey, for its part, was motivated largely by its desire for a closer relationship with the United States at this juncture. In the decades prior, an alliance with Britain had lent Turkey some protection vis-à-vis Russia, their primary security concern. After the end of the War, Britain could no longer afford the material or political commitments to Turkey, prompting an immediate turn by Turkey towards the United States.\textsuperscript{112} Although it welcomed US military aid at the time, Turkey wanted more than just aid, it wanted an alliance.\textsuperscript{113} American aid, by itself, was not seen as sufficiently binding the US and Turkey together.\textsuperscript{114}

---

\textsuperscript{111} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 76.
\textsuperscript{112} Athanassopoulou. 1999, p. 58-59.
\textsuperscript{113} Ahmad notes clearly that although US military aid was important “Turkish leaders wanted much more than just US military aid; they sought an agreement resembling an alliance.” Ahmad, 2004, p. 30. See also Ibid.
\textsuperscript{114} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 93.
The threat from the USSR was keenly felt in Istanbul, and most, if not all, of Turkey’s actions vis-à-vis the US in this period were a reflection of concerns over the Soviet threat. During World War II, the USSR had strongly pressured Turkey to end its neutrality and also to grant concessions to Moscow.¹¹⁵ Such concessions included a demand that Turkey agree to changes in the Montreux Convention that would allow Soviet naval forces access to the Mediterranean and bases on the Bosporus Straits.¹¹⁶ After the end the war, relations with the Soviet Union deteriorated even more. In 1945 Moscow refused to renew their mutual Treaty of Friendship from 1925, and insisted once again that Turkey renegotiate the management of the Straits of Bosporus in a way that would allow the USSR to jointly defend the straits¹¹⁷ and demanded that Turkey give two of its provinces to Soviet Georgia.¹¹⁸

Of course, relations between Turkey and Russia had historically been poor since the time of the Ottoman Empire, but with the world now divided up into two global superpower camps, the proximity of the USSR prompted Turkey to seek protection, which in 1950, only the US could reasonably provide. The Turks were “adamant in their determination to resist Soviet demands” and eagerly sought a US military guarantee of their security.¹¹⁹ In the face of the Soviet threat, such a guarantee was necessary since

¹¹⁸ Brown, 2008, p. 98. The CIA noted in late 1948 that “There has been no appreciable lessening in Soviet pressure on Turkey. The situation regarding revision of the Montreux Agreement of 1936 concerning the status of the Straits is at a deadlock, since the USSR has not abandoned its demands for privileges in the control and defense of this waterway. The USSR...has also sought to annex certain strategic areas in northeastern Turkey...” Declassified CIA paper. Project NLT 81-19, “Turkey SR-1/1.” Dec 22, 1948. P. 2. Available at http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/doctrine/large/index.php
Turkish forces were greatly outnumbered and generally inferior to Soviet forces (and this even though approximately half of the entire Turkish budget went to its military). In a war, they could likely hold out against a Soviet invasion for only a few weeks.\textsuperscript{120} Furthermore, Communist governments had been installed in Romania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, and Soviet-led uprisings had allowed Russia to establish footholds in Northern Iran and within the Kurdish independence movements. Turkey was essentially encircled, which greatly enhanced their fear of Soviet domination.\textsuperscript{121} It is clear then that “given this situation, the only hope the Turks had was to ally with a power strong enough to deter the Soviets; should deterrence fail, the ally would need sufficient armed forces to prevent the Soviets from taking over the country.”\textsuperscript{122} Only the United States fit that bill, and Turkey plainly sought a formal alliance with the US.\textsuperscript{123}

Nonetheless, the US remained ambivalent towards a formal alliance or security guarantee. Turkish President Inonu made clear requests for a binding commitment from

\textsuperscript{120} Drawing on declassified CIA sources, Brown notes that “By 1950 the Soviet Union possessed the second most powerful military on earth, with 2.5 million men (including 175 line divisions). Considering that Turkey’s armed forces in 1950 only consisted of approximately 235,000 men, Turkish forces were estimated by most to be capable of holding out only a few weeks in the face of a direct Soviet invasion….\textquotedbl” Brown, 2008, p. 98. See also See Memo 782.5/8-1450. “Memorandum by the Ass’t Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs (McGhee) to the Deputy Under Secretary of State (Matthews). Aug 14, 1950. FRUS, Vol. 5, p. 1289. Declassified CIA paper. Project NLT 81-19, “Turkey SR-1/1.” Dec 22, 1948. pp 6-7 go into detail on the exact composition and capabilities of the Turkish armed forces at this time. Available from \url{http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/doctrine/large/index.php}

\textsuperscript{121} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 45-46.

\textsuperscript{122} Brown, 2008, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{123} Note also that Turkey took a similar tact in the 1920s and 1930s when it turned to Britain as a protector against Russia. See Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 5. The capability, and willingness, of Britain to act as a security guarantor for Turkey rapidly diminished after the end of WWII, however, because in the wake of the War, Britain lacked the resources to do so. Essentially, Britain was replaced by the US as the only power with the strength to protect Turkey against Russia. See Athanassopoulou, ch. 1-3 for extensive detail on this.
the US in 1947, but US officials remained non-committal.\textsuperscript{124} Turkish efforts to join the newly formed NATO organization were rebuffed as well (as were similar efforts by Greece).\textsuperscript{125} In May 1948, the Turkish ambassador to the US explained that because the US had extended security guarantees to Western Europe but not Turkey, it actually emboldened the Russians to pressure or perhaps invade Turkey, and demoralized the Turks themselves.\textsuperscript{126} He insisted that Turkey needed a clear guarantee from the US.\textsuperscript{127} By 1949, the Turks were hinting that further Turkish military buildups, in cooperation with the US, might be forewarned if they led to aggravating tensions with the USSR. In April 1949, Turkish Foreign Minister Sadak asked Dean Acheson why Turkey should risk incurring Soviet wrath if the US was not willing to defend it.\textsuperscript{128} In essence, they attempted to play the “neutrality card” but the US remained unconvinced.\textsuperscript{129} Throughout 1948-1949 the US continued to rebuff the Turks’ requests for a formal alliance, yet still maintained a strong interest in Turkey’s security vis-à-vis the USSR.\textsuperscript{130} And Turkey, for it’s part, continued and failed to convince Washington of the need for a formal security arrangement.\textsuperscript{131} Domestic politics did not alter this calculus: the last attempt to join a US

\textsuperscript{125} It wasn’t really membership in NATO that interested Turkey so much as an American security guarantee. See Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 150.
\textsuperscript{126} Athanassopoulou. 1999, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{127} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 100.
\textsuperscript{129} Athanassopoulou. 1999, p. 134-136.
\textsuperscript{130} The US remained unwilling to commit formally to Turkey’s security throughout these years. See Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 117-121, 135-136.
\textsuperscript{131} In this time period, Turkey, in fact not only pressured Washington but also coaxed London. Britain, as the former security guarantor of Turkey was still regarded as a potentially useful ally and, more importantly, and important player in relations with the US and in NATO politics. If the Turks could attain the approval of Britain, then they would have that much more chance to convince the US to create a formal arrangement with Turkey or to allow Turkey into NATO. This dissertation, concerned as it is with relations between Turkey and the Superpower, does not delve into great detail on the Turkish-UK relations at the time. They are explored in great detail in Athanassopoulou, 1999.
backed security arrangement was made by the governing Republican Party in Turkey in May 1950, when the Turkish government applied to join NATO (and was rebuffed). Soon after, on May 14th, the Democrat Party was swept into power. Led by Adnan Menderes, it did not alter the overarching foreign policy goals of its predecessors.132

In summary, US attitudes towards Turkey were that it was a useful strategic partner in the Cold War, but the US was not yet willing to offer it a security guarantee. As for a Turkish contribution to the Korean War, US officials generally perceived that as more of a hindrance rather than a help. Thus, the willingness for the US to pay for a Turkish contribution (IV1) is ‘low’. Conversely, Turkey was motivated to enhance its relationship with the US, and hoped to come under the US’ security umbrella so that it might gain protection against the USSR. The Korean War provided an opportunity for Turkey to enhance this relationship and demonstrate its value as an ally. Thus, Turkey would be very willing to pay for a coalition contribution. The value for my model’s IV2 is therefore ‘high’. Given these two variables, this case would fall squarely within quadrant 4 (“Currying Favor”).

My theory predicts then that:

- Turkey would be willing to pay high costs to the US and the US would therefore have greater bargaining leverage.
- Turkey would contribute to the coalition at its own expense
- Turkey will actively offer its own resources (i.e. its own troops or materiel) to the US.

Analysis:

In this context, the outbreak of the Korean War on June 25th 1950 is a clear chance for Turkey to curry favor with the US so as to increase its odds of being admitted into NATO.\textsuperscript{133} Turkey immediately condemned the North Korean invasion, and during the UNSC deliberations on June 26th, the Turkish ambassador called the aggression a critical test that demanded decisive action.\textsuperscript{134} The Turkish government quickly lined up behind the US in support of its efforts against North Korea. This belief was shared almost universally across the Turkish political sphere.\textsuperscript{135} Turkish Prime Minister Menderes (newly elected) told reporters “for the UN not to take action against aggression that takes place, wherever it occurs, will open the door to new violations and will be considered as a reward to the recent aggression.”\textsuperscript{136} Nonetheless, the initial US reaction was lukewarm. As noted above, the US Joint Chiefs of Staff considered Turkish forces to be unattractive, either because they were deemed necessary in Turkey to defend against Russia, or because they would be too hard to integrate into operations in Korea.

On July 14th, the UN Secretary General Trygve H. Lie urged 50 UN member nations to consider offering forces to assist the combat efforts in Korea. On July 22nd, the

\textsuperscript{133} As one Turkish scholar notes, “When the Korean War erupted on June 25, 1950, Turkey had already been grappling for some years with Soviet pressure on the status of the Straits and territorial demands on her eastern provinces. Washington’s reaction to the dangers menacing Turkey…resulted in the Truman doctrine. However, Turkey’s virtual isolation continued and her attempts to join a Western security scheme were thwarted. It was against this background that Turkey’s…government decided to respond positively to the UN Secretary-General’s request for a military contribution to the defense of South Korea.” Turkmen, 2002, p. 161. Brown notes that “When the Korean War broke out, Turkey’s newly elected Democratic Party government immediately realized that the war presented an opportunity to demonstrate their solidarity with the West, dedication to the principle of collective security, and most importantly, Turkey’s military usefulness as an ally.” Brown, 2008, p. 102.

\textsuperscript{134} Telegram 330/6-2650 “The US Representative at the United Nations (Austin) to the Secretary of State.” June 26, 1950. FRUS Vol. VII, p. 188.

\textsuperscript{135} See Brown, 2008, p. 103.

US Ambassador in Ankara met with the Turkish Foreign Minister who noted that he wanted the US to “bear witness to [Turkey’s] sincere desire manifest by practical action its loyalty to UN and to Turk-US collaboration. [and that] We wish particularly that our reply conform with US policy and public opinion.” US Ambassador Wadsworth did not urge Turkey to promise ground troops in response to Lie’s request, but rather he consulted the next day with US General McBride and Senator Harry Cain (who happened to be in Ankara at the time).\textsuperscript{137} After that consultation, he told the Turkish Foreign Minister that, in his personal opinion, “Turkish government could best manifest its support of UN policies by prompt dispatch of fully equipped regimental combat team.” General McBride had apparently described what such a regimental combat team should consist of and that it should be equipped with its own transport, ammunition, spare parts, and be a “fully self-contained combat unit of between 4,000 and 4,500 officers and men.”\textsuperscript{138} All agreed that by such action Turkey could “best show…its loyalty to UN and Turk-US collaboration and at same time best serve its own interests.” The Turkish Foreign Minister noted too that “I trust this decision will be taken promptly by Cabinet and will render even more effective our collaboration in political as well as military

\textsuperscript{137} The actions of Senator Cain in promoting a Turkish contribution a way for Turkey to join NATO are somewhat controversial. The State Department took pains to point out the Cain was speaking as a private citizen, but this would clearly have bolstered Turkish hopes in that regard. See Brown, 2008, . 103, and Athanasopoulou, 1999, p. 164 who notes that “Cain…favoured Turkey’s admission into the Atlantic Pact. In late July he was visiting Turkey and urged in his public utterances the dispatch of Turkish forces to Korea, suggesting that Turkeys’ offer to assist might result in its inclusion into the Atlantic Treaty. Cain was also very active behind the scenes to the same end, but Erkin’s memoirs testify that the decision had been taken before his arrival.”

terms.” He promised to present the proposal to the Turkish cabinet on July 25th. One Turkish General even noted at the time that “It will be [the] greatest crime in Turkish history if we fail to take advantage of this opportunity.”

The Turkish cabinet moved rapidly after this encouragement. On July 26th, they formally offered 4,500 of its troops to the UN forces in Korea. Over three weeks later, on August 19th, the US government (as the Unified Command of the UN forces) formally accepted the offer. While the reasons for the change in US attitudes between June and August are not entirely clear from existing archives – after all, it is possible that Wadsworth and McBride were encouraging the Turks without specific orders to do so - it does however appear that the operational situation in Korea played a part in convincing the US that Turkish troops could be useful. On August 8, MacArthur made a compelling case to President Truman and the Joint Chiefs that he needed significantly more combat forces within weeks:

“Time works against us in the Korean situation. Early military victory is essential…a maximum coordinated offensive effort of US forces should be made at the earliest possible date…[with the objective of] the destruction of the main North Korean armed forces…before the onset of next winter. The forces now scheduled to be operationally available…by 25 September are inadequate for the successful accomplishment of this mission…every effort should be made to secure the maximum of United Nations combat ground forces, particularly British, Canadian, Pakistani,

---

Australian, Turkish, and perhaps French, and at the earliest possible date.”\textsuperscript{142}

The above was given to President Truman on August 9\textsuperscript{th}, at which point:

“The President requested the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to give immediate consideration to MacArthur’s proposals…the Joint Chiefs of Staff met at once to consider the military recommendations proposed…and within twenty-four hours approval had been given to the plan.”\textsuperscript{143}

It seems quite likely then that the military necessities of the Korean conflict led directly to a change of heart amongst the Joint Chiefs.\textsuperscript{144} But it is also important to note that McBride insisted that the Turks furnish a fully equipped, self-contained, and supplied combat unit (rather than one that would require extensive US support to be of operational use).\textsuperscript{145} This implies that the issue of whether Turkish forces would be a net operational positive or negative on the battlefield were still of concern to the Joint Chiefs. In any case, the Turks did not hesitate to jump at the opportunity, and clearly took all of McBride’s suggestions to heart. Given the speed and completeness with which the Turks

\textsuperscript{142} Memo 795.00/8-850 “Memorandum of Conversation, by Lieutenant General Matthew B. Ridgway, Deputy Chief of Staff for Administration, United States Army.” Aug 8 1950. FRUS Vol. 7, p. 540-541.
\textsuperscript{143} Memo 795.00/8-850 “Memorandum of Conversation, by Lieutenant General Matthew B. Ridgway, Deputy Chief of Staff for Administration, United States Army.” Aug 8 1950. FRUS Vol. 7, p. 541, footnote #2.
\textsuperscript{144} Brown considers that US officials may also have shifted their opinions regarding Turkish contribution due to concerns that “the coalition was continually being charged by Soviet leaders…of leading a new wave of colonialism. By integrating Thai and Turkish forces, the US wanted to demonstrate that Malik’s claim was baseless as the US was being aided by Asian countries themselves.” Brown, 2008, p. 95. This claim is based upon discussions between the US representative at the UN and the Ambassador from India (Rau). The claim that Turkish and Thai troops would mitigate Soviet propaganda appears to have been made by Ambassador Rau, not the US Ambassador, however. See Telegram 330/8-1650 “The US Representative at the United Nations (Austin) to the Secretary of State.” Aug 16, 1950. FRUS, Vol. VII, p. 591.
\textsuperscript{145} McBride did however acknowledge that the unit might not have adequate small arms, since none had been given to them under the American assistance program. McBride was the chief of the American mission in Ankara that was modernizing Turkish forces, so he would certainly understand the capabilities of Turkish units. See Telegram 123 Wadsworth, George. “The Ambassador in Turkey (Wadsworth) to the Secretary of State,” July 24, 1950. FRUS, Vol. V, p. 1281.
responded to Wadsworth and McBride’s suggestions, it appears that they were hoping to make a favorable impression on the US. As others have noted, “Turkey wanted to achieve more than simply flying its flag in Korea – it wanted to prove its worth as an ally to the United States and other NATO members.”146 The Turks in fact sent more men to Korea than any other coalition member except the US, UK, and Canada.

The Turks did not waste any time attempting to link their offer to a tightening of US-Turkish relations, even while the US was endeavoring to make the point that Turkish contributions would not necessarily lead to inclusion in NATO or a formal security guarantee from the US.147 On July 31, five days after the Turks made the offer (and almost three weeks before the US accepted it) Ambassador Wadsworth cautioned the Turks that there was no link between their contribution and inclusion into NATO or increased US aid. Nonetheless, the Turkish Foreign Minister was clear in his belief that the Korean War “impelled reconsideration [of] Turkey’s place in over-all western mutual defense” and that he hoped the US, French, and British governments would consider accepting Turkey into NATO.148 Prime Minister Menderes noted that:

“I have given particular instructions that defense planning by our staff and your officers be given top priority; but planning does not depend on one party alone. We naturally want to know what you are planning and are prepared to do in, and for joint defense of, Turkey, in event of war….our collaboration should be as close in political as in military and economic

146 Brown, 2008, p. 95.
147 Telegram 782.5/7-3150 “The Ambassador in Turkey (Wadsworth) to the Secretary of State.” July 31, 1950. FRUS, vol. VII, see footnote one on p. 1285 which refers to an unprinted telegram that “suggested the Ambassador George Wadsworth caution[ed] Turkish officials against drawing the conclusion that the Turkish offer to assist in Korea might result in Turkey’s inclusion into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and have a bearing on the extent of US economic aid to Turkey.”
fields...Korean War has opened new era, one in which we must strive harder and work faster towards common objectives.\textsuperscript{149}

One week after offering their troops to the Korean conflict, the Menderes government put forward a formal request to join the NATO alliance.\textsuperscript{150}

Nonetheless, the US rebuffed the Turkish application. Although Truman would officially adopt the recommendations of NSC-68 by the end of Sept 1950 (which led to a greatly expanded defense budget and called for rearming of crucial allies), the US was still hesitant to include Turkey in its formal defense arrangements.\textsuperscript{151} While admitting that Turkey was threatened by the USSR and that control of the Turkish Straits was critical to the interests of the US, the US National Security Council recommended that in the event of a Soviet attack on Turkey that:

\begin{quote}
\textquote{The United States should provide accelerated military assistance to Greece or Turkey and deploy such United States forces to the support of these countries as can be available without jeopardizing US security. In the case of Turkey the United States should urge the UK and France to give full support under the Anglo-French-Turkish mutual assistance pact, and should make every effort to obtain the support of Turkey by the Moslem world including Pakistan.}\textsuperscript{152}
\end{quote}

Furthermore, there was a concern that the nascent NATO organization would be ‘diluted’ and its organizational progress would be impeded, if it were to immediately expand to include Greece and Turkey.\textsuperscript{153} Also, the US Joint Chiefs were skeptical of being able to provide any further military aid to Turkey than it already planned, although they

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{149} Telegram 782.5/7-3150 “The Ambassador in Turkey (Wadsworth) to the Secretary of State.” July 31, 1950. FRUS, vol. VII, p. 1286-1289.
\item \textsuperscript{150} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 165. Vander Lippe, 2000, p. 96.
\item \textsuperscript{151} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 174-175.
\item \textsuperscript{152} NSC report, 25 August 1950, FRUS, Vol. 1, p. 387.
\item \textsuperscript{153} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 176-177.
\end{itemize}
acknowledged that to defend Europe effectively would require an eventual commitment to the Eastern Mediterranean once the resources to do so became available.\textsuperscript{154} In the end, instead of admitting Turkey into a formal arrangement, the US offered Turkey an associate status in the organization and a slight increase in military aid to the extent that they felt Turkey could effectively utilize.\textsuperscript{155} The NSC did note that the “Turkish offer of 4,500 ground troops for service in Korea is a welcome demonstration of Turkish solidarity with the United States in support of United Nations principles” and that due consideration should be given to their desire to join the Atlantic Pact.\textsuperscript{156}

Despite these rebuffs, the Turks did not abandon their efforts. In one aspect, the very manner in which Turkey support the KWC seems to further support the idea that Turkey was trying to demonstrate their worth and reliability as an ally of the US. First, it was politically costly to the Turks to send troops overseas. Turkey had taken great efforts to remain neutral since the 1920s, and so committing strongly to the US and sending troops overseas was a bold step for the new Turkish government. Throughout World War II, despite intense pressure from the USSR, Germany, and the Allies, the Turks refused to become involved. And Turkish foreign policy since the founding of the Republic had been built, in large part, on the concept of neutrality. Thus, dispatching Turkish troops to fight overseas was seen by domestic opposition groups as a radical departure from the

\textsuperscript{154} Memo 740.5/9-1150 “Memorandum by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Secretary of Defense (Johnson)” 9 Sept., 1950. FRUS, Vol. V, pp. 1306-1309.
\textsuperscript{155} S/S-NSC Files: Lot 63D351: NSC 42 “Memorandum by the Acting Secretary of State to the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council (Lay)” Sept 19, 1950. FRUS Vol. 5, p. 1317-1319.
\textsuperscript{156} S/S-NSC Files: Lot 63D351: NSC 42 “Memorandum by the Acting Secretary of State to the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council (Lay)” Sept 19, 1950. FRUS Vol. 5, p. 1320.
core principles of Turkish foreign policy, and was used to strongly criticize the Menderes government.\textsuperscript{157}

Secondly, the actions of Turkish forces in Korea seem also to indicate that they were demonstrating their value. After arriving in Korea, the Turkish brigade spent two months training with American weapons, but the Turkish General noted that the Turks had come to fight and that the brigade should see some action.\textsuperscript{158} By all accounts, the Turkish brigade conducted itself with extreme bravery, astounding the American commanders.\textsuperscript{159}

US thinking regarding the strategic significance of Turkey, as well as that of Greece and other states, began to evolve rapidly in the face of the growing Soviet threat and the entry of the Chinese into the Korean conflict on November 1950.\textsuperscript{160} There was a growing sense that the USSR might indeed risk an all out general war with the West which the US was not yet prepared for.\textsuperscript{161} At the same time, Turkey’s position had changed little: the Turks continued to insist on an American security guarantee, regardless of the exact nature of the multilateral arrangements that might make that a possibility.\textsuperscript{162} The unwavering Turkish diplomatic efforts, combined with rising

\textsuperscript{158} Vander Lippe, 2000, p. 97.
\textsuperscript{159} Vander Lippe notes that “The Turks first saw action in the battle of Kunu Ri, at the Chosin Reservoir, one of the bloodiest battles of the entire war. At one point, surrounded by the Chinese, and low on ammunition, the Turks fixed bayonets and stormed a Chinese position. The American division commander refused to believe the Turkish claims and sent his own inspectors, who counted 900 bayonetted Chinese. For its accomplishment the Turkish brigade was awarded the American Distinguished Unit Citation.” Vander Lippe, 2000, p. 97 from Basri Danisman, \textit{Situation Negative} (The Hague, 1973), pp i-iii. See also Turkmen, 2002, pp. 173-175.
\textsuperscript{160} For a full recounting of the evolution of US concerns, see Athanassopoulou, 1999, Ch.6.
\textsuperscript{161} Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 196.
\textsuperscript{162} In a conversation between Turkish Ambassador Erkin and George McGhee (Ass’t Sec’y of State for the Near East) McGhee recalls that “As the Ambassador was leaving I asked him if…he had changed his views
apprehension in the US government about Soviet capabilities, appears to eventually have had an effect. By spring of 1951, the US State Department and Department of Defense agreed to review the idea of a reciprocal security arrangement with Turkey (and Greece). The Joint Chiefs of Staff concluded in April 1951 that:

“Certain new developments and trends have become apparent in the world situation…[the Soviets objectives are] to prevent or delay the rearmament of the Western World…to prevent the United Nations from achieving their objectives in Korea…[and] the British Government is apprehensive of United States global policies and is not whole-heartedly supporting them…the military power of France, as well as that of the other continental NATO nations, has not increased as rapidly as expected…the progress of the rearmament of Western Germany has been slow and in general unsatisfactory…in general the development of strength in the other NATO countries is unsatisfactory…from the military point of view, regional international arrangements for international security should only be entered into when they will directly enhance the security interests of the United States. In this connection it is considered that admission of Turkey and Greece to NATO should be proposed now.”

The National Security Council, and President Truman, accepted this recommendation in May of 1951. These decisions made the inclusion of Turkey and Greece into NATO

---

as to the possibility of Turkey’s entering into regional arrangements in the absence of a US commitment. The Ambassador very emphatically indicated that there was no change in his views and that he would strongly oppose Turkey’s participation in such agreements. “ See Memo 740.5/1-2451 “Memorandum of Conversation, by the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs (McGhee).” January 1951. FRUS 1951, Vol. V, p. 1112.

165 Athanassopoulou, 1999, p. 203. See also Brown, 2008, p. 105 where he notes that “NATO’s decision to reverse itself and accept Turkey as a member was [not only a result of their participation in the Korean War but] also the result of a major re-evaluation amongst various policy makers that led them to conclude that the country was actually more an asset than a liability. One of the core arguments for this new appraisal was that Turkey (along with the other new members) would add significantly to the total forces available to NATO. And…the value of these forces was considered to be even greater by American laymen and policymakers after the robust performance of the Turkish soldiers in Korea. Secondly, Turkey’s geographic position – which had previously been a negative factor because it was seen as outside the area of concern –
largely a foregone conclusion, and NATO extended an invitation to them on Sept 21, 1951.\textsuperscript{166} The Turkish press attributed this change of heart directly to the heroic actions of the Turkish brigade who had proven Turkey’s value to the West.\textsuperscript{167} Although the US decision was clearly linked in American minds to the defense needs of the US vis-à-vis the threat from the USSR, to Turks it was a result, albeit a bit tardy, of their participation in the Korean War. In an oft-quoted editorial of the time, a the newspaper of the ruling Democrat party noted that “There has been a great and honorable share of the blood of our Korean heroes in the signatories ink used...for the invitation extended to Turkey for her entry into the Atlantic community...Today’s Turkey is a source of power for peace, and not a liability.”\textsuperscript{168}

Furthermore, although the Turks had exerted their efforts to join NATO, it is obvious that their true purpose was to obtain a security guarantee from the US as the only power that could ensure their protection. Becoming a member of NATO was simply the most surefire way to do that.\textsuperscript{169} The Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Fuad Koprulu, told UK Minister Bevin as early as 1950 that he

\textsuperscript{166} The British did object in some fashion to the accession of Turkey to the NATO arrangements, primarily over their desire to retain operational control over the Mediterranean, but they had very little influence in relation to the bipolar power of the US. See Turkmen, 2002, pp. 176-178, and Athanassopoulou, 1999, pp. 207-230. As Athanassopoulou notes “Turkey found itself in NATO as a result of American support. The United States alone, as the voice par excellence in the Atlantic Alliance, secured Turkey’s membership. London continued to view Turkey in an exclusively Middle Eastern security context, and deluded itself into believing that the Americans would agree to Britain’s operational control over Turkey as part of their Middle East defence planning. London resisted Turkey’s NATO membership, but it lacked the clout to get its way.” P. 229-230.

\textsuperscript{167} Vander Lippe, 2000, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{168} This quote is originally from \textit{Zafer}, the newspaper of the ruling Turkish Democrat party. It is referenced by Vander Lippe, 2000, p. 98, Brown, 2008, p. 105.

\textsuperscript{169} Athanassopoulou notes that “In reality, at the beginning of August 1950, the Turkish government seemed still flexible like their predecessors in relation to other possible security alternatives to Turkey’s...
“wished to make it clear that the Turkish government were not attached to any particular formula for the solution of their problem...provided that the United States government could be committed he did not mind whether it was by means of an extension of the Atlantic Pact to cover Turkey and Greece, or by the formation of a new Eastern Mediterranean Pact, which would have to invite the United States, Turkey, and Greece as well as the United Kingdom and France.”

He also noted that if it were not possible to have Turkey accepted into NATO, then Turkey would accept as second best anything that obligated the US to come to the military aid of Turkey. Although it took almost two years, Turkey eventually got all everything it wanted.
Results (dependent variables):

I predicted that Turkey was motivated to demonstrate its value and reliability as an ally to the US, in order to try to bring the US and Turkey closer together and so ensure Turkey’s survival in the face of the threat from the USSR. Given that the US had little direct desire for a Turkish contribution to the Korean War Coalition, this implies that the Turks would see the Korean War as an opportunity to enhance the relationship with the US, but that they would therefore be forced to pay most of the costs for that to come about. My predictions were largely borne out.

Specifically, Turkey was willing to pay high costs to bring the US and Turkey closer. The Turkish government proactively sent troops to the Korean theater, with little promise of anything in return. In fact, it initially gained nothing for its efforts, and risked much (its own military resources, domestic criticism of the ruling party, potentially antagonizing the USSR, etc.). What bargaining took place clearly favored the United States – the Turks took the opportunity of the Korean war to demonstrate their commitment and reliability as an ally, but it did not immediately gain them anything in return. Existing security arrangements remained in place, much to the consternation of the Turks and to the advantage of the US which had, de facto, a commitment from the Turks to stand with the US against the USSR in the event of a global war.

It appears just as clear that the Turks committed the large number of men and materiel they did primarily because they valued the relationship with the US so highly.

security requirements...secured their recognition as a member of the western comity of nations.”
Not only did they commit many more men than almost all other contributors to the war\textsuperscript{173}, but their troops went out of their way to engage in risky combat and, in so doing, sent a clear signal about their worthiness as allies. The US did not need any further political support for the war, so once the Turks had their troops on the ground, they needed to demonstrate their commitment in some other way – which they did in their operations.

Despite the leverage of the US, the relationship between the two nations eventually strengthened – Turkey was admitted into NATO with US support. However, this reversal had little to do with the Korean War or Turkish contributions to it. Rather, the US acted to aggregate Turkish power more formally into its global alliance against the USSR. The growing threat of the USSR entailed a need by the US to strengthen its alliances and enrich its allies. It was only when these needs became apparent that the US changed its longstanding position on Turkish and Greek membership in NATO.

**Germany**

**Background (Independent Variables):**

West Germany’s political fate since 1945 had been in the hands of three allied powers: the US, UK, and France, although the influence of the US on German affairs was far more dominant than that of France or the UK.\textsuperscript{174} Originally, the policy of the Office of

\textsuperscript{173} A full list of contributors to the Korean War Coalition is given in Appendix B.

\textsuperscript{174} This was primarily due to the dominant role the United States played in the war, and the overwhelming financial and other resources of the US at the time. See “Memorandum of Conversation by Mr. John W. Auchincloss of the Bureau of German Affairs,” when McCloy noted that “unfortunately the British and French think of German recovery as a responsibility of the United States rather than themselves.” FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4, p. 595. Thoss notes that Adenauer’s reliance on the US for the protection of West Germany was “simply a consequence of the precarious economic and military situation of the two other occupying
Military Government for Germany, United States (OMGUS) toward Germany had been punitive. Like in Japan, the desire of the US was to de-industrialize the country as punishment and insurance that a militarist Germany would never again threaten war. However, from late 1945 the Germans came to be seen more as potential democratic allies against a Soviet Union that was increasingly perceived with fear and suspicion. Thus, punitive policies were soon abandoned because “only the Soviet Union would gain from policies that prolonged German suffering. By 1946, General Clay had halted all major dismantling of industries in the American zone of Germany. The policies of denazification, decartelization, dismantling, and democratization came to be seen as means to rebuild and rejuvenate Germany, rather than punish it. In 1948 the Marshall Plan began send substantial amounts of desperately needed aid to Germany and other countries, and provided the West Germans with solid evidence that the US was not going to abandon them. The US was committed to the defense of Germany against the USSR, even as it was an occupier of West Germany.

powers, Great Britain and France, with their unsolved recovery and colonial problems.” Thoss, 1993, p. 412. Bark and Gress, p. 176. There are, of course, a large number of scholarly, historical, and biographical books that deal with how the wartime cooperation of the US and USSR became a postwar competition and then the Cold War. Bark and Gress, p. 127. Bark and Gress, Pt. 2, Ch. 11 goes into detail on the internal US debates in Washington (involving Acheson, Kennan, Truman, Marshall, et al) on the adoption of a containment policy, Kennan’s assessments of the burgeoning Soviet threat, and how US policy in the postwar world should be reoriented to meet it. One of the most obvious manifestations of this shift in policy was the adoption of the European Recovery Plan, better known as the Marshall Plan, through which US aid would help Europe recover from the effects of the war, and thereby promote peace and democracy – in opposition to the USSR. Bark and Gress, p. 174. See Pt. 2, Ch 10 overall. Bark and Gress, p. 184. Germany, by most measures, regained its independence in 1955. See Bark and Gress, 1989, pp. 252-253. However, some aspects of the Occupation remained in effect much later than is commonly believed. For example, Germany did not posses the legal right to declare a state of emergency, and thereby mobilize civilian assets in a time of war until 1968. Thus, it may be fair to say that Germany remained dependent on
The US shift in regarding Germany first as an enemy to be punished and just a few years later as an important ally was clearly greatly influenced by increasing tensions with the USSR.\textsuperscript{180} The collapse of the wartime alliance with the USSR and the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948 set the stage.\textsuperscript{181} And the Soviet blockade of Berlin from June 1948 to May 1949 brought the two superpowers to a confrontation and ‘spurred a fundamental revision in American strategic thought.’\textsuperscript{182} The subsequent US airlift to relieve the city further drove home the point that the US was committed to Europe while sharpening the confrontation with the USSR.\textsuperscript{183} The US was “now determined to enter actively, rather than passively, into the diplomatic and military struggle for Europe. The US would seek to hinder Soviet political and ideological encroachment by any means available, and would deploy its resources, in particular military forces, in Europe to deter and, if necessary, defeat a Soviet attack.”\textsuperscript{184}

The US and Western Europe formed NATO in 1949 and began planning for the defense of Europe largely because of these tensions.\textsuperscript{185} But the vast numerical superiority

\textsuperscript{180} See, for example, “Memorandum Prepared in the Bureau of German Affairs- Germany in the European Context,” Feb 11, 1950, FRUS, Vol. 4, p.597-602. See also Telegram 762A.5/4-2550 “The United States High Commissioner for Germany (McCloy) to the Secretary of State” in which McCloy notes that “our present approach to problem of preventing Germany from ‘again becoming threat to peace of the world’ in unrealistic…I question whether they [the restrictions placed on Germany] make sense in present divided world, when both sides are struggling for atomic supremacy and both sides are rearming…I suggest that real security for Western Europe lies not in limiting Germany’s production, but in strengthening Western Europe by addition of Germany as willing participant and eventually as full partner…” April 25, 1950, FRUS, Vol. 4, p. 633.

\textsuperscript{181} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 272.

\textsuperscript{182} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 273.

\textsuperscript{183} Bark and Gress, pt 2, ch 15 goes into detail on the Berlin Blockade, the Airlift, and the policies and motivations behind it.

\textsuperscript{184} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 273.

\textsuperscript{185} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 274.
of the Soviet Union and its client states meant that NATO forces needed to be greatly reinforced if they were to seriously attempt to defend themselves. The US and the UK secretly debated bringing Germany into the alliance for these reasons, but “few political leaders dared mention this possibility publicly” at the time. Given the recent Berlin Blockade and the threat from East German and Soviet forces, the Germans, as well, were interested in a closer and explicitly military alliance with the West, or at least a clearer military commitment to the defense of Germany. Despite the clear threat from the USSR, the political realities of the time, in which the memory of World War Two still lingered, prevented such debates from becoming public.

At the same time, the superpower competition brought the Germans and the Allies closer, and led the US to assist in the creation of an indigenous West German government that might eventually be a partner rather than an occupied country – and thereby outside of the sphere of lingering Soviet influence. By the time the Berlin Crisis ended on May 12, 1949, West Germany had adopted the Basic Law as the core of its legal structure and thus “a West German state had been established [albeit] with limited sovereignty, but

---

186 Dulffer, interview, 2008. And not only secretly, for as Kaplan notes, “From the Summer of 1949, voices in Congress and the military were raised on behalf of a German contribution, if not membership, in the [NATO] alliance. On the crassest level, it seemed unreasonable for Germans to enjoy the protection of NATO through the presence of allied forces without their contributing to the common defense. On a more elevated plane, linking Germany to NATO in one way or another would ensure a Western orientation in the Federal Republic and obviate temptations to accept unification on Soviet terms.” Kaplan, 1999, p. 60.


188 In a declassified US State Department Memorandum from February 1950, John McCloy (the US High Commissioner for Germany) noted that “Adenauer has asked whether it is true that we plan to base our line of defense on the Rhine, and he maintains that in disarming the Germans we incurred an obligation to defend them…” “Memorandum of Conversation by Mr. John W. Auchincloss of the Bureau of German Affairs,” FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4, p. 595. See also Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 274.

189 Kaplan, in his history of the early years of NATO notes that “To suggest inviting Germans into an alliance only four years after the end of World War II was impossibility; memories of Nazi bestiality were too strong among most NATO allies.” Kaplan, 1999, p. 59-60.
with the prospect of becoming a full partner in the emerging West European community of democratic nations.” 190 The establishment of the Basic Law did not end the Allied Occupation, but it did finalize the split into two Germanies, and accelerate the shift in authority away from the military governors to the civilian Allied High Commission, of which the USSR was not a member.191

Germany had, of course, been de facto divided into Western and Eastern sectors by the occupying Allied powers since the end of World War 2.192 East Germany was dominated by the Soviet Union, while the West remained under provisional US, UK, and French administration. And by 1950 tensions between West Germany and the USSR and its East German ally were already high. Ideological confrontations were common. Furthermore, the USSR had already stationed twenty-seven Soviet divisions stationed in East Germany - which faced a much smaller Allied force in the West.193 Tensions between the two blocs in 1950 were extremely high. The West German government clearly saw the USSR and its East German client state as an existential threat. The parallels between West and East Germany, and North and South Korea made this perception of threat all the more pressing. A US State Department intelligence estimate prepared immediately following the North Korean invasion notes that:

“In occupied Germany, the success of the North Korean invasion forces will cause especial alarm. Germans in all [Western] zones will

190 Bark and Gress 1989 p 225. See pp. 220-226 and all of Pt. 3, ch 1, for detail on the origins and impact of the West German government Basic Law.
192 For a detailed English language history of Germany at this time, and the politics amongst the Allied powers related to the division and post-war disposition of Germany, see Bark and Gress, 1989
193 Lawrence Kaplan, 1999, p. 60. See also Adenauer, 1965, various sections. For example, in relation to the Korean War, Adenauer details West German vulnerabilities on pp. 272-274.
inevitably consider the possibility of East German paramilitary police playing in Germany the same “unifying” role the Soviet has assigned to its North Korean forces. Neutralist pressures and pressures for some sort of West German security force may be expected to increase.”\textsuperscript{194}

Konrad Adenauer also looms large in West German politics and foreign relations at this time – understanding him is crucial to understanding West Germany’s relations with the US prior to the outbreak of the Korean War. The first autonomous elections held in West Germany brought Adenauer to the Chancellorship in September 1949.\textsuperscript{195} At that time he faced a country not only with a looming external threat from the USSR, but also a dire economic situation.\textsuperscript{196} Similar to the situation in Japan, the currency was greatly devalued, millions of people were living in squalid conditions, and unemployment was nearly 50%.\textsuperscript{197} The country was beset by starvation, labor shortages and social unrest, and could not revive its decimated industrial base or pay for desperately needed basic imports.\textsuperscript{198} The German people were greatly demoralized by economic uncertainty and unemployment.\textsuperscript{199} Germany’s economy was in full blown crisis.

Adenauer was committed to the US and the West, but he was primarily and unsurprisingly committed to German interests. First and foremost, he wanted Germany to be treated as an equal, and to be an equal, within Europe. And he was willing to push for that at every practical and symbolic opportunity.\textsuperscript{200} Adenauer had also been convinced

\textsuperscript{194} State Department Intelligence Estimate No. 7, Korea, June 25, 1950. FRUS, Vol. 7, p. 154.
\textsuperscript{195} For details on this election, see Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 251-255.
\textsuperscript{196} A good overview of postwar Germany’s situation is given by Fulbrook, 1992, especially chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{197} Bark and Gress, pt 3, ch. 4.
\textsuperscript{198} See, for example, Bark and Gress Pt. 2. Ch. 5 contains details on industrial devastation, food and labor shortages and other privations.
\textsuperscript{200} For example, right after he became Chancellor and was summoned to the Allied High Commission for a ceremony announcing the end of Allied military rule of Germany and the assumption of Allied civilian
early on that Germany would remain divided into two countries due to the strategic situation between the US and USSR. Thus, he concluded that the only way for Germans in the West to achieve self-determination and progress was for them to enhance their ties to Western Europe as a robustly federal democratic state. And, although Adenauer and the new German government had a great deal of leeway over domestic policies, for foreign and defense policies, it was Adenauer’s political skill in dealing with the Allies that proved crucial:

“…the influence of the [Allied High] commission was more apparent – in foreign trade, the future of the Ruhr industrial area, political settlements with the new state’s Western neighbors, and last but not least, the increasingly urgent but very sensitive issue of a West German contribution to the defense and security of Western Europe. Serious problems in any of these areas could have dramatically affected the delicate growth of German democracy. Instead, those problems that did emerge were resolved between 1949 and 1955 in ways that strengthened that democracy and served the common interests of all Western Europeans. The common denominator of the solutions was Adenauer’s insistence that West Germany become an integral part of a political and economic alliance of the Western European democracies…Adenauer’s policies focused on achieving that integration…”

It was in large part Adenauer’s acumen and determination that allowed agreements to be reached with the Allied powers that, in the end, promoted Germany’s integration and alliance with the West.

rule, instead of acting as a petitioner to the High Commission, he symbolically acted as an equal. See Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 253-256.
201 Bark and Gress, p. 111.
202 Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 256-257. See also various memoranda in the US State Department regarding dealings with Adenauer. For example, in Telegram 762A.00/5-750 “The United States High Commissioner for Germany (McCloy) to the Acting Secretary of State,” McCloy noted that Adenauer tended to unsurprisingly utilize various political maneuvers in order to obtain concessions vis-à-vis the US, Council of Europe, and so forth. May 7 1950, FRUS Vol. 4, p. 637.
Given Adenauer’s outlook and desire to integrate an independent Germany with the West, while under the threat of Soviet attack that the US and others feared as well, it is not surprising that rearmament was a crucial, yet controversial and very sensitive topic. Under the occupation statutes West Germany was expressly forbidden to possess armed forces of any kind. Nonetheless, the idea of German rearmament of Germany had been secretly debated by the US and British since 1948-49, due to the increased tensions with the USSR.

Adenauer himself pushed for a variety of changes in the occupation statute that could be interpreted as edging towards sovereignty and rearmament. These were typically rebuffed by the Allies. For example, in early May, 1950, he sent a telegram to the Allied High Commissioners urging the creation of a Federal German police force. The Allies, however, “stood firm” against such an idea and decided that the matter “required further study.”

The strategic importance of a German contribution to the defense of the West manifested itself the first time in the Petersberg agreement, probably the first official communiqué that mentioned potential German postwar military forces. It was originally a response to letters from Adenauer to the foreign ministers of the Occupying powers, in which he requested an end to dismantling of West German industry. However, from the US perspective, it had a more strategic dimension. Dean Acheson had met with

---

203 Dulffer, interview, 2008. Haftendorn 2005 notes that “Though the three Western powers agreed with Adenauer’s assessment of the Soviet threat and saw the need for German armed forces, they did not dare say so publicly.”

204 See State Department Telegram 862A.511/5-450 from McCloy to the Secretary of State, FRUS, vol.4, pp. 684 and 686.

Adenauer on Nov 14-15 1949, and became convinced of his sincerity and shared vision for a West Germany that was fully integrated into Western Europe.\textsuperscript{206} Signed in November 1949 between West Germany and the occupying powers, the Petersberg Agreement “set the terms for Germany’s relationship with her allies far more precisely than the Occupation Statute had done…it also inaugurated the close alignment of Bonn with Washington.”\textsuperscript{207} By then, Acheson regarded West Germany as an ally against the USSR.\textsuperscript{208} Although the Petersberg agreement was concerned primarily with economic issues, it did reiterate the demilitarization of West Germany while, at the same time, noting somewhat contradictorily the critical importance of the security of Western Europe.\textsuperscript{209}

Chancellor Adenauer believed strongly that West German and NATO security interests were the same and “envisioned a NATO including Germany as the best and only deterrent to war [with the Communist Bloc].”\textsuperscript{210} It seems clear that the main motivation for Adenauer in this regard was a very real concern about a possible East German and Soviet attack on West Germany. East Germany had, in fact, already been rearmed by the USSR and could now field 70,000 East German para-military police forces and communist mass organizations in West Germany.\textsuperscript{211} Even as early as December 1948,
before he became Chancellor, Adenauer appears to have become alarmed about the military threat from the East.\textsuperscript{212}

By the end of 1948, his advisors had already sketched out an anticipated military role of Germany in Europe. Adenauer's vision at this time however was that Germany should not have an independent military, but should instead be a part of a common European defense. Such an attitude almost certainly resulted in part from an intense opposition by the French and others to any hint of German rearmament.\textsuperscript{213}

While this evolution in thinking was occurring in Germany, similar shifts were occurring among the Allies, notably the US and UK. General Clay and the British war hero Field Marshal Montgomery had both publicly advocated for a German contribution to the defense of Western Europe as early as November 1949, and there were reports that the US Joints Chiefs of Staff were discussing raising 5 West German divisions to contribute to NATO.\textsuperscript{214} Winston Churchill even called for a West German contribution in March of 1950.\textsuperscript{215} Despite this, as of June 1950, the Allied High Commission still publicly opposed German rearmament, and official US policy was that Germany should be disarmed and demilitarized, even after the withdrawal of Allied forces.\textsuperscript{216} It was, after all, only a few years after the end of World War II.\textsuperscript{217} However, in private the US and UK governments had already agreed that a West German contribution was necessary if they

\textsuperscript{212} Dr. Hans Speidel, a respected former General who (like Adenauer) supported integration with France and Western Europe and reliance on the US, noted to Adenauer the vastly superior numbers of the USSR and East German military forces and the threat they posed not only to West Germany but also Europe in general. See Bark and Gress, 1989, pp. 275-276. See also Haftendorn, 2006, pp. 21-23.
\textsuperscript{213} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 277.
\textsuperscript{214} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 277.
\textsuperscript{215} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 277.
\textsuperscript{216} See Memo 762A.5/3-950 "Memorandum by the Director of the Bureau of German Affairs (Byroade) to the Deputy Director of the Policy Planning Staff (Butler). FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4, p. 680.
\textsuperscript{217} See, for example, Kaplan, 1999, p. 59-60.
were to defend Europe against a Soviet attack, and they encouraged Adenauer to establish a group of German military experts to examine the issue.\footnote{See, for example, “Memorandum of Conversation by Mr. John W. Auchincloss of the Bureau of German Affairs,” FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4. For information on the selection of military advisors to Adenauer, see Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 278. They note that the British proposed to Adenauer that he use former General Schwerin to head the group, while the US proposed Reinhard Gehlen (who also had a large network of informants in the East Germany who apparently worked for the US). Adenauer chose Schwerin.} For their part, the French remained adamantly opposed to any German rearmament. President Truman, too, was quite wary of German rearmament.\footnote{On June 16, 1950, Truman indicated to the Secretary of State that “We certainly don’t want to make the same mistake that was made after World War I when Germany was authorized to train one hundred thousand soldiers, principally for maintaining order locals in Germany. As you know, that hundred thousand was used for the basis of training the greatest war machine that ever came forth in European history....” S/P-NSC Files: Lot 62 D 1: NSC 71 Series “Memorandum by the President to the Secretary of State,” June 16, 1950, FRUS, 1950Vol. 4, p. 688.}

Thus, on the eve of the Korean war, the West German, US, and UK governments were all seeking to tighten their military relationships with each other in order to better defend against a clear and present Soviet threat. Adenauer, also, was particularly keen to enhance the long-term relationship with the US as a means to ensure West German security, and attain sovereignty and rearmament. Contributing to the Korean War was seen as one opportunity for moving down that path. Thus the value of IV2 (“how much does Germany value a coalition contribution”) would be ‘high’.

What of the US? How did they value a contribution by West Germany to the Korean War Coalition? There is no evidence that the US ever considered a concrete West German contribution to the war in Korea. This is not particularly surprising, of course. Germany was not only very distant from the Korean front, but, coming so soon after the end of the Second World War, the idea of German troops would have been very difficult to swallow. Furthermore, the Germans had no unique contribution they could have made.
to US forces in the Korean theater. Even given that the US, as a bipole, was looking to tighten its relationship with West Germany to deny them to the Communist Bloc, they had little, if any, interest in a specific German contribution to the Korean conflict. It is unsurprising then that, in my model, I value IV1 ("How much does the US value the coalition contribution of West Germany?") as low. These values would put the West German case in Quadrant 4 ("Currying Favor") of my model.

However, applying my model’s predictions directly to the West German case requires care. Because Germany was an occupied country in June of 1950, my predictions must account for this fact, much as they did for the Japan case. Thus, I examine German actions in the context of their status as an ‘occupied power’ – i.e., they would have little to no freedom of action or leverage over the US and the US would have greatly increased leverage and influence over German policies.

This should not make my model irrelevant to the German case, since the dynamics of asymmetric security valuations should still be in effect if Germany has any ‘room for movement’ in its relations with the US. General Clay, who headed OMGUS went out of his way to encourage democratic elections in Germany as early as late 1945, so that he could transfer more responsibility for governing the country to Germans themselves.\(^{220}\) Elections began in 1946, which “provided legitimate governing authorities in the…US zone…”\(^{221}\) The simple fact was that to administer Germany and successfully carry out any sort of reconstruction or reform (such as denazification), it was necessary to

\(^{221}\) Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 106.
rely on the extant German bureaucracy.\textsuperscript{222} Thus, despite being an occupied country, German bureaucrats exerted a high degree of independence from Occupation authorities. In fact, in the first legislative period of the new republic (1949-1951) the newly created Bundestag “produced more laws and ordinances than [in] any later period” and it did this under the shadow of the Occupation which “allowed the new government a great deal of flexibility.”\textsuperscript{223}

Furthermore, Adenauer was clearly a skilled politician in his dealings with the occupying Allied powers. The definitive English language history of Germany at this time notes that he “possessed the invaluable political gift of being able to say exactly the right words when he wished and to whom he wished, in order to achieve his purpose.”\textsuperscript{224} But, perhaps most importantly, he also knew that he had some leverage in this due to the growing tensions with the USSR:

“The Adenauer’s plan was to accept the fact of foreign control and to gain Western trust within the constraints imposed by that control...he believed that a combination of modesty and firmness might earn the West German state recognition and equality with the rest of Western Europe much faster than most people predicted in 1949. He realized that the Soviet threat and the resulting defense needs of the West, as well as the need for economic reconstruction, absolutely required West German resources, and he was prepared to demand a price for those resources in terms of greater political independence...”\textsuperscript{225}

\textsuperscript{222} See Bark and Gress, Pt. II, Ch. 1. They note, for example, that a nascent German government was established in the US zone in 1945, and by 1946 had assumed responsibility for “food, agriculture, industry, transportation, and prices, so that, as the leading authority on US occupation policy noted, ‘it soon took on the character of a central government of the American zone.’” p. 100-101. The British and French did not allow as much local autonomy in their sectors at first. See p. 101-104. See also Haftendorn, 2006, ch. 1.

\textsuperscript{223} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 256.


In other words, Adenauer and his regime acted as expected: they worked within the constraints of the Occupation to best serve Germany’s interests as they perceived them at the time.\textsuperscript{226} If my model is correct, then the actions of Adenauer and German officials vis-à-vis the coalition should reflect asymmetric security valuation dynamics because they are, in fact, a de facto negotiation over German involvement. Thus, I should still be able to make and test predictions about bargaining leverage, costs, and so forth, as long as I take the fact of greatly reduced German sovereignty into account.

Doing this in the Japanese case meant that the Japanese had more leverage than would be expected with the US, because the US very much desired their contribution to the KWC. Thus, my model could make predictions regarding how much leverage Japan had, and how the costs for a Japanese contribution were borne more by the US than Japan. In that case, Yoshida Shigeru was able to use the US need for Japanese contributions to the Korean war to change longstanding US policies to serve Japan’s interests and, in so doing, tighten the relationship between the two powers.

In this case, however, the US did not have any need for German contributions to the KWC per se. As mentioned before, this is the one key difference between the Japan and German cases if viewed with my model: these two cases are nearly identical except for “how much the US values their contribution to the coalition” (i.e.: IV1 in my model).\textsuperscript{227} On the other hand, the US did desire, in private, to bring West Germany closer

\textsuperscript{226} This is reinforced throughout Adenauer’s memoirs. See Adenauer, 1965.
\textsuperscript{227} Thus, the German and Japanese case comparison comes close to holding equal all variables except for the variable of interest. Also, Berger notes that the two cases, albeit very similar, share a few other differences. First, rearmament had been openly debated in West Germany before the Korean War, but not in Japan. Second, there was greater room for cooperation and compromise between left and right wing political elements in Germany than in Japan. See Berger, 1998, p. 36-37.
into its orbit so it could contribute to the overall defense of Western Europe against the Soviet threat. West Germany and Adenauer had congruent motivations: to tighten their relationship with the US, and integrate more closely with Western Europe. This indicates that, whereas in the Japanese case the US would petition Japan for changes to existing policy (such as the creation of a Japanese national police force as an embryonic army), in the West German case I would predict that the Germans would petition the US and the Allies for such policy changes. In other words my model predicts that West Germany would use the Korean war to promote its interests, but such changes, if they occurred, would be initiated by West German and come at their expense.

Given these caveats, my model would predict that:

- Adenauer would attempt to use the Korean War to help promote West German sovereignty, self-defense, and a closer relationship with the US. However, he would have little leverage in that regard – although he might initiate the debates, changes in policy would likely be a result of a change in Allied perceptions and interests, not West German leverage per se.
- The US would not be willing to pay high costs for such policy adjustments. Rather, any change in policies would come at the expense of West Germany.

This case illustrates the usefulness, indeed the necessity of a process-tracing approach. Because the strategic motivations of West Germany and the US are very similar in this case, rigorous process-tracing is the only method by which we can hope to understand the separate impact of their different security valuations. In other words, my theory predicts that because the US didn’t value a West German contribution to the KWC, then it would not pursue a tightening of the relationship with West Germany. But because both the US and West Germany sought to incorporate West Germany more closely into the Western alliance overall, predicting that the US and West Germany
would draw closer is likely to be over-determined. However, there were still many elements within the German polity and Allied governments (especially within France) still firmly opposed any hint of German rearmament or re-admittance of Germany into the institutions of Western Europe. To disentangle these conflicting influences, it is critical to isolate any specific instances wherein the Korean War by itself played a key role in US-German relations.

Analysis:

There are in fact a number of instances where Adenauer appears to have used the Korean War as a lever to help push for West German rearmament, increased sovereignty, and a close relationship with the US. Of course, the outbreak of the Korean War on June 25, 1950 crystallized the importance of the superpower conflict to the US and other Western powers in relation to other factors. Internal debates within the Allied government indicate that their attitudes towards West Germany shifted subtly. And a

---

228 Haftendorn typically phrases Adenauer’s motivations in this realm as “achieving sovereignty as a consequence of rearmament, maintaining security against the arms buildup in the Soviet zone by Moscow, and achieving the establishment of a European federation.” My theory, however, focuses less on overall German security motivations but rather on the relations with the superpower (i.e. the US). Hence I focus less on ‘European integration’ as a motivation, although it is a roughly similar concept as applied here. This point is reinforced when Haftendorn notes that “No matter how strongly Adenauer felt about reconciliation with France, he nonetheless realized that only the United States had the power to guarantee the security of the Federal Republic.” See Haftendorn, 2006, p. 23. Note that in this analysis, I concentrate on the effect of the Korean War on specific proposals by Adenauer vis-à-vis the rearmament question. For a fully detailed account of the West German rearmament problem, see McGeehan, 1971 and Adenauer, 1965.

229 The NSC paper “Views of the Department of State on the Rearmament of Western Germany” (NSC 71/1) dated July 3rd noted that “It is understood that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not pressing for the immediate rearmament of Western Germany, but rather, recognizing the political implications, are urging that steps be taken to create conditions in Europe under which agreement could be obtained from all concerned on this question. The pace of events, both as regards Germany and as regards European attitudes towards Germany, is fairly rapid. The United States Government is determined, and the British and French governments have recently expressed complete agreement, that we must bring Germany as quickly as possible into close and firm association with the West and that we must create conditions so that the strength of Western Germany can be definitely added to the strength of the West.” This does not mean that
number of highly public positions on German rearmament immediately changed more dramatically: on July 11, 1950 Charles de Gaulle admitted that rearmament of Germany was inevitable, on July 28, the Allied High Commission allowed the formation of a 12,000 man police force in West Germany, and on August 11, advisors to the Council of Europe called for a European army that would include German forces.\textsuperscript{230} It was not only public statements that changed, but concrete planning efforts for German contributions to the defense of the West began as well. In August, the US State Department, which was the last US government agency to remain fully committed to German demilitarization, issued a position paper on a European Defense Force that called for a European Army that included West German contingents.\textsuperscript{231} These events all represent a break with prior policies on the part of the Allied governments occupying and administering West Germany, and they were all in clear response to the outbreak of the Korean War.\textsuperscript{232}

But what of the German position? Only five years after the fall of the Third Reich, it is unsurprising that the German public remained firmly opposed to the idea of rearmament (opinion polls at the time indicate that over two-thirds of the population

the attitudes towards German rearmament entirely changed overnight. The same paper notes that, “From the viewpoint of reaching our Occupation goals in Germany, it is certainly to our advantage to delay the remilitarization of Germany in any form, at least until we have had more time to develop democratic tendencies on the part of the German people and a more responsive form of government. Although world conditions could conceivably force us to abandoned this portion of our program, at the present time we consider that the disadvantages of doing clearly outweigh the risk we may be taking by not adding German manpower in a military sense to the West.” FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4, p. 691. McGeehan claims that “The event which brought the German rearmament question to the action level and prompted a new examination of NATO’s defense efforts was the North Korean attack on the South...security was transformed from a theoretical to a concrete problem, and America’s political role as leader of the alliance was sharply altered.” McGeehan, 1971, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{230} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 278.
\textsuperscript{231} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 279. See also Byroade, 1950.
opposed the idea of rearmament). Pacifist sentiments ran high in West Germany, but respected German public opinion leaders appear to have pushed the idea to the people that West German neutrality in the face of potential Soviet attack was ‘immoral’. The outbreak of the Korean war, too, appears to have “made a public debate on self defense possible.”

But more importantly, it seems clear that the war gave Adenauer the opening he sought. He did not hesitate to use the Korean conflict as a way to gain concessions from the Allies, or at least to make his point, and this resonated with the High Commissioners and Allied governments. For example, in early July 1950, Adenauer once again brought up his concerns over the security of Germany vis-à-vis the Soviet and East German threat. At that time, the British High Commissioner met with Adenauer and later recounted that Adenauer felt:

“there was a real vacuum in all Western preparations. Unless remedied by the introduction of some concrete measures in Europe it

---


234 Bark and Gress illustrate this with the case of Cardinal Frings of Cologne, who faced head on the pacifist arguments of left-wing Catholics by resorting to Just War theory as it related to atomic warfare, making that point that “conscientious objection was immoral and incompatible with Christian thinking.” See Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 279-280, which references the original source of Doering-Manteuffel, *Katholizismus und Wiederbewaffnung*, p. 85.


236 Dulffer, interview, 2008. See also Haftendorn, 2006, p. 21-23. In relation to the nascent NATO organization, Kaplan notes that the Korean War “dramatically changed the relationship between Germany and the Western Allies, as, indeed, it changed the structure of the organization itself. Initially Europeans feared that war in the Far East would divert America’s attention from Europe and lead to the abandonment of the Atlantic alliance. However, Truman’s response to the North Korean attack was reassuring. According to the conventional wisdom of the time, North Korea was a Soviet satellite testing the resolve of the American adversary by attacking an American protectorate. If this were the case, Stalin then might be preparing the ground for aggression by another satellite, East Germany, to strike in another divided land. The result was the energizing of the alliance rather than its abandonment.” Kaplan, 1999, p. 60. Stueck makes almost exactly the same point. Stueck, 1993, p. 176.
would result in a total lack of confidence on the part of the West Germans. His [Adenauer’s] reports gave him no hope from the French and he feared the revival of an attitude among the Germans, particularly if the news from Korea continued bad, that they had better modify their policy regarding Russia unless the Allies took steps to convince the Germans that some opportunity would be afforded them to defend their country in the event of an emergency. [Adenauer] said that he acknowledged that any thought of creating a German army as such was out of the question, at least as long as France remained with no substantial army, but that some provision should be made to maintain stability in West Germany in the event of a Volkspolizei [East Germany’s paramilitary forces] attack from the east and that opportunity should be given to Germans to play some part if such a development occurred. [Adenauer was] also concerned naturally with a Soviet attack and he [made] the same point if the attack should take such a form.  

Whether or not Adenauer’s conversations had the desired effect is hard to know, but by early August, the US High Commissioner for Germany (McCloy) indicated in a telegram that he was convinced that the Korean War greatly affected German security concerns:

“Present West German temper against background latest Korean developments marked by profound concern and realistic appraisal German situation but no general panic or collapse of morale…there has been an acute realization threat to Germany implied in Kremlin decision resort to ‘hot war’ Korea, eliminating German hope that Soviet fear US potential would suffice deter overt military action by Soviet or orbit governments. Generally realized now that Germany defenseless except for strength western powers. Korea causes doubt such strength adequate defense

237 Telegram 762A.5/7-1450 “The United States High Commissioner for Germany (McCloy) to the Secretary of State.” July 14, 1950. FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4, p. 696-670. See also, Insert A, same telegram, wherein the French High Commissioner apparently stated that “he felt German service troops with our [the Allies’] armies could be increased and given training and he also felt that in case of an emergency [there] should be means for Germans to fight with us.” McCloy goes on to note that “Both Kirkpatrick and Poncet [The British and French High Commissioners] expressed the belief that continued bad news from Korea would cause Western Germans to become more restive, dilute their enthusiasm for Adenauer’s Western policy, and create pressure to change it…Kirkpatrick may only be pressing in another form the British desire for the rearmament of Germany and that Adenauer may only be seeking means to strengthen his government by the creation of a federal police force and using the Korean incident as a gambit for this purpose, I feel that continued bad news from Korea…will tend to unseat the general stability of the population which now exists.” (p. 697).
Germany and Europe, and consciousness Germany a ‘soft spot’ and stake of highest importance to Soviets...Evidence of rather wide conviction in West Germany that Korea enhances significance role semi-independent Germany and hence revision occupation statute should at this juncture be along road lines with substantial grants of freedom of action to federal and land governments, and much talk to effect that failure such action may be interpreted as lack of confidence in Germany and unwillingness trust Germany as reliable partner in western community. At same time some of these statements should be discounted as inborn instinct of Germans to capitalize on any situation, which Korea is too good to be missed, in order to extract maximum concessions from occupation powers. [sic]"238

In certain particular episodes, Adenauer used the context of the Korean War to take the initiative and change the status quo in favor of West Germany. This was made possible, of course, by a growing desire by the Allies for a German contribution to European defense.239 In late August, 1950, Adenauer made a bold offer to McCloy, the US High Commissioner. He presented a letter to McCloy that contained two proposals, which he hoped McCloy would present to the Allied governments. The first proposal emphasized how the Soviet and East German forces outnumbered Allied forces in West Germany, and thereby requested permission to create a federal police force to handle potential domestic subversion (much as he had in May 1950 at which time he had been rebuffed). In these letters, Adenauer also stated that “The federal chancellor has furthermore repeatedly stated that he is ready to provide a contribution in the form of a German contingent, in case an international West European army is established. In doing so the federal chancellor has also made it clear that he rejects a remilitarization of

238 Telegram 762A.00/8-450 “The United States High Commissioner for Germany (McCloy) to the Secretary of State” Aug 4, 1950, FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4, p. 704. Citation is faithfully transcribed in the original – note that it is a telegram, thus many words are shortened.
239 A detailed study of German rearmament is given by McGeehan, 1971
Germany in the shape of a national military force.”\textsuperscript{240} The second proposal asked for full sovereignty for West Germany in all domestic and foreign policy except those related to defense matters, as well as an formal end to the state of war between the Allies and Germany. In this proposal also, occupation forces would remain in West Germany to help defend it and the West.\textsuperscript{241}

These proposals were clearly well timed, for McCloy already felt that “confidence of average German in US military strength has been greatly shaken by Korean developments. Morale generally is low. Inner will to resist has been substantially reduced.”\textsuperscript{242} US President Truman soon approved preparations for West German forces to be admitted into the NATO framework, while declaring also that the US remained committed to Europe and would reinforce its troops there. The US conventional and nuclear deterrent presence in Europe was critical, because the French would not support German rearmament in any form unless a strong US presence existed in West Germany.\textsuperscript{243} And, of course, Soviet strength in Europe was overwhelming.\textsuperscript{244} Despite these shifts, Adenauer’s proposal did not have the full effect he sought. The Allied powers did recognize the West German government as the legitimate government of all

\textsuperscript{242} Telegram 762A.00/8-1850 “The United States High Commissioner for Germany (McCloy) to the Secretary of State.” Aug 18, 1950, FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4, p. 708.
\textsuperscript{243} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 282.
\textsuperscript{244} Telegram 762A.00/8-1850 “The United States High Commissioner for Germany (McCloy) to the Secretary of State.” Aug 18, 1950, FRUS, 1950, Vol. 4, p. 707 notes that Adenauer reported to McCloy that “there are 175 to 200 Soviet Divisions at peace strength. Soviets have 40,000 tanks. Soviet forces in Eastern Zone have been increased during summer south of Frankfort-on-Oder…long runways are being built and long range jet bombers are included in plane now in East Germany…” McCloy does note, however, that “my offhand estimates of Adenauer’s appraisal…is that…he is taking the whole thing purely from a German point of view, without any consideration of other Soviet objectives or timing.” (P. 709).
Germany, and permitted the establishment of a foreign ministry and diplomatic service. They also lifted a number of production quotas to help West German heavy industries. But they were not yet ready to officially allow a full West German defense contribution. Rather, they allowed Adenauer to create a 30,000 man federal police force and committed themselves to defend West Germany in case of an attack.245

In other words, Adenauer took the initiative that the Korean war gave him, and pressed for nearly full sovereignty, a formal end to the war, and nascent West German police and military forces.246 In exchange, he would commit to fully integrating German military forces into the cooperative defense of the West. His effort clearly made some progress (probably in part because they coincided with a shift in Allied and public opinion247). But Adenauer didn’t get as much as he hoped for since he had little leverage to influence Allied decision making. Rather, the outcome served the interests of the Allies more than West Germany: they took the opportunity to allow West Germany to move towards rearmament by creating a small police force, and accept a US security umbrella for their defense. They got a slightly stronger Germany that was intricately

246 McGeehan notes the obvious importance of military forces for the sovereignty of a nation in his analysis of German rearmament. He states that “Unlike other areas of concern where ends and means were mingled and somewhat interchangeable, the remilitarization of Germany was probably not in itself a goal of policy. It remained a means, primarily a diplomatic gambit, intended to enhance the defense of the Federal Republic by securing the dispatch of additional forces to Germany, and eventually to lead to agreements which would completely restore equality and independence.” McGeehan 1971, p. 18. He does not however that there is some disagreement over Adenauer’s true motives: “In spite of appearances, the Chancellor may not have wanted a German army, but only a police force to match in size and strength that of the GDR [East Germany]. Adenauer often reiterated his opposition to German rearmament as such, but failed to make clear what the difference might be between this and a force of 150,000 heavily armed men, which would have amounted to remilitarization whatever the label.” McGeehan, 1971, p. 19.
247 Berger goes into detail on West German (and Japanese) pacifist thinking in this time period. See Berger, 1998.
dependent on the US. This of course, partially served West German interests as well, for a closer relationship with the US was critical vis-à-vis the long-term existential threat of the USSR and East Germany. But Adenauer also sought increased sovereignty and significant self-defense capabilities and he was willing to ‘pay for it’ by fully committing West Germany to the West. And while the US did seek a tightening of the long-term relationship with a stronger West Germany, from a structural perspective, it cared much less about West German sovereignty per se. The result supports the supposition that Adenauer had little leverage: Adenauer tried to change existing Allied policies, but while the US attained its’ goals at relatively little cost, German sovereignty improved only marginally.

Adenauer’s next opportunity came soon after: despite not getting everything he wanted, Adenauer was optimistic with the results of his proposals and asked his military advisors to develop a defensive strategy for West Germany. In early October the result was produced: the Himmerod Memorandum, which called for an aggressive defense of West Germany. Based primarily on the geography of Germany, the strategy called for a defense that was “led offensively” into East German territory “as soon as possible” in the event of a war.\(^248\) Such a brash strategy was envisioned to require a force of half a million men, including twelve armored divisions, and significant air and naval assets.\(^249\)

\(^{248}\) The Himmerod Memorandum notes that “German territory must not be viewed as a forefield with the intent of utilizing the Rhine river as the primary line of defense….Wherever possible, the defense must be led offensively. This means that, at the outset, we must counterattack everywhere that is feasible. This method will impress the Soviets tremendously, and warn them to be cautious. There is no natural boundary east of the Rhine, no line that is suitable for a defense (except the Thuringian forest, which lies in Soviet hands). Even with 50 divisions it would be impossible to achieve a stationary defense of the 800-kilometer border from Passau to Lubeck. Only a mobile fighting command can successfully hold the region from Elbe to Rhine…we must strive with all out mans so that the battle gets pushed back onto East German
This was a brash way to address the issue of German rearmament, but it formed the basis for later West German troop numbers. Furthermore, scholars generally agree that the Korean War led in large part to Adenauer’s newly found confidence in promoting West German security interests in such ways. The war “showed Adenauer that he has the means of gaining new respect for Germany” and that he “saw the Korean War as opening the door to Germany’s return to the family of nations.” Thus emboldened, Adenauer made West German defense planning public, even in the face of extensive domestic opposition. He established the nucleus of a Ministry of Defense and explained to the Bundestag that a West German defense contribution to Europe was essential because not only would the Soviets respect strength, but also, Adenauer asserted, the Allies had agreed to a German contribution to the West (even though this latter claim was still really a hope, not a fact).

---

252 See, for example, the extensive pacifist and anti-rearmament “Ohne Mich” or “Without Me” campaign in West Germany at this time. Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 284-285. Fulbrook also outlines the situation in Germany at this time in Fulbrook, 1992, pp. 177-179.
253 In his address to the Bundestag, Adenauer noted that “The Western world finds itself in a truly great danger. West Germany is a part of the Western world, and due to its geographic situation, it is more exposed to that danger than other lands. At the present time, negotiations with the Soviets for the purpose of normalizing relations can only promise success if the Soviet know that their negotiating partner is strong enough to make aggression risky. This strength can only be maintained if the Western world organizes its defense together. The western powers are agreed that this strength will only suffice if Germany also contributes. The German people cannot refuse, not only because it guards us against a lethal danger but also because we have duties to fulfill to Europe and the people of Western civilization.” From Cioc, *Pax Atomica*, 13, cited in Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 286. See also Byroade, 1950, the questions and answers section.
While the US and UK both supported the idea of German contingents in a European army, the French remained deeply suspicious of a rearmed Germany, and in October 1950 they put forth a counter-proposal that addressed their concerns. The “Pleven Plan” would have scattered “German soldiers among units under non-German command, in such small numbers that there would be no such thing, in effect, as a German armed force, only groups of Germans in European uniform.” The French insisted this was a precondition to any acceptance on their part of German rearmament, and Adenauer publicly accepted the plan, primarily on the grounds that it recognized the need for a German contribution and furthered integration into Europe. Nonetheless, he insisted that West Germany be treated as an equal by its allies before it would make any such contribution. The US, for its part, basically ignored the Pleven Plan and continued separate discussions with West Germany on future defense planning, to the annoyance of the French.

---

254 Even as early as Sept 1950, the State Department was publicly discussing West German rearmament. See Byroade, 1950.
256 Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 287. See also Haftendorn, 2005 who notes that under the Pleven Plan, “Military integration was to take place at the level of small combat units. Command would be entrusted to a European Defence Minister, responsible to a European Assembly and Council of Ministers. An integrated General Staff under a French officer was also planned. Procurement, equipment, and training would also be jointly managed. Pleven’s proposal made the deployment of German soldiers possible without, however, creating a West German Army.” See also Large, 1993, pp. 376-377 for a description of French motivations, and US, UK, and other reactions to the Pleven Plan. See also Large, 1993, p. 376-378, and Leffler, 1992, p. 389-390
257 Haftendorn 2005 notes that “For Adenauer, a German military contribution was as much a means to an end as an end in itself. In the first instance he saw it as a means to improve West Germany’s security in the face of Soviet rearmament of Germany’s Eastern zone. Secondly, he viewed it as an opportunity to hasten the end of Germany’s occupation and thereby to re-establish German sovereignty. And, thirdly, he expected it to pave the way for European integration.” See also Large, 1993, especially pp. 378-380.
In mid December, NATO ministers decided to break the deadlock and initiate formal discussions with West Germany over their potential contributions to European defense. Although the French objected to this, the reasoning behind this shift was that strategic situation had clearly changed once again: in Korea, Chinese forces had intervened and once again American forces were being driven down the Korean peninsula.\(^{260}\) Just as before, when the war had broken out the first time, the sudden reversal of fortune for the US and its allies led to a clarification of security concerns and fears grew that West Germany would be next.\(^{261}\) A West German contribution to the West now seemed more important than French concerns.

Despite Soviet attempts to delay them, negotiations on this issue continued amongst the Allies throughout the fall of 1951. Elections in France and Britain resulted in new leadership that was more skeptical of Soviet diplomacy and more amenable to the creation of a West German force. Finally, the US, UK, France and West Germany all agreed to modify the Pleven Plan and create a “European Defense Community (EDC)” which would integrate half a million West German personnel and significant air and naval forces, and support the mutual defense of Europe. German forces would be

---

\(^{260}\) Haftendorn 2005 notes that “When the situation in Korea deteriorated and the likelihood of a Soviet attack on the West increased, the North Atlantic Council decided to turn the Atlantic Alliance into an integrated defence organization and to establish common military structures and forces to which the Federal Republic was expected to contribute….“ See also Stueck, 1993.

\(^{261}\) Stueck makes the same point when he explicitly ties US and Allied security concerns to the changing fortunes of the US forces in Korea. When the military situation in Korea worsened, security concerns increased, leading to countervailing political moves, and vice versa. Stueck clearly ties this to the support the EDC proposal engendered. See Stueck, 1993, pp. 176-178. See also Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 287.
integrated into the EDC in larger units than even the Himmerod Memorandum had foreseen, and certainly larger than the original French Pleven Plan envisaged.²⁶²

Adenauer saw the EDC agreement as yet another opportunity to promote the longstanding goals of West German sovereignty and acceptance. He pushed to combine the establishment of the EDC with efforts to end the Occupation of Germany and conclude a ‘General Treaty’ with the Allies. Such a treaty would bring much more, although not absolute, sovereignty to West Germany. These efforts bore fruition in May 1952, when West Germany and the Allies agreed upon both a General Treaty and the EDC and the establishment of a European armed force by June 1954. By February 1952, the EDC was official policy of all the Allied powers, and the West German Bundestag had approved a German military contribution to it.

As predicted by my model, this episode illustrates how Adenauer initiated debates over German rearmament and sovereignty but had little influence over the outcomes. With the Himmerod Memorandum, and Adenauers’ public statements regarding Germany’s role in the defense of Europe, Adenauer set the terms of the debate. And while the US and UK were amenable, the French certainly were not. Nonetheless, Adenauer had little choice but to accept the Pleven Plan so long as it treated West Germany as an equal – after all, the Plan did recognize the need for a German contribution. It wasn’t until the sudden entry of the Chinese into the Korean War that the negotiations began to emphasize strategic security concerns more than French worries.

²⁶² Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 290. See also Adenauer, 1965, Ch. 18.
This shift led directly to an agreement on the formation of the EDC. And, that agreement gave Adenauer yet another opening to gain more sovereignty for Germany.

In this case, however, the costs for these policy adjustments were borne not by West Germany, as I predicted, but by France. The US and UK preferred an outcome that would have provided division-sized West German contributions to the defense of Europe, which eventually happened with the EDC. Adenauer, too, got what he wanted, and at relatively little cost: not only was West German sovereignty greatly enhanced by the General Treaty, but a German contribution to the West was formalized in the EDC. The French bore the greatest cost: while the Pleven Plan was adopted, their hope for much smaller German units did not come to fruition. This does not necessarily invalidate my model. Instead, it indicates that in a bipolar competition, the superpower may value gaining a new ally into its superpower bloc more highly than satisfying a pre-existing ally, especially if the new ally is more critical to mutual defense. In other words, in the negotiations over the Pleven Plan, it seems reasonable to conclude that the US was willing to face down French objections in order to bring West Germany into its strategic alliance against the Soviet Union. If negotiations had not involved the French, it seems likely that West Germany would have been willing to bear greater costs to come under the US security umbrella. As it was, the US valued West German contributions more than it feared French objections – and thus the French, rather than the Germans, were forced to adjust their expectations.

The issue of a West German contribution did not end with the EDC agreement by the Allies. By February 1952, NATO had shifted to a ‘massive retaliation’ strategy to
compensate for the conventional superiority of USSR forces in Europe and elsewhere. Based on NSC-68, such a strategy envisioned nuclear strikes on the USSR if the Soviets attacked West Germany.\textsuperscript{263} In reaction to this, Stalin attempted in 1952 to prevent the formation of the EDC and German rearmament, and promote German ‘neutralization’.\textsuperscript{264} Two notes sent by Stalin proposed a democratic, free and neutral unified Germany its own armed forces. It is not certain what Stalin’s purpose in sending the note was, but the majority of scholars appear to agree that it was an attempt to “sow dissension between West Germany and its new allies, and within West Germany between Adenauer and the opponents of rearmament.”\textsuperscript{265} As a direct result of the note, debates flared up within West Germany between Adenauer and his political foes. Adenauer however stood firm, and made it clear that he did not believe reunification was possible without being bound to the West and before Eastern Europe was free from Soviet domination.\textsuperscript{266} In May 1952, the Allies signed the General Treaty with West Germany which ended the Occupation, and gave West Germany greatly enhanced sovereignty as an ally within the EDC. The General Treaty, however, was dependent upon the EDC treaty. That treaty was signed immediately, and formally acknowledged West German rearmament. However, it was still subject to ratifications by member governments, and was debated for two years in

\begin{flushleft}\textsuperscript{263} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 298. There are, of course, a large number of works detailing the origin and ramifications of NSC-68 and the Massive Retaliation doctrine.\\textsuperscript{264} This was actually Stalin’s second attempt in this regard. The first came in 1950-51 when he proposed a four power conference to discuss the withdrawal of all Occupation forces from West Germany. Meetings held in this time (known as the ‘Marbre Rose’ days) between the UK, France, and the USSR eventually had little effect except to enliven anti-rearmament forces in West Germany and instill in Adenauer a fear that the Allies might abandon Germany if the USSR successfully ‘neutralized’ it (i.e.: if the USSR promoted a ‘neutral’ and unarmed Germany that would, therefore, be susceptible to Communist infiltration and destabilization). See Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 288.\\textsuperscript{265} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 299.\\textsuperscript{266} Bark and Gress, 1989, p. 299-300.\end{flushleft}
France before finally being rejected in 1954.\textsuperscript{267} This forced a renegotiation of the status and relationships of West Germany. By then, the Korean War had been stabilized by a truce for over a year, the Cold War was an accepted reality, and West Germany was a de facto accepted member of Europe.\textsuperscript{268} The various nations involved soon signed and ratified agreements that returned sovereignty to West Germany, brought it and its military forces into NATO (rather than the now-dead EDC), and provided for the defense of West Germany with significant US military forces stationed on West German soil.\textsuperscript{269}

**Results (dependent variables):**

I predicted that Germany under Adenauer would attempt to use the Korean War as an opportunity to help promote West German sovereignty, self-defense, and a closer relationship with the US. However, I also predicted that Adenauer would have little leverage to get his way – changes in policy would likely be a result of a change in Allied perceptions and interests, not West German leverage per se. Also, the demonstration of Germany as a reliable ally would come at the expense of Germany (Germany would put forth the effort rather than the US urging it to happen).

Most of these predictions were borne out. Although West Germany was eventually accepted into NATO in 1954, the road there was bumpy, and illustrated

\textsuperscript{267} A detailed account of the background and eventual demise of the EDC is given by Large, 1993. See also Fulbrook, 1992, p. 177-180 and McGeehan, 1971.
\textsuperscript{268} Kaplan notes that “The allies would not have accepted the Federal Republic as a NATO member in 1950. After the collapse of the EDC they were prepared to do so.” Kaplan, 1999, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{269} For more detail, see Bark and Gress, 1989, Pt. 3, Ch. 13, pp. 324-334. See also Kaplan, 1999, pp 60-61. A more broadly useful account of US policy towards Germany unification in the 1950s is given by Rupieper, 1993. Outside of the West German context, it seems clear that “without the Korean War or some other military crisis produced by a move of Soviet or Soviet proxy forces, the buildup of NATO at most would have been at a slower pace and on a lesser scale.” Stueck, 1993, p. 174.
Germany’s lack of leverage. Starting in 1950, Adenauer used the Korean War to emphasize the East German and Soviet threat, and show how West Germany could be a valuable contributor to European defense. Nonetheless, each attempt to enhance Germany’s position in this manner was only partially successful, slightly strengthening West German sovereignty but keeping it occupied and dependent on the US and thereby ameliorating French worries. But by December 1950 the war in Korea had turned against the US again, and a West German contribution to the West now seemed more vital than ever – leading directly to the stillborn EDC.

In each of his overtures, Adenauer initiated and set the terms of the debates, but had little direct influence over the outcomes. This is as one would expect of a state attempting to ‘curry favor’. He had little choice but to accept the terms offered to him by the allies. What changes did occur appear to have resulted from a change in allied perceptions and interests, rather than as a matter of West German leverage. However, while West Germany did bear some costs in its efforts to demonstrate its reliability as an ally (for example, Adenauer had to accept limited sovereignty in exchange for the right to create a small police force), the majority of policy adjustment costs were borne by France. This seems to indicate that France was entrapped by the US in the Cold War alliance, and simply had to suffer through US needs for a West German contribution.

The German case stands in stark contrast to the Japanese case. Both nations and situations are nearly identical, but there is one important difference: the US greatly desired a contribution to the KWC from Japan, but had no similar desire for a German contribution. Given this difference, my model disentangles the demands of the coalition
from other effects and in so doing predicts accurately that the burden of tightening the relationship with the US would be borne by Germany, whereas in the Japan case it would be borne by the US side.

This dynamic also explains how the negotiations by Germany and Japan with the US differed so much. Thus, each step towards West German rearmament and sovereignty was largely initiated by Adenauer, while in Japan the reverse occurred. For example, when the Korean War broke out, Adenauer took the initiative in the creation of a German police force by proposing the idea to the allies, who allowed it to happen. In Japan the allies proposed the idea and Shigeru allowed it to happen. In other words, the value that the US (as the coalition leader) placed on a contribution from Germany or Japan appears to have had a significant impact on the process and outcomes of bargaining between those powers.

Summary

Japan

The US was in dire need of armed forces to repulse North Korean forces, and US troops in Japan were the most readily available source. Furthermore, Japanese industry could provide much needed logistical support to US forces. Given the immediate need for troops, any concrete military support Japan might itself provide would doubtless have been welcomed. The Japanese, for their part, clearly perceived a long-term threat from the Soviet Union and understood that the security umbrella of the US was the only way to counter that threat. However the Japanese also longed for a restoration of sovereignty and a reduction of the US military presence in Japan, and were generally ambivalent about
supporting the war effort. Furthermore, Prime Minister Yoshida’s personality was a factor as well – his willingness to negotiate the conditions of the US security umbrella and US force presence in Japan indicates that he was less concerned about the long-term threat of the Soviet Union than the US was about the immediate threat of North Korean aggression. This placed the Japan case in Quadrant 2 (“Enlisting Help”) of my model.

However, this case requires caution because Japan was not fully sovereign at this time. Nonetheless, the fundamental dynamics of the model should still be in effect. Thus, to test its predictions accurately, I examined Japanese actions in the context of their status as an ‘occupied power’ and US actions in the context of an ‘occupying power’.

By adopting those concepts to my model I make three predictions. First, the US would be willing to pay high costs to obtain support from Japan, and Japan would therefore have greater bargaining success than might otherwise be expected of an occupied country. In other words, I predict that Japanese bureaucrats will be able to modify US demands of Japan in their favor because the US values their contribution to the KWC so highly. Second, I predict that Japanese contributions will come at a higher cost to the US than might otherwise be expected. In other words, Japan should be able to exact some form of quid pro quo from the US, even though Japan was occupied and not sovereign at the time. Third, because the US was a bipole at the time I would expect that US authorities and negotiators would embrace a tightening of the long-term bilateral relationship with Japan in order to strengthen the overall strategic power of the US camp.

My predictions for Japan appear to be relatively accurate, even given the semi-sovereign nature of the Japanese government and the undue leverage of the US as an
occupying power. First, Prime Minister Yoshida was able to take advantage of his suddenly increased bargaining leverage in his dealings with the US to alter longstanding US policies in ways that benefited Japan. These shifts seem closely related to the US desire to encourage Japanese support in Korea. For example, the re-creation of an embryonic Japanese army and navy, progress on peace treaty talks and the eventual terms of the peace treaty are the prime examples of Japanese leaders working to modify US demands of Japan in their favor.

Japanese contributions to the US did come at a higher cost to the US than might otherwise be expected. Despite being an occupying power, the US altered longstanding policies towards Japan, agreed to exonerate former Japanese war criminals, and accepted peace treaty terms that were very lopsided in favor of Japan. The eventual terms of the peace treaty were in fact quite lopsided in favor of Japan.

Turkey

The case of Turkey is relatively straightforward: in 1950 Turkey greatly desired a formal security arrangement with the US to protect it against the USSR, and was thus very willing to pay for a contribution to the Korean War. And although the US valued Turkey as a strategic partner in the Cold War, it was not yet willing to offer any formal security guarantees. A Turkish contribution to the war effort was initially seen as more of a hindrance rather than a help. Thus, Turkey was clearly “Currying Favor”.

Therefore, I predict that Turkey would have less bargaining leverage with the US, and would pay high costs to the US to enable its contribution to the coalition. Finally, because Turkey greatly valued the relationship with the US, I predicted it would actively
offer its own resources (i.e. its own troops, materiel, or money) to the coalition. My predictions were largely borne out. Specifically, Turkey paid significant costs to support the war, in an attempt to bring the US and Turkey closer. The Turkish government willingly sent troops to the Korean theater, with no promise of anything in return. What bargaining took place clearly favored the United States, and existing security arrangements remained in place, much to the consternation of the Turks and to the advantage of the US which already had, de facto, a commitment from the Turks to stand with the US against the USSR in the event of a global war.

It seems clear that the Turks committed the large number of soldiers that they did primarily because they valued the relationship with the US so highly. Not only did they commit many more men than almost all other contributors to the war, but their troops went out of their way to engage in risky combat and, in so doing, sent a clear signal about their worthiness as allies.

Eventually, the relationship between the two nations was strengthened – Turkey was later formally admitted into NATO on US urging. However, this reversal had little to do with the Korean War or Turkish contributions to it. Rather, the growing threat of the USSR caused the US to change its longstanding position on a formal security guarantee to Turkey.

Germany

On the eve of the Korean War the Soviet threat loomed large, and West Germany was potentially on the front lines. Chancellor Adenauer clearly sought to enhance the long-term relationship with the US as a means to ensure West German security, and saw
the Korean War as one way to do that. For its part, there is no evidence that the US ever considered a West German contribution to the war in Korea. This is not surprising given that Germany was not only distant from the Korean front but also because the idea of German troops so soon after the end of World War II was unpalatable. Furthermore, the Germans had no unique contribution they could have made to US forces in the Korean theater. Thus, the West German case is clearly an instance of “Currying Favor”.

Because Germany was an occupied country in June of 1950 (much as Japan was) German actions must be examined in the context of their status as an ‘occupied power’ – i.e., they had little to no freedom of action or leverage over the US. Given that, I predicted that Germany under Adenauer would attempt to use the Korean War as an opportunity to help promote West German sovereignty, self-defense, and a closer relationship with the US. However, I also predicted that Adenauer would have little leverage to get his way – changes in policy would likely be the result of a change in Allied perceptions and interests, not West German leverage per se. Also, the demonstration of Germany as a reliable ally would come at the expense of Germany (Germany would put forth the effort rather than the US urging it to happen).

These predictions were borne out. Starting in 1950, Adenauer used the Korean War as an opportunity to enhance West Germany’s position in the West, by emphasizing the East German and Soviet threat and illustrating how West Germany could be a valuable contributor to European defense. Nonetheless, each offer that Adenauer made was only partially successful, and West Germany gained some sovereignty but remained occupied and dependent on the US. Only when the Korean War turned against the US
near the end of 1950 did the US agree to full West German participation in Western European defense through a European Defense Community.

In each of his overtures, Adenauer initiated and set the terms of the debates, but had little direct influence over the outcomes. However, the majority of policy adjustment costs were borne not by West Germany but more by France. This seems to indicate that France was entrapped by the US in the Cold War alliance, and simply had to accept that the US required a West German contribution.

The German case in 1950 stands in stark contrast to the Japanese case at the same time. Both nations and situations are nearly identical, but there is one important difference: the US greatly desired a contribution to the KWC from Japan, but had no similar desire for a German contribution. Under this situation, my model predicted correctly that the burden of tightening the relationship with the US would be borne by Germany, whereas in the Japan case it would be borne by the US side.
Chapter Six: Desert Shield/Desert Storm

Background

In this chapter I will briefly describe the broad outlines of the First Gulf War and the Desert Shield/Desert Storm Coalition (hereafter, DS/DSC). On August 2, 1990, Iraqi forces invaded Kuwait under the orders of Saddam Hussein. Although Kuwait soon fell to Iraqi forces, the US and many other nations around the world took an immediate stand against the invasion. The UN immediately passed Resolution 660, which condemned the invasion, and most major economic powers had stopped all trade with Iraqi within a few days.

Within days, US President George H. W. Bush and his advisors had agreed that a forceful response was needed, not only to reverse the invasion of Kuwait but to ensure that Saudi Arabia did not fall prey to Saddam’s forces as well. According to Secretary of State James Baker,

“The first imperative was to deter an Iraqi move into Saudi Arabia. In combination with that mission, however, was the undoing of Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait by the pursuit of a policy of coercive diplomacy against Saddam Hussein. We would begin with diplomatic pressure, then add economic pressure, to a great degree organized through the United Nations, and finally move toward military pressure by gradually increasing American troop strength in the Gulf. The strategy was to lead a global political alliance aimed at isolating Iraq…to pursue this strategy, I had no doubt we needed a coalition of partners…”

Thus, a plan for deploying 250,000 US troops to the area was quickly drawn up and implemented, and US forces began to flow to Saudi Arabia and the Gulf while the US

---

1 Details on all allied troop and financial contributions to the conflict are given in Appendix C.
2 Freedman and Karsh, 1999, p. 81-82.
used the UN as a forum for garnering political and economic support for its actions. The day after the invasion Bush and his cabinet began to gauge the reactions of a variety of other states to the invasion and make initial requests for aid and solidarity against Saddam. Pledges of troops and financial support began to trickle in, and by September, a number of states had pledged to support the coalition with troops. However, only Britain, France, and Egypt had committed more than a few thousand personnel.³

The initial deployment of 250,000 troops was given the operational name “Desert Shield” and had as its main purpose the protection of Saudi Arabia from further Iraqi aggression. But by November 8th, the Bush administration had decided that economic sanctions were unlikely to coerce Saddam to leave Kuwait and so Bush committed to the use of force.⁴ The number of US troops in the area was doubled to half a million, and James Baker began a series of diplomatic trips to garner support for a UN resolution authorizing the use of force. On November 29th, 1990, US diplomatic efforts resulted in the UN adopting Resolution 678, which gave Saddam Hussein an ultimatum of 15 January 1991 to comply with all previous resolutions and authorized the US-led coalition forces to “use all necessary means” to force Iraq out of Kuwait.⁵ To attain approval for

³ Bennett, 1997, p. 40.
⁴ A transcript of President Bush’s Nov 8th 1990 White House press statement is available in Sifry and Cerf, 1991, p. 228. On that day President Bush stated that “After consultation with King Fahd and our other allies, I have today directed the secretary of defense to increase the size of US forces committed to Desert Shield to insure that the coalition has an adequate offensive military option should that be necessary to achieve our common goals.”
⁵ For a full list of the texts of the various UN resolutions regarding Iraq at this time, see Newell, 2007, Appendix I or Sifry and Serf, 1991, p. 137. Note that the adoption of a deadline further committed the US to action, which meant that its’ prestige and credibility were at risk if it failed to follow through on its plan to liberate Kuwait.
this resolution, the US “offered substantial political and economic carrots to other UN members.” 6

Coalition forces continued their build up in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf, and on January 16th 1991 a series of massive air strikes began the Gulf War. At the time hostilities commenced, the US had the lion’s share of combat forces in the area: wherein the US had 540,000 troops, Britain had contributed 40,000, Egypt 30,000, France 15,000, Syria 13,000, and Pakistan 5,500. Saudi Arabia also had committed around 100,000 troops, but these were used for defending their own territory. 7

In addition, a variety of allies were pressed by the United States to contribute financially. This is because the US anticipated a very expensive conflict. Secretary of State James Baker, the principal diplomat involved in the creation of the DS/DS coalition, recollects that:

“We knew that, even without going to war, those costs would be staggering. We were mobilizing hundreds of thousands of soldiers and shipping them and their equipment to the Gulf by air and by sea. Once we had them there, we had to keep them in everything from missiles to mouthwash for months on end. Our preliminary projections of the direct costs to the United States Treasury ran into the tens of billions of dollars. Moreover, we felt an obligation to come up with the money to help offset the severe economic hardship the trade embargo would impose on several of our coalition partners, especially Egypt and Turkey. And at a time of economic uncertainty at home, it would be politically impossible to sustain domestic support for the operation unless we demonstrated that Uncle Sam wasn’t footing the bill while others with pockets as deep as ours sat on the sidelines.” 8

6 Bennett, 1997, p. 41. Brown, 1997, provides a detailed overview of the broad diplomatic efforts of the US, primarily in relation to the UN. See chapters 2 and 3.
7 For full details on troop commitments, see Review of Persian Gulf Burden Sharing, Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives 102nd Congress, First Session, May 14, 1991. See also Bennett, 1997.
Thus, Baker implies that there were three reasons the US asked other nations for significant financial support for the operation: to share the burden for the public good of liberating Kuwait, to maintain the cohesion of the coalition by alleviating the stress on frontline states that were hurt economically by the embargo and war, and to help build domestic political support for the coalition in the US.

To obtain these financial contributions, Baker and his aides went on “tin cup” trips in which they asked for financial support primarily from four countries: Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Japan, and Germany. Saudi Arabia and Kuwait contributed for obvious defensive reasons – they were directly threatened by Saddam. The actual amounts requested by US officials were arrived at in an ad hoc manner based largely on guesswork regarding how much the war might eventually cost. But eventually $54 billion in cash was raised to support the operation, most of which came from Saudi

---

9 In later testimony after the war, Richard Darman, the director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) stated that “I cannot say there was a systematic way to determine how much you should assess each country. Again, this was an unprecedented $54 billion ad hoc, sudden, fundraising effort that was successful. And the reality of the way these numbers were developed was there was an interagency group, with representatives from State and Treasury and the National Security Council, and a few other major departments, Defense, OMB. And people would sit around and say, ‘well, for the first round, here, what do we think it is going to cost? And how much of it do we think we can reasonably ask, collectively, the other countries to provide. And of that, how should we parcel it out?’ It was judgmental, back and forth, give and take. If you will recall the reality of the situation, at the first stage – at any stage – you did not have any idea what the total costs were going to be, how long it was going to go, so it was for a limited time period and with the understanding that the proportions could change depending upon the character of this thing. The next stage, which was the biggest fundraising stage, was for January, February, and March. For that 3-month period, when that fundraising was done, it was not known how long the war would last, and it was a guesstimate what the war costs would be. And, again, we started with the costs and the guess – and it was just a guess – of the range of costs, because you could not know for sure how the war would develop. You did not even know whether there was going to be ground action or not in that period, and that is a big variable in terms of cost; so, a guess was made.” House Hearings. Hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means, 102nd Congress. July 31, 1991. Serial 102-65. Foreign Contributions to the Costs of the Persian Gulf War. US Government Printing Office, 1991, p. 47. On the plane ride over to Saudi Arabia in September 1990, Bennett notes from Baker’s memoir that the aid figures were doubled “on the spot” simply because the original figures were deemed unacceptably low. See Baker, 1995, p. 288-289 and Bennett, 1997, p. 50
Arabia ($17 billion), Kuwait ($16 billion), Japan ($13 billion), and Germany ($11.5 Billion).10

In the end, the coalition that was eventually constructed to liberate Kuwait was broad and surprisingly equitable. As one study notes,

“The 1991 Persian Gulf War case is puzzling in light of conventional wisdom about burdensharing. Scholars agree that in alliances with one dominant member, that state will pay an even greater proportion of the total costs than its size would indicate, while other pay proportionally less or even ride free. Yet this did not happen in the [First] Gulf War. Even after early, massive, and unilateral US force commitments that ultimately totaled over 500,000 troops, there was still almost no free-riding: more than forty countries collectively contributed $70 billion and 245,000 troops.”11

This coalition is an important one to study because it provides a key test for my model under unipolar conditions. The world in 1991 was clearly unipolar: the USSR had essentially collapsed in the years prior, and although many thought that China might eventually become a superpower, it was still struggling with its economic development and seemed unlikely to challenge US supremacy any time soon.

---

11 Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger, 1997, p. 4. Bennett notes that decisive American leadership in the early phases of the conflict was critical to gaining the support of other nations. See Bennett, 1997. Brown makes a similar point in noting that “American diplomacy provided a strong, cohesive force to the coalition. The United States had taken the lead in the Security Council’s actions and, supported chiefly by the British and Saudis, in the deployment of military forces to the area. The United States would also play key parts in most of the diplomatic mechanisms that would be created over the coming weeks to cope with the crisis. The strategy of coercive diplomacy approved by the UN Security Council meant, in practice, that the United States needed to lead in building the political momentum: the Security Council members and other concerned parties would be urged to ratchet up the pressure on Iraq regularly, through passage of resolutions and the greater use of political, economic, or military leverage.” Brown, 1997, 21-22. For a somewhat different view, see Terasawa and Gates, 1992 where the authors conclude that the Gulf Countries under-contributed to the Coalition but that Japan and Germany over-contributed.
The US, in deciding to liberate Kuwait from Iraqi occupation was acting not only to protect its own security and economic interests, but also to ensure its legitimacy as the hegemon. The risks of ignoring the invasion were too great for the US. Furthermore, the Bush administration felt that only the US could exercise the decisive leadership needed to enable an effective and collective response. US leaders “believed that as the world’s most powerful state, the United States had to bear much of the burden or no other actor would do so and the public good of oil market stability would go unrealized.”

Critics of the US at this time complained that the US was acting as the “world’s policeman” or attempting to create a “new world order.” Nonetheless, there was little serious opposition to US actions by other states. As a unipole, the US could and did act as it wished, while other states were faced with a choice to go along or get along.

In this chapter, I will examine the interactions between the US and four case study nations: Japan, Turkey, Germany, and Poland. These states are important ones to study because they allow me to test my model’s predictions in relation to earlier examinations of the same nations in previous chapters. These states are also important because none of

---

12 Les Aspin’s analysis at the time that noted “The invasion of Kuwait on August 2nd confronted the US government with three concerns…oil, aggression and nukes.” Aspin, 1991, p. 35. Many other works have noted these, or very similar US interests in the war. See, for example, Matthews, 1993, pp. 98-99, Freedman and Karsh, 1992, Hiro, 1992, or a number of articles (both pro- and con) in Cifry and Serf, 1991.

13 Matthews notes that “…the factors determining America’s response were indirect rather than direct, related as much to her status and ‘responsibilities’ as a global power as to the threat to her vital and direct national interests. Perhaps the main determinant of US response was the implication of not responding…American inaction in response to Iraq’s invasion would have risked the message being received (even if it had not been intentionally sent) by many of these [third world] regimes that similar action by them in the future would not bring forth an American reaction…a future world security order based upon a pax americana would require a clear demonstration in the first post-Cold War crisis of the American ability and willingness to take action. An American ‘defeat’ in the Gulf Crisis would have had far more serious consequences than the American ‘defeat’ in Vietnam (both for the United States and for the future system of international order) which to some extent explains the American determination to pursue its objectives in the crisis to a conclusion.” Matthews, 1993, p. 98-99

14 Bennett, 1997, p. 61. See also p. 38.
them were significantly threatened by Iraq at the time of the war. The only one of them that might have been even somewhat threatened by Iraq is Turkey, because they shared a border, yet existing studies indicate that Turkey was motivated less by threat and more by alliance dependence and the idiosyncrasies of its domestic institutions. Furthermore, Turkey, as a member of NATO (and fielding NATO’s second largest army), had little fear of a pre-emptive attack by Iraq on its territory.\textsuperscript{15}

Furthermore, the profit motive does not seem to have been a primary factor for these states. Even though they may have been seeking to solidify their access to oil markets, this does not fully explain their extensive commitment to the conflict. And while some of them did receive monetary compensation for their efforts, it was only after the US was fully committed to the liberation of Kuwait that other coalition partners stepped forward and committed their militaries or treasuries. Most other states had the opportunity to “ride free” on US efforts, yet they choose not to, demonstrating that they were not motivated by profit.\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{Japan}

\textbf{Background (Independent Variables)}:

Given the high anticipated cost of the invasion, it is clear that the US was motivated by the need to obtain a large financial contribution by Japan. Japan was seen

\textsuperscript{15} Brown, 1999, p. 86.

\textsuperscript{16} Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger note that in keeping with the collective action hypothesis, “the United States did…commit to defend Saudi Arabia in August before indications of help from any countries save for Britain and Kuwait. But the collective action hypothesis fared poorly in explaining other state’s behavior, with the exception of Iran. Once the United States made its commitment, other states had an opportunity to ride free as the United States achieved their goals without their help. Yet most countries…contributed to the coalition.” Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger, 1997, p. 346.
by Bush administration officials as a critical potential contributor because it was an ‘emerging global power’ and had the ability to contribute “billions of dollars.” As a secondary consideration, the US also asked for Japanese military assistance such as providing minesweepers and other support vessels to assist US naval forces, as well as some other personnel or administrative contributions to the coalition. However, these material contributions were seen more as politically symbolic rather than operationally important, and US officials understood that legal and normative constraints in Japan made such material or personnel contributions unlikely. Hence, they concentrated on securing a financial contribution.

Prior to the outbreak of the Gulf War, many Japanese politicians had come to see Japan as an ‘economic superpower’ and began to conceive that Japan might play the role of a global power based solely on its economic success. This view was emboldened by

---

17 Baker, 1995, p. 280. In interviews, John Hill recalls that the US asked for contributions from those states that had interests at stake, had the ability to pay, and couldn’t otherwise contribute. Furthermore, it should also be noted that at the time the Japanese were largely perceived in the US as benefiting from the US security umbrella while at the same time engaging in unfair economic competition with the US. This contributed to the perception that Japan would unfairly benefit from a US operation against Iraq, given its dependence on Middle East oil. Brown noted that “Without Saudi, Kuwaiti, and Japanese financing, the effort would have been immeasurably harder.” Brown, 1997, p. 92.

18 Michael Armacost, US Ambassador to Japan at the time notes that “I recognized, of course, that Japan had a unique history and constitution with respect to military engagement abroad, and I had no desire to see Japan dispatch combat troops overseas. But I urged Japanese leaders to think of ways in which Japan could perform noncombat duties in the Gulf region so that it would be seen as an active participant in the broad multilateral effort that was taking shape.” Armacost, 1996, p. 101.

19 See, for example, Blaker 1993, p. 17 wherein he notes that “Certainly the Japanese prime minister seemed eager to step forward. But in what in retrospect seems a masterstroke of unfortunate timing, Prime Minister Kaifu Toshiki chose Foreign Policy magazine in which to proclaim ‘motivated’ diplomacy as Japan’s formula to deal with the emerging post-Cold War order. Based on the premise that ‘dialogue and cooperation now replacing missiles and tanks as the tools for achieving order,’ and that ‘the role of military might in the balance of power is diminishing and the importance of dialogue and cooperation is growing,’ the prime minister declared it Japan’s ‘chance and duty’ to marshal its ‘economic and technological strength, along with its store of experience and its conceptual ability’ in facing the challenges of the new order.” Blaker, 1993, p. 17 referencing Toshiki Kaifu, “Japan’s Vision,” in Foreign Policy, Vol. 80 (Fall 1990): 31, 38.
the ongoing collapse of the USSR, and was a logical consequence of nearly fifty years of the ‘Yoshida Doctrine’ under which Japan had enjoyed unprecedented economic prosperity while under US protection.\textsuperscript{20} However, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait quickly drove home the point that for all its economic strength, Japan remained vulnerable to foreign threats. Thus, Japan’s most critical national interest at this time was its ties with the United States because it was dependent on the US for its security and much of its economic prosperity (through trade).\textsuperscript{21} Furthermore, that dependence was enhanced by a variety of historical, cultural, and institutional factors idiosyncratic to Japan.\textsuperscript{22}

Given these dynamics, the US appears to have highly valued a coalition contribution by Japan (IV1 = high), and Japan highly valued a contribution as well due to their long-

\textsuperscript{20} For more information on the Yoshida Doctrine, see the section on Japan, in the previous chapter.
\textsuperscript{21} Purrington notes that Japan emphasized the ‘low politics’ of a ‘trading state’ under the protective umbrella of the US and that “On the one hand the [Japanese] government was increasingly self-confident – in light of Japan’s continuing large current account surpluses, its competitive edge in many industries, and opportunities presented by the end of East-West tensions. On the other hand, losses in manufacturing competitiveness and twin major deficits in government spending and trade by Japan’s main trading partner and ally, the United States, worried the government in that it was thought the US might decline too quickly for any other nation to step in and fill the leadership void. Furthermore, the end of the cold war meant that the Japan-US security alliance, the principal framework by which Japan had integrated into international society and the US-led international economic order, was declining in importance. To remedy this situation, Japan cautiously embarked on a post-cold war strategy of supporting a declining US hegemon, through a gradual expansion of the Nichibei [Japan-US] partnership into a global relationship, since no other country (including Japan) was yet prepared to play the type of leadership role the US played in international security and economic affairs during the cold war. But in the area of ‘high politics’ (security matters), Japan was still unready and unwilling to play an active role in international affairs before the Gulf War.” Purrington, 1992, pp161-162. See also Blaker, 1993, pp. 18-19 and Unger, 1997, p. 137-138.
\textsuperscript{22} Unger notes that “The extent of Japan’s dependence on the United States exceeds what an outside observer might expect based only on the underlying disparities in power between the two countries. Japan’s dependence is rooted in historical conditions and fundamental Japanese political compromises forged in the early postwar years.” Citing Aurelia George, he notes that “Almost all the Japanese government’s major decisions are held up for scrutiny in terms of their possible impact on Japan’s relations with the United States.” And that “Further, the apparent relative absence of a guiding national strategy, Japan’s ‘minimalist’ foreign policy style, and the concentration of Japanese leaders on ‘external opinions, standards, and tests’ all contributed to magnifying US influence over Japan’s decision-making during the [Iraq] crisis.” Unger, 1997, p 138. Aurelia George quote is from “History Restarted: Japanese-American Relations at the End of the Century,” R. Higgit, R. Leaver, and J. Ravenhill, eds. \textit{Pacific Economic Relations in the 1990s} (Boulder: Lynne Reinner, 1993), p. 46.
term relationship and dependence on the US (IV2 = high). Therefore, my model would place US – Japan interactions in quadrant 1: “bargaining.” My theory would therefore predict that:

- ‘Standard’ bargaining would occur between the US and Japan, because both are willing to pay to enable a Japanese contribution to the coalition.
- Since Japan greatly values the relationship with the US, it will be willing to commit its own resources to the coalition.

Analysis:

The interactions between the US and Japan vis-à-vis the DS/DSC have all the hallmarks of Japan being forced by its dependence on the US to “reveal its preferences and pay up” in the context of a variety of domestic institutional, legal, and cultural hindrances and ineffective political leadership.23 Japan appears to have reacted not to the invasion of Kuwait but rather to the US response to the invasion.24

The initial reaction of the Japanese government was calm. Prime Minister Kaifu reassured the Japanese press that the invasion of Kuwait would have little impact on Japan, and that the primary concern of the government was to assess the impact on Japan’s economy.25 The day after the invasion the Japanese government condemned the invasion, and, upon request from the Kuwaiti government, froze all Kuwaiti assets in Japan.26 Nonetheless, only when US President Bush telephoned Prime Minister Kaifu the next day (two days after the invasion) and requested that Japan join the US, Europe, and

---

24 Unger states that Japan’s response to the Gulf War was more akin to “making the world safe for Japan-US relations” and that “Iraq’s attack on Kuwait in August 1990 struck at the heart of oil-dependent Japan’s most critical national interest: cooperative economic and security ties with the United States.” See Unger, 1997, p. 137.
26 Unger, 1997, p. 139.
Canada in imposing economic sanctions on the Hussein regime, did Kaifu announce that Japan would embargo Iraqi and Kuwaiti oil, and freeze all financial transactions (including aid or credits) with Iraq.\(^{27}\)

As US forces began to flow into the Gulf to protect Saudi Arabia in mid-August, the US government then officially requested that Japan provide financial aid to the coalition forces and countries in the region that had been hit economically by the ongoing embargo of Iraq. The US also requested Japanese personnel and logistical contributions, arguing further that they would mitigate US congressional criticism that Japan was free-riding.\(^{28}\) Other pressures from the US on Japan began to build as well. Reflecting the strained state of US – Japan relations at the time, a group of US Senators had urged Japan


\(^{28}\) Unger, 1997, p. 147. Also Shinoda, 2007, p. 51-52. US officials also used “log rolling” in their interactions with the Japanese and others, in which they sought “sought contributions first where they were most likely to get them and then holding up these contributions as the standard for others to match.” Bennett, 1997, p. 50. The US Ambassador to Japan, Michael Armacost recalls that he requested of Japan “financial support for the coalition; economic assistance for Turkey, Egypt, and Jordan; additional host nation support; and Japanese personnel contributions to back up the coalition. I mentioned a variety of possible responses to this last request: medical volunteers, logistic support in transporting personnel and equipment to Saudi Arabia, Japanese help in managing the anticipated exodus of large numbers of refugees from Kuwait, and participation in the multinational naval force through the dispatch of minesweepers to help clear the Gulf and transport vessels to carry equipment from Egypt to Saudi Arabia. What Washington seemed to want most was the deployment of a Japanese ship manned by Japanese personnel and bearing a Japanese flag as a symbol of Tokyo’s involvement in a common effort.” [emphasis added] Armacost, 1996, p. 102. Note the emphasized sentence implies a symbolic, rather than a substantial, physical contribution to the coalition. Blaker notes that this period of intensive arm-twisting “transformed Japan’s response into what was in effect a test of Japan’s commitment to the US-Japanese alliance...Nonparticipation (‘saying no’) was simply not an option. Japan, it was felt, had to act. Government officials acknowledged the need for Japan to act. Moreover, Kaifu and other officials willingly stated their readiness to do their utmost – to do what must be done – to enable Japan to take a more prominent, responsible role. If ‘we can’t, but we must’ accurately expressed the thinking in Tokyo , certainly one very good reason for such thinking was that the US Congress was scheduled to convene on September 5...Henceforth, in short, Japan’s ‘success’ – or diplomatic performance – would be judged by how well it measured up to ‘good ally’ tests.” Blaker, 1993, p. 20-21.
to take an assertive role in the Gulf Crisis even before Kaifu had announced that Japan would be joining in economic sanctions on Iraq.\textsuperscript{29}

Deliberations between the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) and the Ministry of Finance (MOF) led to a proposal on August 30 for a $1 billion contribution to the coalition as well as medical specialists and a variety of other, non-military and relatively minor aid. This was derided as ‘too little, too late’ and President Bush was apparently disappointed in the amount - US officials had purportedly been counting on at least $3 billion.\textsuperscript{30} In early September, US Treasury Secretary Brady requested an additional $1 billion for the coalition, and another $2 billion in economic aid for countries in the Gulf region. It was reported that when Finance Minister Hashimoto put off committing to that amount, that Brady stated he could not go back to Washington empty-handed, and left for Washington ‘irritated’.\textsuperscript{31}

Further pressure on Japan came not only from the Bush cabinet, but also from the US Congress, which reflected popular US sentiment towards Japan at the time.\textsuperscript{32} On September 12\textsuperscript{th}, the US Congress passed a resolution (by 370 to 53) demanding that Japan take on the entire costs of keeping US forces stationed in Japan if Japanese contributions to the Gulf coalition did not increase.\textsuperscript{33} Similarly, the Senate unanimously

\textsuperscript{29} Blaker, 1993, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{30} Shinoda, 2007, p. 51. This is apparently the package that Armacost refers to as the August 29\textsuperscript{th} offer. However Armacost does not give any dollar figure for that offer. See Armacost, 1996, p. 105-106.
\textsuperscript{32} At the time, an \textit{Asahi Shimbun} poll revealed that “77\% of Americans believed that Japan’s contribution to the crisis was inadequate.” See Purrington and A.K., 1991, p. 310.
passed a resolution implying that relations with Japan were at serious risk.\textsuperscript{34} Two days later Japan indeed did announce a further $3 billion in aid to the coalition and regional economies.\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, on eve of the January 15\textsuperscript{th} deadline for Iraqi troops to withdraw from Kuwait, Japanese officials agreed that they would increase their share of the yen-based costs of stationing US troops in Japan by 50\%.\textsuperscript{36}

After these initial and relatively prompt reactions the Japanese government soon became bogged down trying to respond to US demands for material, personnel, and logistical contributions, which had always been seen as unlikely.\textsuperscript{37} Constitutional and legal constraints on the use of the Japanese Self Defense Forces, in conjunction with an entrenched popular opposition to sending Japanese forces overseas, contributed to an overall government paralysis.\textsuperscript{38} US Ambassador Armacost recalls that:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Armacost, 1996, p. 108-109.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Purrington, 1992, 162.
\item \textsuperscript{37} See Armacost, 1996, p. 102 wherein he recounts that the Japanese Vice Foreign Minister Kuriyama “emphatically noted the political and constitutional difficulties that would attend any involvement of Japanese Self-Defense Forces in an area of strife and clearly signaled that there was no likelihood that Japan would dispatch minesweepers.” Many scholars of Japanese politics have noted that the postwar Japanese political system typically responds poorly to international crises. In relation to this crisis, see Armacost, 1996, p. 99-100 where he notes that “Japan’s postwar history had left its government ill equipped to respond decisively to international security crises. Japan’s involvement in UN peacekeeping was confined to the provision of financial support, and it had no tradition of extending political capital or assuming major political risks on behalf of general principles. Confronted by external difficulties, Japanese leaders had become accustomed to react by keeping their heads down, minimizing risks, and leaving security responsibilities to others – mainly the United States.” Similar points were made in interviews by the author with John Hill and Michael Green.
\item \textsuperscript{38} For example, Armacost notes that “Washington wanted logistical assistance, but many of our specific requests were parried or refused. We asked Japan to provide transport aircraft to carry military supplies. The request was denied on legal grounds. Requests for supply ships and military tankers evoked a similar response. When friends in the Foreign Ministry came up with their own offer to charter nonmilitary ships for supply runs, delays prevented the finalization of arrangements until late September when the heaviest demand for such logistic assistance had passed. In response to our request for the airlifting of troops and supplies to Saudi Arabia, prolonged consultations among the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Transportation, and Japan Airlines yielded a cumbersome and ultimately unworkable plan…hopes that Japanese auto companies might fund or lease vehicle transporters came to naught [also]. A proposal that Self-Defense Force aircraft might be used to transport refugees out of danger zones was dropped, after brief
\end{itemize}
“The Japanese government seemed unable to approach decisions regarding its role in the Gulf crisis boldly or with a sense of urgency. All the usual constraints were evident: the Finance Ministry’s reluctance to release funds, the political establishments’ reticence to consider novel security measures, the ‘business as usual’ inclination of industrial circles, the vulnerability of labor unions to leftist pressures for political correctness, and the sectionalism and parochialism of the bureaucracy. This is not to say that stronger political will could have overcome resistance. Even those eager to help were in a quandary as to what to do. No emergency legislation existed that could have been used to compel civilians to staff commercial vessels to carry out sea lifts. Such legislation could have been proposed; however its passage would have been time consuming and its fate uncertain. Such concerns reinforced the disposition of a weak leadership to delay hard choices.”

These attempts by the Japanese government to contribute to the coalition materially were all unsuccessful. An early attempt to send medical volunteers fell flat when only a fraction of the volunteers could be found. Civilian craft were forbidden from transporting US military supplies by the transport ministry, and a bill that would have allowed military aircraft to be used for refugee evacuation was approved only after it was clear they were no longer needed. Japanese minesweepers were not dispatched because the risks to the craft were deemed too high. An effort by Kaifu to stand up a ‘Peace Cooperation Corps’ which would have sent volunteers to the Gulf failed when not

consideration, for fear of domestic criticism. And transportation services for which Japan paid the bill were limited to carrying food, medicines, and noncombat gear…” Armacost, 1996, p. 105-106. See also Pyle, 2007, p. 290 and Purrington, 1992.


Kaifu announced that 100 medical volunteers would be sent; only 17 were found and dispatched. Blaker notes that this was the only successful attempt to send Japanese manpower to the Gulf “even though the medical team had not been requested, was deemed not necessary, and the group finally sent was not qualified to perform its duties in a region of conflict.” Blaker, 1993, p. 22.

Unger, 1997, p. 141.

In April 1991, long after the war had ended, four minesweepers were dispatched to the Gulf to help clear it for commercial traffic. See Purrington, 1992, p. 171-173.
enough volunteers came forth.\textsuperscript{43} Latter versions of the bill would have sent SDF personnel instead, but acrimonious debates in the Diet finally forced Kaifu to withdraw the bill in early November, as well as suffer accusations that he was an American lackey.\textsuperscript{44} Overall, it became apparent to observers that Japan was simply reacting, and poorly at that, to US political demands rather than the operational demands of the coalition.\textsuperscript{45}

On January 17\textsuperscript{th}, coalition forces in the Gulf began a massive air bombardment of Iraqi forces, with the widespread expectation that US and coalition ground forces would soon advance into Iraqi positions. Three days later, the US government once again pressed Japan for a greater financial contribution, this time for $9 billion more. With the prospect for a ground war looming, the Kaifu cabinet announced within two days that it would comply, bringing the total Japanese contribution to $13 billion.\textsuperscript{46} Nonetheless, even with combat operations ongoing, the bill was still debated fiercely in the Diet, and Japanese public opinion largely opposed.\textsuperscript{47} Due to extensive debates that lasted over a month, the final bill was not passed until March 6\textsuperscript{th}, after the war had ended, which lent further credence to the widespread perception that Japan was supporting the coalition only grudgingly through “checkbook diplomacy.”\textsuperscript{48} US – Japanese relations had clearly

\begin{itemize}
\item Unger, 1997, pp. 141-142.
\item Blaker, 1993, p. 23. For a detailed analysis of internal Japanese debates and decision-making, see Purrington, 1992, esp. pp. 163-167.
\item Freedman and Karsh, 1993, p. 360.
\end{itemize}
been damaged by the entire affair. After the liberation of Kuwait, the Kuwaiti government took out a fullpage ad in major US newspapers thanking all those nations who contributed to the war effort. Japan was left off the list.

**Results (dependent variables):**

Because both the US and Japan highly valued a coalition contribution by Japan to the coalition, I predicted that interactions between the two nations would resemble more ‘typical’ bargaining behavior, rather than the characteristics of asymmetric security interdependence. It seems clear from the above analysis that foreign pressure was the primary factor that motivated Japanese contributions to the DS/DS coalition. The prospect of weakening, or endangering, the relationship with the US motivated the Japanese to overcome a variety of domestic constraints on their actions. The Japanese appear to have been particularly susceptible to threats by the US Congress to withdraw or weaken the US security umbrella over Japan.

---


51 Japanese commentators and other observers have often noted the efficacy of *gaiatsu* (foreign pressure) in overcoming domestic policy gridlock. Armacost notes, in relation to the Gulf war, that “What, one might ask, brought the Japanese around and prompted them to provide such substantial and political support for Desert Shield and Desert Storm despite their initial, deep-seated reservations? The simple answer, I believe, is foreign pressure, principally from the United States. This pressure was sharply focused, and it was sustained. It was broadly based, embracing key elements of both the executive and legislative branches of the US government. And it was fueled by strong emotional support from the American people. While the consequences of a lame response were difficult to calculate, Tokyo could not rule out profound changes in US attitudes and policies toward Japan, including our future readiness to maintain the alliance.” Armacost, 1995, p. 125. See also Pyle, 2007, pp. 291 and Unger, 1997, pp. 148-149.
Nonetheless, Japan was still bound by many non-trivial domestic constraints on contributing to the alliance. In the end the only avenue which the Kaifu government could, and did, utilize was to make substantial financial contributions.\textsuperscript{52} Furthermore, each monetary contribution came in response to commensurate pressure from the US – movement on Japan’s part was clearly a reaction to US demands, rather than pro-active. Finally, Japan had no choice but to support the US, it’s “greatest ally and biggest customer” in the tense war climate.\textsuperscript{53} In other words, the dependence of Japan on the United States for its security and prosperity forced Japan to acquiesce to US demands for a coalition contribution. US Representative Les Aspin gave Japan a “C” on his report card for Persian Gulf burden sharing, noting that Japan had “problems at home, but can still contribute more.”\textsuperscript{54}

This result comports with my prediction that ‘typical’ bargaining would determine the coalition contribution from Japan, rather than asymmetric security interdependence. If asymmetric interdependence had been determinant, then the process of the interactions

\textsuperscript{52} Blaker assesses that “From the outset, Tokyo seemed bereft of ideas, beyond ‘checkbook diplomacy’ that would satisfy American and other foreign critics…despite their oft-stated resolve to act decisively, Japanese officials could not, so long as appeasing the United States was the real objective.” Blaker, 1993, p. 21. Armacost notes that “Within the Japanese government…there were important players…who recognized the importance of demonstrating Japan’s solidarity with the multilateral coalition, or feared the consequences of ignoring US requests, or saw opportunity to stake out a larger international role for their country. In any case, while the United States insistently demanded generous financial and political support from Tokyo, requests for personnel contributions were sufficiently lacking in specificity that Japan was able to find means of responding that required neither a revision of the constitution nor a fundamental reordering of the postwar political consensus.” Armacost, 1996, p. 125-126. Purrington and A.K. note that “Japan found itself largely lacking the means to assist its ally in a nonfinancial manner.” Purrington and A.K., 1991, p. 322.

\textsuperscript{53} Unger, 1997, p. 150. Purrington, phrases it this way: “The ‘Iraqi Shock’ can be defined as the realization that Japan was ill prepared to respond to the demands of a new international system, in which Japan must play a leading role, and the realization that Japan must continue to rely on its Nichibei [Japan-US] partnership and support the United States, which still remains the most important actor in the evolving international system, in order to provide for Japan’s comprehensive security in the post-cold war world.” Purrington, 1992, p. 169. Togo calls the results of the Gulf War a ‘defeat’ for Japan. See Togo, 2005, p. 78.

\textsuperscript{54} Aspin, 1990.
would likely have been very different. If the US had been “enlisting help” then Japan
would have had greater bargaining leverage, and would likely have received some
compensation for its coalition contribution. Alternately, if Japan had been “currying
favor” with the US, then it would have been much more forthcoming with its
contributions and would have presumably demonstrated much more clearly and earlier
that it was a reliable ally. It would have been willing to assume the costs it did, but in a
manner which made it clear that it was a faithful friend of the US. It seems clear that
these things did not happen. Instead, because Japan placed high value on its relationship
with the US, and the US greatly valued a contribution from them, the two states engaged
in occasionally acrimonious interactions that resulted only in a significant financial
contribution after the war had begun.

It is also noteworthy that the long-term burden sharing agreement between the US
and Japan was altered in these exchanges. As noted above, the US Congress angrily
demanded that Japan pay the entire cost of maintaining US troops stationed there, which
resulted in the Japanese increasing their share of support costs by 50%.55 In essence, the
US Congress was willing to put the longstanding US – Japan security alliance at risk over
the issue of coalition support. In so doing, the US took advantage of Japanese dependence
to force them to assume more of the burden of the alliance.

Finally, I predicted that because Japan greatly valued the relationship with the US,
it would be willing to commit its own resources to the coalition. This prediction was
borne out. However, the Japanese government only provided that contribution as a result

of pressure from the United States. This is in line with what one would expect from a situation where alliance dependence dynamics, rather than ‘currying favor’ or ‘enlisting help’ are in force.

**Turkey**

**Background (Independent Variables):**

In the days immediately following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, President George Bush contacted Turkish President Ozal to garner his support. At that time, Bush asked that Turkey shut down the two oil pipelines that ran from Iraq through Turkish territory and join the US and other nations in economic sanctions against Iraq. This would be a costly step for Turkey, since it received nearly two thirds of its oil from Iraq (on preferential terms) and earned almost $300 million in royalties to allow it to pass through to Turkish ports. But, given that oil accounted for 95% of Iraqi exports, and almost two-thirds of it flowed through Turkey, this would presumably greatly strengthen economic sanctions.

In addition to requesting Turkey’s participation in these economic sanctions, when US planners later drew up warplans to push Saddam’s forces out of Kuwait, they planned on being able to utilize Incirlik airbase in Turkey for air missions over Iraq. Incirlik was 500 miles from the Iraqi border, and provided significant air basing capabilities. However, despite the fact that Turkey shared a land border with Iraq, there

57 Brown, 2007, p. 86.
58 Freedman and Karsh, 1993, p. 82, Brown, 2007, p. 86. Baker noted that “Our strategy of economic pressure would have been doomed if Turkey had refused to shut off its oil pipeline with Iraq.” Baker, 1995, p. 278.
was apparently never any serious consideration of asking Turkey for staging or basing of land troops to open up a second front in northern Iraq. The only military request the US made of Turkey was to allow US aircraft to operate from Incirlik in Turkish territory. Doing so would have been easier than utilizing Mediterranean carrier-based or European land-based aircraft. Thus, US warplans did not critically depend on Turkish contributions, but the use of Incirlik airbase would have allowed the US to prosecute the war effort more efficiently. Furthermore, other bases could have provided the same, albeit less efficient, support. For these reasons, I code the value of a Turkish military contribution to the US as ‘low’ (IV1 = ‘low’).

Turkey, however, was motivated by its view that its relations with the United States as crucial to its overall foreign policy and strategic thinking, and thus the US should be supported in its efforts against Iraq. Despite the end of the Cold War, the value that Turkey placed on its relationship with the US appears to have increased rather than decreased with the rapid diminishment of Soviet power in the region. Turkish foreign policy has, since 1921, been committed to Europe and the West, and the close alliance with the US and NATO membership were thus seen as key pillars of that policy. As the USSR collapsed, the founding rationale of NATO disappeared, leading to increased anxiety in Turkey about their value to the West. This led Turkey to redouble its efforts to join the European Community (EC) as a way to solidify its place in the West. As one scholar of Turkish affairs notes:

59 One contemporaneous news article hinted at the possibility of a second front, but it appears that idea was never seriously considered by US planners. It is possible that the Pentagon hinted at a second front in order to pin Iraqi troops down, much as they did (almost by accident) in 2003. See Freedman and Karsh, 1993, p. 205-206.
60 Many scholars of Turkey have noted this. For an example in this context see Brown, 2007, p. 90.
“Ironically, the importance attached by Turkey to its alliance with the United States and NATO became even more pronounced with the end of the Cold War. Turkish officials were apprehensive about the possibility that the transformation of the international system could undermine Turkey’s geostrategic role, its alliance relationships with the United States and Western Europe, and the supply of military and economic aid provided by the West…the importance of strengthening Turkish-American politico-military cooperation became a major foreign policy objective for Ankara. Turkish President Ozal clearly saw the Gulf conflict as an opportunity to achieve this objective.”61

In other words, Turkey in the post-Cold War era feared that its importance to the West was at risk, and that it needed to shore up this pillar of its foreign policy.

Despite these strategic motivations, personalities also played a part in Turkish policy toward the US coalition. Despite the importance Turks placed on European integration, the idea of supporting the US in a war against Iraq was still not a view that was as popular across Turkey as it was in the office of President Ozal. Ozal was highly committed to supporting the US in its actions against Iraq as a way of demonstrating Turkey’s value to the West.62 But most other Turks – not just the public, but also the military, many members of parliament, and the Foreign Ministry – were less enthusiastic about becoming involved in the conflict with Iraq, and were inclined towards neutrality. The Turkish foreign policy making establishment traditionally relied upon consensus building between these different elements, but Ozal’s zeal and political skill allowed him to outmaneuver, confront, and ‘get out in front of’ other key members of the Turkish

62 Hale notes that Ozal’s support for the US “enabled him to demonstrate Turkey’s continuing strategic value to the Western powers, [and] he hoped that full support for the Western powers in the crisis would strengthen Turkey’s case for gaining eventual accession to the EU.” Hale, 2007, p. 38.
government during the crisis. Ozal soon took control of foreign policy making based on his constant contact with other world leaders (such as George Bush). Furthermore, the crisis provided a way for Ozal to deflect attention away from a variety of domestic failings and provide Turkey with an influential role in the region after the conflict ended. As will be shown below, Ozal did clash with those in the government that opposed his activist foreign policy, but nonetheless he retained control over Turkish foreign policy. These strategic motivations, combined with the forceful stance and acumen of Ozal, indicate clearly that Turkey placed high value on a contribution to the US-led coalition against Iraq (IV2 = ‘high’).

Given these values for my independent variables, I expect Turkey to “Curry Favor” with the US (Quadrant 4). Therefore, my model would predict that

- The US would have bargaining leverage over Turkey, since Turkey wants to contribute to prove its reliability and dependability as an ally.
- Turkey would contribute to the DS/DS coalition, and would incur the costs for that contribution.
- Turkey would contribute its own men, money, or materiel to the coalition.

**Analysis:**

The initial response of Turkey’s foreign policymaking establishment to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was cautious: the Turkish National Security Council and Council of

---

63 Hale, 2007, p. 38
64 Hale, 2007, p. 38
65 Hale notes that Ozal believed that “that Turkey would be able to play an important role in the postwar security of the Gulf…it appears that by the late autumn of 1990, both Ozal and President Bush expected that military action to expel the Iraqi forces from Kuwait would be inevitable and that it would be successful. More crucially…they both expected that Iraq’s military defeat in Kuwait would bring about the overthrow of Saddam Hussein…throughout however, Ozal seems to have believed that there was complementarity between Turkey’s national interests and the policies of the United States. Since it was assumed that the Western coalition would win in a war against Iraq, Turkey could best promote those interests by working with Washington, rather than independently.” Hale, 2007, p. 38-39.
Ministers immediately convened, and on the day after the invasion both bodies condemned Saddam’s actions and demanded that he withdraw his forces from Kuwait immediately. Otherwise, no immediate action was forthcoming, and the Turks seemed to be in no rush to impose unilateral economic or other sanctions – preferring instead to see what the response of other countries would be.66

The Turkish foreign policy-making establishment, which relied upon a consensus being built among the President and the legislature, the military chiefs, and the foreign ministry, adopted a ‘wait and see’ attitude.67 They did not have to wait long – on August 3rd and 4th, President Bush talked with Turkish President Ozal multiple times. Accounts differ as to who said what, but the ultimate result of these conversations was that on August 8th Ozal announced that Turkey would join UN sanctions against Iraq and close the Iraqi oil pipelines.68 The closure of these pipelines was costly to Turkey – initial estimates indicate that it resulted in a loss of $7 billion in revenue for Turkey; later estimates were as high as $15-20 billion.69 However, Turkey did receive significant aid during the crisis to partially compensate for these losses: $8.5 billion in direct aid and oil came from other countries (mainly the Gulf States and at US urging), more than $2

66 Brown, 2007, p. 86.
68 Baker claims that Ozal raised the closure of the pipelines first, while Sayari maintains that Bush raised the possibility of closing the pipelines to Ozal, while Brown notes there are accounts that claim Ozal raised it with Bush. See Baker, 1995, p. 284, Sayari, 1997, p. 199 and Brown 2007, p. 86. However, given Bush’s call for economic sanctions against Iraq and the existence of UN sanctions, it is clear that the US desired Turkey to close the pipelines, whether or not it was Bush who initially raised the possibility or Ozal. Note that the details are a bit more elaborate: Iraq sent an emissary to Ankara to try to convince Ozal to not close the pipelines, but tankers were not loading oil at Turkish ports (so there was little point in pumping oil through the pipelines) and in the end Iraq itself actually closed the pipelines, claiming it was a marketing decision. See Freedman and Karsh, 1993, p. 82-83.
billion in world bank loans, and the US itself provided some $282 million in extra aid (above and beyond the $553 million it already provided to Turkey each year). The US also arranged for a significant donation to Turkey of surplus second-hand NATO tanks and aircraft valued at around $8 billion.

In addition to supporting the economic sanctions against Saddam by closing the flow of oil from Iraq to external markets, Ozal lent strong political support to Bush’s diplomatic efforts in both NATO and the UN. Ozal also engaged in a variety of efforts directed at mobilizing neighboring countries to support the coalition against Saddam.

Furthermore, large numbers of Turkish troops, tanks, and artillery were redeployed to the border with Iraq to defend against any possible Iraqi retaliation. For that reason, this move was not seen as controversial within Turkey. By December 1990, there were over 100,000 Turkish troops near the border with Iraq. Although this development was more of a self-serving measure designed to protect Turkey rather than support the US-led coalition, it still had the effect of pinning down a large number of Iraqi forces to guard against a possible second front from Turkey.

In these decisions, Ozal appears to have been at odds with most of the Turkish polity and government. Maintaining Turkey’s historical neutrality was the favored course not only of the public but also much of the government (include members of parliament, the military and its leaders, and the Foreign Ministry), but Ozal steadfastly moved ahead.

---

70 The World Bank, which at this time was headed up by a former Republican Congressman, pledged between $1 and $1.5 Billion a year for two years. See Baker, 1995, p. 285.
in his support for the US despite the political risk.\footnote{Brown 2007, p. 86-87, Sayari, 1997, p. 199.} Relations between Ozal and even his own ministers became notably tense. The first manifestation of these tensions occurred when Ozal announced that Turkey would be closing the Iraqi pipelines: he apparently made this decision without notifying other Turkish officials, not even his own Foreign Minister, Ali Bozer.\footnote{Milliyet, 9 August, 1990. Cited in Sayari, 1997, p. 199. See also Robins, 1991, p. 70, which details how Ozal embarrassed Ali Bozer with the timing and method of his announcing the closure of the Iraqi pipelines.} A few weeks later Ozal clashed with the Foreign Minister again when he urged the Turkish legislature (the Turkish Grand National Assembly, or TGNA) to send a warship to the Persian Gulf to demonstrate Turkey’s commitment to enforcing UN sanctions there. The foreign minister opposed this move, but the TGNA did in fact approve it (although Ozal later changed his mind, maintaining instead that deploying Turkish troops to the border with Iraq was enough of a demonstration to the US).\footnote{See Brown, 2007, p. 87.}

Ozal was intent on joining the military aspects of the US-led coalition in other ways as well. From the very beginning of the conflict, Ozal pushed for full war powers in the TGNA so he could send Turkish troops to Saudi Arabia to participate in Desert Shield (the phase of the operation concerned with defending Saudi Arabia). However, members of Ozal’s own party joined with the opposition to limit his authority so that he could only respond to a direct attack by Iraq. On September 5\textsuperscript{th} Ozal was eventually granted the authority to send Turkish troops abroad, and receive foreign forces onto Turkish soil, but the extensive opposition he faced forced him to limit the role of Turkey’s own military to a purely logistical one.\footnote{Brown, 2007, p. 89; Hale, 2007, p. 42; Freedman and Karsh, 1993, p. 352-353.} When the UN adopted Resolution 678 on Nov 29\textsuperscript{th}, Ozal
appeared ready to commit Turkish troops to the coming conflict, but his energetic support for the US led to a serious rift in his government. Not only did Ozal face substantial parliamentary opposition, but from his own ministers: the Foreign Minister, the Defence Minister, and Chief of the General Staff all resigned in protest by December. In later TV interviews, it became clear that Ozal’s heavy-handed approach and strong desire to send Turkish troops abroad to support the DS/DS coalition, and perhaps even into Iraq to extend Turkish post-conflict influence there, alienated much of his own government. The public also had strong doubts about Ozal’s actions: two-thirds were opposed to military action, instead preferring rigid neutrality.

Thus, when the US began preparations for a military offensive to push Iraqi forces out of Kuwait, Ozal could only offer the use of Incirlik air base even though he clearly wished to contribute more actively. Even that had to be kept discreet at first, and when the Turkish media reported that there was increased US military air traffic at Incirlik, government representatives initially claimed they were on routine training missions. The weekend before the ground war began, the Turkish government finally allowed the US to use Incirlik, but only for humanitarian and logistical flights – although US F-111 and F-16 craft continued to deploy to Incirlik. Only after fighting began did the Turkish parliament acquiesce (to what amounted to a fait accompli) and allow US aircraft to fly

---

combat missions from the airbase. To refuse to support the US at that point, when US troops had begun direct operations on the ground in Iraq, would likely have greatly weakened the US – Turkish military relationship.

Turkey’s support to the US-led DS/DS coalition was, therefore, a result of a tug of war between a strong and activist executive leader and a hesitant government and polity. Ozal worked hard to “take matters into his own hands and short-circuit the normal procedures” in the foreign policymaking establishment. Despite the political costs that he incurred by supporting the US, Ozal consistently pushed to increase Turkey’s role in the DS/DS coalition. In general he was successful in doing so, but his successes were punctuated by domestic opposition that forced him to place limits on his ambitious plans for Turkish forces. For example, although he unilaterally deployed over a hundred-thousand Turkish troops to the border with Iraq, he was prevented from deploying Turkish troops to Saudi Arabia in direct support of Desert Storm.

Observers agree that Ozal’s proactive support for the US was motivated in large part by his desire to strengthen US – Turkish relations and gain support for Turkey’s entrance into the European Community (EC). Although relations between the US and Turkey had been strong in the past, they had been based almost entirely upon mutual strategic need. Thus, because Turkey and the US now lacked a mutual focus on shared

86 Hale, 2007, p. 43. Aydin noted in 2002 that “Turkey’s foreign policy during the crisis was a perfect example of one-man rule a la Ozal. There is no doubt whatsoever that late President Turgut Ozal dominated Turkish policy-making during the Gulf Crisis/War and thus he alone deserved any credit or criticism derived from it...the prime minister and foreign ministry officials were forced, much to the embarrassment of the latter, to the background by his highly visible public stance and successfully publicized foreign contacts, including almost daily phone calls to and from President Bush of the USA.” Aydin, 2002, pp. 2-3.
Soviet threat, the foundations of their relationship were now under question. The strategic value of Turkey to the US was in doubt and the pillars’ of Turkey’s foreign policy – the alliance with the US and integration with Western Europe – were threatened. One scholar notes that:

“Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait and Washington’s commitment to stopping this aggression offered Turkey an opportunity to reaffirm Ankara’s commitment to US – Turkey bilateral relations and to underscore Turkey’s continued importance to US strategic interests and concerns in the Middle East despite changes in the international system. At a time when Turkey’s relations with its Western European allies in NATO were increasingly strained…and Turkey’s future role in Europe appeared uncertain, the importance of strengthening Turkish-American politico-military cooperation become [sic] a major foreign policy objective for Ankara. Turkish president Ozal clearly saw the Gulf conflict as an opportunity to achieve this objective. Ozal believed that Turkey’s strategic and political role would be enhanced by accommodating Washington and firmly lining up Turkey behind the Allied coalition.”

In the final analysis, the Gulf War provided an opportunity to prove Turkey’s value to the West as it had during the Cold War. Ozal appears to have embodied these concerns and strove to overcome domestic preferences for neutrality. As one scholar

---

87 Many scholars make this point. Aydin, for example, notes that: “Since the end of the Second World War, for almost 40 years, Turkish foreign policy had followed the Western lead…While the end of the Cold War had reduced Turkey’s importance to the West on the southern flank of NATO, and thus signaled an end to the military and economic benefits derived from it, the events in Eastern Europe further undermined Turkey’s chances of joining Europe [the EC]…Turkey seemed, by 1990, to be left alone with fundamental political, orientational, and defense dilemmas. Given the fact that orientation toward Europe and eventual integration into it underpinned Turkey’s Kemalist foreign policy, the changes in international politics inevitably came to test its continued validity.” Aydin, 2002, p. 2. Brown notes the interesting parallels between the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition and the Korean War coalition forty years earlier, noting that “In both instances, Turkey’s decision makers were mainly concerned with how the country would fit into a ‘post-war world’ – in 1950 this meant the post-World War II one; in 1990, it meant the post-Cold War one.” Brown, 2007, p. 94. Robins notes that “It seems that President Ozal wanted to take the opportunity to bolster what had become a mercurial bilateral relationship with the United States…Ozal seems to have regarded the crisis as a chance to prove Turkey’s strategic regional importance to the USA…on the diplomatic front, Turkish government officials were clearly under the impression that their chances of being admitted to the EC would be strengthened as a result of the crisis.” Robins, 1991, p. 71. See also Baker’s recollections – Baker, 1995, p. 284.
notes: “With Turkey’s leaders, especially Ozal, anxious that Turkey was becoming irrelevant for Europe and the United States, the Gulf War was first and foremost an opportunity to demonstrate that Turkey was still of great geopolitical significance. Instead of its border with the USSR, it was now the border with the turbulent Middle East that offered strategic utility.”

This is not to say that such concerns were the only relevant inputs into Ozal’s thinking when he took control of Turkish foreign policy. Materially, Turkey was dependent upon the US for a large amount of military largesse each year (Turkey was the third largest recipient of US aid). Furthermore, it was clear that by becoming involved in the conflict on what was clearly going to be the ‘winning side’, Turkey could gain some regional influence and de-fang a dangerous neighbor. Of course, these other factors played into Ozal’s decision-making as well. But the concern of Turkey to maintain its long-term relationship with the US, and its membership in the club of the West, was clearly an important element of Ozal’s thinking.

Results (dependent variables):

---

89 Brown, 2007, p. 95. Brown rightly notes that this was not likely the sole motivation for Ozal to ally with the US as it did. He notes that Turkey’s participation in the war did greatly increase the aid it received. As noted above, Ozal also acted as he did partly in order to exert some influence over post-conflict Iraq, as well as to prevent Saddam from growing any more powerful (i.e.: to alter the balance of power in Iraq’s favor). See Brown, 2007, pp. 95-96. See also Robins, 1991, p. 70-72.

90 Brown, 2007, p. 94.

91 Aydin notes that “Ozal based his plans during the crisis on a number of propositions: 1) Saddam Hussein would not survive the crisis. 2) The map of the Middle East would be re-drawn. 3) Turkey would take its place at the table where the future of the Middle East would be determined. 4) Turkey would be compensated by the Gulf States for its losses. 5) In return for the inconveniences it experienced during the crisis, Turkey would get from Europe and the USA additional aid, support for its EC membership ambition and its policies vis-à-vis Greece and Armenia.” Aydin, 2002, p. 3. See also Robins, 1991, p. 71-72.
My model made four predictions for the Turkish case. My first prediction was that the US would have bargaining leverage over Turkey, because Turkey wanted to contribute to the coalition to prove its reliability and dependability as an ally. My other predictions were that Turkey would contribute to the DS/DS coalition, that it would provide its own men, money, or materiel, and would itself bear the costs for that contribution. These predictions appear accurate: ultimately, US planners and policymakers got everything they had asked for from Turkey for the coalition at very little cost to the US. Ozal immediately and unconditionally supported economic sanctions and cut off the flow of Iraqi oil, despite the high economic cost to the Turkish economy incurred. And Ozal made sure that Incirlik airbase could be fully utilized by US airplanes, despite the extensive domestic opposition and personal political risk such a move entailed. Furthermore, Turkey unilaterally positioned 100,000 troops on its border with Iraq (albeit for defensive purposes). These actions not only put greater pressure on Saddam and pinned down his forces, but more importantly clearly allowed the US to prosecute the war effort more efficiently. In his “Burden sharing report card” US Representative Les Aspin gave Turkey an “A+” claiming that they gave a “superb performance with no prompting needed.”

In exchange, Turkey did receive direct aid from the Gulf States ($8.5 billion) as well as surplus weaponry and significant World Bank credits, all at the urging of the US. Such aid, however, did not likely come close to offsetting the economic losses it suffered, and Turks to this day feel as if their participation in the war caused great economic

---

hardship. Furthermore, the US itself incurred only small costs – it only provided Turkey with an additional $282 million in aid, a small fraction of the amount it provided to other states.

**Germany**

**Background (Independent Variables):**

The Bush administration viewed Germany in a similar way that it viewed Japan: as a friendly and rich state that could contribute significant amounts of funding and logistical support and, potentially, military forces. As noted earlier, the war effort was anticipated by the White House to be very expensive – thus, the potentially great financial contribution from Germany was very highly valued. Furthermore, extensive US bases in Germany would need to be utilized in order to transport large numbers of US forces to the Gulf and support them during operations. Finally, although the White House understood that significant German domestic legal constraints and public opposition to the use of force made direct German military participation unlikely, this did not prevent

---

93 Brown notes that “Turks remain convinced that they were forced to bear an excessive share of the financial burden that resulted from the war (especially due to the sanctions), and many wonder whether their former President [Ozal] could have driven a harder bargain in exchange for Turkey’s cooperation. How severe the losses actually were, however, has never been authoritatively settled, with estimates ranging from $2 billion for the period before hostilities to $60 billion for the entire war and post-war period, though $30 billion seems to be the most accurate.” Brown arrives at these figures by examining analyses of the Economist Intelligence Unit, Financial Times, and other scholars (Hale, Freedman and Karsh, Sayari, et al.) See Brown, 2007, p. 96 and footnote 75. Much of the reticence of the Turkish government and public to US requests to participate in Operation Iraqi Freedom a decade later appears to be derived from a belief that they were forced to shoulder an unfair economic burden in 1991. Interviews with Yetkin, Aliriza, 2007. See also chapter 5 on OIF, above.

94 For example, the US wrote off its seven billion dollar loan to Egypt in exchange for its support against Saddam Hussein. See Bennett, 1997, p. 52 and Aydin, 2002, p. 55.

95 In his memoirs James Baker explicitly noted the need to seek Japan and West Germany. Baker, 1995, p. 280.
the Bush administration from requesting Germany troops for the coalition soon after the
Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. 96

However, at the time of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, Germany was greatly
distracted. 97 The rapid erosion of Soviet power and willingness of Gorbachev to embrace
German reunification in the months and weeks previously had led to unprecedented and
rapid changes in the relationship with West Germany and the USSR. Lengthy and
intensive negotiations between West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Gorbachev, and
the other Allied powers (the “2+4” negotiations) were in process when Iraq invaded
Kuwait in August. 98 These resulted in an agreement that, as of October 3rd the two
Germanies would become one country. 99 However, there were a vast number of

96 A majority of the public and politicians opposed sending any German military personnel to fight in the
conflict, and interpreted the Basic Law as preventing just such an action – while still allowing logistical,
97 This notion of Germany being ‘distracted’ at this time has been noted by many scholars of the DS/DS
collective. Hellman observes that “Of all the main contributors to the Gulf coalition, Germany probably was
the country most distracted.” Hellman, 1997, p. 165; Hellmann further observes that “Throughout this
period the German foreign policy establishment was preoccupied with wrapping up the external aspects of
unification which eventually took place on Oct. 3 1990. Moreover, the first Sunday of December 1990 had
been set as the date for the first federal election of united Germany, so German politicians were paying
even more attention to public opinion, which...was overwhelmingly set against any direct involvement of
German soldiers in the Gulf.” Hellmann, 1997, p. 170. Freedman and Karsh note that “For Germany the
crisis could not have come at a worse time...German politicians were not easily distracted [from their
domestic and other concerns].” Freedman and Karsh, 1993, p. 118. Les Aspin noted that Germany was
“Distracted, could contribute more.” Aspin, 1990. Erb observes that “The Iraq crisis could not have come at
a worse time for the German political system...” Erb, 2003, p. 149. For a detailed examination of events in
Germany at this time, see Haftendorn, 2006, chapter 8 or Bark and Gress, 1993, parts 12 and 13.
98 Bark and Gress illustrate the time consuming nature of these negotiations: “During the remainder of July
and August, German officials in Bonn and Berlin, as well as legal experts and political leaders, worked
overtime to complete the treaty of reunification in all its numerous aspects. For most of 1990 they were
joined by economists, bankers, scholars, and business men and women working in the evenings and on
weekends to complete the agreements uniting the two parts of postwar Germany...the result was the Treaty
on the Restoration of the State Unity of Germany. It defined the means and methods for completing
political and constitutional unity. Its 45 clauses and four annexes totaled over 1,000 pages, and it was
signed on August 31, 1990...the negotiations...had taken exactly seven months..."Bark and Gress, 1993,
pp. 739-740.
economic and political issues to be dealt with in such a merger, not the least of which was the poor economic situation in East Germany.

Despite these concerns, the importance of the strategic relationship with the US – which had always been a cornerstone of German foreign policy – did not change. If anything, the relationship with the US became even more important because of the geopolitical stability it offered, since it could help ensure a smooth transition to a united Germany.\(^{100}\) This was especially important given that not only did Soviet troops remain stationed in East Germany but also because Germany needed to entirely restructure its foreign relations with the USSR.\(^{101}\) US support would be extremely helpful for both of these efforts. Furthermore, accelerating reforms in the USSR and a growing conservative backlash there indicated that the predictable Cold War environment was fading and Germany’s future security environment was still unknown. Given all these uncertainties, maintaining a stable relationship with the US became even more important to German policymakers.\(^{102}\) Finally, at this historic juncture in postwar German history, the US was

---

\(^{100}\) US acquiescence was of course necessary for the 4+2 reunification treaty talks between the four Allied powers (US, UK, France, and the USSR) and the two Germanies and was likely seen as important in overcoming any resistance on the part of the other Allied powers. For example, the support of the US was seen later as useful for overcoming British resistance on minor aspects of the reunification treaty. See Hellman, 1997, p. 175.

\(^{101}\) Bark and Gress note that in the “2+4” talks that began in May 1990, “there were primarily two major issues to be settled. The first concerned the alliance relationships of a united Germany; the second dealt with the military forces of France, Britain, and the United States stationed in West Germany, and of the Soviet Union stationed in Berlin and East Germany. In early May the Soviet Union still had approximately 600,000 troops in Eastern Europe, including almost 385,000 in East Germany.” Bark and Gress, 1993, p. 735.

\(^{102}\) Bennett, Lepgold, and Unger make a similar point in their study of the Gulf War coalition: “Evidence also indicates that several [coalition] contributors were animated not so much by existing conditions of dependence as by anticipation of dependence on the United States…the heightened salience of anticipated dependence resulted from the sudden and sharp disjuncture in the structure of world politics following the collapse of bipolarity and the arrival of a “unipolar moment.” After four decades of firm alignments, this sharp structural discontinuity produced anxiety, uncertainty, and hopes of reaping strategic rewards, particularly on the part of executives who we would expect to be most sensitive to the new structural
widely perceived as having “stood by Germany’s side ever since the end of World War II.” Thus, there appears to also have been a sense of moral obligation inherent in Germany’s attitudes towards the US at this time. Such beliefs were certainly enhanced by the early support George Bush had shown for Germany unity.

In short, the US highly valued a German contribution to the coalition because it could help with the anticipated financial burden of the war. Germany highly valued a contribution as well, because the geopolitical value of the long-term security relationship with the US, as well as a sense of obligation to the US for its earlier support. In my model, this indicates that both IV1 and IV2 would have a ‘high’ value, meaning that the coalition contribution of Germany, and the interactions between the US and Germany, would be determined less by asymmetric security valuations and more by other dynamics such as alliance dependence, domestic institutions, or so forth. My model thus predicts that:

- *Standard* (vice asymmetric) dynamics would determine the outcome of interactions between the US and Germany, because both are willing to pay to enable a German contribution to the coalition.

realities. In France, for example, Francois Mitterrand’s decision to contribute to the coalition despite France’s relatively low levels of dependence on the United States may have resulted from a desire, similar to offensive bandwagoning, to share in the regional influence that victory would bring. In addition, Mitterrand may have hoped to sustain close relations with the United States at a time when France suddenly faced a reuniting and unfamiliar German power. Similar motivations also appear to have led to the contributions made by Syria’s Asad in the wake of the collapse of Soviet power in the region. President Ozal of Turkey also placed particularly strong emphasis on sustaining close Turkish ties to the United States, in part in the (ultimately futile) hope that this would bolster Turkey’s bid for membership in the European Community.” Bennett, Lepgold, Unger, 1997, p. 348.


104 Erb notes that in the context of the Iraq war, Kohl “felt a personal responsibility to President Bush.” Erb, 2003, p. 149. Hellmann notes that “if there was one belief or conviction that drove German decision-making, it was the strong conviction, especially on the chancellor’s part, that the norm of reciprocity made it absolutely imperative for Germany to provide a major contribution. Sharing the burden with the United States and the other allies that had stood by Germany’s side ever since the end of World War II was simply a moral obligation. German unification would have been inconceivable without US support. Thus, Germany did not only have to pay up, it had to pay back.” Hellmann, 1997, p. 183.
• Since Germany greatly values the relationship with the US, it will be willing to commit its own resources to the coalition.

Analysis:

Immediately after Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait, Germany joined the US and other Western states in imposing economic sanctions on Iraq and supporting UN resolutions on the issue. German foreign minister Genscher made it clear in public statements that Germany was strongly opposed to the occupation of Kuwait, and Chancellor Kohl called it an act of barbarity.¹⁰⁵

Three days after Iraq invaded Kuwait, President Bush telephoned Chancellor Kohl and requested permission to transfer US forces in Germany to the Gulf as well as the use of German facilities for the logistical requirements of Operation Desert Shield.¹⁰⁶ Two weeks later, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney formally requested a variety of German assistance, including the deployment of German forces.¹⁰⁷ The Kohl government quickly approved these initial logistical and material requests from the White House, but avoided any troop commitments due to anticipated constitutional issues. Furthermore, at this time Kohl committed only to the small amount of 200 million deutschmarks in financial support.¹⁰⁸

In early September, as the US troop buildup gained steam, Bush made it clear to Kohl in a phone conversation that Germany would be expected to contribute more than it

¹⁰⁵ Hellmann, 1997, p. 167, referencing a variety of German news reports and speeches by Genscher and Kohl. See Hellmann, 1997, footnotes 1, 2, and 3.
had to date, and he arranged for James Baker to meet with Kohl on Sept 15th. Prior to that meeting, on September 6th, Kohl responded that that he was prepared to contribute a major aid package. Kohl’s repeated acquiescence to US pressure however came with political risks. Leading members of Kohl’s own Christian Democratic Party (CDU) were extremely reluctant to involve German forces in the conflict even peripherally, and opposed any support, financial or otherwise, for the military buildup of the US. This stance was based largely on widespread but not legally definitive interpretations that the German Basic Law prohibited German military deployments. In addition, polls indicated that the German public was firmly against sending any German forces outside of Germany and ambivalent even about NATO military obligations – and with elections looming in December, few politicians were willing to risk taking unpopular stands. In early August, Kohl did intimate that German troops might deploy, but when this became known publicly, he was forced to back down in the face of strong opposition from the public and his own party, and henceforth limit German involvement to political, financial, and technical support.

Such stances earned the opprobrium of US legislators, and resulted in even greater pressure on Kohl. When Kohl’s Foreign Minister Genscher supported a September 7th European Community Council vote rejecting any direct contribution to US

109 Based on the memoirs of Kohl’s foreign policy adviser Horst Teltschik, referenced in Hellman, 1997, p. 174 footnotes 40 and 42.
110 For analyses of the constitutional constraints inherent in these issues, see Freedman and Karsh, 1993, pp. 118-120 and Hellmann, 1997, pp. 178-181.
military forces in the Gulf, members of the US Congress reacted strongly. Les Aspin, the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, singled out Germany for particular criticism. Germany was a specific target of ire since the German contributions were widely considered disappointing and the US had wholeheartedly supported recent German reunification talks. On September 11th, Bush informed Kohl that he would not attend the Oct 3 German reunification ceremonies in Bonn. And in a letter to Kohl just before the critical Sept 15th meeting between Kohl and Baker, Bush urged Kohl to contribute a ‘fair share’ and noted that Americans would look closely at what Germany did. This effort was undoubtedly strengthened by the fact that US Congressmen were noting that Germany had pledged $8 billion to support Soviet troops stationed in East Germany until they could return to the USSR, but only a fraction of that to support US efforts in Desert Shield. Secretary of State James Baker recalls that:

“I’d been peppered with complaints during my testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about other nations not pulling their share of the load. Germany had been singled out for special criticism, and while I didn’t say so publicly, I shared the view that Germany’s response

113 See Hellmann, 1997, p. 175, footnote 44. It is also noteworthy that Turkey called upon its NATO allies in December 1990 to assist in the defense of Turkey in the event of Iraqi aggression. NATO’s defence planning committee agreed to send a rapid reaction force which included German soldiers and fighter jets. Significant numbers of German opposition legislators argued against this effort. See Hellmann, 1997, p. 171, 177-178.
115 Based upon memoirs of Kohl’s foreign policy advisor. See Hellmann, 1997, p. 174-175, and footnotes 42 and 46. The letter from Bush arrived the day after the “2+4” treaty on Germany’s reunification had been signed, and a day before the US Senate was to take up deliberations on it. It is also noteworthy that earlier James Baker had announced that the United States was considering further cuts in US forces in Europe even greater than the earlier agreed upon number of 195,000. As Hellmann notes “At a time when it was still uncertain whether or not the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Germany would proceed as smoothly as planned, this announcement was likely to be unwelcome in Germany. Thus, while it is not clear whether these announcements were made with an eye on Germany’s Gulf contribution, they are certain to have contributed to an atmosphere that heightened the awareness among German leaders of their dependence on the United States.” Hellmann, 1997, p. 175-176.
116 Freedman and Karsh, 1993, p. 120.
up to then had been disappointing. Their reluctance was even more perplexing because, two days earlier in Moscow, I had participated in the treaty ceremony where the four Allied victors in World War II had terminated their occupation rights in West Germany, clearing the way for the reunification of Germany after nearly a half-century. It was essentially an American-brokered agreement, and the Germans knew it. Now we needed some help in return.\(^{117}\)

Thus “the events and diplomatic communications prior to the Baker-Kohl meeting clearly suggest the importance of US pressure and resulting German fears of being abandoned in accounting for the size and composition of the first major German contribution.”\(^{118}\) In his meeting with Kohl on September 15\(^{th}\) James Baker “wanted to make sure Chancellor Kohl understood the stakes” and so told Kohl directly that the US had:

> “Worked very closely in the last year to meet your needs…and it wasn’t always easy…but we have some needs now. You’re not going to contribute any forces because your constitution prohibits it, and then it looks like you’re being skimpy on the money, you’re getting all the benefits of this [war] and then you’re not contributing. And even if I don’t believe it, that’s the way it’s perceived. You have to put me in the position where I can argue when I appear before the Congress that Germany is doing its fair share. I know how important the US – German relationship is to you, and you know how important it is to me. But you can’t leave me hanging out there.”\(^{119}\)

In other words, Baker purposely noted the importance of the US-German relationship and the German obligation to the US for its support during German reunification talks, as well as noting that the only way he could fend off US lawmakers would be if he returned home with a notable German offer.\(^{120}\) Kohl’s Ruling CDU party too made such appeals, invoking memories of the Berlin airlift and other episodes throughout US – German

\(^{117}\) Baker, 1995, p. 298-299.
\(^{118}\) Hellmann, 1997, p. 175.
\(^{120}\) This is, of course, a classic example of two-level bargaining as described by Putnam. See Putnam, 1988.
history.\textsuperscript{121} These tactics bore fruit, at least partially: after this meeting Kohl announced a significant financial aid package of almost $2 billion to support the US Desert Shield efforts as well as offset the economic costs borne by Turkey, Egypt, and Jordan in enforcing the economic sanctions. He also provided German ships to transport Egyptian forces to the Gulf.\textsuperscript{122} One scholar notes that “the German contribution [was] largely the result of corresponding US pressure and German fears of abandonment.”\textsuperscript{123} However, given the large amounts of aid Germany had pledged to the USSR and for the rebuilding of East Germany, this amount seems paltry.\textsuperscript{124} Furthermore, Kohl did not offer to pay for any anticipated costs incurred by actual combat.\textsuperscript{125} It appeared to many that Kohl was attempting to straddle the fence by appearing loyal to the US while also avoiding any contentious domestic issues.\textsuperscript{126} It was not until much later when the UN ultimatum to Iraq expired that Kohl publicly stated that it was Iraq, and not the United States or the UN that had endangered the peace.\textsuperscript{127}

By the time the Bush administration had decided to use force in early November, US and other coalition forces in the area numbered half a million, and Secretary of State

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{121} Erb, 2003, p. 152.
\textsuperscript{123} Hellmann, 1997, p. 174.
\textsuperscript{124} As Hellman and others note, German unification brought with it a large financial burden: “In addition to an annual bill of more than $80 billion for the eastern part of Germany for many years to come, German tax payers were confronted with another $50 billion to be used mainly as compensation for the withdrawal of the Soviet army.” Hellman, 1997, p. 166. For a detailed explanation of the expenses required to rebuild East Germany, see Bark and Gress, 1993, Part 13.
\textsuperscript{125} Erb, 2003, p. 150.
\textsuperscript{126} Erb notes that “Kohl’s policy was a thinly disguised attempt to do whatever he could to create the public appearance of German fidelity to the Western cause, while avoiding domestic dissent. The CDU’s [Kohl’s ruling Christian Democratic Party] anti-Iraq pronouncements focused on the human rights violations of Saddam Hussein’s army and the legitimacy granted to the anti-Iraq coalition by the United Nations, rather than on economic or political interests.” Erb, 2003, p. 150.
\end{footnotesize}
James Baker began a second diplomatic offensive to garner support for the use of force. The result was UN resolution 678 which gave Saddam Hussein an ultimatum of January 15, 1991, to leave Kuwait. During these trips, Baker met again with Kohl on January 8th, in which he acknowledged that the Germans had “come through” on their earlier commitments, but now that war was looming, more was needed. Baker requested $335 million per month, and Kohl pledged he would “do something.”

On January 16th 1991 US and coalition air forces struck Iraqi targets, and Operation Desert Storm had begun. Kohl’s cabinet voted on January 29th to provide an additional $5.5 billion for Desert Storm operations, a date that coincided with Bush’s State of the Union speech – which gave the impression that Kohl was attempting to head off any further criticism. By the time the conflict had ended, Germany had eventually contributed approximately $11.5 billion worth of aid, most of which went directly to the United States for its expenses. Of this, approximately one-fifth was technical and logistical support, such as chem-bio detection equipment, transport vehicles, engineering and communications equipment, and so forth. No German combat forces were provided. Furthermore, over 100,000 US and British soldiers based on German soil were redeployed to the Gulf for the war, with the German government providing the logistical support to move these forces, and German naval vessels conducted

---

129 German aid also included humanitarian support to Israel and the Kurds, other financial support to Turkey, Egypt, and Jordan. See Hellmann, 1997, pp. 168-169, and 172. Details on the how these numbers were arrived at vary but generally agree with a final figure of between $11 and $12 billion. See also Hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means, 102nd Congress. July 31, 1991. Serial 102-65. Foreign Contributions to the Costs of the Persian Gulf War. US Government Printing Office, 1991, and Erb, 2003, p. 151.
minesweeping operations in the Persian Gulf after the war ended.\textsuperscript{130} Even though the financial contributions of Germany were welcomed by the US and generally thought of as sufficient, the failure of Germany to provide actual military support remained a source of bitterness.\textsuperscript{131} From the German perspective however, their financial contribution was significant,\textsuperscript{132} especially given that Germany had already committed over $40 billion to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and was faced with the long-term costs of over $100 billion for the rebuilding of East Germany.\textsuperscript{133}

\textbf{Results (dependent variables):}

Due to the anticipated high costs of the DS/DS conflict, the Bush White House made a concerted and high profile effort to elicit a substantial financial contribution from Germany. While the US greatly valued such a coalition contribution, Germany’s motivations vis-à-vis the US were based around its need to maintain its close relationship with the US into the future and its sense of moral obligation. Due to the increasingly

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{130} Hellmann notes that “Within less than 40 days [after November 8th] more than 100,000 American and British soldiers left their German bases for the Gulf.” Hellmann notes that a detailed description of German logistical operations is given in Gunther Gillessen, “Deutschland Hauptbasis für den Truppenaufmarsch am Golf,” in \textit{Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung}, 5 June 1991, p. 5. It is useful to contrast this material support from Germany with that later requested by the US in 2003 for Operation Iraqi Freedom. At that time, far fewer US forces were present in Germany, making the German material (logistical) contribution far less critical to the US efforts. See section on Germany in Chapter Five, above, especially footnote 213.

\textsuperscript{131} Based upon reactions in the US Congress and Les Aspin’s ‘burden sharing report card’ Hellmann notes that “Whereas Germany’s political support for the anti-Saddam coalition was seldom questioned, its military and financial contributions (or the alleged lack thereof) were harshly criticized. In the perception of many politicians of some of Germany’s most important allies, these contributions fell far short of what was expected of one of the world’s leading economic powers. Even though most of the influential foreign observers appreciated Germany’s financial contribution…they also criticized the German government for not doing enough. Most importantly, they constantly reminded the Germans that they had not sent ‘a single soldier, sailor, or airman.’” Hellmann, 1997, p. 167-168.

\textsuperscript{132} Hellmann notes that Germany’s financial contribution to the coalition was close to Japan’s even though the GDP of Germany was about half. See Hellmann, 1997, p. 172 and footnote 33.

\textsuperscript{133} Hellmann, 1997, p. 172-173.
\end{footnotesize}
uncertain security environment and the need to resolve lingering issues with the Soviet Union over the reunification of Germany, the German relationship with the US was critical in this time period. Given these dynamics, my model predicted that interactions between the two nations and a German contribution would be the result of more ‘typical’ bargaining dynamics, rather than being based on the characteristics of asymmetric security interdependence.

The above reconstruction of US – German interactions largely bears this out, especially considering the not-so-subtle pressure from the White House preceding the crucial September 15th meetings between Baker and Kohl. Neither the US nor Germany behaved as if their leverage was based primarily upon their mutual asymmetric concerns. Germany was unable to win any significant concessions from the US based upon how critically the US needed a German contribution. And although the US made it clear that the relationship with Germany might be weakened if their support was not forthcoming, Baker also made the point that Germany owed the US for its support during the “2+4” talks. In other words, Germany appears to have been largely “entrapped” and forced to pay up not only due to its dependence on the US but also its conviction that it needed to reciprocate for past US assistance. Later, when the actual conflict began in January, Kohl proactively increased the German commitment despite the extensive economic burdens Germany was operating under at the time and the domestic constraints he faced.

Given the lopsided results of US – German interactions in this case (the US incurred almost no costs in return for substantial contributions) may at first appear to resemble a situation of “Currying Favor.” However such a conclusion appears to be less
than definitive. If Germany had been attempting to curry favor with the US, it is unlikely
that it would have been so reticent to provide a contribution to the coalition. Nor would
German officials likely have been so willing to risk angering the US by rejecting calls for
German military contributions (and going out of their way to interpret the Basic Law as
forbidding exactly that), or preferring to avoid contentious domestic issues by “fence-
straddling.” Finally, German willingness to contribute to the coalition came only in
response to explicit US pressure and that, in the end, Germany’s relationship was
damaged by their poor showing. 134 Thus, although this case may at first appear to be an
example of “currying favor” it is more clearly an instance of “bargaining.”

Finally, I also predicted that Germany would be willing to commit its own
resources to the coalition. This prediction was borne out by the fact that, after being
pressured by the US, Germany did make substantial economic and technical assistance to
the coalition.

Poland

Background (Independent Variables):

There is little evidence that the US regarded a Polish contribution to the DS/DS
coalition as critical in any way for the US war effort. US efforts to build a political
consensus in the United Nations were broadly successful almost immediately after the
invasion of Kuwait, mitigating any need to shop around for political support from other

countries such as Poland. Furthermore, there is little reason to believe that a Polish military contribution was in any way critical for US war plans. Whatever military support Poland could provide would be redundant or perhaps costly (given the need for interoperability and transportation to the theater). Furthermore, relations between the Poles and the Soviet Union were delicate at this time, due to the rapid changes in the Warsaw Pact and the continued tension over Soviet troops in Poland. It seems unlikely that the US, which was hopeful that the Soviet Union would lend its support to the DS/DS coalition, would avoid any overt attempts to enlist Polish contributions. For these reasons, the value that the US places on a Polish coalition contribution is ‘low (IV1 = ‘low’).

Poland, on the other hand, was in a precarious geopolitical situation at the time, a situation which a closer alliance with the US could mitigate. Post-communist reform efforts had begun in Poland in 1989 when the Solidarity movement took control in partially free elections, and the US had begun providing modest amounts of financial aid to the new government. And although Poland had attained its de jure independence from the Soviet Union, Soviet troops still maintained a significant presence in the country, de facto limiting Polish sovereignty. Over the previous few years the USSR had begun to disintegrate and many of its former satellite states in the Baltic and Ukraine had gained their independence, much to the chagrin of conservative elements within

135 The UN vote on Resolution 660 on August 2nd, demanding a complete and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, passed in the UNSC unanimously 14-0 with only Yemen abstaining and even Cuba supporting. See Baker, 1995, p. 278.
137 It would not be until 1991, with the dismantling of the USSR, that Poland regained its full independence.
Russia. Relations between Poland and the USSR, historically hostile countries, were tense: many elements of the Polish polity clamored for a severing of ties between the two countries, and much of effort by Krzysztof Skubiszewski, Poland’s foreign minister in this period, concentrated on cautiously maintaining, protecting, and enhancing Polish sovereignty while avoiding antagonizing the still regionally dominant Soviet Union. In fact, tense negotiations on the withdrawal of Soviet troops had only just begun by November 1990.

Furthermore, to the West, Germany had recently reunited, causing further concern for the fledgling Polish state. Although the concern that Germany would display recidivist tendencies or challenge existing borders may seem unlikely, to the Poles unresolved borders and tensions between the two states were clearly worrisome. As

---

138 These dynamics would in fact lead to a failed coup by conservatives in the USSR in August 1991.
139 Millard provides a useful summary of the historical influences on Polish foreign policy approaches, noting especially the importance of issues of statehood and sovereignty. See Millard, 1994, p. 202-205. Vinton observes that “The chief preoccupation of Polish foreign policy in the Skubiszewski era was to buttress the sovereignty regained with the collapse of communism. In a country whose historical experience had so often been one of limited sovereignty or outright foreign domination, the imperatives of raison d’etat [raison d’etat] induced a solemnity among politicians that other issues failed to command.” Vinton, 1995, p. 24. Chessa notes that “For all the debate and uncertainty in US foreign policy circles surrounding the collapse of the Cold War order, these same events in Poland brought about a period of foreign policy consensus…despite the overturning of five prime ministers, four changes in government, three national elections, and an overall raucous political environment…Krzysztof Skubiszewski established and managed a broad-based agreement in the area of foreign affairs. Skubiszewski was eager to seize the historical opportunity to establish conditions under which Poland could first recover and then preserve its sovereignty…the foremost objective was to create the conditions under which Poland’s independence could be guaranteed, since sovereignty served as a prerequisite for other important goals, such as the ‘return to Europe’.” Chessa, 2002, p. 179-180. See also Spero, 2004.
140 Such negotiations took over a year to finalize, and the last Russian troops did not leave Poland until September 1993. See Vinton, 1995, p. 38.
141 Polish officials confirm that the unification of Germany was of serious concern to the Poles (Marcin Pietrowski, 2008, interview). Millard notes that “the appearance of German unification on the political agenda aroused atavistic Polish anxieties about a resurgent Germany which were given credence by Chancellor Kohl’s refusal to pledge the eternal immutability of the border on the Oder-Neisse line.” Millard, 1994, p. 218. Vinton notes that “When [German] reunification emerged as an imminent prospect, the [Polish] government mounted a massive diplomatic offensive to ensure that Poland was able to present its views during the ‘2+4’ talks between the two German states and four Allied powers…Poland’s chief
Germany reunification picked up steam in the previous year, the Polish government mounted a diplomatic offensive to ensure its concerns were addressed by the involved parties (the two Germanys and the four occupying Allied powers of the US, UK, France, and Soviet Union). Poland was determined to ensure that a reunited Germany was firmly embedded in security institutions that would protect Poland, and that the border between the two countries be formally accepted and made permanent and inviolable. It was only in mid-November 1990 that Poland and Germany signed a treaty acknowledging the permanence of their border.

In sum, in the period immediately following the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq the newly independent Poland was preoccupied with the potential that a reactionary USSR could become an existential security threat or deny or delay Poland full sovereignty and, at the same time, anxieties over an unresolved border issue with a now reunited Germany. With its security landscape in such flux, the much less powerful Poland was largely at the mercy of events beyond its control, and so would naturally look for a sympathetic ally to provide much needed leverage and enhanced security to balance against the potential Russian threat. The only likely ways that could happen would be to enter into a

---

security alliance with the US or to join NATO. \(^1\) From 1989 until the end of 1991, the Poles were singularly focused on integrating themselves into Western European institutions, carefully finalizing their detachment from the Soviet sphere of influence, and guaranteeing their western border. \(^2\) Because the US would have a de facto veto over any new NATO membership, and would provide much needed influence on these other issues, the Poles were highly motivated to maintain and strengthen the security relationship with the US. Contributing to the DS/DS coalition was one way they could clearly do that. Therefore, I code IV2 as ‘high’.

These dynamics indicate that Poland would be “currying favor” with the US according to my model. Therefore, I predict that:

- *The US would have bargaining leverage over Poland, because Poland wants to contribute to prove its worth and dependability as an ally.*
- *Polish contributions would be ‘paid for’ by Poland itself.*
- *Polish contributions would be comprised of their own men, money, or materiel.*

**Analysis:**

There are very few accounts of interactions between Poland and the US vis-à-vis the Desert Shield/Desert Storm coalition. Given that Poland was not fully sovereign at this time, and the risk that openly supporting the US could antagonize the USSR, this is not surprising. Any support that Poland provided to the US would either be cautious and require the de facto approval of Russia, or be provided ‘under the table’. In fact, it is

\(^1\) Note also that what concerns Poland had vis-à-vis a now-unified German state would be alleviated by US reassurances and a closer connection with the US. Baker notes that at the time of the 2+4 talks on the future of Germany he made specific efforts to reassure the Poles about Germany. See Baker, 1995, p. 247.

\(^2\) Millard, 1994, p. 205-206. Furthermore, the eruption of the Iraq war came at just the right moment for Poland. As one Polish official notes “the invasion of Kuwait was good timing for Poland” because it gave Poland an opportunity to “gain some points” in Washington which would in turn help Poland vis-à-vis the USSR and its border issues with Germany. Interview with Marcin Pietrowski, Senior political-military advisor at the Polish Embassy in Washington, DC 2008.
clear that Polish officials took great pains to avoid antagonizing Soviet officials at this time, and ensured that their statements about Poland’s relations with the West were well crafted.\textsuperscript{145} Therefore, it is notable that what little information is available indicates that Poland did in fact contribute to the DS/DS Coalition in two ways.

First, the Poles provided to the coalition two naval vessels. One was the \textit{Piast}, a medical evacuation ship with 200 military medical personnel for a field hospital unit. The other was the \textit{Wodnik}, a logistics and salvage vessel.\textsuperscript{146} It is unclear what role, if any, these forces played in the actual conflict. However, their very nature indicates that they would be unobtrusive non-combat participants. Furthermore, given the limited casualties the war incurred and the limited role of naval vessels, it seems unlikely that these Polish forces were employed in substantive roles.

However, years after the Gulf War had ended, a second Polish contribution to the conflict was revealed publicly. “Operation Simoon” (in Polish, \textit{Operacja Samum}) was a covert operation conducted by Polish intelligence agents before the start of the war. In a risky operation, the Poles rescued six US intelligence agents who had been monitoring Iraqi troop movements and had become stranded in Kuwait. It appears that other intelligence services, the CIA and MI-6, for example, were unable to rescue the agents due to the lack of contacts in Iraq. However, the Poles had extensive personal contacts in Iraq due to previous work done there by Polish construction firms. After the operations,

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{145}See Spero, 1994. This is also confirmed in interviews with Marcin Pietrowski, senior pol-mil advisor at the Polish embassy in Washington DC. For example, according to Pietrowski, Foreign Minister Skubiszewski never publicly stated that Poland wanted to become a member of NATO.

\end{footnotesize}
in exchange for the rescue, President Bush informed Poland that he would urge other governments to cancel $16.5 billion worth of Polish debt. But the Polish government did not appear to be motivated by profit, and Polish officials claim that the offer to reduce the Poles debt came only after the operation was over. Also, one Polish newspaper claimed in 1999 that “for the government in Warsaw, Operation Simoon was an opportunity to show that Poland could be an equal partner and in the future a worthy member of NATO” and that the head of the intelligence services in Poland at the time stated that the US “owed me nothing because it was a humanitarian mission.” Given that this operation was performed for the benefit of the US, and known only to some of the highest members of the US intelligence community, it seems likely that Poland was hoping to influence US government officials while, at the same time, avoid angering the USSR.

Results (dependent variables):

---


148 Interview with Marcin Pietrowski, Senior political-military advisor at Polish embassy, Washington, DC. Furtermore, it is not entirely clear that such an offer was connected solely to the rescue operation. At the time, there was an effort in the Bush administration to provide assistance to former Soviet bloc countries, and Poland was a prime recipient of such aid. The $16.5 billion may have been, in part, an acknowledgement of thanks for the rescue in conjunction with further aid for post-communist reconstruction. See footnote 136, above.

149 The Warsaw Voice, May 23, 1999. Note that Operation Samum became the subject of a Polish film, apparently with reluctant input from Polish General Czempinski who had actually organized the operation (presumably at the request of the Minister of the Interior, Kozlowski). The article is reprinted online in both German and English at: http://campcatatonia.org/article/1179/operation_samum.

150 It is worth noting that Operation Simoon became publicly known only in 1995, when Poland was attempting to join NATO. It is not known who ‘leaked’ the information about Operation Simoon, but it would certainly have helped make the point that Poland was a Western oriented nation and a reliable ally even in the face of risk.
Because the details of these two contributions are vague they do not necessarily provide conclusive evidence for my theory. However, alternative explanations are hard to discern. Although Poland at this time was receiving US aid, that aid was relatively modest (only $119 million in 1989), implying that some factor other than alliance dependence on the US was at play. There is no evidence that the US specifically asked Poland for any material contributions to the coalition. Given the tenuous nature of the relationship with the USSR at this time, and the eagerness for tacit USSR support of the coalition, it seems unlikely that the US would overtly seek Polish support.

However, Operation Simoon appears different: Poland was the only state that could rescue the US agents trapped in Kuwait. It is not clear whether the US asked Poland for their assistance, but the US did reward Poland afterwards by urging other nations to forgive their portion of Polish debt. Polish claims however strongly indicate that they were simply trying to enhance their relationship with the US and NATO, and were not motivated by profit.

Thus, it seems appropriate to conclude that Poland’s proactive naval and intelligence support was a way to demonstrate its alignment with the US and its reliability as a Western oriented nation. This conclusion is strengthened when one considers that there was a significant risk that already tense relations with the USSR would be

---

151 See Rochelle Stanfield, “Beyond the Cold War” in the National Journal, 16 September, 1989, p. 2255. Chessa notes that the consensus within the US Congress at this time was that such contributions “fell far short of what Poland needed to render [its]…reform process irreversible.” Chessa, 2002, p. 179.

152 Hannah examines the Soviet ‘contributions’ to the Gulf War coalition, and concludes in part that its readiness to support the coalition diplomatically, albeit ambivalently, was of critical importance to the Bush administration. Hannah notes that “It is quite clear that US officials, both at the time and in retrospect, placed an extremely high value on the contribution Moscow made to their efforts, in spite of its evident limitations.” See Hannah, 1997, p. 265.
endangered if Polish intelligence support to the US was publicized. To openly provide such help to the US would have likely antagonized conservative elements in Russia that were already enraged over the continued disintegration of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact. Because of ongoing negotiations between Poland and Russia regarding the status of Russian troops in Poland, Poland had to walk a fine line between avoiding antagonizing Russia and enhancing its sovereignty and security by drawing the US closer to it. This may help explain why the Poles not only provided inoffensive medical and salvage support, but also highly secret intelligence support.

In summary, although the evidence is not necessarily conclusive, it is compelling: my model predicted that the US would have bargaining leverage over Poland based on Poland’s desire to prove its worth and dependability as an ally, and that Poland would contribute its own men, money, or materiel and pay for the privilege of doing so. This appears to be what Poland did.

Summary

Japan

The Bush administration made great efforts to convince the Japanese government to contribute financially and, to a lesser extent, militarily to the DS/DS coalition. Due to the US-Japan security alliance and important trade relations, Japan’s most critical national interest at this time was its ties with the United States. Because the US highly valued a Japanese contribution and Japan highly valued its future relationship with the US, my model correctly predicted that Japanese contributions would result from bargaining between the two states (rather than being based on asymmetrical valuations).
US pressure was the primary factor that motivated Japanese contributions to the DS/DS coalition. And the prospect that the relationship with the US might be endangered motivated Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu to try to overcome a variety of domestic legal and institutional constraints on Japanese actions. Nonetheless, only after much intra-governmental wrangling was the Kaifu government able to contribute to the coalition, and only by providing large financial contributions. Japan had no choice but to support its ally, upon whom it was totally dependent for its security and prosperity. As predicted, relations between the two states were determined by alliance dependence dynamics, rather than asymmetrical security valuations.

Turkey

US warplans for driving Saddam’s forces from Kuwait did not critically depend on Turkish contributions, but US planners did request the use of Incirlik airbase in Turkish territory, because that would have been more efficient than utilizing other options. President Ozal of Turkey however viewed a Turkish contribution to the coalition as an important way to demonstrate Turkey’s’ importance to the West. Although this belief was not shared as widely amongst other elements of the Turkish public and government, Ozal took control of policy making to push his views. In the end he ensured that Turkey ‘curried favor’ with the US by contributing to the coalition. Because of this, as my model predicts, the US had greater bargaining leverage over Turkey and Turkey contributed its own men, money, and materiel to the coalition at little material or political cost to the US.
Germany

In 1990-91, the US highly valued a German financial contribution to help pay for the costs of the DS/DS coalition. Germany, on the other hand, was greatly “distracted” by the historic changes of German reunification and the implosion of Soviet power. Germany did however greatly value its long-term relationship with the US, mainly because of the uncertainties in the surrounding geostrategic environment, but also because US support for German reunification would greatly help in German negotiations with the USSR (which still had substantial troops in Eastern Germany). Furthermore, a sense of historical obligation to the US permeated German decision-making at this time. Because of these dynamics, my model predicted that the interactions between the US and Germany would not be a result of asymmetric security but rather by ‘standard’ dynamics such as alliance dependence, domestic institutions, or so forth, because both states were willing to pay to enable a German contribution to the coalition. It also predicted that the US would resist any new (and more restrictive) formal long-term institutional arrangements with Germany and that Germany would be willing to commit its own resources to the coalition.

These predictions were largely borne out by events: German contributions to the conflict were nominal until the White House exerted concerted pressure on Helmut Kohl’s administration in conjunction with anti-German sentiment in the US Congress. An examination of crucial meetings between Kohl and Bush administration officials make it clear that Germany was partly entrapped by its dependence on the US, but also due to a belief that it needed to repay the US for its past friendship. German attempts to ‘straddle
the fence’ to appease domestic opposition to the war continued up until the very beginning of actual hostilities, when it became clear that Germany had to increase its contribution lest it risk its relationship with the US. Ultimately, as predicted, Germany did make substantial economic and technical contributions. There is, however, only weak evidence suggests that that the US sought to reduce its commitments to Germany.

Because Germany eventually did “pay up” and the US incurred little costs, this case resembles a situation of “currying favor.” However, German politicians were reticent to contribute and were willing to not only anger the US but also liberally interpret the German Basic Law to forbid German involvement. Thus, as my model predicted, this case is more properly assessed as “bargaining.”

Poland

There is little evidence that the US regarded a Polish contribution to the DS/DS coalition as critical in any way for the US war effort. The US did not need Poland’s political or military support, and would not likely risk antagonizing Russia whose political support the US did need. Poland however was preoccupied with enhancing and ensuring its sovereignty in the face of a changing and tense relationship with Russia and a newly unified Germany with whom its borders were not yet finalized. A closer relationship with the US could provide leverage and assistance in both of these issue areas. Thus, Poland was naturally looking to tighten its relationship with the US.

My model therefore predicts that Poland would “curry favor” with the US. Although there are few records available, Polish actions and those statements that do exist support my predictions. Poland did indeed proactively contribute to the US-led
coalition by providing its own medical personnel and naval salvage assets while receiving little in return. The Poles also contributed unique and unpublicized intelligence support (in exchange for which the US did urge other nations to forgive Polish debt), but they claim that they did so only to demonstrate their worthiness towards the West.
Chapter Seven – Cross-Case Comparisons

The above case studies provide strong evidence for the impact of asymmetric security valuations on interstate relations by demonstrating, for example, that if a state is currying favor it should have less leverage than when its help is being enlisted. By comparing outcomes for the same state under different situations my model can be further tested.¹ In this chapter I will briefly contrast my earlier cases to understand how the dynamics between the US and Japan, Turkey, and Germany shifted as their security valuations changed.² If my model is accurate, bargaining leverage and coalition contributions should shift in accordance with their asymmetric interdependence.

Japan

The dynamics governing interactions between the US and Japan shifted greatly across the three warfighting coalitions I have examined. In 1950, Japan was an occupied country, lacking the basic requirements of state sovereignty. Under such a situation, Japan should have had little leverage vis-à-vis the United States. However, when the Korean War erupted, the dynamics of their relationship shifted greatly. Prime Minister Yoshida was soon able to take advantage of greatly increased bargaining leverage because the US was in dire need of Japanese military and logistical support for the war while the Japanese were more ambivalent about their relationship with the US. As a result, the US altered longstanding policies towards Japan, including promoting the re-

¹ Such an examination thereby resembles an application of Mill’s method of difference in which the extraneous variables are held constant and only the variable of interest varies. For this reason such cross-case comparisons provide a strong test for my theory.
² I do not perform a cross-case comparison of the two cases of US – Polish interactions because both are clearly cases of “currying favor.” See chapters five and seven, above.
creation of an embryonic Japanese navy and army and the exoneration of Japanese war criminals, all despite Japan’s status as an occupied nation. Most importantly, the US accepted peace treaty terms that greatly favored Japan, and provided Japan with a firm security guarantee for the remainder of the Cold War. This was clearly a case where the US was willing to pay high costs to enlist Japanese help, and the Japanese were able to use this shift in leverage to their great advantage.

Forty years later, the positions of the US and Japan had shifted. When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the first Bush administration placed great value on a Japanese financial and, if possible, military contribution to the DS/DS coalition. However, Japan was no longer ambivalent about its relations with the US. Instead security and trade relations with the US were the very foundation of Japanese foreign policy. Thus neither side had bargaining leverage based upon asymmetric interdependence. Rather, the US had to pressure the Kaifu government – which contributed only financially and only after much governmental infighting. In the end, Japan’s dependence on the US largely determined how and to what extent it contributed to the coalition.

By 2003, these dynamics had shifted yet again. When the US constructed the Coalition of the Willing to invade Iraq, it had early on received the political support from Japan that it required. Furthermore, the tanker support the second Bush administration required was already being provided by Japan due to prior commitments to the conflict in Afghanistan. The US did not go out of its way to seek any further Japanese assistance. However, Japan at this time was highly dependent on the US for its security, and the growing threats from North Korea made the alliance with the US critical for long-term
Japanese security. Thus, Koizumi went out of his way to provide proactive and unprecedented political, logistical, and direct military (SDF) support to the US, even in the face of extensive domestic political hurdles.

Comparing the outcomes and behavior of Japan and the US across these three coalitions provides strong support for my model. In the Korean War, because Japan had significant bargaining leverage over the US, the US paid for the Japanese contribution. In the end, Japan benefited greatly and at little risk to itself – all despite being an occupied power. By 1991, however, dynamics had changed: Japan now highly valued the relationship with the US, and the US needed its financial contributions. Neither side had an asymmetric advantage, and so Japan’s contribution came only after intense and sometimes acrimonious bargaining between the two states. In the end, the dependence of Japan on the US was the primary determinant of the Japanese contribution. By 2003, these dynamics had become asymmetric once again, but now it was the US that had bargaining leverage. Koizumi ‘curried favor’ with the US by providing early and domestically risky support to the US without being pressured to do so.

**Turkey**

In both 1950 and 1990-91, Turkey attempted to curry favor with the US by making great efforts to join its warfighting coalitions. In 1950, Turkey sought a formal security guarantee from the US to protect it against the growing threat from the USSR. The US, however, did not value any Turkish contribution to the Korean War (nor did it yet highly value Turkey as a strategic partner in the nascent Cold War). As a result, Turkey went to great lengths to demonstrate its worthiness as an ally. Turkey thus had
little bargaining leverage vis-à-vis the US, and bore nearly all costs and risks to enable its contribution to the Korean War. Furthermore, it took nearly two years for security arrangements with the US to change to Turkey’s benefit.

When Saddam invaded Kuwait in 1990, the Turks were more ambivalent about supporting the US. However, Turkish President Ozal viewed it as an opportunity to demonstrate Turkeys’ strategic long-term importance to the US and endear itself to the West. The Bush administration however only marginally valued a Turkish contribution, in part because US warplans did not envision a second front in northern Iraq and also because the use of Incirlik airbase was not a critical, or unique resource. Without being prompted, Ozal took control of Turkish policymaking to push Turkey into the conflict by sending Turkish forces to the border with Iraq, providing the US with full access to Incirlik airbase, and joining economic sanctions against Iraq despite the high cost to the Turkish economy. In the end the US incurred almost no costs, and received everything its warplans required.

These two instances of ‘currying favor’ stand in stark contrast to the events of 2003, when US warplans critically relied upon a second-front from Turkey into Iraq. By this time, however, Turkish concerns over their long-term security and strategic relationship with the US had cooled. The dynamics between the two powers were reversed from those of the Korean and First Gulf Wars. The Turks behaved as if they had significant bargaining leverage and the US made significant financial offers to obtain Turkish assistance. Eventually, despite intense negotiations, the Turks rebuffed US
requests in a very close parliamentary vote, forcing the US to abandon its northern front option.³

The behavior of Turkey and the US in these interactions makes it clear that bargaining leverage and outcomes shifted greatly based upon the asymmetric variables in my model. When currying favor in 1950 and 1990-91, Turkey had little to no leverage over the US and consistently incurred significant costs and assumed great political risk to contribute to the US coalitions. In 2003, when the US suddenly needed a Turkish contribution, the dynamics were reversed: the US was now willing to incur costs and lacked leverage in its dealings with a newly empowered Turkey.

Germany

Like Japan, Germany in 1950 was an occupied state, seeking to rearm, regain its sovereignty, and enhance its security in the face of the growing Soviet threat. The outbreak of the Korean War was seen by Chancellor Adenauer as a chance to move towards these goals by emphasizing the East German and Soviet threat, and he forcefully linked the Korean War to these threats. However, because the US never considered a German contribution to the Korean coalition (and arming German soldiers so soon after World War II was clearly out of the question), Adenauer was unable to take advantage of this opportunity. Thus, this was an instance of ‘currying favor’ in which Adenauer’s leverage with the US was limited even further by the occupied nature of Germany. Only

³ Even if the vote had gone the other way, the measure that would have passed was not what the US requested, but instead benefited the Turks in that it would have resulted in a Turkish military presence in northern Iraq and hence some degree of influence over events there. US planners strongly opposed the presence of Turkish forces in Iraq, thus this measure appears designed not to satisfy US demands as much as to promote Turkish interests – lending credence to the hypothesis that Turkey was acting as if it possessed bargaining leverage over the US in these negotiations whatever the outcome.
by the end of 1950 when the Chinese intervened in the Korean War did the US agree to limited West German participation in Western European defense. Despite Germany’s occupied status, Adenauer’s behavior comports with what would be expected from an attempt to curry favor without bargaining leverage: he consistently initiated rearmament debates, but had little direct influence over the outcomes.4

By 1990-91, the motivations of the US and Germany had shifted greatly. Now the US strongly desired a German financial contribution to fund the DS/DS coalition, and Germany highly valued its relationship with the US as the only way it could ensure its security in the face of momentous changes in the USSR. Germany was, however, distracted and strapped for cash by the challenges of reunification. In this environment, relations between Germany and the US vis-à-vis the coalition were governed by sometimes acrimonious bargaining and a German sense of obligation to the US, rather than the dynamics of asymmetric security interdependence.

In 2003, Germany was faced with a much more predictable and benign security environment, thus it had far less need for a long-term US security guarantee. The US on the other hand, valued German political support for the CotW greatly. Thus when the US attempted to enlist German political support it was in a disadvantageous bargaining position, and ultimately failed to do so. However, because the US valued a German material contribution much less, neither it nor Germany was willing to engage in

---

4 Interestingly, when the Allies did eventually allow West Germany to move towards rearmament and greater sovereignty, the costs for doing so were borne not by West Germany (as predicted) but instead by France, indicating that France was entrapped and had to accept that a West German contribution to the common European defense was necessary. See Chapter Six for more details.
significant bargaining to obtain such a contribution. Thus, pre-existing NATO arrangements determined the level of support Germany provided, rather than any form of bargaining as such.

These cases illustrate how bargaining leverage and state behaviors change as US and German interests intersect and diverge. In 1950, West Germany had little bargaining success inasmuch as it was trying to use the opportunity of the Korean War to curry favor with an uninterested US. By 1990-91, the US valued a German contribution, and Germany valued its relationship with the US. Acrimonious bargaining resulted, and eventually Germany did ‘pay up’ because it was dependent on the US. By 2003, Germany had much less long-term need for the US, and rebuffed its requests for political support. At the same time, because the US war effort was not dependent on German material/logistical support, that support was determined by pre-existing arrangements not interstate bargaining. These findings provide strong support for my model.

---

5 Note that the US deployed over 100,000 troops from Germany for the first Gulf War (DS/DS) in 1990-91, and only 32,000 from there in 2003 for the CotW. For details see Chapter Five, footnotes 213 and 214 and Chapter Seven, footnote 130.
Chapter Eight - Conclusions

The central claim of this dissertation is that contributions to superpower-led coalitions are determined in many cases not by a looming threat from the target state or the potential for profit, but by the dynamics of asymmetric security interdependence. Such dynamics result from the differences in the willingness of the superpower-as-coalition leader and potential minor state partners to pay for a coalition contribution.

The cases examined here have been those in which the willingness of minor states to pay for a coalition contribution was primarily a function of their perception of exogenous security threats. For example, a primary motivating factor for Turkey to contribute to the Korean War in 1950 was its perception that Turkish security was threatened without a US security guarantee vis-à-vis the USSR. Thus, it was willing to pay to enable that contribution. For its part, the coalition leader’s willingness to pay for a specific coalition contribution in the cases examined has been a function of how valuable that contribution is to the overall success of the coalition goals, because to lead a failing coalition would entail a loss of prestige upon which the superpower’s hegemony is founded. Thus, Turkey’s contribution in 2003 was more highly valued by the US than its contribution in 1990-91 – hence, the US was willing to pay far more for Turkish support in the later coalition.

Together, these cases have provided strong evidence for the existence of asymmetric security interdependence dynamics. Figure 2 indicates where these cases lie in my model.
There are, in fact, a variety of factors that can result in more or less willingness to pay for a coalition contribution – many factors aside from security and prestige concerns can drive states up or down the axes in the asymmetric security interdependence model.

The discount rates of states – how much they value current gains over future gains – can greatly affect how willing they are to contribute to a coalition. If states perceive that the future benefits of coalition membership outweigh the current risks, then they would be more likely to value a coalition contribution, and vice versa. In general, one

---

1 Ukraine, Georgia, and South Korea (ROK) have been tentatively included in this chart, although they have not been examined as separate case studies. Their location in the ‘currying favor’ quadrant comports with an initial assessment of their motivations.
would expect that smaller states would be more concerned about current dangers and
risks than the superpower, simply because they are more vulnerable, all else being equal. However, that may not necessarily be the case – the US would doubtless be exceedingly concerned if Iran developed an avowed nuclear capability in the near future, and might be tempted to take immediate action rather than allow Iranian capabilities to increase in the future.

Polarity can also affect the outlook of superpowers and minor states. Because there is no rival superpower camp to compete with, there is little likelihood that a unipole will limit its freedom of action through long-term arrangements if it doesn’t have to. All such institutional arrangements come with some costs that, all else being equal, the unipole will avoid if it can. This means that the unipole’s strategic outlook will tend to be much shorter in duration and it will have less incentive to offer long-term security guarantees or other long-term commitments to minor states than a bipole would, all else being equal. Therefore, while a bipole would look to enlist a wide area of partners in its coalitions, a unipole would likely look to enlist only those that it needed to ensure the success of the coalition.

Such a short-term outlook of the unipole can also affect it’s long-term strategy vis-à-vis other states. If a unipole avoids constraints on its freedom of action, it will be less likely to provide minor security benefits to other states as a key aspect of its global strategy. In other words, a unipole will resist being ‘tethered’ to minor states, even though such tethering may be less costly than its long-term benefits. One possible
manifestation of this dynamic may be the closure of many US bases overseas following the end of the Cold War and the ‘peace dividend.’

Unipolarity also affects minor states individual freedom of action. They will be less constrained in what they can and cannot do, because they no longer have to worry about keeping a superpower placated nor do they need to rely on its security umbrella to protect it from the rival superpower camp. During the Cold War a client state of a superpower had to accommodate its superpower patron’s concerns, but under unipolarity it is more easily able to get ‘off the radar’ of the superpower. Minor states will also be more able to engage in foreign adventures or take risks under unipolarity without fear of provoking major wars or the wrath of a superpower. This is because the unipolar world is no longer defined by a zero-sum competition between two armed camps that forces most other states to choose sides. Nor does every regional conflict risk becoming a major global war between superpowers. Being a client state during the Cold War was often dangerous and might provoke retaliation, intervention, or meddling from the other superpower. Thus, the end of bipolar competition provides minor states with more freedom to take risks – including refuse a unipole’s inducements to join a coalition, or join a risky coalition.

---

2 Such a dynamic runs counter to Ikenberry’s notion that in order to hold on to power and make it last, hegemonic states may “find ways to set limits on their power and make it acceptable to other states.” See Ikenberry, 2001. In this thinking, however, Ikenberry refers largely to multilateral institutions that help to maintain order on a regional or global scale (such as NATO, WTO, and so forth). However this is very different from a tethering dynamic posited here. Tethering is a strategy that minor states would employ to draw the hegemon closer to it via agreement. A unipole can, therefore, both accept constraints on its power by promoting order-maintaining global institutions and at the same time avoid specific bilateral tethering to minor states. On the application of tethering to alliance dynamics, see Weitsman, 2004.

3 This is a function of the fundamental concern of nations that are dependent on others – they fear entrapment or abandonment, and thereby must constantly take the concerns of their superpower ally into consideration.
Prestige can also affect how security interdependence manifests itself: a unipole, being a hegemon, identifies its interests with the rules and institutions of the global structure as it exists today, and it must also protect its power position. To do so, it must maintain its prestige and influence since these are the foundation of its role as the legitimate hegemon. A primary concern of any superpower, unipole or bipole, is to protect its prestige.\(^4\) This strongly implies that the unipole, since it is no longer faced with a long-term competitor, will be focused on the prestige and influence potential from short-term military and economic successes more than those from long-term policies and strategic goals.\(^5\) Thus, it will be more inclined to focus on the short term goals of a coalition, rather than it’s long term potential costs (to existing alliances, bilateral relationships, and so forth).

In conjunction with such motivations, a variety of second-image factors can also affect how willing states are to support a coalition. In the cases examined here, such factors amplified the overarching security concerns of minor states. For example, the personalities and political acumen of leaders such as Koizumi in 2003, Adenauer in 1950, and Ozal in 1990-91 were clearly important in determining how willing those states were

\(^4\) Actually, the first and foremost concern of a superpower, like any state, is protecting its existence. However, the existence of a unipole or bipole is not likely to be under threat, almost by definition. Hence, protecting its’ prestige becomes practically the most important goal of a superpower. It is worthwhile noting what Gilpin (building on Hawtrey) has said regarding prestige and wars: “In the first place, although prestige is largely a function of economic and military capabilities, it is achieved primarily through successful use of power, and especially through victory in war. The most prestigious members of the international system are those states that have most recently used military force or economic power successfully and have thereby imposed their will on others. Second, both power and prestige are ultimately imponderable and incalculable; they cannot be known absolutely by any a priori process of calculation. They are known only when they are tested, especially on the field of battle.” Although Gilpin focuses on hegemonic war, his observations clearly apply to all conflicts - a superpower that lost smaller conflicts would risk as much if not more prestige than if it had lost a hegemonic war. Gilpin, 1981, p. 32-33.

\(^5\) Gilpin discusses the dynamics of prestige as the foundation for a hegemons’ rule in great length. See Gilpin, 1981, especially pp. 27-39.
to support the US. Domestic politics and institutions can also greatly affect the outcomes of interdependence dynamics: Turkish politics and parliamentary rules in 2003, sovereignty concerns in Germany and Japan in 1950, and reunification distractions in Germany in 1990 played key roles in the cases examined here.

The utility of this asymmetric security interdependence approach is that once one understands the key motivating factors of states (be they a desire to maintain one’s legitimacy, discount rates, exogenous security threats, leadership and personalities, domestic institutions, or whatever) then one can estimate the willingness of a minor state and a coalition leader to pay for a specific contribution. This makes the underlying constraints and dynamics of security interdependence clear and allows scholars to better estimate bargaining leverage, coalition outcomes, and the type and modality of coalition contributions.

At the most fundamental level, no matter the motivations behind its actions, the overriding concern of a coalition leader is to enlist those allies that it needs to win its war most effectively and efficiently. Thus, it is willing to pay to enlist those allies it needs most at the time of the conflict. Potential coalition members may, for their own reasons, be more or less willing to support the coalition. These asymmetrical interdependencies can be a source of power between the coalition leader and other states when the war coalition is being constructed.⁶ A coalition leader attempting to enlist the help of a minor state will be at a disadvantage if that minor state is ambivalent about its relationship with

---

⁶ In their seminal work, Keohane and Nye examined asymmetrical interdependence as a source of power, but applied their approach primarily to economic issue areas. See Keohane and Nye, 1989.
the coalition. Conversely, a minor state may be quite eager to join a coalition – putting the coalition leader in an advantageous bargaining position.

There are two other possibilities. When a coalition leader highly values a minor states contribution to a coalition and the minor state also highly values its relationship with the coalition leader, then asymmetrical interdependencies are not sources of power. Rather, these are cases of traditional bargaining, where outcomes are the result of alliance dependence, domestic, ideological and historical factors, personalities and two-level games, and so forth. Alternately, if both the coalition leader and the minor state are disinterested, then neither will seek specific outcomes. Thus, coalition contributions become the result of pre-existing institutions or other arrangements.\(^7\)

To test these claims across bipolar and unipolar structures, I examined eleven cases of interactions between a superpower (the United States) and four minor states (Japan, Turkey, Germany, and Poland) for three different ad hoc coalitions (Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003, The Korean War in 1950, and Desert Shield/Desert Storm in 1990-91) as well as comparisons across these different cases.\(^8\) These examinations provided strong support for my asymmetric security interdependence model across a variety of situations.

\(^7\) These dynamics are described in greater detail in Chapter 4, and illustrated in Figure 1 on page 66.

\(^8\) Note that in examining eleven cases, I have deliberately chosen to sacrifice depth for breadth. Although each case study could be a dissertation in itself (McGeehan 1971 and Athanassapoulou 1999 come close to doing just that) such an approach would be of limited utility because it would not provide as strong a test of my model as possible, nor would my conclusions be as generalizable. In taking this approach, I am able to apply my model to both bipolar and unipolar structures, to both negative and positive cases (cases where contributions did and did not occur) as well as provide coherent cross-case comparisons by examining the same countries across different coalitions (i.e. across time). Therefore, my findings are likely to be more broadly useful than a more in-depth approach would result in. See chapter four for more details on case selection criteria.
Theoretical Contribution

My model provides a parsimonious framework that explains the influence of asymmetric security interdependence on the foreign policy behavior of minor states and superpowers. However, recent scholarship on coalition burdensharing concludes that interstate security relations are the result of highly complex and contingent interactions involving a variety of second-image variables. Nonetheless, my research does not fly in the face of more multifaceted approaches. Rather, it illustrates the continuing utility of third-image approaches for understanding the broad security motivations of states in conjunction with, not instead of, their specific conditions.

In each of the cases I examined, domestic factors played key roles in the final outcomes of coalition choices - although asymmetric security valuations clearly influenced state choices, those choices were still made within the constraints of domestic institutions and other idiosyncratic variables. For example, Japan in 1990 and 2003 acted upon its strategic motivations, and so bargained or curried favor with the United States vis-à-vis its potential coalition contribution. However, the exact manifestation of its contribution was highly contingent on its domestic legal and ideological constraints. Likewise, although Turkey’s motivations and behavior in 2003 were a result of their strategic concerns, the specific manner in which the Turkish government narrowly rejected the motion to support the US was a result of their idiosyncratic parliamentary rules, and the Turkish reluctance to support the US was clearly influenced by the un-

9 Such as those of Bennet, Lepgold and Unger, 1997 or Baltrusaitis, 2008.
10 For an examination of the meta-theoretical justification for third-image theories in conjunction with domestic level variables see Elman, 1996.
willingness of the military to interfere with the Erdogan government, and popular opposition to the looming conflict.

My approach deductively integrates lessons from existing scholarship – primarily the Realism research program – in order to construct a theory that addresses gaps in our understanding of military coalitions and the impact of unipolarity. In this alone it is progressive, since the concept of unipolarity is clearly under theorized in current scholarship.\(^{11}\) My theory is further progressive in that it made predictions about novel facts that can be tested in the future and through archival research, it builds upon the existing body of knowledge, and it resolves contradictions and fills in gaps in the existing research program.\(^{12}\)

My theory builds upon existing scholarship in four key ways. First, the fundamental building block of my theory is Waltz’s structural realism. In essence, I utilize Waltz’s theory but adapt it to a unipolar context. Structural realist dynamics should, by definition, have lessons applicable to all configurations of global power distribution. However, Waltz and others never rigorously apply it to a unipolar system, instead either implying that unipolarity is an aberration, or that the unipole will act freely and possibly dangerously since it cannot be checked. While these propositions are important and congruent with the theory, their implications for military coalitions have

\(^{11}\) See Chapter Two, above.
\(^{12}\) See Lakatos, 1970. Elman and Elman 2003 provide a useful summary. It is also important to note that the literature on alliances and coalitions has generally been plagued by a multiplication of propositions, theories, and concepts – and such breadth tends to come at the expense of concrete, progressive analysis. One only has to look at the appendix of Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan’s critical work to see this - wherein they outline no less than 347 propositions about alliances. Holsti, Hopmann, and Sullivan 1973, p. 249 – 277.
never been fully analyzed. I rectify this gap in my research by addressing how the unconstrained unipole will act towards other powers when forming a military coalition.

Second, the coalition dynamics I describe above, specifically the tendency of a unipole to expend resources to enlist only the aid of a few key allies who provide specific and concrete contributions to the war effort are in accordance with and build upon Riker’s theory of minimal winning coalitions. For example, the Coalition of the Willing looks more like a minimal winning coalition than a maximum winning coalition, even despite the anomalies of Turkey and Poland.¹³ This further implies that future research should examine the importance of efficiency in coalition burdensharing decisions.

Third, a persistent lacuna in the balance of power literature is the failure to understand systematically why minor states would join a coalition in the absence of threat or profit. My theory explicitly sets out to answer this question, and builds upon Walt’s Balance of Threat theory to do so. Part of the attraction of my theory is that in any cooperative military endeavor there are likely to be a set of states that are ‘smaller’, are not threatened, and are not likely to profit, yet which are keenly aware of their future vulnerabilities. Such coalitions seem likely to be more common in the future; hence this theory is timely.

Fourth, there is a wide ranging debate on the impact of unipolarity, much of which revolves around the apparent lack of balancing against the United States. My theory builds upon the most valid theoretical observations in this field. From Walt and Weitsman I have taken the concepts of different strategies of accommodation that minor

¹³ Riker’s theory would have predicted that Turkey would have contributed, while Poland would not have.
states can take towards a unipole, including engaging in soft balancing, tethering, and hedging.\textsuperscript{14} In my model these tactics manifest themselves as different ways that minor states may support a coalition – states that provide only indirect military support can be said to be hedging their bets, while states that oppose the coalition, or only provide moral support, may be engaging in soft balancing behavior.

My theory also fills holes in existing scholarship in at least four ways. The primary contribution in this regard is by applying a number of extant theories to a unipolar context. Major theories of alliance building are explicitly multipolar or bipolar in their analysis, limiting their usefulness for theory and policy today. Waltz, Walt, Snyder, Weitsman and others all discuss state and inter-state behavior but not the impact of unipolarity. For example, Snyder admits that “I make no claim for the theory’s applicability to the post Cold War world…at a minimum the reader may consider this a work in theoretical history.”\textsuperscript{15} I have drawn upon their theories in my approach to unipolarity in order to ensure that my work remains progressive and cumulative.

Second, the literature on alliance and coalition building has suffered from a lack of discrimination between the two terms. Alliances and coalitions are different, and while this difference is lately acknowledged by some theorists, they have not clearly outlined what this means for theory building and predictions. In my research I have clearly defined alliances and coalitions to be different constructs with different dynamics.

Third, as Jervis has noted, there is a contradictory element in Waltzian structural realism – and this is partly the result of Waltz’s focus on bipolarity at the expense of

\textsuperscript{15}Snyder, 1997, p. 3.
unipolarity.\textsuperscript{16} Waltz goes to great lengths to explain that superpowers can rely on internal balancing and can ignore their allies if need be. At the same time he states that each superpower must block the other one throughout the world in a constant global competition. These are contradictory statements, although they did comport with popular perceptions and strategies during the Cold War. But under today’s unipolar structure how can we expect a superpower to react towards minor states? More telling, if Waltz’ theory was self-contradictory when applied to bipolarity, how can we expect to apply it progressively under unipolarity?\textsuperscript{17} Although Waltz went on later to state that the unipole is now “free to act on its whims and follow its fancies” the question remains: what does that imply for coalition formation? My theory fills this hole in the scholarship by noting that superpowers will act to create efficient coalitions, not necessarily minimum or maximum winning coalitions. My work thus adds to the body of understanding related to unipolar politics and may also resolve this key contradiction in structural realism inasmuch as it applies to coalition building.

Fourth, and perhaps most practically, my theory also accounts for some recent oddities of coalition membership. In 2003 the CotW included not only some notable failures of negotiations despite the overwhelming influence of the unipole, but also a wide variety of smaller powers that contributed nothing except moral support. Failures of negotiation are explained by my theory as those cases where the minor state possesses some unique resource that the unipole needs, and thus attempts to drive a harder bargain.

\textsuperscript{16} It should be clear that this emphasis of Waltz’s is natural given the era in which his Theory of International Politics was published. However, Waltz takes great pains to continually remind readers that his is a structural theory and is thereby best viewed from a systems level, vice units, perspective. Thus, his failure to theorize the impact of a unipolar structure is puzzling.

\textsuperscript{17} Jervis, 1999, p. 118.
with the unipole (which fails if the unipole was unwilling to pay the high costs it demanded). Alternately, my theory explains that the variety of minor states that ‘rode free’ in the CotW likely did so based upon their own security preferences vis-à-vis their future relationship with the unipole.

Finally, in addition to building upon and filling gaps in the existing literature, my theory is parsimonious and generalizable. The causal mechanism at the core of my theory is the unadorned balance of threat dynamic. By simply applying the variable of time to these dynamics, my theory is able to explain gaps in our understanding of how and why minor states and the superpower behave towards each other vis-à-vis ad hoc military coalitions. Furthermore, my theory remains within a purely structural (third image) level of analysis, meaning it is broadly generalizable yet still relevant for specific foreign policy predictions.18

Policy Implications

If, as I contend, asymmetric security interdependence can be a source of power for states vis-à-vis military coalitions, then the policy implications are clear. By understanding the primary strategic and security motivations of other states, decision makers can understand the limits of their power and leverage and thereby engage in more effective and targeted diplomacy. These dynamics further imply that if a superpower is

18 The utility of third-image neo-realist theories for specific foreign policy predictions is outlined by Elman, 1996. Of course, as with all social science, this approach is probabilistic. Yet, it does imply that the more minor states focus on their strategic security concerns, and the more superpowers are concerned about potential loss of prestige, then the more likely these dynamics will be determinant. As Morgenthau noted “...the complexities of international affairs make simple solutions and trustworthy prophecies impossible...in every political situation contradictory tendencies are at play. One of these tendencies is more likely to prevail under certain conditions...” Morgenthau, 1993, p. 22.
to effectively create an ad hoc military coalition, then it must first understand clearly what contributions it requires from other powers and what alternatives to them exist. The overall result of these dynamics should lead to more efficient military coalitions.

More specifically, it behooves a superpower to keenly understand the fundamental motivations of minor states and how much they value their potential coalition contribution. Minor states will often have longstanding security concerns that they cannot confront by themselves, or other motivations vis-à-vis the coalition leader that increase or decrease their willingness to support a coalition. Conversely, they will likely understand when their coalition contributions are nearly unique (such as Turkey’s was in 2003) or easily obtained elsewhere (such as Poland’s was in 2003). Failing to understanding these aspects can blunt a superpower’s diplomatic efforts. Understanding them can empower those efforts.

For example, if the United States found it necessary in the near future to consider military action against Iran or to support Georgia against Russia, then it could take advantage of asymmetric security interdependence dynamics to create an efficient and effective coalition to achieve its aims. By first understanding what specific contributions it requires for a successful warfighting effort (such as critical basing, logistics, and direct military contributions), and then determining which states could provide them, the US could focus its diplomatic efforts on those states that are most likely to provide the sought after contribution at the lowest cost. Furthermore, by understanding each potential partner’s long-term strategic concerns US diplomacy could gain a great amount of leverage. To wit, many states in the area are likely concerned about potential Russian
recidivism – a closer relationship with the US could be an effective quid pro quo for contributions against Iran or Russia.

Asymmetric security interdependence is a two-way street however. Minor states which understand that they possess unique resources that the US needs for a pending war will undoubtedly have significant bargaining leverage. To blunt such efforts and ensure that warplans do not need to be altered at the eleventh hour (as happened in 2003 when Turkey refused to support the US just prior to the start of the invasion of Iraq) US planners should make sure they have alternatives to allied coalition contributions. Making such alternatives known could also strengthen US diplomacy by assuring minor states that they do not possess a ‘veto’ over US warplans.

Predictions

Two significant challenges exist today that the US may feel compelled to address with a coalition of other states: stopping Russian aggression against Georgia, and eliminating a potential Iranian nuclear weapons program. The dynamics of asymmetric security interdependence can help predict how such future coalitions might manifest themselves and how costly it would be to put together such coalitions.

Georgia

In August 2008 the US declared its support for Georgia’s defense against Russian military incursions. The US backed such rhetoric up by sending large amounts of aid immediately following the cessation of hostilities. It seems possible that if Russia again took action against Georgia in the future that the US might be motivated to construct a
coalition that could engage in limited operations to repulse Russian military incursions – or at least make them so costly that the Russian leadership would reconsider their actions. Given that only a few nations might be willing to take a firm stance against a newly resurgent Russia, which countries might the US entice to join such a coalition, and what do the dynamics of asymmetric security interdependence imply about how costly would it be to do so?

There are three categories of minor states that the US is likely to seek the support of. Because it is unlikely that the US would risk becoming directly involved in combat operations against Russian forces without significant military and political support from other states, the US would likely seek the support of states who could provide significant military contributions, those that possess key geographical resources, and those whose political support is crucial.

Thus, the US might first attempt to enlist the support of NATO countries (such as Spain, Italy, and France) or regional powers with significant power projection capabilities, such as Israel. It seems however unlikely though that few if any of these states would risk coming into direct combat with Russian forces, due to the high risk that entails. Therefore, the US would be forced to pay a costly price to entice them into such a coalition. Furthermore, such states might be expected to place their support in a humanitarian and peacekeeping context under the rubric of the UN. However, there are other states that might be willing to demonstrate their support of US plans for their own security reasons. Poland, as in 1990-91 and 2003, stands out as one such possible state.
The Czech Republic as well might be inclined to lend some moderate level of support against Russian aggression.

Also, some specific states also possess key geography that the coalition would require access to for its logistical needs – this would have to include access to high-throughput deep-water ports on the Black Sea (necessary for offloading military and humanitarian supplies from larger and deeper-draft US vessels), access to large nearby military airbases (necessary for large scale air transport of military personnel and to support for air missions), and unimpeded access to Georgian ports. Thus, the US would likely seek out the support of Bulgaria, Ukraine, Iraq, and, most importantly, Turkey. It is unlikely that these states would be willing to support the US without significant inducements, however. None of them depend on the US for their fundamental security concerns (especially given the risks of antagonizing Russia) and they are all somewhat vulnerable to Russia. However, assuming Iraq is dependent on US security forces to counter its ongoing insurgency, it may have little recourse but to provide logistic support to US forces.

Finally, the political aspects of such a coalition would also be critical, and for that the US would likely seek out political support from major world powers. The US might seek the support of France, Germany, Spain, Japan, and perhaps even China. France, Germany, and Spain, have in the past tacitly supported the Georgians in their conflict with Russia, so they may be willing to lend political support. Japan is unlikely to be willing to throw its political weight behind such an effort, however, lest it endanger
relations with Russia. China, with its longstanding policy of non-involvement in other states’ internal affairs, would doubtless oppose any action against Russia.

If the above motivations are accurate, then we could expect the asymmetric security interdependence of the US and potential coalition partners to play a key role in whether, and how, they contribute to the coalition. Given the fact that opposing Russia entails significant risks, few minor states would be willing to join such a coalition. Thus the US would likely have to resort to ‘enlisting help’ to a great extent. A hypothetical line-up of these states in my model is given in Figure 3.

Figure 3 - Georgian coalition
If accurate, this indicates that the US would be forced to enlist the help of most of the primary states in the coalition. Eventually, one could expect that the US would gain the political support France, Germany, and Spain and others in NATO, but would require some degree of negotiations over the details, manifestations, and modality of that support. Furthermore, it is likely that these and other states would require any operations to be conducted under a NATO or UN rubric. Military support would probably be much harder to obtain - the US would need to be willing to pay significantly to enlist such help.

Ultimately, the stance of many nations would depend as much on what the US was willing to offer as on how much they were willing to discount their future security relations with Russia. Given that Russia may be regaining some amount of power and influence in the area, it seems unlikely that most regional states would be willing to anger them. This means that the US would be forced to pay commensurately greater costs to enlist their support. Ultimately, this would be a difficult coalition to construct, as only a few nations, perhaps Poland, the Czech Republic, and possibly Ukraine, Slovakia, and other former Warsaw Pact nations would be eager to support it. It may resemble a Kosovo-style operation, in which political support against Russia was widespread, while military support failed to materialize until the US exerted a strong leadership role. If the US is to prevent Georgia from being marginalized or ‘Finlandized’ it would therefore need to be willing take an early and strong stance to enlist the aid of other states, and such enlistment would undoubtedly be quite costly.

Iran
If it became know that the Iranian government was on the verge of possessing a viable nuclear weapons capability, the US might consider pre-emptive military strikes to eliminate it before it become wholly operational. This possibility has been discussed before, and undoubtedly the US military has contingency plans for military operations against Iran. Existing Iranian capabilities, especially ground forces, indicate that a full-scale ground invasion of Iran would be extremely costly and perhaps unsuccessful, especially given the current operational stresses on US forces. Assuming therefore that the goal of such operations was limited to destroying a nascent Iranian nuclear capability, that would still be very difficult because it would depend on first locating and then destroying all the myriad facilities and material that comprise the Iranian government’s nuclear program. For these reasons, the US would seek coalition partners based on two criteria: relevant intelligence and targeting capabilities, and the ability to provide or enable long range US and other precision air and maritime strikes into Iranian territory.

The Gulf States (Bahrain, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Oman) would be critical to a US operation against Iran. Because the US would rely upon its expeditionary air and maritime forces to a great extent, basing and access become critical. The Gulf States provide a wide variety of ports and airbases, as well as housing critical

---

19 There are a wide variety of reasons that a ground invasion of Iran would be unpalatable to the US and unlikely to succeed. Iranian capabilities are much greater than those of Iraq were, Iran is possessed of over three times the population of Iraq (66 million), has a relatively large and well equipped army, and elements of it (such as the Revolutionary Guards) are typically thought to be highly motivated. Furthermore, the geography of Iran (mountainous and bounded by the Persian Gulf to the south) is beneficial to defensive operations. At the very least, an invading coalition force would have to deal with the possibilities of a lasting occupation in a hostile country that was homogenous, populous, rich, and unified in their hostility against occupying forces.
US air and naval headquarters and other vital facilities. Furthermore, the US will need to maintain and protect the flow of oil through the Persian Gulf, so the support of these states would be critical to efforts to patrol and protect shipping in the Gulf. In addition, it is likely that most of the Gulf States would be willing to support the US against Iran, since relations between them and Iran have traditionally been tense. Other states would be both critical to US efforts, and likely to support the coalition. These include the UK which can provide crucial long range strike capability, as well as perhaps intelligence on Iranian nuclear facilities.

Of more interest are those nations that would be critical to US efforts but who are likely to be ambivalent about or opposed to supporting the coalition. The US would certainly seek Pakistani, Iraqi, Afghani and Kazakhstani basing and intelligence support. However, none of these nations would be eager to support the US due to their proximity and vulnerability to Iranian attacks. Thus, due to these asymmetries, they would likely require some form of compensation to overcome their other security concerns. Turkey as well would be a critical and reluctant partner of the US due to the US’ need for access to Incirlik airbase.

A potential wildcard coalition member would be Russia. Russia might be eager to join the coalition, and could certainly provide notable strike and intelligence resources to it. Furthermore, Russia has had historically problematic relations with Iran, and would be as much if not more threatened by an Iranian nuclear capability than the US and NATO.

---

20 The Combined Air Operations Center/Joint Air Operations Center, which controls US air operations across the region, is located in Qatar, while the headquarters of the US Navy 5th fleet forces in the area is located in Bahrain.
would be. For those reasons, it is possible that Russia would be eager to support the coalition. However, the US government may prefer Russia to not have a say in coalition operations or be integrated into the US command structure. Thus Russia may be willing to get involved in the coalition at little cost to the US, primarily because it is acting on largely selfish reasons.

Finally, Israel would likely be willing to participate in such a coalition, due to its oft-professed desire to eliminate Iranian nuclear capabilities. The US, however, would likely oppose Israeli participation in the coalition, as it did in 1990-91 in Iraq, because it might offend Gulf State and other Arab or Muslim coalition partners. Thus, Israel would be in a position of currying favor with the US in order to participate (likely inducements that Israel could offer the US would be specific intelligence on Iranian capabilities, or long range strikes that the US could not or would not itself undertake).

Given these conditions, the likely lineup of nations for an anti-Iranian coalition is given in Error! Reference source not found.
If accurate, these asymmetric security interdependence dynamics would result in the US having to put forth efforts to enlist many of the coalition members, while fending off the potentially troublesome participation of Russia and Israel.

These coalitions indicate that asymmetric security interdependence dynamics provide useful guides to coalition politics. They indicate clearly that these two hypothetical coalitions are both likely to be expensive for the US. This should not be surprising, because the prosecution of these conflicts is clearly more in the interest of the US than other nations. Thus, the US is likely placed in a position of having to seek out allies who are not themselves motivated to join. If the US wanted to construct a cheaper
coalition or a “Coalition of the Willing” for Georgia and Iran, it would have to rely more on those nations that would be ‘currying favor’ with the US and its own capabilities. Given the spent nature of US military forces as of 2008, this makes such coalitions less likely to be successful. Should the US need to rely on Poland and the Czech Republic to protect Georgia against Russian forces, it seems doubtful that it would succeed. An anti-Iranian coalition might be a different story – if the US was willing to work with Russia and Israel, despite the potential long term repercussions of such actions, then it might be successful. This would, however, fly in the face of many longstanding US policies and geopolitical concerns. But it would be a true “coalition of the willing.”

Avenues for Further Research

Traditional power-based approaches such as “balance of threat,” “balance of power,” or “bandwagoning for profit” are un-satisfactory for understanding superpower-led war coalition dynamics in the absence of threat or profit. By applying the dynamics of asymmetric interdependence to security relations this research has illuminated anomalous behaviors and outcomes of states involved in the formation of ad hoc military coalitions. However, the asymmetric interdependence approach has heretofore been used primarily to understand international economic and institutional relationships, rather than interstate security relations. Future research is thus justified to understand how and when asymmetric dynamics are in force when security is at stake. This dissertation provides a good starting point by showing that an understanding of how strategic concerns of two

---

21 If Russia instead operated through proxy forces, such as South Ossetian militias, then the probable chance of success could change.
states relate can lead to an understanding of relative power, bargaining leverage, and outcomes. Future research should combine asymmetric approaches with others that assess the impact of domestic variables on specific coalition outcomes, to more effectively integrate third- and second-image theories of coalition formation.

Another potentially fruitful area of future research concerns how likely states are to embrace, or deny, limits on their freedom of action under different global distributions of power. As noted in chapter two, research on unipolarity to date has concentrated on why a counter-balancing coalition has failed to form against the US. However, this dissertation has provided some evidence that unipoles will try to avoid long-term agreements with other states while bipoles will embrace them. As noted earlier, it is logical to presume that a unipole will avoid limits on its freedom of action, while a bipole will embrace them so long as they tighten its global alliance structure. Such research may shed more light on existing avenues of institution building in the post-Cold War world.

One testable inference of this concept may be an assessment of US basing decisions worldwide – since the end of the Cold War it appears at first glance that the US has reduced its overseas presence. Furthermore, there is some evidence in the case studies examined here that the US as a unipole is less willing to allow minor states to ‘tether’ themselves to it, while as a bipole it was ready to embrace such tethering. This dynamics seems logical, and warrants further examination. In any case, it remains worthwhile to consider further how polarity impacts the behavior of different states in the system.
Appendix A – The Coalition of the Willing against Iraq, 2003

White House Press Release, March 27, 2003

Coalition Members

Who are the current coalition members?

President Bush is assembling a Coalition that has already begun military operations to disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction, and enforce 17 UNSC resolutions.

The Coalition will also liberate the Iraqi people from one of the worst tyrants and most brutal regimes on earth.

Contributions from Coalition member nations range from: direct military participation, logistical and intelligence support, specialized chemical/biological response teams, over-flight rights, humanitarian and reconstruction aid, to political support.

Forty-nine countries are publicly committed to the Coalition, including:

Afghanistan
Albania
Angola
Australia
Azerbaijan
Bulgaria
Colombia
Costa Rica
Czech Republic
Denmark
Dominican Republic
El Salvador
Eritrea
Estonia
Ethiopia
Georgia
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
Italy
Japan
Kuwait
Latvia
Lithuania
Macedonia
Marshall Islands
Micronesia
Mongolia
Netherlands
Nicaragua
Palau
Panama
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Rwanda
Singapore
Slovakia
Solomon Islands
South Korea
Spain
Tonga
Turkey
Uganda
Ukraine
United Kingdom
United States
Uzbekistan

This number is still growing, and it is no accident that many member nations of the Coalition recently escaped from the boot of a tyrant or have felt the scourge of terrorism. All Coalition member nations understand the threat Saddam Hussein's weapons pose to the world and the devastation his regime has wreaked on the Iraqi people.

- The population of Coalition countries is approximately 1.23 billion people.
- Coalition countries have a combined GDP of approximately $22 trillion.
- Every major race, religion, ethnicity in the world is represented.
- The Coalition includes nations from every continent on the globe.

Text of President Bush’s Speech to the United Nations, Sept 12th 2002

Mr. Secretary-General, Mr. President, distinguished delegates and ladies and gentlemen. We meet one year and one day after a terrorist attack brought grief to my country and brought grief to many citizens of our world.

Yesterday we remembered the innocent lives taken that terrible morning. Today we turn to the urgent duty of protecting other lives without illusion and without fear.

We've accomplished much in the last year in Afghanistan and beyond. We have much yet to do in Afghanistan and beyond. Many nations represented here have joined in the fight against global terror and the people of the United States are grateful.

The United Nations was born in the hope that survived a world war, the hope of a world moving toward justice, escaping old patterns of conflict and fear. The founding members resolved that the peace of the world must never again be destroyed by the will and wickedness of any man.

We created a United Nations Security Council so that, unlike the League of Nations, our deliberations would be more than talk, our resolutions would be more than wishes. After generations of deceitful dictators and broken treaties and squandered lives, we've dedicated ourselves to standards of human dignity shared by all and to a system of security defended by all.

Today, these standards and this security are challenged.

Our commitment to human dignity is challenged by persistent poverty and raging disease. The suffering is great. And our responsibilities are clear. The United States is joining with the world to supply aid where it reaches people and lifts up lives, to extend trade and the prosperity it brings, and to bring medical care where it is desperately needed. As a symbol of our commitment to human dignity. The United States will return to UNESCO.

This organization has been reformed, and America will participate fully in its mission to advance human rights and tolerance and learning. Our common security is challenged by regional conflicts, ethnic and religious strife that is ancient, but not inevitable.

In the Middle East there can be no peace for either side without freedom for both sides.

America stands committed to an independent and democratic Palestine, living side-by-side with Israel in peace and security. Like all other people, Palestinians deserve a government that serves their interests and listens to their voices. My nation will continue to encourage all parties to step up to their responsibilities as we seek a just and comprehensive settlement to the conflict.

Above all, our principles and our security are challenged today by outlaw groups and regimes that accept no law of morality and have no limit to their violent ambitions. In the attacks on America a year ago, we saw the destructive intentions of our enemies. This threat hides within many nations, including my own.
In cells, in camps, terrorists are plotting further destruction and building new bases for their war against civilization. And our greatest fear is that terrorists will find a shortcut to their mad ambitions when an outlaw regime supplies them with the technologies to kill on a massive scale. In one place and one regime, we find all these dangers in their most lethal and aggressive forms, exactly the kind of aggressive threat the United Nations was born to confront.

Twelve years ago, Iraq invaded Kuwait without provocation. And the regime's forces were poised to continue their march to seize other countries and their resources. Had Saddam Hussein been appeased instead of stopped, he would have endangered the peace and stability of the world. Yet this aggression was stopped by the might of coalition forces and the will of the United Nations.

To suspend hostilities, to spare himself, Iraq's dictator accepted a series of commitments. The terms were clear to him and to all, and he agreed to prove he is complying with every one of those obligations. He has proven instead only his contempt for the United Nations and for all his pledges. By breaking every pledge, by his deceptions and by his cruelties, Saddam Hussein has made the case against himself.

In 1991, Security Council Resolution 688 demanded that the Iraqi regime cease at once the repression of its own people, including the systematic repression of minorities, which the council said threatened international peace and security in the region. This demand goes ignored.

Last year, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights found that Iraq continues to commit extremely grave violations of human rights and that the regime's repression is all-pervasive.

Tens of thousands of political opponents and ordinary citizens have been subjected to arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, summary execution and torture by beating and burning, electric shock, starvation, mutilation and rape.

Wives are tortured in front of their husbands; children in the presence of their parents; and all of these horrors concealed from the world by the apparatus of a totalitarian state.

In 1991, the U.N. Security Council, through Resolutions 686 and 687, demanded that Iraq return all prisoners from Kuwait and other lands. Iraq's regime agreed. It broke this promise.

Last year, the Secretary General's high-level coordinator for this issue reported that Kuwaiti, Saudi, Indian, Syrian, Lebanese, Iranian, Egyptian, Bahraini and Armenian nationals remain unaccounted for; more than 600 people. One American pilot is among them.
In 1991, the U.N. Security Council through Resolution 687 demanded that Iraq renounce all involvement with terrorism and permit no terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq.

Iraq's regime agreed that broke this promise.

In violation of Security Council Resolution 1373, Iraq continues to shelter and support terrorist organizations that direct violence against Iran, Israel and Western governments. Iraqi dissidents abroad are targeted for murder.

In 1993, Iraq attempted to assassinate the Amir of Kuwait and a former American president. Iraq’s government openly praised the attacks of September 11. And Al Qaeda terrorists escaped from Afghanistan and are known to be in Iraq.

In 1991, the Iraqi regime agreed destroy and stop developing all weapons of mass destruction and long range missiles and to prove to the world it has done so by complying with rigorous inspections.

Iraq has broken every aspect of this fundamental pledge.

From 1991 to 1995, the Iraqi regime said it had no biological weapons. After a senior official in its weapons program defected and exposed this lie, the regime admitted to producing tens of thousands of liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents for use with scud warheads, aerial bombs and aircraft spray tanks.

U.N. inspectors believe Iraq has produced two to four times the amount of biological agents it declared and has failed to account for more than three metric tons of material that could be used to produce biological weapons. Right now, Iraq is expanding and improving facilities that were used for the production of biological weapons.

United Nations' inspections also reviewed that Iraq like maintains stockpiles of VX, mustard and other chemical agents, and that the regime is rebuilding and expanding facilities capable of producing chemical weapons.

And in 1995, after four years of deception, Iraq finally admitted it had a crash nuclear weapons program prior to the Gulf War.

We know now, were it not for that war, the regime in Iraq would likely have possessed a nuclear weapon no later than 1993.

Today, Iraq continues to withhold important information about its nuclear program, weapons design, procurement logs, experiment data, and accounting of nuclear materials and documentation of foreign assistance. Iraq employs capable nuclear scientists and technicians. It retains physical infrastructure needed to build a nuclear weapon.
Iraq has made several attempts to buy high-strength aluminum tubes used to enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon. Should Iraq acquire fissile material, it would be able to build a nuclear weapon within a year.

And Iraq's state-controlled media has reported numerous meetings between Saddam Hussein and his nuclear scientists, leaving little doubt about his continued appetite for these weapons.

Iraq also possesses a force of SCUD type missiles with ranges beyond the 150 kilometers permitted by the U.N. Work at testing and production facilities shows that Iraq is building more long range missiles that can inflict mass death throughout the region.

In 1990, after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the world imposed economic sanctions on Iraq. Those sanctions were maintained after the war to compel the regime's compliance with Security Council Resolutions.

In time, Iraq was allowed to use oil revenues to buy food. Saddam Hussein has subverted this program, working around the sanctions to buy missile technology and military materials. He blames the suffering of Iraq's people on the United Nations, even as he uses his oil wealth to build lavish palaces for himself and to buy arms for his country.

By refusing to comply with his own agreements, he bears full guilt for the hunger and misery of innocent Iraqi citizens. In 1991, Iraq promised U.N. inspectors immediate and unrestricted access to verify Iraq's commitment to rid itself of weapons of mass destruction and long range missiles. Iraq broke this promise, spending seven years deceiving, evading and harassing U.N. inspectors before ceasing cooperation entirely.

Just months after the 1991 cease-fire, the Security Council twice renewed its demand that the Iraqi regime cooperate fully with inspectors, condemning Iraq's serious violations of its obligations.

The Security Council again renewed that demand in 1994, and twice more in 1996, deploring Iraq's clear violations of its obligations. The Security Council renewed its demand three more times in 1997, citing flagrant violations, and three more times in 1998, calling Iraq's behavior totally unacceptable. And in 1999, the demand was renewed yet again.

As we meet today, it's been almost four years since the last U.N. inspector set foot in Iraq -- four years for the Iraqi regime to plan and to build and to test behind the cloak of secrecy. We know that Saddam Hussein pursued weapons of mass murder even when inspectors were in his country. Are we to assume that he stopped when they left?

The history, the logic and the facts lead to one conclusion: Saddam Hussein regime is a grave and gathering danger.
To suggest otherwise is to hope against the evidence. To assume this regime's good faith is to bet the lives of millions and the peace of the world in a reckless gamble, and this is a risk we must not take.

Delegates to the General Assembly, we have been more than patient. We've tried sanctions. We've tried the carrot of oil for food and the stick of coalition military strikes. But Saddam Hussein has defied all these efforts and continues to develop weapons of mass destruction.

The first time we may be completely certain he has nuclear weapons is when, God forbid, he uses one. We owe it to all our citizens to do everything in our power to prevent that day from coming.

The conduct of the Iraqi regime is a threat to the authority of the United Nations and a threat to peace. Iraq has answered a decade of U.N. demands with a decade of defiance. All the world now faces a test, and the United Nations a difficult and defining moment.

Are Security Council resolutions to be honored and enforced or cast aside without consequence?

Will the United Nations serve the purpose of its founding or will it be irrelevant?

The United States help found the United Nations. We want the United Nations to be effective and respectful and successful. We want the resolutions of the world's most important multilateral body to be enforced. And right now those resolutions are being unilaterally subverted by the Iraqi regime.

Our partnership of nations can meet the test before us by making clear what we now expect of the Iraqi regime.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately and unconditionally forswear, disclose and remove or destroy all weapons of mass destruction, long-range missiles and all related material.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all support for terrorism and act to suppress it -- as all states are required to do by U.N. Security Council resolutions.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will cease persecution of its civilian population, including Shi'a, Sunnis, Kurds, Turkemens and others -- again, as required by Security Council resolutions.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will release or account for all Gulf War personnel whose fate is still unknown.
It will return the remains of any who are deceased, return stolen property, accept liability for losses resulting from the invasion of Kuwait and fully cooperate with international efforts to resolve these issues as required by Security Council resolutions.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all illicit trade outside the oil-for-food program. It will accept U.N. administration of funds from that program to ensure that the money is used fairly and promptly for the benefit of the Iraqi people.

If all these steps are taken, it will signal a new openness and accountability in Iraq and it could open the prospect of the United Nations helping to build a government that represents all Iraqis, a government based on respect for human rights, economic liberty and internationally supervised elections.

The United States has no quarrel with the Iraqi people. They've suffered too long in silent captivity. Liberty for the Iraqi people is a great moral cause and a great strategic goal.

The people of Iraq deserve it. The security of all nations requires it. Free societies do not intimidate through cruelty and conquest. And open societies do not threaten the world with mass murder. The United States supports political and economic liberty in a unified Iraq.

We can harbor no illusions, and that's important today to remember. Saddam Hussein attacked Iran in 1980 and Kuwait in 1990. He's fired ballistic missiles at Iran and Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and Israel. His regime once ordered the killing of every person between the ages of 15 and 70 in certain Kurdish villages in northern Iraq. He has gassed many Iranians and 40 Iraqi villages.

My nation will work with the U.N. Security Council to meet our common challenge. If Iraq's regime defies us again, the world must move deliberately, decisively to hold Iraq to account. We will work with the U.N. Security Council for the necessary resolutions.

But the purposes of the United States should not be doubted. The Security Council resolutions will be enforced, the just demands of peace and security will be met or action will be unavoidable and a regime that has lost its legitimacy will also lose its power.

Events can turn in one of two ways. If we fail to act in the face of danger, the people of Iraq will continue to live in brutal submission. The regime will have new power to bully and dominate and conquer its neighbors, condemning the Middle East to more years of bloodshed and fear. The regime will remain unstable -- the region will remain unstable, with little hope of freedom and isolated from the progress of our times.

With every step the Iraqi regime takes toward gaining and deploying the most terrible weapons, our own options to confront that regime will narrow. And if an emboldened
regime were to supply these weapons to terrorists allies, then the attacks of September 11 would be a prelude to far greater horrors.

If we meet our responsibilities, if we overcome this danger, we can arrive at a very different future. The people of Iraq can shake off their captivity. They can one day join a democratic Afghanistan and a democratic Palestine inspiring reforms throughout the Muslim world. These nations can show by their example that honest government and respect for women and the great Islamic tradition of learning can triumph in the Middle East and beyond. And we will show that the promise of the United Nations can be fulfilled in our time.

Neither of these outcomes is certain. Both have been set before us. We must choose between a world of fear and a world of progress. We cannot stand by and do nothing while dangers gather. We must stand up for our security and for the permanent rights and the hopes of mankind.

By heritage and by choice, the United States of America will make that stand. And, delegates to the United Nations, you have the power to make that stand, as well.

Thank you very much.

Coalition members and contributions
**Figure 5 - Coalition of the Willing Contributors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries contributing troops to Iraq coalition, Dec 2003 - May 2007</th>
<th>Personnel contributed as of 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

: year country stopped contributing troops
: year country began contributing

Turkish Parliamentary Motion on Support to US in Iraq (submitted to the Turkish Parliament Feb 25th 2003, voted on March 1st)\(^3\)


\(^3\) Translation from the Turkish graciously provided by Tuba Unlu, PhD.
TO THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE TURKISH GRAND NATIONAL ASSEMBLY (TBMM)

Worrying developments about Iraq have been on the rise and the crisis is deteriorating. Efforts aimed at solving the problem in a peaceful manner have not produced the anticipated outcomes.

Since the beginning, the 58th government has monitored developments closely and with sensitivity; it has endeavored to contribute to a solution. Towards this aim, it has contacted and consulted with all related countries and international organizations, particularly the regional states.

Developments concerning Iraq were assessed by the TBMM in a closed session on February 6, 2003 and the government was authorized to take the necessary security measures and preparations as a precaution.

Within this framework, the TBMM has decided that technical and military personnel from the USA will stay in Turkey for three months in order to carry out the necessary renovation, improvement, construction and extension of infrastructure on military bases and facilities in Turkey; and that in accordance with Article 92 of the Constitution, the government is allowed to make the relevant arrangements.

Accordingly, the government has moved forward with the necessary preparations. Infrastructural work was started after the Memorandum of Consensus, which determined the legal and technical framework of these activities, was concluded with the USA on February 8th 2003.

On the other hand, as negative developments, which had security risks for Turkey, escalated, the necessary negotiations were initiated within the framework of Article 4 of the NATO Treaty and on February 19th the NATO Defense Planning Committee decided that NATO support would be extended to Turkey.

Within this context, it was decided to deploy NATO’s early notification aircraft and NATO missile defense systems in Turkey in order to protect and monitor integrity of the Turkish airspace for defensive purposes, and to provide defense assistance against chemical and biological weapons.

Today, it is more likely that the crisis which has been prevalent in the region may turn into a conflict. Given these deteriorating conditions, we enter a new phase where threats and risks against Turkey’s security are becoming more serious.

The fact that the terrorist elements that target Turkey’s national unity and integrity are harbored in the region is a very significant dimension of the security threat that the situation in Iraq constitutes for Turkey.
In the same manner, developments that might cause dismemberment of Iraq on the basis of ethnic, religious, and sectarian differences are also source of very serious concern.

In addition, past unfortunate experiences require being prepared against the possibility of a collective migration from Northern Iraq to our country. Therefore, taking into consideration humanitarian concerns and in order to prevent possible buildup of masses in our border regions, it is inevitable that we take the necessary measures to stop this migration in a suitable place as far way from our borders as possible. Preparations towards this aim still continue.

Turkey attaches great importance to protection of Iraq’s territorial integrity and national unity and to a peaceful solution of the problem. Use of force is regarded as the last resort. Time is running out to solve the escalating crisis before it turns into a war. In order to prevent war, it has become an inevitable necessity that the Iraqi administration fulfills obligations stated in the UN Security Council decisions about total and efficient disarmament.

It is crucial that the international community continues its decisive approach towards Iraq to comprehend the gravity of the situation and pave the way for a peaceful solution.

As it was emphasized in the joint declaration of the EU Summit held on February 17-18, 2003 in Brussels with participation of the member and candidate countries including Turkey, it would be an effective medium to take tangible and actual deterrent measures in addition to displaying determination and cooperation to convince Iraq in this regard.

The 58th Republican government is preparing all the necessary security measures and implementing them in order to protect Turkey’s fundamental rights and interests against all risks and possibilities that these negative developments might present.

Within the context of the military deterrent measures against Iraq, the TBMM’s granting permission for temporary deployment of foreign armed forces in Turkey would function as an enormous element of pressure in the current crisis environment.

Similarly, getting the TBMM’s permission to send the Turkish Armed Forces abroad to let the Turkish Republic act swiftly and in time and take necessary measures while being prepared for the worst possibility would also be of crucial importance from the perspective of allowing the government to pursue an effective policy.

Use of these forces, based on future developments, would depend on the principles that the government would determine and arrangements to be done on this subject.

In a manner that necessity, scope, limits, and timing will be determined by the government:
In the meeting of the Council of Ministers dated February 24th 2003, it was decided that in accordance with Article 92 of the Constitution, permission of the TBMM was to be asked to:

1 – Send Turkish Armed Forces abroad and to use those forces when needed according to the principles to be determined,

2 – Allow foreign armed forces elements, at most 62,000 military personnel and no more than 255 aircraft and 65 helicopters, in Turkey for six months, temporarily deployed in the contiguous areas to be chosen by the government within the framework of international legitimacy; to deploy combatant land forces excluding support elements in a manner that they could be transferred from the areas where they are temporarily deployed in Turkey to outside Turkey as soon as possible; to deploy foreign air and naval forces together with special forces in a manner to let them be used in a possible operation; and to make the necessary arrangements to let foreign air forces use the Turkish airspace for overflight; to make preparations regarding these foreign armed forces’ coming to Turkey; to make the arrangements within the framework that the government will determine concerning these forces’ status in Turkey and principles and procedures of their cooperation with the Turkish Armed Forces.

The following is the Constitutional Article which is the basis of motion:

“Declaration of State of War and Authorization to Deploy the Armed Forces

ARTICLE 92. The Power to authorize a declaration of a state of war in cases deemed legitimate by international law and except where required by international treaties to which Turkey is a party or by the rules of international courtesy to send Turkish Armed Forces to foreign countries and to allow foreign armed forces to be stationed in Turkey, is vested in the Turkish Grand National Assembly.

If the country is subjected, while the Turkish Grand National Assembly is adjourned or in recess, to sudden armed aggression and it thus becomes imperative to decide immediately on the deployment of the armed forces, the President of the Republic can decide on the mobilization of the Turkish Armed Forces.”
In Turkish:

(25 Şubat 2003)
TÜRKİYE BÜYÜK MILLET MECLİSİ BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Irak konusundaki enide verici gelişmeler çok hızlı bir seyir izlemekte ve kriz ortamı giderek ağırlaşmaktadır. Sorunun barışçıl yollarla çözüme yönelik çabalar bugüne kadar ümit edilen sonuçları vermemiştir.

58 numaralı Cumhuriyet Hükümeti gelişmeleri başından beri yakından ve hassasiyetle izlemiş, barışçıl çözüme katkıda bulunmak amacıyla yoğun çaba harcamıştır. Bu amaçla başta bölge ülkeleri olmak üzere ogni tüm ülkelerle ve uluslararası kuruluşlarla temas ve istişarelerde bulunmuştur.

Irak'a ilişkin gelişmeler 6 Şubat 2003 tarihli kapalı oturumda,TBMM tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve her ihtimale karşı gerekli güvenlik tedbirlerinin alınması ve hazırlıkların yapılması amacıyla Hükümete yetki verilmiştir. TBMM, bu çerçevede, Türkiye'deki askeri üs ve tesisler ile limanlarda gerekli önlemelerin alınması ve hızlı bir şekilde personelin 3 ay süreyle Türkiye'de bulunması, bununla ilgili düzenlemelerin Hükümet tarafından yapılması Anayasa'nın 92 nci maddesi uyarınca izin verilmesini kararlaştırmıştır.

Hükümet gerekli hazırlıkları buna uygun olarak sürdürmüştür ve bu faaliyetlerin hukuki ve teknik çerçevesini belirleyen Mutabakat Muhtırası, ABD ile 8 Şubat 2003 tarihinde sonuçlandığı ve NATO Savunma Planlama Komitesi 19 Şubat tarihinde Türkiye'ye NATO desteği verilmesini kararlaştırmıştır.

Bu kapsamda, Türk hava sahasının bütünlüğünün korunması ve gözetimi için savunma amaçlı olarak NATO havadan erken ihbar uçakları ile NATO harekat alanları füze savunma sistemlerinin Türkiye'de konuşlandırılması ve kimyasal ve biyolojik silahlarla karşı koruma desteği sağlanmasına kararlaştırılmıştır.

Bugün gelinen noktada, bölgede hüküm süren krizin bir çatışmaya dönüşmesi ihtimali giderek güçlenmektedir. Açılan ortam ve şartlar karşısında Türkiye'nin güvenliğine yönelik tehdit ve risklerin ciddi boyutlu bu yeraları kazandığı bir sürece girilmektedir.

Türkiye'nin milli birliğini ve toprak bütünlüğünü hedef alan terö unsurlarının bölgede yuvarlanmaları Irak'taki durumun Türkiye için teşkil ettiği güvenlik tehdidinin çok önemli bir boyutunu oluşturmuştur.
Aynı şekilde Irak'ta etnik, din ve mezhep temelinde bir parçalanmaya yol açabilecek gelişmeler de çok ciddi bir endişe kaynağıdır.

Bunun yanı sıra geçmişte yaşanan müessif tecrübeler Kuzey Irak'tan ülkemizze toplu göç hareketi ihtimaline karşı da hassas ve hazırlıklı olunmasını gerektirmektedir. Bu amaçla sınır bölgelerimizde muhtemel yığılmaları önlemek ve insanı mülahazaları dikkate alarak bu göçün sınırlarımızın mümkün olduğuna ilerisinde uygun bir bölgesinde durdurulmasını sağlamak için gerekli tedbirlerin alınması kaçınılmaz olacaktır. Bu konuda başlatılan hazırlıklar sürdurulmaktadır.


Irak'ın, durumun vahametini idrak etmesi ve sorunun barış ortamı korunarak çözümü kavuşturulmasını önünü açması için uluslararası toplumun kararlı tutumunu sürdürmesi büyük önem taşımaktadır.

Avrupa Birliği üyesi ülkeler ile aday ülkelerin 17-18 Şubat 2003 tarihlerinde Brüksel'de yaptığı ve Türkiye'nin de katıldığı zirve toplantısı ortak bildirisinde de vurguladığı üzere, bu konuda sergilecek kararlılık ve dayanışmanın yanı sıra somut ve fili askeri çaydırıcılık tedbirlerinin alınması, Irak'ın bu konuda ikna edilebilmesinde çok etkili bir vasita olacaktır.

58. Cumhuriyet Hükümeti bu olumsuz gelişmelerin karşımıza çıkarabileceği bütün risklere ve ihtimallere karşı Türkiye'nin temel hak ve menfaatlerini korumak amacıyla gerekken bütün güvenlik tedbirlerini almakta ve uygulamaya koymaktadır.

Irak'a karşı askeri çaydırıcılık tedbirleri kapsamında yabancı silahlı kuvvetler unsurlarının Türkiye'de geçici olarak konuşlandırılması için TBMM'ninizin ve yetki vermesi; bugünkü kriz ortamında muazzam bir baskı unsuru olarak çok önemli ve etkili bir fonksiyon içra edecek.

Aynı şekilde, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin en kötü ihimala karşı hazırlıklı olarak zamanında ve süratle hareket etmesini ve gerekli tedbirleri almasını sağlamak bakımından Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri'nin yabancı ülkelere gönderilmesi konusunda TBMM'ninizin alınması hükümetin etkili bir siyaset izlemesi sağlamak açısından büyük önem taşyıacaktır.

Bu kuvvetlerin, gelişmelerin seyrine göre gerektiğinde kullanılmaları hükümetin belirleyeceği esaslı ve bu konuda yapılacak düzenlemelere bağlı olacaktır.
Bu mülahazalarla; gereği, kapsamlı, sınır ve zamanı Hükümetçe belirlenecek şekilde,

1- Türk Silahlı Kuvvetlerinin yabancı ülkelerde gönderilmesine ve bu kuvvetlerin gerektiğini belirlienecek esaslar dairesinde kullanılsa, 

2- Uluslararası meşruiyet kurallar çerçevesinde en fazla 62.000 askeri personelin ve hava unsurlarını olarak 255 uçak ve 65 helikopteri aşmamak kaydıyla yabancı silahlı kuvvetler unsurlarının Hükümetin tespit edeceği mücadevi bölgelerde geçici olarak konuşlandırılmak üzere 6 ay süreyle Türkiye'de bulunmasına; bu amaçla Türkiye'ye gelecek yabancı kara kuvvetlerinden destek unsurları dansındaki muharip unsurların geçici olarak konuşlandırıldıkları bölgelerden Türkiye dıına intikallerinin en kısa sürede tamamlanması ve yabancı hava ve deniz kuvvetleri ile özel kuvvetler unsurlarının muhtemel bir harekatta kullanılamalarını sağlayacak şekilde konuşlanılarak ve yabancı silahlı kuvvetlere mensup hava unsurlarının Türk hava sahasını üst uçucu amacıyla kullanılması için gerekli düzenlemelerin yapılmasına; bu yabancı silahlı kuvvetlerin Türkiye'ye geliştikle ilgili hazırlıkların yürütülmesine, Türkiye ülkesinde tabi olacakları statü ve Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleriyle işbirliği esas ve usullerine ilişkin düzenlemelerin Hükümetin belirleyecği esaslar çerçevesinde yapılmasına, 

Anayasa'nın 92'inci maddesi uyarınca Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi'nden izin istenmesi Bakanlar Kurulu'nun 24/2/2003 tarihli toplantısında kararlaştırılmıştır.

___________________________________________________________

İzne dayanak olan Anayasa maddesi şöyle:

Madde 92

"Savaş hali ilanı ve silahlı kuvvet kullanılmasına izin verme"

"Milletlerarası hukukun meşru saydığı hallerde savaş hali ilanına ve Türkiye'nin taraf olduğu milletlerarası anlaşmalarının veya milletlerarası nezaket kurallarının gerektirdiği haller dışında, Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri'nin yabancı ülkelere gönderilmesine veya yabancı silahlı kuvvetlerin Türkiye'de bulunmasına izin verme yetkisi Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi'nindir.

Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi tatilde veya ara vermede iken ülkenin ani bir silahlı saldırıya uğraması ve bu sebeple silahlı kuvvet kullanılmasına karar verilmenin kaçınılmaz olması halinde Cumhurbaşkanı da Türk Silahlı Kuvvetleri'nin kullanılmasına karar verebilir."
Appendix B – Korean War Coalition

UN Resolutions Regarding Korean War

Resolution Adopted by the United Nations Security Council, June 27, 1950

The Security Council,

Having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace; and

Having called for an immediate cessation of hostilities; and

Having called upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the 38th parallel; and

Having noted from the report of the United Nations Commission for Korea that the authorities in North Korea have neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn their armed forces to the 38th parallel, and that urgent military measures are required to restore international peace and security; and

Having noted the appeal from the Republic of Korea to the United Nations for immediate and effective steps to secure peace and security,

Recommends that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed forces and to restore international peace and security in the area.

Text of UN Security Council Resolution Authorizing Force in Korea

The Security Council,

Having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace,

Having recommended that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area,

1. Welcomes the prompt and vigorous support which Governments and peoples of the United Nations have given to its resolutions of 25 and 27th June 1950 to assist the Republic of Korea in defending itself against armed attack and thus to restore international peace and security in the area;

2. Notes that members of the United Nations have transmitted to the United Nations offers of assistance for the Republic of Korea;

3. Recommends that all members providing military forces and other assistance pursuant to the aforesaid Security Council resolutions make such forces and other assistance available to a unified command under the United States;

1 From FRUS, Vol. 7, p. 211.
2 Introduced by France and the UK (S/1588) and adopted on July 7 (1950), by a vote of 7 to 0, with 3 abstentions (Egypt, India, and Yugoslavia); Soviet Union was absent. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. 23, No. 576, July 17, 1950, p. 83. Also available electronically from the Harry S. Truman Presidential library at: http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/korea/large/week2/ea_7_50.htm
4. Requests the United States to designate the commander of such forces;
5. Authorizes the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating;
6. Requests the United States to provide the Security Council with reports as appropriate on the course of action taken under the unified command.

Coalition contributions to the Korean War Coalition

Figure 6 - Korean War Coalition Contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries contributing troops to Korean War Coalition, June 1951 - June 1952</th>
<th>As of 30 June 1951</th>
<th>As of 30 June 1952</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Commonwealth</td>
<td>15,723</td>
<td>21,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>8,278</td>
<td>13,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>5,403</td>
<td>5,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>4,602</td>
<td>4,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>2,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix C – Desert Shield/Desert Storm

Figure 7 below details nations that contributed troops to the Desert Storm operation, while details those that contributed financially.

**Figure 7 - Coalition Members and Troop Contributions to Desert Storm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ground</th>
<th>Naval</th>
<th>Air</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>300 Mujahadin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>450 Troops</td>
<td>2 Frigates</td>
<td>2xC-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 Guided Missile Frigate; 1 Destroyer, 1 Supply Ship</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>3,500 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 Fighter Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2,000 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 Minesweepers</td>
<td>1 Sq. of fighters to Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1,700 Troops</td>
<td>2 Destroyers</td>
<td>18xCF-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>200-man Chem. Def.; 150-man Medical Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 Corvette ship</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>35,000 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6th Light Armored Division (10,000 Troops)</td>
<td>6 Ships</td>
<td>3 Tactical Fighter Squadrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 Sq. of fighters to Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 Frigate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>40-man Medical Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 Ships</td>
<td>1 Fighter Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>7,000 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 Tactical Fighter Squadrons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2,000 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 Frigates</td>
<td>1 Sq. of fighters to Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>480 Guards to Mecca</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 Cutter</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2xC-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61 Planes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>10,000 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Medical Team</td>
<td>2 Ships</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 Support Ship</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20 Planes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>Medical Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3xC-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>40,000 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Aprox. 300 Planes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>500 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>27-man Medical Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>30-man Medical Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 Corvettes; 1 Destroyer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>20,000 Troops</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 Frigates</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60 Planes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>45,000 Personnel; 1st Armoured Division</td>
<td>9 Ships</td>
<td>5 Tactical Fighter Squadrons; 18 Lynx Helicopters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Definitive numbers on troop contributions vary, but these figures are widely cited. These are available from globalsecurity.org and various other online sources. For a much more detailed accounting of US and partner contributions, see the Appendices of Norman Friedman, *Desert Victory: The War for Kuwait*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 1991.
Financial contributions to Desert Shield/Desert Storm

Figure 8 - Allied pledges and contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pledge (in millions of dollars)</th>
<th>Contribution (in-kind)</th>
<th>Future receipt</th>
<th>Percent of pledge met as of Nov 1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990 1991 Total</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>$3,339 $13,500 $16,839</td>
<td>$11,052</td>
<td>$3,910</td>
<td>$14,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>$2,506 $13,500 $16,006</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$14,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>$1,000 $3,088 $4,088</td>
<td>$3,870</td>
<td>$218</td>
<td>$4,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$1,740 $8,332 $10,072</td>
<td>$9,416</td>
<td>$571</td>
<td>$9,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$1,072 $5,500 $6,572</td>
<td>$5,772</td>
<td>$762</td>
<td>$6,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>$80 $275 $355</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>$241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$3 $23 $26</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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