

Concept of civil military relations



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The emergence of military interventions in the political life of a country is not a feature of this century. From ancient Greece to the end of the 20th Century, the threat has chosen by displacement or relocation of a government by overt military action, a recurring theme in the scientific literature. However, although previous analysts rather for the military as “ a strange, demonic” fraction not with other social groups interact, but in a position to seek to act against them, it was not until after the end of World War II political scientists began to derive another perspective. Therefore, while Machiavelli would say, a “ man of the military can be a good person” Voltaire would “ streamline manifestation of brute force as” and Samuel Adams would say that a standing army, however necessary, is always dangerous to the liberties of the people.

Of course, the change in the attitude of the science was in the military institution not accidental inspiration. From World War II to an end the traditional role of the military as an instrument of territorial expansion of a state, its utility has been greatly improved as domestic violence. As one of the few large institutions ‘ westernized’, the military as the only effective pressure group, able to play a positive role was seen in a country trying to reach a higher level in the scale of social and political progress. Since the introduction of liberal institutions, Western economic policy in the peripheral countries, the stability of the latter was upset traditional sociopolitical structure appeared the military is the only group that the enforcement and protection of political stability and order. Therefore, as the duties of the officers had to undergo such a major change, and the whole institution was

asked to play a domestic role multidimensional Western academia has been forced to reconsider their former views on the civil-military relations.

Since the role of the military institution can extend the daily political life of the state of minimal impact to direct rule, began in early postwar writers noted the “ benefits” could provide a modernized an officer corps assets political life of a peripheral country. His zeal was such that some even to support the establishment of “ pro-Western” military dictatorships and overestimate the ability of the military ended. For example, with respect to Pauker Southeast Asian countries, argues that a “ cure” for all one social economic problems faced by them in the future: “ It is more likely to be found in the officer corps and politicians.” Since “ strong leadership support of the organizational structure and moral authority” was seen as a necessary component of good management planning and the future of these countries, the only group that was able to show those qualities were the military, suggested.

Others, like Pye moderate perspective in favor of the pro-Western direct military participation in the political life of the peripheral states, did not neglect to mention that the objective of the type of role assigned to the officer corps was to create stable democratic political institutions an practices. Others such as Janowitz, however, began to suggest that one should not confuse discipline and organizational capacity. While officers have been trained to work efficiently when allocated to specific tasks, and their impact on economic development in any country wide, at best, be minimal because of the “ inherent limitations in the profession [infrared].”

Overall, it was very difficult for some Western academics to justify the military intervention and public rule since then, according to the political and economic model that they Anglo American promotion, it is democracy rather than dictatorship, the political system that complements the economic development of capitalism.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the liberalization of the former communist countries of totalitarian regimes, it seems democracy as the best alternative political mechanism can provide the West to these people.

Although the process of democratization can not be done overnight and achieve an outcome, however, it gives the impression that it is the only viable solution for the implementation of peace and security in the world.

As President Clinton noted in his speech at Georgetown University in 1991, countries with democratic governments are more likely to be reliable partners in trade and diplomacy and less likely threat to peace than those with other forms of government. Although the collapse of the authoritarian regime / totalitarianism is the first step toward the democratization process of any country, however, it should not make us believe that such an event would automatically lead to the establishment and strengthening of democratic institutions and practices. While in the transitional period can create a relatively stable configuration of democratic political institutions characteristics, can not be such a system can be considered a democratic system.

Until there is complete agreement of the people and the political and military leaders to the demands inherent in all democracies, for example, support <https://assignbuster.com/concept-of-civil-military-relations/>

large positions for behavioral attitude with democratic institutions and the rules of the game that the latter establishment, then democracy can be a distant dream.

As Sergei Kovalyov, a Russian human rights activist, has put it, “ the quality of democracy depends heavily on the quality of the democrats...without this, everything will be like now, always in fits and start”.

Due to the growing interest from the academic world to understand the different types and levels of civil-military relations in each country as well as in the interpretation, we have a number of writers with certain patterns, in which a number of factors associated with both the changing environments of international and local have been used. Despite some weaknesses arising from the attempt by political scientists to create a global theory regarding the role of the army in all countries, and these patterns tend to complement each other in the supply and the end of the reader a better understanding of civil military relations in general.

TYPOLOGIES OF CIVIL - MILITARY RELATION

Focus on the way that the military can achieve its corporate objectives, accurately distinguishes four types of civil-military relations. In the first category, and he puts all cases while the officers to exercise their influence on the constitutional legitimacy and the civilian government, like any pressure group again, to achieve the objectives, such as increasing the military budget, and in the second, when officers used the threat of penalties or blackmail to reach similar objectives; in the third, when the system replace civil with one another because I did not perform its duties towards

<https://assignbuster.com/concept-of-civil-military-relations/>

them adequately, and in the fourth category, and officers decide sweep civilian system and seize the government itself.

And there is a problem with his rating is its heavy dependence on the degree of military intervention. This makes it difficult to distinguish between behavioral similarities and structural to the military establishment and regulations in different countries, while intervention has been paid to different levels, but the role of the military in society and politics is similar.

Huntington, on the other hand, the rules of classification of its civil-military relations on the political objectives of the actions taken by the officers. He classified into three categories. In the first category, he distinguishes those cases that are similar to a palace coup, and in the second, those similar coup reform, and in the third, similar to those 1 revolutionary. And there is a problem with the classification of him is that his interest is not only personal but also elusive. He failed to consider that military intervention could begin as early as may have one type of a military coup, but to undergo radical changes certain.

In an attempt to overcome the constraints imposed on the model of Huntington, Janowitz makes an important step by differentiating between civilians and military personnel in Western countries relations from those in the terminal. He classified as civil-military relations in the Western countries into three categories: the aristocracy, democracy and totalitarianism. With regard to peripheral States, he classified as civil-military relations in five categories: personal authoritarian, authoritative and comprehensive

democratic competition, between civilians and the military alliance, the military and the oligarchy.

And there is a problem with his rating is that it does not take into account the degree of autonomy that can be civilian leaders of the military. Not clarify this, he makes it very difficult to distinguish the role of officers in democratic and authoritarian regime.

Learning from the mistakes of the previous writers, Lucham tries to offer a more complete model. He bases his typology of civil-military relations around three factors: the strength or weakness of civilian institutions; the strength or weakness of the military institution and the coercive, political and organizational resources at its disposal; and the nature of the boundaries between the military establishment and its sociopolitical environment. By examining these three variables, Lucham's typology classifies civil-military relations based on the roles which the military institution plays in a country's political life.

He divides them into categories in which the military exercises objective, constabulary, apparatus and subjective control as well as in cases of a nation-in-arms from cases in which a praetorian, a garrison or a guardian state has been established or there is political vacuum. And there is a problem with classification Lucham is that he neglects the role of the international environment (political, economic, and military) on the relations between civilians and the military in the state. In the same direction as Lucham, but the definition of Huntington accept "imperial societies", Nordlinger, Clapham and Phili attempt to formulate a complementary

patterns of civil-military relations. After careful consideration of the three models of civilian control and traditional, and liberal models and penetration, Nordlinger says that there is no single model of civilian control that can be widely applied effectively. And therefore, used as a criterion to the extent that exercise governmental authority officers and ambitious objectives. He distinguishes three types of Imperial officers: supervisors and guardians and rulers. First tend to exercise the right of veto on a variety of government decisions without having to take over political power itself. Second, after the overthrow of a civilian government take ten to the same political authority for a limited period of time. It aims to prevent the destruction of the status quo and return to civilian political power. Last, do not only want to control the government, but also being designed to convert a very ambitious community.

Clapham and Philip H. ARG are not interested in how officers can gain political power, but in the methods they use. As a result, they come for the classification of four types of military regimes: the veto, Chair, factional and penetration.

As selectors to be classified as they use the unit's military command structure, and the level of differentiation between the army of civil society, and the level of threat of civil society as well as on the level of political organization independent. Interestingly, it is also interested in the results of the military regimes. They are divided into six categories. The back of the hand, and the renewal of civil, nepotism and factional authoritarian, military state of the party and the state to a standstill.

It is possible that other writers might have come up with new patterns. Based on these known, however, we should not see it as a strict set of categories. These patterns are not used

Out of the study directly from civilian and military circumstances in each country, but instead of extrapolating from historical records that rely heavily on social structural factors. Even when factors are included cultural and ideological, it is widely be discussed. Since the elements that characterize civil-military relations in each country comes out of the unique circumstances of this country and its institutions, and countries that are not and should not be treated as mere examples of the ideal type. Instead, one has to pay special attention to the properties at the same time to maintain these patterns in the views.

For a better understanding of the type of relationship between the civilian and military that dominates the political life of the country, as well as the level of democracy, and there is a need to create a multi-factorial model. This model should be a composite one and to take into account the following factors: First, the military itself. Can A careful monitoring of the size of the military, and social background and level of professional qualification of its members, their ideology political, and the level of cohesion and unity, as well as their desire to protect the interest their corporate (s), he says Janowitz, give us a better chance for “ understanding [ing] all of the officers, [and] internal capacity to its tendency to intervene in domestic politics. “

Second, we must take into account the form of the social impact of the local environment and the economic and political lives in the shadow of the

military and jobs. Particular attention must be paid to the political factor that will determine this much whether the democratization process has established roots strong in any country.

Third, the role of the international factor and more specifically the impact of major powers exerted on the establishment of foreign military alike and internal forces of the country.

Last but not least, we must examine the role of the past and present of the military institution in the development of civil-military relations in each country.

It should add a small rider here with regard to the latter factor. We are very concerned most studies of civil-military relations with the ‘ military factor ‘ only after the intervention happens. Role of the institution in the same domestic policy-making process in cases in which no ruling military are often neglected or underestimated. Although the authors emphasize the immediate factors that led to the military intervention, they forget that the military organization as ‘ a system of meaningful activity continuously from a specific type ‘ functions within the community long before the stage pre intervention. also suggests Johnson, ‘ the direct control of the government by senior officers or military juntas are only reference crude of the role that the armed forces can play at a certain moment, the men in uniform have a variety of ways to make their will felt. ‘

Nor should a result, patronage relations not only within the military, but also among its members and the civilian government dress ignored.

In addition, planned and smooth, or violence, the transition from military rule to another form of government (democracy in the first place), in the peripheral countries, and its impact on the development of civilian rule in them, and deserves attention. Since the role of the military in the decision-making processes are often beyond the immediate scope of professional reference, it must examine its changing role in society transformation.

5. 2 Problems Faced/Challenges on the implementation of the concept of CMR.

Should the idea of a close link between the traditional thinking SSR and CMR analysis is not in itself controversial. Obsessed “ control”, and especially the “ civilian” control, and theorizing much SSR, can be traced directly to the literature of fear and suspicion of the army are reviewed below for a brief period. “ Control”, after all is only necessary if there are potential dangers in a lack of control. If modern thinking SSR does not explicitly mention usually the risk of military coups or military influence unwarranted, and intellectual heritage and clear with it. It can be attributed in particular to work known by Samuel Huntington, supplemented in some cases by others. In turn, of course, Huntington was not writing in a vacuum: a few original ideas in his book, and most have a long history. They are fully in line with a long history of writing (and often anti-military) anti-state, which is, in fact, the prevailing thinking in the world for several centuries political. John Locke’s two treatises of government (1690) is the most famous example in early. Of the complex and varied body of this theory, can distinguish between the main sticking strings in the past.

First, the rise of the middle classes in Britain, and in colonial America, were identified with military aristocracy, and with the power of the king. As a result, the fear of a strong standing army seems to be plagued thinkers, British and American alike, who were influential in the establishment and development of the United States, and fear that still exist also in Britain after American independence. Remarkably that while for the United States (and indeed for most democracies) “ central problem in civil-military relations were not one basic - to prevent a military takeover in the country,” the book British and the Americans and identified these issues, however, exactly what the main problem.

For the middle classes of the eighteenth century, and seek to transform their economic weight in the political power, in the state controlled by the Crown Prince and the aristocracy, the priority was to “ control” of the state and the army, and the reduction of their power to the maximum extent possible. The middle classes of little interest in becoming officers themselves, and in the absence of military service, they had no experience rarely directly to how the military works. They knew little about military affairs care, and the army was a dangerous beast needs to be chained up. Proper role was not as a border guard or of the supreme national interest, but like the rest of the state, an employee with very limited roles. It was kind of trader, that chapter if the quality of the work is not satisfactory.

Second, was directly linked to this lack of interest in military issues to liberal concepts of war and peace in this same middle classes. Dismissed the war as a bad trade, soldiers and stupid and bloodthirsty, and the war as a rational human beings are going to do everything to avoid. They considered that the

<https://assignbuster.com/concept-of-civil-military-relations/>

reason often by armies of the war, which was very large and impressive, or through the arms race between the two countries. Embraced the new economic theories of Adam Smith, who argued that the trade, rather than war, is enriched Nations, and that cooperation was better than the competition. While not the middle classes were rarely peaceful, they have strongly the idea that the war was a stupid often and usually generals were stupid. For the British, the experience of the blunders of the First World War, and the folk-memory of Generals sending a generation of intellectuals to be slaughtered, was to be influential for many decades afterwards.[1]

Yet if these ideas in various forms throughout the centuries, why there was a series of books and articles on civil-military relations between the 1950s and 1970s? There seems to be two reasons. And it was a lot of this American writing, and they are produced in a time when the United States has reached an agreement with a significant increase military equipment, and a network of bases and defense agreements in all parts of the world. Was also a time of fears of a “ military-industrial complex” as expressed by (ex) Eisenhower. Lacks all these fears any basis in fact, of course, and he was not there a moment where the U. S. military looked as if they might seek for a political role or start a war.

The second, more general, and why conscious of systems “ military” that appear on what looks around the world, while political scientists, especially in the United States, began to take an interest in the military as an institution. These systems existed before the war in Europe – in Hungary and Poland, for example – but by the 1950s military intervention in Latin American politics has become almost a cliché, and military regimes

apparently everywhere in that continent. No wonder that transformed relations between the world's political, military, and one of the main themes of the study, although it is difficult to achieve experimentally. As a result, it was a lot of work to be done by inference, through careful reading of the legislation and government statements, and through the application of theoretical models. These models have been derived often from layman's understanding of the work of the American political system. Thus, it is inaccurate and incomplete in general, but with so were they based it strictly on theories about how and was supposed system of the United States to work.

Apparently when the newly independent states in Africa began to fall under military control, as well as, to the extent that there is a trend all over the world for the Army to get energy. This impression was reinforced rise of military governments in various places such as South Korea and Pakistan. Encouraged, therefore, non-specialists began to wonder whether there was, in fact, things to apply what can be said about the army, and a series of books from the 1950s to the 1970s already mentioned implicitly said that there. Although it is important not to minimize the real change in approach between these books, they share some common features. Portrayed armies significantly resemble those of Britain and the United States, as well as those written by specialists on CMR Latin America. They are large, powerful, well trained and well disciplined and so it is a mystery " not that this force rebels against its civilian masters, but why it ever obeys them." [2] Likewise, it was argued that the officers of these armies were always " pessimistic,

collectivist, historically inclined, power-oriented, nationalistic, militaristic, pacifist and instrumentalist in [their] view of the military profession.”[3]

This type of analysis was very simple. It assumed only two actors (the military, often in practice the Army, and civilian politicians), in an adversarial relationship involving a constant battle by civilians to “ control” the military. This in turn meant that the two played a zero-sum game, in which “ the essential premise for any system of civilian control is the minimization of military power.”[4]It was further argued that this power varies with “ the proportion of the national product devoted to military purposes and ... the number of individuals serving with the armed services.” As often with Huntington, this is a little obscure but presumably refers to the percentage of Gross National (or more probably Domestic) Product taken by the defence budget, together with the absolute size of the armed forces, possibly including reserves, or possibly not. These are two of the ways of measuring a nation’s defence effort, although not necessarily the most illuminating ones. Logically, therefore, civilian control is enhanced by reducing defence budgets and manpower levels, and indeed SSR theorists have generally drawn this conclusion, and acted upon it.[5]

There is room for a good comparative study of military interventions in politics all over the world on civil-military relations. First, there is the question of why theorizing about military intervention today do not know the problem correctly. Then there is the question of theory constructed correctly and testable risk of military intervention will actually look like.

Seemed relatively small position in the 1950s and 1960s, and produced an appropriate model of simplistic military intervention, as recounted above. But at the end of the Cold War, military regimes began to disappear rapidly, not only in Latin America, but also in Africa, and there were a few coups to replace them. So what happened? The confirmed civilian control victorious everywhere? The army had undergone an evolution the collective political mysterious? It soon became clear that the military regimes in the post came in all shapes and sizes and there are a few features in common with each other. In many cases, brutally cut budgets and manpower, but scientists have found that there is a relationship between military and civilian regimes new unsuspected complexity, and that "control" was understood more slippery than it looks in the past. The old model of motor power and influence clearly do not apply any more, if ever. Even in a relatively homogeneous area of Latin America, it was not clear whether he had been strengthened civilian "control" or reduced, or even if it means the concept so much. As J Samuel Fitch noted, all this uncertainty was troubling in a field that aspires to be treated as a serious social science. The lack of even minimal consensus on seemingly basic questions undermines our authority as scholars to speak on policy issues that are crucial.[6]

Must be much larger than the size of expertise and comparative analysis available now enables us to build a theory of military intervention that is more subtle and useful than those previously described. But before plunging in to this task, and we may pause and reflect, if any, the general theory of military intervention is indeed necessary. Current thesis, slightly beaten by experience, but still surprisingly strong, holds that military institutions

appetite for power is that this civil-military relations in any country consists mostly of minimizing and controlling the power of the military. But this holds true, but in all cases of military intervention similar. If this is not true, the problem does not exist in reality. The proposal is that the evidence – or rather the lack of it – specifically shows that it does not exist.

In a sense, this is the obvious conclusion is terribly useful. It is not possible to say whether some of the texts of the book known CMR actually believed that their theories were global or not, but in any case such claims would be impossible to prove or to clarify the truth even interesting. What might be called the theory of strong CMR – all armies everywhere seeking power in the same way – to be left to one side as intellectual curiosity. It is similar to Aristotle's theories in physics, which were intellectually dominant for a very long time but is not in fact true. It is still possible to admire Aristotle's writing, but if we tried to build an aircraft based on its principles, it will not leave the runway.

In practice, most writers on CMR and SSR (including, very likely, and some authors cited only) and it seems that the belief is what can be described as theory of weak CMR. This has been anywhere placed correctly, but involves the belief that military intervention in the politics of one kind or another, though not universally. Although the affected properties of historical and cultural, is common enough to be a problem. (In fact, if you are not seen as a problem, and will “ control” of the army not be such a common feature of the various writings). This is at least a coherent position, and moreover it is one that can be tested. One of the logical consequences is that communities need to protect against the possibility of a kind of institutional intervention

by the army to seize power a body corporate. Although the theory of this kind more temporary it is not easy to refute, we can look to see if the examples of the power of institutional Search common in modern history. The easiest way is to look at some well-known cases of military intervention in politics to see if they can find examples to support this version even double the risk theory.

What is indisputable that there are many examples of seizures of power by the army, or at least individual officers, as well as cases where the army clashed with the civilian politicians (elected or not) or where she tried to undue influence. Question, again, is whether any importance to give mass to these events, and whether there are any general conclusions that can be drawn, and now that there are decades of experience in the analysis.

How similar, in fact, are in these episodes, which is supposed to “ military” to “ take power”? Let’s start with two events in 1958 that was most enthusiastic in the world, and access to power in France and Pakistan of General de Gaulle and Ayub Khan respectively.

The first to look at, it is useful to consider the historical background, which is very rarely done. This history - which extends back to the establishment of the Third Republic in 1870 - is of interest precisely because it is not compatible with the concept of kinetic measurement influence military, but suggests instead that power relations are more subtle and many of the side, and this is something similar to energy analysis discussed above is actually more convenient. .

On the face of it, the Third Republic wonderful example of the theory CMR in practice. I've had a strong parliamentary system, where he was weak executive, and president (although the commander of the armed forces) is political entity. Was to take all the important decisions in parliament. Moreover, he was the Minister of Defense civilians for the entire period, and the Ministry for the operation headed by a civilian Secretary-General. Financial controls on civilians and making important political decisions. Not career military officers even allowed to vote in the elections.

After 1940, this political system disintegrated within a few days, to be replaced by authoritarian state headed by retired Marshal. Fourth Republic, succeeding overthrown in a military coup in 1958. So it was what went wrong? And civilian control was less comprehensive than it looks? Army conducted the accompanying political attack? Interpretation, of course, is more complicated than that, and involves the structural weaknesses in the French political system itself. First, because the system was one parliamentary hyper, and was often referred Cabinet that "the Executive Committee" in parliament, could stop any institution did not like the initiative. Means the difficulty of building sectarian governments at a time can be brought down at any moment, and often for reasons of short-term political gain. Ministers therefore had little time to master their memoirs - a year in office was a good start. However, hating to take controversial decisions of Parliament, and often voted "full powers" to the government to make those decisions is Sarah herself. In turn, governments often rather than resign.

And any form of long-term planning or strategic analysis impossible. The system could not cope with the crisis, or the need to manage complex issues, such as relations with Germany in the 1930s. Not have been possible a coherent policy when governments changed frequently, and Parliament became essentially negative force, and to prevent any serious decisions. (It never officially declared war on Germany in 1939, for example).

As a result, the system collapsed hopeless in the eyes of voters. Was widespread in politics, i