

**Program
Participants
Summaries**

PROGRAM

Opening Session

- 9:30– 9:35 Opening Remarks
Toshio Saito (President, NIDS)
- 9:35– 9:40 Welcoming Remarks
Akira Sato (Vice Minister of Defense)
- 9:40– 9:45 Chairman’s Remarks
Junichiro Shoji (Director, Center for Military History [CMH], NIDS)

Keynote Address

- 9:45– 10:25 “How do Wars End?: The Problem of Victory and Defeat”
Hew Strachan (Professor, University of St. Andrews)

10:25– 10:40 Break

Session 1: World Wars

- 10:40– 11:05 “War Termination in Historical Perspective: Imperial Germany 1918”
Holger H. Herwig (Professor Emeritus, University of Calgary)
- 11:05– 11:30 “Ending the Asia-Pacific War: New Dimensions”
Richard B. Frank (Head, Board of Presidential Councilors of the U.S.
National World War II Museum)
- 11:30– 11:55 “The Japanese Termination of War in WW II: The Significance and
Causal Factors of ‘The End of War’”
Junichiro Shoji (Director, CMH, NIDS)

11:55– 13:30 Lunch

Session 2: Regional Wars/Conflicts

- 13:30– 13:55 “Politico-Military Strategy for Ending the First Sino-Japanese and
Russo-Japanese Wars”
Ryuji Hirano (Commander, JMSDF, National Security Policy
Division, CMH, NIDS)
- 13:55– 14:20 “India’s Wars: The Indo-Pakistani Wars and the India-China
Border Conflict”
Takenori Horimoto (Visiting Professor, The Open University of Japan)
- 14:20– 14:45 “Termination of War: The Cambodian Conflict (1978-1991)”
Ang Cheng Guan (Associate Professor, Nanyang Technological University)

14:45– 15:00 Break

Session 3: Theories on and Factors of the Termination of War

- 15:00–15:25 “Theoretical Perspectives on the Problem of Ending Wars”
Christopher Tuck (Senior Lecturer, King’s College London,
University of London)
- 15:25–15:50 “Living with the Problem: Managing Interminable War”
Brian P. Farrell (Professor, National University of Singapore)
- 15:50–16:15 “Intelligence Organizations and the Termination of World War Two”
Ken Kotani (Senior Research Fellow, International Conflict Division,
CMH, NIDS)
- 16:15–16:30 Break

Closing Session

- 16:30–17:30 Discussion and Q&A
- 17:30–17:35 Closing Remarks
Hirofumi Onishi (Vice President, NIDS)

PARTICIPANTS

Chairman

Junichiro Shoji

Director, Center for Military History (CMH), NIDS
M.A., University of Tsukuba

Taishoki Nippon no Amerika Ninshiki (Japanese Perception of the United States in the Taisho Era) (Keiogijuku Daigaku Shuppankai, 2001); *Nichibei Senryaku Shisoshi: Nichibei-kankei no Atarashii Shiten* (History of American and Japanese Strategic Thought) (Sairyusha, 2005); *Rekishu to Wakai* (History and Reconciliation) (co-authored; Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 2011).

Keynote Speaker

Hew Strachan

Professor, University of St. Andrews
PhD, Corpus Christi College, University of Cambridge

The First World War: Volume 1: To Arms (Oxford, 2001); *How Fighting Ends. A History of Surrender* (co-authored; Oxford University Press, 2012); *The Direction of War: Contemporary Strategy in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Speakers

Holger H. Herwig

Professor Emeritus, University of Calgary
PhD, State University of New York at Stony Brook

The First World War: Germany and Austria-Hungary 1914-1918 (Edward Arnold, 1997); *The Outbreak of World War I: Causes and Responsibilities*, 6th Ed. (Houghton-Mifflin, 1997); *Decisions for War, 1914-1917* (co-authored; Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Richard B. Frank

Head, Board of Presidential Councilors of the U.S. National World War II Museum
B.A., University of Missouri; J.D., Georgetown University Law Center

Guadalcanal: The Definitive Account of the Landmark Battle (Random House, 1990); *Downfall: The End of the Imperial Japanese Empire* (Random House, 1999); *MacArthur* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

Ryuji Hirano

Commander, JMSDF; National Security Policy Division, CMH, NIDS

PhD, Keio Gijuku University

Nisshin, Nichiro Senso ni okeru Seisaku to Senryaku – “Kaiyo Gentei Senso” to Riku-Kaigun no Kyodo (Policy and Strategy in the First Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars: “Maritime Limited War” and Army-Navy Cooperation) (Chikura Shobo, 2015); *Senryaku-shi to shite no Asia Reisen* (The Cold War in Asia as a History of Strategy) (co-authored; Keio Gijuku Daigaku Shuppankai, 2013).

Takenori Horimoto

Visiting Professor, The Open University of Japan

MA, University of Delhi

Indo: Gurohbaruka suru Kyojo (India: the globalizing giant elephant) (Iwanami Shoten, 2007); *Indo: Dai-san no Taikoku e – <Senryakuteki Jiritsu> Gaiko no Tsuikyū* (India: Evolution into the Third Great Power – Pursuit of a <Strategically Autonomous> Diplomacy) (Iwanami Shoten, 2015); *India-Japan Relations in Emerging Asia* (co-authored; Manohar, 2013).

Ang Cheng Guan

Associate Professor, Nanyang Technological University

PhD, University of London

Singapore, ASEAN and the Cambodia Conflict, 1979-1991 (NUS Press, 2013); *The Vietnam War from the Other Side: The Vietnamese Communists’ Perspective* (RoutledgeCurzon, 2002), *Ending the Vietnam War: The Vietnamese Communists’ Perspective* (RoutledgeCurzon, 2004).

Christopher Tuck

Senior Lecturer, King’s College London, University of London

PhD, Reading University

Understanding Land Warfare (Routledge, 2014); *Confrontation, Strategy and War Termination: Britain’s Conflict with Indonesia, 1963-66* (Ashgate, 2013); *Amphibious Warfare: Strategy and Tactics from Gallipoli to Iraq* (co-authored; Amber, 2014).

Brian P. Farrell

Professor, Department of History, National University of Singapore

PhD, McGill University

The Defence and Fall of Singapore 1940-1942 (Tempus Publishing Group, 2005); *The Basis and Making of British Grand Strategy 1940-1943: Was There a Plan?* (Edwin Mellen Press, 1998); *Between Two Oceans: A Military History of Singapore From First Settlement to Final British Withdrawal* (Oxford University Press, 1999).

Ken Kotani

Senior Research Fellow, International Conflict Division, CMH, NIDS

PhD, Kyoto University

Interijensu – Naze Jyoho ga Ikasarenainoka (Intelligence of the Japanese Army and Navy: Why Intelligence is Not Sufficiently Utilized) (Kodansha, 2007; translated as *Japanese Intelligence in World War II*, Osprey, 2009); *Mosado – Anyaku to Koso no Rokujuu-nenshi* (Mossad: A 60 Year History of Secret Maneuvers and Conflict) (Shinchosha, 2009); *Interijensu – Kokka Soshiki wa Jyoho wo ikani atsukau bekika* (Intelligence: How States and Organizations should Handle Intelligence) (Chikuma Shobo, 2012).

SUMMARIES

Keynote Address

How Do Wars End?: The Problem of Victory and Defeat

Hew Strachan

Current concepts of international security erode the distinction between war, the product of human agency, and other dangers, arising from natural disasters, climate change or accident. Because we have tended to generalise the concept of security, we are no longer clear where war ends and peace begins. Western armed forces have even begun to argue that the concepts of victory and defeat no longer have relevance. The US says it is engaged in a 'long war', but as its enemies remain ill-defined we can't predict when it will end. The adjective 'long' might as well be a synonym for 'perpetual'.

This does not mean that the distinction between war and peace – or between victory and defeat – has always been clear cut, not least because each exists in a dependent relationship. But blurring the differences makes it harder to understand how to end war. There is a distinction between conflict termination, i.e. ending the fighting, and conflict resolution, or removing the root causes of hostility. War is a reciprocal relationship – it depends on the clash of two (or more) sides. Its conclusion is therefore also reciprocal, depending on some form of negotiation and acceptance by both sides (even if what has to be accepted involves complete surrender or being sold into slavery). In 18th century Europe battle lost its capacity to deliver a clear outcome, but this was not obvious. Napoleon's pursuit of decisive battle and his own defeat in what seemed to be one, at Waterloo in 1815, kept alive the idea that war was ended on the battlefield. Between 1815 and 1914 the aim of strategy was to deliver a decisive battlefield success in short order, even if only a minority of wars were concluded in that way. The First World War was the culmination of this process: battle was at its heart but it did not decide in itself the end of the war.

The core of the problem was the growth of democratic industrialised states, which opened out the distinction between the decision of a field commander to accept defeat on the battlefield and the readiness of a state to negotiate a final peace settlement in order 'to terminate the conflict'. The process of negotiation became more complex, and the complexity was heightened in coalition conflict. The 20th Century's solution to this conundrum, developed in the wake of the First World War, was to pursue the idea of unconditional surrender.

In the 18th century soldiers surrendered, and because prisoners of war were given rights they had a growing incentive to do so. But in 1945 whole nations were asked to surrender. The alternative was for those peoples to rebel against their own rulers, and to show through revolution their own democratic credentials. Many believed that revolution had led Germany to seek terms in 1918, and in the Second World War the use of strategic bombing against

Germany and Japan was motivated by a similar desire to target the will of the people, not the armed forces.

After 1945 the advent of nuclear weapons made it even harder to sustain the idea of victory in war. War was robbed of its political utility, and has struggled to regain it since then, even if the end of the Cold War has diminished the salience of nuclear deterrence. But without some idea of conflict termination and of subsequent peace war becomes an end in itself. Ironically we need to reinvest war with purpose, if we are to bring its means back into some sort of harmony with its ends. From Iraq to Afghanistan, and now back to Iraq again, western powers are using war but with little idea as to how it will shape outcomes.

Session 1

War Termination in Historical Perspective: Imperial Germany 1918

Holger H. Herwig

From the period of the Warring States in ancient China and the Peloponnesian War in ancient Greece, war termination has been an elusive issue, one that has greatly intrigued both combatants and historians. Sun Tzu compared war termination, like the deployment of an army, to the snake of Mt. Ch'ang. "If you strike its head the tail will respond; if you strike its tail the head will respond. If you strike the middle [of the body] both the head and the tail will react." Thucydides warned readers of the failure of the Athenians to terminate the Greek civil war after their victory at Pylos, to keep a clear head, and to remember that war "far from staying within the limit to which a combatant may wish to confine it, will run the course that its chances prescribe."

So it was with Imperial Germany in the First World War. War develops its own dynamic. It tends toward escalation. It arouses the passions of the people. It has to be justified to a suffering public. In Imperial Germany, war aims became the bread and circuses to maintain domestic stability. The suffering would be rendered bearable by vast territorial expansion. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with the Bolsheviks in March 1918 showed the way. For the vast majority of Germans, a "peace with victory" was the only justifiable form of war termination. Only its dimensions, not its reality, were open to discussion.

To be sure, there were formal and informal attempts at *peace making* from the spring of 1916 until the fall of 1917--on the part of President Woodrow Wilson, Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg, the Reichstag, Kaiser Karl I of Austria-Hungary, Pope Benedict XV--but they all foundered on the rock of perceived national interest and security. And who would terminate the war? Constitutionally, that could only be done in Germany by the reigning monarch. Neither the Parliament nor the Army had the power to do so. And the monarch, Wilhelm II, was determined to fight the Great War to a victorious end. When that glorious end failed to come after General Erich Ludendorff's vaunted "Michael" offensive in the spring of 1918, there was no fall-back position. The armies had been defeated in the field. Somewhere between 200,000 and 1 million soldiers had "deserted." Only 1 of 50 senior field commanders was willing to fight on for King and Country. The heavy ships of the High Sea Fleet raised the red banner of revolution rather than take part in a "death ride" against the British Grand Fleet. The Kaiser declined suggestions that he seek an "honorable" death at the head of a regiment at the front or in the planned "death ride" into the North Sea.

On 1 October 1918 General Ludendorff instructed the government of Prince Max of Baden, "Prosecution of the war was senseless." President Wilson in his third peace note of 23 October spelled out war termination for "the military masters and the monarchical autocrats of Germany" in a single word: "Surrender." War termination by capitulation. As a parting shot, Ludendorff maliciously requested the Kaiser to leave war termination to Liberals and Social

Democrats. *“They can now clean up the mess for which they are responsible.”* Therewith he laid the foundations for the infamous “stab in the back” that was to dog the Weimar Republic for the rest of its existence. And whose benefactor was to be a lance corporal of the Great War, Adolf Hitler.

Session 1

Ending the Asia-Pacific War: New Dimensions

Richard B. Frank

Within the vast topic of the end of the Asia Pacific War, this article focuses on two new or neglected areas. The first is the radical changes in American perceptions of the prospects for Operation Olympic, the planned initial invasion of Japan set for November 1, 1945. Radio intelligence disclosed the enormous Japanese defensive build-up on Kyushu. This occasioned a fundamental reassessment at the highest American command levels on the viability of Olympic. Second, just as a reappraisal of the invasion strategy unfolded, a new strategic bombing directive was issued on August 11, 1945. The interplay of this directive with the Japanese food and transportation situation opened the prospect of a calamity for the Japanese population exceeding that of any other U.S. proposed military action. Finally, this article argues that the end of the war involved two distinct steps: 1) a legitimate Japanese authority had to make the political decision that Japan would capitulate; and 2) Japan's armed forces had to agree to end the fighting. Determining what brought about both of these steps requires examination of a number of factors that include not only Soviet intervention and atomic bombing, but also the effects of the ongoing American campaign of blockade and bombardment on the domestic situation in Japan.

Session 1

The Japanese Termination of War in WW II: The Significance and Causal Factors of ‘The End of War’

Junichiro Shoji

In World War II, the principle of unconditional surrender declared in January 1943 at the Casablanca Conference made the termination of the war more difficult. In fact, Germany kept on fighting until the fall of Berlin, and had to surrender unconditionally. In contrast, Japan laid down its arms by accepting the Potsdam Declaration before decisive fighting on the Home Islands began.

Previous studies in Japan mainly focused on the analysis of the causes that delayed its political surrender even when Japan was clearly militarily defeated. In order to address the question of why Japan followed a course quite different from Germany’s toward the termination of the war, this paper shall analyze the background and factors that brought about Japan’s surrender.

First of all, I would like to focus on Japan’s political system and how it affected Japan’s conduct of war. In the last stage of the war, the Supreme Council for the Direction of the War limited Japan’s war objective to the “preservation of the national polity.” However, the members could not reach an agreement to accept the Potsdam Declaration. The war was terminated only after the Emperor indicated his desire to do so twice to the Supreme Council. In comparison, in Germany, the ideology of Naziism along with its political system (a dictatorship) led Hitler to reject capitulation and to adopt a scorched earth policy.

Second, I focus on the underlying “relationship of trust” that existed between Japan and the U.S. even when they were wartime adversaries. This relationship was enabled by the existence of “moderates” of both countries. In Japan, from an early stage, the so-called “Pro-Anglo-American” group and others sought to realize peace between Japan and the U.S. As for the Americans, “pro-Japanese” persons, such as Joseph Grew, played a significant role which was later on referred to as “good fortune in the midst of defeat” (Makoto Iokibe). These persons and groups on both sides devoted themselves to bringing a swift end to the war. As a result, the Japanese leaders came to recognize that the “preservation of national polity” would be ensured. According to Paul Keatskemeti, “The loser may decide to quit because he feels that his core values will not suffer.” This applies to Japan’s decision to surrender.

Third, I consider the military factor, or the contrasting military perception between the U.S. and Japan regarding a “Battle of the Japanese Home Islands.” Exhortations calling for the “Honorable Death by 100 Million” were widely made in order to motivate the Japanese people and military for the defense of the Home Islands. However, the poor combat readiness of Japan’s military, along with the shock of the atomic bombings and the Soviet invasion of Manchuria greatly affected the process of war termination.

On the other hand, the severity and cost of the battles for Iwo Jima and Okinawa led

the U.S. to reconsider its demand for Japan's unconditional surrender out of concern about the military cost which would be incurred if they invaded the Japanese home islands. In other words, the defensive advantages held by Japan by dint of its being an island nation, the availability of substantial ground forces to defend the home islands, and the strong will to resist were all perceived as major dangers by the U.S., in contrast to the situation in Nazi Germany in its final stages. The Japanese thus "did achieve some political objectives. Its defeat achieved a victory of a kind." (John Ferris).

If a decisive battles for the home islands had been fought, the human loss on both sides would have been enormous. Moreover, Japan's urban areas and countryside would have been devastated, and Japan would likely have been put under direct foreign rule and would conceivably have been partitioned similar to Germany. This is perhaps the reason why postwar Germany calls the termination of its war "liberation (from Nazism)" or "defeat (collapse)," while the Japanese refer to the end of their war as the "end of war" or "defeat in war."

Session 2

Politico-Military Strategy for Ending the First Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars

Ryuji Hirano

Both the First Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars ended in Japan's victory. In both cases, however, Japan had not thought out their termination from the time that hostilities were opened. Although both wars were fought before the age of total war, the question of how the Japanese were able to terminate both while still victorious remains an interesting question, especially since this is in contrast to Japan's wars in the Showa Era. This issue has not been fully discussed, since studies on the termination of war are relatively few in comparison with a large amount of research done on the causes of wars. This paper examines the issue in the light of politico-military strategies aimed at war termination.

The process leading to peace in the First Sino-Japanese War progressed through a number of steps. First, Prime Minister Hirobumi Ito suppressed the Imperial General Headquarter's policy of seeking a further escalation of the war with his "Strategy for the Attacking of Weihaiwei and Occupation of Taiwan." Next, the cease-fire treaty signed with the support of Army Minister Aritomo Yamagata prevented intervention by the world powers and promoted peace. Finally, the transit through the Kanmon Straits by the forces which were scheduled to fight the decisive land battle at Zhili prompted Li Hung Chang, plenipotentiary representative of the Qing dynasty, to make a decision for peace.

On the other hand, the process towards peace in the Russo-Japanese War progressed through the following steps. First, escalation of the war was prevented by checking the northward advance by the Manchuria Army and concentrating offensives on Port Arthur. Second, the cabinet maintained the policy of fighting a limited war and seeking an early peace by adopting the policy of "converging military-diplomatic efforts during the Russo-Japanese War." Third, the Japanese won the Battle of Tsushima.

The First Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars thus respectively followed these steps towards peace. Despite dissimilarities in scale, international frameworks, and postures toward peace negotiation, the two wars shared some critical aspects. First, both wars were conducted as limited wars by controlling policies which would have escalated them. The stances taken regarding a possible attack on Beijing, capital of Qing, and on Harbin, command center of the Far East Russian Army, were similar. In other words, both wars ultimately ended without a Japanese offensive against those targets.

Second, more emphasis was placed on the seizure of strategic strongpoints rather than the destruction of enemy forces. In particular, the seizure of Pyongyang was a key or turning point in both wars to the development of the military situation in Japan's favor, and the capture of Port Arthur advanced Japan's political strategy aimed at the termination of the war. Furthermore, the seizure of geographic points isolated by the sea – the Penghu Islands in the

First Sino-Japanese War, and Sakhalin in the Russo-Japanese War – had an effective impact during the peace negotiations of each war.

Third, Japan had to transport substantial ground forces over the open seas. This meant that the results of naval battles and the ability to control the sea would have considerable significance. In the end, the capitulation of the Beiyang Fleet following the attack on Weihaiwei, and the complete destruction of the enemy fleet by the overwhelming victory in the Battle of Tsushima led to peace. However, the Japanese initially did not feel that absolute control of the sea was required. The chief objective was to ensure the maintenance of the sea line of communication to ground forces on the continent. In fact, the Battle of Tsushima was fought in this context, as part of that effort.

Although both Wars differed in many respects, they had in common critical aspects of their politico-military strategies aimed at war termination. Above all, it should be noted that both wars were “maritime limited wars,” in other words, limited wars which were fought with the seas as a medium. This is the major factor that enabled Japan to terminate both wars victoriously in a relatively short period of time.

Session 2

India's Wars: The Indo-Pakistani Wars and the India-China Border Conflict

Takenori Horimoto

I. India's Wars

Since India gained its independence in 1947, it has repeatedly waged war to the present against Pakistan (Indo-Pakistani Wars) and China (the India-China War). All of these wars were caused by territorial disputes.

1. Indo-Pakistani Wars

Three Indo-Pakistani Wars have been fought. The first war broke out in 1947 after British India was partitioned and India and Pakistan gained their independence. The second Indo-Pakistani War was fought in 1965, and a third (alias "Bangladesh Independence War") was fought in 1971. The wars were terminated, respectively, by U.N. resolution, Soviet intervention which resulted in the Tashkent Declaration, and Pakistan's defeat.

The Kashmir dispute, which has been the greatest issue in Indo-Pakistani relations, was deeply intertwined with each of the three wars, and the handling of that dispute was at the heart of the efforts to terminate each of the wars. The outbreak of the Kargil War (in the Kashmir region) in 1999 clearly demonstrates the extent to which the Kashmir issue is deeply intertwined with the Indo-Pakistani Wars. (The Kargil War ended with India holding a predominant position.)

2. Sino-Indian War

India also fought the India-China War. The conflict was caused by a dispute over Arunachal Pradesh state (located in northeast India), and fought from October 20 to November 21, 1962. It ended with the withdrawal of the victorious Chinese.

II. Indian Diplomacy and the Breakout and Termination of Wars

Indian foreign policy has been implemented at three levels: global, regional (Asia) and sub-regional (South Asia). Although India's wars were caused by territorial disputes, the relevance of these three levels of foreign policy to the wars must be considered when they are discussed.

There is no doubt that the Indians displayed their strategic autonomy in terminating the wars. However, the motives harbored by the superpowers, in other words, their tacit international intentions, should not be overlooked. This applies to all three of the Indo-Pakistani Wars. It is also evident in the fact that the India-China War was interrelated with the "Cuban Missile Crisis," which occurred almost simultaneously. Another such example may be seen in the Kargil War, during which the United States expressed deep concern over the

possibility of a nuclear war between India and Pakistan, both of which by then were de facto nuclear weapons states.

As for any future war in which India may be involved, however, it is highly likely that its termination will be quite different from the termination of India's past wars, because both China and India have since developed into great powers.

Session 2

Termination of War: The Cambodian Conflict (1978-1991)

Ang Cheng Guan

The literature on the subject of ‘War Termination’ or how wars end has apparently received lesser attention from scholars than studies on the origins and causes of war. Every war must end, as the late Fred Charles Ikle noted and titled his famous book first published in 1971¹, and rightly so. Thus the question before us is not whether a war will end but ‘*how*’ a war will end and ‘*why*’ it ended the way it did. In short, the issue that needs to be addressed is the process in which belligerents bring war to a conclusion.

I have chosen for this symposium to examine the processes which led to the end or termination of the Cambodian conflict (1978-1991), which I think is a fascinating and challenging case-study given the multiple actors involved, directly and indirectly, and at multiple levels, as well as the long-drawn out duration of the conflict, stretching for more than a decade. A useful approach is to adopt Michael I. Handel’s suggestion that the study of war termination should take into account the three levels of analysis in international relations theory - *the international system, domestic politics and the role of individual actors*² and applying the craft of the historian, weave them all together into a coherent whole.

But before that, we need to first understand why there was a war in the first place, very briefly. Vietnam-Cambodia (Kampuchea) relations had been poor since the 1960s while Sino-Vietnamese relations had been poor since the 1970s, particularly after Ho Chi Minh’s demise. But their troubled relationships were masked by the exigencies of the Vietnam War which ended in April 1975.

Relations between China and Cambodia, on the other hand, had been good under Sihanouk. The state-to-state relation was bad during the brief tenure of Lon Nol (who ousted Sihanouk in March 1970, which drove Sihanouk into the arms of Pol Pot). Sihanouk and Pol Pot maintained good relations with the Chinese leadership. In that sense, there was continuity in China-Cambodia ties. Personality played a big part in Sino-Vietnamese relations as well. It is well-known that Le Duan who succeeded Ho Chi Minh was not close to the Chinese. The war that began in December 1978-January 1979 was therefore the culmination of years of sweeping differences under the carpet. That said, poor relations did not mean that they needed to go to war with each other. War was not inevitable.

While the Vietnamese might have jettisoned the idea of an Indochina Federation, they retained a neo-colonialist attitude/disposition towards Cambodia which irked the Khmer Rouge leadership who were very sensitive of their sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Khmer Rouge after taking over power in 1975 in Kampuchea provoked a series of border

¹ Fred Charles Ikle, *Every War Must End* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971).

² Michael Handel, “The Study of War Termination” in *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Volume 1, Number 1, May 1978.

conflicts and subsequently broke off diplomatic relations with Vietnam in December 1977 which eventually spiralled into an all-out war with the Vietnamese. The decision to invade was taken in incremental steps.

As mentioned earlier, the termination of, in this case, the Cambodia conflict, required the alignment of three complex sets of interacting factors - the international system, domestic politics and the role of individual actors. The paper will discuss each of these factors in turn before describing how the three sets of factors came together to bring about the endgame in 1991.

Session 3

Theoretical Perspectives on the Problem of Ending Wars

Christopher Tuck

This paper examines the key theories that explain why it is that wars often appear to be so difficult to end. Surveying the literature on the problems of war termination, this paper structures the issues by examining the topic according to five key questions.

The first theory concerns the question ‘who will win’? Logically, wars should end when both sides agree that it should, a circumstance that arises when belligerents agree on the likely outcome of the war: that one or other of the sides will win, or that neither side can win and that both sides are locked in stalemate. As this paper demonstrates, however, difficulties in assessing such factors as progress in war, relative power, or future outcomes make such calculations problematic.

A second relevant question is ‘is there a peace to make?’ Ending a war requires that belligerents can define a political settlement acceptable to both sides. However, as this paper shows, history demonstrates that, even where a belligerent might recognise that it is not winning, it might not wish to end a war if such factors as deeply held enemy-images, or value-laden goals make it impossible to compromise politically.

The third question is ‘what will peace cost? Even if a belligerent has concluded that it cannot win a war, it may still persevere if it believes that the costs of peace may be even higher than continuing to fight. This paper concludes that these costs may be internal and external. The former include such factors as the fear on the part of individuals or regimes that peace will destroy them politically; the latter includes such factors as concerns for international credibility.

The fourth question is ‘can the war be stopped?’ As this paper illustrates, even where leaders might conclude that ending a war is necessary, pressures from international allies or domestic political actors may force leaders to persevere with war.

Finally, this paper will consider the question ‘how do we know when a war has ended’? History is littered with examples of wars that apparently have ended, but which then begin again at a later date. Here, the problem is that the termination of armed conflict (that is, an end to armed violence) has not been accompanied by conflict resolution (an agreement that deals with the underlying causes that prompted armed conflict in the first place). The Arab-Israeli dispute provides a good example of this phenomenon – to an extent, it is possible to treat all of the individual wars between Israel and its adversaries as one single conflict in which key points of political contention have remained unresolved. As this paper shows, conflict termination without conflict resolution is likely to provide only a pause in violence, not an end to it. To put this another way, wars can appear to end without actually ending.

In the end, this paper demonstrates that there are deep-seated structural reasons as to why wars are difficult to end and that, indeed, wars generally are much easier to start than they are to conclude.

Session 3

Living with the Problem: Managing Interminable War

Brian P. Farrell

Dr. Christopher Tuck poses five pertinent questions in his examination of theoretical perspectives on the problem of ending wars. Two bear directly on a particular type of conflict, wars that by their very nature defied termination. ‘Is there a peace to make’ and ‘how do we know when a war has ended’ capture the essence of the type of conflict that defied termination to grind on and on, in recurring bouts of violence. Such confrontations did much to shape the stories of an older world defined by a different type of state: the territorial empire. Imperial states sought both to manage diversity and define their domain, in various ways. Many experienced chronic problems literally at their margins, trying to define and manage frontiers and the relationships that permeated them. The most dramatic example of such an imperial dilemma was the protracted Chinese effort to manage a northwest frontier, symbolized of course by the Great Wall. But there is a more pertinent episode, one that resonates more directly in our own time and on which light can be shed by applying Dr. Tuck’s two questions: British India and its own Northwest Frontier.

In 1846 Sir Henry Lawrence established a Frontier Brigade, to consolidate British gains from the victory of the East India Company Army over the Kingdom of the Sikhs. A second Anglo-Sikh War soon followed, resulting in British annexation of the rich province of the Punjab. A full century later, in 1947, Partition and the termination of the British Raj left the modern state of Pakistan with the problem of managing the ‘Northwest Frontier’ established by this 19th century imperialism. Frontier Force regiments maintain the military traditions of empire in the modern Pakistan Army, and much of the ‘Northwest Frontier’ remains designated ‘Federally Administered Tribal Areas,’ marred by near constant military conflict. During that imperial century, the British Raj, having supplanted the obsolete East India Company, never either ‘resolved’ the problem of the Northwest Frontier or ‘terminated’ the recurring military conflicts that punctuated the region. Why not—and so what?

The Northwest Frontier and its wars became a way of life for British Indian soldiers, from 1839 right up to final withdrawal in 1947. Rarely a year went by without any clash between British Indian Army forces or irregular levies on the one hand and Pathan ‘tribesmen’ native to the region on the other. Open wars between British India and Afghanistan only punctuated the low intensity asymmetrical warfare that defined the great mountainous regions between Kabul and the Indus River valley, oriented around the Khyber Pass. The so-called ‘Great Game,’ the rivalry between the British and Russian Empires for paramountcy in Central and Southwest Asia, provided another important dynamic. But the core problem was nicely captured by Dr. Tuck’s first question: was there a ‘peace’ to make? And did that concept even fit this situation? Why did these Pathan peoples practice with such violent determination ‘the art of not being governed?’

Using Dr. Tuck's two questions, this paper will analyze why British India could never terminate military conflict on its Northwest Frontier, and what this can tell us about managing conflicts that defied termination. Paying particular attention to the period from the Second Afghan War of 1878 to the Anglo-Russian Entente of 1907, it will explore the gulf between conflict termination and resolution by more closely examining statecraft, grand strategy, and the use of military force.

Session 3

Intelligence Organizations and the Termination of World War Two

Ken Kotani

Upon the 70th anniversary of the termination of World War Two, this report shall investigate the interrelation between intelligence and the termination of war. It is well known that policymakers and military leaders require various types of intelligence when deciding upon whether to launch a war, in order to carefully consider and compare the benefits versus the costs of resorting to war. As Gordon Craig and others have argued, national leaders tend to focus their attention on how to start and win wars, rather than on how to terminate them.

The role of intelligence becomes less clear, however, during the process of war termination. Decisions by wartime leaders are crucial for the termination of any war. The roles played by intelligence in such decisions, however, are unclear. If wartime leaders always made rational decisions, they would always explore the means for surrender once the possibility of victory had vanished. In reality, however, such a rational decision to think about surrendering almost never happens. In other words, the role of intelligence during the process of war termination differs from war to war. This is because intelligence is one of the many intertwining factors that are considered by wartime leaders when they decide to terminate a war, which makes it extremely difficult to isolate the role of intelligence during the process of war termination.

On the other hand, the view from the perspective of intelligence organizations provides a different picture. Furthermore, this picture differs between the intelligence organizations of the victors and losers. Intelligence organizations on the losing side tend to conceal their wartime intelligence activities, because they will inevitably be saddled with the responsibility for losing the war if these activities come to light. In the case of the termination of World War Two, Reinhard Gehlen and other German Army intelligence officers buried their documents in the European Alps before scattering themselves to avoid capture as a group. When Japanese intelligence officers became certain that the Pacific War would end, they burned their documents, and thereafter sealed their lips regarding their wartime activities.

Intelligence organizations on the winning side face their own postwar problems. Not only will they have less of an opportunity for action, but they will usually also have to slim down their organizations, which tend to expand during wartime. Such intelligence organizations therefore tend to start taking action aimed at organizational self-preservation. During the termination of World War Two, the British and American organizations involved in intercepting signals were probably the most concerned about organizational self-preservation after the war. Even the British Government Code and Cypher School (GC&CS), which Prime Minister Winston Churchill once referred to as “the goose that lays the golden egg,” had to steel itself against the likelihood of extensive postwar reductions to its organization.

The most realistic method for the victors’ intelligence organizations to avoid postwar

reductions is to identify a new threat. After the termination of World War Two, British and American intelligence organizations were lucky because the threat from the Soviet Union was already becoming evident. British and American intelligence organizations prepared for the emerging contest with the Soviet Union by signing the UKUSA Agreement in March 1946. The institution defined by this agreement survived for a long time not only because it was required for the long contest with the Soviet Union, but also because it served the desires of British and American intelligence organizations for self-preservation.

