



Institute for Political Studies of Defense and
Military History, Ministry of National Defense, Romania

Institute for Military History and War Studies
Royal Danish Defence College



THE USE OF MILITARY FORCES IN DOMESTIC AFFAIRS: LESSONS FROM THE PAST, CURRENT ISSUES AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS



Proceedings of the 17th Annual Conference of the Partnership for Peace Consortium
Euro-Atlantic Conflict Studies Working Group
Bucharest, Romania, 29 May – 2 June, 2017



military publishing house

**THE USE OF MILITARY FORCES
IN DOMESTIC AFFAIRS:
LESSONS FROM THE PAST, CURRENT ISSUES AND
FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS**

**Partnership for Peace Consortium
of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes**



**The Institute for Political Studies
of Defense and Military History**
Ministry of National Defense of Romania



**The Institute for Military History
and War Studies**
Royal Danish Defence College

**THE USE OF MILITARY FORCES
IN DOMESTIC AFFAIRS:
LESSONS FROM THE PAST, CURRENT ISSUES
AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS**

Proceedings of the 17th Annual Conference of the
Euro-Atlantic Conflict Studies Working Group
Bucharest, Romania
29 May–2 June, 2017

Edited by
Dr. Carmen Sorina Rîjnoveanu
Jakob Brink Rasmussen



MILITARY PUBLISHING HOUSE
BUCHAREST, 2018

Cover design: Adrian Pandea

Layout: Marius Iorgulescu

Scientific Committee:

Dr. Jan Hoffenaar (Netherlands)

Prof. Dr. Jordan Baev (Bulgaria)

Dr. Harold E. Raugh Jr. (USA)

Dr. Almos Peter Kiss (Hungary)

Dr. Robert S. Rush (SUA)

LTC Dr. Miljan Milkic (Serbia)

English Proofreading:

Michael Anthony Jennings

Published by:

Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History

Constantin Mille 6, sector 1

101142 Bucharest

e-mail: ipsdmh@yahoo.com

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României

The use of military forces in domestic affairs : lessons from the past, current issues and future developments : conference proceedings of the 17th Annual Conference of the Euro-Atlantic Conflict Studies Working Group of the PfP Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes. - București : Editura Militară, 2018
ISBN 978-973-32-1114-3

I. Annual Conference of the Euro-Atlantic Conflict Studies Working Group of the PfP Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes (2017 ; București)

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	7
Address by <i>Mr. Mircea Duşa</i> , State Secretary for Defense Policy, Planning and International Relations, Ministry of National Defense, Romania	11
Welcome by <i>Rear Admiral Nils Wang</i> , Commandant of Royal Danish Defence College	13
Welcome by <i>Major General (r) Dr. Mihail E. Ionescu</i> , Director of the Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History, Romania.....	15
 SECTION ONE: Hybrid War, Separation and Counterinsurgency. New Bottles for Old Wine or New Wine in Old Bottles?	17
<i>Daniela Şişcanu and Manuel Stănescu</i> . Soviet Attempts at Hybrid War against Romania in 1924	19
<i>Sadi Saleh Sadiyev, Daniel H. Mccauley, and Khayal Iskandarov</i> . Hybrid Warfare and Demographic Shift.....	32
 SECTION TWO: The Role of Armed Forces and New Tasks in Domestic Affairs	39
<i>Morgane Barey</i> . A New Aim for a New Army: The Armistice Army and French Domestic Security	41
<i>Matej Medvecký</i> . Civil Defense in Slovakia during the Normalization Period	48
<i>Niels Bo Poulsen</i> . A Defense Force for Domestic Consumption? The Danish Armed Forces in Greenland	58
<i>Lana Mamphoria</i> . Redefining the Role of Armed Forces in Domestic Affairs: The Case of Georgia.....	69
 SECTION THREE: Armed Forces in Civil Wars and Internal Conflicts. Old Roles – New Paradigms	81
<i>John W. Hall</i> . Vicissitudes of Race and Virtue in the Borderlands of Jacksonian America: The U.S. Army and the Removal of the Southeastern Indians.....	83
<i>Orit Miller-Katav</i> . The Six Day War and the Establishment of a Military Government in the Occupied Territories	93
<i>Damijan Guštin and Vladimir Prebilič</i> . To Step into the Arena or Not: Military Intervention in the Yugoslav Crisis (1981-1991).....	107

SECTION FOUR: The Military in Internal Disturbances. Legal Issues and National Experiences	121
<i>Mihály Krámlí. The „Monitor Mutiny” in Hungary in 1919</i>	123
<i>Miljan Milkić and Dalibor Denda. Yugoslav Army Engagement with Livestock Disease Control Regulations in the Julian Region 1946-1954</i>	133
<i>Carmen Sorina Rîjnoveanu. The Role of the Romanian Armed Forces in Domestic Affairs: 1907-1944</i>	143
 SECTION FIVE: The Role of the Armed Forces: Redefining “Enemies” and Reshaping Military Tasks	157
<i>Peter A. Kiss and Stefan Maximilian Brenner. Are We Winning or Losing? Assessing Success and Failure in Internal Conflicts</i>	159
<i>Zisis Fotakis. Restoring Normalcy in Greece in the Latter 1940s: The Role of the Hellenic Navy</i>	175
<i>Herman Roozenbeek. Military Aid to the Civil Authorities in The Netherlands</i>	183
 SECTION SIX: Internal Threats And Risks And Ways Of Countering	197
<i>Octavian Țicu. Societal Security and State-Building in the Republic of Moldova: Regional and European Complications</i>	193
<i>Jordan Baev and Plamen Dimitrov. Migration Flows and Border Control in Cold War and post-Cold War Bulgaria: A Comparative Historical Overview</i>	210
 <i>Appendix A. Contributors</i>	221
<i>Appendix B. Abstracts</i>	229
<i>Appendix C. Conference program</i>	237
<i>Appendix D. List of Participants</i>	243
<i>Appendix E. Euro-Atlantic Conflict Studies Working Group Overview</i>	249
<i>Appendix F. CSWG Events Summary by Dr. Robert S. Rush</i>	269
 INDEX	307

FOREWORD

This volume includes the proceedings of the 17th annual conference of the Conflict Studies Working Group of the PfP Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes. The topic of the conference was: “The use of armed forces in domestic affairs: Lessons of history, current issues and future developments”. The event was jointly organized by the Institute for Military History and War Studies- Royal Danish Defence College and the Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History- Ministry of National Defense of Romania and took place between 29 May and 2 June 2017 in Bucharest, Romania.

The use of the military in domestic sphere has a long history. The role and missions of the military forces have undergone transformative changes in the last two centuries. Traditionally associated with their capacity to provide territorial security and defense, the military forces have been called to assume larger responsibilities in the realm of internal security. For much of the 20th century, the military forces were the only reliable force having the capacity to maintain internal security, public order and respond to various challenges to the authority of the state.

The 21st century brought about new challenges with the rise of non-state actors, high technology penetration, the rise of cyber networks, the increasing use of hybrid technics, etc. After a period characterized by expeditionary warfare and international missions, which dominated the post-Cold War strategic thinking, recent global events seem to underscore the domestic role of military forces. Now, the battlespace is a mosaic of risks and threats that demand a broad re-assessing of the role, tasks and missions of the military forces in domestic affairs.

Obviously, this is not a fully novel situation as history can provide relevant examples of how the military forces changed their role and missions as to tackle domestic challenges. Nevertheless, the scope and urgency facing contemporary military forces today represents a break with last decades’ developments. Furthermore, this contemporary use of military forces in domestic affairs may present contemporary states operating under circumstances different from what characterized past centuries.

This collection of papers addresses historical and contemporary debates about the role and missions of the military forces seeking to provide thought-provoking

perspectives on how the military historically had to and still are to adapt to new tasks and responsibilities in accordance with the changing nature of national security needs. The studies depict the role assumed by the military from supporting nation-building and providing domestic security to providing internal stability and order and counter non-military threats and challenges. The evolution of military's role in domestic affairs, cooperation between military and civilian authorities, legal issues and national doctrine development, emerging security challenges and their impact on shaping the military conduct on the domestic front are major themes of this volume.

The book contains six sections. Each section provides both historical context and a brief look into the emerging contemporary developments that may require a broad re-assessment of the role of the military in domestic affairs.

Section I explores specific challenges associated with hybrid warfare, separation and counterinsurgency which shape and determine the military conduct in domestic affairs. The topics addressed refer to both a historical perspective by analyzing the Soviet Attempts of Hybrid War against Romania- the Year of 1924, and a more contemporary case study focused on democratic shift and the impact of hybrid warfare.

Section II investigates the way in which the military forces had to extend their responsibilities, in times of war and peace, in order to accommodate new tasks and missions to handle specific domestic situations. The case-studies focuses on the role of the French Armistice Army following the defeat of France in June 1940, the organization of the civil defense system in Slovakia after the Warsaw Pact military intervention in Czechoslovakia (August 1968), the Danish military presence in Greenland, and the changing role of the armed forces in Georgia.

Section III addresses the issue of the military's involvement in civil wars and internal conflicts showing how and under what conditions the military forces have been called upon to assume greater responsibilities in domestic affairs. The selected papers are especially relevant to explore this topic with a special focus on analyzing the case of the U.S. Army in the Borderlands of Jacksonian America, the challenges of the Israeli military administration in the occupied territories (1967-1974), and the nature of the intervention of the military in the Yugoslav crisis (1981-1991) as an example of managing an internal crisis in a multi-national state.

Section IV seeks to investigate, based on specific national experiences, the question of how the armed forces intervened to handle domestic crisis and internal disturbances. The papers included in this section address the issue of the role played by the military to suppress the counter-revolutionary mutiny in the Danube Flotilla in 1919, the involvement of the Yugoslav Army on livestock disease control regulations in the Julian Region between 1946 and 1954, as well as the typology of conduct of the Romanian military forces in domestic affairs at the beginning of the 20th century.

Section V analysis the way in which the military had to adapt its tasks and re-assess its responsibilities under specific historical conditions. The case-studies pre-

sented include the transformation of the Greek Army in late 1940s to an efficient policing force and the role of Royal Netherlands Marechaussee, more specifically the dynamic of the relations between police and the military forces in Netherlands during the 20th and 21st centuries. This section also provides a theoretical perspective on the assessment methods and evaluation metrics that can serve as reliable indicators of progress in an internal conflict.

Section VI approaches the changing role of the military forces against the backdrop of rapidly evolving security risks and challenges to domestic security. Under internal and external pressures, the military is now assigned to assume new tasks and missions that reflect both continuity and break with last century developments. The issues of migration, nation-building, and societal security are central themes addressed within this section. The main case-studies depicted focus on: societal security and state-building in Republic of Moldova and the issue of migration flows and border control in the Cold War and post-Cold War Bulgaria.

The originality of this book rests on its overall approach aiming at integrating in an articulated framework both historical experiences and contemporary perspectives. This allows a more comprehensive picture on the overall dynamic of the military engagement and its responsibilities in handling domestic crises and challenges as well as patterns of military typology of action at domestic level.

It is not the scope of this volume to produce a history of the military's involvement in domestic affairs. The main goal is to focus on selected events that are relevant for getting a better understanding of the relations between the military forces and domestic security showing how and to what extent the military can become a useful tool in coping with internal sources of vulnerability. Each of the papers presents a specific case-study that allows to identify and analyze the particular conditions and the main rationales that shape the conduct of the military forces.

This book brings together an international team of scholars and experts to develop a comprehensive approach- both historical and contemporary-on the challenging issue of the role of the military forces in domestic issues.

Another important goal is to stimulate research and debate on the complex issue of the role assumed by the military in domestic affairs and its potential development and also to open up new ways of thinking about the issue of domestic security. The publication is intended to bring a value-added to the existing military history and international relations literature, but also to serve as a useful reference work to those engaged in military-related areas of analysis or decision.

At the same time, the relevance of this book lies in its overall concept and research approach as it contains a collection of studies that draw from various national perspectives, historical experiences and security perceptions. The topics approached cover a wide area of subjects related to the issue of domestic security and military engagements that help to depict possible solutions, best practices and lessons learned that are historically and politically relevant. Based on different national/local experiences, one can explore and identify various angles of analysis regarding the use of the military forces on the domestic front that reflect both spe-

cific national imperatives as well as distinctive state behaviors, patterns of strategic culture or motivations of a state's actions. The historical case-studies included in the volume reveal a complex dynamic that shaped the role of military in the domestic affairs while the more contemporary approaches show that the changing security environment may require new ways of accommodation in terms of goals and missions to be conducted by the military forces at internal level.

Dr. Carmen Sorina Rîjnoveanu
Jakob Brink Rasmussen

YUGOSLAV ARMY ENGAGEMENT WITH LIVESTOCK DISEASE CONTROL REGULATIONS IN THE JULIAN REGION 1946-1954

Introduction

The Julian Region was the subject of a protracted territorial dispute between the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the Kingdom of Italy, and after the Second World War clarifying the status of this region became even more complex due to the interests of the great powers.¹ Yugoslav and Allied Forces entered Trieste on 1 May 1945 almost simultaneously, causing a crisis that threatened to produce an armed conflict between Yugoslav and Allied Forces. The crisis was addressed in Belgrade on 9 June 1945 when Yugoslavia signed an Agreement with the United Kingdom and the United States; and this was followed by an Agreement in Devin on 20 June between the Allied Supreme Commander in the Mediterranean and the Supreme Commander of the Yugoslav Army (Milkić, 2016: 141-160). The Julian Region was occupied and divided into Zone A, which was an area under the authority of the Anglo-American Military Administration (the British XIII Corps and the US 88th Infantry Division), and Zone B which was under the control of the Yugoslav Military Administration. When the Peace Treaty with Italy entered into force on 15 September 1947, the Free Territory of Trieste was formed as an internationally recognized state whose territorial integrity and independence was guaranteed by the United Nations Security Council („Ukaz o ratifikaciji Ugovora o miru sa Italijom“, 1947: 1001-1085). Due to the impossibility of choosing a governor for the entire area, a division was upheld between Yugoslav and Anglo-American areas until the Agreement of 5 October 1954, which resolved the Trieste crisis and divided the Free Territory of Trieste between Italy and Yugoslavia.

Article 4 of the Peace Treaty defined the border between Italy and the Free Territory of Trieste, while Article 22 dealt with the border between Yugoslavia and the Free Territory. (Milkić, 2014: 105-122). The Free Territory's area was 738 square

¹ Janko Jeri. 1961. *Tržaško vprašanje po Drugi svetovni vojni, (tri faze diplomatskega boja)*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba. Duroselle, Jean-Baptiste, 1966. *Le conflit de Trieste 1943-1954*. Bruxelles: Editions de l'Institut de sociologie de l'Université libre de Bruxelles. Bogdan C. Novak. 1970. *Trieste 1941-1954, the Ethnic, Political and Ideological Struggle*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press. Miljan Milkić. 2012. *Tršćanska kriza u vojno-političkim odnosima Jugoslavije sa velikim silama 1943-1947*. Beograd: INIS.

Miljan Milkić. 2010. *Jugoslavija, Velike sile i pitanje statusa Julijske krajine 1943-1945*. In: *Oslobodenje Beograda 1944. godine*. Beograd: INIS, 282-296. Miljan Milkić. 2008. *Jugoslovensko-italijanski odnosi i stvaranje Balkanskog pakta 1953. godine*. In: *Spoljna politika Jugoslavije 1950-1961*. Beograd: INIS, 602-616.

kilometers (Anglo-American Zone 222, Yugoslav Zone 516); the length of the land border with Yugoslavia was 84 kilometers; and the border with Italy was 4 kilometers long. The Free Territory of Trieste had 128 kilometers of coastline. According to statistics from the summer of 1946, there were 164,226 inhabitants in Zone B – of whom 39,219 were engaged in agriculture, and 6,942 in industry (Prinčič, 2007: 425-432). Agriculture was the most important branch of the economy, and the main feature of the Zone B economy was its inter-connected dependence on Yugoslavia (Dukovski, 2005: 183-199; Prinčič, 2008: 147-160; Milkić, 2010: 13-38). Apart from the development of other branches of agriculture, pig breeding was improved, licensing and selection of bulls were introduced, the noble breeds of cattle were imported, and milk control was introduced. In 1949, the number of cattle exceeded pre-state levels by 20% and milk production increased by 7%.¹ In the following year, pork exports reached 3,000 which set a new record. With the help of a well-organized veterinary service, the Yugoslav Military Administration paid great attention to the suppression of contagious livestock diseases.

There were many problems in relations between the Yugoslav and Allied Military Administrations, and these were primarily related to economic issues and the turnover of the population, which was up to 15,000 people daily (Milkić, 2014: 105-122). Economic relations between the two Zones were determined by the Devin Agreement, which regulated the jurisdiction and principles of the joint Yugoslav-Anglo-American Economic Commission. After 15 September 1947 and the Peace Treaty's entry into force, the number of border incidents on the Yugoslav-Italian border increased. At this time, there were already 12 current border disputes and 18 disputes that were resolved.² During the first year of the Free Territory of Trieste, the Yugoslav Army Military Administration recorded a total of 33 incidents on a demarcation line between the Yugoslav and Anglo-American Zones.³ The method of issuing travel permits allowing Yugoslav citizens entry to the Slovene Littoral, Trieste, Gorizia and Istria was regulated by a decision from the Ministry of Interior of 28 September 1945.⁴ Citizens who travelled to Zone A in the direction Ljubljana-Trieste obtained the declaration for entering the territory of the Allied Military Administration from the authorized officer of the Yugoslav Army Military Administration in Postojna. If travelling in the direction Rijeka-Trieste, a pass declaration was supposed to be obtained from the Yugoslav Military Administration in Opatija. The existence of the Free Territory of Trieste caused many violations of Yugoslav airspace by American and British planes flying from Austria to Italy. Freedom of movement and trade was also hindered by the occasional occurrence of cattle diseases in the Julian Region.

¹ Military Archive Belgrade, VU-1, 1368, 4, 1/2.

² Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive, 1947, box 53, No. 53/314.

³ Military Archive Belgrade, VU-1, 1368, 2, 1/88-1/90.

⁴ Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive, 1945, box 14, No. 5783.

The outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in 1946

On 5 March 1946, the British Embassy informed the Yugoslav Ministry of Foreign Affairs that Allied Military Authorities had submitted a report on the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the Julian Region.¹ According to their information, typhus (*Typhus Abdominalis*) appeared in Zone B at the same time. Given that there was no possibility of checking the state of contagious diseases in the entire territory of the Julian Region, Allied Military Authorities, for the purposes of preventive action, proposed a periodic exchange of information and periodic consultation with the appropriate Yugoslav Authorities in Zone B in order to coordinate control measures against the epidemic. The British Embassy declared that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) were cooperating in this business as well. At the end of the announcement, it was proposed that the Yugoslav government designate an official who would go to Trieste to agree with the Allied Military Authorities on the substance of the agreement that should be reached. The information on the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, as well as typhus in Zone B, was also received on 9 March by the US Embassy in Belgrade.² It was emphasized that medics of the XIII corps had no prior knowledge of the sources of these epidemics – neither location nor key indicators – so they were not in a position to organize preventive measures. The US Embassy proposed sending a Yugoslav official to Trieste for the purpose of liaising with the XIII Corps officials about occasional counselling on cooperation regarding the control of the epidemic between the Health Authorities of Zone A and Zone B, and the occasional exchange of information between the Health Authorities of the two Zones. On 9 March, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs contacted the Health Department of the Yugoslav Army General Staff and asked for an opinion on the response that should be given to the British Embassy.³ On 11 March, the Head of the Fifth Section of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, M. Cerović, submitted the text of the British declaration with proposals for suppression of the relevant epidemics to the Health Department of the Yugoslav Army General Staff and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.⁴

Since tackling these issues was within the competence of the Veterinary Department of the Ministry of National Defence, the Deputy Chief of the Health Department, Colonel Dr. Đura Mešterović, submitted the entire case to this department on 11 March.⁵ On 12 March, in a response signed by Minister Dr. Vaso Čubrilović, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry pointed out that foot-and-mouth disease is a readily transmissible infectious disease, which at that moment had not spread to the territory of Yugoslavia on the Zone B borders (in Croatia and

¹ Ibid., 1946, box 39, No. XXXIX/3.

² Ibid., No. XXXIX/8.

³ Ibid., No. XXXIX/4.

⁴ Archives of Yugoslavia, 4, Veterinary Department, 1946/1947, File No. 36, 4-36-309. Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive, 1946, box 39, No. XXXIX/11.

⁵ Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive, 1946, box 39, No XXXIX/15.

Slovenia).¹ Therefore, this Ministry emphasized the need to implement the most comprehensive veterinary and sanitary measures possible in order to prevent the spread of this infection into the Yugoslav territory. Its statement also noted the need for full cooperation between Yugoslav Veterinary Authorities and the Veterinary Authorities of Allied Military Authorities in Zone A where the infection emerged. The ensuing suggestion was that the bodies of the Yugoslav Veterinary Service should contact the Allied Military Authorities in Trieste to reach an agreement on common measures that would be taken to prevent this disease. Thus, pending the approval of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry indicated that it would appoint a veterinary expert who would travel to Trieste and do the job. Equally, the Ministry committed itself to informing, in a special letter, the Ministry of Agriculture of Croatia and Slovenia about the epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease in Zone A, in order to take the necessary measures to prevent the spread of the infection into Yugoslav territory.

On 15 March, an Act containing the text of the American statement was submitted to the Sanitary Department of the Yugoslav Army General Staff and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry by Cerović. He communicated the position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the necessity of accepting the suggestions of the US and British embassies regarding cooperation, noting it was an essential policy for the people and the economy of the Julian Region.²

On the same day, Lieutenant Colonel Dr. Rede Rudolf, the Head of the Veterinary Department, approved the position that there was a need to take the necessary measures to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.³ He stated that the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, through its Veterinary Bodies, should work with the Allied Military Authorities, and that he would issue an order to the Veterinary Bodies of the Fourth Army to cooperate in its field on this issue.⁴

Once an agreement had been reached about the necessity of cooperating with the Anglo-American Military Authorities, the competent Yugoslav ministries worked to harmonize the best forms of cooperation. On 19 March, the Deputy Head of the Political Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, O. Juranić, confirmed to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry that it was necessary to appoint a veterinary expert who would work on site in Trieste to contact Allied Military Authorities and undertake joint measures for the control of foot-and-mouth disease in the Julian Region.⁵ Juranić asked the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry for the timely appointment of a vet who would prepare for the task awaiting in Trieste. Having consulted with the Ministry of Agriculture of the National Republic of Slovenia, the Head of the Department of Veterinary Affairs of the Ministry of Agriculture

¹ Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive, box 39, No. 2615. Archives of Yugoslavia, 4, Veterinary Department, 1946/1947, File No. 36, 4-36-309.

² Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive, 1946, box 39, No 2740.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 2768.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 2768.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 2788.

and Forestry, Milutin Gec, announced on 22 March that a veterinary surgeon, Dr. Lojze Gunde, an official of the Veterinary Department of the National Republic of Slovenia Ministry of Agriculture, had been appointed to cooperate with the Allied Military Authorities.¹

Concerning the information on the typhus epidemic in Zone B submitted by Allied Military Authorities on 11 March, Colonel Dr. Mešterović informed the Veterinary Department of the Ministry of National Defence that the Medical Department would take the necessary measures in cooperation with the Medical Department of the Fourth Army.² On 15 March, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs passed the information about typhus in Zone A and Zone B of the Julian Region to the Sanitary Department of the Ministry of National Defence and requested an urgent situation report on the ground.³ On 19 March, the Head of the Hygienic and Epidemiological Section of the Department of the Ministry of National Defence, Lieutenant Colonel Dr. Černozubov, signed an Act in which the Veterinary Department of the Ministry of National Defence was informed that the field trials found no typhoid sufferers in Zone B, and that it was established through circumstantial evidence that epidemics were not present even in Zone A.⁴ On 22 March, Colonel Dr. Mešterović conveyed this information to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.⁵

Cooperation with the Anglo-American Military Authorities in the field was enabled even prior to the Yugoslav veterinarian's official referral to Trieste. Directives were issued to a veterinary director of the Fourth Army to cooperate, if there was a need, with the Allied Military Authorities in combating foot-and-mouth disease. Collaboration with the Civilian Veterinary Bodies of the Republic of Slovenia was also mandated. In terms of the epidemiological situation in military units located in the Fourth Army's area, Lieutenant Colonel Roda Rudolf reported to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 26 March that there was no evidence of infectious diseases up to that moment.⁶

The official announcement of the adoption of a proposal to coordinate disease-control activities in the Julian Region was made on 3 April, when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs informed the British and US embassies that Dr. Lojze Gunde had been appointed to be the Yugoslav representative. He stood ready to come to Trieste and awaited only the granting of an entry permit for Zone A.⁷ On 11 April, the British Embassy expressed its satisfaction with the fact that the Yugoslav government was ready to send its representative to Trieste.⁸ The Embassy's communiqué expressed Allied approval for the entry of Dr. Gunde into Zone A and stated that after arriving in Trieste, he should report to the UNRRA representative in the ad-

¹ Ibid., No. 3268.

² Ibid., No. XXXIX/15.

³ Ibid., No. 3164.

⁴ Ibid., No. 913.

⁵ Ibid., No. 3164.

⁶ Ibid., No. 3400.

⁷ Ibid., No. 2530 and No. 2740.

⁸ Ibid., No. 4033.

miralty building. On 15 April, the Yugoslav Ministry of Foreign Affairs responded to the British Embassy's statement and thanked them for obtaining the approval for the departure of a Yugoslav representative to Trieste.¹ On the same day, the Head of the Fifth Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, V. Krulj, submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry the English Military Authorities' approval for Dr. Gunde's journey, with the remark that he needed to set off as soon as possible.² On 17 April, the Yugoslav Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Slovenia the approval pertaining to Dr. Gunde.³ A special Act ensued from this Ministry by which Dr. Gunde was designated for this task.

In Ljubljana, on 25 April, Milan Dolenc, the Head of the Veterinary Department of the National Republic of Slovenia Ministry of Agriculture, sent information to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Belgrade, which enabled Dr. Gunde to receive instructions and travel to Trieste.⁴ He had his first meeting with the Allied Military government on 26 April.⁵ Dr. Gunde informed his ministry in Ljubljana about the details of the meeting and on 17 May the report was sent to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. The information on the meeting in Trieste was sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 20 May, together with the positive opinion of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry regarding the agreement reached at the meeting on joint engagement on the fight against animal diseases. It was resolved that on the 1st and 15th of every month there would be a mutual submission of reports between Zone A and Zone B on the movement of livestock diseases.

Livestock diseases in the Free Territory of Trieste

The protection enacted concerning cattle diseases in the Julian Region implied the cooperation of the Yugoslav government with the Italian government. The first initiative on the Yugoslav side was started on 9 December 1947 through an office in Rome related to the regulation of rail transport, which was also supposed to regulate the functioning of the veterinary and phytopathological services.⁶ Various pre-war bilateral treaties based on Article 44 of the Peace Treaty had their importance extended by the Yugoslav government on 25 February 1948 – and among these was the Convention on animal diseases signed on 12 August 1924 in Belgrade.⁷ From 1-10 November 1948, a conference of representatives from the Ministries of Transport, Agriculture, Interior Affairs, Foreign Trade, and the Post of the Federal National Republic of Yugoslavia was held in Trieste with corresponding representatives of the Allied Military Administration in order to regulate the bor-

¹ Ibid., No. 4033.

² Ibid., No. 4033. Archives of Yugoslavia, 4, Veterinary Department, 1946/1947. FileNo. 36, 4-36-309.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive, 1946, box 39, No. 5789.

⁶ Ibid., 1948, box 70, No. 423754.

⁷ *Službeni list*, 74, 3 September 1949, pp. 1054.

der railway traffic and other problems related to it.¹ The conference concluded a provisional agreement regulating border crossing services for passengers, as well as luggage and goods traffic between the Allied Military Administration and Yugoslav state railways. The Agreement – in principle – regulated the customs service, veterinary service, phytopathological service, and postal service. Since the material of the Border Veterinary Service could not be regulated by one Article, the Interim Agreement on Border Veterinary Service between Yugoslavia and the Allied Military Administration was concluded as a separate Annex to that Agreement. On 29 December 1948, the Ministry of Agriculture gave its consent to this Veterinary Agreement. On 1 January 1949, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs told the Yugoslav Economic Delegation in Trieste to convey to the Federal Army Administration that the Yugoslav government agreed with the Agreement on the Border Veterinary Service between Yugoslavia and Zone A. On 4 February 1949, the Head of the Yugoslav Economic Delegation, Dr. Franz Hočevár, informed the Federal Military Administration that the Yugoslav Authorities concurred with the Agreement, thus bringing it into force.²

The Allied Military Administration regularly provided reports within the framework of the agreed exchange of information on the condition of animal diseases. Accordingly, the relevant report on veterinary diseases in Zone A for the period from 1 January to 15 January 1949 was sent to the Yugoslav Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry by the Yugoslav Military Administration on 24 January 1949.³ In addition, the Yugoslav Military Administration received newsletters about infections and veterinary diseases in Zone A. In December 1948, the Military Administration registered one case of anthrax caused by the bacterium *bacillus anthracis* in Zone B; seven cases of swine fever in the district of Kopar caused by classical swine fever virus (CSFV); and 60 cases of swine fever which had been registered in the Buje district.⁴ On 5 January 1949, the Main Staff of the Allied Military Administration in Trieste submitted the Bulletins of Infections and Veterinary Infections in December 1948 in Zone A to the Veterinary Commission of the Military Administration of the Yugoslav Army.⁵ During this period, there was one pre-existing and one new case of pseudo erysipelas (a diffuse inflammation of the skin) in Trieste. A pre-existing instance of the same disease was reported in Devin in Nabrezina, as well as an ongoing case of swine fever in Zgonik.

On 4 February 1949, Hočevár informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the Federal Military Administration had proceeded as per the Temporary Veterinary Agreement, and had advised the Yugoslav Economic Delegation that the municipality of Trieste was the center of the less complex form of foot-and-mouth disease. He asked Foreign Affairs to inform the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry about

¹ Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive, 1949, box 106, No. 4417.

² Ibid., No. 42539.

³ Ibid., box 105, No. 42179.

⁴ Ibid., No. 42179.

⁵ Ibid., No. 42179.

this.¹ On 26 February 1949, the Economic Delegation submitted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a veterinary bulletin for the first half of February 1949, which it had received from the Allied Military Administration.²

Due to animal-borne infectious foot-and-mouth disease in Italian villages along the border, the Yugoslav-Italian border was closed from November 1951 to March 1952 between the province of Gorizia and Yugoslavia for the passage of farm-owners on both sides of the border.³ Livestock disease was soon transferred to Yugoslav territory where 25 livestock were infected. Hence, Yugoslav and Italian vets met and agreed to close the crossings for farm-owners on both sides of the border until the disease was eradicated. Throughout the duration of the infection, vets at the border met several times and consulted on further measures. The commander of the Yugoslav Army's Military Administration, Colonel Miloš Stamatović, informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 14 February 1952 that despite the measures which had been taken at the crossings through the demarcation line, livestock infectious disease had spread from Zone A to Zone B in several villages in the Koper region.⁴ Due to the danger of disease spreading further, the Military Administration of the Yugoslav Army banned the flow of motorway and maritime traffic between the Yugoslav and Anglo-American Zones on 15 February. The prohibition was not imposed on officials of the Yugoslav and Allied Military Administrations, nor on persons with diplomatic passports and foreign travelers. Freight traffic by sea was free only through the port of Piran. The Yugoslav Military Administration informed the Allied Military Administration about the measures taken. On 6 March, the crossings of the relevant farm-owners were opened again, but three crossings remained closed because the Italian side of the sector was still impacted by infectious disease. Other crossings on the Italian side were open to transit of persons, provided the persons were not from the infected sector. In response to the measures taken by the Yugoslav government, on 14 March 1952 the Italian office requested information from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about such actions, with the request that the transit of persons should not be disturbed through the total closure of all border crossings. Once the Ministry of Interior had informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the measures taken to suppress foot-and-mouth disease, the note was sent to the Italian Office on 24 April 1952.⁵

Border closure and various restrictions affected the flow of people and goods. Nevertheless, the Yugoslav and Allied Military Administration tried to provide an unobstructed trade exchange. Cross-border trade between Zone A and Zone B in the period from 1 October to 31 December 1951 was 15% higher than in the previous three months.⁶ After being banned due to foot-and-mouth disease, the import

¹ Ibid., box 106, No. 42289.

² Ibid., No. 44054.

³ Ibid., 1952, box 86, No. 45159.

⁴ Ibid., No. 45159.

⁵ Ibid., No. 45159.

⁶ Ibid., No. 414883.

of cows and bulls from Zone B began to re-start in this trimester. In the period from 1 January to 31 March 1952 – despite a border closure between two Zones from 13 February to 7 March due to foot-and-mouth disease in Zone B – trade increased by 20% compared to the previous three months.¹ Imports were around 58 million liras, while exports reached 47 million liras a month.

Conclusion

The suppression of livestock diseases in the Julian Region and its surrounds between 1946 and 1954 reflected the specific status afforded to this region. Mindful of its foreign policy commitment to resolve the Trieste crisis by uniting the Julian Region, the Yugoslav government tried to protect its economic as well as political interests in the area through its fight against livestock diseases. Cooperation with the Allied Military Administration was initially hampered by the lack of adequate contractual obligations enabling cooperation, as well as by mutual mistrust. Although the Devin Agreement defined the modalities of cooperation between the two Military Administrations, the Yugoslav government started full-capacity cooperation only after the entry into force of the Peace Treaty in September 1947. Appropriate measures for the protection of animal diseases were applied at the border to Italy. The process of establishing the Free Territory of Trieste coincided with the restoration of Yugoslav-Italian diplomatic relations, which facilitated cooperation in the Julian Region quite considerably and introduced these new cooperative parameters into international legal frameworks. The engagement of the Yugoslav government in the fight against animal diseases in the Julian Region was based on Agreements between the Yugoslav Army Military Administration and the Allied Military Administration or it was present within the framework of the Yugoslav-Italian Bilateral Agreements.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Archives of Yugoslavia, 4, Veterinary Department, 1946/1947

Military Archive Belgrade, VU-1, 1368, 2, 1/88-1/90.

Diplomatic Archive, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Serbia, Political archive.

Secondary sources

Dukovski, Darko (2005). „Politički atributi gospodarstva istarskoga porača“. In: *Vojna in mir na Primorskem: Od kapitulacije Italije leta 1943 do Londonskega memoranduma leta 1954*, Koper: Založba Annales.

Duroselle, Jean-Baptiste (1966). *Le conflit de Trieste 1943-1954*. Bruxelles: Editions de l'Institut de sociologie de l'Université libre de Bruxelles.

Jeri, Janko (1961). *Tržaško vprašanje po Drugi svetovni vojni, (tri faze diplomatskega boja)*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.

¹ Ibid., No. 4889.

Milkić, Miljan (2008). "Jugoslovensko-italijanski odnosi i stvaranje Balkanskog pakta 1953. godine" in *Spoljna politika Jugoslavije 1950-1961*. Beograd: INIS, 602-616.

Milkić, Miljan (2010). "Jugoslavija, Velike sile i pitanje statusa Julijske krajine 1943-1945" in *Oslobodenje Beograda 1944. godine*. Beograd: INIS, 282-296.

Milkić, Miljan (2012). *Tršćanska kriza u vojno-političkim odnosima Jugoslavije sa velikim silama 1943-1947*. Beograd: INIS.

Milkić, Miljan (2014). „Društveno-geografske i ekonomske karakteristike jugoslovenske zone Julijske krajine 1945-1954“ in *Istorija i geografija: susreti i prožimanja*. Beograd: Geografski institut „Jovan Cvijić“ SANU, Institut za noviju istoriju Srbije, Institut za slavistiku RAN.

Milkić, Miljan (2016). „Sporazumi o Julijskoj krajini 1945“ in *1945. kraj ili novi početak?* Beograd: INIS.

Milkić, Miljan (2010). „Okupirano područje Julijske krajine u politici jugoslovenske vlade 1945-1947“. *Vojnoistorijski glasnik*, 1/2010, 13-38.

Novak, Bogdan C. (1970). *Trieste 1941-1954, the Ethnic, Political and Ideological Struggle*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.

Prinčič, Jože (2007). „Gospodarstvo cone B: približevanje jugoslovenski ureditvi in iskanje dodatnih virov v coni A (1945-1954)“ in *Dopoguerra di confine. Povojni čas ob meji*. Trieste: Projekt Interreg IIIA/Phare CBC Italija – Slovenija.

Prinčič, Jože (2008). „Primorskogospodarstvom časuvojaškihzasedbenihcon (1945-1954)“. *Prispevkizanovejšozgodovino*, 1/2008, 147-160.

Službeni list, 74, 3. septembar 1949, 1054.

„Ukaz o ratifikaciji Ugovora o miru sa Italijom“. *Službeni list FNRJ*, 29 August 1947.

The volume includes the proceedings of the 17th annual conference of the Conflict Studies Working Group of the PfP Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes. This collection of papers addresses historical and contemporary debates about the role and missions of the military forces in domestic affairs. It presents a number of studies focused on specific national experiences which provide thought-provoking perspectives on how the military historically had to and still are to adapt to new tasks and responsibilities in accordance with the changing nature of national security needs. The studies depict the role assumed by the military from supporting nation-building and providing domestic security to providing internal stability and order and counter non-military threats and challenges. The evolution of military's role in domestic affairs, cooperation between military and civilian authorities, legal issues and national doctrine development, emerging security challenges and their impact on shaping the military conduct on the domestic front are major themes of this volume.



ISBN 978-973-32-1114-3



www.edituramilitara.ro