Military Oath of Allegiance of the Servicemembers of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic

I, a soldier of the Armed Forces, realising my civic and patriotic duties, solemnly pledge allegiance to the Czech Republic.

I will be a brave and disciplined soldier and I will comply with the provisions of military regulations.

I will conscientiously learn to operate military equipment and weapons, and prepare for defence of the Czech Republic and defend it against external aggression.

For defence of the homeland, I am ready to risk my life.

So I swear!
The Armed Forces of the Czech Republic has entered the second year of its existence. The global situation constantly proves that militaries still have to be built, not only for their servicemembers to perform honours for important visits, but particularly because states have reasons to feel threatened. It is only several hundred kilometres from here where images of war atrocities, conveyed by everyday TV shorts, freeze our desire for living life without weapons. It has been a couple of weeks from when a politician after elections in Russia called for changing international borders in Europe. We will have no choice but to carry on seeking for what I believe has been commenced well: to jointly strive for a good repute of our armed forces, its prestige, and to have esteem and confidence in it.

Over the past four years, our armed forces have undergone crucial changes. The military has adopted and respected a new military doctrine that has extricated it, following the abolishment of the Warsaw Treaty, from the influence of then bipolar conception of the world. The General Staff developed a new defence strategy, prepared and elaborated defensive contingency plans, the high command has successfully stood up to commitments under international treaties, which radically reduced the number of both people and weapons. With a huge effort by all, especially career soldiers, military installations concentrated predominantly in west and south-west Bohemia were successfully relocated across the whole national territory. Instead of then military districts, three more or less autonomous territorial commands were formed, which in turn facilitated the division of the former Czechoslovak army in an incredibly short timespan and absolutely seamlessly.

The establishment of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic marked a new phase of the armed forces’ development, which has rejuvenated senior command circles, shortened the conscription service and strived for a qualified structural reform coupled with another reduction of personnel strength. Obvious success of the armed forces transformational effort has in my view been overlooked and we hear, even from some politicians, about uselessness of the military or doubts about its reliability. The armed forces still appear too expensive to many and some call for decreasing the defence budget. Many still wrongly perceive the armed forces primarily or only as a force of career soldiers although the decisive power is with those who have served their civic duty in the military, have trained with arms and learned to defend their homeland, their family, their property, own life and the life of their closest friends, should the need arise. Especially young men, who have spent a year of their life in the armed forces, have born a major share of the responsibility for the opinion that civilian public develops about the military. Only when their conscience of civic responsibility and the commanders’ professional responsibility combine, the atmosphere within the military will change to the better and the confidence in the armed forces will grow in turn. A qualified attitude by political leaders, who should act in a manner conducive to the civic responsibility for preparation to defend the Republic, must play a central role in this respect. Criticism the armed forces has been subject to in recent years was appropriate where it supported possibly fastest and farthest-reaching transformation of a military once incorporated into an aggressive pact, a non-sovereign satellite military, into an armed forces of a democratic independent state. The time is up though to say we have confidence in our armed forces, that our military has managed to handle extremely challenging tasks, proven that its commanders accepted the offered allegiance to democracy, and also attained some internationally recognised achievements.

The armed forces once stood at the birth of Czechoslovakia, soldiers of this military force, dissolved by politicians, fought and distinguished themselves in all World War II fronts, and more recently participated in defending our civilisation in the Persian Gulf and today provide assistance to inhabitants of Yugoslavia. The Armed Forces of the Czech Republic has a tradition to follow on, and the citizens of this country have, as I am sure, already enough reasons to change their attitude to the armed forces, and may have confidence in their military, and those serving with the military have an opportunity and duty to continue acting the way that we could be proud of the military, proud of them.
ARMED FORCES OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC: 20 YEARS
Introduction

While middle and older generation may still have some passing memories of that time, the younger generation already did not manage to capture the dynamic of changes and only began to follow national defence issues in the course of the covered period of the independent Czech Republic (CR) or have not realised to date that national defence represents one of the essential obligations the state has towards its citizens. All citizens are invited to get familiar with the history over the past twenty years of the Armed Forces of the independent Czech Republic, but it will be probably viewed differently by civilians, employees and personnel of the Ministry of Defence, those who served their conscription duty, active-duty servicepeople and ex-military professionals. The publication is also offered to law enforcement professionals, firefighters, medical rescuers and people taking interest in the past and present of the military. Students and scholars may represent another audience to possibly use the present publication for their studies. It should also serve as a source of reference for research and publication activities.

The Czech Republic came into being in specific historical conditions of the disintegrating bipolar world after 1989. That characteristic however does not capture everything the times then embraced. It does not depict the complex of conditions that made it possible for then Czechoslovak and later Czech and Slovak Federative Republic (CSFR) to split at December 31, 1992. The international name of Velvet Revolution underscored the peaceful way the state then divided and outlined developments in the present state territory of the Czech Republic from 1 January 1993. The very term of Velvet Revolution embraces respect to the military part of the society, as the armed forces supported the complex changes the metamorphosis of the political system entailed and later also the division of the state without abuse of military force. The inception of independent Czech Republic had an international and intra-state aspect and primarily impacted the sphere of demography, economy, governance, environment, social and technological development.

Throughout the past twenty years, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic (ACR) has developed as a part of the society, as a power element of the state, as its military. It was not incepted at 1 January 1993 by building a military from scratch, as was the case following 28 October 1918 when the independent state of Czechoslovakia was established. It was backed by the new Constitution of the Czech Republic and laws adopted from the CSFR. Contrarily to law enforcement, the military in the CSFR was only a federal service and only had federal steering bodies. Division of common state therefore involved splitting the military. It was the last large-scale peace operation of the CSFR armed forces and, at the same time, the first peace operation of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic and Armed Forces of the Slovak Republic without the involvement of other countries’ armed forces. The operation was closely followed from international perspective and evaluated positively upon completion.

By the way of introduction, the difference should be highlighted between national security policy, which comprises the defence policy, and real development of the security system, which includes the armed forces. Those terms will be used in the text and it is correct to point out the difference between the idea – notional model of the armed forces – as it appears in the political discourse, and the actual shape of practical defence policy. Security policy is the expression of political opinions. Legislation is endorsed by 200 Deputies of the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic and 81 Senators of the Senate of the Czech Republic. From 2004, the total of twenty-four Members of the European Parliament represented the Czech Republic in the European Parliament and twenty-two MEPs since 2009. Those are politicians involved in making decisions on drafting and passing Acts, strategies, concepts, policies, directives, regulations, plans and other documents shaping national defence.
Politically approved documents affect the contents of the security system’s activities and appropriations allocated for specific ministries and governmental departments in individual years. Those policies formulate the visions of how the complex social system should work in the international environment through vehicles adopted on national level in the state’s legal system, which builds on the constitution and a real political environment. Evolving permanently, the security reality has, in addition to political players, also players in the security system: concrete soldiers and active reserve component personnel, law enforcement professionals, career and volunteer firefighters, medical rescuers, members of the prison service and the judicial guard, mine, mountain and water emergency responders and other citizens we may encounter in emergency management operations. We have been recently informed about their activities particularly during floods, anthropogenic and natural disasters, mad cow disease and joint exercises often with international participation. The Armed Forces of the Czech Republic have been directly or indirectly involved in an overwhelming majority of those actions. The Czech Republic’s national security system is primarily concentrated on performance of assignments in the homeland territory; the Armed Forces and security services has nevertheless operated in support of national interests in foreign countries through their involvement in joint missions and operations of led by the United Nations (UN), the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the European Union (EU) and Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

Based on evaluating selected factors that shape national defence policy and development of its security system, the armed forces and national defence posture, the following stages can be identified to have taken place since the end of 1989 till 2012:

- **Democratisation phase** – spanned the period of armed forces’ democratisation from November 1989 till the division of the state at 31 December 1992.
- **Integration phase** – was associated with development and the very accession of the Czech Republic to the North Atlantic Treaty on 12 March 1999.
- **Reform phase** – led towards the creation of an all-volunteer force and achievement of the armed forces’ initial operational capabilities in 2006.
- **Transformation phase** – is typical for its efforts to create a modern military force with expeditionary capabilities. In this sense, the process of the so-called further transformation commenced in 2007 and was scheduled to take place until 2018, when the armed forces was to achieve full operational capability essential to meet political-military ambitions in accordance with the 2008 *Military Strategy of the Czech Republic*, the 2011 *Security Strategy of the Czech Republic* and the 2011 *White Paper on Defence*.

All the development stages the defence policy has gone through and changes in building the military have been associated with important milestones in the history of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic,\(^1\) CSFR

---

2. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (CSSR) was a state whose name had existed from 11 July 1960 based on the Constitutional Act No. 100/1960 Coll. till 28 March 1990, when the Constitutional Act No. 81/1990 Coll. changed the name to Czechoslovak Federative Republic and, subsequently, on 20 April 1990, following the “hyphen war”, the Constitutional Act No. 101/1990 Coll. renamed the state Czech and Slovak Federative Republic (CSFR). During the existence of CSSR, the Constitutional Act on Czechoslovak Federation No. 143/1968 Coll. was passed to transform the state from 1 January 1969 into a federation and created two independent federal states: the Czech Socialist Republic and the Slovak Socialist Republic. In strict federal purview remained foreign policy and entering into international treaties, national defence, federal state material reserves, federal legislature and administration and protection of federal constitutionality remained an exclusive federal.
and CR. Historical developments also changed names of the military in our state territory. The following is a brief list of names used in reference to the military during its existence:

- From the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic on 28 October 1918, the Czechoslovak army was the primary component of the so-called Czechoslovak military might, as the armed forces were designated then.
- From 15 March 1939 till 8 May 1945, the military of a non-existent state ceased to exist too as a result of annexation of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia by Nazi Germany and breakaway of the Slovak State.
- After World War II, the military used the same name as before the war until 1954, when it was renamed the Czechoslovak People's Armed Forces (CSLA) following the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.
- On 14 March 1990, promulgation of the Act No. 74/1990 Coll. changed the name of the military of then Czechoslovak Federative Republic to Czechoslovak Armed Forces (CSA).
- The establishment of the independent state of the Czech Republic (1 January 1993) is also associated with the new name of the primary military component – the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic (ACR).

On 1 January 2013, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic marked its twentieth birthday. As is common, neither the processes associated with its formation have always followed the right path. But the life of the armed forces has not stopped. The armed forces has not died despite having gone through virulent environment that caused it to lose weight, undergoing operative removal of components previously thought indispensable and developing new habits. What helped the ACR negotiate all booby-traps and pass bottlenecks as a whole, has been its sound professional basis and the ability to keep its basic life functions stabilised. The past twenty years clearly showed military abilities, foreign operations, involvement in flood consequence management, deepening respect in international defence cooperation, the newly established military diplomacy, but the armed forces has also demonstrated its apolitical posture, professionalism and reliability. The esteem has grown that the military profession enjoyed as well as public confidence in the armed forces’ professionalism.
Reforms and transformation of the Czech Armed Forces

The issues of Czech Armed Forces development encompass many perspectives, which in turn identify positions of the observers according to their specialties. Political science, international policy, sociologic, economical, managerial, technological, intelligence, media and other analysis are all in high demand. Only amassed knowledge brought about a crystallized set of popularly accepted documents fulfilling national security policy and its component, the defence policy. Those documents include: legislation, international and national security policy documents, and other defence and security documents.

The armed forces development seen from the viewpoint of military and security criteria is a perspective associated with the very nature of military capabilities and military characteristics of a state’s armed forces. It encompasses tables of establishment, characteristics of military capabilities, command and control officials as well as performance in preparation for practical employment of the armed forces. In this respect, the primary mission of the armed forces is very concisely defined in the fundamental Act laying down the purview of individual ministries and central governmental authorities, the Czech National Council Act No. 2/1969 Coll., on the establishment of Ministries and other central government institutions (the Competence Act), which in its 2012 wording stipulates in Section § 16 Paragraph 1 that the Ministry of Defence is a central state administration for authority particularly for:

- Ensuring defence of the Czech Republic;
- Control of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic;
- Administration of military regions.

Individual phases the development of armed forces in the Czech territory has gone through have not always been straightforward. The processes overlapped across the phases, but the outcome appeared convincing in terms of the true condition of the armed forces. One-word name of the phase is always a condensation, but it denotes the key process taking place then. The principal steering institution over the past twenty years has been the Ministry of Defence (MoD), which successfully performed its key assignments. At the beginning, the MoD ran processes of democratisation, successfully accomplished the integration into NATO, managed to deliver reforms that brought Czech national defence on all-volunteer basis and have delivered progressive transformational steps with the present-day armed forces, adjusting it to contemporary security, demographic, political, economic, ecological and other factors and requirements.

The democratisation phase began in the armed forces immediately after 17 November 1989, became a part of the Velvet Revolution and a part of measures and manifestations the revolution effected in the armed forces. The transition of CSLA into an efficient tool of a democratic state’s defence policy was quite fast. Basic legislation to facilitate the introduction of civilian oversight of the armed forces according to approaches proven in western democracies was created already in the course of 1990. Nevertheless, it should be noted that some consequences of the previous armed forces control by the only ruling party (Communist Party of Czechoslovakia – KSC) showed as late as in 1990s. The created legislation framework that newly instituted relationships among executive, legislature and judicial authorities did not prove fully functional when not run and staffed by experts possessing necessary experience and knowledge. Political parties newly forming in the Czech Republic did not have adequate pool of qualified experts available and struggled with the problem of filling the post of defence minister with a non-military person or such civilian who would have mastered security, defence and military issues to the necessary extent.

The integration phase that logically ran in parallel with the unfinished democratisation and took place already in the divided Czech Republic and Slovak Republic, commenced at 1 January 1993 upon the actual division of the CSFR and its armed forces into two new completely independent states. That phase saw the Czech defence policy define itself as a tool of an independent state. In terms of international orientation, the defence
In the context of forming own Czechoslovak security and defence strategy, training slowly began to alter. Service physical training followed very much the same course, as the focus on general motion and performance of minimum standards progressively expanded with special physical training that sought to develop specific motoric skills in the demanding conditions of physical exhaustion and stress. Photo by Otakar Hromádka

Defence Review was developed in 2001 to inform its implementation. The endorsed policy documents eventually spawned a complete abolition of conscription and created all-volunteer armed forces, after political adjustments at 1 January 2005. The first defence reform step achieved the so-called initial operational capabilities at the end of 2006. The reform framework was delineated by the Concept of Development of All-volunteer Czech Armed Forces and the Mobilisation Concept dated 2002 and the Concept of Development of All-volunteer Czech Armed Forces and the Mobilisation Concept revised on the background of reduced defence policy clearly focused on political-military structures of the West, i.e. collective security and defence. Initial steps were tied to diplomatic and international political activities. At the outset, there was a series of ill-advised attitudes on ensuring national security and defence. No wonder as both politicians and soldiers still had recent negative experience with the Warsaw Treaty membership down in their memory. Therefore, political pragmatism prevailed. Political decisions then – in the first half of 1990s – were affected by the security situation aggravated by negative developments in the Balkans. The break-up of former Yugoslavia and the ethnic conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina shaped the international security environment, which affected home affairs in the Czech Republic and attitudes to developing national defence issues. The primary goals of Czech defence policy were outlined in the 1995 White Book on Defence of the Czech Republic. Lasting over six years, the phase eventually came to a head with the Czech Republic’s accession to the North Atlantic Treaty on 12 March 1999, which attained a long-term political and strategic goal on the path towards strengthening Czech national defence. This stage was associated with numerous changes in legislation. The Parliament passed the so-called defence legislation package. Essential strategic documents and policies were developed and endorsed by the Government to extensively reshape Czech national security and defence in the long term, specifically the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic and the Military Strategy of the Czech Republic.

The reform phase was distinct for its focus on the armed forces internally as they transitioned to an all-volunteer force and changed their internal functions, relationships and assignments, including in terms of abolition of conscription. Security reality brought about a significant spur: the 9/11 terrorist attack against the USA. The closer security environment was dominated by the so-called Kosovo crisis, which was collaterally instrumental in identifying serious shortfalls in Allied armed forces’ operational capabilities, especially those of the European Allies, in the course of the NATO’s military engagement in operations in Kosovo in 1999. That initiated the process of adapting NATO nations’ armed forces’ capabilities to the new conditions. The nature reshaped of assignments armed forces were to perform and the likely scenarios of their employment. The changed paradigm claimed an extensive international cooperation to seek answers to the new challenges. In the Czech Republic, the process resulted in the authorisation of a fundamental defence reform. A Strategic Defence Review was developed in 2001 to inform its implementation. The endorsed policy documents eventually spawned a complete abolition of conscription and created all-volunteer armed forces, after political adjustments at 1 January 2005. The first defence reform step achieved the so-called initial operational capabilities at the end of 2006. The reform framework was delineated by the Concept of Development of All-volunteer Czech Armed Forces and the Mobilisation Concept dated 2002 and the Concept of Development of All-volunteer Czech Armed Forces and the Mobilisation Concept revised on the background of reduced defence
appropriations dated 2003. The reform objective was to create small, mobile, modern and young armed forces with a high degree of interoperability with NATO Allies. Thus, the Czech defence policy was to effectively respond to the changing attitude by NATO to development of capabilities and their employment in response to a host of complex contingencies worldwide. The year 2003 saw the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic updated and the Military Strategy of the Czech Republic follow the suit a year later. Both policies accentuated a comprehensive approach to national security and defence in cooperation with Allies. The political premium was then placed on meeting the conditions for joining the European Union, whose Member State the Czech Republic became on 1 May 2004. In terms of defence policy, the Czech Republic sought to support the EU’s emancipation in the sphere of security and defence policy.

The division of federal armed forces did not involve only splitting the equipment into two thirds for the Czech Republic and one third for the Slovak Republic. For example, air defence became an issue, as it was interconnected into a single system, and the cut was to produce two bodies able to operate completely on their own.

The transformation phase is the last stage adjusting the Czech Republic’s defence policy and defence activities to achieve military capabilities in the changing environment. The phase commenced in 2005 with the transition from conscription to an all-volunteer force. The phase is transformational because it reflects NATO’s transformation following the 2002 Prague Summit and the 2004 Istanbul Summit. Defence budget restrictions have been a major transformation catalyst in NATO nations, including the Czech Republic. The year 2007 saw the appropriations allocated for MoD operations and development drift apart with intention and plans defined for the second reform phase from 2010 till 2012, when the so-called full operational capabilities were scheduled for achievement. Following a thorough analysis, another defence transformation policy was developed and authorised by the Government on 22 October 2007. The transformation effort sought to

---

create armed forces with expeditionary capabilities to deploy for multinational operations outside national territory in all climatic and geographical conditions and different cultural environments. The Military Strategy of the Czech Republic followed in 2008 as well as the very first projection of future capabilities of the whole MoD in the form of the Long-term Vision of the Ministry of Defence. The updated the 2011 Security Strategy of the Czech Republic and the White Paper on Defence were both developed and authorised in 2011.

Development of defence policy can be described along the lines of the adopted strategic policy documents in their sequence and the efforts to realise them. Implementation of those policies largely shaped the actual condition of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic. The interconnection between political decisions and the real status proved the ability and the adopted natural obligation of the armed forces in the sense of service to a democratic leadership. The armed forces were a power element of the state, which turned the political leaders’ decisions into reality and did not seek to assume power. That may seem obvious, but it is not always the case. Such democratic principles were violated in other countries geographically not far away: representatives of the former Yugoslav Army were recently brought before the International Court of Justice in Hague, the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, and have been tried and punished for their actions.

The developments in the Czech Republic document the adaptation of defence policy and armed forces build-up to real developments in security environment, advancements in the military science and observance of the state’s compass of possibilities. That covers both internal and major external aspects guiding identification and implementation of rational approaches to national defence and security, and to armed forces development. Fulfilment of national defence policy objectives in all its dimensions has not always been seamless though. Some phases were marked by serious systemic mistakes that led to the realisation of ineffective steps in national defence policy, which in turn impeded on armed forces development. The original organisation and force levels of then federal armed forces (prior to 1993) are therefore also compared with the outcome of reorganisation and reduction of quantity of weapons and personnel strength, including within the limits of the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE-T). The process of Soviet troops’ withdrawal in 1990–91 is also covered hereunder insofar as the impact it had on basing is concerned. As well, particular attention is given to the course and outcomes of dividing the federal military into two national armed forces at 1 January 1993. Major policy documents that shaped or related to defence reforms after 1989 are listed chronologically with brief description of their aims and what they achieved.

The text also depicts some measures that sought to establish apolitical armed forces and necessary personnel replacements after the 1989 Velvet Revolution. It also reflects worsened social situation career soldiers were faced with and evaluates the causes spawning a massive drain of junior commissioned officers shortly prior and after the ACR’s establishment. The text bellow also briefly discusses military schools, legislation shortcomings and points out positive effects the preparation and entry of the Czech Republic into NATO had on personnel management and social affairs in the Czech Armed Forces. The final part covers
In the 1990s, army depots were packed with arms, not only infantry weapons. From the very start, the political leadership of the MoD was faced with the problem of how to divest of them.

The MoD pursued innovations through defence research and development with a historical track record of institutions and bodies. Special attention should also be paid to military schools as a part of professional training for past, present and future military professionals in a broad range of branches and specialisms. It is also appropriate to underscore international military cooperation and the Czech Republic’s accession to NATO and the EU. Description of how Czech Armed Forces service personnel and units started engaging in international peace operations may expand the picture of how defence capabilities were recognised in practice. Emphasis is also attached to defence cooperation in the Visegrad Four format and bilateral defence cooperation with NATO nations. The section covers the Czech Armed Forces integration in multinational forces, including both NATO operations and involvement in EU-led endeavours as part of the European Security and Defence Policy.

Defence economy management has also been central to successful development. An economic transformation was realised, the defence expenditures followed a downwards trend and the way changed that acquisition policy was approached. It is necessary to point out the complexity of methodologies used for developing and compiling military budget and military expenditures. Such characteristics also provide insight to development of the amount and structure of defence expenditures and highlight some shortcomings. The part on acquisition policy also discusses some issues in the sphere of armaments and its close relation to defence industry. Although the primary focus of this publication is on the Czech Armed Forces, its existence would not be conceivable without this part of the independent Czech Republic’s economy, which engages in arms production and defence supplies. Consequences of privatisation should be analysed as well as the process of large-scale arms industry conversion, notably in terms of the influence it subsequently had on shaping the defence policy and the outcomes of endeavour that led to consolidation of defence industry. Arms trade control data is important too.

A special issue, which affected the Czech Armed Forces over the past twenty years, is the protection of the environment. It mirrors in the measures the MoD has adopted and its subject-matter international cooperation. Management and disposal of various environmental hazards that followed after the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the Czech territory entailed tasks that had not been previously pursued.

State officials, the President – Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the Prime Minister, who is also the Chairman of the National Security Council, the Minister of Defence, Chief of General Staff, members of Security Committees of both chambers of the Parliament of the Czech Republic and those preparing and staffing key documents for them, are vested with the ultimate responsibility for correct decision-making on future defence and security posture. Those decisions are strategic, affecting a long timespan and reflecting in authorised strategic policy documents.

National defence and security issues have never had any definitive and the only right solution. They are one of the contestable measures of the government, because public spending is involved. National defence and security is often seen as non-profit, which is not completely correct. Looking back into history, wars were waged to bring economic benefit. Warring parties took basically two kinds of attitudes that however always yielded gains: the victor occupied the opponent’s territory and introduced own rule over the subjugated lands, or the victor did not occupy the conquered territories but extracted spoils of war and ordered the ways the defeated nations were to pay war reparations.

Maintaining military forces is nowadays the price for peace, for living life peacefully, for ensuring a peacetime economy, for ensuring non-war destinies for citizens in
the territory ruled over. In the last years after the fall of bipolarity, a fundamental shift occurred in the way nations approached building their military forces. Planning for contingency of the most significant threat – a global conflict – was abandoned, and ways were progressively sought to have planning based on defence capabilities providing management of new crises across a very broad mission spectrum.

The previous sentence intends nothing more and nothing less than to point out the systemic change over the past 20 years. Looking at the development over the next 15 to 20 years, this would be the same timespan that compares for instance to service life of military equipment and technology currently introduced to the inventory. The ability to run longterm planning and achieve instant outcomes at the same time, that is an expression of strategic thinking, good routing on the road plan to achieving security and defence of the state.

Think tanks, academic organisations and individuals have joined the endeavour to optimise the relevant processes. Strategic studies have been developed, and information collected and assessed, new information environments have been created and some projections simulated. War games theory and practice has also been pursued. Likewise, there are a number of movie characters in plots dealing with future security challenges, which are often not far from real, scientifically substantiated considerations. Theory and education on strategic thinking has developed along a single keynote idea: why to make mistakes committed by others, when we have the possibility to make new mistakes, yet unproven, while we believe what we are doing is right.

Developing future visions is nowadays not conceivable as a task for individuals. It is always teamwork and there are two types of teams: active and passive. Actively working teams foresee changes in homeland defence and national security and propose early relevant measures; passive teams only redress afterwards what have already come about. Given the amount of tax payers’ money appropriated for national security and defence, it is critical for the team to be active.

Activity of such teams must be informed by basic historical context depicting the past strategic decision-making. They show how past leaders sought answers deconflicting and combining interests, possibilities and needs. At the same time, those bearing the burden of responsibility of deciding the way ahead could not isolate themselves from their environs. They were affected by manners that did not lead to an ideal state of affairs. They knew ideal status was not achievable. It should be respected that decision-making is a biased process and, much the same as in other historical periods, this trait of subjectivity was also present over the past twenty years in reforms and transformations taking place in the Czech Armed Forces.
Continuing democratisation and beginning to integrate 1993–1994

The period of democratisation showed both in the realm of defence policy and in day-to-day life of the Czech Armed Forces. Democratisation changes in the whole national defence system began very shortly after the events of November 17, 1989, but the end of democratisation period is difficult to determine. It is fair to conclude that the non-violent split of the CSFR into two democratic states, involving the division of the armed forces at the end of 1992, proved the existence of majority attributes characterising civilian democratic control of the armed forces in advanced democratic states.

At the end of 1989, the public regarded the CSLA as an instrument of the old regime. Given the historical development, the armed forces only enjoyed a very bad reputation. During the short existence of the young Czechoslovak state after 1918, the military had actually never been employed for defending the country against external enemies. It occurred neither in 1938 when Nazis occupied the borderland, nor during the August 1968 entry of allied Warsaw Treaty armed forces. In both historical moments, the armed forces was not directed to use military power in defence of national interests. The relevant state officials and political representatives eventually did not issue the decisive orders. In 1969, the Communist regime even abused the armed forces against own citizens: some units were ordered to suppress protest manifestations held on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Warsaw Treaty troops’ entry into national territory.

Opinions on uselessness of the armed forces were widespread among the public and abused both against the military and the need to defend national interests by the armed forces.

In the democratisation period initially following 17 November 1989, the defence policy of the newly formed state therefore intentionally sought to depoliticise the CSLA. Quick action was taken to abolish the political apparatus in the armed forces structure in the matter of days. Principles of civilian democratic control began to be implemented making use of lessons that advanced democratic learnt. Removal of symbols of national interests injured and trodden-on by foreigners also became one of the first tasks. The public therefore eagerly followed negotiations and realisation of withdrawal of Soviet troops stationed on the territory of the CSFR as soon as possible. A force levels reduction started to achieve compliance with Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. The Treaty facilitated mutual inspections on personnel strength and armaments and weapons systems of what formerly were enemy militaries comprising the bipolar divided world. The domestic context saw the quantity of weapon systems reduce, defence infrastructure downsized and the character of armed forces changed too, upon authorisation of the armed forces doctrine.

Photo by Jiří Hokův

Soldiers of the 1st Tank Division about to practice snorkelling at the Loutka site in the Boletice Military Training Area in summer 1992. The quantity of hardware was however already being reduced. The time was going to be up for the armoured division...

5 The Treaty dated 19 November 1990 was signed by 30 states in Vienna, members of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The signatory states were Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Canada, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Moldova, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America and the United Kingdom. The Treaty stipulated limits for armaments and timelines and conditions for the limits to be complied with. It followed up on the so-called Helsinki process and also entailed follow-on treaties in the process arms control and reduction.
Formulating defence policy objectives in the post-revolution time swelling with changes of political, legal, security, economic and moral system was affected by international security situation. Czechoslovakia was not the only state for the changeovers to take place. Somewhat earlier, the shift manifested itself in Poland and the progress in Germany's reunification was also remarkable. Civic disobedience by tourists from the then German Democratic Republic (GDR), who declined to return home after they had taken their holidays in summer 1989, and thousands of them came to Embassies of the Federal Republic of Germany, especially those in Prague and Budapest, to demand permission to see their relatives in the West Germany, came to a head on 9 November 1989 tearing down the symbol of divided Germany: the Berlin Wall. Old habits were significantly broken, new attitudes took up and citizens began to endeavour on redressing wrongs and revealing where the "totalitarian democracy" lacked consistency compared with "conceivable democracy".

The cardinal shift that overwhelmed global security reality was the fall of the world's bipolar division. It changed the paradigm much the same way Einstein's relativity theory did in the sphere of physics, turning upside down the way world had been viewed through the prism of Newton Laws. As a result, confrontation ceased to exist between the eastern and western bloc and probability decreased of a massive conventional conflict in Europe. Entailing economic problems for individual states to tackle, the break-up of former eastern bloc (dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty – WARPAC – at 1 July 1991) and the Soviet empire (Mikhail Gorbachev's resigned from the post of the President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic on 25 December 1991), however gave rise to new sources of instability. The political leadership in the making was therefore faced with issues of ensuring national defence and security as well as a whole gamut of political, economic and social problems.

A range of alternative approaches were considered on political level to ensure national defence after 1989, including potential neutrality. A higher premium was placed on seeking international guarantees for national defence in the future while maintaining credible national level of defence capabilities. This requirement was driven by limited national resources to provide a credible posture. Once the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Czechoslovak territory was successfully accomplished, and their transfer from the former GDR at the end of June 1991, plus the Warsaw Treaty ceased to exist, room was finally created to seek ways to provide national defence independently. As then Assistant Deputy Minister of Defence for Strategic Management PhD. Jaroslav Janda coined it: "Now the vacuum can be filled, which had existed in the past when all strategic visions and armed forces development concepts were not developed in Prague, but in Moscow."

Efforts to maintain defence did not slack throughout that period of time. Young men continued to be drafted for conscription service at regular intervals and trained although for a shorter period. That necessitated a review of training and organisational documents at all armed forces echelons, which was performed concurrently with continuously changing assignments and tasks, often associated with political

---

decisions. And so it happened that already the year 1990 saw the initial draft document developed to pave the way for the transition to an all-volunteer force. Its realisation was nevertheless thwarted by a larger political assignment: to divide the Czechoslovak Federal Republic and its Armed Forces.

The instable international development, environment that contained much of the unexpected, fast-developing and unknown, generated a multitude of open and unanswered questions. That was where the threat was concentrated of possibly abusing the situation and of subsequent negative development. It was typical for the time that many new people were assigned into important posts. Inexperienced individuals often came into positions with extensive responsibilities. In spite of that, contingency plans and proposals had to be developed with full responsibility to respond to emerging conflicts that could potentially threaten stability and peace worldwide as in turn in our domestic environment. Armed Forces officials previously only used Russian in their communication, which was almost undesirable in the new circumstances and perhaps burdening. It was essential to be able to communicate primarily in English in a very short period of time in different geographic locations.

That proved already in Kuwait. Iraq threatened peace by its invasion into Kuwait at the end of 1990. The international community was united to a degree that allowed a solution to the situation. A multinational coalition Operation Desert Storm was launched already at 16 January 1991. The situation in the Balkans jeopardised European security. Defence and civilian intelligence services began to approach security situation assessment with increased attention as the civic war broke out there in 1992. Its form of an ethnic conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina associated with the break-up of the former Yugoslavia became a nearby and serious demonstration that too loose democracies may seriously endanger security. Another threat perceived at the time involved the developments in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). Given the Soviet Union’s previous position as one of the two world’s superpowers and the representative of the Eastern bloc, it was not obvious how the endeavours would turn out from applying the right for independent existence to complete separation of individual republics forming the Union. The break-up of the USSR (during 1991), accompanied by the rise of new local sources of instability and tensions especially in the Caucasus region, could not be soothing in this respect.

Escalating developments in various locations spurred serious concerns over the way national defence and security were ensured. Thus, new political leaders had unbiased evidence before them to substantiate the opinion that military defence of the state was needed and that it would claim both commitment and funding.

The key challenges in the domestic political scene included making sure that political changeovers run smoothly (democratic elections, changes in the constitution, redesigning governmental institutions and bodies), launching economic transformation coupled with privatisation of state enterprises and maintaining social stability. Another major challenge consisted in issues associated with restructuring and conversion of the arms industrial base that suffered a very quick decline in both foreign and domestic markets and the overall radical downturn in demand for arms. National defence and its practical realisation also had to cope with the division of the state and its military.
2.1 Cold War legacy

After 1989, national defence and security had to struggle with the Cold War heritage. Until 1989, the concept of Czechoslovakia's national defence was based on bipolar division of the world and full subordination to the commitments stemming from the state's membership in the Warsaw Treaty, a political-military alliance of European socialist countries headed by the then USSR. Much like other Warsaw Treaty countries' militaries, the CSLA was also built and organised along the model of the Soviet Army. Its character and planned employment were commensurate to the political and military ambitions the Soviet Union pursued then. The CSLA formed a component of the first operation wave of the Warsaw Treaty, which was determined by its geographical location and its international border with the Federal Republic of Germany. In line with the post-war arrangement, German units, and especially the U.S. and some other NATO nations' forces were stationed in German territory. From 1968, when the Czechoslovak territory had been occupied by the armed forces of five Warsaw Treaty countries, the Soviet Central Group of Forces with headcount of 73,500 plus associated military hardware was "temporarily" stationed in the Czechoslovak territory. In case of mobilisation and building up the so-called Czechoslovak Front, the CSLA forces were to become a part of the front.

The CSLA organisation and basing reflected the task it was assigned and earmarked to perform in wartime. As at 31 December 1989, the armed forces organisation comprised of the following services: land forces, air force, state air defence force and the military component of the Civil Defence.

The territory of Czechoslovakia was divided into two territorial military districts:

- Western Military District (ZVO) based in the Czech lands and partly in Slovakia was headquartered in Tabor, Czech Republic, and earmarked to form the wartime front. The ZVO exercised command and control over approximately 85% of land forces.
- Eastern Military District (VVO) headquartered in Trenčín, Slovakia, was stationed predominantly in the territory of Slovakia and accounted for the remaining 15% of land forces in personnel terms. Contrarily to ZVO, which primarily comprised combat units, the VVO territory was where military schools, maintenance and other rear facilities were located.

Peacetime armed forces comprised units directly subordinate to the Federal Ministry of National Defence (FMoND), command headquarters of two military districts with their formations (1st and 4th Army), forces, units and components, 10th Air Army, State Air Defence Command Headquarters, Civil Defence Staff, special forces and units, military schools and other installations.

The main combat power of the CSLA comprised 15 army divisions, 2 air divisions, 2 air defence divisions, 1 artillery division, missile and anti-aircraft rocket formations and units. The Czechoslovak Armed Forces operated 16 permanent airfields at 31 December 1989.

As for major weapon systems, the CSLA had in its inventory about 4,500 tanks, 4,900 armoured combat vehicles, some 3,400 artillery pieces and 687 combat aircraft.

The active duty personnel strength totalled 210,000 soldiers, of whom there were 61,405 career soldiers (41,715 generals and commissioned officers and 19,690 non-commissioned officers) and 148,595 conscripts. The defence sector employed around 80,000 civil servants.

2.2 Depoliticising the armed forces

In democracy, the armed forces should be apolitical in principle. It is not permissible after democratic elections that societal powers would be taken off balance by the means of influence exercised by the military. The armed forces property was generated over long term using collected taxes and appropriation for national defence purposes. It is therefore unacceptable that a possibility existed to abuse either weapons

---

8 The political-military alliance of Warsaw Treaty was established on 14 May 1955, following the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, German Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic became the Warsaw Treaty state parties.
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The Coordination Centre of Civic Forum (KC OF) became the most powerful organisations in what often were fundamental changes while past laws and regulations were still in effect.

The new political elite’s confidence in the officer corps was also boosted by reactivating around a thousand rehabilitated and reactivated career soldiers discharged from the armed forces mainly after the occupation of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 by Warsaw Treaty troops. Some of those reactivated were assigned into organisational, mostly staff line structures, who put their professional knowledge to a practical use. One of the primary requirements for professional readiness is for individuals to have suppressed expressions of their political beliefs in service. Abandoning political activities is one of the essential requirements for military professionals to deliver so as to create at least formal guarantees of their loyalty when the state’s political leadership changes. There was an explicit call for the Czechoslovak armed forces to depoliticise, which broke down into multiple subsets of tasks.

It was urgent for this assignment to be delivered as the incoming political elites feared the armed forces could potentially be abused for turning the tide against democratisation processes in the society. A strong argument was the existing political influence the communist party had in the CSLA and loyalty senior commissioned officers and generals in particular showed towards the communist regime. Almost 82% of career soldiers were members of the KSC at the time. To some extent, success of democratic revolution also depended on what the most powerful state component – the armed forces – would do.9

That it was not just barren considerations is proven by the order of the Minister of Defence General Milan Václavík issued on 17 November 1989 to the effect of potentially employing the armed forces and the People’s Militia (LM) in Operations Vlna and Norbert. Armed forces high command issued a statement expressing their commitment to defend the communist regime and “socialist amenities”. The existing concerns over possible abuse of the armed forces thankfully never materialised. In all probability, it was the case thanks to the speed at which changes were taking place and to an early departure of high-ranking MoD and armed forces functionaries. General Václavík, a communist hardliner, was replaced in the Defence Minister’s office by the moderate Lieutenant-General Miroslav Vacek already on 3 December 1989. Major-General Anton Slimák was appointed the Chief of General Staff on 19 December 1989.

General Vacek’s personal authority and prudence facilitated the armed forces’ perception of the new state of affairs; the CSLA showed more than neutrality towards the incoming democratic power. Minister Vacek manifested his loyalty by some relatively fast and energetic steps, and so substantially took forward the implementation of a quick changeover in favour of a robust democratic control of the armed forces. He began the process of depoliticising the armed forces already in December 1989 by abolishing the political apparatus and disbanding the MoD Main Political Directorate. The Directorate for Education and Culture was formed and reorganised at the end of 1990 and renamed the Directorate for Social Affairs. The Act No. 72/1990 Coll. promulgated 14 March 1990 prohibited political party organisations to be active within the armed forces. It is fair to note that practical measures went way ahead of the law, as no political activities had taken place on military premises from January 1990. Those measures definitively did away with the subordination ties between the military and the political leadership of the pre-1989 Czechoslovak state. The Military Political Academy in Bratislava was also closed down. Vetting of officers’ attitudes started vis-à-vis the newly ruling power and the most politically compromised generals and officers were discharged. At the same time, those who did not want to continue their service in the new social and political conditions were also permitted to leave the armed forces. Measures were taken on the strategic level of the MoD and the armed forces to be implemented at the Ministry of Defence, General Staff and Military Districts, as well as on the level of formations, units and installations at a very fast pace. The measures put a great pressure on the realisation of what often were fundamental changes while past laws and regulations were still in effect.

The new political elite’s confidence in the officer corps was also boosted by reactivating around a thousand rehabilitated and reactivated career soldiers discharged from the armed forces mainly after the occupation of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 by Warsaw Treaty troops. Some of those reactivated were assigned into important posts. In May 1991, Karel Pezl, ranked Lieutenant-General, was assigned the Chief of General Staff, and Antonín Rašek became a civilian deputy minister of defence for social and humanitarian affairs in January 1990.

In mid-December 1989, Vojenská obroda (Military Renewal) together with the Military Commission of the Coordination Centre of Civic Forum (KC OF) became the most powerful organisations influencing the

armed forces. It associated ex military personnel and civilian employees discharged in relation with August 1968. Its internal incoherence reflecting the extensive newly forming political spectrum of the Czechoslovak society however prevented the organisation members from filling the decisive posts in the Ministry of National Defence and the General Staff. It did happen to some extent, but the organisation was only influential until the split of CSFR. In the context of eliminating so-called Sixty-Eighters from the political life, the group were later marginalised.10

Some additional facts attested to the growing confidence the new top state and political representatives had in the armed forces high command. Disarming the People’s Militia represented a politically and expertly sensitive tasking assigned to the armed forces. President Havel also requested military assistance on managing problems associated with criminality of prisoners amnestied at the turn of 1989–1990 as a result of amnesty that turned out to be too extensive.11 Practical support by various armed forces command echelons to the new democratic politics also showed in terms of specialist involvement in the preparation of the agreement on departure of Soviet units from the Czechoslovak territory. Another important endeavour involved an early preparation to inform the negotiations on withdrawal of Soviet troops while the CSLA responsibly performed duties under Vienna Treaties and CFE-T and on reduction of national armed forces personnel strength and weapon systems. Major changes were associated with the break-up of global bipolar security system and called for realigning bases and stationing them evenly over the whole territory of the CSFR. It was a highly challenging endeavour in terms of organisational effort, which took place in line with the newly adopted military doctrine that already captured the changed role of the armed forces.12

The armed forces democratisation phase brought about the process of crucial political and social changes in the military, which departed from the defeated totalitarian system and transitioned to a new pluralist system. That was the way towards a comprehensive change in the armed forces’ functions, organisation and structure, personnel replacement and their nature. The realisation was contingent on democratisation of defence policy, and brought about the strategic requirement for redefining the state defence concept as well as a fast reduction of armed forces personnel strength. Enacting the soldiers’ status as citizens was also an important step ahead. Political leadership of the state strove to transform communist totalitarian regime’s military into democratic armed forces and to follow on the democratic tradition of the interwar period.

2.3 Democratic civilian control

Depoliticising the military is an essential part of the process of armed forces democratisation, but the challenge is that armed forces must not lose its meaning during reconstruction and remain an armed organisation with specificities that running a military organisation involves. The time then was marked by the

quest for defining the meaning for terms “civilian control” and “democratic oversight” of the armed forces. Opinions were often voiced making those terms sound vague and suggesting loss of required functions the armed forces are required to deliver. New approaches to defence management and armed forces control were inspired by the traditions of the interwar state of Czechoslovakia, which was described above, and approaches proven well in other democratic countries.13

Practical efforts primarily concentrated on attaining an optimum degree of interlinking the process of civilian control and the command process. That included a broader involvement of the civic society into defence and security policy, which practically did not exist in the previous communist political system. The efforts sought to set up a system of institutions, formal and informal political mechanisms, processes and specific procedures, especially as concerns the Parliament, which would ensure political decision-making on development and employment of the armed forces. Likewise, setting objectives, tasking the armed forces, directing general ways ahead to achieve those objectives and assessment of armed forces’ performance ought to be under the control of democratically elected political representatives. Therefore, the military was not to become a tool of a specific social group, but of the whole society represented by legitimate political elites.14 On the other hand, senior military representatives were expected to be granted certain degree of professional autonomy in implementation of political decisions so as prevent direct political intervention into specialist military matters. Seeking an optimal interface between civilian control and specialist military command represents a permanent source of tension, including in the Czech Republic. There is probably no ideal system: it is always an acceptable compromise solution, usually taking on the form of parliamentary oversight thought sufficient to prevent abuse of military power.

The western model of democratic armed forces control applied as a part of democratisation process in our country works along the following principles:

- Clear definition of relationships among the armed forces, the society and its top political bodies in the country’s legal system in a manner compatible with the democratic regime that subordinates the armed forces and military elites to national political representation.
- Subordination by the armed forces to the rule of law.
- Primacy of the society in making political decisions affecting the armed forces as applied by the means of bearers of citizen’s sovereignty (the President, the Parliament and the Government).
- Primacy of civilians in realisation of political decisions expressed by a civilian minister of defence.
- Participation of soldiers in the democratic process (with some restrictions in place).
- Public oversight.

These general principles lay down relationships between crucial actors in the process of democratic armed forces control, i.e. the armed forces, other security services, state political institutions, interest groups both associated with the armed forces and independent of the military, the defence industrial base, think tanks working defence and security issues, media, soldiers of all categories, and last but not least the citizens.

Concrete application of general principles and objectives of the western model of armed forces civilian control varies from country to country. The specific form reflects expressions of certain cultural differences stemming from traditions, historical development, ways how legislation is developed and passed to regulate relationships among the key players in the process.

The objectives for implementing the western model of armed forces civilian control in the CSFR immediately after 1989 were as follows:

- Ensure primacy of the legitimate political power in development of national policies and, at the same time, professional autonomy for the armed forces;
- Achieve and maintain political neutrality of the armed forces;
- Develop and make use of military potential in line with national interests and needs;
- Use resources appropriated by the society in an effective and transparent manner;
- Develop adequate civil-military relations.

---

Almost one third of conscripts stated they were believers at the beginning of 1990s. Depoliticising the armed forces allowed such personnel not to hide their faith. The discussion got shortly underway about establishing chaplaincy in the armed forces.

Shortly after the democratisation process commenced, some of the political leading representatives attempted to task the armed forces outside official military command chain. To a degree, political leaders also realised their responsibility for developing and maintaining the existing military potential and for allocating adequate resources. However, the efforts failed to create effective feedback vehicles to provide oversight of efficiency, economy and effectiveness of resources spent. Throughout the democratisation process, and later as well, the subtle line was sought to separate political influence over military and specialist military command and control. The political leadership did not possess the necessary quality of specialist knowledge for developing and using the armed forces, and therefore had to lean on specialist military advice and proposals for tasking the military.

On the other hand, mutual understanding was hampered by an overly narrow focus of military specialists, who were not always able to grasp the wide context of developments in the society and national commitments to Allies. In their decision-making, political leaders had to consider not only security, but also foreign policy, economic and social and cultural interests. At that time, the Ministry of Defence and the General Staff did not get any explicit and comprehensive assignments either from the Government, Parliament or the President, as the commander-in-chief, and both institutions therefore rather had to rely on themselves.

Consequently, members of the MoD were dissatisfied with political decisions that were marked by discrepancy between assignments and the resources allocated to deliver them, which often ended up with departure of military personnel. The aim in the democratisation phase was not to create conditions for maximising national military potential while minimising resources. Political efforts primarily sought to ensure that the armed forces could not be abused against democratisation of the whole society and to adjust its mass character, insofar as possible, to new requirements and limited resources fast and without major social shocks at the same time. Those objectives were achieved to certain degree.

In order to attain a greater efficiency of civilian democratic control over the military, the Federal Assembly established the post of civilian inspector general in December 1990. Since consensus was never reached on the candidate to fill the post, the position was cancelled later on. Efforts by some newly elected Deputies in the Federal Assembly dedicated to civilian (public) oversight rather had spontaneous nature than an application of elaborated concept steered by the political leadership.

From among the top state and political officials, it was President Václav Havel who took the greatest interest in developments in the armed forces. President Havel drove the first wave of personnel and structural changes as the commander-in-chief of the armed forces. To expedite civilian control and democratic oversight, President Havel appointed his close friend and dissident, Luboš Dobrovský, who served as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs at that time, the first civilian Minister of Defence in October 1990. Before General Vacek was recalled, he and the armed forces had been subject to intensive criticism for several weeks by the media and the Parliament, because some information were made public about the involvement of the military in preparations for declaring extraordinary security measures that would eventually lead to the suppression of November 1989 events by force.
troops and abolition of the Warsaw Treaty. From the beginning of his term, the new minister strived for implementation of the new defence policy. As for personnel policy, he gave preference to specialist qualifications, but his decision to keep some seasoned pre-1989 military officials in posts was criticised. He was the first Minister to press for transforming the Ministry of Defence into a civilian body, for example by abolishing the post of the Chief of General Staff combined with the post of Deputy Defence Minister and assigning the CGS the supreme commander of the armed forces. He also advocated a broader engagement of civilian experts in senior posts.18

Besides the push by the Parliament to accelerate personnel replacements and despite the President’s personal commitment and appointment of a new civilian defence minister, the armed forces effectively found themselves on the margin of the country’s leadership’s attention, who rather gave preference to economic reforms. That attitude did not change even in the context of growing tensions in the society and in the armed forces as a result of dividing Czechoslovakia. A couple of months before that, again a retired military person, Imrich Andrejčák, who had ended his active-duty service and retired from the post of deputy defence minister shortly before, was appointed the Defence Minister on purely pragmatic grounds. After the split of the federation, Imrich Andrejčák became the first Defence Minister of the Slovak Republic.

An important aspect of civilian control of the armed forces was the development of know how to lean on for strategic decision making on defence policy. A dedicated strategic management branch was established with a Deputy Defence Minister in the lead, plus the FMoD Strategic Studies Institute and Military Social Research Institute were created and the Vojenské rozhledy (Military outlook) periodical was revived. Those institutions launched efforts to draft strategic policies encompassing a system of short, medium and long-term goals for the MoD and the Armed Forces to pursue. Issues of transitioning to an all-volunteer force were elaborated as well as creating a new national security system that would reflect on the changing strategic environment and transition to a new political assignment defined as follows: “Strategy of defence against all from all directions.” In 1993 and subsequent years, activities of those institutions were progressively phased out with the exception of publishing the Vojenské rozhledy periodical.

There was a need to measure how the armed forces and the society were able to live up to the set western model of democratic oversight. Legislation was therefore created to foster forming politically neutral armed forces.19 One of the negative aspects of the principles of democratic control was the fact that the post of Minister of Defence was filled by a military person.20 At that time, nascent political elites had at their disposal neither personalities with theoretical nor practical background necessary to guarantee effective defence management and successful accomplishment of democratisation processes in the armed forces. The defined political tasking that came into being in the euphoric analysis of security environment, lacked erudition and an explicit future vision that would drive the armed forces development in the long run.

It should be however noted that officials of the armed forces high command always remained loyal to the new political representation. That relation has been free of issues on sustained basis despite the fact that majority of military elites as opposed to key political leaders, had a background of affiliation with the pre-1989 regime. So-called military legislation, strategic documents and policies relating to armed forces development, implementation plans plus strategic and extensive armaments projects, defence budgets and the armed forces’ employment or involvement in international operations have always been endorsed by the Government and the Parliament.

The staffing procedure producing strategic policies, particularly those approved by the Government or the Defence Minister was a long-standing problem of the relation between the civilian, so-called political-military part of the defence ministry and the specialist (military) part. Senior military officials called for a political assignment, a public demand, according to which they would steer the future defence capability development.

In essence, that had not happen throughout 1990s largely owing to a low attention the political leaders paid to strategic defence management. Consequently, military officials got into stalemates of protracted and

19 At present, the following conditions apply for enlistment with the Armed Forces: completion of military oath, performance of basic or alternate military service, no membership in political parties, movements or unions, no criminal records and medical fitness. The Act on Career Soldiers No. 221/1999 Coll., passed 14 September 1999, as subsequently amended.
often ill-advised reorganisations. Restructuring efforts did change the armed forces’ quantitative parameters (reduced command and control echelons, personnel strength and quantities of armaments, military equipment and materiel), but only rarely improved the quality of the whole system (internal command and control procedures, planning, acquisition, modernisation, academic and field training) and seldom cultivated internal organisational culture (manners of communication, leadership, ethos, social and life conditions of soldiers and civilian employees). Mr. Jiří Síla commented on this issue in 2004: “... notably the executive intentionally leaves management of decision-making processes in preparation of strategic deliverables on the military. As a result, there are not enough truly civilian experts at the MoD on the subject of strategic defence management and armed forces development, who introduce modern managerial methods into the way business is done at the MoD and a strategic managerial style that is successfully applied in commercial organisations. Majority of senior management post meant to be civilian position were instead filled by soldiers, or soldiers who have just retired (in 2004, there was no truly civilian expert among the directors of MoD divisions).”

2.4 Withdrawal of Soviet Troops

Withdrawal of the Soviet troops became one of the key international policy challenges for Czechoslovakia’s new post-1989 leadership. Realising that step was regarded a prerequisite for restoring state sovereignty in full. A growing pressure by independent movements (e.g. Charter 77, the Civic Forum and other) and official apologies by Parliaments and Governments of five states (Bulgaria, Hungary, GDR, Poland, USSR) that took part in invading the Czechoslovak territory in 1968, paved the way for the withdrawal. State officials met in Moscow on 4 December 1989 and adopted a communiqué that the entry of their states into Czechoslovak territory represented an intervention into internal affairs of a sovereign state and ought to be condemned. That illegal intervention suspended restoration of democracy in Czechoslovakia and had long-lasting negative consequences. An invitation was voiced in that meeting to bilateral talks between the Governments of USSR and CSFR on the departure of Soviet troops and on the commitment that those forces would not be used in the time of political changes to intervene within Czechoslovakia.

In order for the government-to-government Czechoslovak-Soviet talks about an early and complete withdrawal of Soviet forces to succeed, it was initially essential to define the course of action leading to the achievement of that goal. The Soviet party was of the opinion that negotiations would not use in the time of political changes to intervene within Czechoslovakia.


as part of the Vienna talks on armed forces reduction in Europe, which would however defer the withdrawal significantly. In the subsequent bilateral meetings, the opinion prevailed as advocated by the Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marián Čalfa and Foreign Minister Jiří Dienstbier to hold talks strictly on bilateral level. During the discussions that commenced mid-January 1990, the Czech party proved to be very well prepared, which also positively affected the achieved compromise solution: to realise the withdrawal in the course of 18 months. Jiří Dienstbier wrote in his memoirs: "We called for a troops withdrawal agreement to be quickly sealed, but the Soviet delegation tied it to the whole old fabric of European security. We refused that "package". While Soviets worked on the idea that there were two military blocs having disarmament talks underway and still representing the cornerstone of security, our rationale was that the era of blocs was over and that the Warsaw Treaty was a temporary institution we wanted to abolish. Therefore, considerations whether there would be any foreign military contingent stationed in Czechoslovakia or not, were effectively futile. When Aboimov (the head of the Soviet delegation) wanted to leave the negotiation room ostentatiously, Luboš Dobrovský said: "OK, off you go". We did not need an agreement. The troops were here illegally and we would claim an immediate departure. Aboimov returned to the table. Our delegation then proposed just to suspend the talks and resume once the Soviet delegation is given the necessary mandate to complete the negotiation."23

An expert group tasked to make preparations for the negotiation was headed by Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Evžen Vacek and comprised of a legal-policy team and a technical-military team led by Deputy Minister of Defence Lieutenant-General Rudolf Ducháček. A thoroughly elaborated technical documentation (railway capacity, general withdrawal schedule and the like.) informed by estimates of the strength of Soviet forces in Czechoslovak territory proved highly effective. From 2 February 1990, General Ducháček was assigned the head of the Czechoslovak Government Commissioner’s Office for Departure of Soviet Troops.24

In attendance of their heads of state, Václav Havel and Mikhail Gorbachev, Foreign Ministers Jiří Dienstbier and Eduard Shevardnadze signed The Agreement between the Governments of the CSSR and USSR on Departure of Soviet Troops from Czechoslovakia in Moscow on 26 February 1990. The agreement included a schedule with three phases. The first phase was to be completed by 31 May 1990, the second by 31 December 1990 and the third until 30 June 1991. The plan was generally observed. The first phase withdrew 26,000 soldiers, 350 artillery systems, 10 aircraft, 48 helicopters and other equipment. The second stage involved 18,300 service personnel with hardware. The remaining service personnel with equipment then left in the third stage. The Protocol on completed full withdrawal of Soviet troops was signed by government commissioners of both countries on 25 June 1991.

In addition to the Office of the Czechoslovak Government Commissioner for Departure of Soviet Troops, the Federal Ministry of Defence also created the Directorate for Supporting the Departure of Soviet Troops, which was also staffed by civilian governmental ministries and departments. The directorate staff processed damages and claims, and were involved in the activities of the environment and economic commission of the CSFR Government Commissioner for departure of Soviet troops and closely cooperated with the CSFR Federal Assembly Commission for oversight of Soviet Troops Withdrawal.25

As stated in the Report of the Federal Assembly Commission for oversight of the withdrawal of Soviet troops, developed by the head of the commission Michael Kocáč, Member of Parliament, for a joint session of the Federal Assembly, the Soviet troops were primarily transported on rail. In total, the withdrawal used 825 trains with 20,265 railway cars and additional 11,088 cars were transported as a part of regular freight trains. Regular freight trains from Czechoslovakia into the Soviet Union were also used to support the withdrawal. Twenty-seven convoys comprising 1,709 vehicles redeployed on road. Airlift effort involved 15 transfer flights organised by air force units as well as transport of passengers, mostly families of Soviet commanding officers.26

---

24 ŠEDNÝ, J., Odchod sovětských vojsk z Československa, Mezinárodní vztahy 1993, No. 3, p. 43-44.  
26 KOCÁB, M., K ukončení odchodu sovětských vojsk z území ČSFR (Zpráva komise FS ČSFR pro dohled na odsun sovětských vojsk), Mezinárodní vztahy 1992, No. 1, p. 6.
2.5 Armed Forces reduction

Downsizing force levels breaks down into reduction of personnel strength, military equipment and defence technology as a yardstick of real capability to lead an armed conflict. Czechoslovakia placed a high premium on the international aspect of force reductions actually initialised as a part of the Helsinki process, whose first meeting brought together heads of state of European countries, U.S. and Canada took place as early as in 1975.

The Concluding Act of the Negotiation of Personnel Strength of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe was signed in 1989 and became a part of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe; together they entered into force on 17 July 1992. The CFE Treaty itself was signed in the Paris Summit of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) 19 November 1990. On behalf of the Czech Republic, the CFE Treaty was signed by President Václav Havel and the CSFR Federal Assembly ratified it on 19 July 1991. The aim of the treaty was to reduce the threat of military confrontation and sudden military attack in Europe by substantially decreasing the quantity of conventional arms, having a regular exchange of information on armaments and combat units basing and introducing a rigorous control regime to verify compliance. A new term was coined in the political vocabulary of the time – defence sufficiency. States parties were all NATO nations and the former states of the Warsaw Treaty, including successor states of the USSR and CSFR; that is altogether 30 countries. CFE-T obliges the states parties not to exceed the stipulated ceilings in five categories of conventional weapons in the geographic spread from the Atlantic to Ural.

An important vehicle of the CFE Treaty is the regular annual exchange of information on subordination, organisational structure, armaments and actual stationing of land and air forces of the state parties, including unit names (not code names), armaments and coordinates of specific military units down to separate battalion/squadron level. The summary annual information is updated every time a change occurs. The Czech
Republic regularly submits the information to all state parties and receives the same type of information from all states, which maintains transparency and confidence in Europe. The data presented is subject to inspection by other states parties. Every piece of combat equipment and weapons assigned for disposal is subject to inspection by international teams before and after disposal. Every unit, installation or depot with holdings of Treaty Limited Equipment may become an object of verification. Every state party is entitled to realize an inspection in another state’s territory to the effect of verifying completeness and correctness of submitted information. Inspection teams are usually multinational. The teams are entitled to enter the territory of inspected state already after 36 hours from transmitting notification of inspection through diplomatic channels or using the OSCE communication network. Only at the point of entry, the inspectors determine the object of verification, at which the inspection has to begin within 6 hours. The inspection team receive prescribed mandatory information from the site commander, especially actual personnel strength and current stationing of the Treaty Limited Equipment. The inspection involves the right to enter any buildings, hangars and shelters with doors 2 metres wide plus. Under certain conditions, the team is entitled to perform an airborne inspection using a helicopter. Inspections may last up to 48 hours. Such on-site inspections make it possible to credibly assess the situation, condition and possibilities of the armed forces and help build mutual confidence and security at the same time.

Since 1990, the CFE-T state parties have developed their national verification centres. The Czech Republic formed the Arms Control Agency\(^\text{27}\) that concentrated selected Czech Armed Forces service personnel and civilians with excellent language skills. The Czech inspectors won recognition in Europe for their specialist knowledge, diplomatic conduct and a high professionalism.

On the occasion of signing the CFE Treaty, CSFR submitted the following list of major weapons and equipment systems:

- 3,315 tanks;
- 4,593 armoured combat vehicles;
- 3,485 artillery pieces;
- 446 combat aircraft, and;
- 56 attack helicopters.

The CFE Treaty laid down the armed forces strength limit to 140,000 personnel for the CSFR and the following ceilings for major weapons and equipment systems:

- 1,435 tanks;
- 2,050 armoured combat vehicles;
- 1,150 artillery pieces;
- 345 combat aircraft;
- 75 attack helicopters.

Equipment exceeding the limits under the treaty was concentrated at 1 January 1992 into eight staging locations for planned disposal:

- 1,880 tanks;

\(^{27}\) Data courtesy of the Arms Control Agency of the Czech MoD Foreign Activities Directorate.
After the split of the CSFR, the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe imposed that the Czech Republic would have maximum 957 tanks, and the Armed Forces actually had 1,617 of them in the inventory at 1 March 1993. The process of decommissioning got underway...

- 2,453 armoured combat vehicles;
- 2,335 artillery pieces with calibre 100 mm plus;
- 101 combat aircraft.

Realisation of commitments under the CFE Treaty was affected by the division of the armed forces as Czechoslovakia split. In accordance with an agreement between the Government of the Czech Republic and the Government of the Slovak Republic dated 12 January 1993, the ceiling was set for the Czech Republic totalling 93,333 personnel to include the Czech Armed Forces and other Czech armed services.29 On 5 February 1993, an extraordinary conference of the CFE treaty state parties approved succession of the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic as independent state parties. The Treaty became effective on 17 July 1992. The OSCE Summit in Istanbul, Turkey, on 17 November 1999 endorsed the Adapted Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty, which removed the bloc architecture and improved inspection and information exchange mechanisms.

The data submitted by the Czech Republic in the CFE-T framework at 1 March 1993 included the total authorised peacetime strength of 117,838 active duty personnel, of whom there were:

- 6,910 personnel in command authorities and support units;
- 40,101 personnel in the Land Forces;
- 14,060 personnel in the Air Force and Air Defence;
- 21,082 personnel in Ground Based Air Defence (in addition to Air Force air defence);
- 23,285 personnel in centrally subordinated units and facilities (signals, research, construction and the like);
- 12,400 of so-called other military personnel (e.g. soldiers assigned to railway troops and the civil defence).30

Based on the commitments under the CFE Treaty, the authorised national ceilings for weapon systems in 2:1 ratio were split following the division of the CSFR by a separate agreement. Thus, the Czech Republic had the following limits:

- 957 tanks;
- 1,367 armoured combat vehicles;
- 767 artillery systems;
- 230 combat aircraft, and;
- 50 attack helicopters.

From the entry of the CFE Treaty into force till 16 November 1995, the Czech Armed Forces disposed the following quantities of treaty limited equipment:

- 1,179 tanks;
- 1,470 armoured combat vehicles;

---

28 According to the MoD Arms Control Agency, the discrepancy involving 90 AFVs occurred that the number of 4,593 armoured combat vehicles mistakenly included equipment not limited by the CFE Treaty ceilings (OT-65 RL and OT-65) and OT-64 located outside the CFE Treaty application zone, specifically with the Czech battalion deployed for operations as part of UNPROFOR.

29 Data courtesy of the Arms Control Agency of the Czech MoD Foreign Activities Directorate.

30 Ibid.
Not all military hardware surplus to the needs of the Czech military ended up in scrap. Some enthusiasts established military museums; others used the power of armoured mammoths for labour. And yet others for business...
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- 1,498 artillery systems,
- 64 combat aircraft.

That happened in compliance with the commitment of the CFE Treaty states parties to dispose within 40 months from its entry into force the equipment above the limit in elaborately defined ways and under supervision of international inspection teams.

2.6 Reorganisation and base realignment

Very shortly after the 1989 Velvet Revolution, changes started to take place and political debates unrolled about the way of ensuring national defence and the future shape of the armed forces. The first policy document to address some of those issues was the Concept of Development of the Czechoslovak Armed Forces till the end of 1993 approved by the Government in November 1990. Its basic principles were described as 3R: Relocation, Reorganisation and Reduction. Development and activities of the Armed Forces were subsequently affected by the adoption of the Act on shortening the conscription service from 24 to 18 months. It was a political measure that reflected what the society demanded. It should be noted that conscription service was claimed to be an honorary civic duty, but in terms of infringement of personal liberty, accommodation conditions and internal relations it rather approximated to sentence of imprisonment. That did not apply to conscripts only, but to career soldiers alike.

The relocation measures were designed to achieve a balanced disposition of forces across national territory to enable setting up defence formations to fight an attack on the country coming from any direction. At the same time, Air Force bases were realigned to achieve air force unit stationing at a lower number of operational airfields in line with the required life and environmental conditions. The decisive changes in stationing were to take place in conjunction with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from CSFR territory till the end of 1992.

The reorganisation was driven by the need to meet the requirement for an effective defence. The changes were carried out pursuant to reorganisation and relocation orders, which turned decisions into reality in nearly regular six-month intervals. Besides reducing the quantity of equipment, those changes also involved the creation of an integrated state air defence system, simplification of the field command system and a new concept of territorial defence forces. In parallel, it was necessary to create a different and more effective national defence management system and armed forces command system. The CSFR began to get used to having own national responsibility for development of the strategy, and after long years became the bearer of strategic decision making on national defence, having realised no one would do the job for the country as had been the case in the time of the Warsaw Treaty.

Nine motorised rifle and five tank regiments were abolished and combined-arms divisions reorganised in 1991. Four mechanised divisions, three tank divisions, a motorised and an infantry division were formed in the new force structure. The other six divisions remained in the original structure. The army and front service troop component was abolished. Western Military District and Eastern military District were replaced with

---

Military Command West and Military Command East. In the Air Force and Air Defence, two fighter air regiments and an integrated air defence system were created to cover the Czechoslovak territory with a new air defence division in the territory of Slovakia.

The year 1992 saw reorganisation completed of the remaining six wartime build-up combined arms divisions, on whose basis 3 motorised and 3 infantry divisions were formed. Five infantry brigades and eleven territorial defence infantry regiments were created. A new Military Command Centre headquartered in Olomouc was established and separate full-scale branch and combat support service components were formed with all three command headquarters. Flight operations were concentrated from 16 to 12 permanent air stations. The tasking under the CSFR Government’s program statement of July 1992\(^\text{32}\) accelerated the armed forces transformation process, especially in terms of restructuring and actual stationing of forces. The Government’s program statement also included the commitment to thoroughly fulfil defence military doctrine, overhaul the armed forces structure, create conditions for completion of major changes in basing and shorten conscription duty. Given the political situation, the last Cabinet of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic was working from summer 1992 to concurrently divide the federation and the Czechoslovak Armed Forces.

Reduction of force levels, personnel strength and arms inventory took place in line with the armed forces development concept but also as part of delivering the Czech commitments under the CFE Treaty. The original number of active duty military personnel (authorised strength comprising both career soldiers and conscripts), which amounted to approximately 210,000 personnel in 1989, decreased to 159,152 peacetime establishment strength at the end of 1992.\(^\text{33}\)


\(^{33}\) Data courtesy of the Arms Control Agency of the Czech MoD Foreign Activities Directorate.
Transformation also showed in one of the basic activities of military service, which was force training. A coalition system of training determined by the projected employment of the Czechoslovak armed forces in the Warsaw Treaty order of battle had been a long-standing operating principle for the armed forces. A transition took place towards training intended to deliver the newly politically demanded role for the armed forces: to be able to defend the CSFR autonomously against enemies attacking from all directions. But it also meant in practice that extensive and expensive checks of readiness in the form of division-level and regimental level tactical exercises were abandoned. Force training centered on individual training, checking the quality of individual skills and abilities and consolidating units up to battalion level.

2.7 Approval of defence doctrine

The development of military doctrine was initialised by the Helsinki process that sought to shift confidence building among Eastern and Western Europe into the realm of military. It was agreed in international meetings in 1980s that individual countries would formulate own military doctrine that would include an expression of attitude to combat and military solutions to disputes. Doctrines define the rules according to which countries seek to lead military activities in case of conflicts. Such declared approaches were to include a public statement whether the countries intended to observe international law of war and principles of humanity. Development of a military doctrine received relevant attention in Czechoslovakia already before 1989. In 1988-89, defence scientists produced support studies and specified what the doctrine should encompass. Thanks to that, the defence community was prepared to see a policy drafted to express the basics of what the doctrine should incorporate. CSFR military doctrine was promulgated by the Federal Assembly on 20 March 1991. It envisaged that the primary role of the Czechoslovak Armed Forces in the event of an aggression would be to repel land and/or air attack by unspecified aggressor from any direction targeting any part of the Czechoslovak territory. The doctrine explicitly stated that it was not an offensive but defensive proclamation of intentions to use national armed forces. It respected the principle of reasonable sufficiency building only those defence capabilities that were essentially needed for national defence. It also expressed the commitment that the CSFR was ready to commit its forces to perform missions as part of UN peacekeeping operations as well as for managing the consequence of ecological and other natural disasters.

Adoption of the Military Doctrine of the Czechoslovak Armed Forces opened the doorway to realising a major redesign of the armed forces that would be, contrarily to the shape then, unquestionably and exclusively defensive in nature.

2.8 Division of the CSFR and its armed forces

Already shortly after November 1989, the relations between Czechs and Slovaks on the level of the state’s political leadership first indicated the need for a radical solution in the future. In the Federal Parliament, the Czech-Slovak relations developed into a typical misunderstanding between political representatives, which showed in the legislature in 1990 by what was named the “the hyphen fight”. That struggle lowered mutual sympathy among political representatives; biting and poorly substantiated discussions on which party was giving a free ride to the other did not help mutual understanding either. Also, there was not any prominent truly federal political party. In 1991, Slovak deputies in the Federal Assembly refused to adopt the federal constitution and thus strengthened sentiments that were rather anti-centralist than anti-Czech. The situation in Slovakia was exacerbated by difficulties originating in economic transformation and particularly the slump in defence industry, which impacted Slovakia’s economy heavily. Consequently, the calls intensified for Slovakia’s independence and sovereignty.
A tank convoy on their last journey from Strašice to the loading ramp in Holoubkov. Destination: Levice, Slovakia.

Besides defence, federal purview also included foreign relations. Armed forces are planned to be employed in an international environment, and that is why the interest in this sphere of governance is relevant. In the federal system after 1990, national Government of the Czech Republic did not have an equivalent to the component established by the Government of the Slovak Republic, which was the Ministry of International Relations. In line with this development, a sign of settlement only occurred after June 1992 elections. The ODS civic democratic party and the HZDS Movement for Democratic Slovakia won the elections. Replacing Mr. Jiří Dienstbier, a HZDS member Jozef Moravčík was appointed the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the new federal cabinet. The elections resulted in the departure of majority of former dissidents from senior posts on the political scene. The split of CSFR was heralded in the sphere of international politics by the institution of the Ministry of International Relations of the Czech Republic headed by Josef Zieleniec; his counterpart in Slovakia was Milan Kuňažko. Tension was also generated through asymmetry in many institutions – for instance there was the Czechoslovak Television in the territory of the Czech Republic, but the Slovak Television was established in Slovakia, there were also parallel efforts to establish the Slovak Armed Forces, Slovak Police and a Slovak National Bank. The political decision to divide the CSFR into two independent countries was adopted on 8 June 1992 in Vila Tugendhat in Brno, which was the venue to the first round of coalition talks between the elections winners, the Czech Prime Minister Václav Klaus and Slovak Prime Minister Vladimír Mečiar. The outcome of the talks was an agreement on dividing the CSFR.

The time of appeasement policy from the Czech party and partial conciliation by the Slovak party was drawing to an end in 1992. That manifested on 17 July 1992, when the Slovak National Council endorsed the Declaration on Sovereignty of the Slovak Republic. Becoming the last joint President of Czechs and Slovaks, President Havel responded to the document, which although respecting the state system then was an “expression of political will”, by abdicating on 20 July 1992. After his abdication, since there was not any political will to elect a new federal head of state, the President’s executive responsibilities were performed collectively by chairpersons of the Federal Assembly and the Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Federal Republic Jan Stráský. The agreement on the division of Czechoslovakia was again signed in Villa Tugendhat.
on 26 August 1992, which was the venue over the following year to negotiations detailing the division of federal property.

The decision opened the door for an early abolishment of the last federal ministry: the Ministry of Defence and establishing new defence ministries in the framework of governments of the Czech and Slovak Republic and especially physical division of the common “federal” military.

The division of the CSFR armed forces was based on the Constitutional Act No. 541/1992 Sb. on the division of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic and on passing the title to the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, and the Constitutional Act on the Cessation of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic No. 542/1992 Coll.

The policy and general principles for the division of the CSFR armed forces were approved by the State Defence Council on 28 September 1992. Forces and assets were therefore to be divided in the 2:1 ratio taking into account their quantitative and qualitative aspects plus the value of the armed forces’ property (estimated CZK 418 billion) and with a view to population and territory of both countries. Personnel strength limits, and weapons and equipment ceilings were also divided in 2:1 so that the aggregate would not exceed the ceiling CFE Treaty stipulated for the former CSFR.

To perform that task, the Directive of the Chief of General Staff on settlement and movements of the Czechoslovak Armed Forces’ arms, equipment and materiel between the Czech and Slovak Republic was approved by the CSFR Minister of Defence on 26 October 1992 and signed by commissioners of both national governments. In a similar fashion, the Protocol on the division of the Czechoslovak Armed Forces was approved and signed on 31 December 1992 as the principal document treating the scope and material aspects of the legal settlement of property.

The MoD, Armed Forces, political structures and the public paid a high attention to the management of personnel issues in what indeed were multinational armed forces. Career soldiers as well as conscripts had a free choice to decide where they would like to serve or complete their service. Regardless of nationality, career soldiers were required after making their choice to have the citizenship of the country in whose armed forces they would serve. New armed forces were therefore not meant to be built on national principle, but on citizenship. Ahead of splitting the military, an analysis was performed of commanding officers in the sense of their nationality and stationing in specific territories. The analysis showed there were approximately 8,600 career soldiers with Slovak nationality in the Czech Republic, whereas approximately 2,580 Czech commissioned and non-commissioned officers served in Slovakia. Surveys showed that majority of career soldiers intended to continue serving where they had served; only 10-15% of those military professionals entertained the possibility of changing their duty location.

The whole process of division was steered by the General Staff in cooperation with Military Command West, Military Command Center and Military Command East and the Air Force and Air Defence Command. That comprehensive and challenging manoeuvre involved transferring a gamut of equipment and materiel between both countries by the means of 2,324 railway transports and 117 vehicle convoys.

The transfer from the territory of the Slovak Republic in the territory of the Czech Republic involved:

- 224 artillery systems;
- 42 aircraft (31 trainers, 7 helicopters and 4 transport aircraft);

![Splitting the Czechoslovak armed forces also involved the division of personnel. Most career soldiers decided to continue their service in their current station. Only close to 15% considered changing their garrison.](image)
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---

Democratisation of the society also showed in the recognition of heroism of Josef Gabčík and Jan Kubiš who had carried out the assassination of Reinhard Heydrich in 1942 and fell with five other paratroopers in the Orthodox church of Saint Cyrilus and Method in Resslova street in Prague.
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The following items were transferred from the territory of the Czech Republic into the territory of Slovak Republic:

- 347 artillery systems;
- 163 aircraft (98 combat aircraft, 49 helicopters and 16 transport aircraft);
- 164 tanks;
- 59 infantry fighting vehicles and armoured personnel carriers;
- 2,032 trucks and vehicles;
- 610 pieces of other types of equipment.

Underway from 1 November 1992 through 20 December 1992, transfers of arms, equipment and materiel were well-organised and without any extraordinary events. Handover of military aircraft was completed at the end of 1992 in the 2:1 ratio except for MiG-29 fighters, which were dividend in 1:1 ratio, and MiG-23 aircraft, which remained in the Czech Republic.

A commission with representation of both parties was established in Bratislava at the beginning of 1993 to resolve outstanding issues. Partition of the CSFR Armed Forces’ property, which took place in a calm and cultivated fashion, was essentially accomplished at 31 October 1993. Division of file and archive collections of the military defence intelligence, the former defence counter-intelligence service and the Intelligence Directorate was covered later on under a bilateral agreement on mutual access of the collections to authorised persons.

Democratisation of the defence sector and the armed forces was not a one-off endeavour. It rather represented an outset of a lengthy process of changing the mindset, conduct and acting of servicemembers at all command and control echelons and in all personnel categories. In the initial period of approximating to western model of democratic civilian control, principal changes in organisation, personnel and legislation launched a long-term process of transitioning to democratic armed forces. The measures were designed to help minimize the likelihood of the armed forces’ abuse against democratic development in the society. That objective was achieved one-hundred per cent, although it had some repercussions on professionalism of command and combat readiness as a result of relatively quick replacement of many senior commanders.

The society perceived that the military was abused neither by the former political powers nor by the armed forces themselves during the 1989 Velvet Revolution. With that being the case, the armed forces progressively grew into a stabilising factor of societal changes. Despite continuous replacements in key positions of the Defence Ministry and the armed forces high command, the military managed to maintain an integrated command chain and the necessary standards of readiness, perform replacement of personnel very quickly, eliminate the influence political parties attempted to exert prior to the first free elections in 1990 and develop a democratic life in the armed forces without disrupting the indivisible command authority as the basic principle of control. Independent associations began to be active in the armed forces: the Career Soldiers’ Association and the Military Renewal Association. Ex military personnel were associated in multiple organisations, but the year 1996 saw the Soldiers Together Association (AVS) founded to provide umbrella to twelve...

organisations – the Association of Czechoslovak Airmen Abroad 1939–45, Association of Airmen Abroad – East, Rehabilitated Czech Armed Forces employees association, Civil Protection Association, Airmen Association, Union of Auxiliary Technical Battalions – military forced labour camps, Reserve Soldiers Association, Career Soldiers’ Association, Union of Military Sport Clubs, the Military section of the Confederation of political prisoners, Military Club of Hunting and the Intelligence Brigade. The above-mentioned organisations have cooperated with the MoD in realisation of national defence policy and developed the activities of their respective memberships. The AVS is a voluntary, non-profit and non-political association active in the whole Czech Republic having extensive international relations with like-minded organisations.\(^6\)

The attitude changed to education, field and academic training, and the military service was humanised. The Armed Forces was subordinated to the functions and rules of a democratic state. Parliamentary oversight was instituted by establishing the Defence Security Committee of the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament. A defensive military doctrine was formulated and defence policy concept redefined to formulate the first political assignment for the military in democracy. Dialogue with the public was established and transparency increased both in terms of activities performed and allocation of funding. Rehabilitations were carried out and political wrongs to soldiers and civilian employees remedied, including possible reactivation. The Armed Forces successfully managed to accomplish the challenging tasks of dividing the federal military between two newly established independent states, facilitate a seamless withdrawal of Soviet troops from national territory and successfully join crisis management in Kuwait and in the Balkans.

### 2.9 Security reality and the security system during the split of CSFR

At the time of division of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic, the security reality reflected the past bipolar situation and it was not sure whether solutions to international and domestic disputes would not see the involvement of military power. The armed forces maintained high training standards in measures to be performed in mobilisation build-up and had considerable personnel strength as well as subject-matter expertise. It was a very strong military force that neighbouring states perceived as possible military threat.

Since 1976, the MoD force structure included the Civil Defence. There had not been an integrated system in operation in the CSFR territory, which would enable a coordinated employment of the state’s available capabilities including the armed forces to flexibly respond to emergencies or crises.

While the political leadership did not seek to elaborate on issues of comprehensive defence and security in the new era, components of the Federal Ministry of Defence and its research institutions responded by producing studies, analyses, projections and contingency plans. They proactively worked on the assumption that after extracting the CSFR from the Warsaw Treaty militarily, it would be vital to build own dedicated manner of maintaining sovereignty, inviolability of state borders and territorial integrity. The proposal was for creating an effective “CSFR defence system”, which would build on scientific research and not only intuitive, biased and speculative considerations. In addition to the armed forces, such defence system was to encompass other system components to be operational both in

\(^{6}\) Medialní platforma Asociace vojáci společně, Stanovy AVS, Vojenské rozhledy 2006, No. 2, p. 191, 192, 210, 211.
Servicemembers of military rescue units prepare themselves to respond to non-military threats such as accidents involving hazmat, natural disasters and terrorist acts. Photo by Jiří Hokův

the state of emergency and during war. The system also envisaged the involvement of local governments and municipalities, some non-governmental organisations and economic entities. The notion of defence started to incorporate contents that was not limited to meaning "military defence" only. From theoretical viewpoint, the defence system was regarded a measure adopted by state authorities to respond to military as well as non-military crises and to specific threats. Crisis possibly arising out of a military threat was defined as a consequence of a local, regional or global conflict of low, medium or high intensity. Tensions were foreseen to graduate with relevant level of response by the security system addressing them. Military intervention was admitted even without declaring war after political and economic sanctions by foreign states or in reaction to insurgencies, putsch, terrorism and sabotage.37

Non-military threats were perceived as external and internal emergencies, whose management would claim, under certain circumstances, employment of military forces and assets to perform measures prepared and run by state authorities. Such emergencies could result from rapid growth of terrorism and organised crime, massive migration, and natural and anthropogenic disasters that would claim the employment of a comprehensive emergency management system. Specifically, the following set of contingency measures was defined for the armed forces to perform:

- Closing of endangered areas, regulation and patrolling;
- Safeguarding critical defence areas and facilities;
- Emergency management operations, evacuation of citizens and animals;
- Sanitation and decontamination of persons, equipment and materiel,
- Reinforcement of international border security.

On the homeland front, the armed forces were to perform security, protective and stabilisation roles. Performance of security role involved an interdepartmental and interagency cooperation with the Ministry of the Interior that has the primary responsibility for the state’s security. Delivering the protective role involved transforming the civil defence, fire brigades and other emergency management services of the state into an integrated emergency management system in which other armed force’s components would participate based on the law and interdepartmental agreements. The internal stabilisation role was perceived as a guarantee of the society’s democratic development and of “unabusability” of the military in pushing the agenda of any political parties or individuals.38

In the CSFR (1989–1993) and later the Czech Republic, the 1989 revolution changes mirrored in the efforts to develop own security and defence strategy, designing own defence system, which militarily be in accordance with the internationally acknowledged principle of reasonable defence sufficiency and begin to respect the requirement for an emergency management system. The responsibility to elaborate on the system was vested with the Institute for Strategic Studies of the Federal Ministry of Defence in Prague, which was established in 1991.39 The Institute coined the term of comprehensive defence system, which was defined as a system able, based on identified preparations for a military attack against the CSFR, to "repel threats to sovereignty, avert aggression, restore territorial integrity, ensure security and protection of citizens, provide consequence management in wartime, ensure security, protection and rescue of citizens and material values of the society against the consequence of natural and anthropogenic disasters and their ecologic consequence in peacetime". The system was

The Air Rescue Service plays a central role in the Integrated Emergency System.
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to provide the role of "deterrent, defence, security, protection and emergency rescue". The proposed comprehensive defence system comprised the following subsystems:

1. National defence top management subsystem;
2. Executive subsystem: armed forces, comprehensive emergency system (including Civil Defence that was a part of the Federal Ministry of the Interior at the time);
3. Comprehensive national defence support subsystem.

The concept of reasonable defence sufficiency coupled with the nascent European security system played an important role in developing the understanding and practical proposals. The collocation was interpreted as a quality of a comprehensive defence system variable in time. Such system was not capable of an effective aggression against neighbouring countries. What did it entail for the CSFR? While the Armed Forces was regarded a threat, the Czech Republic had to seek downsizing its defence posture to attain a higher credibility that the doctrinal proclamation "about not starting the war first" was meant seriously.

In order to prepare a comprehensive emergency management system in greater detail, a working team was set up in the Institute for Strategic Studies (1992–1993) with the task to reach out to all services, agencies and components providing emergency response management on professional basis. In the context of developments in the international arena, changes in the military doctrine and the projected development of security situation, the team was tasked to propose changes in legislation. The assignment was twofold: to provide coordination activities and propose new legislation.

Researching specificities and policies of individual components that formed a distributed emergency management in the territory of CSFR generated a picture of the 1992 status, its strengths and weaknesses. The concept of the new comprehensive emergency management system was also informed by lessons learnt. The assignment envisaged that the military would not be the steering element for domestic emergency operations. Nevertheless, the armed forces was so experienced component of national defence and security, that it was called to deliver on tasks associated with development of concrete proposals and drafting essential documents.

The team designed a concept that would facilitate coordination of protective and rescue services for the system to be operational in emergencies. The team eventually drafted a bill to be enacted, but given the political situation before the break-up of the CSFR it was not among high priorities and did not make it to the agenda of the Chamber of Deputies. It was typical for that period of time that political leadership was uninterested in systemic management of non-military threats and in ensuring citizen's security and defence.
2.10 Nascence of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic 1993–1994

The first Cabinet of the independent Czech Republic and at the same time the last (eighth) Cabinet of the Czech Republic in the federal system was a coalition cabinet comprising the ODS (civic democrats), KDS (Christian democrats), KDU-ČSL (Christian democrats – Czechoslovak people’s party) and ODA (civic democratic alliance), with Prime Minister Václav Klaus. The Cabinet provided executive state administration in the territory of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia from 2 July 1992 till 4 July 1996. After the establishment of the Czech Republic, the Cabinet continued in office. The number of the Ministries expanded with the Ministry of Defence. The first person to fill the office of the Minister of Defence was a member of the KDU-ČSL party, Antonín Baudýš, whose tenure lasted till 21 September 1994, when he was replaced by Vílém Holán representing the same party. General Karel Pezl had served as the Chief of General Staff of the Czech Armed Forces from 1991 and navigated the military through its division and transformation from federal to national. On 1 July 1993, General Pezl was replaced by Colonel-General Jiří Nekvasil, who was the Chief of Defence until 1998.

The new situation entailed a reduction of personnel strength as a result of division and an objective-based reduction in line with transitioning to defence sufficiency. At the same time, it was critical to keep all military processes including those supported by units stationed in Slovak territory. Therefore, some activities were newly provided by structures within the Czech territory and other activities were abolished at specific units. Promulgated legislation initially permitted career soldiers to decide on their own whether they would serve with the Slovak armed forces or the Czech Armed Forces. That represented just a short-term issue that resolved quickly. Performance of conscription was settled already during the division of the armed forces according to conscripts’ domicile. It is however worthwhile mentioning that there had been rules that posted Slovak soldiers in Czech garrisons; as a consequence it was newly impossible to fill all the posts in military units thickly based along the Western border. The real problem the Czech Armed Forces initially faced were actual manning levels and the existence of “framework” (not on full manning levels) structures that were progressively abolished through regularly issued reorganisation orders.

Another interesting aspect was the transition from two official languages to one in command and control. The Czech Armed Forces did not pay that much attention to the issue: it was commonplace for Slovak language to be received equally to Czech. Some activities as well as common property, such as maps, were divided later on, because it was not possible to seal a fair separation agreement in such a short time. All measures took place in accordance with the protocol on division of the federal property and through proper mandatory procedures.

The new state meant a change of the constitution, state symbols, anthems as well as military insignia and customs. Steps progressively took place to distinctly mark the change and discontinuity of the socialist and federal past. The armed forces changed both within and externally. The extensive indeed family Czech-Slovak ties among the armed forces service personnel, including conscripts, who in innumerable instances continued their careers in the Czech Republic, supported the extraordinary relations between the new states. The past twenty years have proven that amply.

The development of international security reality, in which the peaceful division of the CSFR armed forces played the role of a recognised model, brought about a reverse process: integration of the armed forces of Germany already in 1990. The period of far-reaching changes claimed an increased activity of our new diplomatic representatives towards future military orientation. On 6 October 1991, three months after disintegration of the Warsaw treaty, Foreign Ministers of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary met in Krakow, Poland, and expressed their wish to join NATO’s activities in the military
sphere. In the Rome Summit on November 7–8, 1991, NATO nations adopted two important documents: new NATO Strategic Concept and the Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation. The fast developments institutionalised political will as the NATO Headquarters in Brussels became a venue already on 20 December 1991 to the inaugural meeting of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) attended by 16 NATO nations and 9 states of Central and Eastern Europe. The inaugural meeting of NACC was taking place when the Soviet Union was ceasing to exist and eleven former Soviet Republics became members of the new Commonwealth of Independent States and started to endeavour on political and economic transformation both inside and in their international relations. In March 1992, NACC participation was expanded with all members countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States and Albania and Georgia joined in by June 1992. On 10 April 1992, the first meeting of the NATO Military Committee took place with defence ministers and chiefs of defence of those countries. The conflict in former Yugoslavia was underway and the North Atlantic Council resolved on 17 December 1992 to support additional UN activities in that country. That was a review of international political military situation, in which the process of division and the first days of separate Czech Armed Forces took place.

In 1993, the ACR representatives already started to take part in daily business at NATO Headquarters in the role of liaison officers. The process of NATO’s enlargement with the states of former adversaries from the Warsaw Treaty was officially acknowledged at the end of 1993. The decision was politically crowned in the NATO Summit in Brussels on January 10–11, 1994, which launched the Partnership for Peace (PfP) Programme. The programme was deliberated on foreign and defence ministerial level in 1993. The Combined Joint Task Force concept was approved in the military sphere. Prime Minister of the Czech Republic Václav Klaus signed the PfP Framework Document at NATO Headquarters on 10 March 1994 and first commissioned and non-commissioned officers assigned to work in NATO bodies had begun training several days ahead at the Czech Armed Forces training centre in Komorní Hrádek. The PfP Coordination Group in Mons, Belgium, whose members included the later Deputy Defence Minister, General Jaroslav Škopek, became active on 28 April 1994. Shortly after that, the Czech Republic submitted its PfP Presentation Document that outlined the vision of how cooperation with NATO would be fulfilled. The Czech documents were then deliberated and the Individual Partnership Program for the Czech Republic was endorsed on 25 November 1994. The first joint PIP exercise Cooperative Bridge took place in Poland on September 12–16, 1994, and saw the participation of 13 states.
The split of the CSFR into two democratic states gave a new impetus to the formulation of visions of effective national security and defence. Despite initial achievements in the period of democratisation, it was increasingly obvious that it would be necessary to tackle newly emerging issues associated with funding military defence, stabilisation of armed forces development and long-term development of the changed armed forces’ capabilities. Division of the military potential among two independent states following the 2:1 ratio of the population took place without any major issues. From the international perspective, the process finally confirmed the transition to defence sufficiency and did away with the concerns over the former armed forces’ obvious strength. In the domestic scene, the force reductions made people rightly believe that the military did not represent a potentially destabilising element anymore and it did not show the hallmarks of a power that could endanger the ongoing democratic changes in the society anymore. What followed in 1995–1998 was a period dominated by the process of integration to NATO both in terms the armed forces’ internal development and its international position. It was critical to increase public awareness of the fact that it was not just the armed forces joining NATO, but the whole Czech Republic.

There was a host of unknowns and multitude of new information, processes and procedures that were creatively identified and forged. It was typical of that phase that seeking ways to provide national defence was not always seamless and considerable effort was required to reach consensus on national as well as international level. It remained a major challenge to persuade political leaders that national defence and security and its strategic orientation was a vital political interest. Until 1997, which saw catastrophic flooding in the Czech Republic, efforts had failed to convince those responsible the new independent state in a substantially changed security reality had to modify its security system accordingly. The key driver then for ensuring a fundamentally new quality of the Czech Republic’s external security was its integration the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. The political representation often heard military experts argue: “We are not there yet. It is time to start looking into security issues and engage in changing the Czech Republic’s security system.” It was essentially not until 1998, when the Constitutional Act on Security of the Czech Republic No. 110/1998 Coll. was passed, that the political leadership made clear they wanted to endeavour on the path systemic concept-based development of national defence and security.

Pondering on the origins of the mechanisms that really instigated the change in attitude to ensuring defence and to forming defence policy, it is necessary to get back to the previous phase. The new dynamic in thinking of political leaders after 1993 was fuelled by changes in security reality in Europe driven by the situation in the Balkans. The
news of the continuing civic war in the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) extensively shaped thinking of politicians in Europe including the Czech Republic. Most of them realised there were idealistic misconceptions about a secure world when the Cold War ended, that security would not be granted without effort and care dedicated to maintain it, and that it was a one of the basic life feelings we have to upkeep universally. The Czech Republic was then quick to review the strategic vision of the capabilities and possibility to provide national defence independently and against all directions. So, realistic visions prevailed of ensuring defence and security involved maintaining and developing a credible and real national defence potential. The goal of integration into western political and military structures, i.e. NATO, logically concluded the period of groping and quest.

Initially after the establishment of independent state of Czech Republic, the political assignment for the armed forces was articulated in the wording of the Act on the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic of 1993, the Czech Armed Forces Development Concept till 1996\textsuperscript{40} authorised in the same year, White Paper on Defence of the Czech Republic endorsed in 1995 and the 1994 Military Strategy of the Czech Republic.\textsuperscript{41} Those policies formulated the key roles for the armed forces and directed its activity to the provision of territorial defence against external attack from all directions, while relying of assistance by Allies and meeting own international commitments.\textsuperscript{42} Political tasking conceived that way reflected on a specific historical period still burdened by the process of paying peace dividends (defence cuts, strength reduction, weapon systems limitation and infrastructure downsizing). There was an obvious dichotomy in the attitude to providing security and defence, which showed in the development of two-tier forces: territorial defence forces and the so-called reaction forces earmarked for foreign operational deployments. Those approaches resulted in reprioritisation of modernisation, training and overall support to reaction forces.

A degree of uncertainty and hesitation in the quest for a defence strategy that would best answer the needs of the Czech Republic perhaps also resulted from negative historical reverberations concerning solidity of alliances. Only over time a progressive transition occurred to a clear orientation on western political and military structures as well as multilateral efforts to practically strengthen ties with the West. Decision-making on these issues was affected by the interwar history of Czechoslovakia, shaped by strategic viewpoints, especially the Czech Republic’s geographic location, determined by national economy and the altering economic area, limited by resources and projected development of the security environment. Providing national security and defence progressively became a comprehensive matter that utilised the potentials of a successful foreign policy, the armed forces, internal security mechanisms and prospering economy. Although the armed forces maintained basic prerequisites for defending the state with own forces in the second half of 1990s, the ability to fulfil political assignments on standalone basis without the assistance of Allies steadily dropped.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{40} The Czech Armed Forces Development Concept till 1996, Vojenské rozhledy 1993, No. 7, p. 5–35.


\textsuperscript{42} Military Strategy of the Czech Republic, Prague 1994.

\textsuperscript{43} The Czech Armed Forces Development Concept Outline till 2005, Czech MoD 1997.
3.1 Influences on democratic control after 1993

From the inception of the independent Czech Republic and the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic at 1 January 1993, the relations between civilian leadership and the armed forces command stagnated. There were new situations, the civilian management verified their procedures, formal mechanisms were laid down by law, but there was not a condition that could be described as “major qualitative change”. Security expert Miloš Balabán pointed out in 2004 that there was not a true civilian control and democratic oversight of the military, which however could not be judged just on the basis of its rather formal expression (appointing civilians as defence ministers), but particularly through a consistent application of substantial and competent inputs by the political representation into the process of strategic defence and armed forces management. Likewise, General Jiří Šedivý, Chief of General Staff Czech Armed Forces in 1998–2002, alerted to the fact in 2009 that the traditional goal in civil-military relations was to keep the military out of politics. Ironically, there was a completely opposite situation in the Czech Republic: how to make politicians engage in defence issues. Almost until the end of 1997, the only institutions practically pursuing development of defence policy and strategy were primarily the Ministry of Defence and the General Staff. The reason for that was the principle of sectoral policy that prevailed during the coalition Cabinets led by PM Klaus, when defence issues were tackled exclusively by the aforementioned military institutions and not the Government as such. As a matter of fact, economic transformation became the Government’s priority number one in the independent Czech Republic.

Defence management in 1990s was hampered by general rejection of longterm planning, which was perceived as associated with the previous regime and allegedly incompatible with market economy. That impeded forming and approving fundamental strategic documents by highest political authorities. In the context of the division of Czechoslovak Federation, the State Defence Council was abolished, because the Council and its status were not incorporated in the new Constitution of the Czech Republic, which became effective on 1 January 1993. Absence of such a central steering body vested with the responsibility for coordinating all matters relating to national security across individual ministries and governmental agencies left an empty space in this vital sphere. It was not until 1998 that the state of affairs was redressed in the light of the Czech Republic’s potential integration into the NATO Alliance through Article 9 of the Constitutional Act on Security of the Czech Republic No. 110/1998 Coll., which again established a similar body named the National Security Council headed by the Prime Minister.

During the tenure of civilian defence minister Antonín Baudyš (KDU-ČSL), some negative organisational measures were realised that seriously impacted defence scientific research and, along with that, analytical support for decision-making. The MoD
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strategic management section, Institute for Strategic Studies, Social and Humanitarian Affairs Section, the Military Institute of Societal Research and other institutions and organisations creating strategic and social support were all abolished. Some issues were worked by ex-military personnel employed in civilian institutions (for example in the Institute of International Relations in Prague or at the Department of Public Policy of the Charles University Faculty of Social Sciences). The Minister’s Collegium (a senior advisory board), the Military Council and Public Diplomacy Councils also stopped working in steps. Abolished sections and institutions were mostly replaced by different ones, but they lacked a systematic approach, consistency, concept and erudite personnel. A routine administration practice started to prevail realised on one hand by those with experience from the previous regime, and newcomers with a limited experience with working in government, the MoD and the armed forces. Combining defence and security matters into a single Committee of the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic, which favoured deliberation of security issues over military matters, proved awkward. The state of affairs lasted until the 2006 parliamentary elections, when two dedicated committees – for defence and for security – were established in the Chamber of Deputies.

A broader involvement of the Parliament of the Czech Republic, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), political parties, academic and research institutes, scholars and non-governmental organisations, comprising the security community, into the process of defence and security policy, could be seen only when the Czech Republic had intensive preparations underway for integrating into NATO, which started two years prior to NATO enlargement in 1999. Until then, there were no crucial deliberations of matters of the Czech defence and security policy taking place in the Parliament, with the exception of regular parliamentary sessions reading the state budget. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which had not been involved in development of the National Security Strategy for instance, only increased its activity in the sphere of security policy in 1997. After Jozef Zieleniec resigned as Foreign Affairs Minister in September 1997, he was replaced by former Czech ambassador to NATO, Jaroslav Šedivý. Mr. Šedivý was appointed on 8 November 1997 and continued in the second Klaus Cabinet as well as in the technocrat Cabinet of Josef Tošovský until 22 July 1998. The Cabinet led by Prime Minister Tošovský well understood the need for a broad-based coordination of defence and security policy and supported it comprehensively. Productivity also improved in deliberating defence and security issues in the Defence and Security Committee of the Chamber of Deputies as a result of several politicians with MoD background among the Committee members. That practice carried on after early elections in 1998, when three former Defence

47 From 1990, the armed forces public image was positively shaped by public liaison councils attached to all echelons of command until the split of the federation. The councils were staffed by representatives of political parties and movements, local governments, churches, media, military professional associations and other organisations. The councils focused on increasing transparency, promoting a positive image of the armed forces and on winning a greater support of the public for developing democratisation, increasing professionalism and defence reforms.

48 RAŠEK, A., Vytváření a realizace bezpečnostní politiky České republiky, p. 18.

Ministers (Vilém Holáň, Miloslav Výborný and Michal Lobkowicz) and two former Deputy Defence Ministers (Petr Nečas and Miroslav Kalousek) were newly elected into the Parliament along with several MPs from the previous Defence and Security Committee.50

Based on coalition agreement, representatives of the Christian Democratic Union – Czechoslovak People’s Party (KDU-ČSL) were appointed defence ministers in the coalition cabinets led by the right-wing ODS party. In 1993–1997, three politicians – Antonín Baudyš, Vilém Holán and Miloslav Výborný – consecutively served as defence ministers for KDU-ČSL. In the technocrat Cabinet of Josef Tošovský in office from January till July 1998, Michal Lobkowicz of a newly formed party, the Union of Freedom, became the minister of defence. None of those politicians had ever engaged in defence issues before. The situation was not made any easier due to instability of the bureaucratic apparatus that prepared documents informing decision-making. All of that in combination generated a series of ill-advised steps and erroneous decisions, especially in 1993–1995, plus some contracts later criticised were entered into (especially the costly modernisation of T-72 tanks and procurement of seventy-two L-159 subsonic aircraft).51 As the caretaker Government ended and minority social democrat Government headed by Prime Minister Miloš Zeman took over for the period of so-called Opposition Agreement, receiving vital sup-
The Armed Forces also won recognition and appreciation of the Czech public through the assistance it provided during floods in 1997 (shown here), but also with similar emergency management efforts in 2002, 2006, 2009 and 2010. Photo by Oldřich Jeřábek

Upon joining NATO on 12 March 1999, the Government of the Czech Republic adopted new defence legislation, developed fundamental security policies and allocated 2.2% GDP for defence. The MoD sought to start up a formal planning, programming and budgeting system. As concerns the development of political assignment for the armed forces, this period of time involved step specification of tasks, development of essential legislation and resources to deliver them. The above-mentioned permanent body — the National Security Council — was created on the level of Government to provide coordination of activities in advancing security policy as part of developing the Czech Republic’s security system.

In order to fulfill the political assignment, military requirements (outputs of the planning, programming and budgeting system) for modernising the armed forces were defined to address problems with the predominantly Soviet-made weapon systems and military equipment that were getting obsolete and phased out progressively. That was when plans were incepted to modernise the Air Force inventory with light combat aircraft and upgrade of T-72 tanks. The Government’s final decision-making reflected both military requirements and the interests of the idle defence industry that struggled with limited demand in domestic as well as international markets. At that time, the Government strived to maintain research, development and manufacturing capacities in the defence industry sector. Quality of approved modernisation plans was hampered by limited productivity of longterm planning that represented, given its discontinuity, the weakest link in the planning, programming and budgeting system. Modernisation programs at hand did not build on necessary analyses and projections of development in the security environment, military science and technology. Some projects with significant funding requirements later turned out to be exaggerated and offering questionable operational value.

In case of armed forces modernisation, the system of democratic control failed in the sense that it allowed authorisation and realisation of costly projects with limited effectiveness for national security and defence.

The post of the defence minister was filled by civilians in the integration phase. Frequent rotations in the post however showed certain limits the Government faced in the endeavour to stabilise the development in the MoD Department. The armed forces again managed to win confidence of citizens, particularly through its achievements on tactical and operational level – by foreign deployments and crisis management efforts in the homeland territory, particularly during flooding in 1997. Public opinion polls by the MoD Personnel Division, as well as independent institutions (MARKET, s. r. o., Centrum pro výzkum veřejného mínění and others) confirmed a growing trend in confidence the public had in the armed forces in 1990s. For instance, 55% of respondents had confidence in the military in 1996.

Specific forms of democratic control had limited and sometimes ambiguous effects on the armed force’s development. The media’s awareness of military matters was rather superficial; they showed extensive sensationalism.

54 KRŽIŽ, Z., Civilní řízení a demokratická kontrola AČR. Peripetie transformace vojensko-civilních vztahů po roce 1989, Masaryk University Brno, Institute of Political Science, Brno 2004, p. 103.
and sought neither constructive positions nor positive information. There was not any community that would constructively work defence and security issues. Professional associations were active in the armed forces and fostered cultivation and democratisation of the armed forces to some extent. Academic program was realised for senior state administration officials in a Security Policy Course at the Military Academy in Brno, which covered the issues of democratic control of the military and development of security and defence policy.

The mechanisms in place (legislature, institutions) of the democratic control over the armed forces in the integration phase were fully in line with those applied in advanced democratic countries. The armed forces and its members were politically neutral. Although some shortfalls prevailed in practical implementation of the model, it is fair to conclude that particularly after 1997 politicians began to engage more in formulating the political assignment for the armed forces. Performance on the set goals was overseen in a transparent manner by the means of parliamentary authorisation of the defence budget and subsequent feedback. The armed forces reached out to the public (events for the public, such as the Bahna Army Day, Open days) and the media (press conferences, course for media at the Military Academy in Vyškov, introduction of public information officers into the armed forces structures and other measures).

It is difficult to assess effectiveness of democratic oversight of the military and indeed of the whole security system, in other words to measure to what extent the armed forces contributed to its effective, economical and efficient development and to optimising the military potential of the Czech Republic. In the course of the NATO integration phase, the political assignment got ever more specific and found it difficult to abandon idealistic visions the Czech Republic’s future defence and security needs. Measured on achievements, the strategic level of command and control was perhaps not able and to some extent event did not strive for formulating longterm visions that would outline the future development direction for the armed forces to elaborate on.

At the end of the NATO integration phase in 1998, a critical discrepancy emerged among tasks, the existing operational capabilities, resources and international assignments of the armed forces. Unrealistic commitments to NATO not supported in personnel, organisational, materiel, logistic and intelligence terms, further aggravated the disproportion. It was nevertheless obvious in political and diplomatic terms that the Czech Republic wanted to become a NATO member nation, which was perceived as the final goal. Another challenge was tabled: how to convince people that it was just a step on the path towards achieving a higher quality in ensuring national defence.

### 3.2 Integration to NATO

Elaborating on the Czech Republic’s integration to NATO, it is necessary to realise what the political leadership strived for; in other words what sort of organisation the Czech Republic actually wanted to join. The change in attitude to providing security and defence occurred both in individual nations and NATO as a whole. The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation had had efforts for quite some time to define a flexible response to the changes in security reality, to geopolitical problems, changes in the strategic environment, shifts in the meaning of security and in development of international relations. NATO underwent an internal evolution from an organisation concentrated solely on collective defence against a clearly defined enemy into a much more complex global security tool. The 50th anniversary NATO Summit in Washington saw the heads of states and governments endorse the Alliance for the 21st century vision and adopt the new [Strategic Concept](#).

The Washington Summit communiqué evaluated the period of the Czech Republic’s integration to NATO as follows: “The North Atlantic Alliance, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, remains the basis of our collective defence; it embodies the transatlantic link that binds North America and Europe in a unique defence and security partnership. Fifty years ago, the North Atlantic Alliance was founded in troubled and uncertain times. It has withstood the test of five decades and allowed the citizens of Allied countries to enjoy an unprecedented period of peace, freedom and prosperity. Here in Washington, we have paid tribute to the achievements of the past and
we have shaped a new Alliance to meet the challenges of the future. This new Alliance will be larger, more capable and more flexible, committed to collective defence and able to undertake new missions including contributing to effective conflict prevention and engaging actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations. The Alliance will work with other nations and organisations to advance security, prosperity and democracy throughout the Euro-Atlantic region. The presence today of three new Allies - the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland - demonstrates that we have overcome the division of Europe. The NATO of the 21st century starts today - a NATO which retains the strengths of the past and has new missions, new members and new partnerships. To this end, we have approved an updated Strategic Concept."55

In the retrospect, it should be noted that this was a two-sided process: not only us, but also NATO had to change. One of the first outcomes of the internal change in the Alliance was the inception of the PfP programme initiated by the U.S. and declared by President Clinton at the beginning of 1994. The Czech Republic joined the programme and was the first country of the former eastern bloc to establish a liaison office at NATO Headquarters in Brussels. Prior to joining the PfP, the Czech Republic became, on the day of its inception – 1 January 1993, a member of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. PfP membership represented for the Czech Republic a tool facilitating fulfilment of its strategic intention, which was joining an organisation guaranteeing collective defence. The First Deputy Minister of Defence in 1997-2000, Mr. Jaromír Novotný, reflected: "The PfP Programme allowed every country to put its capabilities to a test and made it possible for the countries to adapt their armed forces to cooperation with NATO. In addition, the program also admitted countries that did not ever intend to join NATO. The PfP programme was like a menu for every country invited by Brussels to select items according to their possibility and capacity. Thus, the PfP programme created a new security dimension in my view. Armed forces and military professionals were going several steps ahead and proved for politicians that cooperation was viable using practical examples. For example, joint Czech-German field training exercises had been organised long before the Czech-German Declaration was signed in 1997. The first exercise still aroused resentments, the second less so and the third one became a routine annual event."56

55 The communique is available at <http://www.mzv.cz/jnp/cz/zahranicni_vztahy/bezpecnostni_politika/nato_a_zahranicni_bezpecnostni_politika/nato_a_cr/washingtonsky_summit/nato_zahranicni_bezpecnostni_politika/nato_a_cr/washingtonsky_summit.html> [14 January 2009].

56 Available at <http://www.army.cz/avis/publikace/integrace/soucast_nejvet_demokratsii_sveta.pdf> [cit. 20 August 2012].
"It is not a question whether but when the Czech Republic joins the NATO defence community," said Supreme Allied Commander Europe General George A. Joulwan in a meeting with Czech Defence Minister Vilém Holáň in 1994.

The process of our country’s integration to western political and security structures had nevertheless started much earlier than 8 July 1997, when the Czech Republic received an official invitation in the NATO Summit in Madrid, and before it joined NATO on 12 March 1999 with all rights and responsibilities. NATO Secretary General visited the then CSFR already in September 1990 and again in spring 1991. Possible membership of the Czech Republic was among the subjects discussed during political talks. It should be noted, however, that NATO was not ready then to enlarge eastwards for both political and military reasons. Possible negative reaction by then Soviet Union was the source of great concern.

In the run-up to NATO accession, the Czech Republic fulfilled a host of legislation-related pre-requisites. On the military side, the so-called minimum military requirements were delivered on to create the necessary host nation support capacity for the contingencies on national territory and provided the necessary standards of communication, information sharing and facilitated progressive integration to the NATO Integrated Air Defence System (NATINADS).

The citizens’ opinion on NATO membership also underwent an interesting development. On 12 March 1999, the day when the Czech Republic became a full-fledged NATO member, some 66.9% of citizens supported that step while 22.6% were against and 10.5% had no opinion on the issue. Members of the Armed Forces appreciated NATO accession even more remarkably than other citizens – approximately 80% of active-duty service personnel were in favour. The public support however diminished in the following years. That unfavourable trend was probably driven by the dissatisfaction many Czech citizens felt in connection with the Alliance’s approach to solving the so-called Kosovo crisis without the UNSCR mandate in the framework of so-called humanitarian intervention.

The Czech Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Otto Pick coined it on 8 February 2000 in an international conference marking the first anniversary of the Czech Republic’s accession: "The Czech Republic’s entry into the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation created a brand new international environment for our state. It was one of the first achievements of our post-1989 foreign policy that set the integration into western structures as the priority of paramount importance."58

3.3 Inception and the first concept of Czech Armed Forces Development

Pursuant to the Constitutional Act on the Cessation of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic No. 542/1992 Coll., names and designations in the defence sector changed as the Czech Republic was established at 1 January 1993. Many components remained stationed in their installations, but their mission changed extensively. The Federal Ministry of Defence transformed into the Ministry of Defence
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of the Czech Republic, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic (ACR) and the General Staff ACR were established. Federal laws, basic orders and military regulations, orders and directives retained validity in the ACR.

At 1 January 1993, the Czech Armed Forces comprised the land forces, air force and air defence. The armed forces furthermore included Civil Defence units, railway troops and units guarding critical defence infrastructures. Compared to today’s status, the Land Forces had an incredibly great potential:

- 2 tank divisions with reduced manning levels;
- 3 mechanised divisions (of which 1 on reduced levels);
- 1 missile regiment;
- 2 artillery brigades;
- 4 engineer brigades;
- 2 CBRN defence brigades;
- 1 signal brigade;
- 2 technical support brigades;
- 2 materiel support brigades and;
- 2 medical support brigades.

Effective at 31 December 1999, the following units were extracted from the organisation of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic: Civil Protection rescue units, railway troops, guard units providing security to critical infrastructure, top-level military sport and the President’s support units, which totalled 15,183 service personnel at 1 January 1994. Military courts and prosecutors’ offices were transferred into the civilian sphere already at 1 January 1993. Units earmarked for UN Peacekeeping Forces were always composed from personnel and equipment from various units, and thus were not organic units that could be extracted from the overall ACR establishment.

The process of armed forces development from 1993 – 1996 was realised in accordance with the 1993 Czech Armed Forces Development Concept (hereinafter 1993 Concept), which was the very first concept of the kind. Its key goal was to transition from the four-echelon system of command in place (strategic – General Staff, operational – military districts, operational-tactical – corps and armies, tactical – divisions and brigades with their subordinate units) to a three-echelon (strategic – Ministry of Defence, operational – Corps, tactical – Brigades). Personnel strength reduction was to continue in line with the 1993 Concept. The armed forces high command strived for stabilising the armed forces basing and optimising the number of operational installations. Personnel replacements in key positions at the Ministry of Defence and units continued. In line with the western model of armed forces support system providing necessary services and materiel, a transition was proposed to a logistic system that would integrate technical and rear support service into a comprehensive force support system. The concept envisaged implementation of the planning, programming and budgeting system. Approximation to NATO with the objective to achieve compatibility and interoperability in key areas was also accentuated.

Realignment and reorganisation measures and force downsizing took
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place in the following years. The year 1993 saw a reorganisation of the strategic echelon, the Ministry of Defence. Tactical Air Corps Command, Air Defence Corps Command and the Logistics Command were formed on the operations echelon. Air Force/Air Defence Command was abolished as well as the Composite Air Corps Command. Transition began on tactical level to a brigade system through reorganisation of one of the mechanised division into a mechanised brigade. In the context of shortening the conscription service to 12 months, the Armed Forces transitioned to a new augmentation and training system.

In 1994, the development was completed of the operational echelon through reorganisation of Military Command West (Tábor) and Centre (Olomouc) into the 1st and 2nd Army Corps command headquarters. On the tactical level, the Rapid Deployment Brigade, five mechanised brigades and 13 territorial defence brigades were formed in the Land Forces. The Air Force establishment comprised 5 airbases (tactical, fighter, training, helicopter and transport air command were abolished) plus 3 radio-technical (signal) brigades. The command headquarters of the 2nd and 3rd Air Defence Divisions were abolished as well as three infantry and one motorised divisions and the railway troops. The Logistics Command took over the responsibility for materiel support of all armed forces components.

In 1995, another mechanised brigade and a territorial defence brigade were created and organisational structures were stabilised that way. The number of forces, units and installations was reduced significantly. Service personnel strength was decreased in steps to 65,000. Compliance was achieved with the ceilings under the CFE Treaty for major weapon systems. The armed forces had available major types of weapons and equipment manufactured domestically or Soviet-made. Surplus combat equipment was disposed according to prescribed procedures. Subject to regular military inspections by CFE Treaty State Parties, the whole process was completed at 15 November 1995.

The ongoing base realignment and closure program saw a substantial number of installations closed (24 big to medium size
and 37 small garrisons were abandoned. Force stationing was decided based on operational, training, economic and social aspects.

From 1 January 1995, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic comprised the command authorities, Land Forces, Air Force and Air Defence, logistics support, military medical service and the Military Police. The organisational structure comprised two army corps, tactical air corps, air defence corps, Logistics Command and separate forces and units directly subordinate to the General Staff ACR. The Land Forces comprised the field forces, rapid deployment forces and territorial defence forces. The Air Force was organised into airbases and divided into tactical, helicopter, transport and special branch. The State Air Defence Forces comprised the fighter air force branch, air defence missile and radiotechnical forces.

Outside the authorised Czech Armed Forces tables of establishment was the Civil Protection of the Czech Republic, units assigned to UN peacekeeping forces, Military Office of the President, the Castle Guard, Arms Control Agency in Prague, the Dukla Army Sport Centre Prague, two unexploded ordnance clearing detachments and a sampling team for the so-called radon control program.\(^{62}\)

### 3.4 Armed Forces development concepts in 1997–1999

In order for the kind reader to have an idea of the context in which the Czech Armed Forces developed, it is appropriate to describe the political situation then. Elections into the Chamber of Deputies were held on 1 June 1996, based on which the second Cabinet of Prime Minister Václav Klaus was formed to take office on 4 July 1996. The Cabinet comprised a coalition of ODS, KDU-ČSL and ODA parties. Mr. Miloslav Výborný of the KDU-ČSL became the Minister of Defence. Economic problems and tensions grew during the tenure, which resulted in an internal crisis and departure of the KDU-ČSL and ODA from the government coalition after a scandal broke out with ODS party financing in autumn 1997. The Cabinet resigned on 30 November 1997, but remained in office till 2 January 1998, when the caretaker Cabinet of Prime Minister Josef Tošovský was appointed. The Tošovský Cabinet resigned collectively after the elections and was in office till 22 July 1998. Mr. Michal Lobkowicz was appointed the Minister of Defence. Following extraordinary elections in June 1998, the minority Social-Democrat Cabinet led by Prime Minister

Miloš Zeman was formed. From 22 July 1998 till 4 May 2001, Vladimir Vetchý was the Minister of Defence.

In 1997-99, the armed forces development was bolstered by the efforts to join NATO. National defence policy had concrete outcomes that reflected in elaborate and well aligned concepts and policies. In March 1997, the Government endorsed the National Defence Strategy (Governmental resolution No. 177 dated 26 March 1997) and the Czech Armed Forces Development Concept till 2000 with outlook till 2005 (Governmental resolution no. 178 dated 26 March 1997). The Concept was built on the objectives defined under National Defence Strategy and set forth a set of specific and interlinked measures for the armed forces to ensure early attainment of capabilities to perform missions defined under the Concept and commitment associated with expected membership in NATO. While there was the potential danger of significant delay and consequently inefficient spending as a result of terminating the implementation of the previous concept at the end of 1996 and late implementation of the new concept that was not mature yet, the MoD only started to realise an outline of the concept. The key shortfall of the two mentioned documents was that they were not realistic in terms of human, financial and materiel resources available, which deepened some problems on tactical level directly in the units.

The situation in the society that was not willing to develop systemic solutions to national defence and security took a specific course. Practical consequences of security policy represented one of the theoretical options: We would not do anything – at the end of the day, nothing serious is going to happen. The time when "something was going to happen" came with the 1997 flooding. Urged by security experts for a long time, the political attention finally concentrated on updating security legislation. The floods in 1997 caused extensive damage including to military property, but at the same time meant a success in terms of the armed force’s employment in a non-military crisis situation. Disasters and the practical experience that the whole security system and the armed forces had lacked for a long time necessitated the adoption of crucial legislation to provide for security and defence in the independent Czech Republic.

The time from 1993, when the independent Czech Republic’s political elite neither came up with a new comprehensive emergency system, nor supported visions of a comprehensive national defence system, was terminated in 1997. The defence sector was busy completing the “peace operation” of dividing the CSFR armed forces and problems associated with the division
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were dealt with. The top management of national defence and security authorities were involved in seeking diplomatic and political assurances of the “new architecture of Europe’s security system”, while expecting there would not be any emergencies possibly putting to a test the whole disrupted and destabilised national system that was rather custom-based than newly built. The proposals for a systemic solution to national defence and security, including the newly developed Security Strategy of the Czech Republic, were submitted by an interdepartmental research team led by PhDr. Jaroslav Janda (International Relations Institute Prague). The political leadership did not reflect on the recommendations to amend legislation, without which it was practically not feasible to advance structural changes in a state with rule of law. Neither the former State Defence Council was functional throughout that period of time.

The period of wising up in 1998–2000 was closely associated with two ground-breaking events: enactment of the Act on security of the Czech Republic as an expression of state sovereignty and the integration to NATO. Floods in 1997 and the subsequent evaluation of their consequence and causes showed that warning reports by the MoD and the Ministry of the Interior, state authorities and local governments concerning shortfalls in legislation were justified.

The Constitutional Act on Security of the Czech Republic No. 110/1998 Coll. was passed by the Parliament on 22 April 1998. In accordance with Paragraph 9 of the Act, National Defence Council was established, whose membership and workings were laid down for the first time in the history of the independent Czech Republic by the Government’s resolution no. 391 dated 10 June 1998 on National Defence Council and on planning national defence measures. After a five years’ intermission, a top-level state administration authority was created with the mission to provide coordination of activities in the realm of security and defence.

At the beginning of 1998, the MoD prepared the Czech Armed Forces development concept till 2000 with outlook till 2005, which the Government noted 29 June 1998. With a view to the fact, however, that the document only covered the Czech Armed Forces development from the perspective of preparations for accession and not the upcoming membership in NATO, and was neither backed at the same
time by an approved Security Strategy of the Czech Republic, nor Military Strategy of the Czech Republic, the Minister of Defence decided to launch a major revision of the document. The policy document named MoD Development Concept till 2004 with outlook till 2009 was submitted to the Government for approval in 1999. Authorisation of the concept by the Government in June 1999 had already been preceded by the approval of the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic (Governmental resolution no. 123 dated 17 February 1999) and the Military Strategy of the Czech Republic (Governmental resolution no. 257 dated 29 March 1999).

Much like in all NATO nations, a rigorous Government-supervised defence planning system was implemented in the process of the Czech Republic’s accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation at the end of 1998. The MoD was responsible for performance of defence planning assignments and measures, while the responsibility for coordinating the planning measures to ensure defence was vested with the Defence Planning Committee, a permanent working body of the National Security Council. Within the process of defence planning, NATO authorities formulated the total of 52 force proposals for the Czech Armed Forces in 1998, of which 26 pertained to the whole Armed Forces, 14 set targets for the Land Forces and 12 for the Air Force. The Czech Republic fully accepted twenty-eight force proposals and twenty-four partly, which then became force goals. Individual force goals were formulated as a proposal of specific requirements with specifically defined timelines for the Czech Armed Forces to realise in its development and operations. Realisation of individual force goals was planned through 2003 with projected expenses over CZK 60 billion.

The force planning process proved how essential an effective medium to long term defence planning system based on a shared projection of economic development was for the MoD and the whole government. Simultaneously, it created medium to long term prospect for defence industry and helped stimulate economic development in the Czech Republic that way.

Despite the obvious need for such a system, the MoD failed to create a concept or planning document that would retain relevance over a longer period of time, even after joining NATO in 1999, as a result of multiple effects. On one hand, despite the Government’s effective commitments, defence appropriations were unstable to permit financing targets defined under concepts and plans. The other factor was internal and represented the MoD’s limited ability to objectively determine practical objectives in relation to developments in the security environment, advances in military science, demographic and technology development and their effects on national defence and armed forces development in the long run. Such inability was aggravated by major replacement of personnel as well as progressive erosion of the acquired strategic management capabilities. All of that generated an instable environment for strategic planners at the Ministry of Defence in 1990s.
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The accession of the Czech Republic to NATO completed one of the country’s strategic goals that had been progressively formulated after 1989. Besides democratising the society and its transition towards a market-based economy, the Czech Republic’s integration in western democratic political military structures was attained after ten years of diplomatic efforts. It was neither just the Armed Forces nor only the MoD that acceded to the North Atlantic Treaty, but indeed the whole Czech Republic. For the Czech Republic and its defence policy, that historical milestone represented a definitive solution of issues associated with ensuring national security and defence. NATO membership did not furnish only the guarantee of a collective assurance of national defence, but also its commitment to collective defence in the sense of contributing within the compass of national possibilities to a fair burden sharing in the Alliance. The accession to NATO created completely new conditions for the armed forces development and the window of opportunity opened up to finally get over the legacy of the Cold War, which had prevented building an effective national defence system. NATO integration also paved the way for continuing the process of integrating into the European Union, primarily in economic terms.

In terms of formulating defence policy and the Armed Forces’ development plans, it was an important period of reforms that started with the 2000 Strategic Defence Review and ended upon the achievement of the Armed Forces’ Initial Operational Capabilities at the end of 2006. The Strategic Defence Review represented a crucial stocktaking in how the Czech Republic’s defence had been organised in the light of its changed international position and set conditions for realisation of necessary defence reforms in pursuit of implementing national defence policy.

Defence reforms plans had one important common denominator. Contrarily to the previous more or less successful reorganisation, realignment and reduction attempts, the reforms focused on improving the armed forces qualitative parameters and increasing MoD’s effectiveness and efficiency as a whole. The push for improving the armed force’s capabilities and the international support processes stemmed from identification of existing shortfalls based on lessons learnt in recent operations in the Balkans, in the wake of which the Alliance launched defence capability development processes and stepped up internal reform efforts.\(^67\) The process of reforms was also marked by dynamic development of the security reality on the strategic global scale. The 9/11 terrorist attack in the U.S. represented a critical changeover in how imminence of the threat was perceived. International terrorism became reality for western civilisations. Following in-depth analyses, radical Islam was identified as the origin of the threat. Militaries were eventually engaged to fight terrorism as NATO nations commenced their military reaction immediately in the aftermath of 9/11. In 2002 in Afghanistan and then in Iraq in 2003, the international community united in the so-called coalition of willing pursued military solutions. The U.S. Administration then launched what is commonly referred to as the global war on terrorism.

\(^67\) NATO launched the Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) at the 1999 Washington Summit. The DCI was designed to strengthen the Alliance’s defence capabilities to increase effectiveness future multinational operations. DCI facilitated multinational cooperation within the Alliance on lower levels and accentuated interoperability both among Allies and between NATO and Partners in peace operations as has been the case in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo.
4.1 Joining NATO

The accession to NATO has been one of the most important political decisions in the history of the independent Czech Republic. In diplomatic terms, it only compares to joining the European Union, which occurred later on in 2004. As a matter of fact, membership in any organisation is associated with certain redistribution of sovereignty, which the Czech Republic only enjoyed for a short period of time from 1991 (Warsaw Treaty abolishment) as the Czechoslovak Federal Republic and from 1993 (establishment of independent Czech Republic) until 1999. Accession to NATO represents an act that inherently upon signature confirms the assumption of commitments whose specific form and shape a country would not be able to influence in the future. The commitment to collective defence under Article 5 Washington Treaty is that in case an armed attack occurs on any NATO nations, that it will "take forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic Area". The most important aspect in the decision-making of leading officials then was that the Czech Republic would become a member of the largest and most powerful military alliance in the world, and that NATO had as its paramount objective the protection of its member nations and the transatlantic values it is based on. By signing the Treaty, the Czech Republic assumed its share of responsibility for security in the whole North Atlantic Area, i.e. in a region that is many times larger than the size of the Czech Republic's territory. The Czech Republic sits at a joint table with other NATO nations. The nations are expected to live up to their commitments and cooperate, including the expression of own position on deliberated issues. Nations are able to shape NATO's decisions and measures NATO and bear responsibility for them as well.

On January 29, 1999, the Government of the Czech Republic received a letter from the NATO Secretary General Javier Solana, which conveyed the invitation to accede to the Alliance. On February
26, 1999, President Václav Havel signed the protocols of accession of the Czech Republic to the North Atlantic Treaty in Prague, which completed the process of joining NATO on the Czech side. The Czech Republic officially became a NATO member nation on 12 March 1999. Czech Foreign Minister Jan Kavan, Polish Foreign Minister Bronisław Geremek and Hungarian Foreign Minister János Martonyi deposited instruments of accession in a ceremony at Independence, Missouri, with U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright to complete their respective countries’ formal entry into NATO.

NATO is a political-military organisation and, much like other countries’ national representation, the Czech representation had to be set up in parallel with the accession, comprising two delegations: political section run by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the military section sponsored by the Ministry of Defence. Both governmental ministries managed to go through the pre-accession period without major issues.

A different situation, however, prevailed in political bodies. Already on 24 March 1999, the Chamber of Deputies of the Czech Parliament endorsed sending an unarmed An-26 transport airplane to perform transport missions in support of NATO’s peace accords supervision effort in Kosovo. On 2 April 1999, the Government of the Czech Republic decided to open the Czech airspace for transit flights of Allied military aircraft of all types in connection with operations against Yugoslavia. Subsequently on 14 April 1999, the Parliament endorsed the deployment of a military field hospital for 18 months and an unarmed Czech Air Force An-26 airplane to support NATO requirements in connection with the conflict in Kosovo. On 21 April 1999, the approval was endorsed for NATO military aircraft to land at airfields in the Czech Republic and for transits of NATO forces via the Czech territory.

From 27 May through 4 June 1999, the command post exercise Cooperative Guard ’99 took place in Vyškov, Czech Republic, with specific focus on practising procedures of planning and executing peace support operations and to enhance interoperability among Partner nations and NATO, which saw the participation of 2,000 military personnel from 26 NATO and PfP nations. On 17 June 1999, the Senate of the Czech Parliament endorsed the decision dated 15 June 1999 by the Chamber of Deputies to deploy a military force comprising up to 800 personnel into Kosovo as part of KFOR multinational forces.

The above overview bears testimony to the increased political interest in defence issues closely tied with new tasks performed as a part of the Czech Republic’s membership in NATO.

4.2 Defence management in 1999–2004

Following 1999, civilian democratic control sought to adapt the armed forces to changes in the security environment and new security challenges. The new challenge was for the Czech Republic to prove it was a reliable NATO Ally able to deliver on its commitments in full and assume its fair share of the burden of providing collective security and defence.

A truly meaningful political assignment for the military was only defined after the Czech Republic’s entry into NATO in the form of strategic security policy documents.68 The Cabinet led by Prime Minister
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Miloš Zeman defined vital national security interests and determined the level of political-military ambitions. Security was treated comprehensively in the language of those policy documents and encompassed defence of the country, internal security, diplomacy and economy. An MoD Reform team with extensive know-how was formed to elaborate in more detail and translate the political tasking into sequenced planned steps and measures with defined goals and targets for the transformation package to achieve.69

In the reform phase, functional mechanisms of all forms of democratic civilian control of the military were already in place. Problems nevertheless prevailed with filling the position of defence minister. The position was filled by civilians, but two ex military officers were also appointed defence ministers, who essentially “took off their uniforms” for the political appointment.70 Development of a realistic defence reform concept and its implementation required that the post of defence minister be filled by a highly qualified person to act in a specific environment. But the political representation did not have such a personality available at the time.

Apart from functional democratic oversight by the President, the Parliament and the Government, another specific form of the armed forces’ democratic oversight developed. That primarily involved activities of the security community formed around former high-ranking armed forces and defence officials and intellectuals (Antonín Rašek, Karel Pezl, Jan Eichler). The security community has strived for shaping constructively the Czech Republic’s security and defence policy, rightly voiced criticism on posting some politicians and experts in the security system and their possible poor qualifications to perform specialist functions. The security community also criticised the integration of the MoD and the General Staff as an outcome of reforms after 2003. To increase effectiveness of democratic control, the security community proposed a more intensive training of parliamentarians on national security policy.71

When the Czech Republic was acceding to NATO, the executive power was held by the coalition Cabinet comprising the ČSSD, KDU-ČSL and US-DEU parties with Miloš Zeman as the Prime Minister, Vladimír Vetchý the Defence Minister, Jan Kavan the Minister of Foreign Affairs and General Jiří Šedivý the Chief of General Staff Armed Forces of the Czech Republic (1998–2002). On 4 May 2001, Mr. Jaroslav Tvrdík was appointed the Defence Minister and continued his tenure after the 2002 elections in the Cabinet of Prime Minister Vladimír Špidla (coalition of ČSSD, KDU-ČSL, US-DEU). General Pavel Štefka was appointed the Chief of General Staff (2002–2007).

Including in the context of preparing the concept of transitioning to an all-volunteer armed forces, former soldiers were consecutively appointed ministers of defence: Jaroslav Tvrdík (ret. LTC), who was replaced by Miroslav Kostelka (ret. LTG) in 2003. Both of them were previously deputy defence ministers. In 2004, Minister Kostelka was appointed the Chief of General Staff (2002–2007).

69 All-volunteer Czech Armed Forces Development and Mobilisation Concept revised based on reduced defence appropriations, Czech MoD, 2003.
70 Mr. Jaroslav TVRDÍK (Defence Minister 2001–03), Mr. Miroslav KOSTELKA (Defence Minister 2003–04).
(continued...)

again replaced by a genuine civilian, Mr. Karel Kühnl, a representative of the coalition party US-DEU. Key MoD policies did not deal with this subject, which attests to underestimation of civilian control as an element of strategic defence management to shape intentions and plans. In this respect, the 2002 Military Strategy of the Czech Republic indeed only included intents concerning development and employment of the armed forces in what was just a very general outline. The overall defence management strategy, both external and internal one, was neither covered under the All-volunteer Czech Armed Forces development and mobilisation concept revised based on reduced defence appropriations of 12 November 2003. The 2004 Military Strategy included a section named the Czech Republic’s Defence Strategy, but aside from declaring basic general principles, the language did not go into any greater detail as concerns the national defence system and its management.\(^\text{72}\)

Popularly expected to report on the armed forces’ activities and operations and act as an element of effective civilian democratic control, the media played a rather controversial role. On one hand, media coverage of the military helped positively identify serious problems facing the armed forces (namely issues connected with ineffective management and non-transparent placement of public contracts), but their sensationalism on the other hand impeded performance of service duties.

The Armed Forces performance was also hampered by the loose wording of the Act on Civil Service No. 73/1990 Coll. dated 14 March 1990. The Act permitted individuals not to be conscripted because of the service being contradictory to their conscience, but it was nevertheless abused by a considerable number of young people aiming to avoid performance of their conscription duty service. That significantly impeded the armed forces preparedness and combat readiness, morale and motivation of career soldiers to organise day-to-day life in the military.\(^\text{73}\)

As a crucial element of civilian democratic oversight of the armed forces, the armed forces’ public diplomacy initially lacked an overarching concept. The Ministry of Defence realised there was a need to communicate effectively and sought to use communication channels and means efficiently, while the degree of openness displayed by personalities leading the MoD and the General Staff played a central role. But those were mostly measures of reactive nature in response to inquiries, requests for information, appeals or criticism voiced by the public.

The primary form of the MoD’s public diplomacy effort was communication through the media. As to promotion of the military on TV and the radio, a significant reduction took place compared to the previous regime. Already at the end of 1980s, the military editorial team in the Czechoslovak Television, producing various TV programmes on military and security subjects, and regular radio program for armed forces servicemembers named Poští pošt (Field Post) were closed down. Media coverage of the military only increased as the country was integrating into NATO. The NATO Summit in Prague in 2002 and, in that context, participation of Czech military professionals in peace operations and the process of transitioning to an all-volunteer force, increased visibility of defence issues.

The focus on various public target groups was used much less, while communication with the internal audience, servicemembers and defence civilians, was dominated by military periodicals. Until...


\(^\text{73}\) RAŠEK, A., Vytváření a realizace bezpečnostní politiky České republiky, p. 20 and additional information provided by A. RAŠEK on 21 February 2006.
One of the important tasks for the Czech Armed Forces after joining NATO was to increase interoperability of the Czech communication and information systems as well as command and control systems within the NATO Alliance.

2001, the MoD did not have any internal regulation stipulating authority and responsibility for public diplomacy, which would define its rules and principles. The situation only changed when the defence minister authorised an order on provision of information following on the promulgation of the Act on Free Access to Information. When the all-volunteer Czech Armed Forces Development Concept was in the making in 2001, communication and information activities targeting public groups became a vital part of promoting the concept in the public.\

4.3 The 1999 MoD Development Concept

On 14 September 1999, the "Military Acts" were passed to create prerequisites for the Czech Republic's accession to the North Atlantic Treaty:
- Act No. 218/1999 Coll., on the Scope of Conscription and Military Administrative Authorities (the Conscription Act);
- Act No. 219/1999 Coll., on the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic;
- Act No. 220/1999 Coll., on the Course of Conscription or Alternate Service and Military Exercises and on Some Legal Relations of Reserve Soldiers;
- Act No. 221/1999 Coll., on Career Soldiers;
- Act No. 222/1999 Coll., on Ensuring Defence of the Czech Republic.

On June 28 and 29, 2000, the so-called “crisis management package” was passed laying down the principles for employing the armed forces in emergencies or non-military crises:
- Act No. 240/2000 Coll., on Crisis Management and on amendment of some Acts (Crisis Management Act);

The 1999 MoD Defence Development Concept (hereinafter the 1999 Concept) concluded that despite multiple problems associated with the shortcomings in interlinking the Armed Forces development and re-organisation in 1993–1998 with real economic possibilities of the state, a military force had been successfully built with capabilities to perform both national defence missions on standalone basis and to participate in operations through its forces assigned to NATO.

The Armed Forces transitioned from Division to Brigade system. Brigades and battalions were formations that better matched the downsized armed forces and also enabled the armed forces to be employed more operatively and variably. The ability of Czech units to operate as a part of NATO multinational forces was nevertheless limited by a low interoperability of command, control, communication, computer, information and surveillance systems, obsolescence and insufficient capabilities of weapons and other military equipment and materiel.

The 1999 Concept stated the key benefits of the armed forces' reorganisation were the approaches that focused on meeting the minimum military requirements for the Czech Republic to join NATO, institutionalising a formal defence planning system, personnel reduction without major social consequences and limitation of the number of major weapon systems, base closures and a more balanced distribution of the armed forces over
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national territory. The relationship between the population and the military improved. Introduction of a formal language training program for service personnel was also a step in the right direction.

According to the 1999 Concept, the persisting difficulties included the lack of modern managerial methods, inadequate ranking and education structure of career personnel, which did not match the requirements according to the newly established post and rank system. The 1999 Concept also alerted to the lack of major redesign of the system of military schools, integration of defence research and development and slow progress in reduction of immovable property, downsizing and restructuring stockpiles and modernisation of weapon systems and other equipment.

Among starting points and limiting factors of the objective force, the 1999 Concept classified the ability, while respecting membership in NATO, to eliminate potential security risks and threats defined under the 1999 Military Strategy of the Czech Republic while ensuring as a NATO member nation that Article 5 collective defence commitments are delivered on, including involvement in NATO multinational deployed peace operations. The previous concept of autonomous national defence turned into collective defence while retaining individual ability to defend national territory as a whole, in accordance with Article 3 and 5 the North Atlantic Treaty, and keeping forces and assets assigned to NATO on required standards of readiness. Resource limitations (manpower, material and financial) were to be central to achieving force goals and meeting assigned objectives.

Besides the ability to eliminate risks in the collective defence system and while maintaining the ability to ensure autonomous national defence, the key goals laid down by the 1999 Concept included the achievement of NATO interoperability by selected forces. A high premium was also placed on bringing the armed forces development in harmony with the compass of national economy. The key missions focused on the provision of necessary quality and quantity of personnel, weapon systems and other equipment according to NATO standards. Planned changes were prioritised according to MoD development plan that, in addition to providing national defence, modernising weapon systems and improving personnel qualification, also included deepening of the civilian democratic control of the armed forces, CIS development, building an integrated logistic support system and application of environmental friendly technologies.

In the section dedicated to the MoD components and their mission, the 1999 Concept laid down that the Defence Department would comprise of the Czech Armed Forces, civilian part of the MoD and its subordinate units and installations, personnel on foreign deployments and temporarily also the Civil Defence of the Czech Republic. The total personnel strength of the MoD in 2002 was not to exceed the peacetime ceiling of 62,000 personnel (career soldiers, conscripts and civil servants).

In keeping with the 1999 Concept, the Armed Forces comprised the Land Forces, the Air Force, Territorial Defence Forces and support components. In peacetime, the Land Forces were to comprise the Land Force Command superior to a newly formed mechanised division to provide forces and assets into combined NATO task forces, plus Rapid Deployment Brigade and the training and mobilisation bases of individual arms and branches. The peacetime structure of the Air Force was to consist of the Air Force Command and its subordinate command, control and surveillance forces, air forces organised into four airbases, and air defence missile forces forming a single formation.

The territorial defence forces were intended to provide defence of national territory and protect critical defence infrastructures within national territory. In peacetime, the force structure would comprise Territorial Defence Forces Headquarters with subordinate regional territorial defence forces commands, mobilisation bases and military rescue units.
After the Czech Republic’s entry into NATO, the Czech Armed Forces, in addition to units manning foreign operational deployments, began to assign units to the immediate or rapid reaction forces to be transferred under NATO command in case needed. According to operational assignment and NATO categories, forces were categorised as Immediate Reaction Forces (with 10-day standby readiness), Rapid Reaction Forces (with 20-day readiness) and Main Defence Forces (peacetime and wartime build-up formations and units, which would be divided according to NATO categories, into those transferred, assigned and earmarked for NATO and forces under national command. Peacetime formations and units were to be able to augment and relieve immediate reaction forces and rapid reaction forces). Immediate Reaction Forces and Rapid Reaction Forces were prepared for assignment under NATO command and to be earmarked for NATO, respectively, and for possible employment to eliminate sudden military and non-military threats to national security.

Forces and assets of up to 1,000 personnel equivalent to a reinforced mechanised battalion, a helicopter flight and an air transport group were to be developed to perform specific missions as part of multinational peace operations. Combat service support components (CBRN defence, engineer, medical support and the like) equivalent to company or detachment (field hospital) were to be developed alike.

From 31 December 2002 on, actual numbers of main types of weapon systems and other equipment were to be as follows:

- 795 tanks;
- 1,252 armoured combat vehicles;
- 657 artillery systems with calibre 100 mm plus;
- 200 combat aircraft, and;
- 50 attack helicopters.

The planned quantities were to decrease to 541 tanks, 96 combat aircraft, 36 attack helicopters, 18 combat support helicopters and up to 22 short to medium range air defence missiles systems. Seventytwo L-159 subsonic multirole tactical aircraft and up to 24 supersonic multirole tactical aircraft were to be progressively introduced to the inventory subject to available funding. According to the data submitted by the Czech Republic in compliance with the CFE-T at 1 January 2003, actual numbers of main weapons and equipment systems were as follows: 541 tanks; 1,235 armoured combat vehicles; 528 artillery pieces with calibre 100 mm plus; 125 combat aircraft and 34 attack helicopters.75

The command and control system was to stay three-tiered:

- Strategic: the Ministry of Defence;
- Tactical: headquarters of formations, bases, units and installations subordinate to higher echelons.

The 1999 Concept scheduled the performance of major MoD development tasks as follows:

- By the end of 2000: transfer mechanised brigades under the command headquarters of the mechanised division and achieve the ability to perform missions as part of combined and humanitarian aid operations;
- By the end of 2001: complete the development of the integrated defence data network on the strategic and operational level;
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75 Data courtesy of the Arms Control Department of the MoD Foreign Activities Directorate.
By the end of 2002: achieve the mandatory limit of MoD personnel strength, build an immediate reaction forces command and control system, integrate the air defence system and air traffic management system into the relevant NATO systems and hand the helicopter airbase over to the Land Forces structure;

By the end of 2004: rearm a part of tactical air units with L-159 subsonic multirole aircraft, and, depending on allocated funding, commence the introduction of multirole supersonic tactical aircraft into operational use plus complete the development of the integrated defence data network;

By the end of 2006: complete development of NATO assigned or earmarked forces and develop command and control system for rapid reaction forces; commence the process of integrating the communications infrastructure, modernise the Land Forces' fire control systems, weapons and other equipment and increase airlift capability with air units. In addition, key measures were to be realised of the social program, ecological program and measures to improve quality of life for career soldiers and conscripts, restructure stockpiles concurrently with the introduction of new armaments and other equipment;

After 2006: implement a multi-channel air defence and missile defence system and complete restructuring of stockpiles;

By the end of 2009: in case replacement of supersonic multirole tactical aircraft in the Czech Armed Forces inventory would be authorised, complete the introduction of the new system.

The 1999 Concept foresaw a progressive drop in the pool of potential conscripts but still estimated it amount to 20,000 personnel. The number of military professionals was intended to reach 22,500 personnel. The MoD leadership and the armed forces high command obviously still had not considered creating all-volunteer forces then. To sustain foreign deployments, the existence of conscripted armed forces (with conscripts) was still counted with. Relevant military specialists who were not military professionals would still be called up to active duty service for operational tours. This approach led to a continuing development of dual track armed forces: one part usable only for territorial defence and the other one for foreign deployed operations. Only units and subunits of immediate reaction forces with a short notice to move were to be made all-volunteer, whereas similar units and subunits with longer readiness were to be manned with conscripts and defence civilians – reserve soldiers in peacetime, albeit to smaller extent.

As to resources and infrastructure, the 1999 Concept set forth twelve program areas covering central management and administration, education and social security, foreign activities, development of the Land Forces, Air Force, Military Intelligence, command and control, development of central logistic support system, military medical service, science and research, renewal of immovable infrastructure and ecology. According to the 1999 Concept, the defence scientific and research efforts were to receive a rational support building on productive coordination or research and technology activities on national and NATO level. The process was to continue of effective concentration of forces into garrisons and bases with a high future development potential to meet the requirement for a more efficient and effective utilisation of immovable property.
In terms of required funding, the 1999 Concept recalled the Czech Government resolution no. 478/1996 on the intended annual increase of defence spending by about 0.1% GDP so that it would reach roughly 2% GDP in 2000. At the same time, the 1999 Concept called for setting a new estimate of financial resources in the medium term till 2004 with outlook to 2009, which would represent fixing the total MoD spending at 2.2% GDP. The need was pointed out to observe the payment schedule of the L-159 programme authorised by the Government in June 1997, and meeting Force Goals that the Czech Republic had undertaken to deliver as a NATO member nation. In addition to the above factors affecting the structure of MoD spending, the Concept accentuated the need to increase spending allocated for operation and maintenance expenses and especially field training for units assigned to NATO, creating stockpiles for rapid reaction forces and disposal of surplus stockpiles.

The MoD never managed to realise the 1999 Concept in full due to the context it was developed and endorsed in. The scene was set with highly optimistic projections of defence appropriations, with the Government declaring progressive increase of defence spending in the light of events associated with NATO membership. On the other hand, the MoD was still faced with the burden of Cold War legacy equipment, huge amount of surplus and excessive property and unusable infrastructure, the divestiture and disposal of which were highly funding intensive. The highly ambitious modernisation of both Land Forces and the Air Force was not based on objective needs of the Armed Forces for its future missions and significantly burdened defence economy. International military situation and sort of sobering up also played a role as assessments of NATO’s operational engagement in the Kosovo conflict revealed a range of shortfalls in operational capabilities possessed by individual nations and an immense gap between the U.S. and European Allies.

4.4 Minister Tvrdík’s reform

Based on the Primary Strategic Principles and Objectives of Armed Forces Reform authorised by the Government in August 2001 to the objective of creating an all-volunteer force till 2006, the team headed by the governmental commissioner for preparation of armed forces reform developed the Concept of All-volunteer Armed Forces Development and Mobilisation (hereinafter The 2002 Concept). In addition to the definition and timelines, another pillar of the governmental assignment was the annual defence appropriations set to 2.2% GDP. The concept’s development was shaped by several principal factors: development of the security environment, particularly following 9/11; the Czech Republic’s integration to NATO; development of military science and high technology; and last but not least, consequences of the Cold War, which showed in the past as well as more recent legacy (for instance neglected infrastructure, major stockpiles of surplus property, obsolete armaments). The Concept rounded off the second stage of the preparatory period of the ACR reform and completed the Strategic Defence Review launched in November 2000. The Government endorsed the final iteration of the Concept, submitted by then Defence Minister Jaroslav Tvrdík, on 13 November 2002. At the same time, the Government tasked the Ministry of the Interior with developing the concept of the Czech Republic’s national security system by 2004 and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with national security strategy. So, defence reform
was designed ahead of the planned security system architecture, which should ideally be the other way round.76

The reform plans were based on defence appropriations that were proclaimed realistic and steady upon authorisation. However, the Government changed its priorities in the context of consequence management following large-scale flooding in 2002 and the subsequent accelerated preparations for public spending reform as part of preparations for European Union membership. Thus, it was not affordable for the state to allocate the spending for armed forces development as envisaged under the reform concept. The forced drop in defence budget substantially changed the context for the defence reform already in 2004. In that critical period, the MoD had to start implementing the reform in 2003, elaborate the 2002 Concept on the background of reduced appropriations and make them consistent with each other on sustained basis. So, one of the fundamental pillars of the defence reform changed. Disregarding that shift would however take the whole concept off balance and objectives would become disproportionate to possibilities. 77

4.5 Minister Kostelka’s reform

Draft Concept of All-volunteer Armed Forces Development and Mobilisation revised on the background of reduced defence appropriations (hereinafter the 2003 Concept) was submitted by the new Defence Minister Miroslav Kostelka. The Government endorsed the draft on 12 November 2003. As opposed to previous cases MoD spending was not defined in terms of GDP percentage, but as an amount necessary to cover the assignments associated with achievement of Initial Operational Capabilities in 2006. The real year-to-year increase in nominal value was set in outlook to approximately CZK 3 billion based on the missions the MoD would be assigned to perform.

The concept ordained the defence of the Czech Republic’s territory to make a maximum use of the collective defence system as the Czech Armed Forces’ primary mission. Furthermore, it was essential to support foreign deployments with forces earmarked for operations led by NATO, the EU and other organisation and for coalition operations. Additional missions included the defence of the Czech airspace, provision of host nation support to NATO forces in case of military threat to national territory or NATO’s security and performance of missions in the event of non-military threats to the Czech Republic and missions mandatory under the Czech law. The scope and manner of delivering those missions was to be based on the armed forces’ future niche specialisation in passive surveillance systems, chemical, biologic, radiological and nuclear defence and a well-balanced development of other branches and services.

The 2003 Concept spawned the 2005-10 Medium Term Development Plan, while the year 2004 was regarded the bridge connecting it with the 2003-08 Medium Term Development Plan. The armed forces’ primary missions remained unchanged: defence of the Czech territory in the collective defence


77 Defence Minister Jaroslav Tvrdík resigned on 9 June 2003 in connection with the need to revise the 2002 Concept. The rationale he provided was that he had been too closely personally connected with the original iteration of the concept and promises he had made to the military and the public, especially in locations where large garrisons had been stationed, which however would not be attainable in the new circumstances. Details are available at www.radiocz.cz/clanek/41375.
system, support of foreign deployments, airspace defence, performance of NATO commitments and readiness to perform national tasks in non-military emergencies. The Czech Republic defined its political-military ambitions in terms of possible involvement in Washington Treaty Article 5 and Non-Article 5 operations, and the ability of the Czech Armed Forces to take part in such operations:

- In a high threat scenario with nearly zero probability of occurrence, the whole armed forces would engage in the operation plus general mobilisation would possibly be declared. Despite readiness to provide national defence using own sources, Allies were relied on for providing assistance according to Article 5 Washington Treaty;
- For a low intensity Article 5 operation, which could involve a conflict in NATO’s territory in an area not adjacent to the Czech Republic, a mechanised brigade equivalent was to deploy (without rotation).

*The 2003 Concept* laid down the requirement to defend the airspace in any situation as a part of the NATO Integrated Air Defence System (NATINADS) and to perform assistance rescue or humanitarian aid missions in the homeland territory.

The Armed Force’s peacetime structure was to provide security without mobilisation and without the need to adopt additional extraordinary measures. The Czech Armed Force’s Full Operational Capability was planned for achievement in 2010–12.

For Non-Article 5 operations, the Armed Forces planned to assign a brigade equivalent force with up to 3,000 personnel (without rotation). As opposed to the 2002 Concept, the strength went down by about 2,000 personnel. Involvement in two concurrent operations was envisaged: about 1,000 strong force in one operation and a deployment of up 250 personnel for the other operation on case by case basis.

In the contingency of a limited local conflict outside the Czech territory, a brigade was envisaged to deploy for a low-intensity article 5 operation from 2007. The brigade, or indeed a battalion and a specialised unit, would deploy without rotation for maximum 6 months. In case of a peacekeeping operation, the force would be sustained over longer period of time using rotations.

For management of non-military threats, the Armed Forces planned to assign 1,000 servicemen for up to 3 months to augment the Police of the Czech Republic in peacetime (the previous 2002 Concept envisaged 2,000 personnel). The 2003 Concept also lowered the original intent of personnel assigned to reinforce the Integrated Emergency System to 1,200 for the period of one month.

The Czech Armed Forces objective force structure envisaged three command posts:

- Ministry of Defence (integrated with the General Staff) – Prague;
- Joint Force Command – Olomouc;
- Support and Training Force Command – Stará Boleslav.78

---

78 Concept of development of all-volunteer Armed Forces of the Czech Republic and its mobilisation revised on the background of reduced defence appropriations. A report 2003, no. 24, p. 3–4.
Integration of the Ministry of Defence and the General Staff had been underway for quite some time by then. Despite multiple efforts to restructure the MoD, the responsibilities between the civilian part and the General Staff were not divided right. The principle of interdependence between authority and responsibility was not applied consistently. Therefore, general principles of command and control were not observed, neither purview nor responsibility at individual echelons were defined systemically, and duplication and overlaps occurred. The integration sought both to do away with duplications and improve communication among individual components. The components of the former separate General Staff became MoD components, but remained subordinated to the Chief of General Staff. Establishment of a transformed MoD reduced the number of personnel in both the civilian and military component and eliminated duplications in areas such as personnel management and defence planning. The last major restructuring was done in 2002, but without any formal evaluation of its effectiveness; further redesigns were carried out in steps: at 1 December 2003, and then at 1 January and 1 April 2004. The MoD Strategic Planning Division, MoD Personnel Division, General Staff Personnel Division and General Staff Long-term Planning Division were abolished. Newly created were the MoD Personnel Division, MoD Defence Policy and Strategy Division and MoD Force Planning Division. Likewise, the MoD National Armaments Directorate and Strategic Infrastructure Projects Office were abolished and the MoD Armaments Division was established at 1 January 2004.

As opposed to personnel reduction at 1 December 2003, the reorganisation at 1 April 2004 was more extensive. The original number of 2,300 personnel considered for being made redundant was decreased to 1,690. That round of reorganisation also impacted military units and installations directly subordinate to the MoD and General Staff. The aim was to create a single organisation supporting the integrated Ministry. There was a push for minimising the number of directly subordinated units and so all support components were transferred under the command of the Support and Training Command, and other components were moved into the Joint Force structure. As a part of the effort to eliminate duplications, several divisions were abolished in the General Staff at 1 April 2004 (e.g. logistics division, command and control division, medical support division etc.) and several joint divisions were established at the MoD.

Joint Forces integrated the primary services with units prepared for possible operational deployment. The Joint Force Command was responsible for a comprehensive force preparation and served as the force provider. The Joint Forces had their own command headquarters collocated with the Land Forces, Air Force, Specialised Forces commands and support components.

The Land Forces comprised only two mechanised brigades (the 2002 Concept envisaged a mechanised division), an artillery brigade with two artillery battalions and a reconnaissance battalion planned for further development.
The Air Force included a tactical airbase, helicopter airbase, transport airbase and an air defence missile brigade.

The Specialised Forces consisted of the Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Brigade (national CBRN defence battalion and a NATO CBRN defence battalion), Joint CBRN Defence Centre of Excellence, unit with VERA mobile passive surveillance systems, Civil-Military Cooperation Centre and Psychological Operations Centre and the Central Military Medical Institute.

Support components included the following: logistic support brigade with a supply battalion, maintenance battalion and a headquarters support battalion, engineer support brigade with one deployable combat support battalion and five territorial rescue battalions, and a signal battalion.

Support and Training Forces a territorial type of formation and were predominantly based in stationary installations. Their primary mission was to provide personnel, financial, logistic, medical, communication and other support to the MoD components and NATO forces as a part of Host Nation Support (HNS). Those components included the Support and Training Forces Command, and Logistic and Medical Support Directorate, Personnel Support Directorate and the Training and Doctrines Directorate. Furthermore, the Support and Training Forces structure comprised the Communication and Information System Base, an Information Security Centre, fourteen Regional Military Headquarters, the Agency of Military Information and Services (AVIS), military bands and a support battalion.

The reform included a major organisational overhaul of military schools. The Military Academy in Brno, Army College in Vyškov and Military Medical Academy of Jan Evangelista Purkyně in Hradec Králové were abolished. After the promulgation of the Act No. 214/2004 Coll., on the Establishment of the University of Defence, the only university for education of military professionals nationwide came into being in Brno at 1 September 2004, with Faculty of Economy and Management, Faculty of Military Technology both based at Brno and the Faculty of Military Health Sciences in Hradec Králové. The University of Defence was subordinate directly to the Minister of Defence.

The Joint Force units were scheduled to achieve Initial Operational Capability in 2006 and Full Operational Capability in 2010–12. Support and Training Forces were planned to complete the reform already in 2008.

By 2006, selected units were to be able to perform missions defined under the Czech Republic’s political-military ambitions anywhere on the globe (except for arctic zones) and draw level in training standards and armaments with other NATO nations’ forces, with which they would deploy for combined operations. While the existing reform provided for the armed forces development approximately till 2012, there were plans to work out a long-term vision looking ahead to 2020–25.

The Chief of General Staff Czech Armed Forces submitted a report to the President of the Czech Republic on 31 December 2006 that the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic had achieved its initial operational capability, which encompassed developing and achieving the required level of readiness with units and components necessary to form a brigade-size task force or rotation in battalion task force for peace enforcement, peace support or peacekeeping operation. In practice, the Czech Republic had available a NATO-certified brigade equivalent force (3,000 personnel) on required training standards and with necessary equipment for low through high intensity operations. That successfully concluded
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79 DANDA, O., Kühnl chce diskutovat o rušení posádek, Právo daily, 13 August 2004, p. 2.
80 Interview by Pavel BAROCH with the Chief of General Staff LTG Pavel ŠTEFKA published in the Hospodářské noviny daily on 12 September 2005, p. 4.
stage one of the reform and completed the first step towards progressively fulfilling political-military ambitions articulat-
ed by the 2003 Concept 2003 and updated under the 2004 Military Strategy of the Czech Republic.

The Czech Republic’s security system for military and non-
military situations underwent significant changes in 1999–
2004. Crisis management law became effective from 1 January
2001 and provided for the fulfilment of visions originated
in 1992. The Fire Service and Civil Defence were integrated
into a single organisational component under control of the
Fire Rescue Service of the Czech Republic. To that effect, Civil
Defence was transferred from the MoD into the Ministry of
the Interior and individual components began getting used
to each other. In accordance with the Act No. 239/2000 Coll.
the Integrated Emergency System of the Czech Republic (IES)
was established, in which the military, specifically “the Czech
Armed Forces’ assigned forces and assets”, were regarded an
auxiliary IES component. The primary IES components include
the Fire Rescue Service of the Czech Republic, fire units as-
signed to regional coverage, Police of the Czech Republic,
Medical Rescue Service. The Act on Regions (Regional System)
No. 129/2000 Coll. promulgated on 12 April 2000 abolished
district council authorities. The systems for registering poten-
tial conscripts and the armed forces augmentation system changed. In daily life of the security system,
development was under way as people were getting used to new structures with new missions while
fully meeting the needs of the population.

The Analysis of the Czech Republic’s Security System was developed in 2004 to outline proposals
for optimising the system. Public administration reform, which included restructuring and modernisa-
tion of central state government bodies, also reshaped the security system and internal dependen-
cies among its components. The last major change that affected the projected level of involvement
by individual security system components in contingency plans was the transition to an all-volun-
teer force from 1 January 2005. The change was carried out based on the Act No. 585/2004 Sb., on
Liability to Conscription and its ensuring (the Conscription Act), which abolished the Act on the Scope
of Conscription and Military Administrative Authorities No. 218/1999 Coll. Termination of mandatory
conscription affected the armed forces’ engagement in consequence management in the wake of non-
military emergencies (floods, large-scale anthropogenic disasters and the like).

The Czech Republic’s entry into the European Union on 1 May 2004 was a crucial milestone. As one
of the components of the society, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic joined implementation of
the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) and commenced contributing its part to solutions of
joint tasks. While European Union and NATO membership overlaps significantly, the situation was not
completely new for our military and defence. Under the agreement between NATO and EU, known as
Berlin+, the two organisations made arrangements that planning joint operations under the EU flag will
be done by NATO planning authorities. Necessary preparation also showed practically for supporting
specific EU assignments defined under so-called Petersberg Tasks.81

Cooperation in this subject-matter area affected specific missions the Czech Armed Forces has per-
formed since 2004 as well as military training.

81 The missions were approved by the Western European Union (WEU) ministerial conference that took place in Petersberg Hotel at Bonn,
Germany, in June 1992. WEU Members States declared their readiness to provide military units assigned from their conventional forces
for military missions led by the WEU. The forces can be used for the following tasks: humanitarian and rescue missions; peacekeeping
missions; combat operations in crises, including peace enforcement. These tasks are presently explicitly included in Article 17 the Treaty
on European Union and are an integral part of the ESDP.
At this point, the kind readers may ask why they witness the continuous repetition of the process producing new or revised policies that lay down plans for future MoD and Armed Forces development. It seems that MoD plans & policy making has been and most probably will be associated with upheavals of high expectations followed by waves of disappointment. Every new concept however aroused hopes with defence civilians and armed forces service personnel, which were associated with creating new conditions hopefully suitable for a long-term sustainable development possibly bringing about continuity and ensure a clear future prospect – a state that would not be followed again and again by further personnel reductions, closure of no-future installations and formation of new units, abandoning just renovated bases and transfer into installations that do not provide for any reasonable continuation of their mission. MoD servicemembers and defence civilians trusted that the vital modernisation would be launched or would continue and that obsolete equipment and materiel would be replaced, the military would divest of surplus materiel, ammunition and spare parts for equipment decommissioned a long time ago, that career management systems, acquisition systems, planning, programming and budgeting systems etc. would be finally implemented and stabilised.

It never happened during the transition from a massive totalitarian conscription army to a democratic state’s modern military force that reasonable continuity would be confirmed. Why it did not happen is hard to explain. One of the explanations at hand is connected with the permanently changing environment – these are “liquid times in an age of uncertainty”. Efforts to maintain national defence posture were realised in any situation. The ability proved to be limited to successfully foresee the likely future development of both internal and external environments (developments in economy, the security reality, in military science, demography and technology) and their impact on armed forces development and employment scenarios. The process of the armed forces’ adaptation to the new conditions was encroached by what was not always an unbiased political decision-making. Likewise, the dynamic of changes impeded on the armed forces stabilisation. Obviously, both Minister Tvrdík’s and Minister Kostelka’s defence reform plans sold under a highly attractive advertising slogan: “lean, young, modern and mobile” could not hold out long in such a dynamically developing situation.

On 1 January 2005, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic became an all-volunteer force. For the first time in the history of Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic, the military structure and manpower has been without conscripts. In the new situation, politicians, and defence and security experts asked whether the military would manage the situation the way they managed in other countries where they had already had all-volunteer forces. The transition to an all-volunteer force was the final step of reform effort that included procedures of altering, redressing and improvement. No further reform step is expected. The Armed Forces of the Czech Republic set out on the path of transformation – metamorphosis in response to the changing security reality. There will logically not be just one transformation. A sequence of transformation efforts should cater for the requirements of the Czech Republic’s defence against military threats.

---

82 In the foreword to his book Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty, Zygmunt Bauman writes: “Solid phase of modernity turned into liquid phase as social forms and institutions have no longer enough time to solidify, as they disintegrate and dissolve quicker than they can establish... the collapse of long-term thinking, planning and acting, and the disappearance or weakening of social structures in which thinking, planning and acting could be inscribed for a long time to come, have lost strength of disappeared completely.” Zygmunt BAUMAN, Tekuté časy: život ve věku nejistoty. Academia, Prague, 2008, p. 9-10, ISBN 978-80-200-1656-0.
5.1 Defence management in 2005–2012

In the successive Cabinets of social democratic Prime Ministers Stanislav Gross and Jiří Paroubek, the post of Defence Minister was filled by Karel Kühnl, from 4 August 2004 till 4 September 2006. Then, former Director of Foreign Relations Institute with no party affiliation, Mr. Jiří Šedivý, was appointed defence minister in the ODS Cabinet led by Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek, which formed after parliamentary elections in June 2006. The first Cabinet led by PM Mirek Topolánek did not pass confidence vote on 3 October 2006, and so steps were taken to form the second Topolánek Cabinet. Post elections arrangements did not allow Minister Šedivý to continue in office because he was independent. On 9 January 2007, another civilian person was appointed the Defence Minister. For the first time in the history of our country, there was a female defence minister, lawyer Vlasta Parkanová of KDU-ČSL. During the Czech Presidency of the European Union, the second Cabinet of PM Mirek Topolánek did not pass the vote of confidence on 24 March 2009. On the appointment of Caretaker Government led by Prime Minister Jan Fischer’s caretaker Cabinet on 8 May 2009, Martin Barták (independent, proposed by ODS) became the Minister of Defence. The Fischer Cabinet was originally to end their term during early elections in the fall of 2009, but the elections only took place at regular term in May 2010. The Cabinet of Petr Nečas (ODS) was appointed on 13 July 2010 and Alexandr Vondra, a member of the ODS, became the Defence Minister. That was a coalition Cabinet comprising ODS, TOP 09 and the Věci Veřejné party.

General Pavel Štefka (2002–07), General Vlastimil Picek (2007–12) and Lieutenant-General Petr Pavel successively became the Chiefs of General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic.

5.2 Starting points for further transformation

After 2006, the defence budget was curtailed, which significantly hampered the Defence Ministry’s ability to fund development plans and support its activities and operations in line with the 2003 Concept. Defence cuts were driven by the Cabinet’s push for meeting macroeconomic criteria for adopting the EURO (public finance deficit rate and national debt rate). External factors for the armed forces development and activities changed as well. In 2008 and 2009, the defence budget sustained additional cuts as result of the global economic crisis impact on national economy. NATO and EU continued their rather intensive deployed operations in the Balkans, the Middle East and in Africa to some extent, in which the Czech Republic took part adequately to its resources or would be likely to take part in foreseeable future, for example upon the possible activation of the EU Battle Group the Czech Republic developed and had on standby in the second half of 2009. Involvement of the Czech Republic and its Allies in multinational foreign deployed operations had a major effect on development of capabilities in all NATO nations’ and EU Member States’ militaries. The underlying requirements were for higher standards of deployability, sustainability, interoperability and force protection in asymmetric warfare. Further process of Czech MoD and Armed Forces transformation was affected by

---

83 The MoD budget dropped deep under the NATO recommended 2% GDP mark.
NATO’s reformulated political-military ambitions that were newly defined by the 2006 NATO Ministerial Guidance. In principle, the Ministerial Guidance voiced the need to prepare for concurrent and usually long-lasting operational efforts in multiple smaller operations far away from NATO’s territory in demanding climatic and geographical and different cultural environments.

Obviously, those circumstances extensively affected development of armed forces in all NATO nations and the process of shaping national defence policy to meet new security challenges was and essentially will be never-ending. The environment, in which the capability development processes occur, has changed with a great deal of dynamism. Politicians, defence policymakers and military planners have only one thing for sure: everything is on the move. Changes became integral and central to their day-to-day life and everything can be and usually will be otherwise than originally thought.

The spectrum of missions the military is called to perform has expanded significantly. Their employment in current operations has both military and non-military dimension. Soldiers may perform combat missions and concurrently be involved in stabilisation and reconstruction efforts in crisis areas, collapsed states with broken societal values, and political, administrative and economic systems. They are faced with asymmetric warfare on daily basis. The opponent is not on par technologically and is unable of open combat, but they use insurgency methods. Oftentimes the opposing forces lean on the support of locals, capitalise on excellent familiarity with the battlefield they operate in and are very flexible when it comes to climatic conditions. Such opponent is hardly identifiable and their effective elimination is very demanding. In addition, such opponents are able to very effectively publicise the conflict to shape public opinion in countries involved in the operation. Terrorism materialises with subversion in the forms of terrorist acts. Their goal is to induce fear in the public, arouse the public’s resistance to deploying forces for those operations and exert political pressure on withdrawal of the forces. To pursue their interests, the asymmetric opponents have a much greater timespan available than the states forming multinational coalitions. Long operational force deployments (it is in this sense that long wars are spoken about) projected over great distances from own territory are highly funding intensive and require sustenance of an expensive rotation system, plus the warfighters suffer from both mental strain and physical attrition.

All those aspects and challenges called for crucial changes in the attitude to the development of the Czech military and its quantitative and qualitative aspects. In that respect, there was also a clear political responsibility for creating relevant preconditions for the armed forces to be able to meet the tasks they are assigned. That particularly involves the necessary quantity of personnel, training, weapons and weapon systems, adequate standards of technology, infrastructure and other materiel and services to be used on operations as well as for training and day-to-day activities of the servicepeople.
Already when the Government authorised the 2003 Concept, there was the assumption that upon the achievement of Initial Operational Capabilities an evaluation will be made of performance on the reform and the schedule will be revised of its future development based on changed preconditions. The MoD made a progress evaluation of the 2003 Concept and submitted to the Government by mid-2007. The current assessment of the Czech Republic’s reply to the NATO Defence Planning Questionnaire (DPQ 2006) was also available, and gave a positive evaluation of the overall direction and progress made reforming defence, the achievement of Initial Operational Capability and the level of involvement in foreign deployed operations.

On the other hand, NATO identified permanent decrease of the defence budget and the delays it had produced in capability development as the critical shortfall. Negative assessment was given to resourcing of extensive in-place structures at the expense of deployable forces; overhead armed forces command and control structures were assessed as inadequate, disproportionate and lacking transparency, and a high quantity of airbases was a source of concern. In terms of measures to be possibly taken, recommendations were offered to reduce central management bodies, including various support components. At that time, the MoD leadership planned to maintain the overall number of personnel, but simultaneously realised there was a need to reverse the unfavourable ratio between deployable and in-place forces. NATO recommended that the Czech Republic rather focused on the ability to assign battalion-size task forces while maintaining the ability to develop a brigade task force. Compared to their western equivalents, Czech military units performed missions as part of the Integrated Emergency System that appeared too broad-based and excessively burdening the whole system by draining the MoD budget (meaning rescue battalions, whose members did not have, in accordance with international law of war, the combatant status). In the sphere of mobilisation, the option was pointed out to reduce costs associated with sustaining the mobilisation capability by reducing relevant administration, stockpiles and unusable reserve forces. NATO recommendations for the Czech Republic on personnel included adding the missing rank corps (enlisted personnel and non-commissioned officers) and reviewing their current ratio (adjusting the rank pyramid).

The conclusions of the NATO assessment clearly necessitated a revision of the course followed in reforming the MoD and developing the armed forces. The Government tasked development of a new policy document to guide the plans to further transform the MoD till 2018.

5.3 MoD Transformation

Through its resolution no. 1194 dated 22 October 2007, the Government adopted the policy document Transformation of the Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic (hereinafter Transformation) designed to align the concept of the reform’s second phase to current security environment, restricted resources and new approaches applied to capability development. The Transformation brought in

---


Defence Minister Vlasta Parkanová and Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek visiting the Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic in August 2008. Photo by Jiří Hokův

In connection with the decision to deploy Czech transport helicopter unit to ISAF, Czech aircrews underwent special air training in mountain, desert and dusty environments. The teams were also reinforced with gunners. Photo by Jan Koubá

harmony the intentions to improve capabilities with the restrictions of the originally predicted defence expenditures. Defence budget cuts inevitably delayed realisation of necessary acquisitions and other programs to achieve the required capabilities.86

Based on development trends in the security environment, Transformation built on the premise that, in the light of its NATO and EU membership and with a view to good neighbourly relations, the Czech Republic was in a favourable security situation and that a large-scale military attack against the territory of the Czech Republic or other NATO and EU member states was highly unlikely. There was also a conviction that it would be possible to identify such type of threat early and prepare for its elimination in collaboration with Allies. Thus, the Czech Republic was able to definitively abandon the concept of autonomous defence and thoughts about national territorial defence. The Czech Republic’s airspace defence coverage became a high priority. The country shaped its defence policy to defend national and NATO security interests outside national territory anywhere those interests may be threatened. Autonomous military engagement in those operations was no longer entertained – always in cooperation with the Allies.

Compared to defence appropriations envisaged under the 2003 Concept, the planned MoD budget was decreased by roughly CZK 45 billion in 2004–2010. Comparing the defence budget development to the 2002 Concept, the discrepancy would be even more remarkable. The effects were obvious: deferment of realisation, postponement of some modernisation programs past the originally envisaged timelines, project curtailment or complete suspension. In parallel with those measures the MoD sought savings in defence personnel, operation and maintenance costs. Plans were developed and implement to rationalise management and other related processes. Proposals were submitted to continue reduction of excessive infrastructure, surplus stocks and the quantity of equipment in the inventory. The changes were motivated so as to maintain and develop defence capabilities that will continue to

86 The MoD revised the contract for acquisition of armoured fighting vehicles from 199 originally planned vehicles down to 107.
be usable in advancing vital, strategic and other important security interests defined under the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic. That would take on the form of employing forces and assets in the territory of the Czech Republic in defence of national airspace, in emergency management operations as part of the Integrated Emergency System and predominantly through deployments of forces and assets for operations led by NATO, EU or other international organisations or in ad hoc coalitions.

In terms of new approaches to capability development, Transformation primarily focused on delivering so-called Full Operational Capabilities. The term of “Full Operational Capabilities” was understood as a state attaining the planned measures, especially those related to restructuring and modernisation, and ensure the armed forces’ higher quality standards comparable to those displayed by NATO nations’ and Partner militaries. The FOC expressed the level of intent, visions and requirements for further development of capabilities, which were a product of the time they were articulated at. So, the concept of the armed forces’ full operational capability in 2007 differed from those envisaged under the 2002 and 2003 Concepts. By achieving the so-called Initial Operational Capabilities at 31 December 2006, the Czech Armed Forces was able to deliver on the minimum level of the Czech Republic’s political-military ambitions defined under the 2004 Military Strategy of the Czech Republic. There were nevertheless certain risks and caveats for employment in high intensity operations (very unlikely to occur) as part of providing collective defence to NATO nations.

What however mattered was the fact that the definition of Full Operational Capability changed with a view to newly defined force goals in NATO’s defence planning process. The deliverable outcomes were new force goals for NATO nations to pursue in 2008–18, whose achievement would take forward capabilities of the NATO Alliance as a whole to the intended level. The aim was to foster achievement of such defence capabilities that would furnish NATO with critical forces and assets to perform contemporary assignments, spawn development of future capabilities and meet future security challenges.

Given the challenges NATO faced in projecting the necessary amount and quality of forces for operations in Kosovo and particularly in Afghanistan, those objectives were much more ambitious, challenging and implied higher-quality and usability of the armed forces in expeditionary multinational operations, specifically in terms of increasing the proportion of deployable task forces, while making sure they may be projected over strategic distances and display a high degree of personnel and logistic sustainability. At the same time, it involved rationalising the armed forces organisational structure and basing in performance of non-combat missions in the territory of the Czech Republic, particularly as concerns air policing and reinforcement of the Integrated Emergency System.

Same as the NATO defence planning cycle, Transformation was directed at 2018. Transformational defence development plans were synchronised with NATO intentions towards that year. The achievement of Full Operational Capabilities was postponed from 2012 to 2018. Likewise, the Czech Republic’s political-military ambitions were adjusted to reflect new developments in the security environment. Armed Forces development plans were harmonised with the reduced defence spending framework
and objective force goals became more realistic. *Transformation* responded to the changing requirements for operational capabilities in the form of Force Goals 2018 as a part of NATO defence planning process. Preconditions were created for achieving higher quality capabilities than those originally planned under the 2003 Concept, and for meeting the Istanbul NATO Summit commitments that demanded 40% of land forces and their support forces to be structured, equipped and prepared for operational deployment (so-called deployable forces) and 8% land forces and their support forces be deployed for operations or on standby for deployment at all times.87

The *Transformation* programs also included acquisition of light armoured vehicles and completion of the armoured fighting vehicles and medium support truck replacement programs. The 21st Century Soldier project was designed to enhance combat effectiveness of individual soldiers and increase their protection. Operational stocks needed to be created to increase force sustainability.

The *Transformation* envisaged operating the leased JAS-39 Gripen supersonic fighters and modernisation of L-159 ALCA subsonic aircraft. There were also plans to modernise transport and combat helicopters. Acquisition of tactical fixed-wing transport aircraft was planned to enhance the armed forces’ operational employment and provision of airlift for forces and assets. Strategic airlift was to be provided through involvement in multinational and international projects.

The Czech Republic’s airspace defence concept was to lean on national capabilities, and dedicated set of measures were planned for the period post 2015, when the lease of supersonic aircraft terminates. The plan was to involve air force command and control systems, sensor modernisation and acquisition of active elements (aircraft, air defence).

In terms of Land Force infrastructure, a high priority was assigned to realignment of units associated with building army bases in Žatec, Bechyně and Přáslavice. There were also plans for the Air Force to complete building combat and logistic zones at the Náměšť and Čáslav airbases and renovation and completion of dormitories in peacetime stations. Adequate training facilities using simulation technology were to be built as well.

The NATO Security Investment Programme (NSIP) was planned to be used for completing complete development of fuel depot and distribution systems for Čáslav and Náměšť nad Oslavou airbases, renovation of the reinforced building of the Air Force Control and Reporting Centre and integration of the Czech Armed Forces into the NATO Integrated Air Defence System.

---

87 Czech MoD plans to achieve 65% deployable and 12% sustainable Land Forces by the end of 2014 across the whole NATO mission spectrum.
The airfield at Náměšť nad Oslavou started to be counted with for possible use in NATO framework and that was why it was included into the NATO Security Investment Program (NSIP).

command chain. Furthermore, there were plans for developing a comprehensive communication support to deployable forces, completing the development of communication system networks in national territory and development of operational-tactical command and control system in a Network-Enabled Capability (NEC) environment. The MoD planned to continue its specialisation in CBRN defence in the NATO framework.88

Defence budget was to fluctuate between 1.4 and 2.0% GDP till 2018 to enable the achievement of objectives under the Transformation. At the expense of stationary forces, a high priority was assigned to development of deployable forces to increase rapid force projection over long distances from the home territory in very different cultural environments and climates. Furthermore, the armed forces structure was to adopt a three-tier command system comprising strategic, operational and tactical echelons. Light motorised battalions and a logistic supply battalion were to be developed in relation to reorganisation of engineer and rescue units. All those plans were based on calculations that envisionned achieving the objective MoD personnel strength of up to 36,800 personnel comprising around 26,200 service personnel, some 8,800 civil servants and 1,800 cadets not usable in their specialism during their training and preparation. The number of ranks was to decrease, and the junior NCO and enlisted corps were to be boosted. Importantly for the armed forces development, the Government undertook on authorising the transformation package to ensure financing of costs associated with possible activation of Czech Armed Forces’ forces and assets assigned to the NATO Response Force and EU Battle Group from sources outside the defence budget.

The Transformation policy document brought the Czech Republic’s political-military ambitions again on par with the resources allocated to meet them. The contents and timelines reflected changes in the security environment and their effects on the armed forces development and employment. Objectives and assignments under the Transformation were then aligned to current projection of available financial, human and material resources. That paved the way for stability in the MoD and Armed Forces development in the longterm planning cycle and for developing advanced armed forces able to defend future vital, strategic and other important state interests.

88 Based on the so-called Prague Initiative focused on developing NATO’s CBRN defence capabilities, the Czech Republic created the NATO Joint Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Centrum of Excellence (JCBRN COE), which was activated at 1 August 2007 as a NATO International Military Organisation. Yearbook of the Ministry of Defence 2007, Czech MoD – AVIS, Prague, 2008, p. 27, ISBN 978-80-7278-452-3.
5.4 The 2008 Military Strategy

In the context of Transformation, the Government tasked an update of the 2004 Military Strategy of the Czech Republic, a primary strategic national defence policy that lays down basic principles for the armed forces development and employment. The update was based on an assessment of the Czech Republic’s security situation, which made it possible to accept certain level of risk associated with armed forces development and providing national defence.

The Czech Republic did not envisage developing active forces and assets for a high-intensity global conflict. The most likely scenarios of employment were meant to be at heart of the armed forces development. The highest priority was assigned to developing capabilities enabling defence of the Czech Republic’s security interests particularly outside national territory. Measures to build up forces and assets in the aftermath of aggravating security situation of the Czech Republic were to elaborate on a concept assuring their reliable operation but maintaining minimum requirement for resourcing. In that sense, a review was to be performed of the existing robust mobilisation system, the quantity of maintained military equipment, weapons, ammunition and other materiel, reserve component concept (registering and training) and the economic mobilisation system. Applying the principle of postponed requirement, projects would be in place to acquire materiel to support graduated force build-up. The newly shaped defence system continued to build on the premise that state defence is a duty of all the state’s citizens and that is why it was not possible to abolish conscription liability, just suspend it.

Under the updated Military Strategy of the Czech Republic, the Government ordained the level of the Czech Republic’s political military ambitions to ensure own defence and contribute to NATO Article 5 collective defence. Defence of the Czech Republic’s territory was always to be performed in the framework NATO’s defence.

In an armed conflict threatening nationality sovereignty and territorial integrity, all forces and assets of the all-volunteer Armed Forces would be employed, eventually including general mobilisation. In Article 5 collective defence operations for contingencies not immediately threatening state sovereignty and territorial integrity, the Czech Republic would be able to provide land and air forces from the set of forces earmarked in the frame of NATO defence planning, the main component of which is a medium type mechanised brigade task force. Airspace defence would be assured through the NATO Integrated Air Defence System. In case of political consensus with NATO Allies, the Czech Republic would join international programs centered on defence against means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction, particularly against ballistic missiles. The Czech Republic would keep its Host Nation Support (HNS) ability.

For non-article 5 operations, the Czech Republic would stand ready to contribute to maintaining international peace and stability with mechanised forces, special forces, engineer, medical and chemical,

---

biologic, radiological and nuclear defence forces, with transport and tactical air forces and the Military Police.

Engagement in concurrent operations was planned to take on the form of:

- Brigade-size task force or an air equivalent without rotation;
- Battalion equivalent task force with a six-month rotation.
  As a part of deploying the battalion task force, the Czech Republic would be able to provide a multinational brigade task force command for up to one year;
- Company task force for six months with rotation or an air force equivalent for three months without rotation;
- Up to battalion size task forces to fill rotations of the NATO Response Force or the EU Battle Groups alternately to the brigade task force deployment.

The Czech Republic would continue to be able to contribute into additional operations with special task forces or groups of experts, e.g. special forces and teams, expert teams to provide training and mentoring or teams to man international staffs and observer missions.

In non-military crisis situations in the homeland territory, ad hoc forces and assets would be assigned in support of the Police of the Czech Republic or the IES to the extent necessary and subject to availability. Those could be reinforced by active reserve component forces. Airlift capabilities would be provided for humanitarian aid and rescue operations outside the territory of the Czech Republic subject to their current free capacity.

Achieving that level of political-military ambitions required the attainment of both quantitative and qualitative parameters in the armed forces' readiness (manning levels, weapons systems and hardware in inventory and training standards). At the end of 2008, the Armed Forces only displayed the ability to meet the Czech Republic's political-military ambitions in part. The Armed Forces high command expected that the required standards of readiness with individual brigade, battalion and company task forces required to fulfill the specific level of political-military ambitions across the whole operation spectrum practically without geographical limitations would be achieved at the end of the planning period – in 2018, at earliest.

5.5 Long-term MoD Vision

It is completely fair to conclude that the MoD lacked a comprehensible longterm vision of its development throughout the reform and transformation period after 1989 and was often criticised for that shortcoming. The lack of concept negatively influenced decision-making on expensive modernisation programs that were realised in an extent not adequate to actual requirement of the armed forces. A longterm document was therefore to be based on an analysis of projected development of the security environment and all aspects shaping requirements for future defence capabilities including the prediction of funding requirement associated with realisation of longterm plans. Developing a policy with longterm validity, which would drive capability development in the prospect of 20 years, began in 2004. The process sought to develop a longterm future vision of the MoD development, which was to be staffed by other Ministries, scholars, think tanks and the security community.

In 2005, the Intention of the vision of ensuring security and defence of the Czech Republic was drafted with scheduled completion in 2006. In the context of general elections in 2006 and subsequent changes in the MoD leadership, the policy document did not reach an approval phase. In spite of that, there was a continuous need to have a vision. Already in the second half of 2006, efforts were launched to develop the Longterm MoD Vision. Its development saw the involvement of experimentation using
simulation, which verified selected technologies for development of future operational capabilities in brigade-level command post exercises.

The Longterm MoD Vision was successfully finalised in summer 2008, when it was deliberated and approved by the Government. The vision set forth the direction and priorities for development of capabilities central to an effective realisation of the Czech Republic’s defence policy over the next twenty years. The requirements for longterm capability development operationalized analyses of longterm trends in development of security and operational environment.

The vision defined four sets of strategic priorities:
- Development of an effective and efficient national defence system;
- Development of deployable and interoperable forces;
- Provision of an effective organisation, command and control;
- Qualified and motivated people.

The vision was not regarded a longterm plan that would define implementation steps associated with funding and therefore claimed elaboration in the defence planning process into concepts and plans.

Development of the Longterm MoD Vision (2008), updating the Military Strategy of the Czech Republic (2008) and approval of the policy document Transformation of the Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic (2007) finalised the formulation of political assignment for the armed forces development and employment in 2008. Elaboration into detailed plans and policies followed. The planning process was specified under the Minister’s guidance for planning MoD development and activities for 2009–14 (hereinafter the Guidance) promulgated at the end of 2007, and set forth strategic goals for the MoD and ordained tasks, priorities and resource limitations to meet those goals. The Guidance was elaborated into the MoD Medium term development plan for 2009–14, which identified programs, projects and activities to meet the strategic goals.

The strategic MoD goals sought to:
- Develop an effective and efficient national defence system while synergising with other governmental departments and agencies, and provide necessary level of its capabilities with the possibility to develop (build up) forces and assets based on changes in the Czech Republic’s security situation and expected consequences;
- Development of deployable and interoperable forces capable of performing missions in cooperation with Allies across the whole spectrum of NATO led and coalition operations (including high-intensity combat) in demanding geographical and climatic conditions (except for arctic zones) and culturally different environment;
- Development of a modern and effectively managed organisation with simple and adaptable structure continuously increasing its performance and quality of activities performed using available advanced command and control and information support tools;
- Recruiting and retaining qualified and motivated people who would ensure future MoD development;
- Complete operationally useful and socially acceptable basing;
- Realise a well thought-out modernisation and a state-of-the-art infrastructure.

The strategic MoD goals set the scene for development of capabilities to be effectively usable for elimination of the most likely security risks associated with international terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means, weak collapsed states and security of supply of strategic materials. To manage less likely but in terms of consequences the most serious crisis situations in the form of regional and global conflicts threatening security interests of the Czech Republic, sufficient timespan was expected to be available to mount an effective response and develop necessary capabilities in the framework of an efficient system of graduated force build-up with a reduced requirement for overhead structures and funding. The Czech Armed Forces was not expected to be employed outside the Czech Republic’s territory on standalone basis.

5.6 The 2011 White Paper on Defence

In his foreword to the White Paper on Defence, Minister of Defence Alexandr Vondra openly characterised the situation then as follows: “The White Paper bluntly describes the current condition of the Armed Forces. It is not really a pleasing reading, but we cannot approach solutions without being honest. I refuse to speak with financially driven intentions, nor do I have any expectation of step increases in defence budget the way step cuts were made in recent years. But I remain optimistic the defence appropriations will progressively increase.

We are at a juncture. After years of budget reductions, ill-considered interventions and squandered political capital, analyses of the Ministry show our reserves have been exhausted. Solutions to problems we presently face are complex, but answers do exist. They call for redesigning systems and redirecting resources to the key business missions the Czech Armed Forces are to perform. Understandably, the White Paper on Defence proposes many unpopular, yet necessary changes; some will question the termination of some non-essential capabilities. But if we would not do anything, it would mean abandoning our national defence.”

An important message conveyed by the White Paper on Defence is the conclusion that in 2012 the MoD had less than a half of funding compared to the assumptions the 2002 Concept worked on. The key findings are as follows:

- As a result of demographic development and the armed forces’ dropping competitiveness in the job market, it will not be feasible to attain the currently planned ambition of 26,200 military service personnel.
- The MoD has an internal deficit of CZK 80–90 billion generated in the past.
- In the years ahead, many types of weapon system and equipment will end their service life and the MoD will not be able to fund all previously planned modernisations.

91 In its Resolution No. 458 dated 18 May 2011, the Government endorsed the White Paper on Defence and tasked elaborating its conclusions into the MoD environment in line with the White Paper framework implementation schedule, contained its chapter 11 thereunder, and inform the Government once a year about the progress achieved.
The principal document comprises of eleven chapters with the first two ones providing background and context. The first chapter summarises mandatory and politically defined starting points and restrictions, commitments and ambitions that must be observed in drafting the Czech Republic’s defence policy and development of its tools. The next chapter defines the strategic security environment of the Czech Republic and its Allies, threats and risks originating in the environment, and articulates the Czech Republic’s security interests. That provides the basis for definition of roles and functions of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic, the nature of its capabilities and discusses human, financial and material resources required to provide adequate force structure. Further chapters formulate the vision of providing quality of defence capabilities and the associated requirements for their sustenance, development and possible employment. Pursuant to that objective, reorganisation options are listed in the last but one chapter. The final chapter includes a general schedule for realising the White Paper on Defence in the 2011–14 timeframe.

With respect to the condition of public spending, significant increase of defence appropriations is not conceivable at the moment. The White Paper therefore proposes a series of measures to be adopted in order for the MoD to remain viable. Those measures address all spheres of activity including the restriction of some military capabilities. Besides starting efforts to elaborate on individual conclusions of the White Paper, the MoD leadership will need to focus primarily on preparing and introducing measures to increase social and financial stability of military service personnel.

5.7 The 2012 status

In terms of military security threats, the Czech Republic was in a favourable situation in 2012 as was attested by its good neighbourly relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, Poland, Slovakia and Austria as well as its membership in NATO and the EU. Intelligence summaries concluded that no armed conflict spilling over into national territory would occur in the medium term. Further strengthening of the Czech Republic’s military security would at the same time contribute to NATO enlargement.

Ironically, as far as the current security situation is concerned, there are well substantiated assessments that it has worsened on the global scale. Although not representing a military threat, terrorist attacks have occurred on a frequent basis. The Armed Forces of the Czech Republic has also been involved in the global war on terrorism operating as a part of NATO forces in the territory of Afghanistan. Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction has continued, and the military is also tasked to counter them. A gamut of conventional and non-conventional assets with the potential of causing mass casualties and major damage is getting into untrustworthy hands that may elicit change of security status anywhere on the globe, including in the Euro-Atlantic area. The danger looms larger with the realisation that weapons with high lethality are in possession of totalitarian, dictator and ideologically or religiously intolerant regimes or non-state actors, such as terrorist organisations, radical movements and groups working on religious, sectarian or extremist basis. Their ability and commitment to use those assets represent a high threat for NATO, EU and the Czech Republic as well.

In extreme cases, when counterterrorism, non-proliferation and peace efforts fail, the Czech Republic may be involved in military action. Such cases would be accompanied by the declaration of the following states defined by law:\52

---

state of national emergency or the state of war. The question is how the state security system is ready to cope with such scenarios and what situations it is able to handle.

As a central governmental authority in accordance with Section 16 Paragraph 2 the Czech Republic Act No. 2/1969 Coll., on the establishment of Ministries and other central government institutions (the Competence Act), as subsequently amended, the MoD:

- Is involved in developing national military defence policy;
- Develops the concept of operational preparation of national territory;
- Proposes measures essential to ensuring national defence to the Government, the Defence Council and the President of the Czech Republic;
- Provides coordination of central authorities, administration bodies, municipalities, communities and legal persons critical for national defence in preparation for defence;
- Controls the Military Intelligence;
- Ensures inviolability of the Czech Republic’s airspace (in 1989, the wording still included the provision: “and coordination of military air traffic control with civilian air traffic management”);
- Organises and performs measures to mobilise the ACR, maintain register of Czech nationals liable to conscription and the register of material assets to be assigned for the needs of the ACR in a state of national emergency or a state of war;
- Calls up Czech nationals to perform their conscription duty.

Within European security structures, the MoD organises cooperation with other member states’ armed forces. In addition to that, the MoD performs state inspection over radiation hazard safety in military installations.

On 14 September 1999, the Act on the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic no. 219/1999 Coll. was adopted, which regulates the position, mission and basic structure of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic, their control, preparation and equipping with military materiel, plus the use of military weapons by service personnel while on active duty and damages. The Act defines the Armed Forces’ primary missions as follows:

1. Prepare for defending the Czech Republic and defend it against an external aggression.
2. Perform assignments as a part of the Czech Republic’s commitments under international treaties on collective defence against an aggression.
3. Perform other missions of the ACR, Military Office of the President and the Castle Guard, which include possible employment for:
   - Providing security to critical defence infrastructure;
   - Performing duties of the Police of the Czech Republic, should the Police forces and assets prove insufficient to ensure internal order and security, for the necessary period of time;
   - Emergency management efforts during disasters or other serious emergencies threatening life, health, major property or the environment or for disaster consequence management;
   - Averting other imminent threat using military hardware;
   - Air transportation of top state officials;
   - Providing emergency medical air transportation;
   - Providing transportation for own needs;
   - Providing air services;
   - Providing lift based on decisions of the Government;
   - Supporting cultural, education, sport and social events;
   - Performing civil protection humanitarian aid missions.
Since 2012, the Czech Military Police has assigned an MP platoon to the NATO Multinational Military Police Battalion. Photo by Vladimír Marek

The Act 219 lays down the armed forces’ tasks relating to international cooperation as follows:

1. The Armed Forces cooperate with foreign countries’ armed forces based on international treaties.
2. The Armed Forces participate in activities in support of peace and security, particularly by engaging in peace support and peacekeeping operations, rescue and humanitarian aid operations; individual service personnel may also be sent for such operations and activities.
3. The Armed Forces are permitted to take part in military training exercises together with foreign armed forces in the territory of the Czech Republic or in foreign countries.

The Armed Forces’ primary mission93 is to prepare for defence of the Czech Republic, defend it against an external attack and perform assignments based on commitments under international treaties. The actual compass of possibility of the Czech Republic is specified in the military-political policy document named the Military Strategy of the Czech Republic4. That strategy had its predecessors in 1999, 2002 and 2004. As to the 2008 Military Strategy of the Czech Republic, it does not include into the armed forces, as laid down in the Act on Armed Forces,5 the Czech Armed Forces, Military Office of the President and the Castle Guard, but the Czech Armed Forces, Military Police and Military Intelligence. The year 2011 saw the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic6 updated and the White paper on Defence7 developed though a collaborative effort of leading defence officials and representatives of the security community.

The key attitudes, commitments and tasks for a military defence of the Czech Republic in 2012 are summarised as follows:

- The defence policy is realised by the armed forces, whose principal component is the Czech Armed Forces. The armed forces have permanently ready contingency plans and standby projects to step up their capabilities to the extent necessary.
- The Czech Republic’s security is provided by the armed forces, armed security services and emergency rescue services.
- National defence is also a mission for other components of the security system and involves central governmental bodies, regional government bodies, municipalities and communities, natural and legal persons according to the Czech legal order, and internal and external security are mutually interlinked.
- Defence of the Czech Republic’s territory relies on the collective defence system.
- The Czech Republic plans to provide for its participation in operations outside homeland territory with its forces earmarked for operations led by NATO, the EU and other organisations and for coalition operations.
- Defence of the Czech airspace is provided as a part of the NATO Integrated Air Defence System (NATINADS).8

---

93 According to Section § 9 paragraph 1 and 2 the Act on the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic No. 219/1999 Coll.
95 The Act on the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic No. 219/1999 Coll.
98 In the light of the need to provide continuous air defence coverage, NATO nations agreed to set up a joint integrated air defence system designated NATINADS (NATO Integrated Air Defence System). It is unique for being active in peacetime, in crisis and in wartime alike. Engagement of assigned forces and assets in the NATINADS was endorsed by the Resolution of the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic no. 1 348/2000 dated 7 December 2000 and of the Senate no. 16/2000 dated 20 December 2000.
In the contingency of threats to the territory of the Czech Republic or the NATO Alliance, it is essential to create a host national support capability to receive NATO forces in homeland territory.

In the contingency of non-military threats, the armed forces are planned to perform missions mandatory under effective law.

The military doctrine articulated the political-military ambitions outlining the Czech Republic's vision of the scope and manner of the armed forces employment and on approach to managing military threats. The following types of contingencies have been identified:

- Armed Forces’ employment outside the territory of the Czech Republic;
- Article 5 collective defence operations;
- Armed Forces’ employment in non-Article 5 operations;
- Armed Forces employment in support of civilian authorities in non-military emergencies.

The Security Strategy of the Czech Republic is the primary policy document of the Czech security policy. Formulating the political expression of the attitude executive power of the state on military crisis situation, its contents is given by the Constitution99, Constitutional Act on Security100 and other related acts. The Strategy also includes the statement on the relation to ensuring military defence of the state, both for the Czech citizens and for international audiences. The Czech body of laws inextricably incorporates international commitments101 that are based on the Czech Republic’s membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the European Union (EU), the United Nations (UN) and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). That is just a declaratory statement, but it should be understood that those organisations have their internal policies, strategies and procedures.

---


101 Paragraphs 10, 10a, 10b of the Constitutional Act no. 1/1993 Sb., where Article 10 reads: “Promulgated international treaties, whose ratification was endorsed by the Parliament and which have obliged the Czech Republic, are included in the body of laws; in case an international treaty provides otherwise than an Act, the international treaty will prevail.”
The Czech Republic subscribes to them and observes the adopted procedures that restrict the states’ individuality in favour of increasing defence posture and providing defence against military threats as part of shared sovereignty.

How have the official opinions on attitudes to military threats reverberated in primary security policy documents? Elections at the end of May 2010 brought into office the new Cabinet led by Prime Minister Petr Nečas. The Cabinet’s program included the following statements: “The Government will develop a new foreign policy concept concurrently with a new Security Strategy of the Czech Republic”\(^\text{102}\) and: “Following on the authorisation of NATO’s new Strategic Concept ... at the Lisbon Summit ... and in the light of the overall development of international environment, the Government will revise and update the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic. At the same time, the Ministry of Defence will develop the White Paper on Defence, which will become the groundwork for development of the new Defence Strategy building on the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic.”\(^\text{103}\) The program furthermore reads: “The Government will deepen interoperation and enhance equipment of primary components of the Integrated Emergency System to include strengthening of its cooperation with the Armed Forces to the effect of minimizing the consequence of emergencies on life and property of citizens and rationalising public spending.”\(^\text{104}\)

National Security Council resolution no. 32 dated 29 November 2010 approved the Schedule of updating the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic. An ad hoc working group of the NSC Committee for Coordination of Foreign Security Policy was established in December 2010. Under the leadership of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the efforts to develop the policy document saw the involvement of the Office of the Government, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of the Interior, Ministry of Finance, intelligence services, Office of the President and the State Material Reserves Administration as well as the security community, and Deputies and Senators from relevant parliamentary committees. Six specialist teams were formed within the working group. The resulting language underscores continuity of starting points and security interest of the Czech Republic as they were defined in the 2003 Security Strategy. The main portion of work was done in the course of two months during 2011. Basic structure of the updated strategy matches that of the previous Security Strategy of the Czech Republic.

The starting points used for the Security Strategy of the Czech Republic already explicitly provide that the “Security Strategy of the Czech Republic sets forth the approaches, tools and measures to ensure security, defence and protection for the citizens and the state.” At the same time, the strategy highlights a new observation that is the combination of external and internal, military and non-military threats and the need to address them in a comprehensive fashion. The primary responsibility for organising security is vested with the Government, regional governments, municipalities and communities in relevant scope. On resources for security, the strategy concludes for the first time that “the political and economic stability of the European Union is of key significance in safeguarding the Czech Republic’s security. The exceptional openness of the Czech economy exposes it to external influences, particularly with respect to market access and energy


\(^{103}\) Ibid, p. 15.

\(^{104}\) Ibid, p. 19.
supplies”. At the same time, the strategy formulates an articulate approach: “In view of the values and principles which it espouses, the Czech Republic favours joint action within international organisations and groupings of states that advocate peaceful conflict resolution, a collective approach to security, and mutually beneficial economic cooperation.” Essentially, membership in those organisations does not mean we would lose the primary responsibility for own security and defence.

The Czech Republic’s security interests retained basic structuring into vital, strategic and other important interests. Vital interests failed to be expanded with population protection. Strategic interests include “internal security and population protection”. Furthermore, the interests are expanded with “preventing and managing local and regional conflicts and their consequences”, “preventing and suppressing threats influencing security of the Czech Republic’s and of NATO Allies” and “safeguarding the Czech Republic’s energy, raw-material and food security of the Czech Republic”. The definition of other important interests was refined on the merit of their perception. That type of interests lead to safeguarding vital and strategic interests and will newly make it possible to “increase resilience of the society against security threats”. The points from the previous 2003 Security Strategy were slightly reformulated, some left out and newly involved “development of civic associations and non-governmental organisations active in the sphere of security” and “improving public awareness and citizens’ active involvement in developing security”.

The concept of security environment significantly differs from that in 2003. The 2003 Strategy described the role of states, international organisations and the position of the Czech Republic, and then the trends. The 2011 Security Strategy of the Czech Republic outlines the strategic context of security environment that features the most prominent trends and factors. A table listing security threats with brief characteristics of each is provided separately and identifies the following threats:

- Terrorism;
- Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery;
- Cyber attacks;
- Instability and regional conflicts in and around the Euro-Atlantic Area;
- Negative aspects of international migration;
- Organised crime and corruption;
- Threats to effective operation of critical infrastructure;
- Interruption of supplies of strategic raw materials or energy;
- Natural and anthropogenic disasters and other emergencies.

The strategy newly identified threats and trends expected to interfere with the Czech Republic’s security interests. The threats that do not directly affect the Czech Republic, but are significant for NATO Allies, reverberate in the strategy too. They were mostly adopted from NATO and EU strategic policy documents.

The strategy of promoting the Czech Republic’s security interests has been emulated in a different manner. In 2003, the promotion strategy was structured along the purview of governmental ministries as follows:

1. Foreign policy;
2. Defence policy;
3. Internal security policy;
4. Economic policy and provision of security;
5. Public awareness policy.

The 2011 Security Strategy of the Czech Republic explains in the article opening the promotion strategy (art. 31): “The nature of contemporary security threats and trends necessitates a broad approach
to security combining military and non-military tools. The Czech Republic is developing tools to promote its security interests both at national level and through its active involvement in multilateral and bilateral relations. The successful promotion of its security interests also requires the involvement of the population, legal entities, individuals and public authorities in the safeguarding of security and strengthening society’s overall resilience to security threats.”

After such introduction, the subject is treated in a new matrix of perspectives that seek to diminish the compartmentalised ministerial prism and underscore that those are common security challenges for the Ministries to tackle in their respective purviews but through a multiagency effort. The strategy does not tamper with the way business is done at individual Ministries. The approach focused attention into the following basic fields:

- Collective dimension of ensuring security and defence;
- Security threat prevention and suppression strategy;
- Economic framework for safeguarding security interests;
- Institutional framework for ensuring security.

The opening four sections of the 2011 Security Strategy of the Czech Republic were elaborated into 30 articles. The strategy to promote the interests is described under the remaining 66 articles. Obviously, the strategy covers individual threats in depth and offers detailed formulations of approaches to be applied should such contingencies occur.

The collective dimension of defence and security focuses on describing approaches shaped by the international security policy context, highlights stable ties to the UN, NATO, EU and OSCE, and newly also recalls tools and policies provided for by the Treaty of Lisbon. In addition to defence, that section discusses the growing collaboration among EU states on internal security, population protection, defence of critical infrastructure, migration, cyber security, energy and raw-material security.

The threat prevention and suppression strategy offers solutions to nine explicitly identified threats. All threats with international context are addressed by a common approach that uses international tools and a positive engagement of relevant Czech authorities. The strategy accentuates a highly professional approach by the personnel of national security system and security services for management of internal threats. As to critical infrastructure, emphasis is attached for the first time to monitoring foreign investments to avert enterprises being misused against the Czech Republic’s interests by foreign actors.

The economic framework for safeguarding security interests is based on the Czech Republic’s economic policy that will continue to drive human, material and financial resources. A high premium is placed on sustainable economic growth and a favourable economic climate. It also addresses the possibility of topping public budgets up from international sources. The Government is called upon “to draw up a predictable and adequate budget framework to promote and implement an effective security and defence policy”. In the compass of possibility, the strategy calls for the Czech Republic to join NATO and EU common strategic capability development programs in the realm of security and defence, and especially supports the strategic partnership with the USA. This section again makes a mention of “supporting and sustaining security and defence research and development”. The approach is tied with international environment both in research and technology and in security and defence industry with the recommendation to integrate the industry and “develop a single European defence equipment market”. The strategy also points out the system of economic measures for states of emergency, which is designed to generate and maintain stocks of essential items as well as strategic production capacity.

Institutional framework for ensuring security covers the tool of national security policy: the security system. The security system's role is to integrate, coordinate and control individual components and flexibly respond to emerging security situations. The Czech Republic promotes its foreign policy through its diplomatic and consular services, which is an innovation in the context of the Security
Strategy. It is listed as one of the Czech security system’s components for the first time. Its mission is to protect the Czech citizens and national interests abroad. The tool providing defence are the armed forces comprising the ACR, Military Intelligence and Military Police. The final article is dedicated to an approach exercised by the Government to effect of combining crisis and defence planning tools with rational use of public funds and resources from the private sector.

The text is complemented with a table providing basic facts about the Czech Republic’s security system, its functions, structure and operations. The Cabinet of Prime Minister Petr Nečas authorised the 2011 Security Strategy on 8 September 2011.

The security system has already been ready to manage identified threats. None of the nine identified threats represents a military aggression. The occurrence of a large-scale conventional conflict in the territory of NATO nations or EU Member States continues to be unlikely. It will be possible to identify such type of threat early and adopt effective measures for military defence.

Military crisis situations involve:

- Use of military force by a foreign power against protected interests of the state (abroad or in the homeland territory). That may involve an armed response to the Czech Republic’s engagement in international peace and humanitarian aid missions or performance of NATO commitments abroad.
- Subversion associated with preparations for military aggression by a foreign power.
- Aggression (military attack on the state).
- Performance of NATO commitments abroad.
- Military threats to life and health of citizens in foreign countries, basic values of democracy and freedom according to the UN Charter105 and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights106 in the scope threatening international security and leading to the employment of armed forces into an international peace operation, including engagement of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic.

States of crisis are declared in accordance with the Constitutional Act on Security of the Czech Republic No. 110/1998 Coll. The state of national emergency is declared for a limited geographical area or for the whole national territory. In case of possible military threat, when there is an immediate threat to state sovereignty, territorial integrity or democratic foundations of the state, the state of emergency will be declared for the whole state territory. That state is declared by the Parliament of the Czech Republic based on proposal by the Government, and passing the motion on declaring the state of national emergency requires consent by simple majority of all Deputies of the Chamber of Deputies and simple majority of all Senators of the Senate of the Parliament of the Czech Republic. The state of war is declared for the state territory as a whole by the Parliament in the following situations: threat

of an impending attack, aggression, and performance of commitments under international treaties on collective defence. The decision to declare the state of war is published in the media and promulgated the same way as Acts are. It becomes effective on the instant defined as a part of the decision. It enables the use of all forces and assets of the state, legal and natural persons to avert the aggression. In the state of war, central management applies to the government, national economy and armed forces operations. Reserve component soldiers are called up en masse for performance of extraordinary service in the armed forces measures are implemented in national economy to cater for the requirements of the armed forces and civilian population. In terms of international law, a state of war is invoked upon the outbreak of an armed conflict, regardless of whether war was declared or not.

Operational preparation of the state territory is the primary process for ensuring national defence. It comprises a set of military, economic and defence measures planned and carried out in peacetime, in the state of emergency and in wartime to the effect of creating conditions necessary for the armed forces to perform their missions and to ensure the needs of the population. The operational preparation is a part of steering and organising national defence in the purview of the MoD, as defined under Section § 3 of the Act on Ensuring Defence of the Czech Republic No. 222/1999 Coll. The primary policy documents of operational preparation of national territory are as follows:

- **Concept of Operational Preparation of National Territory** developed by the MoD in accordance with section § 16 paragraph 2 letter b) of the Competence Act (Act No. 2/1969 Coll.);

- **Plan of Operational Preparation of the National Territory**, which is a part of the **Plan of Defence of the Czech Republic** (hereinafter the **Defence Plan**) according to section § 2 letter e) of the Governmental ordinance no. 51/2004 Coll., on state defence planning.

Operational Preparation of National Territory is a live subject and its progressive development claims both funding and interdepartmental and interagency collaboration as well as involvement of natural persons and business entities. The progress in this field cannot be evaluated without strategic shifts in national defence, which occurred following the Czech Republic’s accession to NATO on 12 March 1999 and upon the decision to develop the 2002 Concept.

The primary planning document for managing and organising state defence is the **Defence Plan**. It is based on law and driven by these security policy documents: **Security Strategy of the Czech Republic** and the **Military Strategy of the Czech Republic**. It is coordinated with other policy documents laying down procedures for providing protection to the population, property and the environment. A good example thereof is the Population protection concept as a document that covers solutions to non-military as well as military threats by non-military means. The **Defence Plan** was developed under **MoD** leadership and ordains what the country and individual security system components have to do to ensure defence of the Czech Republic. Additional components of the security system (ministries and central administration bodies) develop so-called sectoral defence plans. Only when the MoD performs its responsibilities in full, the Government of the Czech Republic may ensure national defence by the means of its decisions. The **Defence Plan** is an implementation document for national defence in military crisis states. The **Defence Plan**:  

- Lays down basic lines of preparation for the use of all resources of the state and the society for defence in military crisis situations;

---
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Creates conditions in peacetime for objective analyses and evaluation of material, operational and combat capabilities of available forces and assets of the state, particularly the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic;

Creates the conditions in the state of emergency and in wartime to launch actual planning and use of available forces and assets including the involvement of the Czech Republic’s security system authorities into the process.

As military crisis situations are not very frequent in the current security reality, the Defence Plan uses established processes and contains structural documents for its development and for keeping it current. The Defence Plan spans a four-year planning period, is submitted by the Minister of Defence and approved by the Government. Its contents comply with the Act on Ensuring Defence of the Czech Republic No. 222/1999 Coll. as amended by the Act No. 320/2002 Coll.

The Plan of Defence of the Czech Republic involves the following processes:

- Defence planning is a complex of activities, procedures and links realised by state authorities to determine goals, requirements and tasks of national defence and the ensuing procedures, timelines and the manner of checking on performance. Defence planning drives planning of forces, armaments, resources, communication and information systems and logistics.
- Operational planning. It is a planning process designed to translate military-strategic goals into comprehensive military operation plans coordinated in time and space.
- Mobilisation planning. It is a planning process whose purpose is to determine the sequence, timelines and the way of performing mobilisation of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic in terms of their human and material resources.
- Planning preparedness of national defence system. It is a planning process to ensure a comprehensive preparedness of national defence system.
- Planning preparations for rescue operations and for performance of humanitarian aid missions. It encompasses a set of components, activities and legislative, economic and specialist measures. The objective of this type of contingency planning is to avert or minimise immediate consequence of emergencies. It also involves a system of executive elements for planning in other ministries and departments and primarily centres on civil emergency planning and crisis planning. The preparations follow on the Crisis Management Act and the Act on Integrated Emergency System.

The Czech Republic’s defence plan comprises a set of policy documents defining measures and procedures for ensuring national defence and to meet requirements associated with delivering commitments under international treaties on common defence, including the participation of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic in activities of international organisations in support of peace, participation in peace operations and its involvement in rescue operations and performance of humanitarian aid missions. The Defence Plan comprises the following documents:

- Plans of the activities by the state in ensuring defence of the Czech Republic against external aggression.
- Plans of the activities by the state for performance of commitments under international treaties concerning collective defence against aggression.
- Review of forces and assets and their augmentation.
- Economic mobilisation plan.
- Plan of essential supplies.
- Plan of operational preparation of national territory.
- Concepts of contingency operation plans and standing operation plans.
- List and catalogue of measures used by the national crisis response system.
- Crisis response system manual.

Military-strategic goals are either longterm, set by defence policy and military strategy, or targeted ones that are tied to specific employment of military force and may be determined by the military command.


documents and legislative measures in the sphere of defence, update the Plan of Defence of the Czech Republic by 31 March 2013. The Defence Strategy also tasks updating the Government on the implementation of the Defence Strategy of the Czech Republic in a two-year cycle by the means of the Czech Republic’s National Defence Status Report.

National defence builds on a responsible approach by the Government of the Czech Republic on the positions of other government authorities involved in defence. The goal is also to generate capabilities for NATO collective defence missions. The Defence Strategy underscores the role of citizens in their involvement in defence activities, particularly in serious national emergencies and highlights conditionality of the level of defence on economic projections for the years ahead. It also foresees ramifications of the economic, financial and debt crisis and concludes it is critical to increase effectiveness of public spending. A responsible investing of funds allocated for the Czech Republic’s national defence is one of the principal recommendations provided under the Defence Strategy of the Czech Republic, to the effect of minimising potential risks of resource, organisational and personnel destabilisation and subsequent decline in quality of military service personnel and national defence capabilities. That could in turn weaken the Czech Republic’s credibility and international position.

The system of the Czech Republic’s security documents and the reverberation of real risks that may influence national defence on economic grounds document the context and the approach by the state and its security policy to military threats. The status in 2012, when the Defence Strategy of the Czech Republic was approved as a new type of policy document, attested to the government’s having dedicated a significant attention to the issue in question. The Czech Republic is prepared for declaring the state of national emergency or the state of war, provides for a continuous operational preparation of national territory and updates Defence Plan of the Czech Republic. Czech Armed Forces service personnel have deployed for missions in Afghanistan, Lithuania, Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Somalia, in Sinai, and in UN, EU and OSCE observer missions. Those tasks are performed to the required standards the lack of resources notwithstanding.
At 1 January 2013, the Czech Republic will mark the twentieth anniversary of its independent existence. Approximately 2,150,000 Czech citizens had not live to see the anniversary from 1993, which accounts for 21% of the population then. The international security context has changed; the world is no longer divided on bipolar basis, but has seen new forms and shapes of threats especially owing to the increased global terrorism. The Czech Republic is a member state of NATO and the EU. Much in a similar way, the situation altered for the use of the Czech Armed Forces, development of its manpower, ageing and replacement of military systems and extensive digitisation of defence technology. Czech Armed Forces service personnel have taken part in nearly fifty foreign operations and missions, learned a huge body of new lessons and won international recognition.

The Czech Republic’s security system is operational and reflects a development of two decades. Its growth made use of the traditions and experience of Czechoslovakia and the Czechoslovak Federal Republic and was informed by lessons learnt by comparable European states. The key principles of providing security of the Czech Republic are tied to the Czech constitution and law. The security system is interconnected with NATO, the EU and other international institutions such as UN, OSCE and the World Health Organisation. It has an extensive degree of commonality and interoperability with NATO’s and other, particularly European security systems. The security system generates a qualified input for keeping national security policy current and for decision-making of its individual components. Systemic preparation and preventive action are both an integral part of the security system.

The decision-making processes on the use of the security system to address military threats involve the legislative, executive and judicial branch, as well as regional governments, municipalities and communities, legal persons and business entities having responsibility for ensuring security of the Czech Republic. The central authorities of security system include the President, the Government, the Parliament of the Czech Republic, National Security Council and its working bodies, the Central Crisis Management Staff, staffs of ministries and central government authorities. The key executive component to deliver the defence policy, defence strategy, and the bearer of military science, i.e. the military strategy, operational science and tactics are the Armed Forces with its key component, the Czech Armed Forces. Same as the whole society, the Armed Forces has underwent a challenging period of “slimming metamorphosis”. It was born on 1 January 1993 initially following the break-up of the bipolar world and the split of Czechoslovakia. With the contribution of political representatives, the Czech Armed Forces performed the role of an ageing and a weakening power tool that was to prove being capable of providing defence but not intimidate other states. The whole process took place under international control and the Czech Republic itself inspected that metamorphosis going on in other comparable states.

The present publication sought to focus on discussing selected factors that have shaped national defence policy and driven its armed forces’ development to ensure defence from 1989 till 2012 in the following phases of development:

- Democratisation phase: spanned the period of time from November 1989 till the division of Czechoslovak state at 31 December 1992, which characterised the ACR’s prenatal period.
- Phase of continuing democratisation and beginning integration: from the ACR’s birth on 1 January 1993 till the end of 1994.
Reform phase: from 1999 till the end of 2004 – first five years in NATO and the decision to transition to an all-volunteer force.

Transformation phase: from 2005 till 2012, marked with the endeavour to create modern armed forces with expeditionary capabilities. The process of continuing transformation in that sense started in 2007 and was scheduled until 2018, when the armed forces would achieve its full operational capability essential for meeting political-military ambitions defined under 2008 Military Strategy of the Czech Republic, 2011 Security Strategy, the 2011 White Paper on Defence and the 2012 Defence Strategy.

Reviewing the twenty years’ path of the Czech Armed Forces invokes awe and admiration of critical changes that accompanied a true metamorphosis of this power component of the state. The journey was well navigated, took place under democratic control of political representatives as well as the security community. Given the significant reduction of manpower, ex-military personnel managed to find respectable positions in the civilian sector and have continued to create appropriate conditions for a good understanding of what military security requires. The greatest respect and credit for all of that rightly goes to all those who have actively worked in their respective roles to make these breathtaking changes happen, all those who dedicated a part of their life to serving in support of military defence of their homeland.
CZECH ARMED FORCES
SERVICEMEMBERS IN FOREIGN DEPLOYED OPERATIONS
The ceremony on 12 March 1999, which officially made the Czech Republic a NATO member nation, concluded a very eventful that saw Czech soldiers and airmen learn, often by trial-and-error method, first valuable lessons on foreign deployments.

That development stage goes back to the twilight of the pre-1989 socialist Czechoslovakia and its armed forces (CSLA) that were called upon at the end of 1980s by the United Nations to participate in UN peacekeeping operations.

At the of 1988, the Foreign Relations Directorate of the General Staff of the Czechoslovak People’s Army led by Colonel Jiří Jindra (promoted Major-General 1 May 1989) was tasked to send first Czechoslovak officers into UN peacekeeping missions. That General Staff component had previously primarily provided liaison with foreign defence, army and air attachés posted in Prague, but also performed inspections according to the Treaty between the USSR and the USA on the Elimination of their intermediate and short range missiles of 11 December 1987.

The African Test

Unlike our Polish and Austrian neighbours, who had belonged to the “Brotherhood of the Devoted”, i.e. among the countries most frequently participating in these missions, together with Finland, India, Ireland, Canada, Sweden or Norway, for many years, Czechoslovakia took part in a UN peacekeeping operation for the first time only in January 1989, when seven officers of the Czechoslovak People’s Army under command of Lieutenant-Colonel Miroslav Tůma left for Angola to supervise the withdrawal of Cuban intervention troops. Three months later, another group of 22 officers was dispatched to another African country, Namibia; due to the forthcoming elections and Namibia’s transition to independence, their role was to oversee and monitor the withdrawal of South African units from the country and to supervise the repatriation of refugees at the mission’s detached outpost in the Angolan territory.

As it turned out, Africa became a huge reservoir of invaluable experience with foreign missions for us. As a matter of fact, serving in a multi-national team of a UN mission is extremely tough, both
physically and mentally; moreover, the personnel are unarmed, although discharging duties which are as risky and dangerous as in any other military operation.

A stay in one of the world’s hotspots, where landmines, venomous snakes, unpredictable paramilitary groups (often including intentionally drugged child fighters), unusual climatic conditions a European finds quite difficult to get accustomed to, or various malignant diseases are commonplace, requires soldiers who are physically and mentally fit, proficient in languages and well-trained. Unfortunately, the armed forces’ attitude to using the field-proven officers in its transformation was rather casual at that time, which was why many of them left the military with some bitter feelings to the latter’s own detriment.

### Czech military observers in UN missions in Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1989–1992</td>
<td>40 Czechoslovak officers served in UNAVEM I and II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>1989–1990</td>
<td>22 Czechoslovak officers served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1993–1995</td>
<td>39 ACR officers progressively served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1993–2009</td>
<td>Two missions: UNOMIL and UNMIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>1999–2005</td>
<td>39 ACR officers progressively served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia &amp; Eritrea</td>
<td>2001–2008</td>
<td>39 ACR officers progressively served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>from 2000</td>
<td>ACR officers still serve tours in the DRC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Czech officers served in other UN missions in the following years, such as in Georgia (UNOMIG), where 73 Czech Armed Forces officers served tours between 1994 and 2009, or in Tajikistan (1998 – 2000, 6 Czech officers).

The start of the system of preparations for and management of Czechoslovakia’s participation in UN missions was supported by political changes in November 1989 and a subsequent visit of UN Secretary General Javier Pérez de Cuellar in Prague in May 1990. Following his meeting with the Czechoslovak President, the armed forces command took additional organizational measures to improve the preparedness of soldiers for the new tasks.

### Training in the Region of the Rožmberk Rose

As early as in January 1990, a department of UN peacekeeping forces was established under the Directorate of Foreign Relations, whose first CO was Colonel Ján Valo, since October 1990 the commander of a special NBC unit trained for UN missions, which was soon to take part in the Desert Shield and Desert Storm operations in the territory of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. With our increasing participation in UN missions, the fact that the UN Peacekeeping Forces Department was later commanded or staffed by officers who had themselves served in UN peacekeeping operations, including Lieutenant-Colonel Adolf Turek, Colonel Miroslav Tůma or Colonel Stanislav Žák and others, was definitely a positive thing.

October 1990 also marked the beginning of the operation of the Training Centre of UN Peacekeeping Forces (MU 2941) in Český Krumlov. The training was organized with a rapid deployment battalion in mind. The battalion structure comprised two airborne companies and the training programme was focused on reconnaissance, medical aid and engineering, but also on lessons of English, psychological training or studies of the culture, religious and political situation in regions where the battalion might be deployed.

In January 1993, the Centre was transformed into the Training Base of Peacekeeping Forces, which was subordinated to the
newly established Section of Foreign Relations of the Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic. In the late 1990s, the base was transferred under the Operations Department of the General Staff and later, as of October 1, 2000, it was subordinated to the Ground Forces Command in Olomouc. Since 1997, it had also comprised the Boletice Military Training Area established in 1946. At that time, the mission of the base was to train units and troops for UN, OSCE and NATO peacekeeping operations. The base provided training to staffs and units earmarked for peacekeeping or humanitarian operations, organized intensive courses of English and special courses, and operated training facilities in the Boletice Military Training Area. In May 2002, a historical epithet “of Colonel Švec” commemorating the legendary Czechoslovak legionnaire was bestowed upon the base by a presidential order. However, the base was closed down just one year later. Throughout its existence, its tough training programme produced more than 3,500 “blue berets” for UN missions, plus more than 6,300 soldiers of the Czech Armed Forces for NATO operations (IFOR, SFOR and KFOR).

Today, the role of the former Training Base of Peacekeeping Forces is mainly performed by the Training and Doctrine Command – Military Academy in Vyškov, where a peacekeeping training centre was established; the local ops training department has also introduced training courses for future military observers (UNMOC – United Nations Military Observer Course).

Since 1991, the importance of the Military Education and Training Centre in Komorní Hrádek was growing as well. It started organizing three-week training courses for officers earmarked for deployment as UN military observers, which took place several times a year. The training programme was focused on complex activities in specific environments where they were expected to be deployed. Since the same year, officers of the Czechoslovak (and later Czech) Armed Forces were also sent to similar training courses abroad, e.g. to Finland, Canada, Austria, Sweden or Switzerland.

On this occasion, the rules of engagement and limits which Czech soldiers had to comply with while serving in UN missions should be reminded. Although no functional framework or rules of deployment of UN forces have never been officially codified by the UN, even the very first UN missions, which took place between 1948 and 1964, and practical experience acquired in their course resulted in some unwritten principles applying to the deployment and operation of UN forces, which are basically valid even today. Although traditional peacekeeping operations are based on three pillars (consent of the parties, impartiality of peacekeepers, non-use of force), their broader principles include the seven points outlined below:

- UN peacekeeping missions operate under the command and control of the UN Secretary General;
- They represent moral authority rather than force of arms;
- Their composition reflects the universality of the United Nations;
- They are deployed with consent of the parties involved in the conflict;
- They are neutral and operate without any prejudice or bias toward rights and aspirations of any of the parties involved in the conflict;
- They take minimal risks and attempt to minimize casualties;
- They do not use force or a threat of use of force, except in necessary self-defence.

It should be noted that the term “necessary self-defence” has never been specified or defined. While a small unit of UN peacekeepers somewhere in Africa may have to defend itself against an attack of a group of insurgents from time to time, there has always been a nagging question how an isolated UN outpost, manned by 15 to 20 troops, is expected to fight off a ten times stronger force without any hope of reinforcements. As a matter of fact, Chapter VII of the UN Charter stipulates that UN forces may be deployed in combat operations only if their mandate has been formulated by the UN Security Council and permits the UN forces to enforce or restore peace by force. In most UN missions, UN forces always act only as an intermediary between warring states or belligerents.

Desert Prologue

However, as the UN peacekeeping battalion was being born in Český Krumlov, a new urgent task attributable to the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait in August 1990 and requiring a fast solution appeared.
The UN Security Council passed a total of 12 resolutions condemning the deceitful and brutal aggression of Iraq against Kuwait, with all its five permanent members voting unanimously for the first time. Thanks to the UN’s unambiguous position, a coalition of 28 countries was formed and its units set off for the Persian Gulf theatre.

On September 23, 1990, the Federal Assembly of the Czechoslovak Federative Republic also expressed its consent with the participation of a Czechoslovak NBC unit in the solution of the Persian Gulf crisis. Colonel Ján Valo, then Chief of the Department of Peacekeeping Forces of the Directorate of Foreign Relations of the General Staff of the Czechoslovak People’s Army, was appointed its commander. Colonel Valo was a good choice for the mission; he had a fluent command of Arabic, which he had acquired as military lecturer in Egypt.

It took just two months to select volunteers, prepare the equipment and coordinate the operation of teams in Slaný. Professional soldiers accounted for 56% of the personnel of the unit participating in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm; the balance was made up by conscripted soldiers who became extended active duty servicemen as of the day their deployment began. In the end of November 1990, the commander reported the 169-strong unit ready for deployment. The unit was airlifted to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in thirteen C-5 Galaxy transport aircraft sorties between December 11 and 14, 1990.

The Czechoslovak NBC unit thus became a part of the coalition forces and was ready to fulfil tasks in accordance with UN Security Council resolutions. The principal objective of Operation Desert Shield was to push Iraqi forces out of Kuwait.

On the Christmas Eve of 1990, the Czechoslovak unit assumed positions in the northern part of Saudi Arabia, in the desert around the city of Hafar Al-Batin.

The Czech and Slovak soldiers were cooperating not only with Saudi armoured brigades, but also with US, British and French troops. As the conflict was drawing to its end, they moved as far as the Kuwaiti border, crossed the notorious Saddam Line of minefields and ended the campaign just a few kilometres south of the capital of Kuwait, not far from burning oilfields. The commander then seconded a part of the unit to guard our embassy in Kuwait City.

The unit was operating in the territory of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait from December 15, 1990, to April 22, 1991, when its withdrawal began.

However, this was not the end of our presence in the region. Czechoslovak soldiers also served in the UNGCI mission (United Nations Guards Contingent in Iraq). The non-standard “guarding” mission was launched by UN Resolutions No. 706/1991 and No. 712/1991 in support of international humanitarian aid to Iraqis at the time of the liberation of Kuwait and a trade embargo was imposed upon the regime of Saddam Hussein.

In May 1991, the establishment of the UNGCI mission was voted through and approved by the Iraqi government. The first “guards” started arriving to Iraq soon thereafter. In the summer of 1991, the UNGCI mission had 500 people and consisted of 50-strong national contingents from Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, the Philippines, Ghana, Nepal, Poland, Austria, Greece and Thailand. The international military and police force operated in three northern provinces of Iraq and also in the south, around Basra and Amarah, providing security to civilian UN elements distributing food, medical supplies and other humanitarian aid among Iraqis.
The first 50-strong Czechoslovak rotation consisting of professional soldiers and some 17 extended active duty servicemen arrived to Iraq in two groups by air, via Geneva, in early July 1991. From 1996, the mission continued under the auspices of the UN Oil for Food programme. At that time, the Czech Republic was sending 10-strong contingents to it. The UNGCI mission was terminated in 2003, and the total number of Czech and Slovak soldiers who had participated in it was 307.

In addition, altogether eleven NBC experts of the Czechoslovak Armed Forces participated in the work of the UNSCOM (United Nations Special Commission). The special and non-standard mission created by the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution No. 687 of April 3, 1991, conducted inspections aimed at identifying and destruction of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction and took place between July 1991 and 1993. The inspectors were organized in teams of experts the composition of which varied; the duration of the inspectors’ stints in Iraq was also variable.

In any case, it must be emphasized that the participation of the Czechoslovak NBC unit in the conflict with the aggressive regime of Saddam Hussein in 1991 laid the foundations of our modern-time military traditions...

Baptism by Fire: UNPROFOR

While the Czechoslovak unit was operating in the territory of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, first indications of a crisis of the Czechoslovak federation started appearing, which ultimately resulted in its splitting and creation of two independent states. At that time, however, the Czech and Slovak soldiers were about to face the hardest test so far, the operation known as UNPROFOR and taking place in the Balkans, in the territory of the disintegrating Yugoslavia.

The initial plan was that our troops would be deployed either in Cambodia (UNTAC), or Western Sahara (MINURSO); however, in spite of the theoretical training the candidates had received, a decision was made to deploy the Czechoslovak unit in the territory of former Yugoslavia, which was definitely less demanding in terms of logistic support and transportation, although the Cambodian mission ultimately included units from Poland and Bulgaria.
The United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) mission, whose task was to restore peace among belligerents in former Yugoslavia, was established by UN Security Council Resolution No. 721 of November 27, 1991. The decision to participate was adopted by the government of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic on January 16, 1992. Immediately thereafter, a special 500-strong Czechoslovak battalion comprising three companies started an accelerated training programme for the mission in the Training Centre of UN Peacekeeping Forces in Český Krumlov.

Only a few Czechoslovak soldiers had got any experience with foreign missions. Basically, it was just a handful of officers (Adolf Turek, Miroslav Lysina, Ladislav Sornas, Vladimír Braun...), who had served as UN military observers in Angola and Namibia, or been members of the Czechoslovak NBC unit participating in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm Operations at the turn of 1990 and 1991. The unit leaving the republic in April 1992 was in for the hardest military experience in our post-war history.

The bulk of the Czechoslovak battalion started departing from Český Krumlov by rail on April 11, 1992. Having passed through Austria and Slovenia, it arrived to the Croatian town of Karlovac. From there, it was transported by trucks to its area of operations at the Plitvice Lakes. The battalion was expected to fully deploy by April 18.

While en route to their destination, the Czechoslovak soldiers must have realized that they not only were in a war zone, but that Yugoslavia, once so popular in their country, no longer existed. On the move from Karlovac, they could see fresh signs of war everywhere – houses in ruins, demolished churches, or destroyed civilian and military vehicles. Artillery fire could be heard in the distance every now and then, and the faces of locals were full of tension and questions; just what role will the men with blue berets be playing here?

After the arrival to Croatia in mid-April 1992, the Czechoslovak battalion took positions around the Plitvice Lakes, in the Republic of Serbian Krajina, a self-proclaimed Serbian entity in Croatia, where the Czech and Slovak troops were deployed in Sector South, together with peacekeeping battalions from France and Kenya, later also from Canada and Jordan. The battalion was supposed to guard an area of 1,918 km² and approximately 90 kilometers of the border separating the belligerents.

When soldiers wearing blue helmets or berets with a UN badge started building their first observation posts and checkpoints in the Sinai Peninsula back in 1956, they used mostly sandbags. Actually, sandbags constitute the basis of “fortifications” of UN peacekeepers even now; although the UNPROFOR mission saw a significant improvement in troop protection, due to the use of the Hesco system, an invention of British engineer and businessman Jimi Heselden. Today, these collapsible wire mesh containers filled with sand or gravel are used by the Armed of the Czech Republic to protect its bases in Afghanistan.

In the spring of 1992, the beginnings of the UNPROFOR mission thus amounted to many hours of hard work spent on the construction of control posts and checkpoints, and also of field observation posts which were usually codenamed Tango in this sector (T–11, T–23, T–30...). Filling hundreds of bags with sand and using them to build improvised pillboxes blending with the terrain and offering them some protection against small arms fire and mortar and artillery shrapnel was a new experience for our soldiers. As they also represented a do-it-yourself nation of weekend cottagers, it was also a challenge to present their talent, skills and ability to improvise. There was also a vast reservoir of time-tested
experience of French and later Canadian troops to draw from. As time went by, UN posts were gradually converted into massive shelters even in the section of the Czechoslovak battalion.

The first (still Czechoslovak) unit had roughly 500 men in three companies. It was reinforced by an additional mechanized company, a reconnaissance company, an engineer company, an anti-tank platoon and a field surgical hospital, altogether 480 troops, only between February and March 1994, reaching strength of 958.

When the first UN units started operating in the sector in April 1992, they comprised just 1,505 troops. By September 1993, Canadian Colonel Oehring already had 2,007 men under his command; by the time he finished his tour, his subordinates included 3,821 military personnel, 89 military observers and 128 UNCIVPOL civilian policemen. In August 1995, the number rose to 5,000, comprising Canadian, Czech, Kenyan and Jordanian battalions, an Indonesian field hospital and a company of Slovak combat engineers. Due to the limited UN mandate and the fact the national contingents were only lightly armed, the final Croatian-Serbian clash in August 1995 was unavoidable, in spite of the increasing numbers.

### UNPROFOR and UNCRO Sector South Commanders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Commander</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tour of duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COL George Oehring</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>April 1993 – March 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN Rostislav Kotil</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>April 1994 – July 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN Alain Forand</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8 July – 10 October 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A major part of Czech public, including publicists, political scientists and even historians grew accustomed to using the abbreviation of UNPROFOR peacekeeping mission in reference to Czech military deployments as part UN peacekeeping forces in the territory of former Yugoslavia in 1992-95. Since majority of Czech troops were stationed in Sector South in a Croatian territory called the Krajina (borderland), it should be recognised that at the end of bloody war in the Balkans, UNPROFOR mission was replaced in the territory of Croatia at 31 March 1995 with what was essentially just a formally new mission, the UNCRO (United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation), pursuant to UN Security Resolution 981.

The reason that drove that change was the statement made Croatian President Franjo Tudjman in January 1995 that his country would not elongate the mandate for UNPROFOR forces, which was to expire on 31 March 1995. Clearly seen as foreboding a military solution of the Croat-Serbian dispute, this decision elicited disagreement with the international community and resulted in extending the mandate for UN forces with certain modifications and with a changed name.

In total, 2,250 Czechoslovak and Czech Armed Forces service personnel served in the two missions.

### Commanding officers of the Czechoslovak and Czech battalion in UNPROFOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battalion CO</th>
<th>Tour</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTC Karel Blahna</td>
<td>March 1992 – April 1993</td>
<td>The battalion’s 1st and 2nd rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Vladimir Braun</td>
<td>April 1993 – April 1994</td>
<td>Czech Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Vojtěch Seidl</td>
<td>April 1994 – March 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Ludovít Cirok</td>
<td>April 1995 – January 1996</td>
<td>UNCRO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a Multinational Environment

The coexistence within a large multinational family of very different armies was a great lesson for our soldiers. It is thus worth reminding our first partners.

Nine hundred and fifty French troops from the elite 2° RIMA (2 régiment d’infanterie de marine) marine regiment under command of Colonel Robert Meille had arrived to Krajina shortly before the Czechoslovak battalion did so in April 1992. The French soldiers lent their Czechoslovak counterparts their engineer equipment and helped them with materials needed to build checkpoints and guard posts. At that time, our soldiers admired especially their French partners’ ample experience from many foreign missions and professional attitude.

Half a year later, the French marines were replaced by soldiers of the 8e RI (8e régiment d’infanterie) infantry regiment. In January 1993, the relations between members of the two units were strengthened by a selfless action of Czech soldiers who came to rescue an isolated and heavily shelled French outpost, Karin Plaž, which was under frequent mortar fire from both the Croatian and the Serbian sides. The mortar shells killed to French soldiers. French units could not help their comrades, as the only bridge they could use had been destroyed. At that time, the French outpost was manned by 55 troops. The Czechoslovak battalion was the only functional UNPROFOR unit in the area. Twenty-nine Czechoslovak soldiers with 2 OT-64 APCs under command of the battalion’s S-3, Lieutenant-Colonel Petr Pavel, and the company commander, Major Karel Klimovský, were thus sent to extricate the French unit. The evacuation of the French soldiers was completed successfully.

It is worth having those days recalled in memories of Lieutenant-General Petr Pavel, now the Chief of the General Staff the Czech Armed Forces: “For God’s sake, do all you can to find and rescue those French soldiers, that was the order I received. After a week’s search in the mountains of Serbian Krajina, I indeed found them and brought them to safety. There were fifty-three of them. We also loaded the shrapnel-shredded remains of the two men they had lost into our APC … We were trying to avoid places where the fighting was going on, but we often had to flee from artillery or mortar fire anyway. The soldiers who had volunteered for the mission were ordinary guys, types you could easily overlook out in the street, no iron pumpers, cue ball heads or bruisers at the first sight … and I admired

Some of the UN checkpoints on the hot Croat—Serbian line grew into quite massive fortifications over time.
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Four Czech officers were later awarded the Military Cross for Valour with a Bronze Star (Croix de la Valeur Militaire avec Étoile de Bronze) for their role in the rescue mission, which was handed over to them by French Minister of Defence François Léotard.

The second partner unit of our troops in Sector South consisted of soldiers from the East African state of Kenya, who arrived to the area in mid-May 1992. Even at that time of the year, they were suffering from cold and found it quite difficult to get accustomed to the conditions. The friendship with the Kenyans was a welcome distraction for the Czech soldiers, taking their minds off their tough and sometimes monotonous duties. They could learn – for example from legendary Maasai tribesmen – something about their life, customs and eating habits back home.

Kenyan general James Arap Rob was the first commander of the sector. He and his officers relied on British military traditions and many of them were graduates of British military colleges. Although a person from Central Europe might view the participation of the Kenyan unit in the peacekeeping mission in the Balkans a bit strange, it should be borne in mind that Kenya had at that time a much longer and richer tradition of participation in UN peacekeeping missions than the Czech Republic, and soldiers from the East African country often take part in them even now. Seven of them lost their lives in the Balkans ...

In February 1994, Sector South received yet another reinforcement – a battalion of troops from the desert Kingdom of Jordan. They were Bedouins from the Jordanian Desert Police, a crack unit succeeding the legendary Arab Legion. However, arriving at the time they did, they lived through the same cold experience as their Kenyan predecessors two years earlier. The Jordanians were not particularly fond of living in tents and snow, and also took a long time to get accustomed to the cold Croatian hills, although the Jordanian Armed Forces too has a long tradition of taking part in UN peacekeeping operations.

Early in September 1993, the French contingent in Sector South was replaced by Canadians, who soon proved they would aspire to being the hard core. Their 875-strong unit was based on the 2nd Battalion of Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry. As early as on September 15, the Canadians under command of no-nonsense Lieutenant-Colonel Jim Calvin stood their ground against an attack of Croatian units in the so-called Medak Pocket (Medački džep) off the Croatian town of Gospić. For a price of just four wounded, they repelled the Croatians, among whose commanders was also Agim Çeku, a notorious war criminal and later also the Prime Minister of Kosovo. At that time, the Croatian forces ignored the UN safe zone status of the area and started plundering the Medak pocket on September 9. Serbian civilians were shot, women were raped, and houses were systematically burnt down. The villages of Divoselo, Ćitluk and Počitelj, all inhabited by ethnic Serbs, were razed to the ground. Regardless of the UN mandate, Lieutenant-Colonel Jim Calvin and his men attacked the Croatians, who lost at least 30 dead and about a hundred wounded. As the world community’s opinion in the Yugoslav civil war was definitely against the Serbs, the Canadian intervention against Croatian units did not receive any positive response. Even at home, the Canadian soldiers were decorated for their successful action only in 2002!

While the Canadian and the Czech battalions were not direct neighbours, there were friendly contacts and many Canadian officers at the battalion and sector command level, particularly sector commanders, Colonel George Oehring and General Alain Forand, were held in high esteem by their Czech counterparts.
When listing foreign units that our soldiers were in active contact with during the UNPROFOR mission, one should not forget the Polish Armed Forces, whose members had ample experience with UN missions since the 1970s. The 893-strong Polish battalion, whose first commander was Colonel Wiesław Kurzyca and which was composed of soldiers of the Silesian Military District (Śląski Okręg Wojskowy), arrived to Krajina in April 1992, at the same time as the Czechoslovak soldiers. It was deployed next to our unit in Sector North, its headquarters located in the town of Slunje. The Polish battalion reached its highest number of 1,245 personnel in February 1995. By December 1995, the total number of Polish soldiers rotated through the unit, whose tasks were the same as those of the Czech battalion, was 3,876. The Poles lost seven men in the mission.

The geographic, language and cultural proximity of the soldiers of the two armies represented a positive factor which the commanders of both battalions were trying to develop. The Central European neighbours thus were a northern neighbour of the Czech troops in this mission too. After the false “fraternal friendship” of the Warsaw Pact days, it was finally possible to draw from truly positive historical traditions of the days when Polish and Czechoslovak soldiers had been fighting side by side during the siege of Tobruk in 1941.

However, the Czechoslovak and Polish soldiers in Croatia found themselves in the same position, between the proverbial fire and the frying pan. Being members of the same language family, both Croats and Serbs demanded more understanding and sympathy for “their” respective concepts of the conflict and its solution. In spite of all this, the Czechoslovak and Polish soldiers maintained their neutral attitude and did their best to treat both belligerents even-handedly.

**With Death at the Heels**

However, it was mainly Czech officers serving as military observers who witnessed most horrors taking place in the Balkans. Covering a larger area, often out of reach of armed UN units, and numbering just a few dozens, the UNMO (United Nations Military Observers) members were monitoring the situation, supervising frequent and incessantly violated armistices, escorting humanitarian convoys and documenting innumerable war crimes committed equally by Serbs, Croats and Muslims. They had the hardest job in Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially around Sarajevo.

That was also where three Czech officers, Lieutenant-Colonel Karel Krátký, Major Zlatko Kožušník and Captain Oldřich Židlík experienced particularly dramatic moments when captured, together with their colleagues from a number of other countries, by Bosnian Serbs in retaliation for NATO airstrikes against Serbian positions.

Some of the hostages, including the three Czech officers, were tied as human shields to important military objects, such as bridges or ordnance depots, or were kept (as in the case of Karel Krátký) in the area of Sarajevo’s TV transmitter. The capture of the UNPROFOR personnel dealt a major blow to the prestige of the United Nations, but all the hostages were ultimately released. Another 82 of the blue berets operating in the Balkans between 1992 and 1995 were not so lucky and lost their lives there. Unfortunately, UN peacekeepers were not succeeding, for many reasons, in restoring peace in the Balkans. At the end of the day, the dramatic conclusion of the protracted conflict also took place in the area of responsibility of the Czech battalion.

In May 1995, the Croatian Army, in spite of the armistice agreement, launched operations to deal with the problem of Serbian Krajina by force and once and for all. The tension in Sector South started building up again, the principal question being when, where and with what force the Croats would strike again.

UN, OSCE and EU authorities had been vainly trying to bring peace negotiations in the Balkans to a successful conclusion. Covert pressure of powers had thus become the principal factor. The first such operation was executed in Croatia.

The backstage games ultimately resulted in Operation Storm (Oluja), meticulously planned by the Croats and executed between August 4 and 7, 1995, with tacit support of US President Bill Clinton’s Administration and the government of German Chancellor Helmut Kohl. More than 150,000 well-armed and –trained Croatian soldiers were faced by about 30,000 troops of the Serbian Army of Krajina (Srpska vojska Krajine).
The operation resulted in the taking of Krajina, but also in an exodus of about 200,000 Serbs forced to leave the area and murders of hundreds of stragglers by paramilitary commandos advancing behind the regular armed forces. The symbol of the flight of the Serbian refugees were small tractors carrying the barest essentials, as the Serbs were leaving ruins of their systematically destroyed houses behind.

The operation placed the “blue buffer” consisting of some 16,000 lightly armed UN peacekeepers that were, due to their limited mandate and meagre numbers, unable to intervene, in a desperate position of mere onlookers, as the solution of the problem by force was unwinding around them. Moreover, the role of the 984-strong Czech battalion was complicated by the fact that some of its members were just returning from a furlough at home, while others were getting ready for it. Those who were on duty at that time got to know the war in all its cruelty...

The crew of T-23 Repetitor Observation Post situated in the hills off the town of Ljubovo, at the road between Korenica and Lički Osik, were also watching Croatian shelling of Serbian positions in the morning of August 4. The Serbian defences were centred on the nearby hill of Čukovac. It was the nature and strategic importance of the area that made the fighting last an extra day and placed eleven Czech soldiers of the 3rd platoon of the 1st company manning the post in a deadly trap.

Unfortunately, the first message reporting five wounded Czech soldiers was too optimistic, as two of them – Warrant Officer Luděk Zeman, aged 37, from Hodonín, and Sergeant Petr Valeš, 22, from Rožmitál na Šumavě – succumbed to their serious injuries. Both were posthumously promoted Second-Lieutenants by the Minister of Defence.

Three other soldiers – Warrant Officer Roman Čelanský and Sergeants Jiří Hubáček and Jiří Suda – were also injured. The observation post was heavily damaged and leaving it under fire was nothing short of an ordeal for the casualties and other members of the unit of First-Lieutenant Jaromír Alan.

In January 1996, President Václav Havel decorated some of the men who had participated in the tragic event with the “For Bravery” medal, together with the last fourteen surviving legionnaires who had fought in the Great War! The arrangement of the ceremony was a de facto recognition and appreciation of all Czech soldiers who had taken part in UN peacekeeping missions. The event was also an opportunity for a meeting of two heroes separated by more than 76 years of age, i.e. almost four generations – Václav Kratochvíl, aged 100, a former member of the 5th Rifle Regiment of the Czechoslovak Legions in Russia, and Roman Čelanský, aged 24.

More Years in the Service of the Fragile Peace in the Balkans

Following the signature of the so-called Dayton Accords in December 1995, the UN peacekeeping units in the territory of the former Yugoslavia were converted into the multinational Implementation Force (IFOR), of which the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic was also a part; Czech soldiers were involved in guarding the very fragile peace in the Balkans, particularly in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, since 1996 till 2004, participating in the SFOR and SFOR II operations as well.

In the first half of December 1995, the soldiers earmarked for the Czech IFOR battalion started their training programme in the Military Training Area of Boletice. Step by step, the
troops advanced through individual, section-level, platoon-level and company-level training segments most of which were dedicated to target practice, tactics and combat engineering.

On February 12, 1996, the 6th Mechanized Battalion of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic, assigned to the IFOR multinational operation, was included in the Order of Battle of the 2nd Canadian Multi-National Brigade, which was in turn a part of the British-led Multi-National Division South-West, and subordinated to its operational command.

The Czech Armed Forces contingent participating in the operation was composed of members of various units and formations, as well as reservists. Throughout the operation, it had some 850 people. It consisted of the 6th Mechanized Battalion (roughly 700-strong) and military personnel assigned to various IFOR HQs – the Czech contingent’s HQ in Zagreb, the headquarters of the British-led Multi-National Division South-West in Gornji Vakuf (which was later moved to Banja Luka), and the Canadian Multi-National Brigade’s HQ in Čoralići. Some officers were permanently based in Zagreb and Split in the acquisition group of the National Support Element and in the Support Team.

Having arrived to the battalion’s area of responsibility, the Czech soldiers started building bases. During the IFOR operation (January 1996 – February 1997), they built five of them. The battalion HQ was in Donja Ljubija, the 1st mechanized company was stationed in Stari Majdan; the 2nd mechanized company was based directly in the separation zone, in the village of Arapuša, the 3rd mechanized company found a home away from home in Brežičani, off the town of Prijedor, and the logistics base was located in Bosanska Krupa. At the same time, the unit was taking over its territory of responsibility, whose area was between 3,200 and 3,600 km² during the operation. The length of the separation zone was 62 km.

Representatives of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic in the IFOR mission, also doubling as commanders of the Czech contingent, were Major General Jiří Šedivý (January to July 1996) and Colonel Jaroslav Jásek. The commanders of the 6th Mechanized Battalion, which constituted the core of the contingent, were Lieutenant-Colonel Josef Sedlák (till July 27, 1996) and Lieutenant-Colonel Josef Prokš (till March 27, 1997).

As the peacekeeping operation was evolving, the strength of the Czech contingent and the number of its bases were gradually decreasing. Step by step, sites earmarked for future bases and routes to be used by mobile and foot patrols were cleared of mines in the battalion’s area of responsibility. Mine-clearing operations also had to be undertaken in the vicinity of bridges that were being repaired and reinforced by combat engineers to allow passage of heavy military vehicles. In 1996, altogether 61 minefields were cleared in the Czech battalion’s area of responsibility, which meant removal and disposal of 1,714 anti-personnel and 84 antitank mines.

Pilots of the Czech Air Force were also involved in the IFOR operation in the territory of the former Yugoslavia. The crews of Mi-17 helicopters and An-26 and L-410 fixed-wing airplanes were ferrying materiel and personnel most of the time, but they also participated in reconnaissance and monitoring missions for the benefit of multi-national forces.

During the IFOR operation, the Czech soldiers confiscated altogether 246 small arms, anti-aircraft and heavy weapons and 65 hand grenades. Several thousands of small arms ammunition rounds were confiscated as well.

The IFOR operation was concluded on December 19, 1996, at midnight, at which time the relay baton of the peacekeeping operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was passed to the so-called Stabilization Force (SFOR). Czech soldiers continued to participate in the SFOR mission; their contingent consisted of an HQ, a 22-strong section responsible for cooperation and coordination with other SFOR staffs, an about 600-strong mechanized battalion, and a rotary-wing aircraft detachment, also 22-strong; there were altogether eight rotations. The mandate of the SFOR peacekeeping operation ended in June 1998; it was replaced by SFOR II, which ended in December 2004. However, at the turn of 2001 and 2002 the Czech Republic chose to step...
up its presence in Operation Joint Guardian in Kosovo and downsize its participation in Operation Joint Forge in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

By the end of 2001, only 15 Czech soldiers remained in the SFOR II peacekeeping mission, who were either assigned to various HQs or working on various unfinished projects at the Civil-Military Cooperation Centre (CIMIC) in Prijedor. The CIMIC group in Prijedor and the national element of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic at MND-SW’s HQ in Banja Luka were withdrawn in October 2002. However, Czech soldiers continued to be present at SFOR’s HQs in Zagreb and Sarajevo. In 2004, there were seven Czech officers participating in Operation Joint Forge. They concluded their mission in December 2004, when the European Union Operation Althea took over from SFOR.

In addition, there were other missions complementing the principal operations in the Balkans, in which members of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic were also taking part.

The UNTAES (United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia) mission in the territory of Eastern Slavonia in Croatia was one of missions succeeding UNPROFOR and took place from January 1996 till March 1998. There were six Czech officers assigned to it at different times as UN military observers; since March 1996, there was also a Czech field surgical hospital with some 40 medical personnel, which was the mission’s top-level medical facility, providing medical support to about 7,000 personnel from 30 countries who participated in the mission.

The UNPREDEP (United Nations Preventive Deployment Force) mission operated in the territory of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia from March 1995 to February 1999. It was a so-called “second-generation” mission, acting as a tool of “preventive diplomacy”, with units deployed in border areas and monitoring the situation. Three Czech officers participated in it in the capacity of military observers.

The smallest UNMOP (United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka) mission, with only 28 UN observers, in the Prevlaka peninsula in Croatia, was established by UN Security Council Resolution 1138, dated February 1, 1996, and shut down on December 15, 2002. The Czech Republic participated in it since November 1996. Altogether seven Czech officers rotated through the mission.

It was the engagement of the Czech Republic’s soldiers in the Balkans that brought the Czech Republic closer to the membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; at the NATO Summit in Madrid in the summer of 1997, the Czech Republic was invited to start accession talks with the Alliance. The process, successfully concluded in the spring of 1999, subsequently enabled a profound transformation of the Czech Armed Forces into an all-volunteer, lean, young, modern and mobile force, which makes a significant contribution to the fight against international terrorism and protection of the Czech Republic’s and European security, working shoulder-to-shoulder with NATO allies.

In the Ranks of Allies

At the time the Czech Republic became a full-fledged member of the North Atlantic Alliance in March 1999, Czech soldiers were deployed in the following international missions:

A 556-strong Czech contingent under command of Colonel of the General Staff Michal Vass was operating in northwestern Bosnia under the extended mandate of SFOR II multi-national forces. Its core was the 3rd Mechanized Battalion under command of Lieutenant-Colonel Vladimir Stříž, with 503 troops.

The contingent was deployed as follows:

- HQ in Bosanska Krupa;
- National representatives at HQ SFOR in Sarajevo;
- National representatives at the Multinational Division South-West (MND-SW) in Banja Luka;
- Mechanized battalion with bases in Donja Ljubija and Bosanska Krupa;
- MND-SW support platoon in Banja Luka;
- Air unit (Mi-17 helicopter detachment in Velika Kladuša and L-410 airlift group operating out of the Divulje airbase, off Split).

The contingent was rotated in October 1999; its command was taken over by Colonel Zdeněk Košvanec and its core was composed of troops of the 1st Mechanized Battalion under command of Lieutenant-Colonel Martin Květoň.
At that time, 30 Czech officers were serving as UN military observers in Iraq, Sierra Leone, Croatia, FYROM, Georgia and Tajikistan. An additional 21 officers were attached to OSCE missions in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Nagorno-Karabakh, Croatia, Chechnya and Kosovo.

An indication of how the activities of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic in international missions had expanded in a mere seven years between 1999 and 2006 is provided, for example, by a meeting of the Czech Government which took place on November 22, 2006, and which discussed a document submitted by the Minister of Defence and named *Report on the deployment of forces and assets of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic in operations abroad from January 2006 to July 2006*.

“During the period covered by the report, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic, acting pursuant to a resolution of the government approved by both Houses of the Parliament of the Czech Republic, was participating in operations abroad. Czech units were operating in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Iraq and Afghanistan.

During the above period, the Czech Republic was the Framework Nation of the Multinational Battle Group Centre (MNBG-C) of the KFOR mission in Kosovo. Operating under the Czech command were also Finnish, Swedish, Irish, Slovak and Latvian troops. The total strength of the Czech contingent in the area, the core of which was composed of members of the 13th Artillery Brigade based in Jince, was 501. Its principal elements were a mechanized company and the National Support Element. The area of responsibility of the Czech contingent, which was based in Sajkovac, Gazala Lines and Lipljan, was approximately 966 km². The length of the monitored section of the provincial border between Kosovo and Serbia was 112 km. Its principal tasks consisted in guarding and monitoring the Kosovo-Serbia provincial border and providing security to local population. The commander of the contingent and also of the Multinational Battle Group Centre was Colonel Miroslav Hlaváč.

The strength of the Czech contingent assigned to EUFOR’s Operation Althea in Bosnia and Herzegovina was 65. The main element of the contingent was a guard platoon which was a part of a multi-national (Czech-Estonian-Austrian-Slovak) guard company. The unit was stationed at Eagle Base in Tuzla. Its principal task was to protect and guard the headquarters of the Multinational Task Force North and the Eagle Base camp. The commander of the 3rd contingent (until June) was Lieutenant-Colonel Pavel Jelínek, who was succeeded by Lieutenant-Colonel Vojtěch Prýgl as the commander of the 4th contingent in the second half of 2006. The commander of the contingent also serves as S-1 at the headquarters of the Multinational Task Force North.

During the period covered by the report, the Czech Republic was involved in the ISAF mission in the territory of Afghanistan, providing two contingents the total strength of which was 101. The first of them, 18-strong, was operating at the Kabul International Airport and consisted of an EOD detachment and an air traffic weather service group. Between October 2005 and March 2006, the contingent’s commander was Major Bořek Valiček. In March 2006, he was succeeded by Major Zdeněk Hejpetr.

The second, 83-strong contingent of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic was operating in Fayzabad, Badakhshan Province (northeast Afghanistan) as part of the local Germany-led Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT). Its principal mission was to protect the PRT and the Fayzabad airfield, to escort vehicles and convoys, to liaise with the local population and to monitor the situation. In addition to the German PRT, there were also Danish troops present at the base. Between October 2005 and March 2006, the contingent’s commander was Lieutenant-Colonel Radek Černý. In March 2006, he was succeeded by Lieutenant-Colonel Tibor Budík.

At the same time, a 120-strong Czech Special Forces contingent was also operating in Afghanistan as part of the counterterrorist Operation Enduring Freedom. The contingent’s personnel and materiel
were transported to the theatre in May 2006. Its principal mission was special reconnaissance, i.e. the acquisition of information on important targets and localization of selected objects. The contingent’s commander was Colonel Ondrej Páleník.

The Czech Republic’s contribution to the operation of coalition forces in the territory of Iraq was a Military Police contingent the strength of which was up to 96 people. The contingent was stationed at the Shaibah Base (British). Its main task was to train Iraqi policemen attending the Police College, instructors of Iraqi police stations and members of the Iraqi traffic police. In the first half of 2006, members of the contingent trained 547 Police College students, 58 traffic police officers and 75 instructors. In addition, 1,872 and 933 Iraqi police officers completed a basic police work course and an advanced course, respectively, and 711 policemen completed a firearms course. All in all, the contingent trained 4,196 Iraqi police officers during the period covered by the report. There were two three-month rotations; the contingent’s commanders were Lieutenant-Colonel Miroslav Mrček from January to March 2006 and Lieutenant-Colonel Jiří Neubauer from March to June 2006.”

Let us now have a look on the international missions the Czech soldiers have taken part in since the accession to the NATO until today.

Among the Peace Guardians in the Balkans Again

In the first year of the Czech Republic’s membership in the North Atlantic Alliance, the Czech soldiers also travelled to Albania in April (6th Field Hospital, 69 personnel), where they helped provide medical care to a wave of refugees of Albanian Kosovars until September, and in August also to Turkey, where a 33-strong mobile team of the 6th Field Hospital took part in disaster-relief operations in the earthquake-stricken city of Gölcük.

However, the most important deployment was the third one, Operation Joint Guardian in Kosovo. The Government of the Czech Republic decided to participate in it at its extraordinary meeting on June 8, 1999. The start of the mission was special in that the first Czech Armed Forces unit to be sent to a NATO international operation was put together, in terms of both personnel and equipment, in just ten days! The commander of the first Czech contingent, the 126-strong 6th Reconnaissance Company, was Major Karel Klinovský, his deputy was Captain Milan Kovanda. The core of the unit was composed of 65 members of the 6th Special Forces Brigade from Prostějov (now 601st Special Forces Group). The company was supposed to be logistically self-sustainable for six months. Preparations started on June 14, and the company commander reported readiness on June 24. Four days later, the first part of the unit set off from the Prostějov railway station for the Balkans.

Colonel Karel Klinovský, then commander of the unit, now recalls the tense moments with a smile: “Our contingent travelled by train through six countries. We arrived to Macedonia at 11PM. I immediately went to see the commanding general who, however, told me we would have to wait until the turn of our assigned convoy number came, which meant we would have got to Kosovo in no less than ten days. I summoned my people and we decided we would not wait and rather set off first thing in the morning under our own power.”

The Czech column was halted at the border by French MPs, who wanted to know the convoy number. However, the Czech talked them into letting the convoy go even without the number and pushed
on. On July 5 at 3PM, the company commander reported to his British superior in Podujevo. “He told me he was glad to have me there and asked when the unit would arrive. I showed him our column lined up out in the street. He couldn’t stop shaking his head... They assigned us a damaged school in Gornji Silovac, telling us to repair it so that the troops could spend six months in the building. The superior commander told me to report back in about ten days’ time, when we put the school back in good shape. I answered that all my soldiers would be billeted and have a hot meal and a hot shower by 9PM. When the Brits saw it in the evening, they couldn’t believe their eyes...”

Our task in the theatre was to monitor a 42 km border section. While the Czech SFOR II mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina was concluded on September 15, 2001, Czech troops were about to stay in Kosovo for twelve long years to supervise the peace between feuding ethnic communities in the northwestern part of the unstable region. Between July 12, 1999, and February 19, 2002, there were altogether five rotations of reconnaissance companies in Kosovo.

SFOR rotations in Kosovo from July 1999 till February 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commanding officer</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Karel Klinovský</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6th Reconnaissance Company</td>
<td>Reinforced with 56 troops (11/99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Vladimír Podlipný</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4th Reconnaissance Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Zdeněk Pitner</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2nd Reconnaissance Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Vlastimil Rozumek</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>7th Reconnaissance Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Petr Smola</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11th Reconnaissance Company</td>
<td>11 additional troops = the battalion’s core</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to guard duties on the Kosovo-Serbia administrative border, principal tasks of the Czech reconnaissance companies operating in the framework of the Multinational Brigade Centre (and subordinated to the British task force) included monitoring all activities taking place along or in the vicinity of the assigned border section, registering refugees and ensuring their safe return, and creating prerequisites for the restoration of peaceful coexistence of Serbian and Albanian Kosovars in the unit’s operational area. The companies were continuously guarding and providing uninterrupted protection to isolated enclaves inhabited by the Serbian minority. If it had not been for the protection of the Czech soldiers, many tragedies would undoubtedly have occurred.

In addition, the Czech CIMIC team and the People in Need Foundation participated in the renovation of the school in the village of Hrlica. The project was completed in the end of 1999. The team was also cooperated with Moravsko-slezské dřevařské závody (Moravian-Silesian Timber Company) in Uničov on a project of 10 prefabricated modular cabins for the villagers of Orlane, a community located in the area of responsibility of the Czech contingent.

A Czech airlift group (one An-26 transport aircraft and 16 people) was conducting airlift operations for the Kosovo Force and the Allied Forces Southern Europe (AFSOUTH) command in Naples. Based in Split, Croatia, the group clocked an average of 70 flight hours a month, ferrying personnel and materiel to and from Pristina (Kosovo), Skopje (Macedonia), Tirana (Albania), Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Naples.

A significant change occurred in February 2002, when the area of responsibility of the Czech unit was taken over by the 1st Czech-Slovak Battalion, which had 416 personnel at that time. In the course of time, the unit’s strength stabilized at approximately 500, 400 Czechs and 100 Slovaks.

The unit was rotated several times (with the battalion's number being changed with each rotation) and continued operating in the area until December 2004, when the 5th Czech-Slovak Battalion was replaced by the 6th contingent of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic as a result of changes in the mission which, insofar as the Czech Armed Forces was concerned, consisted mainly in the takeover of the Lead Nation role in the Multinational Brigade Centre by the Czech Republic from Finland as of August 1, 2005. It was the first time ever that the Czech Armed Forces was assigned a task of this type, scope and exigency, but the Czechs passed the test with flying colours. Participating in the task were mainly members of the 7th KFOR contingent the Czech Armed Forces, the core of which was composed of troops of the 4th Rapid Reaction Brigade under command of Colonel Aleš Vodehnal, and of the 8th contingent, consisting mainly of members of the artillery brigade from Jince and under command of Colonel Miroslav Hlaváč, who handed over the role of the Lead Nation to Sweden on July 31.
At the time of the Czech command, the Multinational Brigade Centre was composed of Czech, Finnish, Irish, Latvian, Slovak and Swedish units.

Until 2011, the principal mission of our troops in Kosovo was to guard the provincial Kosovo-Serbia border and to protect the Serb minority and their historical and cultural monuments in the area of responsibility against threats and attacks of radical and extremist groups. Long-term tasks of the battalion also included restoration of mutual trust of ethnic groups, support of members of the UN mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and monitoring of activities of members of the Kosovo Protection Corps.

When the last Czech rotation shut down the base overlooking the town of Šajkovac at the turn of October and November 2011, it was the time to look back and take stock of how the Czechs had built themselves a home away from home in all those years that had elapsed from the arrival of Klinovský’s and Kovanda’s Special Forces.

It took six trainloads to withdraw all military equipment and materiel of the Czech KFOR contingent. The trains had altogether 110 freight cars and 7 passenger carriages and their aggregate length was 2,507 m. The weight of the equipment and materiel, which had to be escorted by 90 members of the Military Transportation Department of the Support Command, was 3,815 tons!

The Unjustly Overlooked Mission

The very praiseworthy and demanding activities of Czech soldiers in the Kosovo mission, and later also in Iraq and Afghanistan, always received relatively enough media attention and the public could make a fair enough opinion on what taking part in a mission amounts to. The mission of the Czech soldiers in Macedonia in 2001 is somewhat away from the limelight. It is perhaps because the time of the Czech contingent’s deployment was relatively short, or simply because we unjustly regard the small Balkan country, which is still denied the right to its rightful historical name and must therefore use the grotesque abbreviation FYROM (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), as unimportant in the context of international policy. Viewed from the perspective of our own history and the year 1938, with Henlein’s Sudetendeutsche Freikorps paramilitaries on the rampage in border regions of Bohemia and the Munich treachery committed by European powers on the democratic Czechoslovakia threatened by Hitler, the deployment of our soldiers for the purpose of saving Macedonia’s independence and democracy and eliminating the violence and subversion perpetrated by gangs of Albanian secessionists belonging to UÇK (Ushtria Çlirimtare Kombëtare) seemed to be more than justified and rightful.

I am referring to Operation Essential Harvest, the purpose of which was to collect and dispose of arms and weapons of Albanian insurgents and in which 120 Czech paratroops attached to the British 16th Airborne Brigade took part from August 17 to October 10, 2001. The core of the Czech contingent was composed of the 3rd company of the 43rd Airborne Mechanized Battalion from Chrudim under command of Captain Oldřich Nápravník. In addition to Brits, Belgian, French, Italian, Canadian, German, Dutch, Greek, Spanish and Turkish units were also participating in the operation.

The Czech Armed Forces unit was sent to Macedonia pursuant to Resolution of the Government of the Czech Republic No. 639, dated June 20, 2001. Its primary task was to protect the Multinational Brigade headquarters, to serve as the airborne reserve of the brigade commander, to guard relay stations, to escort convoys and to conduct patrols around the brigade HQ.
In addition to a command element and three platoons of paratroopers, the Czech unit included sniper, grenade launcher, engineer and EOD sections, a logistic platoon and a company dressing/medical aid station. Two Czech officers were assigned to the mission’s staff.

The chief objective of the operation in Macedonia, which the Czech soldiers took part in, was fulfilled. The planned goal of collecting 3,300 pieces of armament from the Albanian insurgents was exceeded; soldiers of the Multinational Brigade collected 3,875 of them during the operation, including 4 armoured vehicles, 17 surface-to-air missile systems and 162 mortars.

Both military representatives of the Alliance and Macedonian mass media regarded the Czech troops as an elite unit. The participation in the operation was proof positive of the Czech Armed Forces’ ability to dispatch a military contingent upon request of the Alliance and according to its specifications at short notice.

### Heading to Iraq for the Third Time

While the paratroops from Chrudim were doing their job in Macedonia, an event marking a turning point in the field of international security occurred on September 11, 2001. Only a person out of his or her mind cannot see the terrorist attack against New York for what it was – an attack against the whole civilized world, and thus a threat to the Czech Republic’s security. The Armed Forces of the Czech Republic could not just stand aside and watch. NBC specialists were again the first to be given an opportunity to test and prove their capabilities. And that opportunity was Operation Enduring Freedom, based on the invocation and implementation of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, in the framework of which they were deployed in the territory of Kuwait and Iraq.

In the evening hours of March 18, 2002, President of the Czech Republic Václav Havel said goodbye to members of the elite 9th CBRN company from Liberec departing from Prague’s Ruzyně Airport. The unit completed its move to Camp Doha, off Kuwait City, next day in the morning. Twenty-four hours later, MV Sochi carrying 132 vehicles and 84 containers with materiel dropped anchor in the Kuwaiti port of Ash-Shu’aibah. The reinforced company under command of Major Gajdoš had 251 personnel (including 8 women). The first commander of the Czech contingent in Kuwait was Colonel Josef Prokš, who was succeeded by Lieutenant-Colonel Dušan Lupuljev on August 5. In September, the unit was relieved and its tasks were taken over by the 4th CBRN Detachment from Týn nad Vltavou under command of Major Radek Černý. Following a US request, the detachment was reinforced to a battalion-sized unit; on February 1, 2002, the 395-strong 1st CBRN Battalion started fulfilling its mission in Kuwait. In accordance with a resolution of the Czech government approved by both Houses of the Parliament, the territorial coverage of the unit was expanded to Turkey and Israel.

The unit was also given a mandate to become engaged in potential international actions and measures implemented to enforce compliance with relevant resolutions of the UN Security Council. It was also permitted to take part in any rescue, disaster-relief or humanitarian operations in the region in the event of a justifiable suspicion that weapons of mass destruction might have been used.

The unit’s task was to protect coalition forces and civilian population against any intentional use of chemical, biological, nuclear or radiological weapons or substances, as well as against consequences of any unintentional incident or
accident related to such weapons and substances, and consequences of the use of powerful conventional ammunition and ordnance. In practice, the task amounted to radiation, chemical and biological surveillance combined with continuous monitoring, detection and early warning functions.

Another change occurred on March 1, 2003, when the unit got a new name – the 1st Czech-Slovak CBRN Battalion; it consisted of 400 members of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic and 69 members of the Slovak Armed Forces. The joint unit was a result of the battalion’s reinforcement by a Slovak CBRN company.

The battalion was pulled out of the theatre in reaction to a formal announcement of the end of hostilities and combat operations, which was issued on May 2, and in accordance with the decision of the superior command. The withdrawal to the Czech Republic commenced on May 7 and was completed on June 2, 2003.

When the participation of the Czech and Slovak CBRN specialists in Operation Enduring Freedom in Kuwait was over, the baton of presence in the region was passed to the 7th Field Hospital the Czech Armed Forces, which participated in the follow-on Operation Iraqi Freedom. It was set up in the south Iraqi city of Basra as part of a local humanitarian operation and went operational on May 18, 2003, in the presence of Czech Minister of Defence Miroslav Kostelka.

The Czech military contingent in the region consisted of the following elements:

- 7th Field Hospital, 155 personnel, under command of Colonel Mojmír Mrva;
- Military Police, 79 personnel;
- Humanitarian detachment, 31 personnel;
- National Support Element (NSE), 30 personnel;
- Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) Team, 13 personnel.

After the rotation on October 6, the commands of the Czech military contingent in Iraq and of the 7th Field Hospital went to Colonel of the General Staff Přemysl Škácha and Colonel Vojtěch Humlíček, respectively.

Military doctors and other medical personnel completed their operational task on November 20, 2003, and were withdrawn home from December 5 to December 20, 2003. While in Iraq, they provided medical treatment to 10,146 patients (9,112 Iraqis, 1,034 members of coalition armies) and performed 242 operations. The total number of in-patients was 308.

Pursuant to Resolution No. 1031 of the Czech government, which was approved by both Houses of the Parliament, the military doctors and medical personnel operating in the territory of Iraq were
succeeded by Czech military policemen, who helped train local security forces at the Police Academy in Az Zubayr and local police stations. They were rotated several times and their presence in Iraq continued until December 2006.

Just like in 1990 and 1991, at the time of Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, the deployment and work of our soldiers in the cultural and climatic environment they had not been accustomed to were risky and mentally and physically demanding. However, men and women of all services and elements of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic deployed in Iraq fulfilled their duties with honour and retained the respect of their foreign partners they had enjoyed until then.

Under the ISAF Flag in Afghanistan

Czech soldiers rightfully retained the respect even on the hot soil of Afghanistan, where they were a part of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) established pursuant to the Agreement on Provisional Arrangements in Afghanistan signed by 30 prominent Afghans under the auspices of the United Nations on December 5, 2001. The ISAF mission was established for an initial period of six months by UN Security Council Resolution 1386 dated December 20, but its mandate has been repeatedly extended since then. The ISAF's principal tasks include creating a safe and secure environment enabling future development and reconstruction, expanding the Afghan government's authority to the whole territory of the country, assisting the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan with the training of the Afghan National Army or helping implement disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes.

The initial Czech involvement in the ISAF operation started with the 6th Field Hospital, which was sent to Afghanistan in May 2002 and based in Kabul. In October 2002, it was succeeded by the 11th Field Hospital, whose mission ended in February 2003. Between 2002 and 2003, the Czech military medical doctors and other medical personnel provided treatment to about 2,000 coalition soldiers and 12,000 locals in Afghanistan.

Since August 11, 2003, with the responsibility for the ISAF mission having been taken over by the North Atlantic Alliance, the Czech Republic sent a number of other military professions to the country; there were seven Czech personnel attached to the ISAF HQ and logistic support elements, followed by a 16-strong contingent composed of an EOD (Explosive Ordnance Disposal) detachment and an air traffic weather service group and stationed at the Kabul International Airport (KAIA) and at the NATO headquarters in Kabul. The EOD detachment consisted of two teams conducting explosive ordnance and engineer reconnaissance of the airport and its vicinity followed by safe disposal of unexploded ordnance and improvised explosive devices. Since October 2004, the EOD detachment started assigning an IED disposal team for the ISAF rapid reaction system for the entire Kabul area of operations. The weather service group was providing comprehensive meteorological support to air traffic control authorities at the Kabul Airport.

Between December 1, 2006, and March 31, 2007, the Czech Republic was even performing the Lead Nation role at the Kabul International Airport, being responsible for controlling and supporting its operations, providing security and preparing it for a hand-over to the Afghan government. To this end, the existing Czech contingent was reinforced to 47 people (not including the 19-strong EOD detachment), who had up to 500 troops and specialists from other NATO member states and Afghanistan under their command.

Following the successful fulfilment of all these demanding tasks as of March 31, 2007, the Czech contingent was withdrawn from the Kabul Airport and returned to the Czech Republic by mid-April.
2007. However, Czech soldiers remained at the Kabul Airport even after that date; a new contingent, up to 111-strong and composed of a field hospital and a light CBRN unit, in respect of both the Czech Republic was acting as the Lead Nation, arrived in March 2007 and stayed there until November 2008.

The mission of the field hospital was again to provide professional medical help to wounded and ill members of coalition forces operating in Afghanistan and, subject to available capacities, naturally also to the local population. The field hospital had a surgical unit, an intensive care unit and an in-patient ward. It also included a medevac point the task of which was to assist and look after all wounded patients waiting to be medevacked from KAIA.

The light CBRN unit was continuously monitoring the CBRN situation in the area by taking samples in the field and analyzing them in a mobile laboratory, and was prepared to provide an early warning to coalition forces and local government authorities if necessary.

In April 2008, the Czech contingent in Kabul was further reinforced by an Operational Mentoring and Liaison Team (OMLT) providing training to Afghan pilots and ground support personnel operating the Mi-17 and Mi-24 helicopters donated by the Czech Republic to the Afghan National Army. Its members also helped their Afghan partners check and inspect of the aircraft and repair defects if necessary.

Perhaps the most prestigious unit of the Czech Armed Forces, the 601st Special Forces Group of General Moravec from Prostějov, was deployed in Afghanistan in 2004 as part of the counter-terrorist Operation Enduring Freedom, i.e. outside the framework of ISAF forces. As the unit’s name suggests, the nature of the deployment was very special. The 601st Special Forces Group is subordinated to the Military Intelligence Service, which is why most of the information on its activities and operations is classified.

Let us thus remind ourselves of at least the essential facts. The 111-strong unit from Prostějov under command of Colonel Ondřej Páleník was operating in Afghanistan since April till September 2004. Its members were stationed at the Bagram Air Base (known mainly from the days of the Soviet intervention between 1979 and 1989). They named their base Camp Mauer, to honour the memory of Warrant Officer Pavel Mauer, the unit’s member who had succumbed to injuries sustained in Iraq in May 2003.

From there, they were venturing out to forward operating bases to fulfil their tasks. Their area of operations was located east of Kabul and was defined by the towns of Cherikat, Asadabad, Jalalabad and also the notorious Tora Bora cave complex, which had once been the last operational base of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda.

The core of the Czech Special Forces contingent was composed of three Special Forces detachments. Their tasks included mainly special reconnaissance, i.e. i.e. the acquisition of information on important targets and localization of selected objects. The deployment of the Special Forces troops from Prostějov was tremendously important for the Czech Armed Forces, as the priceless lessons they learned were to be put to good use by other Czech units that were deployed in the theatre later.

**Hard Times in the Shadow of Hindu Kush**

A Ministry of Defence press release: “On Wednesday, March 9, 2005, a chartered airplane carrying the last segment of troops of the Reconnaissance Battalion from Prostějov landed at the Afghan airport of Mazare Sharif. For the next six months, the soldiers will be a part of one of the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRT) of the ISAF mission in Afghanistan. Their CO, Major Miroslav Vybihal, and
five staff officers had already flown to Afghanistan on Monday, March 7, 2005. In the evening hours of Tuesday, an additional two aircraft took off from the Přerov Air Base and landed in Mazare Sharif on Wednesday morning. The Ilyushin wide-bodied cargo planes carried vehicles and logistic materiel. The personnel were transported by an An-72 airplane. The forty Czech soldiers will take part in tasks related to security arrangements in the province of Badakhshan and protection of ISAF international forces. They will also cooperate with the local population. The scouts from Prostějov are included in an approximately 250-strong team alongside Danish and German Bundeswehr troops.

The new deployment of Czech troops in Afghanistan in 2005, this time in the north of the country, in the wild mountain ranges of Hindu Kush of the Badakhshan province, as a part of the international Provincial Reconstruction Team led by Germany, was another demanding test of skills of Czech soldiers, which they again passed with flying colours.

The very arrival of the first Czech soldiers to their destination, the city of Fayzabad, is also something that should not be forgotten. The movement, which has become a legend since then, was a spectacular test of capabilities of Czech paratroopers. After a ten-hour flight of the reinforced platoon of the 102nd Reconnaissance Battalion of General Karel Paleček to Mazare Sharif, the unit set off for a long journey only two hours since it had touched the ground. Awaiting it was a first leg, 280 km long, on winding roads often lined with mines liberally strewn on the shoulders. At midnight, the scouts reached the base in Kunduz. At 05:00 AM, however, they set off again for another 230-km leg, most of it on unpaved “roads” high in the mountains. The Czech convoy consisted of eight obsolete UAZ off-road vehicles and even one venerable and invincible Praga V3S mobile workshop. It was with this “vintage” fleet of vehicles that the soldiers from the heart of Europe were fording wild mountain streams and fighting their way through equally wild mountain passes. It took them eighteen gruelling hours to reach Fayzabad.

They reinforced the existing complement of 39 Danes and 130 Germans there. However, it was just the beginning of what later proved to be an extremely demanding stint, with vehicle-mounted patrols facing risks posed by melting snow, bottomless mud etc. all the time.

When the second and more numerous Czech contingent replaced its predecessors in October 2005, its members received more modern and less defect-prone vehicles - up-armoured Land Rover 110 TDi off-roads. However, they had to bring them from Kabul, which amounted to another three-day and 700 km long arduous journey through Afghan mountains.

Czech contingents manning the PRT Fayzabad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commanding officer</th>
<th>Tour</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Deployment core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Miroslav Vybíhal</td>
<td>March–October 2005</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>102nd Reconnaissance Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Radek Černý</td>
<td>October 2005 – March 2006</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>102nd Reconnaissance Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Tibor Budík</td>
<td>March–September 2006</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102nd Reconnaissance Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Peter Salák</td>
<td>September 2006 – March 2007</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>102nd Reconnaissance Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Aleš Opata</td>
<td>March–August 2007</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43rd Airborne Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Petr Procházka</td>
<td>August–December 2007</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43rd Airborne Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core of the Czech contingent, which was rotated six times and operated in the Badakhshan province until December 2007, was a protection detachment, which provided security to the local Provincial Reconstruction Team, but also to the Fayzabad airport, was escorting PRT vehicles, liaising with locals, monitoring the situation in its area of responsibility and assigned forces and assets for the Provincial Reconstruction Team’s rapid reaction unit.

The reconnaissance detachment was patrolling the assigned area of responsibility, liaising with locals and monitoring the situation at the local level. The region is populated mainly by Tajiks, most of whom harbour no particular love for the Taliban. However, as local farmers often grow poppy seed used to produce opium, there was some tension and distrust toward the ISAF troops among the locals, which needed to be gradually eliminated.

However, the greatest enemy of the Czech soldiers was probably the surrounding nature – peaks of the Hindu Kush mountain ranges literally in the backyard, almost nonexistent hard-surface roads, huge temperature variations and malaria. Altitudes between 3,000 and 5,000 m above sea level prevail in most of the region. The altitude of the river valley and Fayzabad itself is from 1,600 to 2,600 m above
sea level. Apart from staked routes, the mountain terrain is practically impassable to vehicular traffic. During the spring thaw, local “roads” become mud-filled traps in many places. Moreover, the Panj River turns into a hatchery producing huge quantities of malaria mosquitoes in late spring. Antimalarial medications thus had to be provided to the Czech contingent.

The spring in the region lasts only two months – since April till the end of August. The weather is very volatile at this time of the year. There are up to eight rainy/drizzly days a month. Subzero temperatures at night and snowing in the mountains are commonplace in April. In the summer, from June to September, the average daily temperature rises up to 25°C. Night temperatures are around 19°C. Daily temperatures in the hottest months – July and August – climb up to 40°C. The autumn period, from October to November, is generally drier and colder than the spring. The winter lasts since December till March and is very cloudy. The average daily temperature is -4°C, but nights can be really frosty, with temperatures dropping as low as -20°C. There is a danger of avalanches in the mountains and temperatures up on mountain peaks is up to -15°C lower than those in valleys.

It was the rough nature which caused the first painful loss sustained by the Czech Armed Forces in the ISAF mission. On May 3, 2007, an avalanche of mud and rocks hit a vehicle-mounted Czech patrol returning to the base some 40 kilometres away, killing Senior Warrant Officer Nikolaj Martynov, a member of the 43rd Airborne Mechanized Battalion from Chrudim. With a wild rainstorm raging around, the landslide hit a column of four Czech off-road vehicles, sweeping one of them off the road and burying it. As the crews of the other vehicles came to its rescue, another avalanche of mud and rocks slid down the mountain slope, which proved fateful to the Senior Warrant Officer, who had just relieved one of his comrades at the accident site, and seriously injured another soldier, Warrant Officer Miloš Prášil.

Afghan Geography

The vicinity of Kabul, the Bagram Air Base or the Badakhshan province have already been mentioned, but Czech soldiers have come to know many more provinces of the country which has been plagued by decades of fighting in over ten years of their presence in Afghanistan. Especially the following Afghan regions deserve to be mentioned:

KANDAHAR

Members of the elite 601st Special Forces Group of General Moravec under command of Colonel of the General Staff Ondrej Páleník spent six months since May 2006 in the Taliban’s stronghold as a part of a very demanding, but successful operation codenamed White Lion. It was their second operational deployment in Afghanistan. They named their permanent base at the Kandahar Airport Camp Prostějov.

The third deployment of the 601st Special Forces Group in Operation Enduring Freedom took place since August 2008 till the end of 2009. There were three rotations, each up to 100-strong, which took part in combat operations in the territory of Afghanistan during that period.

Their tasks again included special reconnaissance, counterterrorist strikes and military assistance in the assigned area of operations in the southern and south-eastern part of Afghanistan. The Czech contingent was transported by airplanes of the US Military Airlift Command to the south of Afghanistan, namely to the allied base in Kandahar. That was the contingent’s base camp, a crucial prerequisite of command, control and logistic support of special operations conducted in the area of combat operations in the Uruzgan province.

Following a meticulous and thorough planning phase, the combat segment of the contingent moved to its area of combat operations through territory teeming with Taliban fighters. The trip took eight endless days of perpetual fighting through enemy territory. At 2,000 m above sea level, the Czech soldiers built a forward combat base (Camp Anaconda) from where they started launching an entire spectrum of special operations together with their coalition partners. While there, the “Specials” from Prostějov conducted more than two hundred of them.

Unlike their counterparts commanding other allied forces in the region, the commanders of the rotations of the 601st Special Forces Group, Colonel of the General Staff Milan Kovanda, Colonel Roman
Kopřiva and Colonel Josef Kopecký, were always able to proudly report they had not lost a single soldier!

The Czech Special Forces troops assigned to Operation Enduring Freedom were rightfully held in high esteem by the operation’s command for their professionalism and excellent performance, as indicated by multiple requests for their repeated deployment in the theatre.

**Helmand**

A 35-strong contingent of the Special Operations Group of the Czech Military Police was operating in the province as a part of the ISAF mission from April 2007 to October 2008. The unit reinforced British troops deployed in Helmand and was assigned special tasks, such as hostage rescue, strikes against illegal paramilitary groups and perpetrators of violent crimes, or VIP protection. Forward Air Controllers from the 22nd Airbase Náměšť nad Oslavou, as well as canine officers from the Veterinary Base in Chotyně, who were testing an experimental project of a special SDAT (Special Dog and Tactical) unit in Afghanistan, were successfully learning combat lessons alongside the MPs. The Special Operations Group rotated three contingents through Helmand, the commanders of which were Major Petr Krčmář, Major Pavel Růžička and Lieutenant-Colonel Miroslav Murček.

Unfortunately, the successful deployment of Czech soldiers in Helmand alongside their British and Danish colleagues was marred by a black day – on March 17, 2008, a suicide bomber attacked a foot patrol in the village of Gereshk, killing four Afghan civilians, Danish soldiers Christian Jørgen Grundt Damholt and Sonny Kappel Jakobsen, and also Chief Warrant Officer Milan Štěrba, a member of the Special Operations Group.

With their mission in Helmand over, some members of the Czech contingent returned home, while others reinforced the Czech Provincial Reconstruction Team in Logar, where they remained until October 2008.

**Uruzgan**

Satisfying a request of the Dutch government for assistance, the Czech Armed Forces deployed a 63-strong contingent of the 31st CBRN Defence Brigade from Liberec under command of Major Miroslav Brázda in Uruzgan in June 2008, whose task was to protect the Hadrian FOB of the Dutch Task Force Uruzgan. The next rotation was composed of troops of mortar batteries of the 41st Mechanized Battalion in Žatec and the 42nd Mechanized Battalion in Tábor under command of Captain Jiří Líbal.

Our soldiers were collocated with 200 Dutch troops and French mountain infantrymen. The Forward Operating Base was some 400 km southwest of Kabul, off the town of Deh Rawod. The operational deployment of the Czech soldiers ended in March 2009, when the Czechs were replaced by Slovak troops.

**Balkh**

In addition to being engaged in long-term operations in some parts of Afghanistan, Czech soldiers were also used in short stints which, however, also deserve to be mentioned. A case in point was the deployment of an NBC detachment of the second contingent of the Czech Armed Forces under command of Major Libor Švec in the northern part of Afghanistan, namely in the town of Heyratán in the Balkh province, from June 21 to June 23, 2009.

The Czech NBC unit conducted a reconnaissance mission in the Kaldar district, near Heyratán, in close cooperation with German and Finnish troops.

The region had hosted a logistic depot of Soviet units in the past, and a high level of environmental pollution was obvious at first sight. A potential capture of poorly stored substances or abuse of existing industrial facilities by terrorists posed a risk both to the local population and to allied units.
The industrial buildings are located close to the Amu Darya River, which forms a natural state border with Uzbekistan and is a source of water for the local population. The task of the Czech CBRN specialists was to reconnoitre the site, take samples, analyze them in their mobile laboratories parked at the Kabul Airport, and evaluate potential risks.

At that time, the temperatures in the area were extremely high. Combined with high dust levels, they made any movement of soldiers extremely difficult and exhausting. However, the CBRN specialists from Liberec demonstrated their capabilities even in these conditions and confirmed their well-deserved reputation of an elite unit.

Wardak

Since September 2010, Czech soldiers have been performing two important tasks in this province. The first of them, affectionately nicknamed “the omelette” by our troops, is represented by activities of the Operational Mentoring and Liaison Team (OMLT). The team’s main task is to train, mentor (educate, teach explain) and help in the process of planning, command and control of a battalion-sized infantry unit (“kandak”) of the Afghan National Army. The purpose of the training format is to improve operational capabilities of all units of the kandak, to ensure a safe and secure environment and freedom of movement in the area of responsibility, and to provide prerequisites for conducting a broad spectrum of operations.

In addition, members of the Czech Military Police have been helping build a strong Afghan National Police there since March 2011.

Unfortunately, the province has so far made two tragic entries in the history of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic. The first one was May 31, 2011, when an Iveco LMV carrying three Czech soldiers and their Afghan interpreter was hit by an IED off the village of Salar. The explosion killed Warrant Officer Robert Vyroubal, fatally wounded the Afghan interpreter and also caused injuries to the remaining two Czech soldiers.

Only thirty-six days later, the Czech unit was hit hard again; on July 6, Czech soldiers manning a forward post, again close to Salar, were the target of a Taliban attack. Warrant Officer Adrian Werner was seriously wounded in the ensuing firefight. He received medical treatment and was medevacked home, but he succumbed to his injuries in the Military Hospital in Olomouc on October 9, 2011, in spite of all the care.

Paktika

Since December 2009, three upgraded Mi–171Sh helicopters, nicknamed ‘Hippo’ because of their silhouette, which creature is also emblazoned on the coat-of-arms of the 23rd Helicopter Airbase in Přerov, were also involved in the mission in Afghanistan. Operating out of the Sharana Forward Operating Base, they remained in Afghanistan till December 2011. Their main tasks included ferrying materiel and personnel for coalition units subordinated to the ISAF Regional Command East, search and rescue and medevac operations.

Nangarhar

Having been deployed three times in Operation Enduring Freedom, members of the 601st Special Forces Group of General Moravec became involved the ISAF mission for the first time in June 2011. The commander of their 100-strong unit was Colonel Karel Řehka. The commander of the second six-month rotation was Colonel Pavel Kolář.

This time the unit was conducting various special operations from a base called Camp Hombre (after the nom-de-guerre of its former commander, Colonel Ondrej Páleník).
close to Jalalabad. It stayed in Afghanistan until June 2012 and one of its tasks was to build, train and mentor a special rapid reaction unit of the Afghan National Police and to conduct operations together with it.

Another and no less demanding task consisted in cooperation and coordination with all intelligence and special units and organizations fighting against terrorism, drug or arms trafficking and criminal elements in the region.

While operating in Afghanistan, the “Specials” from Prostějov were again repeatedly commended not only by top-level commanders of coalition units, but also by Afghan leaders for their steadfast and unconventional approach to the fulfilment of all tasks for the benefit of NATO special forces.

The unit was conducting operations to stabilize the province’s security situation together with the provincial rapid reaction unit built and trained by our soldiers. One of their goals was to disrupt the drug production and distribution network, one of the sources funding anti-government and anti-coalition operations.

The success was almost instantaneous. The unit captured more than a thousand kilograms of hashish, marijuana and opium and a substantial amount of heroin. Illegally held weapons and dozens of kilograms of small arms and artillery ammunition and explosives – components used to assemble improvised explosive devices – were also apprehended and subsequently destroyed.

The operations carried out in cooperation with Afghan security forces resulted in the capture of several wanted individuals who had organized or participated in terrorist activities, and their handover to Afghan justice authorities. Together with their partner unit, the Czech Special Forces troops also handled several cases of abduction and hostage rescue some of which involved children. In spite of the tough and demanding nature of their mission, both deployments of the 601st Special Forces Group returned home without having sustained any casualties.

Logar – a Somewhat “Czech” Province

However, the Czech engagement in Afghanistan culminated in the Czech Republic creating and leading its own Provincial Reconstruction Team in the province of Logar, south of the capital city of Kabul, as of March 19, 2008.

The province does not rank among the poorest regions of the country, but its development still requires a lot of attention. The work of the PRT thus concentrates on the development of agriculture, schools, medical care, infrastructure, security and assistance to local authorities in the promotion of principles of good governance, all of which will expected to provide prerequisites for an influx of capital and investments which will help start economic and social development. Every PRT consists of a civilian element and a military element. The core of any PRT is composed of civilian experts, usually sent by foreign ministries and development agencies; they maintain contacts with the local population and authorities, identify their needs, propose development projects and supervise their implementation. They are protected by the military element which is, as a rule, more numerous than the civilian segment because of the tense security situation. In addition to protecting the civilian members of the PRT, the military element also assists local authorities in maintaining order and security in the region. It is a long-term commitment, as development work cannot be rushed. In military and security terms, the support and sustenance of the PRT is one of the most difficult current tasks the Czech Armed Forces have.

Czech soldiers have to deal with attacks of Taliban terrorists when patrolling the province or escorting supply columns and civilian experts. Shortly after being deployed in the province, the Czech team suffered a tragedy, when an improvised device exploded under a Humvee, killing Sergeant Radim Vaculík.

However, members of the Provincial Reconstruction Team often have to cope with attacks aimed directly at their camp. For example, the second contingent was targeted by three missiles fired by insurgents shortly after their arrival, on August 13, 2008. Further, fortunately unsuccessful, attacks soon followed, but on September 22 a missile injured several Czech soldiers as they were rushing into a shelter.
The presence of PRTs in provinces is nevertheless an important stabilizing factor of the ISAF mission. Their members maintain everyday contacts with villagers, tribal elders, and district and provincial authorities, and their efforts and activities targeting specific objectives can start a process of long-term and coordinated development based on multiple shared resources.

The concept of Provincial Reconstruction Teams has evolved from the US Coalition Humanitarian Liaison Cells project. PRTs are now an inseparable part of the ISAF mission. There are 26 PRTs currently operating in Afghanistan, which represent a key component of the Alliance’s strategy in the country. Their principal task is to support the central government in provinces and to help ensure a safe and secure environment for the reconstruction of the country.

The primary mission of the Czech PRT, which was stationed at U.S. operated Camp Shank, included:
- Supporting the central government in the Logar province;
- Assistance on providing a safe and secure environment for reconstruction;
- Monitoring and assessing the local and regional security situation;
- Realisation of reconstruction and humanitarian projects;
- Base security;
- Provision of logistic support and other services associated with stationing, billeting and performance of missions off base;
- Working with Afghan National Security Forces in the province including assistance on their training.

Czech Armed Forces’ organic units manning the Provincial Reconstruction Team Logar in ISAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commanding officer</th>
<th>Tour of duty</th>
<th>PRT core force with 198–293 personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COL Ivo Střecha</td>
<td>March–August 2008</td>
<td>102nd Reconnaissance Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Pavel Lipka</td>
<td>August 2008 – February 2009</td>
<td>7th Mechanised Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Petr Procházka</td>
<td>February–August 2009</td>
<td>41st Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Milan Schulc</td>
<td>September 2009 – February 2010</td>
<td>42nd Mech &amp; 43rd Airborne Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Rudolf Honzák</td>
<td>February–August 2010</td>
<td>72nd Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Ctirad Gazda</td>
<td>August 2010 – February 2011</td>
<td>71st Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Miroslav Hlavač</td>
<td>February–August 2011</td>
<td>43rd Airborne Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC Pavel Andráško</td>
<td>August 2011 – February 2012</td>
<td>53rd Reconnaissance and Electronic Warfare Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Antonín Genser</td>
<td>February–August 2012</td>
<td>42nd Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Josef Kopecký</td>
<td>August 2012 – February 2013</td>
<td>74th Light Motorised Battalion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governor of the Logar Province Attiqullah Ludin said in 2010 concerning the Czech aid: “I hope we will be able to continue working with Czechs and that you will help us in the future as well. We have great plans for economical reconstruction of the province. We would like to focus on renovating roads, bridges and on reconstruction of agriculture, particularly apiculture. I trust when you will be leaving this place one day that locals would say Czechs are good people...”

Although individual Czech Armed Forces’ deployments were perfectly prepared, dangerous and demanding service in ISAF unfortunately sometimes claims painful losses. The servicepeople of the Czech Armed Forces will honour the memory Nikolaj Martynov, Milan Štěrba, Radima Vaculík, Robert Vyroubal and Adrian Werner, laid down their lives fighting international terrorism in the interest of security of their homeland and that of other NATO Allies.

May they rest in peace!

The Czech Armed Forces plans to draw down its engagement in ISAF in the years ahead. The Czech Armed Forces’ contribution to countering fanatic opponents of freedom and democracy has been remarkable and the participation of Czech men and women in uniform in foreign deployed operations compares the endeavour of Czechoslovak legionaries during World War I or the members of Czechoslovak forces abroad in 1939–1945. The Czech Republic’s membership in NATO does not mean only the guaranteed support in protection or even defence of the Czech Republic by NATO Allies, but logically also that the Czech Republic joins NATO operations in turn.
THE MILITARY AND THE PUBLIC OPINION
The November 1989 events sparked processes of social changes in the Czecho-Slovak society. The armed forces, until then representing an important power tool of the Communist party, and thus enjoying a privileged social status, naturally could not avoid them. As a result of an action by handful of military representatives during the Velvet Revolution, who had attempted to offer a military option for the purpose of resolving the existing political situation, the armed forces were distrusted by new political elites. The public did not know exactly what to expect of the military; and military representatives did not know what to expect of the public. At that time, no standard public opinion polls were conducted in Czechoslovakia.

The transition to democracy required a sociological mapping of the relationship between the military and the public. The new political elites needed to know the public opinion regarding the development, deployment and use of the armed forces. However, the new leadership of the Ministry of Defence also needed to be aware of what was going on within the armed forces, if the transformation of the military was not to produce a fiasco. This was why a military institution focusing on social science research and capable of running sociological surveys and opinion polls was established soon after the first-ever civilian leadership had taken over the Ministry of Defence.

The Prague-based Military Institute of Social Research was established on May 1, 1990, pursuant to Order No. 20/1990 of the Minister of Defence of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic. According to its statutes, the institute was supposed to “collect and generalize information, as well as assist in implementing results in the following areas: optimization of relations between the public and the military; democratization of the armed forces and humanization of military service, improvement of the social climate and conditions at and away from the workplace of members of the armed forces; determination of the professional position and roles of different categories of professional soldiers, improvement of their personalities, authority and social prestige, as well as their education … In the opinion of the leadership of the institute, the key topic of social research should be the relationship between the Czechoslovak society and the armed forces.”

Outputs produced by the institute were regularly published in the Facts annex of the MoD professional magazine Selection of Articles for Professional Education and Requalification.

Following the break-up of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic, the institute lived on for a while and then its competencies went over to the Research Department of the Military Office of Personnel Information and Statistics, and later to the Main Personnel Office of the Ministry of Defence, and later still to the Personnel Division of the Ministry of Defence. In 2005, the in-house research capability ceased to exist and relevant issues have been outsourced as public procurement contracts since then. In spite of the adverse developments, it has been possible to maintain some long-running research projects/surveys, including even those started by the Military Institute of Social Research. The most important of them is the Army and Society, the first report of which, comprising 71 pages and an annex, was issued in 1991.

Combined with surveys of renowned public opinion agencies, the results of the Army and Society research project give the civilian leadership of the Ministry of Defence and the military command a basic guideline indicating what their efforts should be directed at, both as regards the Czech society and within the armed forces. The former include, for example, the long-term Our Society research project conducted by the Public Opinion Research Centre (the Czech acronym is CVVM) of the Sociological Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences, or the Trends series of surveys of the Centre of Empirical Research (the Czech acronym is STEM). Thus, more than 20 years since the establishment and 15 years since the demise of the Military Institute of Social Research, the institute’s mission – understanding the relationship between the society and the army – is still carried on.
Following is a selection of the most attractive and most important indicators of the relationship, which have been monitored for a long time. These include:

- public trust in the armed forces;
- public attitudes toward collective defence;
- public opinion concerning the mission and qualities of the armed forces;
- reputation of the military profession and perception of soldiers’ qualities;
- public attitudes toward sources of defence funding;
- opinions related to conscripted military service in peacetime.

Public Trust in the Armed Forces

This issue has been monitored in a survey dedicated to trust in security institutions. It is the longest-monitored attribute of civilian-military relations in the Czech Republic. The database of the Centre of Empirical Research contains data collected since 1992. STEM establishes the public trust in the army using both a separate question and a battery of questions which gives respondents an opportunity to compare the army with other institutions.

The initial decline in the first half of the 1990s notwithstanding, the public trust in the armed forces has been growing. It has now stabilized at a level slightly above 60%, which means the military ranks among government/state institutions enjoying the highest public trust. In this respect, STEM’s Trends 2/2001 issue states that: “The army is one of the few institutions which have an almost identical score in all population segments. The trust in the military does not depend on age or education, and even political affiliation does not play a decisive role. While the trust in the Czech Armed Forces among supporters or followers of the strongest parties does show some fluctuations, the differences between the right and left sides of the political spectrum are fairly small... However, there exists a relation between the trust in the military and the opinion on our foreign policy; people who believe our foreign policy is, as a rule, correct generally claim to trust the Czech Armed Forces as well, while those who think our foreign policy is generally wrong tend to distrust our army as well.” The above statement is particularly important in connection with the strategic decision to ensure our security against an external attack through our participation in a collective security arrangement, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.
Public Attitudes toward Collective Defence

The monitoring of the trust in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was prompted by the decision to join the Alliance. As early as in March 1994, the then Prime Minister Václav Klaus signed the Partnership for Peace (PfP) framework document, which is regarded, in the light of subsequent developments, as the first step the Czech Republic made toward its integration in the NATO structures. In July 1997, the NATO summit in Madrid decided that the Czech Republic could become a member of the Alliance.

Although fluctuating, the long-term trust in the NATO has been standing at over 50%. The indicator of trust is very important in relation to the manner in which the Czech Republic ensures its defence and security. The Czech membership in the Alliance is linked to the existence of a reciprocal security guarantee. In any collective defence system, the members share not only its benefits, but also its costs. Generally speaking, each member can only get what it and other members put in. The NATO membership is a commitment to provide one’s military forces and assets to a NATO ally in case of need, and a reciprocal commitment of the allies to do the same in one’s own case of need.

NATO is an alliance with global reach. Building confidence in the security guarantee it provides is therefore related to a proven capability of each member state to deploy and sustain its troops far away from its territory. To a certain extent, the participation in international missions under a mandate of the
UN or other international organizations thus simulates a potential deployment in the territory of another NATO ally in the event a war conflict breaks out. For this reason, the public opinion on the deployment of Czech soldiers abroad and public support to specific international missions also rank among very important public opinion indicators. The importance of these indicators naturally increased after the Czech Republic had joined the NATO in March 1999, and particularly since September 11, 2001, after the attacks against the United States, with the Czech Republic, as a NATO ally, joined UN-mandated expeditionary operations in places regarded as hotbeds of terrorist activities aimed at Western democracies.

The level of public consent with the deployment of Czech soldiers abroad was fluctuating in the past, just like that of the public trust in the Alliance. However, when looking at the level of public consent, whether with the non-military use of forces and assets of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic in peace-keeping operations in the 1990s or with the Czech participation in combat operations against terrorists since 2001, it holds true that the public have always accepted the fact that our troops operate abroad. In general, the level of public disagreement declines as the mission gets longer.

| Missions abroad test the quality of our army. | 62.4 71.1 77.7 81.9 79.1 83.5 85.3 89.0 68.2 77.0 71.3 72.6 73.5 76.2 72.7 70.0 |
| The participation in (peace-keeping and humanitarian) missions improves the image of the Czech Republic/Czech Armed Forces. | – 72.4 76.8 78.5 80.2 85.2 83.0 – – – 75.3 77.0 – 74.4 71.2 77.0 |
| Our soldiers (unnecessarily) risk their lives in missions (the objectives of which are not quite clear). | 54.8 47.1 44.2 53.5 52.4 49.3 56.7 – 72.3 – 58.1 50.1 57.0 50.5 53.3 59.0 |
| The only reason why soldiers take part in missions is money. | 76.1 71.9 69.9 73.4 76.6 74.2 71.5 67.4 77.9 – 72.0 69.9 68.4 59.6 64.0 72.0 |
| Spending taxpayers’ money on foreign missions is waste. | – 39.2 34.8 37.4 38.8 32.6 36.9 37.2 57.6 – 47.0 46.0 51.9 46.4 49.0 54.0 |

Source: MoD, “Army and Society/Public” research project
However, views of the Czech public on the exercise of the military policy are contradictory. On the one hand, more than 70% of the population believes that international missions abroad test the quality of our armed forces and contribute to a positive image of the Czech Republic and our military abroad; on the other hand, the public are not quite convinced that such missions are necessary. As a matter of fact, the percentage of respondents identifying themselves with the “Our soldiers risk their lives in missions unnecessarily” statement increases with the duration of the anti-terrorist operations our troops are engaged in. The skeptical attitude – which probably stems from the fact that foreign policy issues have not exactly been in the focus of attention of Czech politicians and media for a long time – also generates an unfair suspicion that money is the main reason why Czech soldiers take part in the missions. The vagueness of objectives of the military policy may lead to a reduction of the taxpayers’ willingness to finance the policy, as indicated by the survey.

Public Opinion on the Mission and Qualities of the Armed Forces

The public opinion concerning the mission of our armed forces has long been affected by a deeply rooted dilemma between the use of forces and assets directly for the benefit of Czech citizens, in the territory of the Czech Republic, and the use outside our territory. On the one hand, there exists a need to strengthen our security guarantees through our involvement in the international security system in the most active way possible, the spin-off effects of which, such as reduction of illegal immigration, which often brings along diseases long eradicated in our country or criminal activities, need not necessarily be immediately obvious to an ordinary citizen. Attitudes of the Czech public indicate that our national interests in this field are not clear enough for the public. On the other hand, there is a demand for assistance roles of the armed forces, clearly manifested after the disastrous floods in Moravia in 1997 and in Bohemia in 2002.

Public perception of selected threats and risks (%)

(1996–2002 answers “make(s) me feel threatened” and “very/rather probable threat”; 2003–2011 answers “I am definitely/rather afraid”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attack by another country/Future military threat to the Czech Republic</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International terrorism/Terrorist attacks/Attacks by terrorists</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack using biological weapons (anthrax etc.)/Use of biological weapons</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural disasters</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace violation/attack</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MoD, “Army and Society/Public” research project

The Czech public is not actually too much afraid of a potential attack by another state. Apart from crime, the strongest factor bringing about the feeling of being threatened in Czech citizens is represented by natural disasters. On the other hand, fear of terrorism or an attack using biological weapons is ebbing as the year 2001 is more and more distant in the past. The longer the time elapsed since the attack on the United States, the weaker the perception of these threats by the public. To some extent, the decline may also be interpreted as a success of the Czech Republic’s involvement in the fight against terrorism.
Public views concerning the mission and tasks of the armed forces (%)
(sum of “very/rather important” answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defence of the territory/sovereignty of the Czech Republic</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to population in the event of natural disasters and environmental accidents (floods, spillages of oil products etc.)</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight against terrorism</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-keeping missions under UN command/Participation in peace-keeping missions abroad</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat operations under UN command/Participation in combat operations abroad</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in missions abroad (under UN, NATO, EU mandate)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The armed forces are both a part of the state apparatus and a social institution that can be characterized by certain qualitative parameters. The public opinion concerning these characteristics was progressively changing, reflecting the changes taking place in the armed forces itself. In the early 1990s, the Czechoslovak (and later Czech) Armed Forces was still a mass military. Its public reputation of an effective fighting force was rapidly deteriorating. However, since the mid-1990s it started winning its good reputation back. The fastest restoration of the perception of essential qualities of the armed forces coincides with the full professionalization of the armed forces.

Evaluation of qualities of the armed forces (%)
(sum of “definitely yes” and “rather yes” answers)

Opinion on qualities of the armed forces (%)
(sum of “definitely yes” and “rather yes” answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is capable of fulfilling its commitments toward the NATO/other NATO allies.</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is ready to fight against international terrorism.</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is capable of helping citizens in the event of a natural disaster.</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MoD, “Army and Society/Public” research project
The prevalence of perception of threats related to internal security leads to a general expectation that the armed forces will be used, first and foremost, to deal with non-military situations, including natural disasters and accidents. However, the Czech Republic's obligations toward the NATO are primarily related to the development, build-up and preparation of our armed forces to deal with military risks and threats. This is the principle that the solidarity within the Alliance is based on. Whenever the military budget was reduced in the past, the cuts affected mainly the “assistance” functions of the armed forces. If the Czech Republic continued to reduce its military capabilities, it would weaken the collective security principle and gradually become a joy-ride-rather than a regular passenger within the North Atlantic Alliance.

Prestige of the Military Profession

The monitoring of the prestige of the military profession began as early as in 1992, when a survey named Attraction and Prestige of the Military Profession was undertaken under the leadership of Z. Cach of the Military Institute of Social Research. At that time, the survey focused on the perception of 11 military professions, or Military Occupational Specialties, among 58 professions, both military and civilian. The respondents included professional and extended service soldiers, civilian employees and conscripts. Surprisingly, a soldier (upper echelon commander/general) then appeared in the sixth place, preceded by a minister (5th), factory manager (4th), mayor (3rd), university professor (2nd) and nuclear physicist (1st). The professions that finished behind the upper echelon commander/general included a general practitioner, writer and four other military professions: officer – associate professor at a military college; officer – scientist/researcher; regimental/divisional commander; and chief engineer. A divisional staff officer, EOD squad member and military engineer finished 18th, 20th and 21st, respectively. Still behind them were a regimental logistic support officer (28th), officer of the divisional social/HR management section (34th), battalion technical officer (36th), followed by an officer of the regimental social/HR management group (38th). A company commander finished as low as in the 41st place.

Prestige of different professions in the Czech Republic in terms of the ranking within a set of selected professions, occupations and positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University lecturer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Parliament</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional soldier</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop assistant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private farmer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building worker</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charwoman</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: The first three columns in the table contain an evaluation of 24 selected professions taken over from the Army and Society research project, 2002 – 2004. These values too show an improving ranking of professional soldiers. Source: CVVM, “Our society” research project 2004–2012

Research/surveys of the prestige of the military profession became much more important in 2002, when a decision was made to abolish mandatory conscripted service and fully professionalize the armed forces by the end of 2006. Since 2004, the prestige of the military profession has been monitored.
in the *Our society* research project/survey conducted by CVVM. The project is based on a set of 28 selected professions/general positions and determines the ranking of each. Contrary to Cach’s earlier research project, all military professions and occupational specialties are grouped in a single category comprising all professional soldiers. According to CVVM’s data, the prestige of the military profession has improved in the last eight years, moving from the lowest segment of the set (bottom fifth) to somewhere in the middle (10th to 20th place), where the military profession falls into a group of professions with a score from 45% to 55%. The professional soldier is now close to the manager in the rankings. In this respect, it is also necessary to bear in mind that there has been a change of the rank structure. Twenty years ago, there were more than three quarters of officers and generals among professional and extended service soldiers, the ratio today is quite opposite, with NCOs and warrant officers of the ‘silver-starred corps’ accounting for the bulk of professional soldiers.

Public opinion on qualities of professional soldiers (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional skills/qualification</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral prerequisites/Morale (since 2008)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical fitness</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to risk life for the country</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MoD, “Army and Society/Public” research project

It may also be possible that the prestige of the military profession is linked to the public opinion on soldiers’ qualities. With the transition to an all-volunteer force at January 1, 2005, a radical change occurred in the perception of qualities of professional soldiers. The public now perceives them as a truly professional corps. They are well-qualified for their work and show adequate physical fitness. Another positive factor is an increasing score of their moral qualities and their willingness to risk their lives for their own country. It is a question whether and to what extent the change has been brought about defence expenditures. As a matter of fact, the 1990s saw a reduction of military capacities due to budget cuts.

Public Attitudes toward Defence Expenditures

The public opinion concerning defence expenditures shows ambivalence similar to that related to the tasks that Czech citizens expect the armed forces to fulfill. On the one hand, there is a generally recognized need of common defence; on the other hand, there is not much willingness to pay for it.

Public attitudes to defence and defence expenditures (%)
Perhaps remembering their civics lessons and recalling what Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic were through during the 20th century, an overwhelming majority of Czech citizens realize that the sovereignty of our country must be protected. On the other hand, the society does not show an adequate willingness to spend resources on potential defence of the Czech Republic's territorial integrity and sovereignty. No matter how high or low the defence budget is, Czech citizens believe it represents an unnecessary burden for the Czech Republic. This is a quite surprising finding, especially in the light of the MoD budget dropping continuously since 2006, from roughly 2% of GDP to 1% of GDP at present. The lower the willingness of the Czech public to spend a part of the domestic product on national defence, the lower also the willingness to risk life in the defence of the Czech statehood. Both trends can also be seen during the period of fully professional armed forces.

The armed forces cannot be an island isolated from the rest of the society. It therefore has not escaped budget cuts. The first of them came shortly after the adoption of the concept of a fully professional Armed Forces of the Czech Republic on November 13, 2002. A year later, almost to a day, it was decided that the MoD budget would not be 2% of GDP, as initially planned, until 2010.
Where should the armed forces save (reduce costs)? (%)
(sum of “definitely yes/reduce” and “rather yes/reduce” answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades and acquisitions of military equipment</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of missions abroad</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of training and service of soldiers at units in the Czech Republic</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement pension or benefits/social security of soldiers</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing allowance for active-duty soldiers</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of soldiers</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MoD, “Army and Society/Public” research project

Any all-volunteer armed forces which is regularly deployed, trains and upgrades its weapons, weapon systems and equipment is generally more expensive. However, it uses the potential of its troops more efficiently. With the reduction of the budget needed to build it, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic could expect problems, especially in the field of recruitment, selection and stabilization of military personnel. It is surprising that most respondents would cut remunerations of professional soldiers, believing that the housing allowance and social security of soldiers offer most room for the savings. However, the two abovementioned benefits have proven their indispensability for maintaining the competitive ability of the armed forces in the labour market. Moreover, the highest level of interest in the service in the military could be seen at the time when the housing allowance was granted to practically every soldier. Any savings in remunerations of professional soldiers thus carry a risk of a collapse of the personnel structure. The Czech Republic could also find itself in the role of a joy-ride within the NATO.

Aside from the long-standing ambivalence of the Czech public manifested by a refusal of deployments of our armed forces abroad combined with an expectation of unconditional help from our allies, attention should be paid to an increasing percentage of respondents who oppose continuing upgrades and replacements/reproduction of military equipment. According to the White Paper on Defence of 2011, there is a deficiency in technical capabilities even after 10 years of reforms, which would need approximately CZK 80 billion to remedy. The cause of the increasing percentage of negative public attitudes toward further funding of upgrades of military capabilities is not the army per se; it is rather a reaction to political scandals connected with acquisitions of new equipment.

Opinions Related to Conscripted Military Service in Peacetime

The mandatory military service is now history. Still, the compulsory national service should not be neglected because of its social importance and the role it used to play in the plans of the national sovereignty defence. It is true we have had professional all-volunteer armed forces since 2005, but there still exists a possibility the conscripted service may be reintroduced in the event of an extraordinarily critical security threat. After all, the Czech Republic continues to rely on its ability to mobilize forces, and it needs military reserves to be able to do so.

A traditionally neuralgic point of the relation between the armed forces and the Czech society was the conscription. For a relatively long time since the fall of the Iron Curtain, it was not possible to ensure the functionality of the armed forces in any other way but the conscription. Although the public attitude to the conscription duty was critical, the latter was also seen as one of the ways ensuring civilian control of the military. Anyone who could look inside the Czech Armed Forces while discharging his conscription duty was undoubtedly able to provide some evidence influencing those around him and subsequently also the broader public. The systematic monitoring of public attitudes toward the conscription and compulsory service ended only in 2001, when the intention to terminate the peacetime conduct of conscripted military service was announced to the public.
Although the prevailing opinion among the Czech public was that the conscripted military service was a loss of time and money (with a slightly declining trend), the survey showed that the conscripted military service still should be a matter of honour for every young man (with a slightly increasing trend). Every one of them should be personally involved in securing the defence of the country, in spite of the loss of time in his career and the money he could have earned. A voluntary active reserve force could have been an option.

![Bar chart showing public attitudes toward conscripted military service from 1996 to 2001.](chart)

**Source:** MoD, “Army and Society” research project

### Public attitudes toward conscripted military service (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing the conscripted military service is a matter of honour for every young man.</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conscripted military service is a loss of time and a financial loss for young men.</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** MoD, “Army and Society” research project, 1996–2000

Although the prevailing opinion among the Czech public was that the conscripted military service was a loss of time and money (with a slightly declining trend), the survey showed that the conscripted military service still should be a matter of honour for every young man (with a slightly increasing trend). Every one of them should be personally involved in securing the defence of the country, in spite of the loss of time in his career and the money he could have earned. A voluntary active reserve force could have been an option.

### Public interest in the service in the voluntary active reserve force in 2003 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** MoD, “Army and Society” research project 2003

The formation of the active reserve component units was not easy. The problem indicated by surveys conducted at that time was a low level of public interest in the service in the reserve corps. On the average, only every fifth Czech citizen was willing to serve his country as voluntary active reservist, which was how the reserve troops were called at that time. The highest level of interest was shown by people up to 29 years of age (30%). It should also be mentioned that the possibility of continued military service after retirement/contract expiry was attractive even for two thirds of professional soldiers at that time. In 2004, only every tenth Czech citizen was willing to serve in the active reserve force. These surveys confirmed the trend identified as early as in the mid-1990s. Czech citizens were saying “yes” to a (professional) armed forces, but without their personal involvement.

The Armed Forces of the Czech Republic is interested in having active reservists, not only because of the savings the scheme brings, but mainly because it represents an important bridge between military professionals and the civilian part of the Czech society.
MILITARY OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT
AND THE CASTLE GUARD
Military Office of the President

History

One of the first decisions Thomas Garrigue Masaryk took upon his return into the independent state of Czechoslovakia was to establish a military section within the Office of the President of the Republic, which materialised on 1 January 1919. The Act No. 654/1919 Coll. gave it a permanent title of Military Office of the President and specific purview, whose concept prevailed till nowadays.

The responsibilities of the Military Office of the President (MOP) were defined only very broadly. In principle, the MOP had a status of an auxiliary body to the President as the commander-in-chief of the Czech military power, supported realisation of the President's decisions and acted on his direct orders. Its activities also included a general support to military ceremonies attended by the head of the state.

The Present

The Military Office of the President is a military unit of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic and a separate component thereof besides the Czech Armed Forces and the Castle Guard.
The MOP performs specialist and organisational tasks associated with the performance of the powers of the President of the Czech Republic in his capacity as the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, and command and control of the Castle Guard.

The Military Office of the President is headed by the chief, who is appointed and recalled by the President of the Czech Republic and who is directly subordinate to the President.

The Chief of the Military Office of the President is superior to the Castle Guard and he has the authority to appoint and recall the Castle Guard Commander.

The MOP status and mission is laid down primarily in the Act on the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic No. 219/1999 Coll., as subsequently amended, and also in the Act on the Office of the President No. 114/1993 Coll., as subsequently amended.

Chiefs of the Military Office of the President in 1990–2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Ladislav Tomeček</td>
<td>1990–2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Vlastimil Picek</td>
<td>2003–2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Ivo Žbořil</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General František Hrabal</td>
<td>2008–2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Zdeněk Jakůbek</td>
<td>since 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photo by the MOP
History

The Castle Guard’s modern history started on 7 December 1918. The Czechoslovak Military High Command assigned the task of providing security to the seat of the President of the Czechoslovak Republic to an infantry century of the 28th Infantry Regiment. It was named the Castle century and comprised three infantry platoons and a machine rifle platoon, with total strength of 5 career soldier and 166 enlisted personnel. It was the first regular military unit with the mission to provide defence and security to the Prague Castle and support military ceremonies associated with official duties of the President. Throughout its history as well as today, the Castle Guard has honoured the tradition of the Czechoslovak legionaries who shed blood in World War I battlefields in the fight for an independent state.

The present

After nearly ninety-four years of existence, the Castle Guard (CG) is an autonomous, full-fledged and integral part of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic with the mission to provide external security and defence to the places of residence of the President of the Czech Republic and ceremonial duties associated with the President’s official activities. High level protocol acts that the Castle Guard supported in 2012 included the meeting of the Presidents of the Czech, Slovak, Serbian and Croatian Republic at the Lány Chateau, official visits by the Presidents of Lebanon and Iceland, Azerbaijan, the President of the Swiss Confederation, President of the Federal Republic of Germany and President of the Republic of Kazakhstan.
Organisational structure

Command and staff

1st Guard Battalion
- 1st Guard Company
- 2nd Guard Company
- 3rd Guard Company

2nd Guard Battalion
- 1st Guard Company
- 2nd Guard Company
- 3rd Guard Company

Support Company
- Transport platoon
- Motorcycle platoon
- Canine platoon
- Support platoon

Castle Guard Band

Photo by Radko Janata (2×)
Castle Guard servicemembers are selected and augmented from the Czech Armed Forces or through direct recruitment according to specific criteria. The Castle Guard’s mission is based on assignments defined under Section 28 of the Act on the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic No. 219/1999 Coll.

The Castle Guard is a brigade type of military unit with total strength of 653 personnel: 81 officers, 75 senior non-commissioned officers, 377 junior non-commissioned officers, 77 enlisted personnel and 43 civil servants.

Commanders of the Castle Guard in 1990-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Jaroslav Indruch</td>
<td>1 Feb 1990 – 31 Dec 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Commander Castle Guard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Commander Castle Guard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Radim Studený</td>
<td>since 1 Apr 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Military Police was established on 21 January 1991. The MP operations are regulated by the Act on Military Police No. 124/1992 Coll., as amended. At the same time, the Military Police observes legal regulations of the Czech defence law, the Criminal Code, Criminal Procedure Code and the Administrative Infractions Act. The Military Police’s relationship to command authorities and members of the armed forces are laid down in detail in bylaws of the Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic.

The mission

The Military Police (MP) performs missions of police security in relation to the armed forces, military installations, military materiel and other state property managed by the Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic.

Photo by Vladimír Marek
Military Police services

- Traffic, patrol and security service
- Crime detection and documentation service
- Special police activities

Organisational structure

**With nationwide purview:**
- Headquarters Military Police Prague
- Headquarters Security Service Prague

**With territorial responsibility:**
- Military Police Command Tábor
- Military Police Command Stará Boleslav
- Military Police Command Olomouc

![Organisational structure diagram](image-url)
The Military Police and the MP Headquarters are headed by the Chief of Military Police, who is directly subordinate to the Minister of Defence of the Czech Republic.

**Chiefs of Military Police from 1993 through 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Josef Bečvář</td>
<td>1 Feb 1997 – 31 Jan 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Rudolf Jilka</td>
<td>1 Feb 1998 – 30 Jun 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Josef Bečvář</td>
<td>1 Jul 1999 – 30 Sept 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Oldřich Kubát</td>
<td>1 Oct 2003 – 28 Feb 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Milan Schulc, MSc.</td>
<td>From 1 Mar 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MILITARY INTELLIGENCE AND THE 601st SPECIAL FORCES GROUP
The Military Intelligence is one of the Czech Republic’s three intelligence services (the other are the BIS Security Information Service and the ÚZSI Foreign Relations and Information Office) with the mission to provide counter-intelligence and intelligence in the sphere of defence and security based on the Act on Intelligence Services of the Czech Republic No. 153/1994 Coll., as subsequently amended, the Act No. 412/2005 Sb., on Information Security and Information Eligibility, as subsequently amended, as well as other missions in performance of informational support to the Czech Republic’s defence and security or for performance of our commitments to NATO.

In that sense, the Military Intelligence (MI) receives tasking from the Government of the Czech Republic via the Minister of Defence. As an integrated Czech armed intelligence service, the MI performs its mission in the sense of the Act on Military Intelligence No. 289/2005 Coll. and is controlled by the Ministry of Defence in the sense of the Act No. 2/1969 Coll., on the establishment of Ministries and other central government institutions of the Czech Republic, as subsequently amended.
Mission

The Military Intelligence performs its tasks in terms of providing information originating in foreign countries, which is important for defence and security of the Czech Republic, on foreign intelligence services in the area of defence, on intentions and activities directed against national defence of the Czech Republic and intentions and activities threatening classified information in the sphere national defence.

The Government of the Czech Republic assigns and authorises the priorities for the Military Intelligence on annual basis. In doing so, the Government reflects on its current requirements for information, projected development of security situation over the next twelve months and its program priorities. Although the Government of the Czech Republic sets priorities annually, the tasking usually spans a longer of time and es-

sentially do not change for several years. They rather have a medium term nature. The President of the Czech Republic may also task the MI subject to the Government’s approval.

MI personnel also provide intelligence security to Czech and other Allied deployments in foreign operations. The 601st Special Forces Group based in Prostějov, which performs important missions, particularly in combat operations, has a special status in the Military Intelligence.

The Military Intelligence uses its assets to acquire information from multiple sources. That process involves Human Intelligence (HUMINT), Signal Intelligence (SIGINT), Imagery Intelligence (IMINT) and Open Source Intelligence (OSINT). High-value information is also obtained through bilateral and multilateral cooperation.
Leading officials of the Military Intelligence Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Kozojed</td>
<td>1990–1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Radovan Procházka</td>
<td>1993–1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Petr Pelz</td>
<td>1995–1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Štěpánek</td>
<td>1997–2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Andor Šándor</td>
<td>2001–2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Prokš</td>
<td>2002–2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Zdeněk Novák</td>
<td>2003–2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leading officials of the Military Defence Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Duchek</td>
<td>1991–1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Petr Lužný</td>
<td>1993–1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Jiří Růžek</td>
<td>1994–1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Gisel</td>
<td>1999–2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Miroslav Krejčík</td>
<td>2003–2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leading officials of the Military Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Radovan Procházka</td>
<td>1995–1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Petr Pelz</td>
<td>1997–2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Prokš</td>
<td>2003–2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Miroslav Krejčík</td>
<td>2004–2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Ondrej Páleník</td>
<td>2007–2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Milan Kovanda</td>
<td>since 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Czech Armed Forces, the 601st Special Forces Group and the Special Forces Directorate are the only representatives of the special forces branch. At present, Special Forces report directly to the Minister of Defence through the Director of Military Intelligence and represent a strategic asset for both the military high command and the political leadership of the Czech Republic. The Special Forces’ mission and tasks are authorised by the Government of the Czech Republic. Those missions involve a high level of physical and political risk, may be performed both in wartime and peacetime, and are highly effective.

The 601st Special Forces Group of General Moravec is a special unit with tradition exceeding 60 years associated with the garrison city of Prostějov. In 1995, the 22nd Special Purpose Airborne Brigade was transformed into the 6th Special Brigade. After the Czech Republic’s entry into NATO, a special forces company was assigned to rapid reaction forces and they trained to NATO standards for special forces. In 1999, the special forces company deployed for KFOR as the very first Czech unit, where it paved the way for subsequent Czech Armed Forces’ deployment.

In the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attack on the United States, special forces have proven indispensable and critical in contemporary conflicts. The Czech Minister of Defence subsequently authorised an armed forces reform. Reorganisation into the 601st Special Forces Group (SFG) in 2003 concluded the unit’s transformation into an advanced special force, whose specific structure is unparalleled in the Czech Armed Forces.
The mission

The 601 SFG won an extraordinarily high reputation primarily during their operational tours in Afghanistan, where they deployed in 2004 in the frame of the counterterrorist Operation Enduring Freedom as the very first Czech Armed Forces to have such a mandate since the end of World War II. The first successful tour was followed by subsequent deployments in 2006, 2008–09 and 2011–12. The last deployment served their tour as a part of NATO ISAF. In Afghanistan, the 601 SFG has so far been engaged in combat for 3 years and nine months altogether and performed hundreds of operations across the special forces mission spectrum, ranging from focus on special reconnaissance at the outset, to offensive activities and to support and training of the Afghan National Army Special Forces. Special Forces also manned additional Czech Armed Forces contingents deployed for operations in the former Yugoslavia, Iraq and Afghanistan, where small teams of specialists were embedded.

Leading officials of the Special Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonel</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petr Pavel</td>
<td>1997–1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josef Trojan</td>
<td>2000–2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondrej Páleník</td>
<td>2002–2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan Kovanda</td>
<td>2006–2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karel Řehka</td>
<td>since 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1

Military ranks and rank corps

**Generals**
- General
- Lieutenant-General
- Major-General
- Brigadier-General

**Senior Officers**
- Colonel
- Lieutenant-Colonel
- Major

**Junior Officers**
- Captain
- First-Lieutenant
- Lieutenant

**Senior Non-Commissioned Officers**
- Chief Warrant Officer
- Senior Warrant Officer
- Warrant Officer
- Master Sergeant
- Sergeant First Class

**Junior Non-Commissioned Officers**
- Staff Sergeant
- Sergeant
- Corporal

**Enlisted Personnel**
- Private First Class
- Private

Images show embroidered rank insignia worn on field uniforms.
Annex 2

Ministers of Defence of the Czech Republic (1993–2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RNDr. Viliém Holáň</td>
<td>22 Sept 1994 – 3 Jul 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDr. Miloslav Výborný</td>
<td>4 Jul 1996 – 1 Jan 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Jaroslav Tvríček</td>
<td>4 May 2001 – 2 Jun 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDr. Karel Kühnl</td>
<td>4 Aug 2004 – 4 Sept 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiří Šedivý, Ph.D.</td>
<td>4 Sept 2006 – 9 Jan 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUDr. Martin Barták</td>
<td>8 May 2009 – 12 Jul 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNDr. Alexandr Vondra</td>
<td>13 Jul 2010 – 7 Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNDr. Petr Nečas (Prime Minister, acting Minister of Defence)</td>
<td>21 Dec 2012 – 18 Mar 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Vlastimil Picek</td>
<td>since 19 Mar 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3

**Chiefs of General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic (1993–2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonel-General Karel Pezl</td>
<td>1 May 1991 – 30 Jun 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jiří Šedivý</td>
<td>1 May 1998 – 30 Nov 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Petr Pavel, M.A.</td>
<td>since 1 Jul 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 4

**Ambassadors of the Czech Republic to NATO (1995–2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhDr. Jaroslav Šedivý, CSc.</td>
<td>25 Nov 1995 – 8 Nov 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing. Karel Kovanda, Ph.D., MBA</td>
<td>1 Mar 1998 – 23 Apr 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiří Šedivý, Ph.D., M.A.</td>
<td>since 1 Sept 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personnel strength of the Ministry of Defence in 1993–2012 (actual manpower)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (personnel at 1 January)</th>
<th>Generals</th>
<th>Senior officers</th>
<th>Junior officers</th>
<th>Senior non-commissioned officers</th>
<th>Junior non-commissioned officers</th>
<th>Enlisted personnel</th>
<th>Cadets / trainees(^2)</th>
<th>Unassigned personnel</th>
<th>Career soldiers</th>
<th>Conscripts</th>
<th>TOTAL service personnel</th>
<th>Civil servants</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27,267</td>
<td>10,625</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>38,049</td>
<td>68,630</td>
<td>106,679</td>
<td>25,286</td>
<td>131,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23,592</td>
<td>9,317</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>33,282</td>
<td>54,326</td>
<td>87,608</td>
<td>23,634</td>
<td>111,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21,199</td>
<td>8,488</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30,413</td>
<td>43,178</td>
<td>73,591</td>
<td>27,726</td>
<td>101,317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18,965</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27,654</td>
<td>36,797</td>
<td>64,451</td>
<td>26,456</td>
<td>90,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17,323</td>
<td>7,725</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26,340</td>
<td>32,174</td>
<td>58,514</td>
<td>27,060</td>
<td>85,574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15,341</td>
<td>7,196</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23,759</td>
<td>32,942</td>
<td>56,701</td>
<td>21,797</td>
<td>78,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14,671</td>
<td>7,122</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22,966</td>
<td>33,281</td>
<td>56,247</td>
<td>21,481</td>
<td>77,728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>7,323</td>
<td>6,744</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>23,721</td>
<td>31,185</td>
<td>54,906</td>
<td>21,301</td>
<td>76,207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>7,556</td>
<td>6,607</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>23,184</td>
<td>24,955</td>
<td>48,139</td>
<td>21,157</td>
<td>69,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4,531</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>6,428</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>20,627</td>
<td>21,235</td>
<td>41,862</td>
<td>20,888</td>
<td>62,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,153</td>
<td>5,528</td>
<td>6,489</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>21,249</td>
<td>19,783</td>
<td>41,032</td>
<td>22,675</td>
<td>63,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>21,055</td>
<td>6,359</td>
<td>27,414</td>
<td>20,808</td>
<td>48,222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>6,339</td>
<td>6,879</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>22,145</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22,145</td>
<td>17,288</td>
<td>39,433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>6,641</td>
<td>7,834</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>23,110</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23,110</td>
<td>14,971</td>
<td>38,081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,674</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>8,977</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>24,229</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24,229</td>
<td>13,358</td>
<td>37,587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,589</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>7,206</td>
<td>8,619</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>24,334</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24,334</td>
<td>11,946</td>
<td>36,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>7,363</td>
<td>8,486</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>24,103</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24,103</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>34,678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>6,969</td>
<td>8,683</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>23,136</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23,136</td>
<td>11,946</td>
<td>33,082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>7,657</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>22,261</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22,261</td>
<td>8,303</td>
<td>30,564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>6,052</td>
<td>7,399</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>21,751</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>21,751</td>
<td>8,241</td>
<td>29,992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation:

1. The number of personnel does not include the covert part of Military Intelligence, but it does include unassigned service personnel both paid and unpaid.


Annex 5
MoD budget in 1993–2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MoD budget revenues w/o non-budgetary resources of the reserve fund (CZK million)</th>
<th>MoD budget expenses without transfer of unspent funds into reserve fund (CZK million)</th>
<th>Gross Domestic Product (CZK billion)</th>
<th>MoD budget as GDP percentage (CZK billion)</th>
<th>Czech state budget expenditures</th>
<th>MoD expenditures as percentage of state budget expenditures (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2,181.3</td>
<td>23,776.6</td>
<td>910.6</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>356.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2,102.6</td>
<td>27,007.7</td>
<td>1,037.5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>380.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,045.8</td>
<td>28,275.2</td>
<td>1,252.1</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>432.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,256.6</td>
<td>30,508.8</td>
<td>1,414.0</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>484.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2,295.8</td>
<td>31,328.3</td>
<td>1,650.0</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>524.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,540.4</td>
<td>37,643.1</td>
<td>1,820.7</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>566.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2,349.6</td>
<td>41,688.1</td>
<td>1,849.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>596.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,460.1</td>
<td>44,669.7</td>
<td>1,900.0</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>632.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,607.4</td>
<td>44,977.5</td>
<td>2,139.0</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>691.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,630.0</td>
<td>48,924.1</td>
<td>2,192.0</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>736.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,266.9</td>
<td>53,193.9</td>
<td>2,405.0</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>808.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,204.5</td>
<td>52,481.2</td>
<td>2,757.0</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>869.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,353.9</td>
<td>58,445.0</td>
<td>2,920.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>923.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,001.5</td>
<td>55,358.4</td>
<td>3,222.0</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1,021.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,787.8</td>
<td>54,948.8</td>
<td>3,535.0</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1,092.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,872.4</td>
<td>49,827.1</td>
<td>3,689.0</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1,107.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,316.4</td>
<td>51,823.9</td>
<td>3,627.0</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1,167.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,167.9</td>
<td>47,705.7</td>
<td>3,691.0</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1,157.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,638.4</td>
<td>43,878.4</td>
<td>3,814.0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1,179.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,206.5</td>
<td>43,474.1</td>
<td>3,922.0</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1,189.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation:
GDP – Gross Domestic Product
2012¹ – Authorised budget; the data for other years are actual

Source: www.army.cz
Annex 7

List of major weapon and equipment systems in 1993–2012

The following is an overview of major weapon and equipment systems published in the annual exchange information on the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic in compliance with the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE-T), the Vienna Document (VD) and the Global Exchange of Military Information. The quantities include major weapon systems and equipment in the inventory of the Armed Forces irrespective of its planned use, assignment in combat units or depots, at combat readiness or in the process of decommissioning.

Numbers of major weapon and equipment systems of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MBT</th>
<th>ACV</th>
<th>Arty</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>AH</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jul 1992&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>177,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National ceiling</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mar 1993&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>105,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1994</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1995</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nov 1995&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1996&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1997</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1998</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 1999</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2000</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2001</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2002</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2003</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2004</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2005</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2006</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2007</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2008</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2009</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2010</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2011</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Jan 2012</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Personnel strength of the Czechoslovak Armed Forces at the entry of CFE-T into force.
<sup>2</sup> Personnel strength of the Czech Armed Forces according to the first CFE-T and VD annual exchange information; identical to the strength at 1 January 1993.
<sup>3</sup> Personnel strength of the Czech Armed Forces when downsizing was completed to attain national ceilings set for the Czech Republic.
<sup>4</sup> CFE-T annual exchange information was not submitted, only notes were conveyed specifying quantity of weapons and equipment systems.
Notes:
- National ceiling is a CFE-T stipulated limit that restricts the number of major weapons and equipment systems.
- MBT includes all versions of the T-72 tank family.
- ACV – armoured combat vehicles include all combat versions of combat vehicles of infantry fighting vehicles of the BMP-1, BMP-2, BPzV, Pandur II 4×4 CZ types and OT-90 and OT-64 armoured personnel carriers.
- The numbers submitted at 1 January 2003 and 2004 do not include three OT-64 APCs as they were deployed outside the treaty area of application.
- All quantities submitted from 1 January 2004 through 1 January 2008 do not include 4 units of OT-64 and 10 units of BMP-2.
- The number as of 1 January 2009 does not include 4 units of OT-64 and 14 units of BMP-2.
- The number as of 1 January 2010 does not include 8 units of BMP-2.
- The number at 1 January 2011 does not include 8 units of BMP-2 and 6 units of BMP-1.
- The number at 1 January 2012 does not include 4 units of Pandur II 4×4.
- Arty – artillery pieces with calibre 100 mm plus include all versions of ShKH M77 Dana howitzers, M70 MRLS and ShM 85 and M M1982 type of mortars.
- CA – combat aircraft include all versions of SAAB 39 Gripen and L-159 ALCA type of aircraft.
- AH – attack helicopters include all versions of Mi-24 (plus Mi-35).

Courtesy Arms Control Agency of the MoD Foreign Activities Directorate
UNPROFOR / UNCRO – YUGOSLAVIA

Mission: establish and run checkpoints; organising mobile observation teams; oversight of deposited weapons of warring parties; provide security the Croatian Podlapač community; patrolling and humanitarian aid; escorting convoys carrying displaced persons from the Republic of Serbian Krajina into Croatia

Bases: Knin, Borje, Jezerce, Udbina, Klapavica etc.

(March 1992 – April 1993)
Battalion commander LTC Karel Blahna
Personnel 500

(April 1993 – April 1994)
Battalion commander COL Vladimír Braun
Personnel 500

(April 1994 – March 1995)
Battalion commander COL Vojtěch Seidl
Personnel do 1 000

(April 1995 – March 1996)
Battalion commander LTC Ludovít Cirok
Personnel do 1 000

Commander Sector South MG Rostislav Kotil

(October 1995 – January 1996)
Commander Sector South COL Karel Blahna

IFOR – BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mission: implement individual parts of the Dayton Accords; maintain militarily secure environment; permanently monitor activities of the formerly belligerent armies in barracks and staging locations; provide organisational and logistic assistance to OSCE during elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bases: Donja Ljubija, Bosanska Krupa, Stari Majdan, Arapišani, Brezičani

6th Mechanised Battalion (January–June 1996)
Commanding officer MG Jiří Šedivý
Battalion commander LTC Josef Sشدák
Personnel 669

6th Mechanised Battalion (July–December 1996)
Commanding Officer COL Jaroslav Jäsek
Battalion commander LTC Josef Prokš
Personnel 669

The 6th MechBn continued as part of SFOR from 20 December 1996.

UNTAES – CROATIA

FIELD HOSPITAL

Mission: provide medical care to UN personnel
Base: Klisa

(March 1996 – March 1997)
Commanding Officer MAJ Pavel Budínský
Personnel 40

(April 1997 – March 1998)
Commanding Officer LTC Miloslav Matoušek
Personnel 40

SFOR – BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mission: supervise implementation of military aspects of the Dayton Accords; stabilising zones of separation; continue to stabilise the secure environment; assist in creating favourable environment for a safe return of refugees and displaced persons, humanitarian aid and reconstruction

Bases: Donja Ljubija, Bosanska Krupa, Divulje, Velka Kladuša etc.

6th Mechanised Battalion (December 1996 – February 1997)
Commanding officer COL Jaroslav Jäsek
Battalion commander LTC Josef Prokš
Personnel 669

6th Mechanised Battalion (March–November 1997)
Commanding Officer COL Zdeněk Mach
Battalion commander LTC Pavel Jiráček
Personnel 669

6th Mechanised Battalion (November 1997 – August 1998)
Commanding Officer COL Jiří Kalpárek
Battalion commander LTC Josef Semelák
Personnel 669

The 6th MechBn continued as part of SFOR II from June 1998.

7th Mechanised Battalion (August 1998 – March 1999)
Commanding Officer COL Ján Gurník
Battalion commander COL Jaroslav Pražan
Personnel 588

3rd Mechanised Battalion (March–October 1999)
Commanding Officer COL Michal Vass
Battalion commander LTC Vladimír Stržiž
Personnel 588

1st Mechanised Battalion (October 1999 – April 2000)
Commanding officer COL Zdeněk Košvanec
Battalion commander LTC Martin Květon
Personnel 580

43rd Mechanised Battalion (April–October 2000)
Commanding Officer BG Vladimir Lavička
Battalion commander LTC Aleš Opata
Personnel 580

ACR Foreign Deployments and Missions (1993–2013)
4th Mechanised Battalion (October 2000 – April 2001)
Commanding Officer COL Jaroslav Lazorišák
Battalion commander LTC Radek Henner
Personnel 580

5th Mechanised Battalion (April-December 2001)
Commanding Officer COL Jan Niplech
Battalion commander LTC Antonín Vícha
Personnel 580

CZECH ARMED FORCES NATIONAL REPRESENTATION IN SFOR II

Bases: Zagreb, Sarajevo, Banja Luka, Prijedor

(December 2001 – April 2002)
Commanding Officer COL Miroslav Žižka
Personnel 15

(April–October 2002)
Commanding officer COL Jaroslav Kolkus
Personnel 15

(October 2002 – April 2003)
Commanding officer COL Jiří Kuchař
Personnel 8

(April–October 2003)
Commanding officer LTC Petr Smola
Personnel 5

(October 2003 – April 2004)
Commanding officer LTC Jaroslav Kulišek
Personnel 7

(April–December 2004)
Commanding officer LTC Ladislav Buček
Personnel 7

AFOR – ALBANIA, TURKEY

ALBANIA, KAVAJE – A HUMANITARIAN AID MISSION

Mission: Provide medical aid to Kosovar refugees and AFOR service personnel; provide specialist medical aid in the branch of traumatology, ENT, X-ray, dentistry, cardiology and psychiatry; provide humanitarian aid to Kosovar refugees

TURKEY, GÖLCÜK – A HUMANITARIAN AID MISSION

(aid after disastrous earthquake)

Mission: provide specialist medical aid; provide medical and logistic support to provisional shelter camps

6th Field Hospital (May–November 1999)
Commanding Officer LTC Jindřich Sitta
Personnel 89

KFOR – KOSOVO

Mission: safeguarding the Administrative Border Line separating Kosovo and Serbia; monitoring all activities at the ABL and in the border areas; registering and ensuring a safe return of displaced persons; creating conditions for the restoration of peaceful coexistence of Kosovar Serbs and Albanians; protection of cultural monuments; monitoring activities of the Kosovo Protection Corps and participation in its transformation and training.

Bases: Camp Sajkovac, Gazala Lines, Lipljani etc.
10th ACR Contingent KFOR (January–July 2007)
Commanding Officer: LTC Ladislav Švejda
Personnel: 391
Ops Reserve Force Coy: 116 (in home station)

11th ACR Contingent KFOR (July 2007 – January 2008)
Commanding Officer: LTC Milan Schucl
Personnel: 433
Ops Reserve Force Coy: 116 (in home station)

12th ACR Contingent KFOR (January–July 2008)
Commanding Officer: LTC Jiří David
Personnel: 406
Ops Reserve Force Coy: 116 (in home station)

13th ACR Contingent KFOR (July 2008 – January 2009)
Commanding Officer: LTC Jiří Roček
Personnel: 402
Ops Reserve Force Coy: 116 (in home station)

14th ACR Contingent KFOR (January–July 2009)
Commanding Officer: LTC Jiří Roček
Personnel: 386
Ops Reserve Force Coy: 102 (in home station)

15th ACR Contingent KFOR (July 2009 – February 2010)
Commanding Officer: LTC Jiří Kyvála
from 10 December 2009 LTC Jan Ciňka
Personnel: 386
Ops Reserve Force Coy: 102 (in home station)

16th ACR Contingent KFOR (February–October 2010)
Commanding Officer: LTC Martin Kavalý
Personnel: 322
Ops Reserve Force Coy: 102 (in home station)

1st CZE ORF KFOR (October 2010 – July 2011)
Commanding Officer (home): LTC Jan Ciňka
Personnel (home): 503
CO core force: MAJ Ladislav Horák
Personnel: 92

1st CZE Task Force KFOR (June–November 2011)
Commanding officer: MAJ Josef Nejedlý
Personnel: 99

1st CZE Team HQ KFOR (August 2011 – February 2012)
Commanding Officer: MAJ Pavel Udvorka
Personnel: 7

2nd CZE Team HQ KFOR (February–August 2012)
Commanding Officer: LTC Vladimir Petera
Personnel: 6

3rd CZE Team HQ KFOR (August 2012 – February 2013)
Commanding Officer: LTC Ales Stybor
Personnel: 7

ESSENTIAL HARVEST
– FYROM / MACEDONIA

Mission:
security of the Headquarters
Multinational Brigade and relay stations;
escorting supply convoys; patrolling in the HQ
MNB area; developing the MNB Commander’s
airborne reserve force
Base: Skopje

43rd Airborne Company (August–October 2001)
Company commander: CAPT Oldřich Nápravník
Personnel: 120

ENDURING FREEDOM – KUWAIT
CBRN DEFENCE UNITS

Mission:
protection of coalition forces
and civilian population against intentional
use of chemical, biologic, radiological or
nuclear weapons or systems; radiological,
chemical and biologic surveillance
coverage along with a sustained and
continuous detection and early warning; performance of
assignments in support civil defence of the State of Kuwait;
consequence management following the use of weapons of mass
destruction or accidents in an assigned area of responsibility
Bases: Camp Doha, Kuwait City

9th Reinforced Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear
Defence Company (March–September 2002)
Commanding Officer: COL Josef Proklá
from 5 August 02 LTC Dušan Lupuljev
Personnel: 251

4th Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear
Defence Detachment (September 2002 – February 2003)
Commanding officer: COL Jan Weiser
Personnel: 251

1st Czech-Slovak Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear
Defence Battalion (February–June 2003)
Commanding officer: COL Dušan Lupuljev
Personnel: 395

ISAF – AFGHANISTAN

FIELD HOSPITAL – KABUL

Mission:
provide Role 3 medical care to
the injured, the burnt and ill both during
combat activities and at other times;
short-term in-patient treatment for ISAF
service personnel; provide medical and
humanitarian aid to the local population
Base: KAIA

6th Field Hospital (May–October 2002)
Commanding Officer: COL Jindřich Sitta
Personnel: 140

11th Field Hospital (October 2002 – February 2003)
Commanding Officer: LTC Marek Obreťel
Personnel: 140

Field Surgical Team (February–April 2003)
Commanding Officer: COL Peter Gál
Personnel: 12

EOD & METEO – KABUL

Mission:
EOD reconnaissance, disposal of unexploded ordnance,
improvised explosive devices and engineer reconnaissance
of the Kabul International Airport area; meteorological support to
air traffic management; measuring and sharing hydrological and
meteorological data
Base: KAIA

1st EOD Detachment ISAF KAIA (March–September 2004)
Commanding officer: MAJ Radek Augustýn
Personnel: 16

2nd EOD Detachment ISAF KAIA (September 2004 – March 2005)
Commanding officer: CAPT Zbyněk Koza
Personnel: 16
3rd EOD Detachment ISAF KAIA (March–September 2005)
Commanding officer: LTC Milan Pavlík
Personnel: 15

4th EOD Detachment ISAF KAIA (September 2005 – March 2006)
Commanding officer: MAJ Bořek Vaříček
Personnel: 17

5th EOD Detachment ISAF KAIA (March–September 2006)
Commanding officer: MAJ Zdeněk Hejpetr
Personnel: 18

6th EOD Detachment ISAF KAIA (September 2006 – March 2007)
Commanding officer: MAJ Martin Kolář
Personnel: 19

PRT FAYZABAD, BADAKHSHAN PROVINCE

Mission: Provide security to the German PRT; security of the Fayzabad airfield; escorting vehicles and PRT resupplying convoys; liaison with the locals; patrolling in assigned area of responsibility and situational awareness
Base: Fayzabad

1st PRT Fayzabad ISAF (March–October 2005)
Commanding officer: MAJ Miroslav Vybíhal
Personnel: 40

2nd PRT Fayzabad ISAF (October 2005 – March 2006)
Commanding officer: LTC Radek Černý
Personnel: 44

3rd PRT Fayzabad ISAF (March–October 2006)
Commanding officer: LTC Tibor Budík
Personnel: 83

4th PRT Fayzabad ISAF (October 2006 – March 2007)
Commanding officer: MAJ Peter Salák
Personnel: 82

5th PRT Fayzabad ISAF (March–August 2007)
Commanding officer: COL Aleš Opatá
Personnel: 96

6th PRT Fayzabad ISAF (August–December 2007)
Commanding officer: LTC Petr Prochážka
Personnel: 86

LEAD NATION KAIA – KABUL

Mission: performing the lead nation role at the Kabul International Airport; provide aerodrome daily operations management; provide security for civilian persons at the airport and its preparation for handover to civilian representatives and the Afghan Government
Base: KAIA

1st Contingent LN KAIA ISAF (November 2006 – April 2007)
Commanding officer: COL Bohuslav Dvorák
Personnel: 47

FIELD HOSPITAL AND CBRN DEFENCE UNIT & METEO & AIR OMLT – KABUL

Mission: Provide Role 2E medical care to injured, burnt and ill patients both during ISAF combat operations and at other times; short-term in-patient treatment for ISAF service personnel; provide medical and humanitarian aid to the local population; performance of CBRN reconnaissance, sampling and identification of agents in a mobile lab; CBRN assessment and early warning for forces and local authorities; personnel decontamination up to platoon level; meteo support to air traffic management; performance of measurements and sharing hydrometeorological data; observation and assessment of basic meteo elements and phenomena; since April 2008, training Afghan Air Force personnel on Mi-17 and Mi-24/35 helicopters.
Base: KAIA

1st FH and CBRN contingent (April–August 2007)
Commanding officer: COL Zoltán Bubeník
Personnel: 98

2nd FH and CBRN contingent (August–December 2007)
Commanding officer: COL Igor Krivosudský
Personnel: 99

3rd FH and CBRN contingent (December 2007 – April 2008)
Commanding officer: COL Marek Koevrlíč
Personnel: 104

4th FH and CBRN contingent (April–August 2008)
Commanding officer: COL Mojmir Mrva
Personnel: 104

5th FH and CBRN contingent (August–December 2008)
Commanding officer: MAJ Martin Benda
Personnel: 105

MP SOG – HELMAND

Mission: training ANA forces; assistance on force development, internal security operations with ANA forces; ANP training support
Base: Camp Shank

1st SOG contingent ISAF (April–October 2007)
Commanding officer: MAJ Petr Krčmář
Personnel: 35

2nd SOG contingent SOG ISAF (October 2007 – April 2008)
Commanding officer: MAJ Pavel Růžička
Personnel: 35

3rd SOG contingent ISAF (April–October 2008)
Commanding officer: LTC Miroslav Murček
From August 2008: MAJ Pavel Horník
Personnel: 35/23

PROVINCIAL RECONSTRUCTION TEAM LOGAR

Mission: support humanitarian aid and reconstruction activities in the province; security of the PRT civilian component; ANSF training; monitoring and assessment of military and civilian situation; providing base security; maintaining dialogue with the province governor and district governors; performance of confidence-building activities with local authorities so as to minimise the risk of conflict
Base: Camp Shank

1st PRT Logar ISAF (March–August 2008)
Commanding officer: COL Ivo Střecha
Personnel: 198

2nd PRT Logar ISAF (August 2008 – February 2009)
Commanding officer: LTC Pavel Lipka
Personnel: 200

3rd PRT Logar ISAF (February–August 2009)
Commanding officer: LTC Petr Prochážka
Personnel: 275

4th PRT Logar ISAF (August 2009 – February 2010)
Commanding officer: LTC Milan Schulc
Personnel: 275
### 5th PRT Logar ISAF (February–August 2010)
- **Commanding officer**: COL Rudolf Honzák
- **Personnel**: 275

### 6th PRT Logar ISAF (August 2010 – February 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Ctibor Gazda
- **Personnel**: 283

### 7th PRT Logar ISAF (February–August 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: COL Miroslav Hlaváč
- **Personnel**: 293

### 8th PRT Logar ISAF (August 2011 – February 2012)
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Pavel Andráško
- **Personnel**: 292

### 9th PRT Logar ISAF (February–August 2012)
- **Commanding officer**: COL Antonín Genser
- **Personnel**: 293

### 10th PRT Logar ISAF (August 2012 – February 2013)
- **Commanding officer**: COL Josef Kopecký
- **Personnel**: 293

### URUZGAN

#### 1st Contingent Uruzgan ISAF (July 2008 – January 2009)
- **Commanding officer**: MAJ Miroslav Brázda
- **Personnel**: 63

#### 2nd Contingent Uruzgan ISAF (January–April 2009)
- **Commanding officer**: CAPT Jiří Líbal
- **Personnel**: 63

### KAIA AND CBRN UNIT + METEO + AIR OMLT – KABUL

#### 1st Contingent KAIA and CBRN unit
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Pavel Jelínek
- **Personnel**: 70

#### 2nd Contingent KAIA and CBRN unit
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Jiří Pluhař
- **Personnel**: 64

#### 3rd Contingent KAIA and CBRN unit
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Josef Šimůnek
- **Personnel**: 61

### HELICOPTER UNIT – PAKTIKA

#### 1st Heli Unit ISAF (December 2009 – March 2010)
- **Commanding officer**: COL Petr Schwarz
- **Personnel**: 100

#### 2nd Heli Unit ISAF (March–June 2010)
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Milan Koutný
- **Personnel**: 99

#### 3rd Heli Unit ISAF (June–October 2010)
- **Commanding officer**: MAJ Robert Papš
- **Personnel**: 99

#### 4th Heli Unit ISAF (October 2010 – January 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: COL Jaromír Sebesta
- **Personnel**: 99

#### 5th Heli Unit ISAF (January–May 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Karol Krejčířik
- **Personnel**: 98

#### 6th Heli Unit ISAF (May–August 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: COL Václav Valeš
- **Personnel**: 99

#### 7th Heli Unit ISAF (August–December 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: COL Jaromír Sebesta
- **Personnel**: 99

### AMT / AAT KABUL

#### 1st AMT ISAF (April–November 2010)
- **Commanding officer**: CAPT Vladimír Vladik
- **Personnel**: 11

#### 2nd AMT ISAF (November 2010 – March 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Petr Kratochvíl
- **Personnel**: 19

#### 3rd AMT ISAF (April–August 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Rudolf Straka
- **Personnel**: 19

#### 4th AMT ISAF (August–November 2011)
- **Commanding officer**: MAJ Miroslav Borufka
- **Personnel**: 19

#### 5th AAT ISAF (November 2011 – March 2012)
- **Commanding officer**: LTC Petr Kratochvíl
- **Personnel**: 19

#### 6th AAT ISAF (March–July 2012)
- **Commanding officer**: MAJ Jaroslav Falta
- **Personnel**: 19

#### 7th AAT ISAF (July–November 2012)
- **Commanding officer**: MAJ Josef Karišek
- **Personnel**: 49
CZECH ARMED FORCED TASK FORCE ISAF + NSE – KABUL

Mission: The Czech Armed Forces Task Force ISAF provides an organisational umbrella to all Czech MoD units and components deployed in the territory of Afghanistan, including the provision of comprehensive support to the deployments.

Base: KAIA

CZE TF + NSE ISAF (June 2010 – January 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Pavel Šiška
Personnel: 55

CZE TF + 4th NSE ISAF (January–June 2011)
Commanding officer: COL Jaroslav Jirů
Personnel: 55

CZE TF + 5th NSE ISAF (June–December 2011)
Commanding officer: COL Jaroslav Strupl
Personnel: 61

CZE TF + 7th NSE ISAF (December 2011 – June 2012)
Commanding officer: COL Ján Kožiak
Personnel: 61

CZE TF + 8th NSE ISAF (June–December 2012)
Commanding officer: COL Martin Štochl
Personnel: 61

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENCE UNIT – KABUL

Mission: provide reconnaissance, sampling and identification in a mobile lab; radiological and chemical situation assessment and early warning for ISAF forces and local authorities.

Base: KAIA

9th CBRN Team ISAF (June 2010 – January 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Karel Dvonč
Personnel: 11

10th CBRN Team ISAF (January–June 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Miroslav Brážda
Personnel: 14

11th CBRN Team ISAF (June–December 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Jaroslav Bartoš
Personnel: 14

12th CBRN Team ISAF (December 2011 – June 2012)
Commanding officer: MAJ Petr Zdralaha
Personnel: 14

13th CBRN Team ISAF (June–December 2012)
Commanding officer: CAPT Věra Bielská
Personnel: 14

OMLT – WARDAK

Mission: Train, mentor and assist on planning, command and control of a battalion equivalent ANA infantry unit (kandak).

Bases: COP Carwile, COP Soltan Kheyl

1st OMLT ISAF (September 2010 – 6. March 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Ladislav Svéjda
Personnel: 54

2nd OMLT ISAF (April–September 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Michal Kucharski
Personnel: 54

3rd OMLT ISAF (October 2011 – March 2012)
Commanding officer: LTC Zdeněk Mikula
Personnel: 54

4th OMLT ISAF (April–October 2012)
Commanding officer: LTC Martin Botík
Personnel: 54

5th OMLT ISAF (November 2012 – April 2013)
Commanding officer: MAJ Igor Jašek
Personnel: 54

FIELD SURGICAL TEAM – KABUL

Mission: provide specialist medical care as a part of French medical facility.

Base: KAIA

1st FST ISAF (February–May 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Martin Oberreiter
Personnel: 10

2nd FST ISAF (May–September 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Josef Roubal
Personnel: 10

3rd FST ISAF (September 2011 – January 2012)
Commanding officer: LTC Michal Plodr
Personnel: 11

4th FST ISAF (January–June 2012)
Commanding officer: MAJ Tomáš Dušek
Personnel: 11

5th FST ISAF (June–September 2012)
Commanding officer: MAJ Radek Pohnán
Personnel: 11

6th FST ISAF (September 2012 – January 2013)
Commanding officer: LTC Ivo Žvák
Personnel: 11

MP TRAINING TEAM – WARDAK

Mission: training the ANP.

Base: outpost at Durani community

1st MP Trng Team ISAF (March–September 2011)
Commanding officer: CAPT Martin Čajan
Personnel: 12

2nd MP Trng Team ISAF (September 2011 – March 2012)
Commanding officer: CAPT Zdeněk Koreczki
Personnel: 12

3rd MP Trng Team ISAF (March–September 2012)
Commanding officer: MAJ Radek Ocelka
Personnel: 12

4th MP Trng Team ISAF (September 2012 – March 2013)
Commanding officer: MAJ Libor Daněk
Personnel: 12

SPECIAL FORCES TASK FORCE – NANGARHAR

Mission: perform operational assignments tasked by Commander ISAF SOF.

Base: Camp Hombre (Jelalabad)

1st SOF TF ISAF (June 2011 – January 2012)
Commanding officer: COL Karel Řehka
Personnel: 100

2nd SOF TF ISAF (January–June 2012)
Commanding officer: COL Pavel Kolář
Personnel: 100
IRAQI FREEDOM – IRAQ

7TH FIELD HOSPITAL, HUMANITARIAN DETACHMENT, MP TEAM

Mission: provide humanitarian aid, particularly by means of transportation and distribution of water and collecting and disposal of unexploded ordnance; medical care for the local population to mitigate the consequence of the postwar condition; provide specialist medical care to Czech Armed Forces personnel and other states’ armed forces’ servicemen operating in the territory of Iraq; MP – escort, security and guarding duties; provide police security to all Czech deployments

Base: Basra

(April–October 2003)
Commanding officer COL Mojmír Mrva
Personnel do 320

(October–December 2003)
Commanding officer COL Přemysl Škácha
Chief of hospital COL Vojtěch Humlíček
Personnel 280

EU OPERATION IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA (FYROM)

Mission: staff tours at the operation HQ
Base: Concordia Skopje

(April–December 2003)
Team lead MAJ Petr Sýkora
Personnel 2

IZ SFOR / MNF-I – IRAQ

MP CONTINGENT – BASRAH

Mission: provide escort, security and guard duties; police security to the Multinational Division South-East (MND-SE); training Iraqi police at the Az Zubayr Police Academy; training instructors at Iraqi police stations and training Iraqi traffic police
Base: Shaibah, Az Zubayr

MNSTC-I – BAGHDAD

Mission: training selected groups of commanders (strategic and operational command echelon officers); assistance on development of the Military Academy and the Training, Education and Doctrine Centre; assistance on developing and building security structures in Iraq

(December 2003 – March 2004)
CO 1st MP Contingent LTC Jiří Neubauer
Personnel 92

(March–June 2004)
CO 2nd MP Contingent LTC Milan Diviak
Personnel 92

Sovereignty of the Republic of Iraq was restored at 28 June 2004, and the Iraqi Zone Stabilisation Force (IZ SFOR) was renamed Multinational Forces Iraq (MNF-I) at 19 July 2004.

(October–December 2003)
CO 3rd MP Contingent LTC Luboš Bahnik
Personnel 92

(March–June 2005)
CO 5th MP Contingent LTC Jiří Neubauer
Personnel 100

(June–September 2005)
CO 7th MP Contingent LTC Pavel Chovančík
Personnel 100

(Southern Iraq Stable Base – Basra)

Mission: security of the Delta and Ritz main entry gates and security of the COB internal premises; monitoring and mentoring Iraqi Police stations
Base: Basra – COB (Contingency Operating Base)

1st CZE Contingent MNF-I (January–April 2007)
Commanding officer MAJ Jan Marša
Personnel 99

2nd CZE Contingent MNF-I (April–August 2007)
Commanding officer MAJ Marcel Kříken
Personnel 100

3rd CZE Contingent MNF-I (August–December 2007)
Commanding officer LTC Pavel Rous
Personnel 99

4th CZE Contingent MNF-I (December 2007 – June 2008)
Commanding officer MAJ Jiří Hrazdil
Personnel 99

5th CZE Contingent MNF-I (June 2008 – December 2008)
Commanding officer MAJ František Grmela
Personnel 17

6th CZE Contingent MNF-I (December 2008 – February 2009)
Commanding officer COL Zbyněk Janečka
Personnel 4
OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM – AFGHANISTAN
SPECIAL FORCES GROUP

Mission: special reconnaissance

6th Special Group (March–September 2004)
Base: Camp Mauer (Bagram airport)
Commanding officer: COL Ondrej Páleník
Personnel: 111

6th Special Group (May–October 2006)
Base: Camp Prostějov (Kandahar airfield)
Commanding officer: COL Ondrej Páleník
Personnel: 120

– 1st deployment
Base: Camp Anaconda (Kandahar)
Commanding officer: COL Milan Kovanda
Personnel: 99

601st Special Forces Group (January–August 2009)
– 2nd deployment
Commanding officer: COL Roman Kopřiva
Personnel: 96

601st Special Forces Group (August–December 2009)
– 3rd deployment
Commanding officer: COL Josef Kopecký
Personnel: 99

OPERATION ALTHEA (EUFOR) – BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

GUARD PLATOON & HELI UNIT – TUZLA

Mission: security and guarding the MNTF (N) command and camp; aerial reconnaissance and air transport of personnel and materiel
Base: Eagle Base (Tuzla)

1st CZE Contingent EUFOR (December 2004 – July 2005)
Commanding officer: LTC Radim Řehulka
Platoon leader: CAPT Miroslav Folvárský
Personnel: 85

2nd CZE contingent EUFOR (July–December 2005)
Commanding officer: LTC Pavel Hurt
Platoon leader: CAPT Karel Vlček
Personnel: 90

Commanding officer: LTC Pavel Jelinek
Platoon leader: 1LT Michal Vorschneider
Personnel: 65

4th CZE contingent EUFOR (June–December 2006)
Commanding officer: LTC Vojtěch Prýgl
Platoon leader: 1LT Jiří Novotný
Personnel: 65

5th CZE contingent EUFOR (December 2006 – July 2007)
Commanding officer: MAJ Otto Klos
Platoon leader: 1LT Lukáš Novák
Personnel: 52

6th CZE contingent EUFOR (July–December 2007)
Commanding officer: MAJ Josef Pierovsky
Personnel: 4

7th CZE contingent EUFOR (December 2007 – June 2008)
Commanding officer: LTC Petr Voborný
Personnel: 4

REPRESENTATION AT HEADQUARTERS EUFOR – SARAJEVO

Mission: staff tours at Headquarters EUFOR
Base: Butmir (Sarajevo)

1st CZE Team EUFOR (June–December 2010)
Commanding officer: MAJ Jiří Hanke
Personnel: 2

2nd CZE Team EUFOR (December 2010 – June 2011)
Commanding officer: LTC Jiří Kubík
Personnel: 2

3rd CZE Team EUFOR (June–December 2011)
Commanding officer: MAJ Milan Holusek
Personnel: 2

4th CZE Team EUFOR (December 2011 – June 2012)
Commanding officer: LTC Eduard Gregor
Personnel: 2

5th CZE Team EUFOR (June–December 2012)
Commanding officer: LTC Luděk Krč
Personnel: 2

EUFOR CHAD/RCA

REPRESENTATION AT THE OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS (EU OHQ) – FRANCE

Mission: activities in the OHQ operations team
Base: Mont Valérien

(November 2007 – August 2008)
Operations team officer: LTC Jaroslav Průcha

(August 2008 – March 2009)
Operations team officer: MAJ Josef Melichar

REPRESENTATION AT THE FORCE HEADQUARTERS (EU FHQ) – TCHAD

Mission: logistic support
Base: Ndjamen

(March 2008 – March 2009)
Logistic group officer: MAJ Leon Šoc

OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS EU BG (OHQ EU BG) – GERMANY

LIAISON TEAM AT OHQ EU BG

Mission: development of planning documentation; coordination of possible deployment of the Czech-Slovak EU Battle Group (CZE/SVK EU BG)
Base: Ulm

(April–August 2009)
Commanding officer: COL Miroslav Hlaváč
Personnel: 5

(September–December 2009)
Commanding officer: LTC Libor Grmela
Personnel: 3
### BALTIC AIR POLICING – LITHUANIA

**Mission:** policing the airspace of the Baltic States: Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in the framework of NATINADS  
**Base:** Shiauliai, Lithuania  
(May–August 2009)  
Commanding officer: MAJ Jaroslav Míka  
Personnel: 117  
(September–December 2012)  
Commanding officer: COL Petr Lanči  
Personnel: 64

### EU NAVFOR ATALANTA

**REPRESENTATION AT OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS – THE UNITED KINGDOM**

**Mission:** ACR servicemembers served staff tours at the operational headquarters commanding the counterpiracy operation at the Horn of Africa  
**Base:** Northwood  
1st CZE Team Atalanta (January–July 2010)  
Commanding officer: LTC Jozef Podoba  
Personnel: 3  
2nd CZE Team Atalanta (July 2010 – January 2011)  
Commanding officer: MAJ Vladimír Rébl  
Personnel: 3  
3rd CZE Team Atalanta (July 2011 – January 2012)  
Commanding officer: MAJ Zdeněk Fuka  
Personnel: 3  
4th CZE Team Atalanta (January–July 2012)  
Commanding officer: CAPT Jaroslav Černý  
Personnel: 3  
5th CZE Team Atalanta (January–July 2012)  
Commanding officer: MAJ Václav Řidkošil  
Personnel: 3  
6th CZE Team Atalanta (July 2012 – January 2013)  
Commanding officer: MAJ Petr Manda  
Personnel: 3

### REPRESENTATION AT MFO COMMAND HEADQUARTERS IN EGYPT

**MULTINATIONAL FORCE AND OBSERVERS (MFO)**

**Mission:** ACR members served staff tours at HQ MFO  
**Base:** El Gorah  
1st Team MFO (November 2009 – May 2010)  
Commanding officer: MAJ Oto Klos  
Personnel: 3  
2nd Team MFO (May 2010 – July 2011)  
Commanding officer: LTC Ladislav Sekan  
Personnel: 3  
3rd Team MFO (July 2011 – July 2012)  
Commanding officer: LTC Josef Lejsek  
Personnel: 3  
4th Team MFO (July 2012 – July 2013)  
Commanding officer: LTC Libor Grmela  
Personnel: 3

### Czech Armed Forces’ activities in UN observer missions (1992–2013)

#### UNGCI (UNITED NATIONS GUARDS CONTINGENT IN IRAQ) – IRAQ

The mission was established based on the Memorandum of Understanding between the UN and the Government of Iraq on providing security to humanitarian workers and creating the feeling of safety and security for Kurds and Shiites. It was a specific humanitarian mission. Our participation started in 1991 (Czechoslovak Armed Forces) and ended in April 2003. Total participation of Czechoslovak and Czech Armed Forces: 307 service personnel.

#### UNSCOM (UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL COMMISSION) – IRAQ

The mission involved inspection activities to search and dispose weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and the Czech Armed Forces personnel participated from 1991 through 1993. The mission worked in the form of inspection teams, whose composition changed as needed, and their tours varied as well. Total participation of Czechoslovak and Czech Armed Forces: 11 NBC specialists.

#### UNPROFOR (UNITED NATIONS PROTECTION FORCE) – YUGOSLAVIA

UNOMOZ (UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN MOZAMBIQUE) – MOZAMBIQUE
The mission was established to provide assistance on preparing elections in Mozambique and supervising them based on an agreement that ended civic war in the country that had lasted 14 years. The first team of 20 military observers were sent in May 1993. The effort ended in January 1995.
Total ACR participation: 39 service personnel.

UNOMIL (UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER MISSION IN LIBERIA) – LIBERIA
The mission was established in cooperation with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in September 1993 with goal to provide political stability in Liberia. A team of 15 Czech military observers were sent into the country in December 1993. As a part of general reduction of the military component, the number of Czech service personnel was reduced to 5. The effort ended in August 1997.
Total ACR participation: 34 service personnel.

UNOMIG (UNITED NATIONS OBSERVERS MISSION IN GEORGIA) – GEORGIA
UN mission established to supervise the truce between Georgia and Abkhazia. The first team of 5 milobs arrived the area in October 1994. The effort was terminated in 2009.
Total ACR participation: 73 service personnel.

UNCREO (UNITED NATIONS CONFIDENCE RESTORATION OPERATION IN CROATIA) – CROATIA
The UN mission in the territory of Croatia, one of the successors of UNPROFOR, was taking place from March 1995 till January 1996. Its area of responsibility was a Serbian-controlled territory of the Republic of Croatia. The effort was completed in January 1996.
Total ACR participation: 6 service personnel.

UNPREDEP (UNITED NATIONS PREVENTIVE DEPLOYMENT FORCE) – MACEDONIA / FYROM
The UN mission in the territory of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. It was a so-called 2nd generation missions following the division of UNPROFOR, established to provide preventive diplomacy. The mission was active in borderlands of the country from 1995 till 1999.
Total ACR participation: 3 service personnel.

UNTAES (UNITED NATIONS TRANSITIONAL ADMINISTRATION FOR EASTERN SLAVONIA) – CROATIA
One of the successors of UNPROFOR, the mission in the territory of Eastern Slavonia in Croatia took place from January 1996 till March 1998. A Czech field hospital started to operate in support of the mission in March 1996 with a specialist staff of 40 personnel (see Czech Armed Forces servicemembers in foreign deployed operations 1992–2012).
Total ACR participation: 6 service personnel.

UNMOP (UNITED NATIONS MISSION OF OBSERVERS IN PREVLAKA) – CROATIA
The UN observer mission mandated to monitor the situation on the border between Croatian territory and Montenegro. One of the successors to UNPROFOR, that mission was established in 1996. In 1996, it was augmented with several new national representations, including the Czech Republic. ACR participation terminated in December 2002.
Total ACR participation: 6 service personnel.

UNMOT (UNITED NATIONS MISSION OF OBSERVERS IN TAJIKISTAN) – TAJIKISTAN
That was an observer mission with the primary objective to supervise the observance of truce on the border between Tajikistan and Afghanistan. The mission was established in 1994. In June 1998, it was reinforced with some new national representations, including the Czech one. The effort was terminated in May 2000.
Total ACR participation: 6 service personnel.

UNMIK (UNITED NATIONS INTERIM ADMINISTRATION MISSION IN KOSOVO) – KOSOVO
UNMIK has not been an observer mission; it rather provides basic civil administration functions and support autonomous Kosovo. It also supports an in-country humanitarian aid program, where it operates by the means of a network of liaison centres. It was established based on UNSC Resolution 1244 in June 1999 and has been active to date.
Total ACR participation: 12 service personnel.

UNAMSIL (UNITED NATIONS MISSION TO SIERRA LEONE) – SIERRA LEONE
The UN observer mission was established to supervise truce between insurgent groups and governmental forces in Sierra Leone. A team of 5 military observers deployed there in October 1999. The effort continued through 2005.
Total ACR participation: 27 service personnel.
MONUSCO (MISSION DE L’ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR LA STABILISATION EN RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE DU CONGO) – DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO
MONUSCO is one of the largest UN missions supervising truce between local insurgents and governmental forces. A team of 4 Czech military observers deployed in the area for the first time in May 2000. The mission started under the name of MONUC (Mission de l’Organisation des Nations Unies en République Démocratique du Congo) and was renamed in 2011, is still active.
Total ACR participation: 39 service personnel.

UNMEE (UNITED NATIONS MISSION IN ETHIOPIA AND ERITREA) – ETHIOPIA AND ERITREA
The UN observer mission was established to develop confidence between Ethiopia and Eritrea and for the preparation of the Military Coordination Commission. In addition to that, the mission provides oversight of the withdrawal of military forces of the parties involved in the conflict and monitor observance of truce after the end of the war. A team of 2 military observers were sent into the area in January 2001. The effort was completed in 2008.
Total ACR participation: 16 service personnel.

UNMIL (UNITED NATIONS MISSION IN LIBERIA) – LIBERIA
That mission was established based on UN Security Council Resolution 1509 of 19 September 2003 with the objective to maintain security and stability in the country, provide conditions for holding presidential and parliamentary elections in 2005, realise security sector reform, renovate infrastructure etc. First Czech military observers were sent for the mission already when it was launched, the last Czech tour was served in 2008.
Total ACR participation: 17 service personnel.

UNAMA (UNITED NATIONS ASSISTANCE MISSION TO AFGHANISTAN) – AFGHANISTAN
The role of that supporting mission was to coordinate the UN civilian and military efforts in the country, provide advisory assistance to the Government of Afghanistan, support to development of Afghan National Security Forces, issues of development of society and democracy, realisation of gender related activities and coordination of humanitarian aid. Czech soldiers joined the effort, which still lasts, in 2008.
Total ACR participation: 5 service personnel.

UNSMIS (UNITED NATIONS SUPERVISION MISSION IN SYRIA) – SYRIA
Mandated to supervise ceasefire and provide support to the fulfilment of the Peace Plan in Syria, the mission was commenced in 2012.
Total ACR participation: 3 service personnel.

Czech Armed Forces’ activities in OSCE observer missions (1992–2013)

OSCE – GEORGIA
One or two Czech Armed Forces’ military monitors-supervisors performed duties in the territory of Georgia from 1994. The mission controlled from the CPC/OSCE centre in Vienna had a similar assignment as the UNOMIG observer mission established to supervise truce between Georgia and Abkhazia. The mission ended in 2005.
Total ACR participation: 14 service personnel.

OSCE – MOLDOVA
The mission was also controlled from the CPC/OCSE in Vienna. It was tasked to monitor the situation in the Dniester area in the territory of Moldova. The Czech participation ended in September 1997, and the whole mission was closed down in December later that year.
Total ACR participation: 3 service personnel.

OSCE – NAGORNO KARABAKH
The Czech Armed Forces personnel filled the post of “field assistant” to the mission head and performed duties continuously from 1995, with responsibilities being very much similar as in the mission in the territory of Georgia. The effort was concluded in October 2001.
Total ACR participation: 5 service personnel.
OSCE – Bosnia and Herzegovina
The mission operated in the form of regional headquarters in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina where it had been active from the beginning of 1996. The ACR filled several posts based on the national contingent rotation key. The effort was terminated in August 2001.
Total ACR participation: 17 service personnel.

OSCE – Croatia
The mission in the territory of Croatia commenced in October 1997, and the Czech participation ended in May 2001. ACR servicemembers were primarily assigned to monitor human rights.
Total ACR participation: 11 service personnel.

OSCE – Chechnya
The Czech participation in the mission began in September 1998 by assigning a Czech soldier to the post of an assistance group member. The individual terminated his assignment in March 2001.
Total ACR participation: 1 servicemember.

OSCE – Albania
From January 1999 till February 2001, there was always one individual assigned to the post of monitor-supervisor.
Total ACR participation: 3 service personnel.

KVM (Kosovo Verification Mission) – Kosovo
An OSCE led mission designed to supervise the situation in Kosovo as tensions escalated in spring 1999. The mission failed as the situation came to head with the “Kosovo crisis” and the arrival of KFOR forces. Eight Czech Armed Forces personnel were progressively sent into the area; 7 were sent back in March 1999, and one individual continued tour as a liaison officer in the OSCE mission in Albania.
Total ACR participation: 8 service personnel.

OSCE – Kosovo
After the termination of the Kosovo Verification Mission, one Czech Armed Forces soldier served there from March 1999 till February 2000. Another servicemember transferred to Kosovo from the OSCE mission in Albania. The effort ended in September 2001.
Total ACR participation: 2 service personnel.

Czech Armed Force’s activities in missions of other international organisations (1992–2013)

NNSC – Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission – Korean Peninsula
The United Nations established the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission (NNSC) already in 1954 as a vehicle to supervise armistice following the Korean crisis. The responsibility for coordinating the Czech participation was assigned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Czech Armed Forces participated with 6 persons. Total participation counts in dozens of persons, but the Foreign Relations Directorate of the General Staff Czechoslovak People’s Army did not keep any records. The Czech participation was terminated at 10 April 1993.
Total participation of the Czechoslovak People’s, Czechoslovak and Czech Armed Forces was not documented.

MAPEXT-WEU – Albania
A Czech medical team operated as a part of that mission in Albania from August 1998. The mission was led by the West European Union. The Czech participation was covered using national funds and ended on 30 June 2001.
Total ACR participation: 8 service personnel.

Courtesy of MoD Joint Operations Center
The Pandor II wheeled IFV is an amphibious vehicle with a permanent drive of the 1st, 3rd and 4th axles and an engageable 2nd axle drive. Its features include high manoeuvrability, agility, off-road mobility, and capability to traverse water obstacles and streams by swimming. It also provides adequate ballistic protection to its crew. The Pandor II can engage enemy personnel and light- and medium-armoured targets and provide fire support to dismounted troops from vehicle-mounted weapons from a stationary position, during a short stop or on the move, against stationary or moving targets, both in daytime and at night or in reduced visibility conditions.

The Armed Forces of the Czech Republic will use six role versions of the vehicle, namely KBVP (wheeled infantry fighting vehicle), KBV-VR (wheeled fighting vehicle – company commander), KBV-Pz RL (wheeled fighting vehicle – reconnaissance, with radar), KBV-Pz (wheeled fighting vehicle – reconnaissance, without radar), KOT-Z (wheeled armoured personnel carrier – combat engineers) and KOT-Zdr (wheeled armoured personnel carrier – ambulance).

The KBVP role version is armed with the RCWS-30 remote-controlled weapon station with a 30mm ATK Mk44 automatic gun, a 7.62mm M240 coaxial machine gun and a SPIKE-LR ATGM launcher.

**Basic tactical and technical specifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>7,384 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>2,670 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, top of hull</td>
<td>2,080 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>448 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>20,800 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top speed on the road</td>
<td>110 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>700 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming speed</td>
<td>10 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>3 + 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LOV 50 B Iveco M65E 19WM 4×4 light armoured vehicle is intended for motorized troops, in particular for engaging enemy personnel, light-armoured and soft-skinned vehicles and other lightly fortified objects. It is a robust, highly mobile military vehicle that can seat five (1 + 4). It is based on a M65E 19WM 4×4 chassis with a permanent all-wheel drive and meets STANAG 4569 Annex A LEVEL 3 (ballistic protection) and STANAG 4569 Annex B LEVEL 2 (protection against explosion) requirements.

The LOV 50 B serves as a platform for different role versions. The version in service with the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic is armed with the Kongsberg PROTECTOR M151 A2 remote-controlled, fully stabilized weapon station with a 12.7mm M2 machine gun. Alternatively, the vehicles are armed with the ZSRD-07 remote-controlled weapon station with a 7.62mm FN MAG machine gun, or serve as ambulances.

**Basic tactical and technical specifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>4,800 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>2,200 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Rover Defender 130 Military-Armoured 4 Kajman

The six-seat vehicle is designed for combat and special missions conducted by an airborne battalion assigned to an Alliance battle group or a peace support operation outside the territory of the Czech Republic. Its characteristic features include high deployment readiness, air transportability and ability to be parachuted or ferried by a helicopter to wherever it is required to conduct a special mission. It allows a rapid conversion between “transport” and “combat” configurations; insofar as the latter is concerned, the vehicle can be armed with a) a 12.7mm NSV machine gun and a 7.62mm TPKB machine gun; b) two 7.62mm TPKB machine guns; c) a 7.62mm TPKB machine gun and a 30mm AGS-17 grenade launcher; or d) a 7.62mm TPKB machine gun and 12.7mm PL 38/46 DShKM anti-aircraft machine gun.

Special modifications and equipment may include STANAG 4569 LEVEL 1 spall liner enhancing crew protection in the front part and on the bottom of the vehicle, or bulletproof glass. In addition to communication equipment, the vehicle is also fitted with a WARN XDC 12 V winch the rated line pull of which is 42.2 kN (4,300 kg).

Basic tactical and technical specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>6,060 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>2,245 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>2,660 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>220 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum permissible weight</td>
<td>4,200 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top speed on the road</td>
<td>110 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>540 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradient</td>
<td>30°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical step</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fording</td>
<td>500 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>1 + 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tatra T810 medium off-road truck

Between 2008 and 2009, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic replaced the venerable Praga V3S by the Tatra T810 medium off-road truck in different role versions – platform truck with a tail lift unit, truck carrying a box-shaped superstructure, container carrier, load-handling unit, platform truck with double controls, or platform truck with a fully armoured cab. The Tatra T810 has a ladder frame and a chassis with rigid portal axles. Its RDXi7 six-cylinder in-line supercharged engine delivering 177 kW meets EURO 3 emission limits. The Tatra T810 is the first-ever off-road truck in the service of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic which is equipped with disc brakes on all wheels. The cab floor is up-armoured by a steel plate. The three-seat cab can be tilted forward (cab-over-engine), is air-conditioned and designed to allow the installation of add-on armour. It has a roof hatch with a 7.62mm Model 59 machine gun mount.

Basic tactical and technical specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>7,750 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>2,550 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>3,200 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum GVW</td>
<td>13,000 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payload</td>
<td>4,750 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top speed on the road</td>
<td>100 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>800 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fording</td>
<td>1,200 mm (incl. wave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>3 + 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T-72M4 CZ Main Battle Tank

The T-72M4 CZ Main Battle Tank has an up-to-date fire control system with thermal night vision devices, a new powerpack including an automatic transmission and an engine delivering 736 kW, and an add-on armour package significantly increasing the tank’s battlefield survivability. Compared to the T-72 MBT it is based on, its combat efficiency, mobility and crew protection have been substantially improved. Its 125mm main gun with an autoloader can use high-performance anti-tank ammunition. The tank’s secondary armament includes a 12.7mm machine gun and a 7.62mm machine gun.

Basic tactical and technical specifications
- Length, including the main gun: 9,800 mm
- Width: 3,800 mm
- Height: 2,700 mm
- Combat weight: 48,000 kg
- Top speed on the road: 61 km/h
- Range: 700 km
- Crew: 3

JAS-39C Gripen multi-role combat aircraft

The Gripen is a single-seat (or two-seat in the case of a training version) single-engine mid-wing aircraft with a delta wing in the rear part of the fuselage and canard control surfaces aft of the cockpit. It is a fourth-plus (4+) generation fighter plane, the primary mission of which is to protect the airspace of the Czech Republic and possibly also of other NATO allies; however, its concept allows it to engage ground or naval targets as well. Due to its three-leg nosewheel landing gear, it can take off and land on short runways, grassy airstrips or highway sections. Its onboard armament consists of a 27mm automatic gun. The Gripen’s external pylons can carry AIM-120 AMRAAM or AIM-9 Sidewinder air-to-air and AGM-65 MAVERICK air-to-ground missiles, and, if necessary, also Meteor and IRIS-T air-to-air and RBS-15 anti-ship missiles.

Basic tactical and technical specifications
- Wingspan: 8.4 m
- Length: 14.1 m
- Height: 4.7 m
- Maximum takeoff weight: 13,000 kg
- Maximum ordnance weight: 4,200 kg
- Top speed (at 12–18 km above the ground): 2,128 km/h
- Top speed (at 1 km above the ground): 1,223 km/h
- Time of climb to 10 km: 120 s
- Time of climb to 14 km: 180 s
- Ferry range: 3,000 km
- Combat radius with 2000 kg of payload: 700 km
- Crew: 1 pilot

CASA C-295 M

The CASA C-295 M is a twin-turboprop tactical military transport aircraft designed to haul cargo and personnel to short and medium distances. It can carry up to 66 passengers or 46 fully equipped paratroops. The aircraft can also be configured for medevac operations; in this capacity, it can carry up to 24 stretcher patients and accompanying medical personnel.

The 46.9 m³ cargo bay can accommodate palletized cargo weighing up to 9,250 kg. With this cargo, the airplane’s range is 1,200 km. With a 6,000 kg load, the range is extended up to 3,900 km.

Basic tactical and technical specifications
- Wingspan: 25.81 m
- Length: 24.5 m
- Height: 8.66 m
- Maximum takeoff weight: 23,200 kg
- Payload: 9,250 kg
- Cruise speed: 480 km/h
- Service ceiling: 9,150 m
- Range / Number of passengers: 5,500 km / up to 66
- Crew: 2 pilots
Airbus A-319 CJ

The Airbus A-319 CJ is a twin-engine jet airplane designed to transport personnel and cargo to long distances. The A-319 CJ is a corporate version of the standard A-319 model. It has extra fuel tanks in the cargo bay, which give it an extended 12,000km range. The first aircraft was delivered in December 2006, the other in October 2007. Both are named after Czech WW2 veterans, Generals Karel Janoušek and Josef Ocelka. In March 2011, the two military transport aircraft flew to Japan to evacuate 106 people after the disastrous earthquake and tsunami.

Basic tactical and technical specifications

- Wingspan: 34.1 m
- Length: 33.84 m
- Height: 11.76 m
- Maximum takeoff weight: 75,500 kg
- Cruise speed: 840–850 km/h
- Range / Number of passengers: 6,480 km / 98 personnel
- Range / Number of passengers: 8,660 km / 42 personnel
- Crew: 2 pilots

L-159 ALCA

The L-159 ALCA is a single-engine single-seat (or two-seat in the case of a training version designated L-159T1) lightweight multi-role subsonic tactical low-wing monoplane with a one-piece tapered wing. It is designed to destroy ground targets and to provide direct support to ground forces, to engage air targets at short and medium distances, and to perform tactical reconnaissance. Its armament and equipment allows it to operate both in daytime and at night.

In addition to a 20mm pod-mounted twin-barrel ZPL-20 "Plamen" automatic gun, it can carry short-range air-to-air missiles, different types of bombs, air-to-ground missiles or auxiliary external fuel tanks.

Basic tactical and technical specifications

- Wingspan: 9.54 m
- Length: 12.72 m
- Height: 4.87 m
- Maximum takeoff weight: 8,000 kg
- Maximum ordnance weight: 2,700 kg
- Top speed: 935 km/h
- Climb rate close to the ground: 53 m/s
- Combat radius: 420–950 km
- Crew: 1

Mi-171Sh transport helicopter

The Mi-171Sh is the latest upgrade of the Mi-8/Mi helicopter. Its improved powerful engines perform better in high altitudes or in an environment with a high air temperature. The redesigned tail section houses a hydraulic access ramp which allows cargoes to be loaded and unloaded faster and more safely than with the original bridges. The upgrade has made the rotary-wing aircraft combat-deployable. However, the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic does not plan to use the helicopter in this capacity; instead of weapons, the side pylons can carry external fuel tanks which will extend the flight duration up to six hours.

Tactical and technical specifications

- Length: 25.45 m
- Height: 5.52 m
- Main rotor diameter: 21.3 m
- Empty weight: 7,640 kg
- Maximum takeoff weight: 13,000 kg
- Maximum onboard cargo weight: 4,000 kg / 24 passengers
- Maximum underslung cargo weight: 4,000 kg
- Maximum crane load: 150/300 kg
- Cruise speed: 240 km/h
- Static ceiling: 3,980 m
- Dynamic ceiling: 6,000 m
Maximum range ........................................ 950 km
Combat radius ........................................ 495 km
Crew ......................................................... 2 pilots + engineer
Cargo bay dimensions: Length .................... 5.34 m
                               Width .................. 2.3 m
                               Height .................. 1.8 m

**W-3A Sokol helicopter**

The W-3A Sokol is a twin-engine multi-purpose helicopter. The Czech Air Force operates two role versions, a SAR (Search and Rescue) one, and a transport version capable of carrying up to 12 passengers or a cargo weighing up to 2,200 kg. Both versions can also carry a Bambi bucket and be used to fight fires. The helicopter is equipped with a four-blade main rotor and a three-blade tail rotor. The capacity of its onboard tanks is up to 1,700 litres of fuel. The instrument/avionics suite allows the aircraft to operate in adverse weather conditions or at night.

**Basic tactical and technical specifications**

- Length ........................................ 18.8 m
- Height .......................................... 4.2 m
- Main rotor diameter .............................. 15.7 m
- Empty weight .................................... 3,300 kg
- Maximum takeoff weight ...................... 6,400 kg
- Payload ........................................... 2,200 kg
- Top speed ........................................ 260 km/h
- Cruise speed ..................................... 235 km/h
- Endurance ........................................ 3.5 h
- Service ceiling .................................. 6,000 m
- Climb rate close to the ground ............. 9.1 m/s
- Range .............................................. 1,225 km
- Crew ................................................ 2 pilots + engineer
- Cargo bay dimensions: Length .............. 3.2 m
                                   Width .................. 1.55 m
                                   Height .................. 1.38 m

**5.56 x 45 mm CZ 805 BREN A1/A2 assault rifle**

The CZ 805 A1 assault rifle and the CZ 805 A2 carbine (with a shorter) represent a unified modular weapon system using 5.56 x 45 mm NATO ammunition and offering three firing modes (single shots, double taps, continuous bursts). The weapon can be used for any combat activity, including those involving the use of personal CBRN protective equipment, winter clothing articles, body armour elements or tactical goggles. The weapon is designed for aimed fire at ground, lightly armoured and air targets.

**Accessories:** collimator-type ZD-Dot red dot sight, transparent plastic magazine for 30 rounds, three-point strap, magazine pouch (for two or three magazines), combat knife and scabbard, night vision sight, NV-Mag3 night vision riflescope, magnifying module, DV-Mag3 daytime riflescope, PPGrip and MVG tactical grips/bipods, underslung CZ 805 G1 grenade launcher.

**Tactical and technical specifications (A1 / A2)**

- Calibre ........................................... 5.56 x 45 mm
- Length, with unfolded shoulder stock unfolded .... 868 mm / 782 mm
- Length, with folded shoulder stock .................. 670 mm / 587 mm
- Length, with unfolded shoulder stock and a combat knife fitted .............................. 1,050 mm
- Weight, including a full magazine and strap ........ 4,120 g / 4,075 g
- Effective range of fire .................................. 500 m / 400 m
- Maximum range of fire .................................. 4,300 m
- Number of magazines .................................. 8
- Technical lifecycle duration ......................... at least 20 years
FN Minimi light machine gun

The versatile Minimi machine gun developed by Fabrique Nationale Herstal, Belgium, is a long-barrelled, fully automatic military weapon designed to engage individual human targets or groups of enemy personnel, lightly armoured or soft-skinned vehicles, low-flying air targets at a distance up to 1,000 m, or for harassing fire up to its maximum range, i.e. 4,000 m. It is the primary support weapon of a squad (platoon), carried and served by a single soldier. However, it can also be mounted on a tripod or integrated onto a vehicle, in which configuration it also offers limited capabilities of a universal machine gun.

Basic tactical and technical specifications
- Calibre: 7.62 × 51 mm NATO
- Maximum length: 1,015 mm
- Width: 128 mm
- Height: 230 mm
- Height, including bipod: 340 mm
- Unloaded/loaded weight: 8.5/11.8 kg
- Effective range of fire: 1,000 m
- Maximum range of fire: 4,100 m
- Combat rate of fire: 50–400 rounds/minute
- Muzzle velocity: 810 m/s

Carl Gustaf M3 recoilless rifle

The Carl Gustaf M3 is a multi-role recoilless weapon. Due to a wide assortment of rounds it can use, it is able to engage tanks, armoured vehicles, field fortifications, enemy infantry hiding in buildings, in the open or in trenches, and can be also employed to illuminate or lay a smoke screen on the battlefield. Depending on the round type, its range may be up to 700 meters.

Ammunition used – HEAT 751, HEAT 551, TP 552, HEDP 502, HE 441, SMOKE 469, ILLUM 545, TPT 141 a 553 B.

Basic tactical and technical specifications
- Calibre: 84 mm
- Length: 1,065 mm
- Weight: 10 kg
- Range: up to 700 m
- Practical rate of fire: 6 rounds/minute
- Crew: 2

ANTOS LR-2 mortar

The ANTOS LR mortar is designed to increase the firepower of airborne, reconnaissance and special units. Its role is to act as an artillery support weapon at the squad or platoon level. It is designed to engage enemy personnel hiding in trenches or shelters, especially in situations which do not permit the use of direct fire (positions on reverse slopes, in ravines etc.), to demolish roadblocks and obstacles, observation posts, gun emplacements, local pockets of resistance, bases, depots etc. The weapon makes use of 60mm Model 99 rounds in six different versions – high explosive/incendiary (HEI), high explosive fragmentary (HEF), PR-S and JUMP training rounds, illumination (ILLUM) and smoke (SMK).

Basic tactical and technical specifications
- Calibre: 60.7 mm
- Barrel length: 1,000 mm
- Weight of combat-deployed weapon: 15.9 kg
- Total weight, including accessories: 43 kg
- Minimum range: 102 m
- Maximum range: 3,098 m
- Rate of fire: 20 rounds/minute
- Crew: 2
OP 99 FALCON sniper rifle

The Falcon large-calibre sniper rifle is used mainly by ground and special forces. It is designed to engage point targets, such as command and control assets of rocket and artillery units, light armoured vehicles, communication assets, radars, helicopters, and fuel or ammunition depots, at great distances. Its standard version is equipped with a ZD 10 × 50 daytime riflescope and mechanical sights.

**Basic tactical and technical specifications**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calibre</td>
<td>12.7 × 99 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon length</td>
<td>1,290 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel length</td>
<td>927 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>13.4 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective range</td>
<td>1,600 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective range</td>
<td>800 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzzle velocity</td>
<td>790–900 m/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glock 17 pistol

The Glock 17 pistol is an individual weapon designed for self-protection and engaging enemy personnel at short distances (up to 50 m). It is a semi-automatic handgun the loading principle of which is based on a short rearward movement of the barrel combined with a cam that forces the barrel down as it moves rearward. When the pistol is fired, its breech is in the front position. Its properties, including simple design, reliability, low weight and reasonable accuracy, have made it popular among members of the Military Police.

**Takticko-technická data**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calibre</td>
<td>9 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>9 × 19 Luger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall length</td>
<td>185 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel length</td>
<td>114 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty weight</td>
<td>620 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full magazine weight</td>
<td>260 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum range</td>
<td>approx. 2,000 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective range of fire</td>
<td>50 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzzle velocity</td>
<td>360 m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine capacity</td>
<td>17 rounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RBS-70 man-portable short-range air-defence system

The RBS-70 MANPADS is designed to destroy enemy airborne attack and tactical assets, such as cruise missiles, glider bombs and cluster bombs dropped by aircraft in order to provide air defence to manoeuvre ground units engaged in all types of combat, to protect important industrial and military facilities, and to secure airspace as part of emergency or counter-terrorist measures. The system offers a possibility of plugging in an IFF system.

**Basic tactical and technical specifications**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>semi-automatic command to line-of-sight (SACLOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target tracking</td>
<td>manual/visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile type</td>
<td>man-portable surface-to-air missile, Mk1, Mk2 or BOLIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of the system: Sight</td>
<td>34 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile</td>
<td>27 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.3–8 km (depending on missile type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>3–5 km (depending on missile type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment time</td>
<td>30 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reloading time</td>
<td>do 5 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum target acquisition to launch time</td>
<td>5 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Božena 5 mine clearing vehicle

The Božena 5 mine clearing vehicle is designed to dispose of anti-personnel and anti-tank mines by detonating or mechanically destroying them. The demining system consists of a set of mutually complementing elements and tool attachments designed for rapid deployment and quick transport to the demining site. It is used to clear large areas of mines in peacetime conditions, employing a flail unit attached to the quick coupler of the remote-controlled primary B-5 vehicle. Due to its wide assortment of tools and attachments, the system offers a broad range of applications — from mine clearing to destruction of low dense vegetation, earthmoving operations, handling of hazardous materials or evacuation of casualties.

Basic tactical and technical specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demining unit length</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>7,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5 primary vehicle length</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>4,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flail unit width</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flail unit maximum width</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine-cleared strip width</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>2,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary vehicle height</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>2,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total weight, including flail unit</td>
<td>kg</td>
<td>12,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimum demining speed of flail unit</td>
<td>rev/m</td>
<td>350–500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel speed</td>
<td>km/h</td>
<td>4–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demining speed</td>
<td>km/h</td>
<td>0.1–0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demining rate</td>
<td>m2/h</td>
<td>1,000–5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote-controllable up to</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tatra 6×6 815-7 EOD/IEDD special truck

The vehicle is designed to carry EOD/IEDD teams and their equipment. A low-slung cab makes the vehicle C-130 Hercules-transportable. The Tatra 6×6 815-7 EOD/IEDD has a permanent rear axle drive and an engageable front axle drive, ABS and CTIS. Its engine meets EURO 2 emission limits. The chassis and the cab are up-armoured to withstand a mine explosion and the superstructure provides ballistic protection to crewmembers. The cab is equipped with an overpressure air filtration system, a heated windshield and an air conditioning system.

The superstructure – EOD/IEDD team workplace — houses a Panda 12 kW generation unit, air filtration and air conditioning systems, modular racks, a 500 kg tail lifting platform, a telescopic mast with a halogen floodlight, an intercom system, a mechanical workstation and a workstation of the thEODor robot operator.

Basic tactical and technical specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>9,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fording</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine power output</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

thEODor EOD robot

The remote-controlled automatic tracked robotic vehicle is used by specialized engineer and EOD teams to inspect, remove or dispose of dangerous or suspicious objects posing a threat of explosion. The battery-powered vehicle can also climb stairs and the revolving arm of its multi-role manipulator can lift a load weighing up to 30 kg. It can carry other tools and attachments, such as an X-ray unit to examine a suspicious object or a disruptor.

Basic tactical and technical specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>kg</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full operation time</td>
<td>hours</td>
<td>3–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Rover RCH CBRN reconnaissance vehicle

The Land Rover RCH vehicle is designed to perform CBRN reconnaissance tasks. Its equipment allows either a manual reconnaissance mode, or an automated mode of collection, evaluation and transmission of information. Its principal components are a Land Rover Defender 130 TD 5V vehicle with a driver’s cab, a box body, a special CBRN superstructure and a box-body twin-axle trailer.

**Tactical and technical specifications**
- Length: 5,160 mm
- Width: 2,005 mm
- Height: 2,840 mm
- Weight: 3,495 kg
- Pressurized space overpressure: at least 250 Pa

VERA S/M passive surveillance system

The unique passive surveillance system is designed to search for, identify and keep track of airborne, but also naval, targets, using signals emitted by their onboard radars, navigation instruments, communication devices and other sources of electromagnetic signals. The VERA S/M passive surveillance system typically comprises one central and three side sites and a number of other evaluation and logistic elements. It provides information both on the position and heading of the targets it is tracking and on some parameters of their onboard radar systems.

**Basic tactical and technical specifications**
- Accuracy: 50–500 m
- Range: 450 km
- Arc sector: more than 120°
- Capacity of target library: 10,000
- Number of tracked targets: up to 200 simultaneously
- Crew: 1 operator at the situation display

RAT-31DL radar

The modern three-dimensional FAD (Fixed Air Defence) radar at Sokolnice, off Slavkov u Brna, is an important contribution to the security of the Czech Republic and other NATO allies. Together with a similar radar installation at Nepolisy, it will become a part of the trunk radar network of the Alliance’s integrated air defence system (NATINADS). This is why most of its construction costs were financed from the NATO budget. The radar provides a continuous picture of the airspace situation within a radius of up to 470 km.

**Basic tactical and technical specifications**
- Radar height: 25.5 m
- Protective spherical radome diameter: 18 m
- Range: 470 km

Source: Equipment Repair Facility Štěpánov, MoD PDD
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MoD Defence Decorations

National Defence Cross of the Minister of Defence of the Czech Republic

Golden Linden Decoration of the Minister of Defence of the Czech Republic

Cross of Merit of the Minister of Defence of the Czech Republic 1st Class

Medal of the Minister of Defence of the Czech Republic, For injury

Medal of the Minister of Defence of the Czech Republic, For Service Abroad

Czech Armed Forces Service Medal 1st Class
Annex 11

List of Generals promoted in 1993–2012

Generals promoted post-mortem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Bohumil Borecký</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Zdeněk Gold</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Hošt</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Bohumír Koblíha</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Kosík</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Kozera</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Rudolf Martinec</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Perníkář</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Alois Sitek</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Emil Grégr</td>
<td>8 May 2000</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Stanislav Kraus</td>
<td>8 May 2000</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Karel Kuttelwascher</td>
<td>8 May 2000</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Alois Laub</td>
<td>8 May 2000</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General František Němec</td>
<td>8 May 2000</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jan Štursa</td>
<td>8 May 2000</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Václav Morávek</td>
<td>8 May 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Josef Bryks</td>
<td>11 Nov 2008</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generals promoted into higher general ranks post mortem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Balabán</td>
<td>8 May 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Mašín</td>
<td>8 May 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generals promoted after the end of active duty military service (after retirement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Václav Beran</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Bogataj</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Promoted by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General dipl. tech. Jan Bret</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jaroslav Kašpar-Páty</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Emil Konopásek</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Otmar Kučera</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Vladislav Olšina</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Robert Pavlík</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Karel Jindřich Procházka</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Otto Procházka</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Řehulka</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jaroslav Sommer</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Václav Strejček</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Gustav Svoboda</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Ignác Syrovátková</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Šanovec</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Antonín Špaček</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Vaniček</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Žák</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Vladimir Dufek</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Raimund Hanák</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Miloslav Kašpar</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jindřich Macháček</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Herbert Němec</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Peřina</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Ludvík Peterka</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Karel Alex Pospíchal</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Prokop</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Souček</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Vladimir Soukup</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Alois Šeda</td>
<td>1 July 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Hyhlik</td>
<td>1 Mar 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Novák</td>
<td>1 Mar 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Stanislav Hlučka</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Chábera</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Irving</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Miroslav Kácha</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Adolf Karlovský</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Miloš Knorr</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generals promoted into higher general ranks after the end of their active-duty military service (after retirement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Tomáš Sedláček</td>
<td>8 May 1998</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General František Peřina</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Promoted by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General František Fajtíl</td>
<td>8 May 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Vladimír Nedvěd</td>
<td>8 May 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Tomáš Sedláček</td>
<td>11 Nov 2008</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Military professionals promoted into the first general rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Radovan Procházka</td>
<td>24 Feb 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General MUDr. Milan Suchomel</td>
<td>24 Feb 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Nekvasil</td>
<td>23 June 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Pavel Jandaček</td>
<td>8 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Ladislav Klima</td>
<td>8 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Karel Kuba</td>
<td>8 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Pavel Štráblo</td>
<td>8 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Zdeněk Zezula</td>
<td>8 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Dufek</td>
<td>8 May 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General JUDr. Ladislav Kozler</td>
<td>8 May 1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Rostislav Kotil</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Piskláč, CSc.</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Martinek</td>
<td>8 May 1996</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Šedivý</td>
<td>8 May 1996</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Alois Schulz</td>
<td>8 May 1997</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Štěpánek</td>
<td>8 May 1997</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Petr Voznica, CSc.</td>
<td>8 May 1997</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Hrabal</td>
<td>8 May 1998</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jaroslav Hudec</td>
<td>8 May 1998</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Kubala</td>
<td>8 May 1998</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General JUDr. Jaroslav Švábík</td>
<td>8 May 1998</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Padělek</td>
<td>8 May 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Petr Pelz</td>
<td>8 May 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Hynek Blaško</td>
<td>1 Dec 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jiří Giesl</td>
<td>1 Dec 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jiří Javůrek</td>
<td>1 Dec 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General doc. MUDr. Leo Klein, CSc.</td>
<td>1 Dec 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jindřich Lesný</td>
<td>1 Dec 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Josef Prokeš</td>
<td>1 Dec 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Promoted by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Vladimir Sova</td>
<td>1 Dec 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jaroslav Škopek</td>
<td>1 Dec 1999</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General MUDr. Jan Petráš</td>
<td>8 May 2000</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Karel Blahna</td>
<td>20 Mar 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Miloš Doubek</td>
<td>20 Mar 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Vlastimil Picek</td>
<td>20 Mar 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jiří Zabranský</td>
<td>20 Mar 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jiří Čuma</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jaroslav Dienstbier</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jan Ďurica</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jaroslav Jásek</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Rostislav Mazurek</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Andor Sándor</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Pavel Štefka</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General František Maleninský</td>
<td>8 May 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Josef Sedláčk</td>
<td>8 May 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Ivo Zbořil</td>
<td>8 May 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jiří Halaška</td>
<td>28 Oct 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Josef Prokš</td>
<td>28 Oct 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Emil Pupiš</td>
<td>28 Oct 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jan Vachek</td>
<td>28 Oct 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Petr Pavel</td>
<td>12 Dec 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Josef Bečvár</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Pavel Jevula</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jaroslav Kolkus</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Ladislav Minařík</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General doc. Rudolf Urban, CSc.</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jiří Jančík</td>
<td>28 Oct 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Vladimir Lavička</td>
<td>28 Oct 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Antonín Pugzík</td>
<td>28 Oct 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jiří Baloun, Ph.D.</td>
<td>8 May 2004</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Ján Gurník</td>
<td>8 May 2004</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Oldřich Kubát</td>
<td>8 May 2004</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Michal Pažůr</td>
<td>8 May 2004</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Petr Mlejnek</td>
<td>28 Oct 2004</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Zdeněk Plchot</td>
<td>28 Oct 2004</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Čestmír Tesařík</td>
<td>28 Oct 2004</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Promoted by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General doc. František Vojkovský, CSc.</td>
<td>28 Oct 2004</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Miroslav Krejčík</td>
<td>8 May 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Vladimír Trněný</td>
<td>28 Oct 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Libor Krejcar</td>
<td>8 May 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Pavel Adam</td>
<td>28 Oct 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Radoslav Rotrekl</td>
<td>28 Oct 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Ondřej Páleník</td>
<td>4 Dec 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Miroslav Bálint</td>
<td>8 May 2007</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jaroslav Kocián</td>
<td>8 May 2008</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Aleš Opata</td>
<td>28 Oct 2008</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Miroslav Žižka</td>
<td>28 Oct 2008</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jan Bureš</td>
<td>30 June 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jan Kaše</td>
<td>30 June 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Vladimír Ložek</td>
<td>30 June 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Přemysl Škáchá</td>
<td>30 June 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jiří Verner</td>
<td>30 June 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General MUDr. Pavel Zbořil</td>
<td>30 June 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Bohuslav Dvořák</td>
<td>8 May 2010</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Milan Kovanda</td>
<td>8 May 2010</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Rostislav Píl</td>
<td>8 May 2010</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Pavel Rybák</td>
<td>8 May 2010</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jaromír Zůna, MSc.</td>
<td>8 May 2010</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Vladimír Halenka</td>
<td>8 May 2011</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Štefan Kaleta</td>
<td>28 Oct 2011</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jaroslav Kankia, MSc.</td>
<td>28 Oct 2011</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Jaroslav Malý, MPA</td>
<td>28 Oct 2011</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General František Mičánek</td>
<td>8 May 2012</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Pavel Bulant</td>
<td>28 Oct 2012</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General MUDr. Božetěch Jurenka</td>
<td>28 Oct 2012</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military professionals in the rank of generals promoted into the second general rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Lubomír Jura</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Karel Kuba</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Promoted by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Jiří Nekvasil</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Radovan Procházka</td>
<td>8 May 1995</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Ladislav Klíma</td>
<td>8 May 1997</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Jiří Martinek</td>
<td>8 May 1998</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Jiří Šedivý</td>
<td>8 May 1998</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jindřich Lesný</td>
<td>20 Mar 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jaroslav Škopek</td>
<td>20 Mar 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Vladimír Sova</td>
<td>8 May 2001</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jan Řurica</td>
<td>28 Oct 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Giesl</td>
<td>28 Oct 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Pavel Šťěrka</td>
<td>28 Oct 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Rostislav Mazurek</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Vlastimil Picek</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Prokš</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Emil Pupiš</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Sedláček</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jaroslav Kolík</td>
<td>28 Oct 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Halaška</td>
<td>28 Oct 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Pavel Jevula</td>
<td>28 Oct 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Vladimir Lavička</td>
<td>28 Oct 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Hynek Blaško</td>
<td>8 May 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Jančík</td>
<td>28 Oct 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Oldřich Kubát</td>
<td>28 Oct 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Ladislav Minařík</td>
<td>28 Oct 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Antonín Pugzík</td>
<td>28 Oct 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Ivo Zbořil</td>
<td>8 May 2007</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General František Malenínský</td>
<td>8 May 2008</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Ondrej Páleník</td>
<td>8 May 2008</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Josef Bečvár</td>
<td>28 Oct 2008</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Čestmír Tesářík</td>
<td>30 June 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jiří Baloun, Ph.D., MSc.</td>
<td>8 May 2011</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Petr Pavel</td>
<td>8 May 2010</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Aleš Opata</td>
<td>28 Oct 2011</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Miroslav Žižka</td>
<td>28 Oct 2011</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Jaroslav Kocián</td>
<td>8 May 2012</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Bohuslav Dvořák</td>
<td>28 Oct 2012</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Military professionals in the rank of generals promoted into the third general rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonel-General Karel Pezl</td>
<td>24 Feb 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Jiří Nekvasil</td>
<td>8 May 1997</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General František Padělek</td>
<td>8 May 2000</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Miroslav Kostelka</td>
<td>28 Oct 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Pavel Štefka</td>
<td>8 May 2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Jan Řurica</td>
<td>8 May 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Jaroslav Kolkus</td>
<td>28 Oct 2005</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Vlastimil Picek</td>
<td>8 May 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General František Hrabal</td>
<td>8 May 2007</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Ondrej Páleník</td>
<td>28 Oct 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General Petr Pavel, M.A.</td>
<td>8 May 2012</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military professionals in the rank of generals promoted into the fourth, the highest general officer rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Karel Pezl</td>
<td>30 Sept 1993</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jiří Šedivý</td>
<td>8 May 2002</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Pavel Štefka</td>
<td>8 May 2006</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Vlastimil Picek</td>
<td>28 Oct 2009</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military professionals temporarily promoted into general officer rank for the performance of their duties in foreign countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Promoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major-General Stanislav Thurnvald</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>President Havel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Dušan Lupuljev</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier-General Josef Rada</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>President Klaus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Based on the Act on Career Soldiers No. 221/1999 Coll., the general rank insignia was altered at 1 December 1999. The rank of Colonel-General was abolished. Originally the first general rank, Major-General was replaced with Brigadier-General rank. Major-General rank became the second in the row and Lieutenant-General the third. Soldiers who were earlier promoted Major-General and Lieutenant-General retained their ranks. Soldiers previously promoted to Colonel-General rank were newly ranked Lieutenant-General.
Annex 12

Standard uniforms of the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic

Uniforms, accessories and clothing items changed in the context of new missions the armed forces service personnel performed and hand in hand with the armed forces transformation. The concept of replacing standard armed forces uniforms was launched already by the Czechoslovak Federal Republic in 1992 and was completed in 1998. At that time, servicemembers of the Czech Armed Forces received new service, formal, mess dress and full dress uniforms. It should be noted that the MoD did not focus just on apparel of the members of the armed forces and the Military Police, but the replacement also applied to the members of the Military Office of the President, the Castle Guard and defence attaches. Famous designer Theodor Pištěk was also invited for cooperation on the program.
In addition to new cuts, patterns and materials used for uniforms, new accessories and items were added such as sleeve badges identifying the unit the individuals are a part of. Development of armed forces uniforms and accessories is however a never ending process. Well-proven items, which underwent innovation, were soon complemented by brand new ones meeting current operational requirements of our armed forces. Items newly issued to servicepeople included new camouflage nets, tactical vests and helmets, ECWCS (Extended Cold Weather Clothing System) items for cold weather operations, sleeping or bivouac bags, harness systems, thermal underwear as well as clothing with low flammability, summer and winter uniform variants as well as uniforms and boots for desert or jungle environments. Indeed the list of all governmental issued items exceeds 600 lines.

Based on activities performed by service soldiers and airmen, the main types of uniforms divide into four basic categories: service, formal, evening uniform/mess dress and full dress uniform. The following are some of the variants...
Berets distinguishing services and arms

- Land Forces
- Reconnaissance
- Airborne
- UN peacekeeping forces
- Air Force
Formal uniform 97

Full dress summer uniform 2005

2008 Evening uniform / Mess dress

Logistics  Civil Defence  Military Police
Over the past two decades spanning the existence of the independent Armed Forces of the Czech Republic, the DUKLA Army Sport Centre changed from a military sport unit that, besides soldiers training to be members of national team in Olympic Games and world competitions, also provided facilities and training of athletes performing their conscription duty, into a professional European defence sport club, whose top-performing athletes are military professionals. The mission of ASC Dukla is to support the Czech Republic’s national and MoD representation teams in top-level world competitions, such as Olympic Games, World and European championships and World Cups. The ASC has also admitted females, who recently became the greatest mainstays of the Czech national team. ASC DUKLA also prepares own junior sport team as well as children and youth in cooperation with TJ Dukla.

ASC DUKLA athletes have confirmed their excellent performance by winning medals; they managed to win 1,280 podium positions in important international events over the past twenty years.

Medals won by ASC DUKLA athletes from 1993 through 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Total medals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This is an aggregate number of medals from Olympic Games, World Championships, European Championships, World Junior Championships, European Junior Championships, Universiades and world military competitions.

2 Number of medals till 31 October 2012.
Over the past twenty years, ASC DUKLA athletes have participated in ten Olympic Games and won 29 medals, which accounts for nearly half of medals won by the whole Czech national team.

The proportion of ASC DUKLA athletes in podium ranking of the Czech national team in summer and winter Olympic Games in 1994–2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olympic Games</th>
<th>Total medals won by Czech national team</th>
<th>Of which ASC DUKLA medals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Gold – Silver – Bronze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG 1994 Lillehammer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOG 1996 Atlanta</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0 – 0.5 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG 1998 Nagano</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 – 1 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOG 2000 Sydney</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 – 1 – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG 2002 Salt Lake City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOG 2004 Athens</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1 – 1.75 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG 2006 Torino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 – 1 – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOG 2008 Beijing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 – 2 – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG 2010 Vancouver</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2 – 0 – 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOG 2012 London</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 – 1 – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td><strong>29.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 – 10.25 – 7.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 14

Simple organisational structure of the Ministry of Defence of the Czech Republic at 1 Jan 2012

MINISTER OF DEFENCE

First Deputy Minister of Defence
Chief of General Staff
Deputy Minister for Personnel
Deputy Minister for Economy
Deputy Minister for Defence Acquisition
MoD General Secretary
Director of Military Intelligence
Chief of Military Police

Joint Force Command

Land Forces
Air Force
Support component
Training units and installations

Land Forces

4th RDBde – 4th Rapid Deployment Brigade “Obrany národa”
41st MechBn – 41st Mechanized Battalion
42nd MechBn – 42nd Mechanized Battalion “Svatováclavský”
43rd ABMechBn – 43rd Airborne Mechanised Battalion “Československých paratroops”
44th LMBn – 44th Light Motorised Battalion of General Josef Eret

7th MechBde – 7th Mechanised Brigade “Dukelský”
71st MechBn – 71st Mechanised Battalion of Siberia

Air Force

21st AFB – 21st Tactical Airbase “Zvolenská”
22nd AFB – 22nd Airbase “Biskajská”
23rd AFB – 23rd Helicopter Airbase of Edward Beneš
24th AFB – 24th Transport Airbase of T. G. Masaryk
25th ADMBrde – 25th Air Defence Missile Brigade “Tobrucká”
26th C2SBde – 26th Command, Control and Surveillance Brigade

Support component

21st LogSpt Bde Pardubice
14th LogSpt Bde Pardubice
15th Eng Bde Bechyně
152nd Eng Bde Rakoněk
31st CBRN Def Bde Liberec
53rd Recce EW Bde Opava

Training units and installations

101st Sgn Bn Lipník n. B.
103rd CIMIC/PSYOPS Ctr Lipník n. B.
141st Sup Bn Pardubice
142nd Mainte Bn Klatovy
143rd Mainte Bn Klatovy
147th Sup Bn Pardubice
25th ADM Bde Strakonice
26th C2S Bde Boletice
25th Log Bde St. Boleslav
26th C2S Bde Prague

Spt Bn Olomouc

CSCT Brno
Tng Cr České Budějovice
Tng Cr Brno
Tng Cr Hradec Králové
Tng Cr Liberec

103rd OMIC/PSYOPS Ctr Lipník n. B.
532nd EW Bn Opava
311th CBRN Bn Liberec
312th CBRN Bn Liberec
103rd Recce Bn Prostějov
102nd Recce Bn Prostějov
101st Sgn Bn Lipník n. B.

TraCam-MA Vyškov
Spt Bn Výskov
CSCT Brno
Výskov
Vyškov

Trng Ctr Liberec
Trng Ctr Brno
Trng Ctr Hradec Králové
Trng Ctr České Budějovice

41st MechBn – 41st Mechanized Battalion Žatec
42nd MechBn – 42nd Mechanized Battalion Tábor
43rd AMechBn – 43rd Airborne Mechanised Battalion Chrudim
44th LMBn – 44th Light Motorised Battalion Úštěk

7th MechBde – 7th Mechanised Brigade “Obrany národa”
71st MechBn – 71st Mechanised Battalion Vicenze
72nd MechBn – 72nd Mechanised Battalion Příbram
73rd Tn – 73rd Tank Battalion Hradec Králové
74th LMBn – 74th Light Motorised Battalion

311th CBRN Bn Liberec
312nd EW Bn Opava
313rd CBRN Bn Liberec
532nd EW Bn Opava
62nd EW Bn Opava

141st Sup Bn Pardubice
142nd Mainte Bn Klatovy
147th Sup Bn Pardubice
25th ADM Bde Strakonice
26th C2S Bde Boletice
25th Log Bde St. Boleslav
26th C2S Bde Prague

Spt Bn Olomouc

CSCT Brno
Výskov
Vyškov

Trng Ctr Liberec
Trng Ctr Brno
Trng Ctr Hradec Králové
Trng Ctr České Budějovice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 March</td>
<td>First combat engagement involving Czechoslovak troops in the Eastern front in the fight against Nazi Germany and its allies in 1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>First major combat engagement of the ‘Nazdar Company’, a Czech voluntary unit within the French Foreign Legion, during an offensive in the Artois region in 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May</td>
<td>Assassination of the Deputy Reich Protector Reinhard Heydrich performed in 1942 by members of Czech paratrooper teams inserted from the Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>Victory of Czechoslovak legions in the Battle of Zborov in 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 July</td>
<td>First clash between Hussite fighters and a crusade in the battle of Vítkov in 1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Successful participation of Czechoslovak airmen in the Battle of Britain Day in 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Sept</td>
<td>Successful battle of the Czechoslovak Division at Doss Alto in Northern Italy in 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Sept</td>
<td>Declaration of general mobilisation of the Czechoslovak military might in 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Oct</td>
<td>Troops of the 1st Czechoslovak Army Corps in the USSR reentered their homeland territory in the Dukla Pass area in 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Oct</td>
<td>Soldiers of the Czechoslovak infantry battalion 11 joined defenders of port of Tobruk in North Africa in 1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct</td>
<td>Successful offensive by the Czechoslovak Independent Armoured Brigade Group assaulting German garrison of the port of Dunkirk in northern France in 1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>Air Advisory Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>Arms Control Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR</td>
<td>Armed Forces of the Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACV</td>
<td>Armoured Combat Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Air Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFOR</td>
<td>Albania Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSOUTH</td>
<td>Allied Forces Southern Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Attack Helicopter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT</td>
<td>Air Mentoring Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>Afghan National Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANP</td>
<td>Afghan National Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSF</td>
<td>Afghan Nation Security Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>Army Sports Centre (DUKLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVIS</td>
<td>Czech Military Service and Information Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>Association Soldiers Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Battle Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Combat Aircraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBRN</td>
<td>Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFE-T</td>
<td>Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Castle Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMIC</td>
<td>Civil-Military Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCBRN COE</td>
<td>Joint Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Centre of Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTT</td>
<td>Centre of Simulation and Trainer Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCE</td>
<td>Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSFR</td>
<td>Czech and Slovak Federal Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSLA</td>
<td>Czechoslovak People’s Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSR</td>
<td>Czechoslovak Socialist Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Distribution Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>Defence Capabilities Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPQ</td>
<td>Defence Planning Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC/MM</td>
<td>European Community Monitoring Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD</td>
<td>Explosive Ordnance Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESDP</td>
<td>European Security and Defence Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUFOR</td>
<td>European Union Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUTM</td>
<td>European Union Training Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Forward Air Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FADR</td>
<td>Fixed Air Defence Radar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>Field Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHQ</td>
<td>Force Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMoND</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of National Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMoD</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRS</td>
<td>Fire Rescue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FST</td>
<td>Field Surgical Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYROM</td>
<td>Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS ACR</td>
<td>General Staff Armed Forces of the Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDR</td>
<td>German Democratic Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNS</td>
<td>Host Nation Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMINT</td>
<td>Human Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZDS</td>
<td>Hnutí za demokratické Slovensko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDD</td>
<td>Improvised Explosive Device Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES</td>
<td>Integrated Emergency System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFOR</td>
<td>Implementation Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMH</td>
<td>Institute of Military History Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMINT</td>
<td>Imagery Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAF</td>
<td>International Security Assistance Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>Institute of Strategic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZ SFOR</td>
<td>Iraqi Zone Stabilization Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOC</td>
<td>Joint Operations Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIA</td>
<td>Kabul International Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDS</td>
<td>Československá demokratická strana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDU-ČSL</td>
<td>Československá a demokratická unie – Československá strana lidová</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFOR</td>
<td>Kosovo Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSČ</td>
<td>Communist Party of Czechoslovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVM</td>
<td>Kosovo Verification Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Official Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFO</td>
<td>Multinational Force and Observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Military Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND-SE</td>
<td>Multinational Division South-East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND-SW</td>
<td>Multinational Division South-West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNF-I</td>
<td>Multinational Force – Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNSTC-I</td>
<td>Multinational Security Transition Command – Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNTF (N)</td>
<td>Multinational Task Force (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNTF-C</td>
<td>Multinational Task Force – Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD</td>
<td>Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoI</td>
<td>Ministry of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUC</td>
<td>Mission de l’Organisation des Nations Unies en République démocratique du Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUSCO</td>
<td>Mission de l’Organisation des Nations Unies pour la stabilisation en République démocratique du Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>Military Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Military Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>Military Training Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACC</td>
<td>North Atlantic Cooperation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATINADS</td>
<td>NATO Integrated Air Defence System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATC-A</td>
<td>NATO Air Training Command – Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVFOR</td>
<td>Naval Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>Nuclear, Biological and Chemical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>Network Enabled Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNSC</td>
<td>Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRF</td>
<td>NATO Response Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>National Support Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSIP</td>
<td>NATO Security Investment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTM-I</td>
<td>NATO Training Mission in Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Občanská demokratická alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>Občanská demokratická strana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHQ</td>
<td>Operation Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMLT</td>
<td>Operational Mentoring and Liaison Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF</td>
<td>Operational Reserve Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSINT</td>
<td>Open Source Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDD</td>
<td>MoD Public Diplomacy Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFP</td>
<td>Partnership for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Provincial Reconstruction Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ret.</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>Republic of Central Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMHQ</td>
<td>Regional Military Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAT</td>
<td>Special Dog and Tactical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFOR</td>
<td>Stabilisation Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGINT</td>
<td>Signal Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOF</td>
<td>Special Operations Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOG</td>
<td>Special Operations Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Středisko empirických výzkumů</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEDC</td>
<td>Training Education and Doctrine Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TraCom – MA</td>
<td>Training Command – Military Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UÇK</td>
<td>Ushtria Çlirimtare Kombëtare (Albanian separatist group – National Liberation Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMA</td>
<td>United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMSIL</td>
<td>United Nations Mission to Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAVEM</td>
<td>United Nations Angola Verification Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCIVPOL</td>
<td>United Nations Civilian Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCR</td>
<td>United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGCI</td>
<td>United Nations Guards Contingent in Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMEE</td>
<td>United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMEN</td>
<td>United Nations Military Experts on Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIK</td>
<td>United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIL</td>
<td>United Nations Mission in Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMO</td>
<td>United Nations Military Observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMOC</td>
<td>United Nations Military Observer Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMOP</td>
<td>United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMOT</td>
<td>United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOMIG</td>
<td>United Nations Observers Mission in Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOMIL</td>
<td>United Nations Observers Mission in Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOMOZ</td>
<td>United Nations Operation in Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOMSIL</td>
<td>United Nations Observers Mission in Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOSOM</td>
<td>United Nations Operation in Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPREDEP</td>
<td>United Nations Preventive Deployment Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPROFOR</td>
<td>United Nations Protection Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSC</td>
<td>United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSCOM</td>
<td>United Nations Special Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSMIS</td>
<td>United Nations Supervision Mission in Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTAC</td>
<td>United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTAES</td>
<td>United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, or also někdy též United Nations Transitional Authority for Eastern Slavonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTAG</td>
<td>United Nations Transition Assistance Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Union of Soviet Socialist Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-DEU</td>
<td>Unie svobody – Demokratická unie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVO</td>
<td>Eastern Military District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>World Championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEU</td>
<td>Western European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>Weapons of Mass Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZVO</td>
<td>Western Military District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th RDBde</td>
<td>4th Rapid Deployment Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th MechBde</td>
<td>7th Mechanised Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th ArtyBde</td>
<td>13th Artillery Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th LogSptBde</td>
<td>14th Logistic Support Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th EngBde</td>
<td>15th Engineer Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st AFB</td>
<td>21st Air Force Base Tactical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd AFB</td>
<td>22nd Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd AFB</td>
<td>23rd Air Force Base Helicopter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th AFB</td>
<td>24th Air Force Base Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th ADM Bde</td>
<td>25th Air Defence Missile Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th C2S Bde</td>
<td>26th Command, Control and Surveillance Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st CBRN Bde</td>
<td>31st Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st MechBn</td>
<td>41st Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd MechBn</td>
<td>42nd Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43rd AB MechBn</td>
<td>43rd Airborne Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th LM Bn</td>
<td>44th Light Motorised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53rd RecceEW Bde</td>
<td>53rd Reconnaissance and Electronic Warfare Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion Code</td>
<td>Battalion Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st MechBn</td>
<td>71st Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd MechBn</td>
<td>72nd Mechanised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73rd TBN</td>
<td>73rd Tank Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74th LM BN</td>
<td>74th Light Motorised Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101st SigBN</td>
<td>101st Signal Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102nd RecceBn</td>
<td>102nd Reconnaissance Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103rd CIMIC/PSYOPS</td>
<td>103rd Civil-Military Cooperation and Psychological Operations Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104th SptBn</td>
<td>104th Support Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141st SupBn</td>
<td>141st Supply Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142nd MainteBn</td>
<td>142nd Maintenance Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151st EngBn</td>
<td>151st Engineer Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152nd EngBn</td>
<td>152nd Engineer Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153rd EngBn</td>
<td>153rd Engineer Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311th CBRN Bn</td>
<td>311th Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312th CBRN Bn</td>
<td>312th Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314th CBRN EWCtr</td>
<td>314th Chemical, Biologic, Radiological and Nuclear Early Warning Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532nd EWBN</td>
<td>532nd Electronic Warfare Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601st SFG</td>
<td>601st Special Forces Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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