THE HISTORY OF THE EMERGENCE AND INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF AIR DEFENCE SYSTEMS WORLDWIDE (LATE 19TH – LATE 20TH CENTURY)

Sultonov Ruslanbek Sharipovich
Senior teacher of the air defense cycle of the Combat Training Department of the Higher School for the Training of Sergeants

Abstract. This article traces the emergence and institutional transformation of air defence from late nineteenth-century technological preconditions to the integrated surveillance, command, and interception structures of the late twentieth century. Using a comparative historical and documentary approach, it examines the shift from improvised countermeasures against aerial threats to specialized anti-aircraft units, centralized reporting networks, radar-based command systems, and multinational aerospace defence institutions. British, American and Soviet developments are considered alongside Uzbek-language scholarship on the historical experience of local air defence and civilian protection in Central Asia. The analysis distinguishes military air defence from civil defence, while showing their interaction in wartime organization. The findings indicate that institutional integration—especially the coordination of information, command authority and response forces—was as consequential as advances in weapons technology. The article is based on published historical sources, not newly discovered archival documents.

Keywords: air defence history, anti-aircraft artillery, radar, institutional development, command and control, civil defence, NORAD, twentieth century.

INTRODUCTION

The history of air defence cannot be reduced to a succession of guns, aircraft and missiles. It is equally a history of how governments defined a new security problem, allocated responsibilities among services, built warning networks, and linked information to decisions. The late nineteenth century witnessed rapid advances in ballooning, artillery and communications; powered flight after 1903 transformed the prospective aerial threat. During the First World War, aerial attacks against cities and infrastructure demonstrated that isolated defensive weapons could not protect large territories without coordination.

This subject remains significant for military history and institutional studies because the modern air defence organization emerged through interaction among technological innovation, administrative reform, military doctrine and civilian protection. The research question is: how did dispersed counter-air measures develop into permanent, integrated and, eventually, multinational defence institutions between the late nineteenth century and the end of the twentieth century?

The article argues that the decisive institutional transition occurred when detection, information processing, command and interception were organized as a continuous system. The argument is tested against British interwar experience, North American Cold War organization, and the Soviet/local air-defence tradition represented in Uzbek scholarship [1–8].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study applies historical-comparative analysis and documentary synthesis. Its principal sources are an article by David Zimmerman on the information revolution in British air defence [1], Alexander Rose's analysis of radar policy in the 1930s [2], Historic England's documented account of First World War anti-aircraft installations [3], the US Army Center of Military History's institutional study of space and missile defence [4], official NORAD historical resources [5], and the US Missile Defense Agency's

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

historical overview [6]. Uzbek-language perspectives are drawn from the National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan entry on air defence forces [7] and academic material describing the formation of local air defence and civilian protection institutions in Uzbekistan [8, 9].

The sources were compared using four analytical categories: the nature of the perceived aerial threat; the institutional locus of responsibility; the means of detection and response; and the degree of integration across services and civilian agencies. Periodization is interpretive rather than a claim that identical stages occurred in every country. Military air defence, which seeks to detect and counter airborne attacks, is distinguished from local air defence or civil protection, which seeks to warn and safeguard civilians and essential facilities.

RESULTS

1. Preconditions and early organization, late nineteenth century–1914

Before military aviation became operational, balloons and airships raised questions about the vulnerability of troops and settlements from above. Artillery developments and experiments with elevated firing solutions provided technical preconditions, but standing air defence institutions were limited. The emergence of powered aircraft made counter-air measures a more immediate military problem. Uzbek encyclopedic literature likewise connects the rise of specialized air defence troops to the military use of aviation and describes the appearance of anti-aircraft weapons in European armies shortly before and during the First World War [7]. Such accounts are useful for broad chronology, although precise claims about which country was ‘first’ depend on the definition of a specialized weapon, unit or integrated system.

2. The First World War and integrated urban defence, 1914–1918

The First World War marked the transition from improvised countermeasures to coordinated territorial protection. German Zeppelin and Gotha raids forced British authorities to combine observation, searchlights, guns, fighter patrols and communications. According to Historic England, the London Air Defence Area was established on 31 July 1917 and integrated reporting, sound locators, searchlights, gun sites, balloon arrangements and aircraft patrols under a control centre [3]. Its significance was organizational: the effectiveness of separate weapons increasingly depended on shared information and centrally directed action.

Zimmerman traces the origins of the British information-based air defence revolution to wartime reporting and control practices, rather than treating radar as a sudden and self-sufficient breakthrough [1]. This interpretation reveals an important institutional continuity between the First World War and the 1930s: new sensing technologies could be exploited because procedures for filtering reports, identifying threats and directing defenders had already begun to develop.

3. Interwar consolidation and the Second World War, 1919–1945

Interwar planning exposed the challenge of defending major population centres against faster aircraft. In Britain, radar was adopted within a pre-existing organizational framework of observation and command. Rose shows that the choice to develop radar was closely connected with air policy debates and the search for a credible defensive response to bombing [2]. During the Second World War, the combination of radar, observation posts, reporting and fighter control demonstrated how information could be converted into coordinated interception decisions [1, 2].

Institutional development was not restricted to fighter defence. Civilian warning, shelters, rescue and industrial protection also became essential parts of wartime preparation. Uzbek research on the history of local air defence notes the institutionalization of population-protection structures within the Soviet system, including the 1932 organizational framework and subsequent wartime training

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

arrangements [8, 9]. This material illuminates the Central Asian and Uzbek dimension of the broader history, but local air defence for civilians should not be confused with the operational command of fighter or surface-to-air forces.

4. Cold War specialization and transnational integration, 1945–1991

Jet aircraft, long-range bombers, nuclear weapons and guided missiles altered both the speed and scale of aerial threats. In the United States, the defence mission became distributed among aircraft interception, radar warning, anti-aircraft artillery and guided missile programs. The US Army's official historical study describes how inter-service agreements and later decisions clarified responsibility for surface-to-air missile systems and ballistic missile defence, while the Air Force maintained central roles in early warning and related systems [4].

North American defence also required institutional cooperation across national borders. The establishment and subsequent development of NORAD institutionalized binational warning and aerospace defence arrangements between the United States and Canada [5]. Such structures illustrate a move beyond local protection of individual targets toward continental surveillance and coordinated command. Missile defence history adds a related but analytically distinct development: the US Missile Defense Agency traces ballistic missile defence efforts to the post-Second World War period and records intensified programs during the 1950s and 1960s [6].

In the Soviet sphere, the organization of territorial air defence and the parallel development of civil protection reflected centralized state structures and the strategic demands of the Cold War. Uzbek-language historical scholarship provides evidence about the local civil-protection branch, especially the training and administrative arrangements inherited from the Soviet era [8, 9]. However, those studies do not by themselves establish a complete organizational history of Soviet combat air defence forces; additional specialized archival research would be needed for that purpose.

5. Comparative institutional synthesis

Period	Dominant challenge	Institutional development	Representative evidence
Late 1800s–1914	Emerging aerial platforms	Early weapons and specialist responses	Uzbek encyclopedia [7]
1914–1918	Raids on cities and industry	Integrated urban reporting and defence	London Air Defence Area [3]
1919–1945	Faster bombers and mass attack	Radar-linked warning and fighter control; civil protection	Zimmerman [1]; Rose [2]; Uzbek studies [8, 9]
1945–1970s	Jet, nuclear and missile threats	Specialized commands; surface-to-air missiles; binational coordination	US Army [4]; NORAD [5]
1980s–1990s	Complex aerospace and missile threats	Networked surveillance and expanded missile-defence research	US Army [4]; MDA [6]

The principal historical trend is a transition from equipment-centred responses to institution-centred systems. The wartime British case highlights the integration of reporting and operational control; the Cold War North American case highlights service specialization and international coordination. Uzbek historical materials enrich the comparative picture by documenting how local air-defence and civil-

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

protection structures were institutionalized, while also reminding researchers to distinguish civilian preparedness from military interception.

DISCUSSION

The comparative evidence supports three propositions. First, technology was necessary but insufficient: radar became strategically effective only when embedded in routines for reporting, classification and fighter direction [1, 2]. Second, institutional boundaries changed with the threat. Anti-aircraft artillery, fighter aviation and missile defence generated overlapping missions that required formal allocation of authority [4, 6]. Third, territorial defence and civilian protection developed in parallel. Their operational purposes differed, but both required warning, training, communication and coordination [3, 8, 9].

A strictly technological narrative risks presenting air defence as an inevitable linear progression. In practice, institutions were shaped by national political systems, budgets, inter-service rivalries, geographical exposure and alliances. The British and North American cases therefore illustrate influential pathways rather than universal templates. The available Uzbek-language sources are especially useful for examining the civil-protection dimension in Central Asia, but the source base is less extensive for a detailed reconstruction of combat air defence command structures.

This study is limited by its reliance on published secondary scholarship and official institutional histories, which may emphasize the achievements of their own organizations. Future research should compare original military orders, organizational charts, budgets and archival correspondence across several states, and investigate the relationship between Soviet-era air defence structures and post-1991 institutions in Central Asia.

CONCLUSION

Between the late nineteenth century and the end of the twentieth century, air defence evolved from experimental and fragmented responses to a permanent institutional field linking surveillance, command, aviation, artillery, missiles and civilian warning. The First World War accelerated integrated urban defence; interwar radar development and the Second World War strengthened information-centred command; and the Cold War fostered specialized services, guided missile systems and multinational arrangements. The defining historical change was not the replacement of one weapon by another, but the creation of organizations capable of transforming warning into coordinated action. Uzbek-language scholarship adds a valuable regional perspective on local air defence and civil protection, while further archival study is required to connect this history more fully to the evolution of military air defence institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Zimmerman, D. (2004). Information and the Air Defence Revolution, 1917–40. Journal of Strategic Studies, 27(2), 370–394. https://doi.org/10.1080/0140239042000255968
2. Rose, A. (1998). Radar and Air Defence in the 1930s. Twentieth Century British History, 9(2), 219–245. https://doi.org/10.1093/tcbh/9.2.219
3. Historic England. First World War: Anti-Aircraft Sites. https://historicengland.org.uk/research/current/discover-and-understand/military/first-world-war-home-front/air/anti-aircraft-sites/
4. Bernstein, L., Lang, S., & Walker, J. Seize the High Ground: The Army in Space and Missile Defense. US Army Center of Military History, CMH Pub 70-88-1. https://history.army.mil/Publications/Publications-Catalog/Seize-the-High-Ground-The-Army-in-Space-and-Missile-Defense/

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

5. North American Aerospace Defense Command. NORAD History. https://www.norad.mil/About-NORAD/NORAD-History/
6. US Missile Defense Agency. History Resources: Origins of the US Missile Defense Program. https://www.mda.mil/news/history_resources.html
7. O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi. “Mamlakatni havo hujumidan mudofaa qilish qo‘shinlari” [Uzbek-language encyclopedia entry]. Reproduced at https://uzsmart.uz/encyclopedia/encyclopedia/18459.html
8. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi. Research information on the historical formation of local air defence and civil protection in Uzbekistan [Uzbek]. https://www.oak.uz/index.php/pages/31777
9. To‘rayev, Z. T., & Shomansurov, S. S. (2025). Fuqaro muhofazasi sohasining yaralish tarixi [The history of the emergence of civil protection]. Fan, muhofaza, xavfsizlik, 1(15). https://fvvfmi.uz/media/book_files/15._Fan_muhofaza_xavfsizlik_115_2025.pdf

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.