

June 2006

## IN DEPTH...

Views expressed in the **reports** are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect U.S. government

### **U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE GUIDE TO NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY AND STRATEGY, 2ND EDITION**

J. Boone Bartholomees, Jr., Editor  
United States Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI)  
June 16, 2006 – 405 pages

This edition of the U. S. Army War College Guide to National Security Policy and Strategy reflects both the method and manner the college uses to teach strategy formulation to America's future senior military leaders. It contains essays on the general security environment, strategic thought and formulation, the elements of national power, the national security policymaking process in the United States, and selected strategic issues.

### **AFGHANISTAN AND ITS NEIGHBORS: AN EVER DANGEROUS NEIGHBORHOOD**

Marvin G. Weinbaum  
United States Institute of Peace (USIP)  
June 2006 – 20 pages

The fate of Afghanistan and the success of U.S. and coalition efforts to stabilize Afghanistan will in large measure be affected by the current and future policies pursued by other countries in the region. The author evaluates the courses of action key neighbors may take that will affect Afghanistan's physical, political and economic security. Weinbaum stresses the following themes:

- \* Predatory neighbors have been a fact of life for the Afghan state throughout most of its history. In defense, Afghans have chosen both isolation and resistance. Today, openness and cooperation with regional powers offers the best prospects for security and economic progress for Afghanistan.
- \* Conversely, the region's political stability and economic potential are broadly influenced by the ability of post-conflict Afghanistan to succeed in its recovery.
- \* The region's opportunistic states are liable to revive their interventions in Afghanistan in the event of a faltering Kabul government or an international community that reneges on its commitments to help secure and rebuild the country. Already there are some indications that the forbearance shown by neighbors in recent years may be flagging.
- \* Pakistan and Iran offer Afghanistan its most imposing and critical regional bilateral relationships. Whether they cooperate or create obstacles for Afghanistan's recovery is greatly influenced by American strategic policies in the region.

### **TRANSATLANTIC HOMELAND DEFENSE**

National Defense University (NDU), Center for Technology and National Security Policy, Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS)  
May 2006 – 6 pages

This report proposes that enhanced transatlantic homeland defense be a major initiative for adoption at the 2006 Riga Summit and completion at the 2008 summit. The initiative would include four categories of homeland defense:

- \* Guarding the approaches and achieving border security for the NATO region.

- \* Pursuing enhanced/integrated and linked continental early warning and air/missile defense capabilities.
- \* Preventing and managing terrorist incidents.
- \* Strengthening transatlantic capabilities for consequence management, ranging from terrorist use of WMD to large-scale natural disasters.

## **[2005] COUNTRY REPORTS ON TERRORISM**

United States Department of State

April 28, 2006

This annual publication offers a strategic assessment of trends in international terrorism and the nature of the terrorist threat, as well as chapters examining terrorist safe havens, efforts to build international will and capacity, and the nexus between weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. The report also includes an annex of statistical information from the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) that addresses the victims of terrorism.

The 2005 report covers developments in countries in which acts of terrorism occurred, countries that are state sponsors of terrorism, and countries determined by the Secretary of State to be of particular interest in the global war on terror. The report reviews major developments in bilateral and multilateral counterterrorism cooperation as well. The report also provides information on terrorist groups responsible for the death, kidnapping, or injury of Americans, any umbrella groups to which they might belong, groups financed by state sponsors of terrorism, reports on all terrorist organizations on the Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) list, and other terrorist groups determined by the Secretary of State to be relevant to the report.

Starting this year the Country Reports on Terrorism will also address terrorist sanctuaries and terrorist attempts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. It will also include statistical information provided by the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) on the number of individuals killed, injured, or kidnapped by terrorist groups.

## **IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

Sharon Squassoni

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service

Updated April 12, 2006 – 6 pages

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspections since 2003 have revealed almost two decades' worth of undeclared nuclear activities in Iran, including uranium enrichment and plutonium separation efforts. Iran agreed in 2003 to suspend its enrichment and reprocessing activities in exchange for promises of assistance from Germany, France, and the UK (EU-3), but negotiations broke down in August 2005. On September 24, 2005, the IAEA Board of Governors found Iran to be in noncompliance with its Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) safeguards agreement (GOV/2005/77) and voted (GOV/2006/14) on February 4 to report Iran to the U.N. Security Council. The Security Council issued a presidential statement on March 29 that called upon Iran to reinstitute its voluntary suspension of enrichment and reprocessing and asked the IAEA to report on Iran's compliance by April 28.

On April 11, Iranian officials announced that they had enriched some uranium to 3.5% enrichment (fuel-grade).

Uranium enrichment can be used for both peaceful (nuclear fuel) and military (nuclear weapons) uses. At the heart of the debate lie two issues: doubt about Iran's intentions, magnified by revelations of almost two decades of clandestine activities, and whether the international community can adequately verify the absence of enrichment for nuclear weapons or should further restrict access to sensitive nuclear technologies.

## **CIVILIAN PATROLS ALONG THE BORDER: LEGAL AND POLICY ISSUES**

Stephen R. Vina, Blas Nunez-Neto, Alyssa Bartlett Weir

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service

April 7, 2006 – 27 pages

Civilian patrols along the international border have existed in a wide variety of forms for at least 150 years. Over the past 15 years, civilian border patrol groups appear to have proliferated along the U.S.-Mexico border, partly due to the increasing numbers of aliens entering the country illegally. In the spring of 2005, attention focused on these civilian patrols, when the "Minuteman Project" mobilized hundreds of volunteers along the Arizona-Mexico border to observe and report the movement of illegal aliens to the

U.S. Border Patrol. Although some participants were armed, Minutemen volunteers were instructed not to engage in hostile confrontations with any illegal alien. Organizers of the Minuteman Project have expanded the Project to the other southwestern border states and Canada and have split the mission into a border defense corps and an internal vigilance operation that monitors businesses and government. A new nationwide Minuteman Project began in April 2006.

This report provides a history of civilian border patrol groups, with a focus on those groups operating along the southwest border, including most particularly, the "Minuteman Project." It also addresses some of the legal and policy issues that have surfaced from civilian activities at the border. The report concludes with summaries of legislative proposals that have been introduced in the 109th Congress that address the issue of civilian border patrol groups.

### **THE BASQUE CONFLICT: NEW IDEAS AND PROSPECTS FOR PEACE**

Gorka Espiau Idoiaga  
Unites States Institute of Peace (USIP)  
April 2006 – 12 pages

In March 2006 the Basque separatist group Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA) announced a permanent cease-fire. The announcement may offer a significant window of opportunity for the initiation of an all-party peace process between the Spanish government and the Basque community.

This report examines recent promising developments, outlines remaining obstacles, and offers recommendations to ensure that the present opportunities for peace in the Basque Country are strengthened.

### **TOWARD A EURO-ATLANTIC STRATEGY FOR THE BLACK SEA REGION**

Eugene B. Rumer and Jeffrey Simon  
National Defense University (NDU), Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS)  
April 2006 – 40 pages

[NOTE: Extra discretion advised. Portions of this item may not reflect current Department of State policy. Consult with an American officer in the Public Affairs/Public Diplomacy section before distributing to outside contacts.]

The Black Sea region is increasingly important to Europe and the United States as a major east-west energy supply bridge and as a barrier against many transnational threats. The security environment in the region is a product of diverse interests of littoral states and their neighbors. Some of these interests coincide with those of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members, while others reflect a unique regional security agenda.

The authors argue that: "This environment warrants a Euro-Atlantic strategy to bolster institutions and activities initiated by Black Sea littoral states as a means to temper regional suspicion and rivalries inimical to stability and broader mutual interests. This strategy should ensure local ownership by littoral states and constructively engage Turkey and Russia."

**IN DEPTH** is published **quarterly** by the AERC-American Embassy Resource Center.  
If interested in **full text of reports** above, please e-mail [matostm@state.gov](mailto:matostm@state.gov)

March 2006

## IN DEPTH...

Views expressed in the **reports** are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect U.S. government

### **U.S. OCCUPATION ASSISTANCE: IRAQ, GERMANY AND JAPAN COMPARED**

Nina Serafino, Curt Tarnoff, and Dick K. Nanto  
Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service  
March 23, 2006 – 16 pages

This report provides aggregate data on U.S. assistance to Iraq and compares it with U.S. assistance to Germany and Japan during the seven years following World War II. U.S. aid allocations -- all grant assistance -- for Iraq appropriated from 2003 to 2006 total \$28.9 billion. About \$17.6 billion (62%) went for economic and political reconstruction assistance. The remaining \$10.9 billion (38%) was targeted at bolstering Iraqi security. A higher proportion of Iraqi aid has been provided for economic reconstruction of critical infrastructure than was the case for Germany and Japan. Total U.S. assistance to Iraq thus far is roughly equivalent to total assistance (adjusted for inflation) provided to Germany -- and almost double that provided to Japan -- from 1946-1952.

For Germany, in constant 2005 dollars the United States provided a total of \$29.3 billion in assistance from 1946-1952 with 60% in economic grants and nearly 30% in economic loans, and the remainder in military aid. Total U.S. assistance to Japan for 1946-1952 was roughly \$15.2 billion in 2005 dollars, of which 77% was grants and 23% was loans.

U.S. assistance to Germany and Japan largely consisted of food-related aid because of severe war-induced shortages and the need to provide minimum subsistence levels of nutrition. In Iraq, humanitarian aid has been a minor part of the assistance. Expectations also have changed. Countries today have much higher expectations of what the United States should contribute to reconstruction in Iraq relative to what was expected following World War II. Germany and Japan also are larger than Iraq -- both population and size of their respective economies -- and the extent of war damage to each country's industrial capacity was different. Iraq also faces an insurgency that deliberately sabotages the economy and reconstruction efforts, whereas there were no resistance movements in either Germany or Japan. This report will not be updated.

### **TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME: PRINCIPAL THREATS AND U.S. RESPONSES**

John R. Wagley  
Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service  
March 20, 2006 – 24 pages

This report examines the growing threat of transnational organized crime to U.S. national security and global stability. The end of the Cold War and increasing globalization has helped criminal organizations expand their activities and gain global reach. Criminal networks are believed to have benefited from the weakening of certain government institutions, more open borders, and the resurgence of ethnic and regional conflicts across the former Soviet Union and many other regions. Transnational criminal organizations have also exploited expanding financial markets and rapid technological developments.

In addition, terrorist networks are believed to be increasingly supporting themselves through traditional crime, and have been linked to criminal organizations. Alliances between the two groups could amplify

threats to American security. Transnational criminals engage in a spectrum of illicit activities, including narcotics and arms smuggling, trafficking in persons, counterfeiting, and money laundering and other financial crimes.

The report also outlines the U.S. response to international crime. While U.S. policy is framed within the 1998 International Crime Control Strategy, it is also shaped by other more recent federal and agency plans. Agencies heading government efforts include the Departments of State, Defense, Justice, Treasury, and Homeland Security. Key federal programs and initiatives and their interagency coordination are discussed. International cooperation and agreements are vital to U.S. strategy, and many programs seek to assist and train foreign law enforcement. Finally, this report examines likely Congressional concerns related to U.S. efforts to combat transnational crime. The report will not be updated.

### **WHO ARE IRAQ'S NEW LEADERS? WHAT DO THEY WANT?**

Phebe Marr

United States Institute of Peace (USIP)

March 2006 – 20 pages

USIP's ongoing examination of Iraq's emerging leadership finds a revolutionary change in the forces shaping the new leaders and their political orientation since the end of the Ba'th regime. This report by Iraq expert Phebe Marr examines the backgrounds of the new leaders and their views on the future of Iraq, via interviews and their published works.

The author looks at three groups of leaders to see what they may reveal about change and continuity in the new Iraq:

- 1) Those who were in power at the close of Saddam Hussein's long dictatorship.
- 2) A cohort of ninety-seven new leaders who have held cabinet-level or other top offices in the state since 2003.
- 3) Iraqi leaders appointed by the CPA (Coalition Provisional Authority) in 2003 and those elected to office in 2005.

Among the report's primary findings are the following:

- \* Changes in leadership since Saddam have been revolutionary. Among Iraq's new leaders there are virtually no holdovers from the Ba'th era.
- \* The ethnic, sectarian, and regional balance of the leadership has also been reversed since Ba'th times.
- \* Ideological changes are also dramatic.
- \* Although new government leaders recognize the need for economic development, they do not make it a priority. This puts them at odds with many of their constituents, who say they want services and security.
- \* The new politics of communal identity is making compromise on governing difficult.
- \* It is crucial to address fragmentation before it becomes irreversible.
- \* The new political leadership must develop an alternative vision for the future that encourages economic development, a new middle class, and communal tolerance.

### **HOW NOT TO MAKE PEACE: "CONFLICT SYNDROME" AND THE DEMISE OF THE OSLO ACCORDS**

Robert L. Rothstein

United States Institute of Peace (USIP)

March 2006 – 56 pages

In assessing the reasons for the Oslo Accords' failure, the author, an international relations professor, writes that it is essential to understand the "conflict syndrome" that affects negotiating and decision-making processes. The syndrome, he explains, consists of a set of attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs that become embedded over decades of bitter conflict and are difficult to unlearn even if some kind of peace agreement -- or exploratory truce -- has been signed.

Taken as a whole, the syndrome's individual elements exert a powerful influence on most peace processes and inform the choices each side makes.

These elements include distrusting the opposite side's motives by default; cheating for fear of being cheated; making only tentative concessions that can easily be revoked; and asking the other side to prove its good faith by making large initial concessions.

According to the author, the significant role this syndrome plays in perpetuating conflict is frequently ignored or undervalued. Thus, the stop-and-go, on-and-off, crisis-driven peace processes in the Middle

East and elsewhere should not be taken as aberrations: they are the norm that should be anticipated and planned for.

The author identifies various policy implications of persistent conflict syndrome, including:

- \* The search for quick solutions and "last negotiations" is likely to lead to a return of bitter discord.
- \* High-risk/high-gain negotiating strategies are bound to fail.
- \* To solve the Middle East conflict, a carefully calibrated peace process --"gradually accelerating incrementalism"-- is needed.
- \* Demands for stricter compliance with commitments can and should increase as the process begins to provide both sides with tangible evidence that it can produce mutual benefits and is worth preserving.

### **QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW REPORT**

Department Of Defense

February 6, 2006 - 113 pages

Since the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, our nation has fought a global war against violent extremists who use terrorism as their weapon of choice, and who seek to destroy our free way of life. Our enemies seek weapons of mass destruction and, if they are successful, will likely attempt to use them in their conflict with free people everywhere. Currently, the struggle is centered in Iraq and Afghanistan, but we will need to be prepared and arranged to successfully defend our nation and its interests around the globe for years to come.

This 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review is submitted in the fifth year of this long war. The QDR is part of the continuum of transformation in the Defense Department. Its purpose is to help shape the process of change to provide the United States with strong, sound and effective warfighting capabilities in the decades ahead.

### **THE DOHA ROUND AFTER HONG KONG**

Gary Clyde Hufbauer and Jeffrey J. Schott

Institute for International Economics (IIE)

February 2006 – 9 pages

The IIE Senior Fellows assess the outcome of the December 2005 World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in Hong Kong. They contend that the ministers accomplished only the minimum necessary to keep the Doha Round moving forward -- toward an undetermined and probably distant conclusion. In their view, the meeting achieved more in spirit than in substance, and placed more emphasis on the negotiating process than on policy reform.

Moreover, much of the 40-plus-page ministerial declaration confirms policies already being pursued by the major trading nations.

Questions they address about the Doha Round's future include:

- \* How do negotiations look from the perspective of key players?
- \* What events are likely to drive negotiators in 2006?
- \* What are the wildcards?

[Note: Contains copyrighted material.]

### **DATA MINING AND HOMELAND SECURITY: AN OVERVIEW**

Jeffrey W. Seifert

Library of Congress.Congressional Research Service

Updated January 27, 2006 – 27 pages

Data mining, a key feature of many homeland security initiatives, involves the use of data analysis tools to discover previously unknown, valid patterns and relationships in large data sets. According to the author of this CRS report, limitations to data mining's capabilities include:

- \* It does not tell the user the value or significance of the patterns it reveals - those determinations must be made by the user.

\* It does not necessarily identify a causal relationship in the connections it identifies between behaviors and/or variables.

Data mining is becoming increasingly common in both the private and public sectors. Industries such as banking, insurance, medicine, and retailing commonly use data mining to reduce costs, enhance research, and increase sales. In the public sector, data mining applications are used to detect fraud and waste, and measure and improve program performance. However, some of the homeland security data mining applications represent a significant expansion in the quantity and scope of data to be analyzed, and have attracted a higher level of congressional interest.

The author outlines various implementation and oversight issues that can influence the success of a data-mining project's outcome, including:

- \* Data quality - the accuracy and completeness of the data being analyzed.
- \* Interoperability of the data mining software and databases being used by different agencies.
- \* Mission creep - using the data for purposes other than those for which the data were originally collected.
- \* Privacy - the degree to which government agencies should use and mix commercial data with government data.

The author surveys legislative proposals introduced during the 108th Congress that would restrict data mining activities by some parts of the federal government, and/or increase the reporting requirements of such projects to Congress. He reports that data mining has continued to be a subject of interest in the 109th Congress. This CRS report will be updated as events warrant.

**IN DEPTH** is published **quarterly** by the AERC-American Embassy Resource Center.  
If interested in **full text of reports** above, please e-mail [matostm@state.gov](mailto:matostm@state.gov)

December 2005

## IN DEPTH...

Views expressed in the **reports** are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect U.S. government

### **AMERICA'S PLACE IN THE WORLD 2005: OPINION LEADERS TURN CAUTIOUS, PUBLIC LOOKS HOMEWARD**

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press  
November 2005 – 110 pages

Produced in collaboration with the Council on Foreign Relations, this quadrennial study examines the foreign policy attitudes of the U.S. general public and U.S. opinion leaders -- state and local government officials; security and foreign affairs experts; military officers; news media, university, think tank, and religious leaders; and scientists and engineers.

Conducted September 5 - October 31, 2005, the survey reflects the major changes in the world that have occurred since the previous poll was taken just prior to the 9/11 attacks.

Principal findings indicate that, preoccupied with war abroad and growing problems at home, U.S. opinion leaders and the general public are taking a decidedly cautious view of America's place in the world. Over the past four years, for instance, opinion leaders have become less supportive of the United States playing a "first among equals" role among the world's leading nations, and the goal of promoting democracy in other nations has lost ground.

Other survey findings include:

- \* China's emerging global power is not triggering increased concern among opinion leaders or the general public.
- \* Underscoring the rising importance of Asia generally, foreign affairs specialists and security experts most often name India as a country likely to emerge as a more important U.S. partner.
- \* Solid majorities in every group of opinion leaders - and 84% of the public - say it is important that the partnership between the U.S. and Western Europe remain close.
- \* Americans express considerable concern over the spread of AIDS and other infectious diseases.
- \* The public overwhelmingly believes post-9/11 restrictions on foreign student visas are worth it to prevent terrorists from entering the country.
- \* Americans view the goals of reducing the flow of illegal immigration and combating international drug trafficking as much more important long-term priorities than do opinion leaders.

[Note: Contains copyrighted material.]

### **THE IMPERATIVE FOR ACTION: AN UPDATE OF THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON AMERICAN INTERESTS AND UN REFORM**

Task Force on the United Nations  
November 2005 – 49 pages

A follow-up to the Congressionally mandated report issued in June 2005 by the bipartisan Task Force on the United Nations co-chaired by Newt Gingrich and George Mitchell, this report assesses what was or was not achieved at the September UN summit meeting, and what should be done next. Like the June report, this progress report is written from an American perspective.

The Task Force believes, however, that reforming the United Nations is not a favor to the United States, but an effort to advance goals that are widely shared by the members of the United Nations -- some two-thirds of whom are now electoral democracies.

The report is divided into five sections -- human rights and genocide; management reform; weapons of mass destruction proliferation; preventing and ending conflicts; and development and humanitarian assistance.

### **THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICA: SHIFTING GEOPOLITICS IN AN "AGE OF TERROR"**

Brennan M Kraxberger

Africa Today, Fall 2005, Vol.52, Iss. 1; pg. 46, 25 pgs

Africa is a region of renewed interest for American foreign-policy elites, both in and out of government. The purpose of this paper is twofold: to explore American foreign-policy elites' assessments of Africa before and after 11 September 2001, and to analyze how these assessments have been translated into American foreign policy toward Africa. The analysis is based on a review of government, think-tank, and other publications and transcripts associated with American foreign-policy elites, including the journal Foreign Affairs. Special focus is given to the strategic ranking and assessment of foreign countries within a global geopolitical code, or mental map of priority areas for U.S. military, economic, and diplomatic resources and engagement. American foreign-policy elites' assessments of Africa have shifted substantially since the 1990s, when the continent was largely regarded as quite marginal to American interests. Since late 2001, concerns about failed and failing states have emerged as a central theme in American foreign-policy elites' assessment of Africa and other parts of the developing world. Concerns about the nexus of transnational Islamist terrorism and failing states have prompted many such elites to call for a grand American geopolitical program of nation-building and military decentralization. To date, the United States has taken only small steps to align its foreign policy toward Africa. Significant tensions and contradictions limiting the execution of a new grand strategy remain.

### **TRANSFORMING GLOBALIZATION AND SECURITY: AFRICA AND AMERICA POST-9/11**

Pádraig Carmody

Africa Today, Fall 2005, Vol.52, Iss. 1; pg. 96, 26 pgs

Africa has traditionally had a marginal and decreasing role in international affairs. Since the attacks of 11 September 2001, however, the continent has taken center stage in the emerging security discourse, and access to African oil is now a strategic priority for the United States, which now trades more with Africa than Central Europe and the former Soviet Union combined. This fact, and the potential threat from global terrorism, are reflected in emerging security regimes on the continent, bolstered by increased U.S. military assistance. Thus, global forces have penetrated not only African economic policymaking, but also security; however, increased military assistance and the suppression of human rights are further distancing society from the African state, worsening long-term instability and jeopardizing U.S. access to African oil. The creation of genuine security in Africa and the United States will depend on the reconceptualization of security as human security, and the addition of a substantive social-welfare dimension to globalization.

### **STRUCTURAL POWER AND THE POLITICS OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY RELATIONS**

Matthias Kaelberer

The Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies, Fall 2005, Vol.30, Iss. 3; pg. 333, 27 pgs

What are the sources of monetary power and how does the concept of monetary power explain the politics of international monetary relations? This paper argues that international monetary power rests on the differential domestic costs of macroeconomic adjustment obligations between weak and strong currency countries. At their very core, exchange rate relations reflect questions of how to distribute the burden of adjustment. Monetary interdependence implies that countries need to establish consistency between internal macroeconomic policy and external exchange rate policy. Countries solve the consistency issue on the basis of market power. Strong monetary players have greater bargaining leverage in monetary negotiations because they do not face a reserve constraint. They can use their leverage to protect their own domestic macroeconomic priorities and to compromise merely on questions of external adjustment and financing. The paper evaluates these analytical assumptions by comparing two European exchange rate regimes (the snake and the European Monetary System), the Bretton Woods system of 1944 to 1971 and the current monetary relations between the United States and China (often referred to as Bretton Woods II).

## **EUROPEAN DEFENSE INTEGRATION: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN STRATEGY AND CAPABILITIES**

Michele A. Flournoy and Julianne Smith  
Center for Strategic and International Studies  
October 2005 – 99 pages

This report is the culmination of the CSIS European Defense Integration project. Its foreword states that building stronger European defense capabilities is critical for the transatlantic relationship, as both sides of the Atlantic must work closely together to combat common security challenges. It calls for a greater degree of defense integration that would coordinate the efforts of individual European countries, the European Union and NATO to create an enhanced and more interdependent set of collective defense capabilities to meet Europe's future defense needs.

Each chapter of the report addresses a different part of the defense integration equation from an examination of national efforts, to the roles and responsibilities within and between NATO and the European Union for addressing priority capability shortfalls. There are also chapters on the role that the defense industry plays in driving defense integration and on a new "country cluster" methodology to address high priority capability shortfalls. Each chapter includes concrete recommendations - over 50 in all - that aim to assist policymakers, defense planners and political elites in bridging the gap between strategies and capabilities.

[Note: Contains copyrighted material.]

## **PRECEDENTS, VARIABLES, AND OPTIONS IN PLANNING A U.S. MILITARY DISENGAGEMENT STRATEGY FROM IRAQ**

W. Andrew Terrill and Conrad C. Crane  
United States Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI)  
October 2005 – 68 pages

In his forward, the SSI Director writes that questions of how to empower the Iraqis most effectively and then progressively withdraw non-Iraqi forces from that country is a complex issue that often has been oversimplified in many of the current media debates. He finds that there are too few serious discussions of problems, opportunities, and meaningful precedents that might be useful in developing guidelines and considerations for U.S. policy in Iraq.

This monograph by Drs. W. Andrew Terrill and Conrad C. Crane seeks to present the U.S. situation in Iraq in all of its complexity and ambiguity. They consider previous instances of U.S. military occupation of foreign countries and the difficulty of maintaining domestic support for such operations. While the authors view the empowerment of a viable Iraqi central government and a security force to defend its authority as vital to the future of that country, they also suggest that there are severe constraints on the United States' potential to sustain its military presence at the current level. They conclude that the United States must be prepared to withdraw from Iraq under non-optimal conditions, and that the chief U.S. goal should be to devise an exit strategy for Iraq that focuses on bolstering Iraqi government legitimacy. The authors strongly reject the idea of withdrawing from Iraq according to a formal timetable.

## **THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: TRANSFORMATION THROUGH INTEGRATION AND INNOVATION**

October 2005 – 32 pages

In the foreword of this publicly available document, the Director of National Intelligence, John Negroponte, writes that this National Intelligence Strategy capitalizes on the talents and patriotism of America's diverse intelligence professionals and relies on the U.S. tradition of teamwork and technological innovation. A strategy, he observes, is a statement of fundamental values, highest priorities, and orientation toward the future, but it is an action document as well.

The Strategy sets forth two kinds of strategic objectives - mission and enterprise. Key mission objectives are:

- \* Defeating terrorists at home and abroad by disarming their operational capabilities, while seizing the initiative by promoting the growth of freedom and democracy;
- \* Preventing and countering the spread of weapons of mass destruction;
- \* Bolstering the growth of democracy and sustaining peaceful democratic states.
- \* Developing methods to infiltrate and analyze tough intelligence targets; and

\* Anticipating threats and identifying opportunities and vulnerabilities for decision makers.

Enterprise objectives for the intelligence community include:

- \* Building an integrated intelligence infrastructure that will address threats to the American homeland, consistent with U.S. laws and the protection of privacy and civil liberties;
- \* Strengthening analytic expertise and exploring alternative analytic views; and
- \* Attracting, engaging, and unifying an innovative, results-focused Intelligence Community workforce.

### **NATURAL ALLIES? REGIONAL SECURITY IN ASIA AND PROSPECTS FOR INDO-AMERICAN STRATEGIC COOPERATION**

Dr. Stephen J. Blank

United States Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI)

September 2005 – 215 pages

According to the author, Indo-American relations increasingly comprise expanded strategic and economic ties. India's government, led by Prime Minister Mamonhan Singh, has stated its intention to intensify these ties with America. Similarly, the Bush administration has indicated its intention to sustain, as a priority, the gains achieved since 2001.

This book-length monograph seeks to illuminate India's rising power and capabilities with regard to the key regions on its periphery: the Persian Gulf, Central Asia, and South East Asia. The author also considers the major issues pertaining to India's bilateral defense agenda with the United States. By revealing the dimensions of India's growing capabilities and interests, he provides a strategic rationale for the development of the U.S.-India partnership to date, and for its further evolution.

### **PROVINCIAL RECONSTRUCTION TEAMS: MILITARY RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN**

Michael J. Dziedzic and Colonel Michael K. Seidl

United States Institute of Peace

September 2005 – 16 pages

This report stems from a joint project conducted by the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) and the RAND Corporation that resulted in the publication of the book *Aid During Conflict: Interaction Between Military and Civilian Assistance Providers in Afghanistan*, September 2001-June 2002, and an October 2005 conference.

The report examines Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan, and the complications that arise when international civilian and military personnel are simultaneously involved in providing humanitarian relief or reconstruction assistance in the midst of combat or in other non permissive environments. Among the concerns that repeatedly arise are security, the proper role of the military in providing assistance, information sharing, coordination, and preservation of the "humanitarian space" that NGOs and International Organizations rely upon to perform their tasks.

After reviewing the deployment and evolution of the PRTs, the authors describe the different perspectives from which international civilian assistance providers and military actors view these issues. The report concludes with specific recommendations for PRTs, and general suggestions for enhancing the quality of the relationship between military forces and civilian assistance providers.

### **NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL: THE U.S.-RUSSIAN AGENDA**

Amy F. Woolf

Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service

Updated August 8, 2005 – 19 pages

By the late 1990s, arms control negotiations were not as important to the U.S.-Russian relationship as they were to the U.S.- Soviet relationship during the Cold War. Nevertheless, the United States and Russia continued to implement existing nuclear arms control agreements and to pursue negotiations on further reductions in their strategic offensive weapons and modifications to limits on ballistic missile defenses. This issue brief summarizes these agreements and tracks progress in their ratification and implementation.

## **U.S.-PAKISTAN ENGAGEMENT: THE WAR ON TERRORISM AND BEYOND**

Touqir Hussain  
United States Institute of Peace  
August 2005 – 16 pages

Written by a senior fellow at the United States Institute of Peace, the report examines the history and present state of U.S.-Pakistan relations and addresses the key challenges the two countries face.

In the author's view, while the war on terrorism may have provided the rationale for the latest U.S. engagement with Pakistan, the present relationship between the United States and Pakistan is at the crossroads of many other issues. These include Pakistan's own reform efforts, America's evolving strategic relationship with South Asia, democracy in the Muslim world, and the dual problems of religious extremism and nuclear proliferation. As a result, the two countries have a complex relationship that presents a unique challenge to their respective policymaking communities.

The report concludes with policy recommendations for both Pakistan and the United States that suggest ways of broadening the relationship to make it long-term, stable, and mutually beneficial -- as envisioned in the 9/11 Commission Report.

## **LAW VS. WAR: COMPETING APPROACHES TO FIGHTING TERRORISM**

Shawn Boyne, Michael German, and Paul R. Pillar  
Introduction by Dallas D. Owens  
United States Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI)  
July 2005 – 29 pages

In three papers, the authors address one of the fundamental assumptions underlying the conduct of the War on Terrorism? the nature of the enemy and whether perpetrators of terrorist activities are criminals or soldiers (combatants). Although the United States recognizes that terrorist acts are certainly illegal, it has, in many ways, chosen to treat perpetrators as combatants. By contrast, much of the world (including many traditional U.S. allies) has opted for a purely legalistic approach. The papers were presented at a February 2005 conference -- "Beyond the U.S. War on Terrorism: Comparing Domestic Legal Remedies to an International Dilemma" - sponsored by the University of Virginia School of Law, in cooperation with the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI).

In his "Foreword" essay, the SSI director writes that these authors exemplify the important dialogue taking place in their respective communities: federal government, law enforcement, and academia. "Their insights into how our respective cultures and histories influence our definitions, assumptions, and subsequent policy decisions can help us respect and learn from competing strategies. They correctly surmise that our current international struggle is too important for us to ignore assumptions underlying our own and competing ideas." He notes that SSI has offered these thought-provoking readings as a contribution to the national security debate about fighting the War on Terrorism.

## **U.S.-JAPAN RELATIONS: PROGRESS TOWARD A MATURE PARTNERSHIP**

James J. Przystup  
Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS); National Defense University  
June 2005 – 48 pages

Prepared by an INSS senior research fellow, this study assesses the steps taken by the governments of the United States and Japan to implement the recommendations of the October 2000 special report, *The United States and Japan: Advancing Toward a Mature Partnership*, and to chart a course for future action.

In the study's "Foreword," INSS Director Stephen Flanagan observes that while the 2000 special report did not anticipate the profound transformation of the international security environment following September 11, 2001, the U.S.-Japan alliance has responded remarkably to the unprecedented challenges. The cumulative effect of the policy decisions and attendant actions has transformed this alliance into an instrument that enhances stability and security across the globe -- thus supporting the national interests of both the American and Japanese people.

He writes that, at the same time, the security challenges touched on in the initial special report involving the Korean Peninsula and the Taiwan Strait have not disappeared. Likewise, in Southeast Asia, ethnic and religious differences remain susceptible to both internal and external exploitation.

"The threats posed by international terrorism and WMD proliferation, as well as the enduring challenges of maintaining security and prosperity in East Asia and globally, warrant close coordination of U.S. and Japanese national policies and further steps to enhance the alliance." The new paper, U.S.-Japan Relations: Progress Toward a Mature Partnership, contributes to efforts to advance these goals.

**IN DEPTH** is published **quarterly** by the AERC-American Embassy Resource Center.  
If interested in **full text of reports** above, please e-mail [matostm@state.gov](mailto:matostm@state.gov)

September 2005

## IN DEPTH...

Views expressed in the reports are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect U.S. government

### AFRICA

#### **A STRATEGIC U.S. APPROACH TO GOVERNANCE AND SECURITY IN THE GULF OF GUINEA**

David L. Goldwyn and J. Stephen Morrison  
Center for Strategic and International Studies  
July 2005, 48 pages

In 2004, the Center for Strategic and International Studies launched the CSIS Task Force on Gulf of Guinea Security. Comprised of a broad array of experts from corporations, human rights and activist groups, the military, academia, and government, the Task Force examined the nature of the Gulf of Guinea's regional threats and sought to develop forward-looking, practical solutions for U.S. policymakers. The Task Force's report offers the following principal recommendations for U.S. action:

- Make security and governance in the Gulf of Guinea an explicit priority in U.S. foreign policy toward Africa, and promulgate a robust, comprehensive policy approach to the region
- Name a special assistant to the President and Secretary of State to coordinate U.S. policy and support the efforts of U.S. ambassadors to the Gulf of Guinea -- modeled on the existing special adviser for Caspian Basin Energy
- Offer monetary incentives and support for good governance, transparency, and democracy-building, and strengthen regional and country-level capacities to manage maritime environments, protect fisheries and energy infrastructures, and curb criminality
- Work to strengthen promising regional initiatives like the International Maritime Organizations cooperative arrangements with the region's ports, the Food and Agriculture Organizations efforts to deter illicit fishing in the region, and the nascent Gulf of Guinea Commission
- Make Gulf of Guinea policy a regular agenda item in high-level discussion with the European Union, the G-8, and with China, whose presence in the region is growing apace

[Note: Contains copyrighted material.]

### ASIA

#### **U.S.-PAKISTAN ENGAGEMENT: THE WAR ON TERRORISM AND BEYOND**

Touqir Hussain  
United States Institute of Peace  
August 2005, 16 pages

Written by a senior fellow at the United States Institute of Peace, the report examines the history and present state of U.S.-Pakistan relations and addresses the key challenges the two countries face.

In the author's view, while the war on terrorism may have provided the rationale for the latest U.S. engagement with Pakistan, the present relationship between the United States and Pakistan is at the

crossroads of many other issues. These include Pakistan's own reform efforts, America's evolving strategic relationship with South Asia, democracy in the Muslim world, and the dual problems of religious extremism and nuclear proliferation. As a result, the two countries have a complex relationship that presents a unique challenge to their respective policymaking communities.

The report concludes with policy recommendations for both Pakistan and the United States that suggest ways of broadening the relationship to make it long-term, stable, and mutually beneficial -- as envisioned in the 9/11 Commission Report.

## EUROPE

### **NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL: THE U.S.-RUSSIAN AGENDA**

Amy F. Woolf

Library of Congress / Congressional Research Service.

Updated August 8, 2005, 19 pages

By the late 1990s, arms control negotiations were not as important to the U.S.-Russian relationship as they were to the U.S.-Soviet relationship during the Cold War. Nevertheless, the United States and Russia continued to implement existing nuclear arms control agreements and to pursue negotiations on further reductions in their strategic offensive weapons and modifications to limits on ballistic missile defenses. This issue brief summarizes these agreements and tracks progress in their ratification and implementation.

## MIDDLE EAST

### **REBUILDING IRAQ: STATUS OF FUNDING AND RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS**

United States Government Accountability Office (GAO)

July 28, 2005, 49 pages

Rebuilding Iraq constitutes the largest U.S. assistance program since World War II. This report provides information on the funding applied to the reconstruction effort, and U.S. activities and progress made in the oil, power, water, and health sectors.

The GAO found that as of March 2005, the United States, Iraq, and international donors had pledged or made available more than \$60 billion for security, governance, and reconstruction efforts in Iraq. The United States provided about \$24 billion (for fiscal years 2003 through 2005) largely for security and reconstruction activities. Of this amount, about \$18 billion had been obligated and about \$9 billion disbursed.

According to the report, the U.S. has completed projects in Iraq that have helped to restore basic services, such as rehabilitating oil wells and refineries, increasing electrical generation capacity, restoring water treatment plants, and reestablishing Iraqi basic health care services.

However, as of May 2005, Iraq's crude oil production and overall power generation were lower than before the 2003 conflict, although power levels have increased recently. In addition, some completed water projects were not functioning as intended; and construction at hospital and clinics is under way. Reconstruction efforts continue to face challenges such as rebuilding in an insecure environment, ensuring the sustainability of completed projects, and measuring program results.

### **ESTABLISHING LAW AND ORDER AFTER CONFLICT**

Seth G. Jones, Jeremy Wilson, Andrew Rathmell and K. Jack Riley

The RAND Corporation

July 2005, 293 pages

This RAND study contains the results of research on reconstructing internal security institutions during nation-building missions. It analyzes the activities of the United States and other countries in building viable police, internal security forces, and justice structures. The study examines the reconstruction efforts

in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Kosovo -- three of the most important instances in the post-Cold War era in which the United States and its allies have attempted to reconstruct security institutions. It then compares these cases with six others in the post-Cold War era: Panama, El Salvador, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, and East Timor.

Finally, the study draws conclusions from the case studies and analysis, and derives recommendations to help the United States and other international actors improve their performance in the delivery of post-conflict security.

The results should be of interest to a broad audience of policymakers and academics concerned with the successes and shortcomings of past security efforts. While not intended to be a detailed analysis of U.S. or allied military doctrine regarding stability operations, the authors believe that the study provides a useful set of guidelines and recommendations for a wide range of military, civilian, and other practitioners.

[Note: Contains copyrighted material.]

### **THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR AND U.S. DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: USAID ALLOCATION BY COUNTRY, 1998-2005**

Todd Moss, David Roodman, Scott Standley  
Center for Global Development  
July 2005, 19 pages

This working paper assesses changes in the U.S. Agency for International Development's allocation of foreign aid since 1998, in order to gauge the Global War on Terror's (GWOT) impact on funding for anti-poverty programs.

The common expectation, the authors note, has been that development assistance would be used to support strategic allies in the GWOT, perhaps at the expense of anti-poverty programs. The researchers studied the changes in USAID's country allocations over 1998-2001 versus 2002-05. For each country, they also looked at such variables as: the presence of foreign terrorist groups; sharing a border with a state sponsor of terrorism; troop contribution in Iraq; and relative share of Muslim population.

They conclude that any major changes in aid allocation due to the GWOT appear to be affecting only a handful of critical countries, namely, Iraq, Afghanistan, Jordan, and the Palestinian Territories. The extra resources to these countries also seem to be coming from overall increases in the bilateral aid envelope, combined with declines in aid to Israel, Egypt, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The aid curtailments to Israel and Egypt were planned well before 2001, and the decline to Bosnia and Herzegovina is the result of the end of the immediate post-conflict reconstruction phase. While this increased availability of funds may be a coincidence, it also is clearly an enabling factor that allows aid to be channeled elsewhere. At this point, they write, concerns that there is a large and systematic diversion of U.S. foreign aid from fighting poverty to fighting the GWOT do not appear to have been realized.

[Note: Contains copyrighted material.]

## NATO

### **Transatlantic Trends Overview: 2005**

*Transatlantic Trends* is an annual public opinion survey examining American and European attitudes toward the transatlantic relationship. A project of the German Marshall Fund and the Compagnia di San Paolo, with additional support provided by Fundação Luso-Americana and Fundación BBVA, this year's survey examines what citizens on both sides of the Atlantic think about a broad range of topics, including:

- Perceptions of foreign policy threats, such as international terrorism, nuclear weapons, and global warming
- American and European views of each other and other countries, as well as their ability to work on global and international problems together

- George W. Bush's efforts to mend transatlantic relations
- European feelings about the EU, particularly in light of the failure of the referenda on the EU Constitutional Treaty
- Transatlantic views on the role of the European Union as a global actor and potential superpower
- Democracy promotion as a foreign policy goal
- Turkey's accession to the European Union
- The role of NATO and the United Nations

*(Transatlantic Trends 2005 was conducted by TNS Opinion & Social. Data for the survey was collected in the United States and ten European countries: Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, and Turkey).*

## UNITED NATIONS

### **AMERICAN INTERESTS AND UN REFORM: REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE UNITED NATIONS**

United States Institute of Peace (USIP)  
June 2005, 154 pages

Mandated by Congress, this report was issued by the bipartisan Task Force on the United Nations. The task force was organized by the United States Institute of Peace and led by Newt Gingrich, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, and George Mitchell, former majority leader of the Senate. It focused on the United Nations from the perspective of American interests and America's international responsibilities.

The task force's report offers an actionable agenda for Congress to strengthen the United Nations. Its recommendations include:

- 1) Addressing urgently needed internal UN management reform by: establishing a single, very senior official in charge of daily operations and filling the role of Chief Operating Officer; empowering the Secretary General to replace his or her top officials; creating an Independent Oversight Board that has the audit powers to prevent another scandal like Oil-for-Food.
- 2) Action by the U.S. government to call upon the UN and its members to "affirm a responsibility of every sovereign government to protect its own citizenry and those within its borders from genocide, mass killing, and massive and sustained human rights violations."
- 3) Abolition of the current UN Human Rights Commission, and establishment of a new Human Rights Council, ideally composed of democracies, and dedicated to monitoring, promoting, and enforcing human rights.

## UNITED STATES

### **ADHERENCE TO AND COMPLIANCE WITH ARMS CONTROL, NONPROLIFERATION, AND DISARMAMENT AGREEMENTS AND COMMITMENTS**

Bureau of Verification and Compliance  
United States Department of State  
August 30, 2005, 111 pages

This Congressionally mandated report reflects the importance the Administration and the U.S. Congress place upon compliance with arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements and commitments.

A primary objective of the report is to highlight cases of noncompliance or of compliance concern, so that policymakers can focus their attention upon returning violators to full compliance as rapidly as possible. Another key objective is to make it very clear that the United States takes compliance assessment seriously, and applies only the highest standards of analytical rigor in making its compliance findings. The report's clarity and detail are designed to set the global standard for compliance assessment.

The report, in turn, addresses U.S. compliance; compliance by Russia and other successor states of the Soviet Union with treaties and agreements concluded bilaterally with the Soviet Union; compliance by other countries that are parties to multilateral agreements with the United States; and compliance with commitments made less formally that bear directly upon arms control, nonproliferation, and/or disarmament issues.

Although the Report primarily reflects activities that occurred from January 1, 2002, through January 1, 2004, every effort has been made to include significant developments that have occurred more recently. Unless otherwise noted, compliance issues that first came to light after that period will be addressed in the Noncompliance Report due to Congress on April 15, 2006.

### **STRENGTHENING U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY REQUIRES ORGANIZATION, COORDINATION, AND STRATEGY**

Stephen Johnson, Helle C. Dale, and Patrick Cronin, Ph.D.  
The Heritage Foundation  
August 5, 2005, 16 pages

Now that Karen Hughes has begun serving as Undersecretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, the authors propose additional steps the White House and Congress should take to reshape and redirect U.S. public diplomacy. These are:

- \* Strengthening State Department public diplomacy by providing adequate authority and resources;
- \* Streamlining foreign broadcasting to ensure better coordination with global public diplomacy and development goals;
- \* Integrating public diplomacy efforts across the government by appointing a high-level coordinator and establishing an independent foreign polling center;
- \* Creating a public diplomacy doctrine and global strategy, developed by lead public diplomacy actors; and
- \* Abolishing domestic access limits on public diplomacy products contained in legislation dating from the 1940s.

The authors also recommend the following U.S. diplomatic strategies for countering the influence of Islamic extremism and defusing the root cause of terrorism:

- \* Promote regional and local media initiatives by encouraging the growth of independent private media, and counter misperceptions by providing access to U.S. Arabic-speaking spokesmen and program content that offer balanced news and commentary;
- \* Invest in education by enhancing support for existing American schools, offering local scholarships for the poor, increasing adult education opportunities, and reviving book translation programs; and
- \* Engage opinion leaders and media elites to ensure that they have the information to counter misperceptions, distortions, stereotypes, and lies about America.

**IN DEPTH** is published quarterly by the AERC-American Embassy Resource Center.  
If interested in full text of reports above, please e-mail [matostm@state.gov](mailto:matostm@state.gov)

June 2005

## IN DEPTH...

Views expressed in the reports are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect U.S. government

### MIDDLE EAST

#### **THE COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY'S EXPERIENCE WITH ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION IN IRAQ: LESSONS IDENTIFIED** [USIP Special Report No. 138]

Anne Ellen Henderson.  
United States Institute of Peace (USIP)  
April 2005

[Note: The United States Institute of Peace is an independent, nonpartisan federal institution created by Congress in 1984 to promote the prevention, management, and peaceful resolution of international conflicts.]

This report is a product of the United States Institute of Peace's (USIP's) Iraq Experience Project. It is based on extensive interviews with 113 U.S. officials, soldiers, and contractors who served there. This report is focused specifically on economic reconstruction in Iraq under the Coalition Provisional Authority. [See also USIP Special Report No. 137, cited herein as ADSURLS ITEM # 476] These reports are intended for use as training aids in programs that prepare individuals for service in peace and stability operations, so that lessons identified in Iraq may be translated into lessons learned by those assigned to future missions.

The author notes that Iraq's economic reconstruction under coalition occupation was notable for both impressive accomplishments and serious shortcomings. "Many successful reconstruction initiatives shared essential elements: they were not affected by security disruptions; they were treated as top priorities; their funding was streamlined and their impact was quick; and they built on existing Iraqi capacity. Unsuccessful reconstruction initiatives had very different elements in common. Policy failure often coincided with security headaches, lack of powerful coalition patrons, funding delays, and weak Iraqi implementation capacity. Because of the scarcity of reliable data and the complexity of key tasks, planning for post-conflict reconstruction should incorporate multiple contingencies. It is crucial to factor eventualities such as economic disruption, persistent violence, and state collapse into calculations of the feasible pace of reconstruction. Promises to deliver immediate and dramatic improvements create unrealistic expectations that jeopardize the legitimacy of reconstruction efforts." Henderson outlines steps that can be taken to minimize such discontinuity.

### EUROPE

#### **EUROPEAN VIEWS AND POLICIES TOWARD THE MIDDLE EAST** [RL31956]

Kristin Archick  
Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service  
Updated March 9, 2005

Managing policy differences on a range of issues emanating from the Middle East poses serious challenges for the United States and its European allies and friends. The most vitriolic dispute has centered on the conflict in Iraq. However, divisions over how best to approach the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict, manage Iran and Syria, and combat terrorism also persist. The Bush Administration and Members of Congress are concerned that continued disagreements between the two sides of the Atlantic could both constrain U.S. policy choices in the region and erode the broader transatlantic relationship and counterterrorism cooperation over the longer term. The U.S.-initiated Broader Middle East and North Africa partnership project seeks to encourage reforms in the region and U.S.-European cooperation in tackling Mideast problems.

Many analysts assert that the United States and Europe share common vital interests in the Middle East: combating terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; promoting Middle East peace and stability; ensuring a reliable flow of oil; and curtailing Islamic extremism. U.S. and European policies to promote these goals often differ considerably. Although the European governments are not monolithic in their opinions on the Middle East, European perspectives have been shaped over time by common elements unique to Europe's history and geostrategic position.

Many Europeans believe the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should be a priority. They view it as a key driver of terrorism, Islamic extremism, and political unrest among Europe's growing Muslim populations. In contrast, the U.S. Administration stresses that terrorism and weapons proliferation are the primary threats and must be pro-actively confronted; peace and stability in the region will not be possible until these twin threats are removed. A number of other factors, such as divergent perceptions of the appropriate role of the use of force and growing European Union (EU) ambitions to play a larger role on the world stage, also contribute to the policy gaps that have emerged.

### **THE EUROPEAN UNION IN 2005 AND BEYOND** [RS21757]

Kristin Archick

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service

Updated March 7, 2005.

The European Union (EU) experienced significant changes in 2004 as it enlarged from 15 to 25 members and continued work on a new constitutional treaty to institute internal reforms and further EU political integration. In 2005 the EU is expected to build on these efforts and seek to implement several recent foreign policy and defense initiatives. This report describes the current status of the EU's "constitution," EU enlargement, the EU's evolving foreign and defense policies, and possible implications for U.S.-EU relations.

## **NATO**

### **NATO EXPEDITIONARY OPERATIONS: IMPACTS ON NEW MEMBERS AND PARTNERS**

[NDU/INSS Occasional Paper No. 1]

Jeffrey Simon

National Defense University (NDU), Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS)

March 2005

In an effort to make European troops more employable in out-of-area (OOA) operations, the United States has urged NATO to set goals of having each member nation able to deploy 40 percent of its forces abroad, with at least 8 percent of each nation's military actually deployed at any given time. The motivation behind this idea is to help sustain the ongoing shift from reliance on territorial defenses during the Cold War to expeditionary forces in the post-September 11 era. Even so, says the author, this objective may be exceedingly difficult for new NATO members to achieve, given the competing budgetary and political pressures to which they are subjected. To successfully develop more expeditionary capability, Simon argues that discussions of a new defense and force planning approach might include the following issues:

- \* NATO military authorities need to provide specific advice for specialized force planning, as increasing reliance on expeditionary operations has demonstrated that the Cold War concept of "national responsibility" for territorial defense forces is no longer useful.
- \* NATO military authorities and/or individual member governments should provide international training support (especially for counterterrorism operations) and develop a new approach to multinational formations.
- \* NATO should develop a new system to finance international military operations.
- \* NATO needs to focus on public information methods to provide contributing nations with sufficient information more effectively to sustain public support for military operations far from home.
- \* NATO needs to work with the European Union to explore how defense ministry activities in support of post-conflict and counterterrorism-related missions could be more closely coordinated with the ongoing work of interior ministries.
- \* The United States and European NATO allies need to engage in a transatlantic dialogue that addresses the resulting limitations and obligations of Article 5 in the new post-September 11 environment.

**IN DEPTH** is published quarterly by the AERC-American Embassy Resource Center.  
If interested in full text of reports above, please e-mail [matostm@state.gov](mailto:matostm@state.gov)

**MARCH 2005**

Views expressed in the reports are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect U.S. government

## **IN DEPTH...**

### **Middle East**

#### **A BETTER WAY TO SUPPORT MIDDLE EAST REFORM**

[Carnegie Endowment Policy Brief No. 33]

Thomas Carothers

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP)

January 25, 2005

The Bush administration established a new aid program for the region in late 2002, the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI), headquartered at the State Department. Carothers argues that: "Housing an aid program within the State Department may have carried with it the promise of a positive synergy of diplomacy and aid for reform, in which U.S. government political muscle could bolster a challenging pro-reform aid program, but conflicting U.S. interests in the Middle East have led to the opposite result. An aid program run out of the State Department bureau responsible for managing America's close ties with many of the region's autocratic governments has ended up not being very daring in its approach and often undermined by other policy imperatives.

The author also believes that MEPI does not belong with either USAID or the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). Rather, he argues for the reestablishment of MEPI as the Middle East Foundation (MEF), a private foundation that would function in ways similar to the Asia Foundation and the Eurasia Foundation.

#### **IRAQ'S CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESS: SHAPING A VISION FOR THE COUNTRY'S FUTURE**

United States Institute of Peace (USIP)

February 2005

The elections that have just taken place in Iraq are not simply for an ordinary legislative body; the elected National Assembly will also have the responsibility of drafting a constitution for the nation. That constitution-making process can be elite-driven and subject to external interference, or it can be transparent, participatory, and truly Iraqi, leading to greater legitimacy and stability. The United States Institute of Peace (USIP) Rule of Law Program, together with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), is finishing a three-year project that has examined constitution making in eighteen countries, most of which have undergone post-conflict transitions. At the same time, the Rule of Law Program, through extensive consultations in Iraq, has analyzed Iraqi hopes and ambitions for the constitutional process.

This report, written by the Rule of Law Program staff, addresses the following issues:

- \* What lessons for Iraq might there be from other post-conflict constitution-making processes?
  - \* How can members of Iraq's new National Assembly work with civil society groups and use the constitutional process to set the country on a new, more hopeful path, and to ensure that Iraq is both inclusive and stable?
  - \* What role might there be for the international community in supporting this Iraqi sovereign process?
- The recommendations in this report are directed both to the international community and to the elected assembly as it begins its important constitution-making efforts.

## **IRAQ: ALLAYING TURKEY'S FEARS OVER KURDISH AMBITIONS**

[Middle East Report No. 35]

International Crisis Group (ICG)

January 26, 2005

This report warns that tensions are at boiling-point in the oil-rich Kirkuk region of Iraq. The authors urge the U.S. and the EU to do more to resolve the Kirkuk question and help Ankara protect its vital interests without resort to destabilizing threats of military intervention. The situation has been aggravated by the worsening state of affairs in Iraq and by political actors, especially Kurds, who are seeking to undo the grave injustices of the ousted regime's policy of Arabization. Kurds are currently returning in large numbers and laying claim to multi-ethnic Kirkuk as the capital of a future Kurdish region, or state. Tensions have been contained somewhat by the presence of U.S. troops and a U.S.-engineered interim political arrangement -- a provincial council broadly representative of the four communities -- that, against all odds, has held, but only just.

The report states the situation in stark terms: "From Ankara's perspective, chaos or civil war in Iraq, the creation of a Kurdish state in the north with Kirkuk as its capital that would serve as a magnet or model for Turkey's own Kurdish population, or a combination of these, are nightmare scenarios. Should Turkish national interests seem to be in jeopardy, there is no real insurance against the threat of military action." The authors offer a number of recommendations for Turkish, Kurdish and U.S. negotiators.

## **ISRAEL'S CORE SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR A TWO-STATE SOLUTION**

Shlomo Yanai

Brookings Institution, Saban Center for Middle East Policy

January 2005

Since the Camp David meetings of August 2000, which included the broadest and most detailed discussion between Israeli, Palestinian, and U.S. officials of Israel's security requirements in a final status agreement, many myths have emerged about Israel's security demands. On the Palestinian side, some described Israel's negotiating position on its security requirements as draconian, an attempt to continue the occupation through other means. Others charged that the demands were obsessive and unnecessary in the new atmosphere of coexistence and cooperation at that time. On the Israeli side, critics argued that Israel's security demands were not stringent enough, and if implemented would undermine the security of the state. The author takes the view that some of these arguments were simply due to political machinations, but some emerged from a fundamental misunderstanding of basic security-related concepts and security arrangements, and from insufficient or biased information about Israel's security concept.

Yanai says that "the ultimate test of any security concept is whether it can provide answers to a changing reality and respond to events that were not foreseen at the outset; for by definition, there is no way to know exactly what the future holds. In a region like the Israeli-Palestinian arena, which has been characterized by instability and upheaval, risks will remain prevalent, and any security concepts and arrangements should take into account the possibility of unexpected changes."

## **Asia**

### **THE U.S.-INDIA RELATIONSHIP: STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP OR COMPLEMENTARY INTERESTS?**

Amit Gupta

United States Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI)

February 2005

Relations between India and the United States have run the gamut over the last half-century. Factors that have strained relations include divergent views on Cold War alliances, tensions between India and Pakistan, India's views of U.S. actions in the Bangladesh war, nuclear weapons and various other issues.

Despite significant tensions, however, India and the United States have continued to work together to overcome difficulties. The author argues that "India's continued economic and military growth, as well as its ongoing commitment towards secularism and democracy, makes it a future ally towards establishing strategic stability in Asia and in assisting future nation-building efforts across the globe. In the short run, therefore, the relationship should be based on securing complementary interests: ensuring stability in the Indian Ocean; promoting secularism and democracy across the world; and getting the Indian government to work proactively to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their associated systems."

## **PAKISTAN-U.S. RELATIONS**

K. Alan Kronstadt

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service

Updated January 28, 2005

The 21-month-old Pakistan-India peace initiative continues, most notably with expert and foreign secretary-level talks in Pakistan in December. Both sides called the series of talks "cordial and constructive," but only agreements to meet again in the future resulted.

New pessimism about progress arose in January, when talks between Pakistani and Indian officials failed to resolve an ongoing dispute over a dam that India is constructing in Baglihar, Kashmir. A Pakistani official said the failure would have a negative impact on the bilateral dialogue process and, on January 18, the World Bank announced that it had been asked by the Pakistani government to appoint a "neutral expert" to help resolve the dispute under the 1960 Indus Waters Treaty. New Delhi called the request "unjustified" and said that dam construction will continue. On the same day, the Indian army accused Pakistani troops of firing a dozen mortar shells over the Kashmiri Line of Control (LOC) in violation of a 14-month-old cease-fire agreement. Pakistan denied the accusation and later made its own claim that Indian small arms fire across the LOC was a cease-fire violation.

The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-458) and the Foreign Operations FY2005 appropriations bill (P.L. 108-447), enacted at the close of the 108th Congress, contain Pakistan-specific language and reporting requirements. In the 109th Congress, the Targeting Terrorists More Effectively Act of 2005 (S. 12, introduced January 24), identifies "a number of critical issues that threaten to disrupt" U.S.-Pakistan relations, calls for "dramatically increasing" USAID funding for Pakistan-related projects, would require the President to report to Congress a long-term strategy for U.S. engagement with Pakistan, would set nuclear proliferation-related conditions on assistance to Pakistan, and would earmark \$797 million in economic and military assistance to Pakistan for FY2006.

## **NORTH KOREA: A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS, OCTOBER 2002-DECEMBER 2004**

Mark E. Manyin, Emma Chanlett-Avery and Helene Marchart.

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service

January 24, 2005

This report provides a chronology of events relevant to U.S. relations with North Korea from October 2002 through December 31, 2004. The chronology includes significant meetings, events, and statements that shed light on the issues surrounding North Korea's nuclear weapons program. An introductory analysis provides background on U.S. policy preceding October 2002 as well as an overview of developments and dynamics among the major players in the North Korea nuclear dispute: South Korea, Japan, China, Russia, and the United States. Particular attention is paid to the demise of the Agreed Framework, the ongoing six party talks, China's prominent role in the negotiations, inter-Korean relations, and the Japanese abductee issue. Also discussed is Congress' role in dealing with North Korea, including the passage of the North Korea Human Rights Act (P.L. 108-333).

## **KOREAN REUNIFICATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES AND NORTHEAST ASIA**

Charles L. (Jack) Pritchard

Brookings Institution

January 14, 2005

The author argues that the reunification itself of the Korean peninsula is less important than when and how the reunification takes place. He favors a gradual unification, as this would have a better chance of political success and would entail less financial hardship for the South Korean populace. One potential problem with gradualism, however, is that the U.S. and other countries may find that any attempts at gradual reunification as a strengthening, albeit limited, of the Kim Jong-il regime. Pritchard also contemplates the roles of regional organization, arguing for a new Northeast Asia Security Dialogue (NEASD).

## **Europe**

### **U.S.-RUSSIAN RELATIONS: THE CASE FOR AN UPGRADE**

Andrew Kuchins, Vyacheslav Nikonov, and Dmitri Trenin

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP)

January 26, 2005

The authors of this report point to the recent Ukrainian elections to illustrate the fragility of U.S.-Russian relations. They present an overview of how Russia and the United States understand their

broader interests in international relations, to what extent their goals and interests overlap and how in the coming years the two nations may be able to increase that overlap.

According to the authors, the driving factors now and in the foreseeable future that will promote closer U.S. and Russian interests will be mainly in the security and energy realms. In terms of security issues, the U.S. and Russia broadly share interests in combating terrorism and preventing proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Despite a common interest of peace and stability across Eurasia, the two countries have competing visions and goals in the former Soviet states, and as the recent presidential elections in Ukraine displayed, different perceptions prevent deep cooperation. Moscow's status as an energy superpower possessing the largest overall hydrocarbon (oil and natural gas) reserves in the world is increasingly significant for U.S. policy and commercial interests.

## **KOSOVO: TOWARD FINAL STATUS**

[Europe Report No. 161]

International Crisis Group (ICG)

January 24, 2005

This report examines the mounting tensions in Kosovo and says that independence is the only solution that can dispel the gathering storm. Over the past five years, the final status issue has been delayed and ignored while Kosovo's two million people continue to exist in an international limbo. The population, 90 per cent of them ethnic Albanian, will never accept a return to Belgrade rule, but the international community has yet to grasp their increasing discontent, even after the deadly rioting in March 2004. The authors argue that Kosovo's independence must come soon, but only on the basis of a number of conditions being met, and the report sets out a timeline of decisions and events that would lead to an internationally recognized Kosovo by mid-2006. The situation in Kosovo is increasingly dangerous, threatening wide-scale unrest and even renewed war. Urgent progress must be made toward establishing Kosovo as an independent state, but only on the basis of fully guaranteed protections for its Serb and other minorities, says ICG.

Either 2005 will see the start of a final status solution that consolidates peace and development or Kosovo may return to conflict and generate regional instability. As a first step, the report urges the six-nation Contact Group to issue as soon as possible a statement spelling out a schedule for the resolution of the status issue, with independence as the goal. Such a statement will need to contain some crucial ground-rules: that the protection of minority rights is the issue on which progress will most depend, and that neither Kosovo's return to Belgrade's rule, nor its partition, nor any possible unification of Kosovo with Albania or any neighboring state or territory will be supported.

## **U.S.-EU [EUROPEAN UNION] COOPERATION AGAINST TERRORISM**

Kristin Archick

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service

January 19, 2005

As part of the European Union's (EU's) efforts to combat terrorism since September 11, the EU has made improving law enforcement cooperation with the United States a top priority. The Bush Administration and Members of Congress have largely welcomed this EU initiative in the hopes that it will help root out terrorist cells in Europe and beyond that could be planning other attacks against the United States or its interests. This is in line with the 9/11 Commission's recommendations that the United States should develop a "comprehensive coalition strategy" against Islamist terrorism, "exchange terrorist information with trusted allies," and improve border security through better international cooperation. Some measures in the resulting Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-458) mirror these sentiments and are consistent with U.S.-EU counterterrorism efforts, especially those aimed at improving border controls and transport security.

U.S.-EU cooperation against terrorism has led to a new dynamic in U.S.-EU relations by fostering dialogue on law enforcement and homeland security issues previously reserved for bilateral discussions. Despite some frictions, most U.S. policymakers and analysts view the developing partnership in these areas as positive, and one of the relative bright spots in the recently much-strained transatlantic relationship. At the June 2004 U.S.-EU Summit in Ireland, the two sides issued a joint declaration on combating terrorism that reinforces their commitment to work together on this global challenge. However, the United States and the EU continue to face several challenges as they seek to promote closer cooperation in the police, judicial, and border control fields.

**IN DEPTH** is published quarterly by the AERC-American Embassy Resource Center.

If interested in full text of reports above, please e-mail [matostm@state.gov](mailto:matostm@state.gov)