

Running head: EFFECTIVE NATION BUILDING

Effective Nation Building

Matthew S. Grucella

Nelson E. Blankenship

Paris A. Williams

Kawanda A. Dixon

Donald Okumu

Anthony R. Thomas

United States Army Sergeants Major Academy

Class 58

Sergeant Major Cornelius Bak

27 NOV 2007

Abstract

Much of the world and many of the Arabic nations view the United States attempts at nation- building as U.S. democratic imperialism or dangerous adventurism that destabilizes countries and political regions. In light our current ongoing difficulties in Iraq and our historical failures and successes in nation- building, the United States government should redesign its nation-building strategy into a living and adaptive nation-building model in order to support and strengthen our national security policy. The role of our military in effective nation-building is paramount to success as security and stability are universally accepted as the first perquisites to successful nation-building. In the past three decades our government has either embraced the military's role in nation-building or railed against military involvement. However, the fact remains that whether for or against the premise of our armed forces involvement in nation-building, every administration in the past three decades has engaged our military in increasingly ambitious nation-building missions. Unfortunately, each administration has also approached each nation-building endeavor with a new label and a new approach irrespective of historical precedents and lessons learned.

Effective Nation Building

Since the early 1980's the United States, aided by rapid technological advances, has exponentially increased its ability to kill and destroy with precision and minimal collateral damage. These improvements coupled with the tearing down of inter-service rivalries, modernization in all branches, and the rapid improvements in full spectrum operations and battlefield synchronization has created the most lethal military force the world has ever known. Yet, remarkably there has been no matching improvements in how to withdraw, leaving stable and secure democratic governments strong enough to combat domestic and external terrorism. Our nation's commitment to win the war on terror, defeat rogue nations, and prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons implies the successful implementation of nation-building. The following analysis will demonstrate, with historical lessons learned and the adoption of an adaptive strategy to incorporate all agencies of the government, that nation-building can be a cost-effective tool in the pursuit of our current national security policy.

A note on definition, nation-building is a foreign government or governments using a unilateral or multilateral military force to bring about regime change within a country to establish a duly elected, strong democratic government capable of providing security and stability to its people. Thereby, improving regional geopolitical stability, and supporting the tenets of our current national security policy. Notably in this definition is regime change; Vietnam for instance, is not included in our historical precedents of nation-building as the United States was merely supporting a puppet government and did not seek to bring about complete regime change and subsequent democratization.

This work will look at the nation-building efforts of Germany and Japan after WWII, and Haiti, Somalia, and Bosnia during the 1990's; correlating the threads of successes and failures that will assist us in tackling the final part of this study; the current costly difficulties that our military and government are experiencing in Iraq today.

Germany

During the better part of WWII the United States and Britain conducted comprehensive carpet bombing of Germany consisting of over 2.5million sorties, destroying over 70 percent of Germany's major cities, to include Berlin, Frankfurt, and Dresden. Approximately 15 million German soldiers and over 20 million civilians had been killed. The war overall caused over 10 billion dollars in damages, and although the bombings effectively halted Germany's military production, helping the Allied forces gain a tremendous advantage, it also crippled the local civilian economy.

The United States and its Allies met in February 1945 to discuss the impending occupation of Germany. During these discussions all countries agreed that an unconditional surrender from Germany was the only acceptable condition for ending the war. As its top priority, the United States pushed for an occupation of Allied forces after Germany's surrender. The United States also expressed its concern over its current war with Japan. The meeting countries worked out the details of the occupational structure. Each country agreed that the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union would occupy Germany to manage the rebuilding effort. The council drew a boundary separating East and West Germany, and then divided western Germany

into 3 sectors. The three western German sectors were controlled by France, Great Britain, and the United States, with the Soviet Union gaining responsibility for East Germany.

The United States, France, and Great Britain worked diligently to establish their own style of government within their assigned sectors and quickly initiated economic reform under the tenets of the Marshall Plan. The three countries facilitated a 5 year rebuilding effort and reform strategy. Unfortunately for Eastern Germany, the Soviet Union controlled the eastern bloc and it maintained its communist control over the region. The Soviet Union made very little effort in rebuilding the east sector of Berlin or the country as a whole. Adding to the already difficult circumstances Germans were expelled from countries like Poland. Ironically, the mass German exodus created a flood of over 14 million “German” refugees moving back across the neighboring borders into their native country, West Germany.

The reconstruction of Germany was a huge undertaking for the United States and its Allies. The West German infrastructure lay in ruins after years of continuous bombing. Apart from the infrastructure damage, twenty percent of all available housing was completely destroyed and one million Germans were out of work and homeless. The United States and its Allies faced a dual responsibility of supporting its occupying force as well as taking care of the German population. Setting up troop quarters, establishing financial institutions, and providing for the local citizens cost the occupying countries millions of dollars yearly.

Due to the destruction of most public utilities, power plants were completely rebuilt, new sanitation lines laid, and new water treatment facilities constructed. The efforts also included the restoration of roads and removal of bomb rubble to open city streets and facilitate vehicle traffic. Hospitals were rebuilt, but the country had a shortage of doctors and nurses. German cities struggled with providing medical care within an already strained system. In an attempt to ease

the medical crisis, the United States transported several tons of medical supplies for treating injuries and infections such as tuberculosis and typhoid fever. The Red Cross and other private relief organizations contributed to the humanitarian aid with food, clothing, and medical care.

Despite the challenges of the massive rebuilding efforts, the United States faced the additional task of establishing a democratic government in Western Germany. Under the Nazi regime, democratic rule was nonexistent. The concept of a free democratic society was new to the German people, especially after experiencing the wrath of Hitler's rule. The United States faced the daunting task of total dismantlement of the Nazi party structure that had been in power for twelve years. Part of the reform strategy was to eliminate the former Nazi party, and begin advancing the idea of a democratic society which set the stage for a new German government. The Nuremberg trials, authorized and sanctioned by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, conducted from November 1945 until October 1946 dealt with the war crimes of the ruthless and inhuman Nazi regime. Over 21 Nazi's were found guilty of gross human rights violations, genocide, and torture, many were given life in prison or death sentences for their offenses. The trials helped bring justice to millions affected by the Nazi war criminals and set an emotional course for the healing of a psychologically broken country.

The United States, Great Britain, and France embarked on a huge reconstruction effort in West Germany after the war. After extensive bombing campaigns in all the major German cities during the war, they occupied the country after its surrender and worked to rebuild it. The Allied countries dismantled the Nazi regime and established a strong democratic society that would decades later prove pivotal in winning the Cold War. Sixty years later, Germany is the third leading technological and economic force in the world, behind the United States and Japan.

Japan

The American Air force fire bombed 67 Japanese cities to include the capital city of Tokyo which killed an estimated 395, 000 civilians. The U.S. bombed Nagasaki and Hiroshima with atomic weapons bringing an end to WWII. The Japanese signed the article of surrender aboard the battle ship U.S.S. Missouri on 2 September, 1945.

The final terms of surrender and allied occupation of Japan were finalized at the Potsdam treaty on 26 July, 1945. The U.S. felt it had played the largest role in the defeating of Japan and would lead the occupational force of Japan. The U.S. was facing difficulty in the occupation of Germany due to constant disagreement with the other four Allied nations. The U.S. took the lead and it was supported by China, Soviet Union, and Britain. The Allies agreed to a 600,000 man occupational force that would be shared equally among the four Allies, but it would never come to fruition. The nations of China and the Soviet Union would never send Soldiers to occupy Japan. General Macarthur felt that security had to be maintained in dense populated areas to stabilize the country. President Truman along with the English Prime minister pledged unconditional support of Macarthur's occupational efforts and would send as many Soldiers as he deemed necessary to accomplish the mission of security. Macarthur realized that nation building could not take place until security of the nation was complete. The General was given supreme authority to take whatever actions he saw fit to achieve this goal.

One of the first tasks facing the Allied forces was the demobilization and disarmament of seven million armed Japanese Soldiers and the destruction of war material. At the request of the Japanese, the Allies agreed to let the Japanese to disarm themselves. The Americans provided oversight and surveillance to the Japanese disarmament. The Japanese dumped munitions and sank ships in the sea and recycled whatever they could for reconstruction.

Macarthur was also faced with the daunting task of establishing a democratic based government and eradicating the power of Emperor Hirohito. The American and Allied governments called for the Japanese Emperor to be brought to trial for war crimes. Macarthur made the decision not to try him for war crimes but to make him a puppet of the United States. The General realized that the Emperor could help maintain rule and security for Japan. The Allies launched a massive publicity campaign to make the Emperor look like a democrat and peacemaker. He began to tour his country in 1946 and placed blame on his advisors for the Japanese role in WW II. Just as Macarthur had planned the Emperor supported the occupation and in the end raised the moral of his people. Because of the language barrier Macarthur made the decision to retain some government officials in power and under the supervision of the Allies. Macarthur's decision to leave the emperor in place along with key government officials proved to be key in the establishment of a new democratic government. The remaining government officials to include Prime Minister Hideki Tojo and six other officials were tried and sentenced to death for war crimes. The Allies purged Japan of former military officers, police, and government officials to transform the country from a military base society to a democratic nation.

The directive of the Potsdam treaty called for Japan to become a democratic based society. The first priority in democratization was to adopt a new constitution and education system. Macarthur assigned General Whitney to draft a new Japanese constitution; he did so in just two weeks in February, 1946. The Japanese constitution was adopted and put into law on 6 March, 1946. The constitution mandated that the government be ruled by a Prime Minister with Cabinet, House of Representatives, and the Upper House. This new system mirrored the governments of the United States and Great Britain. The first democratic elections were held on

10 April, 1946 with the participation of 363 separate political parties. The Japanese Emperor was reduced to a figure head with no control of the government. The second priority in the democratization process was education reform. The reform would strengthen a new democratic nation. Efforts were made to remove all elements of Emperor worship and militarism. It was also prohibited to bow to the Emperor, salute the flag, and sing the national anthem. Local U.S. military government advisor teams enforced this law. The goal of the Allies was to abolish Japanese nationalism in the youth of Japan. An education law was passed in July, 1948, which freed education from government control. The new law would allow schools to be governed at the local level. The law also made it mandatory that education be free to all and not just the wealthy.

The Reconstruction of Infrastructure would prove to be a daunting and expensive task for the Allies and the Japanese. Japan lay in complete ruin from the American fire bombing campaign against 67 major cities. The bombing campaign targeted military complexes, transportation networks, power facilities, and civilian residences. Japan was a military based economy with little non military export. To make matters worse the Japanese dollar was now worthless. The Japanese had produced more money than it had gold to support its value. Then to make matters even worse, Japan would have to pay war reparations to the Allies. MacArthur managed to convince the President and other Allied nations to temporarily dismiss payments until the Japanese economy was stable, they agreed. Japan dismantled all financial holding companies and divided wealth equally to the banks of Japan. This enabled banks of Japan to lend money to business owners. This created growth and expansion of a new economy which would flourish to present day. The Japanese would focus their efforts in dominating the automobile, computer, and electronic industries. These efforts would stabilize their economy by

1963 and Japan would become an economic super power. Additionally 80% of the Japanese population now had a stake in the nation's economy which supported a democratic and capitalist society.

The American bombing campaign left the Japanese power system all but useless. The war destroyed over 76% of the Japanese power industry. The Allies assembled a top reconstruction team consisting of 300 power plant experts. These experts along with the Japanese were able to provide power to the entire country within two years. Additionally the Japanese would convert from coal powered facilities to nuclear power starting in the mid 1970s.

A massive transportation network began in 1947 to connect the entire country by rail and automobile. The original transportation system revolved around the military complex. This system only connected major cities and gave little access to the population as a whole. The new system allowed travel throughout the country and connected the rural population with the major cities. This new highway and rail system worked hand in hand in strengthening the country's economy.

The Japanese medical system remained a state sponsored health system. The old system provided health care plans to those who paid health insurance. The new reform provided health care to all. This system was designed for all and grew to one of the best systems in the world. All Japanese are able to choose a hospital and provider of their choice. The Japanese health care costs is 1/3 the cost of American and European health costs.

Over 9,000,000 Japanese living in major cities were left homeless. The fire bombing campaign specifically targeted the cities to displace civilians and cause unrest. The housing reform of 1945 called for the construction of building made of concrete and brick to prevent total destruction and the spread of fire. The new construction was subsidized through the Japanese

government backed by Allied money. By 1949 all Japanese civilians were housed in privately and government housing.

The Allies feared that hunger and starvation would undermine the Japanese democracy. The Allies would provide the Japanese people with 800,000 tons of military food stuffs between 1945 and 1946. Macarthur requested \$250,000,000 for food to sustain the Japanese from starvation from 1947 to 1948. Additionally the Allies launched a humanitarian program asking for citizens to donate cloths and non perishable foods. It has been estimated that the American and British people donated over 20,000,000 tons of food and clothing to the Japanese people. The Allies maintained humanitarian aid to Japan until 1950.

The result of the Allied Nation Building of Japan became of model for future Nation Building. Japan became an economic super power that dominates the world market today. The United States established a democratic nation that is rivaled by few. The Nation building of Japan was successful because General Macarthur was given supreme authority to execute his plan. Additionally the Allies provided him with financial and government support. Within seven years Japan was a fully functional country with a functioning democratic constitution. The success of the Allied nation building effort can be seen to this day in Japan. The lessons learned showed that democracy could be transferred to no western societies, cultural awareness, and unilateral nation-building is faster and less financially burdening.

Haiti

On Dec 16, 1990 a free election was held and Jean-Bertrand Aristide was elected president of Haiti. After only nine short months of being in office, the Haitian military forced him to flee the country. Gen Raul Cedras was the leader of the Haitian Army and no other

country recognized him or his military as a legitimate power. For nearly three years after this incident, Haiti, under the leadership of Gen Cedras received pressure from the international community to restore President Aristide to office. Finally, in an effort to avoid United States invasion Gen Cedras signed an agreement to restore President Aristide to power. President Jimmy Carter negotiated this agreement which allowed coalition forces and US troops to enter Haiti.

The United Nations (UN) Council authorized member states to use whatever means they deemed necessary to remove Gen Cedras from power on July 31, 1994. At the same time, a UN peacekeeping force was formed so that it might replace the original forces once there was security of the country. On September 19, 1994 as Operation Uphold Democracy got underway more than 23,000 soldiers entered Haiti. The soldiers entered the country with a priority mission to restore democracy to Haiti and Aristide to his presidential office. This was a United States led “international force”. On 15 Oct Jean-Bertrand Aristide was once again President of Haiti. When the military forces went into Haiti the first thing they were to do was to secure control of the country. They were to ensure that everything was safe in preparation for the return of Aristide. They accomplished this by searching and seizing weapons arsenals and conducting presence patrols. The United States had no desire or intention of addressing any law enforcement issues, however this soon became impossible. The Haitian Army served as the police force and the Army, so they could not be relied upon to conduct day-to-day law enforcement during this time. The US led coalition forces also had to create new courts, penal authorities and police forces. There was never much resistance to the coalition forces. Only a few violent incidents occurred during this time. US Marines opened fire on a group Of Haitian soldiers who were making threatening gestures toward them; this resulted in the death of seven

Haitian soldiers. Just a few months' later groups within the Haitian Army began fighting. The international police and U.S. troops managed to gain control of the situation. By the time it was all over 83 Haitians went to jail, seven were injured, three killed and over 450 weapons were confiscated. On March 31, 1995 security responsibility changed hands from the Multi-National Forces (MNF) to the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH). As the largest contributor of soldiers to this mission, the U.S. maintained military command and control. In June 1995, the UNMIH totaled 6,000 soldiers. It consisted of 2,300 U.S. troops and 800 international police. It was very difficult to recruit international civilian police, with no alternative the US had to depend on the Haitian Army to maintain security until the arrival of the international police. A peaceful crowd gathered to watch the departure of the U.S. Soldiers and the Haitian police dispersed the crowd by severely beating them. This incident led to the US deploying additional military police to oversee and monitor Haiti until the arrival of international civilian police.

The United States also began to put together an Interim Haitian Police Force comprised of scarcely trained Haitian military and newly trained recruits taken from the Haitian refugees at Guantanamo Bay. At the same time, the US selected and trained a brand new civilian police force referred to as the Haitian National Police (HNP). These soldiers became a very valuable asset to Haitian government. However, it was not long before they fell into the familiar corruption and ineffectiveness of the Haitian culture.

A year-and-a-half later Canada received the baton from the U.S. All American soldiers left the country except a small number of medics and engineers. Although both handoffs went seemingly well, they greatly lessened the US government's ability to supervise and guarantee a lasting democratic transformation of the Haitian society. President Clinton and his administration insisted that the purpose of the US's intervention was to restore democracy in

Haiti. Although President Aristide was elected in a free election not many elements of a true democracy were evident. It was no secret that the Haitian parliament was corrupt, while the Haitian presidency continued to be frail and inept. The judiciary system was also a failure. After only eight months in office, President Aristides became unstable; no one knew whether he stood for establishment of a democratic society.

The Haitian economy was weak. Foreign investment was forced out of the country by economic sanctions. Per capita GDP fell greatly during 1991-1994 as manufacturing companies closed their doors and tourism became almost nonexistent. In 1990 Haiti was one of the poorest nations in the world. While both the MNF and the UNMIH shouldering the responsibility of establishing a secure environment in Haiti they were not responsible for any type of economic reconstruction. Neither the Haitian government, nor anyone else in the international community invested in Haiti's roads, airports or ports. There was no concentrated effort to improve the business community or the rebuild the legal system.

The Haitian Operation had a great beginning. It progressed as the U. S. had hoped and it ended at the politically correct prearranged time. An accomplishment such as the restoring of Aristide to the presidential office was overshadowed by legitimate shortcomings. U.S. troops and International military left the country before a capable governmental administration was formed. Time was not allotted for a self-sufficient democracy to stand up and for lasting economic reforms to be put in place and properly evaluated. The United States efforts in Haiti were admirable. Unfortunately, this mission proved unsuccessful because the rebuilding of a nation requires in-depth planning, ample time on the ground, determination, and adequate resources.

Somalia

The republic of Somalia, one of the countries in the “Horn of Africa,” is situated in the eastern side of the continent of Africa. Somaliland president then Mohammad Siad Bare started a disastrous war against Ethiopia over dispute on the land of Ogaden in 1987. The situation grew worse in Somalia when western humanitarian donors cut off aid. The economy collapsed, and there was uprising in the country. President Bare started a policy of state sponsored abduction and assassination of rival clan leaders. Anti- government riots led the Army to turn against him and he fled the country in 1991 leaving the country in chaos.

Immediately, an eruption of clan/ethnic violence led to the destructions of the central government system, the economy, and infrastructure. Hundreds of thousands of Somalis were displaced; starvation and drought took its toll on the people with few relief organizations providing services to the dying Somalis. As Somalia plunged into ethnic warfare, the military disintegrated and were now fighting alongside their clan warlords/leaders.

In 1992, the United States deployed forces mainly for humanitarian relief operations. They established security in Mogadishu, and later in the countryside where they would deliver relief supplies to the starving and dying Somalis. The U.S. government didn’t attempt to establish any civil administration while conducting its operation in Somalia. Meanwhile the UN and the International community’s had the mandate of building and reestablishing a new mechanism or interim government which failed because of a lack of unified command.

The U.S. government didn’t establish any means to revise the already sinking economy of Somalia on the basis that their mandate was an entirely humanitarian assistance operation.

The power sector was not reconstructed either because most of the power stations were in the countryside which were occupied by the warlords and their fighters. Some

international relief organizations (NGOs) attempted a small scale reconstruction projects within the secured zones as would help them in efficient delivery of relief assistance. The U.S. didn't build any permanent facilities in the country but the relief organizations had mini hospitals to help deliver medical services to the affected people.

The ethnic clan-clan warfare in Somalia left most of the housing units destroyed and during the U. S. operation little was done to rebuild or reconstruct the damaged houses. The main basis for a peaceful government as I said earlier is security. As the U.S. established its presence within Somalia, with the lack of infrastructure and civil administration, the education sector was paralyzed and to date the Somaliland education system is the worst among the countries in East Africa. Prior to the arrival of the U. S. forces in Somalia, private relief organizations established refugee camps, paying ransom money to the warlords as they tried to provide relief supplies. More often than not, the supplies didn't reach the suffering and displaced people who needed it most but instead were looted either by the warlords or their fighters and shared or sold to them to enhance their own power and prestige.

The failure of the U. S. and UN nation building in Somalia led to the death of hundreds of thousands of Somalis. While the U.S concentrated on the security for the relief organizations, they should as well have laid a foundation for the Somalis and help them build a strong and united security force including a permanent and effective police force. The U.S. didn't integrate other American agencies to help reconstruct infrastructure while they took care of security. Failure to translate military tasks into political objectives was another failure of the U.S. and the UN. Premature withdraw of both the UN and U.S. from Somalia created a security gap which gave the warlords time to reinforce their positions. Lack of force integration under one commander hampered the Somalia mission. The UN as the world largest body should be

strengthened and empowered to deal with delicate situations like the one in Somalia. Resource availability including financial assistance should be set aside for effective nation-building.

Although the U.S. provided minor assistance in its relief mission, the unstable political situation in Somalia crippled the U.S. and allied forces as a result it became, a poorly planned and executed UN nation-building operation.

Bosnia

The path to peace in Bosnia was a long one. Its final phase marked by disaster, was a change in the fate of war and also changed how the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) got involved militarily. In 1995, Muslims at Srebrenica were massacred by the thousands under the hand of the Serbs. This and other incidents led the U.S. to get actively involved in organizing peace talks between the Muslim-Croat and Bosnian Serbs in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21, 1995 (USAID, 2007).

The General Framework Agreement for Peace (GFAP) in Bosnia, better known as the Dayton Accord was signed in Paris three weeks after the initial talks in Dayton. The Dayton Accord created two entities within the Bosnian state that were almost identical in size: the Bosniac-Croat federation, which controls 51 percent of the country's territory, and the Republika Srpska, which controls 49 percent of the country (Dobbins, 2007).

The Implementation Force (IFOR), another international force commanded by NATO, played a key role for the military annex of the Dayton Accord. IFOR had 60,000 troops assembled to assist with the division of the country. The country was divided into three sectors. The United States, The United Kingdom, and France, all had a lead regional sector. IFOR had the right to monitor and guarantee there was compliance with the agreement on military aspects

and fulfill certain supporting tasks. IFOR also had the right to carry out its mission using force if necessary. It had unimpeded freedom of movement, control of airspace and status of forces protection (Dobbins, 2007).

NATO remained in Bosnia even after the IFOR's mandate expired. There was much doubt of withdrawing, even though the majority of the military responsibilities had been completed. There still remained the fact that the security problems still existed in Bosnia and indications revealed that they were not ready to sustain themselves on their own. This led NATO to believe that civil war would erupt almost immediately upon departure (Dobbins, 2007). As a result, another NATO-led force, the Stabilization Force (SFOR), followed IFOR. SFOR accomplished all of its primary military tasks so they became more involved in civil affairs.

The civilian implementation had become a difficult task mainly due to the fact that there was a U.S. and European disagreement over the most feasible angle as to executing the civilian portion of the Dayton Accord (Dobbins, 2007). The result was a completely disorganized effort; NATO controlled all the military tasks of Dayton, while OHR controlled the civilian tasks. In the beginning, communication between the two organizations was nonexistent. First, it is the responsibility of the High Representative (HR) to work for the civilian implementation of the GFAP and thereby for the reconstruction of the state. In the very beginning after 1995, however, the HR was a "toothless" tiger against the obstruction of the ethno-nationalist parties and politicians in the institutions of Bosnia due to the competencies given to him under Annex 10 of the GFAP. Thus, in 1997, the Peace Implementation Council (PIC) extended the mandate of the HR meeting in Bonn so that he could intervene in the legislative process and dismiss obstructionist public officials. Based on these new, so-called "Bonn Powers", the HR immediately started an integrationist legislation for state and society by decreeing laws on

citizenship, the flag, the national anthem, the currency, ethnically neutral license plates and passports: all laws the nationalist parties could not agree on in the Parliamentary Assembly (Dobbins, 2007). Secondly, the HR began to dismiss more and more public officials, from mayors up to members of the collective State Presidency for obstructing the implementation of the GFAP.

Infrastructure repair is the most visible of all U.S. aids programs in Bosnia. The one U.S. aid program that took the lead in support was the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Starting in 1995, the program targeted structures that would help restart and assist citizens to return to normal living. In all, USAID power projects directly restored power to 200,000 households, and assisted an additional 1 million people by providing a more stable power supply. USAID repaired schools for 30,000 students, provided water and improved sanitation for 300,000 households, rehabilitated health centers serving 500,000 citizens and repaired roads and bridges used by 40,000 commuters daily. In 1998, most of the major infrastructure, repairs had been made and USAID shifted its focus to supporting the return of minority refugees and displaced persons to their homes (USAID, 2007). The program relied on direction provided by local officials and returnee groups to determine what kinds of projects were most needed. Eventually, it became clear that, once home, returnees needed a way to earn a living. Therefore, the program expanded to include small grants, loans and technical assistance.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees took the lead on just about all of the humanitarian concerns in Bosnia since early 1992. The humanitarian concerns and needs were placed heavily on Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), mined victims, and returning refugees. (Dobbins, 2007). The bulk of the returning refugees were the Serbs, Croats, and Bosnians.

Returning home was not an easy task for most of them due to the fact that they faced violent attacks in some areas.

There was no doubt mixed success in the efforts of Bosnia's nation-building. In spite of its limited view of responsibilities that were adopted, NATO still remained effective and well organized from the beginning of implementation. On the other hand, civil order took longer to control and maintain, due to fact that the international tasks were dispersed on a more broader scope. There have been economic and political improvements in Bosnia. However, there is still a huge lack of self-sustainment, economically and politically (Dobbins, 2007). The lessons learned, gathered from collected after action reports include: elections are vital landmarks in the direction heading toward a democratic state, and a united command effort to capitalize on the importance for the civil phase of peace operations as it is for the military. Also, if elections are held too soon, they may allow for forces that reject the ideas of democracy rather than encourage the positive change. In addition, it should be noted that trying to bring a nation together can be quite difficult if not impossible, if its neighboring nations are pulling it apart at all sides. In order to be successful at nation-building, outside assistance, or shall we say international assistance, must be prepared to make long and substantial commitments. Also, there should be extensive educational train-up on cultural awareness to better prepare any outside assistance.

Iraq and Beyond

The United States invaded Iraq in early 2003 to remove Saddam Hussein from power in order to disarm Iraq of its Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). The U.S. had the support of Britain, Australia, Japan, and Spain, with secret permission from Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The United States and Britain were unable to convince Turkey, Germany, France, Russia, China and

the UN of the existence of WMD's or perhaps more importantly the need for immediate military action. Iraq had a dictator just as ruthless as Hitler and the Baath Party bore many of the similarities of the NAZI party of WWII Germany. The case for regime change and democracy to stabilize a region shattered by the Iraq-Iran war, ruthless state-sponsored policies of genocide, and the Desert Storm war were clear reasons for an international military force to invade and begin a multilateral initiative at nation-building. However, where was the gun pointed at our Nations heart? If Iraq had WMD's, it was widely agreed that they did not possess the capability for delivery or the ability to export WMD's.

Three years before WWII had come to a successful end the three major allied leaders, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin corresponded and met to agree to the conditions of the occupation and restoration of Germany. During the next two years Britain and the United States carefully planned the occupation and restoration of Germany. Under the supervision of then Vice-president Harry Truman and General Marshall a comprehensive nation-building plan bearing Marshall's name was developed. Paradoxically, no real plan was developed for the occupation of Iraq. No plan was staffed through our governments' agencies of energy, treasury, and education; nor was the Attorney General, the Justice Department, or even the State Department tasked for any input for a plan for the occupation of Iraq. Simply stated the rush to invade Iraq was shortsighted at best. As stated earlier there can be no doubt that the most lethal military the world has ever known would win the war. Yet, with the subsequent peace now costing thousands of coalition lives, tens of thousands of Iraqi lives, upwards of 1.5 million dollars a day and with forecasted total costs of the "reconstruction phase" raising to the eight billion dollar mark our failure to adopt nation- building as a means to a political end has proven disastrous.

The first condition of successful nation building then is thorough preparation for the ensuing peace. Incorporating not just the military, but all agencies of the government including the Departments of Energy, Transportation, Education, Treasury, Homeland Defense, Justice and the State Department to work with and for the overall commander of the occupation force in developing an adaptive plan for occupation before a single soldier has entered the target country. Inherent in this plan must be a thorough understanding of the vanquished people. Is it a homogenous population with a similar religion and national entity, or as in the case of Iraq fractured by sectarianism, tribalism and ethnicity? The successful nation-building of Japan after WWII clearly shows that democratization can translate effectively into nonwestern societies.

All of this preparation determines the size, and composition of the force required to fulfill the next prerequisite step to effective nation-building; the occupying force that will provide absolute security for the reconstruction effort. Every successful case of nation-building had an occupation army that met the specific security challenges of the occupied country. General Shinseki warned that Iraq would require upwards of 400,000 soldiers to accomplish the subsequent occupation of Iraq. Additionally, it must be understood that these forces can expect to stay a minimum of two years and as long as four to provide a lasting continuity of security and fostering long term relationships with the occupied people.

The Third step is unilateral or a multilateral occupation force. The latter spreads the burden across the occupying countries and may help share the economic cost but unity of command must remain in place. A subsequent part of this step must identify the neighboring states of the occupied country and an open dialog must be initiated, were regardless of differences of ideology the neighboring countries must be invited to participate in the occupation at a minimum. Stalin and communism were the United States and Britain's avowed enemy yet

Churchill and Roosevelt understood that no lasting reconstruction and peace could happen in Germany or Japan without at least the acquiescence of the Soviets. So too should the United States have invited the countries of Syria, Turkey, and Iran regardless of their non-support of the Iraq invasion, to participate in the occupation and reconstruction of Iraq. The result of not including them is the proxy war that now exists between Syria and Iran using the Iraqi Sunni and Shiite populations with the United States in the middle; and Turkey's unilateral military strikes against the Kurdish nationalists in the north. It should never be forgotten that Turkey's active modern military is over one million, second only to the United States in NATO.

The fourth step in the effective nation-building process is the composition of the reconstruction team. It must be comprised of the best and brightest of all of our great nation's institutions. Nationally, committees and work teams must be built from each of the governments' agencies that form our nation from energy to education that will work side by side with the occupying force to rebuild the infrastructure and social systems that support a strong democracy. Actual congressman and members of the judiciary branch will work hand in hand with the nascent occupied countries leaders and lawmakers to develop and implement a constitution and system of democratic government that specifically fits the cultures of the peoples it represents. At the equivalent State and local level U.S. states will build Senatorial taskforces that will address the issues of local governance and will institute the training of the national and local police force. Our entire nation must contribute to the reconstruction effort.

The fifth and ongoing step of the nation-building process is the training and standing up of an effective armed forces to gradually take over the domestic and external protection of the newly created democratic republic. Our own forces and specifically the Special Forces must be tasked with this great task. Specifically, our Special Forces should be retooled back to their

origins where John F. Kennedy envisioned a twelve man A-team could train battalions quickly and efficiently. Regardless of who is chosen for this task, ongoing security operations must continue without interruption.

Conclusion

The peace and reconstruction process in Iraq may yet prove successful. However, at what exorbitant price must our soldiers and our nation pay because of the ignorance or dismissal of historical precedents, patchwork nation-building, the failure to employ our entire nation into the rebuilding process, the shortsighted policies that fail to address neighboring countries in the reconstruction effort, and policy/ exit strategies based on the opinion polls of a far removed public whose only source of information is sensationalist press? The failure to employ even the most basic aspects of nation-building has ensnared our military in a quagmire that we may win, but has effectively hamstrung our ability to respond to any other large scale operation or threat in the world, and strained our military personnel and families, equipment and medical facilities to the absolute breaking point. Clearly our nation is engaged in a war on terror that will last for decades. Accordingly, nation-building models should be built for every potentially hostile country contrary to the interests of our National Security Policy. The models would be prepared by established committees comprised of representatives' of all of the governments' agencies, and be paired with the Pentagons established war plans into one comprehensive living and adaptive document that the National Security Council may use in the event of the deterioration of relations with a country or region. These war/reconstruction models must be updated regularly to maintain relevance and the top threat countries reviewed yearly by the National Security Council. Our Nation's National Security Policy initiatives to end to the threats of terrorism, rogue nations, and the nonproliferation of WMDs clearly mandates the establishment of a living

and adaptive nation-making model that the entire nation must contribute in its implementation and subsequent success.

References

Kasper, M. P. (May 2003). *Lessons from the Past: The American Record on Nation Building*. Washington, DC 20036: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

James Dobbins, J. G. (2003). *AMERICA'S ROLE IN NATION-BUILDING FROM GERMANY TO IRAQ*. Arlington, VA: RAND.

"Iraq Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance Fact Sheet," No. 24, May 1, 2003

Tripp, Charles, *A History of Iraq*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2001. "After Saddam," *Survival*, Vol. 44, No. 4, Winter 2002–3, pp.23–37.

Seiple, Chris, *The U.S. Military/NGO Relationship in Humanitarian Interventions*, Carlisle, Pa.: U.S. Army War College Peacekeeping Institute, 1996.

Smyth, Gareth, "US Will Oversee Return of Displaced Kurds," *Financial Times*, April 24, 2003.

Schwartz, Eric P., *Iraq: The Day After*, Report of an Independent Task Force on Post-Conflict Iraq Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2003.

Eisenstadt, Michael, and Eric Mathewson, eds., *U.S. Policy in Post-Saddam Iraq: Lessons from the British Experience*, Washington, D.C.: Washington Institute for Middle East Policy, 2003.

Crane, Conrad C., and W. Andrew Terrill, *Reconstructing Iraq: Insights, Challenges, and Missions for Military Forces in a Post-Conflict Scenario*, Carlisle, Pa.: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, February 2003.

10 Downing Street, "Draft Resolution Calls for Vital UN Role in Iraq," news release, May 12, 2003. Online at <http://www.pm.gov.uk/output/page3649.asp> (as of June 12, 2003).