Strategy Research Project

PRE-CONFLICT PEACE BUILDING AS A MISSION FOR USACE

BY

MR. NICK M. PANASIUK
Department of Army Civilian

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2009

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	**2. REPORT TYPE**	**3. DATES COVERED** *(From - To)*
29-04-2009	Strategy Research Project	

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Pre-Conflict Peace Building as a Mission for USACE

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)

Mr. Nick M. Panasiuk

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Colonel R. Scott Buran
Department of Military Strategy, Planning, and Operations

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

U.S. Army War College
122 Forbes Avenue
Carlisle, PA 17013

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Distribution A: Unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has a long history of vital service to the United States of America. In order to stay relevant, ready, responsive, and reliable over the years, the Corps has adapted its organization, missions, and skills sets to meet requirements in support of the national interests of the United States. As the new Administration's use of the elements of power in pursuit of national interests focuses on "smart power," the skillful interweaving of diplomatic, information, military, and economic might rather than depending on military power only, a new role for the USACE is possible within this construct in pre-conflict peace building and capacity development. This SRP examines the history, organization, and missions of the USACE; provides an assessment of the current and future strategic environments; and offers insights and recommendations on how the USACE might posture itself to provide capability as the Nation's Engineer of Choice in pre-conflict peace building, as an integral element of the Nation's smart power arsenal.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

Corps of Engineers, Smart Power, Peace Building, Capacity Building, Water Resources, Construction

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			**17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT**	**18. NUMBER OF PAGES**	**19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON**
a. REPORT	**b. ABSTRACT**	**c. THIS PAGE**			**19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER** *(include area code)*
UNCLASSIFED	UNCLASSIFED	UNCLASSIFED	UNLIMITED	36	

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

PRE-CONFLICT PEACE BUILDING AS A MISSION FOR USACE

by

Mr. Nick M. Panasiuk
Department of Army Civilian

Colonel R. Scott Buran
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Mr. Nick M. Panasiuk

TITLE: Pre-Conflict Peace Building as a Mission for USACE

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 29 April 2009 WORD COUNT: 7784 PAGES: 36

KEY TERMS: Corps of Engineers, Smart Power, Peace Building, Capacity Building, Water Resources, Construction

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has a long history of vital service to the United States of America. In order to stay relevant, ready, responsive, and reliable over the years, the Corps has adapted its organization, missions, and skills sets to meet requirements in support of the national interests of the United States. As the new Administration's use of the elements of power in pursuit of national interests focuses on "smart power," the skillful interweaving of diplomatic, information, military, and economic might rather than depending on military power only, a new role for the USACE is possible within this construct in pre-conflict peace building and capacity development. This SRP examines the history, organization, and missions of the USACE; provides an assessment of the current and future strategic environments; and offers insights and recommendations on how the USACE might posture itself to provide capability as the Nation's Engineer of Choice in pre-conflict peace building, as an integral element of the Nation's smart power arsenal.

PRE-CONFLICT PEACE BUILDING AS A MISSION FOR USACE

> But over the long term, the United States cannot kill or capture its way to victory. Where possible, what the military calls kinetic operations should be subordinated to measures aimed at promoting better governance, economic programs that spur development, and efforts to address the grievances among the discontented, from whom the terrorists recruit.[1]
>
> —Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates,
> January 2009

The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has a long history of vital service to the United States of America. Since the inception of the Corps of Engineers (Corps) in the early years of the Nation, USACE missions, roles and responsibilities have changed and continue to evolve as requirements for its expertise mature and develop. Originally providing reconnaissance, mapping, and surveying functions, the Corps' list of missions expanded during the 19th century to include civil works and military activities such as water supply and the construction of coastal fortifications, inland navigation, and shoreline harbor improvements. In the 20th century, new missions were assigned to the USACE such as construction of the Panama Canal, the Pentagon, the Manhattan Project, and the John F. Kennedy Space Center. Due to the Corps' expertise with water resources, design and construction of flood control works to protect life and property were assigned. Ecosystem restoration activities to restore the environment, such as the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan were assigned as mission areas. Military facility construction both in the United States and overseas was directed as an additional mission. Now in the first decade of the 21st century, the Corps of Engineers is leveraging its engineering, real estate, contracting, and construction expertise in support of post-conflict reconstruction and stability operations in the Nation's fight of the "Overseas Contingency Operation" (OCO) formerly known as the "Global War on

Terror" (GWOT) in Iraq and Afghanistan. With the arrival of the new Administration, new opportunities for the next decades of the 21st century have arisen for the USACE in an unexplored variation of its current, well-established post-conflict reconstruction and stability operations mission. Consistent with the new Administration's emphasis on smart power is an opportunity for the USACE to pursue a preemptive, pre-conflict, peace building construction and stability operations mission.

Smart Power

The advent of the new Administration has brought with it an emphasis on the use of "smart power," which is the skillful, balanced interplay of all the elements of power at the U.S. Government's disposal to achieve desired effects in its interactions around the world. These elements of national power of the United States, typically referred to as DIME (diplomatic, information, military, and economic) are a complex system of complementary efforts both kinetic and non-kinetic in nature, which are woven together by strategists at the highest levels to shape the national security environment in support of U.S. national interests. Current Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, during her confirmation hearing on January 13, 2009 referred to this strategic concept of balancing defense, diplomacy, and development:

> We must use what has been called smart power, the full range of tools at our disposal -- diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal, and cultural -- picking the right tool or combination of tools for each situation.[2]

This renewed emphasis on the interplay of the various elements of power affords the USACE an opportunity to assume a variation on its current mission in complex contingency operations, which is in post-conflict reconstruction operations. The opportunity to employ the USACE and its capabilities as an element of U.S. smart

power in Phase Zero shaping activities[3] through pre-conflict peace building efforts consistent with USACE expertise is a new opportunity for USACE involvement in the support of the security and stability interests of the Nation.

Peace Building

Former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali first defined peace building at the United Nations in 1995 as "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict."[4] His successor, former Secretary-General Kofi Annan similarly described peace building as efforts seeking to "prevent the resurgence of conflict and to create the conditions necessary for a sustainable peace in war-torn societies."[5] Joint Publication 1-02 defines "peace building" as "stability actions, predominately diplomatic and economic, that strengthen and rebuild governmental infrastructure and institutions in order to avoid a relapse into conflict."[6] Peace building as defined in the Joint Publication clearly speaks to the smart power concept of the interplay of the elements of national power due to the employment of diplomatic and economic elements of power. According to Department of Defense Directive 3000.05, stability operations are to be planned and executed concurrently with combat operations. Section 4.2 of 3000.05 continues:

> ...the immediate goal is often to provide the local populace with security, restore essential services, and meet humanitarian needs. The long-term goal is to help develop indigenous capacity for securing essential services, a viable market economy, rule of law, democratic institutions, and a robust civil society. [7]

Therefore, peace building operations are now a mission of the Department of Defense. Further, in accordance with the Quadrennial Defense Review Report of 2006, guidance directs "…greater emphasis on forces and capabilities needed for deterrence

and other peacetime shaping activities."[8] Peace building is frequently done in a joint fashion with civilian and military assets because of the inherently unsafe nature of stability efforts in a post conflict environment.

"Peace building" is distinct and separate from "peace enforcement," "peacekeeping," and "peacemaking" operations. "Peace enforcement operations" refers to the use of military force to compel compliance with international sanctions. "Peacekeeping operations" imply maintaining a peace that has already been agreed to among parties. "Peacemaking operations" are usually diplomatic efforts to negotiate a peace between warring parties. "Peace building operations" refers to a process, both before and after war, whose goal is to create or to recreate the ability in entities, states, structures, and capacities to resolve conflict before or once violence erupts. According to Doyle and Sambanis in their work on peace building,

> In plural societies, conflicts are inevitable. The aim of peacebuilding is to foster social, economic, and political institutions and attitudes that will prevent these conflicts from turning violent. In effect, peacebuilding is the front line of preventive action.[9]

Post-conflict peace building efforts are typically disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) of former combatants together with reconstruction efforts. Pre-conflict peace building efforts are preemptive, and attempt to address the root causes and effects of conflict, and seek to prevent their recurrence through reconciliation, institution building, and political and economic reconstruction. While the term "pre-conflict peace building" might seem to be inherently contradictory, war and peace may be seen as a continuum, with periods of peace between periods of war. As former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice described at a House Armed Services Committee hearing in 2008,

> I believe that the way that we have come to think about the world that we face is that there are no longer neat categories between war and peace. More often, we are facing a continuum between war and peace.[10]

Prevention of conflict is not the ultimate goal of peace building; rather its intent is to channel and to direct the factors that cause conflict to resolution by the structures and capacities that peace building efforts create. The peace building process seeks to help transition States from conflict to reconstruction and development. Preemption of conflict makes sense from an economic point of view, as preparation for natural disasters reduces their adverse economic impacts, so would preemption reduce the economic impacts of conflict. Preemption may also be considered a moral imperative, especially as the world community has the means to intervene in areas of conflict to prevent and halt organized violence. The new Administration's popularity and its strategic message of hope and change have afforded it the political capital to maximize its ability to pursue this pre-conflict peace building concept. In order to understand how the USACE might contribute to pre-conflict peace building efforts, an understanding of the organization, the diversity of its mission and its functions, and current position on this potential new mission area is required.

USACE Origin

In 1775, the Continental Congress authorized a Chief Engineer of the Army in one of the first major moves of the new government after the start of the Revolutionary War. The former British officer Major General Richard Gridley, artillerist and engineer, accepted a demotion to the rank of colonel in George Washington's Army, as the first Chief of Engineers. His first military construction project was to plan and build, on the night before the battle on 16 July 1775, the fortifications at Bunker Hill in Boston, MA,

one of the one of the earliest battles of the American Revolution. In 1802, President Thomas Jefferson's Administration passed a law creating the Corps of Engineers, and established the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York ("USMA" or "West Point"). West Point was the first engineering school in the United States, and until 1835 was the only school in the country to produce qualified engineers, as engineering was then strictly a military science. The USMA remained under the direction of the Corps of Engineers until 1866. The current Chief of Engineers, Lieutenant General (LTG) Robert L. Van Antwerp is the fifty-second chief, is himself a graduate of the USMA at West Point, and is a registered professional engineer, so the history and the legacy of the organization's culture continues.

USACE Organization

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a specialized Major Army Command (MACOM) with over 600 military and 33,000 civilians with various expertise and skills sets including archaeologists, economists, program managers, engineers, and other professionals to meet national security, emergency and contingency operations, and other national mission requirements. It is the largest public engineering, design and construction management agency in the world. In order to meet the challenges of its broad mission areas, the USACE is organized under a national headquarters office (HQUSACE), with geographically and functionally aligned regional division and local district offices; centers of expertise; labs for research and development; and one active component and two reserve component commands located throughout the United States, Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. Currently, Corps of Engineers personnel are

deployed and executing primarily post conflict reconstruction missions in 90 countries around the world.

Strategic direction and policy making is formulated at the national headquarters in Washington, DC. The nine regional division offices execute the operational function of the Corps, with forty-five subordinate district offices executing the local missions. Division and district offices are located both within (CONUS) and outside (OCONUS) the continental United States, usually near the constituencies whom they serve. The ninth provisional division office, the Gulf Region Division (GRD) in Baghdad, Iraq, was created to undertake the Iraq contingency reconstruction mission in 2004, and will stand down upon completion of the contingency reconstruction mission. GRD has three subordinate contingency district offices assigned to it (North, Central, and South), which will also stand down upon completion of the reconstruction mission in Iraq. The forty-fifth district office, the Afghanistan Engineer District (AED) in Kabul, Afghanistan, is a contingency district as well, and was also created in 2004 to support reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan, however, instead of reporting to a division office, this district office reports directly to the national headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Other members of the USACE organization include six main engineering, research and development, finance, and technical centers; the 249th Engineer Battalion (Prime Power); and the 412th and 416th Theater Engineer Commands.[11] The USACE also maintains a network of smaller laboratories and centers of expertise responsible for research, development, and testing in disciplines as diverse and far ranging as the Center for Curation and Management of Archaeological Collections in St. Louis, Missouri, and the Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center in New Orleans, Louisiana.

USACE Vision

The vision of the USACE as championed by the Chief of Engineers is,

> A GREAT engineering force of highly disciplined people working with our partners through disciplined thought and action to deliver innovative and sustainable solutions to the Nation's engineering challenges.[12]

The emphasis on the term "GREAT" in the Vision statement is a reference to the work by Jim Collins "Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap... and Others Don't"[13], where Collins analyzes the best practices of eleven elite, top performing U.S. companies, and shares what helped them improve their already successful performance. Consistent with Collins' thesis, the Chief's vision is to ensure he has the right team, in the right seat on the right bus, going to the right destination. His focus on sustainability in his vision statement indicates the Chief understands and supports the importance of, and the strong nexus to, the peace building concepts whose theories recommend the creation of durable structures and capabilities in nations.

USACE Mission

The current mission of the Corps of Engineers is to "Provide vital public engineering services in peace and war to strengthen our Nation's security, energize the economy, and reduce risks from disasters."[14] This mission encompasses the full spectrum of operations from war to peace in support of national interests. These three legs of the mission stool, strengthening national security, energizing the economy, and reducing risks from disasters are implemented using a bifurcated organizational composition, through a military and a civil works mission focus.

Military Mission

The four core military missions of the Corps of Engineers are:

1. Strategic Integration (Base Realignment and Closure - BRAC)
2. MILCON Transformation (Military Construction)
3. Gulf Region Integration & Security Assistance
4. Stability and Reconstruction Operations[15]

As part of its Strategic Integration mission, the USACE serves as the agent for implementing the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) effort initiated in 2005, and as the disposal agent for property in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 2002. The USACE is also the real estate agent for the Army, and can dispose of property via numerous authorities.[16] The USACE MILCON Transformation (Military Construction) mission in CONUS consists of design and construction of all Army facilities, assigned Air Force facilities, and installation support activities. The OCONUS USACE construction mission extends to the following countries in accordance with DOD Directive 4270.5, issued February 12, 2005, which reestablished the role of the USACE as the OCONUS construction agent for DOD.[17]

- Afghanistan
- Canada (excluding Newfoundland)
- Central America
- Europe (excluding Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, and the British Isles)
- Greenland
- Iraq
- Japan (including the Ryukyu Islands, Okinawa)
- Korea
- Marshall Islands
- Mexico
- Middle East (including the Saudi Arabian Peninsula, Egypt, and Israel)
- Northern Eurasia (Russia and the former Soviet republics)
- South America
- Southeast Asia, from Iran to Myanmar (Burma)
- Sub-Saharan Africa (excluding Kenya and Somalia)
- Taiwan
- Turkey

The Gulf Region Integration & Security Assistance and Stability and Reconstruction Operations mission currently underway include USACE reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Funding for the Corps of Engineers military mission flows annually through the Department of Defense Appropriations Act as well as budget authority granted in Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Acts. Other military mission efforts are undertaken with funding received for efforts from other nations, agencies and entities for design and construction efforts or other reimbursed endeavors.

Civil Works Mission

The civil works missions of the USACE include the water resources development activities, and the natural disaster and emergency response missions. Water resources development activities include the planning, design, construction, and operation of flood damage reduction, inland and coastal navigation, hurricane and storm damage protection, ecosystem restoration, recreation, hydroelectric power, and water supply projects. Congress authorizes these activities through Water Resources Development Acts (WRDA's), which historically are considered by the Congress biennially, but are usually only passed quadrennially. Congress typically funds these civil works activities in annual Energy and Water Appropriation Acts (EWDA). Civil works mission efforts beyond those funded directly in the EWDA appropriations are undertaken using funding received from other agencies and entities in support of their priorities and requirements.

This expertise of the USACE in water resources planning, design, construction, and operation in CONUS is an untapped resource in the OCONUS arena. Water is a scarce resource around the world, and therefore a potential source of conflict among

nations. Projects that seek to optimize water resources utilization are therefore critical to pre-conflict peace building and stability efforts in the future. The Joint Operating Environment (JOE) of 2008 estimate is that by the year 2030, 3 billion people could be adversely impacted by the scarcity of water. This scarcity of water will challenge future joint force commanders, making

> …conflict over water endemic to their world, whether as the spark or the underlying cause of conflicts among various racial, tribal, or political groups. Were they called on to intervene in a catastrophic water crisis, they might well confront chaos, with collapsing or impotent social networks and governmental services. Anarchy could prevail, with armed groups controlling or warring over remaining water, while the specter of disease resulting from unsanitary conditions would hover in the background.[18]

Chronic water pollution, whether due to uncontrolled industrialization or due to the dumping of human sewage will be a threat to human health and welfare, as well as to surrounding ecosystems. The USACE has been providing water supply since the construction in 1850 of the Washington Aqueduct, which provides water to the National Capitol Region. The USACE is one of the nation's largest providers of water, operating over 130 projects in 26 states and Puerto Rico, providing 5 billion gallons of water per day, enough to supply the needs of 55 million Americans daily.[19] This demonstrated capability that the USACE possesses in providing water supply, combined with the JOE's focus on scarcity of water as a trend influencing world security, begs the Administration to employ the USACE as an element of smart power to ameliorate future impacts of water deficits with its expertise.

Other civil works activities in addition to water resources planning, design, construction, and operation are USACE natural disaster and emergency response activities. The Corps of Engineers executes its emergency response activities under two authorities. The first authority is Public Law 84-99[20], the Flood Control and Coastal

Emergency Act (FCCEA), which is essentially a flood fight authorization, and the second authority is Public Law 100-707, the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act) as amended by Public Law 106–390.[21] Under PL 84-99, the USACE is authorized to undertake activities including disaster preparedness, emergency flood response operations, rehabilitation of damaged flood control works, repair of federally authorized protective works damaged by coastal storms, and provision of emergency water supply. The Stafford Act authorizes the Corps to undertake disaster response assignments in accordance with the USACE Emergency Support Function (ESF) #3 - Public Works and Engineering Support of the National Response Framework[22] under Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) leadership. ESF #3 activities of the USACE include debris removal, temporary housing, provision of water and ice, emergency power, and emergency infrastructure repair and assessment. These activities are the civil works equivalent of the USACE's Stability and Reconstruction Operations military mission.

Reconstruction Experience

The USACE has been involved in the construction of fortifications and other river, harbor and road projects since its creation. However, reconstruction efforts have also been a part of its history. One of the USACE's first notable reconstruction efforts was the fortification of New Orleans, LA after the War of 1812. The Corps of Engineers was assigned to rebuild the burned capital in Washington, D.C. in 1814. After the Civil War, the Corps of Engineers again had a major role in reconstruction of Washington, D.C., this time of the Capitol. In 1887, the Corps developed plans for reconstruction of locally constructed locks and dams ceded to the Federal Government on the Ohio River.

Twentieth century USACE reconstruction efforts included the USACE modernization of Havana's sanitary sewer system for the Cuban Department of Public Works following the Spanish-American War in 1907. In 1917, the Corps of Engineers' 15th Engineers deployed to France to undertake railway reconstruction. In 1944-45, the USACE oversaw the reconstruction of ports and the development of supply routes to U.S. forces in Europe. During World War II, the USACE led the reconstruction of airfields in Italy, North Africa, and Great Britain. After WWII, the USACE heavily contributed to the reconstruction of defeated Germany and Japan. More recently, US Army engineer assets supported recovery efforts after the September 2001 terrorist attacks on the homeland. USACE also executed disaster relief operations after Hurricane Katrina.

Current Reconstruction Efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan

Most recently, the USACE currently plays a significant role in the Overseas Contingency Operations (formerly GWOT) leading significant reconstruction operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Corps of Engineers has to its credit many successfully designed and completed projects undertaken during post-conflict reconstruction and stability operations. In Iraq, the Gulf Region Division provides engineering expertise and contract construction management services to U.S. and Coalition partners, to include the Iraqi government. Over 4,500 infrastructure reconstruction projects, valued at nearly $7 billion have been completed, with nearly 75% of contracts awarded to small, Iraqi-owned businesses, and with many supplies purchased through local companies, thus stimulating economic growth, building capacity, and bringing essential services to Iraq. Other statistics from the GRD's Cumulative Reconstruction Fact Sheet dated 01 April 2009

indicates it has completed 44 hospital renovation projects, and 132 Primary Healthcare Centers (PHC) have been completed and turned over to the Iraqi Ministry of Health. These projects have increased the capacity to treat patients to approximately 6.6-million patients in the renovated hospitals, and 4.6-million outpatients at the PHC's annually. GRD has completed 570 water treatment and sewage projects, yielding 0.9 million cubic meters per day of water treatment capacity achieved, thus positively affecting 5.2 million people. Work has been completed on 95 fire station projects, 145 border posts and 14 Point of Entry facilities. Rehabilitation of five correctional facilities will provide nearly 8,500 beds and improve conditions for many more. Currently underway at GRD are 340 ongoing projects totaling $1.9 billion.[23]

In Afghanistan, the USACE works through the Afghanistan Engineer District (AED) in cooperation with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and U.S. Commands including the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), the Combined Security Transition Command - Afghanistan (CSTC-A) and Regional Command - East, among other organizations. The AED efforts fall into four major program areas:

1. Afghan National Security Forces Program
2. U.S./Coalition Forces Power Projection Program
3. Counter-Narcotics/Border Management Initiative (CN/BMI Program)
4. Strategic Reconstruction Program[24]

The AED, through the Afghan National Security Forces Program, designs and constructs facilities such as barracks, dining facilities, administration buildings, maintenance facilities, and utility systems. For the U.S./Coalition Forces Power

Projection Program, AED designs and constructs runways and airfield facilities, ammunition supply depots, barracks, and associated infrastructure and utility systems. As part of the Counter-Narcotics/Border Management Initiative, AED designs and constructs forward operating bases and border crossings. Most closely related to the United Nations peace building operations initiatives however, are projects undertaken in support of the Strategic Reconstruction Program, including design and construction of roads and bridges, alternative power initiatives such as small hydropower stations, and water management studies. These efforts are significant because they offer the local population the ability to improve access for the Afghan people to participate in governance, education, health, trade and other development that are critical to peace building efforts in creating sustainable development.

The successful implementation of reconstruction and stability operations projects in Iraq, and similar successes in Afghanistan have helped to build a more secure and stable environment in these areas, and consequently a more secure and stable U.S. due to the reduced potential for these countries to become failed states. As Secretary of Defense Gates postured the Pentagon for the future he cautioned, "…the United States needs a military whose ability to kick down the door is matched by its ability to clean up the mess and even rebuild the house afterward."[25] This acknowledgement of the importance of stability and reconstruction operations is consistent with the mandate of DOD Directive 3000.05, which bestows equal importance to stability operations and combat operations.

The USACE, having accomplished a range of reconstruction efforts over time from the War of 1812 to the current Overseas Contingency Operation, clearly

demonstrates its value to the Nation in successfully accomplishing Secretary Gates' vision of the military of the future by its significant expertise in stability and reconstruction efforts. This same power, energy, and expertise that the USACE provides in the stability and reconstruction operations mission can similarly be channeled into the proactive, preemptive peace building mission in order to achieve national interests of security and stability.

Interagency Cooperation

The USACE is currently operating in support of Cabinet level agencies of the United States Government at the strategic level in providing support for reconstruction and stability operations. This interagency team includes the following: the US Department of State (DOS), specifically the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS); the Department of Transportation (DOT); the Department of Commerce (DOC); the Department of Justice (DOJ); the Department of Homeland Security (DHS); the Department of Energy (DOE); Department of the Treasury (Treasury); and frequently the National Security Council (NSC). In addition to these Cabinet level agencies, the USACE provides support to, and works as a team member with, a multitude of organizations and agencies at the tactical level, including among others:

- Host Government entities
- The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
- US Agency for International Development (USAID)
- International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)
- Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and Task Force troop level engineer elements

- Multi-National Security Transition Command, Iraq (MNSTC-I)
- Joint Contracting Command-Iraq/Afghanistan (JCCI/A)
- Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC)
- Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR)
- Joint Area Support Group-Central (JASG-C)
- Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)
- Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs)

The tactical level PRT deserves special emphasis, as it is the basic, interim interagency coalition directorate team integrated under Provincial Governors. The PRT's mission definition in Joint Publication 1-02 is "…to improve stability in a given area by helping build the legitimacy and effectiveness of a host nation local or provincial government in providing security to its citizens and delivering essential government services."[26]

Current and Future Environment

Today's strategic environment offers challenges which add to the volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) nature of a world made smaller and more instantly accessible by globalization, through the acceleration of technology, time and transportation. In the Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO v3.0) dated 15 January 2009, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen, USN broadly described his vision for how the joint force would respond to national security challenges in the years 2016-2028. Future operating environments will be characterized by uncertainty, complexity, rapid change, and persistent conflict.[27] The recently

published 2008 National Defense Strategy of the United States defines the environment thusly,

> The United States, our allies, and our partners face a spectrum of challenges, including violent transnational extremist networks, hostile states armed with weapons of mass destruction, rising regional powers, emerging space and cyber threats, natural and pandemic disasters, and a growing competition for resources.[28]

Wars today are waged using asymmetric, irregular warfare by state and non-state actors, and combatants indistinguishable from the local citizenry who appear, strike, and melt back into the population. Today's wars are hybrid wars, fought in multiple theaters on multiple fronts at the same time using different methods, complicated by the intricate interactions of state and non-state actors, non-governmental organizations, trans-national agencies, crime syndicates, narco-traffickers, and other players. Frank Hoffman defines hybrid wars as wars that,

> Can be waged by states or political groups, and incorporate a range of different modes of warfare including conventional capabilities, irregular tactics and formations, terrorist acts including indiscriminate violence and coercion, and criminal disorder.[29]

The Commander of United States Joint Forces Command, General James N. Mattis, USMC, in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee in March 2009, assessed the future environment as one where,

> Overall, our future enemies are likely to confront us much as we are challenged by today's enemies—through indirect methods in wars of a "hybrid" nature that combine any available irregular or conventional mode of attack, using a blend of primitive, traditional and high-tech weapons and tactics.[30]

Another factor affecting the future environment is the effect of globalization, which is the rapid worldwide integration and interaction of people, processes, and communication making distances shorter, interactions quicker, and relationships more

complex. Globalization offers the positive effect of increased economic opportunity, and yet can unevenly distribute wealth. Uneven distribution of wealth can increase migration by those seeking economic justice, or induce environmental degradation due to the appetite for resources thus exacerbating unrest. Thus the current and near future environment is a three-dimensional chessboard consisting of challenges such as failed and failing states; terrorist threats; insurgencies; illegal immigration; population growth; peace making, peace keeping, and peace building operations; stability, transition and reconstruction operations; catastrophic global economic recessions and attempts to refuel growth with stimulus packages; natural disasters; disease and pandemic threats; piracy along failing states; proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; globalization; and competition for natural resources including the need for basic services including clean air, potable water, and food. All these factors of the VUCA environment pose complications, risks, and threats to U.S. national interests.

In order to create a strategy for achieving U.S. national interests within the context of the current environment, a revision to the classical framework of how to fight and win these irregular wars was necessary for the U.S. and the Department of Defense. In December 2005, the Bush Administration issued National Security Presidential Directive 44 (NSPD-44), Management of Interagency Efforts Concerning Reconstruction and Stabilization.[31] NSPD-44 mandated a whole of government approach as the key to success of reconstruction and stabilization efforts, and aimed to promote the security of the United States through improved coordination, planning, and implementation of reconstruction and stabilization assistance for foreign states at risk from conflict or civil strife. One week prior to the issuance of NSPD-44, Secretary of

Defense Rumsfeld issued DOD guidance in Directive 3000.05, Military Support to Security, Stability, Transition and Reconstruction Operations. This Directive mandated that “Stability Operations are a core U.S. military mission that the Department of Defense shall be prepared to conduct and support” concurrently and complementarily with combat operations:

The role of the military element of power would no longer be simply an outstretched hand holding a rifle. In addition to the rifle in one hand, the other hand would now hold a set of training manuals, a guide to good governance, perhaps a Civil Affairs how-to book, construction plans and specifications, and a checkbook. However, this concept behind DOD Directive 3000.05 is not new. In fact, the following quote from the King James Version of the Old Testament of the Holy Bible predates the DOD Directive by several thousand years: “They which builded on the wall…every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon.”[32] Although it was unlikely to be able to work with a weapon in one hand and a construction tool in the other, the message is there, that every builder is also a soldier and every soldier is a builder. There is a clear parallel to today’s 21st century warrior, who is tasked to balance stability and combat operations, and to be a master of each.

The implementation of DOD Directive 3000.05 also reflects a new era of defense transformation focused on changing organizational culture, knowledge bases, processes, and skills that together will enhance the Department’s ability to conduct stability operations. This transformation does not require expensive new technology or weapons acquisition, or boxes of new black berets. According to his 2006 testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, General James L. Jones, USMC,

Commander of the United States European Command, insisted that In order to be successful in the future environment, the majority of his operations would be,

> Peace support operations, ranging from peace enforcement, to stability operations, to training missions and exercises. Proactive peacetime engagement activities reassure allies and partners, promote stability and mitigate the conditions that lead to conflict. We base our strategies on the principle that it is much more cost effective to prevent conflict than it is to stop one once it has started.[33]

According to General Jones, the more cost effective approach to stability operations is to prevent conflict rather than to stop it once it has occurred.

USACE Capacity Development

The employment of the USACE for its contracting, engineering, construction and management expertise during stability and reconstruction operations is already well known and documented. However, as the pendulum of power use swings from the utilization of the hard power military might instead to the use of balanced smart power diplomacy and preventive peace building, the capability of the USACE to execute that preventive mission must be assessed. The good news is that the USACE has endeavored to define a concept called capacity development.

Capacity development is a new term introduced into the lexicon of the Corps of Engineers by retired Chief of Engineers LTG Henry J. Hatch. The USACE defines capacity development in a USACE Capacity Development White Paper dated June 2008 below:

> Capacity Development is the building of human, institutional and infrastructure capacity to help societies develop secure, stable and sustainable economies, governments and other institutions through mentoring, training, education, and physical projects, the infusion of financial and other resources, and most importantly, the motivation and inspiration of people to improve their lives. [34]

This definition of capacity development bears a strong resemblance to the definition of peace building in that the intent of both is to build structures and capabilities to help defuse and resolve conflict. However, simply because the USACE has defined the term does not mean that it is postured to accomplish the mission associated with the concept. A framework does exist within the joint force environment with which to assess capability gaps and to identify non-major materiel changes required to an organization in accordance with the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS).[35] That framework is the DOTMLPF Change Recommendation (DCR) [36] analysis, which assesses functional areas, needs, and solutions through a capabilities based assessment. The DOTMLPF analysis specifically assesses an organization's doctrine, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel, and facilities. Examining the USACE capability to address the potential pre-conflict peace building mission using this framework allows the strategist to determine any constraints or challenges to institutionalizing the pre-conflict peace building mission as a core USACE competency through an assessment of each element of the DOTMLPF.

DOTMLPF Analysis

Doctrine. Doctrine is the guidance by which military organizations worldwide organize, plan, train, and fight. According to the U.S. Institute for Peace, there is no similar doctrine or strategic framework within the U.S. military to support peace building efforts once major fighting ends.[37] However, the recent Army Field Manual 3-07, Stability Operations, dated October 2008, which was coordinated with the interagency, provides guidance on how to implement stability operations. The USACE itself does have at the HQUSACE level an ongoing concerted effort to develop doctrine for USACE

capacity development endeavors. There is currently a draft Engineer Pamphlet with implementation guidance for these USACE efforts being circulated for concurrence and issuance to the field. This draft doctrine follows on the Corps of Engineers' Capacity Development White Paper approved at the Executive Level in June 2008[38], which described the rationale for why the USACE should be engaged in such efforts. This effort at the HQUSACE is being led by a full-time Program Manager with OCONUS peace building experience, whose primary duty is to develop and staff the action plan and develop implementation guidance for the USACE Capacity Development effort.

Doctrine Recommendation. The USACE should circulate the peace building implementation guidance immediately upon concurrence such that the USACE community can initiate planning efforts in anticipation of opportunities in appropriate areas of responsibility, along with the current USACE Commander's personal statement emphasizing the importance of this endeavor for the organization.

Organization. The USACE is currently not sized optimally when viewed against its existing contingency mission essential task list (METL) requirements, and therefore cannot undertake an additional full time mission task set such as the pre-conflict peace building or capacity development mission. The Corps of Engineers cannot budget for contingency operations; therefore, it cannot maintain a permanent force to be able to accomplish that contingency mission. The Corps may not budget for contingency operations because of their nature, nor can the Corps afford to maintain an idle force to accomplish a potential contingency mission either. That means that upon the receipt of a contingency mission or in the case of an emergency response, resources and manpower are diverted from other missions in order to be able to respond to the

contingency effort with the creation of a provisional team, thus causing gaps, delays, and loss of momentum for the mission being left behind. If the USACE cannot accomplish its METL comfortably within existing resources because it is not authorized or appropriated to organize to meet the potential contingency mission, it will be even more difficult to accomplish additional missions that expand the breadth and scope of these traditional missions. Currently, a provisional division and three subordinate district offices exist in Iraq and a provisional district exists in Afghanistan; however, these provisional organizations will stand down upon completion of the post-conflict mission there. Continuity and the preemptive pre-conflict nature of peace building cannot be effective under these circumstances.

Organization Recommendation. Each CONUS regional division office should be given responsibility for USACE pre-conflict peace building and capacity building efforts within a U.S. Geographic Combatant Commander's (GCC) area of responsibility (AOR) or a subset thereof. This responsibility should not be a simple dual-hatting of individuals as an additional responsibility to existing employees. Further, a permanent USACE district office comprised of fulltime permanent staff should be co-located with each Geographic Combatant Commander to work with their staff and the Ambassadors in those AORs to help better shape the pre and post-conflict environments.

Training. There is minimal training currently offered at the USACE in order to prepare its workforce in the joint techniques, tactics, and procedures necessary to execute the preemptive peace building mission. The HQUSACE Capacity Development Program Manager suggested that a one-week course in the implementation of the

doctrinal aspects of capacity development would be offered in the future, upon completion and issuance of the related guidance.

Training Recommendation. Concur with the USACE Capacity Development Program Manager's recommendation that a basic level training class encompassing the final doctrine, for example, a "USACE Capacity Development 101 Training Course" be developed and provided to all deploying individuals. Further, recommend that USACE organizational assets who would be accepting positions in newly staffed division or co-located district offices, be trained at the United Nations Peace Operations Training Institute and earn a Certificate of Training in United Nations Peace Support prior to engaging on peace building responsibilities. Ongoing higher level training would be required and obtained from other sources as necessary to enhance proficiency and capabilities.

Materiel. Materiel consists of all items necessary to equip, operate, maintain, and support activities. In this case, the funding to staff, train, equip, and run a permanent organizational element to accomplish the pre-conflict peace building effort is the item of concern. Funding for the organization's current post-conflict contingency mission is not provided on a regular basis and is not budgetable, so it is likely that funding for a preemptive peace building mission would be similarly difficult to secure. The efficiency and effectiveness of the traditional provisional division and district office construct, a temporary contingency office, may be undermined by the knowledge of the staff that the organization will cease to exist once the funding runs out for that particular effort, even before the desired effects can be achieved. The same reaction can be expected of an

organization due to uncertain funding sources for a potential pre-conflict peace building mission.

Materiel Recommendation. A consistent and uninterrupted funding stream should be provided in order to allow the organization's focus to stay on the intermediate and long term goals of pre-conflict peace building and capacity development. Until a Congressional Appropriation line item can be secured to fund this effort, recommend that due to the mission's focus, the funding stream should be provided from within Department of Defense's discretionary funds that are frequently allocated to Department of State for USAID efforts.

Leadership. The executive leadership of the USACE organization has not published any strategic messages on pre-conflict peace building or the capacity development effort at this time; however, there is an active effort at the HQUSACE to develop guidance on the implementation of capacity development. Therefore, the leadership of the organization is aware of the opportunities available in pre-conflict peace building operations as a potential subset of the DOD's stabilization, security, transition, and reconstruction operations mandate. That message however, has not yet been published by the leadership.

Leadership Recommendation. Strategic messages are important tools of the change process within any organization. The vision statement and campaign plan should be revisited to reflect pre-conflict peace building operations. The Chief should also articulate to the entire staff, whether via Town Hall meetings or via Video Teleconferencing the value of capacity development as a pre-emptive peace building effort, and the relationship of how USACE involvement in these efforts would support

the national interest. In order to convey the importance of the topic, the Chief's address should be made live and broadcast nationally.

Personnel. The time it takes to hire an employee into the Federal service can take an excess of six months from the time of submittal of an employment application to the time an offer is made to the applicant. Further, employees for contingency missions are currently hired as term employees, meaning that their employment with the Federal Government expires after a prescribed time, one, two, three, or five years hence. Sometimes, by the time a term employee's expertise has risen to a high performing level, it is time for that individual to be separated from government service, thereby losing institutional memory and continuity in an organization.

Personnel Recommendation. The Corps should consider efforts to attract, hire, train, equip, and retain a cadre of permanent hire individuals to serve this new pre-conflict peace building mission. The duty stations for these individuals would be co-located directly with the military Geographic Combatant Commanders, to work within the interagency team to develop plans and conduct pre-conflict peace building operations. Further, the duration of the process between the submittal of an application for employment to the time an offer is made should be shortened and limited to no longer than thirty days, with the intent to deploy within sixty days. In order to foster an expeditionary mindset in the workforce, all future CONUS hires in the USACE should, as a condition of employment be required to sign a deployment agreement that would require those individuals to deploy OCONUS during their career in accordance with certain requirements. In order to instill that expeditionary mindset in the existing CONUS workforce, health care and aftercare, salary, and performance awards for volunteer

deployees should be accommodated similarly with respect to injuries sustained while deployed and income tax consequences as for service members who deploy OCONUS.

Facilities. Existing CONUS USACE facilities should be sufficient to accommodate the cadre of individuals that would be working as the regional division's representative organization to the OCONUS USACE district offices co-located with the GCCs. Sufficient OCONUS facilities exist for the USACE individuals deployed in support of post-conflict contingency missions in USACE provisional offices. An additional organization standing up may not have appropriate facilities to occupy.

Facilities Recommendation. Upon standing up a permanent district office for the pre-conflict peace building effort, additional facilities might have to be leased to account for the increased personnel deployed to that theater. The existing OCONUS USACE Europe District (NAU) arrangement should be used as the model for facilities in other AORs. Facilities to prepare and deploy the increased number of personnel associated with the new mission should be the current CONUS Replacement Centers (CRCs) currently used by the military in power projection.

Summary

The United States has incorporated stabilization, security, transition, and reconstruction operations (SSTRO) into an integrated civilian/military, interagency, intergovernmental, multilateral strategy using a combination of the elements of power at its disposal in order to advance U.S. national interests. The USACE, as an element of that national power, is a vital contributor to the Nation with its full spectrum capable, Army values-based interdisciplinary force of trained and ready high-quality civilians and soldiers, dedicated to public service, and capable, among a multitude of other missions,

of providing support to SSTRO in post-conflict peace building efforts. The USACE stands at an enviable position due to its hybrid nature. It is a military organization with a strong civilian presence, and with a combined military and civil works workload. It can function strictly within the military element of power or within the smart power balance of all the elements of power. However, the USACE should and can do more.

The USACE's value to the Nation may increase exponentially by its assumption of the complex pre-conflict peace building, capacity development mission as described previously. The challenge is to understand what evolutions the Corps of Engineers must undertake to better posture itself to embrace these opportunities identified within the current and future strategic environment, to preempt the need to exercise pure military might, or hard power. There would be a huge opportunity lost to the Nation should the USACE not proceed to work within the interagency and staff, train, and equip for pre-conflict peace building operations, and instead simply continue its current post-conflict stability and reconstruction operations.

Recommendation

In order for the USACE to posture itself to provide pre-conflict peace building operations, consistent with direction from all levels of the Federal Government and the United Nations, the USACE should execute a formal DOTMLPF analysis to determine opportunities to posture itself for greater success. The USACE has the history, experience, expertise, and demonstrated ability in post-conflict reconstruction efforts and is therefore the appropriate entity to execute the pre-conflict peace building mission as described in this paper. Peace building efforts undertaken by the USACE during pre-conflict peacetime periods can stabilize fragile or failing states before they fail, which is

consistent with national interests. The Corps of Engineers in using its capabilities for peace building in pre-conflict as well as post-conflict operations would truly address the entire spectrum of conflict from peace to war in deed as well as in word. The United States Army Corps of Engineers, properly organized, trained, led, staffed, and resourced will continue to serve U.S. national interests of security, stability, solvency, and stature anywhere in the world.

Endnotes

[1] Robert M. Gates, "A Balanced Strategy: Reprogramming the Pentagon for a New Age," *Foreign Affairs* 88 (January/February 2009): 2.

[2] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *Nominations: The Honorable Hillary R. Clinton to be Secretary of State,* 111th Cong., 1st sess., January 13, 2009, 4.

[3] The most recent iteration of the U.S. Army Field Manual 3-07, Stability Operations, dated October 2008, defines shaping as proactive engagement efforts that prevent or mitigate conflict or crises to maintain or enhance stability. U.S. Department of the Army, *Stability Operations*, Army Field Manual 3-07 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, 2008).

[4] Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda for Peace 1995,* 2nd ed. (New York: United Nations Publications, 1995), 11.

[5] Kofi Annan, *Prevention of War and Disaster* (New York: United Nations Publications, 1999), 101.

[6] U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, Joint Publication 1-02 (Washington, DC: U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, September 30, 2008), 413.

[7] U.S. Department of Defense, *Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR) Operations*, Department of Defense Directive: 3000.05 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, November 28, 2005), http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/300005p.pdf (accessed March 18, 2009).

[8] Donald H. Rumsfeld, *Quadrennial Defense Review Report* (Washington, DC: The Pentagon, February 2006), 36.

[9] Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis, "International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis," *American Political Science Review* 94 (December 2000): 779-801.

[10] U.S. Congress, House, Armed Services Committee, *Opening Remarks by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice,* 111th Cong., 1st sess., April 15, 2008, 1.

[11] "USACE Directory," in *Serving the Nation and the Armed Forces: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers* (Tampa, FL: Faircount, 2009), 100, http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/2e39bb28 (accessed April 1, 2009).

[12] United States Army Corps of Engineers, "Mission and Vision Statements," http://usace.army.mil/about/Pages/Mission.aspx (accessed March 14, 2009).

[13] Jim Collins, *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap... and Others Don't,* 1st ed. (New York, NY: HarperBusiness, 2001).

[14] United States Army Corps of Engineers, "Mission and Vision Statements."

[15] United States Army Corps of Engineers, "Military Program Core Missions," http://www.usace.army.mil/CEMP/Pages/CoreMissions.aspx (accessed March 15, 2009).

[16] U.S. Department of the Army, "Army 2008 Posture Statement: Information Papers, Real Estate Disposal," http://www.army.mil/aps/08/information_papers/other/Real_Estate_ Disposal.html (accessed March 15, 2009).

[17] U.S. Department of Defense, *Military Construction,* Department of Defense Directive 4270.5 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, February 12, 2005) http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/html/427005.htm (accessed March 15, 2009).

[18] General James N. Mattis, USMC, *The Joint Operating Environment (JOE) 2008, Challenges and Implications for the Future Joint Force* (Washington, DC: The Pentagon, November 2008), 21.

[19] United States Army Corps of Engineers, "Value to the Nation, Water Supply," http://www.vtn.iwr.usace.army.mil/watersupply/default.htm (accessed April 1, 2009).

[20] *Flood Control and Coastal Emergency Act*, USACE Disaster Operations Public Law 84-99, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iltf/docs/PL84-99factsheet.pdf (accessed March 15, 2009).

[21] *Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act* (1974), as amended by Public Law 106-390, 106th Cong., (October 30, 2000).

[22] Federal Emergency Management Agency, "National Response Framework Resource Center," http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nrf/ (accessed March 15, 2009).

[23]Statistics regarding Iraq reconstruction efforts generally obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Gulf Region Division, *Cumulative Reconstruction Fact Sheet, Data as of 01 April 09* (Gulf Region: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2009), http://www.grd.usace.army.mil/ news/factsheets/docs/March_2009.pdf (accessed April 1, 2009).

[24] United States Army Corps of Engineers, "Afghanistan Engineer District," http://www.aed.usace.army.mil/mission.asp (accessed April 1, 2009).

[25] Gates, "A Balanced Strategy: Reprogramming the Pentagon for a New Age," 2.

[26] U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, 441.

[27] Admiral Mike G. Mullen, USN, *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations, Version 3.0* (Washington, DC: The Pentagon, January 2009), 2.

[28] Robert M. Gates, *The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, DC: The Pentagon, June 2008), 1.

[29] Frank G. Hoffman, *Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars* (Arlington, VA: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, 2007), 58.

[30] Statement of General James N. Mattis, USMC, Commander, United States Joint Forces Command Before the House Armed Services Committee, March 18, 2009, http://www.jfcom.mil/newslink/storyarchive/2009/sp031809.html (accessed April 1, 2009).

[31] George W. Bush, *Management of Interagency Efforts Concerning Reconstruction and Stabilization*, National Security Presidential Directive/NSPD-44 (Washington, DC: The White House, December 2005).

[32] King James Bible, Nehemiah 4:17, http://kingjbible.com/nehemiah/4.htm (accessed March 18, 2009).

[33] General James L. Jones, USMC, Commander, United States European Command, Testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, March 7, 2006, http://armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2006/March/Jones%2003-07-06.pdf (accessed March 15, 2009), 12.

[34] U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, *Capacity Development White Paper* (Washington, DC: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, June 30, 2008), ii. Author provided this document by Sheryl Lewis, Program Manager, Capacity Development Initiative, National Headquarters Corps of Engineers.

[35] U.S. Joint Chiefs Of Staff, *Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System,* Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Of Staff Instruction: CJCSI 3170.01F (Washington, DC: U.S. Joint Chiefs Of Staff , May 1, 2007), Enclosure A, http://www.dtic.mil/cjcs_directives/cdata/unlimit/3170_01.pdf (accessed March 16, 2009).

[36] Defense Acquisition University, “Acquisition, Technology & Logistics Knowledge Sharing System,” https://acc.dau.mil/CommunityBrowser.aspx?id=28924 (accessed March 15, 2009). The joint doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, personnel, and facilities (DOTMLPF) change analysis is the assessment process for determining necessary changes to existing joint resources when such changes are not associated with a new defense acquisition program.

[37] United States Institute of Peace, *Peacebuilding Toolkit, Strategic Framework: Fragile States and Societies Emerging from Conflict* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2007).

[38] U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, Capacity Development White Paper.*