

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

Nation-Building, The American Way

by

Colonel Jayne A. Carson
United States Army

Colonel James Helis
Project Advisor

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

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

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) 07-04-2003	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO) xx-xx-2002 to xx-xx-2003	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Nation-Building, The American Way Unclassified		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
		5b. GRANT NUMBER	
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Carson, Jayne A. ; Author		5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
		5e. TASK NUMBER	
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks Carlisle, PA17013-5050		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS ,		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT APUBLIC RELEASE			
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
14. ABSTRACT See attached file.			
15. SUBJECT TERMS			
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 39
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Rife, Dave RifeD@awc.carlisle.army.mil	
c. THIS PAGE Unclassified		19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number DSN	
			Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39.18

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: COL Jayne A. Carson

TITLE: Nation-Building, The American Way

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 07 April 2003

PAGES: 39

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The United States has conducted nation-building operations since 1898 and does so in a uniquely American way. Nation-building is the intervention in the affairs of a nation-state for the purpose of changing the state's method of government and when the United States pursues these efforts there is one goal – democratization. Removing existing governments requires force, and history has shown that the Army is the force of choice. The story of America's nation-building efforts starts with the Spanish-American War when the United States decided that Cuba and the Philippines should no longer be colonies of Spain. After defeating Spain in Cuba and routing their forces from the Philippines, the United States began nation-building efforts to establish democratic governments that were representative of the populace.

This paper examines select nation-building operations beginning in Cuba and the Philippines. The success of transforming post WWII Germany and Japan are described, as are the failures in Somalia and Haiti, and the ongoing efforts in Bosnia and Kosovo. It concludes with an examination of the Herculean efforts that will be required if the United States is to see success in Afghanistan.

The United States is reluctant to use the term nation-building and for this reason, many military personnel do not understand the critical role the military plays in this mission. It is a role that extends long past the time that battles, campaigns, and wars have been won. The military, specifically the Army as the ground presence and symbol of America's commitment, is required to remain in place long after the fight has been won in order to create the conditions for democracy to take root. This is the reason why Army officers need to understand why and how the United States builds nations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
NATION-BUILDING, THE AMERICAN WAY	1
PROPOSED DEFINITION	2
AMERICA BECOMES A NATION-BUILDER	3
CUBA	3
THE PHILIPPINES	6
MILITARY GOVERNMENT	10
GERMANY	11
JAPAN	13
SOMALIA	15
HAITI	17
BOSNIA	19
KOSOVO	20
AFGHANISTAN	21
LESSONS LEARNED	22
CONCLUSION	23
ENDNOTES.....	25
BIBLIOGRAPHY	31

NATION-BUILDING, THE AMERICAN WAY

This paper examines the United States Army's role in nation-building by exploring America's history of nation-building pursuits. It details the origins of United States nation-building in Cuba and the Philippines and reviews post WWII nation-building in Germany and Japan. The failures and successes of nation-building in Somalia, Haiti, and the Balkans are examined. It explains the ongoing efforts in Afghanistan, concluding with why it will be difficult for the United States and international community to see either short term or lasting results of the nation-building efforts there.

A recent Washington Post article entitled "Pentagon Plans a Redirection in Afghanistan – Troops to Be Shifted Into Rebuilding the Country" quoted an unnamed senior official who said, "Since September 11, I think everyone understands that we have a stake in the future of Afghanistan that is not simply nation-building for the sake of the Afghan people, it's security-building to prevent terrorists from returning. That's not a mission we ever thought about before for the United States."¹ This paper will demonstrate that not only is nation-building a mission that the United States has thought about but that it is a mission that the United States has repeatedly engaged in since 1898.

Nation-building is a term used world-wide by politicians, international organizations, and in news and scholarly publications, and yet no single doctrinal definition exists. The phrase is not found in President Clinton's 2000 National Security Strategy nor is it referred to in President Bush's 2002 National Security Strategy. Nation-building was, however, one of the defining foreign policy differences between the two parties and the subject of much debate during the 2000 Presidential election campaign.² The United Nations is involved in many seemingly nation-building-like activities, yet is reluctant to use the term "nation-building", preferring to categorize these missions under the heading of peace keeping operations.

The United States military recognizes the importance of doctrine, terms, and words; they must be exacting and understood. Understanding the difference between deter and defend has very real implications to the battlefield commander. Yet, despite a long history of military involvement in nation-building, United States joint doctrine does not define this term nor is there an existing doctrinal guide which outlines the activities involved. Perhaps this is why that senior official in Afghanistan believes that the United States has never considered this a mission.

Evidence that the United States is likely to engage in nation-building in the future can be found in the words of the title of Chapter VII of the 2002 National Security Strategy, "Expand the Circle of Development by Opening Societies and Building the Infrastructure of Democracy."³

Evidence that the United States has engaged in nation building in the past is found in the presidential quote that accompanies the chapter title: "In World War II we fought to make the world safer, then worked to rebuild it. As we wage war today to keep the world safe from terror, we must also work to make the world a better place for all its citizens."⁴

PROPOSED DEFINITION

For the purpose of this paper the following definition of nation-building is provided: Nation-building is the intervention in the affairs of a nation state for the purpose of changing the state's method of government. Nation-building also includes efforts to promote institutions which will provide for economic well being and social equity.

The United States conducts nation-building in a distinctive style that seeks first and foremost to democratize other nations or peoples. One of the primary tenants is to install or reinstate a constitutional government that recognizes universal suffrage, the rule of law, and separation of church and state. This is based on a long time belief that fostering democracy abroad is not only in the best interest of national security, but is a national responsibility. This is not to say that spreading democracy requires full-fledged nation-building activities. On the contrary, democracy can and does promote itself, sometimes without overt American effort. Providing economic support and humanitarian aid are generally important components of nation-building, although engaging in these types of activities does not signal an American desire to build or rebuild a nation. The fundamental difference between rendering aid and nation-building is the desired outcome. In every nation-building venture that the United States has undertaken, it has attempted to fundamentally change the existing political foundation of that state. The goal of this change is democratization.

Nation-building encompasses a number of objectives. The two most notable objectives are establishing a representative government and setting conditions which will allow for economic growth and individual prosperity. Security must be established in order to achieve these objectives. This is the role of the Armed Forces. Security is most often achieved by using the United States Army either by fighting and winning in war or through peace-making, peace-keeping, or peace-enforcement operations.

Reconstructing the infrastructure is one of the most visible outcomes of nation-building and the United States typically goes well beyond reconstruction by greatly improving and expanding the infrastructure. The American style of nation-building also tends to try to infuse American values. For example, the United States places high value on education and therefore expends great efforts towards establishing compulsory education. Human rights and labor

rights, to include those of women and children, are also important values that nation-building stresses to instill.

AMERICA BECOMES A NATION-BUILDER

The United States emerged from the Civil War and subsequent Reconstruction period as a world economic power. National policies in the 1890s marked a distinct change in United States foreign policy reflecting in great measure the nation's emotions and personality. Americans exhibited tremendous pride and confidence in the nation's industrial capabilities and in their democratic form of government. With this came a sense of "superiority of American political and social values" and America began "to see the world as an arena open and waiting for the embracement of these ideals."⁵ The Spanish American War was a product of this rise to global power and, it can be argued, led to America's first foreign nation-building effort. The reasons for entering this war and the later actions in the occupied territories are hauntingly similar to the conditions which 100 years later led to United States involvement in Haiti, Somalia, and the Balkans.

CUBA

The 1890s marked the height of European colonialism. Cuba and the Philippines were both Spanish colonies. A Cuban uprising against the corrupt, oppressive, and brutal Spanish government occurred in 1895.⁶ The revolt was met with severe measures by Spain which further repressed the Cuban people. Spanish policy resulted in a complete breakdown of the Cuban economy and turned Cuban towns and cities into concentration areas in which Cuban women, children and old men were forced to live in stockades, where they died by the thousand of disease and starvation.⁷

United States intermittent interests in Cuba dated to before the Civil War. Its close proximity to Florida made it a candidate for annexation and there was talk of statehood in the 1850s. By the 1890s, the United States also had significant financial interests in Cuba as a trading partner.⁸ Stories of Spanish barbarism and murder captured headlines and the Spanish atrocities were widely sensationalized by Joseph Pulitzer, publisher of the *New York World*, and by William Randolph Hearst, publisher of the *New York Journal*. Not only did this sell newspapers, but it stirred the emotions of many Americans. Editorials fueled the call for U.S involvement in Cuba to stop the atrocities. One editorial in the *New York World* challenged American leadership by asking, "is there no nation wise enough, brave enough, and strong enough to restore peace in this blood smitten land?"⁹ The American public was angered by the

shocking and often false newspaper accounts of what was going on in Cuba, but in the end, it was the sinking of the Maine that provided the impetus for direct intervention.

The Congressional authority granted to the President in a war resolution on 13 April 1898, thrust the United States into the role full fledged nation-building.

The President is authorized and directed to intervene at once to stop the war in Cuba, to the end and with the purpose of securing permanent peace and order there and establishing by the free action of the people thereof, a stable and independent government of their own on the island of Cuba. The President is hereby authorized and empowered to use the land and naval forces of the United States to execute the purpose of this resolution.¹⁰

The importance of these words cannot be understated, for they would become the foundation of future foreign policy. The United States would intervene to “stop the war,” which was a prelude to future peace-making or peace-keeping operations in Cuba and elsewhere. The willingness of the United States to intervene militarily in the interest of peace and stability was evidenced by repeated returns to Cuba and to other Caribbean and Central American countries throughout the 20th century.

Equally important were the words describing the “independent government” which would be established in Cuba. The United States declared that the government would be established by the “free action of the people.” Translate this to mean a democratic government.

The war resolution was amended several days later by the Teller Amendment which further articulated United States goals and policy. The amendment had four points:

First, the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be free and independent: Second, that it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the government of the United States does hereby demand that the government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters; Third, that the President of the United States be, and hereby is directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces on the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militias of the several states to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect; Fourth, that the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.¹¹

The Teller Amendment provided clarity to the War Resolution as to why the United States was going to war. Of supreme importance was part four of the amendment because it clearly articulated the end state. Cuba would not become a colony of the United States nor would it be annexed. This too would become the foundation of future foreign policy.

On 25 April 1898, the U.S declared war on Spain and so began the United States' "splendid little war" to liberate Cuba. The Teller Amendment put to rest ideas of annexing Cuba but did not limit the amount of United States influence on Cuba's future government. The war lasted a short 10 weeks. With the liberation of Cuba complete, the United States set out to rebuild Cuba in the image of itself: a democratic state with a constitution providing for free elections and an economy that would allow for individual prosperity.

As security was established, the process of building a working government began. In typical American style, the government in Cuba would be a democratized government. Believing that Cubans were incapable of self determination, the United States drafted a constitution for Cuba. Attached to the constitution was the Platt Amendment which placed certain restrictions on Cuba's sovereignty and included the United States' rights in perpetuity to the coaling station at Guantanamo Bay. Threatened by the prospect of permanent occupation, Cuba was coerced into accepting this constitution and the attached amendment.¹²

Most of the success of creating and molding a new Cuba came under the hand of General Leonard Wood. As a Colonel at the start of the War with Spain, Wood commanded the now famous regiment, the "Rough Riders". His friend and subordinate in the regiment was Lieutenant Colonel Theodore Roosevelt. Appointed as the military governor of Cuba from December 1899 until 20 May 1902, Wood brought a unique set of skills. A natural and mature leader, he was a doctor by trade, spoke Spanish, and understood and respected the customs and way of life of the Cuban people.¹³

As the Governor of Cuba, General Wood was responsible for an almost impossible task. He had to restore order, prepare the country for an independent democratic rule, and establish conditions which would allow for economic and individual prosperity. Accomplishing this in a country that had been under foreign control for three centuries would be difficult.

There was no model or doctrine for this military officer to use as a guide. A conversation with one of his officers is revealing. Wood had been dismayed at the deplorable conditions he saw at an insane asylum and directed one of his majors to reorganize the asylum. The Major told Wood, "General, I'm afraid I don't know much about insane asylums" to which Wood replied, "I don't know much about being a military governor."¹⁴

General Wood established both local and national governmental offices which mirrored those found in the United States. It was said that General Wood "transformed the face of Cuba."¹⁵ He reformed the legal system, established a constabulary, and organized a municipal police system which brought order to the cities and rural areas.

Great improvements were realized in the areas of health and sanitation. General Wood forced local communities to clean the streets and houses. He established quarantines to control a deadly outbreak of small pox. Of worldwide importance, he provided Doctor Walter Reed the funds to conduct experiments which led to the monumental discovery that mosquitoes carried the yellow fever virus. He directed improvements in the education system by furnishing funds for schools and supplies. An American style school system was established. In the first two years the number of students enrolled tripled. General Wood also made dramatic improvements to the country's overall infrastructure especially in the area of transportation.¹⁶

The processes, systems, and procedures that General Wood used to achieve order and to establish local and national government in Cuba became the model that the United States would later use with varying degrees of success. Nation-building in Cuba was by all accounts successful. The results, however, were not to be long lasting. As his mission in Cuba came to a close, General Wood wrote in his diary:

The general feeling among the Cubans was one of intense regret at the termination of the American Government. I refer to the better class of people, the people representing the churches, business, education, the learned professional, were all outspoken in their regret and their actions for months preceding the end of the military Government had indicated that their feelings were particularly sincere. I feel we should have stayed longer...¹⁷

And so here the first lesson in nation-building was learned; it is not quick. Three years was not long enough for Cuba to attain self-sufficiency nor long enough for the roots of democracy to take hold. Cuba remained politically unstable and on three occasions (1905, 1910, and 1917) U.S. forces would return to Cuba in what would now be termed peace enforcement missions.¹⁸

The Occupation of Cuba was relatively short and Cuba was granted full independence in 1902. Nation-building in Cuba began a pattern that the United States continues to repeat: secure peace, provide for a constitutional government, restore governmental services, and provide for economic aid either through grants or private capital, all while retaining a significant degree of United States control.

THE PHILIPPINES

The United States went to war in Cuba to free that country of Spanish rule. The war in the Philippines, however, was a sideshow set in motion primarily by Theodore Roosevelt while he was serving as the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. The story is an interesting one. One afternoon in February 1898 (ten days after the sinking of the Maine but before declaration of war with Spain), Secretary of the Navy John Long took an afternoon off to see a local doctor. He left

Roosevelt in charge believing that he would merely continue with the routine duties of the day. Within a few short hours, Roosevelt had directed United States Naval commanders to maximize their stocks of fuel and ammunition and selected various rendezvous points in preparation for war. He dictated a request to congress to increase the navy's authorization of personnel and cabled Commodore Dewey specifically directing the following: "In the event of declaration of war with Spain, your duty will be to see that the Spanish Squadron does not leave the Asiatic Coast, and then offensive operation in the Philippine Islands."¹⁹ Long was surprised by Roosevelt's bold decisions when he returned to work the next morning, but as evidence to Roosevelt's audacity and Long's lack of forcefulness, Long did not rescind any of Roosevelt's orders. Months later, when Dewey cabled back that he had destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay, President McKinley, though delighted with the news, had to consult a map to determine where the Philippines were located - a fitting testimony to this sideshow operation.²⁰

The Treaty of Paris officially ended the Spanish American War ceding Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands to the United States. The Philippines was not mentioned in the War Resolution and more importantly, it was not included in the Teller Amendment. The Teller Amendment had made clear that the United States had no imperialistic designs on Cuba, but there had been little to no thought before the war as to what to do with the Philippines. This far away land, now occupied by United States forces, presented a foreign policy dilemma.²¹

To leave the peoples to themselves left the Philippines vulnerable to Spain's return, to colonization by other European countries, or, more dangerously, to colonization by Japan. The thought of annexation and eventual statehood for the Philippines did not sit well with most Americans. The United States simply did not want to be seen as an imperialistic nation and this, coupled with oriental ethnicity concerns, led the United States to a compromised decision. The Philippines would be a colony of the United States until they were capable of self-rule. Only then would they be given independence. Democratizing the islands was not considered before the war, but once the decision was made to eventually grant them independence, democratization became the purpose and mission of the American forces on the islands.²²

Nation-building efforts were slow, and providing security cost the lives of more than 4,000 American soldiers. In truth, the United States bought the Philippines from Spain for \$20 million and never had to fight the Spanish in Manila. They did, however, have to fight against insurrection guerilla forces which not only wanted immediate freedom from Spain but wanted it from the United States.²³ By 1901, most of the insurrection forces had been contained and security was sufficient enough for nation-building efforts to begin.

Under General Arthur MacArthur, the United States Army established a military government in the Philippine Islands. On 4 July 1901, the power of government was transferred from the military. Civil control was vested in William Taft who served until 1904, with the title of Civil Governor.²⁴

The United States was still without a clear direction or policy for the Philippine Islands when Secretary of War Elihu Root issued the initial set of instructions to Taft. These instructions directed the Civil Governor to establish a government starting with municipalities where the local affairs would be administered by the natives to the extent that they were capable. Root's instructions also specified that the form of government was to be one designed for the people of the Philippines. It was to "conform to their customs, their habits, and even their prejudices."²⁵ The government of the Philippines was not to be the government of the United States. Civil Governor Taft's supervision and control of local governments was to be as unobtrusive as possible. Though seemingly advocating to the Philippines their choice and type of government, Root added:

...the people of the Islands should be made plainly to understand that there are certain great principles of government, which we deem essential to the rule of law and the maintenance of individual freedom, ... that there are also certain practical rules of government which we have found to be essential to the preservation of these great principles of liberty and law, and that these principles and these rules of government must be established and maintained in their Islands for the sake of their liberty and happiness, however much they may conflict with the customs or laws of procedure with which they are familiar.²⁶

Although the Philippines would choose the type of government they would have, the United States had essentially dictated that it would be a democratic government, adhering to the same ideal principles that America claimed and believed to be superior to all other types of government.

Armed with these instructions, Taft summarized his policy as Civil Governor as "The Philippines for the Filipinos."²⁷ Despite his belief in the inferiority of the Filipinos, Taft made significant progress by establishing political parties, granting civil liberties, and separating the church and state. Democratizing the Philippines was made especially difficult owing to the existing governmental process before America's arrival. Though controlled by Spain, the Philippines' internal government was "structured horizontally through kinship structures and vertically through patron-client relations based on ownership of land."²⁸ These structures were locally oriented; hence the Philippines had never had a formal national government of its own. Introducing a radically different system, completely foreign to their past experience, made it necessary to start at the local level before building a national level of government. Additionally,

overwhelmingly agrarian societies are inherently slower to develop democracy because of the natural caste system established between wealthy land owners and poor share croppers.

The overall lack of education was a concern to Taft who once reported that

The incapacity of these people for self-government is one of the patent facts that strikes every observer, whether close or far. The truth is that there are not in these islands more than six or seven thousand men who have any education that deserves the name, and most of these are nothing but the most intriguing politicians, without the slightest moral stamina, and nothing but personal interest to gratify. The great mass of the people are ignorant and superstitious.²⁹

Thus to govern themselves the people must first be educated. Soldiers and officers served as the first teachers and were later replaced by teachers from the United States. Education was to follow the American system and was taught in English.³⁰

Luke Wright, Taft's Vice Governor, recognized that the Army was fully engaged in putting down the insurgency and pacification, what today would be classified as stability operations. He therefore established the Constabulary which was responsible for routine police duties. The Constabulary was led by American officers and the ranks were formed mostly from native Filipinos. In 1905, Wright would follow Taft as the Civil Governor at which time the title was changed to Governor General.³¹

General Leonard Wood, who had been Military Governor in Cuba, would also play an important role in the Philippines. In 1903, he was the Governor of the Moro Province which, because of active insurgency operations, was the only area still under a military government and not under Taft's Civil Government. In 1906, Wood was selected to command the Philippine Department of the Army and from 1921-1926 was the Governor General.³²

The Philippines would not be granted full independence until after WWII. The ceremony in Manila on 4 July 1946 was singularly unique as it was the first time in history that an imperial nation freely relinquished control of a possession.³³ The United States had succeeded in its nation-building efforts. The Philippines was a democratic country - self-governed under the laws of a constitution. Through almost fifty years of military occupation and by nurturing the principals and laws of democracy, America had fundamentally changed the way of government, the economy, and the social structure in the Philippines.

In both Cuba and the Philippines the United States Army was an occupying force which established a military government because the native population, who had no experience in self-government, was deemed incapable of governing itself. By liberating the Philippines from Spanish rule, the United States sought to set the conditions to enable it to achieve self government – a government modeled after that of the United States.

MILITARY GOVERNMENT

Military government is the “administration by military officers of civil government in occupied enemy territory.”³⁴ Although the United States Army had conducted military government in Cuba, the Philippines, and elsewhere (Mexico 1847-48, in the Confederate States after the Civil War, and in the Rhinelands after WWI), the mission had not been considered a military function by either the Army or the government. The situation after WWII differed in that the United States military was both an invading and an occupying force whose mission was not to liberate the residents of Germany or Japan, but to destroy the existing and legitimate governments of the Axis Powers.

Colonel Irwin Hunt was the Officer in Charge of Civil Affairs for 3d Army and in 1930 prepared a report titled “American Military Government of Occupied Germany, 1918-1920.” In what was to become known as the Hunt Report he recorded that “The American army of occupation lacked both training and organization to guide the destinies of the nearly one million civilians whom the fortunes of war had placed under its temporary sovereignty.”³⁵ He argued that the Army needed to establish both guidelines and training to prepare for inevitable future responsibilities in military government. The Hunt Report, one of the only substantial documents on the subject, was used extensively throughout the 1930s by repeated War College committees working in civil affairs. As a result, *FM 27-5, Military Government* was published in July 1940.³⁶

As war in Europe unfolded, it became clear that the scope of military government and civil affairs activities would far exceed those of past wars. WWI had been fought mostly in France, and the French government retained control of civil administration. WWII differed in that nearly all of Europe was occupied by the Axis Powers, and former governments had gone into exile or simply disappeared altogether. Great Britain was conducting politico-military courses as early as 1941 in an effort to prepare officers for postwar reconstruction.³⁷

As it had been for the past 100 years, enthusiasm among United States Army officers for duties in military government was minimal. After Pearl Harbor and in light of the declaration of martial law in Hawaii and the resettlement of west coast Japanese, the need for both military government and civil affairs necessitated the creation of formal training. The School of Military Government was first established at the University of Virginia in April 1942. Later, the Army established the Civil Affairs Training Program. This program trained junior grade officers on civil affairs field-skills as opposed to the high command advisory level staff skills that were taught at the School of Military Government.³⁸

GERMANY

The United States Army's first military government in Germany was established in September 1944 in Roetgen.³⁹ The primary job of military government before the final surrender in 1945 was to take the burden of the civil administration off the tactical commander which would allow him freedom of movement to continue the mission. The military government in Roetgen was made up of a small team of officers and NCOs who performed duties that would be repeated throughout Germany as the offensive gained territory. Their first order of business was to post proclamations and ordinances which announced the occupation and established rules for the civilian population. Next, they located the Buergermeister (mayor) in order to establish a link with the population. If the Buergermeister was a Nazi, the military government team would appoint someone else. Orders were issued to surrender all prohibited items, such as weapons, ammunition and communication devices. This was followed by a house to house search for these items. Curfews were established as well as movement and assembly restrictions. In order to enforce these restrictions, all adult citizens were registered. Other typical civil affair duties included arranging for burial of the dead, establishing a police force, and, if possible, reestablishing water, electricity and other local administrative activities.⁴⁰

As ultimate victory drew closer, so did the task of transforming Germany - a daunting undertaking mired in exceedingly complex issues. The Allies were in agreement that the Axis Powers, particularly Germany, must be purged of not just Nazism but of its aggressive and militaristic character.⁴¹ Germany would be held responsible for the devastation it had caused. Germany had started three wars in Europe in the span of 70 years – 1870, 1914, and 1939. There would be no armistice as there had been in WWI. The war would end in unconditional surrender, and the German people would be accountable for their support of Hitler and for allowing his henchmen to wreck havoc across Europe while committing gross crimes against humanity. The victors would impose their will on the defeated.

Planning for post-war Germany began before the U.S entered the war. Many in the United States believed that the exclusive market policies of Germany and Japan had been one of the root causes of the war. Japan and Germany “had pursued a dangerous pathway into the modern industrial age and combined authoritarian capitalism with military dictatorship and coercive regional autarky.”⁴² Addressing the political and economic principles of free-determination and free trade, Roosevelt sought to set the conditions of the post-war world through the Atlantic Charter. The Atlantic Charter also served Roosevelt's desire to restrain Great Britain's imperialistic tendencies.⁴³

The Yalta Conference formalized the direction for postwar Germany. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin decided that Germany would be divided into three zones of occupation. France was given a fourth zone, which was carved from British and the American zones. Although implementing the policy would be much different in each zone, the conference confirmed that the ultimate aim was to destroy Nazism and militarism in order to ensure that Germany could not emerge as a future threat to world peace. The German armed forces would be disbanded and their equipment destroyed or removed. The German industrial complexes would be rendered incapable of producing war materials. War criminals would be punished and reparations imposed. Lastly, not only would the Nazi Party be crushed, but its laws and influence on society, economics and government would be forever eliminated.⁴⁴

Supreme Headquarters Allied Forces Europe (SHAPE) was dissolved and each of the four occupying countries would report to the Allied Control Council. JCS 1067 was the document which provided instructions to American commanders. It further amplified United States policy in Germany and provided specific guidance pertaining to the limits and restrictions of military government.⁴⁵ JCS 1067 was notable because it severely restricted the military government's capability to rehabilitate the German economy.

The American sector was organized into two districts. The Eastern District was under the command of General George Patton and the Western District was under the command of General Geoffrey Keys. American out of sector commands were also established in Berlin and at the port of Bremen. These four commanders reported directly to the theater commander's general staff using the G5 staff chain.⁴⁶

General Eisenhower was the commander of United States forces until leaving the theater in November of 1945.⁴⁷ He was succeeded by General McNarney and eventually General Lucius Clay. In addition to military government, the Army provided a constabulary force which was principally responsible for policing duties.

The United States' immediate post-war tasks in Germany were denazification, demilitarization, disarmament, decartelizing, and democratization. Policy, as established by the President and State Department, was principally carried out by the United States Army. After winning the war, soldiers took on the task of apprehending and trying war criminals; controlling, caring for, and relocating refugees and displaced persons; restoring law and order; destroying military installations and equipment; and discharging enemy prisoners of war.⁴⁸ In carrying out these military tasks they also set the conditions to create a new, democratic, and self-sufficient government in Germany, to reengineer the economic system, and to fundamentally change the

political culture and civil society. Under Military Government, aided by the Marshall Plan and later the formation of NATO, the nation-building process in Germany was a success.

JAPAN

Military Government was also established in Japan and sought to achieve the same basic goals as those in Germany: demilitarization, decartelization, destroying militant nationalism, and democratization.⁴⁹ Military Government was established under General MacArthur, the Supreme Commander Allied Powers (SCAP).⁵⁰ The challenges confronting MacArthur were similar to those faced by the commanders in Germany. MacArthur's task was simplified somewhat because the United States was the only occupying force and therefore not subject to the complexities caused by the four occupying forces in Germany. Although clashes did occur with the Soviet Union, particularly as the Cold War gained momentum, MacArthur was generally unencumbered in carrying out United States policy.

The magnitude of devastation in Japan, as in Germany, must have at first appeared almost overwhelming. Most of the infrastructure had been destroyed, and during the first two years of occupation, the scarce availability of food and shelter made individual survival a daily concern. Despite this MacArthur quickly began recreating Japan. War criminals were apprehended and tried. The country was disarmed. Enemy prisoners of war were processed and released and prisoners held by the Japanese were returned. Political, economic, and military leaders were purged and replaced.⁵¹

One episode clearly illustrates the power and brilliance that MacArthur exuded over Japan and the relative independent manner in which he carried out his duties. In April 1945, the *Awa Maru* was on the return leg of a voyage whose mission was carrying Red Cross items to American held prisoners of war. Because of the nature of the mission, the United States had guaranteed safe-conduct. The vessel was mistakenly torpedoed and sunk with only one of the 2,004 Japanese on board surviving. Japan immediately submitted an indemnity claim for the loss. Although the United States admitted liability, settlement for the claim was delayed because of more immediate concerns (ending the war) and because the claim was highly inflated.⁵²

After reviewing the claim in 1948, the State Department wanted a more equitable agreement reached and sent instructions on this matter to MacArthur's political advisor. Upon hearing this, MacArthur determined that the 1945 surrender agreement nullified all claims; and in light of the tremendous aid in food and dollars that the United States had already provided Japan, they should therefore withdraw the claim. Thus, MacArthur not only dismissed the State

Department's analysis of the claim, he independently interpreted the surrender agreement and then acted according to his own interpretation. These types of actions were not atypical of MacArthur, nor were the results. Not only did Japan withdraw the claim, but the document they wrote for this withdrawal made clear that they, the Japanese government, had denounced their militarist ways and were beginning to emerge as a democratic nation.⁵³

Evidence of what the United States did to successfully reinvent Japan can be found in the words of the final document concerning the *Awa Maru*. This resolution, entitled "Regarding the Waiving of Japan's Claims in the *Awa Maru* Case" was written in April 1949. It starts by stating that "Japan ...is now emerging out of the ravages of war and clothing herself with a new existence dedicated to peace and to the high principles of freedom and democracy....."⁵⁴

Further testimony to what the United States achieved is found in the second sentence of the resolution: "And whereas, it is the United States of America who as the principal occupying power, has assumed a major role in the formulation and execution of that policy, and the Japanese people owe to the American government and people and incalculable debt of gratitude for their generous aid and assistance toward her recovery and rehabilitation."⁵⁵

The United States conducted four major nation-building operations starting in 1898 and continuing through the first half of the 20th Century. The United States sought to liberate the people of Cuba and the Philippines and to grow them into self-sufficient democratic nations. Initial success was experienced in Cuba, but lasting results were not achieved. Success was achieved in the Philippines although at a large cost in American lives and a long and demanding period of occupation. Nation-building in Germany and Japan were overwhelmingly successful, and now after more than fifty years, both nations remain strong members of the family of peace loving nations and close allies of the United States. Both Germany and Japan were completely defeated in war and surrendered unconditionally. The nazi and militaristic totalitarian governments were replaced with democratic governments. The ideas of freedom of speech, press, and religious practice were instilled and able to grow and develop. Rebuilding Germany and Japan was a vital national interest to both the economic and physical security of the United States

The United States was preoccupied with the Soviet Union throughout the Cold War and nation-building efforts were curtailed. Containment of communism was the benchmark of foreign policy, and non-democratic nations, as long as they were not influenced by the Soviet Union, were viewed as a minor threat and therefore posed no threat to national security.

Foreign policy as it pertained to nation-building changed after the Cold War. Examples of where the United States sought to change the governments of other nations were in the failed states of Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, and most recently Afghanistan.

SOMALIA

Somalia was, in 1992, a failed state experiencing both civil war and famine. There was no formal government, no police, and no education system. The country was in a constant state of violence resulting from clan rivalry, particularly in the capital of Mogadishu. Two of the biggest clans in Mogadishu were led by General Mohammed Farah Aidid and Ali Mohamed Mahdi. Each leader used his private armies in an effort to take control of the state.⁵⁶

Fighting had caused the displacement of nearly 2 million people and had destroyed approximately 60% of the infrastructure.⁵⁷ To make matters worse, a devastating drought had caused the death of 300,000 and threatened the lives of an additional 4.5 million people, half the population of Somalia. Although food donations from international organizations could have alleviated much of the suffering, distributing the food had become impossible. The clans used food as a weapon and food relief convoys were a profitable and popular target. For these reasons the UN intervened. A general cease-fire agreement between Aidid and Mahdi was brokered by the UN followed by the establishment of United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM I). UNOSOM I was established to monitor the cease-fire, to protect stock piles of humanitarian supplies, and to provide security escort for distribution.⁵⁸

The UNOSOM I mission included 500 troops, 50 military observers and other logistical support and civilian staff members who were to provide security for the UN's 100-Day Action Plan for Accelerated Humanitarian Assistance. The plan had eight objectives which included an aggressive infusion of food aid, providing basic health services, and stopping the flow of refugees. The last objective was titled "institution-building and rehabilitation of civil society".⁵⁹ UNOSOM I was ineffective and failed to achieve any of its objectives. Food stocks continued to be pilfered and convoys raided. The cease-fire was not enforced and UN soldiers came under attack. Under this back drop and with pressure from the media, the United States agreed to help.

In December 1992, UN Resolution 794 was approved. Resolution 794 established the Unified Task Force (UNITAF) and authorized the task force to use "all necessary means to establish a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations."⁶⁰ UNITAF was led by the United States which commanded 21,000 United States troops and 16,000 soldiers from other nations. President George H. Bush described the mission as one of limited objectives and

duration. He said that the purpose was to “open the supply routes, to get the food moving and to prepare the way for a U.N. peacekeeping force to keep it open.”⁶¹ Many believed that the mission would last about 6 months.

President William Clinton took office 6 weeks after United States soldiers had deployed to Somalia and under his administration the United States began the next segment of the operation. Clinton’s Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs was Robert Houdek. Houdek announced the direction that the United States would take in Somalia in February of 1993 when he testified before the House Foreign Affairs Sub Committee on Africa.⁶² Houdek said, “We are moving to a new phase of our efforts in Somalia from the job of reestablishing a secure environment to get relief to the most needy to the challenge of consolidating security gains and promoting political reconciliation and rehabilitation.”⁶³

President George H. Bush sent United States forces to Somalia for humanitarian reasons. These troops would provide security in order for the relief supplies to be delivered to those whom desperately needed them. The United States would lead the mission but would hand it off to UN peacekeeping forces as soon as practicable. In May 1993, UNOSOM II succeeded the UNITAF.⁶⁴ Operating under UN Resolution 814, the mission was greatly expanded from the mission of establishing a secure environment for humanitarian assistance operations to that of establishing political institutions and civil administration.⁶⁵ A statement made by Madeline Albright, the U.S. ambassador to the UN, made this perfectly clear: “The key to the future of Somalia will be the establishment of a viable and representative national government and economy.”⁶⁶ The role of the United States also changed dramatically during the spring of 1993.

An attack on UNOSOM II soldiers resulted in 25 killed and 54 wounded Pakistani soldiers. A UN investigation revealed that Aidid was responsible for the attack and therefore directed the UNOSOM Force commander to detain Aidid.⁶⁷ Instead of being a neutral entity keeping warring factions apart, the UN and the United States had taken sides.

United States air strikes were conducted against Aidid’s weapon depots and strongholds. UN Special Representative to Somalia, Jonathan Howe, offered a \$25,000 reward for Aidid’s capture. A ground attack aided by United States airpower against Aidid’s headquarters resulted in 5 UN soldiers dead and 44 wounded.⁶⁸ In reaction to the United States’ new role in the hunt for Aidid, UN Ambassador Albright said that military action was necessary and vital to “rebuilding Somali society and promoting democracy.”⁶⁹ UNOSOM II’s Chief of Staff, United States Army COL Ward voiced his opinion about the UN’s more aggressive approach when in July 1993, he stated that “the UN has stayed behind these walls too long... waited too long to

give something to the people of this city – roofs over their heads, schools for the kids, a judicial system in place.”⁷⁰ He went on to say that American soldiers were prepared to get involved in nation-building activities such as construction of schools and rebuilding roads.⁷¹

On 3-4 October 1993, the United States conducted a major assault in the hunt for Aidid. The mission was unsuccessful and resulted in 18 soldiers killed and 76 wounded. Two Blackhawk helicopters were shot down and their crews were killed or wounded. One pilot was taken prisoner. Most vividly remembered by many Americans was the dragging of dead soldiers through the streets of Mogadishu.⁷²

The United States had had enough. There was no vital national interest at stake in Somalia, in fact, there was no interest whatsoever. President George H. Bush had sent United States soldiers to provide security for humanitarian efforts on what he believed to be a short operation. President Clinton turned the mission into one of nation-building and eventually one of taking sides amongst the warring clans. When the United States left, Somalia still had no central government, no social services or administration, and no police force. Aidid died in 1996, and his clan still celebrates 3 October as a national holiday.⁷³

HAITI

Haiti was the site of the United States’ next nation-building mission. In September 1994, a United States-led multinational force deployed to Haiti with the purpose reestablishing the constitutionally elected Haitian president, Aristide. Aristide had been overthrown in 1991 during a military coup lead by General Ruoul Cedras. Under the oppressive and violent rule of Cedras, the day to day conditions of this already poor and impoverished country worsened.⁷⁴

Thousands of Haitians fled these conditions on small boats heading to the United States. Under President George H. Bush’s policy, most were turned back as economic refugees, not entitled to asylum. During the 1992 presidential election campaign, Clinton challenged this policy claiming it to be heartless and cruel. Because of his campaign rhetoric, days after President Clinton took office hundreds of thousands of boat people began preparing to flee to the United States. There were no vital national interests in Haiti, and accommodating this overwhelming number of Haitian immigrants was not acceptable. President Clinton publicly reversed his opinion and left in place Bush’s policy of turning back Haitian immigrants.⁷⁵

The UN began a series of peacekeeping operations in September 1993.⁷⁶ The first mission failed because the United States naval ship landing the UN peacekeepers at Port-au-Prince was met by mob of Cedras’ armed men. This occurred nine days after the Mogadishu incident and rather than forcing the entry of these UN peace keepers, the ship turned back. UN

sanctions and diplomatic attempts to return Aristide to power were unsuccessful. In July 1994, the UN passed a resolution authorizing the use of force as a means to ending Cedras' illegal regime. Through the diplomatic efforts of Clinton's envoy team (former President Carter, Senator Sam Nunn, and General Colin Powell), and the threat of armed invasion, Cedras capitulated and the United States-led multinational force was unopposed as it occupied Haiti in September 1994.⁷⁷

The multinational force of almost 20,000, most of whom were American, occupied Haiti for six months. During this time Aristide was returned to power and relative security was established. This force was replaced by the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH) whose mandate included all the elements of nation-building.⁷⁸ UNMIH was to "assist the legitimate Haitian Government in sustaining the secure and stable environment ...; professionalizing the Haitian armed forces and creating a separate police force; and assisting the constitutional authorities of Haiti in establishing an environment conducive to the organization of free and fair elections."⁷⁹ The UN reported that the UNMIH was successful, and their list of accomplishments included creating an environment which allowed for free and fair elections and providing extensive assistance toward forming and training a Haitian national police force. Much of the infrastructure was enhanced to include improvements in water, sanitation, electricity and roads.⁸⁰

Occupation of Haiti was clearly for nation-building purposes. The first objective was to reestablish security and democracy, followed by efforts to establish institutions which would support social and economic development. Much of this was accomplished by the United States soldier. One year after the initial deployment, *Soldiers Magazine*, a United States Army monthly publication, featured a story entitled "Haiti: The Mission Continues." This article summed up the role of the United States soldier in Haiti. It starts by stating, "One doesn't normally associate soldiers with teaching people how to put their country back together after years of repression by dictators. But helping Haiti get back on its feet is exactly what the 6,000 soldiers of the United Nations Mission in Haiti are doing."⁸¹ The article continues stating that, "soldiers have been active in Haiti performing a range of nation-building duties – from serving as 'headmaster' of an English-speaking school, to acting as mentors for the Interim Public Security Force." An interview with an Army Captain reveals that this officer's primary concerns were not military, rather they centered on maintaining electric power and securing school supplies.⁸²

United States forces withdrew from UNMIH in March of 1996 and were replaced by Canadian forces. The UNMIH concluded in July of 1997 and was followed by the United Nations Support Mission in Haiti (UNSMIH).⁸³

The military mission in Haiti was successful, but the effects of this nation-building effort may ultimately fail in the long term. In May 2002, Lino Gutierrez, the Principle Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, United States State Department, detailed the current state of affairs in Haiti. Gutierrez remarked that Haiti continued to be one of the poorest countries in the hemisphere and that democracy there was in a delicate state. He stated that, "Corruption, drug trafficking, human rights abuses, increasing authoritarianism, and a declining economy threaten Haiti's fragile institutions."⁸⁴ Nation-building can only be successful if the people of that nation take responsibility and ownership of their government and their society. Gutierrez directed his concluding remarks to the people of Haiti. He said, "Opportunity doesn't come knocking a second time. Now is the time and now is the moment, and we urge Haiti to seize the opportunity."⁸⁵

BOSNIA

Fortunately the United States military was spared from long term duties in Haiti. The same can not be said about the Army's occupation duties in Bosnia. Similar to Somalia and Haiti, Bosnia-Herzegovina was, in 1992, a failed state. Another important similarity was that, aside from European stability, the United States had no vital national interests in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Atrocities, to include ethnic cleansing, vividly and repeatedly televised throughout the world during this civil war, led to UN, NATO, and ultimately United States involvement. Initial efforts by the UN to bring a diplomatic settlement were unsuccessful. UNPROFOR, the United Nations Protection Force, was deployed from February 1992 until December 1995. UNPROFOR's mandate was to expand several times starting with the initial mission of establishing United Nations Protected Areas and evolved to an offensive mission which in April of 1994 included NATO offensive air strikes.⁸⁶

Despite these efforts and repeated temporary cease fire agreements, the war continued. The United States wanted the UN and Europe to solve this problem, but ultimately it would take United States leadership. A peace agreement, negotiated by Richard Holbrooke with leaders of the three warring factions, was reached in Dayton, Ohio, in November 1995. Under the Dayton Peace Agreement, peace enforcement would be accomplished by an Implementation Force (IFOR). IFOR was a NATO led multinational peace-enforcement force of 60,000, 20,000 of whom were United States forces.⁸⁷

President Clinton assured the nation that the mission would be accomplished in one year at which time United States forces would withdraw. In an address to the nation, President

Clinton stated, "If we leave after a year, and they (the Bosnians) decide they don't like the benefits of peace and they're going to start fighting again, that does not mean NATO failed. It means we gave them a chance to make peace and they blew it."⁸⁸

IFOR accomplished all military aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement before the one year mark; however the political objectives were not achieved, which necessitated extending NATO's troop occupation. IFOR's name was changed to SFOR, Stabilization Forces, but the mission remained the same; enforce the peace until the political objectives could be achieved. President Clinton announced that SFOR would be needed for about 18 months and that the number of United States troops was being reduced to 8,500 soldiers. Explaining why soldiers were not withdrawing at the end of the first year, Clinton stated, "Quite frankly, rebuilding the fabric of Bosnia's economic and political life is taking longer than anticipated."⁸⁹

The Army's role in the nation-building efforts in Bosnia remains limited to peace-enforcement missions. Soldiers did not become school teachers, nor did they actively become involved in reconstructing the infrastructure. It has been seven years since the United States Army first began operations in Bosnia and, although the number of soldiers deployed has steadily been reduced (now less than 2000), the mission continues with no end in sight.

KOSOVO

In 1998 Kosovo, a Yugoslavian province whose population is ethnically Albanian, sought independence from Yugoslavia where the majority are ethnically Serbian. The Serb population rejected this idea primarily because many believed Kosovo to be the birthplace of Serbia. The civil war in Kosovo was much like the civil war in Bosnia. Evidence of ethnic cleansing and the very real plight of 2 million refugees fleeing to Macedonia was displayed on television which served to garner world attention. Secretary of State Madeline Albright explained that the task for the United States in Kosovo was to build a multiethnic democracy in Yugoslavia.⁹⁰

Starting in March 1999, NATO conducted 78 days of precision air strikes in Yugoslavia which compelled President Slobodan Milosevic to agree to a cease-fire in Kosovo. In June 1999 the UN passed a resolution which authorized the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).⁹¹ Essentially treating Kosovo as a sovereign nation, the UN began to administer the government of Kosovo with the aim towards building a democratic and self-governing Kosovo for the future.⁹²

Security for UNMIK was provided by a 40,000 NATO-led force, named KFOR. The mission for this occupation force was peace-enforcement. Six thousand of these forces were

United States soldiers. Just as in Bosnia, there would be no exit strategy.⁹³ Military planners want an exit strategy defined because it defines mission success. The complexities of nation-building, however, make it nearly impossible to specify the exact conditions which must exist, much less a specific time, that forces will no longer be needed. And just as in Bosnia, United States soldiers continue today to provide security through their visible presence in Kosovo. Although relative security is being maintained, the results of ongoing nation-building efforts are unsurprisingly slow. A 2000 General Accounting Office (GAO) explains why: "The vast majority of local political leaders and people of their respective ethnic groups have failed to embrace the political and social reconciliation considered necessary to build multiethnic, democratic societies and institutions."⁹⁴

AFGHANISTAN

Nation-building efforts in Afghanistan began with the introduction of combat forces. Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) was initiated on 7 October 2001, for the purpose of removing the Taliban regime and eliminating the al-Qaida terrorist network in Afghanistan. Al-Qaida, founded by Usama Bin Ladin, is an extremist group whose aim is to establish a pan-Islamic Caliphate. They want to rid non-Muslims, particularly Westerners, from Muslim countries and preach that it is the duty of all Muslims to kill United States citizens.⁹⁵ Although their terrorist network is world wide, Bin Ladin was headquartered in Afghanistan and under the Taliban regime was given safe haven to plan and train. Associated with many terrorist acts, to include the bombing of United States embassies in Africa and the attack on the USS Cole, their most devastating action was the 9-11 attacks.

The situation in Afghanistan and its threat to the United States forced President George W. Bush to abandon his campaign rhetoric against United States involvement in nation-building. In his 2002 National Security Strategy he speaks directly to this issue. His approach is to "work with international organizations such as the United Nations, as well as non-governmental organizations, and other countries to provide humanitarian, political, economic, and security assistance necessary to rebuild Afghanistan so that it will never again abuse its people, threaten its neighbors, and provide a haven for terrorists."⁹⁶

Eliminating the Taliban was clearly a vital interest to the United States. Ensuring that Afghanistan does not again become a safe haven for terrorist organizations is also in the nation's vital interest and will require a full fledged nation-building effort.

The Taliban has been removed and al-Qaida no longer has the capability of operating freely in Afghanistan, but filling the void left after toppling the Taliban has been problematic.⁹⁷

Afghanistan has a warlord culture and has no history of democracy. Hamid Karzai, the president of Afghanistan, has been in power for about a year yet his span of control is limited to the capital Kabul. Warlords essentially rule the rest of the country.⁹⁸

A precondition to nation-building is security, and providing security is Karzai's biggest problem. With no standing army and no capable police force, Karzai is incapable of providing for his own security; United States soldiers escort Karzai everywhere he goes.⁹⁹

Training a professional army and a national police force are of high priority and the United States along with other nations has begun this process. The warlord mentality makes this difficult. Afghanistan has never had a professional army and one of the conditions the United States has established in training this new army is that it be representative of all ethnic groups. Long seated distrust exists between most of the ethnic groups and because of this volunteers for this new multiethnic army have been limited. Compounding the security problem is the warlords' reluctance to disarm, and there is no plan to disarm them. This condition continues to prevent the establishment of a secure environment throughout the country.¹⁰⁰

Afghanistan is in economic ruin. Although significant financial aid has been given and much more has been promised, Afghanistan lacks even the most rudimentary economic structure. There is no banking system nor is there confidence in the existing state currency.¹⁰¹ They lack any form of industry. Cultivating poppy seeds for illegal export has long been their most significant commodity for bringing in revenue.

Rebuilding Afghanistan will be a great challenge and will require nation-building efforts that far surpass those seen in the later part of the 20th century. Afghanistan has historically been a country either under colonial rule or ruled by warlords and has little experience with the notion of democracy.¹⁰² This and the lack of any real economic or social structures will continue to challenge the efforts of Karzai, the United States, and the international community to build an Afghanistan that is viable member of the world community of stable and contributing nations.

LESSONS LEARNED

The United States has learned many lessons during the past century. First, nation-building takes a long time and its success appears to be linked to maintaining a standing United States military presence in the country. Efforts in Cuba were short, less than a decade, and ultimately failed. Building a democratic state in the Philippines was successful although it took 50 years before the United States granted the Philippines independence and then nearly another 50 years before the United States would remove all permanently stationed forces. Today, unfortunately, continued democracy in the Philippines is tenuous and the economy is

weak. Changing the governments and social and economic institutions in Germany and Japan was successful. This was attributable in part to the long term post-war commitment of permanently stationed U.S. forces. When the United States decided to remove forces from Somalia, all efforts in nation-building there were abandoned. Although interest remains, determined United States nation-building efforts in Haiti diminished considerably with the removal of United States troops. Haiti's future ability to grow democratic institutions and provide for economic improvement is doubtful. United States soldiers remain present in Bosnia and Kosovo which affirms a long term United States commitment. Soldiers in Afghanistan continue to fight remnants of the Taliban, but even after that mission is complete it is presumed that their presence will be required until the warlord culture is broken.

Second, nation-building is more successful if the state has had experience in self-government and if it has had a viable economy. Neither Cuba nor the Philippines had standing institutions of self-government nor did they fully embrace the principals of democracy. Nation-building in Germany and Japan were successful principally because both nations had existing functional governmental and economic structures. Having both been thoroughly defeated during WWII, these nations were ripe for the seeds of democracy to take hold. The lack of democratic experience or standing economic institutions will continue to challenge success in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan.

The third lesson in nation-building is that it is expensive both in lives and treasure. It is impossible to estimate the cumulative cost of having forces permanently stationed in Germany and Japan since the end of WWII, but is certain that only the richest nation in the world could afford to do so. Maintaining stability in the Balkans has been expensive in both combat readiness and in dollars. The United States General Accounting Office reports that, "From the inception of operations through May 2002, Balkans costs have totaled \$19.5 billion."¹⁰³

CONCLUSION

The United States has been involved in nation-building efforts since 1898, and since then the United States has fashioned a uniquely American style of nation-building, the heart of which is democratization. The measure of success or failure centers on how deeply the roots of democracy are planted. The United States has seen both success and failure. The outcome of ongoing efforts in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan is uncertain, and the prospect of other challenging undertakings, notably Iraq, looms on the horizon. Though reluctant to use the word nation-building, perhaps because it sounds so intrusive, the United States will remain a builder of democratic nations, regardless of its moniker.

To the unnamed Colonel in Afghanistan who thought that nation-building is a mission that “we never even considered,” one might suggest he take a walk through history.

WORD COUNT=: 10,180.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Bradley Graham, "Pentagon Plans a Redirection in Afghanistan," The Washington Post, 20 November 2002, sec. A, p. 1.
- ² John J. Hamre and Gordon R. Sullivan, "Toward Postconflict Reconstruction," The Washington Quarterly, VOL 25, no. 4 (Autumn 2002): 89.
- ³ George W. Bush, The National Security Strategy of the United States of America (Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002), 21.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ Martin Kyre and Joan Kyre, Military Occupation and National Security (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1968), 52.
- ⁶ Allen Nevins and Henry S. Commager, A Pocket History of the United States (New York, N.Y.: Washington Square Press, 1981), 362.
- ⁷ Ibid., 363.
- ⁸ Ibid., 363.
- ⁹ Kyre, 53.
- ¹⁰ Mark Peceny, Democracy at the Point of Bayonets (University Park, PA.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), 63.
- ¹¹ Ibid., 64.
- ¹² Claude Julien, America's Empire (New York, NY.: Random House, INC, 1971), 82.
- ¹³ John H. Napier, "General Leonard Wood: Nationbuilder," Military Review (April 1972): 78.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., 83.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., 79.
- ¹⁶ Ibid., 78.
- ¹⁷ John C. Lane, Leonard Wood and the Shaping of American Defense Policy, 1900-1920 (Ann Arbor, MI.: University Microfilms, 1963), 9.
- ¹⁸ Ivan Musicant, The Banana Wars (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1990), 63-78.
- ¹⁹ Stanley Karnow, In our Image (New York: Random House, 1989), 101.
- ²⁰ Ibid., 104.

²¹ Peceny, 66-71.

²² Ibid.

²³ Tony Smith, America's Mission (Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), 51.

²⁴ Arthur S. Pier, American Apostles to the Philippines (Freeport , NY.: Books for Libraries Press, 1950), 29-36.

²⁵ Ibid., xix.

²⁶ Ibid., xx.

²⁷ Ibid., 30.

²⁸ Smith, 50.

²⁹ Ibid., 43.

³⁰ Pier., 35.

³¹ Ibid., 41.

³² Ibid., 52.

³³ Karnow, 323.

³⁴ John Bimbel, The American Occupation of Germany: Politics and the Military, 1945-1949 (Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press, 1968), 3.

³⁵ Earl F. Ziemke, The United States Army in the Occupation of Germany 1944-1946 (Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History United States Army, 1975), 3.

³⁶ Ibid., 4.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid., 8-9.

³⁹ Ibid., 149.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Robert Wolfe, Americans as Proconsuls: United States Military Government in Germany and Japan, 1944-1952 (Illinois, Southern Illinois University Press, 1984), 9-10.

⁴² G. John Ikenberry, After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 2001), 173.

⁴³ Lucius D. Clay, Decisions in Germany (Garden City, NJ.: Doubleday and Company, 1950), 11.

⁴⁴ Ibid. 10-16.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 16-19.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 59.

⁴⁸ Ziemke, 52-449.

⁴⁹ Wolfe, 37.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 46-51.

⁵¹ William Sebald, With MacArthur in Japan: A Personal History of the Occupation (New York, NY.: W. W. Norton and Company, 1965), 72-74.

⁵² Ibid., 72-74.

⁵³ Ibid., 15-51.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 301.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 301.

⁵⁶ United Nations Department of Public Information, "Completed Peacekeeping Operations; Somalia,"; available from < http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosomi.htm>; Internet; accessed 25 January 2003.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Gary T Dempsey, Fool's Errands (Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 2001), 30.

⁶² Ibid., 31.

⁶³ Robert Houdek, "Update on Progress in Somalia," Statement before the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C., 17 February 1993, United States Department of State, Dispatch 4, no. 8, 22 February 1993; available from <<http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1993/html/Dispatchv4no08.htm>>; Internet; accessed 25 January 2003.

⁶⁴ United Nations Department of Public Information, "United Nations Operations in Somalia, II (UNOSOM II)," updated 21 March 1997; available from <<http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/Mission/unosom2b.htm>>; Internet; accessed 25 January 2003

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Dempsey, 21, quoting Madeline K. Albright's, Statement before the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Exporting Financing, and Related Programs of the House Appropriations Committee, Washington, D.C. 12 March 1993.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Dempsey, 36.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 37.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid., 39.

⁷² See Mark Bowden's Black Hawk Down for entire story.

⁷³ Bowden, Mark, Black Hawk Down (New York, N.Y.: Penguin Books, 2000), 409.

⁷⁴ Department of Public Information, United Nations, "United Nations Mission in Haiti," September 1996; available from <http://www.un.org/Dpts/DPKO/Missions/unmih_b.htm>; Internet; accessed 16 December 2002.

⁷⁵ Dempsey, 56-57.

⁷⁶ United Nations Department of Public Information, "Completed Peacekeeping Operations: Haiti," available from <http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unmih_b.htm>; Internet; accessed 25 January 2003.

⁷⁷ Dempsey, 57-58.

⁷⁸ UN, "Completed Peacekeeping Operations, Haiti".

⁷⁹ UN, "United Nations Mission in Haiti".

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Rick Spearman, "Haiti: The Mission Continues," Soldiers Sep 1995, Vol 50, No. 9.: [Journal on-line]; available from <http://www.army.mil/soldiers/sep95/contents.html>; Internet; accessed 25 JANUARY 2003.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ UN, "United Nations Mission in Haiti".

⁸⁴ Lino Gutierrez, "Haiti and Development Assistance," Remarks at the Inter-American Dialogue Conference, The Madison Hotel, Washington, D.C. 22 May 2002. Available from <<http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/rm/1041pf.htm>>; Internet; accessed 16 December 2002.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Richard Holbrooke, To End a War (New York, N.Y.: Random House, 1998), 34-53.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 319.

⁸⁸ Dempsey, 88.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Dempsey, 124.

⁹¹ United Nations Interim Government in Kosovo, "Fact Sheet, Kosovo," OCT 2002, available from <http://www.unmikonline.org/eu/index_fs.pdf>; Internet; accessed 25 JANUARY 2003.

⁹² United Nations Security Council, "Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Paragraph 10 of the Security Council Resolution 1244," 12 June 1999; available from <<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/175/05/IMG/N9917505.pdf?OpenElement>>; Internet; accessed 25 JANUARY 2003.

⁹³ Dempsey, 124.

⁹⁴ General Accounting Office, Balkans Security: Current and Projected Factors Affecting Regional Stability (Washington, D.C.: United States General Accounting Office, April 2000), 4.

⁹⁵ Terrorismfiles.org, "Terrorist Organizations, Al-Qaida," available from <http://www.terrorismfiles.org/organisations/al_qaida.htm>; Internet; accessed 25 JANUARY 2003.

⁹⁶ Bush, 8.

⁹⁷ Donald H. Rumsfeld, "Testimony of United States Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Progress in Afghanistan (Transcript)," (Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., 31 July 2002). Available from <<http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2002/s20020731-secdef3.htm>>; Internet; accessed 25 September 2002.

⁹⁸ Department of State, "Background Note: Afghanistan," (Washington, D.C. United States State Department, June 2002); available from <<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5380.htm>>; Internet; accessed 2 September 2002.

⁹⁹ Rumsfeld.

¹⁰⁰ Ali A. Jalali, "Rebuilding Afghanistan's National Army," Parameters 3 (Autumn 2002): 73-75.

¹⁰¹ Department of State, "Background Note: Afghanistan".

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Director, Defense Capabilities and Management Neal P. Curtin, "GAO-02-1073 Defense Budget," Memorandum to the Subcommittee on Defense Committee on Appropriations United States Senate, 27 September 2002, 3. Available from <<http://www.gao.gov>>; Internet; accessed 17 December 2002.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bimbel, John. The American Occupation of Germany: Politics and the Military, 1945-1949 Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press, 1968
- Bowden, Mark. Black Hawk Down. New York, N.Y.: Penguin Books, 2000.
- Bush, George W, The National Security Strategy of the United States of America Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002.
- Clay, Lucius D. Decisions in Germany. Garden City, NJ.: Doubleday and Company, 1950.
- Curtin, Neal P., Director, Defense Capabilities and Management Neal P. Curtin, "GAO-02-1073 Defense Budget," Memorandum to the Subcommittee on Defense Committee on Appropriations United States Senate, 27 September 2002, 3. Available from <<http://www.gao.gov>>. Internet. Accessed 17 December 2002.
- Gary T Dempsey, Fool's Errands. Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 2001
- Graham, Bradley. "Pentagon Plans A Redirection in Afghanistan." The Washington Post, 20 November 2002, sec. A, p. 3.
- Gutierrez, Lino. "Haiti and Development Assistance," Remarks at the Inter-American Dialogue Conference, The Madison Hotel, Washington, D.C. 22 May 2002. Available from <http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/rm/1041pf.htm>.> Internet. Accessed 16 December 2002
- Hamre, John J. and Gordon R Sullivan, "Toward Postconflict Reconstruction," The Washington Quarterly, VOL 25, no. 4 (Autumn 2002): 85-96.
- Holbrooke, Richard. To End a War. New York, N.Y.: Random House, 1998
- Houdek, Robert. "Update on Progress in Somalia," Statement before the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C., 17 February 1993, United States Department of State, Dispatch 4, no. 8, 22 February 1993. Available from <http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/dispatch/1993/html/Dispatchv4no08.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 25 January 2003.
- Ikenberry, G. John. After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Jalali, Ali A. "Rebuilding Afghanistan's National Army." Parameters 3 (Autumn 2002): 72-86.
- Julien, Claude, America's Empire. New York, NY.: Random House, INC, 1971
- Karnow, Stanley, In our Image. New York: Random House, 1989.
- Kyre, Martin and Joan Kyre, Military Occupation and National Security. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1968.
- Lane, John C. Leonard Wood and the Shaping of American Defense Policy, 1900-1920 Ann Arbor, MI.: University Microfilms, 1963.

- Musicant, Ivan. The Banana Wars. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1990
- Napier, John H., "General Leonard Wood: Nationbuilder," Military Review (April 1972): 77-86.
- Nevins, Allen and Henry S. Commager, A Pocket History of the United States. New York, N.Y.: Washington Square Press, 1981.
- Peceny, Mark, Democracy at the Point of Bayonets. University Park, PA.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.
- Pier, Arthur S. American Apostles to the Philippines. Freeport, NY.: Books for Libraries Press, 1950
- Rumsfeld, Donald H. "Testimony of United States Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Progress in Afghanistan (Transcript)," Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., 31 JUL 2002. Available from <<http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/2002/s20020731-secdef3.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 25 September 2002.
- Sebald, William, With MacArthur in Japan: A Personal History of the Occupation (New York, NY.: W. W. Norton and Company, 1965
- Smith, Tony. America's Mission. Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Spearman, Rick. "Haiti: The Mission Continues." Soldiers Sep 1995, Vol 50, No. 9. Journal on-line. Available from <http://www.army.mil/soldiers/sep95/contents.htm>; Internet. Accessed 25 January 2003.
- Terrorismfiles.org, "Terrorist Organizations, Al-Qaida." Available from <http://www.terrorismfiles.org/organisations/al_qaida.htm>. Internet. Accessed 25 January 2003.
- United States Department of State, "Background Note: Afghanistan." Washington, D.C. United States State Department, June 2002. Available from <<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5380.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 2 September 2002.
- United States General Accounting Office, Balkans Security: Current and Projected Factors Affecting Regional Stability. Washington, D.C.: United States General Accounting Office, April 2000.
- United Nations Department of Public Information, "Completed Peacekeeping Operations; Somalia.;" Available from <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/co_mission/unosomi.htm>; Internet. Accessed 25 January 2003.
- United Nations Department of Public Information, "Completed Peacekeeping Operations: Haiti;" available from http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unmih_b.htm>. Internet. Accessed 25 January 2003.
- United Nations Department of Public Information, "United Nations Operations in Somalia, II (UNOSOM II)." 21 March 1997. Available from

<<http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/Mission/unosom2b.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 25 January 2003

United Nations Department of Public Information. "United Nations Mission in Haiti," September 1996. Available from http://www.un.org/Dpts/DPKO/Missions/unmih_b.htm>. Internet. Accessed 16 December 2002.

United Nations Interim Government in Kosovo, "Fact Sheet, Kosovo." OCT 2002. Available from <http://www.unmikonline.org/eu/index_fs.pdf>; Internet. Accessed 25 January 2003.

United Nations Security Council, "Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Paragraph 10 of the Security Council Resolution 1244." 12 June 1999. Available from < <http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/175/05/IMG/N9917505.pdf?OpenElement>>; Internet. Accessed 25 January 2003.

Wolf, Robert, Americans as Proconsuls: United States Military Government in Germany and Japan, 1944-1952. Illinois, Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.

Ziemke, Earl F. The United States Army in the Occupation of Germany 1944-1946. Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History United States Army, 1975.