THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL
OF THE UNITED STATES

Security Cooperation and Non-State Threats:

A Call for an Integrated Strategy

Colonel Albert Zaccor
U.S. Army
Atlantic Council Senior Fellow

Occasional Paper

August 2005

THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL
OF THE UNITED STATES

The Atlantic Council promotes constructive U.S. leadership and engagement in international affairs based on the central role of the Atlantic community in meeting the international challenges of the 21st century.

The Council embodies a nonpartisan network of leaders who aim to bring ideas to power and to give power to ideas by:

- stimulating dialogue and discussion about critical international issues with a view to enriching public debate and promoting consensus on appropriate responses in the Administration, the Congress, the corporate and nonprofit sectors, and the media in the United States and among leaders in Europe, Asia and the Americas;

- conducting educational and exchange programs for successor generations of U.S. leaders so that they will come to value U.S. international engagement and have the knowledge and understanding necessary to develop effective policies.

Security Cooperation and Non-State Threats:
A Call for an Integrated Strategy

Colonel Albert Zaccor
U.S. Army

Atlantic Council Senior Fellow

*For further information about the Atlantic Council of the United States and/or its
Senior Fellows Program, please call (202) 778-4959.*

*Information on Atlantic Council programs and publications is available
on the world wide web at* **http://www.acus.org**

*Requests or comments may be sent to the Atlantic Council
via Internet at* **info@acus.org**

THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL
OF THE UNITED STATES

11ᵀᴴ FLOOR, 1101 15ᵀᴴ STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Table of Contents

About the Author

Colonel Albert Zaccor was the 2004-2005 United States Army Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council of the United States and is currently Director for Southern Europe in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, International Security Policy – NATO/Europe. Prior to his tenure at the Council, Colonel Zaccor completed a tour as the Political-Military Staff Officer for the U.S.-European Command in Germany. Zaccor began his Army career with several tours as an infantry officer, and later completed training as a Russia/Eurasia Foreign Area Officer. He has also served as the Defense and Army Attaché to Lithuania. Zaccor holds a bachelor's degree in political science from Hofstra University and a master's in area studies from the University of Michigan. He was a research fellow at the Conflict Studies Research Centre at the Royal Military Academy in the United Kingdom.

Colonel Zaccor wrote this report while in residence at the Council as a Senior Fellow. The Council is pleased to present his work. However, the views presented in this document are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Atlantic Council or the United States Army.

Security Cooperation and Non-State Threats: A Call for an Integrated Strategy

Introduction

There is widespread recognition that the struggle against international terrorism relies heavily on the cooperation of our partners and allies. The National Security Strategy (NSS) of the United States[1] declares that the U.S. will hold partners responsible for doing their part in the struggle -- including efforts to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and trafficking of illicit drugs -- but admits that weaker nations may not be able to fulfill that responsibility. That strategy and other subordinate strategies call for U.S. assistance to those states that lack the capacity to counter effectively those threats. This places foreign assistance and building partner and allied security capabilities at the center of the struggle against terrorism and related transnational threats.

Despite the centrality of aid to our partners, the U.S. Government (USG) does not have an adequate system or process for translating the strategic intent of the President into supporting objectives and tasks to guide the implementation of foreign aid and security assistance programs. The result has been the proliferation of narrowly focused, redundant, and generally uncoordinated assistance programs aimed at increasing the capacity of our partners to fight various transnational threats. These programs often work toward the same goals in a parallel, though uncoordinated, manner. At times, however, due to conflicting bureaucratic priorities or interagency competition, they work at cross purposes. This keeps our assistance from being as effective as it must be in building and maintaining a global coalition to fight terror and its related evils.

While the USG as a whole does not have a detailed process for translating higher strategic guidance into effectively coordinated departmental and agency programs to aid partners and allies, the Department of Defense (DOD) does. This process -- and the tools and programs to which it refers -- is called Security Cooperation. While DOD's process is not perfect, it may provide a template for a much-needed, more comprehensive, and more disciplined interagency process.

---

[1] *National Security Strategy of the United States* (Washington: The White House, 2002), 6.

This paper will explore the role that Security Cooperation can and should play in the struggle against terrorism and related non-state or transnational threats. Part I will examine the nature of the threats facing the United States., its allies, and its partners, suggesting that a more holistic view of the threat will be more useful than a narrow, serial focus on terrorism, counter-proliferation, or narcotics trafficking. Part II will briefly introduce DOD Security Cooperation and offer a revised definition of Security Cooperation that may be applied to the USG interagency as a whole. It will also explore traditional Security Cooperation goals as DOD defines them, demonstrating the central role played by foreign capabilities development. Part II concludes by offering a strategic construct that may be suitable for guiding an interagency Security Cooperation effort aimed at fighting non-state threats on a global basis. Part III begins by making the case for an integrated Security Cooperation strategy in an attempt to go beyond simply calling for improved interagency coordination. Next, it offers a model for integrated interagency Security Cooperation planning. Part IV concludes by examining some of the obstacles to implementing a Security Cooperation planning process for the USG as a whole and offers some specific recommendations for overcoming them.

The fight against terrorism and other non-state threats is the central security task of the early 21st century. Military operations, like those in Iraq and Afghanistan, are critically important in this struggle. Equally important, however, are the actions we take to build a lasting coalition united against non-state threats, and to assist our partners and allies to enable them to contribute to the fight. This is especially true of weak and failing states[2] that are most threatened by terrorists and other transnational criminals and whose weakness indirectly threatens us. The United States can neither hope nor desire to single-handedly defeat these global threats. Security Cooperation provides a useful paradigm for the entire USG to craft a comprehensive and integrated strategy to provide our friends the tools they need to join us in this struggle.

I. Non-State Threats

"Strategic Criminals"

By consensus, the principal threat facing the United States of America is radical, or militant, Islamic terrorism. The NSS identifies terrorism as "the enemy." [3] As we continue to develop a national response to transnational terrorism directed against the United States and its allies, we are in danger of defining the threat too narrowly and leaving ourselves open to other, equally dangerous threats to our own and our friends' security. Global terrorist groups operate in widely dispersed and decentralized networks. What is less well understood is how closely connected terrorist groups are with other non-state "bad actors," such as transnational criminal organizations and drug traffickers. This interdependence has

---

[2] These states are principally those Eurasian, Middle Eastern, and Asian states located along the "arc of instability" which stretches west to east from Southeastern Europe through the Caucasus, Central and South Asia, down into Southeastern Asia, as well as Sub-Saharan Africa and parts of Latin America.
[3] *National Security Strategy*, 5.

contributed to a strategic environment characterized by neither crime nor war.[4] The manner in which we define the threats we face has serious implications for the policies we adopt and the nature of the international cooperation we pursue in support of our security goals and objectives.

Transnational terrorism is one part of a complex web of non-state threats that have emerged as particularly capable and lethal due to globalization.[5] The National Military Strategy[6] notes that the United States faces a wider range of adversaries and stresses the importance of non-state actors. These threats, including transnational criminal organizations (TCOs), narcotics traffickers and narco-terrorists, illegal WMD and arms traffickers, insurgents and traffickers in persons, constitute the dark side of globalization.[7] Terrorists, in particular, have adapted to globalization by developing network structures with centralized strategic leadership and decentralized tactical operations carried out by semi-autonomous groups.[8] These networks use the global transport, financial, and communications infrastructure to operate.[9] Open borders tied to globalization provide terrorists access to safe havens, capabilities, and other support.[10] This has made these groups flexible, adaptable, and resilient, as well as highly mobile.[11] TCO's have similarly ridden the wave of globalization and become increasingly networked.[12] The other non-state threats mentioned above have also capitalized on the changes brought about by globalization, resulting in "arrays of trans-nationally interneted groups"[13] of bad actors.

Many analysts have noted the increasing interdependence of terrorists, TCOs, narcotics smugglers, and other transnational criminals. While terrorists, insurgents, and transnational criminals may have divergent motivations (ideology, profit, etc.), they leverage one another as "force multipliers".[14] Even ideologically diverse groups share tactics, allies and support

---

[4] Phil Williams, "Preface: New Context, Smart Enemies," in *Non-State Threats and Future War*, ed. Robert J. Bunker (Portland: Frank Cass, 2003), xxi.

[5] "In the post-9/11 world, threats are defined more by the fault lines within societies than by the territorial lines between them." "…challenges have become transnational rather than international." *National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States*, (Washington, DC: GPO, 2004) (henceforth the 9/11 Commission Report), 362.

[6] *Military Strategy of the United States*, (Washington, DC: GPO, 2004), 4.

[7] Mark Galeotti, "Transnational Organized Crime: Law Enforcement as a Global Battlespace," in Bunker, *Non-State Threats*, 38

[8] Walter Laqueur, *The Age of Terrorism*, 1st American ed., (Boston: Little, Brown, 1987), 93.

[9] Williams, "Preface", xi. See also, *Military Strategy*, 7.

[10] *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*, (Washington, DC: GPO, 2003), 6.

[11] David Tucker, "Combating International Terrorism," in *The Terrorism Threat and U.S. Government Response: Operational and Organizational Factors*, eds. James M. Smith and William C. Thomas, (USAF Academy, CO: USAF Institute for National Security Studies, 2001), 130-131.

[12] Galeotti, "Transnational Organized Crime," 29.

[13] John Arquilla, David Ronfeldt, and Michele Zanini, from "Networks, Netwar, and Information-Age Terrorism," in Ian O. Lesser, John Arquilla, Bruce Hoffman, David Ronfeldt, Michele Zanini and Brian Jenkins, *Countering The New Terrorism* (RAND Corporation, 1999), in *Terrorism and Counterterrorism : Understanding the New Security Environment : Readings & Interpretations*, eds. Russel D. Howard and Reid L. Sawyer, (Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin, 2003), 98.

[14] Laqueur, The Age of Terrorism, 291. See also, Galeotti, "Transnational Organized Crime," 39; and Jonathan R. White, *Terrorism : An Introduction*, (Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth, 2002), 18.

networks.[15] The National Strategy for Combating Terrorism highlights the reliance of terrorists on criminal activities.[16] Terrorists trade in narcotics as a source of funding. Criminal organizations provide money laundering services, guns, military equipment, and other contraband to terrorists.[17] In some regions of the world, notably South Asia and Latin America, insurgency, terrorism, and the drug trade are locked together in what has been called a "symbiotic relationship."[18] U.S. strategy documents stress the connection between terrorism and proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). Both the NSS and the National Strategy for Combating Terrorism note the importance of preventing WMD falling into the hands of terrorists.[19] Former Director of the Office of Drug Control Policy General (Ret.) Barry R. McCaffrey and John A. Basso argue persuasively that TCOs are increasingly networked and that terrorists tap into this network to support their operations. They call this the "Convergence Phenomenon." According to McCaffrey and Basso, "Understanding the convergence of terrorist organizations and TCOs will be one of the keys to the future security of American citizens."[20]

It appears, then, that we are not challenged by a series of discrete threats that can be easily isolated and separately attacked. Rather than distinct dragons to slay, we are faced with a many-headed beast, or Hydra. The 9/11 attacks proved that radical Islamic terrorism is the immediate catastrophic threat, so it is right to place a priority on chopping off that head. We must not forget, however, that defeating Islamic terrorists, through whatever means, will not slay the Hydra. Other terrorists with different ideological motivations may spring up to take their place. TCOs constitute a direct security threat. These organizations undermine states, including our partners and allies, and may aid smugglers of WMD.[21] Any long-term strategy needs to look beyond the defeat of Al Qaeda to the other non-state threats that will remain. Douglas Menarchik provides a useful shorthand term for these bad actors. He refers to them as "strategic criminals." Menarchik defines strategic crime as "…the combined lawlessness of organized crime, drug trafficking, and terrorism of a quantity and a quality that threatens a range of security interests of a state."[22] He argues persuasively that these non-traditional threats will threaten us more than any future conventional foe.

Implications

What are the implications of this kind of multifaceted threat for U.S. policy and Security Cooperation strategy? McCaffrey and Basso argue for the need for a common conceptual framework and broad strategy, including foreign policy, to deal with this new strategic

---

[15] White, *Introduction*, 231.

[16] *Terrorism Strategy*, 8. The strategy further states that "Breaking the nexus between drugs and terror is a key objective in our war on terrorism…," 22.

[17] Galeotti, "Transnational Organized Crime," 35.

[18] Laqueur, *Age of Terrorism*, 291.

[19] National Security Strategy, 13; and <u>Terrorism Strategy</u>, 10.

[20] Barry R. McCaffrey and John A. Basso, "Narcotics, Terrorism and International Crime: The Convergence Phenomenon," in Howard and Sawyer, *Readings and Interpretations*, 207.

[21] Douglas Menarchik, "Organizing to Combat 21st Century Terrorism," in Smith and Thomas, *The Terrorism Threat and U.S. Government Response*, 259.

[22] Menarchik, Organizing to Combat Terrorism.

environment.[23]   Ashton Carter notes that neither war nor law enforcement paradigms can address the essential character of the new terrorism Al Qaeda and its affiliates represent. Carter bemoans the lack of a "managerial paradigm" to address this qualitatively new challenge:

> There is a fundamental managerial inadequacy, as basic as that of a corporation with no line manager to oversee the making of its leading product.[24]

The interdependent and mutually supporting nature of transnational threats in this environment of "not crime – not war" makes it clear that we cannot divide our efforts neatly among traditional military, counter-terrorism, counter-drug, counter-proliferation, and Homeland Security programs and activities.   The attempt to do so, reflected in the structure of our strategy documents and their associated bureaucracies, programs, and funding streams, amounts to trying to fight simultaneous disconnected "wars" on rogues states, terrorism, WMD proliferation, drugs, and TCOs in turn.

One of the most pressing tasks we face is to break down the stovepipes that separate military and law enforcement approaches to addressing non-state threats. Mark Galleoti points out that, "In many ways the traditional demarcations between national security and law enforcement concerns are becoming increasingly less meaningful."[25] We and our partners will need to fight together against strategic criminals leveraging global networks who may be engaged in several illicit and threatening activities at once.   Our approach must be similarly integrated, complex, and all-encompassing. We must be willing to leverage the resources of any and all U.S. government agencies[26] as well as those of our foreign partners to defeat each head of this global Hydra. While this is a daunting task, it is encouraging to note that the very same resources we need to fight terrorism can also be used to fight drug trafficking and other transnational criminal activities.[27]   The next section will examine the contribution that Security Cooperation can make to this global struggle against non-state threats.

---

[23] McCaffrey and Basso, "Convergence Phenomenon," 217.

[24] Ashton B. Carter, from "The Architecture of Government in the Face of Terrorism," *International Security* (Winter 2001/02), in Howard and Sawyer, *Readings and Interpretations*, 429-430.

[25] Galleoti, "Transnational Organized Crime", 34.

[26] See Richard A. Clarke, *Against All Enemies : Inside America's War on Terror*, (New York : Free Press, 2004), 90. Clarke provides excellent examples of the difficulties entailed in getting Cabinet departments and agencies to work together even on critical security issues.

[27] C. Richard Nelson, "Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism as Competitive Strategies," Unpublished manuscript, 2004 , 6.

II. The Role of Security Cooperation

Defining Security Cooperation[28]

Security Cooperation is a Department of Defense (DOD) term that refers to "…all DOD interactions with foreign defense establishments to:

- Build defense relationships that promote specific U.S. security interests;
- Develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and coalition operations, including allied transformation;
- Improve information exchange and intelligence sharing to harmonize views on security challenges; and
- Provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access and en route infrastructure."[29]

Security Cooperation is not the same as Security Assistance. The latter term refers only to programs such as Foreign Military Financing (FMF), Foreign Military Sales (FMS), the International Military Education and Training Program (IMET), and other programs governed by the Foreign Assistance Act and managed by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency. The Department of State plays a key role in providing policy direction for Security Assistance programs. Security Cooperation is a much broader term that, in addition to Security Assistance, includes such categories of activities as combined exercises, combined training, combined education, military-to-military contacts, humanitarian assistance, and information operations.[30] It also refers to the planning process DOD organizations use to implement these activities.

In essence, the Security Cooperation planning process is a systematic method for translating strategic guidance into programmatic objectives. The Office of the Secretary of Defense issues annual Security Cooperation Guidance (OSD SCG) to guide the planning and activities of Unified and Specified Commands, the military services, and other DOD agencies and actors.[31] The SCG promulgates strategic objectives based on security themes derived from the National Security and Defense strategies. It also provides regional and country priorities, objectives, and measures of effectiveness for assessment.[32]   The Unified and Specified

---

[28] The former term used was "engagement." When the first Bush administration took office in 2001, the Department of Defense changed the term. The new defense leadership indicated that they believed that Engagement had not been sufficiently focused or disciplined and had not achieved specific measurable outcomes. The new approach aimed to avoid "engagement for engagement's sake" and focused on tying Security Cooperation activities to specific measurable objectives.

[29] *Security Cooperation Guidance*, Coordination Draft, unclassified excerpt, Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD SCG), 10 June 2004, 6. For ease of reference, this paper will abbreviate these four goals to: relationships; capabilities; information and intelligence; and access.

[30] *Theater Security Cooperation Activities Handbook – A Primer on Theater Security Cooperation Activities*, United States European Command (EUCOM TSC Handbook), October 2003.

[31] While the OSD SCG is intended to be used as a guide to annual planning, in practice the document has been updated more irregularly, meaning that planning is often driven by successive drafts of the documents.

[32] OSD SCG, 5-9, 15.

Commands, the services, and other DOD players develop subordinate plans to execute Security Cooperation activities in support of OSD's objectives. The Unified Commands, for example, develop regional strategies and country plans to guide the implementation of security cooperation activities in their Areas of Operation.[33]

It is an oft-repeated mantra that in order to defeat transnational terrorism, and by extension other related non-state threats, the United States must apply all the elements of national power, including diplomatic, informational, military, and economic.[34] The OSD SCG directs that DOD Security Cooperation "will be integrated with other elements of national power…in order to achieve national security, defense, and foreign policy objectives."[35] This formulation, while helpful, obscures two key facts. First, Security Cooperation includes activities that by their very nature involve the simultaneous application of more than one element of national power. Security Cooperation at a minimum requires the combination of diplomatic relations, military assistance, military-to-military contacts, and public diplomacy. In other words, Security Cooperation is itself an application of at least three of the classic elements of national power.[36] Second, DOD is not the only entity in the USG that interacts with foreign governments to achieve the stated objectives: relationships, capabilities, information and intelligence, and access. The Department of State, the Intelligence Community, and to a lesser extent, other departments and agencies, conduct activities aimed at the accomplishment of these objectives, broadly understood. There is, however, no common USG, or interagency, definition or concept of Security Cooperation.[37] We will return to this issue in the final section of this paper. For the purposes of the present discussion, this paper offers the following working definition of Security Cooperation:

> Security Cooperation refers to all USG assistance provided to foreign law enforcement, security, and defense establishments in support of national defense, security, and foreign policy objectives.[38]

This expanded definition of Security Cooperation will help us to see how the USG may leverage its programs and activities to fight terrorism and related non-state threats.

The role of Security Cooperation in countering non-state threats is clearly reflected in U.S. strategy. The NSS states that the U.S. will cooperate with nations to counter terrorism and WMD proliferation, assisting those that are willing but unable, and persuading those that are

---

[33] See EUCOM TSC *Handbook*, for example.

[34] See *National Security Strategy*, 1, for one of many examples.

[35] OSD SCG, 6.

[36] The classic elements of National Power are Diplomatic, Informational, Military, and Economic (or DIME.). The U.S. Army War College uses an updated list, derived from the National Strategy for Combating terrorism, that defines the elements of national power as Military, Informational, Diplomatic, Law Enforcement, Intelligence, Finance, and Economic (M.I.D.L.I.F.E.).

[37] Even within DOD there are programs, notably directed against WMD proliferation, that are not covered under the rubric of Security Cooperation. See the discussion of the WMD Proliferation Prevention Initiative, below.

[38] The application of the Security Cooperation paradigm to the entire USG requires a precise definition of security. Defined too broadly, Security Cooperation would simply be a surrogate for foreign policy. Limiting the objectives to specific enumerated defense and security objectives and assistance to foreign establishments playing a role in national security or defense is necessary to circumscribe the issue adequately.

able but not willing.[39] The National Military Strategy (NMS) develops the concept of forward defense, or "Countering Threats Close to Their Source."[40] This is the recognition that the United States' first line of defense is abroad, and that it is necessary to "patrol strategic approaches" and extend U.S. defensive capabilities beyond our borders to create an active "defense in depth."[41] In this context, Security Cooperation is best understood as a set of tools that can shape the strategic battlespace by creating the conditions necessary to accomplish U.S. security and defense objectives.[42] As the NMS's focus on forward defense indicates, these activities are by their nature anticipatory, preparatory, and defensive.[43] They are best used as part of a long-term comprehensive strategy to put in place the relationships, capabilities, information and intelligence, and access to facilitate future offensive and defensive actions to counter non-state, as well as more traditional, threats.

Security Cooperation Goals

Before turning to a detailed discussion of the contribution that Security Cooperation can make to fighting non-state threats, let's briefly examine the four main goals of security cooperation in that context.

Relationships

Fighting strategic criminals will require the cooperation of a variety of governments, including those outside our established alliance relationships. We are not capable of compelling the kind of "willing and competent cooperation" that we need.[44] Security cooperation provides powerful tools to persuade foreign governments to work with the U.S. in support of common objectives. Senior U.S. commanders, notably current and former Geographic Combatant Commanders, regularly stress the critical contribution that Security Cooperation activities make to building the kinds of relationships with foreign leaders that set the stage for successful U.S. operations. The example most often cited is the role that US Central Command (CENTCOM) Security Cooperation activities played in persuading Central Asian leaders, notably in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan, to support U.S. military operations in Afghanistan by granting access to bases and overflight rights.[45] In addition to granting access, good relationships aid in building a common threat perception, which is a necessary precondition for any substantial cooperation. Relationships with foreign defense

---

[39] *National Security Strategy*, ii. See also *Terrorism Strategy*, 17.

[40] *Military Strategy*, 9.

[41] *Ibid.*, 5.

[42] The National Defense Strategy states the need to "…create the conditions for a favorable international system..." See National Defense Strategyof the United States of America (Washington: The Department of Defense, 2005), iv. The strategy also states that Security Cooperation is one of the "preventive actions" contributing to an "Active Layered Defense." Ibid., 10.

[43] The National Military Strategy's focus on forward defense and Security Cooperation's role in setting the conditions for success in such a strategy is a useful corrective to the offensive bias apparent in the National Security Strategy, which focuses on the need for deployable forces to attack terrorists where they are, and does not include a well-developed concept of strategic defense. See *National Security Strategy*, 5, 25.

[44] Philip B. Heymann, *Terrorism, Freedom, and Security: Winning Without War*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), 32.

[45] Discussions at the Atlantic Council of the United States on Global Basing, December 2004.

leaders can also provide the U.S. with influence over the policy direction of key partner states, including efforts at defense reform and the shape of force structure changes. Finally, good relationships make it more likely that foreign governments will share information with the U.S., including, in the extreme case, early warning of potential attack.[46]

Intelligence and Information Sharing

Relationships built on trust and mutual interests are also necessary to obtain cooperation from foreign governments in the area of Intelligence and Information. It is useful to separate the distinct, but related, issues of Intelligence Sharing and Intelligence Security Cooperation. Intelligence Sharing is a critical element in the fight against non-state threats, or strategic crime. By its nature, however, such sharing involves sensitive sources, methods and arrangements, normally in the context of a bilateral relationship. Its sensitivity requires delicate handling in highly restrictive channels. Intelligence sharing, in practice, falls outside the scope of Security Cooperation. Intelligence Security Cooperation, on the other hand, involves the development of interoperable and cooperative intelligence systems and processes designed to enhance the ability of one partner to work with one or several other partners. The core activities in Intelligence Security Cooperation are analytical and expertise exchanges, familiarization, training, and traditional Security Assistance. Both Intelligence Sharing and Intelligence Security Cooperation are mutually supporting. It is clear that the quality and reliability of intelligence we get from our partners depends on the competence, capability, professionalism, and trustworthiness of their national intelligence services and how compatible their operations are with ours. Intelligence Security Cooperation provides the tools to develop long-range relationships with foreign partners to improve both the quality of the intelligence we share and our ability to work together.

Access

The National Defense Strategy stresses the requirement to secure strategic access and retain global freedom of action for U.S. forces.[47] This includes obtaining permanent and deployment basing and overflight. Security Cooperation directly supports access by developing relationships with foreign partners based on trust and mutual interests. Senior officer and other official visits contribute to this by demonstrating U.S. commitment to a defense relationship and staying abreast of host nation priorities, concerns, and requirements. Some Security Cooperation activities directly support access by improving host nation infrastructure, notably airbases, ports, and troop facilities, to support U.S. forces during operational and training deployments. Other activities improve host nation capabilities through training, equipping, and exercises. The NMS recognizes that access has an informational dimension that goes beyond the purely physical access to a partner's territory, facilities or airspace:

---

[46] *The Phase III Report of the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century* (The "Hart-Rudman Report"), Draft Final Report, January 31, 2001, http://www.rense.com/general10/roadmap.htm, 12.
[47] *Defense Strategy*, p. 6.

"…theater security activities with multinational partners provide access to information and intelligence critical to anticipating and understanding new threats."[48]

This insight is important in determining the contribution Security Cooperation can make to countering non-state threats. While DOD and the military services remain understandably focused on the physical dimension of access and its support to current and future operations, the fight against strategic criminals requires that we pay greater attention to securing strategic access to information and information networks controlled by our partners, allies, and adversaries. In some cases "virtual access" to databases, data flows, raw and finished intelligence, sensor data, and other forms of information may be more critical to the success of military operations than the ability to access an airfield, port or overflight corridor. Security Cooperation tools can also support the attainment of this non-traditional form of access.

Capabilities Development as the Core Activity

"...merely coordinating the existing capabilities of the United States to counter catastrophic terrorism is not adequate..."[49]

In this author's view, the goal of developing allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and coalition operations is the first among equals of the four Security Cooperation goals.[50] The sophisticated nature of the network of non-state threats compels us to recognize that the national security of the United States may very well depend on the capabilities of our partners and allies every bit as much as on our own. It is no exaggeration to say that the competence, professionalism, and honesty of a border guard in Georgia or Kazakhstan may be more important to the goal of keeping WMD out of the hands of terrorists, than the effectiveness of any U.S. organization or surveillance regime. The U.S. has a direct interest in ensuring that its partners and allies have "the military law enforcement, political, and financial tools" to fight terrorists and other strategic criminals.[51] The National Strategy for Combating Terrorism notes that, "*constructive engagement*, with sustained diplomacy and *targeted assistance* will be used to persuade…regimes to become more willing, and eventually able, to meet their international obligations to combat terrorism (emphasis added)."[52] Increasing partner capabilities is the central task of Security Cooperation.[53]

---

[48] *Military Strategy*, p. 9.

[49] Carter, "Architecture of Government," 439.

[50] Admittedly, this is not a consensus view. Many DOD and other government officials would argue that one or another of the other Security Cooperation goals is more important. In crisis or contingency situations, for example, access may trump the other goals. Nevertheless, the author contends that capability building is first among the goals, as it is foundational, that it creates the conditions leading to the accomplishment of the other three goals. See page 14, below.

[51] NSS, p. 6. This view is compatible with the National Military Strategy's focus on capabilities rather than adversaries (*Military Strategy*, 3).

[52] *Terrorism Strategy*, 21.

[53] *Military Strategy*, 9.

The centrality of capability-building in Security Cooperation is due, in part, to the nature of the tools themselves. Most DOD and other Security Cooperation programs or tools aim at increasing the capability of our partners and allies to rise to U.S. standards and/or to develop systems, tactics, techniques, and procedures that are compatible or interoperable with ours. Traditional Security Assistance (FMF/FMS, IMET, etc.) provides foreign partners with equipment, training, advice, and education that directly support military reform and modernization. Exercises develop the ability of partners to work with the U.S. and with one another. Military contact programs provide U.S. policy advice, support defense reform, and assist in harmonizing threat perceptions and security or defense doctrines. Other assistance programs provide humanitarian assistance to support civil-military relations and furnish material assistance. Targeted programs support the development and/or improvement of counter-terrorism, counter-drug, and counter-proliferation regimes. Put simply, developing partner capabilities is what Security Cooperation does best.

Developing partner capabilities directly supports the other three Security Cooperation goals as well. The willingness to focus policy attention and devote resources to develop partner capabilities may be a powerful incentive for foreign nations to cooperate with U.S. goals and policies. There is no better way to establish a stable relationship with a partner than to work with that partner to establish or improve a key component of its own security infrastructure. Partners will be more likely to share intelligence and information with the United States if they perceive that the U.S. is willing to assist in the modernization of their national security establishments. As noted above, direct investments in the intelligence capabilities of a partner through Intelligence Security Cooperation will result in more reliable and higher quality intelligence obtained in intelligence sharing arrangements. Capability-building supports access both indirectly and directly. For example, developing partner capabilities builds the goodwill and trust necessary for a foreign country to agree to allow the U.S. to use its airspace, transportation infrastructure, or facilities (indirectly); and it may be necessary to assist a partner in improving its host nation support capabilities to support U.S. presence or transit (directly).

Security Cooperation, is a powerful tool, but a limited one. While Security Cooperation may increase the likelihood that foreign partners will support overall U.S. policy goals, it cannot guarantee such broad support and may be more suited to attaining specific, more narrowly construed objectives. There is little direct evidence that a robust Security Cooperation relationship will ensure foreign nation support for major U.S. policy decisions.[54] The decision of countries such as Germany and Turkey not to support the U.S. invasion of Iraq demonstrates that other strategic or political factors may outweigh even extensive and long-standing defense and security relationships. While garnering support for major policy initiatives like Operation Iraqi Freedom must remain an objective of Security Cooperation activities, it may be more productive to focus on specific, critical objectives that directly support U.S. security in other ways. While formal allies and other close partners may be willing to follow the U.S. lead on strategic matters, other countries require more direct incentives to cooperate with the U.S. security agenda. For example, during the late 1990's NATO aspirant countries seeking U.S. support for entry into the alliance were highly

---

[54] This issue deserves further empirical study.

receptive to U.S. advice on everything from force structure to foreign policy. The incentive of alliance membership obviated the need for more specific incentives to implement policies that met U.S. approval. Many current partners, such as in the Caucasus and Central, South, and Southwest Asia have no prospects, or desires, for near-term entry into a defense alliance with the U.S. and will likely need more targeted inducements to support U.S. policy objectives.

A focus on building partner capabilities *for their own sakes*, therefore, may be more likely to yield definable and measurable benefits than a focus on broader policy goals. A direct offer of U S. assistance to develop a partner capability is highly likely to result in agreement with specific U.S. objectives tied to that capability. For example, a partner is more likely to agree to share data on foreign cargo traffic if it has received direct U.S. assistance in improving its capability to track foreign maritime traffic. In fact, investing in partner capabilities lends itself very well to this *quid pro quo* approach. This method works best when the USG identifies specific capabilities that fulfill partners' security requirements and specific "payoffs" it seeks from that investment. This is more likely to net tangible, reliable, routine cooperation from partners than a less targeted approach.

Focusing on building partner capabilities will also support wider public diplomacy objectives. A key task for the U.S. is to build broad support for U.S. security policies among foreign publics and opinion leaders. Foreign governments and citizens will only support U.S. policies, initiatives, and (where applicable) presence, if they perceive the U.S. supports the security, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of their countries. In this, actions speak louder than words. An effective strategy will include a focus on building the kinds of capabilities, such as crisis response and consequence management or anti-trafficking, that demonstrate U.S. concern for foreign public safety, in addition to more traditional military or security structures.   As we will see below, these capabilities are critical to the struggle against strategic crime. The U.S. willingness to invest in foreign partners' security also helps to counter foreign fears that the U.S. is a "hyperpower" pursuing its foreign policy and security objectives without concern for other nations' interests.

As we have seen, Security Cooperation provides the USG with powerful tools to enable partners to meet their obligations to contribute to the global struggle against our common adversaries. The next section explores how we should apply these tools in light of our understanding of the threats we face.

A Network of Friendly States

> "To be effective, the United States will need to build its own international network to combat international terrorist networks."[55]

The United States needs a sophisticated strategy to deal with the complex and dangerous threat environment posed by terrorists and other strategic criminals.[56] The international

---

[55] Campbell and Flournoy, *To Prevail*, 2.
[56] Heymann, *Terrorism, Freedom, and Security*, 1.

component of this strategy must look beyond established alliances, bilateral relationships, and limited regional partnerships to construct a "powerful coalition of nations maintaining a strong, united international front…"[57]   Such a strategy must be holistic, recognizing the interconnected nature of the non-state threats we face.

Our current strategic approach to non-state threats does not entirely meet this test. First, rather than having a comprehensive strategy to deal with the disorder, lawlessness, and insecurity caused by strategic crime, we have a series of potentially complementary strategies for counter-terrorism, counter-proliferation, counter-narcotics, and Homeland Security. Second, because each of these strategies is associated with a separate bureaucracy, funding stream, and set of organizational priorities, the result is a fragmented effort and de facto competition for policy attention and resources (We will return to this issue in the final section).

As the epigraph to this section states, the task before the United States is to build an international network to counter the opposing network of strategic criminals that plague us and our allies. Phil Williams states in the preface to Non-State Threats and Future Wars, that the United States and its allies need to innovate organizationally and doctrinally, "notably by building new mechanisms for interagency, inter-service, multi-jurisdictional and transnational cooperation."   He also restates the oft-repeated and generally accepted assertion that hierarchies have great difficulty in fighting networks, and that it takes networks to fight networks.[58] The building of what this paper will call a "Network of Friendly States" (NOFS) is a sufficiently complex and sophisticated strategy to address the threats of transnational terrorism and related non-state threats.

For such a strategy to be successful, it must meet the criteria for what has been called a "competitive strategy."[59]   A competitive strategy is one that pits allied strengths against adversaries' weaknesses.[60] It must also be long-term, based on enduring strengths, with costs that can be sustained indefinitely. The chief weakness of strategic criminals is their need to operate without being detected by competent authority. This includes the requirement to communicate secretly, organize and train in safe havens, and move people, money, and things (e.g., weapons) internationally.[61] To do this they use the global transportation and information infrastructure, as discussed above, and exploit weak or failing states. Any successful strategy would have to mobilize U.S. and allied capabilities to prevent strategic criminal networks from communicating, moving, and hiding free from allied detection.[62] The building of a global network to fight strategic crime is clearly a long-term effort, and one that would need to be maintained over an extended period of time (several U.S. presidential administrations, for example) in order to show appreciable benefits. In order for the costs

---

[57] *Terrorism Strategy*, p.19.

[58] Williams, "Preface," xvi-xvii.

[59] I am indebted to Dick Nelson for introducing me to this concept. See Nelson, "Competitive Strategies," 1.

[60] *Terrorism Strategy*, 2. "…using our strength against the enemy's weaknesses."

[61] White, *Introduction*, 125; and *9/11 Commission Report*, 168-9.

[62] *Terrorism Strategy*, 9. Matthew Levitt notes that a principal task is to "constrict the operating environment" of terrorists. See his remarks in, *Final Report, 2004 Dwight D. Eisenhower National Security Conference*, September 14-15, 2004, (Washington, DC: Eisenhower Series on National Security, 2005), 61.

of such a strategy to be sustained indefinitely, a high degree of international cooperation and burden sharing will be required.

A Network of Friendly States implies a more permanent arrangement than a "coalition of the willing," but does not go as far as suggesting the establishment of a NATO-style defense alliance on a global scale. The nature and scope of the international cooperation necessary to wage a long-term struggle against strategic crime implies complex arrangements for systematic cooperation and information sharing. This network would constitute an enduring partnership of like-minded states bound by mutual interests. To be effective, however, it would need to partially break out of the typical "state-centric paradigm"[63] that characterizes traditional state-state relationships in the international system.   The network paradigm captures the interdependence of international partners and the overlapping security concerns presented by the threat of strategic crime to global order and international peace and security. The network concept provides for and depends on U.S. leadership, but does not require U.S. orchestration or domination. Rather, it relies on broad and voluntary support, thereby distributing risks and burdens among the network's members. According to Leon Fuerth, "American policy must be directed toward creating a sense of commonwealth and collective responsibility for its management with other democracies."[64]

A comprehensive USG Security Cooperation effort, using the foreign assistance resources of the entire USG, could enable a global Network of Friendly States by providing its members a system of incentives to fulfill their obligations and cooperate with one another.   The following section will explore in greater detail the desirable characteristics of a Network of Friendly States. At a minimum, it is clear that the willingness to share information and cooperate in the detection, interdiction, apprehension, or neutralization of strategic criminals should be the non-negotiable price of membership in this network. The willingness to give token political support to U.S. policy, or even support of discrete U.S. efforts such as Operations Enduring Freedom or Iraqi Freedom, should not be sufficient to enjoy the benefits of membership in a truly global network to fight strategic crime. It is an open question whether countries that refuse to cooperate fully in fighting strategic crime deserve to be called allies in the global coalition against terrorism.[65] Our Security Cooperation tools and programs give us a way simultaneously to reward those who cooperate[66] and to build up the overall capabilities of the network.

Characteristics of a Network of Friendly States

Before we can determine the best use of Security Cooperation tools and programs in building a Network of Friendly States (NOFS), it will be helpful to examine the key

---

[63] Williams, "Preface," ix.

[64] Leon Fuerth, "A Liberal Grand Strategy," in *Divided Diplomacy and the Next Administration: Conservative and Liberal Alternatives*, eds. Henry R. Nau and David Shambaugh, (Washington, DC: George Washington University Elliott School of International Affairs, 2004), 11.

[65] I have in mind the unwillingness in the past of countries like Saudi Arabia and Greece to share information or take active measures against terrorist networks in their countries.   See Heymann, *Terrorism, Freedom and Security*, 79 and Clarke, *Against All Enemies*, 13, 153.

[66] McCaffrey and Basso, "Convergence Phenomenon," 219.

characteristics of such a network. The purpose is to attempt to identify the critical capabilities the network and its members must possess. The identification of these capabilities, in turn, should drive USG Security Cooperation planning and program implementation as described in the next section.

In order to counter the global network of strategic criminals, a NOFS must be flexible, be adaptable, and have the characteristics of a "learning organization" – one that can process and distribute information quickly and accurately, build consensus, reach decisions, and make changes in its operations, organizations, and procedures. In light of traditional state relations and their reliance on hierarchical decision making, this means enabling and empowering subordinate national entities (agencies, ministries, departments) to build horizontal links with sub-networks of similar entities in other countries, international institutions, and non-governmental organizations for routine and systematic information-sharing, rapid joint decision making, and combined action. The key is, to the degree possible, to free friendly network actors to communicate and cooperate with one another without the incessant intervention of high-level national actors in each country. The critical means to achieve this are the establishment of routine communications links and information sharing, pre-authorized policies on conditions for joint action, and common tactics, techniques, and procedures. One partial example of this model is the worldwide crisis response and consequence management infrastructure, where national and international players are organized into loose aggregates of interlocking networks with a common frame of reference and a degree of standardization.[67] Another potentially promising model is the Bush Administration's initial effort in establishing an international counter-proliferation regime through the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI).[68] As all countries would not be prepared to contribute equally to the Network's capabilities, especially in its early development, a flexible system of membership is necessary. One model for this system is NATO's Partnership for Peace (PFP). PFP includes all non-NATO countries from Ireland to Kyrgyzstan that desire closer relations and the ability to cooperate with NATO. This malleable concept includes countries actively seeking NATO membership, like Albania, historically neutral countries like Sweden, Finland, Switzerland, and Austria that desire close integration with NATO without formal membership, and the Central Asian states, that desire a relationship, but not as close as that of the European countries. Such a flexible system allows for diverse levels and degrees of integration while continuing to provide a

---

[67] This infrastructure is not a formal institution, but rather a network of governmental, non-governmental and international organizations that mobilize to respond to natural and man-made disasters. The development of this infrastructure varies with geography. In Europe, for example, there is a hierarchy of organizations from national to regional, such as NATO and the EU, as well as international organizations, up to and including the UN, that play key roles in international crisis response. The USG takes part in countless workshops, exercises, and other activities to assist in the ongoing improvement of international capacity to react to natural disasters and other crises.

[68] PSI is intended to develop a loose network of states with a common interest in, and commitment to, preventing the proliferation of WMD. PSI signatories undertake to cooperate and share information, but retain the flexibility to determine how to do so. The approach is only "potentially promising" because it is a "stand-alone program," narrowly focused on counter-proliferation and without an assistance or aid component. A broader approach would focus on international maritime interdiction capabilities relevant to strategic crime, and would include targeted assistance to help partners develop critical capabilities. See "Proliferation Security Initiative," http://www.state.gov/t/np/c10390.htm, accessed 10 March 2005.

forum for the promulgation of common tactics, techniques, and procedures as well as information and intelligence sharing.

In addition to the general characteristics of the network discussed above, a Network of Friendly States also requires the following:

- *Sovereign Control.* The ability of each member to control its own territory;
- *Information and Intelligence Sharing.* Established procedures for network members to collect, analyze, and process critical information and intelligence and disseminate it to the network or selected members in a timely manner;
- *Contribution to Regional Security.* The ability and political willingness of member nations to contribute to the stability and security of their own regions through cooperative mutual security mechanisms;
- *Capabilities for Joint Action.* The ability of the network and its members to act together in any combination to counter strategic crime and more conventional threats.

We will now examine each of these characteristics in detail.

Sovereign Control

Each member of a NOFS is responsible for defending, protecting, and preserving its own sovereignty and territorial integrity. As the NSS notes, however, weak and failing states are often incapable of fulfilling this core function of statehood:

> "…poverty, weak institutions, and corruption can make weak states vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within their borders."[69]

The NSS further notes that "America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones."[70] Strategic criminals exploit weak and failing states to gain freedom of action through the acquisition of sanctuaries, transport routes, and access to global information and financial networks. Weak states also provide a pool of disaffected youth from which to recruit new members. Denying strategic criminals freedom of action is the core task facing each member of a NOFS, including the United States.

Weak states are often incapable of maintaining an "effective security establishment, even at the level of local police and border guards."[71] It will ultimately be futile to search out and destroy terrorists worldwide if we do not actively intervene to increase the capabilities of weak and failing states to fulfill the following basic functions:

- Manage and control hostile groups within their territories;
- Protect their populations from significant violence;

---

[69] *National Security Strategy*, ii.

[70] *Ibid.*, 1.

[71] Thomas K. Adams, "Private Military Companies: Mercenaries for the 21st Century," in Bunker, *Non-State Threats*, 59.

- Protect their government institutions and infrastructure; and
- Preserve their territorial integrity, including the control of borders to interdict the trafficking of weapons, people, and contraband (e.g. drugs and other illicit goods). [72]

These are minimal security requirements, and it would be possible to expand the list significantly to include, for example, public health capabilities to protect the population from disease. Generally, we want our partners to have all the same capabilities that we have to prevent attacks, protect themselves, and respond to the consequences of an attack. Since this list of capabilities may be prohibitively long, it is useful to focus on the core capabilities that directly support U.S. interests in fighting strategic crime.

The key capabilities necessary for members of a NOFS to fulfill their obligations to prevent strategic criminals from using their territory are border control, law enforcement, and crisis response and consequence management.

Each state in the network must prevent its territory from being used as a transit corridor for strategic criminal activity.[73] This includes maritime borders and airspace. In the context of the use of WMD by terrorists, as noted earlier, every state's borders are a front line concern for all other states. The improvement of border controls worldwide is a general core task for NOFS and a specific task for U.S. Security Cooperation.

Member states' law enforcement structures are critical to the network for reasons that go beyond their maintenance of domestic law and order. Member states' internal security and police (and military) forces are in the best position to fight strategic criminals within their own borders, as they generally have better information, knowledge of the environment, capabilities to find the adversary while avoiding collateral damage, and ability to deal politically with any collateral damage that may result.[74] While it may be difficult for many in the West to appreciate, foreign partners' police forces are in the front line of the global struggle against terrorism and strategic crime.

Finally, crisis response and consequence management (CR/CM) capabilities allow states to preserve their sovereignty by maintaining stability after attacks, minimizing the time it takes to recover, and, to the degree possible, containing the effects of any attack. One need only imagine the civil chaos that would result from a WMD attack on the population of the U.S. or any other country, to appreciate the importance of CR/CM to the maintaining of the ability to fight strategic crime. Countries with well-developed CR/CM infrastructures also tend to have effective and integrated national and local mechanisms to communicate, share information, and make rapid decisions. They also have experience in bringing together military and civilian agencies with diverse missions to work across agency lines, and even international borders, for common purposes. The "not crime, not war" nature of the fight

---

[72] Campbell and Flournoy, *To Prevail*, 174.

[73] "A key component of any nation's sovereignty is control of its borders. Every nation bears responsibility for the people and goods transiting its borders," *Terrorism Strategy*, 21.

[74] *Terrorism and Counterterrorism: Understanding the New Security Environment, Readings and Interpretations, Revised & Updated 2004*, 394.

against strategic crime makes the CR/CM paradigm of local-national-international interagency cooperation a fitting model for the wider system required by a Network of Friendly States.

The National Strategy for Combating Terrorism notes the need for the U.S. to "vigorously" support states that are willing but not able to exercise authority over their own territory.[75] It further recognizes that the ultimate integration of countries into the world security order is critical to fighting "the forces of disorder and violence."[76] U.S. Security Cooperation, in concert with other partners' assistance programs, has a key role to play in helping weak and failing states to improve their border, law enforcement, and CR/CM capabilities, enabling them to contribute fully to the global struggle against strategic crime. U.S. foreign and defense policy has traditionally shied away from supporting the internal security organs of partners for fear of enhancing the capacity of autocratic regimes to oppress their own populations. While this remains a concern, the strategic situation after the 9/11 attacks compels us to recognize that the capability of our partners to secure their borders, maintain domestic law and order, and respond to a variety of internal and external threats is critical to our security. The integrated and multidimensional nature of the threats posed by strategic crime demand a new framework for helping partners meet both their external and internal security requirements.

Information and Intelligence Sharing

> "We need cooperation. The crucial tasks of gathering intelligence abroad are *not* ones the United States can carry out by itself."[77]

To be truly effective in fighting strategic crime, an NOFS must possess the ability to acquire and share information and intelligence to support individual nation or collective decision-making and operations. The task for the network, as Williams explains, is to attain "intelligence superiority," which requires the fusion of highly classified and unclassified items, traditional and law enforcement intelligence, foreign and domestic intelligence, strategic warning and tactical indicators.[78] The NMS notes the need for the United States to establish "decision superiority – the process of making decisions better and faster than an adversary," and adds that it "requires new ways of thinking about acquiring, integrating, using and sharing information."[79] A NOFS will require both types of superiority to effectively fight strategic crime.

As the epigraph to this section illustrates, there is widespread recognition that international cooperation in intelligence is key to the struggle against terrorism, and to confronting transnational threats in general.[80] The National Strategy for Combating Terrorism calls for the attainment of "domain awareness," or "the effective knowledge of all activities, events,

---

[75] *Terrorism Strategy*, 12.
[76] *Ibid.*, 3.
[77] Heymann, *Terrorism, Freedom and Security*, 78. Emphasis is in the original.
[78] Williams, "Preface," xii.
[79] *Military Strategy*, 17.
[80] See also *Hart-Rudman Report*, 22.

and trends within a specified domain (air, land, and cyber) that could threaten the safety, security, or environment of the United States and its populace."[81] This is a tall order. No nation, not even the U.S., can hope to monitor, track, and follow up on all terrorist groups or other strategic criminals worldwide without significant cooperation from other foreign partners.[82]   Foreign partners often have the best local knowledge, and may have specific expertise that will enhance understanding of the threat environment.[83] What is required is a robust, capable, decentralized and flexible network for sharing information and intelligence in support of decision making and/or operations. Most cooperation against terrorism, however, has been traditionally confined to sharing law-enforcement information among partners on a bilateral basis.[84]   Information sharing has certainly increased in the wake of the 9/11 attack. For example the U.S. and the European Union (EU) have agreed to share information on maritime cargo (the Container Security Initiative) and passenger name records. Agreement on these issues was difficult and the focus remains on law enforcement-related cooperation. Intelligence cooperation continues to be predominantly a bilateral affair.[85]

What specific capabilities do the members of a NOFS and the network itself require? Each member must be able to collect, process, analyze, and disseminate intelligence information domestically across agency or ministry boundaries and share it with other states in compatible formats. (While the emphasis in fighting strategic crime may fall on human intelligence capabilities, other types of intelligence capabilities, such as signals intelligence, may also be critical). Members also must possess sufficient surveillance capabilities (airspace, border, maritime) to be aware of the movement of people, things, and controlled materials throughout their territory. On the basis of these primary national capabilities it would be possible to build "a networked system of information, surveillance, and assessment capability,"[86] on an international basis.

As noted above, intelligence sharing remains a highly sensitive issue, and progress in sharing highly classified information in an internationally networked environment may be necessarily slow. There are three areas, however, that hold promise for building networked intelligence capabilities without dealing with highly classified information and that deserve special mention: 1) comparative analysis of threat information; 2) open source intelligence (OSINT), and; 3) indications and warnings (I&W). Each of these three areas provides opportunities to

---

[81] *Terrorism Strategy*, 25.

[82] Jeffrey D. Simon, *The Terrorist Trap: America's Experience with Terrorism*, 2nd ed., (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 387.

[83] See *Military Strategy*, 10 and, *Terrorism Strategy*, p. 16.

[84] Phillip B. Heymann, *Terrorism and America: A Commonsense Strategy for a Democratic Society*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998), 46-47.

[85] David L. Aaron, et.al., *The Post 9/11 Partnership: Transatlantic Cooperation against Terrorism*, Policy Paper, Atlantic Council of the United States (Washington, DC: Atlantic Council of the United States, 2004), 8-9. The report makes no mention of intelligence cooperation at a multilateral level. This cooperation may take place within NATO.

[86] Matt Begert and Dan Lindsay, "Intelligence Preparation for Operations," in Bunker, *Non-State Threats*, 139. The authors describe the concept of "Intelligence Preparation for Operations," which succinctly captures many of the essential elements of the intelligence system required by a NOFS.

build partner capabilities using Intelligence Security Cooperation tools that could reap specific targeted benefits for the United States and its partners.

- Comparative Analysis. Cooperation in the context of a NOFS is only possible if it is based on a commonly shared view of the threat environment. To build consensus on the threat, nations must come together to share information, compare analyses, and develop a deeper understanding of the threat they face.[87] This already happens in bilateral intelligence sharing relationships, but must expand to international for a at the regional and global level.[88]

- OSINT. Every internet user is aware of the vast quantities of information that can be gleaned from cyberspace on every conceivable topic. The reliance of strategic criminals on global information systems has been noted above. No single country can hope to exploit even a fraction of the open-source information available in cyberspace and elsewhere due to insufficient personnel who have local knowledge and relevant linguistic expertise. A distributed international information network would include local experts capable of extensive and sophisticated open source and other intelligence analysis in local languages that could be made available to the network's members.

- I&W. Providing timely and effective warning to partners concerning threats to their security is the least we can expect from a NOFS. This requires that partners have the necessary detection, analysis, and reporting systems to identify threats and warn partners with enough specificity and time to enable preventative action to be taken.[89] I&W also requires reliable and secure international communications systems for NOFS members.[90]

---

[87] Nelson, "Competitive Strategies", 17.

[88] The degree of openness and mutual trust among partners will clearly dictate the degree to which this is possible. Participation in such a process, however, is critical to establishing the conditions for joint action against strategic crime. The U.S. can play a leadership role in bringing together countries in appropriate groups for these kinds of activities. U.S. willingness to provide releasable intelligence products to begin a process of comparative analysis may induce other countries to share information and assessments on mutual threats more openly.

[89] Campbell and Flournoy, *To Prevail*, 107-110.

[90] USJFCOM is working to develop a Multinational Information Sharing (MSIS) Environment that would facilitate the sharing of classified information among coalition members in an international network environment. While this is promising, it primarily focuses on information sharing in an operational environment. True multinational information sharing will not be effective in fighting strategic crime unless it takes place at the strategic level and the "coalition" it serves is defined broadly enough to support the fight at that level. See U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) description of the Multinational Exercise at http://www.jfcom.mil/about/experiments/mne3.htm. An example of a potentially useful international communications network focused on long-term strategic communications, is the Partnership for Peace (PfP) Information Management System (PIMS). PIMS connects PFP countries in a collaborative information environment that supports crisis response & consequence management exercises, distributed education and distance learning, and other functions. With appropriate funding and encryption, a system like PIMS could be leveraged to support many of the less sensitive information sharing tasks.

Contribution to Regional Security

The members of a NOFS acting alone and in concert with neighbors must fight strategic crime in their own regions, as well as contribute to global efforts. There are two principal requirements: 1) Enforce international norms on their own territories and borders, and; 2) Participate in regional security arrangements. NOFS members must enforce international standards against terrorism, WMD proliferation, drug trafficking, and transnational organized crime within their own territories and keep these threats contained so they do not threaten neighbors or the international community. This implies membership in and support of regimes such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NNPT) and the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) and observance of relevant UN resolutions against trafficking in drugs, weapons, and persons. It also requires that NOFS members actively pursue and support border security cooperation with their neighbors bilaterally or on a regional basis. Participation in regional security organizations, such as the Partnership for Peace, OSCE, and ASEAN also will be critical to the success of a NOFS. Organizations like these provide opportunities for operational cooperation and combined training and exercises that build partner and network capabilities necessary in the fight against strategic crime.

Capabilities for Joint Action

Finally, member states of a NOFS must be able to act together to mount operations against strategic criminals on a local, regional, or global level. This may include operations along the spectrum from highly discreet, small scale intelligence operations against terrorist cells, to major cooperative law enforcement operations against drug cartels, to high intensity military operations against terrorists sheltered by rogue regimes, as in Afghanistan. The members of a NOFS must possess the capability to contribute to joint action beyond their respective borders and regions. Specifically, this means fully capable, deployable, and interoperable forces that can operate as part of a larger coalition of nations against strategic criminals or more traditional military threats. Clearly not every nation requires the same capabilities. Many nations have advantages in certain skill areas that a NOFS can exploit. Rather than asking all partners to develop and maintain the full spectrum of military and security capabilities, it is pragmatic to encourage partners to develop these "niche capabilities." It is critical, however, that NOFS members plan jointly to ensure that key capabilities are collectively available.

No nation, not even a super-power like the U.S., can wield sufficient strength to defeat the full spectrum of transnational threats posed by strategic crime. Bilateral cooperation and exclusive alliances such as NATO are similarly inadequate to the challenges. The creation of a NOFS, as presented here, may seem like a highly unrealistic, even utopian, goal. After all, there is no way to wish away the myriad political, military, and strategic obstacles that have stymied international cooperation in the past. While it is clearly unrealistic to expect rapid progress in the creation of a truly inclusive global NOFS, it is necessary to begin laying the foundations for such a network. Phillip Heymann has pointed out that the long duration of the War on Terrorism will allow us the time to develop the mechanisms and capacities, including alliances, treaties, and other forms of international support, that we need to prevail

in this struggle.[91] The following section will demonstrate how Security Cooperation tools, programs, and planning can contribute to laying the foundations for a global network united in fighting strategic crime.

III. A Model for Integrated Security Cooperation

This paper has so far made two basic arguments. First, the threats facing the United States and its allies go beyond terrorism and cross traditional law enforcement, military, and intelligence functional boundaries. Second, rather than attempting to attack terrorism, WMD proliferation, drug trafficking, and other aspects of strategic crime with distinct strategies, bureaucracies, and programs, the United States needs a more sophisticated strategy – namely, the creation (or empowerment) of a Network of Friendly States. We have also seen how Security Cooperation brings programs, tools, and capabilities to the fight that can be used to enable this NOFS, principally through increasing partners' capacity. In light of the argument thus far, the question becomes how the U.S. should develop an integrated strategy for using its Security Cooperation assets to attain the strategic objective of establishing a friendly network, as well as more specific tactical objectives, such as improved intelligence sharing with targeted partners.

This section will offer a model for integrated security cooperation planning and execution. First, it will make the case for integration, in order to show that mere improvements in information sharing or greater interagency coordination are not sufficient for building partner capabilities. Next, it will offer a framework for planning, including defining requirements and developing strategies for using assistance programs to achieve objectives. Last, it will offer some thoughts on coordinating U.S. strategy with foreign partners.

The Case for Integration

> This [more complex and distributed battlespace] places unique demands on military organizations and interagency partners, requiring more detailed coordination and synchronization of activities both overseas and at home. Our experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq highlight the need for a comprehensive strategy to achieve longer-term national goals and objectives. The United States must adopt an 'active defense in depth' that merges joint force, interagency, international non-governmental organizations, and multinational capabilities in a synergistic manner.[92]

Definitions

What does it mean to call for an *integrated* strategy for using Security Cooperation tools to fight strategic crime?   An integrated strategy would combine the efforts of the various U.S. interagency players in order to accomplish common strategic objectives. An integrated strategy would also comprise U.S. attempts to combine its own national efforts, to the extent

---

[91] Heymann, *Terrorism, Freedom and Security*, 18.
[92] *Military Strategy*, 5.

possible, with those of our foreign allies and partners. In other words, an integrated strategy would bring together programs and strategies that normally function separately to make up a single program or strategy aimed at achieving common objectives. The key principles upon which an integrated strategy would be based are that: 1) planning and programming begin with a set of common strategic objectives, and 2) programs are executed as parts of a single effort under unified management. In order to achieve true integration it is necessary to put in place systems and processes that require the various institutional participants to come together for joint planning and program execution. The purpose of integration is not just to streamline current processes, but to achieve better results in the form of more effective programs because the totality of US efforts in an integrated strategy is almost certain to be greater than the sum of the individual programs working separately.

Coordination, in contrast, means each department and agency, activity and program manager, or (in the case of cooperation with foreign partners) government plans, programs, and implements its own programs. Once programs are fully developed, officials coordinate to ensure that their programs do not conflict with or duplicate other programs aimed at accomplishing similar objectives. For example, six agencies have programs to assist countries in combating the smuggling of nuclear materiel. However, according to a 2002 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, these agencies failed to coordinate adequately, despite the existence of a Department of State-led interagency coordination working group.[93] All government officials know that coordination is difficult and time-consuming, and that there are many similar instances throughout the government of failures to coordinate. Almost all studies urging government reform, including the recent 9/11 Commission, identify failures to coordinate across interagency lines as the principal source of policy failure. The call for better interagency coordination is a perennial one in the history of the U.S. government in the post-WWII era.

While few advocates of more effective government would oppose U.S. government efforts to improve interagency coordination, improved coordination alone will not lead to an effective Security Cooperation strategy to fight strategic crime. Coordination, even when it is successful, still may result in a fragmented, sub-optimized strategy that fails to integrate the various elements of national power.[94]   The Hart-Rudman commission identified this problem and called for a redesign of government to allow "the U.S. government to integrate more effectively the many diverse strands of policy that underpin U.S. national security in a new era…"[95]   David Tucker has similarly noted that the response to terrorism "requires

---

[93] U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), *Nuclear Nonproliferation: U.S. Assistance Efforts to Help Other Countries Combat Nuclear Smuggling Need Strengthened Coordination and Planning,* (Washington, D.C.: GAO, 2002), GAO-02-426, 11.

[94] Former U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) Commander General Anthony Zinni has stated that, despite improvements in interagency coordination, "agencies still tend to plan in isolation from one another, and then meet on the field on game day working off of different playbooks." He called for formalized interagency planning based on integrated monitoring and assessments, and more attention for conflict prevention activities. See General Anthony Zinni and William J. Garvelink, "Civil-Military Cooperation in a Time of Turmoil," Remarks delivered at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, 7 December 2004, http://www.csis.org/isp/pcr/041207_summary.pdf, accessed on 14 March 2005`.

[95] *Hart-Rudman Report*, 47.

some degree of integration of the heterogeneous skills, principles, and standard operating procedures that make up the U.S. government…"[96]   The vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has spoken of the need to integrate military activities more effectively with those of the civilian departments and agencies to fight our adversaries more effectively.[97]   A truly integrated strategy to combat terrorism still has not emerged, though many USG efforts have been directed at that purpose.   As noted earlier, Security Cooperation can contribute to accomplishing the task of integrating the elements of national power into a foreign cooperation and assistance strategy that supports the fight against strategic crime.

In addition to the general need for internal U.S. government integration described above, there are three very specific justifications for making the effort to craft a truly integrated Security Cooperation strategy: economy of resources, effectiveness, and cooperation with foreign partners.

Economy of Resources

There is a limit to the resources the U.S. will be able to commit to the global struggle against terrorism and strategic crime.   Long term structural U.S. budget deficits make it nearly certain that vast new sources of funding will not materialize. The overall costs of the current counter-terrorism campaign are already high and are almost certainly not sustainable. These facts compel the U.S. to seek improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of its foreign cooperation programs.[98]   This means, as a minimum, ferreting out unnecessary, duplicative, conflicting, and ineffective programs.

One of the most cost-effective measures the U.S. can undertake in the global struggle against strategic crime is to invest in the stability of partner nations by assisting them in improving their capabilities. [99]   Such an approach is preparatory and proactive, and may obviate the need for larger investments in the use of "hard power" later.[100]   As argued earlier, Security Cooperation is a highly effective tool for building and improving partner capabilities. USG Security Cooperation can only be economical if it is based on a carefully vetted set of common departmental and agency priorities. In an era of constrained resources, the U.S. should identify foreign partner capabilities that are multifunctional, i.e., that simultaneously accomplish multiple objectives.   These "Core Foundational Capabilities" equip partners with the ability to fight terrorism, WMD proliferation, narcotics trafficking, and other manifestations of strategic crime in support of U.S. security objectives. Such an approach requires an integrated interagency effort to identify priority countries and capabilities and to

---

[96] David Tucker, "Combating International Terrorism," 140-141.

[97] See, for example, General Peter Pace, U.S. Marine Corps, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Extemporaneous Remarks as delivered to the "Marine Corps Association/Naval Institute's Forum 2004," September 7, 2004, http://www.dtic.mil/jcs/vice_chairman/MCANavalInstituteFORUM2004.html. Gen Pace has promoted the idea of a "Goldwater-Nichols" style reform to promote more effective interagency cooperation.

[98] Nelson, "Competitive Strategies," 22.

[99] Ibid., 5.

[100] Begert and Lindsay, "Intelligence Preparation for Operations," 141-142. The authors make this argument about Intelligence Preparation for Operations.

focus foreign assistance on them in a synchronized manner, like that called for in the epigraph to this section.

Effectiveness

If the USG is to be effective in building and improving partner capabilities, it must apply its Security Cooperation resources in an integrated manner. This is due to the nature of capability building. Those not involved in foreign security assistance often mistakenly assume that the provision of equipment and some related training is all that is required to establish a new or improved capability in a foreign military or security force. This is far from the case. Truly effective capabilities involve much more than hardware and associated training. The establishment of even a rudimentary capability requires the development of a spectrum of knowledge, skills, abilities, policies, equipment, infrastructure, and organization. It may even require a significant change in institutional culture for security organizations. The United States Army uses the rubric DOTLMS-F (Doctrine, Organization, Training, Leadership, Materiel, Soldier Systems/Personnel, and Facilities) to capture all of the factors that go into a truly capable armed force. Many of the states most in need of support in building capabilities lack an inherent capacity to develop adequately several aspects of these interdependent requirements.

If we are serious about helping our partners develop Core Foundational Capabilities, we must apply a holistic, or comprehensive, approach that takes into account the need for defense and security structure reform, reorganization, training methodologies, personnel systems, and many other factors. While this is a daunting task, many USG agencies working together can meet this challenge effectively if they pool their efforts and approach the problem in a synergistic way. In many cases, no single USG agency or department has the resources, expertise, or institutional mandate to deal with all of the aspects of building a foreign partner capability. As an example, intelligence cooperation requires, at a minimum, the joint efforts of the Intelligence Community, DOD, and DOS. The establishment of a Maritime Interdiction Operations (MIO) capability, certainly a core foundational capability for littoral countries, is another example. The development of a foreign nation's MIO capability might involve working with its Navy, Coast Guard (or equivalent), border guard, police, customs, port authorities, and special forces, among others. If done correctly, it would require the provision of common training for those directly involved in various types of boarding operations (compliant, non-compliant, or opposed), and specialized training for dealing with specific situations, such as narcotics or WMD seizure, trafficking in persons, or military threats. Once again, it is unlikely that any single USG agency or department has the resources or expertise to deal with such a complex set of requirements. The USG as whole, working in a unified and synchronized manner, however, almost certainly does.

Engaging Foreign Partners

The USG's lack of an integrated Security Cooperation strategy hinders its ability to effectively cooperate with foreign partners, including both those countries targeted for assistance and other donor countries. Foreign partners targeted for assistance expect the USG to speak with

one voice and are often confused by the multiplicity of government representatives who arrive to offer advice, money, or assistance through their department's or agency's program. Many times these representatives offer assistance in the same functional area. For example, several distinct USG programs managed by DOS, DOD, DOJ, Customs (DHS), and the USCG all involve assisting nations in improving their border security. While some coordination does occur, no single agency is responsible for developing an integrated approach to improve the partner's overall border security.[101] This leaves assistance recipients (perhaps with the help of the U.S. Embassy Country Team) to sort out the various assistance efforts and put them in the right context.

If the U.S. does not clearly identify its assistance priorities, it is difficult to engage other potential donor countries and organizations to ascertain what they would be willing to do. Ideally the U.S. would decide what its priorities are, what assistance it will provide, and, just as importantly, what assistance it cannot or will not provide. Armed with these decisions, it is possible to engage other partners or international organizations to see if they can provide assistance to fill shortfalls. If there is any hope for joint U.S.-partner action, it is critical for the U.S. first to determine what it will and will not do.

The most damaging result of failure to craft an integrated Security Cooperation strategy is the reinforcement of dysfunctional partner "stovepipes," especially those that separate foreign military forces and law enforcement.[102] The "not crime, not war" nature of the struggle against strategic crime cries out for vastly improved cooperation between military and police forces, here and abroad. We have already recognized that our own homeland security requirements demand greater military-law enforcement cooperation, but our assistance programs inadvertently cause the opposite result abroad. The current program-driven approach results in a situation in which our policemen talk to their policemen and our soldiers talk to their soldiers. Our assistance programs, by and large, follow this pattern, with military assistance remaining in purely military channels and law enforcement assistance remaining in its channels.[103] For example, several of the former Soviet republics have legacy maritime border guard forces (analogous to our Coast Guard) and fledgling navies. There are strong arguments either to merge these forces or to ensure that they can operate together in situations where both forces are required, such as during some maritime interdiction operations. Moreover, it would be beneficial if these two maritime security entities cooperated in training, vessel maintenance, and other areas where a common maritime approach is warranted. U.S. assistance programs have in some instances undermined the impetus to forge closer working relationships among foreign partner maritime security forces, by funneling assistance through "Navy" or "Coast Guard" stovepipes. Many of our more poorly developed partners have enough trouble embracing needed reform and reorganization without U.S. assistance programs compounding their problems.

---

[101] See GAO, *Nuclear Non-Proliferation*, 11. The GAO report notes that "no government-wide plan links all of the six agencies' programs together," and that "no one agency is in charge of the overall U.S. effort to provide assistance to combat nuclear smuggling," leading to coordination failures and inconsistent results.

[102] *Ibid.* 133-134.

[103] Foreign Assistance Act restrictions on the provision of military assistance to foreign police forces are a principal obstacle to resolving this problem.

There is no compelling argument against pursuing greater integration of our security cooperation and assistance programs. Integration is an approach with substantial potential benefits and no downside. Greater integration imposes no significant additional costs on any part of the USG, while promising a more economical use of resources, more effective partner capabilities, and clearer communication and more productive cooperation with allies and partners. The burden of proof is on those who would oppose greater integration.

An Integrated Planning Model

This section will offer a model for integrated Security Cooperation planning in support of a unified strategy to combat strategic crime. For the present, it will assume the willingness and ability of the various executive branch bureaucracies to engage in this planning based on common objectives. The lack of that willingness or ability will be addressed in Part V of the paper. The model consists of the following:

- *Requirements Definition*. A framework for identifying Core Foundational Capabilities
- *Identification of Resources*. A framework for identifying sources of assistance to build partner capabilities
- *Planning Process*. A set of procedures for developing an integrated Security Cooperation strategy to build partner capabilities
- *Coordination Process*. A framework for engaging partners targeted for assistance and other partners to obtain their support for the strategy.

Requirements Definition

What are the core foundational capabilities that should be the focus of U.S. Security Cooperation resources and activities? Keeping in mind the analysis in the section on a Network of Friendly States, the following framework attempts to define more precisely desired partner capabilities by focusing on four key functions and their supporting capabilities[104]:

Detect. Partners should be able to identify threats to their security through an integrated Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance capability.

- Capabilities:
    - Intelligence Collection
    - Airspace Surveillance, Management, and Control
    - Border (including Maritime) Surveillance, including WMD Detection[105]
    - Public Health/Infectious Disease Monitoring and Reporting

---

[104] This framework is adapted from a concept briefing on the Caspian Guard Initiative, drafted by the author at the U.S. European Command in 2003.

[105] See James Jay Carafano and Alane Kochems, eds., *Making the Sea Safer A National Agenda for Maritime Security and Counterterrorism*, (Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation, 2005), 26-27. The authors note that "maritime security requires sharing data, intelligence, and decision making with key allies and partners" and call for the establishment of an "international maritime regime."

Decide. Partners should be able process, analyze, and disseminate multifunctional intelligence and other information and make it available to their own leaders and foreign partners in support of decision making and operations.

- Capabilities:
    - National (Interagency) Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence (C4I) System

React. Partners should have the tailored forces to respond to the full spectrum of threats to their security posed by strategic crime, whether of domestic or foreign origin, and participate in coalition operations.

- Capabilities:
    - Deployable Military General Purpose Reaction force
    - Military Special Purpose Forces with Counterterrorism and WMD Detection/Seizure Capabilities
    - Civil Police Special Operations Forces with Counterterrorism and WMD Detection/Seizure Capabilities
    - Maritime Reaction Forces (Navy and/or Coast Guard, where applicable)

Contain. Partners should have the capability to isolate threats on their own territory and deal with the consequences of attacks, crises, and other disasters. This includes the ability to protect chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) materials from falling into the hands of strategic criminals, where applicable.

- Capabilities:
    - Civilian Police Forces (National/Local)
    - Border Security
        - Port and Airport Security
        - Immigration and Customs Controls
        - Container Security
        - WMD Portal Monitoring
    - Crisis Response & Consequence Management System
    - CBRN Materials Security

This list of capabilities may strike the reader as either entirely too large to focus U.S. Security Cooperation, or woefully incomplete. As to the first objection, the USG already conducts a large number of programs to address virtually all the items on this list and many more, though in a fragmented and non-synchronized manner. Regarding the second objection, while there are many worthwhile capabilities that could be added to the list, limited resources -- not just money, but also time and policy attention -- require us to focus primarily on those capabilities that directly support the fight against strategic crime. The capabilities listed, in many cases, contribute to satisfying more than one American strategic priority (see Figure 1). It is not be possible, of course, for the U.S. to assist all of its partners with every capability

on this list, which is why prioritization is essential. Whether or not you agree with all of the items on the list or believe that others should be added, the important thing is to develop a unified interagency position concerning which capabilities deserve focus by country and region in order to craft integrated strategies for applying U.S. Security Cooperation resources.

Identification of Resources

A strategic approach to building partner capabilities requires the identification and mobilization of resources. U.S. assistance programs alone cannot and should not bear the burden for building all of the capabilities in the worldwide NOFS. U.S. leadership, enabled by a vision for increased cooperation, strategic planning, and carefully targeted incentives to prompt partner nations to support U.S. priorities, can set the conditions for success. Resources to build partner capabilities are available at the national, intermediate or regional, and global levels.[106]

National level resources include the resources of partner nations targeted for assistance and U.S. and other countries' bilateral assistance programs.[107] It is obvious that nations that can do so should bear the costs of building capabilities that satisfy their own security requirements. U.S. and other countries' assistance efforts are most often useful in providing advice, guidance, and incentives for partners to develop the right capabilities. In the case of partners with very limited resources, the U.S. investment may need to be greater in order to put in place badly needed capabilities.

Intermediate level resources include assistance programs administered by regional institutions, such as NATO, the OSCE or the EU, and other multinational groupings, such as the World Bank or the G-8. Resources from organizations like these can also play a role in crafting an integrated U.S. Security Cooperation strategy to build partner capabilities.[108]

Global resources are principally those available through the United Nations and its associated programs. The United Nations provides legitimacy and a forum for organizing cooperation on a global scale.

---

[106] I am indebted to Dick Nelson for this framework. See Nelson, "Competitive Strategies," 7.

[107] The United States European Command labels partners that can complement U.S. Security Cooperation efforts in a third country "Enabling Partners." Examples include the United Kingdom and Germany, who have assistance programs in many of the same countries as the U.S.

[108] Institutions and organizations at this level can play an important coordinating and integrating role in supporting bilateral national efforts. The OSCE, for example, committed in 2004 to coordinate national efforts to build the capacity of member states to fight terrorism. See The Atlantic Council of the United States, "NATO's Role in Confronting International Terrorism," Policy Paper, (Washington, DC: The Atlantic Council of the United States, 2004), 9, fn10. Organizations like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund can be especially helpful in infrastructure development. The amounts of money necessary to build or improve dual-use (military-civilian) airfields or to improve border control facilities, for example, can often only come from large-scale loans and grants that these organizations can provide.

Planning Process

The principal planning tasks are setting U.S. priorities and objectives by country and region and developing a fully coordinated and integrated strategy for applying USG Security Cooperation resources to accomplish the objectives. To develop a successfully integrated interagency Security Cooperation strategy, all stakeholders (departments and agencies) that possess or direct security cooperation-related resources must participate in all phases of the planning process. Here is a simplified outline for the proposed process:[109]

- Strategy Review. An interagency review of strategic security objectives, led by the National Security Council, sets the stage for the planning process by ensuring that department and agency Security Cooperation planners operate from a common threat perception, and understand the larger strategic framework and specific country or regional objectives.

  o A regional and country-by-country review of strategic priorities, led by State, should follow. This process would determine the specific security objectives that should drive Security Cooperation planning for each country or region. It should be supplemented by a thorough intelligence review to determine requirements and to assess the activities of other bilateral and multilateral players. It may include consultations with partners and international organizations and may require targeted assessments to determine specific requirements. This review should develop a list of capabilities for priority development by region and country for interagency approval.

- Develop Security Cooperation Strategy. Armed with the results of the strategy review, interagency Security Cooperation planners match available departmental and agency resources to build identified partner capabilities, identify shortfalls, and devise strategies for addressing shortfalls. It is worth emphasizing that participation in this process must be mandatory, that no department or agency would have the authority to "opt out." This process would resemble a "clearinghouse" for Security Cooperation resources. A "clearinghouse," as used here, is a place where all those who control resources dedicated to certain objectives come together to see how their efforts might fit in with other clearing house members. NATO operates a Partnership for Peace Clearinghouse, where allies and partners exchange information on their assistance programs to increase transparency and help to prioritize the various national assistance efforts.[110]

---

[109] This process is an adaptation of the U.S. European Command Theater Security Planning Process and the Interagency Political-Military planning process proposed by the authors in, Campbell and Flournoy, To Prevail, 118.

[110] Another example of this approach involving foreign partners is USEUSCOM's South Caucasus Clearinghouse, which is an effort to bring together countries that have assistance programs in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, to coordinate more effectively, and ideally to integrate their activities.

- o Matching resources to objective capabilities.
  - ▪ Capability building using Security Cooperation includes programs and activities that perform six basic functions:
    - • Equipping/Sustaining: Providing equipment, hardware, or other materiel to establish, enhance, or sustain a partner's capabilities.
    - • Training/Familiarization: Providing training to build a partner's expertise or technical capabilities.
    - • Advising: Providing consultation on institutional reform, reorganization, or the development of systems.
    - • Educating: Assisting partners in setting up or improving educational institutions (e.g., police or military academies) to sustain the development of their security institutions.
    - • Infrastructure: Assisting partners in upgrading key facilities, such as airfields or ports that support U.S. and partner security requirements.
    - • Exercising: The development of a plan to exercise partner capabilities bilaterally or on a regional basis. Examples include regional crisis response exercises or Proliferation Security Initiative counter-proliferation exercises.
  - ▪ Security Cooperation planners analyze requirements by country (or region) and apply departmental or agency resources to each objective using the functional framework offered above. It is at this point in the process that the potential for interagency synergy becomes apparent, as several different agencies often are able to contribute to the development of a single partner capability. This process helps to identify shortfalls where no U.S. government program is suitable to assisting a partner in developing a given capability. The chart at Figure 2 lists some of the primary USG programs and how they might contribute to improving Border Security programs in a hypothetical partner country.
  - ▪ Planners draft an interagency strategy for using Security Cooperation program resources to achieve country and regional objectives. This must include, as a minimum:
    - • A Concept of Operations that establishes lead and supporting departments;
    - • A common set of objectives for each country, with plans for using supporting Security Cooperation programs;
    - • A common set of regional and country priorities, and;
    - • A strategy to address shortfalls and gaps in the strategy, to include additional budget requests and approaching foreign bilateral and multilateral partners.

Coordination Process

Once the USG has developed a draft interagency Security Cooperation Strategy, it must coordinate and, where possible, integrate its plans with those of partners targeted for assistance and other contributing donor nations. First priority must be to gain the assent of the partners we are trying to help. This will be most successful if the strategy review we conducted during the planning process has been based on prior consultations with partner governments and, where necessary, functional assessments of partner capabilities. At this stage it is important for the USG to be able to make concrete offers of assistance, backed up with secured funding and accompanied by a clear delineation of U.S. expectations connected to the offers of assistance. Offers of U.S. assistance often put foreign partners in difficult positions, requiring them to weigh competing political and other factors (e.g., relationships with other partners or domestic political considerations). A clear offer of assistance with associated costs and mutual obligations is the best way to persuade partners that U.S. assistance is in their interest and that it fully respects their sovereignty. It also ensures that the U.S. does not raise unrealistic expectations concerning U.S. aid. Approaching this as an interagency task will help foreign partners (and U.S. Embassy officials in country) understand how the various parts of the U.S. assistance effort fit together.

Having a coordinated interagency Security Cooperation plan ideally positions the U.S. for engaging other partners bilaterally with assistance programs aimed at the same countries. In cases where the U.S. assistance effort is much larger than other countries', foreign partners will be often willing, or even will prefer, to follow the U.S. lead by taking on elements of the Security Cooperation strategy that the U.S. cannot or will not be able to address adequately. The U.S. was able, for example, to persuade several European nations to supplement the U.S. Georgia Train and Equip Program (GTEP) with equipment and training. It is also possible to establish partnerships with key allies that have an interest in working together to assist third countries. One example is the Department of Defense's Caucasus Working Group (CWG). The CWG is a structured dialogue between the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the Turkish General Staff (TGS) to share information and coordinate their respective assistance programs in Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Kazakhstan.[111]   The prospects for success in persuading other partners to complement U.S. assistance efforts are enhanced significantly if the U.S. is able to negotiate on the basis of a sound, integrated, and resourced security cooperation strategy.

As we have seen, intermediate organizational entities, such as defense alliances and international organizations, have significant resources to contribute to the effort of building capabilities in weaker partners. Deciding on the scope and limits of the USG Security Cooperation effort similarly positions the U.S. to influence and, in some cases, to shape the assistance efforts of multilateral organizations. The U.S. directly participates in many of these organizations, such as OSCE, NATO, G-8, and the World Bank. U.S. leadership in these

---

[111] The CWG effort, in which the author participated in 2002-2004, is still plagued by restriction to the "Defense Stovepipe." Discussions with TGS officials often touched on issues requiring the participation of law enforcement officials, but neither side had such representatives present. Some of these issues were neither purely military nor purely police problems.

organizations can channel portions of the assistance effort to organizations that have a "comparative advantage" in a given area.[112]   NATO's Partnership for Peace (PFP) exercise program, for example, could be a highly useful tool in building alliance and partner capabilities in several areas relevant to the struggle against strategic crime.   Other organizations, like the G-8 and the World Bank, may be better suited to provide funding support for targeted infrastructure improvements.   Even where the U.S. does not have a direct voice, as in the EU, the USG can negotiate with other donor nations to ensure that no major gaps in partner capabilities go unaddressed.

The model for integrated security cooperation planning outlined here offers a rudimentary framework for bringing interagency representatives together to develop a consensus on priorities for U.S. Security Cooperation and to develop a strategy that can form the basis of programming, budgeting, and consultation with allies and other partners.   This process requires that the appropriate USG officials cross department and agency lines to look at the world strategically and craft a collective government response to the security challenges that face our country.   For a variety of reasons, it does not work that way in practice. Part IV examines some of the reasons why.

IV. Obstacles and Recommendations

The proposition that the USG should pool the resources of its departments and agencies in a synchronized manner to support the struggle against strategic crime seems like a straightforward one.   The failure of the government to do this has been mentioned in a variety of studies, reports, and books, some of which have already been cited here.   The need to foster greater interagency integration is particularly acute when it comes to Security Cooperation.   We have seen that lacking a fundamentally integrated effort makes it impossible to use Security Cooperation resources in an economical and effective way and greatly complicates our cooperation with partners and allies.

The inability of the USG to craft and implement a fiscally sound, effective, and integrated Security Cooperation effort is due to four principal obstacles.   First, the USG interagency does not have a common conceptual understanding, or doctrine, for using Security Cooperation programs and resources in a disciplined manner to accomplish strategic objectives. Second, there is no clear authority, accepted by all interagency players, to guide the strategic application of Security Cooperation resources to common strategic objectives. Third, funding for Security Cooperation is based on a wholly dysfunctional and outdated model that unnecessarily hinders executive branch departments in the implementation of policy.   Fourth, the interagency lacks the appropriate bureaucratic processes and organization for proactive and systematic planning and programming for Security Cooperation activities in an integrated and synchronized manner on a long term basis. Let's examine each of these obstacles at greater length.

---

[112] Atlantic Council, "NATO's Role in Confronting International Terrorism," 14-21.

Lack of Doctrine

Part III of this paper offered a definition of Security Cooperation that could be common to the entire USG, not just the Department of Defense. The USG interagency has no such common definition because it lacks a common conceptual understanding of how to translate higher level strategic guidance into specific programs designed to accomplish strategic objectives.

The Department of Defense, despite its size, its diversity, and the scope of its Security Cooperation activities, has such a common understanding. DOD's process is not without its flaws.[113] During the late 1990s and the early 21st century, however, the department has successfully established a rational set of procedures for translating the strategic guidance in the National Security, Military, and, now, Defense Strategies, into specific programs executed by the military commands, services, and defense agencies.[114] This process promotes discipline by forcing subordinate organizations to demonstrate that their Security Cooperation activities directly support specific objectives in the higher-level strategies. Efforts are under way to discipline the process further by establishing an assessment mechanism to provide feedback on the effectiveness of programs and activities.[115] One reason for the success of the DOD program is OSD's publication of periodic Security Cooperation Guidance. This document, in addition to providing authority for subordinate organizations' Security Cooperation activities (see more below), serves the purpose of an informal doctrine, stipulating not only the "what," but the "how" and the "why" of Security Cooperation.[116]

In order for the USG interagency to plan and execute Security Cooperation programs and activities in an integrated and synergistic manner, a doctrine, or common conceptual framework, for Security Cooperation is necessary. Such a doctrine would have to define what Security Cooperation is, and, what it is not.[117] It would have to define precisely which departmental and agency programs qualify as Security Cooperation and outline a procedure for combined interagency planning, programming, and execution. Armed with such a

---

[113] For example, there are still failures to coordinate and inadequate integration among DOD managed programs. Amy Chou, OSD Strategy Office, interview by the author, 14 Jan 05.

[114] Andy Hoehn, former DASD, Strategy, 11 Jan 05.

[115] Amy Chou, interview, 14 Jan 05.

[116] The previous formal doctrine, called Theater Engagement Planning, or TEP, while not entirely displaced, has been superseded by an informal doctrine for Security Cooperation. The lack of a formal doctrine has allowed for considerable variety in the manner DOD organizations plan and implement Security Cooperation without undermining the overall common approach. For example, the Geographic Combatant commands, such as EUCOM, PACOM, and SOUTHCOM all use different procedures for planning and prioritizing Security Cooperation objectives and programs.

[117] As has been suggested here, activities to improve foreign partners' security capabilities conducted by any department or agency would qualify as Security Cooperation. In contrast, general foreign development assistance, although related to security and part of broader U.S. foreign policy, would probably not. Even within DOD, this is not totally clear. Officials in OSD's Counter-proliferation Policy office refused to admit that activities intended to improve the maritime security capabilities of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan in support of counter-proliferation would be included under the definition of Security Cooperation and declined to integrate their program *formally* with other DOD Security Cooperation efforts.

common conceptual framework, executive branch officials and program managers will be better equipped to engage in integrated planning and program execution. True success in this effort, however, will depend on the resolution of the other problems of authority, funding, and process and organization.

Unclear Authority

The USG lacks a clear authoritative basis for guidance of Security Cooperation programs and activities. This is rooted in the lack of overall strategic planning in the USG and the ad hoc and department-specific nature of the planning that does occur. [118] There is no equivalent of the OSD Security Cooperation Guidance for the interagency to guide the programmatic activities of executive branch departments and agencies. The strategy documents, such as the NSS or National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, provide overall strategic intent, goals, and objectives, and suggest broad means for accomplishing them. The strategies successfully link the various non-state threats by cross-referencing them and demonstrating the interconnected nature of terrorism, WMD proliferation, narcotics trafficking, and transnational organized crime. This high-level strategic guidance does not result in integrated strategies, however, because the goals and objectives are too broad to drive implementation at the program level and because there is no requirement for departments and agencies to develop integrated plans.

Moreover, executive branch departments and agencies lack a common set of regional and country-specific Security Cooperation objectives and do not operate according to the same set of priorities. For example, State and Defense are two of the most significant players in Security Cooperation. DOS controls Security Assistance -- including Foreign Military Financing (FMF) and the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program, the largest sources of funds DOD uses to execute its Security Cooperation activities. DOS requests funds from Congress and allocates resources to DOD based on its own assessment of foreign policy requirements, which do not always agree with DOD's. OSD carefully lays out the strategic rationale for its Security Cooperation plans in its Security Cooperation guidance, but DOS officials are free to ignore or accept the contents of this guidance as they like.[119] Likewise, DOD and its subordinate organizations painstakingly prioritize countries and regions to guide allocation of Security Cooperation resources, but the Department of State has its own priorities, which do not always coincide.[120]

The lack of baseline strategic guidance to govern the planning, programming, and execution of Security Cooperation activities has resulted in the classic failures of an "administered policy." According to Barry Posen, administered policies prevail in democracies as political

---

[118] *Hart-Rudman Report*, 48. Rear Admiral William Sullivan, Vice Director, JCS-J5, says the current interagency operating environment leads to "ad hocracy." Comments at the Defense Security Cooperation Agency Annual Conference, 14 October 2004, Arlington, VA.

[119] DOD staffs the OSD Security Cooperation Guidance with the Department of State, soliciting its input, but does not ask for its formal concurrence. DOD and DOS officials are often able to work out disagreements on objectives or priorities informally, but this is not always the case. Andy Hoehn, interview, 14 Jan 05.

[120] The US European Command, for example, uses a computer-assisted quantitative model to determine the allocation of Security Cooperation resources among countries and programs.

leaders trade off initiatives that might be effective in one area against costs measured in terms of other agendas, values, and policies.[121]   The result is bureaucratic politics and competition for resources and policy attention.   To avoid the pitfalls of an administered policy the USG must develop a combined approach that brings together all the stakeholders, assigns responsibilities, and requires integrated planning.[122]   A document or set of documents, under the signature of the President or the National Security Council will be required to provide sufficient authority to require and compel interagency cooperation in crafting and implementing integrated Security Cooperation strategies.

Funding

"Ultimately, the foreign assistance program must change because it does not work."[123]

As Michele Flournoy and Kurt M. Campbell have argued in *To Prevail – An American Strategy for the Campaign Against Terrorism*, the U.S. needs to "rethink, renegotiate, and reinvigorate the patchwork compact on foreign assistance…" that provides the resources we need to fight terrorism and other forms of strategic crime.[124]   The system as they describe it is outdated, underfunded, fragmented, and inflexible. It lacks both clear organization and a strategic basis and is laden with earmarks.[125]   The Hart-Rudman report earlier noted that "no overarching strategic framework guides U.S. national security policy making or resource allocation. Budgets are still prepared and appropriated the way they were during the Cold War."[126]   The funds necessary to fight terrorism and other related networked threats are distributed throughout the budgets of several different departments and agencies.[127] Each department or agency prepares its own budget, with no attempt to develop an overall budget.[128]   Richard Clarke noted that in some cases these departments and agencies do not even request funds to address critical requirements.[129]

---

[121] Barry R. Posen, from "The Struggle Against Terrorism: Grand Strategy, Strategy, and Tactics," *International Security*, (Winter 2001/02), in Howard and Sawyer, *Readings and Interpretations*, 398.

[122] President Clinton's Decision Directive 39 on counterterrorism delineated lead agency responsibilities but did not mandate integrated planning. See PDD 39 at http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd39.htm.

[123] Campbell and Flournoy, *To Prevail*, 163. This chapter in *To Prevail* is an excellent summary of what is wrong with the foreign assistance program and what must be changed. The views expressed here are based in part on their arguments. While Campbell and Flournoy address foreign assistance in general, their criticisms are applicable to the funding for Security Cooperation programs as well, despite the differences in funding mechanisms and interagency processes between the two types of programs.

[124] Ibid., 61.

[125] See *Hart-Rudman Report*, 53. The report notes that the organization of foreign assistance is a bureaucratic morass.

[126] Ibid., 47.

[127] Clarke, *Against All Enemies*, 97-98.   Most of the funds relevant to the discussion here are authorized each year in the Foreign Operations Budget, which funds the operations of the State Department, the Peace Corps, USAID Security Assistance (FMF, FMS, IMET, etc.), and many other major assistance programs.   There are other sources of relevant funding, however.   For example, Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs are authorized in National Defense Authorization Acts.

[128] *Ibid.*, 48.

[129] *Ibid.*, 97-98.

Excessive Congressional earmarks are one of the most pressing problems in Security Cooperation funding. Earmarks are requirements inserted into legislation to require funds be allocated for narrowly defined purposes or for specific countries. They unnecessarily limit the flexibility of executive branch officials to match funds to requirements and directly impede the possibility of integrated planning, by reinforcing agency and program "stovepipes." The 9/11 Commission noted that "…money for assistance is allocated so rigidly that, on the ground, one U.S. agency often cannot improvise or pitch in to help another agency, even in small ways when a few thousand dollars could make a big difference."[130] What is true "on the ground" is also true in Washington.

When Congress appropriates money for specific and narrowly defined purposes in programs tailored for or controlled by a particular agency, it unintentionally erects barriers to cooperation and all but prevents integrated planning, at times even within departments. For example, the Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation Prevention Initiative (WMD-PPI), funded by Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR, or "Nunn-Lugar") funds, will promote improvements in the maritime security capabilities of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan in support of counter-proliferation. This would seem to be a classic Security Cooperation program. OSD officials overseeing the program, however, refused to link WMD-PPI formally with other DOD Security Cooperation activities in those countries. Moreover, they intend to establish their own regional offices to implement the program, rather than relying on the existing Offices of Defense Cooperation in those countries. The officials justify the maintenance of this "bright line" between CTR activities and Security Cooperation on strict Congressional accountability and reporting requirements.[131] The erection of such stovepipes is the all-too-typical unintended consequence of well-meaning Congressional appropriations for narrow purposes.

The plethora of caveats, restrictions, special conditions, and reporting requirements governing funding for Security Assistance, Threat Reduction, Counter-Narcotics, and other programs forces executive branch officials to be virtual contortionists as they try to meet their strategic objectives using tools not designed for the purpose. An official interested in improving a foreign partner's border security capabilities, for example, would be required to cobble together a variety of programs controlled by different bureaucracies dedicated to border security, law enforcement, anti-terrorism, counter-proliferation, and counter-narcotics goals. Each of these programs comes with its own set of legal restrictions, making the integration of the programs into an integrated strategy a lawyer's nightmare. Defense officials, barred from using Security Assistance funds for legitimate cooperation objectives in a given country due either to State Department non-concurrence or legal restrictions, regularly turn to other "pots" of money, such as counter-narcotics, counter-proliferation, or contingency funding, to get the job done. In doing so, these officials are required to demonstrate that their activities adhere to the original intent of the source legislation authorizing that "pot" of funds. When authorizing legislation is broadly written this process

---

[130] *9/11 Commission Report*, 371.

[131] See fn. 109. The author spearheaded a U.S. European Command initiative, known as Caspian Guard to integrate DOD and USG Security Cooperation activities in Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. WMD-PPI program officials refused to integrate their program formally with Caspian Guard and Security Assistance generally.

is not onerous, but when it is narrowly construed, like in the WMD-PPI example cited above, it can be a painful and inefficient process.

One of the most outdated restrictions in the context of this paper is the Foreign Assistance Act prohibition against using Foreign Military Assistance[132] funds to support law enforcement entities in foreign countries.[133] As we have seen, the nature of the threat makes distinctions between purely military and law enforcement tasks less relevant.   The U.S. military has much to offer foreign law enforcement organizations, whose structure and doctrine often differ significantly from those of U.S. police organizations.   Many nations have paramilitary police organizations, like Italy's Carabinieri or France's Gendarmerie. Some former Soviet republics, like Georgia, are seeking to retool their Ministry of Interior troops, an outdated tool of Soviet repression, into modern paramilitary forces like the Carabinieri or Gendarmerie.   These hybrid military-police forces are ideally suited to the war against strategic crime and deserve U.S. support.[134]   The U.S. does not have a "national police force," in contrast to many of our partners and allies.[135] Therefore, we do not have a logical counterpart to engage those of our partners who do have such forces.[136] (Note that it is the U.S. military that is playing the primary role in training internal security forces in both Afghanistan and Iraq). The ability to use FMF and IMET funds judiciously to support foreign law enforcement personnel would allow the U.S. military to engage foreign police forces, as part of an overall USG effort, to provide assistance in areas of its particular expertise, such as training in weapons, tactics, professionalism, and cooperation with military forces. It would promote foreign military-police cooperation, break down stovepipes, and assist in modernizing many foreign police organizations.[137]   U.S. military assistance programs do support foreign law enforcement organizations, notably in the context of counter-narcotics, but Foreign Assistance Act restrictions forestall the kind of broad engagement required by the struggle against strategic crime.

An integrated Security Cooperation strategy requires funding based on the following principles:

---

[132] Foreign Military Financing (FMF) and International Military Education and Training (IMET) programs.

[133]   See   the   Foreign   Assistance   Act   of   1961   with   amendments,   pp.   342-343, http://www.fas.org/asmp/resources/govern/faa01.pdf) Congress has in fact authorized exceptions to these restrictions in the case of counter-narcotics and customs (see fn. on p. 343).

[134] Ministry of Interior forces were tools of oppression during Soviet times. Due to this history, the U.S. has generally avoided engagement with these forces. The reform of these forces into modern paramilitary police forces on the western European model would be a significant contribution to the fight against strategic crime. This requires a comprehensive USG response, in conjunction with our European allies, integrating both our military and law enforcement assistance efforts.

[135] Atlantic Council, NATO's Role in Confronting International Terrorism, 18.

[136] General Wesley Clark notes that the U.S. relies too much on the military as non-DOD agencies lack the resources, culture, and capacity to engage abroad and are consumed with other problems. See Wesley K. Clark, Winning Modern Wars, 1st ed., (New York : Public Affairs, 2003), 169.

[137] U.S. military assistance programs played a major role in modernizing and transforming the military forces of the former Warsaw Pact countries and Soviet republics in the period after the fall of the Soviet Union. These new forces quickly became modern, capable forces that helped their countries qualify for NATO membership. In some of these same countries, however, the old Ministry of Interior organizations remained unreformed and often corrupt.

- *Strategic Approach.*   Budget requests should be based on clear national guidance reflected in well thought out interagency political-military plans.

- *Goal Oriented Budgets.* Congress should authorize overall funding levels for broad purposes, such as foreign border security[138], and require the executive branch to develop an integrated request, subject to Congressional approval, to apportion funds among the various departmental and agency programs.[139]

- *Multi-year/Multi-agency Budgets.* Congress should fund Security Cooperation programs across the interagency on a multi-year basis so that planners know how much they can expect from year to year.[140]

Bureaucratic Processes and Organization

Process

The USG lacks a process that would allow for the routine, long-term, proactive and detailed planning required to develop integrated Security Cooperation strategies.   The existing interagency policy process, consisting of Policy Coordination (PCC), Deputies' (DC), and Principals' Committees (PC), is capable of formulating policy, but not of executing and implementing policy on an interagency basis.   The current policy formulation process translates national level guidance from the President or Congress into departmental and agency programs for execution.   The committees noted above are chartered with coordinating policy, but even the most junior of these, the PCC, is typically made up of officials at the level of Deputy Assistant Secretary.   These officials are too senior to have the time necessary to focus on the day-to-day detailed work of planning and implementing interagency policies at the program level.[141]   Interagency collaboration in the development of coordinated policy approaches combining two or more government programs aimed at a single goal does occur, but usually in an ad hoc manner in response to an emerging situation or crisis, or the uncommon initiative of an energetic policymaker.[142]   Integrated Security Cooperation planning requires standing committees of working level officials with the

---

[138] Campbell and Flournoy, *To Prevail*, 157.   The authors identify transnational threats as one broad area for funding and call for law enforcement funding for anti-terrorism, counter-narcotics and other programs to "complement" traditional Security Assistance. While this is welcome, nothing less than integrated planning will achieve the desired results.

[139] See *Hart-Rudman Report*, 49.

[140] Warren Rudman to Richard Clarke, "We need a transparent process that says you can get this much done for this much money over this many years," quoted in Clarke, *Against All Enemies*, 260.

[141] *9/11 Commission Report*, 17.   The 9/11 Commission report notes that too much interagency collaboration requires high-level intervention and decision making.

[142] One example of this approach was the policy developed for Georgia in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, which resulted in the establishment of the Georgia Train and Equip program. DOS and DOD officials collaborated to craft a combined approach using Security Assistance, Border Security, and military service funding to train Georgian forces to fight terrorists on their own territory.

authority necessary to collaborate with their interagency counterparts in developing combined plans, programs, and budgets on a routine, ongoing basis.[143]

The National Security Council staff could conceivably fulfill the policy execution role, but is not likely to, for at least two reasons. First, the NSC staff is too small to conduct the ongoing, routine, and detailed coordination required to be the center of an integrated planning effort. While the NSC has played a policy execution role in the past, cuts in staffing and the apparent preferences of the Bush Administration to vest policy execution in the Cabinet departments make it unlikely that the NSC would be able to take on such a robust task.[144] Richard Clarke, while serving as the NSC point man on counter-terrorism attempted to integrate department and agency counter-terrorism programs. By his own admission, he had only mixed success in getting the Cabinet departments to collaborate on counter-terrorism policy.[145] Second, the Cabinet departments and agencies are best suited to policy execution, because they have both the staff and the relevant expertise to develop detailed Security Cooperation strategies and supporting plans. The NSC certainly has a role to play in overseeing and disciplining the process of policy execution, but should not play the central role.[146] Yet some entity has to perform this function. This brings up the question of organization.

Organization

The failure of USG departments and agencies to collaborate in the development of integrated Security Cooperation and other foreign assistance strategies is due in part to inadequate organization.[147] There exists no organization or institution with the charter, staffing, and authority to integrate the disparate Security Cooperation activities of the Cabinet departments and agencies as described in this paper. While this problem is widely recognized, the solutions offered have differed substantially.

The difficulties of coordination and information sharing between and among departments and agencies often have prompted reformers to propose centralizing like activities under the same department or bureaucracy. Congress and the Bush Administration essentially followed the advice of the Hart-Rudman Commission in setting up the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Likewise, the failure of the intelligence community to "connect the dots" in detecting the activities of the 9/11 hijackers, led Congress and the President to implement reforms to subordinate a substantial portion of the intelligence community to a single director. General Wesley Clark similarly calls for the establishment of a Department of International Development (DID) to coordinate the myriad non-military aspects of foreign assistance under one Cabinet secretary.[148] The problem with centralization as a solution to

---

[143] Leon Fuerth notes that the USG does not have a structure and process to look at long-term issues. See Leon Fuerth, "NSC Organization, Operations, and Ideology," in Nau and Shambaugh, eds., *Divided Diplomacy*, 18.

[144] Ibid.

[145] Clarke, *Against All Enemies*, 97-98.

[146] See also Carter, "Architecture of Government," 433.

[147] *Hart-Rudman Report*, 10. The USG is "very poorly organized to design and implement any comprehensive strategy to protect the homeland."

[148] Clark, *Winning Modern Wars*, 193-194.

the problem of interagency collaboration is that for every "seam" done away with an equal or greater number of new ones will be created. DHS officials still must reach across agency lines to collaborate with their counterparts at DOD, Transportation, FBI, and the rest of the USG. The Director of National Intelligence (DNI) still must coordinate with DOD intelligence activities and the FBI. General Clark's DID would have a complex relationship with State and DOD, among others. Moreover, all this centralization comes at a huge price. Richard Clarke notes caustically that it is "easier to waste time on reorganization than it is to accomplish anything concrete."[149] If centralization of like activities under one department is not the answer, then what is?

In order to organize the USG in the most effective manner to conduct integrated Security Cooperation planning and program execution, we should embrace the inherent network structure of the USG itself. Critics (including this author) tend to focus on the difficulties of getting the hierarchical Cabinet departments and other agencies to work together across institutional boundaries. David Tucker points out that the USG possesses many of the inherent advantages of a network structure internally and is further networked with other governments bilaterally and multilaterally. True to its network structure, the USG has shown itself capable of adapting to deal with terrorism. Tucker notes that a loosely coordinated interagency process is well suited to the fight against terrorism. He argues that the decentralized and networked character of the interagency increases the likelihood that we will react properly to future threats to our security. Tucker says we should neither centralize nor maintain the status quo, but rather we should exploit both the hierarchical and networked character of the USG.[150] The task, then, is finding a way to "graft" a network structure onto hierarchical departments and agencies to enhance their ability to conduct the ongoing, systematic, and long-term planning needed to develop and implement integrated Security Cooperation strategies.

The USG requires a new interagency institutional framework that leverages the expertise of the various departments and agencies, while bringing them together in a disciplined, ongoing process to develop integrated strategies. This does not require any major reorganization, only presidential leadership exercised through the NSC and sustained policy attention by departmental and agency leaderships. As we have seen, the NSC cannot, and should not, integrate executive branch Security Cooperation programs working by itself, but its participation in the process is essential to represent presidential priorities and to compel participation in the process by all players. The NSC Staff should play the role of high-level coordinator and process manager. The detailed work of program integration should be left to the departments and agencies themselves, organized in functional "working-level"[151] working groups under the leadership of appointed "lead agencies."[152] Many interagency officials are familiar with this type of structure. Various working groups of this nature

---

[149] Clarke, *Against All Enemies*, 90. Clarke opposed the creation of DHS on these grounds.

[150] Tucker, "Combating International Terrorism," 133-134.

[151] Working level is below the SES, political appointee, or General officer rank.

[152] Ashton Carter characterized President Clinton's appointment of lead agencies in PDD 39 as a "failed approach" because it did not require interagency coordination. Ashton B. Carter, "The Architecture of Government in the Face of Terrorism," 431-432.

already exist to coordinate interagency activities. The majority of these are either ad hoc, focused on current military operations, or dedicated to narrow topics. No such structure exists to coordinate Security Cooperation programs across the USG. The kind of working group proposed here would have to be a standing committee of relatively low-level officials working on a continuing basis to refine the collective efforts of the USG in cooperating with partners and allies in the fight against strategic crime.[153]

Once we recognize the inescapable interagency nature of the problem of integrating Security Cooperation activities, we can identify realistic, low-cost institutional fixes to the problems of doctrine, authority, funding, process, and organization. The next section will offer recommendations in each of these areas.

Recommendations

1) *Publish a Presidential Directive (PD) on Security Cooperation.* The NSC should draft a PD for the President's signature that directs the interagency to plan foreign Security Cooperation in an integrated manner under the supervision of the NSC. The PD would establish Security Cooperation as a doctrinal concept for the interagency and provide authority for the establishment of standing interagency working groups. It would also outline a process for political-military planning of Security Cooperation assistance. The PD would include the following items, at a minimum: (A more detailed proposed outline is at Annex A).

    o   A definition of Security Cooperation for the interagency
    o   An initial list of functional working groups
    o   The assignment of lead and supporting agencies for each working group (see Figure 3 for a proposed list of working groups with lead and supporting agencies)
    o   A broad outline of the planning process, including its integration with the budget process, and
    o   The establishment of a feedback mechanism to allow for the periodic assessment of the effectiveness of Security Cooperation programs and activities.

2) *Develop a detailed interagency planning process based on the PD.* The NSC should appoint an interim interagency working group to develop a detailed planning process to implement the guidance in the PD.

---

[153] See Nuclear Threat Initiative Website, "Interdicting Nuclear Smuggling: Second Line of Defense," http://www.nti.org/e_research/cnwm/interdicting/second.asp, accessed on 14 March 2005. The report recommends just such a mechanism for the ongoing coordination of nuclear non-proliferation programs: "All of the agencies with an interest in nuclear smuggling, including DOE, State, the Defense Department, the Customs Service, the Coast Guard, and the Intelligence Community, should be part of a formal committee under sustained National Security Council leadership that collectively agrees on an overall strategic plan, coordinates annual funding allocations, coordinates efforts and allocates responsibilities in each individual country where work is being carried out, and develops country specific plans."

3) *Issue USG Security Cooperation Guidance (SCG) on a bi-annual basis.* A bi-annual SCG serves to amplify or adjust previous guidance and to set priorities to guide planning and programming. This serves as the primary White House direction for the working groups for their strategy and budget submission proposals.

4) *Reexamine Funding of Security Cooperation Activities throughout the USG.*

   o *Reexamine the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, with amendments.* Congress should reexamine the Foreign Assistance Act to determine if it still meets the requirements of the post-Cold War world. In particular, Congress should take a look at the restriction on the use of military assistance funds to train and cooperate with foreign law enforcement organizations.

   o *Rationalize funding for Security Cooperation activities.* Congress and the administration should conduct a comprehensive review of the complex "patchwork" of mechanisms it uses to fund counter-proliferation, counter-terrorism, counter-narcotics, and international law enforcement programs. Congress should consider combining many of these programs under a few broad funding categories intended to support foreign partners in developing "core foundational capabilities" that allow them to fight multiple aspects of strategic crime simultaneously. Under this scheme, Congress would determine how much it is willing to allocate to each functional area, and the interagency working groups would submit a detailed proposal on how they would apportion that funding among departmental programs in an integrated manner. The following are proposed funding categories for foreign Security Cooperation:

     ▪ Foreign Border Security
     ▪ Civil Law Enforcement
     ▪ General Purpose Military Forces (including Peacekeeping)
     ▪ Special Purpose Forces (civil and military)
     ▪ Multinational Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence (C4I) (including Air and Maritime Surveillance)
     ▪ Crisis Response and Consequence Management
     ▪ CBRN Materials Security[154]
     ▪ Foreign Public Health.

---

[154] This would encompass traditional Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) activities to assist foreign nations in securing their CBRN materials, but capability-building programs would be funded through one of the other funding categories listed above.

V. Conclusion

The global struggle against terrorism and other non-state threats requires us to develop new strategies, new relationships, and new capabilities. Central to success in this struggle is finding ways to deepen and broaden international cooperation, both as a central tactic in fighting our adversaries and as a way to generate the power, resources, and sustainability such a struggle will require. U.S. leadership is critical in developing the kind of international cooperation that is necessary. That leadership is on display in both Iraq and Afghanistan, but it will take more than offensive military operations against rogue states to defeat strategic criminals. U.S. leadership is also required to build a powerful, flexible, and adaptable international network united in the fight against our common adversaries. This work is, by its nature, defensive, anticipatory, and preparatory, and complements the more offensive aspects of our strategy.

The U.S. need not, and should not, bear the entire burden of fighting strategic crime around the world. In order to share that burden more equitably, however, we must focus our resources on equipping our partners to fulfill their responsibilities. This means, principally, providing assistance and incentives to our partners to develop the "core foundational capabilities" they need to identify threats, to protect themselves, to share information and intelligence with us and other partners, and to take part in collective efforts to defeat strategic criminals.

The USG already has many programs dedicated to these tasks. The overall U.S. effort, however, is much less effective and efficient than it should be. Our energies are diluted by a hierarchical and program-driven approach that attempts to attack various non-state threats separately through programs controlled by policy "fiefdoms."[155] In order to overcome this problem, the executive branch must develop the doctrine, organization, and procedures to bring interagency players together to develop integrated strategies for foreign security assistance to accomplish common strategic goals. Additionally, Congress must seriously reexamine the way that funds foreign assistance projects, with the aim of rationalizing and streamlining the system.

DOD Security Cooperation offers a model for an interagency process that would translate national strategic objectives into program-level plans and activities.   The development of such an interagency process does not require any major reorganization. It merely requires the development of a common conceptual framework, or doctrine, with the associated policies, procedures, and organization to implement that doctrine. The result, if successful, will be the creation of a policy execution network linking and leveraging the complementary programs of the interagency. This kind of network is essential in fighting the networked threats of terrorism, narcotics trafficking, WMD proliferation, and transnational organized crime. If the U.S is to be successful in leading an international coalition, or network, against terrorists and other strategic criminals, it must model a network structure within its own government as an example for our partners to emulate.

---

[155] Campbell and Flournoy, *To Prevail*, 158.

Just as the creation of an international network of friendly states allied in the fight against strategic crime requires U.S. leadership, the creation of such a network within our own government requires presidential leadership. Only the President, working through the National Security Council staff, can demand and compel the various USG departments and agencies to sit down, think, and plan together. Our entrenched bureaucratic obstacles to interagency cooperation are essentially a "force multiplier for our enemies."[156]   The American people deserve -- and the times require -- that the entire U.S. government work together to defeat the forces that threaten our security and that of our friends and allies.

---

[156] John P. Sullivan, "Networked Force Structure and C4I," in Bunker, *Non-State Threats*, 149.

Annex A. Outline of a Presidential Directive on Security Cooperation

Subject: U.S. Government Security Cooperation Activities

Introduction

- The United States and its allies and partners are engaged in a struggle against a variety of networked transnational criminals, including terrorists, narcotics smugglers, and proliferators of WMD-related materials.
- Cooperation with foreign allies and partners is critical to success in this struggle. We must focus on broadening and deepening cooperation with our more advanced partners by promoting information sharing, collective decision making, and the capacity for combined action. Cooperation with our less-advanced partners must focus on building their capabilities to defend themselves and undertake national, regional, and global security tasks.
- Improving international cooperation and building the capabilities of partners and allies demand that the U.S. government apply all the elements of national power in an integrated, synchronized and synergistic manner.

Definition

- This directive establishes a Security Cooperation Activities policy for the Executive Branch, with the aim of promoting integrated interagency planning and program execution among all departments and agencies involved in providing security related assistance to foreign allies and partners.

    o Security Cooperation refers to all USG assistance provided to foreign law enforcement, security, and defense establishments in support of national defense, security, and foreign policy objectives.

- The U.S. government will focus its assistance efforts on improving the abilities of foreign partners and allies to cooperate with the U.S. and contribute to the combined struggle against terrorism, the proliferation and illegal use of WMD-related chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) materials, narcotics smuggling, arms smuggling, and trafficking in persons. Due to limited resources, our programs will seek to develop core foundational capabilities that will allow our partners to confront several of these challenges simultaneously. These capabilities fall into the following broad categories:

    o Border Security
    o Law Enforcement
    o General Purpose Military Forces
    o Military and Civilian Special Operations Forces
    o Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance

- o Multinational Information Systems
- o Crisis Response and Consequence Management

Organization

- The National Security Council (NSC) will oversee an integrated planning effort led by appointed executive branch departments and agencies with the aim of developing and implementing integrated interagency plans for improving allied and partner capabilities in the categories listed above. Lead departments or agencies will be responsible for organizing interagency working groups for planning and program execution. Supporting agencies and departments will cooperate with the lead agencies in developing integrated plans and by implementing their programs in accordance with NSC approved guidance and instructions.

- The following is an initial list of capabilities categories with lead and supporting agencies:

  - o Border Security
    - ▪ Lead: DOS
    - ▪ Supporting: DOD, DHS, DOE, Commerce
  - o Law Enforcement
    - ▪ Lead: DOS
    - ▪ Supporting: FBI, DEI, DOD, DHS, Treasury
  - o General Purpose Military Forces
    - ▪ Lead: DOD
    - ▪ Supporting: DOS
  - o Military and Civilian Special Operations Forces
    - ▪ Lead: DOD
    - ▪ Supporting: DOS, CIA, DEA, Treasury
  - o Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance
    - ▪ Lead: Director for National Intelligence
    - ▪ Supporting: CIA, DOD, FBI, DOS
  - o Multinational Information Systems
    - ▪ Lead: DOD
    - ▪ Supporting: DOS, DHS, FEMA
  - o Crisis Response and Consequence Management
    - ▪ Lead: DOS
    - ▪ Supporting: FEMA, DOD, DHS, DOE, USAID

Process[157]

- The NSC staff will oversee the development of multi-year interagency action plans for each of the capabilities categories listed above. The process will follow an annual

---

[157] As noted above, this is adapted from Campbell and Flournoy, *To Prevail*, 118.

calendar, timed to provide detailed budget requests to Congress for funding to support Security Cooperation activities included in the plans. The following are the major elements of this planning process:

- o *Security Cooperation Guidance.* The NSC will issue annual Security Cooperation Guidance to update and clarify presidential strategic objectives and priorities.

- o *Strategy Review.* Departments and agencies, under NSC guidance, will conduct a broad review of U.S. strategic requirements and priorities. This will be based on a thorough intelligence review by the Intelligence Community and a foreign policy review by the Department of State.

- o *Security Cooperation Strategies.* Departments and agencies, under the direction of the lead agency for each working group, develop plans for using U.S. Government resources to accomplish Security Cooperation objectives in an integrated, synchronized, and synergistic manner. This will include identifying and prioritizing target capabilities by region and country, identifying shortfalls, and developing strategies to overcome them.

- o *Action Plans.* Each interagency Working Group will submit a multi-year interagency action plan to the NSC for the President's signature, in time to form the basis of the annual budget request to Congress.

- o *Annual Program and Budget Review.* At the end of the year, before the beginning of the next planning cycle, the NSC will oversee an annual program and budget review to ensure that agencies' and departments' programs were implemented in light of the approved guidance and plans.

- Each interagency Working Group will conduct capabilities and/or program assessments as necessary to form the basis of ongoing planning, programming, and budgeting activities. The purposes of these assessments are to determine the effectiveness of programs and to update country and regional priorities.