# INFORMING THE BLUE HELMETS

# INFORMING THE BLUE HELMETS:
## THE UNITED STATES,
## UN PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS, AND
## THE ROLE OF INTELLIGENCE

Robert E. Rehbein

# The Martello Papers

The Queen's University Centre for International Relations (QCIR) is pleased to present the sixteenth in its series of security studies, the *Martello Papers*. Taking their name from the distinctive towers built during the nineteenth century to defend Kingston, Ontario, these papers cover a wide range of topics and issues relevant to international strategic relations of today.

Over the past several years, as peacekeeping activity has become more substantial in Europe and the Americas, the Centre has devoted increasing attention to it. The experience of peacekeepers in complex post-Cold War conflicts has underlined the importance of intelligence capabilities in peacekeeping. Given the dearth of in-house intelligence resources in the United Nations system, it is frequently assumed that peacekeepers must rely to a considerable extent on national intelligence gathering capabilities, and notably those of the United States. This *Martello Paper*, by Robert Rehbein of the United States Air Force, addresses the question of US intelligence support for UN peace operations. It is a timely and valuable contribution to the analytical discussion of post-Cold War peacekeeping. We are particularly grateful to the United States Air Force for posting Major Rehbein to our Centre as a Visiting Defence Fellow.

The QCIR engages in scholarly research and teaching on various aspects of international relations, with a particular emphasis on national and international security policies. Working in conjunction with the Royal Military College of Canada, the QCIR also sponsors an active program of guest lectures and seminars. The work of the Centre is supported by a generous grant from the Security and Defence Forum of the Department of National Defence.

We are fortunate to have the advantage of the technical skills of Valerie Jarus and Marilyn Banting in producing the *Martello Papers*.

S. Neil MacFarlane,
Director, QCIR

# *Contents*

# *Acknowledgements*

The greatest thanks in writing such a lengthy research report go to those who endured the greatest sacrifices during the long arduous days and nights of writing, rewriting, and tinkering. I am most grateful for the patience and good humour shown by my wife Suzanne and my children Sean and Anna in putting up with my long absences and dark obsession with this *Martello Paper*.

Thanks also go to the US Air Force for sending me to this one-year sabbatical at Queens University after four long years at the Pentagon. As always, just when you're about to throw in the towel, a plum assignment like this turns up. Dr. Joel Sokolsky aided greatly in reviewing what I thought would be the final draft and I hope that some of his excellent writing style has rubbed off here.

Of course, the opinions expressed in the paper are mine alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of the US Air Force, the Department of Defense, or the US government.

<div align="right">

Robert E. Rehbein
1996

</div>

# *Introduction*

Fifty years ago, the victors of the Second World War met in San Francisco. They faced crossroads between peace and war, between new and old ways of thinking; yet, they were hopefully optimistic that they could diverge onto the path less taken, a path that would, in the words of the preamble to the United Nations Charter, "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind."[1]

Whatever high hopes the Allied nations had in creating an international structure able to meet those lofty goals were soon dashed by the Cold War. Instead of a fully capable diplomatic and military mechanism to halt, if not prevent, haemorrhaging inter-state conflict, the interim bandage fix became peacekeeping. Sometimes the bandage worked, sometimes it failed to stop the bleeding, and other times it could only slow down the bloodshed without addressing the root causes of conflict.

Today, in the post-Cold War world when the barriers to truly effective peacekeeping and other UN peace operations (e.g., humanitarian relief and peace enforcement operations) should have fallen like the Berlin Wall, the fiascoes in Somalia and Bosnia overshadow the successes in Namibia and El Salvador. As a result, many are advocating the abandonment of UN peace operations as an institution, peacekeeping, peace enforcement, etc. as concepts. While they are not panaceas, many of their failures lie not in the *concept* of UN peace operations per se, but in their uneven practice, in the reluctance of the belligerents to strive for peace, and in the inadequate support from the member states of the United Nations.

## Argument

It is to the latter area that this paper concerns itself. In the past, member states have failed to give United Nations peace operations (UNPO) adequate financial

support, strong unwavering political backing, and the full resources at their disposal. This paper asks if the United States has, can, and will provide its full resources, specifically intelligence, to UNPOs.

On the surface, intelligence support to peace operations — particularly from the recognized leader in the field of espionage — *appears* to be a resource which can make or break an operation. Conversely, failure to provide such support leads one to recall the admonishment from Rabbi Hillel the Elder: "[I]f I am only for myself, what am I? If not now, then when? If not me, then who?" Thus in *this* perspective, American intelligence can and must be made a supporting player in all ongoing and future UNPOs.

This argument has two components: moral and practical. From the moral side, one can argue that if one is aware of crimes against humanity or serious violations of international law, yet does nothing about it, one becomes an accomplice to the activity. In this viewpoint, there are three levels of such "sins of omission": no response, inadequate response, and silence in the face of evil. For example, to stand by and watch the unfolding horrors in Rwanda and do nothing is unforgivable. To go about remedying the symptoms of ethnic hatred in a half-hearted manner is almost as "sinful." A lesser but nevertheless still serious category of "mortal sin" would be to know what is going on, but not to pass that information on to those who are actually doing something and coming to the aid and assistance of others. Faced with a moral choice, individuals and nations must therefore inform others of wrongdoings and dangers.

Descending to a less lofty plane of pragmatism, there seem to be several practical reasons for the United States to provide intelligence to UNPOs. Not only does the US have the resources, but, given its humbling run-in with the Somali militias, it may find that intelligence might be one of the few assets that the United States can contribute without endangering American combat troops in a high-risk, low-gain operation. Furthermore, as the United Nations becomes embroiled in increasingly violent intra-state conflicts or those with a very wide mandate (or both, as in the case of Cambodia), its needs for intelligence for pre-deployment planning and for the security of UN personnel grow. Without a formal intelligence apparatus of its own, the United Nations must then turn to member states for assistance. The obvious "fit" between what the United Nations needs and what the United States can provide appears to be perfect for intelligence.

## Counter-Argument

This at least was the initial position when I started to research this paper. Not only was American intelligence support to UNPOs the "right thing to do," it seemed to make a great deal of practical sense. All that needed to be done was to find the right types of computer and communications' devices to hook UN headquarters and field commanders to the massive US intelligence network, waive some of the

annoying and overdone security classification rules, and "hey, presto!" it would work.

Unfortunately, this is not the case. It is not simply secrecy that limits or prevents such laudable intelligence support. In fact, secrecy is only a minor factor. The key question which must be asked is not could or would the United States provide intelligence, it is whether it *should*. For its part, the United Nations must ask itself whether *it* should accept such products and services. The answer many times is "no" or at most a qualified "maybe."

Although the United Nations has yawning gaps in intelligence gathering and analysis while the United States has a prodigious global intelligence system, there are numerous problems with this "fit," problems which sharply constrict both the intelligence producer and intelligence consumer from sharing and using this information. Intelligence support will not be impossible, just difficult. These problems essentially lie with the mismatch between the American intelligence system on the one hand and the United Nations and UNPOs on the other. Frequently, these two sides of the equation are at odds with one another and *only* when they converge — or at least share enough of a common goal to temporarily set aside differences — can one expect to see national intelligence successfully supporting a UNPO.

In a nutshell, national intelligence has intrinsic weaknesses which hamper both the quality and the applicability of its information to UNPOs. Not only has American intelligence frequently failed its own master, its systemic weaknesses will be increasingly strained when intelligence is provided to a nontraditional consumer operating in nontraditional operations in a nontraditional setting, namely the United Nations in peace operations in the Third World. Additionally, the United Nations typically does not see itself as a collector or user of espionage products. More importantly, the organization has a fundamentally different attitude toward intelligence (or in UN parlance "military information") — particularly in operations — which places it at odds with traditional state views toward such products and services. Finally, UNPOs strive for impartiality, if not always neutrality, at all costs making the collection and use of intelligence problematic. This impartiality/neutrality requirement further limits the extent of foreign intelligence sharing, gathering, analysis, and reporting. Fortunately in UNPOs there are several historical alternatives other than intelligence to gather information, each with its own strengths and limitations. *Only* when all these methods have been tried and failed, should the UN turn to the United States — and by extrapolation other member states — for intelligence support.

In the end, however, intelligence, like peace operations, is not a panacea for deeper systemic problems. In UNPOs, knowledge is not power if there are neither sufficient resources nor the will of both the member states and the belligerents to use that knowledge to achieve a lasting peace. Only when the latter areas are adequate will information and intelligence emerge as a substantive factor. Whether UNPO forces use information gathered by ground observers or intelligence

gathered by American satellites, intelligence will only rarely play a major role in the success of an operation.

## Scope and Research Limitations

With the few exceptions noted below, this paper examines all past and current United Nations peace operations, looking for those in which intelligence — or barring that, information — was a noted aspect. It incorporates the opinions and commentaries from a very wide range of scholars, intelligence experts and military officers on UN affairs and intelligence (usually commenting on one of the topics, but only occasionally on both). It also incorporates responses to a series of questions on the subject posed to the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), the US Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), American military services, Canada's National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ), and several international peacekeeping training centres. On a more personal note, the author has also included his impressions from more than a decade in the military intelligence profession, especially from his last posting as the Operations Officer, Directorate of Intelligence, Headquarters Combined Task Force, Operation Provide Comfort. There the author saw firsthand the difficulties involved in providing intelligence to a multinational, quasi-UN-sanctioned peacekeeping operation operating in Kurdish-controlled northern Iraq.

In such a broad study, there are the inevitable shortfalls in research, though they are hopefully largely shortfalls in data rather than in logic or presentation. In the paper — for reasons discussed below — there are three crucial assumptions: (i) the limited data on the role of US intelligence in a wide variety of past non-UN peacekeeping/UN peace enforcement operations can still shed some light on how the United States sees intelligence being used in UNPOs in general; (ii) intrinsic problems within intelligence and how the United States has applied that information in war-fighting coalitions will affect the adequacy and applicability of future intelligence support to UNPOs; and, (iii) certain lessons learned and constraints in traditional UN information gathering (e.g., ground observation, aerial surveillance) are applicable to intelligence in an UN operation.

Given the shadowy nature of intelligence and the normal reluctance of the intelligence community and the UN to fully discuss how, or if, an intelligence relationship exists and operates, some facts are simply unavailable. This has two implications: an agency may refuse to make any comment whatsoever, choose not to provide an official response, or not provide full answers to my questions (as did the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Canada's NDHQ and DIA respectively). Secondly, since the author is an American military officer, this research paper has been vetted through the DoD to ensure no classified material is revealed, regardless of whether that information came from the author's own

recollections or from unclassified writings of journalists and scholars. Hopefully, the absence of any excised portions will not weaken the thrust of the argument.

Other data shortfalls include: little to no use of Congressional committee reports, a heavy reliance on secondary sources — especially a book edited by William Durch — for reports on past UNPOs, little to no data on four UN operations (UN India-Pakistan Observation Mission (UNIPOM), UN Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL), UN Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG), and UN Observation Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL)), and not utilizing the numerous reports and theses on the subject written by American military officers over the past several years.[2]

Finally, there may be an unconscious bias toward the efficacy of intelligence in general, and American military intelligence in particular. Not only does the paper deal exclusively with American intelligence at the expense of the intelligence agencies of the other permanent members of the UN Security Council, it may betray an overconfident belief that the UN really wants American intelligence and that the American intelligence community could easily provide that support.

As mentioned above, the paper will ask whether the United States should provide intelligence to UNPOs and whether the United Nations should accept such products and services. To make an effective argument however, one must back up several steps to understand the constraints each party to this Faustian bargain is under. To understand the "should," the "why," the "would," and the "could" must be answered first.[3]

The paper is therefore composed of several chapters. Chapter 1 asks the question "Will there be future UNPOs?" while Chapter 2 asks "What role will the US play in these future operations (to include intelligence support)?"; these answer the "why" and the "would" questions respectively. The following chapter looks at both the capabilities and the inadequacies of the American intelligence system, a system upon which many have placed their hopes. Chapter 3 thus answers the "could" question.

From there on, the paper addresses the "should" issue. Chapter 4 asks "Does US intelligence and UN peacekeeping mix well?" As mentioned above, the answer to this question is usually "no" or at most a qualified "maybe." Rather than close the discussion on a pessimistic note, the final three chapters examine intelligence alternatives, guidelines, and the utility of intelligence in a UN peace operation. Specifically, assuming that there are *at least some* instances where intelligence support is needed, Chapter 5 looks first at alternative methods of information gathering and establishes a typology of when these alternatives and foreign intelligence support would be most useful. The penultimate chapter develops ground rules for information gathering — whether openly collected or espionage — and establishes constraints for the collection and use of intelligence specifically. The final chapter concludes on whether in the long run intelligence and information will make a substantial difference in the success of UNPOs.

## Notes

1.  *Charter of the United Nations and Statue of the International Court of Justice* (New York: United Nations Department of Public Information, April 1994), p. 1.

2.  Oddly enough, being at a private university, much less one in Canada, the author has been unable to convince the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to send him numerous unclassified reports and theses written by American military intelligence officers attending post-graduate and professional military schools.

3.  Access to DTIC materials could have helped in addressing the "how."

# 1. *Future United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*

This question is obviously the most important to answer. If, after the string of disasters in Angola, Somalia, Bosnia, and Rwanda, the United Nations and/or a host of crucial peacekeeping contributing states (e.g., Canada) and UN Security Council member states sour on the whole concept of peacekeeping, then peacekeeping's tenuous, if long life, will be cut short. The question of intelligence support to UNPOs will then become moot.

## Problems With Traditional Peacekeeping

Certainly traditional peacekeeping operations (PKO), characterized by its force's neutrality, acceptance by the belligerents to both the PKO troop presence and to an eventual peace, and having only a limited suite of weaponry and personnel, has sometimes been suspected as being ineffective, inefficient or incompetent. Several authors have pointed to failures in the UN itself and advocate using regional or multinational approaches to peacekeeping. However, their critics in turn argue that there is not much to be gained and much to be lost by such a move.[1] For instance, Paul Diehl has commented that

> [r]egional and multinational peacekeeping operations have the potential to succeed or fail for many of the same reasons that UN operations do ... Yet they also carry with them some unique risks and problems that make their applicability much more limited ... Analysis of most prominently suggested substitutes for UN peacekeeping arrangements reveals that the current system is among the best available. Certainly, the conclusion that other alternatives can systematically substitute or replace UN operations is unfounded.[2]

Other, more recent commentators have gone a step further and suggest that peacekeeping itself is a failed concept, although upon closer reading much of this

criticism revolves around failures in misapplying peacekeeping tools or failures in those who apply the tools themselves rather than a failure in peacekeeping itself.[3]

Like intelligence, when peacekeeping works, it is faintly praised, but when it fails, it is usually roundly and vociferously damned. It tends to be a frustrating experience either way for forces geared for battle and action, not for watching and reporting. Even a old peacekeeping hand such as Sir Brian Urquhart would comment that "[t]here have been times where the peacekeeping function was more like that of an attendant in a lunatic asylum, and the soldiers had to accept abuse and harassment without getting into physical conflict or emotional involvement with the inmates."[4]

Taking his metaphor further, peacekeeping forces have typically played less of an aggressive military role and more of a dispassionate policing or warden role, using moral persuasion rather than threats or force to cajole and convince the belligerents to back away from another "mental breakdown."

Ultimately what makes traditional peacekeeping work when it does is when it gives "the inmates in the asylum" sufficient breathing space and time to cure themselves, to arrange for a mutually acceptable peace. In this sense, a full and lasting peace will only come about if the belligerents themselves truly seek peace. It cannot be forced from without. Alan James called the short- and long-term effects of PKOs:

> a derivative function, in the sense that it is dependent on the will of the parties towards peace. If one or both of them are bent on war, the peacekeeping body will not offer a serious obstruction, having neither the mandate nor the resources to do so. What it does provide a barrier against, however, is an unwanted war.[5]

And, despite the chequered past of peacekeeping, despite the occasional "escapes from the asylum," there have been notable successes in preventing outbreaks of unwanted wars.

In addition to being successful, peacekeeping, especially when compared against the costs of wars, unwanted or otherwise, has also proven to be a bargain over the long run. Commentators from Michael Renner, William Durch, and Sir Brian Urquhart are among the many who quote the infinitesimally small fraction of monies spent on peacekeeping as compared to the enormous amount of money spent on wars and preparing for wars.[6] All the same, peacekeeping still requires money and as William Durch put it "[p]eacekeeping is much cheaper than warfare, but it isn't free."[7] While peacekeeping is neither "a kind of expensive luxury [nor] big money,"[8] financing such operations has been a continual problem for the United Nations. In the second edition of *An Agenda for Peace*, the seemingly discouraged UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali wrote:

> [t]he financial crisis is particularly debilitating as regards peace-keeping. The shortage of funds, in particular for reconnaissance and planning, for the start-up of operations and for the recruitment and training of personnel imposes severe constraints on the Organization's ability to deploy, with the desired speed, newly approved operations.[9]

Having to go begging hat in hand, the United Nations is an international Blanche DuBois, forced to rely upon the kindness of strangers. While member states have demanded greater efficiencies in UN operations, they have been unwilling to pay their allotted share or expect a quick and dramatic return on their peacekeeping expenditures, returns that, even if PKOs are expertly run, take many years to bring in a "profit."

## Problems With Newer Types of UN Peace Operations

Aside from constant money problems, making matters more difficult for the United Nations and for peacekeeping in general has been the surge in numbers and types of peacekeeping operations in the immediate post-Cold War era. Peacekeeping has of late become an umbrella term for numerous and sometimes unrelated operations, from "peace building," "peace enforcement," and "peace establishment" to "peace-making" and "peace restoration."[10] In overextending itself, in grasping for what it cannot reach, by becoming a catch-all, peacekeeping has lost its intellectual coherence. The very concept itself becomes tainted with the failures of these new peace missions. Thus, failures in any of these new missions cause already sceptical critics to unfairly cast doubt upon both the UN and peace operations.

The most famous of these failures is of course peace enforcement, particularly in intra-state conflict. Peace enforcement is not new to the United Nations, either in its inter-state variety (the Korean War and Persian Gulf War)[11] or its intra-state variety (the Congo operation from 1960 to 1964 and the UN Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II)). Peace enforcement by any other name is internationally sanctioned war; and war, no matter who the actors are or how innocent and pure their motives may be, is a far different animal than traditional peacekeeping. The success rate for such operations is mixed: success in the Persian Gulf, eventual success in the Congo, stalemate in Korea, and abject failure in Somalia (the latter called by several diplomats and UN officials as "the worst UN operation they have ever seen").[12]

Following the American defeat in Vietnam, there arose a cry among the military "No more Vietnams." Similarly, after the defeat of the UN in Somalia, there is the new cry "No more Somalias." It was recently noted that:

> [i]n a sense, the United Nations' experience in Somalia represents a loss of innocence. The operation has left a bitter aftertaste in the Pentagon, at UN Headquarters, in the capitals of the Western countries that sent troops, in world opinion, and, not least, among the Somalis themselves.[13]

There have been a number of explanations for the failure in Somalia, ranging from the UN's weak command and control structure, the absence of an independent international force completely under the UN's control, the inability of an international organization composed of sovereign states to challenge a single state's

sovereignty, to the unwillingness of member states to commit themselves in areas where they have little to no national interest.[14]

But, putting aside for now the earlier question of a bad peace enforcement action making things bad for peacekeeping, does a failure in this latest peace enforcement operation, which started out as a humanitarian intervention operation, invalidate the concept of peace enforcement or of humanitarian intervention? Can the lessons of Somalia be overdrawn to the extent that, instead of learning how to do it correctly, the UN and its member states shy away from doing anything altogether when states implode and degenerate into famine and anarchy? Interestingly enough, the bulk of the recent criticisms regarding peace enforcement operations do not single out the concept of peace enforcement or of humanitarian intervention. Rather what is criticized is the tendency to apply peacekeeping principles, peacekeeping-sized forces and peacekeeping mandates to these far different problems.[15]

Again, it is not the tool which is itself criticized, but it is whether that tool is appropriate for the problem at hand. Admittedly there is a great divide between peacekeeping and humanitarian intervention or peace enforcement that must not be crossed lightly or precipitously. One must never attempt to use peacekeeping forces in a more activist, offensive role. If there is one lesson to be drawn from Somalia, it is that the UN and member states certainly must avoid "mandate creep." Mats Berdal quotes a British military observer on this very point:

> UNOSOM II [has] demonstrated what seems likely to happen in theatre if a peacekeeping force crosses the impartiality divide from peacekeeping to peace enforcement. If perceived to be taking sides, the force loses it legitimacy and credibility as a trustworthy third party, thereby prejudicing its own security ... To cross the impartiality divide is also to cross a Rubicon. Once on the other side, there is very little chance of getting back and the only way out is likely to be by leaving the theatre.[16]

Indeed, to use another metaphor, while peacekeeping operations may at times resemble a hell, they are at worst a purgatory where one always has hope for eventual salvation. On the other hand, blindly stumbling into peace enforcement or humanitarian intervention activities while still operating in the peacekeeping mindframe is akin to entering Dante's hell. In such circumstances, there is no possible hope for salvation and one would be wise to "abandon all hope, ye who enter."

Unfortunately for the Rwandans, hope was abandoned due to fears of another Somalian hell. And sadly for the beleaguered Bosnian Muslims, what little hope they may desperately cling to is likely to be soon snuffed out as continued intransigence on the part of the Bosnian Serbs and callous dithering on the part of the Europeans and the Great Powers ensures that UN troops will continue to be "taunted, exploited, and taken hostage and, from time to time, shot dead."[17] Peace enforcement and humanitarian intervention will never be easy, should never be taken up lightly, nor should it be amateurishly run. Most importantly, it should not give itself the mantle of impartial peacekeeping.[18] In doing so, not only is

peace enforcement doomed to failure, but so is the credibility of the UN to perform any future peace operations. But this still does not mean that humanitarian interventions and peace enforcement operations should never again be attempted. Their failures reflect inadequacies in their facilitation, not in their conception. In the end, peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention, and peace enforcement are equally valid yet separate concepts.

## The Continuing Need For UN Peace Operations

The future will demand more, not less, UN peace missions, especially in the turbulent Third World. The growing crises there, the collapse of artificial states, the rise of unbridled ethnic and tribal hatreds, the return of genocide as an acceptable and unpunished tool of vengeance, famine, demographic surges, diseases like AIDS and the Ebola virus, and even regionwide mental illnesses resemble the coming of the "four horsemen of the apocalypse"[19] and will all demand international attention. Robert Kaplan gravely predicted that:

> West Africa is becoming *the* symbol of worldwide demographic, environmental, and societal stress, in which criminal anarchy emerges as the real "strategic" danger ... West Africa provides an appropriate introduction to the issues ... that will soon confront our civilization ... [T]hose [borders] separating West Africa from the outside world are in various ways becoming more impenetrable. But Afrocentrists are right in one respect: we ignore this dying region at our own risk."[20]

Yet, to borrow a phrase from Steven David's article of the same name, "the Third World still matters."[21]

Wars in far away lands in the end come back to wear away at the UN member states, through refugee movements, increased arms build-ups, and perhaps challenges to democracy itself. In a recent *Foreign Affairs* article, Leslie Gelb wrote:

> the core problem [of the post-Cold War world] is wars of national debilitation, a steady run of uncivil wars sundering fragile but functioning nation-states and gnawing at the well-being of stable nations... [T]he costs of [trivializing]... these wars of national debilitation could prove high... The failure [of the West] to deal adequately with such strife, to do something about mass murder and genocide, corrodes the essence of a democratic society... In sum, democracies have a large practical as well as moral stake in finding reasonable responses to wars of national debilitation.[22]

Nevertheless, despite these threats, they are still as far away from us intellectually and emotionally as they are geographically. While it is easier to engage in preventive diplomacy or peacekeeping, the international community's track record is to delay until pushed to make the hard inevitable choices and then try to fix the problem on the cheap and easy, doing too little too late.

Failure to engage in these UN peace operations may demonstrate a lack of national interest in the area or a lack of trust in the utility of such operations, but

they do not mean that UN peace operations, whether they be termed peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention, or peace enforcement, are *passé*. At the end of the day, as Ingvar Carlsson scolded, we the member states are responsible for the failures of UN peace operations.

> [Criticism about recent UN failures in peacekeeping] is important, but it should be a process informed by the most basic fact about the United Nations — a fact that many governments and most commentators readily forget in their rush to condemn. It is simply that the UN is *us*. It is not a separate entity with a life, will and energies of its own. It is whatever we have given it the ability to be ... [I]t is we who have been a primary cause for the greater part of the UN's shortcomings.[23]

The problem with peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention, or peace enforcement is not in their concepts, but with the deficiencies in member states' will and resources to make those concepts work.

## Notes

1.  It is interesting to note that despite his reservations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali has consistently spoken out for the benefits of regional and multinational peacekeeping to take the load off the UN. See Barbara Crossette, "U.N. Chief Ponders Future of Peacekeepers," *New York Times*, 3 March 1995, p. A3; and Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda For Peace: 1995*, 2d ed. (New York: United Nations, 1995, p. 15. Taking the opposing viewpoint are numerous scholars and activists including Paul F. Diehl, *International Peacekeeping* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993) and "Institutional Alternatives to Traditional UN Peacekeeping: An Assessment of Regional and Multinational Options," *Armed Forces & Society* 19 (Winter 1993):209-30; Alain Destexhe, "The Third Genocide," *Foreign Policy* 97 (Winter 1994-95):3-17; and S. Neil MacFarlane and Thomas G. Weiss, "The United Nations, Regional Organisations and Human Security," *Third World Quarterly* 15 (June 1994):283.

2.  Diehl, "Institutional Alternatives," p. 228.

3.  See Diehl, *International Peacekeeping*, pp. 104-05; Richard K. Betts, "The Delusion of Impartial Intervention," *Foreign Affairs* 73 (November/December 1994):22-24; and Alvin and Heidi Toffler, *War and Anti-War: Survival at the Dawn of the 21st Century* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1993), pp. 210, 227-28.

4.  Sir Brian Urquhart, quoted by Augustus Richard Norton and Thomas George Weiss, *UN Peacekeepers: Soldiers with a Difference*, Headline Series No. 292, (New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1990), p. 4.

5.  Alan James, "The UN Force in Cyprus," *International Affairs* 65 (Summer 1989):500.

6.  See Michael Renner, *Critical Juncture: The Future Of Peacekeeping*, Worldwatch Paper no. 114 (Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, 1993); William J. Durch, "Paying the Tab," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping: Case Studies and Comparative Analysis*, ed. William J. Durch (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 44; and Sir Brian Urquhart, *The Role of the United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post*

*Cold War World*, Young Memorial Lecture 1993 (Kingston, ON: Royal Military College, 1993), p. 3.

7.  Durch, "Introduction," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, pp. 2-3.

8.  Urquhart, *The Role of the United Nations*, p. 9.

9.  Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda For Peace: 1995*, 2d ed. (New York: United Nations, 1995), p. 36.

10. Alex Morrison, "Canada and Peacekeeping: A Time for Reanalysis?" in *Canada's International Security Policy*, ed. David B. Dewitt and David Leyton-Brown (Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall, 1995), p. 210.

11  Admittedly these are not typically held to be UN peace operations, but all the same they were approved and performed under the auspices of the United Nations.

12  Donatella Lorch, "Marines Cover U.N.'s Pullout from Somalia," *New York Times*, 28 February 1995, p. A1. Also see Shawn H. McCormick, "The Lessons of Intervention in Africa," *Current History* 94 (April 1995):162-68; and Matthew Bryden, "Somalia: The Wages of Failure," *Current History* 94 (April 1995):145-51. For a counter-argument that the Somalia mission was not a complete failure, see Chester A. Crocker, "The Lessons of Somalia: Not Everything Went Wrong," *Foreign Affairs* 74 (May/June 1995):2-8.

13. Rafael Moreno and Juan Jose Vega, "Lessons from Somalia," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 23 (May-June 1994):11.

14. See respectively, Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda For Peace: 1995*, p. 28; Michael Mandelbaum, "The Reluctance to Intervene," *Foreign Policy* 95 (Summer 1994):10; Toffler, *War and Anti-War*, pp. 210, 227-28; and Barbara Crossette, "U.N. Chief Ponders Future of Peacekeepers," *New York Times*, 3 March 1995:A3.

15. See Norton and Weiss, *UN Peacekeepers*, pp. 36-37; Charles Dobbie, "A Concept for Post-Cold War Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Autumn 1994):121-22; Betts, "The Delusion of Impartial Intervention," p. 28; and Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda For Peace: 1995*, pp. 15-16. For a more darkly pessimistic view of the efficacy and desirability of humanitarian intervention and peace enforcement, see Adam Roberts, "Humanitarian War: Military Intervention and Human Rights," *International Affairs* 69 (July 1993):429-49 and Mats R. Berdal, "Fateful Encounter: The United States and UN Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Spring 1994):30-50.

16. Berdal, "Fateful Encounter," p. 43-44.

17. Roger Cohen, "U.N. Chief Orders Review of Peacekeeping Mission in Bosnia," *New York Times*, 13 May 1995, p. A3.

18. Betts, "The Delusion of Impartial Intervention," p.21.

19. See Terrence Lyons, "The Political Lessons of Somalia," *The Brookings Review* 12 (Spring 1994):46; Barbara Crosette, "Mental Illness Found Rising in Poor Nations," *New York Times*, 16 May 1995, p. C9; and Roberts, "Humanitarian War," p. 436.

20. Robert D. Kaplan, "The Coming Anarchy," *Atlantic Monthly* 273 (February 1994):46, 76.

21. Steven R. David, "Why the Third World Still Matters," *International Security* 17 (Winter 1992-1993):127-59.

22.  Leslie H. Gelb, "Quelling the Teacup Wars: The New World's Constant Challenge," *Foreign Affairs* 73 (November/December 1994):5-6.

23.  Ingvar Carlsson, "Roles for the UN in International Security after the Cold War," *Security Dialogue* 26 (March 1995):7.

## 2. *The Role of the United States in Future UNPOs*

Of all the UN member states, the United States has in the past and will in the foreseeable future make or break a peace operation, regardless of whether it deploys its formidable combat forces. Particularly now, as the remaining world superpower, the United States can freely choose to apply or withhold its considerable will and vast resources. Fortunately for the United States, the UN, and the world at large, it appears that Washington will not heed calls for a new isolationism or selective disengagement as many, including the Secretary General, have feared.[1]

Rather, in the words of Secretary of State Warren Christopher, the United States is anything but hesitant about remaining engaged. Writing in a recent issue of *Foreign Policy*, Christopher stated:

> As a global power with global interests, it is the United States that stands to lose the most if we retreat. The post-Cold War momentum toward greater freedom, openness, and tolerance must not be reversed through shortsighted neglect or indifference. Only the United States has the capacity and the vision to consolidate these gains — as long as we remain engaged, and lead.[2]

This is not to say that it can be expected that the United States will play the part of the global policeman alone or that it will apply its will and resources everywhere. The natural limits of resources, let alone national interest, preclude that. Where vital national interests are at stake, as in the Persian Gulf or Western Europe, the United States will be found. Where national interests are neither vital nor imminently obvious, such as in many of the Third World disasters which call out for peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention, etc., the United States could show its concern and lend its assistance through the United Nations and peace operations.[3]

There are several lessons and extrapolations to be drawn from past American experiences in peace operations which may apply in future UN operations. During

the Cold War, and despite the image of the Security Council Permanent 5 states being frozen out of most if not all UNPOs, the United States has certainly been active in the operations' financing, logistical, and at times operational support. While American military personnel were a rarity in UNPOs during this period, the United States routinely provided no-cost airlift and sealift for the deployment and withdrawal of peacekeepers around the world.[4] Although the United States has not had the extensive background in traditional peacekeeping operations as do Canada, the Nordic countries, Bangladesh or Pakistan, past American financial, diplomatic, and at times military support at times have been more crucial to their success. William Durch once remarked that "In 45 years of UN peacekeeping operations, all that have gone forwards have had US support, while others that were stillborn suffered a lack of such support.... Washington can marshall an awesome array of political, military, and financial resources when its governmental machinery is bent on the task."[5]

In the post-Cold War era, when the restriction against using superpowers in UNPOs was largely lifted, this machinery quickly geared itself up. An initial wave of euphoria swept New York and Washington now that the US could bring its full forces to bear on several intractable problems. In this short period of optimism, the United States provided unprecedented levels of manpower and resources to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in the Western Sahara (MINURSO), the United Nations Protection Force in the former Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR), the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH), and, most infamously, UNOSOM II.

It can never be known whether the United States would have become a more active player in current UNPOs if UNOSOM II had been successful. However, there is no mistaking that the debacle in Somalia contributed to strong American public and leadership reluctance to enter into the fray quickly. The most obvious reaction from Washington has been the reduction of the American financial share of the UN peacekeeping budget to 25 percent and the end of free airlift, sealift, and other military goods and services to UN peace forces.[6]

## Constraints on US Role in UNPOs

The cry of "No more Somalias" has affected not only how much money the United States will contribute to UNPOs, but whether and under what circumstances the United States will contribute combat forces. There is a growing hesitancy to deploy American forces, primarily ground troops, in the minds of the administration, Congress, public opinion and the US military. Taken together, the bright hopes of Secretary of State Christopher to remain engaged become increasingly dim until there are few other choices. Before the paper addresses at least one of those choices (i.e., intelligence support in lieu of ground troop support to UNPOs), it is first

necessary to review the constraints and limitations which these domestic actors place on American participation in peace operations.

The most notable set of constraints on the American military to date has been the classified Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 25 which establishes several guidelines on whether to vote in favour of a UNPO and whether to commit the American military to support a UN operation. According to the Department of State's document entitled *The Clinton Administration's Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations* (apparently an unclassified version of PDD 25), the following factors will be considered:

- UN involvement advances U.S. interests...
- [T]here is a threat to breach of international peace and security...
- [T]here are clear objectives and an understanding of where the mission fits...
- [F]or traditional ... peacekeeping operations, a ceasefire should be in place and the consent of the parties obtained before the force is deployed
- [F]or peace enforcement ... operations, the threat to international peace and security is considered significant; the means to accomplish the mission are available ...; the ... consequences of inaction ... are considered unacceptable; the operation's anticipated duration is tied to clear objectives and realistic criteria for ending the operation...
- [T]he risks to American personnel ... are considered acceptable....
- [P]ersonnel, funds, and other resources are available
- U.S. participation is necessary for the operation's success
- [T]he role of U.S. forces is tied to clear objectives and an endpoint for U.S. participation can be identified
- [D]omestic and Congressional support exists or can be marshalled
- [C]ommand and control arrangements are acceptable [i.e. forces can be placed under operational control of a foreign commander, but the greater the anticipated U.S. role, the less likely this will occur]"[7]

While many elements of PDD 25 are realistic defensible criteria, several analysts have sharply criticized the administration for backing away from previous international commitments, from shirking its responsibilities. The comment by Charles Maynes that PDD 25 "adopts criteria so restrictive that they would seem to bar the kind of U.N. force that has successfully monitored the ceasefire on the Golan Heights" typifies these criticisms but is surely overdrawn.[8] When Canada, one of the most active players in peacekeeping operations, adopted somewhat similar constraints in recent white papers, there were no shouts of alarm or cries of foul.[9] PDD 25's criteria are rational and logical guidelines which limit US involvement to where it can be effective. If the United Nations is, as Major General Baril, then the secretary-general's military adviser, once stated, "the inner city emergency room of the world, taking in the patients no one wants to treat,"[10] then PDD 25 is a managed health-care plan, sending scarce resources where they

can cure a problem and keeping them from being needlessly diverted toward the terminally ill and hopelessly insane patients.

However, even with the administration's reasonable limitations on American involvement in UNPOs in place, Congress — particularly one dominated by the opposition Republican party, a party that has initiated a conservative contract with the American public — will place even further restrictions on any future US combat role in these operations. As S. Neil MacFarlane and Thomas G. Weiss have argued "[t]here simply is no political pay-off for Congressional support for the UN."[11] Moreover, the current Congressional leadership is ill at ease with UN collective security mechanisms such as peacekeeping. At times it even expresses a visceral distrust and hostility toward "international civil servants." In the view of Senator Bob Dole, the United Nations — and by inference peacekeeping — will needlessly jeopardize American lives, weaken American sovereignty, and be the worst of all possible worlds. "International organizations — whether the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, or any others," wrote Senator Dole,

> will not protect American interests ... International organizations will, at best, practice policymaking at the lowest common denominator — finding a course that is the least objectionable to the most members ... The choices facing America are not, as some in the administration would like to portray, doing something multilaterally, doing it alone, or doing nothing. These are false choices. The real choice is whether to allow international organizations to call the shots — as in Somalia or Bosnia — or to make multilateral groupings work for American interests — as in Operation Desert Storm.[12]

The current Congressional leadership has already made its move to implement some of the concerns expressed by Senator Dole. Earlier in 1994, the House recently passed HR 7 (the *National Security Revitalization Act*), the defence portion of the Republican "Contract with America" and has passed it over to the Senate. If marshalled through the Senate by Senator Dole and subsequently approved, *and* if Congress can override any possible presidential veto, HR 7 would even more severely limit the United States' role in UNPOs. For example, under HR 7 President Clinton would have to seek Congressional approval to place troops under a foreign UN commander, approval which would probably be difficult, if not impossible, to receive.[13]

Another factor further limiting American combat troop deployments to UNPOs is public opinion. Sympathy for the Somali children dying by the thousands every day was what ultimately motivated President Bush to send forces to that long war-torn famine-ridden country. Yet, although sympathy is "a powerful emotion and a precious one," as Michael Mandelbaum put it, "[w]hether it can — or should — be a decisive motive in the conduct of foreign policy, however, remains doubtful."[14] While American public opinion is frequently moved by the sympathetic plight of Third World refugees and video clips of victims of genocide transmitted daily into our homes by CNN, it has a low tolerance for accepting American troop casualties if there is no strong national interest perceived to be at stake.[15]

In addition, even when vital interests are at stake, the American public prefers a quick clean conflict with easily understood objectives and more easily identifiable villains to caricature. The quick success in the Persian Gulf War only reinforced this latent tendency. Long drawn-out operations in countries most Americans could not find on a map and for which there are no clear "black hats" and "white hats" run counter to the public's tastes and attention span. Michael Mandelbaum stated that:

> In the wake of Vietnam, the American public has come to expect military engagement in other countries to correspond to surgery: The United States diagnoses the problem, performs the appropriate operation — the shorter, cheaper, and cleaner the better — and then moves on. However, state building is more likely to resemble psychiatry: long and frustrating treatment bringing only incremental change, with no obvious or speedy date for termination.[16]

Returning to the asylum metaphor of Sir Urquhart, it is questionable whether the American public will have the patience to seek the patient's long-term recovery or instead opt for the cheap quick fix.

If UN peace operations have no constituency in Congress, they hardly have any strong and deep support in public opinion. Several polls show inconsistency in the American public's backing of UN operations, ranging from "strong support for the United Nations and a sizable degree of willingness to place U.S. troops under a U.N. commander for peacekeeping purposes"[17] to "[t]he peacekeeper role evokes an ambiguous response, but the public strongly rejects the peacemaker [i.e., peace enforcer] role."[18] Additionally, recent polls quoted by John Reilly of the public's and American political leadership's opinions toward the United Nations and support of American foreign policy pursuing humanitarian goals are hardly encouraging.[19] Given that PDD 25 lists public and Congressional support as an important factor in deciding whether to send combat forces into a peacekeeping mission, this polling data, Senator Dole's article in *Foreign Policy*, and the recent Congressional legislation will give the administration a difficult time in selling any future UNPOs.

A final factor restricting the deployment of American ground combat troops is the US military itself. Several issues arise here: the "strategic culture" of the US military, the primary mission of the US armed forces, and training and readiness factors. As with the domestic political constraints noted above, these problem areas do not make use of ground troops impossible, but they do make them more difficult to bring about and use effectively.

As to the first issue, a number of analysts have commented that the US military culture itself is ill-suited for UNPOs, particularly traditional peacekeeping operations, that its strategy of annihilation and preference for an aggressive high-tech fight do not fit with the more inconclusive, inactive nature of traditional peacekeeping.[20] Mats Berdal pointed to this culture clash as a source of the failure in UNOSOM II when he wrote,

The UNOSOM II experiences suggest that the US armed forces may not at present be temperamentally or culturally attuned to the requirements of low-level military operations of the kind required in Somalia and similar operations ... [There is] a distinctive mind-set and approach to low-intensity operations which had been shaped by the American experience during and after Vietnam, and by a deeply entrenched belief in the efficacy of technology and firepower as a means of minimising one's own casualties. It is an approach that was inappropriate to the particular circumstances of Somalia.[21]

However, as with criticism of PDD 25, this notion of a culture clash may be overly exaggerated. There is the strong possibility that US military forces could in fact be acculturated to adopt the less offensive-oriented, more patient approach needed in traditional peacekeeping.[22]

Assuming that the cultural and attitudinal problems are not as serious as believed, or at least can be contained, another problem with using American military forces in UNPKOs revolves around the military's primary mission: high intensity battles against a major regional power. Expending manpower and other resources for a long-term low-intensity peacekeeping operation might not only compromise the military's requirement to meet two simultaneous — or nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts, it may be an inefficient use of such highly-trained soldiers.[23] Others have commented that peacekeeping operations do not play to the strength of US forces, that "the US should play the role of the police SWAT team to the United Nation's cop on the beat."[24] In the final analysis, being able to succeed in peacekeeping operations is only a side benefit of having combat proficient troops, but it is not the purpose or the primary mission of the US military. The current chairman of the joint chief of staff recently came down hard on this matter, arguing that

The profusion of Operations Other Than War [which includes peacekeeping operations] has elicited a stream of ideas about how to restructure or reorient our forces specifically for this purpose. This would be wrong. *We cannot become confused about the fundamental purpose of our armed forces*. That purpose is their readiness to fight and win our nation's wars. No other purpose is as vital to our security. As we reshape and train our forces, it must be for this purpose above all others. (emphasis in the original)[25]

In Shalikashvili's perspective, combat is primary, peacekeeping is ancillary at best.

A final concern which the US military has with regards to peacekeeping is in training and readiness. Given that the mission of the military is to fight, deploying troops into a UNPKO where they may merely act as interpositional forces or see very little fighting directed against themselves quickly degrades their combat skills.[26] Furthermore, spreading one's energies and manpower around in increasingly diverse tasks may make for an organization that can do none of the tasks well. Lt. Col. Eikenberg of the US Army once noted that

Some point out that organizations can only be good at so many things and, as such, we should be cautious about embracing PKOs. Business literature abounds with tales of the pitfalls of rapid product-line diversification by firms that quickly lost their sense of identity and purpose. The analogy is not inappropriate. That participation in peacekeeping operations could have a deleterious impact on the Army's ability to maintain its competitive edge within a very unforgiving world market is beyond doubt.[27]

Combined with budget cutbacks which increase operational tempo, place the deployment burden on fewer shoulders, and offer fewer opportunities for realistic combat training, readiness takes a tremendous hit when forces are asked to perform in nontraditional duties such as peacekeeping and humanitarian relief operations.[28]

## American Intelligence as an Option

Given the constraints above, does that mean that the United States, despite the Clinton administration's desire to remain engaged, must stay at home and never deploy ground forces in UNPOs? Will it be limited to its Cold War policy of writing the checks and occasionally transporting forces and equipment? While the efforts of the current air operations in support of UNPROFOR are commendable, there is still a vast world of difference in degree and quality of an American commitment between ground troops and the more transient air and sea forces. Are there any possible options other than sending ground combat troops overseas? If the bulk of the United States military is generally ill-suited, reluctant and otherwise engaged, what else can the US do? Perhaps one can moderate the caution expressed by Lt. Col. Eikenberg above by seeking out new markets for a proven product rather than expanding into a new product line. Thus the answer may well lie in providing the United Nations with products and services which it needs, for which the United States has a clear advantage, and for which there will be little to no domestic and military restraints. Intelligence support to UNPOs would seem to fit the bill quite nicely.

In this regard, several scholars and military officers agree that there is a bright future for the provision of classified American intelligence products and services to UN forces. For example, Mats Berdal has stressed that the United States should focus on improving the flow and processing of intelligence to the United Nations.[29] Others have argued that rather than attempt to dilute and misuse American combat forces in an operation which plays upon their weaknesses, it would be prudent for the United States to play to its strengths, one of them being intelligence. In this perspective, intelligence is seen as equal to other better known American military capabilities such as strategic airlift and sealift, communications satellites, and carrier and land-based aviation.[30]

Until fairly recently, the very notion that American intelligence would flow to the United Nations would have been considered ludicrous in US military circles. Nowadays it has evoked a great deal of interest at all levels. Senior officers and civilians in the intelligence community have been deeply involved in examining the prospects of serving this new consumer. Intelligence support to peacekeeping (or at least to OOTW of which peacekeeping is a part) has been the main agenda item both for a recent Senior Military Intelligence Officer Conference[31] and a symposium at CIA entitled "Oracle Blue."[32] Joint and US Army doctrine have recently been developed on peacekeeping operations, both of which discuss intelligence support in great detail.[33]

Courses on the subject are also being taught at a number of American military intelligence schools, from a three-day course entitled "Intelligence and Peace Operations" at the Joint Military Intelligence Training Center to an elective course at the master's level entitled "Enhancing the United Nations: Intelligence Issues" taught at the Joint Military Intelligence College (JMIC), both in Washington, DC.[34] In a departure from past practice, second lieutenants undergoing initial intelligence officer training at Goodfellow AFB in Texas are now formally instructed on the provision of intelligence to UN peacekeeping operations.[35] The number of theses and research reports on the subject written by military officers attending professional military schools has skyrocketed and in fact graduate students at the JMIC have had to be dissuaded from adding to what appears to be a glut of reports.[36] Even the Clinton administration and Congress have gotten involved, the former offering to share intelligence with the United Nations as long as it is reimbursed and security precautions are taken while the latter, departing from its harsh and restrictive language in HR 7, is relatively amenable to providing UN PKOs with intelligence (as long as there is adequate security to protect sources and methods).[37]

And it is not just the Americans who are actively pursuing the topic. For example, Canada's Lester B. Pearson Peacekeeping Training Centre in Nova Scotia is currently considering establishing a two-week course on intelligence support to peacekeeping operations. If and when a working group of outside experts in the field determine whether there is enough material to develop a curriculum, if the Centre determines there is a need for such a course, and if money is available from the Canadian government, a course will be established. If the course is held, it will be a first of its kind for an international peacekeeping centre and will be a quantum change from the low-key "low-tech" observation and reporting training held at other international peacekeeping training centres. A good example of this current "low-tech" approach to information/intelligence would be the Finnish UN Training Centre, where students are taught the main features of the armies and the equipment needed in the areas where they will deploy, the English vocabulary related to the equipment, and the reporting procedures.[38]

If this trend continues, it will mark a major sea change in the concept of intelligence, from a carefully guarded national asset to just another product or service

which the United States and other nations can provide. Much as the American strategic airlift offered to past UN operations, intelligence support would soon become a commodity to be traded (albeit to a select group of customers). Hugh Smith had an interesting thought when he wrote of the possibility of intelligence support to the UN as being a money-maker for organizations facing budget cuts.

> These [national intelligence] organisations ... are ... facing the challenge of diminishing resources [with] cuts in intelligence as part of the peace dividend. One consequence may well be less support for the UN, but an alternative response could be a search for new roles. Support for UN peacekeeping might prove an attractive budget-enhancing, or at least, budget-protecting option for national intelligence organisations.[39]

And if the administration has its way it can begin cheerfully charging for services rendered for the cause of peace.[40]

From the UN's perspective, it would like these services, although charging for intelligence may force a "broke" United Nations to drive a hard bargain, settle for less or go without. From all reports, the United Nations, which has traditionally avoided being tainted with the very notion of intelligence, is increasingly interested in acquiring such information from member states.

Boutros Boutros-Ghali in the first edition of *An Agenda for Peace* called upon member states to "provide the Secretary General with detailed information on issues of concern ... needed for effective preventive diplomacy."[41] In two separate statements subsequent to the *Agenda for Peace*'s publication, the president of the UN Security Council repeated the secretary general's request that

> The Council therefore invites ... regional arrangements and organizations to study ... ways and means to improve coordination of their efforts with that of the United Nations ... [to] include, in particular, exchange of information and consultations with the Secretary-General, or where appropriate, his special representative, with a view to enhancing the United Nations capability including monitoring and early warning.[42]

and invited "[m]ember States to provide the Secretary-General with relevant detailed information on situations of tension and potential crisis."[43] Even the General Assembly, where one would have thought Third World sensitivity to the very nature of intelligence would have made the issue a political hot potato, joined in the chorus for member states to pass intelligence information to the secretary general.[44] Not only has the United Nations been willing to accept offers from member states for intelligence, but as will be discussed below, it has made an active effort to curry such support.[45] And, in the most optimistic note sounded so far, the then chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator David Boren, raised the distinct possibility that by gaining access to US intelligence, the United Nations would "eventually become the truly international force that President Truman envisioned at the inception of the world organization."[46]

## Areas Where US Intelligence May Help UNPOs

In the realm of future UN peace operations, there are five areas where it *appears* that US intelligence can assist and bolster the UN's underdeveloped information collection and analysis mechanisms. First and foremost, it can provide an indications and warning capability before conflicts begin or get too far out of hand. Ingvar Carlsson noted that in addition to the UN developing its own early warning system, "governments with extensive information-gathering capacities should share with the UN information on trends with the potential to cause conflicts or tragedies."[47] Second, once a decision is made to send peacekeeping forces to a country or region, intelligence can assist in pre-deployment planning to select the location of UN field headquarters, access to major transportation routes, status of the belligerents' forces, terrain, etc. In fact, knowledge of where a military force is going to operate was recognized centuries ago by Sun Tzu:

> Generally, the commander must thoroughly acquaint himself beforehand with the maps so that he knows dangerous places for chariots and carts, where the water is too deep for wagons; passes in famous mountains ... [and] the size of cities and towns ... [A]ll these facts the general must store in his mind; only then will he not lose the advantage on the ground.[48]

Interestingly enough, inadequacies in having sufficient information for predeployment planning has frequently been acknowledged as one of the United Nation's central weaknesses, a weakness that could be overcome by US intelligence support.[49]

The third area where intelligence may play a role will be the security of the UN force. Once UNPKO forces arrive in country and until the day the last soldier leaves, it is fundamentally necessary that the forces be secure from attack. Obviously if the UN force were engaged in a peace enforcement operation or were in a situation where anarchy prevailed, this requirement would be paramount, but even in a traditional peacekeeping setting, situational awareness of what the hostile parties might do to one's force, either deliberately or accidentally, is every commander's key responsibility.

Fourth, UN forces monitoring ceasefires and disengagement agreements, particularly over large areas of land, may be well served by American intelligence acting as a supplement to their ground and air-based observation missions. Such information will help the forces do their job more effectively and efficiently. As Peter Jones remarked: "[t]he greater the ability of the peacekeepers to detect what is going on around them, the greater their ability to take actions designed to prevent activities in an area from getting out of control."[50] Intelligence information could also be used to shame those belligerents who are cheating the ceasefire to abide by the accords.[51] Finally, if a peacekeeping operation turns sour and slides into the realm of peace enforcement and needs to retreat under fire (such as in Somalia during the pull-out of the remaining 2,500 Pakistani and Bangladeshi

troops from Mogadishu where American photo reconnaissance played a small role, or if a bona fide humanitarian intervention/peace enforcement operation takes offensive action against one or more of the local parties, extensive intelligence information could prove useful in determining status, locations, and intentions of the hostile belligerents.

## Case Studies of Past US Intelligence Support

In the past and up to today, the US has occasionally assisted in at least some of these five areas. The few documented instances where there has been American intelligence support to UN peace operations have generally been successful.[52] However, there is a major problem with evidence. For the cases where there is good documentation, all of them are fundamentally different from each other. Conversely, in several other cases which are similar, there is very little documentation.

Specifically, there is in fact only one well-documented case where American intelligence support has been provided to a UNPO: UNOSOM II. Intelligence support to the UN Special Commission (UNSCOM) has been quite extensive and backed up with good evidence, but it does not fit the normal pattern of any previous UN operation. Finally, while not a UN peacekeeping mission controlled by the UN, the Sinai mission received a great degree of US intelligence assistance.

On the other hand, while there have been sketchy reports of support to the UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), UNPROFOR, UN Assistance Mission in Rwanda (UNAMIR) and the UN Mission in Haiti (UNMIH), for the most part all that is revealed is that intelligence has been supplied, not what the nature, scope, and constraints of such intelligence support were.[53] Falling somewhere between the proper model/documentation dilemma is the recent introduction of American intelligence support to the UN headquarters itself. Despite there being limited data at best on the role of US intelligence in a wide variety of peace operations, important initial lessons can still be drawn from these limited cases that may be applicable to UNPOs in general. This is the first critical assumption as mentioned in the introduction. Each case is discussed in more depth below.

### *UNOSOM II*

American intelligence support to UNOSOM II is the only well-documented test case. Aside from the difficulties associated with the force sliding into a peace enforcement operation for which it was not equipped, it also began on a sour note when the United Nations was initially reluctant to accept American intelligence support. The in-theatre American intelligence structure and procedures which eventually evolved was a variation on US military doctrinal guidelines for joint

support to US-only operations. In joint intelligence doctrine for US-only opera-
tions, intelligence would follow a relatively straight course down from the national
intelligence community level (e.g., DIA, CIA, NSA and the National Military
Joint Intelligence Center-NMJIC) through the theatre J-2 or Joint Intelligence
Center (JIC) and then onto the combat commander or joint task force commander
J-2/JIC.

In Somalia, American intelligence from the NMJIC flowed in a more convo-
luted, bifurcated fashion. Moving "horizontally," data flowed from the NMJIC in
Washington, DC across to the US United Nations' mission in New York, from
there to the UN situation room and then forwarded to the UNOSOM II Informa-
tion Center in Mogadishu where it was finally sent to a variety of UN locations
throughout Somalia. Moving "vertically," intelligence flowed from the NMJIC,
down through the CENTCOM/J-2, to the US Intelligence Support Element (ISE)
in Somalia, and from there to the UNOSOM II Information Center where it was
again sent throughout Somalia. For information intended for a UN consumer, US
intelligence was either hand-delivered (for information which could be shown to
selected UN officials but not retained by them) or electronically transferred (for
information labelled "UN Restricted" which could be retained by the UN and
presumably having far less restrictions on its internal UN distribution).[54]

What difference there was between the "horizontal" and "vertical" intelligence
is unknown. Perhaps since the "vertical" flow went to US forces in theatre first,
that information may have been more time-sensitive and focused on pressing mili-
tary threat issues while the "horizontal" flow which went to the UN headquarters
might have been less time-sensitive intelligence, such as long-term political trends
in Somalia. One would hope that the two "flows" neither contradicted nor re-
peated the other's information.

> The American ISE in Somalia had the mandate to provide intelligence support to
> UNOSOM II and USFORSOM [US Forces, Somalia]. All US intelligence [would]
> be derived from and pass through the ISE. The ISE ... consist[ed] of a US-only
> intelligence cell, US representatives to UNOSOM II headquarters, intelligence-related
> systems and communications personnel, and other US intelligence support activities.[55]

According to an after-action report from several US Army intelligence personnel,
the ISE enabled UNOSOM II forces — or at least US forces — to gain "access to
theatre level intelligence assets."[56]

Was there any other national intelligence support to the operation besides from
the Americans? Jonathan Brock, who had worked with Medicin Sans Frontieres
in Somalia recalled Australian intelligence officers asking him for information as
well as providing him with warnings of renewed fighting in the area.[57] There may
have been other national contingents collecting and analyzing data while in
UNOSOM II. Did they share information, and if so, did they do so bilaterally or
was the UNOSOM II Information Center a clearing house?[58] Unfortunately, there
is no information available to answer this question.

There are even more lingering unanswered questions regarding this operation.[59] What form did this intelligence take (e.g., imagery support, analytical reports, SIGINT or HUMINT reports)? Was the UNOSOM II commander satisfied with the intelligence he received in terms of relevance, timeliness, and accuracy? What made the UNOSOM II force change its mind regarding American intelligence? However, the most important question is whether the lessons learned from Somalia can be broadly applicable to those UNPOs where US forces are *not* deployed; this is after all where intelligence is used as a trade-off for an actual US presence. Somalia may very well be an atypical case study. The increasingly volatile nature of the UNOSOM II humanitarian intervention/peace enforcement operation cried out for intelligence support, if anything but to protect the troops from being continually harassed and sniped at by Somali clansmen. The need for intelligence in traditional peacekeeping and humanitarian relief operations may be less urgent, more muted.

## UNPROFOR

The most pressing UN operation requiring intelligence is, of course, Bosnia. As mentioned earlier, reports of US intelligence support to UNPROFOR are sketchy and incomplete. In addition to the limited DIA and UN DPKO references to American intelligence being provided to UNPROFOR, Misha Glenny in a spring 1995 issue of *Foreign Policy* makes passing reference to "two spy planes [operated by the Department of Defense but outside NATO auspices in northern Albania to monitor troop movements in Bosnia and Serbia."[60] Assuming the report is true, not only do we not know what type of sensors are on the aircraft or how often it flies, but we also do not know whether this information is retained within US channels only, freely shared within UNPROFOR, or is shared only with NATO countries involved in UNPROFOR.

There is precedent for the latter case, with a report that a "UNPROFOR commander, Lieutenant General Satish Nambiar, ... could not, as an Indian national, receive intelligence from NATO sources."[61] This does not mean that all US intelligence information is so restricted, but may only apply to the "vertical" flowpath to the small US ground contingent in Macedonia and Croatia (presumably from the NMJIC via EUCOM/J-2 and/or the Joint Analysis Center at RAF Molesworth). At least along the "horizontal" path, it appears that member state information which is sent to the UN headquarters is freely shared among all national PKO contingents. According to one UN official, the UN has not "imposed any type of restricted access." Nevertheless, there still does appear to be some differentiation between national contingents in the former Yugoslavia. Depending upon how widespread this occurs and how diplomatically it is handled, the issue arises: if information is unevenly shared in Bosnia, it may also have been unevenly shared in Somalia and elsewhere.

## UNTAC, UNAMIR, and UNMIH

There is even less documentation on and more speculation regarding intelligence support to the UN operations in Cambodia, Rwanda, and Haiti.[62] What is known is that DIA has been designated by the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) as the American intelligence community's executive agent for intelligence support for these operations, implying that there is in fact operational support. While DIA states that UN headquarters and field commanders are generally pleased with the American intelligence support, the UN indicates that it has been more of a mixed bag. However, it is still not known whether any complaints have been levied against a certain type of support, for a specific UNPO, or any recurring problem areas. It has been suggested that the intelligence support which has been provided to these and other UN operations has consisted of "consolidated edited reports" and at times diagrams derived from imagery rather than the imagery itself. However, due to the lengthy bureaucratic process to receive American intelligence support, current situational reports are not as valued as are mid-to-long term assessments. Looking to the Haitian example and as in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia, a separate "vertical" channel of US intelligence flows through the unified command (in this case US Atlantic Command) to the American field mission in UNMIH, but — as in UNPROFOR — it is not known whether this information is then filtered and passed to a UNPKO Information Centre or even if such a centre exists in UNMIH or UNPROFOR.[63] (Information regarding specific support to UNTAC and UNAMIR is even more limited).

The operations in Cambodia and Rwanda pose a broader issue: without a significant American ground presence in a UNPO, it is very possible that the intelligence flow would be less than in one where there was a US presence. Although given the paucity of data surrounding these two operations there is admittedly no proof for such a contention, it does have its own perverse logic. If American troops are not involved in an operation and if the United States has no great national interest served in its successful outcome, the intelligence community's level of attention and interest would probably be correspondingly low. At least in UNOSOM II, and presumably to a far lesser degree for American troops in Macedonia, the use of US combat forces guaranteed that there would be some form of intelligence support to the American soldiers. Furthermore, with American soldiers shoulder to shoulder with other national contingents, intelligence (especially on threats to the forces) will inevitably find its way to other national contingents facing the same dangers, sharing the same risks, regardless of whether such intelligence sharing is formally approved by agreements between Washington and New York, between Washington and the national capitals, or informally condoned at the field level. The critical questions then arise: What happens when US forces are not on the ground? Will intelligence support be as free flowing as it apparently was in Somalia?

## Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) in the Sinai

The only true peacekeeping mission where there was well-documented American intelligence support was in fact not even a UN mission. During the MFO, the United States flew weekly tactical photo-reconnaissance missions along the UNEF II buffer zone and the Giddi and Mitla passes with the full knowledge and support of the Egyptian and Israeli governments. Additional flights were arranged to verify possible violations. Not only was American reconnaissance openly performed, the results of the missions were freely shared with the Egyptians, the Israelis, and the commander of UN forces in the area.[64]

   As a supplement to this airborne imagery collection, the Sinai Field Mission was established with an American defence contractor (E-Systems) operating an electronic surveillance network (including seismic, acoustic, infrared sensors although SIGINT sensors cannot be ruled out judging by the known expertise of the company in the latter field) in the two passes.[65] That the US may have tapped into its satellite assets to cover the area as one author suggests is certainly not surprising, but whether that fact, any data or even imagery from those sources was provided to the non-American forces is only a matter of conjecture.[66]

   Here however, it is not known whether US intelligence support was adequate, whether information flowed from national sources and agencies through the UN to the field, and whether there was any other form of intelligence support (e.g., SIGINT or HUMINT).

## United Nations Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM)

The United States intelligence community has been most deeply and publicly involved in its direct support to UNSCOM. UNSCOM's mandate is "to carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical and missile capabilities, to provide for the elimination of these capabilities," and to assist the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in its inspection of Iraqi nuclear facilities is one which is of critical national interest to the United States.[67] It is also one that cannot be completed without extensive American technical and intelligence expertise in NBC detection.

   Through its provision of a U-2 reconnaissance aircraft flying several times a week complete with pilots and ground crew as well as possibly satellite imagery and other intelligence information given to the commission and to the IAEA, the United States can greatly influence the success of UNSCOM's mandate and the IAEA's mission to find and destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) program.[68] For example, with the help of the U-2, UNSCOM was able to locate cauldrons associated with the Iraqi electromagnetic isotope separation effort which the Baghdad government had dispersed and buried in remote areas. German-loaned

helicopters, recently equipped with gamma detectors, FLIR sensors, and ground penetrating radar, have also proven to be both a useful tool for UNSCOM and a source of controversy with Baghdad.

Ultimately, such an intrusive intelligence collection, even on behalf of a neutral United Nations, can run into a great deal of hostility by the party being observed. Despite Iraq having been painfully defeated by the Desert Storm coalition, it remained (and remains) defiant toward the United Nations, UNSCOM, and the U-2 and helicopter reconnaissance flights, vociferously complaining that the latter infringed upon its sovereignty by conducting "espionage" and demanding significant restrictions on their activities. The United Nation's right to exercise freely its mandate was underscored in January 1993 when air and cruise missile attacks from the United States and other coalition nations struck Iraq. Unfortunately, as Tim Trevan noted, a recidivist Iraq returned to harass and delay UNSCOM activities later that same year, and "UNSCOM's efforts in 1993 were dedicated largely to forcing Iraq to acknowledge the plans for ongoing monitoring and verification and to present better accounts of its past programmes and supplies, supported by credible documentary evidence."[69] In the final analysis, what has allowed the intelligence mission — and by default UNSCOM proper — to continue (although not without many disturbances) was the will of the United States and others to uproot the Iraqi WMD program and sufficient resources nearby to make a recalcitrant Iraq more cooperative. It is highly questionable whether the UN could have summoned up either the will or the resources to do what the coalition did to Iraq that January on the UN's behalf.

## Situation Centre at UN headquarters in New York

The final area where American intelligence has been active is in its support to the UN headquarters itself. Ostensibly due to the secretary-general's request, but in actuality arising from member states' preference to "dealing with one of their own" when providing intelligence to the UN, the Information and Research (I&R) Unit was created in April 1993 as part of the larger DPKO situation centre. For its part, the US sent an American intelligence officer in September 1993 to act as the head of the four person quasi-intelligence I&R Unit.[70] A DIA/J2 intelligence officer is assigned to the US mission to the UN. Together these two individuals, along with the newly created UN Support Desk in the NMJIC, facilitate the UN's request for information and help transfer intelligence information to the UN on a daily and ad hoc basis. To preclude the inadvertent disclosure of sensitive intelligence sources and methods, this information is "sanitized" to a level where it is less sensitive but still useful and is then provided to either "a limited number of [UN] individuals" or shared fully within the I&R staff, if not the situation centre and DPKO personnel as well.

The process for requesting information appears somewhat cumbersome and sluggish: UN headquarters and field commander requests for information (RFI) are sent to the I&R Unit which taps into its open source references and online public access data services. If more information is needed, I&R has the option of passing the request to the member state mission(s) for assistance. In the case of the US, each of these requests must then be cleared and approved by the State Department before being passed to the US intelligence community with DIA acting as the overseer. Once an appropriate answer is found and downgraded or sanitized to the "UN Restricted" level, the information is then passed to the US UN mission, where it is subsequently forwarded to the I&R Unit. It is unknown whether other member states have been tapped for information and what their bureaucratic procedures entail.

Washington has also sold an intelligence data processing system to the United Nation's I&R Unit. The system — called the Joint Deployable Intelligence Support System or JDISS — was initially provided to support UNOSOM II operations.[71] In order to prevent a UN JDISS user from tapping into information which the United States does not wish to be shared, the UN's 2 terminals are isolated from the larger US intelligence network.[72] No American intelligence is loaded into the UN's JDISS terminals and instead they are used "strictly as an information and RFI-passing device between the US mission in New York and the I&R office".[73] Having a JDISS to manipulate information along with one on-site and several "off-site" intelligence officers who can tap into the larger US intelligence community represents the beginning halting steps of the UN to make the UN situation centre a true "war room" for its worldwide peacekeeping operations. Much more still needs to be done to make that a reality, including more personnel, greater communications capability, and diversified sources besides the Americans for intelligence information.

Although each case is special in its own right, they do provide a basis from which to draw several lessons. First and foremost, intelligence support can prove useful for monitoring ceasefires and, as is assumed in the case of Somalia and Bosnia, for the protection of the UN force. Second, for most UNPOs, there may be little or no local intelligence collection or analysis assets, thus necessitating a reliance and a hope upon the national system to cover the bases in sufficient time and with sufficient resources to meet the UN forces' needs. However, the system to bridge the gap between the UN and the national intelligence community may prove cumbersome and unable to respond quickly to requests, particularly on fast-moving events (i.e., threats to the blue helmets).

Third, in a traditional PKO or relatively non-hostile humanitarian relief operation where there is an intelligence asset in the theatre of operations, it is critical to obtain the strong support of the belligerents to perform such a function and to be relatively open and candid with the belligerents during the process. In cases of ceasefire monitoring, intelligence must be equally shared not only with all the

peacekeeping forces, but with the belligerents as well. The confidence engendered by the sharing of US tactical reconnaissance products with the Israelis and Egyptians payed handsome dividends in the overall success of the mission.[74] This latter case may pose a serious operational problem if: (i) the belligerent(s) do(es) not permit intelligence activities on its territory, or (ii) the nation providing the intelligence does not permit all UN forces — much less the belligerents — equal access to information. While in a more combat-oriented peace operation (e.g., peace enforcement), the first criteria may be overriden, ignoring the second criteria foolishly sets up several of the UN national contingent for needless danger.

Lastly and most importantly, while the quantity and quality of information is important and the types of communications and computer support often critical to make a "jury rigged" system work, what really ensures the responsive delivery of US intelligence to UNPOs is the on-site presence and personal direct involvement of Americans in peacekeeping. A crude continuum can be deduced — the more Americans there are involved in a UNPO, the closer they are to the field operation and the higher the subsequent possibility of violence and threats to the American forces, the better the US intelligence support. When that presence is absent, dedicated and relevant intelligence support may become doubtful. In answer to the rhetorical question posed earlier in contrast to the situation in UNOSOM II, Lt. Col. Seney commented:

 If the US does not send troops to a PKO, under current circumstances, it is highly unlikely that it will be willing to provide intelligence information to support that operation. (The exception being medical information [e.g., information on infectious diseases in the PKO's area, capability of indigenous medical support]).[75]

From a sheer parochial intelligence perspective, one can drop down from a "Somalia high" to a "Rwanda low."

These are just the initial lessons learned from a limited number of cases using even more limited information. To draw broader lessons for the future, we must now make the second critical assumption: that despite its impressive capabilities, there are intrinsic problems within the US intelligence system and the intelligence process itself. These inadequacies and how the United States has applied intelligence information in war-fighting coalitions will in turn affect the adequacy and applicability of future intelligence support to UNPOs. This will be addressed in the next two chapters.

## Notes

1.     Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda For Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping* (New York: United Nations, 1992), p. 46.

2.     Warren Christopher, "America's Leadership, America's Opportunity," *Foreign Policy* 98, (Spring 1995):7.

3.   Steven R. David, "Why the Third World Still Matters," *International Security* 17 (Winter 1992-93):127-59. However, although the US *could* participate in UNPOs there is no guarantee that it *would*.

4.   See Joseph T. Jockel, *Canada and International Peacekeeping*, Significant Issue Series, Vol. 16, 3 (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1994), p. 22; John Mikulaninec, "International Peacekeeping: Under the Blue Flag or the Stars and Stripes," *The Changing Face of Peacekeeping*, ed. Alex Morrison (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1993), pp. 173-79; Augustus R. Norton and Thomas G. Weiss, *UN Peacekeepers: Soldiers with a Difference*, Headline Series no. 292 (New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1990), p. 9.

5.   William J. Durch, "Getting Involved: The Political-Military Context," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 23.

6.   Christopher S. Wren, "In UN's Future, a Leaner Budget," *New York Times*, 28 April 1995, p. A12; and US Department of State, *The Clinton Administration's Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations* (Washington, DC: Department of State, May 1994), p. 12.

7.   *The Clinton Administration's Policy*, pp. 4-5. Note however that the document also states that "no single factor [is] necessarily ... an absolute determinant."

8.   Charles William Maynes, "Relearning Intervention," *Foreign Policy* 98 (Spring 1995):108-09.

9.   For Canadian government policy in 1987 and 1989 on this topic, see Alex Morrison, "Canada and Peacekeeping: A Time for Reanalysis?"in *Canada's International Security Policy*, ed. David B. Dewitt and David Leyton-Brown (Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall, 1995), p. 210. For the most current policy, see Canada's *1994 Defence White Paper* (Ottawa: Department of National Defence, 1994), p. 29. Similarities between the Canadian and American criteria include concern for the belligerents' agreement to a ceasefire, adequate logistical and personnel resources, a clear mandate or at least clear rules of engagement and a defined concept of operations. There is, of course, not a perfect fit between the two countries' positions in some areas. For instance, where Canada requests that Canadian presence be acceptable to all parties, the US stresses the advancement of American national interests, where Canada worries whether it is able to take on new commitments, the US focuses on ensuring risks to its troops are acceptable and that domestic support can be gained. Most critically, the view from Ottawa is that the command and control structure simply be effective and that there be a single identifiable authority to support operations; the view from Washington is that not only must command and control be acceptable, but placing American combat forces under foreign or UN command becomes increasingly unlikely the larger the American contingent.

10.  Major General Baril, military adviser to the UN secretary general. Speech to Royal Canadian United Services Institute, Kingston, Ontario, 15 October 1994.

11.  S. Neil MacFarlane and Thomas G. Weiss, "The United Nations, Regional Organisations and Human Security," *Third World Quarterly* 15 (June 1994):282.

12.  Bob Dole, "Shaping America's Global Future," *Foreign Policy* 98 (Spring 1995):36-37.

13. Elaine Sciolino, "G.O.P. Senators Fire Away at Foreign Policy," *New York Times*, 27 January 1995, p. A8.

14. Michael Mandelbaum, "The Reluctance to Intervene," *Foreign Policy* 95 (Summer 1994):16.

15. Mats R. Berdal, "Fateful Encounter: the United States and UN Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Spring 1994):30-50. See also Andrew Kohut and Robert C. Toth, "Arms and the People," *Foreign Affairs* 73 (November/December 1994):61.

16. Mandelbaum, "The Reluctance to Intervene," p. 12.

17. John E. Reilly, "The Public Mood at Mid-Decade," *Foreign Policy* 98 (Spring 1995):76-77.

18. Kohut and Toth, "Arms and the People," p. 47.

19. Rielly, "The Public Mood," pp. 81, 83.

20. See respectively Russell F. Weigley, *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Strategy and Policy* (New York: Macmillan Publishers Co., Inc, 1973), xxii; Martin P. Adams, "Peace Enforcement Versus American Strategic Culture," *Strategic Review* 22 (Winter 1995):16; and John F. Hillen III, "UN Collective Security: Chapter Six and a Half," *Parameters* 24:33, 35.

21 Berdal, "Fateful Encounter," pp. 41-42.

22 Adams, "Peace Enforcement," p. 15; and Harvey Sicherman, "Winning the Peace," *Orbis* 38 (Fall 1994):523-44.

23. Stephen J. Cimbala, "Military Persuasion and the American Way of War," *Strategic Review* 22 (Fall 1994):39, 41.

24. Lieutenant Colonel John L. Clarke, "The Enforcement Specialists: US Forces are Best Suited to Peace Enforcement," *Armed Forces Journal International* 132 (February 1995):34.

25. General John M. Shalikashvili, "Lessons Learned," *Policy Letter Digest* (Washington, DC: Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, March 1995), p. 3.

26. Louis C. Finch, deputy under-secretary of defense for readiness, "Keeping the Force Ready," *Defense* 95, 1 (1995):5. Even Canada, one of the most active participants in UN operations but now undergoing major force drawdowns, has voiced concerns over the combat training issue. See David Pugliese, "Canadian Forces to Stay in Bosnia," *Defense News*, 8-14 May 1995, p. 4.

27. Lieutenant Colonel Karl W. Eikenberg, "The Challenges of Peacekeeping," *Army* 43 (September 1993):15.

28. Mark T. Clark, "Avoid the Fad of 'Collective Security'," *Orbis* 39 (Spring 1995):256-57.

29. Berdal, "Fateful Encounter," p. 47.

30. Clarke, "The Enforcement Specialists," p. 34. See also Hugh Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Autumn 1994):174-92); James J. Wirtz, "Constraints on Intelligence Collaboration," *Defense Analysis* 8 (1992):247-59); and Loch K. Johnson, "Smart Intelligence," *Foreign Policy* 89 (Winter 1992-93):53-69.

31. Maj. Karen Noss, HQ USAF/INX. 12 May 1995 telephone conversation with author.

32. Maj. Buikema, HQ USMC, Command, Control, Communications, Computer and Intelligence Department. 25 April 1995 E-mail with author.

33. See US Department of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Peacekeeping Operations* (Joint Publication 3-07.3) (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 29 April 1994), the draft *Joint Doctrine for Multinational Operations* (Joint Publication 3-16 (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 1994); and, *Field Manual 100-23, Peace Operations*, final draft (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 22 September 1994). US military doctrine on PKO has its roots in previous doctrine on low-intensity conflict (LIC) and operations other than war (OOTW) as well as the relatively limited American experience in UN PKOs. With regards to intelligence, PKO doctrine highlights include:

   • the need for an effective and responsive all-source intelligence gathering capability to ensure the protection and security of the force and for monitoring the ceasefire/disarmament agreement

   • barring being able to bring in such an extensive array of intelligence collection systems, increasing the reliance upon HUMINT collection against local civilians, belligerents, and from one's own forces

   • the fundamental requirement to decompartment and share classified US intelligence with other members of the PKO force

   • a caution against leaking the intelligence about one belligerent to another.

   (NB: There is an ongoing debate whether LIC and OOTW doctrine and experience can be applied to PKO, with Major Brad M. Bergstrand arguing that there is applicability and Charles Dobbie arguing such an approach confuses "pigs with parrots." See Bergstrand, "What Do You Do When There's No Peace to Keep?" *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 23 (Spring 1994):27-29; and, Charles Dobbie, "A Concept for Post-Cold War Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Autumn 1994):142.

   Looking north to Canada, despite its long history of involvement in UN PKOs, it is just now developing doctrine on this subject; there appear to be some similarities with the American doctrine regarding intelligence support issues. (Maj. Grant, 11 May 1995 correspondence, p. 2.

34. Maj. Ken Johns, NMJIC UN Support Desk/J2M, correspondence with author entitled "UN Intelligence Support," undated but probably May 1995.

35. Noss, 12 May 1995 telephone conversation with author. US Army intelligence personnel, both officer and enlisted, are given familiarization training in PKO operations. Lt. Col. John R. Brower, Office of the Deputy Chief of [Army] Staff for Intelligence, Chief, Doctrine and Training Division. 19 April 1995 correspondence with author.

36. Dr. Gross, Dean of Intelligence Studies, JMIC. 15 November 1994 telephone conversation with author.

37. *The Clinton Administration's Policy*, pp. 8-9, and Gopher computer information service.

38. Lieutenant Colonel Pekka Hannukkala, Commanding Officer, UN Training Centre, Niinisalo, Finland, 16 May 1995 correspondence with author. Sweden's UNSOC performs similar training on "information" during one section of its course entitled

"Staff Responsibilities, Duties and Activities." Lt. Col. Alf Gorsjo, Development Section, Swedish Armed Forces International Centre, 9 May 1995 correspondence with author. Conversely, the Danish school apparently provides no training in intelligence or information gathering and analysis, arguing that "it is the basic policy of all UN peacekeeping missions that active intelligence collection is incompatibel [sic] with the role of the UN." Lt. Col. E.B. Dam, Acting Chief Operations, Logistic & Budget Division, Army Operational Command Denmark, 22 May 1995 correspondence with author.

39. Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping,"p. 185. It is very difficult to see how the budgetary review process will look favourably upon intelligence support to a UNPKO as ample justification for continuing funding for scarce intelligence manpower, equipment, communications circuits leasing, etc. especially when other American consumers are making demands for those same resources. From a strict accountant's perspective, intelligence support to UNPKOs provides no direct return to the United States and is at best a derivative function of work which is already being done for US consumers. And if the UN is a sole consumer of a certain product or service, it will have to be a high-level political decision to retain it, especially in light of budget cuts.

40. There are several serious difficulties with this approach. Besides the problem of determining the cost of an intelligence estimate or national imagery support, will the United States charge "full price" if it is providing essentially the same information to US forces participating in the PKO, ask for a nominal "shipping and handling fee," or waive the cost altogether? In the event there are no US equities or personnel involved in the operation and the UN needed to make a "special order" for intelligence on an area which the US was not watching, would not the costs of such dedicated intelligence support be even higher? How will the US and UN start initial negotiations on requirements, availability of information and cost? In either event, could the US retain or demand some form of "local copyright protection" in the guise of classification guidelines and restrictive handling instructions for material which the UN "purchased"? Can the UN haggle for a lower price if it feels that quality and timeliness of the product are inadequate? Could the UN attempt to drive prices lower if it openly sought intelligence from other member states and break the American monopoly? What if the UN did not have any funds to purchase such intelligence? What choices does this international "Blanch Dubois in blue" have?

41. Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda For Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping*, p. 14.

42. "Statement by the President of the Security Council," S/25184, 28 January 1993, ibid., pp. 128-29.

43. "Statement by the President of the Security Council," S/25859, 28 May 1993, ibid., pp. 140-41.

44. Resolution of the General Assembly, "An Agenda for Peace: preventative diplomacy and related matters," A/RES/47/120 A, 18 December 1992, ibid., p. 78.

45. Lt. Col. Shirley A. Seney, Chief, Information and Research, DPKO, United Nations, 19 May 1995 correspondence with author.

46.   David L. Boren, "The Intelligence Community," *Foreign Affairs* 71 (Summer 1992):57.

47.   Ingvar Carlsson, "Roles for the UN in International Security after the Cold War," *Security Dialogue* 26 (March 1995):11. For other discussions on a UN indications and warning function see Michael Renner, *Critical Juncture: The Future of Peacekeeping*, World Watch Paper no. 114 (Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, 1993), p. 39; and Sir Brian Urquhart, *The Role of the United Nations Peacekeeping in the Post Cold War World*, Young Memorial Lecture 1993 (Kingston, ON: Royal Military College, 1993), p. 13.

48.   Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, trans. Samuel B. Griffith (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 104.

49.   See Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," p. 176; and Mats R. Berdal, Whither UN Peacekeeping?, Adelphi Paper 281 (London: Brassey's, 1993), p. 65.

50.   Peter Jones, "Technology and Peacekeeping," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 21 (November/December 1992):3.

51.   Michael Krepon, "Spying from Space," *Foreign Policy* 75 (Summer 1989):107.

52.   Johns, "[b]y and large, the UN PKO leadership and field Commanders [for UNTAC, UNOSOM II, UNPROFOR, UNAMIR, and UNMIH] appear pleased with the quality and quantity of information provided under the program." Johns, "UN Intelligence Support."

53.   Johns, "DIA has been designated as the Executive Agent for the [US] Intelligence Community's support to UN operations in Cambodia, Somalia, the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Haiti." Unfortunately the DIA paper provides no further specific details on US intelligence support in any of these operations. Also see Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, p. 2 where it is revealed that "[US] information was provided for the operations in Cambodia and Somalia. Presently, daily summaries on the former Yugoslavia and Haiti, and on an irregular basis, Rwanda, are provided [to the UN Headquarters directly]."

54    *Joint Publication 2-0*, pp. VII-4 and VIII-2. This delineation between categories of intelligence and the horizontal and vertical flows would now appear to be a standard US procedure for other UN operations. Johns, "UN Intelligence Support." According to Seney, 19 May correspondence, p. 3, "UN Restricted" (formally "UN RESTRICTED — FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY — NO FURTHER DISSEMINATION") is not considered to be classified information per se, but since it is based in part upon national intelligence data and despite efforts to extract references to intelligence sources and methods, it is still considered sensitive information.

55.   "Terms of Reference for US Forces Somalia, United Nations Operation in Somalia," as reprinted in Annex A of *Field Manual 100-23, Peace Operations*, p. A-A-2.

56.   David L. Brand, Paul J. Bryson and Alfredo Lopez Jr., "Intelligence Support to the Logistician in Somalia," *Military Intelligence* 20 (October/December 1994):6.

57.   Jonathan Brock, 10 March 1995 conversation with author.

58.   Beyond the immediate UNOSOM II case, it appears that other member states are following the American lead in providing intelligence to the UN. Which countries

are participating, and the quantity, quality and type of support is unknown. Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, p. 1.

59.  Additional questions include: Was there any difficulty in either the hand delivery method of sensitive intelligence information or in releasing the information to all members of the UNOSOM II information center, much less the various national forces attached to UNOSOM II? Was there any formal method by which the UNOSOM II national force commanders and the overall UNOSOM II commander could forward requirements for intelligence? What were the "theatre level intelligence assets" used by the Americans in UNOSOM II and did they remain under US control?

60.  Misha Glenny, "Heading Off War in the Southern Balkans," *Foreign Policy* 74 (May/June 1995):107.

61.  Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," p. 177. This uneven sharing of information goes beyond intelligence data. There is apparently also uneven sharing of air surveillance and tracking data in UNPROFOR with a NATO-only cell at UNPROFOR HQ providing information only to tactical air control parties attached to NATO member battalions. In one case where a NATO country (Denmark) was working with a non-NATO country (Sweden) in the Nordic Battalion in Bosnia, the latter's non-NATO status prevented the battalion from receiving this data. Gorsjo, 9 May 1995 correspondence with author.

62.  It is possible that the United states also provided intelligence in the ONUCA mission in El Salvador, although the only evidence of this is inferred by the title of an upcoming JMIC master's thesis: "Expectations and Exasperation: Case Study of U.S. Intelligence Support to UN Operations in Central America."

63.  Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, pp. 2-3. Beyond this report and that of Maj. Johns, there is so far no other information available either in the open press, academic journals, or professional military periodicals to cast more light upon the intelligence aspects of UNTAC, UNAMIR, or UNMIH. Judging by the eventual publication of UNOSOM II intelligence "lessons learned" in professional American military journals (e.g., *Military Intelligence Digest* and *Parameters*), researchers may have to wait several months to several years after the UN mission is completed before details are easily available or resort to a Freedom of Information Act request.

64.  David Barton, "The Sinai Peacekeeping Experience: A Verification Paradigm for Europe," *SIPRI Yearbook 1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 543. The type of American reconnaissance aircraft is debatable. Michael Krepon and Jeffrey Tracey refer to tactical reconnaissance aircraft being used in the Sinai while Peter Jones believed the aircraft were the SR-71 and U-2R, hardly "tactical" assets. See Michael Krepon and Jeffrey P. Tracey, "'Open Skies' and UN Peace-keeping," *Survival* 32 (May/June 1990):262, note 2; and Peter Jones, "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance II: From Yemen to the End of the Cold War," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 22 (September-October 1993):4. Further research into primary sources is necessary.

65.  Brian S. Mandell, *The Sinai Experience: Lessons in Multimethod Arms Control Verification and Risk Management* (Canada: Department of External Affairs, Arms Control and Disarmament Division, 1987), pp. 8-11.

66. Ibid., p. 14.

67. Rolf Ekeus, "The United Nations Special Commission on Iraq," in *SIPRI Yearbook 1992: World Armaments and Disarmament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 510-11, 522.

68. R. Jeffrey Smith, "US Lends Spy Plane to U.N. to View Iraq," *Washington Post*, 13 August 1991, p. A12; Rolf Ekeus, "The United Nations Special Commission on Iraq: Activities in 1992" in SIPRI Yearbook 1993: World Armaments and Disarmament, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 694; and "The United Nations Special Commission," in *SIPRI Yearbook 1992*, pp. 511-12, 518.

69. Tim Trevan, "UNSCOM: Activities in 1993," in *SIPRI Yearbook 1994: World Armaments and Disarmament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

70. According to Seney, along with the one American officer, there are also one British and one French officer and a senior Belgian NCO. This spring, Russia will provide a senior civilian to the Information and Research (I&R) Unit. Her opinion is that it is unlikely that the I&R unit will grow any further. Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, p. 2.

71. See Berdal, "Fateful Encounter," p. 46 and Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, p. 3. The notable difference is that Berdal states the system was "provided" by the US, while Seney states that the UN "bought" the system.

72. Johns, "UN Intelligence Support."

73. Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, p. 3.

74. Lt. Bruce Fenton, "The Multinational Force and Observers in the Sinai: A Quiet Success Story," in *Studies in Peacekeeping* (Kingston, ON: The Royal Military College of Canada, 1993), p. 112.

75. Seney, 22 May 1995 correspondence to author.

# 3. *The Capabilities and Limitations of the US Intelligence Community*

From all appearances, it certainly seems that the vast US intelligence community can deliver the goods, that it can easily meet the needs of UNPOs. Many observers of the intelligence business have consistently commented that the sheer size of the American intelligence community, the high-tech wizardry behind its collection and analysis assets, and its seemingly apparent ability to cover instantaneously almost any corner of the globe have given the United States an intelligence organization second to none and, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, without a close competitor.[1] Over the long run, post-World War II American estimative intelligence has been of good quality and information on foreign weapons development and orders of battle have been very good.[2] Most recently, despite occasional intelligence failures in the Persian Gulf, the official DoD report on the war stated "The Coalition forces' overwhelming military victory against Iraqi armed forces was due in large part to accurate intelligence provided to decision makers, particularly at national and theatre level."[3]

The United States' vast array of satellites, listening posts, airborne and shipborne sensors as well as more esoteric emerging technologies (such as high altitude, stealthy, long-endurance unmanned aerial vehicles that can loiter over battlefields for days and NBC sensors hidden in tree trunks, leaves, rocks and clods of dirt) are a major element in gaining the information advantage over its competitors.[4] This high-tech approach toward collection (some would say technologically obsessed) is supplemented in large part by a network of agents.[5] Together, the technical collection systems for imagery intelligence (IMINT) and signals intelligence (SIGINT) and the human collection "systems" (HUMINT) form a critical triad in trying to determine "what" an enemy is doing, "where" and "how" he will do something, and "why" he is doing it.[6]

No single collection discipline can answer all these questions and there is a need for all three elements of the intelligence collection triad. Yet until recently HUMINT has been a poor cousin to its more expensive, capital-intensive brethren.[7] In conflicts other than between major military powers, in ambiguous situations in the Third World or in peacekeeping operations, it will be HUMINT that will prove to be more beneficial than all the high-tech gadgetry floating in space, flying through the air, or travelling through the seas. In times when an enemy's intentions are more critical than his weaponry, when the scope and nature of deadly conflict put out only the weakest of indicators which technologically-oriented systems cannot pick up, HUMINT has been able to give returns on a relatively small investment.[8] Recent initiatives have been made to redress the imbalance. All the same, no single collection discipline should dominate. The combination of different types of collection systems and sources ensures against deception and gaps in data. As Baron Jomini suggested "a general should ... multiply the means of obtaining information; for no matter how imperfect and contradictory they may be, the truth may often be sifted from them."[9] Or in the words of Stansfield Turner,

> [T]he new world order will yield technical systems that will serve as a sword, the broad cutting edge of intelligence collection, and human spying operations that will serve as the rapier, to be applied judiciously to very specific requirements ... Each system has its strengths and its weaknesses. We must make them play to each other.[10]

## Costs of the US Intelligence System

Such an extensive array of intelligence assets does not come cheaply. Press sources estimate the annual intelligence budget at $28 billion with satellites — costing upwards of $400-700 million each — taking up to one-quarter of that amount. The sunken capital costs of acquiring this high-tech system is even larger, with one author estimating the value of the entire technical intelligence system (i.e., IMINT and SIGINT) to be over $100 billion.[11] The high-tech nature of the American intelligence community, particularly the collection side of the house, drives these costs up and also makes it difficult to make marginal improvements without expending vast amounts of money. Bruce Berkowitz and Allan Goodman have noted that:

> The growing cost of technical collection systems has made many of them what an economist would call "lumpy goods" — assets that can produce an enormous amount of intelligence but that also require a large initial investment before any intelligence can be collected at all. For example, often one cannot buy just a little [intelligence] capability for a few thousand dollars. Rather, in order to collect any ... intelligence at all, one might have to buy an entire satellite system, and this is likely to cost several hundred million dollars ... Additional capability often must be bought in increments of several million dollars.[12]

Please note, however, these figures for the annual budget and for individual systems are simply the authors' estimates of classified amounts and cannot be confirmed and may be far off the mark. However, they do give a sense of the high expense associated with operating a first-class worldwide intelligence community, an important caution to those who envision a UN intelligence system dedicated to and controlled by New York (but ultimately funded by member states).

Whatever the costs of operating the US intelligence system, Congress and newspaper editorials are pressing for budget cuts.[13] Whether the cuts are drastic or are crudely applied across the board is a major issue to senior American intelligence officials, but that cuts will come is beyond question or debate. The key question is which intelligence functions are to be eliminated, which analytical redundancies formerly thought necessary to avoid institutional biases are themselves now considered redundant, and which countries and issues will no longer be targeted.[14] No matter how skillful the budgetary butcher, cutting waste and fat eventually involves cutting muscle and bone as well; ideally, there will eventually be a tighter focus on what the intelligence community does and whom it serves.[15] This is hardly the time to look for new products and new (potentially non-paying) consumers.

## Past Intelligence Failures

Even before the budget cutting axe falls, there are several critical intrinsic and self-created weaknesses in the US intelligence community, weaknesses that will only be made worse — or at least not corrected — by the shrinking intelligence budget. If the UN chooses to utilize American intelligence, there must be a sober understanding that despite its suite of cutting edge technologies, the US intelligence community is neither omniscient, omnipresent, nor omnipotent. There will be mistakes, some of them serious. On one level, there will always be intelligence failures; there are no crystal balls packed with an intelligence officer's kit. On another level, however, the instances of failure will be exacerbated when intelligence is directed to UNPKOs in the Third World. This latter issue will be addressed in Chapter 4, but for now the discussion will be restricted to an examination of intelligence failures in general.

Of all the failures that can occur in the intelligence field, none is more serious nor is more difficult to predict than a warning of an unexpected strategic attack by an enemy. Surprise — if large and bold enough — can permanently unsettle one's ability to counter an enemy's move; the sudden loss of one's queen in chess will inevitably lead to checkmate. Once the battle is joined or once the intelligence system is geared up to focus on an emerging threat, subsequent failures such as misunderstanding the enemy's location and intention or difficulties in disseminating various intelligence products are less critical. One must first recover from the initial shock.

The American intelligence saga is littered with failures in indications and warning (I&W), from North Korea's invasion of South Korea and the subsequent entry of Chinese troops into the fray to the Tet offensive, and from the fall of the Shah to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The most famous I&W failure is Pearl Harbor, a failure best chronicled by Roberta Wohlstetter in her still insightful and unchallenged treatise *Pearl Harbor: Warning and Decision*. In it she pins down one of the most frequent causes of I&W failure: a too low signal-to-noise ratio.

> [I]t is apparent that our decisionmakers had at hand an impressive amount of information on the enemy. After the event, of course, a signal is always crystal clear ... But before the event it is obscure and pregnant with conflicting meanings. It comes to the observer embedded in an atmosphere of "noise," i.e., in the company of all sorts of information that is useless and irrelevant for predicting the particular disaster ... [W]e failed to anticipate Pearl Harbor not for want of the relevant materials, but because of a plethora of irrelevant ones.[16]

The intelligence disaster 54 years ago at Pearl Harbor produced widespread repercussions which led in large part to the creation of the CIA and to the structure and procedures of the national intelligence community of today.

Failures can also take on the form of underestimating a potential opponent's force buildup (as we did in the 1970s with North Korea), having incomplete or inadequate information before a military operation as in Grenada and Panama, or not being able to get the intelligence analyses to the right people at the right time (as was frequently the case in Operation Desert Storm).[17] If there is any cold comfort, it is that these types of failures are not unique to American intelligence, but are almost unavoidable in the intelligence business regardless of nationality. For instance, in 1973 the Israelis failed to predict the Yom Kippur War and the United Nations did not put its information to good use in Namibia, the Western Sahara, Rwanda, and Somalia.[18]

Even the second-century BC Greek city-states failed to understand the full implications of Roman political and military might, only to fall one by one in the Macedonian Wars. Chester Starr wrote that:

> [P]roblems of political intelligence really did exist in ancient Greece; this is not an issue which is anachronistically smuggled back from modern times. If we omit technological and other aspects peculiar to the modern world, it is proper to say that information about the potentialities and intentions of one's neighbors was fully as important in Hellas as today ... The events of the second century B.C. reflect the most terrible failure of Greek intelligence procedures as "the clouds that loom in the west" settled down on Hellas ... The Greek world would in any case have fallen before the might of Roman arms ... but mutual incomprehension helped to make the saddening series of explosions the more inevitable and more devastating in their consequences.[19]

If the ancient Greeks suffered from intelligence failures, who are we to be so arrogant to think that such failures cannot happen to us in the modern era?

## Why Intelligence Failures Occur

Rather than continue to list a series of anecdotes about intelligence failures, it would be better to systematize those anecdotes to determine where things can go wrong, specifically during the stages of the intelligence process, from collection and analysis to dissemination. From day to day, while most of these failures do not occur or are corrected in time, there is still the chance that any one or more of the errors listed below can crop up at anytime. While it is highly improbable (and in some cases illogical) that there can be circumstances when all or most of them are set off, chaos theory suggests that a small error, especially one early on in the process and if left unchecked, can seriously skew the final product. It is because of these errors, these intrinsic and in some cases unseen weaknesses that the quality and usability of intelligence is frequently questionable.

## Flaws in Intelligence Collection

Turning first to collection, there may be several problems. At the most basic level, a country may simply not be interested in collecting information on that area or issue. This is not due to a lack of intellectual curiosity, but merely one of priorities. Even the dominant intelligence system in the world cannot hope to cover every country to the same depth as it did the USSR, or even cover that country at all. Despite John Hedley's recent contention that "[t]here are no obscure countries and remote regions anymore,"[20] Mark Lowenthal's comment a decade ago that "[w]ithout the expenditure of tremendous sums on intelligence, choices must be made; even with unlimited resources there might still be surprises"[21] holds true today.

    The US intelligence system might be able to recover quickly from faulty analysis, but no act of stupidity can be worse than that of ignorance. For example, in the 1983 invasion of Grenada, American troops were forced to use maps from local gas stations to analyze the island's terrain.[22] And this in America's backyard! What about the more obscure countries in the Third World where the United States has very little presence and even smaller interest? On this issue Robert Jervis, in a remarkably prescient statement made in 1985, rhetorically asked:

> [W]e might wonder whether the intelligence community contains the necessary breadth and depth of expertise in many areas outside the Soviet Union and China. When it comes to less crucial but still "exotic" countries, it often seems that in the intelligence community, knowledge is very limited. (Indeed, in many areas there are few experts outside the government as well. How many specialists are there on Iraq, for example?)[23]

Ironically enough in a repetition of the Grenada operation, prior to the outset of Operation Desert Shield, Iraq was such a low collection priority that existing maps for many of the troops in the desert were 10-30 years old.[24]

Even when a nation decides to gather information about an adversary, much of the critical information may not be easily available in spite of one's vast array of collection systems. In part this may be due to inherent limitations of the collection systems themselves. Satellites, for instance, cannot determine intentions; they cannot peer into a terrorist's mind. Additionally, their orbits are predictable and can give an adversary time to shut off his systems, disperse and conceal his assets, and engage in deception.[25] In another sense, the information we seek may simply not be available except under the most extraordinary circumstances. For example, it wasn't until after Iraq's utter defeat in the Persian Gulf War that the United States was able to get full details on Iraq's nuclear weapons program.[26] Finally, there are only so many collection assets to go around and, despite popular belief, they cannot cover the entire world simultaneously. There may be higher priorities for the collection system(s) elsewhere or there may be political and military restrictions on using more invasive intelligence collection platforms (e.g., an airborne sensor or a mobile ground-based listening post).

Conversely, there may be too much information collected, so much so that it becomes difficult to sift fact from fiction, reality from deception. This is what Wohlstetter pointed to when she spoke of the signal-to-noise ratio. Anyone who has worked in intelligence (or academia for that matter) is well aware of a common fault of collecting so many reams of data that an analyst, a student, or even oneself can no longer pick out the relevant materials or find a pattern. The glut of information pouring into the US intelligence community everyday is overwhelming to any analyst unable to find the forest for the trees.

The problem is not necessarily fixing the communications circuits and computer equipment so that they can handle more data; this is a mechanistic solution which fails to address the real problem. What is of greater concern is that this information overload may not only make analysis harder to do, it may in fact contribute to an atrophying of one's analytical capabilities, of unconsciously steering analysts to report events, but not analyze them. (An interesting research topic would be to examine how other cultures process information in decisionmaking. How much information does a Bangladeshi Army officer need to make an operational decision compared to his American counterpart. Or perhaps, a better question, how much information is he comfortable with? Is there a trade-off between data "crunching" and analysis skills?) Thus the criticism by Jay Young that "far too many pieces of current intelligence reporting — perhaps even a majority — provide little or no insight than a good article in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*."[27]

Intelligence information may come from sources that one cannot trust, whether their credibility is suspect, the quality of information is notoriously bad, or one fears that the source may have a hidden agenda and has deliberately cooked the data. For example, prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, British and American officers shared intelligence but distrusted the other's information. A Peruvian report that the Japanese were planning an attack on Pearl Harbor was rejected

outright since the source was not considered very reliable.[28] In Somalia, UNOSOM II headquarters apparently "displayed initial reluctance to accept intelligence support from the United States, because of the organisation's distrust of military intelligence and of US intelligence in particular."[29] Finally, during Desert Storm, several coalition countries provided intelligence reports to the United States, some of which reached the Pentagon but which many analysts disregarded as uncontrolled reporting of rumour after rumour. If there is no trust in the data, and especially in the reliability and credibility of the source of that data, then it is a waste of both parties' time and effort to continue further. Unfortunately, it might also result in ignoring a critical piece of the intelligence puzzle.

Another area affecting collection of intelligence data is that there may be no overarching authority or common procedures for setting collection requirements in the first place. Given a finite number of collection assets, there must be prioritization of what targets they go after. If an intelligence consumer has no mechanism to present a case for collecting against an item of interest to him or if several collection assets are looking at the same problem, the downstream user either receives no information or gets too much duplication at the expense of other requirements. In UNOSOM II for instance, lack of communication between the US intelligence system and combat forces in Somalia, allied nations' intelligence systems, and the UNOSOM PKO headquarters with regard to coordinating collection was termed by several US Army intelligence specialists as "one of the greatest detractors to the intelligence collection effort."

## Flaws in Intelligence Analysis

Assuming that all the relevant data is collected and is neither too little nor too much, we now turn to analyzing this information. There are several critical problems here that can result in shoddy and inaccurate intelligence reporting. Beginning on a more philosophical plane, it is highly doubtful whether one can really know everything about what is going on even with all possible error-free evidence at hand. The more abstract the reasoning, the greater the potential for error. For example an analyst may see a series of rectangular-shaped blobs from a synthetic aperture radar sensor. Based on his experience and relying on reports from other types of collection assets, he may argue that those blobs are a company of tanks. He may then conjecture about which unit they belong to, where they are heading, how they fit into the enemy's overall battle plan, and what the ultimate intent of the enemy is. As this hypothetical analyst moves from what is seen, to what is induced, to what is deduced, to what is assumed, and finally to what can only be guessed at, the level of confidence declines. Intelligence analysis runs the gamut from physics to psychics, from restating proven scientific facts to predicting fuzzy-headed alternatives.

Descending down to a more practical level where mistakes can hopefully be corrected, an overly restrictive security classification system can hamper full analysis of all available and relevant facts. While there is a need to protect sensitive sources and methods of intelligence collection from disclosure to a hostile power, it is simply ludicrous for analysts, particularly those working on the same issue, to have varying degrees of security clearance. Yet it continues, perhaps out of force of habit, or perhaps out of excessive caution growing out of the possibility of future Aldrich Ames. Michael Handel noted that there may be an innate professional bias of intelligence organizations to "err in the direction of excessive caution and underutilization of information ... yet underused information is ineffective and has repercussions beyond the mere wasting of the collection effort."[30] Limiting access to information which might be the final piece of an intelligence puzzle is nothing short of a self-inflicted wound. It impedes creative analysis. A factor leading to the intelligence failure at Pearl Harbor was a security system, particularly for SIGINT intercepts, which limited the internal distribution of reports, so as "to reduce this group of signals to the point where they were barely heard." Stansfield Turner cautioned that such compartmentation today has left the United States "just as vulnerable to a Pearl Harbor now as in 1941."

Secrecy has its own malignant charm as well; a report that bears a higher classification tends to be considered as being more accurate that those of a lesser or no classification, regardless of whether the former report fits logically with the bulk of other evidence. Alvin and Heidi Toffler quote an unidentified government official who said "[t]here was an enormous cult of secrecy — and secrecy itself became a litmus test as to the validity of ideas."[31] Breaking the grip of the high priests of security would almost be akin to Protestant reformers publishing the Bible in the vernacular for the first time. If anything, increasing internal access to all sorts of intelligence would expand the marketplace of ideas and produce a better product.[32]

Intelligence analysis may also suffer simply due to sloppy thinking and poor quality control. Estimations of a bomber gap in the 1950s relied on questionable assumptions regarding the numbering system of Soviet Bison bombers.[33] The lazy analyst's friend, straight-line extrapolation, led to a vast underestimation of the North Korean military in the early 1970s. Trying to work out a compromise between CIA and DIA estimates on Soviet military spending, as well as problems with the various supporting economic models themselves, resulted in worst-case estimates which were neither "unbiased [nor] objective as possible."[34]

Contributing to such poor analysis may be the pedestrian issue of using young and relatively inexperienced analysts. A former naval intelligence officer noted that the tendency to move analysts from country desk to country desk over a very short time span and the pressure on them to seek greater responsibilities in administration and management, rather than on analysis contributes in large part to "[m]ilitary intelligence estimates [being] made, for the most part, by amateurs in the subject of the study."[35] A solution to the problem of poor quality analysis and

analysts sometimes turns out to be yet another contributor to the problem of intelligence failure. Management review of analytical products can help tighten the sloppy thinking of junior analysts, but it can also stifle creative thought if left to grow beyond its mandate and abilities. Marvin Ott criticized the CIA for going overboard on the number of reviews necessary before a report could leave the headquarters. The end results are frustrated analysts and fuzzy analysis.

> Rather than sharp delineation or risk-taking, the system rewards artful obscurantism and a cover-all-the-bases approach that protects the analyst from being proven wrong but gives the policymaker little useful guidance. It is what General Norman Schwarzkopf referred to as "mush." It is Cheez Whiz rather than sharp Cheddar."[36]

To add insult to injury, there is the tendency of bureaucracies and management oversight structures — intelligence and otherwise — to perpetuate themselves at the expense of line positions and field staff. Perhaps budget cuts and the current "reinvention of government" will reverse that tendency, but one must never underestimate the power of an entrenched bureaucracy to protect its interests.

A second aspect of intelligence bureaucracies is the possibility that they can unwittingly or deliberately foster an institutional bias in their analyses. For example, rivalries between the service intelligence staffs in promoting their views of the Japanese military threat was yet another thorny path which led the way to surprise at Pearl Harbor.[37] The tussle between the USAF on the one hand and the CIA and the other services on the other regarding the Soviet bomber and missile gaps was not just one of differing analytical perceptions, but of defending institutional equities as well.[38] As late as 1987, Robert Gates freely admitted that the CIA had an institutional bias, a bias which has resurfaced in recent disagreements between it and the US Navy over the Russian submarine modernization program.[39] If institutional biases are a multiheaded hydra difficult to destroy, then a redundancy in analytical effort in order to minimize a single dominant bias makes sense. However, as budget cuts slice away at redundancy and make the scramble for remaining funds more intense, it will take more than a Hercules to cut through the institutional biases, especially from those agencies closely associated with an operational or policy organization.

Another institutional factor affecting analysis is the more subtle relationship between the intelligence producer and the intelligence consumer. In a nutshell, the two institutional actors are on the same planet but exist in different worlds. The intelligence producer wishes to be a dispassionate purveyor of the facts while the consumer has an operation or a policy to pursue. The facts which the producer delivers frequently expand the range of options for the consumer precisely when he or she wants those options narrowed. The two communities' perceptions of intelligence are often markedly different. Whereas the intelligence producers see their charter to be accurate, timely, and relevant (in that order), the consumers want their intelligence to be relevant, timely, and accurate (in *that* order).

Given these differences in viewpoints, it becomes difficult for the intelligence producer to develop a close relationship with the consumer in order to understand

the latter's needs. When those needs are not well understood (which appears to be a common documented occurrence, at least for CIA analysts[40]), problems arise. The most recent case was in Operation Desert Storm. For a variety of reasons, the CENTCOM theatre intelligence staffs were geographically and operationally separated and disassociated from the air campaign planners in the famed Black Hole. As a result, the intelligence staffs were marginalized in the planning process while the air campaign planners chose to use an "old boy network" back at the Pentagon to acquire their intelligence data.[41] In addition to those reports that were watered down to "Cheez Whiz," estimates produced by national intelligence agencies were widely criticized as being too heavily footnoted with dissenting views. According to the DoD study on the Persian Gulf War, the main problem was that "to a combat commander, this reporting method often presents too broad a picture and too wide a range of options to affect combat force posturing or employment."[42] In part this was due to agencies' fears of making a wrong call on a critical topic, but one must also factor in the overlooked geographical and organizational distances between producer and consumer, between Washington and Riyadh.

Ultimately, what is needed to make an intelligence product acceptable for the consumer is a good, professional relationship between the two institutions. Sherman Kent once observed that:

> There is no phase of the intelligence business which is more important than the proper relationship between intelligence itself and the people who use its product .... [This relationship] is established as a result of a great deal of persistent conscious effort, and is likely to disappear when the effort is relaxed.[43]

There must be an atmosphere of mutual trust between the intelligence consumer and the producer. The consumer must not play the part of the cuckolded husband. In turn, the intelligence producer must remain a faithful wife to the goals of the operator. The military intelligence analyst in particular must show a willingness to "share the risk" with the operational and policy staffs. In particular, this concept of shared risks, of having a common goal and sharing the same sacrifices when things go poorly is especially crucial when the intelligence news is bad or in the middle of a crisis situation.[44] The closer an intelligence organization is to the issue at hand and the intelligence consumers, geographically, intellectually, or emotionally, the better this relationship becomes.[45]

However, if between the two worlds there is a great deal of distance, little common experiences or a low level of confidence and trust, this relationship will suffer and the intelligence analysis will be increasingly hard pressed to develop relevant products. Additionally, as much as the intelligence producers share risks with the consumers, the latter must share a sense of common ownership over the intelligence effort, that they must not only admit a need for the intelligence organization, but there must also be a sense that that organization belongs to them. Unless a commander sees those intelligence assets as much as his as are *his* aircraft, *his* men, *his* supplies, intelligence will always be viewed with a note of suspicion and disdain.[46]

The flip side of maintaining a close relationship with intelligence is getting so close that intelligence becomes an advocate of a position rather than a deliverer of the facts. In this case, analysis may be politicized to fit the presumed viewpoints of the intelligence consumer. To put it bluntly, this is deliberate manipulation of the facts and outright lying. The most outrageous case happened during the Reagan years during the debate over trading arms with Iran in return for hostages. A National Intelligence Estimate was changed to argue for the existence of high-level moderate Iranian government officials. Additionally, a channel was set up outside the control of the CIA Director of Intelligence to provide the White House with intelligence on Iran.[47] Fortunately politicization of analysis appears to be as rare an occurrence as a total solar eclipse, but when it happens, it throws a shadow of doubt over the entire intelligence community long after the event has passed.[48] In the end, intelligence must walk a fine line between loyalty and integrity. To once again quote Sherman Kent, "[i]ntelligence must be close enough to policy, plans, and operations to have the greatest amount of guidance, and must not be so close that it loses its objectivity and integrity of judgment."[49]

The most subtle, insidious, and dangerous fault in any analysis, particularly because it cannot be seen by an insider, is the cultural and conceptual blindspot. Cultural and conceptual filters help sort out the daily flood of information assaulting our senses, but they can also leave us blinded to things which are never expected or have never been experienced. The notion of a conceptual blindspot or paradigm is like the Platonic concept of prisoners bound in a cave, unable to move and unable to see more than the shadows of reality, but believing those shadows, those "silly nothings," are the true reality.[50] Even if an intelligence analyst were somehow to break free from his bounds, see the sunlight outside the cave, and gain a more comprehensive conceptual paradigm, he would still be ridiculed by those analysts still "in the cave."

Even when all the collection and analysis errors previously mentioned may not have occurred, an analyst's perception of the world at large, his paradigm of thought, will almost always attempt to fit new data into certain pre-validated "boxes" (e.g., "recent intensification of fighting in northern Iraq is a sign of a breakdown in intra-Kurdish relations"), to manipulate when there is no exact fit (e.g., "while the recent statement by the Russian defense minister contained some ambiguities and inconsistencies, we believe that Grachev is honestly attempting to reassert military control over the other CIS states"), or to discard altogether as "noise" (e.g., "North Korean public statements on its nuclear program are complete fabrications and half-truths"). Only when there are massive amounts of data which persistently and consistently challenge these conceptual paradigms will these paradigms change. For the intelligence analyst, these paradigm shifts may be accompanied by great tragedy and come too late to sound the I&W alarm.

Intelligence failures caused by such inflexible conceptual paradigms are legion. At Pearl Harbor since "no one [was] listening for signals of an attack against a highly improbable target, then it [was] very difficult for the signals to be heard."[51]

Another reason why the United States disregarded the Peruvian Embassy report on Japanese plans to attack Pearl Harbor was that such a move would be "in direct contradiction to Japanese naval tactical doctrine."[52] American intelligence officers in South Korea had for so long grown accustomed to North Korean deployments and South Korean skittishness that they failed to notice any change in the threat.[53] The failure to predict the location of the Tet Offensive in 1968 was not due to lack of relevant data, ignorance of the enemy or lack of fully trained intelligence staff but to a preconception that since the American troops were the major threat to the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese regulars, they — and not the ARVN — would be the subject of the attack. James Wirtz observed that "Officers misinterpreted indications of imminent attacks against southern cities as evidence of a communist diversion away from the main offensive along the DMZ; they mistook the main attack for the diversion and the diversion for the main attack."[54]

Applying American naval models to the Soviet Navy led the US Navy intelligence analysts to believe that the Soviets would adopt a bastion strategy to protect their forces, which in turn led the Navy operational planners to then advocate the more offensively-oriented Maritime Strategy to deal with this fictive threat.[55] Misinterpretation and stereotypical images of the "other" resulted in the Israeli failure to anticipate the Yom Kippur War and more fatally to the subjugation of the Greek city-states by Rome.[56] As is painfully obvious, conceptual paradigms and cultural blindspots are common to all intelligence organizations and can prove to be disastrous.

## Flaws In Intelligence Dissemination

Dissemination, the final phase in the intelligence process, has its own shortcomings, although the ability to apply technical solutions to this area has tended to focus undue attention on resolving its problems while more serious shortfalls in collection and particularly analysis are given shorter shrift. Dissemination failures are, however, the most frustrating, knowing that one has the information and not being able to get it out in time as anyone who has worked with a recalcitrant fax machine or word processor can attest to. There are two problem areas here. There may be an awareness that an attack is coming as in the hours prior to the Tet Offensive or there are reams of classified imagery to forward to aircrews in the desert as in Desert Storm but the supporting communications system cannot process the material quickly enough to get that intelligence out in time.[57]

Second, the same security restrictions that hampered the analysis of information can also strangle intelligence's utility and credibility as well as the responsiveness of intelligence staffs to the users of intelligence.[58] Too much security can leave a nation unable to act upon the intelligence simply because its dissemination is so highly restricted. Sherman Kent once remarked:

[I do not mean to] play down the importance of security regulations and their observance. I am concerned with the point that security is like armor. You can pile on the armor until the man inside is absolutely safe and absolutely useless. Both producers and consumers of intelligence can have their secrets, and in safeguarding them they can so insulate themselves that they are unable to serve their reasons for being.[59]

## Failures in the Intelligence Consumer-Producer Relationship and Unique Problems of Multinational Operations

Operating outside of the intelligence system and not an intelligence failure per se is the failure of the operational or policy communities to act upon the intelligence information they have received. This is in part a symptom of the degree of trust and confidence the decisionmakers have in their intelligence support, but it also reflects a deeper absence of their own will and resources. If a senior official has access to the finest intelligence that money can buy, yet has no intention of taking any action, then that intelligence has been wasted. The intelligence analysts then become modern day Cassandras, prophesying doom but not being heard. There are, unfortunately, times when this has happened outside the realm of mythology. For example, Stalin refused to heed Soviet intelligence warnings of a Nazi attack and as a result, millions of Soviets died for his recklessness.[60] The UN's previously mentioned inability or refusal to use its information on Namibia and the Western Sahara in planning for deployment of peacekeeping forces is a lesser example of this same problem.[61]

One may ask, if the UN is unwilling to assign blame for the sniper shooting of a single French soldier for fear of antagonizing the Serbs,[62] what use would it be to provide this organization with intelligence information which can be used to eliminate that particular troop security problem in the future? An unidentified Bosnian looking up at a UN aircraft was once quoted as saying, "There goes the UN — monitoring genocide."[63] And even if intelligence is listened to, it cannot, no matter how good, resurrect a poor policy or a stupid operational move from itself. As the report from the Rockefeller Commission noted: "Good intelligence will not necessarily lead to wise policy choices.[64]

The above mentioned problems are largely intrinsic to the nature of intelligence. There are also self-imposed restrictions on the quality and applicability of intelligence which are a unique subset of the larger intelligence-producer relationship issue discussed earlier. These constraints arise from the need to work in multinational war-fighting coalitions where information and intelligence is shared in varying degrees. On the level of operations, coalition warfare deals with combat and offensive actions designed to destroy an enemy. Thus, its practices are largely inapplicable to many UNPOs. Yet on the level of command, control,

communications and intelligence, certain experiences and problems in coalition warfare can be applicable to multinational UN operations. By their very nature, both UNPOs and war-fighting coalitions are composed of multinational units with different traditions and difficulties in working together. Of concern here are the frequent snags in communicating information, whether that information be orders to advance to a hilltop, operational data like air surveillance tracking information, or warnings and estimates on the "other." A careful sorting of the relevant information reveals further inadequacies in any future American intelligence support to a multinational UNPKO.

Part and parcel of coalition warfare is the sharing of intelligence data to some degree or another. If forces in a coalition are to work together effectively, there should be a common level of understanding about the opponent. Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm would not have been as successful if the coalition had not cooperated on intelligence matters. The trust the United States demonstrated in sharing the "good stuff" with its allies in the desert helped cement the bonds of a common objective.[65] The benefits to all parties in an intelligence-sharing coalition are fairly obvious. The collection and analytical workloads are efficiently divided and intelligence capabilities are shared. Cooperation can also be used to signal a larger trust and confidence in a coalition partner. If a nation in a coalition is unable to provide combat or logistical support, it can offer its intelligence capabilities as an offset.[66]

The more formal such an intelligence relationship is within a coalition, the longer the period of time to work together, and the more frequent the positive experiences of such intelligence support, the stronger the coalition becomes. On the other hand, in hastily cobbled together coalitions, this intelligence relationship may be nonexistent or immaturely developed. One can assume that this would frequently be the case in UN peace operations where there is usually a mixture of "old hand" countries like Canada and Bangladesh and "greenhorns" like Colombia and Switzerland. Eventually some form of "gentleman's agreement" may be developed between a nation and the UN or between national contingents, but these ad hoc intelligence exchanges are fragile as gossamer wings, as long-lived as a mayfly, and can be blown away by a single mishandling of classified intelligence data.[67]

Yet, regardless of whether a war-fighting coalition intelligence relationship is long-established or quickly put together, several problems repeatedly crop up. Whenever the United States regularly passes intelligence to the United Nations or among national contingents, these same issues are certain to manifest themselves. These pitfalls will in turn determine the degree and nature of its intelligence relationship with the UN.

The most obvious problem is one of security. The problems that security imposes on intelligence analysis and dissemination within the US intelligence community are compounded several-fold when dealing with other nations.[68] The most fundamental issue here is whether the United States believes the benefits of

sharing intelligence with a coalition partner(s) outweighs the risks of jeopardizing its intelligence sources and methods.

Information may not be fully shared or even provided to another national contingent. For one, the intelligence may simply not be of interest to the other nation or is not considered necessary for the overall goal of the coalition. An unequal sharing of intelligence information, no matter how cleverly justified can, however, lead to spurned coalition members feeling that some partners are more equal than others and lead to divisions within the coalition over larger issues.[69] Finally, there may be the fear that once a coalition partner begins to receive intelligence, it may want that flow to continue long after the coalition is dissolved.[70] In some cases, it might be better not to initiate an intelligence relationship, especially when the United States may be supporting "the most unlikely of allies in the most unlikely of locations."[71]

When a nation decides to provide intelligence to another, it may have an ulterior motive beyond simply wanting to make the coalition or partnership stronger. It may want some intelligence or some other *quid pro quo*.[72] It may use the intelligence channel to deceive another nation as did Nazi Germany with the Soviet Union prior to Operation Barbarossa.[73] Intelligence can be a tool to manipulate deliberately the perceptions and behaviour of the other, to adopt its own hidden agenda.[74] In the more extreme cases of ex-colonial powers, it may even have some of its own citizens or even intelligence agents placed in several important intelligence posts in the former colonies as has France in francophone Africa.[75]

In a more innocent relationship, a country may *blindly* accept another's perceptions, particularly in a long-established intelligence-sharing relationship when the other country is the dominant intelligence partner. The junior partner may bristle at being kept at a constant information disadvantage, of being seen as just another junior partner among many others — thus the push by some US allies in Europe and Asia to develop their own high-tech spy satellite systems. In the words of one observer of the Japanese government, Japan feels "handicapped by being totally dependent on intelligence that the US offers."[76] In the worst case, the junior partner may find itself forced to choose between continuing the broader relationship (to include intelligence sharing) or setting its own course. When New Zealand, one of the members of the long-standing US-UK intelligence network, decided to enforce its policy regarding port visits by nuclear vessels, "the United States ... [substantially] decreased the access of New Zealand to ... intelligence gathered by U.S. sources."[77] It is perhaps this fear — as well as being a commercial competitor with the United States — that made Jean-Pierre Rabault, director of the missiles and space division of the French procurement agency DGA, caution Germany against purchasing an American photo reconnaissance satellite: "[b]ut the questions the Germans will have to ask is who will have final control of the satellite. And what happens the day that the Americans no longer wish you to have their lovely system. That is where the problems come in."[78]

Ironically, such an assimilation of perceptions and loss of control can go the other way. A close day-to-day working relationship can lead to the senior dominant partner being co-opted by the perspectives of the junior member, particularly at the lower working levels of a liaison officer. "Going native" is a commonplace occurrence, but is particularly treacherous when it occurs in the intelligence field. An intelligence analyst or HUMINT agent may unconsciously adopt the conceptual paradigm and biases of a partner, accept his data without question, or cover up his faults. The most recent example would be the relationship between the CIA and the Guatemalan military. Tim Weiner wrote in the *New York Times*,

> The failure of the [CIA] station chief to acknowledge human rights abuses or to warn the Ambassador about the reported plot [by Guatemalan Army officers to destroy the Ambassador's reputation by spreading false rumors about her personal life] ... suggested the station chief was showing a stronger affinity for his contacts in the Guatemalan military than he had for the Ambassador.[79]

Finally, a coalition intelligence partnership may ultimately lead to a major counter-intelligence fiasco. Increased personal access to another country's intelligence system can reveal weaknesses and shortcomings in that system and identify personnel to exploit later. This goes both ways: Freedonia may now be tempted to conduct counter-intelligence against Lower Slobovia, if just to see how the latter is protecting the former's intelligence, and in turn Lower Slobovia may be conducting counter-intelligence against Freedonia for a more maleficent purpose.

Given all these weaknesses and failings, intelligence is certainly far from a perfect science and intelligence sharing has its costs as well as its benefits. There will always be surprises, but hopefully, the small successes will outnumber the large failures. Intelligence operates somewhere between half-truths and almost-perfect truths, in a purgatory of nagging doubt and hopeful optimism that it "got it right." Christopher Andrew summed it up best when he wrote:

> Even the ablest intelligence analyst cannot hope to avoid being regularly surprised by the movements of global politics and arms races, just as economists cannot expect to predict all the movements of the stock market. Military intelligence has the power to diminish but not to abolish military surprise. It is, and will remain, both fallible and indispensable.[80]

It is not a science like meteorology, much less physics, but it is far more than a pseudo-science like astrology. In the end, the greatest caution to UNPOs thinking of getting intelligence support from the United States or any other country is *caveat emptor*.

# Notes

1.  For example, see Jeffrey T. Richelson, *The U.S. Intelligence Community*, 2d ed. (New York: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1989), p. 11; Mark M. Lowenthal, "The Burdensome Concept of Failure," in *Intelligence — Policy and Process*, ed. Alfred C. Maurer, Marion David Tunstall and James M. Keagle (Boulder: Westview Press, 1985), p. 53; and Lt. Col. Martha Maurer, *Coalition Command and Control: Key Considerations* (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1994), p. 88.

2.  Jack E. Thomas, "The Defense Intelligence Community," in *The Military Intelligence Community*, ed. Gerald W. Hopple and Bruce W. Watson (Boulder: Westview Press, 1986), p. 7.

3.  United States Department of Defense, *Conduct of the Persian Gulf War,* Appendix C: Intelligence (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 1992), p. 345.

4.  See Pat Cooper, "Long-Range UAVs Key Spy Network," *Defense News*, 10-16 April 1995, p. 3; "Smart Trees, Rocks Aid U.S. NBC Effort," *Defense News*, 1-7 May 1995, p. 1; and "Stealthy UAV Gives Instant Imagery," *Defense News*, 5-11 June 1995, p. 4.

5.  James Sherr, "Cultures of Spying," *The National Interest* 38 (Winter 1994/95):57.

6.  George A. Carver, Jr., "Intelligence in the Age of Glasnost," *Foreign Affairs* 69 (Summer 1990):164.

7.  Stansfield Turner, "Intelligence for a New World Order," *Foreign Affairs* 70 (Fall 1991):151; Michael I. Handel, *War, Strategy and Intelligence* (London: Frank Cass and Company: 1989), p. 280, n. 104; Bruce W. Watson, "The Future of the Intelligence Community," in *The Military Intelligence Community*, p. 290; and Alvin and Heidi Toffler, *War and Anti-War: Survival at the Dawn of the 21st Century* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1993), p. 158.

8.  For a dissenting view that technological sensors can also provide information on an enemy's intentions, see Turner, "Intelligence for a New World Order," p. 154.

9.  Baron de Jomini, *The Art of War*, trans. Capt G.H. Mendell and Lt W.P. Craighill (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977), pp. 273-74.

10. Turner, "Intelligence for a New World Order," p. 159.

11. See Tim Weiner, "C.I.A. Pick is Facing Senate Test," *New York Times*, 26 April 1995, p. A5; and "Nominee for C.I.A. Vows to Clear Out Cold War Culture," *New York Times*, 27 April 1995, p. A1; Allan E. Goodman and Bruce D. Berkowitz, "Intelligence Without the Cold War," *Intelligence and National Security* 9 (April 1994):311; and Ann M. Florini, "The Opening Skies: Third-Party Imaging Satellites and U.S. Security," *International Security* 13 (Fall 1988):111.

12. Bruce D. Berkowitz and Allan E. Goodman, *Strategic Intelligence for American National Security* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 19. Costs for a major constellation of spy satellites for the WEU have been estimated at $10 billion. Since these numbers come from an Europeanindustrial consortium, they may be questionably low. Peter B. deSelding, "Lawmakers Urge WEU to Join European Spy Satellite Effort," *Defense News*, 26 June-2 July 1995, p. 3.

13.  Weiner, "C.I.A. Pick," p. A5; and "Mr. Deutch's Message," *New York Times*, 28 April 1995, p. A32.

14.  For a discussion on these issues, see John Hollister Hedley, *Checklist for the Future of Intelligence*, Institute for the Study of Diplomacy Occasional Paper no. 1 (Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, 1995), p. 16.

15.  Ibid., p. 3. Unfortunately, there is a bureaucratic tendency that once a product or service is regularly provided or a new consumer placed on distribution, it is very difficult to stop that support. Ironically, this inertia may result in a product or service being continued when it has long outlived its usefulness while it becomes doubly difficult to add new products or customers.

16.  Roberta Wohlstetter, *Pearl Harbor: Warning and Decision* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), pp. 392-93.

17.  See Joseph R. Wood, "President Carter's Troop Withdrawal from Korea," in *Security in Korea: War, Stalemate, and Negotiation*, ed. Phil Williams, Donald M. Goldstein and Henry L. Andrews, Jr. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994), pp. 162, 164; Loch K. Johnson, "Smart Intelligence," *Foreign Policy*, 89 (Winter 1992-93):57; and *Conduct of the Persian Gulf War,* p. 339.

18.  See Christopher Andrew, "The Nature of Intelligence," in *Go Spy the Land*, ed. Keith Neilson and B.J.C. McKercher (Westport, Conn: Praeger Publishers, 1992), p. 12; Virginia Page Fortna, "United Nations Transition Assistance Group," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 363; William J. Durch, "United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 421; Alain Destexhe, "The Third Genocide," *Foreign Policy* 97 (Winter 1994/95):9; and Hugh Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," *Survival* 30 (Autumn 1994):174-92.

19.  Chester G. Starr, *Political Intelligence in Classical Greece* (Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1974), pp. 4-6, 47-48.

20.  Hedley, *Checklist for the Future*, p. 8.

21.  Mark M. Lowenthal, "The Burdensome Concept of Failure" in *Intelligence — Policy and Process*, ed. Alfred C. Maurer, Marion David Tunstall and James M. Keagle (Boulder: Westview Press, 1985), p. 53.

22.  Johnson, "Smart Intelligence," p. 57.

23.  Robert Jervis, "Improving the Intelligence Process: Informal Norms and Incentives" in *Intelligence — Policy and Process*, p. 116.

24.  James A. Winnefeld, Preston Niblack and Dana J. Johnson, *A League of Airmen: U.S. Air Power in the Gulf War* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1994), p. 184.

25.  See Bill Sweetman, "Why Not Just Satellites?" *International Defense News* 26 (February 1993):107; and Richelson, *The U.S. Intelligence Community*, p. 153.

26.  Abram N. Shulsky and Gary J. Schmitt, "The Future of Intelligence," *The National Interest* 38 (Winter 1994/95):65.

27.  Jay T. Young, "US Intelligence Assessment in a Changing World: The Need for Reform," *Intelligence and National Security* 8 (April 1993):130.

28.  Wohlstetter, *Pearl Harbor*, pp. 382-86.

29. Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," p. 178.

30 Michael I. Handel, "Strategic Surprise: The Politics of Intelligence and the Management of Uncertainty" in *Intelligence — Policy and Process*, p. 265.

31. Toffler, *War and Anti-War*, p. 159. In a lighter vein, a RAF intelligence colleague once gave me a tongue-in-cheek "Ten Commandments of Intelligence," the last one stating "Whenever thine analysis is questioned, thou shall claim access to a higher [security classification] compartment than is held by the lowly questioner, thus making him appear to be a fool."

32. Bruce D. Berkowitz and Allan E. Goodman, "Why Spy — and How — in the 1990s," *Orbis* 36 (Spring 1992):277.

33. Fred Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1983), pp. 157-60.

34. Franklyn D. Holzman, "Politics and Guesswork: CIA and DIA Estimates of Soviet Military Spending," *International Security* 14 (Fall 1989):103-31.

35. Robert B. Bathurst, *Intelligence and the Mirror: On Creating an Enemy* (London: Sage Publications, 1993), pp. 119-20.

36. Marvin Ott, "Shaking Up the CIA," *Foreign Policy* 93 (Winter 1993-94):140-41.

37. Wohlstetter, *Pearl Harbor*, pp. 393, 395.

38. Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon*, pp. 158-59, 165-66.

39. Robert M. Gates, The CIA and American Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs* 66 (Summer 1987):222-23; and Robert Holzer, "Navy Faults CIA on Russia Submarines," *Defense News*, 24-30 May 1995, p. 3.

40. Gates, "The CIA and American Foreign Policy," p. 219.

41. Winnefeld et al., *A League of Airmen*, p. 187. Even a small distance between various offices can make for even greater distances in the level of crosstalk and support. At the Operation Provide Comfort headquarters building at Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, the American and British intelligence contingent shared a common suite on the second floor for handling SCI material. There we received all our national intelligence information, performed the bulk of our analysis, and briefed the CTF commander and senior staff daily. Because they did not have the appropriate security clearances to work in the "SCI suite," the single French intelligence liaison officer sat immediately outside our main door while the Turkish intelligence liaison officer chose to sit downstairs. Whenever a crisis occurred behind our doors, we had to continually remind ourselves "not to forget the French or the Turks."

42. *Conduct of the Persian Gulf War,* pp. 336-37.

43. Sherman Kent, *Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949), p. 180.

44. See Berkowitz and Goodman, *Strategic Intelligence*, p. 62; and Jervis, "Improving the Intelligence Process," p. 121.

45. Kent, *Strategic Intelligence*, p. 195. A single voice criticizing the central importance of the producer-consumer relationship is Mark Lowenthal who wrote: "Organization [of the national or military intelligence community] does matter, but only to a point ... The key issue is the ability of the community to deliver timely,

digestible, and accurate analysis to policymakers and the priority among the myriad areas of interest and concern. Although bad organization can greatly impede such an effort, the reverse is not necessarily true; even the best organization cannot ensure 'good' intelligence." Mark M. Lowenthal, *U.S. Intelligence: Evolution and Anatomy*, The Washington Papers, no. 157 (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1992), p. 144.

46.  Recalling a heated discussion I once had with a senior Air Force pilot over a long-forgotten issue, I was told "you intelligence guys are really mucking it up for us Air Force folks." A "we" versus "them" attitude is both a symptom and cause of the gulf which often separates the USAF intelligence and operational worlds.

47.  Ott, "Shaking Up the CIA," p. 136.

48  This conclusion is based upon the author's four years at the Pentagon where he was deeply involved in the writing, review, and production of National Intelligence Estimates.

49.  Kent, *Strategic Intelligence*, p. 180.

50.  *The Republic of Plato*, trans. Allan Bloom (New York: Basic Books, 1968), pp. 193-96

51.  Wohlstetter, *Pearl Harbor*, p. 393.

52.  Ibid., pp. 382-86.

53.  Bruce Cummings, *The Origins of the Korean War*, Vol II: *The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947-1950* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), p. 448-49.

54.  James J. Wirtz, *The Tet Offensive: Intelligence Failure in War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), p. 268.

55.  Bathurst, *Intelligence and the Mirror*, p. 1.

56.  See Christopher Andrew, "The Nature of Intelligence," in *Go Spy the Land*, p. 13; and Starr, *Political Intelligence in Classical Greece*, pp. 43-44, 47-48.

57.  Wirtz, *The Tet Offensive*, pp. 259-62; and *Conduct of the Persian Gulf War, Appendix C: Intelligence*, p. 339.

58.  See Toffler, *War and Anti-War*, p. 159; Ernest R. May, "Intelligence Reform," *Foreign Affairs* 71 (Summer 1992):72; Kent, *Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy*, p. 191; Berkowitz and Goodman, *Strategic Intelligence for American National Security*, p. 117; and Michael I. Handel, "Strategic Surprise: The Politics of Intelligence and the Management of Uncertainty," in *Intelligence — Policy and Process*, p. 265.

59.  Kent, *Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy*, p. 193.

60.  Mark Kramer, "What Stalin Did When Nazis Invaded," *New York Times*, 10 May 1995, p. A22.

61.  Virginia Page Fortna, "United Nations Transition Assistance Group," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 363; and William J. Durch, "United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 421.

62.  Roger Cohen, "U.N. Won't Say which Side Killed Peacekeeper in Bosnia," *New York Times*, 18 April 1995, p.A10.

63. Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," p. 181.

64. Commission on CIA Activities within the United States, *Report to the President* (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 6.

65. See *Conduct of the Persian Gulf War,* p. 340; and Lieutenant Colonel Marc Michaelis, "The Importance of Communicating in Coalition Warfare," *Military Review* November 1992, pp. 41, 44, 48-49. In other examples, France and Russia, after the end of the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, briefly shared intelligence from the newly emerging field of SIGINT. See Andrew, "The Nature of Intelligence," p. 6. Of course, the most well-known intelligence collaboration in a coalition grew out of the Second World War. The US-UK alliance eventually grew to incorporate Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Except for the recent exclusion of New Zealand from access to US materials, that coalition is today kept strong and vibrant by the sharing of intelligence. See Jeffrey T. Richelson and Desmond Ball, *The Ties that Bind: Intelligence Cooperation Between the UKUSA Countries – the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand* (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1985), p. 1.

66. See Wirtz, "Constraints", p. 248 and Lt. Col. Martha Maurer, *Coalition Command and Control: Key Considerations* (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1994), pp. 34, 86-88.

67. Regarding the last point, UNOSOM II staff allegedly left some sensitive US intelligence material behind in Somalia. While the United States response was that no state secrets were compromised, a Congressional inquiry may be underway. Mr. James Kiras, Pearson Peacekeeping Training Centre, 18 May 1995 telephone conversation with author. While the author has yet to independently verify this incident, a series of UN slip-ups with US intelligence material will almost guarantee this flow being sharply reduced or halted outright.

68. For example, despite decades of working together in NATO, national security classification restrictions make it difficult for intelligence agencies to exchange data beyond the bilateral levels "even though they may all have received the same information." See Maurer, *Coalition Command and Control*, p. 87. During Operation Desert Storm, the fast pace of combat operations and the stakes involved resulted in the "loosening of tongues," but as the official DoD study of the war warned, "[t]he liberal provision of American intelligence during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm will cause pressure for continued access to sensitive information, possibly straining the ability to protect sources and methods." See Michaelis, "The Importance of Communicating," pp. 48-49; and *Conduct of the Persian Gulf War,* p. 340.

69. Hugh Smith's report of an Indian UNPROFOR commander not being able to receive NATO intelligence is especially pertinent here. See Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," p. 177. From my experience, although the British, French and Turkish partners in Operation Provide Comfort had varying degrees of bilateral intelligence exchanges with the Americans (and in some cases different needs for intelligence), we had to be extremely careful not to leave the perception that one country was getting more intelligence information relevant to the mission than the others. For instance, based upon the broader US-UK relationship, the RAF contingent could have access to American SCI information while the French who flew over northern Iraq with the RAF were limited to SECRET information. Try as we

might to "decompartment" the relevant SCI for release to the French in addition to other initiatives, the French always expressed a nagging suspicion that they were not getting the full story.

70.   Maurer, *Coalition Command and Control*, p. 87.

71    Lt. Colonel Karl W. Eikenberg, "The Challenges of Peacekeeping," *Army* 43 (September 1993): 20.

72.   Richelson and Ball, *The Ties that Bind*, p. 168.

73.   Wirtz, "Constraints," p. 251.

74.   Maurer, *Coalition Command and Control*, p. 34.

75.   Roy Pateman, "Intelligence Agencies in Africa: A Preliminary Assessment," *Journal of Modern African Studies* 30 (December 1992):576.

76.   Naoki Usui, "U.S. Firms Offer Remote Images to Japanese," *Defense News*, 15-21 May 1995, p. 6.

77.   Richelson, *The U.S. Intelligence Community*, pp. 270-71.

78.   Jean-Pierre Rabault, quoted by Giovanni de Briganti and Peter B. deSelding, "Germany Hesitates on Joint French Space Plans," *Defense News*, 3-9 April 1995, p. 26.

79.   Tim Weiner, "More is Told About C.I.A. in Guatemala," *New York Times*, 25 April 1995, p. A6.

80.   Andrew, "The Nature of Intelligence," p. 15.

# 4.  *US Intelligence and UN Peace Operations: A Match Made in Heaven or Somewhere Lower and Warmer?*

Recalling the earlier metaphor of peacekeeping, peace enforcement, etc. as tools which, if improperly used or used by the wrong "mechanic," will be ineffective, US intelligence is also a tool which many would like to acquire for UN peace operations. Chapter 3 outlined several caveats against the accuracy, timeliness, and relevancy of the intelligence tool itself, its inability to handle more than a certain amount of "torque" without breaking. Moreover, as with specific types of UNPOs, the intelligence tool may be inappropriate to the task at hand. Sometimes the "fit" will be good and other times it will be akin to using a straight-edge screwdriver to drive in a Phillips head screw. It will not be a perfect fit, but it will make do. But when US intelligence support threatens to undermine the essential characteristics of peacekeeping, it is tantamount to using the same straight-edge screwdriver to drive in a Robinson screw; it will not only be ineffective, it will be counter-productive and "strip the screw."

From one aspect, there is no guarantee that US intelligence support will be adequate for a UNPO. Try as it might to correct itself, the intrinsic and self-imposed weaknesses of the US intelligence system discussed above will be exacerbated when asked to support this non-familiar customer in a non-familiar role in a non-familiar setting. There may also be problems with the UN fearing that a too-heavy reliance upon American intelligence may jeopardize its neutrality or make itself a "hostage" to the US point of view.

Conversely, although there have been major attempts made for greater openness in the intelligence world, the US may actually be more inclined to pass secrets to its former enemies than it would be of releasing classified intelligence to the

UN. At least in the former case, there may be hope that action could be taken to support or advance a US interest; there is no guarantee that the UN would be able to press singlemindedly the US's case. More fundamentally, however, a case can be made that the US and the UN have widely divergent perceptions toward intelligence or information. This section examines the above issues and asks the "should" question: Would US intelligence support be appropriate for the information requirements of UNPOs?

The US intelligence system may not be fully responsive or provide adequate intelligence to a UNPO. Its relative unfamiliarity with the Third World, its tenuous relationship with the UN, and the unique collection constraints and analytical needs of a peace operation highlight several of the weak areas listed in Chapter 3. All or none of these may occur during a UN operation, yet over the long term, the possibility of them occurring will be higher than normal.

They are shortcomings in: collection (the US may not or is unable to collect information on that country, the risk of sending US HUMINT agents to support a UNPO is not worth the gain, or alternative sources may not be credible), analysis (not enough experienced analysts in the area/UNPOs, the relationship between the US intelligence producer and the UN commander in the field may be hampered by geographic distance and a lack of mutual trust and understanding, or there may be analytical blindspots from the US side or information overload from the UN side), dissemination (security restrictions or sluggish communications systems), and inaction on the UN's part to do anything once it has been given the intelligence.

As mentioned above regarding the chaos theory, the earlier the problem occurs in the intelligence process, the worse the product or service. This is *especially* pertinent for UNPOs which take place in areas where the US has neither the interest nor the intellectual inclination to follow and understand well the commitment to deploy US peacekeepers. Lt. Col. Seney has verified that

> Presently, the US is not willing to provide information on areas in which it has no special interest (specifically, deployed troops), which helps explain why the [UN PKO] standing request for information on Haiti and Yugoslavia are on-going and the standing request on Rwanda has gone to an occasional response.[1]

## Hypothetical Case Study

What follows is a hypothetical worst-case scenario for a traditional UN peacekeeping operation gone bad. As with the development of US-only intelligence, it is highly improbable that all of the errors listed below could happen simultaneously, but it does demonstrate several of the things that can come up short.

Assume for the sake of argument that after years of bitter fighting in the mythical African state of Zululand, the two sides agree to an uneasy ceasefire and ask

the UN for assistance in deploying a peacekeeping force to act as an interpositional force, monitor the ceasefire and disarmament agreements, and assist in rebuilding the destroyed governmental and social structures. But as a former colony of a European power, both the nominally pro-Western government and the Islamic fundamentalist belligerents demand a right to veto the composition, nature and access of the PKO force. Based upon limited reporting from its embassy in Zululand and advice from the State and Defense Departments, the administration agrees that a PKO force could restore the peace, votes for the motion at the Security Council, but elects not to send forces. Rather, it promises funding, airlift and sealift of PKO forces, and intelligence to assist in the predeployment planning and operation of the operation tagged as UN Assistance Mission in Zululand (UNAMIZ). What can possibly go wrong?

First, as intelligence targets go, Zululand is at the bottom of the collection and analysis priority for the United States. The fighting may have gone on for years, but all US intelligence officials know about it is from the occasional embassy reports and even scarcer reports in the press. The last analysis on the fighting in Zululand was five years old from a military reservist given some makework to do during her two-week reserve tour at DIA. There are limited or no IMINT, SIGINT, or HUMINT assets trained against the country. Other higher priorities have prevented that, but as the deployment of PKO forces grows closer, Zululand finally begins to get limited coverage. Additionally, a three-person Zululand working group is created in the NMJIC, using analysts drawn away from other country desks and only one of whom has a working knowledge of African affairs. After a rather rough start, limited intelligence support eventually begins to flow through the UN desk through the US-UN mission and from there to the UN Situation Centre.

However, the level and nature of the fighting precludes easy collection. Although the war has been particularly vicious, it has essentially been between roving bands of insurgents and small groups of government forces using only the crudest of weapons and having limited communications gear. It is thus difficult to see or hear what the forces are up to. Making matters worse, the country's vast tree-cover makes it very difficult to see through to the ground. The belligerents also absolutely refuse to permit aerial overflights of their country by any non-PKO-contributing country. There are no US HUMINT agents who can be quickly trained in the local dialect, much less develop the Zululand contacts necessary for their line of work, nor, if such agents were available, could they easily be inserted into Zululand without a supporting American presence. There are the occasional reports from the former colonial power's embassy and HUMINT agents, but since it has been known to favour one side and had resisted the establishment of UNAMIZ, its reports are highly suspect. It has become painfully apparent that not only is there a limited historical database on Zululand, but as is frequently typical, the national intelligence collection system is not well-geared against a low-level Third World conflict.[2]

Nevertheless, the Zululand working group is able to develop several estimates on the situation in the country. These estimates, as well as satellite photography of the ceasefire lines, suspected headquarters of both sides, major roads and ports are sent to the UN soon before the UN force deploys. There is not enough time for the Nepalese field commander to incorporate all their information into his final planning, but he promises to keep the channels open once he arrives in the country. Reports come to the UN situation centre twice a week thereafter and are then forwarded to field headquarters.

The field commander is, however, suspicious of the accuracy of the American reports, questioning whether the US has a hidden agenda buried in its intelligence reports. He has been disappointed by some reports being irrelevant and dated. He also feels constrained by not being able to contact the analysts directly or, even better, have them work for him in the Zululand capital. Worst yet, as a former commander of Nepalese forces in UNOSOM II and UNPROFOR, he had been left out of the information flow while other national contingent commanders received US intelligence regularly. As such he is concerned that the UN headquarters cannot tell him everything it knows about the situation in Zululand. As the ceasefire begins to fall apart and fighting renews, he is even more worried that he is not getting the full story.

For their part, the Zululand working group analysts back in Washington do not have a good "feel" for the situation in Africa or for the viewpoint of the UNAMIZ commander. The feedback loop is too slow and goes through so many layers of the juryrigged UN intelligence support structure that the actual feedback is distorted. Intelligent and hard-working as they are, they do not have strong backgrounds in this part of the world or in the unique needs of UNPKOs, there is relatively little data coming in, and the group has little visibility or high-level interest for it to receive additional resources. Most importantly however, the Zululand working group misperceives the renewed fighting as a sign of the rebels cheating once again. What they cannot understand is that it is the notoriously corrupt government forces who are actually instigating the fighting, not to counter an imaginary rebel threat but as a way to create a demand for their "protection services" from the local populace. That military forces would stoop so low is beyond the ken of the analysts who have never travelled to Africa and who have never lived under a corrupt military. Intelligence information is usually ambiguous at best, so it is more logical for them to read into the ambiguities a reaffirmation of an intellectual paradigm which coincides with their preconceived notions of each side of the Zululand conflict.

Things quickly turn sour throughout the country and the beleaguered UNAMIZ force is finding itself shot at by both sides. The field commander's requirement for intelligence to protect his own forces and plan for a hasty withdrawal escalate dramatically. By this time, given the administration's now-heightened interest in the area and the greater ease of its national assets in gathering information against

these larger Zululand formations and activities, the drought of data now turns into a flood. The working group is doubled and reports go out to the UN three times a day. However, the field commander is unable to get all this information due to the sensitivity of the collection sources. Even what information he receives not only clogs up his one satellite communications link to New York, it also overwhelms his small military information staff who have never before in their lengthy military intelligence service in their various countries had to deal with so much information and who are more culturally attuned to drawing conclusions on far less information simply because they have had to.

Ill-informed government forces mistake one of the US air transports flying over their positions as an American reconnaissance aircraft and attempt to shoot it down. Despite the UNAMIZ commander's protestations to the contrary, he is now perceived to be not only collecting intelligence against the government forces, but feeding it to the rebels. Subsequently, he receives a report that his HQs will be overrun and he makes a decision to immediately withdraw to the nearest large seaport. Unfortunately he is unable to do so because the UN DPKO has advised the secretary-general not to be an alarmist. When the approval to retreat finally comes in, it is too late. Because the UN member states did not want to expend too much money, the UNAMIZ force has too few transports to take it to the harbor safely. It is ultimately surrounded and held hostage by government forces for several months. UNAMIZ ends in abject failure.

Admittedly, this hypothetical scenario is overdrawn and certainly is not material for a Tom Clancy novel, but it is meant to illustrate the practical difficulties in an intelligence operation and is offered in lieu of any documented reports of intelligence failures in past and present UNPOs. It strains credulity to think that failures did not happen in the previously discussed actual cases as much as it does to think the above fictional story may happen. The truth is sure to lie somewhere in the middle. Yet, aside from the hints from the UN that not all has gone well in the past, there is no firm documentation either way, leaving us only to take the chance and assume that some of the problems detailed in Chapter 3 have and could in the future occur again.

Leaving aside the issues raised here affecting the adequacy of intelligence support, arguments against continuing down this path can only be deduced. Specifically, there are the larger concerns of whether that support will be acceptable to the two parties involved: the United States and the United Nations. These are the problems of domination, neutrality, security, and perception.

## American Domination

Given the suggested absence of any real UN intelligence capability and the global dominance of the high-tech US intelligence system, there is the issue of the United

Nations being forced to rely upon the US and other Western industrial powers for its intelligence services. The UN may find itself dominated by the viewpoints of the Western nations. K.P. Saksena has observed that

> As of now the United States alone ... has the surveillance capability to monitor developments all over the world. If the Secretary-General has to rely on US technology, the United Nations will have to accept the danger that the information would come through a prism with the potential for distortion."[3]

The question of distortion, whether innocently inadvertent as discussed above in Chapter 3 or deliberately deceitful as K.P. Saksena and Kofi Annan suggest (the latter being quoted as saying "[w]e have to be careful because the big powers only give us what they want us to know"[4]) cannot be dismissed very easily or summarily. As with all war-fighting coalitions, it will take years of a healthy intelligence relationship for the UN to overcome these suspicions and only days to destroy trust and goodwill, especially with an international organization that knows the general US level of support for its activities has never been very high. Until then, the intelligence relationship will remain immature and stunted.

There is also the dilemma that reliance upon the US and other high-tech intelligence nations will underscore the perception of the Third World that while they provide the bulk of the UNPO forces, they are being increasingly written out of command and control, including intelligence. In essence, the Third World supplies the blue collar force while the developed world supplies the white collar managers. The further along the high technology slope any UNPO force goes, the more the Western states will play a role, and the narrower the geographic scope of UN contingents. This places an undue burden on them and may make blue helmeted forces less welcome, particularly in the Third World.[5]

More specifically, Third World nations generally have a deep unease toward intelligence; for them the question may arise: Is any of this intelligence given to the United Nations about me?[6] This reflects the distrust many states feel regarding their own military and intelligence establishments which are frequently corrupt, abuse their powers, and are focused primarily inward on dissidents and "enemies of the state" rather than on external threats.[7] Hugh Smith's comment to this concern of Western intelligence domination of the UN that "[t]he reality is, however, that it [the UN] may have little other option" is a cold comfort.[8] What this perception, true or not, could result in is the loss of belief in the UN's neutrality.

## UN Force Impartiality and Neutrality

Here is the crux of the Faustian bargain for the UN: Should it "sell its soul" to the American Mephistopheles so it can grow wiser with knowledge? UN intelligence is almost seen as an oxymoron, particularly in relation to peace operations. Among the characteristics of traditional peacekeeping and even to a degree for the more

offensive-oriented humanitarian relief and peace enforcement operations, the force's impartiality and neutrality and the full support of the belligerents to the force's presence are considered crucial. Intelligence gathering, no matter how commendable its goals, is looked upon as undermining those two peacekeeping traits. The UN has been careful not to offend Third World sensibilities. What little actual intelligence gathering the UN has done in the past, has "often been disguised under labels such as 'public information' and 'military observers'."[9] According to Lt. Col. Seney,

> The parties to a conflict in a peace-keeping environment will be suspicious of all intelligence-related activities. They are likely to regard the gathering of intelligence itself as a hostile act, and lives can be at stake. The standard function of intelligence in peace-keeping is therefore termed "military information." This term should not be used tongue-in-cheek — it is very appropriate.[10]

According to a Finnish military officer conversant in UNPKOs, this sensitivity toward intelligence — or even information-gathering in the field — constrains the ability of peacekeepers from taking too many notes when visiting belligerents![11] Given these constraints, can the UN engage in intelligence in UNPOs and, by inference, is it worth the risk for the UN to accept US intelligence, to have the Americans do its dirty work?

For its part, the US military is extremely sensitive to the neutrality issue versus the image of intelligence gathering as something nefarious and malevolent, recommending in its joint doctrine for peacekeeping operations a "submerging" of the intelligence function in the force structure and an admonishment in its draft Army manual on peacekeeping to safeguard information about one side from another.[12]

"If one side suspects that the force, either deliberately or inadvertently, is giving information to the other side," the manual states, "it could result in accusations of espionage. One or both parties to the dispute may then become uncooperative and jeopardize the success of the operation, putting the force at risk."[13]

## Security and the UN

This uneasiness about intelligence support to the UN is not entirely one-sided. There is the continual American concern over the ability and willingness of the UN to protect the classified intelligence materials it receives. Can it trust the UN to keep a secret, to respect the security concerns of the US as much as the US respects the neutrality concerns of the UN?[14] Highly sensitive material may be downgraded, sanitized or decompartmented, but to the US, it is still privileged, if no longer classified, information. Breaking that trust or abusing that privilege is a surefire way for the UN to guarantee that the flow of American intelligence information will stop.

Admittedly, the classification system has been overused in the past to cover up abuses of power, to wrap up the truly important information in a blanket of trivial classified details, or even to make the product more credible.[15] The comment by William Burrows, "[t]o classify almost everything is to classify almost nothing,[16] is accurate. Thus, the recent Executive Order (EO 12958) signed on 17 April 1995, which sharply limits what can be classified and opens up more historical material to declassification has "established the least secretive policy on Government records since the beginning of the cold war."[17] Yet at the same time, the need to protect the sources and methods of getting the intelligence has never been denied either by the practitioners or the critics of the US intelligence system.[18]

In essence what a classification system does is to set a price on the material, a price that shows not what the article is worth, but what would be lost in terms of sources and methods if the material fell into the wrong hands. While it can act as a hidden cost, making it inaccessible to those who do not have the proper "coin of the realm," its price can be very easily adjusted downward if the United States wishes to share that information with another either in an attempt to have its position accepted or more importantly as a sign of trust.

The release in Spring 1995 of a classified intelligence estimate on Iran's nuclear program to Russia and China was meant to draw a common bond of concern about proliferation of WMD in the unstable Middle East and hopefully encourage those countries to desist from sales that would aid Iran's nuclear ambitions. Such an approach is not always successful but it does show the mutability of security classifications.[19] To a degree, the upper limit of what is released to another nation represents the amount of trust; it is akin to a diamond engagement ring: the bigger the stone, the greater the mutual commitment. Going back to the example of the analysis given to Russia and China, there probably was a great deal of trust that those two countries would not broadcast it outside the proper channels. It may in fact be easier for the US to pass classified material to Russia or China than it is to the UN since the US knows that the former two have at least some form of security apparatus to limit dissemination of the information.

The United Nations has traditionally had a hard time with the concept of deliberately keeping information from other member states or representatives within a UNPO force. It is not in its nature to deal with or keep secrets, at least for very long. Unlike the United States, Russia or China, the UN is built to be open about its activities, candid about its plans. As Hugh Smith wrote:

> The security of UN intelligence — or, more accurately, the lack of security — is a political minefield ... It must be assumed that any information provided to the UN will sooner or later become public knowledge ... The fundamental reason for the openness of UN intelligence is the fact that the organisation is international and its personnel are multinational.[20]

Although Smith goes on to downplay any problems with the inadvertent release of classified intelligence (arguing that most of the material is ephemeral anyway),

this is too cavalier an approach. Perhaps no harm might be done to the unique intelligence assets that gather this information, but irreparable harm can be done to the atmosphere of trust between the UN and the US.

Thus the DCI's guidance to restrict the exchange of information to "the least sensitive to satisfy each requirement ... provide[d] ... to a limited number of individuals" and HR 7's demand that

> before intelligence information is provided by the United States to the United Nations, the President shall ensure that the Director of Central Intelligence ... has established guidelines governing the provision of intelligence information to the United Nations which shall protect intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure ...[21]

In the end, if the UN cannot adapt some of its policies and procedures to protect the privileged information it receives, then it will probably lose all future access. Trust, unlike security classifications, is not easily mutable; like the UN's neutrality, it is hard to win and easy to lose.

## Differing Perceptions of Intelligence and Information

The issues of neutrality and security are symptoms of a greater perceptual divide between the US and the UN. The former sees knowledge as power, power that can be enhanced by withholding it or shared only after there is a quid pro quo given or promised.[22] The efficacy of secret knowledge lies in keeping that information secret. For the US, secrecy is not just a necessary vice, it is at times a virtue. It artificially enhances the value of the product. On the other hand, although the UN also sees knowledge as power, from its viewpoint information's power is enhanced through openly and equally sharing it with all parties. For the latter organization, although it does at times engage in selective self-censorship,[23] for the most part secrecy acts as a corrosive which works away unseen at the very foundations of the United Nations.

As a collection of states acting in the best interests of all and serving the interests of no single nation, the UN fundamentally cannot act like a state when it comes to collecting and controlling information. During the UN Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA) mission, then Secretary-General Pérz de Cuéllar was very reluctant to support expanding the operation's ability to detect violations,

> mainly due to the fact that an international peacekeeping operation cannot undertake the detection of clandestine activities without assuming functions that properly belong to the security forces of the country or countries concerned.[24]

The United Nations may be forced by necessity to adopt temporarily such an unfamiliar role, but there must be special circumstances. A too close identification of the UN with intelligence gathering and with secret knowledge may

ultimately lead to the organization's downfall as a neutral and open arbiter of the world's problems. In essence, the medicine for UNPO problems might cure the disease but kill the doctor.

## Notes

1.     Seney, 22 May 1995 correspondence.

2.     See Bruce D. Berkowitz and Allan E. Goodman, "Why Spy — and How — in the 1990s," *Orbis* 36 (Spring 1992): 274; and Lt. Col. Edward L. Constantine, "Low Intensity Conflict: Are We Prepared?", *Military Intelligence* 13 (June 1987):39.

3.     K.P. Saksena, *Reforming the United Nations: The Challenge of Relevance* (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1993), p. 193.

4.     Michael Renner, *Critical Juncture: The Future of Peacekeeping*, Worldwatch Paper no. 114 (Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, 1993), p. 41.

5.     Peter Jones, "Technology and Peacekeeping," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 21 (November/December 1992):3; and in "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance III: The Post Cold War Era," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 23 (July-August 1994):7.

6.     Mats R. Berdal, *Whither UN Peacekeeping?* Adelphi Paper 281 (London: Brassey's, 1993), p. 66.

7.     James J. Wirtz, "Constraints on Intelligence Collaboration," *Defence Analysis* 8 (1992):253-54.

8.     Hugh Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Autumn 1994):185.

9.     Berdal, *Whither UN Peacekeeping?*, pp. 43-44. Witness the previously noted comment from a Danish officer that "it is the basic policy of all UN peacekeeping missions that active intelligence collection is incompatibel [sic] with the role of the UN." Lt. Col. E. B. Dam, 22 May 1995 correspondence to author.

10    Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, p. 1.

11.    Lt. Col. Pekka Hannukkala, Commanding Officer UN-Training Centre, Niinisalo, Finland, 16 May 1995 correspondence with author.

12.    *Joint Publication 3-07.3*, "Appendix J: Intelligence Support to Peacekeeping Operations", p. J-1-2.

13.    *Field Manual 100-23, Peace Operations*, pp. 3-7.

14.    In this regard, the UN's DPKO has developed a general set of operating procedures (SOP) for each PKO to adapt to its own needs. One area of the SOPs includes procedures for the protection of sensitive information. Furthermore, the US has apparently offered to provide basic security training material for UN military information officers and PKO personnel. Seney, 19 May 1995, p. 3.

15.    See "The Secrecy Infection," *New York Times*, 5 April 1995, p. A24; Jeffrey T. Richelson, *America's Secret Eyes in Space: The U.S. Keyhole Spy Satellite Program*

(New York: Harper Business Publishers, 1990), pp. 261, 264-65; and *The U.S. Intelligence Community*, 2d ed. (New York: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1989), p. 451.

16. William E. Burrows, *Deep Black: Space Espionage and National Security* (New York: Random House, 1986), p. xiii.

17. Douglas Jehl, "Clinton Revamps Policy on Secrecy of U.S. Documents," *New York Times*, 17 April 1995, p. A1.

18. See Sherman Kent, *Strategic Intelligence for American world Policy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949), p. 191; Richelson, *The U.S. Intelligence Community*, p. 451; and "The Secrecy Infection," *New York Times*, 5 April 1995, p. A24.

19. See Steven Greenhouse, "U.S. Gives Russia Secret Data on Iran to Fight Atom Deal," *New York Times*, 3 April 1995, p. A1; Elaine Sciolino, "Beijing Rebuffs U.S. on Halting Iran Atom Deal," *New York Times*, 17 April 1995, p. A1; Steven Erlanger, "Russia Says Sale of Atom Reactors to Iran is Still On," *New York Times*, 4 April 1995, p. A1; and Patrick E. Tyler, "China Reports New Problems in Atom Deal with Teheran," *New York Times*, 18 May 1995, p. A11.

20. Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," pp. 175, 181-82.

21. Gopher information service.

22. Lt. Col. Seney strongly disagrees with my point regarding a quid pro quo arguing that "[t]he member states who are providing information, and warm bodies, are not seeking a quid pro quo from I&R — this office supports DPKO and the UN, not the member states." Seney, 19 May 1995, p. 2.

23. Jonathan Power, "What Didn't Make the United Nations' Cut," *The Globe and Mail*, 26 June 1995, p. A11.

24 Secretary-General's 1990 report on ONUCA as quoted by Brian D. Smith and William J. Durch, "UN Observer Group in Central America," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping: Case Studies and Comparative Analysis* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 456.

# 5. Options for the UN in Lieu of Intelligence

Despite the problems associated with American intelligence support to UNPOs, there are limited cases where it may be necessary, where the "strong medicine" must be applied. But rather than "front load" US intelligence into the equation, it should be utilized only *after* several traditional and less nettlesome nontraditional methods of collecting and analyzing information are tapped dry or found to be inadequate. These include ground patrols; the creation of an analysis cell within the UN force; the use of open-source information, aerial surveillance, commercial airborne imagery, commercial satellite and commercially available spy satellite imagery; as well as a tap into other countries' intelligence networks. Each alternative has its own strengths and weaknesses. Together with US intelligence, these options can be used to varying degrees in indications and warning, predeployment planning, security of the UN force, ceasefire and disarmament agreement monitoring, and supporting either a hasty withdrawal or offensive actions (as in peace enforcement operations).

## Ground Patrols and Observation Posts

The most familiar of United Nations information gathering are its unarmed or lightly armed ground patrols and observation posts found in practically every PKO.[1] A typical ground observer force is that seen in the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization (UNTSO) operating in the Middle East since 1954. Mona Ghali has written that:

> [UNTSO] essentially remains deployed to observe and report illegal incursions across the armistice lines and to mediate disputes between the parties... As observers, UNTSO personnel can merely report on developments in the region; they are

unarmed, with only the moral suasion of their blue berets and UN insignias to protect them from hostile parties.[2]

Sizes of these ground observer contingents have ranged from six for the United Nations Yemen Observer Mission (UNYOM) to 501 in the United Nations Observer Group in Lebanon (UNOGIL). The more mobile and visible the patrols and posts, the better their ability to collect information, and more importantly the greater the confidence of the belligerents in the efficacy of the PKO and their perception that the temporary peace will become a permanent one. Witness the role of the patrols in the ONUCA mission which, although recognizing their inability to spot violations, nevertheless still acted as a confidence-building measure.[3]

Essentially these UN ground observers are acting as rudimentary HUMINT agents, reporting movement of forces, transgressions of peace agreements and the conditions and moods of the local populace. However, unlike traditional HUMINT agents, they are generally open in their collection of information and, because they are perceived to be a neutral force, they usually have fairly free access throughout the conflict zone. Although crude, the information they gather is the primary and sometimes the only data necessary for the UNPKO. As was noted for the UN Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), liaising with both belligerents as well as with other locals is very critical for the UN PKO to accomplish its goals and will always remain necessary to ensure the security of the PKO force itself.[4] Given enough ground observers well-trained in observation skills[5] and with sufficient transportation and full access to the conflict zone, this low-tech approach to "intelligence gathering" might suffice (or might be the only type of collection that a UN force is permitted to do).[6]

## UN Field Analysis Organisation

However, even the best-trained, most aware group of observers are limited in the quantity and quality of information they can produce. The flood of data they report will often be ambiguous and contradictory and will require some review to pick out any patterns or major discrepancies. While there may be some rudimentary analysis done by the observers themselves, they are still too close to the situation to see the "big picture." Instead, a military information cell is required at field headquarters to do the true analysis. The previously described sensitivity to this "intelligence" function requires that its activities be discreetly buried in the HQs structure. This function does not necessarily however require intelligence officers per se,[7] but simply combat/UNPO-experienced officers and NCOs with an ability to deal with torrents of information and logically sort them out to find out the "ground truth." This function should be their full-time duty so as to build expertise and a historical knowledge of the area. Such "military information" cells were used effectively in the UNOGIL operation (noted by one observer as "impressive and objective")[8], UNSCOM by its Information Assessment Unit,[9]

UNOSOM II, and probably several other UNPOs as well. In a larger sense, the creation of the I&R unit at UN headquarters provides this same function, albeit at a higher level and with a broader focus. What will limit these field and UN HQs intelligence functions will be a combination of insufficient data, inadequate numbers of well-trained personnel, and an overestimation of their capabilities to satisfy UNPO requirements.

## Open Sources of Information

There may subsequently be a need to supplement ground observer reports or to develop an initial database in the case of predeployment planning. More data can be derived from the wealth of materials from open sources, whether they be the media, academic and professional journals, reports from NGOs and UN field offices, or other materials found along the information superhighway. In many cases, open sources can substitute for expensive, hard-to-handle classified intelligence. As Heidi and Alvin Toffler recently commented:

> the Third Wave explosion of information and communication means that more and more of what decision makers need to know can be found in "open" sources. Even a great deal of military intelligence can come from the wide-open store next door. To ignore all this and base analysis on closed sources alone is not only expensive but stupid.[10]

The Tofflers join a long list of critics of the US intelligence community who see the greater access of public information driving down the requirements for espionage. Even the newly appointed DCI, John Deutch, has openly advocated an increased reliance upon open sources.[11]

Similarly, there are those who advocate that the UN tap into open sources for its PKO information needs, most recently Hugh Smith.[12] This is what the DPKO's I&R unit is currently doing as a "front-end" process before it turns to the national intelligence communities.[13] In addition to information publicly available, the UN could acquire pertinent information from its worldwide field offices and NGOs. The former possess a vast wealth of expertise and information which may come in handy for a UN peace operation.[14] The latter are familiar with local conditions and are in the field long before a UN force arrives.[15] Being "one of the boys" rather than some ill-considered shadowy national agency HUMINT collector, the UN should be able to receive a great deal of information from these two sources alone. In both cases, the I&R unit is currently involved in "several [UN] interdepartmental projects underway [to share information] that will greatly improve the information data base that will support PKOs."[16] These include establishing an informal electronic database between DPKO, DPA, and DHA on a "country-by-country basis to improve information-sharing interdepartmentally [at the UN]" and tapping into an electronic network to be managed by DHA which will have

information provided by UN agencies, NGOs member governments and academics relating to humanitarian crises. Eventually, PKOs in the field will be able to have access to this latter network.

However, open sources are at best a mixed blessing. While reports from the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Herald Tribune* and the Japanese press provided excellent information on the Japanese political scene prior to Pearl Harbor, there is a lot of roadkill on the information superhighway as anyone who has read the Internet material on Bosnia knows. Relief and developmental NGOs may exaggerate or fabricate the facts to suit their own agendas as in Liberia and elsewhere.[17] A *Globe and Mail* editorial once warned, "as with war, it seems, truth can be the first casualty of aid ... The house of statistical cards that many agencies try to build, perhaps to gain attention, is more than a media gimmick. It sways policy makers to support decisions and investment on the weakest of grounds."[18] NGOs may also act sanctimoniously and wish to stay above the fray of "choosing sides" (or at least taking a stand); information may not thus be forthcoming from certain NGOs. As a prime example, this attitude and culture clashes with the Coalition military in northern Iraq greatly limited the information that the two sides would pass to one another.[19] Furthermore, the local media may deliberately manipulate the facts as it did in Namibia and Rwanda during the UN operations there.[20] While CNN may provide a great deal of news and might be on all the time in the NMJIC, it does not have the ability to cover every crisis in the world, particularly before one blows up. Even traditionally "responsible" and unbiased journalists may abandon caution when reporting a fast-moving story, as in the reporting of the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City.[21]

The bureaucracies from which the DPKO is trying to wrest information are information fiefdoms, oddly similar in their internal struggle for knowledge to those nations who see the withholding of that knowledge as the true source of power.[22] Boutros Boutros-Ghali acknowledged this internal obstacle to sharing information in *An Agenda for Peace* and the under secretary-general for peace-keeping sent a message to all field missions asking them to improve the exchange of information between the mission, local NGOs, other local UN agencies, and UN personnel stationed in surrounding countries. The best of luck goes out to these efforts, but the future may sadly see more cases as in ONUCA, where lack of cross-talk between UN agencies resulted in poorly-coordinated operations "as if a patient lay on the operating table with the left and right sides of his body separated by a curtain and unrelated surgery being performed on each side."[23] When and if the information log-jam is finally broken, the I&R analysts and those in the field may find themselves in a similar situation to American intelligence analysts who are deluged with floods of unclassified information.

In the end, open sources may be unable to provide critical information for UNPOs. There will always be information that is unavailable except through more intrusive, more covert methods. "Open sources [of information]," writes John Hedley,

don't provide the technical details that are needed on foreign radars, weapons, communications systems, military organizations, and force deployments. Nor do they adequately cover changing military technologies, the diffusion of advanced industrial capabilities, and all the related data required to support intelligence for military operations.[24]

Thus there will be times when the above sources and methods will not meet the UNPO's needs, particularly when human resources or transportation assets are limited, time is of the essence, or the area to be observed is too rugged or too dangerous for a ground patrol to access.

## Aerial Surveillance

In these cases, the next step up the information-collection continuum will be aerial surveillance, preferably from a UN-flagged aircraft. As an initial caution, the term "aerial surveillance" is slippery and has been tossed about randomly by academic researchers. To most military officers, it means either an AWACS-type operation or — in the case of peacekeeping — UN observers using just their eyes, binoculars, or at the most, normal hand-held cameras from an aircraft. In these instances, it is better to call it aerial *observation* (i.e., the same function performed by ground observers but from the air). Aerial *reconnaissance* on the other hand implies the use of advanced photo, synthetic aperture radar (SAR), or other sensors attached to or part of an aircraft. The difference between the former and the latter is the difference between information and intelligence: one provides data which is easily understood and requires very little specialized analysis, while the other provides data that must be processed and analyzed by specially trained technicians in order for it to make sense. As will be indicated, further research on primary sources is needed to determine which cases involve observation and which reconnaissance.

Aerial observation had been used in the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) I, UNFICYP, UNEF II, United Nations Iran/Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG), and ONUCA — usually as a supplement to ground patrols.[25] They have been particularly successful when there is an ability for the ground observers and aerial observers to task one another as in the United Nations Observer Group in Lebanon (UNOGIL) and perhaps UNEF I and II. The second set of UN PKOs where aircraft were used to collect information includes UNOGIL, the UN Yemen Observer Mission (UNYOM), the UN Mission for the Referendum in the Western Sahara (MINURSO), and the UN Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM) II.[26] The authors' terminology in these four specific cases precludes a determination of whether the aircraft flew merely observation missions or actually performed reconnaissance, although I would tend to suspect UNYOM falls into the latter case. If they were observation missions, the comments above apply as to the utility of such an operation.

True aerial reconnaissance has been less frequently used in UNPOs and the only documented cases are in the Congo operation when two Swedish S-29C reconnaissance aircraft, along with a Swedish photo analyzing unit and a ground-air surveillance unit, operated from November 1962 to April 1963 and at least when the US Marines redeployed to Mogadishu to assist in the evacuation of the remaining UNOSOM II peacekeepers.[27] Of course the use of imaging and other sensors onboard the U-2 and German-loaned helicopters has been especially critical to UNSCOM's success in finding Iraq's hidden WMD assets.[28] It is important to note that in these three operations, the level of violence was high, access by ground and aerial observers was restricted or inadequate to the task at hand, and the circumstances overrode any UN concern about offending the sensibilities of the affected party.[29] As will be discussed in the penultimate section, this will be a major constraint in collecting intelligence in a UNPO.

## Commercial Airborne Imagery

If using military reconnaissance aircraft is a problem, then the UN could acquire or lease commercial airborne sensors for peace operations. Several recent commentators have persuasively made this argument, suggesting that such an asset would assist in early warning, ceasefire monitoring (particularly over very large areas), and in reducing human resource costs.[30] Not only would the data from a commercial system be releasable to all members of a UNPO force, but for ceasefire and confidence-building measures, it would prove beneficial in showing it to the belligerents. As Krepon and Tracey noted, "states may be encouraged to comply strictly with peace-keeping accords by the prospect of having embarrassing information released to the public ... [P]ictures are often worth more than a thousand reports from inspectors on the ground."[31] A variety of optical and SAR sensors would make this task far easier and may well be in the price range of less well-endowed member states[32] and the United Nations (thus avoiding the "Western domination" problem), although the latter may be unable to pay the estimated $10-17 million to lease or buy such a capability or develop a cadre of trained photo interpreters.[33]

## Commercial Satellites

More or less in the same vein as commercial airborne imaging sensors are commercial satellite imagery and systems or commercially available products from various nations' spy satellites. This latter option is a relatively new development, but it is certain to grow as various nations scramble to find new markets and profit from their enormous Cold War investment in satellite technology. Not only has the UN used SPOT imagery to monitor the withdrawal of Soviet forces from

Afghanistan during the UN Good Office Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) mission and has its situation centre currently ordering such services,[34] SPOT is allegedly also used by nations with less "high- tech" intelligence services.[35] Defence industrial journals now openly carry full-page ads by Western companies offering potential customers spy satellite optical and SAR sensors. Not to be beaten, the Russians are offering spy satellite imagery at a higher resolution than SPOT. In fact, France and the United States are now in bitter competition for such services and have raised the stakes, offering the sale or lease of complete satellite systems themselves (albeit not to the UN.)[36]

There is no further information on how beneficial such commercial satellite imagery has been, which is surprising since the material itself is available for anyone with enough money and there should be nothing to be discreet about. Perhaps it has not been done many times, either due to the high cost (e.g., France has proposed selling imagery from its Helios spy satellite to WEU member states at $39,000 per image),[37] commercial systems' inadequacies, or the novelty of it all.

Theoretically at least, commentators have suggested that commercial satellites could be used by the UN for early warning, predeployment planning (especially for updating maps), and ceasefire monitoring.[38] However, while certainly high-tech, commercial satellites not only share inherent limitations with more advanced spy satellites (e.g., not being able to determine intentions and constrained by cloud and tree cover), their larger resolution has been shown to make them less than adequate for monitoring small military units' movements and identifying smaller or nondescript facilities — particularly in an urban setting or when the exact location of the target is unknown. Other issues include affordability, the capability of a UNPO force to process and analyze all the data, and the timeliness of such support.[39] This does not mean that commercial satellite imagery should not be used; it just cannott live up to expectations.

## Other Member States' Intelligence Networks

Failing all these methods above, the UN can then turn to other member states for intelligence information, but logic would dictate that the problems associated with American intelligence's intrinsic weaknesses and the poor fit between it and UN peace operations would apply here as well. Additionally, the UN should be very cautious about relying on any state that has a significant interest in one side's success or if that country is a former colonial power. The dilemma here is that those member states with intelligence information on the problem are also likely to have these built-in biases. Nevertheless, recalling the warning by Baron Jomini to "multiply the means of obtaining information,"[40] the UN should tap into other intelligence systems if anything to fill in the information and conceptual gaps which the US may have in a particular operation. This appears to be the current

method of the DPKO I&R unit,[41] although how successful they have been, whether they make a request to only one nation or several at a time, and how they handle differences among various national estimates is unknown.

## Typology of Information/Intelligence Requirements for UNPOs

Given all the above strengths and limitations of the alternatives as well as those of the US intelligence system, where can they best be used in the variety of UNPO requirements? The discussion below establishes a crude typology of which asset to use and why.

For indications and warning (prior to a decision to establish a UNPO), open sources are the best bet for availability, low-cost, and sheer mass of information. National intelligence can help provide the details that open sources cannot, but really should be seen as a member state-volunteered addendum to the process as should commercial satellite imagery. During the predeployment planning stage, commercial satellite imagery may take centre stage, with open sources and national intelligence once again playing a role with the same benefits and constraints as with I&W. Obviously, until a UN force is deployed, there will be no observers or field analysis cell.

Which asset is best for the security of the UNPO force once it deploys depends upon a number of factors: likelihood of violence between belligerents and against the troops, limitations of the force's access to the conflict zone, and the belligerents' sensitivities to *bona fide* intelligence gathering. As a general rule, the lesser the likelihood of violence and the fewer the limitations to the blue helmets' presence, the greater advantage lies in ground and aerial observation. Open source material will also be beneficial, although care must be taken to pick out carefully the accurate fast-breaking news. As the violence and limitations on the force increase, it will find itself cut off from some information sources and will have to access open materials, aerial reconnaissance and national intelligence more. However, there is one interesting irony: as the situation gets worse, it is very likely that the belligerents' sensitivity to intelligence collection will increase. When it is not needed, the sensitivity may be low, but when it is needed, the sensitivity will probably be high. Thus, in this situation, the UNPO may have to eschew aerial reconnaissance and instead rely on those national intelligence collection assets which are not overtly noticeable (e.g., satellites), handling the information with extraordinary delicacy. Yet, unless and until the situation gets really out of hand, these national assets may be unable to pick up signals of low-level activities against the force. In any event, an in-place analysis cell is crucial.

Assuming that the peace operation does not have a significant security problem and can instead focus on monitoring the ceasefire and disarmament agreements, the best assets would be in descending order: ground and aerial observers, commercial airborne imagery, commercial satellite imagery, national intelligence, and

open sources. Whether each of these are used largely depends upon the size of the mandate and country versus the size of the force; the greater the ratio, the greater the requirement to access the methods toward the "back end." Again here, as in the "self-protection" mode, the analysis cell will ensure that the UN field commander can react quickly to violations.

It is when things go really wrong for an operation that national intelligence can come in handy. When a UNPO is making a hasty withdrawal from the area of operations, it can be assumed that its ground and aerial observers have at best limited or low-level information. Turning full circle to the I&W problem in the withdrawal scenario, one can hope that these sources would have had their ear close enough to the ground to predict rising tensions. But once things turn nasty, this access would be sharply curtailed. Open sources may be helpful, but aside from the very real possibility that there will be a deluge of information, the percentage of inaccurate information in such a crisis will probably go up dramatically. Commercial satellite imagery services may be too slow. Furthermore, the force commander may not want to risk flying an aircraft over the belligerents' lines for fear that it might be shot down or the tension would be heightened; thus airborne observers and military/commercial reconnaissance could be limited where they are needed most. The analysis cell is especially required in this situation, but will probably focus on the short-term perspective, requiring the I&R unit to provide the longer term assessments. National intelligence will be critical in filling the information gaps.

Finally, in the "take the offensive" scenario, airborne reconnaissance and national intelligence are tied for first place in meeting the UN's information requirements. The less the force concerns itself with the belligerent(s)' sensitivities to intelligence collection and the more willing the UN is to take risks, the more intrusive and overt such information gathering, analysis, and processing can become. The pace of such an operation, its high-level focus, and the need to ensure the highest accuracy of the information for combat plans and operations make commercial satellite imagery, on-scene observers, and open sources less useful. The comments on the analysis cell in a hasty withdrawal situation is doubly important here.

## Notes

1.    *Joint Publication 3-07.3*, p. V-5; and preliminary draft of Canadian doctrine on support to peacekeeping operations, no date, p. 6-5.

2.    Mona Ghali, "United Nations Truce Supervision Organization: 1948-Present," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, ed. Brian D. Smith and William J. Durch (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 84.

3.    Smith and Durch, "UN Observer Group in Central America," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 453.

4.    Karl Th. Birgisson, "United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 453.

5.    Finland for one, while "totally ignor[ing] the word intelligence in UN missions," does teach its peacekeepers the need for each of them to gather information, to attempt some initial analysis, and to report that information upstream. Lt. Col. Pekka Hannukkala, 16 May 1995 correspondence.

6.    For example, see draft Canadian doctrine on peacekeeping operations, Chapter 6 "Military Information in Peace Support Operations," p. 6-5 and *Joint Publication 3-07.3*, "Appendix J: Intelligence Support to Peacekeeping Operations", pp. J-1-2 and J-3. The practical importance of local liaison was observed in northern Iraq (where it was performed to the success of the American ground operation) and in south Mogadishu (where circumstances prevented the Pakistani brigade from being able to protect its own forces from local warlords). Lt. Colonel John P. Abizaid, "Lessons for Peacekeepers," *Military Review* 73 (March 1993): 17-18; and Dobbie, "A Concept for Post-Cold War Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Autumn 1994):128 n 17).

7.    For instance, Canada and Sweden have at times sent intelligence officers and units respectively to provide UN field commanders with collection and analytical support. Canada's experience has been relatively recent. The Swedes have had only one go at it during the Congo operation when they deployed two reconnaissance aircraft along with a photo analyzing unit and ground-air surveillance units from Nov. 1962 - April 1963. Grant, 11 May 1995 correspondence, p. 1; and Gorsjo, 9 May 1995 correspondence, p. 2.

8.    Michael Graham Fry, "The Uses of Intelligence: The UN Confronts the US in the Lebanon Crisis, 1958," *Intelligence and National Security* 10 (January 1995): 71. Also see Mona Ghali, "United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon," p. 173.

9.    Rolf Ekeus, "The United Nations Special Commission on Iraq," in *SIPRI Yearbook 1992: World Armaments and Disarmament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 512.

10.   Alvin and Heidi Toffler, *War and Anti-War: Survival at the Dawn of the 21st Century* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1993), p. 60.

11.   See S. Turner, "Intelligence for a New World Order," *Foreign Affairs* 70 (Fall 1991):161; Mark M. Lowenthal, *U.S. Intelligence* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1992), pp. 109-10.; J.T. Richelson, *the US Intelligence Community*, 2d ed. (New York: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1989), p. 252; and Pat Cooper, "Deutsch: CIA Reform Will Bring Greater Pentagon Ties," *Defense News* 5-11 June 1995:14.

12.   Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Autumn 1994):185.

13.   Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, p. 2.

14.   See Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," p. 186; and Michael Renner, *Critical Juncture: The Future of Peacekeeping*, Worldwatch Paper no. 114 (Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, 1993), p. 40.

15.   Kenneth D. Bush, "Unhappy Marriages of Convenience: Military-NGO Collaboration in Humanitarian Crises," *Security Dialogue* 26 (March 1995):109-10.

16.   Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, p. 4.

17. Howard W. French, "As Violence Mounts, Liberians Hope for Foreign Help," *New York Times*, 3 May 1995, p. A3.

18. John Stackhouse, "Putting a Head Count on Poverty," *The Globe and Mail*, 14 January 1995, p. D1.

19. John Mackinlay, "Armed Relief," in *Humanitarian Relief: Sustaining Civilians in Times of War*, ed. Thomas G. Weiss and Larry Minera (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1993), pp. 85-86, 89.

20. K. Srimal Bhagavad Geeta, "Role of the United Nations in Namibian Independence," *International Studies* 30 (Jan-March 1993):29; and Romeo Dallaire and Bruce Paulin, "Rwanda: From Peace Agreement to Genocide," *Canadian Defence Quarterly* 24 (Spring 1995):10.

21. Walter Goodman, "Although Unrestrained in a Crisis, Television Is a Tie that Binds," *New York Times*, 28 April 1995, p. A27.

22. The same can be said about academia, at least before a paper is published.

23. Alvaro de Soto and Graciana del Castillo, "Obstacles to Peacebuilding," *Foreign Policy* 94 (Spring 1994):74.

24. J.H. Hedley, *Checklist for the Future of Intelligence*, Institute for the Study of Diplomacy Occasional Paper no. 1 (Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, 1995), pp. 18-19.

25. See Mona Ghali, "United Nations Emergency Force I," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 123; Alan James, "The UN Force in Cyprus," *International Affairs* 65 (Summer 1989):494; Brian D. Smith, "United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 252; and, Smith and Durch, "UN Observer Group in Central America," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 449.

26. See Peter Jones, "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance" (3-4) and "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance II: From Yemen to the End of the Cold War," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 22 (September/October 1993):3-4; Allen V. Banner, *Overhead Imaging for Verification and Peacekeeping: Three Studies*, Arms Control Verification Occasional Papers no. 6 (Ottawa: External Affairs and International Trade, March 1991), p. 29; Durch, "United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 425; and, Virgina Page Fortna, "United Nations Angola Verification Mission I," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 384.

27. Donatella Lorch, "Marines Cover," *New York Times*, 28 February 1995, p. A15.

28. Ekeus, "The United Nations Special Commission," p. 694.

29. Of course, if reconnaissance was performed in UNYOM, my case is not as strong on this point. Additionally, considering the lack of local support for the ceasefire which UNYOM was sent to monitor, it is highly unlikely that the local parties were supportive of a reconnaissance mission (as the Israelis and Egyptians were during the Sinai support mission). Perhaps they did not know.

30. See Jeffrey Tracey, "The Use of Overhead Surveillance in United Nations Activities," in *The Changing Face of Peacekeeping*, ed. Alex Morrison, Russ Tychonick

and Susan McNish (Toronto: The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1993), pp. 135-36; Banner, *Overhead Imaging for Verification*, p. 38; Mats Berdal, *Whither UN Peacekeeping*? Adelphi Paper 281 (London: Brassey's 1993), pp. 65-66.

31.  Michael Krepon and Jeffrey P. Tracey, "'Open Skies' and UN Peace-keeping," *Survival* 32 (May/June 1990):259.

32.  Although this may be financially hard for even those well-endowed states who have been very active in UN peacekeeping, are technologically advanced, and are comfortable with (and are part of) the Western intelligence "establishment." Even Canada, according to one report, has serious problems supplying its peacekeepers with basic essentials: "They're tired, ill-equipped and feel betrayed by their own military leaders ... Some of the armored vehicles Canadian soldiers operate in the Balkans, and used on missions in Somalia, were never meant to be used in a war zone ... [P]eacekeepers lined the floor and sides of their armoured cars with sandbags in hopes the added bulk would protect them from bullets and landmines. Handguns used by Canadians soldiers overseas were made during the second World War. The armed forces is hesitant to use the [explosive-sniffing] dogs, say some [combat] engineers, because it doesn't want to upset animal rights groups by putting the canines in danger." David Pugliese, "Troops Tired and Ill-Equipped," *Whig-Standard* (Kingston), 6 May 1995, p. 16. What hope then would it be for Canada to finance or buy an airborne sensor for UN PKOs? Better to take the risk and adopt a low-level posture, or, as the future portends, become far more selective in choosing the easily winnable, low-threat PKOs.

33.  Tracey, "The Use of Overhead Surveillance," pp. 135-36, 149. I believe Jeffrey Tracey underestimates the difficulties to find imagery analysts for the UN when he commented "a couple of imagery analysts with some half decent image processing equipment can do quite an adequate job of putting out a report that could be used for ground-based observers." Even the United States had difficulties in finding sufficient numbers for Operation Desert Storm and, at least for some observers, this — and not the imagery dissemination bottleneck — was the cause of the failure of bomb damage assessment.

34.  Tracey, "The Use of Overhead Surveillance," p. 129; and Smith, "Intelligence and UN Peacekeeping," p. 185.

35.  Peter D. Zimmerman, "The Uses of SPOT for Intelligence Collection: A Quantitative Assessment," in *Commercial Observation Satellites and International Security*, ed. Michael Krepon, Peter D. Zimmerman, Leonard S. Spector and Mary Umberger (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), p. 77.

36.  See Peter deSelding, "France Offers to Sell Spy Satellite," *Defense News* 13-19 March 1995, p. 4; and Giovanni de Briganti and Peter B. deSelding, "Germany Hesitates on Joint French Space Plans," *Defense News* 3-9 April 1995, p. 1.

37.  Peter B. deSelding, "Western European Ministries Mull Spy Satellite Options," *Defense News* 22-28 May 1995, p. 12.

38.  See Johan Jergen Holst, "Enhancing Peace-Keeping Operations," *Survival* 22 (May/June 1990):273; Susan B. Chodakewitz and Louis J. Levy, "Implications for Cross-Border Conflict," in *Commercial Observation Satellites and International Security*, p. 96; Banner, *Overhead Imaging for Verification*, pp. 27, 96; Tracey, "The Use of

Overhead Surveillance," p. 108; and Michael Krepon, "Spying from Space," *Foreign Policy* 75 (Summer 1989):107.

39.  See George Bell, "Concluding Remarks," in *The Changing Face of Peacekeeping*, p. 212; Ann Florini, "The Opening Skies: Third-Party Imaging Satellites and U.S. Security," *International Security* 13 (Fall 1988):99; and Tracey, "The Use of Overhead Surveillance," pp. 130-31.

40.  Baron de Jomini, *The Art of War*, trans. Capt. G.H. Mendell and Lt. W.P. Craighill (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977), pp. 273-74.

41.  Seney, 19 May 1995 correspondence, pp. 1-2.

# 6. *Guidelines for Information and Intelligence in a UNPO*

Now that the UNPO force commander knows by the above typology which asset(s) he should use in his current situation, are there any basic ground rules he should follow? Based upon the larger (and better documented) problem with information gathering in UNPO, will they be any different for intelligence collection and analysis? Here is where the third and final critical assumption is made: there is a great deal of commonality inherent intelligence and the alternative, less objectionable methods of gathering information. After all, the only real difference between information and intelligence is the methods and secretiveness by which one goes about creating the latter.[1]

While these methods and secretiveness may affect a unique handful of the constraints listed below, broad ground rules can still be developed and constraints discovered for both intelligence and information. The findings in this section are derived from the author's longitudinal study of all but four of the more than 30 UN peace operations since 1947. Although it can be said that no UN operation is like any other before or since, several general principles can be deduced regarding the collection, analysis, handling, and dissemination of information, regardless of whether it comes from observers on the ground or satellites in space. The following ground rules for information/intelligence in a successful peacekeeping operation are arranged in a rough order of descending priority.

*Rule 1*: The United Nations headquarters and the field commander must continually seek out and obey the warning signs that: (i) a crisis will erupt requiring UN blue helmets; and (ii) a crisis may erupt endangering any deployed forces. The June 1993 killing of 23 Pakistani soldiers in Mogadishu was a clear failure to obey the warning signs and a painful reminder that this will always be the paramount rule in UNPOs.

*Rule 2*: Information regarding ceasefire or disarmament violations should be put to use as soon as possible. Not only is inaction or sluggish reaction a waste of

the information gathered, it can lead to the UN making easily-correctable mistakes or being made a fool of. In the UN Transition Assistance Group Namibia (UNTAG) for instance, the UN had a wealth of information on Namibia, but failed to put it to good use during the predeployment phase, resulting in numerous logistical and operational gaffes.[2] Worse still, in ONUCA the tardy response of UN observers to complaints of violations gave "ample time for reported transmitters to be dismantled or hideouts to be vacated."[3] If the UN is to be stupid about acting on the information, perhaps it would be better to leave it ignorant.

*Rule 3*: Ultimately the peace force and the United Nations must back up its right to observe and collect pertinent information on the situation. For the sake of the operation and the future credibility of the UN, it should not long acquiesce to restrictions on this area without declaring the party(ies) in violation of the spirit and letter of the ceasefire and its own mandate. When faced with this situation, the UN should either back up its demands to monitor with implicit force or plan to cancel the entire operation. It should never dither, hoping that the belligerent(s) will come around. This rule applies regardless of whether a UNPO force is invited in by the belligerents or, in the case of a humanitarian intervention/peace enforcement force, is not wanted by one or any of the sides. For example, UNSCOM was able to continue its U-2 and helicopter flights over Iraq only because of the January 1993 attacks against military targets in Iraq.[4] During the MINURSO operation, UN helicopters and aircraft had full freedom of movement over its area of operations; concerned over the possibility that Morocco would try to hinder the operation, the UN would only permit Moroccan air traffic controllers to "interrupt movements of UN air units solely for legitimate technical reasons."[5] Conversely, limitations on the free movement of UN observers significantly hampered the UN missions' activity in the UNGOMAP, UNIMOG, and UNAVEM II.[6]

*Rule 4*: As the belligerents must not limit the UNPO's access, the force must neither limit itself to gathering information only at certain places and times nor trust the belligerents to police themselves. To be effective, they must not adopt a garrison mentality but must be unpredictable in their observation schedules and methods. They must be perceived as "seeing all, knowing all." While neutral or at least impartial, UNPOs must not be naive about the possibilities of underhanded behaviour by any side. For example, although years, mandates, and technologies widely separate the UN Military Observer Group India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) and UNSCOM, both missions are noted for being highly mobile and active in confirming violations.[7] Conversely, the failure or inability of UNAVEM II military observers to move beyond certain assembly points and "critical points" in Angola deluded the peacekeepers that the ceasefire would hold.[8] Much as the UN could hope that all parties will be as scrupulous in following accords as did the Soviets in Afghanistan and the Cubans in Angola without a continuously watching UN "mother hen," such naivete has failed to prevent cheating by UNITA in Angola and the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia.[9]

*Rule 5*: UN peace operations must have good predeployment information and follow the pattern — if not the method — first set by UNMOGIP's first commander, Lieutenant General Delvois, who "closely inspected both the Pakistani and Indian fronts from 'low-flying planes, as well as by car and by jeep"[10] and by Major General Carl von Horn, Chief Military Observer for UNYOM, who personally "conducted both ground and aerial reconnaissance of both sides of the Saudi-Yemen border ... and covered the 15,000 square kilometers of the proposed buffer zone."[11] Failure to perform adequate reconnaissance in Cambodia prior to deploying UNTAC forces resulted in numerous logistical problems for the peace missions.[12]

*Rule 6*: In the absence of any other information gathering system, it is crucial for the force to liaise actively with local authorities on both sides of the conflict. Not only does this gain them information regarding ceasefire violations and safety of their own troops, it also demonstrates a reassuring presence and creates a pause for the hotter heads to cool down. For example, unable to patrol borders given its diminishing resources, ONUCA gathered much of this information through liaison with the armed forces and national police of the five Central American governments.[13] The UNOGIL headquarters in Beirut enjoyed such close relations with the Lebanese government that the latter freely provided "information about suspected infiltration sites, which the [UNOGIL] observer group then investigated."[14]

*Rule 7*: Never abandon ground observation as the primary tool of a UNPO, but when there is too much territory to cover or is difficult to access, use air observation, air reconnaissance, and national intelligence (in that order if possible) to supplement, but not replace, ground observers. For example, terrain difficulties in the Sinai Peninsula, Lebanon, and Iran/Iraq, limitations in the road network in the Western Sahara, and manpower constraints in the Yemen mission resulted in the use of aerial patrols in UNEF, UNOGIL, UNYOM, UNIIMOG, and MINURSO.[15] These systems can gather a great deal of information more quickly and efficiently than can ground observers, but are expensive and can engender some unease from the belligerents. More fundamentally, they do not provide the crucial UN "presence" on the ground. One highly effective use of air assets was in UNOGIL, UNEF I and II where the ground patrols and aircraft worked closely together in monitoring the borders.[16] This tie-in ultimately enhanced the ground presence.

*Rule 8*: Whatever means and methods are used to collect information or intelligence, they must be up to the task and be as good as if not better than what the belligerents have. Peter Jones would point to the danger that a UN force more sophisticated in information/intelligence capabilities would arouse suspicion among the belligerents.[17] Although a traditional PKO force should be lightly armed so as not to add fuel to the fire, the ultimate purpose of any UNPO force is to observe, inform, and develop confidence between the parties. It need not have the combat advantage but it must have the information advantage. If it does not have the information advantage, it will be unable to detect one side's cheating early on

before the other side discovers it. Purposely blinding a UNPO (or at least distorting its vision) makes it more ineffectual than its limited resources and will would have made it. Having advanced sensors does not necessarily lead to distrust of the peacekeepers; at most it may make the parties envious of the information the UN has on both sides, not suspicious of the UN's intent.

For example, whatever faults may lie with UNFICYP's ability to keep the stalemate but not force the peace on Cyprus, its possession of "binoculars and night vision devices — which the UN believes are of higher quality than any others on the island"[18] has not led the Greek and Turkish Cypriots to suspect the UN's motives or take pot shots at the peacekeepers. Conversely, not to give UN observer missions such as in UNYOM or UNAVEM II sufficient manpower or equipment,[19] or to suggest that the United Nations Iraq/Kuwait Observer Mission (UNIKOM) can hope to do its job of covering 3,000 square kilometers with only

> one observer for every ten square kilometers ... [and equipped with] only the most basic of equipment: binoculars and one passive night vision device for each fixed observation post ... [and no] thermal imaging equipment and no ground surveillance radars to spot incursions and cue patrols[20]

is simply begging for failure.

*Rule 9*: Adopt a novel approach in collecting information and utilize the observations of support personnel, NGOs, and other UN field agencies. As previously discussed, the UN's I&R unit is working on information sharing with NGOs and other UN field agencies. Although the topic is not discussed in PKO literature, the UN could take a page from American experiences in Somalia and Canadian doctrinal guidance on PKOs to augment their observers' information collection. The professional American military journals contain a wealth of information from junior to mid-level Army officers who make a strong case for using "[t]ruck drivers, engineers, and MPs [military police] ... [as] the only in-country assets that could provide timely and accurate information."[21]

For its part Canada, one of the UN's most active peacekeeper nations, is making slow moves toward this approach. Currently Canadian military personnel are not given any specific training vis-à-vis observation skills (except presumably those who will formally perform observation duties) and instead rely on the few Canadian intelligence officers assigned to the UN PKO as "military information officers" since 1990 to be the intelligence experts. However, a study will soon be underway at NDHQ on how to tap into this low-tech, "amateur" approach to information collection and analysis much as the Finnish and Swedish peacekeepers are already doing today. Draft Canadian doctrine foreshadows this concept, stating,

> All personnel from the peace support force will notice many items of value during the course of their duties... Particularly valuable will be the observations of those drivers, and others, who are assigned to resupply convoys. These personnel will see more of the theatre of operations and may have access to some areas which are otherwise restricted to travel and observation.[22]

*Rule 10*: When all else has failed, when ground and aerial observation are ineffective, when one side is threatening to use force against the UNPO force or a major conflict is brewing which can embroil the UN troops or endanger regional security, *and* the perception of the UN's neutrality is not a major issue or would suffer acceptable damage, then — and only then — should the UN tap into member states' intelligence communities for information. For instance, the unique information requirements of UNSCOM could not be filled by the traditional and less objectionable nontraditional methods of information gathering. As Peter Jones observed, "UNSCOM has a very specific set of technical tasks which call for the use of highly intrusive means not normally required by traditional peacekeeping forces."[23] Conversely, the inability of ONUCA assets to detect violations of Esquipulas II[24] would have benefited greatly from US intelligence support if that support could have been guaranteed to be objective and impartial.[25] This last rule sums up the thrust of chapters 3-5.

Looking back at the guidelines imposed upon information gathering in a UNPO, the guidelines for intelligence developed from the limited American support in UNPOs to date are really no different. The constraints of intelligence as mentioned earlier (i.e., adequacy of support, concern over US domination, fear of losing UN neutrality, and differing perceptions of intelligence) are also confirmed. Some constraints regarding intelligence also appear to affect information as well. If anything, the following constraints affect both overtly collected unclassified UN information and covertly collected classified US information:

1. Relying upon a member state for information may lead to accepting that state's hidden agenda or perspectives.

2. Belligerents will not always act in good faith regarding ceasefire accords, thus necessitating the need for the UN to monitor for any cheating.

3. Belligerents can also delay or restrict information/intelligence gathering; this is fundamentally a symptom of the level of trust which they have in the United Nations force to be truly neutral, if not also support their cause.

4. Information and intelligence may not be fully shared within a UNPO field operation or at UN HQs.

5. Poor information and intelligence can in fact be more dangerous than none at all in that it gives a false sense of confidence that one knows what is really going on when one really does not.

## Notes

1.    For discussion on the difference between the two, see Ray S. Cline, "An Approach to the History of Military Intelligence," in *The Intelligence Revolution: A Historical Perspective*, ed. Walter T. Hitchcock (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1991), p. 302; and *JP 2-0*, p. II-3.

2.    Virginia Page Fortna, "United Nations Transition Assistance Group," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, ed. Brian D. Smith and William J. Durch (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 363.

3.    B. Smith and W. Durch, "UN Observer Group in Central America," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 453.

4.    Rolf Ekeus, "The United Nations Special Commission on Iraq," in *SIPRI Yearbook 1992: World Armaments and Disarmament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 693-97.

5.    W. Durch, "United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 425.

6.    Birgisson, "United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, pp. 307-8. Brian D. Smith, "United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 252; and Fortna, "United Nations Angola Verification Mission II," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, pp. 394, 399.

7.    See Birgisson, "United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan," p. 279; and Ekeus, "The United Nations Special Commission," p. 694.

8.    Fortna, "United Nations Angola Verification Mission II," p. 398.

9.    Birgisson, "United Nations Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan," pp. 299, 308; Fortna, "United Nations Angola Verification Mission I," pp. 381, 383, 385; John A. Marcum, "Angola: War Again," *Current History* 92 (May 1993):223; and Craig Etcheson, "The 'Peace' in Cambodia," *Current History* 91 (December 1992):416.

10.   Birgisson, "United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan," p. 278.

11.   Birgisson, "United Nations Yemen Observation Mission," p. 211.

12.   Mats Berdal, *Whither UN Peacekeeping*? Adelphi Paper 281 (London: Brassey's, 1993), p. 44.

13.   Smith and Durch, "UN Observer Group in Central America," p. 453.

14.   Mona Ghali, "United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon," p. 173.

15.   See Peter Jones, "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance," p. 3 for information on UNEF and UNOGIL and "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance II: From Yemen to the End of the Cold War," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 22 (September/October 1993):3-4 for UNYOM; Smith, "United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group," p. 252 for UNIIMOG and Durch, "United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara," p. 425 for MINURSO.

16.  See Ghali, "United Nations Emergency Force I," p. 123; and, Jones, "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance," p. 3-4.

17.  Peter Jones, "Technology and Peacekeeping," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 21 (November/December 1992):3-4.

18.  Alan James, "The UN Force in Cyprus," *International Affairs* 65 (Summer 1989):493.

19.  Birgisson, "United Nations Yemen Observation Mission," pp. 213-14.

20.  William J. Durch, "The Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 267.

21.  David L. Brand, Paul J. Bryson and Alfredo Lopez Jr., "Intelligence Support to the Logistician in Somalia," *Military Intelligence* 20 (October/December 1994):5-7. Also see Major Martin N. Stanton, "TF 2-87, Lessons from Restore Hope," *Military Review* 74 (September 1994):41 where mention is made of using native interpreters to provide information, albeit with some caution if the translator is suspected of having hidden loyalties.

22.  Preliminary draft of Canadian doctrine on support to peacekeeping operations, no date, pp. 6-5.

23.  Peter Jones, "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance III: The Post Cold War Era," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 23 (July-August 1994):6.

24.  Smith and Durch, "UN Observer Group in Central America," pp. 451-52.

25.  Notwithstanding the single piece of evidence (based upon the title of an upcoming JMIC thesis) that the US did play some sort of intelligence role, this support has yet to be independently confirmed and expounded upon.

# 7.  Conclusion

Does intelligence and information ultimately affect a UNPO's success? At the end of the day, when all the risks and benefits are weighed and some degree of the various types of intelligence/ information are collected, etc., for a UNPO, does it all really make a difference? Alluding to the earlier notion of intelligence being a resource akin to strategic airlift which the US can provide to the UN, the lack of airlift would have made deployment of peacekeeping troops problematic, but it has never been cited as a key element leading to the failure or success of a UNPO. Similarly, can it be argued that the lack of intelligence and/or information would slow things down and prevent certain sub-tasks from being performed, but that its absence would not be the root cause of any single operation's failure? If this is true, then the utility of intelligence support is greatly outshined by the need to fix other problems in UN operations. This final chapter looks across the board at UNPOs to attempt an answer to this question.

Several recurring themes regarding the basic necessities for a successful UNPO, specifically traditional PKOs, crop up in the works of a number of noted researchers: prior consent of the parties to either a ceasefire and/or the presence of peacekeepers, impartiality of the peacekeepers, the non-use of force, and support of the Great Powers.[1] While this listing is fairly comprehensive and has been alluded to in chapter 1, an in-depth examination of the full panoply of the failed and successful UNPOs comes up with a slightly different listing. More importantly, by checking the frequency of occurrences and applying logic, one can prioritize the requirements.

There are six critical requirements for a UNPO to succeed: the local parties support the peace process (excepting full-scale peace enforcement operations); there is great power support to resolve the conflict; the UNPO mandate is concrete, enforceable and reasonable; sufficient resources are available to carry out the mandate; the UN does a good job at predeployment planning and in-field coordination, UN management is competent and the peace force has a sober

realization of reality and what it may wish is going on; and the UNPO force is able to observe freely and/or gather information about what is going on in the conflict zone. While only the first two requirements are "show-stoppers," absence of the latter four can make it extremely difficult for the UN to create a lasting peace. Each requirement is covered in detail below.

At least for traditional peacekeeping and at times humanitarian relief operations, the most important requirement is that the belligerents agree to a ceasefire, the deployment of peacekeepers, and to the basic modalities of the peace process. Neither the UN nor the United States can hope to impose a peace easily or quickly where it is not wanted. UN failures in UNYOM, UNOGIL, UNIFIL, MINURSO, UNTAC, UNOSOM II, UNAMIR, and UNPROFOR[2] can largely be laid at the feet of the belligerents and surrounding states who were unwilling to support the cause of peace. While lack of local support might eventually be turned around or run over as in the Congo operation,[3] that single operation alone demonstrated the near impossible tasks that a peacekeeping force, let alone a peace enforcement one, has in quelling the violence if those fighting see no reason to stop.

Second, the great powers must wholeheartedly support a UNPO and put aside selfish national interests to ensure the operation's success. Simply by virtue of the veto power of the permanent five members of the UN Security Council, any great power can stop an operation dead in its tracks. Yet aside from that, their attitudes toward an already approved operation could rob the UN of diplomatic backing, divert full undivided attention to keep the inertia toward peace going, or even curtail any concern that the operation is failing for other reasons.

Lack of active great power support crippled UNYOM and MINURSO while hidden agendas and conflicting interests made ONUC such a long drawn-out affair.[4] Admittedly, the refusal of the ethnic groups in Bosnia to see negotiations as nothing more than a zero-sum game is the predominant cause for the inefficacy of UNPROFOR, but Western indifference, bickering, and differing goals have only made matters worse.[5] The failure of the great powers to come to an agreement on Bosnia recalls the concept of "mortal sin" mentioned in the introduction, of seeing evil and doing little to nothing about it. Lawrence Freedman was especially critical when he wrote:

> There are no good options left [in Bosnia]. The opportunities for constructive action have progressively narrowed. The relatively desirable outcomes have become impossible. If emerging crises such as Bosnia's are not decisively acted upon before they go critical, then the international community will be implicated in solutions that reflect the raw, internal balance of power rather than external criteria of justice and sound precedent.[6]

The same indifference and inaction seen in Bosnia has been repeated in the tepid international response to the ethnic genocide in Rwanda, an apathy which Maj. Gen. Dallaire, the former UNAMIR commander, called "shocking and immoral."[7] To quote the title of an editorial in the *Globe and Mail*, "we botched it in Rwanda."[8]

The third and fourth requirements grow out of the second: if great power support is wavering, the blue helmets' mandate is likely to be vague, unreasonable, too broad or unenforceable or they won't have sufficient resources to fulfil their mission. Typical of such ill-conceived mandates is that of the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), whose mandate was criticized by Mona Ghali for being

> impracticable from the start. In entrusting the force with restoring the authority of the Lebanese government, the Security Council did not give adequate consideration to the fact that the government had lost all its effective authority. The Security Council, in effect, called for UNIFIL to raise a Lazarus.[9]

Other failed and failing PKOs with poor mandates include ONUC, UNYOM, UNOSOM II and UNPROFOR.[10]

Shortages in human resources and equipment, in quantity and/or quality, are a direct reflection of how important the success of the mission is to the great powers and the other UN member states and less one of poor UN logistics systems or other UNPO commitments. Among this rogue's gallery of misfits are ONUCA and many of the usual suspects: ONUC, UNYOM, UNOGIL, UNAMIR, and UNPROFOR.[11] It is also in this light of insufficient resources that appears to be positioning the latter operation for failure, as Lawrence Freedman writes:

> Over time the actual role of the U.N. operation became more and more overtly to sustain the rump of a Bosnian state. Yet the U.N. force was never designed for the role. In its size, structure, and equipment it was designed to signal impartiality and a disinclination to engage in combat. As a consequence, it was stretched thin as the demands of its actual role grew.[12]

The fifth requirement for successful UN peace operations is the competence of the UN to plan adequately for and run the show. Here failure to plan for the operations in the Congo, Namibia, and Central America, wishful thinking in Angola, the Western Sahara, and Cambodia, and just plain incompetence and bureaucratic squabbling in Somalia and El Salvador harmed those operations, although not always irreparably.[13] It is interesting to note that this is where most of the criticism about UNPOs is directed, especially by the administration and Congress. This is not to say that the United Nations cannot do things better, but one would have hoped greater efforts would be made to address the more pressing problems in requirements 1-4 above as well.

It is not until we get to the sixth and last requirement that there is any mention of whether the UNPO force is able to observe freely what is going on in the conflict zone. Inadequate observation resources hampered the UNYOM, UNOGIL and UNPROFOR from gathering information,[14] the belligerent(s) placed undue restrictions on the mobility and access of the observers in UNIIMOG, UNAVEM II, and UNAMIC[15] while simple reliance on biased or little to no information made things difficult for ONUC and UNTAC.[16] It would be very tempting to argue that many of these information collection difficulties arose from a great power

reluctance to provide sufficient resources or a symptom of the belligerents' lack of support of the operation or the peace process itself. Thus in this perspective, out of all of the many UNPO failures, only ONUC and UNTAC would include information as a contributing requirement, and thus for UNPOs in general, a relatively insignificant one.

However, this line of reasoning is specious. Observing what is going on is a key function of peace forces. While restrictions on this activity may stem in large part from broader problems, the lack of information keeps a UNPO force from acting as an intelligent honest broker between the two sides. It will be placed at an information disadvantage vis-à-vis one or all of the belligerents and will have nothing to confirm violations of ceasefires, threats to its own forces and the like. When all other means have failed or are inadequate, that is where there is still a small yet important niche for US intelligence to fill.

Admittedly, there are no cases where the lack of American intelligence scuttled a UNPO, but that support is still relatively new and such an urgent requirement for it is rare. It can be effectively argued that only in the case of UNSCOM, if there were no American intelligence support, the operation would be hard-pressed to fulfil its mandate. The lack of intelligence in just such a case would do more than just slow things down; it would be the root cause of an operation's failure. The question is how often will there be an overpowering requirement for such specialized information?

The only plausible scenario would be in a major humanitarian intervention or peace enforcement operation where US forces were involved and, judging by the pain evoked by Somalia, that will not happen anytime soon. Until then, American intelligence will act as a gap-filler, not as a primary source of information for UNPOs. Here then is the final dilemma of the subject at hand: US intelligence may be offered as an offset to ground forces in a UNPO and US intelligence will be most in need when the threat of conflict is high, *but* that intelligence will probably be neither an adequate trade-off for actual US troops nor will it be an adequate solution for a UNPO's information needs. It will never be a panacea.

Given its limitations and the danger of an UN force losing its neutrality and the support of local belligerents, American intelligence should be used very rarely. Its price is high and the benefits only occasionally outweigh the risks. For the US to launch into a major intelligence relationship with the UN cannot only lead into promises that it cannot meet, it jeopardizes exposing its intelligence system's strengths and weaknesses for an operation that suffers from deeper systemic problems and is doomed to fail. The United States cannot afford many more ill-conceived high-risk, low-gain adventures abroad.

There can still be some payoff for the UN and the US in certain highly limited cases. Intelligence support must be tapped into only when there are no other options and the guidelines outlined in Chapter 6 are followed. To borrow a quote from the secretary-general, "[t]here is no reason for frustration or pessimism. More progress has been made in the past few years towards using the United

Nations as it was designed to be used than many could ever have predicted."[17] Just a final word of caution: if the UN chooses repeatedly to travel down this particular path, this toll-road of American intelligence support, it must be careful. The woods through which this path travels are full of spooks.

## Notes

1    See Paul Diehl, *International Peacekeeping* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), pp. 168-71; William J. Durch, "Introduction,"in *The Evolution of Peacekeeping*, ed. W.J. Durch (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 12; and Adam Roberts, "The Crisis in UN Peacekeeping," *Survival* 36 (Autumn 1994):94.

2.   See K. Birgisson, "United Nations Yemen Observation Mission," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, pp. 206, 215; Mona Ghali, "United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon: 1958," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 162 and "United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon: 1978-Present," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 197; W. Durch, "United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 430; Jonathan Tombes, "Cambodia: Lessons for UN Peacekeepers," *The American Enterprise* 5 (May/June 1994):48; Roger Hill, "Preventive Diplomacy, Peace-Making and Peace-Keeping," in *SIPRI Yearbook 1993: World Armaments and Disarmament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 55.

3.   William J. Durch, "The UN Operation in the Congo: 1960-1964," in *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*, p. 345.

4.   Birgisson, "United Nations Yemen Observation Mission," p. 215; and Durch, "United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara," pp. 406, 430 and "The UN Operation in the Congo," p. 345.

5.   John Fenske, "The West and 'The Problem from Hell'," *Current History* 92 (November 1993):353-56; and Lawrence Freedman, "Why the West Failed," *Foreign Policy* 97 (Winter 1994-95):54.

6.   Freedman, "Why the West Failed," p. 69.

7.   Speech given at "Peacekeeping '94" conference, Washington 14-16 November 1994. See also Alain Destexhe, "The Third Genocide," *Foreign Policy* 97 (Winter 1994/ 95):3, 9; and Shawn H. McCormick, "The Lessons of Intervention in Africa," *Current History* 94 (April 1995):164.

8.   A. John Watson, "How We Botched It in Rwanda," *The Globe and Mail*, 23 December 1994, p. A17.

9.   Ghali, "United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon," p. 197.

10.  See Durch, "The UN Operation in the Congo," pp. 334-35; Birgisson, "United Nations Yemen Observation Mission," p. 215; McCormick, "The Lessons of Intervention in Africa," pp. 162-63; and Rosalyn Higgins, "The New United Nations and Former Yugoslavia," *International Affairs* 69 (July 1993):468-69.

11.  See Smith and Durch, "UN Observer Group in Central America," p. 457; Durch, "The UN Operation in the Congo," p. 345; Birgisson, "United Nations Yemen

Observation Mission," p. 215; and Ghali, "United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon," p. 175.

12. Freedman, "Why the West Failed," p. 63.

13. Durch, "The UN Operation in the Congo," pp. 332-33; Fortna, "United Nations Transition Assistance Group," p. 363; and Smith and Durch, "UN Observer Group in Central America," p. 457; Fortna, "United Nations Angola Verification Mission II," pp. 398-99; William J. Durch, "Building on Sand: UN Peacekeeping in the Western Sahara," *International Security* 17 (Spring 1993):151; and Tombes, "Cambodia," p. 48. See R. Moreno and J. Vega, "Lessons from Somalia," *Peacekeeping and International Relations* 23 (May/June 1994):11-12; Matthew Bryden, "Somalia: The Wages of Failure," *Current History* 94 (April 1995):147; and Alvaro de Soto and Graciana del Castillo, "Obstacles to Peacebuilding," *Foreign Policy* 94 (Spring 1994):74.

14. See Birgisson, "United Nations Yemen Observation Mission," pp. 213-14; Ghali, "United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon," pp. 162, 175; and "Bosnia Underscores Intelligence Gaps," *Aviation Week & Space Technology* 122 (March 20, 1995):56.

15. See Smith, "United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group," p. 252; Jones, "Peacekeeping and Aerial Surveillance III," pp. 5-6; Fortna, "United Nations Angola Verification Mission II," pp. 394-95, 398-99; and Tombes, "Cambodia," p. 51.

16. Durch, "The UN Operation in the Congo," p. 332.

17. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda For Peace: 1995*, 2d ed. (New York: United Nations, 1995), p. 38.

# *Glossary*

| | |
|---|---|
| AFB | Air Force Base |
| AWACS | Airborne Warning and Control System |
| CIA | US Central Intelligence Agency |
| DCI | Director of Central Intelligence |
| DIA | US Defense Intelligence Agency |
| DoD | US Department of Defense |
| DPKO | UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations |
| DTIC | Defense Technical Information Center |
| HUMINT | Human intelligence "system" |
| I&R | Information and Research Unit |
| I&W | Indications and Warning |
| IAEA | International Atomic Energy Agency |
| IMINT | Imagery intelligence |
| ISE | US Intelligence Support Element |
| JDISS | Joint Deployable Intelligence Support System |
| JMIC | Joint Military Intelligence College |
| MINURSO | UN Mission for the Referendum in the Western Sahara |
| NDHQ | National Defence Headquarters (Canada) |
| NMJIC | National Military Joint Intelligence Center |
| ONUCA | UN Observer Group in Central America |
| ONUSAL | UN Observer Mission in El Salvador |

| | |
|---|---|
| OOTW | Operations other than War |
| PDD | Presidential Decision Directive |
| PKO | Peacekeeping Operation |
| RFI | Request for information |
| SAR | Synthetic aperture radar |
| SIGINT | Signals intelligence |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNAMIR | UN Assistance Mission in Rwanda |
| UNAVEM | UN Angola Verification Mission |
| UNEF | United Nations Emergency Force |
| UNFICYP | UN Forces in Cyprus |
| UNIFIL | UN Interim Force in Lebanon |
| UNIIMOG | UN Iran/Iraq Military Observer Group |
| UNIKOM | UN Iraq/Kuwait Observer Mission |
| UNIPOM | UN India-Pakistan Observation Mission |
| UNMIH | UN Mission in Haiti |
| UNMOGIP | UN Military Observer Group India and Pakistan |
| UNOGIL | UN Observer Group in Lebanon |
| UNOMIG | UN Observer Mission in Georgia |
| UNOMIL | UN Observer Mission in Liberia |
| UNOSOM II | UN Operation in Somalia |
| UNPO | United Nations Peacekeeping Operations |
| UNPROFOR | UN Protection Force in the former Yugoslavia |
| UNSCOM | UN Special Commission |
| UNTAC | UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia |
| UNTAG | UN Transitional Group Namibia |
| UNTSO | UN Truce Supervisory Organization |
| UNYOM | UN Yemen Observer Mission |
| USAF | US Air Force |
| WMD | Weapons of Mass Destruction |

# Robert E. Rehbein

Major Rehbein is a native of New York City and was educated at Cornell University, where he received a bachelor's degree in Russian and Soviet Studies before entering the Air Force as an intelligence officer. He subsequently received a master's degree (*cum laude*) from the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School in Japanese and Asian Studies. Academic and professional honours include the National Merit Scholarship, National Defense Fellowship, and "Who's Who in California." In addition to his numerous classified analyses on Asian, African and Middle Eastern political and military developments, he has published articles on the Japanese-Soviet economic relations and on the future of military intelligence.

In his 14 years as an Air Force officer, Maj. Rehbein has been posted to Germany. Turkey, Iraq, and Canada, with other assignments throughout the United States. He has served in a wide variety of intelligence functions from unit to major command to Headquarters Air Force level as an analyst, program manager, special security officer, and staff officer. Immediately prior to his posting as a Visiting Defence Fellow at Queen's University, he served as the Operations Officer, Directorate of Intelligence, Combined Task Force, Operation Provide Comfort where he saw firsthand the difficulties involved in providing intelligence to a multinational, (quasi-UN sanctioned) peacekeeping operation. Following his one year sabbatical in Canada, Maj. Rehbein is now serving as the Chief of the Aviation Branch, US Strategic Command Joint Intelligence Center, Offutt Air Force Base in Omaha, Nebraska.