

Testimony of J. Brian Atwood

The Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs

University of Minnesota

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

September 23, 2003

Chairman Lugar, Senator Biden, members of the Foreign Relations Committee, it is good to be back at this table. Thank you for inviting me.

I am pleased to offer my thoughts today on the President's supplemental request for the reconstruction effort in Iraq. This Committee's inquiry is vitally important to Americans who are today preoccupied with the threat of terrorism and who are becoming increasingly worried that our intervention in Iraq has run off the tracks and has not made them safer.

Mr. Chairman, I support our efforts to transform Iraq. I opposed going in without the support of the international community, but that is the past. If we now fail to build a stable and democratic Iraq, we will have handed terrorism a major victory. I also support the President's request for supplemental resources for Iraq, but only if there are conditions attached to this appropriation that alter the approach the Administration has taken to date. Proceeding on the current path will mean throwing good money after bad.

I worked on several post-conflict reconstruction missions during my tenure at USAID. I also served on a panel created by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan to review UN peace operations. The panel's report, known as the Brahimi Report, after our chairman, offered several recommendations for improving UN peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations. More recently, I participate in the joint CSIS and US Army Association study on Post-Conflict Reconstruction chaired by my fellow panelist John Hamre and General Gordon Sullivan. I was a member of the Council on Foreign Relations Commission that produced the study titled "Iraq: The Day After." And finally, I serve on the Board of the National Democratic Institute (NDI), an organization that is working in Iraq to build support for democratic change. References to Iraqi opinion in this testimony are derived from recent focus group research conducted by NDI in 15 locations in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, my experience with post-conflict situations leads me to conclude that there are no prototypes. Every situation is messy. Each requires a strong security umbrella, deft diplomacy to achieve a semblance of agreement among factions, effective humanitarian relief for the victims of violence and strong reconstruction and development programs that reinforce the effort to reconcile differences and give palpable hope to the population.

These situations also require a strong international presence that establishes the legitimacy of the transition, signals the concern of the global community and enables many nations to utilize their strongest assets and their resources to build a new nation. This multiplicity of missions and organizations -- from military units to humanitarian NGO's -- creates very difficult interfaces between organizational cultures and not a small amount of tension. Still, if there is a well-understood plan and a vision for the future that the local population shares, the transition can surmount the bumps in the road and move forward.

Several of these key elements are missing in Iraq. Most importantly, there is no clearly understood plan that is embraced by the Iraqi people and by the organizations working there. The constant shifts in position by the

Coalition Provisional Authority are confusing to Iraqis. No one knows whether we are building the nation from the top down or from the bottom up. Is the United States really interested in creating an Iraqi democracy, or are we fearful that giving power to the Iraqi people will produce policies counter to our interests? Perhaps the worst manifestation of this confusion is a growing belief on the part of ordinary Iraqis that the chaos they are experiencing must be what we Americans really want.

No transition can proceed apace without security. Today there is no pervasive security presence on the ground in Iraq. Our troops are either protecting key institutions or they remain garrisoned in secure locations. They are seen only rarely by Iraqis, usually in fast-moving convoys going from one location to another. We are spread too thin to offer the security umbrella needed to protect the essential transition activities.

Mr. Chairman, the Brahimi panel on UN peace operations, warned the Security Council that UN peacekeepers should not be deployed unless and until they had mustered a force of sufficient size and capability to defeat or deter the “lingering forces of war.” The coalition led by the United States and Britain did not heed that advice in Iraq. The consequence is that many of our soldiers have paid the ultimate price and Iraq has become a magnet for terrorists who see it as part of the international battleground for their cause.

Iraq today is reminiscent of the situation the Clinton Administration faced in Somalia in 1993-94. We did not have a clear mission there and we did not have enough troops to protect ourselves. When we suffered through incidents such as “Black Hawk Down”, the inadequacy of our force size became obvious. Our departure from Somalia followed, a Secretary of Defense resigned and the “Somalia syndrome” inhibited decision makers for several years.

We do not have the option of leaving Iraq in this era of terrorism. Yet, we owe it to our military to give them the force structure to protect themselves. To date, the young men and women of our military services have not been well served by the civilian leadership of the Pentagon.

It is critically urgent to establish a security umbrella for Iraq and to secure a UN resolution authorizing a UN peacekeeping force. When this is in hand, we should then request that NATO form the core of that force. A failure in Iraq would be a direct threat to our European allies in that it would facilitate the spread of terrorism. This is, therefore, a legitimate role for NATO. We have a strong case to take to the leaders of the NATO nations.

We must also accelerate the training of an Iraqi military force and a separate police contingent. The Iraqis need to take control of their own security, but this process cannot be rushed. Arming Iraqis before vetting them and training them thoroughly would be very dangerous. We are already guilty of having done that. In the meantime, we urgently need a pervasive blue-hatted UN presence in the country.

Mr. Chairman, I fear we will fail in our effort to gain an international consensus and a strong UN resolution so long as we continue to insist that the civilian transition be under an American Administrator. The French government's position that we should transfer power to the Iraqis within months is wrong. I agree with Secretary Powell that if we rush this transfer, we will have created a very fragile government whose legitimacy will be questioned each time a crisis arises. But in the interim, the administration of Iraq should be UN, not U.S.

The United States does not need the high profile it now has in Iraq. In fact, this profile has both raised and then dashed Iraqi expectations with the sad result that Iraqis believe that their current state of chaos is an American plot. It is time to step aside in favor of a Representative of the UN Secretary General who will coordinate the multi-faceted transition activities. This also will encourage other donors to come forward and enable all relevant UN specialized agencies to play an even larger role.

A concession on this point, Mr. Chairman, may make other Security Council members more likely to accept US leadership of the peacekeeping force. I believe having an American military commander, hopefully of a

NATO core force, would be well worth the price of giving up the American civilian administrator. This is not a reflection on Ambassador Jerry Bremer, a very competent professional. Rather, it recognizes that our goals can better be accomplished with a broader UN-sanctioned international coalition and a lower American profile.

It also is time, Mr. Chairman, to end the Pentagon's control over the civilian side of the reconstruction effort. My experience in working with the military in Kosovo, Bosnia and Haiti is that they are highly efficient in undertaking both engineering and logistical missions in post-conflict transitions. These capabilities -- and the security umbrella they provide -- contribute greatly to a reconstruction effort. The problem is that DOD's tasking procedures and their coordination protocols do not translate well in a fluid transitional civilian environment. NGO's do not work well under Pentagon "task orders," nor do the contractors whose expertise lies in various essential development or humanitarian fields, such as education, healthcare or democratization. Furthermore, DOD has precious few professionals who have worked in foreign cultures. DOD professionals tend to approach a transition as if it were a linear exercise, proceeding from mission to mission ad seriatum. What is needed are multiple activities undertaken simultaneously -- humanitarian relief, reconciliation programs, infrastructure repairs, political and economic development. These are not part of the Pentagon's playbook.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge this committee to separate out the reconstruction portion of this supplemental request and authorize it for expenditure by the State Department and USAID. State can use these resources to leverage other donors. It also can make resources available to UN agencies through its International Organizations and Refugee Bureaus. USAID should vastly expand its ground presence and those of its NGO and contractor network. Its Office of Transitions Initiatives has great flexibility in transitions and its professionals are comfortable working in foreign environments, even very difficult ones. Such a move also would allay the concerns of other potential donors who normally work with State and AID and who feel uncomfortable working directly with the Defense Department.

These two actions by our government – yielding control of the civilian operations to the UN and removing the Pentagon from full control of the reconstruction funding -- would dramatically improve the international climate and enhance our prospects for burden sharing. It is vitally important that we begin immediately to internationalize this effort. American talent and resources are needed if this transition is to succeed, but we do not need control and we most certainly do not need such a high profile. If we back the UN, the UN has a greater chance of success than does the near-unilateral approach we have taken to date.

Mr. Chairman, the focus group research conducted by NDI shows that the window is still open for democracy in Iraq. Political parties are proliferating, yet there is little understanding of how the search for power relates to other democratic values, such as the protection of minorities. Iraqis are pleased that Saddam is gone, but, at the same time, they consider themselves to be ungovernable. Some will say they need 12 Saddams to govern the country. Many equate democracy with the chaos and street violence they are now experiencing. They also believe that the Americans could stop all of this and bring order if we wanted to. Once again, we are reminded that progress in these situations is tied to security.

Democracy in Iraq cannot be imposed from the top down. If that is the exit strategy of the Administration, it will fail. Before the window of opportunity closes forever, it is urgent that we start a bottom-up democratization and community reconciliation effort now. This means electing neighborhood councils, school boards and eventually village and municipal councils. These communities understand their needs, and if they are given the legitimization of their fellow citizens through localized elections, they can be the channel for informing the reconstruction efforts.

The next step would be for communities to work together in regional institutions. The combination of representative local government and rising levels of hope that will flow from tangible progress in fixing the nation's infrastructure, will prepare the foundation for a national constitution and national elections.

Mr. Chairman, time is short and we already have wasted precious moments. The only way to overcome the very poor beginning we have made in Iraq is to fundamentally change our approach. That means internationalizing the effort under UN auspices, shifting responsibility for civilian reconstruction operations to civilian agencies and moving from a top-down to a bottom-up reconstruction strategy. The first requirement is, as always, security. A UN force large enough to defeat and/or deter our potential enemies, commanded by an American and with NATO at its core, is the sine qua non for success. To achieve that goal, we will have to give up American control of the civilian transition. We should do this because it is consistent with our long-term objectives. I urge this committee to separate out the reconstruction resources requested in this supplemental to enhance our prospects for internationalizing this effort.