

National Peace Essay Contest 2001-2002
Teaching Guide on Debating the U.S. Military's Role in International
Peacekeeping

Six Suggested Lessons

- I. Introducing the National Peace Essay Contest (NPEC) and the 2001-2002 Question to Students (1 period)
- II. Understanding Terms in the National Peace Essay Contest (1 period)
- III. Map Activity 1: Where are U.S. Military Forces Located? (1 period)
- IV. Map Activity 2: Where has the United Nations and the U.S. Participated in Peace Operations? (1 to 1 1/2 periods)
- V. Introducing Bibliographic Resources and Opposing Viewpoints (1 1/2 - 2 periods)
- VI. Forming an Opinion and Considering the Challenges of Peace Operations (1- 3 periods depending on use of activities)

Notes

- This teaching guide has been prepared to coincide with the 2001-2002 NPEC, however the materials can be used at any time independent of the contest.
- These lessons assume a 45 minute-class period. If your school uses block scheduling, these lessons may be combined or may be used as a portion of one day's block.
- While the teaching guide has been assembled to be used as is, teachers may vary the sequencing or selection of lessons to suit their own particular requirements.

- Students working independently on the NPEC should do the exercises that appear at the bottom of each lesson page.

Teaching Materials

- Library access
- Overhead projector
- Internet access (if available)

Advance Preparation

1. Review this teaching guide and the NPEC guidebook.
2. Decide
 - Will this be a required, extra-credit, or extracurricular project for your students?
 - At what point in your course will you include the NPEC?
 - How many class hours can you devote to this project?
 - How will the class hours be scheduled among other assignments and activities?
 - Which exercises or portion of exercises will you use?
 - Will you use any of the extension activities?
3. For each student, make copies of the essay question, your schedule of assignments, and grading criteria. If you are submitting essays to the NPEC, you may also want to make copies of the contest rules and judging criteria located on pages 5 and 6 of the NPEC guidebook. *Please note that you can request additional copies of the guidebook for each student in your class by contacting the Institute at (202) 429-3854 and students can also access the guidebook on the NPEC web site.*
4. Make copies of the worksheets, overhead transparencies, and reference materials for the lessons you have decided to use.
5. Confer with colleagues in other departments whose assistance you may be seeking for substantive information or essay-writing skills.

Objectives of the Teaching Guide

- To assist students in gaining an understanding of US foreign policy, history, and the nature of peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations.
- To make students aware of the current debate on the U.S. military's role in international peacekeeping
- To provide teachers with lesson plans, bibliographic sources, and factual material to assist them in preparing students to write essays for submission to the National Peace Essay Contest.
- To enable classroom teachers, contest coordinators, and students to:
 - Understand the overall theme of the essay topic;
 - Define and understand concepts contained in the essay question;
 - Identify current U.S. military deployment abroad;
 - Review bibliographic resources and select sources for research;
 - Analyze opposing viewpoints on U.S. involvement in peace operations and formulate a thesis for essays;
 - Examine cases of U.S. participation in peace operations and apply that information to the essay;
 - Write, edit, and submit essays to the United States Institute of Peace.
 - To meet National Content Standards in Civics, Language Arts, Life Skills, U.S. History, and World History.

2001-2002 National Peace Essay Question
Debating the U.S. Military's Role in International Peacekeeping

One of the important foreign policy/national security debates today concerns the role of the U.S. military in international peacekeeping operations. Many conflicts that marked the 1990s – in Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Cambodia, Haiti, and Kuwait – involved the U.S. military and the international community in peacekeeping and peace enforcement missions. This engagement required the U.S. military to take on new, unfamiliar tasks not traditionally part of its national defense and security mandate.

Some foreign policy experts argue that peacekeeping and peace enforcement missions are an appropriate use of American military power in pursuit of U.S. interests abroad. Resources unique to the military should be harnessed in support of international efforts to resolve humanitarian crises and in UN or alliance peace operations. They emphasize that the U.S. should provide international leadership in preventing and or ending violence, using military power as necessary to do so.

Other national security experts assert that peacekeeping operations distract the military from its principal mission, which is to defend U.S. territory and the physical security of its citizens, and promote American interests abroad. They point out that the use of military forces must be limited to order to remain prepared for strategic combat missions and major regional conflicts. It is also critical for the U.S. military to be active in collective defense arrangements with important allies in areas such as Europe and Asia. The unique demands of peacekeeping erode the military's war-fighting capacity and leave it unprepared to defend security interests.

In a 1500-word essay, examine the alternative arguments in this debate.

- Begin your essay by explaining why this debate has arisen at this time, giving a brief explanation of peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations, and how they differ from the military's traditional role in national defense.
- Explore the pros and cons of each argument. That is, what are the implications, both positive and negative, of U.S. military engagement in peacekeeping and peace enforcement activities? What are the implications, positive and negative, of restricting U.S. military engagement abroad only to clear threats to American security?
- Support your analysis by briefly examining two or more current and historical examples of U.S. military engagements, both in traditional military missions and in peacekeeping and/or peace enforcement.

Conclude your essay by giving your opinion on what role our military should play over the next decade in ensuring international peace and security and in protecting American interests at home and abroad.

Lesson I

Introducing the National Peace Essay Contest to Students (1 period)

Objectives

Students will:

- Learn about the National Peace Essay Contest and the United States Institute of Peace
- Read the 2001-2002 essay contest question and review the NPEC and class guidelines for the essay assignment
- Begin to explore issues related to the essay question

Materials

Each student will need

- The essay contest question
- NPEC rules and guidelines
- Schedule of due dates, grading policy or rubric, and guidelines for the project
- Copies of Lesson 1 Worksheet: "Why Now?" on p. 20

Step 1

Introduce this project to your students and give them time to read over the information about the U.S. Institute of Peace and the contest rules and guidelines that you have prepared for them. Point out the objectives of this contest and how it relates to the class. Go over the schedule of lessons and assignments.

Step 2

Ask students to read the National Peace Essay Contest question.

Direct their attention to the first line of the first bulleted item in the question, which considers "why this debate has arisen at this time." You may wish to distribute and review copies of the Worksheet: "Why Now?" at this point or conduct this discussion while completing lessons III and IV. You may also wish to assign the worksheet for homework.

Step 3

Introduce Lessons II-VI by asking these questions:

- Do your students know where U.S. forces are stationed or deployed abroad?
- Do they have friends or relatives who have served in the military in the U.S. or abroad?
- Do they have friends or relations who have been involved in a peace operation?
- What are their initial thoughts about the difference between the classical role of the military and peace operations?

For students working independently

- Follow Steps 1, 2, and 3.
- Read Lesson 1 Worksheet “Why Now?” on p. 20 and answer discussion questions

Lesson II
Understanding Terms in the National Peace Essay Question
(1- 2 periods)

Objectives

Students will:

- Understand general vocabulary terms in the peace essay question
- Compete in a quiz show-like format to build comprehension of vocabulary found in the glossary

Materials

Each student will need:

- His/Her own copy of the essay question with unfamiliar terms highlighted
- A copy of the glossary (p. 21 – 25) for distribution after class quiz

Step 1

Review the essay question. Discuss students' understanding of the question and review vocabulary terms that they may not have understood.

Step 2

Divide the class into four teams of roughly equal sizes. The teacher will act as quiz master. Using the glossary the teacher should randomly pick one glossary item at a time and present it in question form (e.g. What are weapons of mass destruction?) Students should not be given access to the glossary of terms until after the quiz has been completed. Students should indicate when they have an answer, the quiz master will call on them, and if the student offers what is judged to be the right answer, they are awarded one point. The process continues until all the glossary items have been covered. Teachers should ensure they record those items that receive no right answers or those that the teacher feels need greater discussion.

Step 3

Once all the glossary items have been covered in the quiz the teacher should add up points and declare a winner.

Step 4

Lead a discussion on the terms either poorly understood, or not correctly identified in the quiz. Teachers may also wish to open up the discussion to some of the other terms students appeared to find interesting or problematic.

Step 5

Introduce Lesson III and IV.

For students working independently

- Read through the glossary on p. 21 – 25.
- Refer to references listed on the Additional Resources sheet for more information.

Lesson III

Map Activity 1: Where Are U.S. Military Forces Located? (1 period)

Objectives

Students will:

- Review terms and concepts
- On a world map, locate U.S. military forces on foreign soil, as well as naval deployments abroad
 - Gain a sense of the numbers and distribution of U.S. military forces posted abroad
 - Participate in a class discussion concerning the role of U.S. military forces abroad and the strategic implications of their numbers and locations

Materials

Teacher will need:

- Transparency copy of the world map on p. 28

Each student will need:

- The list of definitions of military and foreign policy terms
- Worksheet “Why Now?” (if you have not already discussed)
 - A copy of blank world map 1 on p. 26
 - The list of U.S. military force deployment on p. 30
 - Colored pencils or markers

Step 1

Review definitions covered in lesson II and if desired, discuss worksheet “Why Now?”

Step 2

Distribute copies of the world map and the list of U.S. military forces. Ask students to locate U.S. military forces and note the number of forces stationed in each country or area. See instructor’s map on p. 28.

Step 3

When students have finished their maps, present a transparency of the completed map to the class. Ask students for their reaction to the information.

- Where are the greatest numbers of U.S. military forces?
- Were students surprised at the numbers and locations of troops?
- Are you aware of any correlation between violent conflict and U.S. military deployments?
- To what regions could ground or naval forces be most easily deployed in a crisis?
- What does the placement of forces indicate are the areas of vital national interest to the United States?

Step 4

Introduce Lesson IV

For students working independently

- Examine the map on p. 26.
- Review and answer the questions in Step 3.

Lesson IV

Map Activity 2: Where Has the United Nations and the U.S. Participated in Peace Operations? (1 period)

Objectives

Students will:

- Review definitions
 - Locate UN peace operations on a world map
 - Identify those operations in which the U.S. has participated
 - Analyze peace operations in light of U.S. strategic interests
 - Select two or more examples of peace operations to use in their essay

Materials

Teacher will need:

- Transparency of completed versions of map activity 2 p. 30

Students will need:

- The glossary on p. 21 - 25
- Worksheet on “Why Now?”
 - A copy of blank map 2 on p. 27
 - The list of peace operations p. 32 -34
 - Colored pencils or markers

Step 1

Review the definitions of peace operations on p. 24 - 25, discussing some of the examples given in the definitions. Also continue discussion on “Why Now?” if desired.

Step 2

Students should mark on the map the location of each peace operation from the list of selected UN peace operations since 1945.

Step 3

Ask students to identify those peace operations in which the U.S. participated.

- Where has the U.S. been most active?
- Review the list of UN peace operations since 1945. How has the location of peace operations changed over time? Can you suggest reasons why this has occurred?
- Compare the map of U.S. military overseas and the map of peace operations. What strikes you about the comparison? What conclusions do you draw from your observations?

Step 4

Student discussion: Compare and contrast traditional US military operations with peace operations. You may wish to especially focus on the following areas: objectives of the mission, rules of engagement, and measures of success.

For students working independently

- Examine the map on p. 27.
- Review and answer questions in steps 2, 3, and 4.

Lesson V
Introducing Bibliographic Resources and Opposing Viewpoints (1 1/2 - 2 periods)

Objectives

Students will:

- Review NPEC rules, guidelines, and suggestions for sources and bibliography
- Understand the difference between primary and secondary sources
- Use the Internet and other references to define military terms related to the essay topic
- Read articles representing opposing opinions on the essay topic
- Utilize a graphic method of depicting opposing opinions

Materials

Each student will need a copy of:

- NPEC rules, guidelines, and suggestions for sources and bibliography on p. 4 - 5 of the contest booklet
- Primary and Secondary Sources Worksheet on p. 35
- The glossary on p. 21 - 25
- The opposing viewpoints articles p. 37 - 41
- Lesson V Worksheet: A "T" graph for Analyzing Opposing Views on p. 36

Step 1

Review guidelines for sources and bibliography suggestions with students and answer any questions they have. Be sure to emphasize that essays submitted to the NPEC must have a bibliography which should: include a variety of sources; adhere to the NPEC guidelines regarding encyclopedias, web-sites, and dictionaries (located on p. 4 - 5 of the NPEC guidebook); and include material that is as up-to-date as possible. Only reliable on-line sources should be used.

Step 2

Distribute the worksheet on primary and secondary sources. Give students fifteen minutes to complete the exercise. Briefly discuss their answers to the worksheet.

Step 3

Point out that writing the National Peace Essay will require students to examine opposing viewpoints on the topic of the U.S. military's role in peace operations. Ask for suggestions of types of sources they can use to find competing arguments. Suggested references may be found on the USIP web-site.

Step 4

Hand out the opposing viewpoints articles and Lesson V Worksheet: "A 'T' graph for Analyzing Opposing Views". Review the "T" on the worksheet and tell students that their homework assignment is to read the two articles and list points supporting each side of the issue under the "Pro" or "Con" heading. Suggest that use of this graphic may be a helpful method of analyzing the material they read to prepare themselves to write their essay expressing their own opinion on this issue.

For students working independently

- Complete Primary and Secondary Source Worksheet on p. 35.
- Follow Steps 1, 3, and 4.

Lesson VI

Forming an Opinion and Considering the Challenges of Peace Operations

Note: Teachers may use either any or all of the three activities below.

Objectives

- Students will:
- Practice articulating particular points of view
- Be exposed to alternative points of view
- Develop an improved perspective on various arguments concerning the NPEC question

Activity #1: A debate on either statement: “The U.S. military should engage in peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations” or “America’s involvement in peace operations does not serve its vital national security interest.” (1 period)

Materials

Each student participating in this debate will need a copy of:

- The statement being debated
- Your rules for the debate

Activity #2: A simulation of a meeting of the U.S. President and his or her foreign policy advisory team deciding how to respond to a fictional crisis. The group must decide whether or not the U.S. military should engage in a particular peace operation and what form that participation should take. (1 period)

Materials

Each student participating in this simulation will need a copy of:

- The background materials on the crisis in San Dimas
- An assigned role in the simulation with the instructions on how to prepare for the activity on p. 42

The goal of this exercise is to give students an idea of the kind of decision regarding peace operations an American president and his or her advisers might face. There are nine roles so the simulation can be run simultaneously with 3 or 4 groups of students. Any of the roles can be expanded or deleted in order to fit the numbers of students in a given class.

Distribute the scenario to the students, assign them roles, and then give each a slip of paper with the description of his or her assigned role. Students should be encouraged to discuss why they arrived at the decision they did and determine what factors and priorities guided them in reaching that decision.

***Caveat:** If the students decide to intervene, it is important that they discuss how they will intervene and what role the use of force will or will not play in their policy recommendation. What kind of peace operation would they prefer?*

Activity #3: Engage in classroom discussion over the scenario involving an American military peacekeeper in Kosovo. (1 period)

Materials

Students will need

1. Copy of the Kosovo scenario for each student, which is found on p. 44

The objective of this scenario is to encourage students to consider the practical consequences presented by peace operations. There is no right answer to the scenario and students should be encouraged to think critically and imaginatively. You may wish to have students first consider the scenario in small groups in preparation for classroom discussion.

Tips for Helping Students Write a Successful Essay

Here are some ideas for improving the quality of your students' essays and making them potential winners!

- ⇒ Be sure students carefully read all the rules and guidelines for successful essays.
- ⇒ Encourage students to read winning essays from past years that appear in the brochure and on the U.S. Institute of Peace website (www.usip.org).
- ⇒ Because your students are now familiar with the peace operations used in Lesson IV of this guide, you may anticipate that many of them will select these operations for their examples. Point out that other peace operations could also be used, for instance peace operations carried out by regional organizations. Stress to students that originality and creativity in making such selections will be recognized by the essay judges.
- ⇒ If students select examples that remain at crisis stage at the time their essay is written, be sure they acknowledge this situation in their essay and have the most up-to-date sources possible at the time of writing.
- ⇒ English and Social Studies teachers can complement each other's knowledge and abilities if they work together to help students with the essay. Consider collaborating or team teaching for this project. You may choose to permit students who have research paper requirements in courses in both departments to use the NPEC to satisfy both assignments.
- ⇒ After all essays are written, consider asking one or more colleagues to read and rate the strongest ones. Students whose papers receive high ratings can then prepare them for submission to the NPEC by correcting all

typographical or grammatical errors, updating information as needed, and making last-minute improvements.

Teachers: Students are permitted to submit essays to the National Peace Essay Contest as individuals or as part of a classroom submission by a teacher. Direct students who are not writing the essay as a class assignment to use the “Tips for Students Working Independently” at the end of each lesson.

Special Feature: Extension Activities

The following extension activities would give your students opportunities to expand their knowledge about peace operations. In addition, if your state or school requires students to complete a large project prior to graduation from high school, the National Peace Essay Contests and these activities may be used to satisfy this requirement.

- Conduct a public opinion poll on questions related to the Peace Essay topic and analyze the results in a written and/or oral presentation that includes graphic depictions (bar, pie, and line graphs).
- Interview your member of Congress, staff person from your Senator’s office, a professor of international relations, political science, or ROTC (or teacher of junior ROTC, if the program exists at your school) or a person with expertise or experience related to the topic. Write a report of this interview.
- Write letters to elected officials, newspapers, or magazines expressing your opinion on the topic.
- Participate or establish a web-site related to the topic, including a chat-room for interested persons to share their opinions.
- Interview officials from local or state police in your area to learn whether they perform any functions similar to peace operations.
- Interview or correspond with a member of the U.S. military.

Lesson 1 Worksheet: Why Now?

The appropriate role of the U.S. military in international peace operations has recently become an important topic of debate. Not only has the issue caused controversy among the general public and in military circles, disagreements regarding the future role of the military arose during the 2000 presidential campaign. Subsequently, the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, conducted a complete review of the US military. One important objective of this review was to examine whether or not the military was prepared to meet current threats and face future challenges.

Military strategies and technologies that were appropriate to fight a war 15 years ago may no longer be suitable for more modern military engagements and missions. During the Cold War period, U.S. foreign and military policy was defined by containing communism, or defending noncommunist states. The U.S. was prepared to fight two large-scale wars simultaneously. However, the demise of the Soviet Union and the changing nature of conflict have presented new challenges for international involvement and cooperation. Many of the new missions include U.S. military leadership roles in smaller, often internal, conflicts, as well as activities categorized as “peace operations.” Engaging in these activities requires a rethinking of U.S. post-Cold War policy, which in the last decade has included humanitarian assignments, peace enforcement, and peacekeeping. The current military examination will address how the U.S. military can best prepare for future threats and problems.

Military readiness, responsiveness, training, equipment and technology are a few of the areas being reviewed to ensure that the military is prepared for the 21st century. The debate of how to reach this objective requires the U.S. to look into the future and make crucial decisions about the role of the U.S. military in providing national and international security.

Comprehension Questions:

- What are some of the reasons why the issue of U.S. military involvement in international peace operations is currently an important topic of debate?
- What were the goals of U.S. foreign and military policy during the Cold War period? How have they changed? Have peace operations reflected American foreign and military policies?
- Since the end of the Cold War, what form has international conflict taken?

Discussion Questions:

- What challenges does the United States face when the international response to crisis takes the form of a peace operation?
- Where has the U.S. been involved in peace operations in the past 10 years? With what result?
- What are vital U.S. national interests? Are they changing?
- What kind of threats is the U.S. facing? How have these changed?

- What kinds of conflicts require peacekeeping and enforcement responses? Are they a threat to the US national or international security? Why or why not?

Glossary

Terms Related to US National Security

National security interests

“The foundation for the development of valid national objectives that define US goals or purposes. National security interests include preserving US political identity, framework, and institutions; fostering economic well-being; and bolstering international order supporting the vital interests of the United States and its allies.” (*Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/doddict)

National defense and security mandate

Defines and formulates the goals and missions of national defense and security.

American interests abroad

A set of aims/agendas outside the country that have been identified as important to the U.S. government.

Major regional conflicts

Conflicts occurring within a particular geographical region such as the Korean peninsula or the Persian Gulf, that are currently viewed as constituting the most serious threats to U.S. interests.

New threats

Since the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has been faced with new challenges to its national security, including such threats as:

Terrorism The calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological.

Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction The spread of weapons that are capable of a high order of destruction and/or of being used in such a manner as to destroy large numbers of people. These can be nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons.

Rogue states Countries engaged in behavior counter to the norms of international security, such as supporting terrorism or developing weapons of mass destruction.

Transnational criminal organizations Criminal organizations operating across state borders whose conduct represents a threat to national and international security. Such organizations may be involved in trafficking in drugs, people, or arms for example.

Terms Related to Military Operations and Defense Policy

Power projection

“The ability of a nation to apply all or some of its elements of national power - political, economic, informational, or military - to rapidly and effectively deploy and sustain forces in and from multiple dispersed locations to respond to crises, to contribute to deterrence, and to enhance regional stability.”

(www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/doddict/)

Strategic combat missions

Aimed at destroying or depriving an enemy of resources vital to the maintenance of national power capabilities.

Conventional forces

Forces capable of conducting operations using non-nuclear weapons.

Bilateral and multi-lateral security commitments

Commitments between two states (bilateral) or among many states (multilateral) to assist the other(s) in the event of security threats.

Collective defense arrangements

Agreements between states guaranteeing to assist each other in the event of external attack.

Forward presence

Personnel and equipment used to support tactical operations without establishing full support facilities.

Homeland defense

Homeland defense “...includes, deterring and defending against strategic attack, supporting domestic authorities for crisis management, protecting national security assets, such as installations and deploying forces, and helping to ensure the availability, integrity, survivability, and adequacy of other critical assets.”

(www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/doddict/)

Readiness

“The ability of US military forces to fight and meet the demands of the national military strategy. Readiness is the synthesis of two distinct but interrelated levels: a. unit readiness--The ability to provide capabilities required by the combatant commanders to execute their assigned missions. This is derived from the ability of each unit to deliver the outputs for which it was designed. b. joint readiness—The combatant commander's ability to integrate and synchronize ready combat and support forces to execute his or her assigned missions. “

(www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/doddict/)

Selective engagement

Strategy that advocates charting a middle ground between excessive militarism and isolationism in order to deploy U.S. military force where it is most needed and in ways that are most effective.

Theaters of war

The area of air, land, and water that is, or may become, directly involved in the conduct of a war.

Terms Related to Peace Operations**Peacekeeping**

Military operations that are undertaken with the consent of all major parties to the conflict, and conducted by troops that are only lightly armed. Peacekeeping operations are designed to monitor and facilitate implementation of an existing truce and support diplomatic efforts to reach long-term political settlement. They can be undertaken by troops from a single state or by a multinational force (i.e. in UN peacekeeping operations).

Peace-enforcement

The application of military force, or the threat of its use, normally with international authorization, to compel compliance with resolutions or sanctions designed to maintain or restore peace and order. NATO's activities in Bosnia and Serbia are examples of peace enforcement.

Peacebuilding

Peacebuilding usually refers to post-conflict efforts, undertaken by national and international actors, to re-establish the elements of peace. It may include destroying weapons, deploying police, establishing the rule of law, and the re-establishment of a market economy, for example.

Consent

The agreement of all parties involved in the conflict to the peace operation. For example, all parties agree to the involvement of peacekeepers in a conflict zone. Peace enforcement operations usually do not have consent of all parties to the conflict.

Impartiality

Impartiality may be thought of as 'even-handedness', or not giving undue support to one side or another.

Humanitarian crises

Natural or man-made disasters that present a serious threat to life and property.

Military Operations Other Than War (MOOTW or OOTW)

Operations undertaken by the military in support of a peace or humanitarian relief operation, including peacekeeping, peace enforcement, observer missions, and logistical support for emergency operations.

Lesson III & IV Worksheet
Blank World Map

Lesson III Worksheet - Instructor's Map
Map Activity 1: Where are U.S. Military Forces Located?

**Lesson III - Key for Map Activity 1:
Location of U.S. Military Forces**

As of September 30, 2000 there were 257, 817 U.S. military personnel serving abroad. This figure includes 44, 959 troops afloat in various parts of the world. The following list comprises some of the countries with the largest concentrations of land-based U.S. troops.

Belgium	1, 554
Bosnia-Herzegovina	5, 708
Germany	69, 203
Iceland	1, 636
Italy	11, 190
Serbia (includes Kosovo)	5, 427
Spain	2, 007
Turkey	2, 006
United Kingdom	11, 207
Japan	40, 159
Republic of Korea	36, 565
Kuwait	4, 602
Saudi Arabia	7, 053

There are a total of 101, 851 troops deployed in NATO countries and 105, 630 in the Pacific Theater.

Lesson IV Worksheet - Instructor's Map

**Map Activity 2: Where Has the United Nations and the U.S. Participated in
Peace Operations?**

Selected UN Peace Operations since 1945

<u>Mission</u>	<u>Year</u>
Africa	
1. Operation in The Congo (Brazzaville)	1960-1964
2. Angola Verification Mission	1988-1997
3. Transition Assistance Group in Namibia	1989-1990
4. Operation in Mozambique*	1992-1994
5. Operation in Somalia*	1992-1995
6. Assistance Mission For Rwanda	1993-1996
7. Observer Mission In Liberia	1993-1997
8. Aouzou Strip Observer Group In Chad/Libya	1994
9. Observer Mission In Angola	1997-1999
10. UN Mission for Referendum In Western Sahara*	1991-present*
11. Mission in the Central African Republic	1998-2000
12. Missions in Sierra Leone	1998-present
13. Organization Mission in The Democratic Republic of the Congo (Kinshasa)	1999-present
14. Mission In Ethiopia And Eritrea*	2000-present
Americas	
15. Mission of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in the Dominican Republic	1965-1966
16. Observer Group in Central America	1989-1992
17. Observer Mission in El Salvador	1991-1995
18. Missions in Haiti*	1993-2000
19. Verification Mission in Guatemala*	1997
Asia	
20. Military Observer Group in India/Pakistan	1949-present
21. Security Force in West New Guinea	1962-1963
22. India-Pakistan Observation Mission	1965-1966
23. Missions in Cambodia	1991-1993
24. Mission Of Observers in Tajikistan	1994-2000
25. United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor*	1999-present
Europe	
26. Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus	1964-present
27. UN Observer Mission in Georgia*	1993-present
28. Protection Force in Macedonia*	1993-1995
29. Missions in Croatia*	1995-1998
30. Preventive Deployment Force in Macedonia*	1995-1999
31. Mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina*	1995-present
32. Mission of Observers in Prevalaka, Croatia	1996-present
33. Police Support Group in Croatia	1998-present

Mission in Kosovo

1999-present*

Middle East

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 34. Truce Supervision Organization
(Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Syria)* | 1948-present |
| 35. First UN Emergency Force - Egypt | 1956-1967 |
| 36. Observation Group in Lebanon | 1958-1958 |
| 37. Yemen Observation Mission | 1963-1964 |
| 38. Second United Nations Emergency Force-Egypt | 1973-1979 |
| 39. Disengagement Observer Force in Syria | 1974-present |
| 40. Interim Force in Lebanon | 1978-present |
| 41. Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group | 1988-1991 |
| 42. Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission* | 1991-present |

* indicates U.S. participation

Lesson V Worksheet - Understanding Primary and Secondary Sources

Name _____

Date _____

Directions

For each item below:

- ♦ place a P in front of those which are Primary sources
- ♦ place a S in front of those which are Secondary sources

_____ Rumsfeld, Donald. Interview. *NewsHour with Jim Lehrer*, PBS; February 14, 2001.

_____ Haass, Richard N. "Using Force: Lessons and Choices for U.S. Foreign Policy," *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*, eds. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, with Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996: 197-208).

_____ Filipovic, Zlata. *Zlata's Diary: A Child's Life in Sarajevo* (USA: Penguin [Paper], 1995).

_____ Stedman, Stephen John. *Peacemaking in Civil War* (Boulder, CO:Lynne Rienner, 1991).

Directions

In the spaces provided list *four Primary* sources for your essay and *four Secondary* sources.

Primary Sources

Secondary Sources

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Directions

In a short paragraph explain why a good essay would be based on both primary and secondary sources.

Lesson V Worksheet: A “T” Graph for Analyzing Opposing Views

The U.S. military should engage in peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations

Pro	Con



Lesson V First Article

Copyright 2000 The Houston Chronicle Publishing Company
The Houston Chronicle

June 04, 2000, Sunday 2 STAR EDITION

SECTION: OUTLOOK; Pg. 3

LENGTH: 737 words

Let's Finally Face Fact: Peacekeeping is a Bad Idea

BYLINE: CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER; (Krauthammer is a Pulitzer Prize-winning syndicated columnist based in Washington, D.C.)

Peacekeeping: the idea, often taken seriously, that the presence of soldiers wearing blue hats and under orders not to shoot will bring peace to wars of unusual ferocity; a specialty of the United Nations; a favorite of the United States. b. 1957, Sinai Peninsula; d. 2000, Sierra Leone.

Peacekeeping was invented in the 1950s by Lester Pearson, then Canada's foreign minister. It was a nice, theoretically interesting idea at the time: that the United Nations, acting on behalf of the world community, could, by interposing itself between belligerents, create cordons of peace for the separation and, ultimately, the pacification of the various warring parties.

The idea's first test came in the Sinai Peninsula. It failed.

In 1957, Israel withdrew from the Sinai in return for promises that the Sinai would be demilitarized and its neighboring straits kept open to Israeli shipping. The United Nations put in a peacekeeping force called UNEF (United Nations Emergency Force) to guarantee those promises and keep the peace.

Ten years later, in May 1967, President Gamal Nasser of Egypt decided it was time to throw the Jews into the sea. On a gambit, he ordered the U.N. troops out of the Sinai. The U.N. secretary-general complied immediately. (What was this lightly armed foreign presence to do? Resist?) Within hours, the buffer was gone. Within days, Egypt and Israel were at war.

Thirty-three years after this first demonstration of the flimsiness and almost fictional quality of "peacekeeping," the United Nations was still at it, this time in Sierra Leone. Mercifully, however, Sierra Leone may finally mark the end of the idea, an idea whose nobility is matched by its emptiness.

When hundreds of helpless U.N. peacekeepers were captured and taken hostage by Sierra Leone's ragtag rebels, people finally began to wonder: Under what idiot theory were these underarmed, undertrained troops sent there in the first place?

In the name of peacekeeping, the United States had brokered a formal cease-fire that freed the rebel commander and gave him control of the country's mines - the perfect fuel for a warlord in a place where diamonds are practically the only source of wealth. He was supposed to be restrained by his signature on a piece of paper and a Potemkin U.N. police force. He proceeded to go on a rampage and utterly humiliate the blue-helmeted peacekeepers. Surprise!

We will continue to be surprised until we face the fact that there are three kinds of armed intervention - peacekeeping, policing and occupation - and peacekeeping is the worst.

Policing is slightly better because the troops, generally not U.N. but real contingents of real national armies, are allowed to arrest and shoot bad guys. This is certainly an improvement - in Sierra Leone, the peacekeepers were under ridiculous orders to shoot only in self-defense. But even policing is not serious enough when the warlords are determined. We learned that to our chagrin in Somalia, when we went after the notorious Mohammed Farah Aideed, and lost 18 American soldiers in the attempt.

The only serious way to intervene is to occupy. Take over a country, reorder the society, establish new institutions and create the basis for leaving one day. We did that in Germany and Japan after World War II and it worked. But it required total commitment, a huge investment and much patience.

Where we are not prepared for such a commitment, we should not be venturing in with half measures, like the kind of policing we are engaged in in the Balkans.

In Kosovo, we are certainly not paper tigers. But we are not remaking Kosovo, simply because Kosovo is of too little importance to us to warrant the resources and risks that would necessitate. But that means that as soon as we leave, things blow up again. And that means that we are not leaving. We are stuck.

Congressional critics are nonetheless wrong to demand an exit day from Kosovo. That is an open invitation to bad guys to gird their loins and gather their weapons for the resumption of fighting on the day we leave - and for harassing us as the deadline approaches. (See, for example, Hezbollah's harassment of the Israelis as they were leaving Lebanon on a fixed timetable.)

Nevertheless, the open-ended policing of the Balkans and the farcical show of peacekeeping in Sierra Leone should be a lesson: If you want to intervene, do it seriously. Occupy, or stay home.

Lesson V Second Article

Copyright 2001 International Herald Tribune
International Herald Tribune (Neuilly-sur-Seine, France)

January 19, 2001, Friday

SECTION: News; Pg. 2

LENGTH: 1489 words

Bush's Stand on Kosovo Gets Few Cheers in the Field; Peacekeepers' Role / 'A Real-World Mission'

By Michael R. Gordon and Steven Erlanger; New York Times Service

DATELINE: GNJILANE, Kosovo

:
As the commander of a U.S. Army tank company, Captain Joseph Cantello has trained hard for armored warfare. But these days, in helmet and body armor, the 29-year-old captain is trying to coax wary Serbs and Albanians to agree to a school in which their children would study under one roof, though in separate classrooms.

Captain Cantello, however, is not complaining. In fact, he says he enjoys his responsibilities as a member of the U.S. peacekeeping force in Kosovo.

"In the army you spend practically all of your time training," he said. "Here, we are executing a real-world mission. We get to interact with the other NATO militaries. And things are so decentralized that I have a lot more autonomy in making decisions. It's good experience."

During the U.S. presidential campaign, George W. Bush and his aides complained that Balkan peacekeeping diverted the military from its primary task of preparing to fight the nation's wars and degraded necessary skills.

One aide, Condoleezza Rice, said during the campaign that "we don't need to have the 82d Airborne escorting kids to kindergarten." Ms. Rice, who has since been appointed to be Mr. Bush's national security adviser, said at the time that if Vice President Al Gore became president, "America's military will continue to be overdeployed, harming morale and re-enlistment rates, weakening our military's core mission."

But a trip across Kosovo provides a different impression of America's peacekeeping role. Most of the scores of young U.S. officers and senior commanders interviewed for this article believe their mission is important. Most striking, many of them insist that their work here is making them better soldiers.

"The units that come out of the Balkans are better than the units that have never done a Balkan deployment," said Lieutenant Colonel Jim Embrey, chief operations officer for Task Force Falcon, as the U.S. peacekeeping force in Kosovo is known.

Kosovo is a good test case of the effect peacekeeping is having on the U.S. military. With a doctrine requiring the U.S. military to prepare for two nearly simultaneous regional wars, the armed forces have plenty to do even without peacekeeping.

But commanders here say that duty in Kosovo offers something their troops would never get in training: the chance for young officers and soldiers, armed with live ammunition, to operate in a complex and potentially risky situation, making decisions that affect people's lives.

"There are things that will gather rust in our conventional war-fighting skills during our six months here," said Brigadier General Kenneth Quinlan, the Falcon commander. "But by my calculation the pluses overwhelm the minuses. In terms of junior-leader development, there is no better training environment than where we are today."

For all the debate that Balkan peacekeeping has generated among U.S. politicians, the 5,245 U.S. troops in Kosovo make up about 13 percent of the multinational peacekeeping force here.

The current U.S. force is part of the 1st Armored Division, one of the army's premier combat units, which spent the Cold War training to go toe-to-toe with the Warsaw Pact and joined in the army's famous left hook against Iraq's Republican Guard during the 1991 Gulf War. The troops are dispatched here on six-month tours and leave their families behind.

Critics have portrayed peacekeeping as a poor substitute for intensive combat training at the vast ranges the army has established in Europe and the United States. Some troops in Kosovo agree, saying that they are soldiers, not police officers. But others stress that the mission in Kosovo is far more varied than many critics recognize, taking a view that is widely shared by their European NATO counterparts. -

Peacekeeping in Kosovo not only means staffing checkpoints and escorting frightened Serb civilians to markets, schools and hospitals in Albanian areas. It also involves armed patrols along the rugged boundary with Serbia intended to stop the flow of arms, food and supplies to Albanian insurgents, who operate in a 5-kilometer (3-mile) strip of Serbian territory adjoining Kosovo from which Serbian armed forces are banned by the agreement that ended the 1999 Kosovo war.

Containing that insurgency has become an important NATO mission because of the need to limit the possibility for another explosion of ethnic violence.

With their boundary mission and other tasks, U.S. helicopter pilots fly three to five times as many hours each month as they do in at their bases in Germany, General Quinlan said. One pilot, Rob Smith, who helped capture a group of Albanian insurgents earlier this month, said that his reconnaissance missions provided a good opportunity to train in mountainous conditions.

"Our flying skills are developed a lot better here than in a sea-level environment," he said, and the pilots operate without the restrictions common in purely peacetime exercises.

Artillery might seem out of place in a peacekeeping force. But U.S. troops are using their 155mm guns to fire special illumination rounds to light up the wild boundary region. Combat engineers have been blowing up smuggling trails.

Most of the U.S. effort, of course, is directed at more traditional peacekeeping, for which these troops received months of training. Even so, soldiers say that their duties here provide good experience for intelligence officers, medical and logistical personnel, communications specialists and civil affairs units, which have helped to restore basic services in Kosovo.

But some skills do fade during the military's service in Kosovo. To preserve soldiers' combat skills, the army arranged for intensive combat training before the Kosovo deployment. Training ranges have also been set up in Kosovo. But the Americans will not be able to maneuver large armored units and coordinate their operations with U.S. helicopters, warplanes and artillery, a limitation that will affect the soldiers' ability to fight a major war.

"We will go out of Kosovo with some of our skills degraded at the company and battalion level, combined arms stuff that we won't get to do here," General Quinlan said. "Companies can't operate as companies here. Battalions can't operate as battalions in conventional sense with tanks."

General Quinlan said it would take 90 days for his soldiers to regain their previous combat proficiency after they complete their assignment in Kosovo and return to Germany. But what if his troops were suddenly called upon to fight? He said that, if needed, they would be ready to go to war.

With the army's ambitious training regimen and a steady series of overseas deployments, there has also been concern that extended time away from families will prompt many young soldiers to conclude that the army life is not for them. So far, that problem seems to be under control here, at least measured in terms of re-enlistment rates.

The 1st Armored Division, which provided the troops for the previous U.S. peacekeeping deployment in the army, as well as the current one, has the highest retention rate in the army, according to Sherman Fuller, the command sergeant major for the task force.

At Pones, Captain Cantello and his men are taking steps to maintain their combat skills. His 75-man company drives its 14 tanks once a week. And they train on special tank simulators at least once a week.

Captain Cantello's main focus these days, however, is not tank maneuvers but Pones, a divided town with separate Serb and Albanian mayors. The two communities keep their distance, but tensions are high. The UN police force is too weak to control Kosovo, and the nascent Kosovo police are inexperienced and untested.

The platoon of U.S. soldiers, based in the town, seem to enjoy the most trust.

The theory is that Americans will provide the security and space to enable the Kosovars to do more for themselves - and, ultimately, allow the Americans and other international forces to leave Kosovo. But those days are clearly not yet at hand.

U.S. soldiers, and some of their officers, sometimes talk as if Kosovo would be just fine if everybody could just be friends. But the interethnic violence and revenge continues daily, and despite efforts at conciliation, much of what international troops do is simply try to keep one side from hurting the other.

To build ties between the two communities, the army is promoting plans for the new school that Serb and Albanian children would both attend. The project would be paid for from nonmilitary budgets.

So far, the Serbs in Pones have balked, saying the Albanians may squeeze them out after the school is built. But the soldiers have not given up. Sergeant Kevin Gleason, 33, has invited the Serb and Albanian leaders to a new meeting to break the logjam. The place: the U.S. Army platoon's base in Pones.

Lesson VI Worksheet

Activity 2 – Scenario and Roles

Scenario

The American embassy in San Dimas reports that rebel forces in the North, where there is widespread drought and famine, have massacred civilians in six villages. Government forces have engaged in fighting with some rebel forces along the eastern border but many have fled into neighboring Monte Alban where they are given sanctuary. Initial reports are that over 5,700 civilians have been killed, many in very brutal fashion.

The rebels, a secretive and isolated group, killed tens of thousands of civilians and intentionally mutilated many more during eight years of civil war.

Thousands of people are fleeing the intensifying fighting and the drought in the Northern and Eastern areas of the country. However, the neighboring countries are no longer allowing many refugees into their countries. Most of them are turned back by soldiers at the border and there is evidence that many refugees are then killed and many young men and boys are forced into taking up arms for the rebels. The small contingent of UN peacekeeping forces on the ground have been ineffective and eleven of them have been killed or wounded. The mandate of the UN force is simply to protect convoys of food and civilians into the rebel-dominated areas. UN peacekeepers are not allowed to take the initiative against rebel troops.

The UN Secretary General has urged the international community to act: “We must halt the widespread killing and suffering that is being perpetrated in San Dimas.” He has specifically asked the United States to lead a military force that can isolate or oust the rebels and then provide peacekeeping forces that will allow for security to be re-established in the area and give humanitarian aid organizations the opportunity to help the stricken populace. The government of San Dimas has sent a similar request.

The President of the United States has convened a meeting of top advisers to review the situation and choose the best course of action. With students playing the following roles have them determine the best course of action for the United States and the response the President should give to the requests for an American military force. Such an exercise can be played over different lengths of time and the roles can be expanded if desired.

Roles

President: Two images are haunting you: the bodies of innocent San Dimas citizens, and the bodies of young American soldiers. You have always touted the United States as a good global citizen, but are unsure how to prevent one of the images from becoming reality without ensuring that the second image does as well.

Vice President: You are opposed to any intervention in San Dimas, because you believe that there is not enough at stake that affects vital American interests. Opinion polls show that a majority of Americans are opposed to armed intervention in San Dimas.

National Security Adviser: You are concerned that there is no one else to do the job in San Dimas. Neither food nor humanitarian aid workers can reach the victims of the growing famine because the situation is so insecure. American intervention could greatly improve the situation while at the same time providing U.S. forces important experience in dealing with the type of violent conflicts that have become predominant since the end of the Cold War.

Secretary of State: You oppose military intervention at present because you feel that diplomatic measures have not been exhausted. You would like to increase pressure on San Dimas' neighbors who are providing safe haven for the rebel forces and also work to freeze the financial assets of the rebel leaders who have profited greatly from the guerilla war they are carrying out. However, if the killings continue then a swift, armed intervention may be necessary. All the while, diplomatic efforts should continue and there should be no long-term military commitment.

Director of the CIA: You support military intervention because CIA intelligence analysts believe that a small, but resolute show of force will be enough to halt the killings and defeat the rebels or at least drive them underground. The only type of force that will work, according to intelligence, are ground troops because this is a very low-tech conflict. And, air strikes will cause too many civilian casualties.

Secretary of Defense: You oppose any long-term commitment of military forces and favor the minimum necessary to stop the killings. You prefer massive and surgical air strikes so that an overwhelming use of force is brought to bear on the conflict with the lowest risk of American casualties. Finally, you are wary of the use of American troops in UN peacekeeping operations because the rules of engagement too often prevent soldiers from taking the initiative and using force against those who threaten peace and security. Such peacekeeping operations have too often left soldiers very vulnerable to attack by rebel and guerilla troops. You will insist that any peace operation have robust rules of engagement that will allow American soldiers the capacity to defend themselves and use force where necessary.

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs: You support military intervention to halt the killings and establish a cease-fire, but then want the United Nations to provide peacekeeping forces that will ensure continued adherence to a cease-fire and protect the lives and security of the citizens in the North and East. There must be no long-term commitment of U.S. troops. You also believe that it is unrealistic to expect that air strikes will be sufficient to stop the violence in San Dimas. You support the use of any ground forces in order for any intervention to be effective.

White House Chief of Staff: You are primarily concerned about how the decision

will affect the President's public image and the consequences for the mid-term congressional elections. Polls show that the majority of Americans (and the majority of those in Congress) oppose a peace operation in San Dimas. At the same time, other polls show that Americans believe that the United States should not sit by while innocent people are being killed and there are massive violations of human rights.

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations: You strongly support sending an American-led peacekeeping force to San Dimas. You are concerned that if U.N. member states do not respond to the urgent needs of San Dimas and halt the escalating killing, U.N. (and American) credibility will be damaged considerably. The San Dimas government has asked for help and it is important that the world not stand idly by while the slaughter continues.

Lesson VI Worksheet

Activity#3 Kosovo Scenario

During a regular patrol in Kosovo in a former ethnically mixed village that falls under the American sector assigned to a U.S. peacekeeping division, an American soldier comes across a very heated argument outside the house of one of the older Serb residents who stayed behind after the peace agreement was signed.

Through a young girl who is nearby and speaks some English, the soldier understands clearly that the younger Kosovar Albanian man is accusing the older Serbian resident of being responsible for Kosovar houses in the village having been destroyed. The Serbian owner is vehemently denying the accusations and says that he has lived in the village with Albanians his whole life and that he tried to prevent the looting and burning of their houses.

The American lets the two men continue to “talk” with one another for a little while in order to understand better why each is upset. Soon, however, a small crowd of both Serbs and Kosovar Albanians begins to gather and the two men start to get physical with one another.

The soldier needs to decide quickly whether there is anything constructive that can be done to manage this situation. If left unchecked, this confrontation might lead to a serious escalation of violence. There have been several instances where Serbians were harassed and beaten recently. The soldier does not know whether either of the two men engaged in the argument is armed nor whether any of the bystanders are armed.

The American soldier could simply draw a weapon and demand that they break up the argument and force everyone to move along. But what if they don't obey? Under the rules of engagement that form the basis of the peace enforcement operation and the standing orders, soldiers are allowed to draw weapons only to protect life and/or property. In addition, American weapons are not loaded. The soldiers are issued ammunition but are allowed to load their weapons only in an emergency situation. Concern has been heightened because a Russian peacekeeper was recently the victim of a sniper attack and the peacekeeping troops often cannot determine who is friend or foe among the civilian population.

Question for Discussion

What should the US soldier do? Why?

Does this scenario alter your view on the nature of peace operations? If your view has been changed, why did it change?

Additional Resources

- Aall, Pamela, Daniel Miltenberger and Thomas Weiss, *Guide to IGOs, NGOs, and the Military in Peace and Relief Operations*, Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 2000.
- Arkin, William M. *The U.S. Military Online* (2nd edition) London, U.K.: Brassey's, 1998.
- Betts, Richard K. "The New Threat of Mass Destruction." *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 77, No. 1, January-February 1998: 26-41.
- Blechman, Barry M and Tamara C. Wittes. "Defining Moment: The Threat and Use of Force in American Foreign Policy Since 1989." Daniel Druckman and Paul C. Stern (eds.) *International Conflict Resolution after the Cold War*, Washington, DC, National Academy Press, 2000: 90-122.
- Bowen, Wyn Q. "The US National Interest and the Future of Military Intervention." In Andrew M. Dorman and Thomas G. Otte eds. *Military Intervention: From Gunboat Diplomacy to Humanitarian Intervention*, Brookfield, Vermont: Dartmouth, 1995: 83-108.
- Carter, Ashton B. "Keeping America's Military Edge." *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 80, No. 1, January-February 2001: 91-105.
- Department of Defense. *Worldwide Manpower Distribution by Geographical Area*. 30 September 2000. Online. Internet. 26 April 2001. Available at <http://web1.whs.osd.mil/mmid/mmidhome.htm>
- Durch, William, *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping: Case Studies and Comparative Analysis*, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Durch, William, *The United Nations and Collective Security in the 21ST Century*, Carlisle Barracks, PA, Strategic Studies Institute, 1993.
- Fishel, John T. *Civil Military Operations in the New World*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1997.
- Haass, Richard N. "Using Force: Lessons and Choices for U.S. Foreign Policy" in Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson with Pamela Aall, eds. *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*, Washington, D.C.: USIP Press, 1996: 197-208.
- Hoffman, Stanley. "The Politics and Ethics of Military Intervention." *Survival* Vol. 37, No. 4, Winter 1995-1996: 29-51.
- Luttwak, Edward N. "A Post-Heroic Military Policy" *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 75, No. 4, July-August 1996: 33-44.
- _____. "Give War a Chance." *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 78, No. 4, July-August 1999: 36-44.
- Nye, Joseph S. "Redefining the National Interest." *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 78, No. 4, July-August 1999: 22-35.
- Odom, William E. "Transforming the Military." *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 76, No. 4, July-August 1997: 54-64.
- "Peacekeeping: Issues of U.S. Military Involvement." *Congressional Research Service Issue Brief*, 21 February 2001, no. 40. Available at <http://fas.org/man/crs/IB94040.pdf>.
- Roberts, Adam. "The Crisis in UN Peacekeeping." in Chester A. Crocker, et. al., *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*, 297-320.
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. *SIPRI Yearbook 1999*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1999.

