



Foreign Policy -- Defense -- Documents on the web -- December 2010

Table of contents:

U.S. Government documents.....	page 1
• On Passing of Richard Holbrooke.....	page 1
• The White House: Remarks.....	page 2
• Department of State: Remarks.....	page 2
• Key U.S. Government Reports.....	page 2
• Congressional Research Service.....	page 3
Think Tanks And Research Centers.....	page 6
• Afghanistan – Pakistan.....	page 6
• Asia.....	page 7
• Defense.....	page 8
• Diplomacy.....	page 11
• Iran.....	page 12
• Korea.....	page 12
• Middle East.....	page 13
• NATO.....	page 14
• Nuclear.....	page 15
• Russia.....	page 15
• Sudan.....	page 16
• Terrorism – Counterterrorism.....	page 16
• Wikileaks.....	page 17

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS:

Passing of Richard Holbrooke

STATEMENT FROM THE PRESIDENT ON RICHARD HOLBROOKE:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/12/13/statement-president-richard-holbrooke>

STATEMENT FROM THE VICE PRESIDENT ON RICHARD HOLBROOKE:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2010/12/13/statement-vice-president-richard-holbrooke>

STATEMENT FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON RICHARD HOLBROOKE:

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/12/152782.htm>

THE PASSING OF AMBASSADOR RICHARD C. HOLBROOKE: CONDOLENCES:

http://www.state.gov/s/special_rep_afghanistan_pakistan/c40884.htm

The White House: Remarks

Please find below the link to the President Obama and other White House Officials' Speeches and Remarks:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-and-remarks>

Department of State: Remarks

Please find below the link to the Secretary of State Clinton and other Department of State Officials' Remarks:

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/index.htm>

Key U.S. Government Reports

Department of Defense:

REPORT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH A REPEAL OF "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL"

U.S. Department of Defense. November 30, 2010. 266 pages.

[http://www.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_gatesdadt/DADTReport_FINAL_20101130\(secure-hires\).pdf](http://www.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_gatesdadt/DADTReport_FINAL_20101130(secure-hires).pdf)

U.S. Government Accountability Office:

B-2 BOMBER: REVIEW OF THE AIR FORCE'S DECISION TO CHANGE EXTREMELY HIGH FREQUENCY SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS ANTENNAS

U.S. Government Accountability Office. Report to Congressional Committees. December 16, 2010. 30 pages.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11180r.pdf>

DEFENSE MANAGEMENT: DOD NEEDS TO MONITOR AND ASSESS CORRECTIVE ACTIONS RESULTING FROM ITS CORROSION STUDY OF THE F-35 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER

U.S. Government Accountability Office. Report to Congressional Committees. December 16, 2010. 36 pages.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11171r.pdf>

NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION: COMPREHENSIVE U.S. PLANNING AND BETTER FOREIGN COOPERATION NEEDED TO SECURE VULNERABLE NUCLEAR MATERIALS WORLDWIDE

U.S. Government Accountability Office. Report to the Chairman and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives. December 2010. 46 pages.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11227.pdf>

DISPLACED IRAQIS: INTEGRATED INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY NEEDED TO REINTEGRATE IRAQ'S INTERNALLY DISPLACED AND RETURNING REFUGEES

U.S. Government Accountability Office. Report to Congressional Committees. December 2010. 78 pages.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11124.pdf>

DEFENSE ACQUISITIONS: ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AS DOD MODERNIZES ITS FLEET OF TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES

U.S. Government Accountability Office. Report to Congressional Committees. November 5, 2010. 35 pages.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d1183.pdf>

AFGHANISTAN DEVELOPMENT: U.S. EFFORTS TO SUPPORT AFGHAN WATER SECTOR INCREASING, BUT IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED IN PLANNING AND COORDINATION

U.S. Government Accountability Office. Report to Congressional Addressees. November 2010. 75 pages.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11138.pdf>

Congressional Research Service

Just clicking on the links won't open the documents. Please copy/paste the urls in your browser to be able to read them.

AFRICA: U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ISSUES

By Ted Dagne. Congressional Research Service. December 9, 2010. 14 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153305.pdf>

GUANTANAMO DETENTION CENTER: LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY IN THE 111TH CONGRESS

By Michael John Garcia. Congressional Research Service. December 9, 2010. 23 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153307.pdf>

TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

By Clare Ribando Seelke. Congressional Research Service. December 9, 2010. 22 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153303.pdf>

UGANDA: CURRENT CONDITIONS AND THE CRISIS IN NORTH UGANDA

By Ted Dagne. Congressional Research Service. December 9, 2010. 39 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153304.pdf>

AFGHANISTAN CASUALTIES: MILITARY FORCES AND CIVILIANS

By Susan G. Chesser. Congressional Research Service. December 8, 2010. 6 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153302.pdf>

NUCLEAR COOPERATION WITH OTHER COUNTRIES: A PRIMER

By Paul K. Kerr, Mary Beth Nikitin. Congressional Research Service. December 8, 2010. 9 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153300.pdf>

THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE: CURRENT ISSUES

By Derek E. Mix. Congressional Research Service. December 8, 2010. 13 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153301.pdf>

AMERICAN JIHADIST TERRORISM: COMBATING A COMPLEX THREAT

By Jerome P. Bjelopera, Mark A. Randol. Congressional Research Service. December 7, 2010. 135 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153298.pdf>

COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY: BACKGROUND AND CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

By Jonathan Medalia. Congressional Research Service. December 7, 2010. 51 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153282.pdf>

SECURING AMERICA'S BORDERS: THE ROLE OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

By Richard A. Best Jr. Congressional Research Service. December 7, 2010. 14 pages.
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153312.pdf>

STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS: FY2011 BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS

By Marian Leonardo Lawson, Susan B. Epstein, Tamara J. Resler. Congressional Research Service. December 7, 2010. 36 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153295.pdf>

U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES (SOF): BACKGROUND AND ISSUES FOR CONGRESS

By Andrew Feickert, Thomas K. Livingston. Congressional Research Service. December 3, 2010. 13 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/153311.pdf>

NORTH KOREA'S 2009 NUCLEAR TEST: CONTAINMENT, MONITORING, IMPLICATIONS

By Jonathan Medalia. Congressional Research Service. November 24, 2010. 41 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152614.pdf>

DEFENSE: FY2011 AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS

By Pat Towell, Coordinator. Congressional Research Service. November 23, 2010. 92 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152615.pdf>

AFGHANISTAN: POST-TALIBAN GOVERNANCE, SECURITY, AND U.S. POLICY

By Kenneth Katzman. Congressional Research Service. November 19, 2010. 97 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152628.pdf>

AFRICA COMMAND: U.S. STRATEGIC INTERESTS AND THE ROLE OF THE U.S. MILITARY IN AFRICA

By Lauren Ploch. Congressional Research Service. November 16, 2010. 45 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152602.pdf>

IRAQ: POLITICS, ELECTIONS, AND BENCHMARKS

By Kenneth Katzman. Congressional Research Service. November 16, 2010. 29 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152603.pdf>

AFGHANISTAN: POLITICS, ELECTIONS, AND GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

By Kenneth Katzman. Congressional Research Service. November 12, 2010. 52 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152604.pdf>

NORTH KOREA: U.S. RELATIONS, NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY, AND INTERNAL SITUATION

By Emma Chanlett-Avery, Mi Ae Taylor. Congressional Research Service. November 10, 2010. 21 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152629.pdf>

AFGHANISTAN: U.S. RULE OF LAW AND JUSTICE SECTOR ASSISTANCE

By Liana Sun Wyler, Kenneth Katzman. Congressional Research Service. November 9, 2010. 48 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152606.pdf>

IRAN SANCTIONS

By Kenneth Katzman. Congressional Research Service. November 9, 2010. 60 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/151979.pdf>

RUSSIAN POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND SECURITY ISSUES AND U.S. INTERESTS

By Jim Nichol, Coordinator. Congressional Research Service. November 4, 2010. 61 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152036.pdf>

COUNTERING TERRORISM IN EAST AFRICA: THE U.S. RESPONSE

By Lauren Ploch. Congressional Research Service. November 3, 2010. 71 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152039.pdf>

“DON’T ASK, DON’T TELL”: A LEGAL ANALYSIS

By Jody Feder. Congressional Research Service. November 2, 2010. 17 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152042.pdf>

YEMEN: BACKGROUND AND U.S. RELATIONS

By Jeremy M. Sharp. Congressional Research Service. November 1, 2010. 41 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/152043.pdf>

THINK TANKS AND RESEARCH CENTERS:

The opinions expressed in these publications do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Government.

AFGHANISTAN – PAKISTAN

PLAN A-MINUS FOR AFGHANISTAN

By Michael E. O'Hanlon, Bruce Riedel. The Washington Quarterly. The Brookings Institution. Winter 2011. 10 pages.

http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/articles/2010/12_afghanistan_ohanlon_riedel/12_afghanistan_ohanlon_riedel.pdf

The strategy in Afghanistan, as outlined by President Obama in his December 2009 West Point speech and earlier March 2009 policy review, still has a good chance to succeed. Described here as Plan A, it is a relatively comprehensive counterinsurgency strategy. Directed at defeating the insurgency or at least substantially weakening it, while building up Afghan institutions, it has reasonable prospects of achieving these goals well enough to hold together the Afghan state and prevent the establishment of major al Qaeda or other extremist sanctuaries on Afghan soil. Nevertheless, the strategy is not guaranteed to succeed, for reasons having little to do with its own flaws and more to do with the inherent challenge of the problem. Critics of the current strategy are right to begin a discussion of what a backup strategy, or a Plan B, might be.

AFTER HOLBROOKE, NEW AFGHAN TESTS

By Jayshree Bajoria. Council on Foreign Relations. December 14, 2010.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/23632/after_holbrooke_new_afghan_tests.html

The death of Richard Holbrooke, U.S. special representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan since 2009, following surgery to repair a ruptured aorta, could have a significant impact on the Obama administration's efforts in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

RESPONSIBLE TRANSITION: SECURING U.S. INTERESTS IN AFGHANISTAN BEYOND 2011

By Lieutenant General David W. Barno, USA (Ret.), Andrew M. Exum. Center for a New American Security. December 12, 2010. 44 pages.

http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS_ResponsibleTransition_BarnoExum_2.pdf

The summer of 2011, when U.S. troops will begin to draw down in Afghanistan, will mark a watershed in the U.S. and NATO's decade-long effort in the country. A second watershed will occur in 2014 when the United States and NATO will transfer full responsibility of their efforts to Afghan leadership. But how does the United States and its allies get there from here? And what should the U.S. role be in Afghanistan beyond 2014? This report lays out a strategy for the post-July 2011 phase of U.S. and NATO efforts in Afghanistan, defines the U.S. troop presence and commitment beyond 2014, and offers operational and strategic guidance for protecting U.S. and allied long-term interests in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

RETHINKING AN AFGHANISTAN EXIT STRATEGY

Interview of Richard L. Armitage, President, Armitage International L.C. Council on Foreign Relations. November 12, 2010.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/23388/rethinking_an_afghanistan_exit_strategy.html

With an Afghanistan policy review to come, the Obama administration needs to decide whether the war in Afghanistan is succeeding and, if there is no progress, should think

about starting to draw down troops earlier than July 2011, says Richard Armitage, the co-chair of a new CFR Independent Task Force Report.

U.S. STRATEGY FOR PAKISTAN AND AFGHANISTAN

Richard L. Armitage and Samuel R. Berger, Chairs; Daniel S. Markey, Project Director. Council on Foreign Relations. November 2010. 112 pages.

http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Pakistan_Afghanistan_TFR65.pdf

Ahead of President Obama's December review of the U.S. war effort in Afghanistan, a new Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)-sponsored Independent Task Force report on U.S. Strategy for Pakistan and Afghanistan finds that the current approach to the region is at a critical point. "We are mindful of the real threat we face. But we are also aware of the costs of the present strategy. We cannot accept these costs unless the strategy begins to show signs of progress," says the Task Force.

ASIA

SECURITY IN THE INDO-PACIFIC COMMONS

By Michael Auslin. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. December 15, 2010. 32 pages.

<http://www.aei.org/docLib/AuslinReportWedDec152010.pdf>

Due to its economic strength, military power, and political dynamism, the Indo-Pacific will be the world's most important region in coming decades, and its significance will be felt throughout the globe. For that reason, ensuring security in this region will be the primary foreign policy challenge for the United States and liberal nations over the next generation. Doing so successfully will provide the greatest economic and political opportunities for the next quarter century. Conversely, a failure to maintain stability, support liberal regimes, create cooperative regional relations, and uphold norms and standards of international behavior will lead to a region, and world, of greater uncertainty, insecurity, and instability.

DETER AND ASSURE: CHARTING A COURSE FOR AMERICA'S ASIAN ALLIANCES IN A NEW NUCLEAR AGE

By Tim Sullivan. Center for Defense Studies. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. November 2010. 17 pages.

<http://www.aei.org/docLib/CDS%20Working%20Paper%20-%20Deter%20and%20Assure.pdf>

As home to a number of the world's most dynamic economies, two rising powers, and six nuclear states, Asia is a region of enormous strategic importance to the United States. For over six decades, America has functioned as the preeminent power in Asia, playing a vital role in providing security and ensuring a stable balance of power that has allowed the region's states to flourish politically and economically. The U.S. security framework in the region has rested historically upon a series of bilateral alliances and strategic partnerships. The arrangement has impressively stood the test of time despite concerns that the lack of

an overarching, multilateral security architecture would lead to inefficiencies in the United States' pursuit of regional stability.

DEFENSE

THE DEFENSE BUDGET AND AMERICAN POWER

The Brookings Institution. December 22, 2010. 46 pages.

http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/events/2010/1222_defense_budget/20101222_defense_budget.pdf

The United States is confronting a period of great economic challenge and uncertainty, coupled with unsustainable increases in the federal debt. The potential exists for other world powers to benefit from the relative U.S. decline. In a new Foreign Policy paper, "Defense Budgets and American Power," Brookings Senior Fellow Michael O'Hanlon explores the question of historic change and the transformations in global economics that affect military power and national security. Though the main burden of reducing prospective deficits cannot fall on the Department of Defense alone, O'Hanlon offers suggestions for saving 10 percent in the annual defense program.

THE END OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL: A LONG TIME COMING, BUT NO MORE TIME TO WASTE

By Peter W. Singer. The Brookings Institution. December 21, 2010.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/1221_dadt_singer.aspx

A few years ago, the author of this report wrote that Don't Ask, Don't Tell was akin to a dead man walking. Even with a president who supported the ban and a Congress unwilling to act, it was still evident that due to the combination of changing social trends and national security concerns, the policy's days were over, it was just that the old culture warriors didn't yet know it.

SINO-U.S. COMPETITION AND U.S. SECURITY: HOW DO WE ASSESS THE MILITARY BALANCE?

By Dan Blumenthal. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. December 14, 2010. 32 pages.

<http://www.aei.org/docLib/A10-Sino-US-Competition.pdf>

This essay argues that scholars and analysts can help policymakers advance U.S. interests in Asia by assessing the dynamic Sino-U.S. balance of power in the region. Assessments of the military competition between China and the U.S. are badly needed but mostly missing. Such assessments should consider the political objectives of the competitors, their military doctrines, and alliance politics, in addition to quantitative measures of military power in the context in which such capabilities would be deployed. Clashing political and military objectives will define the rivalry between the U.S. and China.

BUILDING LEADERS: IMPROVING NATIONAL SECURITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

By Jena Baker McNeill and James Carafano. The Heritage Foundation. December 14, 2010. 2 pages.

http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2010/pdf/wm3082.pdf

Today, few individuals in government have all of the skills necessary to lead the national homeland security enterprise. In essence, Washington does not think very well. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS)--as well as other federal actors who work on security matters--like other arms of government, use tired thought processes to analyze public policy choices that simply do not reflect the new threat realities--which will not help the U.S. outthink its enemies. Absent extensive professional development in the realm of homeland security, it has and will continue to have a profound impact on the ability of the United States to protect, prepare for, and respond to terrorist attacks and other disasters.

HOUSE SPENDING PLANS FOR DEFENSE WOULD HARM THE MILITARY

By Mackenzie Eaglen. The Heritage Foundation. December 14, 2010. 2 pages.

http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2010/pdf/wm3081.pdf

There is little good news in the U.S. House of Representatives version of the continuing resolution (CR) spending bill for the Department of Defense (DoD) for fiscal year (FY) 2011. The House-passed CR would freeze defense spending for 2011 at FY 2010 levels, allowing for no inflation adjustments. Clearly, this would prevent the DoD from keeping up with inflationary costs, even though requirements and the burdens on the military are growing. Additionally, the cost of doing business at the DoD predictably outpaces inflation historically. For all of these reasons, the House plan for defense spending in 2011 is grossly insufficient. The impact of the House freeze on defense would be felt immediately and cause the military to suffer negative effects in the current fiscal year and over the next several years.

TURNING MOMENTUM INTO VOTES: REPUBLICAN SUPPORT GROWS TO REPEAL "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL"

By Crosby Burns, Jeff Krehely. Center for American Progress. December 13, 2010.

http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/12/dadt_repeal_support.html

The Senate last week failed to proceed to debate the Fiscal Year 2011 National Defense Authorization Act, which includes language to repeal "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy for gays and lesbians serving in the U.S. military. But there is evidence that repeal efforts supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our armed forces, the Obama administration, and a majority of Congress can still win the day.

EMP ATTACKS -- WHAT THE U.S. MUST DO NOW

By James Carafano and Richard Weitz. The Heritage Foundation. November 17, 2010. 12 pages.

http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2010/pdf/bg2491.pdf

Most Americans -- whether members of the public or politicians in Congress -- ignore or are unaware of the very real threat of an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) attack. A nuclear device detonated high in the atmosphere above the American mainland can easily disable the

country's electrical grid -- shutting down nearly all communications, transportation, and service systems. Overnight, daily life as Americans know it will be a thing of the past. There are ways to prevent devastation from an EMP -- and the U.S. must invest in them now before it is too late. Two of the country's preeminent national security experts explain how to prevent the worst.

IRAQ'S LESSONS FOR TRANSITION IN AFGHANISTAN

By James M. Dubik (U.S. Army, Ret.), Marisa Cochrane Sullivan. Institute for the Study of War. November 15, 2010. 3 pages.

http://www.understandingwar.org/files/Backgrounder_IraqsLessonsforTransitionAf_2.pdf

The United States actually experienced two types of transitions in Iraq. The first occurred from 2004 to 2006, where responsibilities for security and governance were handed over to the Iraqis even as the security situation continued to deteriorate and even if their capacities were insufficiently developed. This approach was widely deemed a failure. The second approach began in 2007 and continues today. Six factors govern the more successful second approach. While they may be applied differently in Afghanistan, they will certainly be important considerations in the months ahead.

DECIDING TO BUY: CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS AND MAJOR WEAPONS PROGRAMS

By Quentin E. Hodgson. Strategic Studies Institute, United States Army War College. November 10, 2010. 130 pages.

<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/download.cfm?q=1030>

The development and procurement of major weapons programs in the United States is a complex and often drawn-out process complicated by political considerations and often sharp disagreements over requirements and the merits of systems. Secretaries of Defense since Robert McNamara have sought to impose discipline on the process, with varying degrees of success. Conflicts between a Military Service and the civilian leadership are inevitable. A Service wants to develop the most advanced system to address its perceived need, whereas the Secretary of Defense must balance competing requirements across the Department of Defense. The military and the civilian leadership may also have different strategic perspectives that feed this conflict. Through the detailed analysis of three case studies--the Nuclear Surface Navy in the 1960s, the B-1 Bomber in the 1970s, and the Crusader Artillery System in the 2000s--the author explores some of the common themes and sources of friction that arise in civil-military relations concerning major weapons programs. He concludes with some thoughts on how the Secretary of Defense can anticipate and reduce these sources of friction, while retaining an environment that supports healthy debate.

DIPLOMACY

THE QDDR: FOLLOWING THROUGH ON CIVILIAN POWER?

By Noam Unger. The Brookings Institution. December 16, 2010.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/1216_qddr_unger.aspx

On December 15, the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development unveiled the much-awaited Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review entitled "Leading Through Civilian Power." The specific conclusions of the review are certainly of interest to many policymakers and policy watchers in Washington and around the world, but it is important to first recognize that the QDDR represents a critical effort to enhance strategic thinking and planning at both State and USAID. With an eye toward sharpened capabilities, one of the biggest tests of the review's success will be whether it actually fosters an alignment of strategies and plans with appropriate resources.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING: THE NEED FOR A NEW STRATEGIC PLAN

By Helle Dale. The Heritage Foundation. December 13, 2010. 2 pages.

http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2010/pdf/wm3080.pdf

One of the mysteries surrounding U.S. international broadcasting is why more money spent each year is buying less and less airtime. Even as the budget for such operations continues to grow, U.S. broadcasting services are being cut back--and, no less, in parts of the world that are of immense strategic value to the U.S. The new Congress should ask questions about the long-term strategic goals of U.S. international broadcasting and how best to meet those objectives while adapting to a changing environment.

BELT-TIGHTENING FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Interview of Michael Mandelbaum, Christian Herter Professor, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, The Johns Hopkins University. Council on Foreign Relations. December 2, 2010.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/23537/belttightening_for_us_foreign_policy.html

Partisan squabbling on U.S. spending priorities continued following the release of the White House's deficit-reduction commission report on December 1. Though the report is unlikely to garner political agreement on needed cuts, it drives home the message that "everybody will have to take a hit." Mr. Mandelbaum says an inevitable result of deficit reductions for U.S. foreign policy will be fewer U.S. interventions abroad. Still, he stresses the need for continued military presence in Europe, East Asia, and the Middle East. U.S. presence in East Asia is especially vital to economic growth, says Mandelbaum, since U.S. naval forces protect international trade routes. He says the greatest threat likely to emerge from a reduced U.S. presence abroad is Iran, which could attempt to "control the supplies of oil on which the global economy depends."

IRAN

POTENTIAL IRANIAN RESPONSES TO NATO'S MISSILE DEFENSE SHIELD

By Michael Eisenstadt. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy. November 19, 2010.

<http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=3272>

The new "Strategic Concept" of NATO offers the advantage of an early initial capability to defend Europe against the emerging Iranian ballistic missile threat. For now, the Islamic Republic is unable to reach targets in Eastern Europe, but that could change as early as

2012 if Tehran decides to commence production of the medium-range Sajjil-2 missile. And because the NATO concept hinges first on the deployment of ship-based missile systems to the eastern Mediterranean, followed later by the deployment of land-based interceptors, it entails certain vulnerabilities that Iran could exploit in the near term.

IRANIAN INFLUENCE IN AFGHANISTAN: REFUGEES AS POLITICAL INSTRUMENTS

By Ahmad K. Majidiyar, Ali Alfoneh. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. November 5, 2010. 5 pages.

<http://www.aei.org/docLib/2010-11-MEO-g.pdf>

As the United States and its allies target the Taliban in Afghanistan, Iran is using the forced return of Afghan refugees to leverage its influence in Afghanistan at the expense of U.S. interests. Waves of refugees cause humanitarian crises and are used to shield the movement of foreign terrorists into Afghanistan. This Outlook examines how the Iranian government systematically uses forced repatriation of Afghans living in Iran both to undermine U.S.-led efforts to stabilize Afghanistan and to extract concessions from the Afghan government.

KOREA

DEALING DIRECTLY WITH NORTH KOREA

Interview of Leon V. Sigal, Director of the Northeast Asia Cooperative Security Project, Social Science Research Council. Council on Foreign Relations. December 14, 2010.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/23627/dealing_directly_with_north_korea.html

North Korea has been hosting a series of visits by American groups in the past month, including a view of uranium-enrichment facilities, in what some experts see as an effort to de-escalate tensions in the Korean peninsula. One U.S. expert recently in Pyongyang, Leon V. Sigal, says North Koreans have been “trying to get negotiations going,” both bilaterally with the United States as well as in Six Party Talks, and he believes resumed talks are the best way to ease the threat from the North.

SHOULD THE U.S. TAKE MILITARY ACTION AGAINST N. KOREA?

By Michael Mazza. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. December 7, 2010.

<http://www.aei.org/article/102870>

In the wake of North Korea's shelling of Yeonpyeong Island on Nov. 23, there was plenty of talk about what can be done to prevent future provocations from the North. But left largely unmentioned in all the talk so far has been any discussion of a U.S. military response. That needs to change. The fact is that the U.S. has reasonable military options for dealing with North Korea, and it may be time to use them.

NORTH KOREA TESTS U.S. “STRATEGIC PATIENCE”

By Scott A. Snyder. Council on Foreign Relations. November 22, 2010.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/23479/north_korea_tests_us_strategic_patience.html

Reports from two separate U.S. delegations to North Korea have confirmed that North Korea continues to strengthen and potentially expand its nuclear capabilities. Both delegations were shown initial construction of what was described as a 25-30 Megawatt-electric (MWe) Light Water Reactor (LWR). One of the delegations was also shown a fuel fabrication plant in which 2000 centrifuges were organized in six cascades configured to enrich uranium, either for fuel production for LWRs or possibly for the purpose of expanding stocks of weapons grade fissile material. The 5 megawatt plutonium reactor that was shut down in July of 2007 remains inoperative.

MIDDLE EAST

THE WAY OUT OF THE MIDDLE EASTERN MORASS

By Martin S. Indyk. The Brookings Institution. December 28, 2010.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/1209_middle_east_indyk.aspx

The Middle East peace process just died, but nobody seems to be in mourning. Twenty months of U.S. efforts to freeze Israeli settlement activity to create a conducive environment for negotiations have produced only deadlock. Few seemed to even notice when the Obama administration quietly announced this week that it had ended the effort. Even in Gaza, a new normalcy is taking hold, albeit under repressive Hamas rule. Hamas, Hizbollah and Iran still swear they will liberate Palestine through violence, but in the meantime they do nothing to upset the current calm. Could it be that the Middle East has found a way to survive without a peace process?

CLEAR GOLD: WATER AS A STRATEGIC RESOURCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

By Jon B. Alterman, Michael Dziuban. Center for Strategic and International Studies.

December 13, 2010. 34 pages.

http://csis.org/files/publication/101213_Alterman_ClearGold_web.pdf

The real wild card for political and social unrest in the Middle East over the next 20 years is not war, terrorism, or revolution--it is water. Conventional security threats dominate public debate and government thinking, but water is the true game-changer in Middle Eastern politics.

NATO

NATO AND TERRITORIAL MISSILE DEFENSE: A "NO BRAINER" OR MORE QUESTIONS THAN ANSWERS?

By Simon Lunn. The Atlantic Council of the United States. November 2010. 6 pages.

http://www.acus.org/files/publication_pdfs/403/ACUS_Lunn_NATOTerritorialMD_Nov2010.pdf

The decision to develop a NATO TMD capability has a compelling logic. Ballistic missiles pose a known and growing threat as they are acquired by more and more countries. At the same time advances in technology are making defense against them more feasible. Why

not take advantage of U.S. plans to deploy this technology through the PAA as part of its missile defences; harness these plans to NATO's more limited goal of protecting military forces, and in so doing create a defense system for Europe? The initiative would create -- in the words of NATO Secretary General Rasmussen -- "a common security roof," ideally including Russia, at what he believes would be a bearable cost for Alliance members.

RISKING NATO: TESTING THE LIMITS OF THE ALLIANCE IN AFGHANISTAN

By Andrew R. Hoehn, Sarah Harting. The RAND Corporation. November 2010. 109 pages.

http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG974.pdf

NATO's success in Afghanistan -- or lack thereof -- will have significant implications for the alliance itself. Success could promote the image of a capable global security alliance. Failure, or even an indeterminate outcome, would cloud the alliance's own future. The authors examine the risks, commitments, and obligations of the current mission in light of NATO's history and with an eye toward the future, as well as the effects on the alliance's internal dynamics. Drawing on a wide range of sources, the authors describe how NATO came to be involved, concerns and tensions that have developed over the investments and risks that member and nonmember states have in the operation, management of the expectations of nations and peoples, and the need for a coherent, comprehensive, and coordinated long-term strategy.

NUCLEAR

THE NEXT ROUND: THE UNITED STATES AND NUCLEAR ARMS REDUCTIONS AFTER NEW START

By Steven Pifer. The Brookings Institution. December 2010. 58 pages.

http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/articles/2010/12_arms_control_pifer/12_arms_control_pifer.pdf

Assuming that the New START Treaty is ratified, President Obama has said that he will seek another round of negotiations with Russia to achieve further nuclear arms reductions. Steven Pifer examines the issues that will arise in the "next round" and discusses how the United States and Russia might deal with those questions.

WHY SENATE REPUBLICANS SHOULD PASS THE NEW START TREATY

By Robert Kagan. The Brookings Institution. November 10, 2010.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/1111_new_start_kagan.aspx

Senate Republicans seem sorely tempted not to pass the New START agreement during the lame-duck session. Some simply won't vote for the treaty. Some think the newly elected members should have a say and that there's no need to rush. Others, such as Jon Kyl, are negotiating with the administration over issues such as modernization of the U.S. nuclear arsenal and are trying to get the best possible deal. Still others just want to deny the president a victory.

NEW START: CRITICAL LIMITS ON U.S. MISSILE DEFENSE OPTIONS PERSIST

By Baker Spring. The Heritage Foundation. November 10, 2010.

<http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2010/11/New-START-Critical-Limits-on-US-Missile-Defense-Options-Persist>

The State Department continues to assert that the new strategic nuclear arms control treaty with Russia, called New START, imposes “no constraints on deploying the most effective missile defenses possible.” This sweeping assertion is simply inaccurate. New START limits U.S. missile defense options at two levels. The first level is the essential context within which the treaty exists and that --according to both the Obama Administration and Russian leaders-- permits the treaty to be viable and effective. The second level is within the text of the treaty itself, where there are several direct limitations or other requirements regarding missile defense.

RUSSIA

INDISPENSABLE INSTITUTIONS: THE OBAMA-MEDVEDEV COMMISSION AND FIVE DECADES OF U.S.-RUSSIA DIALOGUE

By Matthew Rojansky. Carnegie Endowment For International Peace. November 2010. 76 pages.

http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/indispensable_institutions.pdf

Having fallen to a historic low after the 2008 Russia-Georgia war, U.S.-Russia cooperation is again on the rise, thanks to last year’s “reset” of the relationship. The U.S.-Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission, launched at the July 2009 Moscow summit, aims to enhance cooperation between the two countries on a broad range of shared interests. Although the Commission appears promising so far, significant challenges lie ahead and the two sides must work closely to monitor both the structure and the substance of this new institution to ensure it continues to produce results.

SUDAN

SUDANESE PERSPECTIVES ON THE 2011 REFERENDUM

By Richard Downie, Brian Kennedy. Center for Strategic and International Studies. November 29, 2010.

http://csis.org/files/publication/101129_Downie_SudanesePerspectives_Web.pdf

The people of Southern Sudan are a little more than one month away from casting their votes in a referendum on whether to remain part of Sudan or become an independent state. The referendum is the most significant milestone in a six-year interim period that began with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2005.

TERRORISM - COUNTERTERRORISM

COUNTERING THE THREAT FROM YEMEN

Interview of Richard A. Falkenrath. Council on Foreign Relations. November 8, 2010.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/23338/countering_the_threat_from_yemen.html

Yemen-based al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) is the prime suspect in the recent plot involving explosives sent on cargo planes from Yemen to Chicago. This places a country that just a few years ago was considered “low risk” back in the forefront of U.S. counterterrorism concerns.

AMERICA'S MOST COMMITTED MUSLIM ALLY

By Dr. W. Andrew Terrill. Strategic Studies Institute, United States Army War College. November 2, 2010. 2 pages.

<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/download.cfm?q=1031>

On December 30, 2009, a young captain and military intelligence expert was murdered in Khost, Afghanistan, by an al Qaeda suicide bomber. He died along with seven comrades from the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency in a covert operation gone terribly wrong. After his death was announced, the officer was described as a hero throughout his country, and the head of state was among the mourners at his funeral. His name was Sharif Ali bin Zaid, and he was a Jordanian and a Muslim. In considering his case, such bravery and commitment can hardly come as a surprise. Even before 9/11, the United States and Jordan were cooperating in the struggle against al Qaeda, and a senior Jordanian intelligence official is thanked by name in former CIA Director George Tenet’s memoirs for such cooperation. Somehow in the rage over the New York Mosque and Cultural Center, many of America’s Muslim allies have been forgotten. Jordan is an especially important case.

WIKILEAKS

POWER SHIFT: WIKILEAKS ILLUSTRATES A NEW DYNAMIC AT PLAY ACROSS THE GLOBE

By Brian Katulis, Rev. Dr. Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite. Center for American Progress. December 16, 2010.

http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/12/power_shift.html

Beneath the surface of the furor over the latest WikiLeaks releases of classified government documents are the outlines of a new understanding of power and how it works in the world today. Power is being redefined. It is now redistributed among a broader range of actors. Once the preserve of global elites and institutions, power is now more “open source,” with fewer barriers to entry and subject to more than just military or economic forces.

WIKILEAKS AND FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET

By Adriane Lapointe. Center for Strategic and International Studies. December 16, 2010.

<http://csis.org/publication/wikileaks-and-free-flow-information-internet>

In past weeks, many commentators have greeted the release of classified U.S. documents published by WikiLeaks as a marvelous demonstration of the power of the Internet. Some have gleefully asserted that U.S. objections to the dissemination of the documents demonstrate the hypocrisy of U.S. government leaders who claim to support the free flow of information on the Internet. It might be well, however, to note some simple facts. First,

most of those who praise WikiLeaks for releasing this classified U.S. data probably do not believe that WikiLeaks or any other Internet entity should have free access to the content of their own personal e-mail messages. Or their own personal financial data. Or their children's school records. Or the content of the equivalent to their country's Social Security Administration databases. All those data are protected, in the United States and in many other countries, by legislation that forbids the release of the kinds of personally identifiable information that those files contain. It seems unlikely that anyone would suggest that the decision to withhold such information from general circulation without the owner's consent reflects a hypocritical disregard for the importance of the free flow of information on the Internet.

THE LEGAL CASE AGAINST WIKILEAKS

Interview of John B. Bellinger III, Adjunct Senior Fellow for International and National Security Law. Council on Foreign Relations. December 13, 2010.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/23618/legal_case_against_wikileaks.html

The release of more than 250,000 diplomatic cables by WikiLeaks.org has raised questions about what legal course might be pursued against WikiLeaks and its founder, Julian Assange. The State Department will likely push for Assange to be prosecuted under all available statutes for releasing information "damaging to our foreign relations and also potentially to sources of information to the State Department," says John B. Bellinger III. He notes the threat of invoking the Espionage Act was implicit in a letter to Assange and his lawyers sent by State's legal adviser before the WikiLeaks dump. Bellinger sees the potential harm to sources mentioned in the cable as more problematic than any damage to foreign relations and predicts considerable legal wrangling if the United States tries to extradite Assange from Britain, where he is jailed on Swedish charges of sexual assault.

WIKILEAKS AND JULIAN ASSANGE: TIME TO UPDATE U.S. ESPIONAGE LAWS

By Paul Rosenzweig and Charles Stimson. The Heritage Foundation. December 8, 2010. 2 pages.

http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2010/pdf/wm3078.pdf

Almost everyone seems to be asking the same question with respect to the WikiLeaks saga: What, if anything, can Julian Assange, and those who have worked closely with him, be prosecuted for? Most Americans have a visceral reaction that Assange did something wrong and must be held to account for disclosing classified documents involving sensitive national security matters. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has gone so far as to claim that his acts are "an attack" on the United States, and Assange himself seems to describe his opposition to America in military terms. But federal prosecutors will still have a difficult time finding an appropriate criminal charge and making it stick.

THE END OF DIPLOMACY AS WE KNOW IT

By Helle Dale. The Heritage Foundation. December 2, 2010.

<http://blog.heritage.org/?p=47561>

There is no such thing as secret diplomacy anymore, maybe not even plain old diplomacy. This week's mammoth WikiLeaks dump of State Department Internet traffic has ensured that henceforth all diplomacy may end up in the public domain at the push of a button.

WIKILEAKS AND ARAB OPINION

By Shibley Telhami. The Brookings Institution. December 2, 2010.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/1202_wikileaks_arabs_telhami.aspx

One of the highlights of the most recent Wikileaks release has been the focus on Arab attitudes toward Iran. The headlines suggest Arab unanimity in support of a U.S. or Israeli military attack on the Islamic Republic, as long as Arab governments are allowed to keep their heads low to the ground. There was much evidence, and many colorful quotations, to make the case, especially from Saudi, Bahraini, and United Arab Emirates' leaders. And although some of the quotations were jaw-dropping, in truth it was all a bunch of stuff we've heard before. But analysis by the media that followed, and the sweeping conclusion that "Arabs support attacking Iran," is misplaced and ignores significant differences among Arab governments about how to deal with Iran -- and especially missed the boat on true attitudes of the Arab public.

TEHRAN'S HUBRIS MAY NOW KNOW NO BOUNDS

By Suzanne Maloney. The Brookings Institution. December 1, 2010.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/1201_iran_maloney.aspx

In the coverage of the revelations contained within the thousands of leaked U.S. governments cables, official American reports of Arab animosity and trepidation toward Iran have gained much attention. Lost amid the brouhaha is one simple, unfortunate reality: the prospects of making meaningful progress on constraining the Iranian nuclear programme have just got tougher.

Previous issues of Foreign Policy -- Defense -- Documents on the Web are available at:

<http://france.usembassy.gov/web-alert.html>