

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 15, 1993

PRESIDENTIAL REVIEW DIRECTIVE/NSC-13

MEMORANDUM FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT
THE SECRETARY OF STATE
THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED
NATIONS
DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
THE CHIEF OF STAFF TO THE PRESIDENT
ACTING DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
ACTING ADMINISTRATOR OF THE AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: Multilateral Peacekeeping Operations (C)

With the end of the Cold War and increased cooperation among Russia and the Western members of the United Nations Security Council, nations have come to rely increasingly on the UN to resolve international and internal disputes through the use of peacekeeping forces or UN authorization of enforcement actions. Regional organizations have also expanded their peacekeeping roles. Despite this growth in peacekeeping and enforcement actions, the UN and some regional organizations have not changed their relevant policies or structures significantly. Although the U.S. promulgated a new policy on conventional peacekeeping and emergency humanitarian relief operations last year and recently shared it with three members of the Security Council, there are many issues that remain to be resolved before the U.S. has a complete policy. (C)

This PRD is intended to be a zero-based review of the issues involved in the creation of a U.S. policy on peacekeeping and to identify options leading to Presidential decisions. The phrase "multilateral peacekeeping" is meant, except where otherwise noted, to include the full range of activities including observers, peacekeeping and humanitarian relief operations, and implementation/enforcement actions. (C)

The study should include, but not be limited to, the questions and issues in the outline below. When options are developed, they should also be analyzed. Each analysis should compare a set of options against a common set of evaluative criteria. Two

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 12958,
AS AMENDED

2008-1220-1-1

criteria that should be given special attention are the availability of funding sources for new activities and the ease/difficulty in obtaining UN support for change options. (C)

I. BACKGROUND (INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY)

Describe recent and current multilateral peacekeeping in terms of their origins, scope, goals, participation (U.S. and other), and effectiveness. Identify what has made for success and failure, what has worked and what has not. (C)

II. THE ROLE OF PEACEKEEPING (STATE)

What options are there for the role that multilateral peacekeeping should play in our foreign and security policies? Specifically:

A. When are U.S. interests best served by reliance upon multilateral peacekeeping and when are they best served by action that is unilateral or not sanctioned by the UN? (C)

B. Does the trend toward multilateral peacekeeping undermine in an undesirable manner our ability to act unilaterally? (C)

C. To what extent are nations becoming dependent upon the UN peacekeeping to solve internal problems that they could or should be solving themselves? (C)

D. To what degree does the downsizing of U.S. and allied militaries mean that we may need to rely increasingly upon international organizations and coalitions for intervention capability? (C)

E. Should decisions about increasing reliance on UN peacekeeping be tempered by the possibility that Russia and China may change policies and begin vetoing peacekeeping operations which we support? How likely is such a change? What could we do to continue international peacekeeping if this change did occur? (C)

F. What are the public/legislative attitudes towards peacekeeping (multilateral and unilateral) within key foreign states and the United States? (C) (WITH USIA)

III. THE ROLE OF REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (STATE)

A. Briefly describe and evaluate the status of peacekeeping policy, structure, and operations in key regional organizations including the OAS, OAU, CIS, ECOWAS, NATO, CSCE, WEU, Arab League, GCC, and ASEAN, as well as current U.S. policy thereto. (IC) (C)

B. Develop options for U.S. policy toward peacekeeping by key regional organizations, including steps the U.S. might take to strengthen the capabilities of these groups. U.S. policy toward the NATO/CSCE question should be specifically developed with options and a proposed gameplan. What relationship should

these groupings have to the UN system politically and militarily? What criteria should be developed for deciding whether to employ the UN or a regional organization? In all cases, these analyses should be coordinated with relevant regional interagency studies. (STATE) (C)

IV. THE UNITED NATIONS (STATE)

The study should identify the shortcomings of the current United Nations conventional peacekeeping and emergency humanitarian relief system and propose options for improvements. The options should include information about feasibility, resource availability, and plans for achieving UN Secretariat and member support for implementation. Among the issues that should be reviewed are:

A. Structure (roles, missions, organization, cost sharing arrangements, and staffing): including the structure of Under Secretaries, the Emergency Coordinator for Humanitarian relief, the Military Staff Committee, the Military Advisor to the Secretary General, and the Field Operations Division, to include field operations. How can UN multilateral peacekeeping operations be effectively monitored in order to minimize waste and abuse? (STATE/JCS) (C)

B. Command, Control, Communications: What are the UN's C3 requirements for conventional peacekeeping and emergency humanitarian relief and what options are there for meeting them? What options are there for what the U.S. could provide, including facilities and hardware, both gratis and as in kind services to create the necessary system? (DOD/JCS) (C)

C. Information Support and Intelligence: What options are there for how the information function can be integrated into the C3 system? How can U.S. intelligence be provided on a regular (not ad hoc) basis to various components of the UN system and its field operations? How do we identify UN collection requirements? Do current collection priorities give sufficient attention to UN requirements and, if not, what can be done to improve collection? (IC) (S)

D. Logistics and Transportation: What are the deficiencies of UN logistics and lift systems and what are options for improvement, taking into account needs such as speed and interoperability? (DOD/AID) (C)

E. Plans and Training: What options are there for creating a UN system for conventional peacekeeping/emergency humanitarian relief planning, including a permanent staff? What options are there for developing a training system, including use of US facilities for simulations and exercises? (DOD/JCS) (C)

F. Doctrine and Rules of Engagement: Should the past practice of somewhat passive conventional peacekeeping be altered and, if so, what are the options? Include an examination of the Chapter VI and VII dichotomy. (STATE) (C)

G. Emergency Humanitarian Relief: What options are there for enhancing the UN's capabilities? What are the options for a new international standing/on-call capability? Include non-UN options. (AID) (C)

V. MULTILATERAL PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS AND U.S. PARTICIPATION (DOD)

A. The UN Charter: How do the authorities under Chapter VI, VII, and VIII of the UN Charter apply to the new challenges and environments for multilateral peacekeeping operations? Does the UN Participation Act need to be modified? (State/UN) (C)

B. Article 43: What are the options for U.S. policy regarding a standing UN force as outlined in Article 43 of the UN charter, including on-call forces, commitments of specific units in specific time-frames, or commitments of specific capabilities in specific time-frames. Assignment of specialized national roles and the concept of a volunteer, quick reaction force (non-national in character) should be examined. An explicit differentiation should be made between peacekeeping forces and emergency humanitarian relief forces in this examination. (State/DOD) (C)

C. The Command Relationship and U.S. Participation: What options are there for policy regarding the participation of U.S. combat and support forces in multilateral peacekeeping organizations, including consideration of control of U.S. forces by non-American commanders? (State/DOD) (C)

VI. THE UNITED STATES (DOD)

A. Organization: OSD, JCS, STATE, AID, and the IC should describe how they are structured to support multilateral peacekeeping and examine options for improving their existing structures. They should also propose options for an interagency structure for policy development and implementation in these areas. (ALL) (C)

B. Training: What are options for improving U.S. military and civilian training for multilateral operations? (JCS/AID) (C)

C. Funding: What options are there for reflecting the U.S. contribution to UN peacekeeping in the U.S. budget, including placement solely in the 050 account, the 150 account, or shared between the accounts on the basis of some formula? Other funding related issues that should be addressed include accounting for in-kind services, transfer authority between accounts, the desirability of additional contingency reserve funds similar to ERMA, options for payment of the U.S. assessment and arrearage, and options for the priority that multilateral peacekeeping should have in the 050 and 150 budgets relative to other programs. Are there ways to pursue cost sharing. (OMB) (C)

D. Legislation: What options are there for amending the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 and other legislation

related to multilateral peacekeeping? Would any of the options suggested in this study require such amendment? (STATE) (C)

VII. STUDY PROCESS

Initial drafting responsibilities for the sections of the study are indicated in parenthesis in the PRD and listed below. All agencies (in the address) can participate in each sub-group and their options and views should be included in the drafts presented. After review by the sub-groups, the drafts should be presented to an Interagency Working Group (IWG), which for the purposes of managing this study, will be chaired by the NSC Staff. The IWG shall be responsible for integrating the products into a single study with agency views and decisionable options for examination by the Deputies Committee. The IWG shall also be responsible for enforcing drafting deadlines, as indicated below. (C)

<u>WORKING GROUP</u>	<u>CHAIR</u>	<u>DRAFT DUE TO IWG</u>
1. Background, Role, and Regional Organizations (Sec. I, II, III)	STATE	24 February
2. The UN (Sec. IV)	STATE	27 February
3. Multilateral Peacekeeping and U.S. Participation (Sec. V)	DEFENSE	8 March
4. United States (Sec. VI)	DEFENSE	12 March

The IWG should report to the Deputies Committee no later than 19 March. Subsequent to the PDD, a strategy and organization for implementation will be tasked. (C)

Anthony Lake
Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

20086
REDO

ATL

1530



February 9, 1993

✓
SIGNED

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: SAMUEL R. BERGER

FROM: RICHARD A. CLARKE/MICHAEL A. SHEEHAN

SUBJECT: Multilateral Peacekeeping Presidential Review Document (PRD)

Attached is the Multilateral Peacekeeping PRD. We have worked informally with State, OSD, JCS, and USUN (Rick Inderfurth) in the preparation of the document.

State and Defense both insist that they should have the lead in preparing the study. The PRD recommends that State chair two major sections of the paper (broad policy and UN issues), and that Defense chair two sections (operations and U.S. Government issues). The NSC would be the honest broker to compile the paper and ensure all views are fairly represented in policy options.

You may want to consider calling Peter Tarnoff and Frank Wisner or David Jeremiah to consult with them on the compromise solution of an NSC chair.

Concurrence by: Nancy Meyer *NM*

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the PRD at Tab I.

Attachments

Tab I PRD on Multilateral Peacekeeping

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 12958,
AS AMENDED

2008-1220-m
rws 12/15/08

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

~~SECRET~~