

**U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE IN THE GULF:
CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS**

Sami G. Hajjar

March 2002

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

The author wishes to thank the U.S. Air Force Institute for National Security Studies and the U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute for their financial support that made researching this monograph possible. He is grateful to those who granted interviews in the United States and in various Persian Gulf States.

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave., Carlisle, PA 17013-5244. Copies of this report may be obtained from the Publications Office by calling commercial (717) 245-4133, FAX (717) 245-3820, or via the Internet at Rita.Rummel@carlisle.army.mil

Most 1993, 1994, and all later Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) monographs are available on the SSI Homepage for electronic dissemination. SSI's Homepage address is: <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usassi/welcome.htm>

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please let us know by e-mail at outreach@carlisle.army.mil or by calling (717) 245-3133.

ISBN 1-58487-085-0

FOREWORD

The Gulf region has been vital to the interests of the United States and the industrial world for many years. The Gulf War of 1991 and the forward presence of U.S. military personnel and equipment in several of the Gulf countries demonstrate the Gulf's importance to U.S. policymakers and their commitment to its security and stability. The war on terrorism and its aftermath have further enhanced the need for U.S. engagement in a region that includes two of the "axis of evil" countries identified by President George W. Bush in his State of the Union address.

The author of this monograph, Dr. Sami Hajjar, considers the critical questions of U.S. military presence in the Gulf, the challenges it faces, and the prospects that lay ahead. He relies, in his presentation and analysis, on a variety of regional sources including newspaper reports and personal interviews conducted in the United States and the Gulf region, as well as on government and academic sources. The result is a comprehensive study, including policy recommendations for U.S. military and civilian decisionmakers, that makes intelligible the complex subject of U.S.-Gulf relations.

The Strategic Studies Institute is pleased to offer this monograph as a contribution to the national security debate on this important subject at this juncture of our nation's history, as it grapples with the problem of intentional terrorism.

DOUGLAS C. LOVELACE, JR.
Director
Strategic Studies Institute

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

DR. SAMI G. HAJJAR was born in Beirut, Lebanon. He taught a variety of courses including American Government, Middle East Politics, and Islamic Political Theory at the University of Wyoming where he was employed as Professor of Political Science from 1966-87. While at Wyoming, he was assigned for 2 years to the Governor's Office and worked on international trade promotion for the State of Wyoming. In 1987 Dr. Hajjar joined the U.S. Information Agency and was assigned first to Riyadh as Cultural Affairs Officer and in 1990 to Abu Dhabi as Public Affairs Officer, before returning to Washington in 1992 as Gulf Desk Officer. In 1993 he resigned the Foreign Service to become consultant to the Emirates Center for Strategic Studies in Abu Dhabi. In September 1994 until his retirement in January 2002, Dr. Hajjar joined the U.S. Army War College as Professor and Director of Middle East Studies in the Department of National Security and Strategy. He is currently on assignment with the Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College. Dr. Hajjar received a B.A. and M.A. in Public Administration from the American University of Beirut and a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Missouri-Columbia in 1969. He is the author of more than 30 professional articles in public administration, political science, and Middle East studies.

SUMMARY

In this monograph, the author discusses the history and evolution of U.S. military presence in the Gulf region. He focuses on U.S. national interests in the area and appraises how U.S. policies and military presence serve those interests. A regional perspective on U.S. engagement and its long-term prospects also is discussed. The tenor of the discussion is strategy and policy assessment as opposed to operational and tactical considerations.

The presence of vast energy resources and location at the center of the Middle East account for the Gulf's geo-strategic importance and its attraction to major powers. U.S. involvement and military presence dates back to the early part of the last century, and includes a host of political, economic, and geo-strategic objectives. Prior to the Gulf War, U.S. military presence was largely over the horizon, accommodating the sensitivities of local culture. After 1991, it remained deliberately low profile, and yet U.S. presence was criticized due to local perceptions of misconstrued U.S. policies that are harmful to Arab and Muslim interests. The September 11 attack on the United States and subsequent events associated with the war on terrorism have exacerbated negative public attitudes about U.S. policies and engagement in the region. Simultaneously, however, the traditional regimes of the Gulf countries continue to welcome U.S. engagement, regarding it as the cornerstone for the region's security.

Access to oil, security of Israel, and stability and security of the region are identified as perennial U.S. interests. It is argued that U.S. policies for the Gulf are affected by developments elsewhere in the Middle East and often lead to the charge of double standards and bias. The U.S. handling of the peace process and its support for Israel are contrasted with how the United States implements the dual containment policy against Iraq and Iran. U.S. security

strategy for the Gulf and the defense cooperative agreements it has with Gulf Cooperation Council members that authorize its military presence are detailed. Forward presence and the pre-positioning of equipment are the linchpins of U.S. deterrence strategy and U.S. ability to enforce the United Nations (U.N.) mandated sanctions against Iraq.

Following a survey of security challenges and U.S. policies to manage them, the author presents a regional appraisal of U.S. military posture. He elaborates on the Gulf states' attitudes toward U.S. military presence on their soil and notes that each state views its engagement with the United States differently. This analysis provides a glimpse of Gulf regional politics and security concerns.

The last section deals with the war on terrorism whose consequences are regarded by Islamic radicals as a "clash of civilizations." However, others in the region are calling for a "dialogue of civilizations" to contain the phenomenon of terrorism. The discussion reveals that the Bush administration, in prosecuting the war on terrorism, has discovered a link to the festering Middle East conflict just as the former Bush administration was exposed during the Gulf War to the same conflict.

The author concludes that until September 11, the size, posture, and mission of U.S. military presence in the Gulf were appropriate for the assumed threat perception. The on-going war on terrorism and future regional security realignments that could emerge may impact the nature of U.S. military presence. This presence, however, must continue to be low-key for cultural and political reasons. Given the negative popular attitudes stemming from U.S. regional policies, force protection measures become a priority. The author offers a number of policy recommendations which include a comprehensive public diplomacy program that engages, among others, the American chaplains and Muslim clerics serving with Gulf forces. A slightly different approach to the peace process

that gives hope for a breakthrough and a more neutral U.S. stance as peace broker is recommended. Finally, the author alludes to Iraq and the war on terrorism, concluding that U.S. military presence is indispensable, with the land power component being essential for the security of the world's most important real estate.

U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE IN THE GULF: CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS

Prologue.

The writing of the main sections of this monograph was completed in late summer 2001. What remained was to write a conclusion when the events of September 11 took place. I decided to leave the main text intact but to add a separate section accounting for the war on terrorism and its implications for U.S. military presence in the Gulf.

As the reader will note, the issues that became widely publicized in the United States and international media after September 11, which involve U.S. relations with the Arab and Muslim worlds, global terrorism, and U.S. management of the peace process, were all part of the discourse associated with the U.S. role in the Middle East since the Gulf War of 1991. The attack on America added poignancy to this discourse.

Introduction.

In August 2000 Gulf Air flight 143 crashed in the shallow waters of the Gulf as it approached for landing at Manama (Bahrain) International airport. All 135 passengers and 8 crewmembers were killed. U.S. naval assets, part of the 5th fleet stationed in Bahrain, participated in the rescue and recovery effort, yet the state-owned Bahrain television that gave prominent coverage to this tragedy ignored any reference to the U.S. participation. This move accorded the two sides' (Bahraini and American) preference for shielding their relations from the public, which necessitated minimal reference to the United States in the events of the Gulf region.¹

Bahrain is not unique in its management of relations with the United States. Gulf governments want strong

relations, especially in the security field, but prefer to do so in a quiet manner. What concerns them is the reaction of their own people to such relations. Apparently not even U.S. military assistance in a humanitarian activity of rescue and recovery is immune to this blackout.

Many U.S. military personnel serving in the Arabian/Persian Gulf region, it is safe to assume, consider this tour of duty a direct consequence of the 1991 Gulf War that ejected Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, which he had occupied in August 1990 and declared a province of Iraq. The objectives of U.S. military presence involve the enforcement of United Nations (U.N.) imposed sanctions on Iraq, and deterrence to maintain regional security and stability against the potential of renewed threats from possible regional aggressors such as Iraq and Iran.

Unless versed in the history of the Gulf and the evolution of U.S.-Gulf relations, the average person is not likely to be aware that U.S. presence in the region outdates by many years the Gulf War, or that it has had a host of interests encompassing political, economic, and geo-strategic objectives. The low-key and generally unobtrusive presence of U.S. forces tends to be anomalous to the pattern of forward presence with the objective of deterrence. During the Cold War years, the U.S. military stationed in Europe or Asia, for example, were very much visible. Their deterrent value was enhanced by such visibility. Now that the United States is the sole remaining superpower, it deems it prudent, due to local circumstances, to lower the profile of its military footprint in the Gulf.

Technology enthusiasts and optimists argue that as the military further transforms itself into a force with increased reliance on advanced technology, a more agile, automated, long-range and rapidly deployable force decreases the need for forward presence. If such a transformation transpires, it could be the answer to the peculiarity of U.S. forward presence in the Gulf by obviating its need.

Why the United States maintains forces in the Gulf and the long-term prospects of their presence are the fundamental questions that will guide this analysis. Specifically, the focus is on the reasons, challenges, and prospects of U.S. military presence in the region. The author examines U.S. interests in the Gulf as well as the Middle East, of which the Gulf is an integral part, and elaborates on the strategies and policies in support of those interests. He also identifies those major forces and trends that challenge U.S. interests and presence in the area. The tenor of the discussion is strategy and policy assessments as opposed to operational and tactical considerations. As the reader will note, the author relies on a variety of regional sources including newspaper reports and personal interviews conducted in the United States and the Gulf region, as well as government and academic sources, hoping to present the complex subject of U.S.-Gulf relations in as comprehensive a fashion as possible.

U.S. Regional Interests.

Since its independence, the United States has had interests in and relations with the Middle East. Morocco was the first country to establish relations with the new nation, and in 1866 American missionaries established the Syrian Protestant College in Lebanon that later became the famed American University of Beirut. During the early part of the 20th century, business entrepreneurs were responsible for the major oil discoveries in Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, it was Alfred Thayer Mahan, the noted American naval officer and strategist, who coined the term “Middle East” as that area between Arabia and India “with its center—from the point of view of the naval strategist—in the Persian Gulf.”²

U.S. relations with that center³ began on September 21, 1833, when it signed a treaty of amity and commerce with Oman.⁴ Since then, U.S. involvement in the Gulf region has widened and deepened, given the increasing relevance of

Gulf petroleum to the world economy, and the geo-strategic importance of the region during the Cold War. In the wake of the Gulf War, U.S. involvement there has accelerated because of the U.N.-imposed sanctions on Iraq and the policy of containing regional rogue actors.

A plethora of official documents and statements address U.S. interests and strategy in the greater Middle East region that includes the Gulf and Southwest Asia.⁵ The most current and authoritative document is *A National Security Strategy For A Global Age* (known by its acronym of NSS) issued December 2000 by The White House just a few days before President Clinton left office. The overarching statement falls under the subheading of “Enhancing Security” and states:

The United States has enduring interests in pursuing a just, lasting, and comprehensive Middle East peace, ensuring the security and well-being of Israel, helping our Arab partners provide for their security, and maintaining worldwide access to a critical energy source. Our strategy reflects those interests . . .⁶

With respect to the Gulf region (Southwest Asia), NSS proclaims that the United States:

remains focused on deterring threats to regional stability and energy security, countering threats posed by WMD [weapons of mass destruction], and protecting the security of our regional partners, particularly from the threats posed by Iraq and Iran. We will continue to encourage members of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) to work closely on collective defense and security arrangements, help individual GCC states meet their defense requirements, and maintain our bilateral defense relationships.⁷

The enduring trinity of interests, namely, Middle East peace, security of Israel and friendly Arab states, and the access to energy sources, has been, in one expression or another, the stated objective of U.S. security strategy for the region since NSS documents became mandated by law in 1986. In that year, Congress passed the Goldwater-Nichols

Department of Defense Reorganization Act which amended the National Security Act of 1947, requiring the President to transmit to Congress an annual comprehensive report on the national security strategy of the United States.⁸ President Reagan issued the first report under the new law in January 1987. It stated,

Our principal interests in the Middle East include maintaining regional stability, containing and reducing Soviet influence, preserving the security of Israel and our other friends in the area, retaining access to oil on reasonable terms for ourselves and our allies, and curbing state-sponsored terrorism.⁹

Similarly, the 1991 report submitted by the Bush administration in the immediate wake of the Gulf War added to the above three interests the objectives of “curbing the proliferation of WMD and ballistic missiles,” and “countering terrorism” as the strategic concerns of the United States.¹⁰

Prior to Goldwater-Nichols, comparable statements of interests and strategic concerns could be found in various Presidential Decision Directives (PDD), National Security Council (NSC) policy documents, and official memoranda addressing broad, national strategic planning.¹¹ Many of these documents addressed U.S. interests in the region but often in the context of the Cold War. A linchpin document is NSC 47/2 of 1949, written the year following the creation of the state of Israel. The NSC concluded that the Middle East is “critically important to American security,” that the United States should “promote pro-Western ties to prevent Soviet penetration of the region,” and “argued that Israel and its Arab neighbors had to reach an accord on their own . . .”¹² Three decades later in 1977, President James Carter identified the Gulf region as “vulnerable and vital . . . to which greater military concern ought to be given,” in Presidential Review Memorandum 10. The Memorandum led the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) in 1978 to highlight

essentially the current trinity of interests that continue to define U.S. strategic concerns for the region.¹³

U.S. interests in the region have been consistent since the early days of the Cold War, and the articulation of these interests by both Democratic and Republican administrations also has been consistent. When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, the threat, as the Bush administration correctly surmised, was to long-standing U.S. strategic concerns. Saddam miscalculated on how far the United States was willing to go in defending its vital interests. The end result was the skillful assembly of a coalition of Arab and Western allies by the Bush administration to plan and then swiftly achieve victory over Iraq that restored the government and independence of Kuwait. Following the war, the administration seized the opportunity of a new political environment in the region to orchestrate, with a nominal role to the then Soviet Union, the Madrid Peace Conference which convened in October 1991. This conference became the basis on which the current Middle East process was launched.

Also in the aftermath of the Gulf War, the Bush administration spoke of a “New World Order.” The Preface of the NSS-91 referred to this new order as an “aspiration . . . to build a new international system in accordance with our own values and ideals, as old patterns and certainties crumble around us.”¹⁴ The Gulf provided a historic instance of this emerging order, according to Bush, in which “we saw the United Nations playing the role dreamed by its founders, with the world’s leading nations orchestrating and sanctioning action against aggression.”¹⁵ This strategic vision did not last long, partly because the Bush administration was defeated at the polls in 1992, but, more importantly, because much of the rest of the world interpreted the “new world order” as hegemony in international affairs by the United States in and out of the U.N. Hence, the last NSS issued by the Bush administration in January 1993 did not mention a “new world order”; instead it referred to the future as an “Age of Democratic

Peace.”¹⁶ A year later, the Clinton administration announced its own strategic vision in the forms of “Engagement and Enlargement.” The United States was to exercise global leadership by engaging selectively in only those challenges affecting its own interests, and to seek to enlarge the circle of democratic countries in the world.¹⁷

While Clinton reversed many of his predecessor’s domestic strategies and policies, in foreign affairs, his administration built on Bush’s strategic vision of democratic peace. With respect to the Middle East, the new administration carried further the efforts to achieve peace between Israel and the Arabs and presided over the famous handshake in 1994 between Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman Yasser Arafat and the late Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, as well as the signing of the peace treaty between Israel and Jordan in 1996. In the Gulf, the Clinton administration continued to demand that Iraq unconditionally abide by U.N. resolutions with respect to WMD as a prerequisite for lifting sanctions imposed on it during the tenure of the Bush administration. It also called on Iran to change its policies regarding the peace process, its support of terrorism, and its attempt to acquire WMD. These two “rogue” or “backlash” nations could not be left unchecked to oppose U.S. vital interests in the region. The policy of “Dual Containment” was formulated in 1993 to confront the “rogue” threat in the Gulf. Before discussing U.S. Gulf policy and its related strategies, general knowledge of U.S. security policy for the region is essential.

Shades of Containment.

The policies that were adopted by various administrations to secure America’s strategic interests in the Middle East since the start of the Cold War were greatly influenced by the grand strategy of containing the Soviet Union. The first clear policy was based on the Truman Doctrine of May 1951 that established a Mutual Security Program designed to assist free nations of the Middle East

“with half of the world’s oil revenues,” as President Truman said, resist Soviet pressure and help increase their security and stability. The Eisenhower administration supported the establishment of the Baghdad Pact in 1956 as a security alliance involving Iraq, Pakistan, Iran, and the United Kingdom. This pact, also known as the Middle East Treaty Organization, was supposed to extend the line of NATO from Turkey to India. However, it collapsed because the Iraqi revolution of 1958 ended the country’s pro-Western Hashemite monarchy, and because of the rise in the same year of anti-Western nationalism in Iran under Prime Minister Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, who forced a brief exile of the Shah.

During this period, the security of the oil-rich Gulf region was being guaranteed by Great Britain. However, when Great Britain began to terminate its protectorate of the region in 1970 with the crucial sheikdoms becoming independent states, a security vacuum was created. Because of the Vietnam experience, direct U.S. intervention in the Gulf was not possible. Instead, the United States was to rely on the pro-western Shah of Iran to maintain regional peace. To that end, the Nixon administration provided the Shah with substantial material assistance to enable him to fulfill the surrogate role of local hegemon.

The demise of the Shah’s rule in 1979 and its replacement by an anti-western Islamic government ushered in a new policy under the Reagan administration. Its essence was to capitalize on the Iraq-Iran war that broke out in 1980 by seeking to create a balance of military power between these two large Gulf powers in order to prolong the war, weaken them, and prevent an anti-Western local actor from dominating the region. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990 that resulted in a U.S.-led coalition to reestablish the status quo ante, and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union meant that a new security environment was emerging in the region. This new environment afforded the Bush administration the opportunity to convene the Madrid Peace Conference in 1991 and to launch the Middle East

Peace Process. It also meant that the grand strategy of containment was no longer valid or applicable following the collapse of the Soviet Union. In the Gulf, it was replaced by the “Dual Containment” policy.

Dual Containment.

In a major foreign policy speech on May 18, 1993, at the Soref Symposium of The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, the then senior director for Middle East Affairs of the NSC, Dr. Martin Indyk, outlined the Clinton administration’s approach to the Middle East.¹⁸ Indyk began by noting the new security environment in the region including ongoing Arab-Israeli peace negotiations; a balance of power in the Gulf in which the military capability to threaten our interests was at a much reduced level; the collapse of the Soviet Union and with it the collapse of the radical, rejectionist front in the Middle East that opposed the peace process; and the rise of other radical movements, “cloaked in religious garb,” that challenge governments across the Arab world with the potential of destabilizing the region. He then stated the central concept of the Clinton administration’s approach based on the:

interdependence between the eastern and western halves of the region: thus, containing the threats posed by Iraq and Iran in the east will impact on our ability to promote peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors in the west; similarly, promoting Arab-Israeli peace in the west will impact our ability to contain the threats from Iraq and Iran in the east; and our success in both realms will affect our ability to help friendly governments create a better life for their peoples than that offered by proponents of violence.¹⁹

This is an important point for, as we will note later, it confirmed in the minds of those in the region who subscribed to a conspiracy theory that U.S. Gulf policy was designed primarily to support its pro-Israel policy in the Arab-Israeli dispute. The policy also had the added advantage of

pressuring Gulf potentates to purchase advanced U.S. arms to counter the Iraqi and Iranian threats.

Dual containment assumes that the balance of military power policy between Iran and Iraq by which the United States would help build one up to balance the other has become bankrupt since both countries' regimes are hostile to U.S. interests in the region, and since Iraq demonstrated the nonefficacy of this policy by its invasion of Kuwait. Dual containment seeks Iraq's full compliance with all U.N. resolutions—resolutions designed to insure that it dismantles and destroys all of its WMD, and ends its repression of the Iraqi people. The policy was also designed to insure that “the regime of Saddam must never again pose a threat to Iraq's neighbors.” Furthermore, according to Indyk, “. . . we will want to be satisfied that any successor government complies fully with all U.N. resolutions.” Likewise, critics of U.S. policy often cite this point to illustrate U.S. double standards by demanding full Iraqi compliance with U.N. resolutions but overlooking alleged Israeli defiance of U.N. resolutions. Lastly, the purpose of the policy “is to establish clearly and unequivocally that the current regime in Iraq is a criminal regime, beyond the pale of international society and, in our judgment, irredeemable.”

With respect to Iran, its containment is justified on the basis of the argument that it challenges U.S. interests and the international community by sponsoring terrorism across the globe, it opposes the peace process, and it ferments instability in the Arab world by actively seeking to subvert friendly governments and by attempting to acquire WMD including nuclear weapons capability and the means of their delivery. However, there is a major difference in containing Iran as opposed to Iraq. Indyk explained that the Clinton administration is not opposed to the Islamic government in Iran. Rather, the objection is to the regime's behavior and its abuse of the human rights of the Iranian people. Given the absence of U.N. imposed sanctions on Iran, its containment would have to be pursued

unilaterally, and through the effort of seeking support from U.S. allies to recognize the Iranian threat and respond to it. Finally the Indyk speech alluded to the Middle East peace process and noted that the policy of “dual containment in the Gulf is also lent greater urgency by its impact on the other arm of our policy . . . the pursuit of Middle East peace.” In retrospect, the Clinton administration gathered correctly that the changes in the strategic environment in the region were conducive to progress in Arab-Israeli peacemaking, whereby the United States was to play the role of a “full partner” in the negotiations. The United States also was to strengthen the strategic relationship with Israel by “fulfilling our commitment to Israel’s qualitative military edge,” as Indyk stated. The policy of dual containment is designed to weaken the two large Gulf nations. The policy’s relationship to the peace process and United States ensuring the military superiority of Israel are the crux of the opposition to U.S. presence in the Gulf, as this study will attempt to show. How was dual containment implemented?

Anthony Lake, President Clinton’s first national security advisor, suggested that the containment of backlash states could be through a variety of measures including isolation, pressure, diplomatic, and economic measures. He further emphasized that: “Dual containment’ does not mean duplicate containment. The basic purpose is to counter the hostility of both Baghdad and Tehran, but the challenges posed by the two regimes are distinct and therefore require tailored approaches.”²⁰

Unlike Iraq, Iran did not face U.N. mandated sanctions. Containing it meant that the United States had to adopt unilateral measures. Initially, the United States opted for diplomatic pressure to isolate Iran. However, Iran and the U.S. oil company Conoco, Inc., agreed in 1995 on a \$1 billion contract to develop an offshore natural gas field in the Gulf. The prospects of an American company assisting Iran develop its energy industry led Clinton to invoke the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and issue an executive order terminating all commerce with Iran.²¹

This meant that American companies were excluded from the lucrative Iranian market, creating a vacuum that companies from other nations, including Western nations, were more than happy to fill.

In 1996 Congress passed and the President signed two bills aimed specifically against the “backlash” states of Cuba, Iran, and Libya. The first was the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, known as the Helms-Burton Act; and the second was the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act, known as the D’Amato Act. Their purposes were to isolate the target countries by imposing penalties on companies doing business with them. These laws quickly became highly controversial and iniquitous since they raised some serious international law issues. Among them are the extraterritorial effects of the laws, the imposition of secondary boycotts, violation of sovereignty and nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations, and infringement of international rules of commerce and trade.²²

With respect to Iran, the D’Amato Act was touted by its supporters as an inducement to Iran to end its support of terrorism and to halt its WMD programs. The Act obliges the President to impose penalties making certain types of investments in Iran that would assist it develop its energy resources difficult. The President is also authorized to grant waivers of the sanctions “to nationals of countries that implement ‘substantial measures, including economic sanctions,’ to prevent Iran from acquiring WMD and supporting international terrorism.”²³

The D’Amato Act as an effective tool to sanction Iran has not worked as well as intended since its application led to friction between the United States, its European allies, Russia, and other nations. Consequently, in 1998, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright announced a waiver on three companies—Total of France, Gazprom of Russia, and Petronas of Malaysia—who inherited the Conoco deal and planned to invest \$2 billion in an Iranian gas field. In

addition, the election in May 1997 of moderate Mohammed Khatami as Iran's president and his seeming desire to improve relations with the United States eventually led the Secretary of State to announce, 3 years later, the ending of restrictions on the import of Iranian-made carpets. The United States also would reduce prohibitive tariffs on pistachios and caviar as measures "to show the millions of Iranian craftsmen, farmers, and fishermen who work in these industries, and the Iranian people as a whole, that the United States bears them no ill will."²⁴ Since the law prohibiting the import of these products was widely flouted, it is doubtful that Iranian farmers, craftsmen, and fishermen were suddenly overcome with a sense of goodwill and gratitude to the United States and Albright as a result of the announcement.²⁵ This is especially true since almost simultaneously Clinton signed a bill that would halt financial contributions to Moscow if Russian firms were found to help Iran in its WMD program.²⁶

The case of Iraq is indeed different as Anthony Lake noted. The United States regarded the Iraqi regime an international renegade for having committed war crimes and crimes against humanity. The U.N. that imposed a sanctions regime designed to prevent Iraq from again threatening its neighbors, to prevent the regime from committing further crimes against its citizens, and to destroy Iraq's WMD arsenal, authorized its containment. In containing Iraq, therefore, the United States would be forcing it to comply fully with all relevant U.N. Security Council (UNSC) resolutions.²⁷

A decade later sanctions have become increasingly controversial, raising fundamental questions as to their real purpose—to bring Iraq into compliance or to permanently cripple its industrial and societal capacities as some have charged.²⁸ In her well-documented and comprehensive book on the subject, Sarah Graham-Brown mused about the goal of post-war sanctions on Iraq: "Who really was deciding what the rationale of sanctions was? Was it some impersonal force of international law? As

unanimity in the Security Council on the goals of sanctions began to break down, whose version was valid?”²⁹ The fundamental issue, however, was whether the sanctions had become, for the Clinton administration, an end in themselves as opposed to means instrumental in implementing clearly-defined policy objectives about Iraq. The scope and the duration of the sanctions have contributed to the controversy about their effectiveness as a punitive measure that would hasten the demise of the Iraqi regime. The issue of a de-facto Kurdish state, the humanitarian toll that the sanctions have inflicted on the Iraqi population, and the fairness of the standards by which the United States demands the verification and complete dismantling of Iraq’s WMD program while turning a blind eye to several other regional proliferators also have raised questions.

Acting swiftly following Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait, the UNSC adopted on August 6, 1990, Resolution 661 whose principal architect was the United States, that imposed a wide-ranging economic embargo on Iraq reminiscent of the embargo that was imposed on Rhodesia in 1966. Its purpose was to compel Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. The resolution froze Iraqi financial assets abroad and banned all commerce save for medical and food supplies for humanitarian needs. A number of additional measures were adopted in the period prior to Operation DESERT STORM and whose purpose was to broaden the embargo. Hence Resolutions 665, 666, and 670 imposed a shipping blockade, extended the blockade to other forms of transport such as air traffic, and gave the U.N. Sanctions Committee established under Resolution 661 the authority to determine when humanitarian circumstances applied to allow food shipments.

After the war, the UNSC adopted in April 1991 Resolution 687 that continued the economic embargo and demanded, among other things, the identification and destruction of Iraq’s WMD, and specified the conditions that

Iraq must meet to have the sanctions lifted. The net result of these resolutions was that

measures which affected the well-being of the civilian population were combined with those which resemble “the process of disarming a conquered country generally imposed by contemporary peace treaties.” This was also the first time such a draconian U.N. embargo had been imposed on a state which had just suffered severe infrastructure damage in the course of a war.³⁰

For the United States (and also the United Kingdom), the U.N. sanctions were not only the means to change Iraq’s conduct and force it to abandon its WMD and recognize the independence of Kuwait, as the other three permanent members of the Security Council assumed, but also ways that could lead to a regime change in Baghdad, and until that happens, they serve the purpose of containing Iraq.³¹

Since the promulgation of the Dual Containment policy, much has been written in support and in opposition to it. A major argument in favor of the policy and its continuation is based on the logic of the Cold War when George Kennan recommended in 1947 the containment of the Soviet Union. Just like the Soviet Union that ultimately imploded in 1991 because it could not meet the needs of its people, so will Iran and Iraq for the same reason. Hence, Patrick Clawson of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, where the policy was first announced, argues that it is “appropriate to maintain economic sanctions against Iran and Iraq as a cost-effective means of containing the threat posed by these regimes while awaiting their eventual collapse.”³² By contrast, the policy could actually lead to the opposite of what it was intended to accomplish; instability in the Gulf region. This is because, as Stephen Pelletiere argues, “unlike its namesake—the famous containment policy of George Kennan—it does not respect the principle of power-balancing.”³³ Hence, the policy “amounted to a *dictat*” and “the policymakers seem not to have understood the nature of the societies they were setting themselves up

to oppose. Nor did they seemingly understand the context in which the societies operate.”³⁴ Another writer summed up the criticism as follows:

The dual containment policy is shot through with logical flaws and practical inconsistencies and is based on faulty geopolitical premises . . . American allies in the region and elsewhere have shown no enthusiasm for dual containment, making its implementation highly problematic . . . it ties American policy to an inherently unstable regional status quo . . . The policy could end the very results—regional conflict and increased Iranian power—that the United States seeks to prevent.³⁵

Given the experience with Cuba, sanctions have proven their durability as a foreign policy tool under several administrations, especially if a powerful lobby backs them. Dual Containment could very well last for some time to come, which is why the United States has devised an elaborate and expensive strategy to carry out this policy.³⁶

U.S. Gulf Strategy.

U.S. security strategy for the region was primarily motivated by the three factors of interest in oil; the geo-strategic centrality of the Middle East, particularly for Great Britain’s imperial lifeline (e.g., Suez Canal as demonstrated in the 1956 war); and the reality of the Cold War. After WWII, containment of the Soviet Union rapidly became the critical factor for the steady increase in U.S. military presence in the Middle East.

Initially, Admiral Richard C. Conolly, Northeastern Atlantic and Mediterranean commander-in-chief based in London (CINCNELM), established Task Force 126 on January 20, 1948. It consisted of tankers in the Gulf to take on oil to meet the increasing dependence of the U.S. Navy on refined Gulf petroleum products. In 1949 the command was named Middle East Force, and in 1951 a rear admiral was placed in its command. Since then the U.S. Navy has maintained a permanent presence in the Gulf and operated from Bahrain, the site of a major British base. Ras Tannura

and Dhahran in Saudi Arabia were the other ports frequently visited by U.S. naval vessels.³⁷ This presence reflected the U.S. policy of promoting expansion in Gulf oil production to meet the higher demand in the West.

It was not until the Carter administration that the United States decided to establish a Rapid Deployment Force (RDF) to provide strategic mobility in the “Persian Gulf region and Korea,”³⁸ a decision that reflected U.S. concern with Gulf and Korean peninsula regional problems. This concern was to become the basis of the force-sizing paradigm whereby the armed forces must be prepared to fight and win in two “Major Theaters of War” (MTW) simultaneously. For the Middle East region, the RDF came under the command of a commander in chief Special Command, Middle East (CINCSPECOMME).³⁹

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the collapse of the Shah’s regime in Iran in 1979 were clear indications that security of the Gulf based on the Nixon Doctrine of “Two Pillars,” whereby Iran and Saudi Arabia were to play the dominant role in establishing security in the Gulf with the United States playing a reduced role, was no longer valid. The Gulf, and particularly Iran, was to occupy centerstage on the evening news beginning November 4, 1979, and for the remaining 444 days of the Carter administration as Iranian radical “students” held U.S. Embassy personnel hostage. Since that time the U.S. military involvement in the Gulf became more robust, involved, and gradually expanded.

The Reagan administration, which was highly skeptical of the Soviet Union and its worldwide intentions, proceeded to develop further the RDF. On December 31, 1982, it deactivated the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force (RDJTF), that had been in existence since March 1980, and replaced it on the following day with U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM), whose area of responsibility included Egypt, Sudan, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Afghanistan, Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Pakistan,

the People's Republic of Yemen, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates (UAE), Yemen Arab Republic, Jordan, Red Sea, and the Arabian (Persian) Gulf. Later, Eritrea and Seychelles were added as was a portion of the Indian Ocean. With the addition in 1998 of the five central Asian nations of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, USCENTCOM's area of responsibility (AOR) consists of 25 countries in the Arabian peninsula, northeast Africa, and south and central Asia. Lieutenant General Robert C. Kingston, USA, the commander of RDJTF, was named the first commander-in-chief of CENTCOM, and in 1984 he received his fourth star a year before he retired. All subsequent commanders held the rank of four-star general, comparable to other commanders-in-chief of geographic commands.⁴⁰

Until 1985 CENTCOM and its predecessor, the RDJTF, were looked upon as an intervention force serving U.S. interests without consultation or participation by countries in the region. General George B. Crist, USMC, the second U.S. Commander in Chief, Central Command (USCINCCENT), set out to change this perception and to develop a more positive relationship between CENTCOM and local governments. The object was for CENTCOM to act in partnership with them to develop their capabilities to defend their interests against local or regional threats to their security. CENTCOM was to deal with threats beyond their ability to respond. In other words, CENTCOM began to adopt a more cooperative and consultative attitude with local partners in the execution of its programs and to dictate less to these regional partners. The exercise programs were a case in point whereby local training needs were considered in planning and executing joint exercises. In addition, Crist preferred not to deploy ground combat forces to the region and stated that, "We do not seek permanent ground or air bases in the region. If we have to send U.S. ground forces into the CENTCOM area of responsibility, the situation will be serious indeed."⁴¹

The security situation in the region did become serious enough, leading to increased U.S. military involvement. During the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s, the combatants resorted to attacking neutral ships in the Gulf including Kuwaiti tankers. Kuwait sought help from the permanent members of the UNSC, and, when the Soviet Union offered to charter Kuwaiti tankers, the United States reversed an earlier decision and decided to place the tankers under its flag and protection.⁴² Between 1987 and 1990, the United States conducted 489 missions, escorting reflagged tankers through the Gulf to Kuwait and back out through the straits of Hormuz in Operation EARNEST WILL. During these escort operations, USCENTCOM forces engaged Iranian naval forces on several occasions, in response to Iranian mine laying activities in the Gulf or because of their missile attack on reflagged Kuwaiti tankers.⁴³

During the watch of the third USCENTCOM commander, General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, Iraq invaded Kuwait and precipitated the second Gulf war which eventually led to acceleration in U.S. military presence in the region, as well as a much more visible and robust commitment to the collective and individual security of friendly Gulf States. Heightened U.S. presence was achieved through a series of defense cooperative agreements that the United States entered into with Gulf governments.

The Defense Cooperative Agreements.

Iraq was defeated by the United States and its coalition allies and agreed in March 1991 to all of the Coalition demands, yet Saddam found ways to refuse compliance with relevant UNSC resolutions. These resolutions sought to protect Iraqi citizens from the regime's repression, and to ensure that Iraq gave up all of its WMD. By refusing to implement U.N. resolutions, Iraq continued to be a threat to the security and stability of the region, necessitating

continued U.S. military presence and activities in support of U.N. resolutions.⁴⁴

The various defense cooperative agreements provided USCENTCOM the ability to plan a security strategy for the area based on a baseline of U.S. military presence protected by the terms of the agreements. Forward land-based presence in the form of limited personnel and pre-positioned equipment (in addition to naval assets operating in the region) serves as an important deterrent to potential aggressors, and offers the advantage of enhanced initial capabilities in the event of military hostilities.

The specifics of each of the cooperative defense agreements are classified at the request of the Gulf countries concerned.⁴⁵ In general terms, however, the United States signed cooperative defense agreements, in some instances also referred to as access agreements, with Oman (1990), Saudi Arabia (1990), Bahrain (1990), Kuwait (1991), Qatar (1992), and the UAE (1994). These agreements defined the conditions under which the United States is granted access to local facilities, the terms governing the use of these facilities, costs of operations and maintenance, the status of U.S. personnel (this was the main issue that delayed agreement with the UAE), taxation provisions, claims, and other logistical and administrative issues. In all, these agreements cemented the security relationship between the United States and each of the signatory states, and created opportunities for long-term military-to-military relations and joint endeavors such as exercises, training, and provision of defense equipment.

For a superpower in competition with another superpower, access to overseas facilities is, needless to say, of paramount importance. This is even more so in a region with identifiable vital superpower interests. Given the threat that the Iraq-Iran war posed to U.S. and allied interests (threat to shipping), it was not surprising that General Schwarzkopf noted in his statement to the U.S. Senate, 6 months prior to Saddam's invasion of Kuwait, that

“The greatest threat to U.S. interests in the area is the spillover of regional conflict which could endanger American lives, threaten U.S. interests in the area or interrupt the flow of oil, thereby requiring the commitment of U.S. combat forces.”⁴⁶ Consequently, Schwarzkopf noted the importance of access to regional facilities as a key element for projecting U.S. forces into the region in times of conflict, and concluded that USCENTCOM’s peacetime strategy relied on the three pillars of “presence, security assistance, and combined exercises.”⁴⁷ Presence, or more specifically forward presence, requires, as one of its key elements, prepositioning of equipment which, in turn, requires agreements with local authorities to provide access.

Access to the region through these three pillars, with the prepositioning program as a key element of the forward presence strategy, was incorporated in CENTCOM’s posture statements submitted to Congress by CINCENT General Joseph P. Hoar in 1993 and 1994.⁴⁸ In 1995, General J.H. Binford Peay III, Hoar’s successor, expanded the strategic pillars by adding the two pillars of “power projection” and “readiness to fight” to the theater strategy.⁴⁹ This mix of strategic pillars was to achieve a “near continuous presence” in the region that could better “deter conflict, promote stability, and facilitate a seamless transition to war, if required.”⁵⁰ It would appear that Peay’s intent was to further emphasize deterrence, as the added “pillar” required enhanced coalition building and military-to-military access to promote stability in the region.⁵¹

General Anthony Zinni, who succeeded Peay as commander-in- chief, assessed the five strategic pillars as having improved CENTCOM’s ability to fight and win a major contingency conflict in the region. This strategy furthermore, “has given us the ability to move forward and balance our fighting capabilities with the regional strategy of collective engagement.”⁵² [Note influence of NSS on enlargement and engagement.] There are two aspects to

this strategy: an identification of shared defensive priorities that lend themselves to a collective approach to defense against regional threats; and the need to view CENTCOM's AOR in terms of "sub-regional" perspective with a specific collective engagement strategy applying to each of the subregions—those being the Horn of Africa, the Gulf, the Red Sea (Jordan-Egypt), and the south and central Asia subregion. In the words of Zinni,

The consistent element throughout our engagement strategy is military-to-military personal contact as the catalyst for enhanced national and regional self-defense, and for coalition building. We have recently begun a review of our strategy to bring more focus, flexibility, long-term vision, and cooperative approach to it. Additionally, we seek to fully identify and tap the resources available to us to affect our strategy. This must be done in a complementary manner with other governments and non-governmental agencies, and with our allies in the region. We believe our Area of Responsibility may be in a transition and we want to be forward looking and prepared to handle change to our advantage.⁵³

In his statement to Congress a year later, Zinni elaborated further on his concept of "collective engagement," revealing a sophisticated understanding of the diversity of the region and an approach to its security that emphasizes "an ounce of proactive engagement 'prevention' is cheaper than a pound of warfighting 'cure'."⁵⁴ Hence the strategy is evolving away from a primarily Gulf-centered approach to one with more balance between CENTCOM's major responsibilities in the Middle East and Southwest Asia, including assuring access to natural resources and assisting friendly countries defend themselves. To that end, CENTCOM has become committed to the goal of developing professional, nonpolitical militaries through such activities as combined exercises and international military education and training programs that demonstrate the idea of a professional military subject to civilian authority and respectful of human rights. Again in Zinni's words, "We will consider ourselves successful if we can help build and

maintain a coalition that is organized to maintain collective security and is composed of professional militaries responsive to lawful authority.”⁵⁵

The trend emphasizing program coordination with partners and friends in the region continues to define CENTCOM’s approach to the security of its AOR. The Command’s website discusses the theater strategy in terms of the three goals of warfighting; engagement; and development, with the latter goal focusing on environmental and humanitarian issues.⁵⁶ Along with focused subregional strategies, it is evident that CENTCOM is actively involved in a broadly defined security relationship with the militaries and governments of the region. In that sense, its officers have acquired the role of diplomats in uniform to promote and preserve U.S. interests in the region along side their diplomat colleagues in a business suit.⁵⁷

In May 2000, Clinton nominated Lieutenant General Tommy Franks to the appointment of General to become the Commander in Chief of Central Command. Based on Franks’ remarks to Congress during his confirmation hearing in June 2000⁵⁸ and his subsequent testimonies in October⁵⁹ and in March 2001,⁶⁰ the overall parameters of CENTCOM’s strategy for the region are expected to remain constant since U.S. interests in the region continue unaltered. The strategy seeks to shape the security environment “through ongoing operations, military-to-military contact, engagement, and the building of relationships . . .”⁶¹ However, two factors are likely to impact the security strategy. One is the issue of Army Transformation about which Franks was asked during his nominations hearing. The lack of permanently assigned forces in the AOR means that the Army’s Transformation plan for a lighter, more flexible, and more lethal force will result in “forces that arrive earlier and with tremendous fighting capability—a strategically responsive and dominant force.”⁶² It will also mean that the “prepo[sitioned] stocks will be changed over time, consistent

with the transformation of the Army units and the training of soldiers who are likely to come to our Area of Responsibility.”⁶³

The second factor is force protection. Historically, CENTCOM’s AOR is an unstable and volatile region so that “in carrying out all aspects of our mission, force protection is a high priority . . .” as Franks stated.⁶⁴ The widely publicized Khobar Towers bombing of June 25, 1996, in Saudi Arabia and the attack on the USS *Cole* at the Port of Aden, Yemen, on October 12, 2000, occurred in CENTCOM’s AOR, thus dramatically underscoring the priority of force protection. These incidents demonstrated the urgent need to reevaluate the efficacy of antiterrorism and force protection measures (AT/FP). To that end, the USS *Cole* Commission Report made several specific recommendations in this regard—the thrust of which were designed to improve the Unified CINC’s AT/FP capabilities.⁶⁵

Exacerbating the region’s volatility, and therefore the heightened need for AT/FP measures, was the unrest between Israel and the Palestinians that began in September 2000 and is referred to as the “*Al Aqsa intifada*,” with long-term implications for the security environment in the region. The unrest, with its increasingly religious undertones, impacts the ability of CENTCOM to maintain its engagement level and its effectiveness in shaping the region. The following Questions and Answers from Franks’ congressional testimony illustrate the point:

Rep. Snyder: I wanted to ask a question. Your command deals with what most of us consider the Arab world. Some have suggested, or are suggesting, that the United States should consider closing the Palestinian Authority offices in the United States and the PLO offices in the United States. From your perspective, how would that potentially impact your relationships with both the nations you referred to as moderate Arab states and those that we think are not so moderate?

Gen. Franks: Sir, let me preface comment by saying that the policy on whether the Palestinian offices in the United States

should be closed obviously will reside with the policy team and so I wouldn't want to presuppose any sort of work that policy might take, or the direction that the policy might take. One of the great benefits that CENTCOM offers to our country is, as you—for the reason you describe, and that is that the CENTCOM AOR is the mass of Arab states. We, in fact, provide balance by our military-to-military associations, relationships, some of which are very personal, in the region. And it is obvious that any action that is taken that is extremely biased in the direction—perhaps biased for good reason, I make no qualitative judgment, but any action that is perceived in the region as unbalanced in favor of someone, of a non-Arab, has an effect on the relationships that we have in the region. And, sir, that's probably, even though circuitous, the most direct answer that I can give you to the question.⁶⁶

Franks' subtle concern regarding U.S. bias is very much a serious matter for Arab leaders. In a recent interview, Egypt's foreign minister complained, “. . . the right and the left—I mean in the U.S. administration—meet on taking Israel's side. We are talking here about the level of that bias, which pushes some U.S. officials to try to exert pressure on the Arab countries to accept the Israeli view.” Musa went on to conclude: “The U.S. understanding of the Arab is defective. They are unable to understand that the Palestinian issue is deeply implanted in the Arab hearts, and that no Arab state can carry out the Israeli policy, even if it were disguised under a U.S. title.”⁶⁷ The proper conclusion to be derived from these observations is that, while Arab leaders exhibit a degree of understanding of U.S. bias due to U.S. domestic political considerations, there is a limit to the extent they can openly associate with a biased U.S. policy before running the risk of losing control over their peoples who are far more critical, less understanding, and less forgiving of the U.S. pro-Israeli stance. Collectively, the U.S. military in the region are regarded by many Arab citizens as the guarantors of America's pro-Israeli policies. We turn next to a discussion of the extent of U.S. military presence in the region.

To support the security strategy for the Gulf configured on “forward military presence” to deter aggression and “crisis response” in case deterrence fails, the United States has deployed military assets off shore and on shore in Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Oman, and the UAE.⁶⁸ In contrast to the pre-Gulf war period when forward presence was kept at a low key in the form of “over the horizon” military presence in deference to the political and cultural sensitivities of the conservative Gulf states, U.S. military presence today is far more visible, substantial, and controversial.

Franks noted in March 2001 that CENTCOM has, on a given day, between 18,500 and 25,000 men and women in uniform deployed in its AOR. The majority of these soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coast guardsman, along with their necessary support equipment, operate in the Gulf region to enforce the no-fly zone in Iraq, and to conduct maritime intercept operations in the Gulf to monitor movement of illegal cargo to and from Iraq.⁶⁹ These forces, along with the local militaries of U.S. allied Gulf countries, are the guardians of the region’s security. Because of the time and distance separating the Gulf from the eastern United States—approximately 7,000 miles and 24-hour transit by air; 8,600 miles and 21 plus-days transit by sea—CENTCOM has established a prepositioning program in the region. And despite deliberate efforts to select circumspect sites away from populated areas, the prepositioned equipment, along with the service personnel deployed, gives U.S. forward presence in the region an unmistakable large footprint. Furthermore, because of harsh weather conditions in the region, prepositioned equipment is being housed in permanent structures built by the U.S. military, often with host-nation funding or partial funding. These permanent housing facilities—not to be confused with permanent bases—and the local civilians they employ contribute to making U.S. military presence even more visible.

The most visible presence is the U.S. Naval Forces Central Command headquartered in Bahrain, which demonstrates U.S. commitment to the region. This component command of CENTCOM is the only one permanently located in its AOR. According to Zinni, the Navy and Marine Corps Maritime Prepositioning Force (MPF) Program is comprised of Maritime Prepositioned Ship Squadrons 1,2, and 3, with plans to add a fleet hospital, a navy mobile construction battalion, an expeditionary airfield, and additional warfighting equipment to each squadron.⁷⁰

The Army plans to preposition a heavy division of equipment in the region. In Camp Doha, Kuwait, it has a fully operational brigade set that is maintained at a high state of readiness and exercises regularly. A site under construction in Qatar will house a second brigade set and a division base set. In addition, one complete and combat ready brigade afloat, APS-3 supports CENTCOM's AOR, with a second afloat combat brigade planned to augment the first one in FY02.⁷¹

The Air Force also has a prepositioning program to support CENTCOM's requirements. The program consists of a Harvest Falcon bare-base material program comprised of assets to support the generation of Air Force combat sorties in the early stages of contingencies. These assets are located in several GCC counties, with the largest segment of the housekeeping sets prepositioned in Qatar, Oman, and Kuwait.⁷²

The prepositioning program in the Gulf is an on-going activity involving continual assessment of CENTCOM's requirements and involving increased participation by host nations especially financially. The program is under constant review, with CINCCENTCOM having the responsibility of determining what type of equipment needs to be prepositioned where, depending on the nature of the threat and the anticipated exercise plans. Other issues associated with the program include the desired mix

between ashore versus afloat equipment. The latter provides a greater degree of flexibility but requires the availability of ports with loading capabilities to move the equipment forward. Clearly equipment prepositioned ashore requires agreements with host nations, and the United States may encounter restrictions on its use, as is the case with munitions stored in Saudi Arabia. The Saudis have restricted access to Air Force munitions as they do not want the United States to bomb Iraq above the 32nd parallel, adopting instead a policy that allows the use of munitions only in case Saudi Arabia is directly threatened. Because of these restrictions, the United States has considered moving some of the munitions to other locations in the region.⁷³ In the final analysis, the op-tempo of the various elements of the forward presence program points to a trend for a long-term U.S. presence in the region. This is especially true in Kuwait, whereby the Kuwaiti government has approved upgrading U.S.-used facilities in Al-Jaber Air Base, Ali Salem Air Base, and Camp Doha, although it is not certain yet who will fund the approximately \$193 million construction bill over the next several years.⁷⁴ Qatar is also very interested in expanding U.S. presence and is constructing air force facilities in Al-Udeid to attract U.S. Air Force prepositioning.⁷⁵ This trend points toward the creation of de-facto permanent U.S. bases in the region, although for political reasons the temporary character of U.S. presence continues to be publicly emphasized.⁷⁶ Apparently Gulf nations seem to believe that U.S. presence is indeed temporary, while the potential threat from Iraq and Iran is always present. This might explain why Gulf nations hedge their bet and engage other major powers like France and the United Kingdom primarily by buying major weapon systems from these nations.⁷⁷

Only a few years ago, an Army colonel wrote a study in which he complained that the United States is attempting to secure its many important interests in the Gulf “on the cheap, by maintaining a ‘half pregnant’ forward presence posture.”⁷⁸ Today the situation is far different, with most

experts firmly believing that the level of U.S. presence is sufficient should aggression occur from any known threat in the area.⁷⁹ This is especially true when U.S. forces are combined with local forces that are making progress training and becoming credible as is evident by the frequency and quality of the exercises.⁸⁰ On the other hand, a larger military presence increases the odds of asymmetric attacks on U.S. personnel and assets. After the 1996 Khobar Towers bombing, for example, U.S. military personnel in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, are now located in the outskirts of the city in an area known as “Iskan” [Arabic for housing]. Although the billeting and other service facilities are of high quality, one cannot escape the feeling, as the writer did when visiting the camp in the summer of 2000, of isolation and confinement due to heightened security measures and restricted movement. Morale and quality of life issues become of concern in such an abnormal environment. I turn next to a brief discussion of the nature of the threat facing the U.S. military presence in the Gulf region.

Security Challenges.

In his last report to the President and Congress, former Secretary of Defense William Cohen noted that, while the security environment at the start of the new millennium is positive, the world “remains a complex and dangerous place.” He went on to broadly outline the significant security challenges confronting the United States and listed five categories of challenges.⁸¹ Cross-border conflict is a threat in Southwest Asia since “Iraq continues to pose a threat to its neighbors and to the free flow of oil from the region.” The second challenge identified by the Cohen report is internal conflict. The short-term prospects of such conflict erupting in the Gulf region in the form of civil disturbance, armed uprising, or civil wars are limited due to a combination of factors including the authoritarian nature of the region’s governments, the enhanced and modernized capabilities of their intelligence and security services, and the ability of

most regimes to use their power of the purse to secure the loyalties of their citizens.⁸²

Another challenge is the proliferation of dangerous military technologies. In the Gulf, the proliferation of modern military technologies and the attempt to develop WMD capabilities and the means to deliver them are certainly trends of concern in a region with the financial resources to allocate for these purposes as well as the existence of states—principally Iraq and Iran—with motives and justifications to proliferate.⁸³

The fourth security challenge is transnational threats—a broad category that includes drug trafficking, organized crime, piracy, and terrorism. Acts of violence against U.S. personnel and assets have been and continue to be the major security challenge for the United States in a region with the common perception that U.S. policies are biased, anti-Arab, and anti-Muslim.

Lastly, the report identifies humanitarian threats in the form of failed states, famines, uncontrolled migration, and other natural and man-made disasters as security challenges that could affect U.S. interests. They require the unique capabilities of U.S. military forces to provide stability and assistance. While the chances of humanitarian threats occurring in the region are low, the possibility of some kind of an accident involving oil spills, a nuclear reactor breach, or a natural disaster such as an earthquake cannot be dismissed.

Terrorism is today the most critical security concern for the United States. U.S. military presence in the region provides a tempting target for determined radical groups opposed to U.S. policies and interests, as the attacks on Khobar Towers and the USS *Cole* demonstrated. None of the other security challenges in the Gulf are as directly related to U.S. presence. During the Gulf War, Saudi financier Osama bin Laden and his al Qaida [the Base] organization sought to remove U.S. forces from Saudi Arabia. Failing this, they came to regard the United States

as the enemy of Islam to be fought wherever possible—hence the attacks on two U.S. embassies in East Africa and recent reports of foiled attempts by individuals with ties to bin Laden to target the U.S. embassy and personnel in India and Yemen.⁸⁴ And while bin Laden and his fanatical supporters pose a credible threat to Americans and their interests, there are other sources of threats that cannot be ignored.⁸⁵

Of the seven states that the United States has given the designation of “state sponsors of terrorism,” two are major Gulf states—Iran and Iraq—three others are Arab countries—Syria, Libya, and Sudan—and the remaining two are Cuba and North Korea, with the latter often suspected as being a seller of weapons to terrorist groups.⁸⁶ Iran, with its manifest hostility to Israel and the United States, poses the most serious threat to U.S. interests. According to the State Department, this is because “Its Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) and Ministry of Intelligence and Security (MOIS) continue to be involved in the planning and the execution of terrorist acts and continue to support a variety of groups that use terrorism to pursue their goals.”⁸⁷ The most well-known group with close ties to Iran and which receives funding, weapons, training, and safe-haven is Lebanon’s Hizballah. Other groups supported by Iran include the Palestinian group HAMAS, the Palestine Islamic Jihad, and the Palestine Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command. All are rejectionist groups that oppose the U.S.-sponsored Middle East peace process. In addition, because Iran maintains embassies in all of the Gulf states, it is safe to assume that agents of MOIS operate in the Gulf collecting intelligence on host country governments and on U.S. military assets stationed in the region.⁸⁸

As for Iraq, its activities in support of international terrorism have focused on groups that oppose the regime of Saddam, and provide support to the anti-Iranian terrorist group Mujahedin-e Khalq (MEK), but “the regime has not attempted an anti-Western terrorist attack since its failed

plot to assassinate former President Bush in 1993 in Kuwait.”⁸⁹ At the same time, however, Iraq has actively and publicly supported the Palestinian *intifada* and allows several Palestinian rejectionist groups such as the Palestine Liberation Front and the Abu Nidal Organization to maintain offices in Baghdad.

American personnel and assets in the region are also vulnerable to acts of terrorism by a variety of local groups who oppose U.S. presence and policies. Most Gulf countries have opposition groups, usually radical religious activists, some of whom may have ties to bin Laden. Other groups such as radical Shi’a elements are assumed to have ties to Iran. During the year 2000 for example, the State Department reported that Kuwait uncovered an international terrorist cell reportedly planning to attack Kuwaiti officials and U.S. targets in Kuwait and the region. Also during that year, there were several threats against U.S. military and civilian personnel and facilities in Saudi Arabia.⁹⁰ The porous nature of the border between some of these states make it possible for terrorist groups to move from one country to another to conduct a terrorist act. In other words, it is not surprising that U.S. military presence in the region is a magnet that attracts plots by anti-U.S. elements and even becomes the target of intelligence collection by intelligence services of other nations with presence in the region. In such an environment, force protection becomes a priority as terrorist threats in virtually the entire Gulf are assessed as high.

It would be inaccurate to conclude from this discussion that U.S. military presence in the region is the reason why radical opposition groups are formed. There are several political, economic, and social reasons as to why opposition groups exist in the region. The close relations that Gulf regimes have with the United States make American military personnel and facilities an especially sought after target by radical groups. Likewise, none of the other security concerns alluded to in the Department of State report is attributable to U.S. military presence. In fact, U.S.

presence is arguably justified as a deterrent to these security concerns and as a factor contributing to the long-term stability and security of the region. Still, terrorism will always be a matter of immediate concern as long as U.S. military and civilian personnel and facilities are present in the region at a time when, despite all the statements of friendship and good will, U.S. policies engender strong emotional opposition. In the next section, I will examine public attitudes in the Gulf towards the United States.

U.S. Policies and Gulf Attitudes.

American officials serving in the Gulf who interrelate regularly with local policymakers are fully aware that local official views on U.S. Middle East policy and military activities in the region tend to be supportive in private diplomatic discussions.⁹¹ Publicly, however, these same officials voice criticism of U.S. policies, at times in harsh sound bites, designed to appease the sentiments of their citizens who, more often than not, are critical of their country's pro-U.S. stances.⁹² Former Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs noted this phenomenon in response to a journalist's question about U.S. bashing by radical Arab states, "They constantly bash us in public because that's what they think their people want to hear, and then they constantly are saying, why aren't you more active, why aren't you more engaged? It's a split personality."⁹³ The Palestinian *Al-Aqsa intifada* that began in September 2000 and rapidly escalated to an almost "state of outright war" between the Palestinians and the Israelis and which several commentators feared was gradually taking religious overtones,⁹⁴ eventually led Crown Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia, long-known for his sympathetic Arab nationalist and Islamic views, to show his displeasure with the United States and the Bush administration's support of Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's heavy-handed treatment of the Palestinians.⁹⁵ In an unusual gesture, Crown Prince Abdullah turned down an

invitation to visit the White House in May 2001, saying that “the time was not right.” In a rare press interview given to a major western paper, he stated:

We believe the U.S. when it says that it is an advocate of human rights, the rights of people, international legality, and that it seeks a new world order. What has appeared until recently as one-sided support to the behavior of an extremist Israeli government contradicts the position of the U.S.. Our relations with the U.S. and Europe are moving along, and we hope that they progress for the better. What we want to see from them is justice and respect for human rights. We want them to look at the reality and to consider their conscience. Do they see what is happening to Palestinian children, women, the elderly, the humiliation, the hunger?⁹⁶

Crown Prince Abdullah’s snub to visit the White House was widely acclaimed in the Arab press as a much needed signal to Bush that even America’s strongest Arab ally is dismayed with his administration’s policy of total support of Israel. But beyond the diplomatic language of signaling, it seems that Arab rulers are finding it increasingly difficult in the age of satellite television and the Internet to ignore the Arab street. The actions of Prince Abdullah were a manifestation of the reality that Arab public opinion must be factored in when dealing with sensitive issues involving Palestinian rights and the ultimate fate of the Muslim holy places in Jerusalem. No longer can the United States or other western governments deal directly with Arab governments while ignoring Arab public opinion.⁹⁷ A similar assessment was arrived at by Edward Walker, President of the Middle East Institute and former Assistant Secretary of State for the Near Eastern Affairs and his Middle East Institute deputy, former Ambassador David Mack, who reported following a visit in June 2001 to the three Gulf nations of the UAE, Qatar, and Kuwait, that Gulf leaders are extremely disappointed with Bush’s Middle East policies and that the “Arab street” can no longer be ignored. They concluded that American interests, primarily the free flow of oil, face no immediate short-term problems

in the Gulf but that, in the long-term, the situation may be different if Bush is unable to stand up to Sharon as his father did with respect to Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir.⁹⁸ In the long term, therefore, Arab rulers, including those in the Gulf, may come under increasing pressure from their public to reduce or even eliminate U.S. military presence should the perception of biased and anti-Arab U.S. policies persist.⁹⁹

While disparity between the attitudes of Arab rulers and their public is expected, particularly since none of the Gulf rulers are democratically elected, this does not mean that the public finds no policies it can support. Before the *Al-Aqsa intifada* took centerstage in Middle East politics, the sanctions on Iraq were the subject of concern. A 1999 U.S. Government-sponsored survey, for example, found that 71 percent of Saudis believed that Iraq presented a danger to their country. This substantial majority supported their government's policy of maintaining the sanctions on Iraq until there is a regime change in that country. The same survey also found that 64 percent of the public, a solid majority, approved of U.S. policies toward Iraq.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, occasionally the Arab press publishes an article supportive of the United States. As Clinton was leaving office in January 2001, he came under severe attacks in the Arab media, which prompted the Chief Editor of the prestigious London-based Arabic daily, *Al-Sharq al-Awsat*, to respond:

Allow me to say that, though the former President did not shake the world and did not perform miracles, yet his handling of our causes was much better than his predecessor's handling. Clinton was the only president who sent his forces to the Balkans and liberated the Muslims of Kosova . . . he was the only U.S. leader who was bold enough to announce his willingness to recognize a Palestinian state . . .¹⁰¹

Another illustration related to U.S. policy of promoting normalization between Arabs and Israelis is the defense of Al-Jazeera TV, a controversial but highly popular satellite

broadcast based in Qatar by a Jordanian writer. The station came under severe criticisms by numerous Arab organizations for its habit of broadcasting interviews with Israeli officials and journalists. Dr. Fahd al-Fanik argued that *Al-Jazeera*, which is watched by some 50 million Arabs, represents “a pioneering action in contemporary Arab media” and that it has “made a transition in the Arab media and freedom of expression before rushing to denounce a professionally sound practice.”¹⁰² Generally, however, those who regularly track the Arab media are led to conclude that the Arab press tends to be frequently critical of the United States and its policies in the region.

Negative attitudes towards the United States are at times bolstered by the common perception that key U.S. officials in charge of Middle East policy have a Zionist bias by virtue of their political backgrounds and Jewish religion. We have already noted the background of Dr. Martin Indyk, the Clinton administration’s author of the dual containment policy, who, on the eve of his appointment on the NSC in charge of Middle East policy, was the director of the pro-Israeli Washington Institute for Middle East Policy. When Dr. Indyk faced a security investigation over his use of classified material on an insecure computer, the Arab press began to speculate that he might be spying for Israel.¹⁰³ Also during the Clinton years, the Arab media frequently reminded their readers that the administration’s point man in the peace process, Ambassador Dennis Ross, was also associated with the same pro-Israeli Washington institute. Furthermore, when the George W. Bush administration was assembling its cabinet members and other key officials, an Arab reporter based in Washington wrote about American Jews’ concern that the new administration did not nominate sufficient number of Jews in high-level positions.¹⁰⁴ At the same time, the Arab press noted that the Bush administration recruited influential Jews to manage its Middle East policy. Among these are Richard Haas, Mark Grossman, John Hanna, and Robert Satloff, all known for their pro-Israeli stances and the latter

two were associated with the Washington Institute for Near East Policy.¹⁰⁵

The U.S. media has long been believed in the Arab world to be biased in favor of Israel,¹⁰⁶ and coupled with the equally long-standing perception that Congress is an institution beholden to the powerful Jewish lobby, Arabs despair at the possibility of an even-handed U.S. approach to the region's problems and especially the critical issues of the sufferings of the Iraqi and Palestinian people.¹⁰⁷ Given these negative attitudes toward the United States, how will this trend impact U.S. military presence in the Gulf region?

Regional Appraisal.

By most informed accounts, U.S. military presence in the Gulf is necessary, welcomed, and poses no problems that could not be managed by local governments. To this statement there is, of course, the added caveat that the profile of U.S. military footprint should be low key and inconspicuous. Also, U.S. involvement in the region is, on balance in the post bipolar world, an indispensable guarantor for political stability and regime survival.¹⁰⁸

There do not appear to be other appropriate generalizations regarding U.S. military presence since each Gulf nation views that presence and its bilateral relations with the United States differently. Highlights of some of the more salient features of Gulf appraisals about U.S. military presence follow.

Of all the Arabian Peninsula states, Kuwait is decidedly the most supportive of U.S. presence fundamentally because there has not been a regime change in Iraq since the 1990 invasion. Kuwait is understandably Iraq-centric and "Kuwaitis overstate the threat [from Iraq] to us; if the threat changes, Kuwait might change its attitude toward U.S. presence."¹⁰⁹ Consequently Kuwait is very satisfied with the terms of the Defense Cooperative Agreement (DCA) it has with the United States and "when that agreement is up

for renewal, Kuwait will not ask to renegotiate it.”¹¹⁰ Indeed since the Gulf war, Kuwait has become very serious about its defense, and in the past decade the United States has sold it upward of \$6 billion worth of military equipment, including F18 fighters.

Additionally, Kuwait pays the bulk of the expenses associated with U.S. military involvement in the country. At the same time, however, and despite the strong support for U.S. presence, “the perception among the average citizen is that by paying for all the expenses associated with U.S. military presence, Kuwait is being taken advantage of.”¹¹¹ Such a perception has led the government to emphasize that the military bases housing U.S. military personnel and equipment [primarily Camp Doha at the outskirts of the capital] are Kuwaiti and not U.S. bases; “the government also does not wish to publicize that air strikes against Iraq are initiated from Kuwait.”¹¹² A fair assessment would be that Kuwait strongly supports measures to change the regime in Iraq so that sanctions could be lifted. Until then, however, and despite popular sympathy for the suffering of the Iraqi people, Kuwait would oppose a change in the sanctions regime. As one high-ranking Kuwaiti officer opined, “The United States should be weary of Arab calls to lift the sanctions; Arabs are ‘emotional’ and their reference to the suffering of the Iraqi people is based on emotional considerations as opposed to rational calculations. As long as Saddam is in power, Iraq is a major threat.”¹¹³

Financial and national honor considerations seem to be the more serious factors associated with U.S. military presence in Kuwait. A U.S. Embassy political officer did not regard the various political and religious divisions in the country such as liberals and conservative, secularists and Islamists, Sunni and Shi’a, as threatening to the regime despite the fact that the Kuwaiti Parliament in which some of these divisions are manifest has managed “to annul several Emiri decrees . . . there are no signs of a trend coalescing to oppose or undermine the regime . . . the government successfully plays a balancing act.”¹¹⁴ The Shi’a

of Kuwait, constituting approximately 30 percent of the population, are fairly well-integrated into Kuwaiti society, and many are prominent businessmen and professionals. Still, the fact that in 2000 there was only one Shi'a member in the government and that Shi'a mosques numbered 30 compared to 200 Sunni mosques produces a feeling of discrimination "although this does not seem to be a glaring problem."¹¹⁵ To be noted as well is the fact that Kuwaiti Islamists recognize the need for U.S. military presence but regard it as a necessary evil, for socially and culturally they associate negative consequences with this presence.

The leadership in Kuwait that is ageing and has a reputation of inadequacy is criticized for not empowering a younger generation of leaders and for lacking an effective economic policy. Little is done with the wealth that Kuwait has, and more than 95 percent of the Kuwaiti workforce is employed by the government. The net result has been the creation of a de facto socialist state whose base is Kuwait's energy income. The ability to open the tap a bit more and to buy loyalties is the key to the regime's survival.¹¹⁶

The leadership is also criticized, for it has been anxious to resolve its border and maritime disputes with Saudi Arabia and Iran on terms perhaps less than optimal for Kuwait. An agreement has already been reached with Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait has called upon Iran to mediate the dispute over a gas field claimed by both nations in the Gulf.¹¹⁷

U.S.-Kuwait bilateral relations, including a moderately visible U.S. military presence in Kuwait, are based on mutual vital interests. The United States provides Kuwait with critical security guarantees against an Iraqi regime that continues to regard it as a province of Iraq,¹¹⁸ and a potentially bellicose Iran. The United States is also a primary source of advanced military equipment and training for Kuwait's armed forces whose performance on the eve of Iraq's invasion in 1990 was less than exemplary—in fact, embarrassing. For the United States,

Kuwait is critical for the successful implementation of U.S. policy objectives in the Northern Gulf, foremost among which is the containment of Iraq and secondarily Iran. Kuwait's stability insures that its vast oil reserves continue to reach the world market at reasonable prices. And yes, Kuwait's security needs, as well as those of other Gulf states, offers the United States a lucrative market for arms sales.¹¹⁹

In a nutshell, the U.S. position in Kuwait stands on firm bases and is not likely to change drastically, not even in a post-Saddam Iraq. This is because as many Kuwaitis suspect, the Iraqi claim of Kuwait is national rather than regime-specific. Future Iraqi generations are also likely to blame Kuwait for the negative impact of the sanctions. It is a case where national (Iraqi, Kuwaiti) blood is thicker than Arab blood, so that Iraqis will hold a grudge against Kuwait for years to come.

While Kuwait openly embraces U.S. security assistance and presence in the region, the UAE is the most cautious in its policies toward the United States and the presence of U.S. forces in the Gulf. A major reason for this cautionary position is that the UAE is Iran-centric almost as much as Kuwait is Iraq-centric. A complicating factor is that the federal leadership in Abu Dhabi—Al Nahyan family—“views Iran as a major threat while the Emirate of Dubai looks at Iran as a major commercial customer.”¹²⁰ Abu Dhabi has a unique view of Iran, regarding it as expansionist and hegemonic leading to a “paranoid attitude about U.S.-Iran relations suspecting that these relations are farther along than we are willing to tell them.”¹²¹ It follows then that the UAE does not view Iraq as a threat. Rather, Iraq is viewed, as it was prior to the Gulf War, as the first line defense against Persian expansionism, and policies perceived as leading to the break up of Iraq are strongly opposed by the UAE. Furthermore, the UAE is a strong advocate for lifting the sanctions on Iraq, as it is concerned that the future Iraqi generation will blame the Gulf Arabs for the sanctions.

The cautious attitude that the UAE has toward the United States should not be understood to mean that bilateral relations are fractious. There are many areas of cooperation, particularly in the commercial field, with the UAE being one of the top ten trade markets for the United States.¹²² The UAE has purchased F16 fighters at a cost “equivalent to about 17 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (\$45 Billion/year),”¹²³ making the deal one of the largest U.S. arms sale in the world. The deal with Lockheed Martin Corporation, involving 80 fighters developed to UAE specifications, is also the UAE’s largest arms purchase to date. Still, the UAE does not rely solely on U.S. armaments, and the country is a lucrative market for French weapons. U.S.-French competition in the UAE is fierce.

A potential irritant in U.S.-UAE relations is the DCA. As already indicated, the specific terms of the agreement are classified; however, the problem seems to be procedural and a difference in interpretation. The UAE adheres to the view that DCA is essentially nonexistent without an accompanying implementation agreement, while the United States takes the position that a secondary agreement is not required. A further complicating issue is that Dubai felt that it was not consulted on the agreement since a major component had to do with the status of U.S. military personnel, including those on R&R leave (vice TDY) in Dubai.¹²⁴

It would seem that the UAE has developed a strategy of survival based on forging security relations, albeit cautious, with the United States and some European nations, principally France. At the same time, the UAE tries to “keep Saudi Arabia (with whom it has had border problems), Iran, and Iraq at logger-heads.”¹²⁵ As an example, the UAE uses the islands issue (Abu Musa and the Greater and Lesser Tunbs Islands occupied by Iran) to foil Saudi-Iranian relations when it senses rapprochement between them—much like the Palestinian issue is often used by some Arab states as a nationalism tool to deflect potential rapprochement between a moderate Arab state and Israel.

Ambassador Theodore H. Kattouf summed up the situation by noting that the UAE and most other Gulf states are “schizophrenic; they want us in the region, but don’t want us to generate domestic political liability.”¹²⁶ This is a true assessment indeed.

Between Kuwait’s embrace and UAE’s caution lie the attitudes of the other Gulf States regarding U.S. regional involvement. Saudi Arabia, which is undoubtedly the most important Gulf state for U.S. policy interests and with whom the United States has had a long security relationship, seems to encompass the inclinations of Kuwait and the UAE in terms of its relations with the United States.¹²⁷ It supports U.S. presence and the association it has with the U.S. military, but at the same time is very sensitive to that presence. Consequently, the U.S. Military Training Mission (USMTM) is closely involved with the Saudi military and very much part of the Saudi Ministry of Defense and Aviation (MODA). However, the Saudis have shunned a detailed DCA with the United States (the 1990 agreement is, in fact, no more than a letter of understanding ensuring the right of Saudi Arabia to request the departure of U.S. forces from the Kingdom if it deems necessary) and have never seen the need for a SOFA (status of forces) agreement. Unlike the UAE that is interested in exercising jurisdiction in criminal matters over U.S. military personnel as a matter of sovereignty, the Saudis “have always asked us to send the offender home.”¹²⁸

The Saudis rely on the United States to train their military, and they pay the entire training bill. “Training missions constitute the backbone of our military relationship,” stated an American Embassy official.¹²⁹ Additionally, the restrictions placed on U.S. troops in the Kingdom, according to the same official, are based on a U.S. decision and not a Saudi one. This is because the United States recognizes that Saudi Arabia is “the linchpin of our presence in the region, and we have to take them as they are.”¹³⁰ This explains why U.S. presence in the Kingdom is based on tacit understandings rather than legal

documents—an arrangement that has worked well for both sides for over 4 decades of U.S. military presence. It also explains why the United States accedes to the Saudi request that “issues of democracy and human rights not be mentioned loudly since they might detract from U.S. commitment to the regime of Al-Saud.”¹³¹ The relationship is a complex one and aptly summed up in a *Newsweek* article as:

a dance of veils. It has to be understood as an extraordinary and sometimes secretive web of connections—of money, power and personal loyalty. It is a tale of favors and I.O.U.s, high-stakes gamesmanship, genuine friendship and cunning manipulation.¹³²

To be sure, the close and not always visible alliance with the United States does not mean that Saudi Arabia is a U.S. client state.¹³³ Crown Prince Abdullah, who runs the day-to-day affairs of the state, has been actively promoting rapprochement with Iran, especially after the coming to power of moderate President Khatami. Improved relations with Iran serve Saudi purposes of a successful and peaceful *hajj* (pilgrimage to Mecca; recall the 1988 riots in the city instigated by Iranian pilgrims). They also serve Saudi oil policies in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), as cooperation with the core oil producing Iran is critical in this respect. And although Saudi officials regard the regime of Saddam as a threat, “the U.S. should no longer peg its presence to the Gulf war . . . it’s being given a longer rope to either hang itself or figure out the bases on which we are present.”¹³⁴ The suggestion that a U.S. review might lead to a reduction of its military presence and a reevaluation of its security relationship with the Kingdom was a cause of alarm to a Saudi official who saw absolutely no need to change the status quo.¹³⁵

The other three members of the GCC, Oman, Qatar, and Bahrain, are strong supporters of U.S. military presence on their soils. Of the three, Oman prefers that the association with the United States be kept low-key and away from

public debate. This preference is also in line with the Omani policy of shielding the true nature of the relationship with the United States from its neighbors. The access agreement with the United States provides Oman, a poor country by GCC standards, with about \$50 million annually, as well as with a sense of prestige and protection. The desire to lessen the traditional ties with Britain also drives Oman to wanting closer relations with the United States, including an interest in U.S. equipment such as the F16 fighter.¹³⁶ To this utilitarian list of interests that Oman has in U.S. military presence, a Omani officer who coordinates the presence of U.S. prepositioned equipment noted that, in the early 1980s, Oman was forward looking by seeking a security relationship with the United States, for at that time the region was unstable due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and because of the Yemen-Oman border problems.¹³⁷ In short, Oman welcomes U.S. presence on its soil not for any perceived immediate danger to its security, but as a prudent measure to be included under the U.S. security umbrella, and to benefit financially and technologically (modernization of its military) from the relationship.

The policies in Bahrain and Qatar regarding the association with the United States are more transparently accommodating. These two states have had a long history of dispute over territories focusing primarily on several islands and reefs located off the Qatari coast.¹³⁸ Strong relations with the United States, it can be speculated, allowed the leadership in each state to feel confident that the outcome of the International Court of Justice arbitration regarding the disputed areas would be accepted and enforced without interference from neighboring states that may have an interest in a particular outcome. For instance, the Shah of Iran had at one point claimed Bahrain as Iranian territory, while the UAE, the Qataris worried, might use their French tanks “to come and take the gas and make Qatar part of the federation.”¹³⁹ As a point of fact, the Bahraini Emir was very concerned to lose his claim to

Hawar Island to Qatar, believing that this would cause Bahrain to lose its national identity and be an incentive to Iran to take over the rest of Bahrain.¹⁴⁰ The implication was that, if these neighboring states still harbored notions of expansion, they would have been interested in adjudication to the border dispute that would justify an opportunistic belligerent move, if they could get away with it.

As noted above, U.S. naval presence in Bahrain dates back several decades. But as a state with virtually no oil reserves, Bahrain has sought to become a banking center in the region and a “tourist” spot where alcohol and entertainment are widely available on the island, which is easily accessible to Saudi patrons through the causeway connecting the Eastern shore of the Kingdom to the island. Bahrain has a close relationship to Saudi Arabia, which is its main benefactor and protector. Its special relationship to the Kingdom and its ties to the U.S. military are guarantees against the principal external threat from Iran and potential domestic threat that could emanate from dire economic conditions and the Shi’a majority. Consequently, Bahrain has a strong interest in continued U.S. presence under the terms of the DCA although it prefers to keep the relationship private. And yet, its liberal laws make Bahrain an attractive “rest and relaxation” destination for U.S. military personnel who are usually very visible and welcome in their civilian attire in and around the capital city, Manama. As one local journalist explained with a smile, “Bahrain’s liberalization—alcohol, bars, etc., is not because of U.S. military presence, but because Bahrain is a tourist country.”¹⁴¹

The U.S. Defense Attaché in Doha said, “the best DCA and relations that I have seen,” in reference to the agreement and relations that the United States has with Qatar.¹⁴² The Emir of Qatar has a reputation of being some sort of maverick wanting genuine democracy in Qatar and taking steps in that direction such as free local elections and women suffrage. Qatar allows an Israeli trade office to operate in Doha (Israel has a similar arrangement with

Oman), much to the dismay of many in the Arab world. It also allows the now-famed Al-Jazeera satellite television to broadcast programs and talk shows that challenge established Arab political mores and taboos. In its regional policies, Qatar is often at odds with the policies of its GCC partners, especially Saudi Arabia, which “if it says one thing, Qatar says another.”¹⁴³

From a security standpoint and now that the border dispute with Bahrain is behind it, Qatar’s main threat perception is Iran with whom it shares off-shore oil and gas fields. U.S. military presence is a major source of security guarantee. To that end, Qatar is very welcoming of U.S. presence and even desires a “much larger U.S. footprint—they want American personnel to intermingle with the local population, and want the U.S. to commit to permanent presence basis.”¹⁴⁴ To that end, the Qatari government has undertaken several measures that would “please the Americans such as allowing the sale of alcohol in hotels, liberalization measures such as women voting . . . These measures are criticized by segments of the populace that think the government has gone too far.”¹⁴⁵ They are bold and risky steps to undertake in a conservative state that adheres to the Saudi-style Wahhabi brand of Islam. Apparently, however, the current leadership thinks them justifiable, and Qatar is charting a pro-American course.

The above regional appraisal discussion indicates that the Gulf states approach their relationship with the United States differently. While most prefer the relationship to remain low-key and hidden from their public, Gulf governments regard U.S. presence in the region as an essential security shield. At the same time, however, U.S. presence is a potential source for political instability that could challenge the legitimacies of existing regimes. Thus far, Gulf regimes have successfully managed to contain and control domestic challenges by instituting limited political reforms, liberalization measures, using their power of the purse to “buy citizen loyalties,” and constantly improving the state’s internal security capabilities.¹⁴⁶ But how have

developments since the September 11 terrorist attack on the United States affected policies and attitudes in the Gulf that could impinge on U.S. military presence? As the war on terrorism is unfolding at the time of this writing, I will briefly speculate about this question before arriving at a final conclusion and policy recommendations.

The War on Terrorism.

The September 11, 2001, coordinated terrorist attack on the United States by suspected members of Osama bin Laden's al Qaida organization was apparently designed to target the American "remarkable trinity" symbols—to use Clausewitzian terminology. The World Trade Center represented the general public; the Pentagon, the military; and the hijacked flight that crashed in Pennsylvania was destined to attack the White House or the Capitol, the government. Bin Laden, if indeed he masterminded the scheme, was seeking to escalate the conflict with the United States presumably to send a message that U.S. homeland security is in jeopardy unless Muslims are also secure in their homelands.

In taped statements that were broadcast on the Qatari Al-Jazeera satellite television, bin Laden made references to what he described as the "slaughter" of Muslims in Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Palestine by western crusaders and Jews, and insisted that the war the United States is waging in Afghanistan is a religious war.¹⁴⁷

By engineering the attack on America, bin Laden, there should be no doubt, doomed himself, his supporters, and sponsors. With the collapse of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, he also doomed the radical Islamic cause—the establishment of an Islamic state based on a fundamentalist interpretation of the *Sharia* (Islamic Law)—not that such an extreme radical cause had a chance of becoming viable. However, bin Laden also unwittingly affected regional and international politics as a consequence of America's war on terrorism in response to his actions.

Undoubtedly, many works will be written in the future to chronicle and analyze America's war on terrorism. For purposes of this study, the central question is how has this war affected regional politics and the challenges and prospects of U.S. military presence in the Gulf?

All indications thus far, a few months after the attack on the United States, are that the war has sharply focused and magnified the basic political and strategic issues raised in this study. Foremost among these is the "clash of civilizations" thesis, prevalent in the Arab world following the Gulf War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, to the effect that Islam and Arabs are the new enemies of the West. Bin Laden's statements to Al-Jazeera were clearly designed to highlight and capitalize on this thesis.

Aware of the serious ramifications of how the war might be perceived in the Islamic world, Bush has gone to great lengths to emphasize that the war is against terrorism and not Islam.¹⁴⁸ He implored the public to avoid racial and ethnic profiling, and promised a firm stand against hate crimes directed against Arab-Americans and Muslim-Americans. On the other side of the Atlantic, however, the urbane Amr Musa, Secretary-General of the Arab League and former Egyptian foreign minister, convened a conference of Arab intellectuals and officials on the subject of "dialogue of civilizations." The purpose was to examine Western attitudes toward Arabs and Muslims. Musa cautioned that the West is nearing a phase of ethnic and religious discrimination against Arabs and Muslims and asserted, "the proposition of the supremacy of one civilization over another does not withstand the test of history that demonstrated the feasibility of cross fertilization between Western and Eastern cultures."¹⁴⁹ Obviously, the Arab world remains concerned about its image in the West and is fearful that Western policies toward the region stem from an essentially hostile vision about Arabs and Muslims. Arabs suspect that American and Western behavior in the aftermath of September 11 is

premised on “the clash of civilization” thesis, the rhetoric of western leaders notwithstanding.

Just as the first President Bush discovered a linkage between the Gulf War and the Arab-Israeli conflict, President Bush the son has also found a linkage between the war on terrorism and the festering conflict in the Middle East. Arab and Muslim coalition partners could not openly identify with the U.S.-led coalition against the Taliban unless the United States signaled a more balanced approach toward the plight of the Palestinians whom they believe are victims of Israeli state oppression.

The Bush administration began its tenure in office with what amounted to a hands-off approach to the Middle East peace process and tacit support of the government of Sharon in its tactless handling of the Palestinian *Intifada*. But almost 2 weeks after the attack on America, Bush made public statements regarding U.S. support for an independent Palestinian state—statements whose sincerity were questioned in the Arab world. Hence, for instance, one skeptical writer opined that the Bush administration has already transformed “U.S.-Israeli relations from mutual strategic interests to some form of existential and emotional association . . . leading to an abiding belief in supporting the Zionist state and insuring its absolute military superiority over all the nations of the region . . .”¹⁵⁰ In short, references to a Palestinian state by the Americans are not taken seriously.

Bush’s overtures to the Arabs were soon followed by Secretary of State Colin Powell’s speech in mid-November in which he outlined a U.S. position regarding the peace process that appeared evenhanded, signaling a possible tilt in the direction the Palestinian and Arab position. Essentially, Powell referred to a settlement on the basis of U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338 that established the “land for peace” formula, called on the Palestinians to stop the violence and the Israelis to halt their settlement activities. He also named retired Marine General and former

CENTCOM's CINC Zinni as his envoy to work with the parties to achieve a durable solution to the conflict.¹⁵¹ Israeli and Arab officials positively received the speech, but the jury is still out on whether the U.S. engagement in the peace process under the stewardship of Powell and in the shadow of the war on terrorism will bear any fruit.¹⁵²

A third basic strategic issue that may impinge on U.S. military presence in the Gulf is the expansion of the war beyond Afghanistan. The Bush administration has signaled that the war against the Taliban is but the initial phase of the war. Subsequent phases may target Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon for their support of terrorist organizations such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and Hizballah. Iraq is singled out for its continued efforts to develop WMD and its refusal to submit to U.N. weapons inspection.¹⁵³

Expanding the war, as “hawkish” and pro-Israeli elements in the Bush administration are counseling,¹⁵⁴ would greatly complicate U.S.-Arab relations. Many Arabs consider anti-Israeli activities by such organizations as Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and Hizballah as legitimate resistance to Israeli occupation. These organizations, it is alleged, have no global reach and are merely engaged in a national liberation effort. They also argue that Israel, through its “targeted killing” policy and oppressive measures against Palestinians, is engaging in terrorism and should be included in the U.S. anti-terrorism campaign. As for Iraq, there has been a concentrated effort to link Saddam to the September attack and subsequently to the anthrax scare, but no evidence could be found to justify U.S. military action against Iraq.¹⁵⁵ The Bush administration may still go after Saddam (and possibly after Iran as well), arguing that he is developing germ warfare capabilities and refuses to cooperate with the U.N. inspection regime.¹⁵⁶ Such a justification will undoubtedly enrage Arab public opinion that sees in this justification a pro-Israeli bias insofar as the United States does not raise the issue of Israeli possession of WMD capabilities. Arabs have also

blamed the United States for the devastating impact the sanctions regime has had on the Iraqi people, and U.S. military action against Iraq will find no or little support in the Arab world and elsewhere, even among America's closest allies.¹⁵⁷

The war on terrorism, although in its initial stages, has galvanized some of the fundamental issues associated with U.S. military presence in the region. Since it is uncertain how the war will expand, what it will target, and with what means, an accurate assessment as to the challenges and prospects awaiting U.S. military presence in the Gulf is difficult to state. I will, nevertheless, conclude this study by speculating on U.S. military presence in the region based on the evidence already presented, and the seemingly new unilateralist strategic posture of the United States in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attack.

Conclusion and Recommendations.

Had this conclusion been written prior to the September 11 attack on the United States, I would have noted that the size, posture, and mission of U.S. military presence in the Gulf was appropriate for the assumed threat perception. The United States, in partnership with Gulf allies, was poised to deter and withstand the initial phase of an attack on the region by either Iraq or Iran. The prepositioned assets make it possible for home-based U.S. troops to reach the theater of operation and engage the enemy in a short time.

Another point to be noted is that the necessity for a low profile and small footprint presence was due to cultural and political considerations. A high visibility posture of American military personnel in the Gulf is a sensitive matter to the majority conservative Muslim population. The public in the Gulf, as in the rest of the Arab world, is fundamentally opposed to U.S. policies in the region and regards them as anti-Arab and Muslim. The anti-American sentiment was accelerating, given the deteriorating

Israeli-Palestinian conflict and U.S. failure to move the peace process forward. Fueling the negative image of the United States is the continued suffering of the Iraqi people blamed on the sanctions regime perpetuated and sternly enforced by the United States. Increasingly, the United States was approaching the need to rethink its policies in the region that have become out of synchronization with the security strategy of forward presence and prepositioning in an environment of heightened ill-will towards it—this irrespective of official local governments’ acquiescence or tacit support for U.S. policies.

Signs of opposition to U.S. military presence on the Arabian Peninsula, and particularly Saudi Arabia, were clear and unmistakable. As American troops began arriving in the region on the eve of the Gulf war, the popular conservative Saudi cleric Sheikh Safar al-Hawali preached a sermon that was broadcast from Mecca, in which he said,

We have asked the help of our real enemies in defending us. The point is that we need an internal change. The first war should be against the infidels inside and then we will be strong enough to face our external enemy. Brothers, you have a duty to perform. The war will be long. The confrontation is coming.¹⁵⁸

Words were soon followed by actions. The bombings of the Khobar Towers, the U.S. embassies in East Africa, and the World Trade Center, as well as the attack on the USS *Cole* were all part of a violent trend against the United States by Islamic radicals linked to bin Laden’s al Qaida organization. Further attacks on U.S. interests were expected, which is why force protection became and should remain CENTCOM’s highest priority. Unfortunately, no one expected the pattern of opposition to lead to the September 11 massive and coordinated terrorist attack.

Unfolding events since the attack on America, including the war in Afghanistan, will ultimately result in a rearrangement of regional politics and security policies. The nature of this rearrangement will largely depend on how the United States decides to use its military and foreign policies

in the region in a manner commensurate with its status as an unchallenged superpower.

The Bush administration, in the name of the war on terrorism, can pursue a unilateralist approach to the issues of concern in the region by acting militarily against Iraq, tightening the sanctions against Iran, pressuring Syria and Lebanon to deal with organizations within their borders that the United States (and Israel) regard as terrorists, and turning a blind eye to Israeli government harsh measures against the Palestinian *Intifada*. Additionally, in the wake of the terrorist bombings in Jerusalem and Haifa in early December 2001, the administration has supported the “war” that Sharon declared on the Palestinian Authority with little or no regard to negative Arab reaction. In brief, the United States is very much capable in the short run of creating a new regional order by imposing stability under its hegemony. There is little that governments in the region can do to effectively oppose determined U.S. actions save for the usual verbal condemnations and diplomatic protestations. Such a course, however, will certainly widen and perpetuate Arab and Muslim anger against the United States and lead, in the long run, to additional acts of terrorism. Arab popular anger may even cause the downfall of regimes regarded close to the United States.

In reality, the Bush administration is more likely to pursue less brash regional policies. Peace in the Middle East is key to the fight against terrorism by eliminating a major cause that galvanizes Arab and Muslim sentiments regarding Palestinian rights and Islamic holy places in Jerusalem. Dealing with Saddam is a complicated problem for it involves a fundamental policy review. An Iraq without Saddam and the Ba’th party is an Iraq whose future as a unified and cohesive country, as all of its neighbors desire, becomes questionable in the current circumstances. It will also deprive the United States of one of its more convincing arguments as to why it needs to be present militarily in the Gulf. It will eventually shift the balance of regional power in favor of Iran. These are among the more serious

considerations that U.S. policymakers must weigh before acting to target Iraq after Afghanistan.

At the time of this writing, the situation in the region is extremely volatile and fluid as U.S. forces are concluding operations against the remaining al Qaeda and Taliban supporters, and at a time that the Israeli government is deeply involved in its own war on terrorism that it blames squarely on Yasser Arafat—a blame that the United States has publicly agreed with. Sharon has drawn a parallel between the U.S. cause in Afghanistan and Israel's efforts against the Palestinians. Ultimately this could jeopardize the strength of the coalition that the Bush administration has formed with Islamic states in any subsequent phases of the war on terrorism. U.S. Gulf and Middle East policies have rough hurdles to cross before the ultimate objective of a stable and secure region can be realized. Given the fact that U.S. regional interests have not changed but were made even more gripping by the efforts against terrorism, overcoming these hurdles must remain a priority.

I would suggest the following policy recommendations. First, the United States must develop a comprehensive public diplomacy program whose objective is to bridge the information divide between itself and the Arab and Islamic worlds. A campaign to disseminate strategic information should go beyond the general public and be specific to target the region's elites. The objective is to create an environment conducive to a "dialogue of civilizations," as has been called for recently by Arab intellectuals. Several institutions and programs could be highly instrumental, including, for example, the Washington-based U.S. Institute of Peace and the Royal Institute for Religious Studies of Amman, Jordan, that promotes interfaith dialogue. Their programs and activities in this regard deserve material support.

In this vein, the U.S. military services, and particularly the Army, given the large size of Gulf landpower forces compared to other services, should seriously promote contacts and joint programming between American

chaplains and Muslim clerics serving in the Gulf armed forces. Understanding each other's concepts of war and its conduct will contribute positively to the much-needed dialogue of civilizations at the military-to-military level.

Secondly, U.S. policymakers have correctly identified the Palestinian problem as the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and, during the Clinton administration, priority was given to moving the peace process along the Palestinian-Israeli track. While efforts should continue to bring the cycle of violence to a halt, the United States should conduct a fundamental review of the basis of the peace process and adopt a broader approach to tackle simultaneously the Palestinian-Israeli as well as the Lebanese and Syrian-Israeli tracks.

The American and Israeli assumption is that the "land for peace" formula guiding the peace process means that negotiations involve the issue of the extent of Israeli withdrawal from occupied Arab land, the modality of the withdrawal, and the nature of the ensuing peace. Arabs, on the other hand, assume that negotiations are about all relevant military, diplomatic, commercial, and other issues pertaining to post-peace treaty normalization but should not involve the question of the extent of Israeli withdrawal. Israel must withdraw to the pre-1967 borders. These positions appear intractable.

A possible way to achieve progress would be for the United States to shift to the more even-handed approach of encouraging arbitration by an international tribunal of the final border issues at least between Israel and Syria, as Israel and Egypt did in 1989 with respect to the Taba beach resort. On the Lebanese front, Israel has no strategic reason to hold onto the occupied Shaba farms; and by withdrawing from this strip of land along the western slopes of the Golan Heights, it would deny Hizballah, and the Lebanese government that claims the strip, any pretext for further resistance against Israel because it occupies Lebanese territory.¹⁵⁹ On the Syrian front, the United States should

promote arbitration to resolve the fate of the small area around the northern shore of Lake Tiberias (Sea of Galilee) that appears to be the principal stumbling block in achieving a final settlement between Syria and Israel. President Bashar al-Asad cannot be expected to deviate from his father's policy and negotiate away Syrian lands, but since the exact June 4, 1967, border line is disputed, arbitration is the only face-saving approach for Syria, should the arbitration decision favor Israel.

If Israel can make peace with its two state neighbors, the political atmosphere of the region will become more positive. The Arab world and Israel will be better situated to complete the journey of peace on the Palestinian track, which is proving to be the truly complicated track as it involves the emotional issue of Jerusalem, the Israeli ideological claims to the West Bank and Gaza, and Palestinian counterclaims and national aspirations.

Thirdly, the changed focus of responsibility of CENTCOM, that finds it prosecuting the war on terrorism, suggests that the Command should have a long-term presence in the region. The Gulf has been a critical transient location in support of the war efforts in Afghanistan. It is inefficient and awkward for a command that has had to fight two wars in its AOR in the past decade to operate, as it does, from 7,000 miles away. The State of Qatar that is welcoming of U.S. military presence on its territory has been mentioned as a potential site for CENTCOM's headquarters. I recommend, therefore, the relocation of CENTCOM's headquarters to the region, and, in addition to Qatar, Jordan should be considered as a potential site. Jordan is centrally located in CENTCOM's AOR (which one day will include Israel, Syria, and Lebanon) and has a tradition of pro-Western and moderate government. This recommendation makes further sense, as U.S. presence in the region is increasingly becoming *de facto* permanent.

I confess to being unable to suggest any fresh approaches to Iraq. An action to dislodge the regime of Saddam and to

bring to power the Iraqi National Congress assumes that the leadership of this Congress will have the support of most factions of the Iraqi people. This assumption should be carefully examined before pursuing such a path that could dismember Iraq. The policy of “smart sanctions” that would provide humanitarian assistance to the people of Iraq, but at the same time deny the regime access to military technology, is the best practical method of dealing with that country. Fundamentally, however, the United States should come to a realistic assessment as to the nature and scope of the threat the regime poses to the region. Even by Israeli account, and “Despite the deterioration of the monitoring and verification regime applied against Iraq in the aftermath of the Gulf War, Saddam Hussein failed to rebuilt the facilities of the production of chemical and nuclear weapons.”¹⁶⁰ Hence the continued containment of Iraq might be preferable to a hostile military engagement with Saddam’s regime whose *political* outcome we are unsure of.

Lastly, it should be noted that, while many Arabs and Muslims oppose U.S. policies, the overwhelming majority of them also oppose terrorism and the kind of political vision and government style as proposed and practiced by bin Laden and the Taliban. This fact presents the United States with solid opportunities to be effective should it succeed in convincing the majority of the region’s people that its policies are judicious and evenhanded.

I conclude this study with a final comment speculating on the long-term role of the Army in the Gulf. For as long as Gulf oil remains vital to the interests of the United States and its allies, the presence of an Army heavy combat capability based in the region is to be expected. This capability is to prevent a cross-border invasion into Kuwait and Saudi Arabia by Iraq. The possibility of an Iraqi incursion will remain for some time, even after the regime of Saddam has been replaced. As already noted, this is because of the Iraqi argument that historically Kuwait belongs to Iraq, and because future Iraqi governments are likely to

blame Kuwait for the impact the sanctions have had on Iraqi society. Hence, even if Baghdad is ruled by a moderate regime that is friendly to the West, this should not mean that Iraqi national aspirations would necessarily be abandoned.

In addition to Iraq, the Gulf region is likely to remain fundamentally unstable for several decades to come. Iran can be a source of instability insofar as it regards itself as the dominant Gulf power that is entitled to a commensurate role in the region. Sharing major maritime oil and gas fields with the littoral Gulf states means that Iran and the Arab sheikdoms have potential friction points. U.S. military presence, especially naval and air force capabilities, in several of the Gulf countries is a critical check to Iranian ambitions and possible adventurism.¹⁶¹

The uncertain prospect for the long-term stability of the traditional Gulf regimes is another issue of concern. These regimes, as this study has demonstrated, welcome American military presence. Several scenarios could be discussed as to what would happen if these regimes were to fall. I believe that, in the unlikely event this is to occur, it would not simultaneously happen in all of the Gulf states. If there were a regime change in Saudi Arabia, for example, the pressure would be more and not less on the United States to enhance its military presence, and specifically the presence of heavy combat capabilities in the other Gulf states. In other words, there is no realistic end in the foreseeable future to U.S. military engagement in the Gulf. The vital interests the United States has in the region, the desire of local governments to retain U.S. military presence, and the inability of Japan and European powers that depend on Middle East oil to project power for a long period of time, mean that U.S. engagement is there for the long haul. The Army should plan accordingly, for an over-the-horizon presence strategy is no longer valid. Air and naval power are highly effective in defeating aggression by hostile forces; land power is, in the final analysis, what

will secure the world's most precious and coveted real estate.

ENDNOTES

1. Beirut *Assafir*, (in Arabic; Internet Edition), August 25, 2000.

2. Bernard Lewis, *The Middle East and the West*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963, p. 9. Given the location of the Persian Gulf, Mahan recognized its strategic importance for the British whose empire relied heavily on naval power. Incidentally, Mahan wrote the highly influential book, *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660-1783*, published in 1890, which was considered by most observers as the definitive statement on politics and war—with naval supremacy as essential to national greatness.

3. This study uses the more neutral term “Gulf” as opposed to “Persian Gulf”—the traditional designation of the region, or the “Arabian Gulf”—a term that came into vogue during the Gulf War to appease the U.S. Arab coalition partners.

4. See Michael A. Palmer, *Guardians of the Gulf*, New York: The Free Press, 1992, p. 4.

5. Examples include U.S. Department of State, *United States Strategic Plan for International Affairs*, Washington, DC, February 1999; U.S. Department of Defense, *United States Strategy for the Middle East*, Washington, DC, May 1995; Robert H. Pelletreau, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, “American Objectives in the Middle East,” Remarks at CENTCOM Symposium, Tampa, Florida, May 14, 1996, available at <http://www.state.gov/www/regions/nea/960514.html>.

6. The White House, *A National Security Strategy For A Global Age*, December 2000, p. 58.

7. *Ibid.*

8. 50 U.S.C, 402, Title I of the National Security Act of 1947, as quoted in Don M. Snider, *The National Security Strategy: Documenting Strategic Vision*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, July 1994, p. 2. Snider, who was a member of the National Security Council that prepared the early reports of 1987 and 1988, provides an excellent background and subsequent reports until 1993.

9. The White House, *National Security Strategy of the United States*, January 1987, p. 17.

10. The White House, *National Security Strategy of the United States*, August 1991. p. 10.

11. For a detailed discussion of national security strategy documents, see Aaron L. Friedberg, "The Making of American National Strategy, 1948-1988," *The National Interest*, Spring 1988, pp. 65-75; Don Snider, *The National Security Strategy: Documenting Strategic Vision*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, March 1995, pp. 25-41; and Palmer, *Guardians of the Gulf*, for specific references to the Gulf.

12. See Palmer, p. 56.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 101-102.

14. The White House, *National Security Strategy of the United States*, August 1991, p. v.

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*, January 1993, p. ii.

17. The White House, *National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*, July 1994, p. 5.

18. Dr. Indyk, an Australian immigrant, was the director of this pro-Israeli Institute at the time of his appointment to the NSC in 1992 (See *Boston Globe*, January 21, 1993, p. 7.) He held the positions of U.S. Ambassador to Israel, then Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, before he was once again named Ambassador to Israel, reportedly at the request of Prime Minister Ehud Barak. Dr. Indyk's biography, especially his pro-Zionist activities and views, were of concern to some Arabs in his role as one of the Clinton administration's principal authors of U.S. Middle East policy. His speech, entitled "The Clinton Administration's Approach to the Middle East," is available at <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/pubs/indyk.htm>. On the other hand, and in fairness to Dr. Indyk, he spoke to an Israeli audience on the very sensitive subject of Jerusalem and told them "There is no other choice than to share the holy city. It cannot be the exclusive preserve of one religion." This remark led one Likud member of the Knesset to demand that the United States recall him as Ambassador to Israel. See *The Jerusalem Post*, Internet Edition, September 18, 2000. It should also be noted that Iran and Iraq, along with Cuba, North Korea, and Libya, were also referred to by the Clinton

administration as “backlash” states that the United States had to neutralize, contain, and eventually transform into constructive members of the international community. See Anthony Lake, “Confronting Backlash States,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 73, No. 2, March-April 1994, pp. 45-55.

19. Indyk.

20. Lake, p. 49.

21. See Gary Sick, “A Look at the Iranian Stalemate: They’re Changing, Why Can’t We,” *The Washington Post*, March 28, 1999, p. B03.

22. For a detailed discussion of the Helms-Burton and the D’Amato Acts, see Stefaan Smis and Kim Van der Borgh, “The EU-US Compromise on the Helms-Burton and D’Amato Acts,” *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 93, No. 1, January 1999, pp. 227-236.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 229. The penalties for noncompliance with the D’Amato Act include denial of U.S. Export-Import Bank assistance; denial of the right to receive U.S. exports; denial of loans from U.S. financial institutions; exclusion from U.S. Government procurement; and restrictions on the right to import goods into the United States.

24. David Sanger, “U.S. Ending a Few of the Sanctions Imposed on Iran,” *New York Times*, March 18, 2000, p. A1.

25. As an example, it has been reported that the Clinton administration “has played down reports that Conoco had breached U.S. sanctions against Iran by acting in an advisory role over the giant Azadegan oil field.” Tehran *IRNA*, “U.S. ‘Played down’ Reports U.S. Firm Breached Sanctions Against Iran,” in English, 1401 GMT, September 18, 2000, in *Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS)* Document ID: IA P20000918000042, September 18, 2000.

26. See David Hoffman, “Russia Criticizes U.S. Law Linking Funding to Iran Policy,” *The Washington Post*, March 16, 2000, p. A-18.

27. Lake, p. 50.

28. See Denis J. Halliday, “The Impact of the UN Sanctions on the People of Iraq,” *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2, Winter 1999, pp. 29-37.

29. Sarah Graham-Brown, *Sanctioning Saddam: The Politics of Intervention in Iraq*, New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 1999, p. xi.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 57.

31. *Ibid.*, pp. 59-65.

32. Patrick Clawson, "The Continuing Logic of Dual Containment," *Survival*, Vol. 40, No. 1, Spring 1998, p. 33.

33. Stephen C. Pelletiere, *Landpower And Dual Containment*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, November 1999, p. 1.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

35. F. Gregory Gause III, "The Illogic of Dual Containment," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 73, No. 2, March/April 1994, pp. 56-57.

36. The new Bush administration, facing mounting criticisms from its Arab allies over the humanitarian impact of the sanctions on the civilian population in Iraq, has proposed a policy of "smart sanctions." Presumably these are ones that target the regime but spare the population. It remains to be seen how this policy will be implemented, and whether it can succeed.

37. See Palmer, pp. 46-49.

38. Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Power and Principle: Memoirs of the National Security Advisor, 1977-1981*, New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1983, p. 17, as quoted in Palmer, *Ibid*, p. 101.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

40. For a detailed discussion of CENTCOM's history, see Jay E. Hines, "Confronting Continuing Challenges: A Brief History of the United States Central Command," available on line from USCENTCOM's home page at <http://www.centcom.mil/whatpercent20is/hisory.htm>, accessed November 16, 2000.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

42. See Malcolm Russell, *The Middle East And South Asia 1999*, Harpers Ferry: Stryker-Post Publication, 1999, p. 144.

43. See Hines, pp. 8-10.

44. The major activities included Operation SOUTHERN WATCH, which began in August 1992, that established a no-fly zone south of the 32nd parallel to monitor Iraqi compliance. Operation PROVIDE

COMFORT was a similar operation to protect the Kurdish population in the north.

45. There appears to be two primary reasons as to why the various Gulf states insisted on classifying these otherwise simple and essentially straightforward access agreements. The desire not to publicize a formal agreement with the United States in order to deprive local opposition forces a cause celebre was a major reason. A second reason was to avoid disclosing the specific terms of the agreement to other states in the region.

46. Statement of General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, Commander-in-Chief, United States Central Command, to the Senate Armed Services Committee, February 8, 1990.

47. *Ibid.*

48. See U.S. Central Command, *Posture Statement*, 1993 and 1994.

49. See U.S. Central Command, *Posture Statement*, 1995, p. 39.

50. U.S. Central Command, "Shaping U.S. Central Command For The 21st Century," *Strategic Plan II, 1997-1999*, p. 5. The same five pillars were also stated in CENTCOM'S *Posture Statements* of 1996 and 1997.

51. See Hines, p. 21.

52. Statement of General Anthony C. Zinni, Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command, before the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on National Security, March 17, 1998.

53. *Ibid.*

54. Statement of General Anthony C. Zinni, Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command, before the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Defense, February 10, 1999, p. 16.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

56. See http://www.centcom.mil/theater_stra/theater_strat.htm, accessed January 31, 2001.

57. One commentator recently noted that, because of the disproportionately large resources of the Department of Defense, "the Pentagon defines foreign policy in ways no other department, including the State Department, can." Additionally, "Its theater commanders and

their entourages lord like proconsuls over entire regions of the globe.” Lawrence F. Kaplan, “Containment: Cheney Versus Powell, Round Two,” *New Republic*, February 5, 2001.

58. See Federal News Service, Inc., “Hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee,” June 27, 2000.

59. See U.S. Department of State, “General Tommy Franks Testimony on USS *Cole* Attack,” *Washington File*, October 25, 2000.

60. See Federal News Service, Inc., “Hearing of the House Armed Services Committee,” March 28, 2001.

61. U.S. Department of State, *Washington File*, October 25, 2000.

62. Franks, June 27, 2000, Senate Hearing.

63. *Ibid.*

64. Franks, October 25, 2000, testimony.

65. See Department of Defense, *USS Cole Commission Report*, January 9, 2001, available from <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/cole20010109.html>.

66. Franks, March 28, 2001, House Hearing.

67. Mahmud Abd-al-Wahhab interview with Egyptian Foreign Minister Amr Musa, *Cairo Al-Ahram*, in Arabic, May 2, 2001, p. 9. Also see *FBIS* Document ID GMP20010502000168, May 2, 2001.

68. See Howard Schneider, “In the Arabian Desert, U.S. Troops Settle In,” *The Washington Post*, May 3, 2001, pp. A01, A18.

69. See Franks, March 28, 2001, House Hearing.

70. Zinni, Testimony Before the Senate Armed Services Committee, February 29, 2001.

71. There have been reports that the Army would have preferred to locate a third brigade in the UAE, but negotiations with that country were not positive, leading to the decision to utilize the afloat option. See James Bruce, “USA Moves Armoured Brigade into Qatar,” *Jane’s Defence Weekly*, Vol. 25, No. 3, January 17, 1996, p. 14.

72. This information is based on briefings I received from members of the Prepositioning Branch staff, Directorate of Logistics and Security Assistance, (CCJ4/7-RP), USCENTCOM, in May 2000, in Tampa, FL.

73. Author interview with CENTCOM J-5 officers, May 12, 2000.

74. See Jim Garamone, "Kuwait OKs Long-term U.S. Presence, Base Upgrade," American Forces Information Service, October 25, 1999, available from http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/docs00/n10251999_9910253.htm. The author was informed that Kuwait has been more than willing to pay the entire bill for upgrade and improvement costs made at facilities used by U.S. forces, interview with Brigadier General Walter Wojdakowski, Office of Military Cooperation, U.S. Embassy, Kuwait, June 2000.

75. Brent J. Talbot and Jerry Hicks, "Led by a Lion," *Aerospace Power Journal*, Fall 2000, p. 81.

76. See, for example, the article by Zinni in which he states "... we are not after a permanent presence which a lot of those that are out to get rid of us in the Gulf and our presence use or accuse us of." Anthony C. Zinni, "United States Policy in the Gulf," *RUSI Journal*, Vol. 144, Issue 4, August 1999, pp. 44-49.

77. This is an explanation given the author by CENTCOM J-5 officers, Tampa, FL, May 12, 2000.

78. Colonel John F. Troxell, "Protecting Vital Interests: The Need for a Balanced Forward Presence in Southwest Asia," Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College Strategic Land Power Essay Contest winner, unpublished paper, June 1997.

79. This is a common general assessment that may vary slightly, depending on who is making the assessment and when. For instance, a J-4 officer on the Joint Staff told the author that "equipment-wise, we have sufficient presence, but manpower-wise, we are still lacking." Interview with Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Taylor, J4, The Joint Staff, Pentagon, May 5, 2000.

80. Assessment of Navy Captain Cooper, J5/Pol Mil/CENTCOM, interviewed by the author in Tampa, FL, May 11, 2000. It should be noted that this is a general assessment involving all U.S. assets stationed in the region. More specifically, however, the U.S. Air Force alone could achieve the halt phase against Iran if that country is to plan an attack against any of the GCC countries; the land power forces could do the same in the event that Iraq is to plan an incursion into Kuwait.

These are, of course, hypothetical scenarios, but they do give an indication of the level of firepower the United States presently has in the region.

81. Secretary William S. Cohen, *Annual Report to the President and the Congress*, Department of Defense, Washington, DC, 2001; available at <http://www.dtic.mil/execsec/adr2001>.

82. This is a pre-September 11, 2001, assessment. Depending on how the war on terrorism unfolds and how local regimes adjust to post-September 11 events, the long-term stability of Gulf governments may not be as certain.

83. For a detailed discussion of the causes and dynamics of WMD proliferation in the Middle East, see Sami G. Hajjar, "The Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East," *Comparative Strategy*, Vol. 19, No. 1, January-March 2000, pp. 35-56.

84. See *The Washington Post*, June 16 and 19, 2001, p. A14.

85. These words were written prior to September 11. No one could have predicted that the bin Laden terrorist schemes were as ambitious as to plot the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. The lesson here might be "where there is smoke, anticipate a fire."

86. See United States Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2000*, Publication 10822, April 2001, pp. 31-35.

87. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

88. The religious ties that Iran has to the Gulf Shi'a community and the presence of thousands of Iranian nationals, especially in the UAE, provide Iranian intelligence agents with ample reliable sources of information.

89. U.S. Department of State, *Pattern of Global Terrorism 2000*, p. 33.

90. *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

91. A pro-Libyan paper, for example, has written recently, "The United States and Israel have agents, collaborators, and followers in the corridors of some [Arab] rulers." Ahmad al-Huni, "Israel Prepares, The United States Divides Us, the Intifadah Is Targeted, and Our Rulers Are Just Watching," London *Al-Arab al-Alamiyah*, in Arabic, March 9, 2001, p.1.

92. An example is the statement by the UAE minister of Information and Culture, Shaikh Abdullah bin Zayed, that the “United States should classify itself, along with Israel, among the forefront of nations that support terrorists.” See Al-Shaarjah, *Al-Khaleej* in Arabic, Internet Version, April 5, 2001. This statement, which came as a reaction to Bush’s support of Sharon’s strong-handed measures against the Palestinians, spurred an unusually strong anti-U.S. editorial in the Abu Dhabi semi-official *Al-Ittihad* entitled “US, Israel at Top of Terrorist List” which accused Bush as having given “his friend, ally, and partner” approval to continue his “barbaric aggression against the Palestinian people.” Abu Dhabi *Al-Ittihad*, in Arabic, Internet Version, April 5, 2001; also in *FBIS* Document ID GMP20010405000254 dated April 5, 2001. Of course, official statements and editorials critical of the United States and its pro-Israeli policies are very common among the “rejectionist” Arab states such as Syria or Libya.

93. Janine Zacharia, “Sharon’s Settlement Plan is More Than Natural Growth—Walker,” *The Internet Jerusalem Post*, May 11, 2001.

94. See Ahmad Al-Muslali, “The Arab Israeli Conflict: Has it Been Transformed into a Muslim-Jewish Conflict?” Beirut *Al-Safir*, in Arabic, Internet Version, February 24, 2001; also Sami G. Hajjar, “The New Bush Administration and Middle East Realities,” *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 278, No. 1620, January 2001, pp. 23-26. The reader should note that this *intifada* is related to the visit on September 28, 2000, the eve of Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish New Year, of Sharon, then leader of the Likud opposition party, to the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, which is the site of the third holiest mosques, al-Aqsa mosques, in Islam. Sharon’s visit resulted in violent protest following the next day’s (Friday) prayers at the mosque, which quickly spread to other areas in the West Bank and the Gaza strip; thus the designation Al-Aqsa *intifada*.

95. Even before the events associated with this *intifada*, Crown Prince Abdullah had been steering Saudi foreign policy away from close association with Washington by seeking rapprochement with Iran and pursuing a course at odds with Washington’s dual containment policy. See John Templeman, “Why the Saudis Are Inching Away from Washington’s Tent,” *Business Week*, April 13, 1998, p. 53.

96. Roula Khalaf, “Interview with Saudi Arabia’s Crown Prince Abdullah bin Abdul Aziz al-Saud,” London, *The Financial Times*, Internet Version, June 25, 2001, in *FBIS* Document ID EUP20010625000169 dated June 25, 2001.

97. See Shibly Talhami, "The Perils of Erroneous Analysis to Dimensions of Arab Public Opinion," London *Al-Hayat*, in Arabic, April 30, 2001, p. 9.

98. See "Report on a Fact-finding Visit to Three Gulf States," Beirut *As-Safir*, in Arabic, Internet Version, June 28, 2001. It can be recalled that former President Bush froze loan guarantees to Israel to pressure Shamir to halt illegal settlement activities in the occupied territories.

99. For the time being, U.S. military presence in the region continues to be very much welcomed. A Saudi official whom I interviewed was alarmed at my hypothetical suggestion that the United States might in the future, for financial or political reasons, reduce or eliminate its military presence in the Kingdom. I was informed that Saudi Arabia very much depends on U.S. presence to safeguard its security against the unpredictable regimes of Iraq and Iran, and that, for the foreseeable future, U.S. military presence and assistance is required. Author interview with Dr. Abdul Aziz al-Fayez, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Shoura Council, Consultative Council, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, July 5, 2000.

100. Department of State, Office of Research, *Opinion Brief* B76-99, Washington DC, November 30, 1999.

101. Abdul Rahman al-Rashed, "Why Did the Arabs Bid Clinton Farewell by Attacking Him?" London *Al-Sharq al-Awsat*, in Arabic, January 22, 2001, p. 9.

102. Dr. Fahd al-Fanik, "The Call to Boycott Al-Jazirah," Amman *Al-Ra'y*, in Arabic, May 9, 2001, p. 20.

103. See "Even in Investigations, Washington Adopts Double Standards: The Likelihood that Indyk Spied for Israel," Al-Sharjah, UAE, *Al Khaleej*, in Arabic, Internet Version, September 30, 2000. Also see Salah Hazin, "Martin Indyk: Whose Victim?" Abu Dhabi *Al Ittihad*, in Arabic, Internet Version, September 30, 2000. The reader should note that Indyk was never charged with any crime, and he served out his term as Ambassador to Israel. The point that is being emphasized here is the perception that Arabs have regarding the bias of U.S. officials toward Israel.

104. Melhem Hisham, "Jews Disappointed at Being Excluded from the Bush Administration: But What's Important Are Policies Not Identities of Officials," Beirut *Assafir*, in Arabic, Internet Version, January 12, 2001.

105. See Victor Shalhoub, "Reassembling Influential Jews on Bush's Foreign Policy Team," Al-Sharjah, UAE, *Al-Khaleej*, in Arabic, Internet Version, February 18, 2001.

106. See, for example, Ralph Begleiter, "Is the Media Biased? Covering the Middle East from the Journalist's Vantage," *Middle East Insight*, January-February 2001, pp. 41-45.

107. Powell recognized the growing trend in anti-American sentiments in the region because of the sufferings of the Iraqi and Palestinian peoples. See Melhem Hisham, "Powell Concerned About Growing Anti-American Sentiments: Not Visiting Lebanon Does Not Mean Ignoring It," Beirut *Assafir*, in Arabic, Internet Version, March 16, 2001.

108. These were the overarching impressions that I surmised from extensive interviews conducted in the summer of 2000 with a host of Gulf officials and elites and U.S. civilian and military officials, including many stationed in the Gulf.

109. Interview with Brigadier General Walter Wojdakowski, Office of Military Cooperation, American Embassy, Kuwait, June 28, 2000.

110. *Ibid.*

111. Interview with Douglas Bell, Second Secretary, Economic Section, American Embassy, Kuwait, June 28, 2000.

112. *Ibid.*

113. Interview with Brigadier General Fouad Haddad, Kuwaiti Armed Forces, Kuwait, June 30, 2000.

114. Interview with Ms. Lori Roule, Political Officer, U.S. Embassy, Kuwait, June 28, 2000.

115. *Ibid.*

116. This was the general assessment of U.S. Embassy Kuwait officers that I interviewed in June 2000. Not a single Embassy officer disputed the view that Kuwait appears to be a country adrift and caught in a riot due to lack of leadership.

117. See Ramin Seddiq, "Border Disputes on the Arabian Peninsula," *Columbia International Affairs Online*, available from <http://www.ciaonet.org>, accessed November 8, 2001; and "Kuwait Asks

Iran's Mediation Over Border Dispute," available from <http://www.ArabicNews.com>, May 12, 2000.

118. See "Denunciation of [Tariq] Aziz's statements regarding Lebanon and Kuwait," Beirut *As Safir*, in Arabic, Internet Edition, November 9, 2001.

119. A U.S. Ambassador stated that arms sales is, in fact, one of the *raison d'être* of U.S. involvement and interest in the Gulf region. Interview with Ambassador John Craig, U.S. Embassy, Muscat, Oman, June 18, 2000.

120. Interview with Mr. Matthew R. Koch, First Secretary, American Embassy, Abu Dhabi, June 20, 2000. This is essentially also the view of Ambassador Theodore H. Kattouf, who I interviewed on the same day.

121. Interview with Mr. Scott Edelman, Political Officer, American Embassy, Abu Dhabi, June 20, 2000. Mr. Edelman also revealed that Shaikh Zayed Al Nahyan, UAE President, does not "talk about Iran in the same way as he talks about Israel [viewing Israel as less of a threat]. The issue is personal with him. Even the Northern Emirates Shaikhs would prefer that Zayed lowers the tone about Iran and is less public about his criticisms."

122. According to Mr. Koch of the American Embassy, the United States had, in 2000, approximately \$2 billion in trade surplus with the UAE. The United States exports about \$2.7 billion in goods and services, while importing \$0.7 billion. Interview with Mr. Koch.

123. *Ibid.*

124. Summary views based on interview with Ambassador Theodore H. Kattouf, American Embassy, Abu Dhabi, June 20, 2000. I should point out that the U.S. Liaison Office at the American Embassy was unable to arrange meetings with UAE military officers or other officials willing to discuss these issues with me.

125. *Ibid.* Ambassador Kattouf noted that the 1974 border agreement between the UAE and Saudi Arabia is viewed with suspicion by some of Shaikh Zayed's sons on the basis that it gave too much to the Saudis in terms of mineral rights in the border area.

126. *Ibid.*

127. For a broad review of Saudi-U.S. relations, see "The Saudi Game," *Newsweek*, November 19, 2001.

128. Interview with Colonel Hatley, Chief U.S. Military Training Mission Joint Advisory Division, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, July 2, 2000. Hatley noted that the United States is working closely with the Saudis, training them to act as a joint force rather than using each of the services separately, and also to operate in a coalition environment. Inroads were being made in this regard, according to Hatley, but he also observed that the Saudis “do not allow lieutenant colonels and colonels to work with them in the field; the cooperation is limited to MODA.” This point was confirmed by another military officer at the U.S. Embassy but was disputed by the Embassy Deputy Chief Mission who argued that the U.S. military is well-integrated in the Saudi military and is deployed with them throughout the country. The Saudis even encourage social interaction between the families of U.S. and Saudi military personnel.

129. Interview with Mr. Albert A. Thibault, Jr., Deputy Chief Mission, American Embassy, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, July 3, 2000.

130. *Ibid.*

131. Interview with Hatley. The Royal Family is concerned about internal opposition and seeks to preserve its legitimacy; the fanning of political ideas and programs might feed the aspirations of political dissenters and is troubling to the ruling family. For a discussion of oppositional politics in Saudi Arabia, see Mamoun Fandy, *Saudi Arabia and the Politics of Dissent*, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999; on how the Royal Family has attempted to keep dissenters at bay, see Seymour M. Hersh, “King’s Ransom: How vulnerable are the Saudi royals?” *The New Yorker*, October 22, 2001, pp. 35-39.

132. “The Saudi Game,” p. 35.

133. The Saudis rely on the United States for security assistance, yet from the Saudi perspective, that assistance has not always been reliable, causing the Kingdom’s leadership to seek security assurances by other means independent of the United States. See Richard L. Russell, “A Saudi Nuclear Option?,” *Survival*, Vol. 43, No. 2, Summer 2001, pp. 69-79.

134. Interview with Frederick W. Axelgard, Political-Military Affairs Counselor, American Embassy, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, July 3, 2000.

135. This was the view of Dr. Abdulaziz al-Fayez, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Shura, Consultative Council, interviewed in his office in Riyadh on July 5, 2000.

136. This view is based on my interview with Ambassador Craig. This observation was also made by Lieutenant Colonel Eric J. Brooks, Commander, Executive Coordinating Agency, American Embassy, Muscat, Oman, June 18, 2000.

137. Interview with Colonel Abdullah bin Hamoud Al-Menji, RAFO, Muscat, Oman, June 19, 2000. Another officer intimated that, since Iraq is no longer a serious threat and since Oman has good bilateral relations with Iran, which in his mind meant that Iran is not a threat either, the United States should make every effort to reduce its visibility in the region. By this, he did not mean its level of forces or prepositioned equipment, but the public aspects of the presence such as the often publicized joint exercises. Interview with Brigadier Ali Bin Salem Al-Maamary, COSSAAF, Muscat, Oman, June 19, 2000.

138. The territorial dispute was finally resolved through the long-awaited decision of International Court of Justice that essentially divided the disputed areas between the two states—a decision that was accepted by both parties. For details on this issue, see “The Bahrain-Qatar Border Dispute: The World Court Decision,” Parts I and II, *The Estimate*, Vol XIII, Nos. 6 and 7, March 23 and April 6, 2001, available from <http://www.theestimate.com/public>.

139. Interview with Colonel Brian R. Kerins, Chief, U.S. Liaison Officer, American Embassy, Doha, Qatar, June 6, 2000. Qatar is the largest producer of natural gas in the Gulf. Its so-called North Dome off-shore gas field is vulnerable to Iranian attack.

140. This was a point made during my interview with the American Embassy Country Team Members, Manama, Bahrain, June 26, 2000.

141. Interview with Dr. Hilal Al-Shaiji, Editor of *Akhbar al-Khaleej*, Manama, June 26, 2000.

142. Interview with Commander Zimmerman, Defense Attache, American Embassy, Doha, Qatar, June 24, 2000.

143. *Ibid.*

144. Interview with Colonel Kerins.

145. Interview with Shaikh Hamad bin Salman Al-Thani, member of the Qatari Royal Family, Doha, June 25, 2000.

146. The issue of internal stability is of major concern and is often spoken about by American diplomats in terms of succession, since most Gulf rulers are aging and in declining health. The U.S. Ambassador to

Qatar, for example, informed me that, given Emir Hamad's declining health and the fact that the crown prince is his third son who is in his middle 20s with little political experience, concern has been raised about the stability of the regime. Note: Hamad had deposed his father, Shaikh Khalifa, in 1995 in a palace coup; Khalifa himself became Emir after deposing his cousin Ahmad bin Ali in 1972. Interview with Ambassador Elizabeth McKune, American Embassy, Doha, Qatar, June 25, 2000. For a general discussion of the problem of succession in the Gulf, see J.E. Peterson, "The Nature of Succession in the Gulf," *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 4, Autumn 2001.

147. For a text and commentary on bin Ladin's statement, see the "World" section in Beirut *Assafir*, in Arabic, Internet Edition, November 5, 2001.

148. Still one finds many writings even in the West that view the war as some sort of a religious conflict. See, for example, Andrew Sullivan, "This Is a Religious War," *New York Times Magazine*, October 7, 2001. One Israeli academician has bluntly faulted the view that the war is not against Islam, arguing that the religion of Islam is violent and intolerant. See David Yerushalmi, "Terror in One Nation or Islam and Marxism," WWW-text in English, Jerusalem Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, November 12, 2001, in *FBIS Document ID GMP20011127000083*, November 27, 2001.

149. See Beirut *An Nahar* in Arabic, Internet Edition, October 27, 2001. The final recommendations of the conferees included a denunciation of terrorism including acts of terror directed against Arabs, called for intensified dialogue with the West, and a thorough reexamination of the Arab educational systems to encourage scientific inquiry and limit the "brain drain." For complete details of the recommendations, see al Sharja, UAE, *Al Khaleej*, "Dialogue of Civilizations," in Arabic, Internet Edition, November 27, 2001.

150. Mohammad Saleh al-Masri, "Palestinian State of an American Maneuver?" Al-Sharja, UAE, *Al-Khaleej* in Arabic, Internet Edition, October 28 2001.

151. See Secretary Colin L. Powell, Remarks at the McConnell Center for Political Leadership, University of Louisville, Kentucky, November 19, 2001, available from <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2001>. Note: Zinni is widely known and highly respected in the region. It is rumored that he is of Lebanese descent which, along with his intimate knowledge of the region, should make him a credible envoy to those on the Arab side who doubted the objectivity of former envoys with ties to the pro-Israeli Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

152. Despite the general support the speech received in the Arab and Israeli press, e.g., Beirut *The Daily Star*, Jedda, *Ukaz*, in Arabic; and Tel Aviv, *Ha'aretz*, all from November 21, 2001, there were strong criticisms of the speech on both sides as in *Ahmad al-Huni*, "Powell: We Are Committed to Israel's Security and Our Ties With it Are Eternal. Where Are the Capitulationists?" London *Al-Arab al-Alamiyah* in Arabic, November 21, 2001, p. 1; and Nahum Barne'a, "Ordered to Make Peace," Tel Aviv *Aharonot*, in Hebrew, November 20, 2001, in *FBIS* Document ID GMP20011120000028, dated November 20, 2001.

153. See "Powell Does Not Discount that Iraq is Next," Beirut *An-Nahar* in Arabic, Internet Edition, November 8, 2001; "American Escalation to Target Iraq and Lebanon," *Al-Sharja*, UAE, *Al-Khaleej*, in Arabic, Internet Edition, September 9, 2001.

154. See Jason Vest, "Saddam in the Crosshairs," *The Village Voice*, November 21-27, 2001, available at <http://www.villagevoice.com/issues/0147/vest.php>.

155. See *Ibid.* Vest indicates that American Enterprise Institute researcher, Deputy Defense Secretary Wolfowitz, and former CIA Director Woolsey have sought evidence against Saddam to justify military actions against Iraq.

156. See Steven Mufson, "U.S. Says Iraq, Others Pursue Germ Warfare," *The Washington Post*, November 20, 2001, p. A08; Reuven Pedatzur, "The Core of Terrorism in Iran," Tel Aviv *Ha'aretz*, Internet English Edition, November 20, 2001. The author states: "Iran will be one of the next targets. . . . top [U.S.] officials express the view that Iran is a serious threat to the West."

157. See excellent commentary by Hugo Young, "Americans Want a War on Iraq and We Can't Stop Them: Bush is Looking for the Next Target and His Country is Right Behind Him," London *The Guardian*, Internet Edition, November 27, 2001.

158. As quoted in Howard Schneider, "Saudi Missteps Helped Bin Laden Gain Power," *The Washington Post*, October 15, 2001, p. A01.

159. For a detailed discussion of this issue, see Sami G. Hajjar, "Creating Peace Between Lebanon and Israel," *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 279, No. 1626, July 2001, pp. 1-8.

160. See "Israeli Strategic Dominance: A Deterrent to Regional Conflict," Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies (JCSS), *Bulletin*, No. 27, Tel Aviv University, November 2001, p. 3.

161. At one point, as U.S.-Saudi relations experienced friction due to differing views on security for the region, there were reports that the Kingdom had become uncomfortable with the U.S. military presence and would ask them to leave. However, Crown Prince Abdullah dismissed reports of frictions with the United States and indicated no discussions were underway over the future of U.S. troops. See *The Washington Post*, January 18, 2002, p. 1, and January 29, 2002, p. 1.

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE

**Major General Robert R. Ivany
Commandant**

STRATEGIC STUDIES INSTITUTE

**Director
Professor Douglas C. Lovelace, Jr.**

**Director of Research
Dr. Steven Metz**

**Author
Dr. Sami G. Hajjar**

**Director of Publications
Ms. Marianne P. Cowling**

**Publications Assistant
Ms. Rita A. Rummel**

**Composition
Ms. Kimberly A. Rockwell**