
Concluding Commentary

Professor David F. Davis

Senior Fellow
Program on Peacekeeping Policy
The Institute of Public Policy
George Mason University
Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.
e-mail: ddavis@gmu.edu

Alexander E.R. Woodcock, Ph.D.

Chief Scientist and Vice President
Synectics Corporation, Fairfax, Virginia, U.S.A.
e-mail: woodcock@syncorp.com

Cornwallis IV turned out to be a milestone in the process being followed by the group. For the first time we were able to truly address the issues surrounding the civil-military interactions that occur in Peace Operations and missions in general. Both key-note addresses, by Lieutenant General Kinzer and Mr. Morrison, were focused on these issues and suggesting changes to the group as a whole.

The third day, although still growing in form and content, was productive. We think this was due, in part, to the unexpected call by Mr. Morrison for the Cornwallis Group to become actively and officially involved in the scientific research of the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. Since Mr. Morrison's request at Cornwallis IV, and the publication of this proceedings (late in 1999), two of our committee have visited the Pearson Centre to follow up and to expand this idea. Cornwallis V will involve a great deal of discussion on how best to accomplish this goal.

THE EMERGENT RESEARCH AGENDA

We would now like to close this volume with a discussion of the emergent research agenda. From Jim Narel's summary of the Wednesday Group activity, and the following discussion of the results of the day three experiment, produced a list of potential topics. We would like to take that list and ask the Cornwallis community to begin the process of prioritization. In order to do that, we have initially categorized the findings in the following way: Analysis (7 entries), Assessment (6 entries), Case Studies (4 entries), Doctrine and Theory Building (13 entries), Education and Training (1 entry), Leadership (1 entry) and Logistics (3 entries). See the following.

Simply reviewing this categorization yields some basic information, specifically that new doctrine and theory building has the majority of the individual needs, but analysis and

assessment together meet that numeric requirement as well. Therefore, simply counting the number of entries will not give us insight in prioritizing the list, especially since Leadership and Logistics would have relatively few entries.

ANALYSIS

- Analysis of participating agencies to identify inter-organizational differences in their IT-related systems that may disrupt the flow and dissemination of critical information.
- Analyzing the challenges of conducting forward planning a great distance from national headquarters.
- Cataloging “user needs” for various types of information in an intervention.
- Determining differences in the “motivational alignment” among various actors.
- Developing a simulation to model civilian populations in crisis environments that could be used to anticipate likely public responses to particular crises and relief efforts.
- Identifying the critical elements of a culture and its conflicting factional interests that must be understood in order to shape a successful intervention.
- Identifying the methods and mechanisms that should be established to improve co-ordination of information among the diverse “audiences” in an intervention.

ASSESSMENT

- Analyzing the kinds of decisions common to peace operations with an eye to identifying the seemingly small issues that tend to have big consequences.
- Determining the critical elements of effective civil-military decision making in a coalition environment.
- Identifying systematic criteria for determining whether to intervene in a crisis.

-
- Identifying the factors that contribute to the deterioration of public order and degradation of civil police effectiveness following withdrawal of military intervention forces.
 - Identifying the indicators by which civil and military leaders can judge that sufficient stability has been achieved to schedule withdrawal of military forces.
 - Identifying the key factors of conflict in a society that may require an international intervention, as well as existing mechanisms that may contribute to achieving resolution.

CASE STUDIES

- Determining the accuracy and usefulness of the surveys conducted by the Humanitarian Assistance Survey Team (HAST) and the Office for Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA).
- Evaluating the degree to which the effort to coordinate communications among civilian actors worked during UNOSOM I and UNITAF, respectively.
- Reviewing and analyzing the interaction in Somalia intervention between the civil-military effort and the media.
- Tracing the relative effectiveness of the United Nations' Humanitarian Operations Center (HOC) across the phases of the operation—UNISOM I, UNITAF, and UNISOM II.

DOCTRINE AND THEORY BUILDING

- Defining or developing a process to link the main actors and agendas.
- Determining how such a process to link actors and agendas of intervenors can be extended to the local population and factions.
- Determining how to enhance and optimize a civil-military operations center (CMOC).
- Developing a methodology and creating a mechanism for estimating a time frame and determining resource requirements to achieve the objectives of an intervention (including those that must continue after a military withdrawal).
- Development of a “civil doctrine” for intervention, and an overarching “strategic doctrine” for civil-military interaction. Its elements would include measures of effectiveness; a framework of legitimacy, accountability, and

governance; balanced provision of near and long-term aid; and means for determining exit criteria for both military and civilian agencies.

- Discerning the areas where the disconnect between military and civil agencies causes the greatest delays or disruptions and focusing efforts there on increasing civil-military cooperation.
- Establishing operating standards for NGOs and DARTs that could serve as operational guidelines and criteria for evaluating performance.
- Evaluating effects of “role changes” on the military. For example, are leaders accustomed to making command decisions able to employ consensual techniques when appropriate?
- Evaluating whether and/or how assigning an Operational Analysis group to the commander could help identify and address civil-military issues unique to peace operations.
- Examining how the experience of U.S. National Guard units, accustomed to performing disaster relief operations, including subsequent hand-off to civilian agencies, can be “exported” to U.S. active duty military units.
- Expanding the military doctrine of “unity of effort” for all participants.
- Identifying disconnects between responsibility and authority in the policy- and decision-making aspects of peace operations, to ensure that those elements charged with the responsibility for achieving certain ends possess sufficient authority to bring them about.
- Identifying key civil-military links and developing a mechanism to ensure their timely establishment.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

- Determining what education and training are requisite for the military and civil actors in an intervention, both on a contingency basis and as part of the pre-deployment preparations.

LEADERSHIP

- Identifying the leader attributes that are especially important for those in charge of peace operations, and ensuring that senior leaders are selected accordingly.

LOGISTICS

-
- Analyzing the challenge of maintaining national commitment for peacekeeping operations.
 - Identifying and organizing resources in a peace operations headquarters to ensure that the right materials are available to the appropriate parties.
 - Identifying the resources that need to be allocated to each civil-military task.

**PLEASE REVIEW THE FINDINGS
ON OUR WEB SITE**

These thirty-five findings and seven categories are now available on the Cornwallis Web site (at <http://www.gmu.edu/departments/t-po/cornwallis>) for the readers review. We would be most grateful if you would send e-mail messages to David Davis (ddavis@gmu.edu) or Ted Woodcock (woodcock@syncorp.com) in response to the following four questions:

1. Are you or your organization currently engaged in research on these topics?
2. How would you or your organization prioritize these topics; within category, across categories, or by categories?
3. What is your priority?
4. Would you or your organization add or delete from the above list?

Hopefully we will be able to report to Cornwallis V on the outcome of this very subjective exercise. In the meantime — please use this list as a first cut at a research agenda. Much still needs to be done!

**EVOLUTION OF THE CORNWALLIS GROUP
TO BECOME THE RESEARCH ARM
OF THE PEARSON PEACEKEEPING CENTRE**

We look forward with great interest and excitement to the evolution of the Cornwallis Group as the research arm of the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. Initial discussions by several members of the Committee and two subsequent visits by Ted Woodcock to the Pearson Center for meetings with President Alex Morrison, Vice President Robert Hamilton, and Susan Armstrong, Director of Publications, have led to the following proposals:

- The establishment of a series of *Cornwallis Group Monographs on Peacekeeping Studies* to be written by individuals who have attended one or more Cornwallis Group Workshops.

- The establishment of *Cornwallis Group Visiting Fellowships* that would permit members of the Cornwallis Group to visit the Pearson Center for a relatively short period of time; work with Centre staff; use Centre facilities; attend and take part in training activities, briefings, and lectures; as well as other appropriate peacekeeping-related activities. Visiting Fellows would be expected to record their activities as a Cornwallis Group Monograph on Peacekeeping Studies.
- The establishment of a semi-annual journal, tentatively to be called *The Peacekeeping Journal*, that would be published in English and French.
- The undertaking of preliminary studies on training effectiveness with members of the Pearson Centre staff.

**FUTURE WORKSHOPS:
CORNWALLIS V AND VI**

We also look forward with excitement to *Cornwallis V: Analysis of Crisis Response and Societal Reconstruction*, to be held from 17 to 20 April 2000. Please see the web site mentioned above for the call and program of that meeting. For those of you who plan well in advance, think also of *Cornwallis VI: Analysis, Measures, and Metrics of Success*, the preliminary theme for the workshop to be held from 9 to 12 April 2001 at the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre.