

---

## Analysis for Governance and Stability: Concluding Remarks

Professor David F. Davis

Peace Operations Policy Program  
The School of Public Policy  
George Mason University  
Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.  
e-mail: ddavis@gmu.edu.

Professor Alexander E.R. Woodcock, Ph.D.

Societal Dynamics Research Center  
School of Public Policy  
George Mason University,  
Fairfax and Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.  
e-mail: aerw@gmu.edu

By now we hope you have enjoyed reading these proceedings, the many very interesting articles of *Cornwallis VIII: Analysis for Governance and Stability*. At the end of which we were able to hold, as we always do, a roundtable of all the participants. We asked them questions about what they think were most important aspects of Cornwallis and what should be the theme of the next Cornwallis. This is just a quick look at some of the responses.

- More interaction in small-group work. This has been a continuing theme. At Cornwallis IX, we believe we are going to change the program so that there is more small group work every day instead of only on the Wednesday.
- More discussion of measures and metrics. Another continuing theme. How do we know if a certain procedure has worked or if a mission is successful? Identifying the measures to take and the metrics to monitor is central to analysis. Of course, knowing how to combine these measures from the bottom up is also an ongoing area of research.
- We need to diversify, even more, the participants. We should attempt to get some Islamic scholars or cultural experts to attend. Cornwallis has a reputation for bringing in a multidisciplinary group of people. However, it is still predominantly military analysts. We need to bring in more non-governmental operators, more diplomats, scholars and practitioners from different disciplines.
- Civil-military issues continue to come up. There is a frustration growing in that the discussion of civil military relationships and how the military, governmental and non-governmental civilians work together – and how all the interveners work with the local civil society – seems to be yielding no new insights. There have been many discussions and workshops for almost a

decade on this subject. As one of the participants put it: “We just don't seem to know how to do it right, although talking about it is a cottage industry. Many people have been looking at it, books and articles, volumes of text have been written on it, but it still seems to be a huge problem. A problem revolving around trust and the understanding of what the other is doing.”

- We need to look at a more Middle East and Asian issues. Of course the War in Iraq refocused us dramatically in the direction of the Middle East, and will be a major portion of Cornwallis IX. Increasing attention should also be paid to emerging concerns in the Far East and Asia.
- Focusing more on the local dynamics. Another recurrent issue is conducting modeling and simulation of civil society as it is impacted by the interventions. Dr. Woodcock's work on societal dynamics as well as John Medhurst's and Ian Mitchell's mind mapping scenario building, may help to focus this kind of analysis.

Of course, while we were in the workshop, Afghanistan was ongoing, and Iraq was still at a high boil. Cornwallis VIII ended during the last week or two of the war in Iraq. For the next meeting, the group consensus was to look at post conflict, or post combat, efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Over the months since Cornwallis VIII, it has come to light that the planning and preparation for what is being called phase four in Iraq, was substandard or not conducted at all, or planning was conducted and the plan not followed, or that the plan on the civilian side was different than the plan on the military side. Without editorializing on what is actually the case in Iraq, what is true is that the military planning and preparation for the post combat portion of Iraq, phase four, seems to be much less detailed than the planning and preparation for phases one, two, and three.

In a later discussion with members of the United States Joint Staff it was clear that use of analytic tools was central to detailed course of action comparison and analysis. Tools were used for the preparation to go to Iraq, for the logistics required and for the many different options for tactical and operational alternatives. For this analysis, many different models, both in the United States the United Kingdom and in other governments, were put to use. What was missing was any kind of strong and useful analytic capability for the transition to phase four or for the activity of phase four. One joint staff officer said the plan was poor because we had no analysis to support it.

Given this lack of analysis and the blurring of the lines between peace operations reconstruction operations, intervention and counter terrorist operations the committee of Cornwallis decided on the theme for Cornwallis IX: *Analysis for Stabilization and Counter Terrorist Operations*. Although the theme and the direction for these two activities, stabilization and counter-terrorism, are focused differently, the activities that one would see on the ground seem to have a large overlap, and exploring that overlap is what we wish to do in Cornwallis IX.

The other major difference for Cornwallis IX is that it is going to be held in Stadtschailing, Austria. The Cornwallis group is not leaving the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, we will be back for Cornwallis X. This is an opportunity to bring in more European allies and for a simple change of pace.

---

Cornwallis IX: *Analysis for Stabilization and Counter Terrorist Operations* will be held from April 5 – 8, 2004 in Stadtschailing, Austria. The call for papers is available and we hope that those reading these proceedings will be able to join us in Austria and to participate in Cornwallis IX. The Cornwallis group is evolving — it has moved from a simple understanding of what peacekeeping is and how analysis can be done in support of peacekeeping to heavy-duty peace enforcement, reconstruction operations, stabilization and now counter-terrorism operations. What the future may hold we don't know. We hope that we can understand the analytic relationships and finally get a handle on how the civil society, civilian and military actors can cooperate, coordinate, and consult for some sort of consensus towards the common good of these international operations.

Looking forward to seeing you at the Burg, Stadtschailing, Austria.