

The Way Forward: Punishment, Deterrence, and Peace Building

Professor David F. Davis
Program on Peacekeeping Policy
The School of Public Policy
George Mason University
Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.
e-mail: ddavis@gmu.edu.

Professor A.E.R. Woodcock, Ph.D.
George Mason University
School of Public Policy
Fairfax and Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.
e-mail: woodcock@erols.com

For 10 years most written work and many discussions surrounding Peace Operations, Operations Other Than War, Small Scale Contingencies and other similar subjects have usually started with “Since the end of the cold war....” We looked at the period between 1988 and 1992 as some great phase transition in the types of interventions that were occurring throughout the world. What we now call Cornwallis I had the name: Analytic Approaches to the Study of Future Conflict. We have continued our themes around these subjects going through: Analysis for and of the Resolution of Conflict, Analysis of Peace Operations, Analysis of Civil Military Interactions, Analysis for Crisis Response and Societal Reconstruction and now Analysis for Assessment, Evaluation, and Crisis Management. The theme for Cornwallis VII was announced in the summer of 2001 as Analysis for Compliance and Peace Building. Thus the general motivation for the Cornwallis Group Workshops has continued.

We are writing this piece in early January 2002. On 11 September of 2001 Davis was participating in a workshop in Garmish Partekirchen for the joint peacekeeping efforts of the Government of Moldova and the separate entity known as the Trans Niestra. We were all very pleased with ourselves that the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and US-German Marshall Center had brought together diplomats from Russia, the Ukraine, Moldova, Trans Niestra, Germany and the United States to spend time on this issue. The views at the foothills of the Bavarian Alps were amazing, it was a wonderful day – until shortly after lunch Central European Time. Now the papers, speeches, and discussions all start with “Since the attacks of 9/11....”

Many of us have lost comrades, acquaintances and colleagues in the Pentagon and in the World Trade Center. The operations in Afghanistan have consumed many of the participants in the Cornwallis Group in the global War on Terrorism. Whereas the transition in the late 80’s seemed to progress rather continuously, this transition on 9/11 was a discontinuous jerk to our safety and our psyche. So many of us asked the question: What does this mean to me and what I do? We extend this question to that of: What does this new era mean to the Cornwallis Group?

In October 2001 Mr. Robert Perito, a sometime participant in our group, wrote a short document entitled: *Is Peacekeeping Still Relevant?* Here are three paragraphs from that unpublished essay:

“... any evaluation of the continued relevance of US participation in peace operations must first acknowledge that ‘failed states’ and ethnic conflicts are the breeding ground for terrorists and terrorist organizations. Osama bin Laden’s movement found sanctuary and recruits in Sudan and Afghanistan, countries with seemingly intractable intra-state conflicts. Failure to deal with the aftermath of ethnic and religious conflict in ‘failed states’ invites continued conflict. Desperate people do desperate things. Desperate regimes look to terrorist organizations for financial and military support. One success of the peace implementation process in Bosnia was the agreement by Bosniak authorities to expel mujhideen fighters who had participated in the conflict, removing the possibility of Bosnia becoming a source of terrorist operations in western Europe.

In the days immediately following the September 11 attack, the US quickly began to assemble a coalition of countries to combat global terrorism. In response to US appeals for cooperation, countries as disparate as Russia and Saudi Arabia asked for increased US efforts to resolve regional conflicts as part of the price for their participation. These countries shared our concern over global terrorism, but they were also worried about local conflicts that threatened their security. While in the Middle East and Russia, US involvement may be largely political, in the Balkans, Africa and Southeast Asia, the desired US response must go beyond ‘peace making’ to peacekeeping and post conflict reconstruction. Whether in Macedonia or Indonesia, the long-term solution to these conflicts will involve US participation in peace operations that ensure sustainable security. It will not make the world safer, if in fighting terrorism, we leave the Balkans and other trouble spots to fester and breed organized crime, illicit trafficking, and other future threats to our security.

The Administration’s effort to assemble a global coalition has been accompanied by a debate within the US over the nature of the current conflict. Are we engaged in a “war” or in “law enforcement”? Clearly the US has been the victim of terrorism. The attack, however, was made by a non-state actor, Osama bin Laden’s al Qaeda Movement, which is now the subject of a congressional declaration of war. The US military is preparing for a punitive expedition against al Qaeda and its protector, the Taliban regime, in Afghanistan. This is not the first time the US has gone to war against non-state actors. Starting with the military action against the Barbary pirates, the US has fought rather than yield to intimidation. As our intention is to wage war against Osama bin Ladin, the need for peacekeeping and post-conflict political, social and economic reconstruction will inevitably follow. If we strike regimes that harbor terrorists, we must accept responsibility for the post-conflict consequences of military action. This will involve peacekeeping and the *utilization of the techniques and skills we have learned in previous operations* (emphasis added).”

“The Utilization of the techniques and skills we have learned in previous operations.” It is this sentence that helps answer our question. Even though the current War on Terrorism continues with success (though as of the writing of this note, bin Laden is still unaccounted for), there is a recognized need to approach Afghanistan, Somalia, Iraq, the Philippines, Indonesia and many other states with the process of rehabilitation and support for the rule of law and the democratic ideals of human rights and social justice. The growing consensus is that those responsible must be punished, that any future threats must be deterred, and – that the situations that supported and exacerbated the terrorist organizations must also be dealt with.

Punishment, Deterrence, and what is referred to as Peace Building must all be accomplished. Our challenge, those of us interested in the Cornwallis Group’s agenda, is to help our governments and our societies make the many tradeoffs that these three goals will put before us. The analytic skills that we bring to bear have continued use in the post 9/11 world. The Cornwallis Group has continued relevance in the post 9/11 world and the theme for Cornwallis VII can now be seen in slightly brighter light — Analysis for Compliance and Peace Building.

We are fortunate this year to have announced the keynote presenters for Cornwallis VII prior to the publishing of the Cornwallis VI proceedings. They are Dame Margaret Anstee, a major force in the United Nations and former Secretary General’s Special Representative in Angola and Ambassador Robert W. Farrand, the former Deputy High Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Administrator of the critical city of Brcko. Their insight and contributions will be very welcome at the workshop in March 2002.

We look forward to Cornwallis VII, the first Cornwallis Group meeting of the new era. What will it bring? What are the tradeoffs between Punishment/Deterrence/Peace Building? How can we better understand the nature of Compliance with agreements and international norms? What is the role of the analyst in the answering of these questions? Come to Cornwallis VII and help us find the answers.