

The Cornwallis Group X: Analysis for New and Emerging Societal Conflicts

Alexander E.R. Woodcock, Ph.D.

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

Alexander E.R. (Ted) Woodcock is Director of the Societal Dynamics Research Center and a Senior Research Professor in the School of Public Policy at George Mason University. Previously he was Chief Scientist and Vice President at BAE SYSTEMS- Portal Solutions (formerly Synectics Corporation), Fairfax, Virginia. He is a Foreign Member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Military Sciences. Woodcock is also a Guest Professor at the National Defence College, Stockholm, Sweden, and was a Visiting Professor at the Royal Military College of Science, Shrivenham, England for 10 years. He is actively involved in the development and implementation of societal dynamics models of military, political, economic, and other processes for the modeling and analysis of low intensity conflict, peace and humanitarian operations, and related areas. Woodcock is Project Director for the Strategic Management System (STRATMAS) project that is producing a facility that uses genetic algorithms and intelligent automata methods for the definition and optimal deployment of civilian and military entities in peace and humanitarian operations. He is Chair, Proceedings Editor, and a Founding Member of the Cornwallis Group. Woodcock was a Fulbright Fellow and Research Associate in Biology at Yale University. He was an IBM (UK) Research Fellow in the Mathematics Institute at the University of Warwick in England and an IBM (World Trade) Research Fellow at IBM Research, Yorktown Heights, New York. He was a Visiting Scholar in biology on sabbatical leave at Stanford University. Woodcock has a Ph.D. in Biology and an M.Sc. in Biophysics from the University of East Anglia in England, as well as a B.Sc. (with honours) in Physics from Exeter University in England. He is a Full Member of Sigma Xi.

SESSION I—SESSION CHAIR: PROFESSOR ALEXANDER WOODCOCK, Ph.D.

A *Foreword* to this volume has been provided by Professor David Davis, the Founding Chair of The Cornwallis Group. Davis is also Director of the Peace Operations Policy Program, George Mason University, Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A. The *Introduction to the Cornwallis Group Workshop: The Analysis for New and Emerging Societal Conflicts* is presented below by Alexander E. R. Woodcock, Ph.D., Chair of The Cornwallis Group and Senior Editor of these proceedings. Woodcock is also Senior Research Professor and Director, The Societal Dynamics Research Center, School of Public Policy, Mason George University, Fairfax and Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.

The Tenth Cornwallis Group Workshop: *Analysis for New and Emerging Societal Conflicts* was held at the Royal Military College of Canada and the Group is most grateful for

the hospitality and support provided to the Group by College personnel as well as by members of the Canadian Department of National Defence and other officials and individuals. The Workshop consisted of the customary Civilian and Military Keynote Papers by invited speakers as well as a series of papers that illustrate the general theme of societal conflict. A new activity for the Cornwallis Workshop consisted of a series of most interesting and informative panels organized by the Canadian Department of National Defence. The Workshop concluded with the customary Cornwallis Round Table where participants could reflect on the Workshop and make suggestions for future activities of the Group.

SESSION II – SESSION CHAIR: PAUL CHOUINARD, Ph.D.

Session II was chaired by Paul Chouinard, Ph.D. and consisted of Welcoming Remarks by Colonel W. N. Peters and a paper by John Mackinlay, Ph.D.

Welcoming Remarks were given by Colonel W.N. Peters, CD, Deputy Commandant and Director of Cadets Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. Colonel Peters observed that these proceedings record some of the work of the tenth annual Cornwallis Group Seminar, a series that began in 1994 at the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre in Cornwallis Nova Scotia. It was hosted at the Royal Military College of Canada for the first time this year. Both this year's focus on measures of effectiveness in civil-military cooperation and the long track record of practical scholarship for which the Cornwallis Group is responsible are important to the Royal Military College, to Canadians in uniform, and to peace and security. I am happy to use this opportunity to link the intellectual contributions of the Seminars to the unceasing work of the College, and that of its allies in universities and the defense science community.

Defeating Complex Insurgency was presented by John Mackinlay, Ph.D., Kings College London, England, United Kingdom. Dr. Mackinlay observed that when conventional forces led by the US attacked the Iraqi army in 1991 and 2003, their success emphasised the value of effects based warfare and the manoeuvrist approach, especially the need to take the initiative and apply constant pressure on the enemy. However expectations that Western military forces, could exploit this approach and their technical advantages, have not been realised in the campaigns to stabilise and rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan. In both cases attrition, rather than manoeuvre, has characterised the coalition campaign. The central proposition of the paper is that, in addition to the short term problems facing coalition forces and the humanitarian/ development agencies in Iraq and Afghanistan, there are fundamental reasons why the international response in both theatres cannot adopt a more manoeuvrist approach.

SESSION III – SESSION CHAIR: GEORGE ROSE, Ph.D.

Session III was chaired by George Rose, Ph.D., and consisted of papers by Robert Bailey and Ms. Alexandra Hall; Sandy Babcock, S. Anders Christensson, and Colonel Christopher T. Mayer.

Building a Scenario-Based Analysis Method for New and Emerging Societal Conflicts Drawing on International Relations, Military Planning, and Operations Analysis by Robert

Bailey and Ms. Alexandra Hall, System Consultants Services Ltd., The Court House, Northfield End, Henley-on-Thames, Oxfordshire, England, United Kingdom. The paper starts with two contrasting mission types (familiar to the authors through analysis) – Crisis Containment – an example of intra-state conflict and Collective Defence – an example of inter-state conflict. The paper describes a logical route from state history, including a ‘future history’ to provide the circumstances to stimulate a future conflict scenario, through an analysis of the causes and effects and invocation of a UN mandate, legitimising intervention.

A Framework for Integrating Civil-Military Responses to Conflict: Network Enabled Operations in Support of Defence, Diplomacy and Development was presented by Mr. Sandy Babcock, Defence Scientist, Directorate Defence Analysis National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. The paper provides an overview of policy and initiatives taken to date, examine two case studies and lessons learned related to integrating defence, diplomacy and development efforts, some of the issues associated with the establishment of a collaborative approach, are detailed and a proposed Network Enabled Operations framework intended to resolve these issues is outlined.

Are Diplomatic, Information, and Economic Resource Planning Consistent with Military Planning for Operations? by Mr. S Anders Christensson, Project Manager, Swedish National Defence College, Department for War Studies, Research and Development Division, Stockholm, Sweden. Christensson notes that the demands on time, the complexity of operations and the possible devastating outcome of operation that causes life, infrastructure and other values have forces the military to develop their unique structures. These structures are used in defensive and offensive operations. The civilian side, on other hand, has developed and used different types of structures for planning their operations. If military and civilian operations need to be planned using DIME (Diplomatic-, Information- Military- and Economic-) based resources then they need to work together. There is a need to find a strategy for synchronizing these different structures to leverage into effects that can generate desired end states. This paper describes a research and development effort that has focused on the solution of such problem since 1996 as well as results from other ongoing activities.

Privatizing Peacekeeping: The Growing Prominence of Private Military Companies in Conflict and Crisis by Colonel Christopher T. Mayer, U.S. Army, Chief of Staff, Defense Reconstruction Support Office The Pentagon, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. Colonel Mayer observes that Private Military Companies are a logical development in the concept of “contractors on the battlefield.” They provide an economy of force to regular armed forces accomplishing security and training functions. Properly used, they are a bridge between security operations inherent to the decisive combat phase of a complex contingency and the time when the civilian government is able to resume effective domestic security operations. However, the potential of PMCs to make a positive contribution in complex contingencies depends on careful planning and effective risk management, and common understanding of PMC capabilities and limitations by military planners, Humanitarian Relief Organizations and the PMC industry.

SESSION IV – SESSION CHAIR: PROFESSOR DAVID DAVIS

Session IV was chaired by Professor David Davis and consisted of the Civilian Keynote by Pauline H. Baker, Ph.D., other papers were presented by Thomas Schmidt, Richard E. Hayes,

Ph.D., Margaret Daly Hayes, Ph.D., and Donald G. Owen; Rena Salayeva and Michael J. Baranick, Ph.D.; and Michael J. Baranick, Ph.D.; and Rena Salayeva,

Civilian Keynote—Threat Convergence and Failing States: A New Agenda for Analysts was presented by Pauline H. Baker, Ph.D. The Fund for Peace, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. Dr. Baker reiterated the necessity for analysts to pursue a new agenda – one that integrates the expertise we have into a larger and more holistic understanding of how the post 9/11 world works. Let us build on the existing consensus by pushing the frontiers of research further into an analysis of “threat convergence” – the intersections between WMD proliferation, terrorism and failing states. Had we done this earlier, we might have avoided the situation in which the U.S. Secretary of State needs to press the President of Pakistan for more information from an alleged rogue scientist who is believed to have supplied Iran and Libya with assistance in developing nuclear weapons technologies as far back as 18 years before it was discovered.

The Joint Operational Environment was presented by Mr. Thomas Schmidt. Futures Directorate, DCSINT, Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), HQ TRADOC, ATIN-IC, Fort Monroe, Virginia, U.S.A. The paper describes the purpose and content of the *Joint Operational Environment (JOE)* as it supports Joint Force Experimentation. The JOE is not intended to compete with existing intelligence analyses. Rather, the JOE frames a range of possible futures, providing the context for joint and service experiments and concept development. It identifies the trends that will shape our future operational environment and those critical variables that will define that environment. A critical examination of these trends and variables leads one to conclude that future conflict will not be resolved through a military confrontation alone, but rather through the resolution of conflicting societal and/or cultural elements. The JOE, together with other evolving Joint concepts, addresses our need to identify this friction and consider it along with the traditional military planning factors.

Humanitarian, Peace, and Reconstruction Operations: The More Things Change, the More They Stay the Same was presented by Richard E. Hayes, Ph.D., Margaret Daly Hayes, Ph.D., and Donald G. Owen Evidence Based Research, Inc., Vienna, Virginia, U.S.A. In this paper, EBR has created an integrated discussion of the enduring principles that underlie successful coalition efforts in humanitarian, peace, and reconstruction operations based on both its own research and the best of the other material that has been created over the past decade. This stresses both generating useful measures that relate to the effects based operations necessary (reaching across the full set of instruments of power and influence), development of appropriate sets of metrics, identifying the conceptual models needed for successful analyses, generating the types of data information necessary, and also specifying the types of tools that can be helpful. This effort looks at conflicts based on ethnicity, religious differences, and ideology.

Addressing Terrorist Threats in Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan: Winning Hearts and Minds was presented by Rena Salayeva, Attache, Security Affairs Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Azerbaijan, Baku, Azerbaijan and Michael J. Baranick, Ph.D., Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. The paper observes that the radical ideology of Islamist fundamentalists espoused by Osama Bin Laden and his transnational network presents a rising threat to global security, particularly in countries undergoing political, social, and economic transformation. Such weak or failed states with their corrupt political institutions, lack of political freedoms, poor economic conditions, high unemployment, and social dissatisfaction and marginalization are

the most vulnerable to radical Islamic movements and may provide fertile ground for sowing the seeds of religious radicalism. In addition, the burgeoning national security threat weak states pose inevitably will have detrimental regional and global implications. Two such examples can be found in Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan—Muslim countries newly emerging after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Both Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan have undergone Islamic revival after decades of Soviet religious repression and both share a common “starting point” in terms of the existing political, social and economic infrastructure.

State-Building in a Transition Period: The Case of Azerbaijan was presented by Michael J. Baranick, Ph.D., Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. and Rena Salayeva, Security Affairs Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Azerbaijan, Baku, Azerbaijan. The paper observes that in the aftermath of the breakup of the Soviet empire in late 1991, Azerbaijan embarked on a course to shake off the remnants of communism, defend its survival and build a politically and economically viable state. This paper traces the varied political, economic and social challenges Azerbaijan faced in its transition from socialism to capitalism. The transition period in Azerbaijan has been protracted and was complicated by the conflict with Armenia over Nagorno-Karabakh as well as the inability of the political elite to instill democratic rules and values to the government institutions.

SESSION V: CANADIAN DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE PANELS

Session V, the Canadian Department of National Defence Panels, consisted of the Military Keynote by Major-General Walter Natynczyk and papers by Alden Skidd, Captain Graham M Longhurst, Colonel Christopher J. Holshek, Martin R Kaye, Christian Leuprecht, Ms. Michele Fisher and Lieutenant Colonel Mark Syvret, Michael A. Hennessy, Ph.D., Andrea Charron, and Larry Wentz and Stuart Starr, Ph.D. Papers by Lieutenant Colonel Ulrich Scholz and Benjamin Zyla. and David Last, Ph.D., were submitted after the conference at the request of the Senior Editor

The Military Keynote—Actionable Statistics was presented by Major-General Walter Natynczyk, OMM, CD, Commander, Land Force Doctrine and Training, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. The topic of the Military Keynote presentation was “Actionable Statistics” and General Natynczyk focused on how the staff of Combined Joint Task Force 7 (CJTF 7) in Baghdad last year used statistics as indicators of what was happening in their area of responsibility.

The Evolving role of Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) Operations in the 3D Approach was presented by Alden Skidd, William Goodenough House, Mecklenburgh Square, London, England, United Kingdom. Mr Skidd observes that governments are increasingly moving towards a 3-dimensional approach to international affairs, integrating defence, development, and diplomacy. This blurring of traditional spheres of influence has caused a certain degree of inter-agency tension. Military personnel are increasingly being called upon to provide both security-sector and developmental assistance in war-torn societies. This has caused considerable concern in the development community. The employment of Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) personnel is of particular concern to the development community, who are apprehensive about the military encroachment into their traditional area of responsibility.

This paper seeks to address some of the difficulties in integrating policy, focusing on how to improve the efficacy of CIMIC units and enhance the 3D approach.

Evolution of Canadian Forces Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) was presented by Captain Graham M Longhurst, Diversity Officer, Canadian Forces Recruiting Center Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Captain Longhurst observed that Canadian Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) is evolving and endeavouring to define itself. The success of CIMIC cells attached to military operations over the past few years has necessitated the defining of policy and procedures for this burgeoning area within the military. With success, comes an increasing scrutiny of how the business of CIMIC is being conducted and whether it's being conducted at the same professional level across the military. This paper is being written with the hope that those in the trenches will continue to influence the direction of this evolution.

Civil-Military Measures of Effectiveness: What's It All About? was presented by Colonel Christopher J. Holshek (U.S.A.), U.S. Army Civil Affairs. Colonel Holshek observed that civil-military cooperation and coordination is an essential element of success in all international interventions, regardless of the type of intervention, its placement on the spectrum between peace and war, or its political cachet. The operations of the "post 9/11" period have only served to reinforce this understanding. Because, however, of the increased complexity, dynamism and danger of these interventions, civil-military operations, at the heart of synergizing success in stability and reconstruction operations, are likewise more difficult, not only to plan, execute and coordinate, but to measure their progress. How do we know when we are doing well in civil-military operations? While there has been a great body of work emerging on determining, quantifying and qualifying success in military operations and in civilian humanitarian relief and reconstruction efforts, how do you measure success in an endeavor that takes place in an increasingly dynamic and complex operational environment involving stability, antiterrorism and counterinsurgency operations, and that is predominantly psychological rather than physical, often defying empirical quantification?

A Structured Framework for Expressing Requirements and Assessing Solutions was presented by Martin R Kaye, Operational Analysis Department (W392), Air Systems, BAE SYSTEMS, Warton Aerodrome, Preston, England, United Kingdom. Kaye presented a framework, called EURECA™, as the basis for analysing activities in the context of new and emerging societal conflicts. EURECA™ was developed as a suitable mechanism to structure and bound requirements analysis, and provide a high-level assessment of possible systems solutions in a military context. The paper notes how the growing military interest in an Effects Based Approach to Operations (EBAO) is entirely consistent with Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC). A significant challenge in both EBAO and CIMIC is how to measure the effectiveness of the operations and actions that are undertaken. It is suggested that Maslow's model of the 'Hierarchy of Human Needs' is a suitable mechanism for identifying and representing Measures of Effectiveness (MOE).

Demographic Change, Pluralism, and Ethno-cultural Diversity: Implications for Civil-Military Co-operation was presented by Christian Leuprecht, Royal Military College of Canada, and Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. Leuprecht observes that the "war on terrorism" has "securitized" many visible-minority diasporas in advanced democracies. He makes a case for inverting this paradigm. Rather than marginalizing them as security threats, He posits diasporas as a rich human-resource potential waiting to be tapped for the skills and talents it has to offer in support of peace, stability, and security operations. After some introductory remarks about demographic trends in advanced liberal-

democracies and the relationship between these trends and regions on which the national-security interests of these countries converge, the author advances some propositions as to why diasporas should be harnessed more systematically in support of the national interest and how this might be done. He then proceeds to examine how to operationalize this proposition.

A NATO Collective Strategy Proposal and Practical Planning and Analysis Experiences from Operations in Afghanistan was presented by Ms. Michele Fisher, Operational Analysis Special Staff, NATO, Allied Joint Forces Command Brunssum (JFCB), The Netherlands, and Lieutenant Colonel Mark Syvret, RM J9 Civil Military Co-operation NATO, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE), Belgium. Fisher and Syvret observe that NATO's strategic concept describes how the assets of member Nations are to be co-ordinated and focused to achieve security goals using diplomatic and military instruments of power. It recognises that coherence of economic components of strategy between member nations is also key, as is the international community working in concert. NATO, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) continues to develop a collective strategy doctrine proposal and linkages to appropriate management and operational planning tools. The proposal is underpinned by academic research and NATO experience on operations in the Balkans and Afghanistan. A collective strategy uses a framework to comprehend the interdependencies of the security, governance, economic, social and human societal domains and to chart the long term coordinated action agreed by the key stakeholders; local governance and the international community. The approach enables consultation, co-operation and co-ordination and seeks to create a self-sustaining secure environment.

Counterinsurgency Lessons from Vietnam was presented by Michael A. Hennessy, Ph.D., Royal Military College of Canada Kingston, Ontario, Canada. Hennessy observes that the Vietnam experience yields many examples worth considering. Nation Building held many innate contradictions that do not appear to be unique to the case at hand. Election and constitutional reform in the face of open rebellion proved and promises to remain tension ridden and a sever test of trust between the host government and its reform minded benefactor. Pacification covered a range of actions and activities requiring cooperation and coordination between allies and among forces of the state—civil and military. Forging the connecting links took time and wasted valuable time and resources before effective coordination took effect. Even then assumptions about the ability of the host government to provide security forces of sufficient numbers and satisfactory stamina often proved overly optimistic. The USMC CAP program offered one clear means of stiffing their backbone, but entailed its own costs and limitations. That local security appeared the most important element in swaying or keeping local loyalties became recognized relatively early, providing both psychological and physical security proved far more difficult.

The Iraqi Prisoner Scandals: Beware the Amity of Public Opinion was presented by Andrea Charron, The Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. Charron observes that civil-military relations are worthy of serious study because, as Hew Strachan remarks, the “dash in the title is [not free] of the tension with which it is customarily associated.” The triangle of relations between civil authorities, the military and civil society is fraught with the tension, in the form of critical questioning, between authority (the civilian leaders), execution (the military) and expectations (civil society). The author suggests that tension between the military and civil society can be useful but has been absent of late, especially in the United States (US). The paper hopes to contribute to the literature by examining the reactions of the American public to the Abu Ghraib prison scandal involving American service men and women and the British public reaction to the Basra detainee

scandal involving British soldiers in order to probe the nature of public opinion vis-à-vis the armed forces.

Information Communications Technology (ICT) Support to Complex Emergencies was presented by Larry Wentz and Stuart Starr, Ph.D., Center for Technology and National Security Policy National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. Wentz and Starr observed that the components of civil-military coordination consist of information sharing, task sharing and joint planning. The challenges include issues such as intelligence versus information, military classification versus civilian need for transparency, command and control of military versus civilian elements, and compatibility of planning tools, processes and cultures. Critical areas for coordination are security, logistics, communications, transportation and information. The sharing of information is particularly critical for complex emergencies because no single responding entity can be the source of all of the necessary information. Making critical information widely available to responding civilian and military elements not only reduces duplication of effort, but also enhances coordination and provides a common knowledge base so that critical information can be pooled, analyzed, compared, contrasted, validated and reconciled. Civil-military collaboration networks for supporting responses to complex emergencies need to be designed to dismantle traditional institutional stovepipes, to facilitate the sharing of information among civilian and military organizations, to capture lessons learned and best practices, and to provide a common knowledge base for the responding civil-military community of interest.

Europe's Military Capability in Crisis Management by Lieutenant Colonel Ulrich Scholz, Centre for International Relations, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada and Benjamin Zyla, Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. Scholz and Zyla observe that the term crisis management is very closely associated with managing conflicts, especially violent conflicts. Conflict usually occurs when two or more states disagree over territorial issues or other issues that have an affect on their country. Nations can be in dispute over economic, security, or environmental issues. These conflicts can be domestic or international and usually touch on differences in opinions and interests. If a non-violent conflict results in violence, diplomacy by definition failed. Research in understanding international conflict has shown that international conflicts have a life cycle of four stages. Not all conflicts pass through these stages, but the intensity of the conflict itself can increase and make the next step more likely.

Rapid Assessment Process (RAP) and Security Sector Reform by Lieutenant Colonel David Last, Ph.D., Registrar / Secrétaire général Royal Military College of Canada, Collège militaire royal du Canada, Kingston, Ontario, Canada. Last observed that Ellen Messer of the World Hunger Program at Brown University argues that RAP has made a significant contribution to the elimination of world hunger, by focusing efforts effectively (Messer, 2004). Not everyone agrees with her. Where it has been espoused as an alternative to other means of project evaluation it has been resisted by those who point to lack of precision and a freewheeling style that can have enormously varying utility. Despite this, it is gaining ground as a suite of helpful tools to guide action in difficult and often dangerous circumstances. We should think of it as a framework for field experiments to improve human security, and if it is working in fields as diverse as agricultural development, community medicine and sexual health, then we should consider applying it to Security Sector Reform.

SESSION VI –SESSION CHAIR: S. ANDERS CHRISTENSSON

Session IV was chaired by S. Anders Christensson and consisted of papers by Jon Parkman, Howard Body, and Simon Pearson; Charis Snell; Ian M. Mitchell; and Hugh Richardson.

Approaches for the Modelling of Stabilisation Operations was presented by Jon Parkman (Dstl), Howard Body (Dstl), and Simon Pearson (BH Partners), Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl), Policy and Capability Studies, Ively Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, England, United Kingdom. The authors observed that Stabilisation Study aims to analyse contemporary and future Military interventions and the resultant stabilisation operations in order to highlight the force structure implications of such operations. This will be achieved by developing a methodology to analyse said operations in the context of a wider, cross-government response, which will inform UK force structure planning. This paper aims to describe a high-level model for representing stabilisation operations currently in development, including the various strands of work which are being combined to provide insight and information to the design team.

The DIAMOND Peace Support Operations Model – Lessons from an Iraq scenario was presented by Charis Snell, Policy and Capability Studies, Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, Ively Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, England, United Kingdom. Snell observed that the DIAMOND model is a high level simulation model, designed to examine multi-party peace support operations scenarios at the campaign level, with various different relationships and rules of engagement between the parties. Originally designed to look at operations in Bosnia, new and emerging conflicts such as the current operations in Iraq pose additional challenges for the DIAMOND model. A scenario based on the ongoing operations in Iraq has been implemented and analysed in DIAMOND to assess the capability of the model to represent insurgency campaigns within a peacekeeping scenario. DIAMOND can also be used to shape data collection from Operations Other Than War (OOTW), by providing an indication of what data should be collected and why. A Data Quality Scoring System has been developed which can help structure and assess the value of the data gathered for analysis use. The future development of DIAMOND will build upon lessons already learnt and aim to incorporate more of the difficult civilian and cross-party tension aspects of peace support operations.

A Science of Better Society: The Place of Operational Research Analysis in the Resolution of Societal Conflict and Regeneration by Ian M. Mitchell, Defence Science and Technology Laboratory Porton Down, Wiltshire, England, U.K. Mitchell considered the broader problem space of rebuilding damaged societies as part of a broader continuum of societal health. It identifies the organisational and physical faultlines fragmenting this space. Methods to bridge these gaps are described. These are based on experiences of Operational Research interventions and recent local initiatives for regeneration. The paper considers what enablers are required for greater contribution by the analytical communities. Outputs of past Cornwallis meetings suggest scope for analysis. The paper discusses technical approaches. It recognises that a new inclusive approach to the management of analysis may be required. It seeks to promote discussion on these technical, social and organisational issues.

HQ ARRC Confrontation and Collaboration Analysis (CCA) Trial was presented by Hugh Richardson. OBE, Head, Operational Analysis Branch, Headquarters ARRC, Rheindahlen, Germany. Richardson described the preparation of key leaders for meetings and

negotiations that has been recognised by HQ ARRC as an area requiring improvement. HQ ARRC, with assistance from the Joint Warfare Centre (JWC) trialed Confrontation and Collaboration Analysis (CCA) on Exercise ARRCAD GUARD 05 during 7 – 11 March 2005. CCA is a tool that can assist in the preparation of key leaders for external engagements with co-operative and non-compliant parties. During Phase 2 of the exercise a number of staff officers, Majors and Lieutenant Colonels (OF3 / OF4) were trained in the use of the CCA technique to enable a CCA Team to form up during Phase 3 of the exercise in order to support 4 x negotiations involving key leaders. Concurrently during Phase 2, the key leaders who were to carry out the negotiations and other senior staff officers were provided with a detailed introduction to the CCA technique.

SESSION VII –SESSION CHAIR: LARRY WENTZ

Session V was chaired by Larry Wentz and consisted of papers by Andrew Hossack and Karthik Sivasankaran, Eugene P. Visco, and George Rose, Ph.D.

Success Factors in CT/COIN Campaigns: Preliminary Results Arising From Current Research was presented by Andrew Hossack, Ph.D. and Karthik Sivasankaran, Policy and Capability Studies Department, Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl), UK Ministry of Defence (MoD), Farnborough, Hampshire, England, United Kingdom. Hossack and Sivasankaran observed that presents preliminary results from the initial phase of an ongoing research programme to better understand both the static and dynamic factors associated with the successful prosecution of Counter-Terrorist/Counter-Insurgency (CT/COIN) campaigns by states and their security forces. In this initial phase of work, an interim sample of 18 historical and ongoing COIN campaigns have been analysed as static points to provisionally identify qualitative and quantitative factors that are statistically correlated with campaign outcome. A number of observations and minor results arising from this analysis are discussed, including some observations concerning the correlations between force measures and campaign success. In addition, a number of generic state and security forces' success factors (attributes, capabilities, civil, military and legal strategies etc) that have been tested for association with campaign success are ranked according to the strength of their *current* correlations. Finally, the anticipated direction of the overall research programme over the next several years is described.

More Than You Ever Wanted to Know About Keynotes was presented by Eugene P. Visco, Fort Meyers, Florida, U.S.A. Visco reviews the keynote addresses for the nine meetings of the Cornwallis Group. Visco makes no apologies for any biases that may be displayed. For some of the symposia there were two keynote talks, one designated a military talk and the other a civilian talk; often the military address was presented by a retired senior officer. At the end of the review Visco provides some observations and suggestions, not conclusions and recommendations.

Review of Cornwallis Workshops I to IX (1996 – 2004) was presented by George Rose, Ph.D., Group Leader, Support to Operations, Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, United Kingdom and Mr. Mat Brazier, Operations Support Analyst Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, United Kingdom. Rose and Brazier observed that the Cornwallis Workshops began in 1996 and they have taken place yearly since then. A considerable body of knowledge in the general area of Peace Support Operations now exists as the Proceedings

of the Workshops. In addition over 200 attendees have had experience of the Cornwallis concept. To help focus discussions at the tenth Cornwallis Workshop on the future direction of the Workshops a study was carried out to investigate the breadth of analyses of presented papers and to elicit opinions from attendees as to the usefulness of the Workshops.

**SESSION VIII —SESSION CHAIR: PROFESSOR
ALEXANDER WOODCOCK, Ph.D.**

Professor Davis, the Founding Chair of the Cornwallis Group has provided some *Final Thoughts* on the Tenth meeting of the Group. Beginning with the Deputy Commandant of the Royal Military College. The theme, *Analysis for New and Emerging Societal Conflicts* has been well covered. Davis was especially taken by John Makinlay's discussion of counter insurgency and its relation to what is also called a Peace Operation. It was also pleasant to have our second Key Note presented by the President of the Fund for Peace, Dr. Pauline Baker. Her treatment of failing states was direct and analytic. The military analysis community had much to learn from her. However, the takeaway for Davis was her comment. "Structured imagination does not flourish in bureaucracies."

Davis observes that the week was full of good papers, good discussions and good networking. On the Thursday, as always, Dr. Woodcock held a round table. This roundtable allowed all of the participants to add to the discussion. Some of the themes were similar to previous themes: more interaction in small group work, More discussion of measures and metrics, we need to diversify the participants, even more, and civil-military issues continue to come up.

The key outcome was that Cornwallis continues to be a useful activity for its participants. It is up to all of us who plan it and present at it to ensure that this continues. There will be a *Cornwallis XI: Analysis for Civil-Military Transitions*. This workshop is scheduled for April 2006 in Boiling Springs, Pennsylvania, just south of Carlisle. The US Army's Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute will associate with the Cornwallis XI workshop for the first time and our support from the Pearson Peacekeeping Center will continue. In fact, plans are already ongoing for workshops beyond 2006. The Cornwallis Group has been useful and innovative; its ten volumes of proceedings have become the touch-stones of the community.

Professor Davis hopes that those of you who read this will join in our work.