

Civil-Military Interactions *

Alex Morrison

President
The Pearson Peacekeeping Centre
Cornwallis Park, Nova Scotia, Canada.
e-mail: amorriso@ppc.cdnpeacekeeping.ns.ca

Christine Vroom

Director of the Office of the President
The Pearson Peacekeeping Centre
Cornwallis Park, Nova Scotia, Canada.
e-mail: cvroom@ppc.cdnpeacekeeping.ns.ca

Alex Morrison, is President of the Lester B. Pearson Canadian International Peacekeeping Training Centre. He was Executive Director of The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies (CISS) and is now the CISS President. He was decorated with the Meritorious Service Cross by the Governor-General in recognition of his work on behalf of Canada and the United Nations. He also received an Award of Merit from the Secretary of State for External Affairs for his performance as a member of the Canadian delegation to the United Nations Security Council. In 1989 he retired from the Canadian Army after 34 years of service. Mr. Morrison was Minister-Counsellor at the Canadian Mission to the United Nations with special responsibility for matters concerning international security, arms control and disarmament, and peacekeeping. In particular, he negotiated with UN Headquarters officials and representatives of the countries concerned with regard to Canadian participation in new and existing peacekeeping operations. He was a member of the Security Council delegation, Rapporteur-General of the 1987 International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, President of the International Year of Peace Pledging Conference, Vice-President of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, and Canada's representative on the Ad Hoc Committee in the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. During the 43rd session of the General Assembly, Mr. Morrison was Chairman of the Barton Group, an international security and arms control body comprising twenty western nations. Mr. Morrison is founding Co-Chair of the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centres and continuing Secretariat Director. He was a special advisor to the Canadian delegation to the Fourth Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty held in Geneva. He is also a member of the Department of External Affairs Consultative Group on Disarmament and Arms Control Matters. He has served as a consultant to a number of governments and to the International Peace Academy on various aspects of peacekeeping. He is the author of numerous books and other publications. He taught at the Royal Military College of Canada, the Canadian Forces College, Columbia University, New York, York University, and at Glendon College of York University. Mr. Morrison is a graduate of Xavier Junior College, Mount Allison University (B.A.), Royal Military College of Canada (M.A.), and the Canadian Land Forces Command and Staff College.

Ms. Vroom is Director of the Office of the President , the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. Her responsibilities include preparation of and participation in presentations delivered by the President, follow-up activities that arise from meetings, and coordination of projects carried out by the Office of the President and her own programme of speaking engagements. Additionally, Ms. Vroom is the co-director of the secretariat for the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centres, which now has in excess of 360 members. Previously she has held positions at the Centre as Administrative and Production Assistant, Course Administrator, Programmes Production Manager responsible for production of all PPC study material and for publications. She is a member of the PPC Exercise Planning and Conduct Team. She has played a number of key roles in a Canadian-led international, inter-disciplinary, combined and joint peacekeeping exercises. She was a key member of the design, conduct, and assessment team for Exercise Spirited Flight, an AFCENT CJTF exercise conducted at the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre and was also responsible for civilian implementation of the exercise peace agreement which involved negotiation with senior American Generals and Admirals to ensure civilian-military cooperation was effected at the highest levels. Ms. Vroom is a graduate of Annapolis West Education Centre and of Annapolis Community College.

INTRODUCTION

We are very happy to be here today to participate in the fourth gathering of the Cornwallis Group. We will offer a presentation that we think asks very significant questions, some of which we think will be of interest to each of you. If they are, we hope that the Cornwallis Group will help us answer them.

- Is the international community developing a new international security, conflict resolution, peacekeeping paradigm? If that is so, what are some of the events that are causing a change?
- Will the United Nations be replaced by one or more other international, but not universal, organizations in the field of peace, security and stability?
- If there is a new paradigm, what will be its shape and methods of operation?
- What are some of the realities we must bear in mind when considering these questions?

It is now clear to us that the international peace and security paradigm appears to be undergoing a shift that will have major implications far into the future. That dramatic movement has yet to attract the attention we feel it deserves. Nor have the future implications of the shift received due theoretical or practical consideration. However, before we can answer these questions, or at the very least provide some opinions and information that might be useful in considering them we must first examine the framework within which civilian and military peacekeepers operate.

THE CIVIL-MILITARY OPERATIONS FRAMEWORK

The main element of the framework is the United Nations. There are now some 186 Member States of the United Nations and a number of observer missions from other countries, territories and entities. They all profess to act in accordance with the terms of the UN Charter, according to which they

"Confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

Chapter VI of the Charter Pacific Settlement of Disputes provides, in Article 34, that The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation, which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

However, Article 33 of the same chapter provides that:

The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

In Chapter VIII, Regional Arrangements, it is laid down quite clearly that :

"no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements without the authorization of the Security Council."

Until relatively recently in the history of the United Nations, the majority of international peace and security operations have been undertaken by the UN *qua* UN. In certain cases, individual countries, groups of countries, regional organizations or other organizations acting in the name of the UN or under the authority of the world body have established peacekeeping missions. Peacekeeping by proxy is the name given by the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre to that process.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has never considered itself to be a regional organization under the terms of Chapter VIII of the Charter. It has always maintained it is a defensive organization and it did not want to be grouped with others that might be engaged in offensive military operations. NATO is also cognizant of the fact that its North Atlantic Charter Article 5 responsibilities would be subject to the UN Security Council according to Chapter VII of the UN Charter if it were to declare itself a regional organization.

Yet NATO, has not, up until very recently, taken action in a non-Article 5 situation without authorization from the UN Security Council. Acting without that Council authority has been the subject of much discussion by the 16, and now 19, NATO members in recent years. There are indications that NATO's new Strategic Concept, to be unveiled and adopted

at the April, 1999 summit in Washington, DC, will deal with the subject in a way which will avoid or postpone a firm decision.

The current NATO military endeavour in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia may well be its first completely independent action in its 50 years of existence. It is being carried out without Security Council authorization or agreement, and in the absence of any other UN approval.

UNITED NATIONS RESPONSE TO THE NATO ACTION

Let us look at how the United Nations has responded to the NATO action. UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, on 24 March, made a 12 line, three paragraph statement entitled :

"Secretary-General, In Statement On NATO Military Action Against Yugoslavia, Acknowledges Use of Force May Be Sometimes Legitimate In The Pursuit Of Peace, But Stresses Security Council Should be Involved."

His words clearly chided NATO for its unilateral action.

After a 12 word introductory paragraph which noted this *"grave moment for the international community,"* the Secretary-General reviewed his actions over the past year in search of peace over war and noted that *"the Yugoslavian authorities have persisted in their rejection of a political settlement."* He concluded that paragraph by acknowledging *"It is indeed tragic that diplomacy has failed, but there are times when the use of force may be legitimate in the pursuit of peace."*

The final paragraph of the Secretary-General's statement begins by recalling Chapter VIII of the UN Charter and the role of regional organizations. It notes that:

"the Security Council has primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security."

and that NATO has recognized this in its own Charter. He concludes:

"Therefore the Security Council should be involved in any decision to resort to the use of force."

Mr. Annan's statement is interesting for many reasons. Let us examine some of its words and the order in which they occurred. Nowhere does he explicitly support the NATO bombing. The closest he comes is in saying,

"there are times when the use of force may be legitimate in the pursuit of peace."

NATO and others are interpreting these words as expressions of support. We are not sure they should be interpreted as such. Perhaps the best light in which they can be viewed is that of non-objection. In UN and diplomatic language, there is a great deal of difference in the

two interpretations. There are those who would take comfort that his sentiments regarding the use of force come before the final part of his statement.

The last paragraph is possibly the most interesting.

After noting that regional organizations have "*an important role*" under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, he is very clear that it is the Security Council which "*has primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security.*" Mr. Annan then points out that NATO recognizes this fact in the text of the North Atlantic Treaty. He concludes with a very pointed sentence: "*Therefore the Council should be involved in any decision to resort to the use of force.*" At no time has the UN explicitly approved the action of NATO in Kosovo and Serbia.

It is clear both from the unilateral NATO actions and the very firm, in diplomatic terms, response of the UN Secretary-General that we are witnessing the emergence of a more activist NATO, one that appears to have adopted a doctrine which some might think might be compared to Stalin's *cordon sanitaire*.

NATO has acted, and is still present in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Now it is undertaking massive military endeavours in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Tomorrow, action might well be undertaken in any of the countries bordering on one or more of the current or future NATO members. Indeed, the NATO Secretary-General has offered security guarantees to other nations, including Macedonia.

If we may be so bold, we will contend at this point that a new international security paradigm is beginning to emerge. In what direction it will develop depends on a number of factors. Among them are the wishes of UN Member States and whether NATO members feel they have first call on any disputes in or near their territory. Although it has been a few years since the term the near abroad has been in wide use in another context, some are now using it with regard to NATO and some non-NATO countries.

SIX REALITIES HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

In considering the form of this new paradigm, there are at least six realities to be taken into account.

1. *The first is the developing situation itself.* NATO officials feel that when considering the impact on the future of current approaches the new methods of operation must be accepted as reality. That is to say we should not judge current requirements and actions in the light of past experiences and practices. We should bear in mind that international conflict challenges of the future will be met with the mechanisms and modalities of the past, but also with new mechanisms. We do not know what they will be as we have yet to be met with those new challenges. Some feel we are being asked to satisfy, *ex post facto*, actions out of the ordinary with the ratification perhaps forming the foundation for future actions.

-
2. *Next is that national sovereignty will no longer be the barrier to international operations that it might have been in the past.* When he was UN Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali maintained that national sovereignty was never honoured in the absolute. A number of national government leaders contended that it is a concept whose time may well have passed. Many countries and the UN itself are beginning to realize that citizens ought not to be held hostage to what may, in the extreme, be an outmoded concept. Certainly, the UN has not shown a reluctance to be more interventionist. As well, the current NATO operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia certainly indicate that when it is determined that the human rights of citizens are being violated, there is a great will and capacity to act.
3. *This importance of human rights in international conflict resolution is the third reality.* The positive attitude and speed with which the military have accepted the important place of human rights in operations have been impressive. Indeed the June 1999 5th Annual Meeting of the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centres was devoted to that subject.
4. *The fourth reality is that of the importance of civilian/military relations.* Peacekeeping and other international conflict resolution operations have never really been exclusively military undertakings and, in the light of post Cold War developments, never will be. There must be a wide and a deep approach to contemporary and future challenges.

Civilians must be involved in every aspect of military concept development, policy and operational planning, implementation, conduct, assessment and refinement. Of course, the same is to be said for military participation in the civilian activities as well.

Civilian/military relations are divided into two categories. The term civilian/military relations covers two areas: the whole of the topic itself, and those aspects dealing with political, diplomatic, strategic, and higher operational matters. Civilian/military cooperation applies to operations at the operational and tactical levels.

5. *The fifth reality deals with both thought and action processes.* The term mission creep is being used in, and has acquired a pejorative meaning. It is employed by members of an individual discipline to protest against an increase in discipline-related tasks or the assigning of out-of-discipline undertakings. Those who criticize being given additional work maintain that the purity of their structure must be maintained. This attitude has resulted in civilian and military peacekeeping assets being under-utilized; this of course ensures that a comprehensive mission will not be completed and that individuals will surely suffer. We recommend that the term mission reality be adopted. It is much more positive in wording and more accurately reflects the conditions which ought to pertain.
6. *The last reality is that even a 19-member organization can reach agreement quicker than one with 185 Member States,* as is the case with the United

Nations. It is also true that many members of such a relatively small group can easily be swayed or worn down by one, or a few, of its states.

We must bear these six realities in mind as we deal with the challenges of present and future peacekeeping.

THE EFFORTS OF THE PEARSON PEACEKEEPING CENTRE

Let us now turn to the efforts of the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre in some of the areas we have raised. The Centre was established in 1994 to enhance the Canadian contribution to international peace, security and stability. Since commencing research, education and training activities in April of 1995, we have welcomed over 1500 individuals to our programmes of courses, seminars and research undertakings. Each educational effort of the PPC is based on a combination of three pillars.

THE CENTRE'S DEFINITION OF PEACEKEEPING

The first pillar is its definition of peacekeeping:

Actions designed to enhance international peace, security and stability which are authorized by competent national and international organizations and which are undertaken cooperatively and individually by military, humanitarian, good governance, civilian police and other interested agencies and groups.

This is a very wide and a very deep definition which encompasses activities ranging from inter-personal conflict resolution, through observer missions and classical peacekeeping of an inter-positional nature, UN Charter Chapter VII operations, democratic development, and all the way to post-conflict reconstruction and development. It emphasizes multi-disciplinary and international cooperation.

THE NEW PEACEKEEPING PARTNERSHIP

The second pillar used by the PPC in all of its endeavours is that of The New Peacekeeping Partnership:

The term applied to the military, government and non-government agencies dealing with humanitarian assistance, refugees and displaced persons, election monitors and media, and civilian police as they work together to improve the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations.

The New Peacekeeping Partnership is entirely consistent with the mission of the PPC and with its definition of peacekeeping. The NPP and the definition serve to emphasize that

peacekeeping is not a purely military activity, but is an undertaking best engaged in a cooperative manner by those who have been professionally trained.

THE PEACEKEEPING UMBRELLA

The third pillar is that of the Peacekeeping Umbrella.

The umbrella is a graphic representation of the activities conducted under the term peacekeeping. In addition to those mentioned above of a functional nature, the PPC definition of peacekeeping includes peacemaking, peace restoration, peace enforcement, peace monitoring, peace building, peace operations, peace support operations, preventive diplomacy, etc.

By bringing civilian and military officials, academics, non-governmental organization members, media personnel, democratic development officials and civilian police personnel to the PPC and teaching them, in university-recognized courses, specific aspects of peacekeeping writ large, we are constantly engaging them in challenging discussions on the future of international conflict resolution and peacekeeping. In addition, the cross-discipline discussions which result from being present in an educationally-fertile environment result in opinions and suggestions that will undoubtedly prove to be of benefit to theorists and practitioners alike.

In our presentation, we have posed a number of questions that need to be answered if we are to ensure an orderly modification of the current international security, conflict resolution, peacekeeping paradigm or an orderly transition to a completely new paradigm.

THE PEARSON PEACEKEEPING CENTRE, AND WE HOPE, THE CORNWALLIS GROUP

Let us now propose an arrangement by means of which these questions and others of importance to the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, and we hope, to the Cornwallis Group, might be answered:

We feel that there is a natural affinity between the Cornwallis Group and the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. We would like to propose a formal cooperative arrangement between the two organizations. The PPC, from time to time, has a requirement for answers to questions of a theoretical and conceptual nature in order to evaluate and assess our current programmes and ensure we offer material of cutting edge material. We do hope that the members of the Cornwallis Group will see fit to respond positively.

Recent events in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have illustrated the value of concerted, concentrated, cooperative action. It has also illustrated that the UN is a valued and valuable organization which continues to contribute to international peace, security and stability.

* Note: This paper has been updated to take account of events up until 21 June 1999.

-