Inevitable Conflicts, Avoidable Failures

PREPARING FOR THE THIRD GENERATION OF CONFLICT, STABILIZATION, AND RECONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS

Project Director
Robert D. Lamb

Author
Johanna Mendelson
  Forman

Contributing Author
Liora Danan

July 2012

50 YEARS | *CHARTING* OUR FUTURE

CSIS | CENTER FOR STRATEGIC & INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Inevitable Conflicts, Avoidable Failures

PREPARING FOR THE THIRD GENERATION OF CONFLICT,
STABILIZATION, AND RECONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS

Project Director
Robert D. Lamb

Author
Johanna Mendelson
  Forman

Contributing Author
Liora Danan

July 2012

50 YEARS | CHARTING OUR FUTURE

CSIS | CENTER FOR STRATEGIC &
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

About CSIS—50th Anniversary Year

For 50 years, the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has developed practical solutions to the world's greatest challenges. As we celebrate this milestone, CSIS scholars continue to provide strategic insights and bipartisan policy solutions to help decisionmakers chart a course toward a better world.

CSIS is a bipartisan, nonprofit organization headquartered in Washington, D.C. The Center's 220 full-time staff and large network of affiliated scholars conduct research and analysis and develop policy initiatives that look into the future and anticipate change.

Since 1962, CSIS has been dedicated to finding ways to sustain American prominence and prosperity as a force for good in the world. After 50 years, CSIS has become one of the world's preeminent international policy institutions focused on defense and security; regional stability; and transnational challenges ranging from energy and climate to global development and economic integration.

Former U.S. senator Sam Nunn has chaired the CSIS Board of Trustees since 1999. John J. Hamre became the Center's president and chief executive officer in 2000. CSIS was founded by David M. Abshire and Admiral Arleigh Burke.

CSIS does not take specific policy positions; accordingly, all views expressed herein should be understood to be solely those of the author(s).

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

INEVITABLE CONFLICTS, AVOIDABLE FAILURES
PREPARING FOR THE THIRD GENERATION OF CONFLICT, STABILIZATION, AND RECONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS

Johanna Mendelson Forman

Foreign internal conflicts are a permanent feature of the U.S. foreign policy landscape. The United States regularly participates in efforts to stabilize countries affected by conflict and to help them recover afterwards. Yet U.S. government officials and the American public in general have difficulty accepting the inevitability of U.S. involvement in such efforts.

Most U.S. military deployments since the end of the Cold War have been to participate in "small wars" or what the Department of Defense once called "operations other than war."[1] Yet the military has usually been more prepared to fight large, technologically advanced wars than smaller contingencies that require greater integration with civilian capacities. As a consequence, each time the U.S. military is deployed to a complex—but "small"—emergency, it has had to relearn lessons on the ground about the best way to manage these types of contingencies.

Civilian participation in stabilization and reconstruction efforts is likewise inevitable, but civilian institutions are even less prepared for such work than the military. Lessons learned over the last decade are only recently being institutionalized. In part this is due to bureaucratic politics. But in large part it is because government officials, Congress, and the American public do not acknowledge that the civilian expertise and resources needed to do this work is inadequate relative to the demand.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have colored perceptions about whether and how the United States should operate in conflict and post-conflict environments. In many ways, those wars were exceptional: the scale of effort, the number of troops deployed, the number of U.S. casualties, and the amount of money were all far higher than any other U.S. intervention since the war in Vietnam. Many in Washington have concluded that U.S. interventions will not come close to that size any time in the near future, and so the capabilities developed to participate in those conflicts need not be emphasized in future strategic decisions.

In other ways, however, those conflicts brought to light the challenges the United States faces in participating in foreign internal conflicts at any scale. Problems have included civilian-military coordination, international civilian coordination, the inability of civilians to move freely and interact with populations in conflict zones, the inability to measure progress, the difficulty of translating tactical and operational success into strategic success, the desire to do for foreign partners

---

1. U.S. Marine Corps, *Small Wars Manual,* NAVMC, 2890 (Washington, DC: Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 1940, 1987); Center for Advanced Command Concepts and Technology (ACT), *Operations Other Than War (OOTW): The Technological Dimension* (Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, November 1995), http://www.dodccrp.org/files/Center_OOTW.pdf.

what they should be doing for themselves, and the tendency to take shortcuts. In other words, the pathologies that exist in the U.S. response to the smallest conflicts were shown in high relief in these large-scale conflicts in a way that, in the popular imagination, has reflected poorly on the institutions and individuals involved in conflict, reconstruction, and stabilization operations.

There is danger, however, to overstating how pervasive these pathologies are. In truth, those institutions and individuals had many successes and made many improvements within Afghanistan and Iraq and in smaller, less-visible conflicts outside of those theaters. In Afghanistan, for example, there has been a 43 percent reduction of enemy attacks over the past year; Afghan security forces, up 31 percent from 2010, now lead half of all combat operations; and school attendance rates for girls have increased 67 percent since 2001.[2]

Is the United States today working to develop effective institutions, capabilities, and policies to engage in stabilization and reconstruction work? This report highlights the history of U.S. involvement in these activities, the risks of not being sufficiently prepared, and the basic requirements for effective engagement. Because successful civilian engagement prevents the need for much more expensive (and dangerous) military engagement, this report focuses mainly on civilian capabilities.

The content of this report has been informed by two workshops convened by CSIS in the spring of 2012, 10 years after the creation of the joint CSIS/Association of the U.S. Army (AUSA) Post-Conflict Reconstruction (PCR) Commission. In March 2012, a group of 22 experts met for a half-day meeting at CSIS, "Politics and Prospects for Stabilization and Reconstruction: PCR Ten Years Later." Those experts discussed the PCR Commission's influences and the continuing challenges—substantive, political, and economic—that the field faces in the wake of Iraq, Afghanistan, and other conflicts. A second half-day roundtable in May 2012, "The Case for Conflict and Stabilization Operations Today," brought together 41 leading and emerging experts to discuss how the case for helping to stabilize foreign countries has changed in the past 10 years and to consider what case can be made for engaging in conflict and stabilization operations today. The event opened with reflections from the original PCR Commission's cochairs, Dr. John Hamre and General Gordon Sullivan, followed by an overview of the changes over the past decade and the significance of the commission by former codirectors Robert Orr and Johanna Mendelson Forman; featured former commissioners and both established and emerging thinkers in the field; and finished with a working lunch with Ambassador Rick Barton, assistant secretary for the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations.

The first two sections of this report briefly review the first two generations of U.S. engagement in what was then called "post-conflict reconstruction" and later termed "stabilization and reconstruction." The first generation, from the end of the Cold War to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, was characterized by strong interplay between the United States and multilateral organizations in coordinating to help countries in conflict. The second generation, from 9/11 to the end of the "surges" in Iraq and Afghanistan, was influenced by the PCR Commission's work on the essential tasks needed for reconstruction and, later, by new doctrine for counterinsurgency.

After combat operations in Iraq and the end of the "surge" in Afghanistan, we have entered a third generation in which skepticism about the value of and capabilities for doing this work is on

---

2. David Feith, "H.R. McMaster: The Warrior's-Eye View of Afghanistan," *Wall Street Journal*, May 11, 2012, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304451104577392281146871796.html.

the upswing. After a decade of conflict, the public is tired and resources are declining. The report's third section, therefore, considers the current state of the field in light of the political and economic mood of the United States today. The final section of this report offers broad recommendations based on the lessons of the past decade.

The First Generation: 1989–2001

By the end of the Cold War, the United States had been involved in a significant number of military interventions. A tremendous amount of military activities and civilian efforts were allocated to "catching up" with the frequency of these interventions. During this time frame, the United States was engaged in a rapid-fire series of events, including the unraveling of Somalia in the early 1990s, the overthrow of a democratically elected government in Haiti, a full-fledged hot war in the Balkans, and genocide in Rwanda. The interventions were first characterized as humanitarian ones that were authorized by the UN Security Council, where the United States provided military and civilian support to multilateral operations. The United States was engaged in some overseas operation, then referred to as humanitarian interventions, almost every other year during this decade; lessons learned from one conflict or crisis were rarely applied to the next. From Central America to the Balkans, the common thread was that eventual peace agreements provided a roadmap for reconstruction. This first generation of post-conflict reconstruction efforts were also models of partnerships among the United States, the United Nations, and other international donors, including for reconstruction operations on the ground.

During the 1990s Western donors began a convening process to review the types of challenges that arose from conflicts in weak and fragile states. International development agencies started to focus their attention on how to work in countries where violence threatened to destabilize the status quo. Loss of Soviet support led to the implosion of many African countries that had served as Cold War proxies, with deeper implications for foreign assistance. In Central America, the wars that had plagued El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua were ending due to the discontinuation of Soviet resources to insurgencies. Eastern Europe's demise also left a funding vacuum, but more importantly, an apparent need to help demobilize militaries, reform the security sector, and integrate former Soviet satellite states into the mainstream of Western Europe. Early humanitarian interventions raised further questions about how to sustain a more stable environment after the initial crisis was subdued. Elections were often used as an exit strategy for military operations, and donors interpreted them as signaling the end of post-conflict efforts.

The World Bank created a Post-Conflict Unit to support both research and short-term funding to help countries overwhelmed by new forms of instability in the absence of former hegemons. The unit sponsored ground-breaking research by analysts including Paul Collier who created new paradigms for understanding conflict drivers and indicators for potential conflict, which captured the thinking of governments seeking solutions to the challenges of stabilization and rebuilding. Collier's research also found that more than half of the conflicts returned to active fighting within five years, despite reconstruction efforts.[3]

The U.S. government was especially interested in finding a way forward in managing the threat of weak states in a world that had overnight been transformed from a bipolar political environ-

---

3. Paul Collier et al., *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2003), p. 22.

ment to one where the United States was the dominant global actor. U.S. government officials began to explore what it would take to equip all relevant government agencies—civilian and military alike—with the necessary tools to transform a society from war to peace, from chaos to a capable state. During this period there was a hope that working with the prevention concept would help the international community to identify the necessary tools to avoid fighting. This rethinking of conflict in the post–Cold War era resulted in a report of the Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Conflict in 1996. It opened the way for understanding how the United Nations would become a necessary partner with the large Western donor states in bringing together the operational tools to prevent war.

In the development arena, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) was also caught up in the challenge of how to provide humanitarian assistance in countries emerging from conflict that would be quick, effective, and targeted for immediate political needs. Ordinary tools that USAID had for putting in place programs to support development were considered too long term to help places that were coming apart. In 1993, the creation of the Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) in the Bureau for Humanitarian Response (now the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, or DCHA) marked a departure from conventional approaches to development. OTI's mission was to integrate the immediate needs for political transformation with the tools of development to produce tangible results. The office helped to quickly develop programs and disburse resources in places in transition. OTI's ability to integrate its rapid-response model into the mainstream of development programming, however, remained an ongoing challenge in an agency whose culture was more accustomed to working on long-range development.

Throughout the first generation, approaches to societies emerging from conflict were more of a tactical exercise than the result of any strategic thinking about the field. In spite of some important efforts in the Balkans, Kosovo, East Timor, Haiti, Guatemala, El Salvador, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, and Burundi, the tendency to throw resources at a problem rather than create a government-wide strategy to address specific needs further complicated the hodgepodge of responses that had characterized the U.S. government's approach to complex emergencies in the 1990s. During the Bill Clinton administration, the publication of Presidential Decision Directive 56 (PDD-56) attempted to codify an interagency framework for coordinating the U.S. response to post-conflict emergencies.[4] The immediate result of this effort was a better operational program in the case of Kosovo. On the military side, the increased missions focused on reconstruction projects were also creating tension in an institution that was being moved away from the traditional war-fighting role to a broader integration of stabilization projects that at first were not necessarily something our soldiers embraced. The so-called military operations other than war became a transformative effort for the U.S. military as the evolving nature of warfare led to a growing role for military support in such activities as community development, elections, and police training. This tension would become quite clear after the invasion of Iraq in 2003.

The Second Generation: 2001–2011

In 2001, the Center of Strategic and International Studies and the Association of the U.S. Army began a project to explore a new framework for post-conflict reconstruction that built on the inter-

---

4. "PDD/NSC 56: Managing Complex Contingency Operations," The White House, May 1997, http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd56.htm.

agency focus of PPD-56. The goal was to lay out a set of recommendations based on lessons from the first generation of rebuilding. The Commission on Post-Conflict Reconstruction included important leaders in the field from Congress, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), scholars, and other international agencies. Based on lessons from first-generation efforts in this field, the project team formulated specific recommendations for the field, including a reconstruction task framework based around four pillars: security, justice and human rights, socioeconomic well-being, and governance. Project leaders recognized how difficult it was to implement the framework due to the dispersion of U.S. capabilities across so many government agencies, both military and civilian. The CSIS project research sought to inform a new policy directive that the newly elected administration of George W. Bush had promised to put in place on reconstruction. But the timing of the work coincided with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the beginning of a new phase in U.S. nation-building efforts.[5]

The 9/11 attacks on the United States transformed the U.S. approach to dealing with fragile states. In Afghanistan, government institutions had been greatly damaged by decades of conflict. The Taliban had taken control of the country, allowing al Qaeda forces to grow and Osama bin Laden to plan the 2001 attacks.

At the outset of hostilities, it was apparent that civilian agencies of government were ill-prepared to manage reconstruction work in a conflict-affected environment. In 2002, as the United States prepared for an invasion of Iraq, and with a war ongoing in Afghanistan, the Pentagon argued that in the absence of an agreed-upon framework for nation building, it should become the U.S. government's focal point for reconstruction activities. By January 2003, President Bush issued National Security Directive 24, formally giving DoD primacy in the post-invasion effort in Iraq.[6] This directive granted the department authority to assert leadership in planning of operations, in spite of misgivings that Rumsfeld had expressed about nation building. While there were important bureaucratic reasons that DoD wanted the upper hand in planning, the department in practice was at a disadvantage. It lacked the institutional knowledge and capacity to perform many of the essential tasks to any reconstruction program; had no experience helping build local government; did not have good relationships with either international or local NGOs, except in terms of humanitarian assistance; and lacked a coordinating mechanism for actions with the United Nations and international financial institutions. While DoD sought an advantage in communication and messaging, it was not very successful in competing for Iraqi hearts and minds.

In 2005, the transfer of authority from the Department of State to the Department of Defense for the management of reconstruction efforts was completed when Defense Directive 3000.05 was issued.[7] This policy committed the Pentagon to develop robust stability operations doctrine, resources, and capacities and defined stability operations in terms of military and civilian activities. While a civilian coordinator for reconstruction and stabilization (S/CRS) had already been created at the State Department a year earlier, in 2004, it was not until 2009 that S/CRS actually engaged in

5. Commission on Post-Conflict Reconstruction, *Play to Win: Final Report of the Bi-partisan Commission on Post-Conflict Reconstruction* (Washington, DC: CSIS/AUSA, January 2003), http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/ playtowin.pdf.

6. "National Security Directive 24: Chemical Weapons Arm Control Initiatives," The White House, September 26, 1989, http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsd/nsd24.pdf.

7. "Department of Defense Directive 3000.05: Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR) Operations," Department of Defense, November 28, 2005, http://kosovo.info.usaid.gov/km/seminars/2006/sss_1_080106_dod.pdf.

supporting stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The U.S. approach to stabilization and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan was at that point firmly established as a military mission. The Pentagon had significant resources for reconstruction activities, but it was also apparent that there would be no short-term fixes to stabilizing governance in either Iraq or Afghanistan. This worried military officials who saw their mission as a short-term project.

At the same time that the United States was engaged in Central Asia, other countries were also facing some extreme consequences of instability. These situations were being managed by the United Nations, which was conducting its own stabilization operations, but simultaneously undertaking its own review of how it would continue to work with fragile states in a changed political environment. By 2005, the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change came forward with a set of recommendations that included creating a Peacebuilding Commission among a group of states to support the ongoing needs of fragile states after the immediate security and humanitarian needs had been met. It published its findings in a report by the secretary general of the United Nations laying out the case for why new, borderless threats were as problematic to security as those threats caused by rivalries between states.[8]

The 2008 elections brought a change to U.S. policy. The Barack Obama administration, with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in the lead, reasserted civilian leadership in the area of reconstruction. With the war in Iraq almost over, and the war in Afghanistan still unresolved, Clinton undertook a whole-of-government review of how the U.S. government could improve stabilization and reconstruction operations, arguing that a diplomacy, development, and defense (or 3-D) approach was essential. Clinton, however, noted that coordination had still lagged behind, in spite of the growing expertise and capacity that existed inside the government to respond to the rebuilding needs. A Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), which finally appeared in early 2011, marked the culmination of thinking on the civilian side for how best to provide policymakers with a means for speaking with one voice in managing the reconstruction and stabilization agenda.[9] This review, however, was more a roadmap than an operational framework for civilian leadership.

The Third Generation?

Now, with U.S. troops withdrawn from Iraq and a departure date of 2014 set for Afghanistan, U.S. conflict and stabilization operations may be entering a third generation.[10] The United States is likely (based on historical experience) to find itself involved in a foreign internal conflict at some point in the near future, and when it does, that involvement will likely trigger a renewed desire to learn and institutionalize the lessons of the past. At the moment, however, this third generation is

8. Secretary General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change, *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* (New York: United Nations, December 2004), http://www.un.org/secureworld/report2.pdf.

9. U.S. Department of State, *Leading Through Civilian Power: The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, 2010), http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/153108.pdf.

10. Elisa Labott and Mike Mount, "NATO Accepts Obama Timetable to End War in Afghanistan by 2014," CNN, May 21, 2012, http://articles.cnn.com/2012-05-21/us/us_nato-summit_1_international-security-assistance-force-nato-forces-isaf?_s=PM:US.

marked mainly by skepticism from Congress, which funds these activities, and from civilian and military planners, who are still unclear whether the metrics to determine success have reflected the real situation on the ground.

U.S. and international policies and interventions have certainly evolved with mixed results in terms of helping war-torn countries rebuild. Much of this work has not been institutionalized, and the case has not been made to the American public that most U.S. efforts going forward are unlikely to follow the Afghanistan and Iraq model. Nor has the case been successfully made that the demand for this kind of work is not likely to subside, although the complexity of addressing instability in the future will challenge U.S. military and civilian capacities. Since 1993, the United States has responded in some way to 20 to 28 foreign internal conflicts, and twice as many humanitarian responses, every year.[11] The U.S. capacity for conflict and stabilization operations simply cannot meet this level of demand. If limits cannot be placed on the frequency of intervention, then either the capacity for intervention needs to be increased, or the capacity for prevention needs to be increased.

Aside from the regional bureaus at the State Department, which have overall responsibility for U.S. policy in particular countries, and USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives, which was created specifically to address short-term stabilization needs, the key civilian institutions for stabilization and reconstruction are USAID's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) and the State Department's new Bureau for Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO), which has subsumed S/CRS. DCHA faces institutional constraints as a result of congressional skepticism toward USAID. CSO is a new institution and inherits S/CRS, which was barely given a chance to succeed, limited both by the regional bureaus and available resources.

Outside of the United States, many other bilateral and multilateral institutions are involved in this work. U.S. agencies have not always succeeded in coordinating with them at the strategic level or in the field. But given the declining resources any individual country is willing to contribute to these efforts, burden sharing in the future will be essential in many parts of the world. The United Nations has acquired enormous experience in this work in the past decades. The Peace Support Office in the Secretariat has been an added complement to the Peacebuilding Commission, functioning as a coordination arm that integrates the operational components of peacebuilding with the planning and strategies needed for UN agency field activities. But individual states have at times relied on the United Nations to take on missions they themselves have wanted to avoid, and UN capacity is limited as well. Opportunities exist not only to improve coordination with these traditional partners but also to increase engagement with regional organizations such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the African Union; with developing countries who are increasingly organizing themselves through mechanisms such as the g7+ group of fragile states; and with emerging powers such as Brazil, Turkey, and China, who have demonstrated a willingness to participate in these efforts—but who sometimes have global objectives related to conflict-affected states that do not align with U.S. interests.[12]

---

11. Nora Bensahel and Patrick M. Cronin, *America's Civilian Operations Abroad: Understanding Past and Future Requirements* (Washington, DC: Center for a New American Security, January 2012), http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS_AmericasCivilianOperationsAbroad_BensahelCronin_0.pdf.

12. "A New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States," International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (December 2011), http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/35/50/49151944.pdf; "Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Ownership, Harmonization, Alignment, Results, and Mutual Accountability," Organization for

Aside from questions about when to intervene and whom to cooperate with, experts and practitioners have identified many remaining opportunities for *how* to improve engagement in conflict and stabilization operations. There is a growing recognition of the need to move from a sole emphasis on state building and institution building toward a more pragmatic engagement with de facto authority structures, including nonstate actors and hybrid political institutions on the ground. This is particularly relevant in conflict-affected countries, where significant territory is often controlled by a nonstate actor or a rogue government official. Local and local-national politics in violent and conflict-affected countries, however, are notoriously difficult for outsiders to understand. These types of situations do not lend themselves to military solutions, but require a greater need for police, improved local institutions that manage justice, and community-based development opportunities that address fundamental structural needs.

Because civilian development budgets are being reduced, there is also an immediate need to identify strategies and approaches that can do more with less. Experts participating in the CSIS workshops suggested improved engagement with veterans returning from Afghanistan and Iraq; increased participation of private-sector actors; and better utilization of experts in local environments. And almost all experts cite the need for improved interagency coordination in this work. Over the last decade, new security assistance authorities and programs have been created under authorities of the Department of Defense rather than the Department of State, and this "has altered the relationship between the two departments with respect to design, implementation, and direction of U.S. security assistance programming."[13] Clearly, new tools are needed to manage the structural issues that affect instability in the countries in question, and those tools that already exist must be fully employed in a way that supports the development of weak states.

Economic Co-operation and Development (March 2005), http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/15/3/46874580. pdf; "Accra Agenda for Action," Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (September 2008), http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/58/16/41202012.pdf; "Bogota Statement: Towards Effective and Inclusive Development Partnerships," Steering Committee of the Bogota High Level Event on South-South Cooperation and Capacity Development (March 2010), http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/images/stories/hlf4/Bogota_Statement_FINAL.pdf; "Dili Declaration: A New Vision for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding," International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (April 2010), http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/images/stories/hlf4/Dili_Declaration.pdf; "Towards a Comprehensive Paradigm for Decent Work and Development Effectiveness," Trade Union Development Network (November 2011), http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/images/stories/hlf4/TU_messages_to_Busan_EN.pdf; "South-South Cooperation: The Same Old Game or a New Paradigm," *Poverty in Focus*, no. 20 (March 2011), International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth, http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/IPCPovertyInFocus20.pdf; "Development Effectiveness in Development Cooperation: A Rights-based Perspective," Better Aid (October 2010), http://betteraid.org/en/betteraid-policy/betteraid-publications/policy-papers/393-development-effectiveness-in-development-cooperation.html; "The Tunis Consensus: Targeting Effective Development," African Development Bank, NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency, and African Union Commission (November 2010), http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Generic-Documents/Tunis_Consensus_3mars.pdf; "The Monrovia Roadmap on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding," International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (July 2011), http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/23/24/48345560.pdf; "Consultative Process on Aid Effectiveness at the Local Level," Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (December 2011), http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/images/stories/hlf4/Aid_Effectiveness_at_the_local_level_HLF-4.pdf.

13. Gordon Adams and Rebecca Williams, *A New Way Forward: Rebalancing Security Assistance Programs and Authorities* (Washington, DC: Henry L. Stimson Center, March 2011), http://www.stimson.org/images/uploads/A_New_Way_Forward_Final.pdf.

Recommendations

As this brief review demonstrates, the demand for conflict and stabilization operations is likely to remain a constant for the foreseeable future. The transnational nature of many threats to peace and stability will continue to increase the complexity of these operations, and the United States will need to understand the conditions under which intervention can be successful. Whether to prevent conflicts or to respond to them, there will need to be a more integrated approach to security and development that includes both civilian and military actors. Addressing crises in an ad hoc manner all but guarantees that interventions, whether preventative or reactive, will be more expensive in lives and dollars than they need to be.

- **Recommendation 1: Design planning processes around a set of objectives that are commensurate with existing capabilities and resources.**

Realistic expectations are essential for the future of conflict and stabilization operations. Being honest up front about what U.S. institutions are capable of achieving and what recipient-country institutions are capable of absorbing is necessary to avoid raising expectations that cannot be met. Realistic planning will improve the likelihood that objectives are met and that Congress, in turn, will approve resources for future operations. Planning for the "army we have" (as it were) rather than the "army we wish we had" is critical for success. The U.S. government should also fulfill the vision articulated in the QDDR—to ensure that civilian capacity for this type of complex work is developed in a way that supports local country needs. This means building up a strong civilian force from government and the private sector that can be rapidly deployed to help sustain security gains. Planning based not mainly on a country's supposed needs, but on an understanding of that country's capacity to absorb the assistance, is equally critical. Real success is likely to come in avoiding catastrophes rather than creating great societies.

- **Recommendation 2: Create a plan to build institutional capabilities for prevention and reconstruction.**

If the short-term focus is on planning around what is achievable, the long-term focus should be on building U.S. institutions with the capacity for preventing conflict, which would reduce the likelihood of future interventions. But success at reconstruction will be determined not only by what the United States can contribute to the immediate needs, but also by the on-the-ground capacity it leaves behind for rebuilding. State-level institutional reforms are important but insufficient. State building has focused too much on capacity and not enough on stability and local legitimacy. The countries in which the United States is operating face serious sovereignty concerns in a way that was not the case two decades ago. The United States must engage fragile states carefully, supporting actors that are agents of change instead of trying to be the central agent of change. Serious progress must be made in engaging legitimate local ownership. It is also important to expand the base of partners on the ground to include more local talent. Local leaders not only have better knowledge of the environment, the stakes of mission success are also higher for them.

- **Recommendation 3: Engage emerging global powers on reconstruction and stabilization.**

Several emerging powers, including Brazil, Turkey, India, and China, have already expanded their investments in countries emerging from conflict. Their approach to assisting countries in transition may not always coincide with that of the United States, but these rising powers can help support and sustain gains that were made through their own resources and knowledge of different regions. For example, India and Turkey can provide valuable development options for helping to

prevent places like Afghanistan from falling back into conflict. Similarly, Brazil has been an invaluable partner in helping to train police and provide security in countries such as Haiti. Its use of trilateral cooperation projects has helped leverage its limited resources with U.S. programs in many parts of Africa. China has also been using its own resources to promote economic development in many unstable regions of Africa while also sending peacekeepers and police to UN missions. While U.S. leadership is still highly valued, burden sharing can mean more effective engagements.

- **Recommendation 4: Make the private sector a partner from the outset to promote a more sustainable future.**

The 40 poorest countries are also the most resource rich. Yet U.S. use of loan guarantees through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), or the way Treasury Department officials help promote credible financial systems, have often exacerbated the economic challenges these countries face. There is a growing recognition that the United States needs to look to partnerships with the private sector in countries that are fragile, but that could potentially emerge as viable nations if technical assistance were coupled with strong incentives for investment. It has taken far too long for this awareness to enter into the planning of many reconstruction efforts, but the presence of the private sector in the early phases of reconstruction planning is now a given. A better understanding of the private-sector role remains to be developed.

Greater focus on local capacity for entrepreneurial endeavors has also led many donors to consider working not only with micro-lending in post-conflict environments, but also in fostering small and medium enterprises (SMEs) as a means of providing jobs and sustainable economic growth. New resources moving toward helping local businesses rather than international contractors would be an enormous and constructive change in many weak and fragile countries. The private sector can lead not only with resources, but also in respect for rule of law and good governance. The challenge will be for donors to help balance the needs of local investors with the ongoing requirements for security that enable commerce and industry to flourish.

- **Recommendation 5: Improve civilian-military cooperation to respond to complex operations that arise not only from traditional conflicts but from crime and violence as well.**

Urban conflict arising from transnational criminal activity accounts for 88 percent of the lethal violence that countries experience today.[14] Whether it is the gangs of Central America and Mexico, or the *favelas* (slums) of Rio, or the violence associated with trafficking of drugs and people, these types of problems require improved internal security forces—especially police—and stronger connections with economic development programs that address job creation and access to education. New types of instability demand a rethinking of how best to prevent conflict through structural changes in the economy and in governance. Lessons learned about rebuilding after war may also help bring local expertise and local voices into the process. Each new problem demands country-specific solutions, and U.S. government officials will need to work effectively with local actors, other donor partners, and international organizations.

- **Recommendation 6: Operationalize the lessons from Busan and the World Development Report.**

In 2011, the Busan Conference on Aid Effectiveness, held in South Korea, produced a "New Deal for Fragile States." This initiative, led by 19 of the 40 states categorized as fragile, recommends that

---

14. Robert Muggah, "Security and Humanitarian Action in Situations Other Than War" (remarks, International Development Research Centre, Canada, November 2011), http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NUYVCbutnu8.

institutions such as the World Bank take seriously the development of these countries as a means of preventing them from falling back into conflict and chaos. The New Deal endorses a common fragility assessment in affected countries; assistance strategies that are locally designed and led; mutual accountability between aid donors and recipients; transparent revenue management by fragile states; and multi-stakeholder dialogue on development priorities in fragile states. It also recognizes the growing voice of the g7+ country ministers, who are now asserting their own demands for development assistance that addresses the specific needs of these poor countries, rather than allowing assistance to be imposed from the outside without adequate regard to individual country needs.[15]

The 2011 World Development Report, in considering the particular challenges of development in fragile and conflict-affected states, concludes that development actors must mobilize around a coherent, inclusive plan, rather than focus on various parts of the technical institutional reform process. It will be important to invest in citizen security, justice, and jobs, and to address issues such as crime reduction or civilian protection, rather than only emphasizing issues that are seen as directly affecting U.S. national security, like counternarcotics or counterterrorism.[16]

These efforts are not the final word on conflict, stabilization, and reconstruction operations, but they are useful in that they have provided two important focal points for efforts to improve practice. The challenge for the United States and other international donors will be to translate their lessons into operational capabilities. The United Kingdom, France, Canada, and other donors, for example, have been working together to operationalize the World Development Report, and moves such as this should be encouraged among other donors as well.

Conclusion

Since the end of the Cold War, it has become increasingly clear that nation building imposed from the outside is unlikely to create the social capital on the ground necessary for stable institutions. Local leadership, coupled with citizen engagement, has proven the only way to ensure that international investment in stability and reconstruction helps to catalyze sustainable change. Security provision alone is insufficient for rebuilding—the private sector, religious networks, women's groups, and the international community must all be engaged in creating the foundations for long-term stability. U.S. leadership will continue to be required in the future, particularly when weak and fragile states pose risks to U.S. security. But the future of U.S. efforts in this field may well be focused on addressing new forms of violence, not from wars, but from criminal elements and transnational actors who count on the weakness of states to impose their will on the most vulnerable of citizens in some of the world's poorest places. Civilian and military agencies will need to develop new tools to address violence and hopefully prevent it. Continued development of U.S. institutional frameworks, and prioritization of international coordination in these efforts, will make possible successful future engagements.

---

15. "A New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States," International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding.

16. Sarah Cliffe, "Strategies for Transitioning from Fragility to Prosperity" (remarks at USAID Frontiers in Developments, June 11, 2012); see also World Bank, *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2011), http://wdr2011.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/WDR2011_Full_Text.pdf.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

March 7, 2012: "Politics and Prospects for Stabilization and Reconstruction: PCR Ten Years Later"
May 15, 2012: "The Case for Conflict and Stabilization Operations Today"

Pauline Baker
The Fund for Peace

Frederick Barton
U.S. Department of State

Douglas Batson
National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency

Nora Bensahel
Center for a New American Security

Chuck Call
American University

Craig Cohen
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Beth Cole
U.S. Institute of Peace

Elisabeth Dallas
U.S. Agency for International Development

Liora Danan
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Stephen J. Del Rosso
Carnegie Corporation of New York

Brendan Doherty
U.S. Department of State

Renata Dwan
United Nations

Vanda Felbab-Brown
Brookings Institution

Johanna Mendelson Forman
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Stacia George
Council on Foreign Relations

Rachel Gerber
The Stanley Foundation

Richard Gowan
New York University

John Hamre
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Cindy Huang
U.S. Department of State

Gerald Hyman
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Robert Jenkins
U.S. Agency for International Development

Amos Jordan
Wheatley Institution of Brigham Young University

Robert Klein
Office of the Secretary of Defense

Jason Ladnier
U.S. Department of State

Robert Lamb
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Hardin Lang
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Stephen Lennon
U.S. Agency for International Development

Michael Levett
CDC Development Solutions

Nancy Lindborg
U.S. Agency for International Development

Clare Lockhart
The Institute for State Effectiveness

Merriam Mashatt
U.S. Department of Commerce

Richard McCall
Creative Associates

Kevin Melton
AECOM International Development

Michael Miklaucic
National Defense University

Kari Mottola
Johns Hopkins University

Diana Ohlbaum
House Committee on Foreign Affairs

Robert Orr
United Nations

Evan Papp
U.S. Agency for International Development

Michael Phelan
Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Robert Polk
Institute for Defense Analyses

Celina Realuyo
Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies

Stephanie Sanok
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Gordon Sullivan
Association of the U.S. Army

Alex Thier
U.S. Agency for International Development

Devlin Timony-Balyeat
Office of the Secretary of Defense

Noam Unger
Brookings Institution

Milan Vaishnav
Center for Global Development

Steve Vigil
former UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations

Daniel Weggeland
former COMISAF Counterinsurgency Advisory and Assistance Team

Dominik Zaum
UK Department for International Development

COMMISSION AND PROGRAM STAFF

Cochairs of the Post-Conflict Reconstruction Commission (2001–2002)

John Hamre
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Gordon Sullivan
Association of the U.S. Army

Commissioners (2001–2002)

John Brian Atwood

Peter Bell

Doug Bereuter

Paul Brest

Susan Collins

Chester Crocker

John Edwards

Sam Farr

George Folsom

John Hamre

Richard Holbrooke

George Joulwan

Geoffrey Kemp

Jeane Kirkpatrick

Nancy Lindborg

Joseph Lopez

Payne Lucas

Jan Piercy

Jack Reed

Pat Roberts

Walter Slocombe

Gordon Sullivan

Julia Taft

Larry Welch

Charles Wilhelm

Timothy Wirth

Frank Wolf

Directors of Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project / Program on Crisis, Conflict, and Cooperation (C3) (2002–Present)

Michèle Flournoy
Center for a New American Security

Scott Feil
Institute for Defense Analyses

Johanna Mendelson Forman
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Robert Orr
United Nations

Frederick Barton
U.S. Department of State

Bathsheba Crocker
U.S. Department of State

Karin von Hippel
U.S. Department of State

Mark Quarterman
Enough Project

Robert D. Lamb
Center for Strategic and International Studies

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Robert D. Lamb is a senior fellow and director of the Program on Crisis, Conflict, and Cooperation (C3) at CSIS and a research scholar at the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland (CISSM). Dr. Lamb studies governance and development amid conflict, with recent field research in Afghanistan, Colombia, and Pakistan. His current research touches on complex violence, hybrid political orders, nonstate-controlled territories, political transitions, international intervention, absorptive capacity, and alternatives to state building.

Dr. Lamb has presented his work to policymakers and experts in Afghanistan, Colombia, Germany, Greece, India, Pakistan, Romania, Russia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom; has appeared on CNN, NPR, and NBC News; and has been quoted in *USA Today*, the *Los Angeles Times*, Reuters, Bloomberg, and other media outlets. He lived for nearly a year in Medellín, Colombia, studying gang governance and legitimacy and joined CSIS as a visiting scholar after returning to Washington in late 2009. As a strategist in the Defense Department's Strategy office in 2006 and 2007, he advised defense policymakers on terrorist, criminal, and insurgent networks and comanaged an interagency study of "ungoverned" areas and illicit havens. He earned a PhD in policy studies in early 2010 from the University of Maryland School of Public Policy in a program combining security, economics, and ethics. He received a BA in interdisciplinary studies from Gettysburg College in 1993, spent half a year in Nicaragua with a microdevelopment project, then worked for nine years as an editor and journalist, winning a National Press Club award in 2001, before changing careers after 9/11.

Johanna Mendelson Forman is a senior associate with Americas Program at CSIS, where she works on renewable energy, the Americas, civil-military relations, and post-conflict reconstruction. A former codirector of the Post-Conflict Reconstruction Project, she has written extensively on security-sector reform in conflict states, economic development in postwar societies, the role of the United Nations in peace operations, and energy security. In 2003, she participated in a review of the post-conflict reconstruction effort of the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq as part of a CSIS team.

Mendelson Forman also brings experience in the world of philanthropy, having served as the director of peace, security, and human rights at the UN Foundation. She has held senior positions in the U.S. government at the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Bureau for Humanitarian Response, and the Office of Transition Initiatives, as well as at the World Bank's Post Conflict Unit. She has been a senior fellow with the Association of the U.S. Army and a guest scholar at the U.S. Institute of Peace. Most recently, she served as an adviser to the UN Mission in Haiti. She holds adjunct faculty appointments at American University and Georgetown University.

Mendelson Forman is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and serves on the advisory boards of Women in International Security and the Latin American Security Network, RES-DAL. She holds a J.D. from Washington College of Law at American University, a Ph.D. in Latin American history from Washington University, St. Louis, and a master's of international affairs, with a certificate of Latin America studies, from Columbia University in New York. She is fluent in Spanish and Portuguese.

Liora Danan is a fellow with CSIS Program on Crisis, Conflict, and Cooperation, where she works on conflict and stabilization issues. Prior to that, she was director of special projects with the Middle East Program at the University of California's Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, where she directed substantive aspects of the UC Track II programs on regional security in the Middle East. Danan has previously served as a fellow with the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom and led research at CSIS on how the U.S. government can better engage the role of religion in conflict-prone settings. She has worked and conducted field research in the Middle East, Central Asia, Africa, and South Asia. Danan graduated from Yale University with an M.A. in international relations and a concentration in U.S. foreign policy and religion. She received her B.A. in political science and policy studies from Rice University.

CSIS | CENTER FOR STRATEGIC & INTERNATIONAL STUDIES