TRACK ONE: RESEARCH PAPER

*Cluster 1: Peace, Security and Human Rights*

# Challenges for Civil-Military Cooperation in Peace Support Operations: Examining the Framework of Comprehensive Approaches

[†] PAREPA, Laura-Anca

## ABSTRACT

*Since the end of the Cold War and following the globalization process, the international community has been facing new challenges and problems — such as humanitarian crises, natural disasters, ethnic and religious conflicts, transnational organized crime and terrorism — which affect in a significant way the life of people around the world. In such circumstances, governments and international organizations, by acknowledging a strong link between development and security, initiated multidimensional and comprehensive approaches in order to address in an efficient manner all these challenges in highlighting the significance of human security. The comprehensive approaches aim to promote strong cooperation and coordination between civilian and military actors involved in peace support operations by addressing several aspects, such as peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, stabilization, counterinsurgency, reconstruction and development aid. This article focuses on how the comprehensive approaches influenced the evolution of civil-military interactions into complex and multidimensional peace support operations. By identifying the new roles and functions of military actors in such operations, the article highlights some challenges to civil-military relations that are brought about by the involvement of military actors in non-military tasks. Analyzing the implementation of comprehensive approaches via Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan, the article underlines that the outcomes are mixed, as long as such approaches can blur the lines between military and non-military activities, combatants and non-combatants. Although the comprehensive approaches[1] were born from a necessity to promote efficient management of resources and to strengthen civil-military cooperation by avoiding overlaps and tensions between the two actors, this article argues for*

---

[†] The author is currently a Research Assistant and Ph.D. Candidate at University of Tsukuba and has participated in the UNU Intensive Core Courses, IPS and ICD in 2013.
[1] The term 'comprehensive approaches' is used in this article in a generic sense, referring to any approach based on integration of activities performed by civil and military actors at local, national or international levels.

*case-by-case implementation that takes into account local features and the specific security situation.*

KEYWORDS: *Civil-Military Relations, Comprehensive Approaches, CIMIC, Peace Support Operations, Provincial Reconstruction Teams*

## I. INTRODUCTION

The process of globalization affects all domains of life, as well as the ways in which war and peace are dealt with. As a result, the roles and functions of military forces have changed and multiplied. Beside the traditional and core mission of defending national sovereignty, military forces are required to engage in an ever-increasing number of peacekeeping and humanitarian operations and to perform law enforcement tasks related to the fight against organized crime, trafficking and terrorism. Therefore, the military, which are seen as key players in addresing war and conflict, could also play an important role in providing humanitarian aid, disaster relief, or performing various non-traditional military functions in different stages of peace support operations (PSOs).

The engagement of military actors in operations and tasks usually performed by non-military actors often triggers controversies. This paper aims to provide a brief overview of some aspects and challenges for civil-military cooperation (CIMIC) within the framework of comprehensive approaches to complex PSOs. After defining the framework and significance of CIMIC, the nexus between security and development that led to the emergence of comprehensive approaches will be analyzed. Then, the article will deal with the new roles of military forces and the challenges that the new roles bring to civil-military relations (CMR) in PSOs by referring to some aspects resulting from the activities of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan. Finally, the article will conclude by discussing the applicability of comprehensive approaches in specific situations.

The information gathered in this paper came from a variety of sources, including reports, commentaries and publications of military, governmental, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, think tanks and academia. This paper also draws on the author's personal experiences in the military field, as well as on discussions with experts and workers involved in the implementation of comprehensive approaches in Afghanistan.

## II. A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR CIVIL-MILITARY COOPERATION

CMR is a complex concept that includes a plurality of aspects related to the interactions between civilian and military actors. In the academic literature, CMR refers to theoretical approaches that tackle the interactions between political elites, military and citizenry by focusing on four specific elements: 1) the degree of civilian control over the military; 2) the degree of the professionalism of the military; 3) the interaction between civilian and military actors in times of peace and war; and 4) the compatibility or divergency of their views.[2]

---

[2] Andrews, Brandy M., *Patterns of Civil-Military Relations in Democracy*, Fort Leavenworth Kansas: United States Army Command and General Staff College, School of Advanced Military Studies, 2008, p.14; Bruneau and Matei identified three criteria: democratic civilian control over military, operational effectiveness, and

# CHALLENGES FOR CIVIL-MILITARY COOPERATION IN PEACE SUPPORT OPERATIONS: EXAMINING THE FRAMEWORK OF COMPREHENSIVE APPROACHES

The first attempt to establish a theory of CMR belongs to Samuel Huntington who highlighted the differences between the values and rules of civil and military cultures by pointing out the necessity for a clear separation between civilian and military activities, as well as the need for civilian control over military forces.[3] Hungtinton's theory was the basis for the development of the convergence theory by Morris Janowitz who, while acknowledging the differences between civilian and military actors, emphasized the difficulty in making a clear separation between them, as well as the risk of seeing the military as an organization apart from society.[4] Contrary to Hungtington who promotes a clear-cut distinction between military and civilian actors in order to ensure efficient CMR, Janowitz promotes the idea of an "integration of the values of the military and the society" in order to achieve the same goal.[5]

Hungtinton's and Janowitz's theories can be regarded as the classical theories of CMR that set a conceptual framework for most of the contributions that followed, such as: Peter Feaver's agency theory, Charles Moskos's occupational theory, and Eliot Cohen's unequal dialog theory.[6] One of the most recent contributions to the field is Rebecca Schiff's concordance theory which emphasizes the need for an agreement and a cooperative relationship between military, political elites and society. Her theory highlights the idea that based on culture, history and politics CMR can take a diversity of forms from separation to integration, but that the most effective results are achieved when civilian and military actors find a common ground.[7]

On a more practical level, civilian-military relationships have been described by various organizations in different ways depending on their purposes and status. Military actors — national or multinational military forces, alliances like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) — focus on military objectives; on the other hand, civilian actors — humanitarian agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Save the Children Fund, the Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere — focus entirely on humanitarian objectives. Intergovernmental organizations, such as the United Nations and the European Union, without neglecting the military aspect of intervention, strongly emphasize the importance of humanitarian goals. Thus, many of these

---

efficiency of military organizations. See: Bruneau, Thomas and Matei, Florina Cristiana, *The Routledge Handbook of Civil-Military Relations*, Abington: Routledge, 2013, p.1.

[3] Huntington, Samuel, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil Military Relations*, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957, p.74-75.

[4] Janowitz, Morris, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*, Glencoe: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960, p.270, 422, 440.

[5] Born, Hans, "Democratic Control of Armed Forces: Relevance, Issues and Research Agenda", in *Handbook of the Sociology of the Military*, eds. Caforio, Giuseppe, New York: Springer, 2006, p.156.

[6] Feaver's agency theory focuses on apects of civilian control of the military and on the compatibility of their goals that can lead to a work-shirk relationship. Moskos's occupational theory highlights the evolution of the military from an institutional model to an occupational model which makes the military compatible with civilian institutions. Cohen's theory of unequal dialog underlines the differences between the conduct of CMR in times of peace and war.

[7] Shiff, Rebecca, "Civil-military relations reconsidered: A theory of concordance", *Armed Forces and Society*, 22(1), Fall 1995, p.9.

organizations make a clear distinction between different types of interactions (e.g. CIMIC, civil-military coordination) that are considered components of CMR, which is a generic concept.

In this respect, CIMIC represents for NATO "the co-ordination and co-operation, in support of the mission, between the NATO Commander and civil actors, including national population and local authorities, as well as international, national and non-governmental organizations and agencies".[8] For the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), CIMIC is seen as a "military staff function that contributes to facilitating the interface between the military and civilian components of an integrated mission, as well as with the humanitarian and development actors in the mission area, in order to support UN mission objectives", while civil-military coordination (CMCoord) refers to "a humanitarian civil-military coordination function"[9] and represents "the system of interaction, involving exchange of information, negotiation, de-confliction, mutual support, and planning at all levels, between military elements and humanitarian organizations, development organizations, or the local civilian population to achieve respective objectives".[10] The Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) describe CMCoord as a "shared responsibility" and "the essential dialogue and interaction between civilian and military actors in humanitarian emergencies that is necessary to protect and promote humanitarian principles, avoid competition, minimize inconsistency, and, when appropriate, pursue common goals".[11]

These definitions are important to the extent that they reveal some differences in perception and significance of CMR among organizations for which such interactions play an important role. Therefore, for the OCHA and the IASC, CMCoord can be understood as cooperation, coordination and co-existence, thus referring to a broad spectrum of relationships that "range from coexistence to cooperation"[12] where cooperation indicates the highest degree of synchronization and coexistence is understood as the minimum level of interaction. NATO prefers to use the term "cooperation" because, as de Coning argues, "coordination represents a higher order of mutual engagement than cooperation" and thus it "regards cooperation as the most appropriate relationship with its humanitarian counterparts".[13] Concurrently, the DPKO prefers to use the term CIMIC when referring to integrated peacekeeping operations.[14]

---

[8] NATO, *NATO Civil-Military Co-operation (CIMIC) Doctrine*, AJP-9, Brussels: NATO Standardization Agency, 2003,1-1; NATO, *NATO Military Policy on Civil-Military Co-operation*, MC411/1, Brussels: NATO, 2002, Section 2 (4).

[9] DPKO, *Civil-Military Coordination in UN Integrated Peacekeeping Missions*, Policy Paper, New York: United Nations, 2010, p.2.

[10] DPKO, *Civil-Military Coordination Policy*, New York: United Nations, 2002, p.2.

[11] OCHA, *Civil-Military Relationship in Complex Emergencies*, IASC Reference Paper, Geneva: United Nations, 2004, p.11.

[12] *Ibid*.

[13] de Coning, Cedric, "Civil-Military Coordination and UN Peacebuilding Operations", *African Journal on Conflict Resolution,* 5(2), 2005, p.104.

[14] Given the complexity and the broadness of CMR, scholars dealing with civil-military interactions in conflict or post-conflict situation, very often tend to use the term CIMIC instead of CMR. On the contrary, the ICRC prefers to use CMR to describe the interactions between humanitarian and military actors in a conflict situation. For more information about CMR and CIMIC, see: Rehse, Peter, *CIMIC: Concepts, Definition and Practice*, Hamburg: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, 2004, p.14-15; Rana, Raj, "At a Crossroad or a Dead-End? Considering the Civil-Military Relationship in Times of Armed Conflict" in Civil-Military Cooperation in Post Conflict Operations, eds. Ankersen, Christopher, Abingdon: Routledge, 2008, p.228;

However, many scholars have pointed out that one of the most important factors in the choice of the type of relationship for civilian actors is strongly linked to the degree of involvement of military actors in combat.[15] Therefore, the higher the degree is, the more civilian actors will be unwilling to maintain a close relationship with military counterparts in order to avoid any violation of the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, which must be observed during humanitarian assistance operations according to the OCHA.[16]

Regardless of how they are defined, civil-military interactions have existed under different forms in multiple fields at national and international levels. Civilian and military actors have operated in the same environment for a long time ago,[17 and] thus, the relationship between them is not a new phenomenon. However, the changes in the international context after the end of the Cold War, the emergence of non-state actors and non-traditional threats, as well as the complex transformations related to the methods and means of warfare, gave rise to new trends and challenges for the interactions between these two actors. Besides the traditional context of an on-going war, it is possible to identify at least two other areas of interaction between civil and military actors: natural disasters and PSO. The complexity of such situations has led both civilian and military actors to understand the crucial significance of their cooperation. Thus, various attempts have been made to create policies, doctrines and guidelines with the ultimate goal to assure a smooth interaction by avoiding overlap and misunderstanding in all the above-mentioned settings. NATO's CIMIC is defined and explained in two fundamental documents: CIMIC doctrine and field handbook.[18] Within the UN, there are several regulations and guidelines[19] that bear the imprint of the UN structures

Ankersen, Christopher "Interrogating Civil-Military Cooperation", in eds. Ankersen (2008), p.3; de Coning (2007), p. 97-103.

[15] De Coning (2005), p.105; Oliker, Olga et al, *Aid during Conflict: Interaction between Military and Civil Assistance Providers in Afghanistan, September 2001-June 20002*, Santa Monica: RAND, 2004, p.xiii; Metcalfe, Victoria, Haysom, Simone and Gordon, Stuart, *Trends and Challenges in Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination*, Humanitarian Policy Group Working Paper, London: Overseas Development Institute, 2012, p.2; OCHA (2004), p.13, figure 1-1.

[16] OCHA, "OCHA on Message: Humanitarian Principles", June 2012. Available from: https://ochanet.unocha.org/p/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf.

[17] The International Committee of the Red Cross was established in 1893 and has been operating since the First World War. The Save the Children Found was created and has been operating since 1919. See: http://www.icrc.org/eng/who-we-are/history/overview-section-history-icrc.htm and http://www.savethechildren.org/site/c.8rKLIXMGIpI4E/b.6229507/k.C571/History.htm. For more information about civil and military actors working in the same environment, see: Slim, Hugo "The Stretcher and the Drum: Civil Military Relations in Peace Support Operations", *International Peacekeeping,* 3(2), Summer 1996, pp.123-140; Sørensen, Birgitte R., "Violence and humanitarian assistance: Reflections on an intricate relationship", *Journal of Humanitarian Assistance*, September 2006, pp.14-19.

[18] NATO, *NATO Civil-Military Co-operation (CIMIC) Doctrine*, AJP-9, Brussels: NATO Standardization Agency, 2003; Civil-Military Cooperation Centre of Excellence, *CIMIC Field Handbook* 3rd.edn., Enschede: Civil-Military Cooperation Centre of Excellence, 2012.

[19] The most recent UN guidelines are: OCHA, *Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets to Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies (MCDA Guidelines)*, 2006; OCHA, *Oslo Guidelines: Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief*, Geneva: United Nations, 2007; OCHA, *Civil-Military Guidelines & Reference for Complex Emergencies*, 2008; IASC, *IASC Non-Binding Guidelines on the Use of Armed Escorts for Humanitarian Convoys*, 2013; DPKO, *Civil-Military Coordination Policy*, 2002; DPKO, *Civil-Military Coordination in UN Integrated Peacekeeping Missions*, 2010.

dealing with civil-military interactions: the OCHA under the authority of the IASC and the DPKO.

Given the diversity of definitions and terminology, the term of CIMIC will be used in this article to refer to interactions between civil and military actors engaged in various tasks in PSO. As for civilian and military actors, based on the definitions of humanitarian and military actors given by the IASC,[20] this paper will use the following definitions: the former refers to national or international, governmental or non-governmental organizations, whose purpose is to provide humanitarian or non-humanitarian assistance, while the latter refers to national, regional or international, governmental or intergovernmental military forces acting under a chain of command and in support of an internationally recognized organization or under a national or international mandate.[21]

## III. THE NEXUS BETWEEN SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT AND THE EMERGENCE OF COMPREHENSIVE APPROACHES

The post-Cold War international context has been characterized by the fragmentation of some multinational states, the increase of ethnic, religious and/or internal conflicts, the rise of non-state actors, the emergence of non-traditional threats, as well as the outbreak of the Global War on Terrorism. Such events have led to at least five different outcomes: 1) Increase of humanitarian crises that need a quick and decisive answer from the international community; 2) Modification of the internal and external roles of armed forces; 3) Change of methods, means and strategies of warfare; 4) Necessity of the reevaluation of civil-military relations by both actors; and 5) Rise of new concepts, policies and doctrines based on an integration of elements which have been, to date, seen as independent.

Concepts such as humanitarian intervention, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, responsibility to protect or complex emergencies have become increasingly well known. They shed a light on an emerging notion of human security with two dimensions: freedom from want and freedom from fear. In this context, a relationship between development and security has been acknowledged by the international community, which has understood that the limitation of international assistance in conflict and post-conflict situations to only one dimension — either security or development — would lead to negative outcomes. Highlighting the importance of development as a means of fostering security and the relevance of security as a means of fostering development, Paul Collier states that "war retards development, but conversely, development retards war"[22], while Olson and Gregorian observe that in fragile states "the interlinked nature of security and development is inescapable".[23] Promoting economic growth and good governance are time-consuming processes even in countries with a safe environment, but in fragile or failed states which face on-going conflict or instable post-conflict situations, only providing humanitarian assistance and building a foundation for

---

[20] OCHA (2004), p.11.

[21] In this present article, military actors do not include private military and security companies, which are sometimes acting outside of a clear chain of command and without a national or an international mandate, being hired directly by NGOs.

[22] Collier, Paul et.al., *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil Wars and Development Policy*, Washington D.C.: The World Bank, 2007, p.1.

[23] Olson, Lara and Gregorian, Hratch, *Beyond Information Sharing & False Coherence: Interagency Coordination in International Peace Missions*, Policy Brief, Calgary: Center for Military and Strategic Studies, 2007, p.1.

medium- and long-term development require high levels of physical security and thus, can become serious challenges for the actors involved in such tasks.

In 1992, with *An Agenda for Peace*, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the former Secretary General of the UN at that time, brought the concept of peacebuilding into the peace and security architecture of the UN in blending elements of security and development.[24] This concept has been developed and enlarged to encompass four stages: indicative post-conflict tasks, stabilization through peacekeeping (short-term), peace consolidation or transition (medium-term) and long-term recovery.[25] Peacebuilding is a complex and multidimensional process that aims not only to avoid the recurrence of conflict in fragile states, but also to build institutions and promote peace and development. Although some would argue that conflicts in fragile states reappear due to a lack of consensus or due to a presence of spoilers at the peacemaking stage, other scholars believe that such recidivism is caused by the emergence of certain gaps within the peacebuilding stages.[26] These gaps often appear as a result of the tendency to focus more on institutional aspects of state reconstruction, restoration of civil order, and security sector reform, rather than adopting an integrated approach that addresses human rights, freedom, reconciliation. In this regard, the African Union highlights the necessity that any post-conflict reconstruction and development process must address not only the "needs of countries", but also "the needs of affected populations", and therefore six areas should be covered: "security; humanitarian-emergency assistance; socioeconomic reconstruction and development; human rights, justice and reconciliation; women and gender".[27]

Whereas peacebuilding can be seen by many as separated and non-related with peacekeeping and peacemaking, it has broader significance for some scholars and covers not only post-conflict (operational peacebuilding), but also pre-conflict stages (structural peacebuilding).[28] Accordingly, peacebuilding becomes a "twofold process of deconstructing the structures of violence, and constructing the structures of peace" and thus, there are "two interrelated but separate sets of activities", which aim at security and development "that must be undertaken simultaneously" in order to achieve a positive impact.[29] Feeling the need for clarification concerning the linkage between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, the DPKO consequently notices that "peacekeeping is not an alternative or precursor to peacebuilding", rather that peacekeepers play important roles as actors in the early stages of peacebuilding by

---

[24] UN, *Report of the Secretary General: An agenda for Peace*, 1992, p.12.

[25] Hoshino, Toshiya, "Peacebuilding & Human Security in Fragile States", *Japan Spotlight*, 28(6), November-December 2009, p.18.

[26] Hoshino (2009), p.18; Aggestam, Karin, "Internal and external dynamics of spoiling: A negotiation approach", in *Challenges to Peacebuilding. Managing spoilers during conflict resolution*, eds. Newman, Edward and Richmond, Oliver, Tokyo: UNU Press, 2006, p.1, 4.

[27] Conflict Management Division, Peace and Security Department, *Policy on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development*, Addis Ababa: Commission of the African Union, 2006, p. v, vii, 5.

[28] Savage, A.J. Owen, "Yes, but is it peacebuilding? Evaluating civil-military cooperation in Afghanistan", in *Civil-Military Cooperation in Post-Conflict Operations*, eds. Ankersen, Christopher, Abingdon: Routledge, 2008, p.105; Keating, Tom and Knight, W. Andy (eds.), *Building Sustainable Peace,* Edmonton: The University of Edmonton Alberta Press, 2005, p.xxxvii.

[29] Bush, Kenneth, "Commodification, Compartmentalization, and Militarization of Peacebuilding", in *Building Sustainable Peace,* eds. Keating, Tom and Knight, W.Andy, Edmonton: The University of Edmonton Alberta Press, 2005, p.25.

performing three types of tasks: articulating peacebuilding priorities, enabling other actors to implement peacebuilding tasks and implementing some tasks by themselves.[30]

In such a context, CMR undergoes a process of reevaluation that led to new approaches in which they evolve from co-existence to coordination and cooperation. Analyzing civil-military interactions over the years, it has been found out that the most common and widespread approach among civilian actors is co-existence, which implies a distance or a clear-cut distinction between the activities and tasks performed by military and civilian actors. Following the changes and challenges that the international community has faced since the end of the Cold War, especially after the beginning of Global War on Terrorism, approaches based on cooperation and coordination began to be adopted and applied. The application has developed from subsidiary or complementary actions to fully integrated activities that involve a high degree of interdependence.[31] Therefore, CIMIC acquired a special significance in acting as an "interface between political and security objectives on the one hand, and humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding objectives on the other".[32]

Concurrently, military actors were given the missions to operate in new and complex environments characterized by a mixture of several elements, such as post-conflict reconstruction, humanitarian assistance, stabilization, counterinsurgency, statebuilding, security sector reform, and development aid. It is necessary to mention that the changes in the strategic context and the realities in the field of operations at the tactical level are factors that significantly influence the conditions in which military actors operate. The notion of the Three Block War, coined by General Krulak[33] after his experiences in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia, described in the most appropriate way the situation in which military actors must perform a spectrum of missions and tasks which cover "a range of mission from humanitarian assistance, to armed peacekeeping, to combat operations".[34] In these operations, traditional and new roles of armed forces are intertwined and the military are not infrequently assigned tasks beyond their usual functions and mandates. This has led to an increasing overlap and interdependence between military and civilian actors in Liberia, Iraq and Afghanistan[35], but also it has compelled armed forces to adjust and modify their doctrines, strategies and ways of warfare in order to cope with realities on the ground and to deal with tasks and roles which do not fall within their traditional responsibilities.

Whether being described as stability and support, stability and reconstruction, peace support, full spectrum, integrated or multidimensional operations, all these notions refer to operations in which military actors performing in instable and volatile contexts must ensure the delivery of military and non-military effects in few hours and within a limited space. In a generic way, NATO has used the notion of PSOs to refer to a broad range of multi-functional operations that involve military and civilian actors, aim to achieve long-term political settlements and

---

[30] DPKO, *Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding: Clarifying the Nexus*, Informal Paper, New York: United Nations, 2010, p.2; DPKO/DFS, *Civil Affairs Handbook,* New York: United Nations, 2012, p.50.

[31] Klingebiel, Stephen and Roehder, Katja, *The Development-Military Relationship: the Start of a New Alliance?*, Briefing Paper 1/2004, Bonn: German Development Institute*,* 2004, p.1.

[32] de Coning, Cedric et.al, *United Nations Civil-Military Coordination (UN-CIMIC)*, Williamsburg: Peace Operations Training Institute, 2012, p.12.

[33] Krulak, Charles, "The Three Block War: Fighting in Urban Areas", *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 64(5), 1997, p.140. C. Krulak is a former commandant of the US Marine Corps.

[34] Sloan, Elinor, *Modern Military Strategy: An Introduction*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2012, p.11

[35] Egnell, Robert, *Between Reluctance and Necessity: The Utility of Military Force in Humanitarian and Development Operations*, Security Policy Library 1/2009, Oslo: The Norwegian Atlantic Committee, 2009, p.3.

encompass peacekeeping, peace enforcement, conflict prevention, peace building, and humanitarian relief.[36] The DPKO and the OCHA prefer the terms integrated or multidimensional peacekeeping/peace missions.[37]

Following the complexity of the situations faced in Somalia (1992-1995), Rwanda (1993-1996) and the former Yugoslavia (1991-2001), the need for integrated approaches that address all the above-mentioned aspects and promote certain coherence and coordination between all actors involved was felt as inevitable by both civilian and military actors which led to the creation of a framework for multifunctional activities within PSOs in fragile or failed states. Various states and multinational organizations (e.g., the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, the European Union, the UN, and NATO) adopted strategies and policies known as Whole of Government, Integrated, 3D[38] and Comprehensive Approaches, in which Quick Impact Projects, PRTs, Commanders Emergency Response Program, Integrated Missions Task Forces play an important role.[39]

All these notions imply a cross-governmental, multi-actor approach and cooperation between armed forces, ministries of foreign affairs, governmental development agencies, international organizations and non-governmental actors, thus creating a broader framework for civil-military relations by including, beside military actors, two types of civilian actors – humanitarian and non-humanitarian. Regardless of their names, all these proactive models are based on "blending civilian and military tools and enforcing cooperation" by promoting a strategy to "engage, secure, hold and develop". Therefore, such operations aim to combine military, political, and development actors in order "to ensure integrated effort by all donors on strategy and delivery and to provide immediate support for post-conflict reconstruction".[40] Building on the operational experience gained in various PSOs, NATO is promoting a "concerted planning and action strategy" based on a comprehensive approach to crisis management and to PSOs, especially to stabilization operations, in highlighting the importance and necessity to "work more closely with civilian partners on the ground, and at a political level — especially the European Union and the United Nations."[41]

Any comprehensive approach implies two dimensions: strategic and tactical. The strategic dimension aims to promote efficient management of resources, high interoperability and policy coordination and coherence at the national level (between defence, diplomacy and development) and at the international level (inter- and intra-organization such as NATO, the

---

[36] NATO, *Peace Support Operations*, AJP-3.4.1, Brussels: Military Agency for Standardization, 2001, 2-1 (0202), p.36.

[37] For more details on the UN multidimensional and integrated operations, see: DPKO, *Civil-Military Coordination in UN Integrated Peacekeeping Missions*, 2010; OCHA, "OCHA on Message: Integration: Structural Arrangements", March 2012. Available from: https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/120229_OOM-integration_eng.pdf.

[38] 3D refers to a whole-of-government approach to security and development that links defense, diplomacy and development efforts in one integrated answer to the challenges that PSOs face.

[39] Council of the European, *Draft EU Concept for Comprehensive Planning*, Document 13983/05, 2005; United Nations, *Report on the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, A/55/305, 2000, p.xiii; House of Commons, *The Comprehensive Approach: the Point of War is not just to Win but to Make a Better Peace*, HC 224, London: The Stationery Office, 2010, p.1; The Joint Doctrine and Concepts Centre, *The Comprehensive Approach*, JDN 4/05, London: Ministry of Defence, 2006, p.1-1.

[40] House of Commons, 2010, p.12-14.

[41] NATO, "A 'Comprehensive Approach' to Crisis Management". Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/ar/natolive/topics_51633.htm.

EU, and the UN). The tactical dimension refers to the implementation of related policies and projects on the ground, by mixed teams of experts. In such circumstances, depending on the affiliation of military and civilian actors, CIMIC includes several types of interactions: internal, external, intra- and inter-agency.

## IV. ROLES, TASKS AND FUNCTIONS OF MILITARY ACTORS IN PSOs

Although comprehensive approaches are relatively new concepts (NATO endorsed its Comprehensive Political Guidance in 2006, at the Riga Summit) and not yet fully implemented, Iraq and especially Afghanistan represent some illustrating and complex cases, in which such approaches have been tested through PRTs.

PRTs were implemented by the Coalition Forces since 2002 in Afghanistan and by the United States since 2005 in Iraq as a means to win the 'hearts and minds' of the local population, as well as a means to provide relief and development agencies with security and access to certain regions. Meanwhile, the goals of PRTs in Afghanistan were to expand the authority of the Government of Afghanistan in key areas, to facilitate and perform various tasks for stabilization, security sector reform and reconstruction. As a structure, a Provincial Reconstruction Team consists of 50 to 150 military and civilian staff who come from defense, foreign affairs and development agencies. The PRTs operate under a military command, but with a joint leadership team. Although expectations for PRTs were relatively high as effective cooperation would be tantamount to a successful integrated approach, any attempt to evaluate their activities should acknowledge their limited capacity to provide solutions to a wide array of problems, such as poverty, insurgency, organized crime and humanitarian concerns.

The Provincial Reconstruction Team is considered one of the concepts most difficult to understand, as there is no universal model and PRTs operate in very different ways.[42] For example, in Afghanistan there were 27 PRTs commanded by different states that were participants in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), each one with its own operational pattern.[43]

However, an analysis of the PRTs' activities can offer a pattern for some of the new roles and tasks that military can have. Although such tasks are secondary activities for the military, they can lead to significant readjustments in their education and training for some specific non-military and multi-purpose tasks. The humanitarian and peace support-related roles that the military actors play encompass a variety of functions as follows:

1. Protection functions: providing a safe and secure environment has become a core function of military actors that aims to ensure a stable framework for reconstruction and development tasks undertaken by civilian actors, especially following the increasing number of attacks in recent years on experts, workers and convoys that provide relief assistance.

2. Civil administration functions: assisting security sector reform (SSR), demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of former combatants are usually done by a mixed

---

[42] Maley, William, *Rescuing Afghanistan,* Coogee: UNSW Press, 2006, p.66-67.

[43] In Iraq there were 25 PRTs operated by the United States.

engagement of military and civilian actors, in which the demobilization-disarmament tasks are performed by the military, and the reintegration tasks are fulfilled by civilian agencies.

3.  Law enforcement functions: provide assistance to domestic security forces (military, police) and the international police. In fragile states, when the domestic security structures are still compromised, weak, new or not yet put in place or when the international police forces do not have sufficient means to face a strong transnational criminal organization, the international military actors might step in and fill the gap.[44]

4.  Logistics support functions: provide logistical assistance to the civilian actors involved in assistance and reconstruction that can cover a wide array of tasks, such as: solving water and sanitation problems, providing water facilities, demining, reconstructing infrastructure, building camps for displaced and refugees, refurbishing or building schools and hospitals, and using military logistics to transport goods and people.[45]

5.  Medical support functions: when security situations in complex PSOs might not permit an easy access of civilian actors to a population in need of health support, military actors can deliver medical services to refugees, displaced populations or people with urgent medical needs.[46]

6.  Emergency relief functions: in complex situations, military actors can provide a variety of types of emergency life support, such as food, water, shelter, and medical services.[47]

7.  Implementing small aid projects and reconstruction functions: while the above mentioned six functions are relatively widely accepted, the direct involvement of the military in aid and reconstruction projects within stabilization operations has raised many concerns. Despite criticism, the Coalition Forces in Afghanistan and the German Bundeswehr in the Balkans relatively successfully conducted reconstruction projects that are usually managed by development agencies.[48]

---

[44] For more information on traditional law enforcement tasks performed by military actors in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, see: Hembruff, Jesse, "The military's role in post-conflict law enforcement: DCAF report on Bosnia and Kosovo". Available from: http://www.ssrresourcecentre.org/2010/05/28/the-military%E2%80%99s-role-in-post-conflict-law-enforcement-dcaf-report-on-bosnia-and-kosovo/.

[45] For more details, see: de Coning, Cedric, "Political, Civilian and Military Dimension of PCRD", in *Post-conflict Reconstruction and Development in Africa*, eds. Theo Neethling and Heidi Hudson, Tokyo: UNU Press, 2013, p.27.

[46] Recent data have shown a prevalence of the treatment of civilians by the military medical teams. For more information, see: Neuhaus, J. Susan, "Medical Aspects of Civil-Military Operations. The Challenges of Military Health Support to Civilian Populations on Operations" in *Civil-Military Cooperation in Post-Conflict Operations*, eds. Ankersen, Christopher, Abington: Routledge, 2008, p.201.

[47] According to some analyses and surveys related to CIMIC in Afghanistan within the framework of PRTs, military assistance to humanitarian efforts is seen as inevitable, but also appreciated by some civilian actors. See: Dusman, Aleksandr et al., *Civil-Military Operations in Conflict and Post-Conflict Situations: Learning from Lithuanian, Slovenian and Estonian Experiences*, Vilnius: VšĮ AKADEMINĖ LEIDYBA, 2012, p.44-72.

[48] Germany adopted in the Balkans a complementary approach based on coordination in maintaining certain independence of defense, foreign affairs and development actors, while in Afghanistan, the US and other NATO

As observed, CIMIC within PRTs has a multidimensional feature: it encompasses an internal aspect which refers to the interactions between the military component of PRTs and their civilian counterparts; and an external aspect that refers to the interactions between the military component of PRTs and external civilian actors. The external dimension of CIMIC includes relations with humanitarian NGOs, as well as with non-humanitarian actors such as civil police, reconstruction teams, political and judicial experts, development experts and local population. Such a diversity of civilian actors can make it difficult for the military to handle interactions that require a different approaches depending on the affiliation of civilian actors. Thus, the main challenges for CIMIC are caused less by the interactions within PRTs than by those with external actors. In this regard, cooperation with humanitarian and development NGOs actors represents one of the most sensitive elements, which has caused the strongest adverse reaction.

## V. CHALLENGES FOR CIVIL-MILITARY COOPERATION WITHIN COMPREHENSIVE APPROACHES

While some scholars and experts support the involvement of military actors in non-military tasks within the PSO by arguing that they can be effective in completing certain humanitarian and reconstruction projects, some others[49] assert that such activities must be left to civilian actors by claiming that these tasks are "fundamentally incompatible" with military actors  and that militarization of humanitarian and assistance projects might lead to negative outcomes.

One argument against the integrated approaches is that in such circumstances, the military are expected to fulfil some functions for which they lack training and commitment. While it is true that the military are not traditionally trained for humanitarian or reconstruction tasks, they do have a lot of skills and the means for providing such assistance in stabilization or transition contexts. Well organized and efficient, they hold robust logistical and manpower resources. In reality, the flexibility and versatility of military actors, that is their ability to adjust rapidly in response to a change and to provide multifunctional capabilities, make them more effective and efficient in providing emergency assistance. Surveys on CIMIC in Afghanistan within the framework of PRTs revealed that at the beginning of PSOs, neither military nor civilian actors knew how to efficiently engage and how to use their expertise to common benefit. After working together, both actors were able to identify each other's strengths and weaknesses by highlighting their comparative advantages such as flexibility and areas of specific expertise in the case of civilian actors, and the capacity for organization, discipline, and quick responses for medical evacuation and emergencies in the case of military forces.[50]

Another argument against military involvement is that as humanitarian assistance must be guided by impartiality (i.e. on the basis of need without discrimination), independence (i.e. autonomy from political, economic and military objectives) and neutrality (i.e. without

---

members pursued a completely integrated approach within PRTs, which gave rise to criticism from civil actors. For more information, see: Klingebiel & Roehder, 2004, p.2.

[49] Weir, Erin A., *Conflict and Compromise: UN Integrated Missions and the Humanitarian Imperative*, KAIPT Monograph 4, Accra: Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre, 2006, p.26.
[50] Dusman (2004), p.44, 72-74, 88.

favoring of any side in a conflict), mixed or military-led actions will blur the lines between civilian assistance and military engagement. Although some NGOs underline that the presence of PRTs in volatile areas of Afghanistan assured them of a certain degree of security, provided useful assistance for their activities and played a significant role in reducing tensions at the local level, some other civilian actors argue that the military have exclusively strategic and tactical motivations to get involved in non-military operations in order to 'win hearts and minds' and to use the assistance to achieve military goals, such as taking key positions, gathering intelligence and enhancing force protection.[51] On the contrary, providing medical aid, water, food or building shelters may be a means to enhance trust and to build a good relationship that can be seen as a contribution to peacebuilding efforts and not necessarily as concealing a hidden agenda. In fact, such actions could be problematic only if military actors behave inappropriately by presenting themselves falsely as humanitarian workers or by making aid conditional on a population's willingness to provide information.[52]

Consequently, promoting an integrated approach and a close relationship with the military may harm the credibility of humanitarian assistance providers and increase confusion between the recipients of aid who have difficulty in distinguishing between military personnel and civilians. Moreover, it may lead to cases in which all external workers and experts associated with the military, become legitimate targets of insurgent groups which may view PRTs as an instrument of counterinsurgency strategy. After five of its employees were killed in Afghanistan, Médecins Sans Frontières suspended its operations in 2004 by justifying its decision on the ground that the proliferation of PRTs, had made the line between civilian and military actors unclear.[53] Such a justification cannot be considered completely wrong, but as Karen Guttieri points out, the insurgents in Iraq, Afghanistan or Somalia fight against not only military forces, but also against any Western presence in the region and thus "the simple status of being an outsider generates a political signature".[54]

Moreover, some assert that military involvement in providing humanitarian and development assistance may dilute the purpose of the task and may subordinate development policy to political and military goals. Here, it is important to make a clear distinction between humanitarian actions that focus on providing short- and medium-term emergency assistance and take place during the early stages of PSOs, and development assistance that focuses on medium- and long-term goals and takes place during the last two stages of a peacebuilding process in which military actors are rarely involved. As de Coning argued, while humanitarian aid can be neutral and impartial, the medium- and long-term goals of development cannot claim to be the same as far as it "aims to change the structural dynamics

---

[51] See: Canadian Peacebuilding Coordination Committee, *NGO/Government Dialogue on Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan and the Militarization of Humanitarian Assistance: Final Report*, Ottawa: Canadian Peacebuilding Coordination Committee, 2003. p.12.

[52] The US forces in Afghanistan distributed leaflets in which people were asked to provide information on Al-Qaida or they would not receive humanitarian aid. See: MacAskill, Ewen, "Pentagon Forced to Withdraw Leaflet Linking Aid to Information on Taliban", *The Guardian*, 6 May 2004. Available from: http://www.the guardian.com/world/2004/may/ 06/afghanistan.usa.

[53] According to Médecins Sans Frontières, "PRT actions had curtailed 'humanitarian space' within which MSF and other humanitarian organizations could operate". Sedra, Mark, "Civil-Military Relations in Afghanistan. The Provincial Reconstruction Team Debate", Toronto: The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, Strategic Datalink 126, 2005, p.1.

[54] Guttieri, Karen, "Humanitarian Space in Insecure Environments: A Shifting Paradigm", *Strategic Insights*, 4(11), 2005, p.2.

of the society".[55] The engagement of military actors in small-scale aid and reconstruction projects (known also as Quick Impact Projects) should be identified with neither humanitarian assistance nor long-term development projects.

Another challenge is represented by the diversity and flexibility of PRTs models. As mentioned previously, PRTs have been implemented by different countries, thus each team has been different from the others and each has had its own pattern of CIMIC. In accordance with national CIMIC doctrines and in response to specific local conditions and needs, each Provincial Reconstruction Team has concentrated on different issues by putting more or less emphasis on security, humanitarian or reconstruction aspects of the project. Such diversity and flexibility can create unequal results from one area to another and raise confusion for the local authorities, the local population and engaged NGOs in respect to the PRTs' purpose, role and strategy.[56]

However, if the PRTs have proved their capacity to be involved in short-term projects and if their activities have been considered successful by some countries, there is little evidence that there are long-term strategies focused on promoting local capacity and building local ownership in order to allow the host nation to assure its own security and development needs after the withdrawal of PRTs.[57] One of the explanations for this situation lies in the comparatively small number of civilians within PRTs, so that the military predominance and command of the PRTs have emphasized to a certain degree the military character of such structures.[58] A misleading conclusion might be drawn that the priorities are set by the military actors and thus, development goals will be subordinated to military ones. Moreover, the rotation of military units at regular six-month intervals can adversely affect the continuity of projects and thus, make military actors less fit for involvement in long-term strategies and projects.

In turn, some military commanders criticize the tendency to consider military actors as a solution for a "wide range of problems for which they were not originally intended or configured". Faced with a lack of troops, a lack of proper support from political leaders and a reluctance of civilian counterparts to cooperation, some United Kingdom senior military officers have highlighted the risks that the military were running in the face of confusing and

---

[55] De Coning (2013), p.28.

[56] Department of State, Office of the Coordinator for Stabilization and Reconstruction, Department of Defense, Joint Center for Operational Analysis/United States Joint Forces Command, Coordination, Agency for International Development and Bureau for Policy Program Coordination, *Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan: An Interagency Assessment*, Washington D.C.: United States Agency for International Development, 2006, p.11.

[57] Some NGOs argued that such attempts were "costly, wasteful, lacking in quality and often not taking into account community needs and created more problems than solutions" and "do not have sufficient community involvement to make them sustainable", see: Cornish, Stephen, "No Room for Humanitarianism in 3D Policies: Have Forcible Humanitarian Interventions and Integrated Approaches Lost their Way?", J*ournal of Military and Strategic Studies*, 10(1), 2010, p.30.; Oxfam International, "Quick Impact, Quick Collapse: The Dangers of Militarized Aid in Afghanistan", Interagency Report, 2010, p.1. Available from: http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/quick-impact-quick-collapse-jan-2010.pdf.

[58] Savage (2012), p.130.

unclear objectives.[59] In fact, their involvement in several non-military tasks at the same time can affect combat readiness, lead to an overstretched military organization as well as to humanitarianisation of military affairs, and this can negatively affect the ways in which the military actors are able to perform their core tasks. Moreover, the United States military underlines that in complex situations, a mix of "well-intentioned but uncoordinated actions can cancel each other or provide vulnerabilities for insurgents to exploit".[60]

As observed, comprehensive approaches implemented via PRTs gave rise to mixed reactions and thus, it is possible to identify two types of outcomes: on one hand, an improved cooperation between civilian and military actors based on a mutual understanding of their strengths and weaknesses that leads to efficient management of resources and appropriate choice of solutions; on the other hand, duplication in efforts, gaps in capacity and confusion created mainly by the dual use of military forces, as they become simultaneously involved in combat and in reconstruction assistance which blurs the lines between the actors.[61]

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

The international community is required to give a multidimensional response in the face of the increasing number of attacks on experts and convoys that provide assistance, the presence of armed groups or counterinsurgents in fragile or failed states, the inability of the new or weak governance to tackle urgent issues and the persistence of ethnic, religious or socio-economic tensions that might lead to the recurrence of conflicts. Thus, civilian and military actors are being called upon to coordinate their roles and tasks in comprehensive approaches. The concept of integrated approaches, i.e. the linking of all actors involved in different stages of PSOs in order to maximize the outcomes, is logical and appealing. However, its implementation raises various practical problems, concerns and adverse reactions mainly from NGOs.

The importance of analyzing the implementation of comprehensive approaches via PRTs lies in the increasing probability that such "models" are likely to be applied in future PSOs elsewhere. A clear identification of problems and challenges that have arisen for CIMIC can provide an important lesson for future operations. While this paper does not claim to offer an

---

[59] Smith, Rupert, *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*, London: Allen Lane, 2005, p.xii; Forster, Anthony, "Breaking the Covenant: Governance of the British Army in the Twenty-First Century", *International Affairs*, 82(6), 2006, p.1045.

[60] United States Army and US Marine Corps, *Counterinsurgency Field Manual*, FM3-24/MCWP3-35.5, New York: Cosimo, 2006, 1-121.

[61] For NGOs's reactions and governmental evaluation of the Comprehensive Approach via PRTs, see: National Audit Office, *Perspectives of Non-Governmental Organisations on Comprehensive Approach,* London: National Audit Office, 2009; Thruelsen, Peter Dahl, *Implementing the Comprehensive Approach in Helmand – Within the Context of Counterinsurgency*, Copenhagen: Royal Danish Defence College, 2008; Dusman, 2004; Williams, Michael J., "Empire Lite Revised: NATO, the Comprehensive Approach and State Building in Afghanistan", *International Peacekeeping*, 18(1), 2011, pp.64-78; Shevlin, James, "Ethical Considerations for PRTs in Afghanistan", *Journal of International Peace Operations,* 3(1), 2007, p.12; Wheeler, Victoria and Harmer, Adele (eds.), *Resettling the Rules of Engagement – Trends and Issues in Military-Humanitarian Relations*, Humanitarian Policy Group Report 21, London: Overseas Development Institute, 2006; Franke, Volker, "The Peacebuilding Dilemma: Civil-Military Cooperation in Stability Operations", *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 11(2) Autumn/Winter 2006. Available from: http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/ vol11_2/cov er11_2.htm.

answer, nor to engage in a theoretical debate, it highlights some crucial problems that have arisen at various levels.

Obviously, it is still a tremendous task to achieve the full cooperation and harmonization of civil and military actors within comprehensive approaches in order to meet the challenges posed during PSOs, especially when changes in the strategic context and at the tactical level can blur the line between coercive and non-coercive action, between military and non-military activity, and between combatants and non-combatants. Moreover, the promotion of comprehensive approaches that imply a proactive engagement of military actors in non-military tasks must be done with relative caution and without ignoring the risks of blurring the lines of competencies and of causing confusion that may result from the subordination of assistance policy to strategic military considerations and the use of assistance resources to fund military missions.[62] Comprehensive approaches must be based on a rigorous planning of tasks to avoid overlap and confusion caused by the rotation of military command and units that will affect the long-term goals of peace building projects.

The application of CMR theories might be useful while analyzing comprehensive approaches at the strategic level by evaluating the relationship between military and civilian actors in the decision-making process. Some scholars completely oppose comprehensive approaches by suggesting the need to make a clear-cut distinction between military and civilian activities in order to avoid any kind of tensions. Other scholars assert that for a successful implementation of comprehensive approaches via PRTs, a complete distinction is not possible but a clear division of the roles and tasks within PRTs is necessary. Accordingly, while working together, the military can be in charge exclusively with the security aspect, while the civilian counterpart will deal with humanitarian and development tasks avoiding in this way confusion and overlap.[63] A more interesting approach that can have a certain applicability in defusing the tensions between civilian and military actors is provided by Schiff's concordance theory that emphasizes that the accommodation and agreement between civilian and military actors should be based on shared values and objectives. Moreover, the concept of "targeted partnership", an extension of the concordance theory, implies "multiple forms of partnership" between both actors by allowing a certain flexibility in their interactions in order to achieve a common objective in a relative short period of time. Designed to be applied in situations such as when counterinsurgency is present, this concept can be used not only at the strategic decision-making level, but also at the implementation level. It might provide a useful framework for dialog and exchange in order to identify common goals and shared interests.[64]

In designing comprehensive approaches, it is necessary to take into account the differences between military and civilian organizational cultures which are based on different goals,

---

[62] Klingebiel and Roehder (2004), p.4.

[63] For opposition toward comprehensive approaches, see Barry, Jane, Jeffreys, Anna, "A Bridge Too Far: Aid Agencies and the Military in Humanitarian Response", Network Paper 37, Humanitarian Practice Network, 2002. Available from: http://www.odihpn.org/hpn-resources/network-papers/a-bridge-too-far-aid-agencies-and-the-military-in-humanitarian-response. For division of tasks, see Hart, Robin, "Civil-Military Coordination in Complex Humanitarian Situations", Report on Wilton Park Conference 895, 2008. Available from: https://www.wiltonpark.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/wp895-report.pdf

[64] Schiff, Rebecca, "Concordance Theory, Targeted partnership, and Counterinsurgency Strategy", in *Armed Forces and Society*, 38(2), 2012, p.320, 326.

values, agendas, functional imperatives and decision-making styles, since these factors often lead to tensions between the two actors and hamper any attempt to harmonize their actions. Moreover, it is important to emphasize that military's culture must be maintained as distinct from civilian one in order to achieve necessary and effective outcomes in the military's traditional mission of combat.[65]

Integrated strategies can, nevertheless, lead to closer cooperation, coherence and a certain level of coordination in creating a favorable framework for military and civilian actors to work side by side. In this regard, keeping in mind that ultimately they share a common goal "to do what is morally right in the face of brutality and hardship"[66], one should not consider the military actors as being completely incompatible with humanitarian or peacebuilding-related tasks. Thus, by identifying shared values and common goals, by understanding the advantages of working together rather than opposing each other, civilian and military actors will be able to find common ground on which they can perform tasks in an efficient way, without letting their differences affect their cooperation in a combined effort to overcome the challenges they face.

In order to avoid misunderstanding and reduce the gaps caused by organizational and cultural differences between civilian and military actors, training and education can play an essential role. The value of human capital in improving cooperation is of great importance and thus, organizing joint pre-deployment training, integrated planning exercises, common assessment processes, joint workshops for sharing information and experiences are some of the means that can facilitate a better mutual understanding. In addition, a collection of best practices that are drawn on the experiences of experts and those involved in implementing comprehensive approaches on the ground could be a useful and important element.[67]

Another element that must be taken into account while defining or implementing comprehensive approaches is the local socio-cultural specificity which can play an important role especially in PSOs. In the academic field, there are some investigations that highlight the role of cultural and ethnical factors in counterinsurgency operations.[68] At a practical level, the development of programs such as the Human Terrain System can give rise to an awareness of these factors as well as provide a scientific methodology that can lead to more effective strategies and policies of CIMIC in PSOs.[69]

---

[65] Egnell (2009), p.22-25; Dandeker, Christopher "On the Need to be Different: Military Uniqueness and Civil-Military Relations in Modern Society", *RUSI Journal*, 146(3), 2001, p.4-9.

[66] Weir (2006), p.26.

[67] McHugh, Gerard, Gostelow, Lola, *Provincial Reconstruction Teams and Humanitarian Military Relations in Afghanistan,* Save The Children Report, 2004 p.54. Available from: https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Docume nts/Save%20the%20Children-%20PRTs%20and%20Humanitarian%20Military%20Relations%20in%20Afghani stan%20%282004%29.pdf. For more information about best practices, see: Douglas, Alex, *Trends in Civil-Military Relations*, Australian Civil-Military Center, 2011. Available from: http://acmc.gov.au/our-work-and-focus/research-and-lessons-learned/civil-military-trends/.

[68] For more details about cultural factor in counterinsurgency operations, see:Schiff (2012), p.330-334, Gompert, David et.all, *Reconstruction under Fire. Unigying Civil and Military Counterinsurgency*, Santa Monica: RAND, 2009, p.17-18, 46,94.

[69] Human Terrain System is a program developed by the United States and is based on the cooperation between experts in sociology, antropology, linguistics and military in order to facilite the understanding of socio-cultural specificity by the military deployed in a certain area. For more details, see: *The Human Terrain System*, U.S.Army. Available at: http://hu manterrainsystem.army.mil/. United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and New Zeeland have also shown interest in such projects. See: *Counter-insurgency and Civil-Military Relations for*

As comprehensive approaches have not yet been fully and widely implemented, there is little evidence on the effectiveness of such approaches on the ground. It remains to be seen what level of integration is possible and in what degree such approaches are effective. Furthermore, it is difficult to claim that comprehensive approaches via PRTs can be used as a model applied to all similar situations without taking into account local specificity. In this regard, a more detailed comparison of the effectiveness of different PRTs in Afghanistan might be relevant. Thus, rather than considering comprehensive approaches as a model applicable in all contexts, a case-by-case method is preferable as it would allow a choice of the most effective solution based on an assessment of the security situation and other relevant conditions.

Finally, one must keep in mind that military actors cannot be seen as the exclusive providers of a universal solution for all problems and they cannot be held responsible for all negative outcomes that may occur in complex PSOs. The military's main focus is to provide security. Thus, non-military tasks must be secondary functions and only be assigned to the military with caution in order not to negatively influence their core tasks by overstretching military organization and affecting their combat readiness.

*Stabilization, Peace-Building and Conflict Prevention*, UNSW Canberra. Available at: http://bus.unsw.adfa.edu.au/research/fsp5.php.

CHALLENGES FOR CIVIL-MILITARY COOPERATION IN PEACE SUPPORT
OPERATIONS: EXAMINING THE FRAMEWORK OF COMPREHENSIVE
APPROACHES

## WORKS CITED

Aggestam, Karin, "Internal and external dynamics of spoiling: A negotiation approach", in *Challenges to Peacebuilding. Managing spoilers during conflict resolution*, eds. Newman, Edward and Richmond, Oliver, Tokyo: UNU Press, 2006, pp.23-39.

Andrews, Brandy M., *Patterns of Civil-Military Relations in Democracy*, Fort Leavenworth Kansas: United States Army Command and General Staff College, School of Advanced Military Studies, 2008.

Ankersen, Christopher "Interrogating civil-military cooperation", in *Civil-Military Cooperation in Post Conflict Operations* eds. Ankersen, Christopher, Abingdon: Routledge, 2008, pp.1-11.

Barry, Jane, Jeffreys, Anna, "A Bridge Too Far: Aid Agencies and the Military in Humanitarian Response", Network Paper 37, Humanitarian Practice Network, 2002. Available from: http://www.odihpn.org/hpn-resources/network-papers/a-bridge-too-far- aid-agencies-and-the-military-in-humanitarian-response (accessed 15 February 2014).

Born, Hans, "Democratic Control of Armed Forces: Relevance, Issues and Research Agenda", in *Handbook of the Sociology of the Military*, eds. Caforio, Giuseppe, New York: Springer, 2006, pp. 151-167.

Bruneau, Thomas, Matei, Florina Cristiana, T*he Routledge Handbook of Civil-Military Relations*, Abington: Routledge, 2013.

Bush, Kenneth, "Commodification, Compartmentalization, and Militarization of Peacebuilding", in *Building Sustainable Peace*, eds. Keating, Tom and Knight, W.Andy, Edmonton: The University of Edmonton Alberta Press, 2005, pp.23-47.

Canadian Peacebuilding Coordination Committee, *NGO/Government Dialogue on Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan and the Militarization of Humanitarian Assistance: Final Report*, Ottawa: Canadian Peacebuilding Coordination Committee, 2003.

Civil-Military Cooperation Centre of Excellence, CIMIC Field Handbook, 3rd edn, Enschede: Civil-Military Cooperation Centre of Excellence, 2012.

Collier, Paul et.al., *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil Wars and Development Policy*, Washington, District of Columbia: The World Bank, 2007.

Conflict Management Division, Peace and Security Department, Policy on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development, Addis Ababa: Commission of the African Union, 2006.

Cornish, Stephen, "No Room for Humanitarianism in 3D Policies: Have Forcible Humanitarian Interventions and Integrated Approaches Lost their Way?", *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, 10 (1), 2010, pp.1-48.

Council of the European Union, Draft EU Concept for Comprehensive Planning, Document 13983/05, Brussels: Council of the European Union, 2005.

de Coning, Cedric, "Civil-Military Coordination and UN Peacebuilding Operations", *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 5(2), 2005, pp.89-118.

de Coning, Cedric et.al, *United Nations Civil-Military Coordination (UN-CIMIC)*, Williamsburg: Peace Operations Training Institute, 2012.

de Coning, Cedric, "Political, Civilian and Military Dimension of PCRD", in *Post-conflict Reconstruction and Development in Africa*, eds. Theo Neethling and Heidi Hudson, Tokyo: UNU Press, 2013, pp.17-36.

Dandeker, Christopher "On the Need to be Different: Military Uniqueness and Civil-Military Relations in Modern Society", *RUSI Journal*, 146(3), 2001, p.4-9.

Department of Peacekeeping Operations, *Civil-Military Coordination in UN Integrated Peacekeeping Missions*, Policy Paper, New York: United Nations, 2010.

Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, *Civil Affairs Handbook*, New York: United Nations, 2012.

Department of Peacekeeping Operations, *Civil-Military Coordination Policy*, New York: United Nations, 2002.

Department of Peacekeeping Operations, *Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding: Clarifying the Nexus*, Informal Paper, New York: United Nations, 2010.

Department of State, Office of the Coordinator for Stabilization and Reconstruction, Department of Defense, Joint Center for Operational Analysis/United States Joint Forces Command, Coordination, Agency for International Development and Bureau for Policy Program Coordination, *Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan: An Interagency Assessment*, Washington, District of Columbia: United States Agency for International Development, 2006.

Douglas, Alex, "Trends in Civil-Military Relations, Australian Civil-Military Center", 2011. Available from: http://acmc.gov.au/our-work-and-focus/research-and-lessons- learned/civil-military-trends/ (accessed 20 February 2014).

Dusman, Aleksandr et al., *Civil-Military Operations in Conflict and Post-Conflict Situations: Learning from Lithuanian, Slovenian and Estonian Experiences*, Vilnius: VšĮ AKADEMINĖ LEIDYBA, 2012.

Egnell, Robert, *Between Reluctance and Necessity: The Utility of Military Force in Humanitarian and Development Operations*, Security Policy Library 1/2009, Oslo: The Norwegian Atlantic Committee, 2009.

Franke, Volker, "The Peacebuilding Dilemma: Civil-Military Cooperation in Stability Operations", *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 11(2) Autumn/Winter 2006. Available

from: http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol11_2/cover11_2.htm (accessed 10 January 2014).

Forster, Anthony, "Breaking the Covenant: Governance of the British Army in the Twenty-First Century", *International Affairs*, 82(6), 2006, pp.1043-1057.

Gompert, David et.all, *Reconstruction under Fire. Unigying Civil and Military Counterinsurgency*, Santa Monica: RAND, 2009.

Guttieri, Karen, "Humanitarian Space in Insecure Environments: A Shifting Paradigm", *Strategic Insights*, 4(11), 2005, pp.1-7.

Hart, Robinm "Civil-Military Coordination in Complex Humanitarian Situations" Report on Wilton Park Conference 895, 2008. Available from: https://www.wiltonpark. org.uk/wp-content/uploads/wp895-report.pdf (accessed 20 February 2014)

Hembruff, Jesse, "The military's role in post-conflict law enforcement: DCAF report on Bosnia and Kosovo". Available from: http://www.ssrresourcecentre.org/2010/05/28/the-milita ry%E2%80%99s-role-in-post-conflict-law-enforcement-dcaf-report-on-bosnia-and-kosovo/ (accessed 12 January 2014).

Hoshino, Toshiya, "Peacebuilding & Human Security in Fragile States", *Japan Spotlight*, 28(6), November-December 2009, p.18.

House of Commons, *The Comprehensive Approach: the Point of War is not just to Win but to Make a Better Peace*, HC 224, London: The Stationery Office, 2010.

Huntington, Samuel, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil Military Relations*, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957.

Inter-Agency Standing Committee, *IASC Non-Binding Guidelines on the Use of Armed Escorts for Humanitarian Convoys*, New York: Inter-Agency Standing Committee,2013

Janowitz, Morris, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*, Glencoe: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.

Keating, Tom and Knight, W.Andy (eds.), *Building Sustainable Peace*, Edmonton: The University of Edmonton Alberta Press, 2005.

Klingebiel, *Stephen and Roehder, Katja, The Development-Military Relationship: the Start of a New Alliance?*, Briefing Paper 1/2004, Bonn: German Development Institute, 2004.

Krulak, Charles, "The Three Block War: Fighting in Urban Areas", *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 64(5), 1997.

MacAskill, Ewen, "Pentagon Forced to Withdraw Leaflet Linking Aid to Information on Taliban", *The Guardian*, 6 May 2004. Available from: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/may/06/afghanistan.usa (accessed 14 January 2014).

Maley, William, *Rescuing Afghanistan*, Coogee: UNSW Press, 2006.

McHugh, Gerard, Gostelow, Lola, *Provincial Reconstruction Teams and Humanitarian Military Relations in Afghanistan*, Save The Children Report, 2004 p.54. Available from: https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Save%20the%20Children-%20PRTs%20and%20Humanitarian%20Military%20Relations%20in%20Afghanistan%20%282004%29.pdf (accessed 22 February2014).

Metcalfe, Victoria, Haysom, Simone and Gordon, Stuart, *Trends and Challenges in Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination*, Humanitarian Policy Group Working Paper, London: Overseas Development Institute, 2012.

National Audit Office, *Perspectives of Non-Governmental Organisations on Comprehensive Approach*, London: National Audit Office, 2009.

Neuhaus, J. Susan, "Medical Aspects of Civil-Military Operations. The Challenges of Military Health Support to Civilian Populations on Operations" in *Civil-Military Cooperation in Post-Conflict Operations*, eds. Ankersen, Christopher, Abington: Routledge, 2008, pp.201-224.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "A 'Comprehensive Approach' to Crisis Management". Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/ar/natolive/topics_51633.htm (accessed 12 January 2014).

North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO Civil-Military Co-operation (CIMIC) Doctrine*, AJP-9, Brussels: NATO Standardization Agency, 2003.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *NATO Military Policy on Civil-Military Co-operation*, MC411/1, Brussels: North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 2002.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization, *Peace Support Operations*, AJP-3.4.1, Brussels: Military Agency for Standardization, 2001.

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *Civil-Military Relationship in Complex Emergencies*, Inter-Agency Standing Committee Reference Paper, Geneva: United Nations, 2004.

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *Civil-Military Guidelines and Reference for Complex Emergencies*, New York: United Nations, 2008.

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets to Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies (MCDA Guidelines)*, Geneva: United Nations, 2006.

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, "OCHA on Message: Humanitarian Principles", June 2012. Available from: https://ochanet.unocha. org/p/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf (accessed 14 January 2014).

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, "OCHA on Message: Integration: Structural Arrangements", March 2012, Available from: https://docs.unocha.org/sites/ dms/Documents/120229_ OOM-integration_eng.pdf (accessed 14 January 2014).

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *Oslo Guidelines: Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief*, Geneva: United Nations, 2007.

Oliker, Olga et al, *Aid during Conflict: Interaction between Military and Civil Assistance Providers in Afghanistan*, September 2001-June 20002, Santa Monica: RAND, 2004.

Olson, Lara and Gregorian, Hratch, *Beyond Information Sharing & False Coherence: Interagency Coordination in International Peace Missions*, Policy Brief, Calgary: Center for Military and Strategic Studies, 2007.

Oxfam International, "Quick Impact, Quick Collapse: The Dangers of Militarized Aid in Afghanistan", Interagency Report, 2010, p.1. Available from: http://www.oxfam.org/ sites/www.oxfam.org/files/quick-impact-quick-collapse-jan-2010.pdf (accessed 22 February 2014).

Rana, Raj, "At a Crossroad or a Dead-End? Considering the Civil-Military Relationship in Times of Armed Conflict" in *Civil-Military Cooperation in Post Conflict Operations*, eds. Ankersen, Christopher, Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.

Rehse, Peter, *CIMIC: Concepts, Definition and Practice*, Hamburg: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, 2004.

Savage, A.J. Owen, "Yes, but is it peacebuilding? Evaluating civil-military cooperation in Afghanistan", in *Civil-Military Cooperation in Post-Conflict Operations*, eds. Ankersen, Christopher, Abingdon: Routledge, 2008, pp.105-142.

Sedra, Mark, "Civil-Military Relations in Afghanistan. The Provincial Reconstruction Team Debate", Toronto: The Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, Strategic Datalink 126, 2005. Available from: http://www.opencanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/ SD-126-Sedra.pdf (accessed 23 February 2014).

Shevlin, James, "Ethical Considerations for PRTs in Afghanistan", *Journal of International Peace Operations*, 3(1), 2007, p.12.

Shiff, Rebecca, "Civil-military relations reconsidered: A theory of concordance", *Armed Forces and Society*, 22(1), Fall 1995, pp.7-24.

Schiff, Rebecca, "Concordance Theory, Targeted partnership, and Counterinsurgency Strategy", *Armed Forces and Society*, 38(2), 2012, pp.318-339.

Slim, Hugo, "The Stretcher and the Drum: Civil Military Relations in Peace Support Operations", *International Peacekeeping*, 3(2), Summer 1996, pp.123-140.

Sloan, Elinor, *Modern Military Strategy: An Introduction*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2012.

Smith, Rupert, *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*, London: Allen Lane, 2005.

Sørensen, Birgitte R., "Violence and humanitarian assistance: Reflections on an intricate relationship", *Journal of Humanitarian Assistance*, September 2006, pp.14-19.

Thruelsen, Peter Dahl, *Implementing the Comprehensive Approach in Helmand – Within the Context of Counterinsurgency*, Copenhagen: Royal Danish Defence College, 2008.
The International Committee of the Red Cross, "History of the ICRC", 2010. Available from: http://www.icrc.org/eng/who-we-are/history/overview-section-history-icrc.htm. (accessed 23 February 2014).

The Joint Doctrine and Concepts Centre, *The Comprehensive Approach*, JDN 4/05, London: Ministry of Defence, 2006.

The Save the Children Fund, "History". Available from: http://www.savethechildren.org/site/c.8rKLIXMGIpI4E/b.6229507/k.C571/History.htm (Accessed 23 February 2014).

UNSW Canberra, The Australian Defense Force Academy, *Counter-Insurgency and Civil-Military Relations for Stabilization, Peace-Building and Conflict Prevention*. Available from: http://bus.unsw.adfa.edu.au/research/fsp5.php (accessed 23 February 2014).

United Nations, *Report of the Secretary General: An agenda for Peace*, New York: United Nations, 1992.

United Nations, *Report on the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, New York: United Nations, 2000.

United States Army, *The Human Terrain System*. Available from: http://humanterrainsystem.army.mil/ (accessed 23 February 2014).

United States Army and United States Marine Corps, *Counterinsurgency Field Manual*, FM3-24/MCWP3-35.5, New York: Cosimo, 2006.

Weir, Erin A., *Conflict and Compromise: UN Integrated Missions and the Humanitarian Imperative*, KAIPT Monograph 4, Accra: Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre, 2006.

Wheeler, Victoria and Harmer, Adele (eds.), *Resettling the Rules of Engagement – Trends and Issues in Military-Humanitarian Relations*, Humanitarian Policy Group Report 21, London: Overseas Development Institute, 2006.

Williams, Michael J., "Empire Lite Revised: NATO, the Comprehensive Approach and State Building in Afghanistan", *International Peacekeeping*, 18(1), 2011, pp.64-78.

TRACK TWO: COMMENTARY

*Cluster 2: Development Governance*

*Cluster 4: Global Change and Sustainable Development*

# Transforming Environmental Values through Ecosystem Payments: Ecuador's *Socio Bosque* Programme

LANDRETH, Nicholas[†]

[†] The author is a graduate from the United Nations University postgraduate programme, Master of Sustainability, Development and Peace, Class of 2013.