



Secretary of State leads and coordinates U.S. response across all agencies involved in stabilization and reconstruction and works with Secretary of Defense to harmonize civilian and military activities

Adjusting to Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations

BY ROBERT HOEKSTRA AND CHARLES E. TUCKER, JR.

Drawing on the lessons learned from coalition interventions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere, by mid-2004, a consensus developed within the executive branch, Congress, and among independent experts that the U.S. Government required a more robust capacity to prevent conflict (when possible) and (when necessary) to manage “Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations [SROs] in countries emerging from conflict or civil strife.”¹

In July 2004, Congress authorized the reprogramming of funds to create the Department of State Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS). In December 2005,

Robert Hoekstra is an Intern in the International Human Rights Law Institute at the DePaul University College of Law and a Student at DePaul. Major General Charles E. Tucker, Jr., USAF (Ret.), is Executive Director of the International Human Rights Law Institute.

President George W. Bush issued National Security Presidential Directive (NSPD) 44, “Management of Interagency Efforts Concerning Stabilization and Reconstruction,” to respond to the continuing need to strengthen whole-of-government planning and response to crises abroad. The goal of NSPD 44 was to promote the security of the United States through improved coordination, planning, and implementation of stabilization and reconstruction assistance. To accomplish this, NSPD 44 empowered the Secretary of State to lead and

in the foreseeable future, complex interagency stabilization and reconstruction operations will remain a staple of U.S. foreign interventions

coordinate the U.S. response across all agencies involved, and to work with the Secretary of Defense to harmonize civilian and military activities.² Notwithstanding this mandate, funding initially appropriated to fund S/CRS was woefully inadequate.

History did not prove kind to the decision to underfund S/CRS. Therefore, in response to the lack of systemic SRO coordination in Afghanistan and Iraq, in October 2008, with broad bipartisan support, Congress passed, and the President signed, the Reconstruction and Stabilization Civilian Management Act of 2008 (Title 16 of Public Law 110–417). The law charged the State Department with leading the interagency effort to significantly improve the ability of the United States to respond to conflict, and to create a civilian counterpart to the U.S. military that is ready and able to assist countries in the transition from conflict and instability. To pay for these efforts, in fiscal year (FY) 2009, S/CRS received about \$45 million

for its Civilian Stabilization Initiative (CSI). The President’s proposed FY 2010 budget (released May 7, 2009) sought \$323.3 million for the CSI to build U.S. civilian capacity for SRO efforts. A cornerstone of this strategy is the development of a Civilian Response Corps (CRC).

S/CRS is currently composed of an 88-member interagency staff, including 11 active members of the CRC. However, it has begun hiring additional personnel, and if the 2010 budget is passed, the CRC initiative will be expanded to establish a permanent government-wide civilian SRO response capacity. In fact, the President’s budget request supports the recruitment, development, training, and equipping of a 4,250-person CRC composed of 250 active component members, 2,000 standby component members, and 2,000 reserve component members. Furthermore, the CRC will span seven Federal departments and an agency (State, Justice, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, and U.S. Agency for International Development [USAID]) and, with its reserve component, will also allow the government to tap the expertise of state and local governments, as well as the private sector.

As S/CRS begins to grow the CRC, we are presented with a unique opportunity to help it meet the needs of future complex operations. In this regard, the lessons learned from previous SRO engagements, as well as from other government and international agencies, can provide important clues to help make State’s efforts in this regard more productive.

Background

Federal Government engagement in complex interagency SROs ranges from tsunami relief to nationbuilding and counterinsurgency.

It is not a new phenomenon. What is new is the number of failed/failing states, transnational terrorists, and manmade/environmental ecological disasters with which the government has recently had to contend. There appears to be no end in sight; in the foreseeable future, complex interagency SROs will remain a staple of U.S. foreign interventions.³ That said, a fair assessment of recent efforts clearly demonstrates that the United States has not been executing SROs with aplomb.⁴ NSPD 44 and its progeny recognize this fact and highlight the importance of creating an effective coordinating mechanism to oversee the interagency process in future complex operations.

Broadly speaking, contemporary interagency SROs typically involve at least one of the following types of foreign engagement or intervention:

- ❖ traditional combat
- ❖ counterterrorism
- ❖ peacemaking/peacekeeping
- ❖ counterinsurgency/nationbuilding
- ❖ monetary development assistance
- ❖ disaster relief.

While not exhaustive, this list illustrates the wide variation in levels of conflict, purpose, duration, and demand (on monetary, capital, and human resources) for which the United States must prepare as it contemplates engaging in future complex interagency SROs. Furthermore, the difficulty in preparing for such exigencies is exacerbated by the fact that more than one of these factors will be playing out at a time.⁵ Although SROs could be made incrementally more efficient by better training in and execution of the tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs) involved in each of these areas of engagement, exponential increases in overall SRO effectiveness would

be obtained by simply improving the coordination of U.S. interagency efforts, as well as by establishing an interagency institution able to balance conflicting priorities.⁶

SRO Overview

Many of the organizational structures, tools, and doctrines that inform the way the United States currently engages in SROs were developed following World War II. This has led some observers to opine that U.S. engagement in SROs—as well as the development of doctrine and TTPs used in such operations—was either an aberration of Cold War politics or a temporary anomaly of the post–Cold War security scene. This, in turn, has led some critics to argue that SROs were being overemphasized within the government in general, and within the U.S. military in particular—that is, the United States has been focusing on SROs and international capacity-building (“nationbuilding”) at the expense of the military’s supposed “core mission” of traditional combat.⁷ However, NSPD 44 and its military corollary, Department of Defense (DOD) Instruction 3000.05,⁸ have now weighed in on these arguments and emphasized that SRO is a core mission of the U.S. interagency and military.⁹ In this regard, it is instructive that notwithstanding the aforementioned criticisms, the government and military have been engaging in complex interagency SROs since well before the advent of the Cold War; the number and tempo of such operations have steadily increased; and the need for institutionalized interagency coordination is greater than it has ever been.

In this regard, we must consider that as early as 1868, the U.S. Navy transported doctors, nurses, and supplies to areas affected by a tsunami in Chile.¹⁰ Civil-military involvement in similar humanitarian relief operations

(HUMRO) has continued ever since. While the overall incidence of the United States providing disaster relief in complex environments has grown in recent years, it has not been the result of ad hoc decisionmaking. For more than 140 years, policymakers have routinely mandated that to further U.S. national interests, the government and military must engage in SROs. Policymakers have likewise indicated that coordinated interagency military assistance to foreign populations affected by disasters (of human or natural origin) is vital to peace, security, and stability in today's world.

U.S. civil-military operations (CMO) have also had a rich and sustained history.¹¹ In fact, the military's engagement in CMO can be traced to the earliest days of the American Revolution. CMO continued throughout the Mexican-American War (1846–1848) and was instrumental in numerous interventions in the Caribbean and Latin America in the early 20th century.¹² Furthermore, in 1943, the military recognized the necessity of institutionalizing CMO capacity when it created the U.S. Army

the phenomenon of U.S. and coalition agencies engaging in stabilization and reconstruction operations while simultaneously conducting more combat operations has substantially complicated the “battlespace”

Civil Affairs Division to train officers for post-war reconstruction and other nationbuilding operations. The importance of CMO for strategic interests cannot be overstated.¹³ Simply put, since at least the end of World War II, CMO have ensured that the international community would not experience a repetition of the war-peace-war scenarios of earlier decades.¹⁴

U.S. counterinsurgency operations are also nothing new. They predate the Philippine War (1899–1902), continued through Vietnam, and culminated in operations in Latin America in the 1960s and 1980s. Now they find their resurgence in Afghanistan and Iraq, but with a twist: they are often conducted concurrently with HUMRO assistance, counterinsurgency operations, and CMO efforts. They are also often conducted alongside more combat and/or counterterrorism operations. The phenomenon of U.S. and coalition agencies engaging in SROs while simultaneously conducting more combat operations has substantially complicated the “battlespace.” This, in turn, has led to renewed calls for the creation of more robust mission deconfliction mechanisms and interagency coordination.

The battlespace has been further complicated by the fact that U.S.-led interagency SROs routinely take place alongside internationally funded development assistance programs. Thus, interagency personnel conducting SROs often bump into an overlapping myriad of civilian monetary agencies. The fact that these agencies routinely acquire, administer, and distribute funds “on the ground” can greatly complicate unity of effort.

There has also been an explosion in the number of international organizations acting in the battlespace. For example, United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking missions have become ubiquitous in the security environment, thus emphasizing the need for not only national, but also internationally coordinated, responses to SROs.

Need for Coordination

Following World War II, the proliferation of civilian agencies involved in SROs (including the International Cooperation Agency,

Development Loan Fund, and Department of Agriculture's Food for Peace program) led to an ever-increasing need for civilian interagency cooperation and coordination. In 1961, this culminated in the creation of USAID. A noteworthy feature of USAID was that it was supposed to have enhanced the coordination of civilian agency efforts regarding the distribution of international aid. However, because the agency was made independent of State, it often worked at cross purposes with the political guidance being formulated within State. That, in turn, led to disconnections between policy formulations and the money needed to fund them. Although numerous attempts to restructure USAID's distribution methods have been undertaken, to date no major coordination reform efforts have succeeded.¹⁵ Thus, State and USAID find that they are often singing off of distinctly separate sheets of music with regard to SROs.

In the meantime, the creation of numerous, often overlapping international aid agencies (including the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and World Trade Organization) has led to an ever-increasing need for whole-of-government/unity-of-effort coordination. In fact, lessons learned from recent SROs highlight the fact that in order to be effective, national and multinational development assistance agencies *must* coordinate with one another, as well as with coalition militaries, to ensure that reconstruction aid is administered through a rational strategy designed to achieve agreed-upon outcomes. Lessons learned similarly demonstrate that if international aid is not coordinated, single sector development measures will often impede measurable economic growth. This can—and *has*—worked to the detriment of SRO endstates. Thus, whole-of-government/unity-of-effort stabilization and reconstruction measures must focus on coordinating opportunities for

growth, while minimizing naturally resulting income divergences between subgroups within a population. Unfortunately, such coordination is usually lacking even now.

Compounding these problems is the fact that there is virtually no coordination with or among the plethora of privately funded international and transnational nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) found in the modern SRO battlespace. Admittedly, NGOs are notoriously independent. However, they fulfill a vital role in SROs by providing critical engagement

the U.S. military must harmonize its counterterrorism and counterinsurgency operations

and capacity-building capabilities often lacking in the government or military. Furthermore, NGOs typically furnish long-term continuity because they are often found working in countries well before the arrival of the “SRO international community,” and will usually remain long after an SRO endstate has been declared. Further still, many NGOs are administratively efficient. Thus, the international community could learn much from NGOs. For instance, by establishing clear and largely nonconfrontational methods of operation that are widely accepted by assistance-receiving populations, many NGOs are able to gain entry into countries more quickly and less expensively than governmental organizations. Therefore, greater coordination and cooperation between government and NGO communities would make attainment of SRO objectives more efficient and effective.

With specific regard to the U.S. military, joint doctrine has moved away from the concept of the sequential battlefield (where



Afghan women and children wait at Afghan National Police outpost for medical care from Provincial Reconstruction Team

combat/counterterrorism operations come first and nationbuilding comes last) to a more nuanced, complex, high-tempo, and multi-layered environment. This has increased the feeling that there should be more coordination between civil-military SRO actors. However, much remains to be done even within the military community itself. In this regard, recent SROs have clearly demonstrated that there must be far greater internal coordination of means and methods within the military, particularly with regard to the U.S. military's engagement in kinetic and nonkinetic operations. Most acutely, the U.S. military must harmonize its counterterrorism and counter-insurgency operations. At the same time, the military's external coordination with other U.S. agencies, as well as with the international community and other SRO actors, must be

enhanced. Until then, complex SROs such as Afghanistan are unlikely to succeed.

Provincial Reconstruction Teams

Until recently, the U.S. institutional commitment toward the adoption of effective SRO coordination mechanisms has largely been aspirational. Despite this, certain ad hoc mechanisms have been implemented. Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan are the clearest example.¹⁶ PRTs are the primary mechanisms through which the international community delivers assistance at the provincial and district level in Afghanistan. As noted by USAID, "As a result of their provincial focus and civilian and military resources, PRTs have a unique mandate to improve security, support good governance, and enhance provincial development. The combination of international civilian

and military resources . . . allows the PRT to have wide latitude to implement their mandate.”¹⁷

The United States first implemented PRTs in 2002 as part of Operation *Enduring Freedom*. They initially met with little success. In part, this was because they were imperfectly realized, haphazardly implemented, and inadequately resourced. They were also not doctrinally integrated with U.S. coalition partners. In fact, the International Security Assistance Force did not integrate them into its operational plan until 2006. Since then, success has been mixed and somewhat difficult to gauge. In part, this stems from the loss of momentum and harm done in the battlespace due to previous uncoordinated actions. Despite this, indications are that since 2006, cooperation and coordination in Afghanistan have increased among the various multinational agencies involved and that this coordination has been paying dividends. And yet we *still* find ourselves struggling to adequately define their mission and doctrine, let alone appropriately resource them. This undoubtedly *helps* explain the predicament in which we find ourselves. Therefore, one lesson that should be internalized from our experience in Afghanistan is that for optimal effectiveness, coordinated response mechanisms utilized during conflicts, natural disasters, and political crises need to be institutionally recognized, doctrinally supported, adequately staffed, sufficiently trained, and appropriately resourced. Simply put, to be effective, SRO coordination mechanisms cannot be an afterthought.

Another lesson learned in Afghanistan relates to response time, strategic communications, and sustainability. On the one hand, quick responses to conflicts, natural disasters, and political crisis undoubtedly help minimize destabilizing effects from them. They also demonstrate willingness on the part of the

international community to help. However, premature, uncoordinated, ill-executed, and poorly articulated international SRO responses may also backfire since they can unreasonably raise local expectations (which cannot possibly be met) and lead to the opinion that the international community may have the wherewithal to help, but not the inclination. In Afghanistan, for example, local uncertainty about coalition intentions arose *after* Afghans observed 6 years of largely post hoc, uncoordinated, and ineffective PRT executions. Uncertainty increased after Afghans observed the often capricious and largely “international-centric” nature of PRT resourcing.¹⁸ And uncertainties were exacerbated when Afghans continually heard about an amorphous endstate (when the international community could go home) rather than about true coalition intentions. Such actions made dealing with local leaders more difficult. Simply put, clear institutional mechanisms and parameters must be established—and articulated—before initializing SROs.

the issuance of NSPD 44 has led the State Department to begin marshalling the resources to accomplish its mission

Recommendations for the CRC

The issuance of NSPD 44, which designated State as the lead in SRO efforts, combined with the provision of initial funding to begin implementing the directive, has led the department to begin marshalling the resources to accomplish its mission. Unfortunately, State has virtually no institutional capacity to help it undertake such a task. Despite this, S/CRS has been directed to immediately begin developing, recruiting, training, and equipping a CRC.

As S/CRS initializes its development plans, it should be mindful of its institutional limitations and take into account the lessons learned from previous SROs.

Assuming S/CRS receives all the FY 2010 resources sought in the President's budget, it will still be comparatively ill resourced and positioned to replicate the institutional capacity levels and functional expertise found in other agencies (for example, USAID and DOD). This could be a problem, especially over the next year or so, when S/CRS will be establishing its doctrine, TTPs, and other methods of operation. The bottom line is that a freshman staff of 100 or so CRC officers, spread across seven Federal departments

because it lacks logistical capacity, it is clear that S/CRS will seldom be the first on-scene U.S. agency involved in stabilization and reconstruction operations

and an agency, cannot be expected to independently develop a significant SRO hands-on capability. Because of this, S/CRS should primarily focus on its coordinating mission. Even to do that, however, it will need to reach out to other agencies for assistance. In this regard, we offer the following recommendations.

The primary nature of the S/CRS intragovernmental coordinating role will undoubtedly dictate that it hires experts in Federal governance. Thus, it will either need to accept intragovernmental transfers, or hire former U.S. Government employees with relevant governance experience. Considering the historical nature of Federal employment, however, it is unlikely that many of these government employees will have significant nongovernmental work experience and/or technical subject

matter expertise. Furthermore, unless it intends to hire military retirees, most U.S. Government employees will have limited deployment experience.¹⁹ Given its funding and staffing constraints, S/CRS should not try to develop such experience. Instead, it should work with its employees, as well as with other Federal agencies, and civil and academic institutions to develop staffing models that will allow it to excel in its managerial and coordination roles.

When contemplating the development of its overarching mission, S/CRS should resist the temptation to reinvent "solutions," particularly with regard to complex SRO implementation. Instead, it should focus on (re)evaluating resources and lessons learned already on hand. As noted, there are numerous sources of expertise/experience available, and S/CRS would be well served to access them. Assuming it did so, in addition to its managerial and coordination roles, S/CRS could also become an SRO best practices clearinghouse for the rest of the interagency community.

By virtue of its position within State, S/CRS is not only uniquely situated to access other agencies, but is also uniquely qualified to coordinate with foreign governmental institutions, international organizations, and NGOs. It should immediately take advantage of that and begin developing the international networks necessary to help it effectively carry out its coordination role.

S/CRS does not possess significant planning or training expertise. Therefore, it should immediately begin working with civil and academic institutions—and with DOD/coalition military partners—to develop scenario-driven training and exercise modules, as well as standard operations plans for execution during the most likely types of contingencies.

In regard to its coordination role, S/CRS should consider modeling its interagency

managerial and coordinating structures on organizational structures already developed and proven reliable, such as those utilized by the interagency community during domestic emergency response situations. Off-the-shelf coordinating structures that could be adopted, modified, and replicated include the Incident Command System and National Incident Management System. Both have proven adaptive for a wide variety of organizations, and both have been effective in interagency disaster response scenarios. In addition, replicating such nonhierarchical, multiorganizational coordinating structures could foster flexibility and enhance interest in managing operational, logistical, and informational mission needs. Moreover, adoption of such civilian structures (versus replication of quasi-military structures) would provide a nonthreatening framework (particularly for NGOs and international organizations) and could reduce tensions in complex operations. In short, it would enhance the ability of diverse actors to work together, as well as to work with the interagency community.

S/CRS should work with DOD to help it restructure its SRO doctrine and organizational structures. Simply put, SROs need to be more accessible to civilian partners. Current military doctrine/structures are often viewed as antithetical to such relationships. Structures that enhance civilian accessibility and reflect local population input and needs are critical to optimum interagency mission accomplishment.

Because it lacks logistical capacity, it is clear that S/CRS will seldom be the first on-scene U.S. agency involved in SRO efforts. Thus, it should not attempt to become a global emergency first responder. Instead, it should understand that this function will continue to fall to the military. In this regard, to improve coordination and develop a common understanding of operational

methodologies, S/CRS should work, train, and exercise with military Civil Affairs and National Guard units. That should help it to leverage its organizational expertise and foster better working relationships with the military.

S/CRS should also make it a priority to engage/train with foreign governmental agencies and militaries. Such engagements should concentrate on harmonizing national policies and encouraging unity of effort during SROs.

Provision of services during most SRO contingency operations primarily involves interactions with local, as opposed to national level, officials. In preparing for such contingencies, therefore, S/CRS should access the expertise of domestic and foreign police forces, school systems, state licensing agencies, bar associations, and other state and local entities.

With regard to the CRC, S/CRS should work with Reserve and National Guard personnel specialists to help it develop a reserve capacity that could realistically be called upon to deploy during times of increased demand. Simply put, if S/CRS wants to develop a deployable reserve capacity, it should model it after the world-class Reserve and National Guard units already in its midst.

S/CRS should consider utilizing private contractors to augment the CRC. Advantages to using contractors (versus Reservists) include minimizing recruitment, education, and retention costs; obtaining comparatively inexpensive access to personnel with experience that is in low demand (and thus supply) in the government but is readily available in the public sector (for example, business managers, agriculture experts, and so forth); and obtaining private sector buy-in and political support.

S/CRS should immediately undertake efforts to coordinate monetary relief planning and assistance policies with USAID

and international organizations, such as the International Monetary Fund. S/CRS must also work with Federal and international partners to increase flexibility regarding the distribution of aid funds. Moreover, it should advocate for a revision of the Foreign Assistance Act so as to obtain discretion in spending, as well as to promote more vertical integration with USAID.

Recommendations for the Military

While S/CRS faces core capacity challenges, the same may be said of DOD. In particular, lessons learned from recent operations clearly demonstrate that a number of military organizations lack the internal capacity, institutional desire, and/or coordinating mechanisms to adequately execute the functions required of them during SROs. Given probable limitations on future funding and staffing for S/CRS, DOD organizations cannot expect to pass a large number of unwanted tasks to State. Therefore, notwithstanding what has been said above, S/CRS and DOD must be

continue focusing on organizing, training, and equipping for its combat-related mission.

The Services cannot forsake their obligation to become as proficient in conducting stability operations as they are in combat operations. Thus, notwithstanding the pushback that they may receive from certain Service-centric, combat-centric “traditionalists,” each Service must develop full-spectrum SRO capabilities.²⁰

The Services must understand that during SROs, their actions cannot be conducted independently of one another or of the U.S. Government interagency decisionmaking process. Additionally, their actions may not be undertaken without adequate attention to the nonkinetic aspects of SROs. Simply put, in the past, when nonkinetic stabilization and reconstruction efforts have been placed under the operational control of the military, interagency civil engagement and reconstruction priorities have often been left unrealized. For this reason, in future SROs, as soon as security allows, it will be vital to prioritize and institutionalize State Department input into DOD decisionmaking.

Although information and intelligence operations are beyond the scope of this article, it is worth noting that both areas need to be reevaluated in light of the changing relationships fostered by NSPD 44. Moreover, SRO informational/intelligence doctrine should be refocused to include greater emphasis on political-military areas of concern.²¹ Since DOD is vested with these missions, it will need to develop significantly improved methods to disseminate information and intelligence to interagency and coalition partners, as well as to local national and nongovernmental agencies.

State and S/CRS have virtually no security and/or logistical support capabilities. DOD does. Clearly, these matters will continue to call for close coordination. One area requiring immediate

one area requiring immediate attention will be the implementation of interagency cost control mechanisms

prepared to develop additional nontraditional, SRO-relevant expertise. In this regard, we must consider that combat operations are a core competency of the military. They are also a functional area that no other Federal agency has the capability to implement. Many future complex SRO interventions will have significant requirements for combatant utilization. This is particularly true vis-à-vis counterterrorism, counterinsurgency, and peacemaking/peacekeeping operations. Therefore, DOD must

attention will be the implementation of interagency cost control mechanisms. In particular, cost reduction strategies need to be implemented vis-à-vis the delivery of supplies and personnel to SROs.

In December 2007, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report that noted:

*S/CRS is developing a framework for planning and coordinating U.S. reconstruction and stabilization operations. . . . [A] guide for planning stabilization and reconstruction operations is still in progress. We cannot determine how effective the framework will be because it has not been fully applied to any stabilization and reconstruction operation. In addition, guidance on agencies' roles and responsibilities is unclear and inconsistent, and the lack of an agreed-upon definition for stabilization and reconstruction operations poses an obstacle to interagency collaboration. Moreover, some interagency partners stated that senior officials have shown limited support for the framework and S/CRS. . . . S/CRS has taken steps to strengthen the framework by addressing some interagency concerns and providing training to interagency partners. However, differences in the planning capacities and procedures of civilian agencies and the military pose obstacles to effective coordination.*²²

Over 2 years after the issuance of this report, many of the underlying GAO findings remain undressed: planning for stabilization and reconstruction operations is still in progress, guidance on roles and responsibilities is still unclear and inconsistent, some interagency partners continue to show limited support for S/CRS, and differences in the planning capacities and procedures of civilian agencies and the military continue to pose obstacles to effective coordination.

Whether S/CRS can effectively transform interagency stabilization and reconstruction coordination processes remains to be seen. In large part, however, its success will depend on the willingness of its interagency partners, particularly DOD, to assist it. To date, progress in this regard has not been encouraging, but the near future will present many opportunities where the development of those relationships and cooperation will be essential. **PRISM**

Notes

¹ See, for example, Clark A. Murdock, ed., *Beyond Goldwater-Nichols: Defense Reform for a New Strategic Era (Phase I Report)* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, March 2004), 9:

Complex U.S. contingency operations over the past decade, from Somalia to Iraq, have demonstrated the necessity for a unity of effort not only from the armed forces but also from across the U.S. government and an international coalition. In most cases, however, such unity of effort has proved elusive, sometimes with disastrous results. The U.S. national security apparatus requires significant new investments in this area. Otherwise, the United States' ability to conduct successful political-military contingency operations will continue to be fundamentally impaired.

See also Phase II Report, July 2005. Joint Publication (JP) 1, *Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States* (Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, May 2007), ii, notes that "At the strategic level, unity of effort requires coordination among government departments and agencies within the executive branch, between the executive and legislative branches, with [nongovernmental organizations], [international governmental organizations], the private sector, and among nations in any alliance or coalition."

² Under National Security Presidential Directive 44, the role of the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) is to coordinate interagency processes to identify states at risk of instability, lead interagency planning to prevent or mitigate conflict, develop detailed contingency plans for integrated U.S. reconstruction and stabilization efforts, and coordinate preventative strategies with foreign countries, international and regional organizations, nongovernmental organizations, and private sector entities.

³ Nora Bensahel, Olga Oliker, and Heather Peterson, *Improving Capacity for Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2009), 2.

⁴ Christopher Preble and Justin Logan, *Failed States and Flawed Logic: The Case against a Standing Nation-Building Office*, Policy Analysis no. 560 (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, January 2006), 10, available at <www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa560.pdf>.

⁵ For example, over the past 8 years, the situation in Afghanistan has sometimes involved the *simultaneous* application of *all* of these types of engagement. However, unity of effort in the execution of these actions has routinely been lacking. In this regard, combat operations (such as civilian casualty-prone counterterrorism engagements in Helmand and Kandahar Provinces) have routinely adversely affected coalition interagency *priorities* by impeding the development of effective governance mechanisms and infrastructure necessary to complete counterinsurgency operations and/or nationbuilding. In situations such as those transpiring in Afghanistan, there must be a *coordinated* and institutionalized recognition that counterinsurgency operations are a prerequisite to nationbuilding, and nationbuilding is the prerequisite to an effective endstate.

⁶ See *Quadrennial Defense Review Report* (Washington, DC: Office of the Secretary of Defense, February 6, 2006), 85: “The QDR recommends the creation of National Security Planning Guidance to direct the development of both military and non-military plans and institutional capabilities. The planning guidance would set priorities and clarify national security roles and responsibilities to reduce capability gaps and eliminate redundancies. It would help Federal Departments and Agencies better align their strategy, budget and planning functions with national objectives.”

⁷ Charles J. Dunlap, Jr., “Forget the Lessons of Iraq,” *Armed Forces Journal* (January 2009), available at <www.armedforcesjournal.com/2009/01/3827971>.

⁸ According to Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 3000.05, “Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR) Operations,” it:

is DoD policy that: (a) Stability operations are a core U.S. military mission that the Department of Defense shall be prepared to conduct with proficiency equivalent to combat operations. The Department of Defense shall be prepared to: (1) Conduct stability operations activities throughout all phases of conflict and across the range of military operations. . . . (2) Support stability operations activities led by other [U.S. Government] agencies . . . foreign governments and security forces, international governmental organizations. . . . (3) Lead stability operations activities to establish civil security and civil control, restore essential services, repair and protect critical infrastructure, and deliver humanitarian assistance.

⁹ Section 3 of DODI 3000.05 defines *stability operations* as “an overarching term encompassing various military missions, tasks, and activities conducted outside the United States in coordination with other instruments of national power to maintain or reestablish a safe and secure environment, provide essential governmental services, emergency infrastructure reconstruction, and humanitarian relief.”

¹⁰ Naval Historical Center, “Tsunami (Tidal Wave) Disasters and the U.S. Navy,” May 10, 2007, available at <www.history.navy.mil/faqs/faq130-1.htm>.

¹¹ Joint Publication 3–57, *Civil Military Operations* (Washington, DC: Joint Chiefs of Staff, July 8, 2008), defines *civil-military operations* (CMO) as the:

activities of a commander that establish collaborative relationships among military forces, governmental and nongovernmental civilian organizations and authorities, and the civilian populace in a friendly, neutral, or hostile operational area in order to facilitate military operations are nested in support of the overall U.S. objectives. CMO may include performance by military forces of activities and functions normally the responsibility of local, regional, or national government. These activities may occur throughout the range of military operations. CMO is the responsibility of the command and will be executed by all members of the command. It is not the sole purview of the [Civil Affairs] team. CMO are conducted across the range of military operations.

¹² As noted in U.S. Army Field Manual 3–07, *Stability Operations* (Washington, DC: Headquarters Department of the Army, October 2008), para. 1–1:

During the relatively short history of the United States, military forces have fought only eleven wars considered conventional. From the American Revolution through Operation Iraqi Freedom, these wars represented significant or perceived threats to national security interests, where the political risk to the nation was always gravest. These were the wars for which the military traditionally prepared; these were the wars that endangered America’s very way of life. Of the hundreds of other military operations conducted in those intervening years, most are now considered stability operations, where the majority of effort consisted of stability tasks. Contrary to popular belief, the military history of the United States is one characterized by stability operations, interrupted by distinct episodes of major combat [emphasis added].

¹³ David M. Tressler, *Negotiation in the New Strategic Environment: Lessons from Iraq* (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2007); and Thomas R. Mockaitis, *Civil-Military Cooperation in Peace Operations: The Case of Kosovo* (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 2004).

¹⁴ Christopher Holshek, “Scroll and the Sword Synergizing Civil-Military Power,” research project, U.S. Army War College, 2006.

¹⁵ A 1999 reorganization of foreign affairs agencies led to the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) being placed under the general purview of the Department of State. However, it remains a distinctly separate agency from State.

¹⁶ According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), *Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan and Iraq*, GAO–08–905RSU (Washington, DC: GAO, September 26, 2008):

PRTs are a means of coordinating interagency diplomatic, economic, reconstruction, and counterinsurgency efforts among various U.S. agencies in Afghanistan and Iraq. [They] are intended to be interim structures; after a PRT has achieved its goal of improving stability, it may be dismantled to allow traditional development

efforts to occur. In Afghanistan, the first PRTs were created in 2002 with the mission of facilitating security and reconstruction by helping the central government extend its authority to the provinces. Since then, PRTs have expanded their purpose to include strengthening local governance and community development. In Iraq, PRTs were initiated in 2005 with the mission to increase the capacity of provincial and local governments to govern effectively and, for newer embedded PRTs (ePRT), to support moderates and assist in the military's counterinsurgency efforts. To accomplish their missions, PRTs engage in and fund a variety of activities, such as developing the capacity of local governments through engagement with local stakeholders; promoting budget execution, business development, agriculture, public health initiatives, and governance; and supporting the delivery of basic social services.

¹⁷ See USAID Web site at <<http://afghanistan.usaid.gov/en/Page.PRT.aspx>>.

¹⁸ Although there are significant variations, PRTs are typically commanded by military officers and staffed with “internationals.” This feeds local concerns about the relative priority of noncoalition objectives—in other words, that the internationals do not adequately understand and/or effectuate local needs. Greater coordination and communication could help ameliorate such concerns.

¹⁹ Thus, even assuming that it wished to, it is highly unlikely that S/CRS could ever obtain the resources necessary to develop a fully staffed group of hands-on “journeymen” nationbuilders.

²⁰ For example, CMO capability needs to be greatly expanded and institutionalized within each of the Services and the National Guard. Notwithstanding current doctrine, lessons learned during recent SROs clearly validate the point that Civil Affairs—a functional area within CMO—should not remain the functional responsibility primarily of the Army Reserve. In addition, DOD needs to refocus its joint doctrine to emphasize the strategic nature (versus tactical expediency) of CMO. Furthermore, CMO curriculum and training needs to be greatly expanded, as well as accomplished in conjunction with interagency partners (especially S/CRS). In particular, interagency CMO training needs to include far greater emphasis on interagency processes, fiscal and human rights law, language and communication skills, and regional, historical, cultural studies.

²¹ As regarding the use of information/intelligence in supporting SROs, see Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), *The National Intelligence Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, DC: ODNI, August 2009), Mission Objective 6.

²² See GAO, *Stabilization and Reconstruction: Actions Are Needed to Develop a Planning and Coordination Framework and Establish the Civilian Reserve Corps*, GAO-08-39 (Washington, DC: GAO, December 6, 2007). Emphasis added.