
Cooperation, Command and Control in UN Peace Support Operations: A Study on Differences in Professional Cultures

Petra S. Buxrud

The National Defence College
Stockholm, Sweden.
e-mail: petra.buxrud@fhs.mil.se

INTRODUCTION

The National Defence College of Sweden has since 1995, conducted a research project analyzing various United Nations peacekeeping operations. The goal is to gain an understanding of problems and difficult situations that may be present in an operation. It is then the purpose to evaluate these findings and transform them into a form that is suitable for teaching. The overall purpose of the research project is to generate knowledge concerning problem areas within UN peace support operations, and then to integrate the findings with the training of future officers.

The research project has published a number of publications on the topic of “Cooperation, Command and Control in UN Peacekeeping Operations.”¹ Among the publications is a pilot study, a case study on the UN operation in Haiti, a survey on the legal framework of UN operations, and a report from a seminar conducted in New York discussing the project’s various findings. The UN operations that have been looked into are Cambodia, Congo, Cyprus, Haiti, and Somalia. The research is based on interviews and among the people interviewed are highly placed representatives from the missions, such as the Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG), the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), the Force Commander (FC), military representatives, civilian police representatives, and representatives from humanitarian organizations.

PURPOSE

In the pilot study seven key issues were identified.² The key issue named “Differences in Language and Culture” described the fact that there are differences among cultures and that

¹ For complete list, please see *Bibliography*.

² The Key Issues from the Pilot Study are:

1. Cooperation between Civilian and Military Components
2. UN versus National Control of Troops
3. Quality of Troops and Equipment
4. Language and Cultural Differences
5. Control of Logistics
6. The Impact of Information

this may cause problems, consequently, a more in depth discussion of the term culture and how differently the term can be interpreted may be fruitful. In this paper, a short discussion of culture and what the concept entails, or more specifically, the concept of national and professional cultures will be presented. After a discussion of culture as a concept and why it can be so problematic, a general survey of the military and the police professions will be made. Differences in language and geographic culture will also be discussed briefly. By identifying areas where problems may arise, an awareness will be created, which is necessary since “peacekeeping operations encompass overlapping political, military and humanitarian components.”³

It is not the aim of this presentation to make an extensive sociological comparison of the military and the police, but rather to come to an understanding of whether or not they differ culturally. The military and the police professions vary from country to country, but it is possible to identify certain factors that can be true to these professions worldwide. By pointing out the professional differences and/or similarities, it will be possible to understand why cooperation problems between the military and the police occur in peace missions. Factors that may affect cooperation could be mentality, tasks, education, and language. By describing the two professions, the differences will be highlighted and through this knowledge, efforts can be made in order to avoid, or at least, attempt to limit the areas that are most prone to difficulties.

In addition, in this paper it will be necessary to make a few generalizations and assumptions. The generalizations made are supported by data gathered by Joseph Soeters, who has conducted a thirteen-country study.⁴ Details of this study will be discussed in greater length later on in this essay.

METHODOLOGY

This research project has followed a specific pattern of research ever since its start in 1995. The methodology chosen has proven useful and very sufficient for the purpose of this study. As stated above, the purpose is to analyze various UN peace support operations and then determine whether or not a number of identified key issues can be applied to them. The way that this research project has conducted its field research is by interviewing actors that have participated in the UN peace support operations. Actors from different levels within the organization, within various work groups and from a wide range of countries have been selected as interviewees. The reason for this is to have as broad of a base as possible.

The operation that was looked into for the purpose of this analysis was UNPROFOR. When selecting who should be interviewed, it was first determined what questions and areas that was of greatest importance for the study. Since this report is focusing on the issue of security in the light of cultural/professional differences, it was necessary to find persons that had experience in this area. UNPROFOR consisted of contingents from 44 countries all

7. Cooperation with, and Coordination of, Specialized Agencies, NGOs and PVOs

Note: for a more detailed description of the key issues, see Ahlquist 1996, 1998, 1999.

³ Michael C. Williams, *Civil-Military Relations and Peacekeeping*, International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelhi Paper 321, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998, p. 22.

⁴ Joseph L. Soeters, *Value Orientations in Military Academies: A Thirteen Country Study*, in *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol. 24, No. 1, Fall 1997, pp. 7-32.

around the world and it was therefore important to locate persons from as many countries as possible since this would give a fair view to the mission as a whole, as well as highlight cultural diversity.

ACTORS

The actor groups chosen was the military, the civilian police, and the military observers. The reason why these groups were chosen is that the difference in professional cultures is most prominent in the interaction between the police and the military profession. The military observer group is a group that experienced vast security problems, and one reason is due to the fact that they were caught between the military and the police. The groups are listed below:

1. *The Military*: The military group consisted of the military component within a UN mission. The level was Force Commander down to company commander.
2. *The Civilian Police*: Members of the civilian police group were the Civilian Police (Civpol) Commissioner and Civpol officers working in the field.
3. *The Military Observers*: The military observer group was a large actor in UNPROFOR. Many military officers acted as observers in the mission, and since they were unarmed, they had tasks that were quite different from what they were used to. It should be noted, however, that this actor group will not be analyzed in this paper.

COUNTRIES

The countries chosen for interviews were Belgium, Canada, France, Iceland, India, Malaysia, Norway, Pakistan, UK, Ukraine, and Sweden. By talking with representatives from these countries it was possible to gain a full picture of the mission area. It is important to speak with officers and Civpols from all areas of the world, since, statements or views that are common in one area may not be true for other areas. Before one can make generalizations based on the interview material, it is necessary to hear all sides. The validity of this analysis would not be valuable unless the base from where the material was collected was broad.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The standardized and structured questionnaire for the Haiti study was formed on the basis of the seven key issues from the pilot study. The interview questions for this report were based on material from the previous studies. However, this time the questionnaire was narrowed down and an emphasis was laid upon questions concerning security and cooperation/coordination, and security and culture/professional differences. To elicit any “new” key issues, supplementary questions were asked when such areas were dealt with. To

avoid misunderstanding, there was an attempt to formulate the questions in a simple manner and not to ask any leading questions.

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

In the pilot study, it was found that “language and cultural differences within a contingent can result in misinterpretation of written and oral directives, orders and standard operating procedures. They can cause inappropriate social behavior in a specific environment or situation, in addition to cooperation problems between a specific environment or situation, as well as cooperation problems between different units because of different customs, beliefs and traditions. Language competence and cultural awareness are also crucial for understanding different political backgrounds and taking advantage of international technology-based information systems.”⁵ It was stated in the pilot study that these culture clashes are a natural component of UN peacekeeping missions, and they should, therefore, be examined so that the effectiveness of a multinational contingent is not challenged due to the UN principle of national diversity. The following two statements are hypotheses that can be seen as a starting point for this more in depth study of the key issue:

1. *Difference in Professional and National Cultures*: a clash between professional and geographic cultures may cause cooperation difficulties within a mission. The ability to merge different cultures may lead to a successful mission.
2. *Language Differences*: language barriers may have an impact on the work of the mission.

In a United Nations’ mission it is often the case that two or more cultures, for example the military and the police, are joined together in one force, *how does then this affect professional cultures?* Another question that could be asked then is what the fundamentals of the military and the police professions are? A discussion of the professional cultures will help us identify the significant behavior within these cultures. Based on interviews and field research, an attempt will be made at drawing a picture of how professional cultures may affect peace support operations. Also, can a distinction between professional and national cultures be made?

It is necessary to examine why culture plays such a vital role and why communication difficulties among professional cultures occur. *Language* is an important aspect because it is connected to the professional culture. The use of language is divergent among the various professional groups. Certain terms are used in specific professions and they could be difficult for outsiders to understand. Therefore, as a result misunderstandings can easily occur. *Traditions* can also play a role. The military and the police have different ways of performing their duties. Also, particular training patterns are reinforced in certain professions. The *structure* of a professional culture may have an affect upon the ability to cooperate with other groups. It is necessary to distinguish clearly between the roles of the military and the police. Other factors that may have an impact on the cooperation could be the following: *Tasks*, what

⁵ Editor: Captain (N) Leif Ahlquist, *Co-operation, Command and Control in UN Peace-keeping Operations, A Pilot Study* from the Swedish War College, Acta C1, 1996, p. 49.

are the primary tasks of each professional group? In order to minimize conflicts and misunderstandings, there has to be a clear delegation of tasks. Are there any overlapping duties? If there are tasks that could be performed by both the military and the police it is necessary that each party understand whom should intervene and when. Otherwise, as stated in the Case Study, there will be occasions when both parties go in at the same time, one goes in when the other should have, or neither goes in. *Organization*, how are the professional cultures organized? Are they differently structured? It is necessary to determine if this could be a factor that causes the cooperation difficulties. *Instrument*, are there any instruments present that could limit the cooperation difficulties? If so, how is it organized and is it able to facilitate cooperation among the military and the police?

From the discussion above, it can be gathered that the problem presented in this paper exists on two levels. First, it is the problem of differences in language and culture since multinational contingents are created due to the UN principle of national diversity. Second, there is the problem of differences in professional cultures. If the differences in national culture could be overcome within a contingent it is due to the fact of the worldwide similarity of the profession's organizational structures. However, then there is the problem of having several professions working together in one mission area. It could then be the case that difference in professional culture cause cooperation problems between the professions. This report hopes to help create an awareness of these problems and open up this issue for discussion. Some questions may still be left unanswered, but it is an area that deserves much attention. However, within the research project, extensive research is in progress regarding this area, and it is the aim to publish a more in-depth report in the near future.

WHAT IS CULTURE?

Culture is what people *can* do and what they *should* do. In other words, culture is something that can be influenced. By examining the word *culture*, it is possible to get an understanding of how culture could be influenced. The word culture stems from the noun *to cultivate*. Just as a plant could be cultivated, so could culture. Through influences such as "watering" and "care-taking," a culture will flourish. Culture is a means by which reality is ordered; it has a distinct purpose, which is to introduce and maintain an order and to oppose any divergences. Culture replaces or complements "nature's order," with an order that is planned and artificial. Culture is something that can be affected. People taking part in a culture feel that there are certain factors that unite them and they will feel connected to each other in one way or another. In a culture, there are more things uniting the people than dividing them. One way of understanding another country's culture is to identify the gap between how things are done on home base and how things are done at other places. Through this awareness, it might be possible to limit problems that arise due to cultural differences. It is necessary to accept that "they do things differently over there," and consequently adjust strategic policies to the operational demands of different cultural settings.

Individual behavior may be affected by membership in a social group. It is not easy to discuss organizational changes. Problems that occur within organizational structures cannot be solved by changing these structures, but instead by changing the aspects of individual behavior. Groups have, in fact, an effect on members. "Organizations are social units which pursue specific goals; their very *raison d'être* is the service of these goals. But once formed,

organizations acquire their own needs, these sometimes becoming the masters of the organizations.”⁶

What is then a professional culture? A professional culture can be described as the norms and behavior that people of the same profession organizes around. It is possible to highlight certain characteristics that are true for an individual profession. For instance, factors such as education, working life, personal interest and disposition are important when choosing a profession. When it comes to the military and the police professions, not everyone is interested in becoming either a soldier or a police officer, a person that chooses one of these professions have certain characteristics that makes him/her more likely candidates than people choosing, for example, the medical profession.

PROFESSIONAL CULTURES

Culture varies from region to region; there are national cultural differences. An interesting question is whether or not these differences may affect work divided into organizational structures, such as the military and the police. Is it possible to make a division between national differences and professional differences? Can it be assumed that, for example, the military profession is the same worldwide, and that officers across the globe understand each other despite national cultural differences?

National cultures can be characterized through four dimensions according to Geert Hofstede⁷. The four dimensions are: masculinity/femininity, individualism/collectivism, power distance (authority), and uncertainty avoidance. Using these definitions it is possible to explain the behavior, decisions, and deeds of a certain profession. Hans Born and Joseph Soeters have made an international comparison of the military culture using the theory of national cultures of Geert Hofstede. In their research, there were a total of 664 cadets of military academies interviewed. The respondents came from: Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, UK, and USA.

The main conclusion that this study came to is “that there exists one international military culture, which is predominantly oriented to the ‘institutional’ aspects of military job. In contrast to the civilian working culture, the attitude of student officers in all nations studied was far more institutional than occupational. Nevertheless there is also a cultural heterogeneity between the military academies of the different countries. There are major differences in cultural attitude of student officers of the different academies, for instance between the military academy of Denmark and Italy. The cultural differences between the different academies are similar to the cultural differences between the national culture of countries. These results put forward an interesting paradox: a student officer of, let say Belgium, shows cultural values that are Belgian and military at the same time.”⁸

The findings of Born and Soeters is important for this paper because it shows that within a profession, national cultural diversity may still exist even though the military tends to be

⁶ Amitai Etzioni, *Modern Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1964, p. 5.

⁷ Hofstede, G.H. Images, The Netherlands, Journal of Social Sciences (1994)

⁸ Soeters, Joseph; Value Orientations in Military Academies: a Thirteen Country Study, in *Armed Forces and Society*, vol. 24, no. 1, Fall 1997:7-32, p. 2.

more institutionally structured. However, due to the similar organizational structures, it could be possible to overcome differences in nationality. One issue that has been raised during the interviews conducted within this research project, is that they are all professionals, and as a result, differences in national cultures is the lesser problem. The problems can instead be detected on another level, cooperation with other professions. Differences in professional cultures can cause problems when they are joined together in a peacekeeping mission. A military officer may not understand why a police officer acts in a certain way and vice versa. It is a problem that can be compared to a situation where people from different cultural backgrounds are brought together.

POLICE CULTURE

First, before examining the police culture, it is important to distinguish the UN civilian police from the military police. The task of the latter is to maintain a military unit, whereas the main tasks of the UN civilian police are to ⁹:

- Oversee the local police and to make sure that they follow the national laws and respect human right.
- To educate the local police. This is done through the establishment of principles of how a police force acts in a constitutional state.
- To support the local police in their job.

UNCIVPOL is an unarmed police force, established for UN peacekeeping missions. Civilian policemen are not commanded and controlled from the home country, but by an internationally recruited police — the Police Commissioner. Civilian police can be very useful in situations where the military is not sufficient, since the policemen of Civpol have often lived closer to the local population than the military. As a result, the police are able to establish good contact and understanding of the locals. Due to the fact that the civilian police often live in rented rooms and not in barracks as the military, it is easier to get in contact with the local population. Also, the fact that they do not carry weapons make them seem like less of a threat, which is favorable since the local population is then more prone to trust them. However, it could also be seen as a problem that the international police force does not have weapons, training or protection for a successful intervention against riots, since they are therefore more vulnerable.

The organizational structures of the police vary internationally, and this could cause problems when policemen from around the world are joined in a united force. Different countries have different methods of training and policing, use different equipment and tactics. Due to the fact that their professional backgrounds differ, communication difficulties within the mission could be a result. Tasks such as routines for reporting, problem solving, and chain of command are not performed in unity around the globe. However, some generalizations of the police profession could be made. The police has a bottom-up structure where the patrolling policemen have a great degree of responsibilities. The police is very dependent on the law and they are subordinated to the district attorneys. The structure of the police

⁹ SOU 1997:104, *Polis i Fredens Tjänst - Utredning om Civilpolis i Internationell Verksamhet*, Betänkande.

organization is rather small, and not very extensive, and as a result, the police officers are not used to working in large organizations with a large amount of personnel. Also, police officers have a tendency to band together and exclude outsiders. This fact may make it difficult for the police officers to cooperate with the military, since police officers often work in close relations with their peers. The reason for this is the comradeship that exists between the police officers. They often work closely and as a result, they develop partnerships, they rely on each other, they share common experiences, problems and frustrations. It is often the case that police officers have a “we” and “they” attitude, and “this combined environmental setting does enhance and reinforce the police culture.”¹⁰ The police culture may be described as a community where the elements that join them together are stronger and more meaningful than the factors that divide them.

MILITARY CULTURE

The role of the military differs from the role of the police and the duties that are facing them are therefore different. In the pilot study, the professional cultures of the military and Civpol were found to differ considerably; the military approaching the mission on a war footing, while Civpol worked in a peacetime routine. A soldier’s behavior is shaped according to the organizational structures of the military. The chain of command is very strict and everyone knows his/her place in the scheme. A soldier is often specialized in certain areas due to the training he/she has received. Also, the military is precisely structured which in turn is reinforced through the actions of the soldier. It is a hierarchically structured organization, due to the inherent nature of the military. The fact that a military organization consists of many components makes it necessary to have a strict and clear chain of command. The military is focused on structures and processes; they are used to order, discipline, command and control. Also, in the military structure, the officers are in the leadership position and give orders about what will be done by their subordinates. The soldiers in the field wait for orders and directives. Military personnel work in units, while policemen work as individuals. The military is a top-led system; the police system is the other way around.

In a UN operation, the military has a clearly defined role. Within a military component, “the tasks can generally be summarized as the separation of opposing sides, the establishment of a buffer zone or equivalent, the supervision of truce or cease-fire agreement, the prevention of armed conflict between nations or within a nation, and the contribution to the maintenance of law and order and a return to normal conditions.”¹¹ It is often the military intervention that “forms the first and crucial element of a peace operation, providing some basic stability and security, and laying the ground for all future steps ... only the military — always ‘*ultra ratio regum*’ — has the necessary capacities to fill the ‘security gap’ in unstable situations where the indigenous security forces and institutions are unable to function or insufficient to maintain law and order.”¹² Despite this fact, it is necessary for the military to cooperate with the police, because they complement each other in a peacekeeping mission and the military alone is just one part of the stable environment.

¹⁰ Drummond, *Police Culture*, p. 26.

¹¹ *United Nations Civilian Police Handbook*, UN Department of Peace-keeping Operations, First Draft – October 1995.

¹² Erwin A. Schmidl; *Police in Peace Operations*, Informationen zur Sicherheitspolitik, Number 10, September 1998, p. 10.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MILITARY AND THE POLICE

Misunderstandings can arise in a peacekeeping mission because the military and the police handle situations differently. The military tends to be more operationally oriented and they will get the job done regardless of how. In a peacekeeping mission, the military operates in groups and they are heavily armed, whereas the police are unarmed.

A soldier occupies a role that is quite specialized and precisely structured, his behavior shaped largely by intra-organizational structures and processes. A policeman's role is slightly different; his behavior depends more on perceptions, judgements and external contacts. Considering the leadership of the two mission components, military and civilian, the problems facing them with regard to cultural differences do to some extent vary. The military commander is used to working in a large organization employing a great number of persons and military culture is quite similar worldwide, e.g. it is institutionally oriented. Things are different for the civilian police leadership. Senior police officers may not be used to working in such a big organization with so many personnel. Professional police cultures vary internationally, with e.g. different routines for reporting, problem-solving, chains of command. The Force Commander has to integrate battalions whereas the Civilian Police Commissioner has to integrate individually recruited policemen with a broad range of professional culture.¹³

When it comes to the professional culture of the police, some argue that the "police departments are almost universally structured to conform to the military hierarchical model of organization."¹⁴ If this is true, the police and the military should have an understanding of each other's cultures and as a result, cooperation problems would be limited. However, there are other factors that come into play. In the military structure, policy is formulated at the top and flows downward, and there is very little reliance on participation. The police officers, on the other hand, are not closely supervised; they are left to their own ingenuity and initiative. They deal with problems that require discretion, and the laws and policies have to be interpreted for each case at street level. It is necessary for the police officer to have a great amount of latitude in carrying out their duties, and as a matter of fact, "policemen even have a difficult time functioning when they find themselves working under the military system."¹⁵

The fact that the military and the civilian forces are joined only at the highest level within a mission can cause a problem for coordination at lower levels, for the mutual understanding between the forces, as well as for the cooperation itself. "In an unstable situation it is the military's duty to fill a security gap 'from the top down,' not expect the police to do this the other way around."¹⁶ However, this can create a problem that lies in the fact that there are no clear borders between the civilian and the military tasks. It is difficult to establish a clear border between the military and the civilian tasks and instead a gray zone is stuck between the military and the civilian forces. This can cause cooperation problems for the whole operation.

¹³ Ed.: Captain (N) Leif Ahlquist, *Co-operation, Command and Control in UN Peace Support Operations - A case study on Haiti* from the National Defence College, Stockholm, Sweden, 1998, p. 74-75.

¹⁴ Drummond, *Police Culture*, p. 19.

¹⁵ Drummond, *Police Culture*, p. 22.

¹⁶ Erwin A. Schmidl; *Police in Peace Operations*, Informationen zur Sicherheitspolitik, Number 10, September 1998, p. 3.

Military contribution is necessary in order to cool down an immediate conflict situation. The reason is that by having the military present, room will be created for negotiations and reconciliation. However, the military may not be sufficient for long term solutions, it is also necessary to have civilian forces present, such as the civilian police and humanitarian organizations. One issue that was raised multiple times during the interviews was that many civilians and military officers with extensive experience from UN peacekeeping missions, believed that the cooperation between these two groups was problematic. When asked why they felt this way, the response was that differences in cultures and educational backgrounds probably were the reason. In the pilot study it was found that, “lack of knowledge of each other’s customs, ideals and working procedures creates mistrust, unnecessary competition and confusion, even though all are working towards the same goal — peace and human rights in a war zone. Military people are used to coordinating or being coordinated, while the humanitarian organizations tend to work in their own fields, striving for total independence.”¹⁷ Another reason given for why it was difficult to cooperate with humanitarian organizations was due to the fact that they were very reluctant to cooperate with anyone else.

INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

This essay has relied to some degree on material gathered through interviews. The persons that have been interviewed were part of the UNPROFOR mission in Former Yugoslavia. Based on the interviews, it has been possible to distinguish four categories: *personality/individuality*, *profession*, *geographic culture*, and *language*. These four aspects have come up under various forms during the interviews and they can all be related back to cooperation in one way or another. Cooperation is an area that will be analyzed in greater detail in a separate report. More or less everyone interviewed has, to some degree, experienced cooperation difficulties. One major reason for these problems was the cultural differences.

One factor that has an affect on cooperation is personality/individuality. This is an area that may not have received much attention, but it could benefit from further investigation. It has been found that in cases where cooperation functions well, despite cultural differences, the reason for this was because the personality of someone at a crucial position within a mission facilitated cooperation. In other situations, cooperation was not possible, not because cultural differences were an obstacle, but rather because of personality clashes. In other words, the human element is always significant. It plays a much greater role in a peacekeeping mission than it would do in a one-nation operation because there you have a system that functions and provides for shortcomings of individuals. There may not be a common notion of this problem, but due to tensions that this may cause in a peacekeeping mission, it is worth noting.

To return to the other three reasons behind cooperation difficulties that were mentioned, a brief comment will be given on each aspect. The interviewees mentioned that different professions, such as the military and the police, were an obstacle for cooperation. It was found that dealing with different professional cultures was problematic. One person who was

¹⁷ Ed.: Captain (N) Leif Ahlquist, *Co-operation, Command and Control in UN Peace-keeping Missions*, p. 55.

interviewed argued that each professional culture has its own foreign interest and its own operational procedures, and they establish their own rules and procedures depending on the situation. The people within a profession are inevitably sure that the next element is behaving, which in turn limits their ability to function properly, and as a result there is a lot of competition within a mission.

Geographic culture is also an issue that was raised during the interviews. Coming from different geographic cultures may cause difficulties when working together because the same experiences are not shared. People from different geographic regions may have divergent perceptions on how to resolve security issues, and also coming from different culture sometimes means that there are various approaches, which in turn can cause some problems in security matters.

Finally, the issue of language was discussed during the interviews. Language can always be a problem in a multinational contingent. If the people involved in the peacekeeping mission cannot communicate with each other, it can cause cooperation difficulties. It can also lead to serious misunderstandings. To sum up, the cooperation in a multinational contingent are affected by different rules, different order, different training, and different mentality.

CONCLUSION

The police and the military are two inherently different organizations and it is within the organizational structures that problems may occur. By joining two professional cultures that have different methods of problem solving, cooperation difficulties may be a result. Both cultures have their own structure and way of doing things; it can therefore take a while before cooperation can develop. When analyzing the situation that may occur, when these two professional cultures have to work together in close cooperation, it is therefore necessary to examine the organizational structures of the two professions. When developing a clear picture of how these two systems look like, it will be easier to determine if and how the cooperation difficulties can be solved. By limiting clashes, cooperation might be easier achieved. Regarding cultural differences, limited knowledge and understanding may cause inappropriate social behavior, resulting in friction in the cooperation. Differences in culture, philosophy, religion and ethnic background might also affect the way a national entity makes decisions and the mode of operation of its forces. Other factors that seem to have an effect on cooperation are personality/individuality, geographic culture, and language. Culture entails many different aspects and each of these affects cooperation in various ways. It is a complex subject that requires further research.

In this essay, several problems and new ideas have been brought forward. The main purpose of this investigation was to bring this issue to everyone's attention. It is a problematic area because cooperation difficulties could lead to friction within a UN mission. In order for a mission to run smoothly, it is necessary to limit the problems that may arise, and one way of doing this is through awareness. The aim is to raise further questions, this paper has not tried to raise solutions for how to solve this problem, but rather to highlight issue areas that could benefit from further research. Some questions are left unanswered which may prompt for further discussions concerning this area. However, within the research

project, further analysis of the interview material is under progress and the intent is to continue the research on differences in culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Editor: Captain (N) Leif Ahlquist, 1996. *Co-operation, Command and Control in UN Peace-keeping Operations — A Pilot Study from the Swedish War College*, Swedish War College, Acta C1.
- Editor: Captain (N) Leif Ahlquist, 1998. *Co-operation, Command and Control in UN Peace Support Operations — A Case Study on Haiti from the National Defence College*, National Defence College, Acta C2.
- Editor: Captain (N) Leif Ahlquist, 1999. *Co-operation, Command and Control in UN Peace Support Operations — The Legal Framework: A Report from a Seminar Sept 1998 at the National Defence College*, National Defence College, Acta C4.
- Editor: Captain (N) Leif Ahlquist, 1999. *Co-operation, Command and Control in UN Peace Support Operations — A Report from a Seminar in New York on December 10, 1998*, National Defence College.
- Drummond, Douglas S., 1976. *Police Culture*, Sage Professional Paper in Administrative & Policy Studies, vol. 3, series no. 03-032, Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.
- Etzioni, Amitai; *Modern Organizations*, 1964. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
- Hofstede, G.H., 1994. *Images*. The Netherlands, Journal of Social Sciences.
- Schmidl, Erwin A., 1998. *Police in Peace Operations*, Informationen zur Sicherheitspolitik, Number 10, September.
- Soeters, Joseph, 1997. Value Orientations in Military Academies: a Thirteen Country Study, in *Armed Forces and Society*, vol. 24, no. 1, Fall 1997:7-32.
- SOU 1997:104, *Polis i Fredens Tjänst - Utredning om Civilpolis i Internationell Verksamhet*, Betänkande.
- UN Department of Peace-keeping Operations, *United Nations Civilian Police Handbook*, First Draft – October 1995.
- Williams, Michael C., 1998. *Civil-Military Relations and Peacekeeping*, International Institute for Strategic Studies, Adelhi Paper 321, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Copyright © 2000. Petra S. Buxrud, All Rights Reserved.