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Abstract

This paper will argue that the military profession is facing a demanding operational environment where they often have to operate without clear objectives in difficult circumstances and with varying capabilities. Western military forces are today deeply involved in Crisis Response Operations and peace building activities around the Globe. For example, the armed international forces in Afghanistan are conducting counterinsurgency in order to stabilise and create conditions for a safe and secure environment at the same time as they are building up the capacity of the Afghan National Security Forces.

Another example is in Kosovo where there has been a great emphasis and efforts by NATO and KFOR to dissolve the old force structures and paramilitary and to a new and democratically controlled Kosovo [Security] Force. These actions are just some fragments of peace building, Security Sector Reform and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration.

Consequently, the military community has been tasked by their respective governments to contribute, participate and, to a certain extent, be in charge and lead international crisis response operations. The overall success or efficiency in these operations can be contested. Not least because we have witnessed many shortcomings and failures.

One of the challenges lies in the fact that the contemporary military means with its current capabilities must both be able to project conventional military power in the vicinity of their borders, as well as be able to deploy to remote areas and failing states with unclear objectives and actors in order to conduct both counterinsurgency and peace building.

From a professional perspective, this is very demanding and arduous for the military profession to achieve. It takes a lot to educate, train and exercise soldiers and military units to be both warriors and peacemakers almost simultaneously - this is a real challenge for the military profession today.
1. Background

1.1 Warfare trends – new environment

The war in the Balkans did not only take Europe by surprise – the ways and means by which it was fought were not easy to adapt to for professional military forces: it was not fought within the laws of war nor was it high tech. Instead, the military was faced with a lot of looting, rape, extortion and brutal killings with ethnic cleansing. The same applies to Sierra Leone, Liberia and to the disaster in Rwanda 1994, where machetes were the main weapons. The US forces were to some extent taken by surprise in Somalia 1993, when a Black Hawk helicopter was shot down and the troops attacked by an armed gang – it led to the US forces to pull out.

The US Army and Marines have some more current experiences from Iraq – experiences which led them to focus more deeply on what it takes to conduct counterinsurgency and to carry out peace building. Their Counterinsurgency Manual from 2007, bears witness to many shortcomings.

This is what has been labelled as the fourth generation of warfare, also referred to as Irregular Warfare\(^1\), Asymmetric Warfare, Low Intensity Conflict (LIC) or Mid Intensity Conflict, Hybrid Warfare and Three Block War.\(^2\) Whatever the name - these wars and counterinsurgency has challenged the armed forces, at least the military ground forces.

Martin van Creveld, a military theorist and historian, described the changes in warfare decades ago. His famous book *The Transformation of War* came out in 1991. He recognised that the state’s ability and enthusiasm to fight each other was declining and he points to the rise of low-intensity conflicts as an alternative. He further stressed: “In the future, war will not be waged by armies but by groups whom we today call terrorist, guerrillas, bandits and robbers.”\(^3\) Even though van Creveld may have been right in many ways, contemporary military power and

---

\(^1\) There are many names for the same trend: An intelligence driven war with opposing actors others than a conventional army and where it is very hard to distinguishing a combatant from a non-combatant.

\(^2\) Three Block War was originally expressed and then published by the US Marines and Gen. (ret.) Charles C. Krulak in the January issue 1999 of *Marines Magazine*: “In one moment in time, our service members will be feeding and clothing displaced refugees, providing humanitarian assistance. In the next moment, they will be holding two warring tribes apart -- conducting peacekeeping operations -- and, finally, they will be fighting a highly lethal mid-intensity battle -- all on the same day ... all within three city blocks. It will be what we call the ‘three block war’.”


capabilities must both be designed and able to project conventional military power in the vicinity of their borders as well as be able to deploy to remote areas and failing states with unclear objectives and actors to do both counterinsurgency and peace building – this is where the real challenge lies.

Military forces as of today are deeply involved in Crisis Response Operations4 (CRO) and peace building activities. The armed international forces in Afghanistan are conducting counter-insurgency in order to stabilise and create conditions for a safe and secure environment at the same time as they are building up the capacity of the Afghan National Army.

In Kosovo there has been a great emphasis and efforts by NATO and KFOR and partner countries to dissolve the old Kosovo force structures (KLA-UCK-KPC) and to build up a new and democratically controlled Kosovo Security Forces (KSF). These actions are just some facets of Peace Building, Security Sector Reform and Disarmament, Demobilization & Reintegration and its activities.

Consequently, the military community has been tasked by their respective governments to contribute, participate and, to a certain extent, be in charge and lead international crisis response operations. The overall success or efficiency in these operations can be contested, not least because, to date, many shortcomings and failures have been witnessed. As an example – why are young men and international “stabilization” soldiers opening fire and killing innocent civilians consciously as recently happened in Afghanistan?

1.2 Military Professionalism – old and recalibrated

There are a number of studies and analyses focusing on the military profession. Amongst these there are some contributions which have become contemporary classics: Samuel P. Huntington (1957), *The Soldier And The State*, Morris Janowitz (1960) *The Professional Soldier* and Charles Moskos (1977) *From Institution to Occupation: Trends in Military Organization*.

4 Non-Article 5 crisis response operations (NA5CRO) can be described as multifunctional operations that encompass those political, military, and civil activities, initiated and executed in accordance with international law, including international humanitarian law, contributing to conflict prevention and resolution and crisis management, or serve humanitarian purposes, in the pursuit of declared Alliance objectives. **Source:** NATO: Allied Joint Publication (AJP)-3.4(A), - Allied Joint Doctrine for Non-Article 5 Crisis Response Operations, p. XI. Website accessed January 19, 2012. <http://www.kam.lt/download/14142/aip-3.4(a)%20rd1.pdf>
Military training and warfare has always placed great demands on adaptation, variation and development through rational deliberation from experiences and lessons learnt. At the same time one could say that there is and has been some unwillingness and conservatism from the higher military levels when it comes to adaption to new threats and what it takes to deal with them, mostly due to reluctance to abandon “the old threat paradigm”. However, there is logic behind this as the old tasks are still there to some extent. It is therefore a major challenge to achieve a balance between the capabilities and capacities and to keep them at an appropriate level, a level which reflects the actual threats and tasks. Furthermore, this means that the Military Profession as such faces a great challenge – in reference to Huntington’s three pillars: what is the role of this expertise and how to achieve it? It is evidently not enough for the military profession to be a community of people which has a “single core” competence: to plan, lead and conduct war on the battlefield. Peace building activities and counterinsurgency tasks take many more competencies to conduct and are in some way in stark contrast to warfare.

1.3 Outline and research topic
These extensive demands on the military forces have led me to focus on what it means for the military profession as such and the associated consequences and implications. The research question is therefore:

Has western military society - as a profession - the right knowledge and schooling, derived from a clear task, in terms of education and training, to perform both conventional war and counterinsurgency with peace-keeping and peace building? If not – what else must be considered?

When analysing and discussing these issues, the paper focuses on what is required for the military profession from an intellectual perspective and in turn what the implications are for education and training. The paper will briefly mention issues regarding jurisdiction of the military profession.

The paper will furthermore focus on Western military forces in general terms as they are the main object. Even if the armed forces of France, United Kingdom and Unites States have different legacies and are operating under other conditions and circumstances, they are to some extent applicable to this study.
Most of the experiences, observations and discussions in the paper apply primarily to ground forces – those who fight, interact and broker peace amongst the people in a zone of conflict. Subsequent to the introduction above there follows a chapter of describing the current warfare trends and conflict environment in comparison with the old war environment. Issues such as mission objectives, actors, counterinsurgency and peace building are further debated.

These issues will then be examined in the next chapter from the perspective of the military profession and what is needed in order meet the trends from a professional view. This will include some aspects of theories from a military sociological view.

In the final chapter there will be a more focused discussion on implications followed by a conclusion.

2. The old and new environment – challenges
The paradigm from the 20th century was interstate wars. The Napoleonic Wars were the starting point for the wars conducted before the end of the cold war. This kind of warfare was discussed especially by General Carl von Clausewitz. He saw war as an act of violence to enforce our will upon the enemy. Clausewitz further argued:

\[\text{that war is not a merely a political act, but also a real political instrument, a continuation of political commerce, a carrying out of the same by other means.}^5\]

European military forces were a significant part of the state and had a very clear responsibility in their nation’s security, sovereignty and integrity. A substantial part of the state’s resources were also devoted to military and civil defence.\(^6\) Whether you were part of an alliance or not, the Armed Forces had a clear overall mission: to deter, prevent and at worst defeat and destroy an invasion or aggressor – with actors which were constituted by another state or a group of states in an alliance.

The way military power and means has been used has obviously changed since the end of the Second World War (WW II). The armed violence during WWII was a business of states fighting each other with sovereign armies which were under a national or combined coalition command.

---


\(^6\) Norway, Sweden, France and UK had all defence budgets between 3.4 – 5 % of GDP in 1971. In 2009 the same countries had budgets between 1.3 – 2.7 % of GDP. Source: IISS Military Balance.
During the Cold War one could say that the paradigm from WW II was further developed by the Western Countries where the individual states developed their military capacities to be able to carry out modern manoeuvre warfare and joint military operations to defend their borders, territory and sovereignty – WWII became the role model. Warfare as described, also called third generation warfare\textsuperscript{7}, was therefore in many cases the paradigm when states assembled and produced their forces - to be able to meet an aggressor and a state with similar capabilities. The former DSACUER – General (ret.) Rupert Smith (UK) – has labelled these wars as industrial wars.\textsuperscript{8} Industrial wars or interstate wars were fought between states as actors where the achievements of the military strategic objectives were fulfilled in reference to the strategic objective - to reach a strategic victory. One of the last wars as such was the Yom Kippur war in 1973 between Israel and Egypt and Syria on the other side. The Falkland War 1982 and to some extent the Iraq War 1990-91, were also conducted as manoeuvre warfare.

Moreover, conflicts today have a tendency to continue for a very long time. Crisis response operations and Peace Support Operations (PSO) therefore seem to be timeless and something which often is in favour of the opponent. Sustainability and not exit strategies seem to be favourable. So, even if the type of warfare today is not a new phenomenon – counterinsurgency has been carried out for decades – its character and combination with the peace efforts we have today, has placed the military profession in a difficult position in regards to the current conflict environment and its conditions.

\subsection*{2.1 The End-State and objectives – from clear-cut to unclear}

Today the strategic victory seems to be replaced by another objective: to set the conditions for peace and for further state building and western influenced democracy with democratic development. The strategic objective of utilizing military force in the old environment was connected to certain clear-cut strategic goals. Or, as General Rupert Smith argues:

\textit{the driving idea behind industrial wars [interstate wars] was that the political objective was attained by achieving a strategic military objective of such significance that the opponent conformed to our will – the intention being to decide the matter by military force. These strategic objectives tended to be expressed in terms such as take, hold, destroy. In the two world wars both}

sides sought to achieve all these on the battlefield, within the understanding that such an achievement would decide the political outcome – which it did in both wars. In contrast to these hard strategic ends we tend now to conduct operations for ‘softer’ more malleable, complex, sub-strategic objectives. We do not intervene in order to take or hold territory; in fact, once an intervention has occurred a main preoccupation is how to leave the territory rather than keep it. Instead, we intervene in, or even decide to escalate to, a conflict in order to establish a condition in which the political objective can be achieved by other means and in other ways. We seek to create a conceptual space for diplomacy, economic incentives, political pressure and other measures to create a desired political outcome of stability, and if possible democracy.9

It is hard to disagree with General Smith, the context has certainly changed for western societies and their forces. If we take a closer look at NATO's engagement and efforts in Afghanistan and to ISAF, we have observed both frustration and shortcomings. Their mission bear witness not only to a comprehensive approach, but also indicates the complexity of the task;

_In support of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, ISAF conducts operations in Afghanistan to reduce the capability and will of the insurgency, support the growth in capacity and capability of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), and facilitate improvements in governance and socio-economic development in order to provide a secure environment for sustainable stability that is observable to the population._10

A mission as such, with complex end-states and objectives implies many tasks and requires several capabilities and competencies. The military units not only have to execute their tasks jointly and combined with a great deal of interoperability, which can be difficult enough, they also have to deal and interact with an array of GOs, IOs and NGOs. All of this is in addition to being advisors and facilitators for the domestic security forces.

These softer or more esoteric strategic objectives have some additional effects. The military commanders in the chain of command have to be more familiar or accustomed to politics: the military has to be more able to interpret the will of the politicians. One can say it has been comparatively more difficult to understand what the civilian side wants and requests of the military community since the end of the cold war. At the same time the civilian and political

---

side need to be more informed with a deeper knowledge about military thinking and capabilities. It might be a task for the military to foster it. It might furthermore have implications for the Civil-Military relations.

2.2 The Conflict Environment and the Actors

The environment today represents a complex system of interplaying state and non-state actors. The actors and environment are shaped by a number of strategic drivers, such as culture, religion and ethnicity. Together with economical motives, they can be drivers in a very complex interaction. These complexities are of great challenge for the military community. However, they can be understood by interacting with the problem and learning from perceived experiences.11

One of the most demanding challenges is the ability and capability to identify the non-state actors and to understand their motives and modus operandi. In many cases there are numerous actors in the same conflict, which themselves have a very complex relationship.

We have learned that the opponents and actors most often operate amongst the people – the battleground has been extended from the traditional battlefield to everywhere. Urban areas populated with all kind of people can become a combat zone. We fight literally amongst the people.12 Civilians can easily be targets and the warring factions use these conditions to their benefit - collateral damage and our unintended misuse of arms does not help us to win hearts and minds. It is quite the opposite, our collateral damage creates a lot of mistrust and often brings the insurgents closer to the people. However, the insurgent’s tactical behaviour and appearance is therefore quite hard to predict – it is crucial to be well informed and to know as much as possible about the people and environment in which operations are taking place.

In the past, soldiers and officers were given fairly comprehensive training and practice, which would deepen their knowledge of the enemy (a single enemy), his tactics, appearance and technical ability. The same applies to today’s circumstances, but with a greater challenge. Today one has to adapt much faster to new conditions and settings and study, prepare and train for many different opposing forces and factions, not a single uttered enemy. This is very demanding from an intelligence perspective. The military community and the way it handles and use intelligence

11 Australian Army, Army’s Future Land Operating Concept. Army Headquarters, Canberra, 2009, p. 5.
has to be further improved – from quantitative information about an enemy and his performance and status to a more widespread approach where we see intelligence as a general capability including environmental, social and cultural aspects together with important historical and regional knowledge and linguistic proficiency.

Taking these experiences and conditions into consideration, one has to realize a change in comparison with the cold war, a change away from solely state centric actors to warring factions and actors which in many cases are hard to define and to identify. First of all we have to be aware of and meet the challenge with the absence of a monolithic enemy; it should and ought to have a great impact on education and training. Another impact comes from the diverse and unclear arena of the battlefield – it leads us to protect ourselves to a very large extent. Force protection has become almost too obvious and demanding. It might have operational consequences as well, as military forces distance themselves from the people when protecting themselves with [too] heavy armour etcetera. This phenomenon makes counterinsurgency operations even more complicated, as it may impede the efforts to win the people’s hearts and minds. This in turn places increased demands on patrolling units' and their performance, behaviour and leadership.

2.3 Counterinsurgency

The French officer David Galula (1919-1964) wrote back in 1964 the book Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice. Much of what has been said and written about counterinsurgency (COIN) lately, is based on Galula and his thoughts. Galula emphasizes the difference between COIN and conventional warfare and he stresses that it is not about winning territory: it is all about winning public support. The arena for the fight and the insurgents has at the same time been transferred to the public arena – we fight amongst the people. The insurgents have no ability to control the territory or to match their opponents in terms of conventional warfare. Instead they use their strategic benefits where they can compete with the opponents and the enemies: these could include: a long term plan that is sustainable in operations; - their own knowledge and understanding of their culture; - the knowledge of the local conditions; - and the close ties and contacts with local people.

The insurgents’ success stands or falls with the local population’s support, it also applies to the counterinsurgent. The purpose of COIN is therefore to get people to change or terminate their loyalties from the insurgents’ to its own security actors and possible foreign forces such as ISAF and equivalent forces. Galula developed four laws and principles of counterinsurgency warfare which have been considered to be important or crucial for a successful counterinsurgency operation:

- “Support of the population is as much a necessity for the counterinsurgent as for the insurgent”\(^\text{14}\), the population, therefore, becomes the objective for the counterinsurgent as it was for his enemy.

- “Support is gained through an active minority”\(^\text{15}\), there has to be active people in the local communities - to find the favourable minority, to organize it in order to mobilize the population against the insurgent minority.

- “The support from the population is conditional”\(^\text{16}\), but they will not collaborate with the counterinsurgents before they realize and trust them to have the capacity to establish stability and be able to defeat the insurgents.

- “Intensity of Efforts and Vastness of Means Are Essential.”\(^\text{17}\)

It is obvious that COIN both draws attention to our efforts and creates a lot of challenges. Experiences and lessons learnt from Iraq and Afghanistan has also led to the development of a relatively extensive US military Manual for COIN, which also refers to Galula. In the introduction of the manual it is emphasized that COIN are complex subsets of warfare and that there are many drivers which have influenced contemporary conflicts; globalization, technological advancement, urbanization, and extremists who conduct suicide attacks, and that:

> *Warfare remains a violent clash of interests between organized groups characterized by the use of force. Achieving victory still depends on a group’s ability to mobilize support for its political interests (often religiously or ethnically based) and to generate enough violence to achieve political consequences. Means to achieve these goals are not limited to conventional forces employed by nation-states.*\(^\text{18}\)


\(^{15}\) Ibid, p. 56.

\(^{16}\) Ibid, p. 57.

\(^{17}\) Ibid, p. 58.

There are some aspects to be highlighted here which have implications for the military profession and its use of military power and means. First of all it is important to emphasize the importance of leadership, ethics and legal considerations - since there are increased demands on the service members as they are now exposed to more complex situations. It takes, as an example, great compassion and empathy to win the populations hearts and minds. If you are young and inexperienced and placed in an environment and context you do not really know and understand, and on top of that are afraid – then maybe it is too much to ask that your soldiers must be empathetic and make every effort at gaining the people's hearts and minds.

A second important issue here is the intelligence perspective. COIN is in that sense very demanding and requires a lot of information before and during a mission. To define the operational environment might at a first glance look quite obvious. However, when analysing the steps and measures you have to carry out and consider, one realise a huge complexity. The so called intelligence preparation of the battlefield (IPB) is an important process with an even more vital outcome – it lays the ground for a proper mission analysis and furthermore the important development of some suitable courses of actions. When conducting an IPB for a COIN operation, there are many political, social and cultural aspects that must be taken into account in order to understand and be able to define the operational environment. Furthermore, the goal is to understand and describe the social structure in the mission area with its various ethnic groups and standards as well as analysing and describing the cultural aspects and belief systems.  

When looking at Afghanistan or at different conflict areas in Africa, one has to realize that the intelligence officers and their community have a very demanding job. We also know that the intelligence personnel are often supported by very skilled specialists and academics with special knowledge, such as anthropologists and linguists, among others. This also applies to the field where units sometimes have civilian anthropologists and linguists attached to support them. The deduction here is that the traditional intelligence and operational planning work has been more demanding and that it takes a lot more knowledge to conduct it.

19 Ibid, pp. 79-81.
2.4 Peace Building

The former UN Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali defined peace building widely as: “action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict.”

Even if this definition could be considered a little simplistic by today’s standards, it indicates that the activities as well as the environment in which they take place, are quite demanding from a military perspective. The retired US Marine General and former chief of US Central Command, Anthony Zinni, has discussed warfare transformation for many years. In his speech from a conference in 2003 entitled What is Nature of Victory?, he gave a quite appealing view which to some extent also touches upon peace building: “We are great at dealing with the tactical problems... We are lousy at solving the strategic problems. How do we cope with that? On one hand, you have to shoot and kill somebody; on the other hand, you have to feed somebody. On the other hand, you have to build an economy, restructure the infrastructure, and build the political system. And there’s some poor lieutenant colonel, colonel, brigadier general down there, stuck in some province with all that saddled onto him, with NGOs and political wannabes running around, with factions and a culture he doesn't understand.”

This quote gives a rather fair picture from a military perspective of what peace building may involve. But there is no consensus on a robust definition of peace building. Practitioners and scholars have varying perceptions on the definition of peace building, as the concept is tremendously comprehensive and conflicts around the globe are diverse. The term Peace Building has been used by the UN while the EU has used Crisis Management and the US the term Stabilisation. Nevertheless, there seems to be mutual agreement on the aim of peace building where it refers to efforts at national, local or international levels to consolidate peace in war-torn societies.

Even the OECD has studied and published documents about state and peace building as well as ideas and facts about sector security reform and disarmament. They define peace building as:
Actions undertaken by international or national actors to institutionalise peace, understood as the absence of armed conflict and at least a modicum of political process. Post-conflict peace building is the subset of such actions undertaken after the termination of armed hostilities.\(^\text{23}\)

Peace building as a part of coercion deals with *Demobilisation, Disarmaments and Reintegration* (DDR) as well as *Security Sector Reform* (SSR) duties. In more practical terms, it implies responsibilities to deal with and take care of combatants and to establish new or to reform existing security agencies; it takes military personnel with the ability to police as well as mentor and advice.

Another central issue to highlight is the importance of managing the civil-military relationship. As discussed, our major crisis response operations require an on-going civilian involvement with many different actors which needs to be coordinated under a comprehensive approach umbrella at almost every level of an operation. However, the military – from command level to lower military units – are not very accustomed to working or interacting with civilian actors and organizations but are used to, by their nature and training, to respond to and operate in a culture and context “relying on specific orders, directives and standard operating procedures”\(^\text{24}\) in a clear hierarchy. This must be seen in stark contrast to many IOs and NGOs and their cultural and operational requirements, as they often operate in “complex emergencies where nonverbal signals, family or tribal status, age, gender, or ethnic differences, or social and expectations carry a lot of meaning”.\(^\text{25}\)

That capability has to be trained, exercised and understood and the ability to coordinate the efforts in close cooperation must be developed. A research paper from the Swedish Defence Research Agency, regarding development efforts in the field of peace building and comprehensive approach, points out three areas of particular interest for improving the civil-military relationship and between different actors in integrated mission or stabilisation operation:

---


- The need for enhanced strategic guidance, meeting a perceived ‘strategic deficit’, signified by limited strategic direction and agility, and insufficient coordination arrangements at strategic level which are negatively impacting on coordination prospects at field level,
- The need for better and more efficient coordinating structures and processes for joint analysis, planning, management and evaluation, often referred to as ‘implementation’, to fill the gap between the political-strategic level and field level, to help achieve better strategic linkage, agility and coordination prospects,
- The need for strengthening of coordination arrangements in the field.  

To conclude; Peace Building relies to a great extent on non kinetic capabilities and activities. These capabilities and activities do not generally reside in military forces and have to be developed in order to ensure the required abilities and competencies among the military profession, and that requires knowledge, training and experience.

3. Military profession – old and new
Huntington believes that there are three important characteristics that define a profession as a special vocation: expertise - a professional person who is an expert and has specific knowledge and skills in an essential area; responsibility - the professional is also an expert on when to practise and exercise their skills and is further working in a society and context where he is essential for people to function, he is responsible for his professional actions in a bigger context where the society is the client; corporateness (or professional loyalty) - anyone who is a part of that professionalism shares a sense of belonging and awareness among members of the profession. This collective sense has originated from formal education and training necessary for obtaining the professional competence. The profession shares to some extent a common awareness of their own role, their values, morals and ethics with some code of conduct.

Seen from an expertise and corporate perspective the military profession could be understood as a quiet homogenous group – their code of conduct and military training, often rather tough, is like glue holding them together. Military personnel are therefore quite open to foreign militaries,


which they often feel kinship with. However, the tough training and the affinity between them doesn’t automatically make the military and their soldiers into good peace-keepers and peace builders. Here lies a contradiction, because the military preparedness and training – in its essence – is a question of training and exercising deliberate use of force and deadly violence. Private soldiers and junior NCOs, which have less formal education and training, are therefore particularly exposed to a vulnerable dualism – first of all, to be prepared and able to act as a deadly warrior but also have the ability to act and to be a beloved peace-keeper and peace builder. This is an increasing challenge to the profession, mostly because the warrior paradigm is the dominating one, which in general terms reflects the core competencies of the military community. This challenge is compounded by the fact that soldiers are increasingly recruited from a narrow segment of the society today, which was not the case during the former common conscription system. It is therefore a risk that the professional armed forces will recruit and consist of individuals with a poor educational background and which also reflects a smaller proportion of its population than before. If so, it will imply limitations in the armed forces diversity of personnel, which furthermore increases the challenge to the military profession.

This is furthermore likely to increase the already existing gap of knowledge and experience between junior soldiers and the more senior officers and non-commissioned officers. The gap itself is a challenge within the military profession – especially when it comes to carrying out the peace building role. The military leadership is to a very high degree dependent on their soldiers and their actions on the ground. But if the soldiers do not have the right background and the knowledge or prerequisites to understand the complexity of the conflict, it is both difficult and dangerous.

The demand for a more advanced, integrated training and professional education – in general terms – are also well-known in the literature and in the debate. A 2010 report from Center for a New American Strategy highlighted, among other things, the need for a more comprehensive professional military officer education system in the U.S. The report asked for better balance between war-fighting studies and studies which promotes a better understanding of strategy and the political and cultural complexities that will affect their activities.28 The report further stressed

---

the importance of language training and cultural education and that it takes time to develop such
a knowledge and capability. It should therefore start early and be reemphasized throughout an
officer’s career. Training should avoid the practice of “fighting the last war” and instead examine
a variety of cultures and ethnicities.\textsuperscript{29}

Another very established theorist is Andrew Abbot with his classical work, The Systems of
Professions. He sketches four essential characteristics to a profession: knowledge, tasks, control,
and jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{30} Abbott delivers a framework which helps us understand how professions
sustain and adapt themselves. It is therefore interesting to analyse the military profession from the
knowledge and jurisdiction perspective. The knowledge viewpoint is vital to Abbot: “In most
professions, its work is tied directly to system of knowledge that formalizes the skills on which
its work proceeds.”\textsuperscript{31} Abbot further emphasizes the importance of jurisdiction, and stresses that
the profession has to claim or assert its dominance over a jurisdiction:

\begin{quote}
“.. to perform skilled acts and justify them cognitively is not yet to hold jurisdiction. In claiming
jurisdiction, a profession asks society to recognize its cognitive structure through exclusive rights;
jurisdiction has not only a culture, but also a social structure.” \textsuperscript{32}

Moreover, Abbott refers to jurisdiction as a social tie “that binds professions and task - a recognised right, a legitimate link
between the two.”\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

Moreover, Anna Bolin points out the jurisdiction issue in her PhD thesis, where she emphasises,
“more varied spectrum of threats” and “a more diverse use of the Armed Forces and military”\textsuperscript{34}
and that it implies a broader professional jurisdiction and expertise.

To conclude; knowledge and jurisdiction are important aspects of the current challenge to the
military profession. It is obviously a trend today where the military establishments’ jurisdiction
has been widened with an increased demand of knowledge from a wider spectrum of tasks. The

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{30} Boggs, Jay W. Cerami, Joseph R. The Interagency and Counterinsurgency Warfare: Stability, Security, Transition,
and Reconstruction Roles. The Influence of Stability Operations on the Army Profession and Public Management by
\textsuperscript{31} Abbott, Andrew. The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor. The University of Chicago
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, p. 59.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{34} Bolin, Anna. The military profession in change – the case of Sweden. Department of Political Science, Lund
problem here is that the military profession and its knowledge base is not completely clear and not fully recognized by society and the client or by the military itself. It is thus not entirely clear what the client requires and which tasks the military profession shall be capable off. One could say that the military's jurisdiction has become a bit vague, which in turn has led to confusion, what are the skills and knowledge required?

4. Implications and Conclusions
As discussed, there are a number of implications and challenges that modern forces are facing when carrying out three block war and counterinsurgency with peace building. These will now be addressed and grouped under two subheadings – suggested changes and conclusions.

Suggested changes and additional training and schooling within the military education system
Leadership and ethics is of vital interest for the military community. Military personnel need to reflect and to understand their roles; they will perform very disparate tasks which take a lot to carry out. On one hand they have to be able to be a deadly effective team to combat an adversary. On the other hand they have to be able to carry out social patrols and projects in a humanitarian perspective, which requires abilities such as empathy, tact and cultural awareness and knowledge. It also takes a lot to be sympathetic and understanding – it is grounded in both education and experience. The ethical part of leadership is of particular interest, mainly because of the increased complexity of tasks and because of decisions taken on dubious moral and ethical basis today, actions can easily be very devastating with great media impact and human suffering. Consequently, leaders have to be able to respond firmly and quickly to any signs of unethical and illegal behaviour. Our formal and informal education and training has therefore to cope with these realities. The leadership training needs to be broadened with case studies, literature studies and exercises where ones judgements are contested, challenged and debated in various ways. A further recommendation would be to involve those with professional knowledge and experience in ethics from various fields, e.g. priests, in order to facilitate military training and education.

Strategy and Civil-Military relations are of most importance as it sets the framework for what needs to be achieved and for important collaboration with civilian actors. This is one of the major issues when discussing a comprehensive approach in crisis response operations. First of all it is a question for the commanding officers, they need to understand and interact with the civilian and
political leaders more expansively and extensively today – otherwise it will be difficult for them to understand their mission objectives and end-states. It takes schooling and extensive training in exercises and form universities and at Staff- and War Colleges to increase this ability.

Another issue is to learn more about GOs, IOs and NGOs and to increase the interaction with them in a more institutionalized form. It is obviously not easy to collaborate side by side in a mission towards a common end-state between military units and civilian actors as NGOs and IOs – it is important to practice it during institutionalised education and in complex exercises with many actors and with vague or difficult objectives. In particular, young officers in small units and in company, battalion and brigade headquarters should be trained to increase their knowledge and ability to interact with civilian organisations in different forms, e.g. staff- and field exercises.

Cultural awareness in itself is a broad area which has a clear intelligence perspective. Today it is not enough to have the knowledge and understanding of the geographical landscape and the enemy. The cultural landscape and the human geography of the mission are as equal important, and there are many aspects of social and cultural origin to be considered. Our missions also requires increased language skills as the military profession nowadays interacts with a far more culturally diverse array of people, groups and organizations than ever before. As discussed earlier, to conduct an intelligence preparation of the battlefield (IPB) is very demanding and important. This is traditionally done by the intelligence personnel together with other staff functions. However, as the complexity in that field has grown it is necessary to consider how to increase the training and education when it comes to intelligence – both in general for everybody and for the specialists, as the intelligence officers and NCOs. It is clear that intelligence also requires an important portion of knowledge linked to cross-cultural competence and awareness. It is therefore recommended to increase the general knowledge of intelligence for every officer and NCO and to combine it with robust and basic courses in cultural awareness in order to develop a Cross-Cultural Competence where the military profession reaches an ability to operate and interact effectively in culturally complex environments. Therefore a new way of thinking may need to be considered when dealing with intelligence, in order to develop both knowledge and procedures to make the traditional products from intelligence and tactical and operational planning more comprehensive.
Conclusions

The military's role is to some extent unclear today, which in some ways has increased uncertainties in the military - you do not really know what kind knowledge you need and what capabilities you must have. The client has to recognise, verify and define the role of the military profession today. This is a prerequisite for successful commitments and missions – what should they be able to do, what can the political sphere demand from them and what should their capabilities be? There must also be certain limits – to define what the military profession should not do. A general conclusion is therefore, the need for a new debate and provision of a solid and clear jurisdiction with consistent tasks concerning the military profession and its role in western society. This has to be done and provided by the civilian clients and by each state before the military itself can define its meaning and transform itself through training and education to ensure the required capabilities, capacity and knowledge. The broad, and to some extent unclear, role and jurisdiction of the military with many diverse tasks makes it more difficult to be professional.

However, the military profession as it stands today – including some doubts of it is core competence – consist of a complex mix of war fighters, peace-keepers and peace builders. These latter two roles are to some extent in conflict with the fighter role, not least because peace builders often find themselves in an advising and mentoring role. Military personnel with long service and extensive training and education might be able to catch up with these roles – as officers and senior NCOs. It is another thing entirely if you are a young private soldier or NCO. Normally they do not have much theoretical education, and their military training – in general – focuses on physical training, how to handle different weapons, to communicate and to interact and manoeuvre jointly to project firepower in different environments within sections, platoons, companies, battalions and brigades. This is itself very demanding during their first years of training. On the other hand, the military profession has at the same time to face the reality of a huge education gap between private soldiers and commanding officers and senior NCOs. This gap has led to a more negative impact today, because of the increased complexity at troop level. There is an important conclusion to be drawn from this reality; The increased complexity requires more education and training, not least at troop level. This could preferably be solved by higher civilian educational requirements for new recruits or either by much higher ambitions by the military itself – to educate and train new recruits and young soldiers more extensively and
comprehensively to make them operational and highly skilled to perform as both warriors and peace builders.

The final conclusion addresses the execution of military training and officer education. As discussed in more details above, it is crucial to give officers a broad education. A diverse curriculum with significant parts of strategy and social sciences and with increased focus on language skills and cross-cultural competence are vital. Service members in general should be trained in a broad spectrum, to be able to operate in very different cultural environments after specific predeployment training. One way to increase openness and capabilities is to broaden the curriculum and training and to offer diplomats and practitioners from GOs, IO, NGOs, and others to participate in both long-term courses at the War College and Staff College, as well as to participate in short courses and in various forms of exercises. In addition, elements of civilian training organized by different civilian agencies should become a part of the military’s development towards its ambitions to conduct comprehensive approach operations. It would generate new knowledge, abilities and a capability as well as expanding the military’s network for future demanding missions.

Finally – the former Secretary General of United Nations and the inventor of Peace-keeping – Dag Hammarskjöld, said: “Peacekeeping is not for soldiers but only soldiers can do it.” This is at its core, what it is all about - to meet these challenges and to overcome them.
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