

## ČAS JE ZA TRANSFORMACIJO

## IT IS TIME FOR TRANSFORMATION

Review paper

**Povzetek** Vojaške organizacije in obrambni sistemi se na prelomu tisočletja intenzivno prilagajajo spremembam v varnostnem okolju ter so postavljeni pred izzive popolne prenove. Ta je sprožena s transformacijsko paradigmo, ki kaže težnjo po tem, da postane nova teorija spreminjanja obrambno-vojaške organiziranosti. To spreminjanje se pojavlja v vseh državah, razvitih in manj razvitih, s poklicnim in naborniškim popolnjevanjem, v velikih in majhnih. V majhnih državah se lahko opuščanje starih modelov obrambno-vojaškega organiziranja navidezno kaže tudi kot izginjanje nacionalnega vojaštva. Obenem pa sprejemanje novih modelov ustvarja vtis utapljanja v večnacionalne ali transnacionalne vojaške strukture ter s tem občutek izgubljanja svoje vojaške identitete. Transformacijska paradigma se zato pojavlja kot pravšnja s svojo zasnovo o celoviti prenovi ob enakovredni vključenosti v transformacijske procese držav in njihovih vojsk, ne glede na velikost. Tudi slovenski primer kaže, da je po osemnajstih letih tranzicije in organizacijskega prilagajanja čas za transformacijo, pri čemer je treba ustvariti razmere za celovito prenovu. Posebno vprašanje pa je, kako v majhnih državah, kot je Slovenija, transformacijo načrtovati in uresničiti med gospodarsko recesijo.

**Ključne besede** *Transformacija, tranzicija, reorganizacija, preoblikovanje, reforma.*

**Abstract** At the turn of the millennium, military organisations and defence systems are intensively adjusting to the changes in the security environment and are being confronted with the challenge of complete renewal. The latter has been launched with a transformation paradigm, which is showing a tendency to become the new theory of modification of defence and military organisation. This modification is occurring in all countries, the developed and the less developed, with full voluntary manning and with conscription, in small and large countries. In small countries the abandonment of the old models of defence and military organisation can be seen in the

disappearance of the national military. At the same time the adoption of new models creates the impression that national armed forces are being subsumed into multinational or transnational military structures, consequently creating a feeling of loss of national military identity. For this reason the transformation paradigm, with its concept of comprehensive renewal together with equal integration into the transformation processes of the countries and their armies, regardless of their size, seems to be the most appropriate. The example of Slovenia also indicates that, after 18 years of transition and organisational adjustment, it is time for transformation, whereby we have to create the conditions for a comprehensive renewal. One specific concern is how to plan and realise transformation in such a small country as Slovenia under conditions of economic recession.

**Key words** *Transformation, transition, reorganisation, reform.*

**Introduction** Change is a constant of military organisations, while the search for and formation of organisational models is the driving force of their progress. Depending on the modification objectives and the approaches and methods, the modification periods are likewise defined differently. Such periods are periods of revolutionary change or revolution in military affairs, adjustment or transition periods and lately transformation period as well.

With the end of the Cold War and bipolarity came the changes to the models of military organisation that had prevailed until then (Moskos et al., 2000, p. 1). This initiated the abandonment of the mass armed forces concept. The changes have been manifested in a large reduction in scope, in modifications to the structure of armed forces and, predominantly, in a new way of manning and preparing personnel not only for classic but also for completely new military tasks. Through intensive integration into peacekeeping operations under the auspices of the United Nations and into crisis response operations implemented by different alliances or coalitions, the military's role and tasks started to change from the classic national defence tasks to preventive tasks in crisis areas, usually far from national borders. At the same time, numerous countries started to modify their defence and security standpoints, their foreign policy standpoints, and even their defence and military concepts, consequently beginning the modification of strategies and national legislation. This confirms that a new form or paradigm of change is taking shape. The terms used so far, such as transform, reorganise, restructure, transfigure or reform, are becoming too narrow. For this reason, the term transformation, which unites the aforementioned characteristics of comprehensive modification of defence and military organisations, seems the most appropriate.

The main purpose of this article is to present the transformation paradigm and transformation process in the defence and military field, more precisely by presenting the theoretical aspects and the key characteristics of this paradigm, as well as the indicators of its establishment. When describing the characteristics, we will take into

consideration the fact that transformation activities take place at the national level as well as at the level of military and political alliances.

The subject of the research is linked to two hypotheses. First: that the notion and process of transformation differ from transition processes and the related occurring notions of transformation, reorganization, restructuring, transfiguration and reform. Second: that the transformation process and activities lead to the renovation of defence and military systems and military organizations. In this they are centrally oriented towards the new, integral approach to the formation of multipliers to make up for the reduction of military capabilities and towards the spectrum of crisis management and preventive operations for the provision of security.

To study the transformation paradigm and the transformation process, the descriptive method and the method of analysis of written sources will be used. The characteristics of the transformation paradigm at the national, transnational and Alliance level will be presented, along with those aspects capable of presenting the new theory of modification of military organisation. The course of adjustment of the defence system in the Republic of Slovenia and in the Slovenian Armed Forces during the period of social and military transition will be explained on the basis of our own experience and by using the descriptive method and the method of observation with participation. The discussion will outline the situation already reached and present the standpoints that should be taken into consideration in the planning of transformation and its implementation in the Slovenian Armed Forces.

## 1 OCCURRENCE OF THE TRANSFORMATION PARADIGM

As the 21<sup>st</sup> century gets underway and the asymmetric threats of international terrorist networks intensify, a new term **transformation**<sup>1</sup> is beginning to come into general use in professional resources to describe modification of the role of the armed forces and the defence and military system. The transformation of military and non-military threats, the transformation of the role of the military and military force in society and in the global environment, transformation in the fields of military strategy, the global economy, new technologies and new weapons systems, and strategic leadership are the main topics of numerous expert discussions and, increasingly, of scientific discussions and research. In the literature, the new approach is referred to as the **transformation process** (NATO Handbook, 2006, p. 20–21), which intensively supplants and replaces the paradigm of the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) (Potts et al., 2005, p. 30). A more comprehensive insight into and study of transformation and its characteristics shows that we can also refer to the **transformation paradigm** (Binnendijk and Kugler, 2006).

<sup>1</sup> Some authors were referring to transformation and its characteristics in the second half of the 1990s; these included Rogers (1995) in: *The Military Revolution Debate – Readings on the Military Transformation of Early Modern Europe*, Donnelly (1997) in the article: *Defense transformation in the new democracies: A framework for tackling the problem in the NATO Review publication*, and Jelušič (1997) in: *Legitimnost sodobnega vojaštva (Legitimacy of the Contemporary Military)*.

The transformation factors are the new, primarily asymmetric threats to national and international security, and the information revolution. The fact that the information revolution is primarily the preserve of industrially developed countries enlarges the gulf between the technologically developed and the technologically less developed or undeveloped countries and moreover between politics, ideologies or religions at risk. On the other hand, it enables new information access and the establishment of networks and connections, and poses questions about their management or control. The threat no longer comes primarily from a sovereign country, a member of the international legal order, but from the transnational association or from the countries without effective authority or social structures (Failed States). The above creates new expectations in relation to armed forces' ability to confront such challenges (Born et al., 2006, p. 15–17). Transformation is global and transnational and appears as a guideline for further development of military force within society.

At the beginning of the new millennium, transformation went through real expansion in the United States, where the first strategic guidelines on implementation were contained in the *Quadrennial Defense Review Report 2001* (Binnendijk, 2002, p. xix), which was already in the process of creation before 11 September 2001<sup>2</sup>. Immediately after the terrorist attacks on the United States, in November of the same year, a special Office of Transformation within the Office of the Secretary of Defense was formed (ibidem, p. xxxi).

In NATO the process of transformation is a means for intensifying the search for answers to the new terrorist and asymmetric threats (NATO Handbook, 2006, p. 20) following the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center skyscrapers in New York on 11 September 2001, and on Madrid railway station on 11 March 2004. The official start of the transformation period was politically verified at the NATO summit in Prague in 2002 (ibidem, p. 20), although the notion of transformation had already been in use within NATO<sup>3</sup>. In practice it is manifested in the transformation of the Supreme Allied Command Atlantic (SACLANT) into the first functional strategic command for transformation (Allied Command Transformation or ACT). The beginning of ACT operation brought transformation action plans at the Alliance level, as well as integration and the harmonization of allied efforts by encouraging transformation activities at the national level and between partner countries and even more widely, for example, through cooperation between NATO and Russia (ibidem, p. 91). In NATO the transformation is a proactive and innovative process of development and integration of new concepts, doctrines and capabilities, with a view to enhancing interoperability within the Alliance and with partners.

During the application of the transformation process in NATO, the concept of reforms was still being used within the EU, although transformation was likewise

<sup>2</sup> Barnett (2004, 2) describes this event as an event, which uncovered the gulf between the military structure that was built for the victory in the Cold War and the need for a safe globalization.

<sup>3</sup> The transformation of the NATO Alliance is already in the NATO Handbook issued in 2001 (NATO Handbook, 2001, 47–50).

being applied. Transformation efforts have progressively seen the light of day with the European Security Strategy from 2003, the Headline Goal 2010 document and the establishment of the European Defence Agency (EDA)<sup>4</sup> in 2004. In the EU, transformation is mentioned when we refer to changes within the country and when we refer to connections with NATO. Within the framework of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), the term Security Sector Reform (SSR) (Germann et al, 2005, p. 7–8) and its concept, which were formulated at the Geneva Center for Democratic Control over the Armed Forces (DCAF), are still being used.

## 2 SOURCES FOR THE THEORETICAL STUDY OF TRANSFORMATION

The sources for the theoretical study of transformation issues are scientific and expert monographs, conceptual documents and documents of a doctrinal nature, as well as scientific documents, expert and organizational documents accessible through the specially designed transformation networks.

In the monograph sources, the transformation paradigm and process and the implementation of transformation are described and treated from numerous perspectives. The conceptual sources include: Binnendijk (2002): *Transforming America's Military*; Alberts (2003): *Information Age Transformation: getting to a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Military*; Binnendijk and Johnson (2004): *Transforming for Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations*; Knott (2004): *Knowledge Must Become Capability: Institutional Intellectualism as an Agent for Military Transformation*; Barnett (2004): *The Pentagon's New Map: War and Peace in the Twenty-first Century*; Alberts and Hayes (2005): *Campaigns of experimentation: pathways to innovation and transformation*; Edmunds and Malešič (2005): *Defence Transformation in Europe*; Binnendijk and Kugler (2006): *Seeing the Elephant: The U.S. Role in Global Security*. We should also add those authors 'searching' for a paradigm but not describing it using the term transformation, e.g. Haltiner and Klein (2002) in: *Europas Armeen im Umbruch*; Moskos, Williams and Segal (2000) in: *The Postmodern Military Armed Forces after the Cold War*.

Important sources also include Allied and national conceptual and doctrinal as well as implementing organisational documents on transformation available online. One such online source is the TRANSNET website of the NATO Allied Command Transformation, which also links the websites of national centres or organizational units for transformation<sup>5</sup>.

It should be mentioned that there is some confusion regarding the use of the term transformation. The term is relatively young and, in practice, supplants the more established and well-known expressions, such as remodelling, reorganization, restructuring, transfiguring and reform, or even revolution, in the field of military affairs (RMA). The terminological confusion continues to increase when we observe

<sup>4</sup> Also addressed by Korteweg (2005) in: [www.ccsl.nl/publications/2006/20060000\\_ccss\\_edp\\_update.pdf](http://www.ccsl.nl/publications/2006/20060000_ccss_edp_update.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> The TRANSNET website (<http://transnet.act.nato.int/WISE/Help0>) provides access to the most important Allied and national conceptual, doctrinal and organisational solutions.

the use of these terms in different countries, with which the terms referring to modifications of organizations are being described. In Slovenia<sup>6</sup> the term **remodel** means to give a different form to something, remodel, obtain different characteristics; the term **reorganize** means to reorganize anew, organise differently, reorganize work; the term **restructure** means to change the structure, restructure the economy, society; the term **transfigure** means to do something or give someone or something different content, form, new ideas, to transfigure people with ideas; the term **reform** means to change a system, organize something, reform an organization; the term **transform** means to remodel, transfigure an organization, transform an organization. It is clear that in order to describe the use of individual terms, the mere lexicographical definition of a term does not suffice, hence we have to take the established usage in theory and practice as a basis.

An in-depth examination of the term transformation demonstrates that this is not only a new or merely a competing notion, but also involves new contents and breadth, which at the same time presents a new quality in perception, approaches and modifications. It is at this very point that we establish that terms such as the remodelling and reorganization of the military, defence restructuring, conversion and defence and military reform have been used in the Slovenian language in those texts and circumstances which refer to the adjustment of defence and military organization in the period of social transition. If we want to use a certain notion to clearly state that, with transformation, we are passing over into a new period and to an entirely new form of change (renovation) in terms of quality, we cannot do this by using notions that have been used for to describe previous transition processes. In order to keep an adequate degree of distance from transition forms of adjustment to modified security circumstances in the Slovenian language as well, we must use the term transformation for new forms of renovation of defence and military systems. Moreover, we must take into consideration the fact that transformation includes the previous forms of modification, to which it adds new ones, and that it is wider in meaning than all other terms previously used. The introduction of the term transformation is also appropriate because the notional and institutional instruments and the approach to transformation have already been established within NATO and the EU, of which Slovenia is also a member. The performed of the written sources below enables a description of the term, paradigm and process of transformation, as well as the drawing of conclusions regarding the objectives and characteristics of transformation and its forms.

### 3 PARADIGM AND PROCESS OF TRANSFORMATION AS A NEW APPROACH TO THE MODIFICATION OF THE ROLE OF MILITARY FORCE AND THE ARMED FORCES

The transformation paradigm refers to the social and military transfiguring of the role of military force or, as Binnendijk and Kugler (2006, p. 10–13) write, it refers to

<sup>6</sup> Based on the dictionary of the Slovenian literary language (*Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, SSKJ), 1994.



the abandonment of Neo-Hobbesian<sup>7</sup> philosophy and the nature of countries, which use military force as a key instrument. The necessity of transformation is based on an analysis of the national armed forces model and the use of military force according to Clausewitz, its inner conflicts and restrictions at a time of globalisation, and the phenomenon of national threats and crisis. This is transition from the armed forces of the industrial age to the armed forces of the information age. Therefore, in the defence and military field, transformation is seen as a rational alternative to the social transformation of the use of military force.

'The concept of transformation of the military is connected with a redefinition of approaches to warfare formed in the transition from the industrial to the information age, where the predictable threats of the Cold War period are increasingly replaced by unpredictable asymmetrical and unconventional threats. This demands renovation of the military and its role and a thorough modification or remodelling.' Transformation has been thus defined in the Slovenian Doctrine of Military Defence (Furlan et al. 2006, p 105).

It should be stressed that in explaining and understanding transformation, we must proceed from the fact that this is a new approach, a new perception of changes, not only in a narrow defence and military sense but also in a wider security and political sense. Transformation thus includes the area of remodelling and transfiguring, in a narrow sense, within the defence and military systems, connecting it with and expanding it to the social environment or the social subsystems. The 'internetwork' approach, in which wide access to knowledge and cognition is becoming one of the transformation principles or one of the levers of a more rapid modification and realization of the new features introduced by transformation, is important in expanding and realizing the transformation paradigm. Transformation is oriented towards an integral approach in understanding and modifying the defence and military sphere, not only in the defence and military structure, defence forces and activities, but also towards political decision-makers including political masters, defence and military strategies and visions. Moreover, it is oriented towards new organizational models.

The special feature of transformation is its orientation towards a carefully planned and voluntary or non-revolutionary modification<sup>8</sup>, which does not exclude radical changes. Due to this, a dilemma appears as to whether this is a continuation or replacement of revolutionary changes. Revolutionary and radical modification in the

<sup>7</sup> In the book *Seeing the Elephant: The U.S. Role in Global Security*, Binnendijk and Kugler (2006) analyse a variety of theories, concepts and philosophies. Among other things they compare two predominant models of state structures, namely the Neo-Kantian and the Neo-Hobbesian. According to the first, the role of military force is of secondary importance because political infrastructure and economic power prevail, but according to the second, military force is primary.

<sup>8</sup> The text *No Revolutions Please, We're British* by the authors Potts and Thackray (2005, p 29–42) published in the book *The Big Issue: Command and Combat in the Information Age* has a meaningful title. The book presents a comparison of three models of modifications of military capabilities. A comparison of two revolutionary models has been made; more precisely from the period of the Blitzkrieg and the model from the period of the later Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) with the model of Planned Incremental Change, which is used in the contemporary modification of military capabilities.

defence and military sphere brings more risks and negative consequences, particularly as the old structure is demolished and the new one cannot be installed right away to replace the operation of the previous system. Transformation signifies the abandonment of revolutionary approaches towards changes in the field of military affairs, due to which it is, at times, difficult to distinguish it from the changes and adjustments that took place in the transition periods.

In countries in which there is a passage from military transition to transformation, this signifies a distancing from adjustment and an orientation towards renovation. Such a passage from the transition to the transformation period requires an orientation towards new ways of thinking regarding renovation of the military and its role so that it is prepared for new challenges and threats. Due to asymmetrical threats, the approach towards the formation of military doctrines is also changing. Here, more than the attainment of military victories, where the standards for their evaluation are increasingly blurred, the management of situations and preventive action are coming to the forefront (Kennedy, 1987, p. 525–535; Pastor, 1999, p. 1–30; Nye, 2005, p. 58, 197–205). Military transition is characterised by the adaptation of military structures and its organizations and operations to emerging circumstances; transformation attempts to establish the advantages not only in structure, organization and operation but also in modification, and to anticipate the possible, which brings a decisive advantage in dealing with the situations to come. With this, the transformation paradigm shows a tendency to become a new theory of modification of military organization.

The objectives of transformation are oriented towards the attainment of new quality and modifications corresponding to contemporary needs in the field of the organization and operation of military forces and the defence sector, more precisely in the personnel, material, technological, informational and political fields. Transformation is manifested in the changing of organizational structures, doctrines and operations, and in an orientation towards capabilities, particularly in the fields of research and development, experimentation and lessons learned. An important element of transformation, perhaps even the most important, is the intellectual element, which includes knowledge, learning and understanding. In this way, education and training, research and development, experimentation and learning from experience, and consequently the intellectual profile of a military professional, are becoming the central areas in which the transformation process is taking place.

Transformation characteristics are also the inclusion of new ways of thinking and the redefinition of approaches to the use of the military and to warfare. Therefore, some of the most dominant characteristics of the transformation process should be listed. These can be seen in the structure of the armed forces, linked with the combined type forms of forces organization at the tactical level as well, in joint staffs, in the orientation towards capabilities and the deployability and sustainability of forces, in the commitment to the management of the requirements of expeditionary operations, in the digitalisation and informatisation of operations, which is spreading into space, in the formation of new branches of military and the new profile of military



professionals, in support for army professionalisation processes and in the demonstration of its new image externally and internally, to the public and society. We should also mention the handover of certain military or support activities to external ('outsourcing') contractors. Another characteristic of modification can be observed in the very approach towards this: that is, the commercialisation or privatisation of military activities. This opens up new possibilities for the commercialisation of peace and security activities at the international level, particularly in those areas where countries and their structures do not have the possibility of operating effectively due to political or normative restrictions.

Transformation can also be observed at the national and transnational levels, as well as at the level of alliances. The indicators of transformation in large and small countries are similar, but it is nonetheless possible to claim that the degree and scope of modifications are greater in larger countries. In the period of bipolarity, countries and alliances strived towards the accumulation of military potentials and, on the basis of this, towards a balance of power (Kennedy, 1987, p. 525–535; Pastor, 1999, p. 1–30). But in the transformation period, countries are keen on mutual interdependence, the reduction or disarmament of weapons potentials and a focus on key, often technologically completely new military capabilities because these present the foundation for multiplying military power (Binnendijk, 2002, p. 31–35; Alberts, 2003, p. 13–22; Knott, 2004, p. 39–42, and others.) The above is already the central challenge of transformation and demands an answer to the question of where it is leading to, particularly at the national level.

The measurement of transformation indicators and characteristics is a special challenge and a foundation for comparisons and for answers to questions about the differences and common characteristics of changes in the defence and military field in different countries. In the available professional literature and defence practice, we can find more approaches, which are useful for evaluating and demonstrating military transformation indicators. NATO has developed a special instrument, which is manifested in the *Defence Planning Questionnaire* and is a foundation for monitoring and for annual reports on defence planning and the capabilities achieved. The methodology is used both for members of the Alliance as well as for members of the Partnership for Peace, but the methodology and the collected data are not accessible to the general public; therefore the methodology cannot entirely be used to examine the transformation characteristics of individual countries. Among the more widely known approaches to the evaluation of modifications in the defence and military system and the armed forces is the methodology for measuring national power, developed by the RAND Corporation in the manual *Measuring National Power in the Post-Industrial Age* (Tellis et al, 2000). The methodology used by the British International Institute for Strategic Studies<sup>9</sup> in its study of the assessment of military capabilities (*European Military Capability – Building Armed Forces for Modern Operations* (IISS, 2008)) is also appearing in professional circles in Europe.

<sup>9</sup> The IISS is known chiefly for its *Military Balance* study, which was drawn up for comparisons between different European countries.

Transformation characteristics in the military field can be observed mainly within the special organizational units of the ministries of defence and joint or general staffs of the armed forces, including the special authorities for transformation<sup>10</sup>, in the existence of special transformation action plans and programmes, in the orientation towards the introduction of changes in research and development activities and experimentation, education and training, as well as in the approaches to the formation of Multiple Futures, in learning from experience and in the existence of transformation networks and connections, which expand the circle of knowledge and experience and influence the changes. In addition, it is possible to compare the changing of the functional and social structure of the armed forces, its operations in national and international environments, the changing of the structure of consumption of financial resources and the indicators of integration into the Allied command structure and forces structure.

#### **4 SLOVENIAN SOCIAL AND MILITARY TRANSITION AS A STARTING POINT AND FOUNDATION FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SLOVENIAN ARMED FORCES**

The end of the Cold War, the crisis in the socialist political arrangement and the end of the bipolar international and political structure have all encouraged the processes of comprehensive social transition in Europe. These processes have been most intensive in the former socialist countries of Europe, and have also taken place, to varying degree of intensity, in Western European countries. An examination and comparison of conceptual, structural and functional modifications in the defence and military field in the transition period in Slovenia points to a variety of characteristics that can be also found in other small countries after the end of the Cold War, and also shows numerous particularities which apply only to Slovenia as a new country and which have continued beyond the period of transition, to form the starting points for the transformation process.

The main common characteristic of these processes is the adaptation of defence and military organization to new circumstances. In the transition period, the essence of the functional imperative<sup>11</sup> was directed towards the provision of national defence and towards entry into military and political alliances, which brings cooperation in the crisis response operations. The essence of the social imperative is the establishment of the operation of institutions of democratic control over the armed forces, which Cottey, Edmunds and Forster (2002, p. 1–10) treat as the first and the second generations of problems in the civil-military relations. These characteristics are also present in the Slovenian case.

<sup>10</sup> *These are the secretaries or assistants of defence ministers for transformation and the deputies of general staffs in charge of transformation, or special assistants for transformation.*

<sup>11</sup> *The functional and social imperative is described by Jelušič (1997, p. 68–69) in: Legitimnost sodobnega vojaštva (Legitimacy of the Contemporary Military).*

As an independent country internationally recognised since 1992 (it was recognised initially as a republic of the former Yugoslavia in 1991), Slovenia has participated in the processes of political, economic, state and national security transition. This includes the introduction of a multilateral political system of parliamentary democracy and a market economy, the construction of the country and its national security components, and preparations for entry into international, political and economic associations such as the UN, OSCE, EU and NATO. Slovenia spent part of the national security transition process simultaneously in the formation and subsequently in the remodelling of the national security system.

The remodelling of Slovenian military organization as a component of national security commenced in 1991, when the process of independence and the protection of a democratic and independent country was conducted on the basis of the previous concept of total defence and mass armed forces, founded on the comprehensive mobilized reserve structure of the Territorial Defence. In Slovenia the process of formation of military organization has taken part simultaneously with the processes of a reduction in mass armed forces and the abolition of military service that have taken place in several industrially developed countries in Europe. It is easier to understand Slovenia's deviations from the tendencies of developed European countries at that time if one considers that it came out of war and was under military threat due to the war on the territory of the former Yugoslavia until 1995.

In the process of forming the active component of the Slovenian Armed Forces, at the exact time when the armed forces should, in compliance with European tendencies, have been transformed into smaller armed forces, the threats to Slovenia gave rise to certain particularities which could not be abolished in the transition period. Most of the transition changes tended towards adjustment rather than a radical modification of the defence and military structure. Those characteristics that can present an obstacle to the transformation of the Slovenian Armed Forces have persisted from the initial period of formation of military organization, through the period of transition and all the way to entry into the period of transformation. The period of the conscripts reserve and the personnel manning adapted to the latter have left behind an officer structure which is inadequate and too large and which still has the mentality displayed by conscript-based armed forces. Two other things, which have persisted, are the infrastructure, which was adapted to obligatory military service for the male population and spread across the entire country, and the branch-like civil and administrative recruitment network. All this was actually remodelled several times during the military transition, but it has not been surpassed in compliance with the new tasks and mission of the Slovenian Armed Forces.

With the intensive help of the countries with which Slovenia began to cooperate at the beginning of the 1990s (United States, Canada, Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Israel and others), there was a gradual realisation that the outdated models of military organization and the operational patterns from the past had to be left behind. Slovenia's entry into the Partnership for Peace in January

1994 signified the beginning of the withdrawal of the old models, and gave rise to the adoption of numerous foreign models. The adoption of models often means the acceptance of everything that has been offered and evaluated as good, regardless of the effectiveness or otherwise of the adopted models when tested under actual conditions in the Slovenian military and defence system. The non-critical and insufficiently selective adoption of models from elsewhere is a characteristic of all transition countries, as pointed out by Haltiner and Klein (2002, p. 7–22).

In the period when extensive preparations for the join into NATO were taking place and when the number of foreign models available was at its greatest, it became clear to the Slovenian defence and military system that we had to be selective. Because the simple imitation or transfer of solutions from partner countries is mostly not possible, questions emerged regarding which military and organizational solutions could serve as a model and which could simply be transferred. We also had to ask ourselves where modifications to the system were necessary so that the transferred solutions could be implemented. A gradual approach and a relatively slow pace of change were characteristic of the period up to 2002, which represented a milestone between the two major strategic changes. First, the Slovenian government and parliament adopted a decision abolishing obligatory military service; and second, Nato adopted a decision at the Prague Summit inviting Slovenia to become as a full member of the Alliance. Both signified the beginning of a period of intensive change and the end of the strategic development orientation, meaning that, despite the limited resources and the small size of the country, in the features of military organization which characterise large countries have to be implemented in the military field in Slovenia as well. The acknowledgement that this was false was as difficult as to give up everything that the Slovenian Armed Forces had believed in up to that point (Šteiner, 2002, p. 9–15).

In relation to the characteristics of the modifications to military organization in the transition period, we should stress the numerous remodellings of the command structure and units of the Slovenian Armed Forces, which were meaningfully dubbed *Kokon*<sup>12</sup>. The transition from one structure to another has often performed mainly at the formal level; therefore, in some examples, no larger changes took place. If the modifications had taken place more slowly, there would probably have been an even greater number of negative influences; without doubt, quite a number of deficiencies or difficulties could have been avoided. The attempt at the systemic formation of the army was realized in the professionalisation of the armed forces project (PROVOJ)<sup>13</sup>. This project was oriented towards the comprehensive formation of a professional army, complemented by a contractual reserve. Different views on how to realize the project and, in particular, on how to conduct it and how to achieve synergy with the support within the Ministry of Defence and the country as a whole, were addressed

<sup>12</sup> *Kokon* was a joint denotation for the plans for the remodeling of commands, units and institutions of the Slovenian Armed Forces from 1997 to 2000. *Kokon* means 'cocoon', from which a butterfly emerges.

<sup>13</sup> The PROVOJ project was prepared in 2002 and implementation commenced in 2003. By 2006 it included more detailed activities. It should last into 2010, in accordance with the dynamics of modification of the structure of the armed forces.

prior to the key matters of the thematic nature of the project. Nevertheless it is PROVOJ that serves as an introduction to the transformation period of modifying the Slovenian military organization, for it signalled an integral approach to the modification of the armed forces and to the solving of all key questions regarding structural and functional professionalisation, which was also characteristic of the transformation processes.

## 5 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There are several answers we can give to the question of why the topic of the transformation of the armed forces matters within the Slovenian expert and scientific environment. First, it matters because it demonstrates the complexity of institutional and functional modification and the perception of the role of military force and the armed forces. Second, it matters because it points to future security challenges and, if we examine the trends, to possible solutions for a more adequate formation of defence and military systems. An understanding of the characteristics, legality and forms of transformation is not only the domain of defence science but also a necessity for Slovenian defence practice.

One characteristic of transformation is the wide range of research and expert and scientific works in this field that have appeared in those countries which are dealing intensively with transformation and which treat it as one of the key scientific, conceptual, strategic and practical challenges of the information society. By contrast, there are not a lot of such studies in small countries. This means, therefore, that those countries in particular which are abandoning the old models of military organization and preparing to become partners or Allies are now confronted with very similar traps and challenges to those with which Slovenia was confronted and are, of course, not sufficiently prepared for them.

Transformation is not a 'fad'. As mentioned elsewhere in this text, the defence and military system is too complex and too sensitive to be a polygon for the testing of precarious models. Another set of questions is therefore arising from the monitoring and study of the military transformation of small countries: whether transformation really is a new approach in terms of content, or is indeed only a 'fad', or is only a new term for the processes of military organization modification used by large countries. From the point of view of small countries, it is also important to know whether the modification of military models of organization using a method that encourages the formation of new military capabilities is in fact a process that leads to the strengthening of the industrially developed countries in which the military technologies for new capabilities are produced, which would in turn lead to the abolition or marginalisation of the defence industries of small and industrially less developed countries. We are therefore also confronted with the question of whether transformation hides levers for the disappearance or excessive reduction of small countries' military or, as some authors write, whether it involves the loss or modification of the national identity of the armed forces (Forster et al, 2003) and its incorporation within

multinational military structures (Haltiner and Klein, 2004). Here the question arises of where the process of ‘reducing the mass armed forces’, analysed by Karl Haltiner in several of his works, is actually leading. All this causes concern that, due to the transformation and the modification of the army, which takes place in line with the available resources, we will become insignificant in a military sense and thus more under threat. Because in both large and small countries transformation is the search for new multipliers to replace the reduction in the military power of nation states and alliances, it is possible to conclude that small countries are more vulnerable in this search than large ones.

National transformation activities are, as a rule, launched ‘top down’, which means from the transformation authorities or centres to implementers at the lower levels. At the transnational level or within alliances there are approaches which strive to multiply national efforts and accelerate national achievements, particularly in planning, capabilities construction, and to introduce certain common denominators of transformation visions and strategies. However, the question of whether and to what extent countries are capable of entering transformation activities at their level and whether all countries, regardless of their military and economic power are equal, remains an unanswered one.

In today’s conditions, associations and alliances, transformation can simply not be avoided. We could understand it differently, but this would only take us further from international currents and from what transformation represents in its wider sense when we refer to the modification of the defence paradigm above the national framework. It is therefore true of Slovenia and the Slovenian Armed Forces that they have entered a period in which it is time for transformation. Or in other words: there is no longer a dilemma of whether we should have transformation or not but, rather, how to undertake and realise it.

## **6 IT IS TIME FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SLOVENIAN ARMED FORCES AS WELL**

The answer to the question of whether the Slovenian Armed Forces are still or predominantly subject to modifications of a transition character or whether we can already talk of the ‘period of transformation’ also depends on the angle from which we observe the questions and challenges of further modification. Given the scope of the changes made so far, the speed and relative success of the transition from a model of territorial organisation into a model of deployable and non-deployable forces, and given the transition from a obligatory reserve to a full voluntary manning system, we can conclude that the transition period has ended successfully for the Slovenian Armed Forces (Grizold, 2005, p. 132–137).

Some sources state that the acknowledgement of military transformation at the national level is achieved when we approach the wide spectrum of transformation processes and activities methodically with a special functional (transformational)



organizational unit, the realization of transformation projects and measures, and exchanges with the international transformation environment. The majority of formal conditions in the Slovenian case have not yet been entirely fulfilled, which means that the passage from the transition to the transformation period has not yet been completed.

The conditions for successful implementation of transformation at the national level are, in addition to its vision and implementation plans, an adequate social climate and support, as well as a connection with Allied transformation efforts. An adequate internal organizational climate and successful management of the transformation process are also necessary. Even though a transnational and global effect is characteristic of transformation, this does not mean that it will be possible simply to lay transformation solutions onto the Slovenian Armed Forces and the wider defence and security system. In the Slovenian environment, the fear that, due to transformation, it will become unimportant in the military sense and therefore more at risk militarily, and that the Slovenian Armed Forces will lose use its national identity, will persist. All these reservations provide additional encouragement in the search for scientific and expert arguments and answers to the dilemmas posed and in the search for reasonable solutions for the transformation of the Slovenian Armed Forces in accordance with Slovenian needs and global tendencies in the field of the countering of asymmetric threats.

The development of the armed forces and defence systems shows that important changes have occurred in special (often crisis) conditions and that they have been characterised as revolutionary. Therefore the question of the circumstances in which it is possible to successfully carry out transformation is posed, particularly if we know that transformation is not in favour of radical or violent modification. This question is much more topical at a time of global economic crisis and recession affecting both large and small countries. In these circumstances the transformation paradigm is confronted with the question of whether survival and adaptation, which are the main characteristics of transition, are the two things that will move the transformation process into the distant future during a general economic recession. The fact is that transformation changes require conditions that do not present any major general threats: they also require the stable provision of resources, mainly financial. Despite this, I am convinced that it is precisely during an economic recession that the requirement to abandon outmoded structures and capabilities and produce new organisational solutions is most relevant.

In the Slovenian case as well, the need for transformation is being felt more than ever before, mainly because the future objectives can no longer be attained by continuing the transition adjustment of the structure, tasks, organization and the armed forces operation. To this we should add the realization that, with the continuation of transition-style modification, the Slovenian Armed Forces would not be able to cope with future security challenges. The Government of the Republic of Slovenia also confirmed this orientation with the adoption of the Military Defence Doctrine

(Furlan et al. 2006, p. 7), where the dilemma of whether to continue with military transition or whether it was time for transformation was solved in favour of transformation. We cannot ignore the radical effects of the economic crisis and recession on the future development of the armed forces. If ever, now is the time for modifications – or more precisely, for *transformation modifications*. It is clear that future transformation solutions and efforts involving the Slovenian Armed Forces, the Ministry of Defence and the wider environment cannot simply be copied from other countries or armed forces.

**Conclusion** After the end of the Cold War, the defence and military system and the armed forces had to adjust to new security conditions by reducing the scope of the armed forces, introducing new tasks and missions, and seeking legitimacy in accentuating the necessity of defence reforms and democratic civil control of the armed forces. With the globalisation of asymmetric threats at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, transformation processes and activities were introduced at the national and transnational levels, and at the levels of military and political alliances, which led to renovation of defence and military systems and were oriented towards a new spectrum of operations for crisis management and preventive operations. The processes of transition- and transformation-based modification of the armed forces are taking place in large and small countries, where, during the transformation period, small countries have the opportunity to enjoy more equal participation in modifications within the framework of transnational structures and military and political alliances than was possible during the transition period.

The purpose of this paper is to present the transformation paradigm and the fields affected by the transformation process. On the basis of a comparative analysis of the written sources, the hypothesis that transformation processes differ from transition processes has been confirmed. In confirming the hypothesis, I have taken a description of Slovenian military transition as my basis. The paper also presents arguments for the establishment of transformation as a term within the Slovenian environment as well, where use of this term differs from the use of the prevailing ones such as remodelling, reorganization, restructuring, transfiguring and reform. Alongside confirmation of the hypothesis that the renovation of military systems and military organizations in transformation is based on the introduction of multipliers of military capabilities, certain particularities, dilemmas and doubts are enumerated. In small countries this is manifested in questions regarding the reduction of military capabilities and the orientation towards crisis response operations for the provision of international security.

In the conclusion to the paper, I answer the question of why it is time for transformation in Slovenia, and draw attention to the necessary conditions for its successful realization. I highlight the dominant questions and the influence of the economic crisis and the recession, which pose questions regarding the survival of transformation.

## Bibliography

1. Barnett, T. P. M., 2004. *The Pentagon's New Map: War and Peace in the Twenty-first Century*. New York: G.P. Putnam's sons.
2. Alberts, D. S., 2003. *Information Age Transformation: getting to a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Military*. Washington D.C.: CCRP Publication Series.
3. Alberts, D. S., and Hayes, R. E., 2005. *Campaigns of experimentation: pathways to innovation and transformation*. Washington D.C.: CCRP Publication Series.
4. Cottey A., Edmunds T., and Forster, A., 2002. *The Second Generation Problematic: Rethinking Democracy and Civil-Military Realations*. *Armed Forces& Society* 29 (1–2002), p. 31–56.
5. Binnendijk, H., and Johnson, S. E., ur., 2004. *Transforming for Stabilization and Reconstruction Operations*. Washington D.C: National Defense University Press.
6. Binnendijk, H., and Kugler, R. L., ed., 2006. *Seeing the Elephant: The U.S. Role in Global Security*. Washington D.C: National Defense University Press & Potomac Books, Inc.
7. Binnendijk, H., ed., 2002. *Transforming America's Military*. Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press.
8. Born, H., Caparini, M., in Fluri, P., ur., 2002. *Security Sector Reform and Democracy in Transitional States*, Band 30. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
9. Department of Defense, 2003. *Military Transformation: A Strategic Approach*. Available on 10 August 2009 at: [http://www.oft.osd.mil/library/library\\_files/document\\_297\\_MT\\_StrategyDoc1.pdf](http://www.oft.osd.mil/library/library_files/document_297_MT_StrategyDoc1.pdf)
10. Donnelly, C., 1997. *Defense transformation in the new democracies: A framework for tackling the problem*. *Nato Review* 45 (1–1997), p. 15–19. Available on 10 August 2009 at: [www://www.nato.int/docu/review/1997/9701-4.htm](http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1997/9701-4.htm)
11. *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, 1994.. Ljubljana: DZS.
12. Edmunds, T., and Malešič, M., 2005. *Defence Transformation in Europe: Evolving Military Roles*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
13. EU Institute for Strategic Studies, 2006. *The New Global Puzzle: What World for the EU in 2025?* Conde-sur-Noireau: Carlot Imprimeur.
14. Furlan, B., 2006. *Vojaška doktrina*. Ljubljana: Defensor.
15. Germann, W. N., and Karkoszka, A., ed., 2005. *Security Sector Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Difficult Paths Towards Success*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
16. Gray, C. S., 2002. *Strategy for Chaos: Revolutions in Military Affairs and the Evidence of History*. London: Frank Cass.
17. Grizold, A., 2005. *Slovenija v spremenjenem varnostnem okolju: k razvoju obrambno-zaščitnega sistema: izzivi in spodbude*. In: *Varnostne študije*, p. 81–140. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
18. Haltiner, K. W., and Klein, P., ed., 2002. *Europas Armeen im Umbruch: Band 29*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
19. Huntington, S. P., 1995. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military relations*. Cambridge, London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press,
20. Jelušič, L., 1997. *Legitimnost sodobnega vojaštva*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
21. Jelušič, L., 2002. *Continuity, restructuring, or development from scratch? Dilemmas of Slovenian defense reform 1991–2001*. In: *Post-Cold War defense reforms: lessons learned in Europe and the United States*, p. 111–134. Washington D.C., Brassey's.
22. Jelušič, L., 2003. *Conversion of the military: resource-reuse perspective after the end of the cold war*. In: *Handbook of the sociology of the military*, p. 345–359. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
23. Jelušič, L., 2005. *Military reforms in Slovenia*. In: *The European armed forces in transition: a comparative analysis*, p. 129–144. New York: Peter Lang.

24. Kennedy, P., 1987. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*. New York: Vintage Books.
25. Knott, S. W., 2004. "Knowledge Must Become Capability": Institutional Intellectualism as an Agent for Military Transformation. *Essays 200*. Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press.
26. Knox, M., and Murray, W., 2001. *The Dynamics of Military Revolution 1300 – 2050*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
27. Korteweg, A., 2005. *The Discourse on European Defence, Europe's developing position on Security and Defence in Quotes*. Clingendael: Centre for Strategic Studies. Available on 10 August 2009 at: [www.ccss.nl/publications/2006/20060000\\_ccss\\_edp\\_update.pdf](http://www.ccss.nl/publications/2006/20060000_ccss_edp_update.pdf).
28. Kotnik Dvojmoč, I., 2002. *Preoblikovanje oboroženih sil sodobnih evropskih držav*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
29. Malešič, M., 2005. Introduction: the challenge of defence transformation in Europe. V: *Defence transformation in Europe: evolving military roles*, p. 1–8. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
30. Metz, S., and Kievit, J., 1995. *Strategy and Revolution in Military Affairs*. Carlisle: Strategic Institute.
31. Moskos, C. C., Williams, J. A., and Segal, D. R., ed., 2000. *The Postmodern Military: Armed Forces after the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press.
32. Nato Public Diplomacy Division, 2001. *Priročnik o zvezi Nato*. Brussels: Office of Information and Press.
33. Nato Public Diplomacy Division, 2006. *Nato Handbook*. Brussels: Public Diplomacy Division.
34. Nye, J. S. Jr., 2004. *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*. 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. New York: Longman.
35. Pastor, R. A., ed., 1999. *A Century's Journey: How the Great Powers Shape the World*. New York: Basic Books.
36. Potts, D., and Thackray, J., 2005. No Revolutions Please, We're British. In: *The Big Issue: Command and Combat in the Information Age*, ed. Potts David, p. 29–42. Washington D.C.: CCRP Publication Series.
37. Rogers, C. J., ed. 1995. *The Military Revolution Debate – Readings on the Military Transformation of Early Modern Europe*. Boulder: Westview Press Inc.
38. Soeters, J., and Manigart, P., 2008. Introduction. In: *Military Cooperation in Multinational Peace Operations: Managing Cultural Diversity And Crisis Response*, p. 1–10. London, New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
39. Šteiner, A., 2002. Projektiranje preoblikovanja strukture sil vojske. In: *Bilten Slovenske vojske 4 (1–2002)*: p. 7–30.
40. Tellis, A. J., Bially, J., Layne, C., and McPherson, M., 2000. *Measuring National Power in the Postindustrial Age*. Santa Monica: RAND Arroyo Center.
41. The International Institute for Strategic studies, 2008. *European Military Capabilities: Building Armed Forces for Modern Operations*. London: Oxford University Press.

**Portals  
in the  
world web**

1. TRANSFORMATION NETWORK, Allied Command Transformation. Available on 10 August 2009 at: <http://transnet.act.nato.int/WISE/Help0>
2. PORTAL MERLIN – National Defense University. Available on 10 August 2009 at: <http://merlin.ndu.edu/index.cfm?secID=118&pageID=3&type=section>