The Displacement of Regimes of Action in the Armed Forces
- A Discussion the Justification of the Profession of Military Command

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to explore how one might approach the profession of military command using the concepts of regimes of justification by Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot in an analysis of the contemporary disputes and tensions between political and professional actors and in a time where the defense is undergoing a radical economical and professional transformation. The paper opens with a discussion of the genesis of the profession of military command as a societal justificatory compromise followed by a discussion of the critical capacity of military commanders (the justification of their contemporary role, responsibility and challenges) and an analysis of the displacement of military regimes in the light of economic and security changes at the societal level. I am arguing that the entrance of new regimes of justification are challenging and displacing the traditional professional justificatory compromises and I am asking, what keeps the military profession together in a time of continuous radical transformations. I am suggesting that it may be the historical strong military institution, the officers’ corps, which currently suffers from severe public denunciation and marginalization.
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1. Military command – a concept of military justification

"Knowledge of the history of the group and its structures is the key to understanding those fleeting everyday phenomena that seem at first sight to be consequences of individual psychology" (Boltanski 1987, 179). As a methodical commitment to the argument of Boltanski, I will offer an initial historical perception of the professional concept and the main subject of this paper, "military command", as it may be recognized from a traditional military position of justification. This introduction should not be seen as a conclusive or definitive definition as it is the emergence and displacement of its justification, I intend to examine. Contrary, I understand the concept as a concept of movement (Bewegungsbegreife - (Koselleck 2007), which from time to time offers new meaning, and thus new justifications of the profession. I assume that those movements occur in a dispute between what Koselleck calls historical semantically conflicts in which I suggest a link to the concepts of disputes and legitimate tests by Boltanski and Thévenot, On Justification (OJ) (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006). This introduction to the concept should be regarded as a glimpse into a historical process of military professionalization which may serve as a justificatory potential for contemporary commanding officers or so to speak, a traditionally military regime of justification.

Before the 19th century military command was seen as an aristocratic prerogative under the sovereignty of the king, but with the growing influence of the middle class a unique class of officers, a corps, occurred as a new societal construction. It may be considered as either a hybrid or an alternative to the two other classes. The rise of a corps of professional officers established a kind of socio-stability between the classes and
the king: "Indeed the completion of the military professionalisation process may be regarded, hypothetically, as a fusion of middle class and aristocratic military tradition and orientations under the supervision of the state" (Teitler 1975, 162). The professionalization of the military command initially assumed significance in a very divergent and asynchronous western professional development: "Before 1800 there was virtually no such thing as a professional officer corps anywhere. After 1900 no world power of any significance was without one" (Hackett 1983, 33). The professionalization of the command of troops changed in accordance with an increasing geographical scattering of the battlefield during those years. All officers should therefore be capable of, if necessary, to act independently in the "fog of war" [1832] (Clausewitz 1986) inside the intention of a higher command and still avoiding that this "frolic" created further chaos in the complex and fragmented battlefield, which otherwise so easily happens, where freedom of action prevails. This process is referred to as a part of a military revolution, which some describe as the essential explanation of "the discipline, the management and the technological innovations that enabled the industrial revolution" that emerged at roughly the same time (Østergaard og Engell 1999, 37). Thus, the officer corps occurred out of a need to handle an increasingly complex societal and professional context in a tight relation with the emergence of the modern national state and the scientific and technological development.

The concept of military command is a part of the grammar of the officer corps. Its justification, i.e. different historical reasoning’s, must be viewed in conjunction with the justification of the military profession as a whole. A distinctive feature of the military profession is that it is a profession of leadership. Regardless of the different historical contexts, the military system has enrolled in, the general and the army has always been mutually constitutive capabilities. The one doesn’t go without the other. The issue of the justification of the military profession has throughout history been answered by various criteria. Furthermore, it has not always been viewed as something that needed to be justified or explained. In the antiquity, it was considered as a natural prerequisite to survive and the way in which a prince reigned and maintained power over his territory and its inhabitants. Plato mentions the need for a special class of guardians to protect society: "Well, the state which now has grown so large, also needs a real army that can deploy, and successfully reject an attack on its property and citizens" (Platon og Wyller 1985, 95). In the Middle Ages the answer of Machiavelli was quite different. He said: "We must either win men along or destroy them" (Machiavelli 2012, 13). This argument only applied to a simple principle: “the right of the strongest”. This model has obviously been challenged in the Western political tradition but it has also be a major challenge of a free world. Thus, decisions of war must rest on more than raw power - it must be justified and legitimized publicly. In other words: "Decisions about as serious and harmful activities as war... must not be in the extension of what is called secret policy [Geheim Politik] in nations of absolutism. Decisions must not follow ‘arkan’ policy and geheim Council negotiations, but must commit to criteria resulting from the so-called deliberative public consultation" (Harste 2007, 322). This is a commitment that binds politicians as well as military professionals.

Through this Military command is a concept that highlights the professional self-understanding of military commanders and the legitimacy of the military system as guardians of the society. When used today, it is most often used in reference to the military leader (officer) who is self-commanding, i.e. the autonomous CEOs of military units which exercises the command with an overall responsibility for all resources during military operations (in war) as well as during garrison life (in peace). Sometimes the concept is also used for the lower ranking officers’ independent (or isolated) command during operations, such as the commander of an expeditionary force, or a shipmaster. Thus, the concept is linked particularly to the head with his full responsibility for a vital societal role.

The concept of military command has been used in the armed forces for many years to denote the duties of military officers. As a specific term the concept can easily be traced 60 years back, but the meaning goes
much further back. In the latest codex of military leadership the concept is justified as a kind of unique situational leadership: "In the armed forces the concept of command [...] is used as an expression for the specific situation of management related to operations [...] Command during operations is thus an essential contribution in order to understand military risk management" (Forsvarskommandoen 2008, 15). In a 50 years earlier professional interpretation, it appears that: "In concept of command it is not only understood that it is about a responsible managing function but also that the executive is at the very front: in his personal capacity, as well as literally or figuratively, when conditions require that sacrifices must be brought" (Hærens Officersskole 1958, 5). Common to those two different justifications are the association of the concept to the importance of the most difficult and fundamental conditions under which people must be able to perform and thus it emphasizes that it is crucially important that the commanders place themselves at the very focal point of action and manage the highly needed responsibility. Thus, it relates to the performance of two key matters, survival and victory, in the most fundamental and existential meaning of those words. In relation to those matters a patriarchal role of the commander, as a father and as the adult guardian of the soldier, the people and the nation, becomes visible. This role involves compliance with very specific rules of conduct as a general states as his obligations to his subordinates: "stand firm, listen and take responsibility" (General K.G.H. Hillingsø in Smedberg, (Smedberg 2004, 16)). This justification is also reflected in the rise of the officers corps during the 19th century and may be related to the Domestic Regime of Boltanski of Thévenot: "The father is principle of cohesion in the family, the one who establishes the link to an origin; like the boss, or, the king, the father is the one who lifts beings up by means of the dependence in which he holds them and who thus gives them access to all the worth they are capable of achieving according to the level they occupy" (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 168).

The concept of military command is associated with a demand for obedience and discipline (Holsting 2010) but also a willingness of "disobedience" in a specific sense of it to act appropriate in accordance with local conditions and in the interests of the whole regardless of the given order as long as it takes place in accordance with the intention of the higher commander. In addition to a high degree of professionalism it requires a high degree of delegation as the Prussian Field Marshal Heinrich von Moltke realized during the 2nd Schleswig War against Denmark in 1864 and during later wars. He described a concept of command that broke with the traditional point of view and thereby made the foundation of an alternative to the traditional school of command: "Either delegate the responsibilities to subordinate commanders (mission command [Führen durch Auftrag]), or attempt to increase control (directive command [Führen durch Befehl])" (Smedberg 2004, 283). Both positions continues to this day to dispute and they are interpreted in numerous ways, although the concept is formalized in NATO’s tactical doctrines under the concept of Mission Command: "Mission command is the conduct of military operations through decentralized execution based on mission orders for effective mission accomplishment" (NATO 2009, 0113). In practice, there are huge individual and cultural differences on how Mission Command is carried out and justified. A former Flag Officer, General K. Bartels’ interpretation is that: "We have a concept in the armed forces, which we call 'command'. In it is for me that responsibility cannot be delegated. Tasks can be delegated, but responsibility remains with the commander; If I distribute operational decisions, they must be handled within the intention I have given; they must be carried out in the spirit of the commander" (Bartels in Berlingske, 02.07.10). This articulation seems also to reveal principles of the industrial regime in regard to the point, that "responsibility cannot be delegated". The landmark of Moltke’s contribution was to justify a kind of management based on a paradoxical simultaneity of freedom and obedience. On the commander’s obedience Moltke pointed that: "Obedience is a fundamental principle, but man is beyond principles" (Bungay 2011, 77). Moltke was inspired by the military philosopher and officer Carl von Clausewitz’ philosophical formulations of the genuine warrior which stresses the need for a spiritual “lordship” (Freiherr) who detests regularity and glorifies the genius, or as he
say: "Woe to the warrior who has to crawl in the poorhouse of rules, which are too poor for the genius, which he gloriously overcome" (Clausewitz 1986, 115). There seems to be a bond to the regime of inspiration in Clausewitz’ justification of military command. Clausewitz forward this argument as a scathing critique of an opposite argument from another contemporary military scientist, Antoine Henri Jomini. This could be regarded as a professional dispute between an industrial and an inspirational justification of command. In relation to this it is interesting that Plato much earlier described the virtues of the guardians of the civil society as a paradoxical combination of humbleness and braveness which unite in a deparadoxing virtue, the desire to learn (Platon og Wyller 1985, 97–99). It could be argued that the concept of military command is based on a compromise between spiritual freedom (regime of inspiration) and scientific control (industrial regime). It is a compromise that in any war, and in any management situation can be questioned and criticized as a result of the specific conditions. Historians and professionals have granted this compromise a lot of attention in the analysis of the cabinet wars of the 19s century and the world wars of the 20s century. A parallel can be drawn to the descriptions of Boltanski and Thévenot regarding the vulnerability of the compromise and how it continuously causes professional disputes and power struggles: "A compromise suggests the possibility of a principle that can take judgments based on objects stemming from different worlds and make them compatible" (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 278).

With the introduction of the general conscription in the Western world the desire to learn extended into a more general societal role, the educational role of the nation’s men. The French Marshal Lyautey pronounced this in 1891: "The officer shall see himself as an educator of the nation" (Hackett 1983, 42). This is a remarkable perception, which on the one hand later has been abused in the 20th century’s illegitimate military dictatorships but on the other hand also gains ground in the international community’s legitimate requests for military assistance to aid in humanitarian and peacekeeping missions with the intention of civilian and political reconstruction. Thus, military command traditionally relates not only inward, it also relate outward to the society: "Security missions conducted by international forces are gradually assuming the guise of a formative process, with missions accomplishing their objectives by passing on globally acknowledged values and norms to the mission area. However, the process puts demands on the deployed forces because forces must be assumed to have internalized these values and norms within the organization and its leadership processes. It is, after all, an accepted fact that ‘we are what we do’" (Brigadier General A. Rokos in Nørgaard and Holsting (Nørgaard og Holsting 2006, 8–9)). As a concept and a phenomenon the officers corps may therefore be regarded as a community, which strives for a higher common societal goal through a professional ethic of duty in which the actor is prepared to sacrifice his life and welfare for the benefit of a greater cause, the common good. Through this perspective the concept of command shares the principles and basic characteristics with the civic regime and its subjects: "The common aspiration to unity defines the dignity of persons. In the civic world, beings are persons when they are capable of having rights and obligations, that is, when they have been created and authorized by an act in which the will of all is expressed" (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 187).

In recent years, a distinction is made in the concept of military command between military risk management, which identifies command in the specific operational context, and corporate governance referring to military command in the business operations of the military organization (Forsvarskommandoens, 2008). This distinction also indicates a more fundamental challenge for the military profession. Its normal state of action is peace but its scope of it is that of war. Moltke previously described the challenges of this in 1866: "In war, the qualities of character weigh more heavily than those of reason (Verstand). Many step forth brilliantly on the battlefield who would be overlooked in garrison life" (Moltke og Hughes 1993, 172). This statement demonstrates a contradictory justification of the concept in accordance with a traditional and legal distinction between war and peace: "While the classical war of national states were separated
from peace through legal acts like declarations of war and peace, and a third state between war and peace didn’t exist... then the wars of today have neither an identifiable beginning or a clear end” (Münkler 2007, 23). The Post-Cold War security situation and the recent years of activist security policy creates such a reality in which the conduct of war and the peacetime public administration are carried out simultaneously. The previously distinction between war and peace (divided by the action of the nations’ mobilization) is thus dissolved. This accentuates the conflict, which traditionally has been a part of but also a separated justification of military command. What actually justifies military command, is undergoing a test or a power struggle and may therefore simultaneously be interpreted with reference to different principles.

As stated without caution, I have already initially suggested a number of links between the justification of military command and the regimes of justification by Boltanski & Thévenot. Thereby it has been my intention to demonstrate that the basis of the profession of military command is a result of a number of historical compromises between mutually incompatible regimes that continues to restart disputes regarding the justification of the profession (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 224). It is within these disputes or tests I intend to engage directly with the professional actors and their efforts to justify military command through actions and arguments or to follow the actors as Boltanski and Thévenot describes it (Luc Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 12) with a reference to Bruno Latour (Latour 2007).

The justification of violence in our society relies on a very fragile compromise as the military historian John Keegan argues: “Our culture is a compromise, and the compromise with regard to public violence has been to denote its manifestation, but to legitimize its use. Pacifism has been elevated to the ideal, while the legal carrier of arms - under strict military justice and within the narrow framework legislation sets - only is accepted as a practical necessity” (Keegan 2000, 23). Military command may traditionally be regarded as a repeated dispute or test resulting in fragile compromises over time between incompatible regimes of justification like the domestic, industrial, civic and inspired regimes of justification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summery description of the traditionally military regimes of justification inspired by Boltanski &amp; Thévenot (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Domestic regime</strong>: In this regime loyalty, selfless and trustworthiness is valued. Hierarchy and tradition is central and the commanders are informed and wise, and care for their subordinates. The professional upbringing and good manners are considered vital in the relationship amongst the actors. The primary aim of command is to preserve, protect and care for the unit, which is not only a functional unit but indeed a family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Industrial regime</strong>: In this regime precision, functionality, efficiency and productivity is valued. Optimization and progress is central and the commanders are guardians of perfection and validation of the combination of mechanics, technology and humans through scientific methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Civic regime</strong>: In this regime the needs and rights of the collective are valued. The actors join the collective by their free will but subordinate to the general will. Commanders are valued due to their informal capabilities and will to represent the interests of the entire unit, nation, etc. It is a regime of union or brotherhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The inspired regime</strong>: In this regime the genius, passion and complete dedication is valued. The actors commit themselves fully to the professional risks accepting all the costs it may imply. The willingness to offer anything in order to reach the moment of genius is crucial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. The critical capacity of military commanders – a contemporary inquiry

This section presents a synchronically discussion based on some of the data from our empirical approach - following the actors\(^1\) - which should be viewed as an anthropological analysis based on a symmetrical rela-

\(^1\) The concept – following the actors – is a concept used by Boltanski and Thévenot in order to acknowledge the critical capacity of the actors as the primary basis of the sociology (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006). They adopt the concept from Latour (Latour 2007) but since Boltanski has never carried out field studies in his methodological programs (Guggenheim og Potthast 2012) we have reflected upon this matter and described an anthropological approach of field study in relation to this methodological approach of the French Pragmatic Sociology (Nørgaard og Holsting 2014a).
tion between the scientist and the actors carried out in a combination of field studies, interviews and a shared process of exploration. The section presents the efforts of two commanding officers, (A) and (B), in order to justify the profession through military command, as they are observed in the most significant test of the military system in 2014, the political resolution of the armed forces 2013 to 2017.

The current criticism of the defense is contextualized by the global economic crisis. The current political dilemma lies in the need to reduce public spending without compromising the quality of public service, as this gives rise to public resistance. This dilemma makes it politically obvious and almost a logic of necessity to justify intervention in the public sector by the agenda of the modernization parole, cheaper and better public service. It is observable through the justification of the requirement for a 15% reduction in the defense budget: "Denmark stands in a time of economic challenges, and there is a need to ensure consistency in the public finances. The parties supporting the resolution agree that the Defense should also contribute to this context... The parties supporting the resolution note with satisfaction that the increased efficiency of the Defense is not going to affect the future operational capacities of the Danish defense" (Resolution 2013-17, 2012, 3-4). The last sentence of the quote has resulted in a significant professional irritation because the commanders consider it untrue, while the argument is not based on professional analysis but primarily on a report from the consulting firm McKinsey and budget analysis from the political administration (Ministry of Defence, 2012). It identifies possibilities of rationalization and efficiency. For many actors it seems as a statistical and economic rather than a professional justification. The professional annoyance is addressed in a central general's speech to a large number of commanding officers: "How do we, in theory, find the proceeds of 2.7 billion? We have an intention, but do we have a plan? No! We just don’t know it! ... It is very much up to you to find a balance in relation to what we gain. We need to think carefully... If we do not succeed now, we end up needing to cut in the future military capabilities. That's what we want to avoid" (Holsting, 2013). The critique of the commanding officers primarily regards the realism and reasonability in the assumption of the argument that a 15% budget reduction is not going to affect the professional quality. More specifically the critique addresses a large number of the approximately 100 centrally decided activities of modernizing. A number of those activities are considered to result in far-reaching and radical changes of the professional practice, quality criteria and professional self-understanding. Most commanding officers believe that it is unproven and dishonest, that a budget reduction of 15% may be executed without loss of quality.

However, it is a field of very divergent strategies of justification. The two commanding officers, (A) and (B), which are presented below, have chosen very different strategies for action and justification, thus showing that the military command constitutes a vast plurality of justifying actions in practice and arguments that both combine and confront each other.

Officer (A) Invokes a compromise of principles from the regimes of market, industry and fame (Holsting, 2014a)

At the introductory seminar where the defence resolution was presented officer (A) discovered, that his unit and everything he had worked for, should be decommissioned. After a brief reflection on this critical situation, he devoted himself to the promotion of a new type of unit that could conduct operational transport for all three Services (Army, Navy and Air Force). To his superiors he argued that with only 2/3 of the existing resources he would be able to carry out this job at the same or better quality than ever before. Through this argument he convinced the Defence Command. They assigned him for the job and gave him

---

2 During the last 10-15 years the military command has been publicly denounced in numerous ways. It has been through different political resolutions and through critique from politicians, public opinion makers, courts and the State Auditing Office, etc. Through the media the entire body of critique is in general summoned up as "yet another scandalous report from military command".
the resources. In an effort to achieve the aims, he is launching a major LEAN-project and promotes the unit through internal "advertising spots", which also has a purpose to educate the customers, in order to save time and resources on consultation and debugging. The project has received a lot of attention from the top-management and the higher levels of command observe the project in order to gain knowledge from it. In this completely new unit officer (A) sanctions against any kind of conventional thinking an against what he calls "old-fashioned" corps habits and any "we do what we always do"-attitudes in case they hinder efficiency and customer-orientation. Further the three Services now have to accept that they no longer have their own operational transport capabilities, but have to purchase it from a common vendor. Officer (A) has impaired the traditional view of how the military order is maintained through the domestic regime. He has consistently launched various technologies of measurement and documentation (objects of the industrial regime). And he has abandoned the traditional military anonymous uniformity and promoted his unit (the regime of fame and market regime) with a remarkable self-confident commercial attitude: "In the world of public opinion, worthy beings are the ones that distinguish themselves, are visible, famous, recognized" (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 179). Further, Officer (A) has put himself completely on the line in this project, which is remarkable in regard to the high uncertainty he is obviously also facing: "I have the concern that when we're done with this [the complete transformation] then it may well be that you can mathematically prove an improved bottom line or a financial profit, but I just think that where we previously provided the professional capabilities to a qualitative standard of 10 or 12 [the highest standard], I am afraid that you still receive a service, but the standard will be decreased to a level of 4 [just enough]" (Officer (A) in Holsting, 2014a). The characteristic of this way of acting and justifying action is a high degree of pragmatic acceptance of the risks that could otherwise be challenged or denounced.

Officer (B) Invokes a compromise of principles from the domestic, civic and inspirational regimes

In the same situation as officer (A) officer (B), who was responsible for the education of officers, experienced that the entire offices’ education was about to be radically transformed. In addition to an organizational change that would move the school from its respective Service and merge it with other schools from other Services in a joint institution, the entire educational program should be brought into the civilian system of accreditation and great savings on education time and methods should be implemented as a result of the cheaper and better program. Fighting against this transformation officer (B) has provided a severe public critique which he believes will destroy the primary operational capability in the armed forces, the officer corps: "[W]e leave a system based on 'the best man for the job' to a system based on 'the cheapest man for the job'" (Officer (B) in Hærens Officersskole, 2013a:3). He also stresses a need for a unique contract between the ‘guardians’ and the society that recognizes them for the unique risks that they assume (survival and victory): "Power positions in the administration of the state do not consider it necessary that the monopoly on power of the state, in the police corps and military, are tied closely and in loyalty to the political system as civil servants. It must be considered that professionalism, esprit de corps, loyalty and self-sacrifices may be purchased directly from the street and educated through fragmented training programs and short-term contract employment" (Officer (B) in Berlingske, 26.08.13). The essence of this quotation invokes principles of family ties and relationships as it is described in the domestic regime: “It is through reference two generations, tradition and hierarchy that order can be established” (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 165). The quotation also reaches acclaimation of the collective subject from the civic regime: "The common aspiration two unit defines the dignity of the person” (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 186). At an earlier stage officer (B) had already criticized a tendency in the public administration to litigate soldiers at war, every time fighting’s cause losses: "if it becomes the rule rather than the exception that you are dragged to court at the slightest suspicion of error, it eventually paralyze people, and make them stop acting and thinking creatively" (Officer (B) in Hærens Officersskole, 2012). One observes the echo of Plato’s virtue, the desire to learn, and Clausewitz’s description of the genuine warrior, which also shows an affinity
to the regime of inspiration: "In the inspired world, natural relationships are relationships of creation" (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 162). The artist's animated creativity may be comparable to a military principle in the classification of the brilliant commander on the battlefield, "a 'flash of genius', a 'kick' that will provoke the appearance of an idea" (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 163).

Whereas the two different cases from (A) and (B) each include specific compromises, it is obviously that the two cases demonstrate significantly different perspectives on how to act and justify the military profession through military command. The justifications of (A) and (B) lead to very different constructions of action that held together seem contradictory. They also bring two very different consequences for executives. Officer (A) is clearly connecting to the discourse on cheaper and better military capabilities and he is very much aware not to convey his critique publicly. This could be regarded as a crucial prerequisite for a system that has been destabilized by intense denunciation: "[L]ack of criticism is not merely negative, not merely a result of domination and alienation. It often requires an active participation of persons and a special capacity so as not to see or, at least not to unveil, what is going wrong. Without this capacity ordinary human relationships would simply be impossible" (Boltanski og Thévenot 1999, 375). The pragmatic acceptance provides the officer with an opportunity to remain in his field of command and thus handle the critique that has been directed toward the profession actively. If he succeeds, it is a win-win situation for all participants in the test even though the professional practice and justification undergoes significant changes. If it fails, he has, if nothing else, conducted a verifying test of the current justification between different regimes. Several officers in the empirical data denotes boldly such a strategy of action as a "happy go lucky"-strategy (Holsting, 2013).

On the contrary the result of the critique from officer (B) was that he was removed from his position and thus was excluded from the test of the current justification thesis, cheaper and better. In his farewell speech he stressed his view of the reason for this: "[T]he reason why my time as your commanding officer ends, is that I in my speech to the officer corps anniversary allowed myself to sum up the challenges of the current defense resolution that we are going to face, based on pure facts... Regrettably, the speech did not lead to a debate on the crucial issues; in contrast it rather led to an abrupt removal of me as the principal of the school. So I am quite concerned about the future conditions of command in the Armed Forces and in the Army" (HærensOfficersskole, 2013b). Thus, the criticism is not necessarily silenced, although many other professionals probably refrain from bringing their critique into the public dispute after this affair. The critique from the professionals has been silenced for the moment being, but it may easily cause that the emerging justifications become even more fragile and vulnerable to future professional denunciation.

In OJ Boltanski and Thévenot distinguish between polities and worlds, where the former’s regimes of justification meet the later in various human and non-human conditions in tests. In the case of officer (A) the key-objects are materials (transport), whereas in the case of officer (B) it is the fundamental ideas of the military profession that are the key-objects. The last mentioned is a far more critical professional issue than the afore mentioned. It may be easier to displace regimes of justification in the world of materials than in the world of fundamental professional ideas. This could be a way to understand the huge diversity between the two ways of justification. Never the less officer (A) has put himself in a much more attractive situation than officer (B). On the one hand the two examples show the wide range of the commanding officers’ critical capacity and pragmatic actions and on the other hand they outline a future justification of military command based on a significant displacement of regimes and the intervention of relatively new regimes.

Summy description of regimes of justification recently intervened in the profession.
Inspiration by Boltanski & Thévenot (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006)
3. The displacement of military regimes of justification – What is displaced?

At this stage it is relevant to reflect on the question of what causes the displacement of professional justification. In this section I will use the regimes of justification from OJ to show a diachronically trend analysis of the changes of the justification during the last approximately 20 years.

The professional narrative is undergoing a significant test in the current situation as it is expressed by leading professionals like Rear Admiral Nils Wang: "In contrast to the military resolution from 2004 the current resolution [2013-17] is not only causing major organizational changes, it also dictates a complete renovation of the military education and employment systems, especially the officer corps. Thus, this resolution is affecting, what you could call the professional bearing parts of the military central nervous system" (Wang in Berlingske, 09.04.2014). In other words the changes cannot be reduced as professional adjustments or adaptations. It is a far more fundamental change which professional key actors describe as a radical change of basic professional principles. Specifically, these is realized through the renovation of the education of the officer corps and the civil service systems, large reductions in the number of military commanders, downsizing and decentralization of HR, merging and reorganization of the top levels of management, restructuring and reallocation of military capabilities, the dismissal of thousands of employees, relocation of a large number of capacities into joint military capacities (JOINT) former devoted to specific Services, continued outsourcing of service and repatriation of troops and units from the most expensive and demanding international operations like the one in Afghanistan (ISAF). The latest resolution, however, is just one in a series of several resolutions, which in recent years have affected the armed forces radically. It has taken place through inhomogeneous approaches as a consequence of quite different reformist mindsets from resolution to resolution1. On a societal level this type of processes has been examined in a background analysis for the recently released final report from the Commission of Productivity (Sørensen og et al 2014). A conclusion in a background paper to this report is that:“[t]he public management has evolved historically over time. Layer upon layer has been added to public management. The overall picture therefore is an increasingly complex administration that cannot be reduced to be only market-based management, coordination and collaborative management or hierarchical and bureaucratic management. New control measures have been laid on top of the existing layers.” (Greve og Ejersbo 2013, 17). In other words one regime of justification is not necessarily replacing the other, but settles as sediment dispositions of dissimilar and even contradictory justifications. Additionally Greve and Ejersbo highlights that the transformation simply cannot be seen as a unique marketization of society as it is often argued through the public denunciation of the concepts of New Public Management (Jørgensen og Dalsgaard 2010). This leads to a proposal for a trend analysis that links the professional displacements to the changes in the policies of security economy (Nørgaard og Holsting 2014a).

Security and economic displacements in the military environment

The displacement of justification of the military profession may happen as a consequence of repeating changes in the Post-Cold War security policy. The breakup in the international world order from the late 80s made clear traces in the defense strategic and in the military thought ((Nørgaard 2004), (Nørgaard og

---

Holsting 2006), (Nørgaard, Holsting, og Thorbjørnsen 2010). Firstly, in the transition from a mobilized garrisoned defense into deployable and flexible military capabilities capable of deployment anywhere worldwide at short notice. Secondly, in the recognition of the fact that the new political wars are not just about beating the enemy or gaining control over a particular territory, but to win the "strategic narrative" that shapes both the military and the political scope for action. Thirdly, based on a real political calculation that shows that the willingness to contribute with military means of power and human sacrifice provides international legitimacy and influence that extends far beyond that which would be obtained for a small nation in the international Post-Cold War power game. Fourthly, progress continues in the light of a slowdown in the so-called activist security policy among alliance partners. The political rhetoric continues to be that of an activist, but there are also other trends that reduce the previous enthusiastic activism (e.g. the conflict in Syria). Fifthly, new battlefields reveal, respectively in the form of cyber warfare and through new territorial disputes growing out of climate change, not least as a result of the melting of the Arctic. Furthermore, technological developments have the effect that several nations within a few years will possess weapons that can reintroduce the relevance of the until recently anticipated safe domestic territory. Finally, the crisis at Crimea and in Ukraine exposes that the Cold War domestic security problems are by no means a historical phenomenon. This has renewed the dispute about the needs for a defense like the cold war defense amongst the partners in the NATO alliance. This tour de force in the ever-changing security situation should be regarded in light of the, in a historical and political sense, extremely short period of just about 15-20 years, where these trends have been encountered in military affairs and in the disputes of the military profession.

In the perspective of Boltanski & Thévenot this may be regarded as displacements of military regimes of justification. Initially it happens through an extension from the domestic principle of the protection of the family (the nation) that displaces from the principles of territorial security (domestic) to principles of freedom, democracy and human rights (civic). This can also be observed in the changing laws of The Armed Forces from 1990 to 1993 with the following added military objective in 1993: “To promote the peaceful development of the world with respect for human rights” (Retsinformation [Law of The Armed Forces 1990 & 1993]). In this an extension into the civic regime of justification is apparent: “They [in casu the military profession] become worthy when they accede to a general state and make themselves the expression of a general will and the embodiment of a general will” (Boltanski og Thévenot 2006, 187). Later the domestic and civic principles are overlaid by a more or less explicit cost-benefit market principle connected to a trade between the will of national sacrifices and increased international influence. E.g. the appointment of the former Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen as Secretary General of NATO (2009-2014) can be seen as such a “return on investment” in relation to the tough Danish contribution in Afghanistan. This was unthinkable during the so-called “footnote security policy” in the 80s. In a forward-looking perspective a renewed relevance of the domestic principle of security may once again be thinkable as a result of technological changes as more and more nations acquire long distance missiles. The discussion and disputes about a so-called missile-shield is an example of a domestic security discussion. The environmental changes

---

6 Denmark is today often referred to as one of America's closest allies in Europe and it is an extraordinary situation that two Danes currently occupy some of the highest positions in NATO. It is Anders Fogh Rasmussen as Secretary General and the former Flag Officer General Knud Bartels, as Chairman of the Military Committee and primary advisor of the Secretary General. This is a significant change compared to the 80s, when Denmark's membership of NATO was brought highly in doubt due to the Danish so-called 'footnote policy', where Denmark again and again came on a collision course with the United States and the other alliance partners in regard to the implementation of Persing II missiles (Hillingsø 2004).

7 International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan 2001-2014. By 31/01/2014 the numbers of dead and wounded Danish soldiers from 2002 to 2014 was 257 (Forsvarets Personelitjeneste, 2014). Relatively this is the highest number of national losses amongst the participating nations from the alliance in the ISAF mission.

8 The Footnote policy is a term used to describe parts of the Danish Security Policy in the period 1982 to 1988. The Administration lacked the Parliamentary majority and were forced to go against major NATO decisions (Hillingsø 2004).
that causes melting in the Arctic causes rearmament in the Arctic nations in order to protect the uncovered areas and resources. This is also a re-actualization of a domestic security agenda. The current military necessity is therefore extremely difficult to determine and the best proposal for a justification today may be derived from Richard N. Haass’ distinction between war of necessity and war of choice. According to the last justification, he states that: "Wars of choice are neither good or bad per se. But they meet two standards, one absolute and one relative, in order to be advisable. First, the likely benefits of using force must look to outweigh the projected costs. Second, this ratio of benefits and costs must be superior to what would be expected from other policies" (Haass 2010, xviii). The absence of a clear and duty-ethical military necessity (to reject an attack on its property and citizens, e.g. Plato) opens up a variety of opportunities related to security and economy which in other circumstances would have been unthinkable or impossible either to realize or to justify. This means that the concept of war no longer leans on a unique and universal scale, a uniquely and common principle of equivalence, which was the case during former eras of security like the Cold-War. The concept of war (or security) has rather become one amongst other domestic resort political issues that compete with each other for limited resources, weighed in the distributional priorities in accordance with different cost-benefit principles.

Displacement of regimes in the military profession (NB! See footnote7)
To understand the displacements that happens in the regimes of professional justification, it is appropriate to relate them to political-philosophical constructions from which they - on a macro-social level - draw their cultural power of reasoning. As described in Section 2, Boltanski and Thévenot offer such a macro-perspective: "These worlds are historical constructions and some of them are less and less able to ground people’s justifications whereas other ones are emerging" (Boltanski og Thevenot 1999, 369). In section 1 I suggested that a number of those cultural constructions have emerged through a line of development that goes back to the very beginning of the professionalization of the officer corps, from the rise of it during the 19th century and even long time before. Through Boltanski and Thévenot we learn, that the influence of these cultural constructions upon society may change very much over time. This also applies in the military profession, whereas some regimes that only a few decades or a few years ago were nodal points of the profession like the civic, domestic, inspirational and industrial regimes, the legitimate forms of argument today increasingly rely on market regimes and regimes of fame (Figure 1).

Regimes that have traditionally been part of the justification of military command
The reduced significance of the domestic regime: As outlined in the section about the genesis of military command (section 1), the domestic principles should be regarded as the traditional regime of justification of military commanders as a result of social conditions and the type of military tasks. During the last 25-30

---

7 This section is based on a hypothesis which in this paper shall only serve to demonstrate an option for a more thorough analysis.
years, the domestic justification of operational tasks has gradually been reduced, but the future development depends on a constantly changing security policy situation. When looking at the internal military organization a fundamental change has been emerging for the last 10 years changing it from a construction of many hierarchical layers of command to fewer levels which today coordinate through horizontal functional coordination and cooperation structures and with far more direct political control. It has been a dramatic change away from a traditional military hierarchical organization which supported the commanding officer as an omnipotent actor: “The functional structure has created new disciplinary requirements which have not been as pronounced in the traditional Weberian organization. The commanders’ duty to obey and his right and the duty to direct subordinates, is in fact supplemented with an equal requirement to coordinate horizontally. It requires a much higher level of general understanding and willingness to coordinate forces than it is the case in the classic line-staff organization. The disciplinary claim is still ‘willingly and faithfully to obey any lawful, professional order given to him by a superior’, but it relies just as much on ‘willingly and accurately to ensure resources coordinated through interaction and binding collaboration across the organization’” (Holsting 2010, 7). The domestic reference to the military commander is declining and management is distributed on numerous actors in coordinating networks. In the logic of a domestic justification this is regarded as a problem, so as much as the responsibility is not clearly linked to one person, which in the traditional point of view means that it easily becomes nobody’s: "When responsibility is divided between two, they get 2% responsibility each" (Officer (C) in Holsting, 2014b). Contrary to this, critics point out that the distributed responsibility makes it harder for the professionals to create a "state within a state"

The increased significance of the industrial regime: The principles of the industrial regime may be identified throughout the military history as a prerequisite for the establishment and deployment of troops. Further the defeat of the enemy should also be regarded as a kind of calculative practices (cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit). Recent years of modernization and efficiency ("cheaper and better") have meant that the organization often is described as an economic subject before anything else. The Defence Resolution 2013-17 (Defense Resolution 2013-17, 2012) built upon a comprehensive budget analysis from the consulting firm McKinsey is not the latest example of this. The Administration has already brought the economic analysis even further into the organizational layers forcing the professionals to confront professional habits with economic principles. The austerity, this practice establishes, represents a dispute with an attitude that the price does not matter as long as the operational considerations require effort. E.g. this applies to the extremely costly transport forth and back from the mission areas in Afghanistan. An increasing cost consciousness arises, which most accept. Contrary to this, a dispute often arises when the price and the safety of the soldiers are weighed against each other.

The reduced significance of the civic regime inside the military organization: The displacement moves away from collective professional rights and privileges of employment, responsibilities, length of service, remuneration to individual performance criteria and contracts based on short-term recruitment and temporary arrangements. As officer (B) argues, the question is, whether it creates a world of "cheapest man for the job" (market regime) and a weakening of the esprit de corps that has defined the professional self-understanding in the officer corps during all times? Right now this is an open question occupying the minds of many officers, and it is certain that the Defense Resolution 2013-17 (Defense Resolution 2013-17, 2012) affects a wide range of objects and relations which traditionally define the officers corps as a band of

---

8 I is not possible to draw a clear distinction between the civic and domestic. In the military profession the esprit de corps may be regarded as a compromise between domestic (vertical loyalty) and civic (self-sacrifice) principles that hold the social system together.
the bonds to the state as its loyal guardians. Further, the question is whether the individualization marks a break with the traditional collective justification, where the officer has so far agreed to put his own welfare and needs aside for the benefit of the community and society? This is yet to be proven in the coming years of development. At the moment it is one of the major points of critique returned from the professionals against the political decision makers.

The increased significance of the regime of Inspiration with a new scope: The requirement to “think outside the box” and take on the responsibility of a risky organizational development is very prominent in the current Defence Resolution (Defense Resolution 2013-17, 2012). Time and again politicians and the senior military management appeal towards the professional commanding officers to jump onboard and participate proactively in the transformation and put an end to old-fashioned professional assumptions, as they put it. A general from the Defence Command made this categorical statement to the officers regarding this: “At the best your previous experience does not stand in the way of development” (Holsting, 2013). Thus, there is a very clear tendency to justify the role of the commanding officer as a reformer of the profession, rather than as the protector of it. This invokes principles that have been traditionally cultivated in the operational practice, the genuine warrior, Auftragstaktik and the desire to learn. Whereas those principles have been cultivated in the operational context, they have been much less appreciated in the administrative context (garrison management). The senior management of the Defence has recently repeatedly pleaded with the professional commanding officers to engage in a common risk community who can complete the transformation of the defense through “Auftragstaktik” (Holsting, 2013).

Regimes that have not previously been part of the justification of military command

The increasing significance of the market regime: Earlier in this section, the concept of "war of choice" has been introduced as a tendency which introduces the market principles into the deliberations and waging of war. Moreover, not least the reforms in the Defense Resolution 2005-9 (Resolution 2005-9, 2004) designed The Armed Forces as an inner market of customers and vendors with mutual relations defined in contracts, service level agreements and executive management groups that replaces the former traditional hierarchical top management structures. In this process, the defense has been split into functional areas of interdependence (operations, personnel, equipment, IT, accounting, establishment, health). Before this point the commanding officers gained the full responsibility and direct influence upon all the resources of the regimental structure. This change meant that the commanding officer literally went from being a conductor to being the coordinator (Holsting 2010). The increased influence of the market regime may be interpreted as the reduced significance of the domestic regime on behalf of the market regime. This process has been even further advanced in the recently adopted reconstruction of the defense's top management, in which the responsibility of the Flag Officer (Chief of Defense) in a similar way has been curtailed so that his area of responsibility is narrowed to the business of military operations. All other matters are now subject to the Defense Department’s civilian administration and a number of government agencies, which the Flag Officer, as head of military operations, must coordinate with in a collaborative network in the future (Ministry of Defence, 2014).

The recent HR strategy (Forsvarskommandoen, 2013) establishes a setting, that will displace the relationship of the commanding officers from that of coordinators to that of competitors and thereby the market principles will be even further implemented.

---

9 The term “band of brothers” originates from the collective of captains serving under the English admiral Horatio Nelson during the Napoleon Wars (Potter 1981)

10 The changed scope of the regime of inspiration which I am arguing also call upon another discussion wetter the genuine warrior is a military version of the regime of inspiration or wetter it is a unique phenomenon between justification, violence and strategic-tactical action?
The increased significance of the *regime of fame*: In recent years, many so-called scandals have exercised influence on decision-making. For the officer’s corps it has not been left unnoticed, how a Flag Officer in 2009 was forced to resign as a consequence of others in the Armed Forces Command had translated and published a book that The Armed Forces in a highly exposed case of freedom of expression had prevented published with the argument of military security. Attention to Defense reputation in public and especially to the dependents of the deployed soldiers has undertaken an increasingly important place among the commanding officers. The displacement from the Cold-War military defense to a defense based on volunteer recruitment also pushes the development. The new HR strategy (HR strategy of The Armed Forces, 2013) also means that commanding officers have accessed an internal competition to be attractive, as the former system of designations has been abolished and replaced by an ordinary system of application. This must be considered as a fundamental break with the HR practice of all times or at least since the introduction of an Army of common conscription in 1849 (Østergaard og Engell 1999). This competition on the labor market results in an increasing amount of local communication and marketing strategies, and the example of Officer (A) demonstrates that it is a development that has only begun.

4. Displacement of military regimes – How is justification displaced?

Whereas the former section presented a perspective of what is displaced this section will bring the reflection further in order to understand how fundamental displacement of justification is possible.

In recent years, discussions of the arrangement of the military profession has particularly been about a contrast ratio between the role of the warrior and the role of the manager (Nørgaard, Holsting, og Thorbjørnsen 2008). The question of what weight, priority and mutual balance those roles must be assigned in the military context has been the focal point of a long professional dispute. In the previous section I have sought to present a more nuanced picture of the different justifications that emerge and displace in the concept of military command. As noted, this development is not exclusively seen as a rational economic displacement or as a reflection of a unique military necessity. On the contrary, the justification of the profession reveals a plurality of arguments that are not necessarily contiguous. But the question is what makes displacements possible? In OJ Boltanski and Thévenot argue that the regimes of action that achieve legitimacy stem from legitimacy tests where the argument and the public articulation is the crucial process. In *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (NSC) Boltanski and Chiapello expands the understanding of the test viewing it as a continuum between a test of strength and a test of legitimacy, as power (violence) according to them is never out of sight in legitimizing processes. In order to explain the complex mix of strength and legitimacy in a test, they define two new concepts of regimes. The one, a regime of categories (*mode of categorisation*), addresses the legitimate tests that can either lead to consensus, compromise or private arrangements. These tests are based on the argument. The second, a regime of displacement (*mode of displacement*), addresses the unspoken element of power through which meaning can be displaced in secret and disputes may be avoided: “It thus avoids any justificatory constraint, constraint that would infer the necessity of referring to a second plane - precisely the same level that, within a logic of categorisation, serves as an embodiment of the equivalency convention... Another consequence of this new type of reaction to criticism, involving the use of displacement, is that it temporarily disarm[s] criticisms by presenting critics with a world that they no longer know how to interpret” (Luc Boltanski, Chiapello, og Elliott 2007, 172 & 175).

This proposal, to understand the displacement of regimes of justification, opens a new discussion of what is at stake in the justification of military command. In section 1, the military concept of discipline and obedience was linked to the concept of military command, as a prerequisite of the necessary freedom of action in the "fog of war". The relativization of discipline is captured in the actors’ will to act appropriately within intention from a higher level. The critical point of the new discussion is that the intention from the higher
level is often presented as an indisputable fact, something that cannot be accessible for public discussion, something that cannot or should be denounced by subordinates or by outsiders. Any critique of the superiors’ intention immediately causes a weakening of the system and threatens it, endangers the survival of the actors and pushes the victory out of sight. Any public critique of the overall intention bring everybody at risk in the military chain of command. In the empiric data there are several indicators of the fact that modes of displacement in as much as modes of categorization provide the framework for the change or the scenario of the professional test. The creation of the latest Defense Resolution (Defense Resolution 2013-17, 2012) has been regarded as a historically darkened process by the military commanders: "Frustration can also be linked to the process where secrecy has been the prevailing premise." (Officer (I) in Holsting, 2013c). In general the commanding officers speak positively of the dialogue with the Flag Officer and the senior management, which was conducted immediately after the political decision in 2012, but as many articulate, after that process any kind of dialogue or tolerance of critique from the professional ranks was not accepted: "... then suddenly they disappear into a secret cave and reject everything, and crack down on everything, actually. OK [General X] travels around in the organization [to justify the resolution] but as soon as anyone raises any critique, then he is chopped. Threatened with being dismissed from UK, and so one, when they raise critical questions" (Officer (anonymous) in Holsting, 2013). A specific example that may be related to the issue of modes of displacement is the dismissal of Officer (B) who was removed from his position because of his critique.

It is striking, that apart from a few available posts on publicly media on the issue of the officer’s formal and public expression, there has been remarkably silent after this. Is it the concern of retaliation to this silent acceptance or resignation? Is the profession witnessing an unique mode or regime of displacement that affects the test between which political demands and professional quality criteria have been treated? In the empirical data there are a lot of divergent attitudes and arguments regarding the transformation of the military profession but it is not spoken in public and the politicians did not ask for a public debate before they settled the decision (Defense Resolution 2013-17, 2012).

Are we witnessing the emergence of a new regime, a project regime (Luc Boltanski, Chiapello, og Elliott 2007) As described, the last 15-20 years have been characterized by continuous political and professional driven changes of the military profession with a constant intention to fight outdated inefficient and unfashionable professional practices. In the perspective of the description of a regime of displacement, it is perhaps not surprising that the professional critique is silenced, despite the transformation that the professional standards currently undergoes. The justification of military command is displaced from the operations of professional quality into the continuous reforms of professional standards so that they can be obtained cheaper without compromising the quality which is not allowed to be slacked. These tests increasingly require the time and attention of the commanding officers: "But in addition to that [operational management] ... we are reaching at least 50% of our entire workload as commanding officers that is connected to support of continuous transformation, development projects related to Defense Resolutions, participation in meetings and working groups, and internet groups and it never stops! And it is utterly fantastic earsplitting, conspicuous and striking how inferior the public critique of the way we do it, is. It is a unique loyalty [of the commanding officers] we are witnessing. There is literally no one in any of the Services, at a sufficiently high level that challenges the assumptions of the decided approach" (Officer (I) in Holsting, 2014c).

This trend may as well be regarded according to the industrial perspective of justification, as it largely concerns continuous efficiency (cheaper and better) based on economic calculations. But it could also be regarded in the perspective of the project regime by Boltanski and Chiapello as it is introduced in NSC. If so, it has brought a quiet revolution into the military profession in the shadow of a more visible and outspoken professional dispute between the positions of the warrior and the manager. Boltanski and Chiapello de-
scribes the project regime as the most significant transformation of the capitalist order in the time from the 60s to the 90s in France. In this regime the ratio of efficiency is based upon flexibility: "One of the characteristic [of the project regime] is that it represents the change as something at once indispensable and desirable. It is a necessity that one should wish for ... And it is something we should wish for because inasmuch the forces it is forced by are relentless, we have no choice, and as far as we are 'responsible', we have to try to get the best of it... it nevertheless represents one of the most common kinds of leadership in the advanced capitalism" (Luc Boltanski 2011a, 287–288).

Equipped with this perspective, an entirely new opportunity to understand the shifts that has occurred in the military operations during recent years is revealed. On the societal level a stable security threat has been replaced by multifaceted threats that have changed the operational patterns of the warrior from the permanent domestic territorial defense into "project-based" missions based on military agility and deployability as it occur in the missions at the Balkan, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya and Mali, etc. In relation to the role of the manager a wide range of management technologies that support the principles of projects like Prince2-project-management, business case models, period plans and project and portfolio technologies has been implemented as objects of this regime. These objects redefine the previous relationship between the professional and political actors and redefine any activity, subject or object as a project. One of the reasons that this project turn has not received as much attention in the professional debate as the dispute between the positions between the warrior and manager may be that this regime as well as the market and industry regimes are contradictory to domestic and civic regimes, but yet have provoked the professional actors in a smaller degree: “Considered from the standpoint of this new model of excellence [the project regime], permanency and especially constancy to oneself, or enduring attachment to various ‘values’, are open to criticism as misplaced, even pathological inflexibility and, depending on the context, as inefficiency, rudeness, intolerance, and an inability to communicate” (Luc Boltanski, Chiapello, og Elliott 2007, 463).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary description of a regime of projects as a possible explanation of the recent years of displacement in the armed forces. Inspiration by Boltanski &amp; Chiapello (Boltanski, Chiapello, og Elliott 2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Project regime: In this regime flexibility, agility and the ability to define anything in terms of projects are valued. The law of the market is central. The successful commanders manage gain trust in loosely composed networks. The ability to be available, to be occupied with development and to be willing to take risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the priorities and actions by officer (A), it appears plausible to elevate them to a project regime as the primary justification. It seems like a regime that fits easily into a compromise with the market regime and the regime of fame whereas the standardization and stability of industrial regime is challenged even though its scientific objects fit into this compromise. On the other hand the project regime disqualifies the universal and preserving principles of the domestic and civic regimes. If the entrance of the principles of the project regime may be verified as the primary change in military command, it offers a plausible explanation of the significant change of the traditional professional compromise and the displacement into an entire new compromise of regimes dominated by the superimposing principles of flexibility and agility.

### 5. Closing remarks

A preliminary conclusion derived from the reflections in the last section is that the current test of justification of military command cannot be fully understand through the regimes of justification by Boltanski and Thévenot. In order to enhance the knowledge of the displacement of justification it is also appropriate to include a concept which is capable of capturing the full continuum from strength test (mode of displacement) to legitimacy test (mode of categories) (Luc Boltanski, Chiapello, og Elliott 2007). Whether and how the entrance of a new project regime alongside the other regimes is affecting the balance between strength and legitimacy in the resent and forthcoming tests of the military profession may be subject for
further exploration but it is clear, that a radical displacement has taken place and it is remarkable, that is has happened with only few public disputes since the professionals in general are very suspicious regarding the ability to maintain the previous qualitative level of military professionalism.

Based on the analysis it is also appropriate to ask how it has been possible for those many compromise of justification to coexist in the military profession so far, the domestic, the industrial, the civic and the inspirational, which in so many ways are contradictory? Is the answer, that a very strong military-institutional framework, the officers’ corps, has been the condition of possibility for this? If so it is even more important to examine it more closely, as two issues are at stake: the military-institutional framework is under attack through denunciation and marginalization, and new regimes of justification (market and fame) and displacement amongst the existing regimes are transforming the profession radically. The compromise between the many traditional regimes and newcomming regimes and the displacement of those threatens the stability.

The profession's probably most critical contemporary obligation is to provide a legitimate response to the denunciation which the profession has been exposed to during the resent years since it has considerable potential of crippling the profession if it is not met with a legitimate professional counter-justification capable of ensuring the professional autonomy as it is argued by Henning Salling Olsen: "When the profession's authority is challenged, the autonomic scope for the professional is usually reduced. In the best case it gives rise to new forms of communication and negotiation where the knowledge of specialized professionals [the commanding officer] must explain and justify their authority again. In any case the workplace relations are redefined from a structure with a single collegiate or individual relationship to an interaction between this profession and outside interests. The power ratio is put to a test. In the worst case - which often occurs in practice - this means that instead of professional autonomy being introduced, rather authoritarian management methods or market mechanisms are introduced" (Olsen 2004, 91–92). As I have demonstrated through the analysis of this paper this is not only a future scenario. It has been going on for some time and the Defence Resolution 2013-17 (Defence Resolution 2013-17, 2012) is a consequence of it.

As Boltanski and Thévenot also mentioned, a system cannot handle unlimited critique. There is a need to counter the critique with justification. The requirement to such a military justification is that it must fit two simultaneous purposes. The one is to legitimize the profession in relation to its civilian surroundings. The other is to ensure the quality criteria that are crucial for the professional practice and standard. Thus, it is necessary that The Armed Forces set a public agenda of the justification of the profession of military command rather than avoiding it, or as the current Flag Officer, general Peter Bartram puts it: "If we do not assign the professional discussion priority, but only look at how we get the necessary revenues, we as a profession are facing a difficult future [ ...] it is needed that we do more to settle the public agenda of the discussion of The Armed Forces." (Flag Officer, Conference 09.16.2013).

The regime analysis demonstrated in this paper established upon the work of Boltanski and Thévenot with others, adds a specific and applicable analytical framework through which new knowledge can be gained in order to begin a professional dispute of the future justification of military command.
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