

## THE REVOLUTION IN MILITARY AFFAIRS IN THE SCOPE OF MILITARY EDUCATION

REJANE PINTO COSTA

rejpcosta@gmail.com  
Superior War College,  
Brasil-Rio de Janeiro

War amongst people is not a better paradigm than interstate industrial war, it is simply different – and understanding difference, and accepting it, must become a central part of our away ahead. (Smith, 2008, p. 374)

**ABSTRACT.** The military post-modern era has brought new threats and challenges to the most relevant armed forces and it refers to the new operational scenario framed by the Revolution in Military Affairs which is based upon technical and sociocultural changes that have been confronting military organizations. This study focuses on the cultural changes required by this new operational context, emphasizing the role of education and training of military personnel in order to better benefit from technical and technological means. It also highlights that if influence of technology on tactics, operations, doctrine, planning, equipment and training of military formations is often to be considered dependent on financial possibilities, opportunity costs of developments and acquisitions; on the other hand, the impacts of technology on these issues are also dependent on investments in military education to develop and appropriately use technology and technical means to deploy in post-modern scenarios.

**Keywords:** Revolution in Military Affairs; military education; peace mission; multiculturalism

### 1. Introduction

The military post-modern era has brought, according to Moskos *et al.* (2000), new threats and challenges to the most relevant Armed Forces, mainly after the Cold War.

In the military, post-modernism refers to the new operational scenario framed by the Revolution in Military Affairs (Moskos, Williams, Segal, 2000), which is based upon technical and sociocultural changes that have been

confronting military organizations today. Thus, amongst the main elements that characterize the Revolution in Military Affairs are the development and use of technical and technological means; interaction between civilians and military personnel; change of the missions from conventional combat operation to humanitarian missions with low intensity; multilateral actions under the auspices of international organisms; and internationalism of military forces. All these facts have been proving that the tendency of war has really changed, as General Rupert Smith has pointed out recently (2008).

This study focuses on sociocultural changes required by this new operational context, emphasizing the role of education and training of military personnel in order to better benefit from technical and technological means. It also highlights that if influence of technology on tactics, operations, doctrine, planning, equipment and training of military formations is often to be considered dependent on financial possibilities, opportunity costs of developments and acquisitions; on the other hand, the impacts of technology on these issues are also dependent on investments in military education to develop and appropriately use technology and technical means to deploy in post-modern scenarios.

In developed countries, technological advances are based on educational systems that allow the transference of new studies and researches, products, information systems and knowledge into social, cultural, economical and scientific development. On the contrary, countries that choose not to face the challenges imposed by education are still under technological threat, dependency and decisions. China and India had chosen to invest in education and the positive results were already reported by the Central Intelligence Agency (2006), proving the relevance of such investment in either civil or military settings.

One possible way to provide educational opportunities for under-developing nations to face the challenges and fill in their educational gaps is to promote partnerships between civil and military Higher Educational Institutions (HEI). This initiative fosters the development of projects and stimulates each other towards implementing sociocultural and technological advances that serve civilian as well as military purposes.

In Brazilian army this initiative had been already taken, thus civil and military HEI have been working on academic projects which aim to bring up civilians to discuss Defence and Security with military personnel through official partnerships already established between Brazilian Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Education (Brasil, 2005).

To face this challenge, the Brazilian army Command and General Staff College has just created an Institute named Instituto Meira Mattos (IMM), which gathers civil and military academicians and Masters candidates willing to take a post-graduate course in a military institution. Therefore, it has

promoted academic partnerships to enrich and strengthen the debates on Defence and Security within Brazilian society.

Since the need to establish these partnerships is already implemented, it is time to think about theoretical and methodological educational policies and practices to underpin these initiatives. In this direction, the framework of multiculturalism (McLaren, 1997; 2000) in military educational settings should be considered to support post-modern environments in which soldiers operate today, mainly because as General James N. Mattis<sup>1</sup> had noticed “we have to diminish the idea that technology is going to change warfare. [because] War is primarily a human endeavor.” (Mattis *apud* Borum, 2012, p. 35). Thus, human terrain and its sociocultural dimensions should be deeply considered in military educational arena to provide the development and better use of technical and technological means and their influence on tactics, operations and doctrine.

Curricular policies and practices as well as technology rely on cultural, political and conservative contexts, especially in military settings where decisions will directly influence on tactics, operations, doctrine and on individuals. Therefore, to convince high commanders of the need to implement sociocultural changes in military education has been a challenge for the organization to overcome, as pointed out in an interview I had with a Dutch soldier.

It has not always been easy to convince the military (from general to rank-and-file) of the need to include cultural training in the military curriculum. But after several military operations abroad (from 1992 onwards: Bosnia, Kosovo, Kampuchea, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Iraq and Afghanistan) the message is now well-understood.  
(2009)

Guided by the theoretical framework of multiculturalism (McLaren, 1997; 2000) and peace studies (Galtung, 1990), the present study emerged from my doctoral thesis (Costa, 2009) and was guided by a qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) I had recently conducted.

This research relies on a case study developed at Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Training Center (CI Op Paz), which was recently evolved into Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center (CCOPAB),<sup>2</sup> proving that the nature and demands of the missions today have required more enlarged educational perspectives. To accomplish this research a documental and discursive analysis was done, mainly interviews held with soldiers who deployed in different peacekeeping missions as well as the speeches of the actors who are in charge of their training.

The study had proved it is a need to (re)think the extent to which Brazilian army is preparing their human resources to face the sociocultural challenges for deploying in post-modern scenarios (Costa & Canen, 2008),

chiefly military personnel prepared at CCOPAB, due to the multidimensional and multicultural demands of peace missions today.

As a result, this study sought to guide decision makers towards solving the opposing tension between invention and innovation in military education and training, pointing out the most appropriate educational practices to support soldiers to deal with the sociocultural challenges and demands required by the Revolution in Military Affairs.

In fact, Lastro & Cassiolato (2003) had highlighted that “[...] more serious than not having access to new technologies and information is not to have enough knowledge to use them.” (p. 12) However, the research problem I carry out is that what if we have full access to knowledge and information, technologies and technical means, but do not deeply consider that

[...] understanding the human dimension of a conflict is critically important. There is much more to the human dimension than knowing an adversary's culture. Even a deep grasp of culture and social dynamics is not sufficient to win a war (though a *deficient understanding* may be enough to lose one). (Borum, R., 2011, p. 36, my emphasis)

In broader educational terms, I argue it is also a need to consider that the lack of access to new information and technology for underdeveloping countries would increase the actual inequalities between developed and emerging countries and contributes even more to separate these countries in terms of technology and information (Arocena & Sutz, 2003), chiefly now when instant, surgical and segregated wars have been considered a privilege of technologically and economically dominant nations (Castells, 1999).

In this direction, it is desirable to any national educational strategy seeking to minimize social exclusion to promote education (either civil or military), towards providing opportunities to learn, select and use appropriately not only information but technology, as well as enlarging students' perceptions on human sociocultural dimensions. The partnerships between civil and military Higher Educational Institutions that have been promoted by Brazilian Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Education is an example of a fruitful avenue that may lead to minimize educational gaps in terms of technology, advances and transference as well as in terms of developing the better competences to provide their use in new operational scenarios.

## **2. Multiculturalism: A Methodological and Theoretical Approach for Military Education**

As already mentioned, a qualitative research investigation directed our methodological path (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003), through the undertaking of a case study, which relies on interviews and documental analyses. Interviews were

held with military personnel who had experienced being in peacekeeping operations to know their perceptions acting within multidimensional/multicultural scenarios as well as those in charge of their training. This strategy of inquiry is especially relevant to research in educational fields because it allows acknowledging actors' and agents' different perspectives and voices. On the other hand, documental analysis provides information to the extent to which a Brazilian military educational institution that prepares troops for peacekeeping operations has taken into account their sociocultural/multicultural needs, other than operational ones. This analysis has been undertaken so as to gauge how far the curriculum has been (or has not been) imbued with a multicultural direction.

That is arguably relevant due to the constant interaction of those troops with different nationalities, cultures, values and languages during military missions. As a result, it becomes important to draw special attention upon strategies and policies adopted to govern or manage the problems of culturally plural societies. In this case, educational strategies and policies for soldiers training to deploy in multicultural scenarios, aggravated by ethnical, religious, cultural conflicts and threats imposed upon those which are not technologically and economically dominant (Castells, 1999).

This study was guided by McLaren's perspective (2000) towards critical multiculturalism (more recently referred to as post-colonial/revolutionary multiculturalism or emancipatory multiculturalism), which promotes concern about the danger of cultural homogenization in educational policies and practices, seeking to explore curricular and evaluative strategies which challenge ethnocentrism and prejudices. This way, multiculturalism is understood as minorities' responses to cultural homogenization.

The theoretical distinction between the terms *multicultural* and *multiculturalism* according to Hall (2000) is also considered in this study since it conceives that

[...] multi-cultural is used adjectively. It describes the social characteristics and problems of governance posed by any society in which different cultural communities live together and attempt to build a common life while retaining something of their 'original' identity. By contrast, 'multiculturalism' is substantive. It references the strategies and policies adopted to govern or manage the problems of diversity and multiplicity which multi-cultural societies throw up. It is usually used in the singular, signifying the distinctive philosophy or doctrine which underpins multi-cultural strategies. 'Multi-cultural,' however, is by definition plural. (pp. 209–210)

The multicultural approach adopted here underpins Castell's interpretation of globalization which pinpoints that instead of developing efforts and results towards science and technology, globalization; on the contrary, has developed

a national concentration of these activities which has been shared between those countries technologically advanced (Castell, 1999).

In this direction, education plays a special role, chiefly because as Castell (*op. cit.*) points out, we have witnessed the effects of globalization which has deeply increased sociocultural and economical differences amongst countries and regions in place of minimizing them. Lastros & Cassiolato (2003) also throw lights on the need to invest in education, since they pinpoint the role of innovation and its impact on technical, institutional and social dimensions as a survival and competitive organizational strategy. However, these authors highlight that the process of innovation requires knowledge and ability to learn, incorporate and use it.

At this point, I argue a *Revolution in Military Education* (our mark) is also required since the Revolution in Military Affairs has not deeply considered and highlighted it yet; otherwise, military organizations will run the risk of being dependant on financial possibilities and opportunity costs of developments and acquisitions as well as on the evaluation of the extent to which new or modern pedagogical practices are innovative or inventive to accomplish contemporary military training. Therefore, military specialization to develop and use technology and technical means should be nurtured as well as military pedagogical and curricular policies / practices to confront the challenges imposed by new contexts.

In this horizon, educational practices should be especially developed to offer military personnel opportunities to rehearse political and intellectual competences, which are considered to be the main challenges imposed upon education since the end of the XX Century (Libaneo, 2001).

Align with this context, the commander of Brazilian army's general guidelines for 2011–2014 periods (Brasil, 2011), stressed the competences and skills expected from Brazilian soldiers, such as:

(...) to implement educational competences to contextualize the teaching in order to link knowledge and technologies to decisions and performances in a variety of situations (...) to create courses for civilians at the staff college (...) to enlarge the exchange with civil academia. (Brasil, 2011, p. 19)

With the release of these guidelines together with Brazilian National Defence Policy (2005) and Brazilian National Defence Strategy (2008), key words such as *integration* of Brazilian army with the nation, *interaction* with civil academic community and *interoperability* between the Armed Forces have been discussed in military educational settings and some relevant initiatives have been taken to attend these needs.

As a result, the exchange between civil and military Higher Educational Institutions should be nurtured to integrate military schools and training

centers, seeking to provide sociocultural competences and skills to better equip military formations in the 21st Century.

To prove this need some excerpts from a documental analysis of a military curriculum from Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center and interviews held with military personnel directly involved with peacekeeping missions will be presented.

## **2.1. Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center: Multicultural Oriented Concerns in the Subject Plan**

The Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center develops different courses for military personnel. Within the limits of this article, the focus will be on the preparation of soldiers, mainly troops, staff officers and military observers. The first ones because they represent a group that is always in touch with local population in a tense and stressing context, allowing us to witness their cultural difficulties and opportunities that arose in those situations. The other groups were chosen due to the fact that the real “weapon” they carry in peacekeeping missions is their ability to strategically manage, negotiate and otherwise nonviolently respond to conflicts.

Those groups of soldiers need specific preparation for dealing with the multicultural dimensions of their missions, with all associated implications, having arguably to particularly acquire multicultural competencies that allow them to manage conflicts in a peaceful perspective.

The study realized that the curriculum of the referred Center is mostly operational in essence.

It is operational. Not only operational, as I told you, the focus on combat operations was higher, straight on combat operations, because we realized the troop should be prepared to the worst situation. Now it has changed. We are aware that the situation may suddenly spoil the personnel have to have these tools [...].  
(interview held with the Head of the Doctrine Division of CCOPAB, 10 mar. 2008)

However, some parts of it do mention multicultural concerns. Below there are some excerpts of the curriculum that evidence some of the discourses presented in the documentation. In fact, the course has specific purposes, in which culturally oriented sensitivities emerge, such as:

describe the importance of cooperation and integration of components in a mission; understanding the relationships and roles of the different components; recognizing the consequences of inappropriate actions to the rules / standards of conduct; recognizing the importance of different cultural events in the peace operations; understanding the various cultural contexts; develop skills for working in multicultural environments; identify the

principles of civil-military coordination; indicate the skills of communication and negotiation; identify how to develop the relationship with the press in the Missions of Peace; identify the impact that exists in their respective roles [men and women] to building peace; describe how to handle tense domestic situations amongst the team members in a multicultural and multinational environment; raise awareness of the situations that can happen when individuals from different cultural and political environments live for long periods together; explain the main concepts related to the multicultural environment; describe and explain the main concepts of loyalty and respect in the team's place; use appropriate language according to various situations. (CCOPAB's subject plan, 2009)

In order to develop the curriculum, the Department of Peace Keeping Operations (DPKO), a United Nations organism, provides Standard Generic Training Modules (SGTM)<sup>3</sup> to all Centers in the world in charge of soldiers' preparation to peace operations and these are the modules that have been presented during the course under study. Due to the limits of this article, we will focus only on the subject plan; however, in previous work (Costa & Canen, 2008) we had also analyzed the intentions expressed in the following ones, due to their intimate connection to our research theme: SGTM 5 (about the code of conduct), and SGTM 11 (about communication and negotiation). SGTM 5 deals with the "Attitudes and Behaviors of the United Nations Peacekeepers" and is further divided into the following sub-modules: 5A- 'Code of Conduct,' 5 B- 'Cultural Awareness'<sup>4</sup>, 5C- 'Gender & Peace-keeping' and 5D- 'Child Protection'.

Some of the curriculum topics of those modules seem to be clearly underlined by multicultural perspectives more aligned to a folkloric approach, valuing cultural diversity, but silencing cultural conflicts and prejudices, as expected in more critical, post-colonial multicultural perspectives (McLaren, 2000; Hall, 2003; 2004).

Indeed, as could be noted in the documentation, some of the objectives clearly point to a multicultural awareness, emphasizing the need to understand cultural diversity in order to act in culturally disparate situations which touches on a broad multicultural perspective (McLaren, 1997; Hall, 2003). However, it does not seem to explicitly incorporate the discussions and concepts related to multiculturalism embedded by tensions present in critical, post-colonial and post-modernized perspectives, drawing upon an understanding of identity as an historic, social and cultural construction in contrast to an intrinsic character to be revealed (McLaren, 2000).

It seems to be clear from the above excerpts that issues such as communication and negotiation, understanding of different cultures and languages, as well as a perspective of empathy towards "the other" are present, indicating multicultural sensibilities (Canen & Costa, 2007; Canen & Canen, 2011).

However, a more explicit and concrete mention of multicultural would be likely to contribute to a better understanding and incorporation of these instructions, arguably enriching and strengthening the preparation of the military agents for peacekeeping missions as well as other operational missions.

By the above illustration, we can infer that the curriculum of CCOPAB has the potential for a multicultural training for soldiers; however, those excerpts seem to convey the idea that the curriculum touches on more abstract multicultural terms, even though at some points prejudices and discriminations are mentioned.

At least, at the level of intentions, the curriculum points out the importance of cultural issues in an era marked by the expansion and the complex nature of modern peace operations. It reminds its readers that peacekeepers represent the United Nations and their own countries; therefore, a positive or negative attitude will impact directly on the mission success.

## **2.2. Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center (CCOPAB): Multicultural Potential and Limits in Soldiers' Perspectives**

The importance of mediation in conflict resolution is strictly connected to a multicultural attitude towards those perceived as different, highlighting the straight imbrications of multiculturalism. Bearing that in mind, we have also analyzed how the curriculum of the CCOPAB has been mediated by those who were targeted by it. We have therefore tried to glean the sense made of that preparation by Brazilian military personnel who had experienced different peace missions, including the following ones: the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH); the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM III); and the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Interviews held with those subjects were instrumental in conveying their feelings, needs and challenges. It is important to note that the interviewees included soldiers, who carry out given orders, up to generals and commanding staff, in the political and strategic planning of the missions. For ethical reasons, their names were omitted in this narrative.

In the limits of the present paper, some of the answers provided by the interviewees should give a glimpse of their ideas concerning the extent to which they felt the curriculum of CCOPAB in the Brazilian Army helped them feel prepared to act in disparate cultural contexts. Initially, most of them seemed to believe in the natural “knack” of Brazilian military agents towards understanding cultural diversity and effectively dealing with it (Costa & Canen, 2008), regardless of multicultural education:

[...] Brazilian people have always been a little bit extroverted  
[...] it's not the characteristic of other people [...] they are more  
serious people [...], they are closed up [...] This question of  
maintaining security is a positive aspect, but it is a bigger issue

that includes Brazil as a whole [...]. However, smaller actions such as social-civilian activities, contact with the people, day-by-day constant talking, helps to make them [the host country] feel Brazil as a friend country that is there [in Haiti] to help. (soldier 1, from MINUSTAH)

Others; however, felt the need to express their feelings as related to the curriculum of the Center in terms of the extent to which they felt some aspects could be worked out more intensely for a multicultural perspective:

I think it would have been interesting if we had worked with those concepts [of respect, for instance] right away in the course, independently of the peace mission [...]. We should have known the reality [cultural one] we would have to face, and that really would have made things easier [...]. If one can make this preparation [cultural one] [...], it would be excellent. (soldier 1, from MINUSTAH)

As shown by the above excerpts, it seems that despite having developed their own strategies to deal with cultural differences, the military personnel interviewed have expressed their feelings about the relevancy of being adequately prepared to act in operations where they are exposed to cultural plurality in their daily routines. The above data seem to point out that a more structured preparation could boost their efficiency in dealing with cultural plurality, and could represent an asset to the Brazilian Army curriculum development. Even though some of the topics the interviewees pointed as lacking in their preparation were present in the curriculum objectives, as briefly discussed in the previous section, it seems to be clear they were not highlighted in curriculum practices and mediations.

This seems to be understood by the subjects of the study, as plainly expressed in the following excerpts:

[...] to listen is very difficult [...]. If everybody learns to listen, there won't be struggles, but we, in general, do not know to listen [...]. It's country "a" wishing to impose itself on country "b", country "c" imposing itself on country "d", and so on [...]. I think the idea that must underlie [our preparation] is exactly to accept the differences [...]. (soldier 1, from MINUSTAH)

[...] I think the Army should develop a programme towards reinforcing this conception [respect and acceptance towards the different] [...] not everybody has this experience of respecting another culture. In some ways, we could also integrate people's cultural backgrounds to the scientific, more organized, more directed knowledge. If we adjust these two factors, we can improve our performance in order to have the soldiers doing it consciously rather than unconsciously. (soldier 8, from MINUSTAH)

Other testimonies of soldiers about the curriculum can be important at this point:

There is a 50 minute instruction. It is mainly theoretical: do like that, culture is this, it is that [...]. There aren't practical exercises [...]. There should be someone from another culture who could be there for a programme [...]. What happened was a 50 minute theoretical instruction about this [cultural issue]. (soldier 1, from MINUTASH)

I think soldiers should have been advised on the following lines: you are going to a mission where there are problems which you will not solve as you are used to, but you will have to solve them, even by not really solving them [...]. (soldier 4 from MINUSTAH)

[...] I think we should have had a more complete study: we should have studied the culture of the country where we have to act, the culture of the political parties there, we should know deeply the history of the conflict, all regional problems [...]. All that cultural part should have been known. (soldier 7, of UNAVEM III)

It would have been interesting [...] to talk to the trainees exactly what they are bound to face, in terms of challenges and cultural aspects...surely there are many aspects that won't be the same among the countries, but those pieces of information are important in order for us not to have a cultural shock. (soldier 5, from MINUSTAH)

We can also, in some way, join what the person has in his/her cultural background with knowledge. I mean scientific knowledge, more organized, more directed. If we adjust these two factors, we can improve this performance so the person does it consciously, not unconsciously. (soldier 1, from MINUSTAH)

As can be noted, even though the soldiers recognize the relevance of the techniques and the training received, they seem to wish that the curriculum should emphasize more the multicultural dimensions in a more concrete way. However, that seems to be on the way of improvement, as it was explained to me by the actual main mediator of the curriculum development in the referred Center, in a recent visit. In fact, the following excerpts should be useful in providing an illustration of that progress, in terms of curriculum development, as explained by its main mediating actor:

We have come to the conclusion that [...] the soldier is not the only component: there also are the civilians, who are in the day-to-day peace keeping operation, who face the routines, the difficulty of the use of foreign language, and a lot of other things. [...] So, during the training, we set up 04 (four) concurrent fiction case incidents in which we took civilian students from the International Relations Course of a University in Sao Paulo, as well as jour-

nalists from another one [...]. In those simulated situations, when a soldier made a mistake, or took the wrong decision, got “shot” or “killed” the commander, the journalist was there to show the news, the international relations person to report and analyse, and, this way, all the wheel moved [...]. The exercise became smart. That made a very big change and, from there, with other troops, we worked the same way [...]. When you get the soldier to be the “actor”, even without wearing his uniform, if I put him/her in front of a colonel, he/she has never seen in his/her life, he/she will make a mistake...but together with journalists, he/she will become coerced to question, even because the profile of the journalist is completely different. (...). All of our exercise is in the street, is contextualized [...]. I think our ability to interact, of having several players [...], should be a competitive advantage of our own, as compared to some of other centers that prepare soldiers to peacekeeping missions [...]. The evolution of the curriculum was done inasmuch as things started to become more structured. (interview held with the Head of the Education Division of CCOPAB, 10 mar. 2008)

Some areas, some professionals who are doing research in masters and doctorate courses are researching something that we are interested in (...). If this information gets here to us tabulated, done [...]. I consider it extremely relevant. [...] Suddenly, we are also going to contribute to the study of an academician [...] it will let him/her improves his/her research. (interview held with the Head of the Doctrine Division of CCOPAB, 10 mar. 2008)

If it were to include a subject for those who are going to such mission environment, it would be towards the cultural dimension of that country. It makes things much easier [...] to emphasize on the cultural history of that country (...) a class, a class period, talking about cultural aspects of that country and giving tips that may be followed by those who are there in mission, to have a really better relationship performance, taking care of cultural aspects, as some training centers outside Brazil already do [...] focusing on culture. Point out cultural awareness aspects. Provide a lecture on cultural aspects of the country [referring to the relationship of those in mission with the local population]. (interview held with the Head of the Education Division of CCOPAB, 10 May 2012)

The above excerpts seem to point out to a much more integrated, cross-culturally informed curriculum practice, in line with many of the feelings previously expressed by the interviewees as related to the need to be culturally trained to face situations from different perspectives. Another excerpt from the above curriculum mediator also highlights the development of a more culturally informed approach to curriculum development, touching on

other markers of identity, such as gender power relations, as can be noted in the following discourse:

Now sexual abuse, gender, and cultural awareness are discussed, towards a more humanitarian approach (...). Haiti has moved from peace enforcement, which had started with the United States, towards our action which has begun with peacekeeping, moving now towards peace-building. The big focus now is on the humanitarian support, how to live with these ‘guys’ [...] hence the idea of the Center is to launch this course, the C3M – operation and civil-military coordination – because it is important that our soldiers begin to understand how to deal with the civilian and the humanitarian agencies. (interview held with the Head of the Education Division of CCOPAB, 10 mar. 2008)

As depicted in the document analysis and interviews, it seems that albeit a concern with cultural issues and their implications for peace operations in the preparation of soldiers is present in the curriculum of the Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center (undoubtedly a positive feature of the case study), there is still a need of a more structured, academic and systematic reflection. The fact that our last visits to that Center showed increased sensitivity to multicultural aspects is undoubtedly a very welcome and auspicious feature, the importance of having military agents adequately and competently prepared for acting in multicultural scenarios is a necessity yet.

As shown earlier, Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center has been improving its curriculum in a multicultural sense, as briefly illustrated by the excerpts of two high level trainers earlier on in this paper. It seems to be much more aware of the relevance of multicultural issues in the preparation of military agents, which has contributed to the establishment of some partnerships between the referred Center and Higher Educational Institutions (HEI), in order to help with culturally-contextualized activities during pre-deployment. We consider that as a positive step and look forward to the strengthening of stronger partnerships that could take multiculturalism produced in the HEIs on board. That could surely help to promoting transformational educational practices both in military and civilian education contexts, towards a more multicultural and peaceful perspective.

### **3. Conclusion**

The present study focused on sociocultural changes required to prepare soldiers to face the challenges imposed by the Revolution in Military Affairs, pointing out the role of education and training of military personnel in a multicultural approach in order to better benefit from the development of technical and technological means. The study aimed at emphasizing the

need to invest in education to develop and appropriately use technology and technical means to deploy in post-modern scenarios.

Based on the collected data, it was noted it is necessary to provide educational opportunities for Brazilian military personnel to face the challenges imposed by the new operational environment. One possible alternative is to promote partnerships between civil and military Higher Educational Institutions (HEI), since it fosters the development of projects and stimulate each other towards implementing sociocultural and technological advances that serve civilian as well as military purposes. Another way evidenced through the interviews held with military personnel was the need to develop a systematized cultural training for deployment of soldiers in multidimensional and multicultural scenarios.

In this direction, it was realized that a *Revolution in Military Education* (our mark) is already taking place, mainly within Brazilian Process of the Transformation of the Army (BRASIL, 2011), as the guidelines of Brazilian Army Commander had highlighted already. Therefore, it is the intention of this research to re-visit Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center in the future. It is to figure out the extent to which its curriculum and the perception of the actors and agents directly involved with the preparation/training for peace missions have expanded towards a multicultural perspective in more engaged critical and post-colonial approaches. As a result, I intend to enlarge this research to operational environments, other than peacekeeping operations, mainly because as Sir Rupert Smith (2008) has highlighted “war amongst people is not a better paradigm than interstate industrial war, it is simply different – and understanding difference, and accepting it, must become a central part of our way ahead” (p. 374).

## NOTES

1. U.S. Marine Corps, Commander, U.S. Joint Forces and NATO Supreme Allied Command.
2. Available at: <http://www.ccopab.eb.mil.br/index.php/en/ccopab/criacao-do-centro>, 21 Oct. 2014.
3. These modules are called Core Pre-Deployment Module (CPTM) today. Available at <http://www.ccopab.eb.mil.br/index.php/pt/>, 21 Oct. 2014.
4. Core Pre-Deployment Module (CPDM) entitles it “Respect for diversity” today. Available at: <http://www.ccopab.eb.mil.br/index.php/pt/>, 21 Oct. 2014.

## REFERENCES

Borum, R. (2011), “Seven Pillars of Small War Power,” *Military Review* XCI(4): 35–45.

Brasil (2005), *Presidencia da Republica. Política de Defesa Nacional*.

Brasil (2010), “Ministerio da Defesa.” Diretriz Geral do Comandante do Exército para o Período de 2011–2014.

Brasil (2005), “Coordenacao de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoa de Nível Superior.” Instruções para Apresentação de Projetos do Programa de Apoio ao Ensino e à Pesquisa Científica e Tecnológica em Defesa Nacional. Brasília, DF.

Canen, A. G., and A. Canen (2011), *Multikulturalne Organizacije*. Zagreb: Society of Plastics and Rubber Engineers.

Costa, R. P. (2009), *Multiculturalismo e estudos para a paz: articulacao possivel no preparo e no emprego de militares para missões de paz*. PhD thesis, Rio de Janeiro. Faculdade de Educacao, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. At <http://www.educacao.ufrj.br/ppge/ppge-teses-2009.html>, 18 June 2012.

Costa, R. P., and A. Canen (2008), “Multiculturalism and peace studies: The case of education for peacekeeping forces in Brazil,” *Journal of Stellar Peacemaking* 3(3). At <http://74.127.11.121/peacejournal/>, 31 Jan. 2012.

Canen, A., and R. P. Costa (2007), “Multicultural Education and Peace Studies: The Need for a Dialogue in Teacher Education,” working document of the International Council on Education for Teaching: ICET’s 52nd World Assembly & 7th Annual Border of Pedagogy, San Diego, CA.

Castells, M. (2006), *A sociedade em rede*, Vol. 1. 6th edn. São Paulo: Paz & Terra.

Denzin, N., and Y. Lincoln (2003), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York: Sage.

Galtung, J. (1990), “Cultural Violence,” *Journal of Peace Research* 27(23): 291–305.

Hall, S. (2004), *A Identidade cultural na pós-modernidade*. Traducao: Tomaz Tadeu da Silva and Guaracira Lopes Louro (eds.). 9th rev. edn. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A.

Hall, S. (2003), “Da Diáspora: identidades e mediações culturais,” in L. Sovik (ed.). Belo Horizonte: UFMG.

Hall, S. (2000), “Conclusion: the Multi-Cultural Question,” in Barnor Hesse (ed.), *Un/Settled Multiculturalisms: Diasporas, Entanglements, Transcriptions*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.

Lastres, H. M. M., and J. E. Cassiolato (2003), “Novas políticas na Era do Conhecimento: o foco em arranjos produtivos e inovativos locais,” *Revista Parcerias Estratégicas* 17.

Libaneo, Jose Carlos (2001), *Adeus professor, adeus professora?: novas exigencias educacionais e profissao docente*. 5th edn. São Paulo: Cortez.

McLaren, P. (1997) *Multiculturalismo crítico*. São Paulo: Cortez.

McLaren, P. (2000), *Multiculturalismo revolucionário*. Porto Alegre: ArtMed.

Moskos, Charles C., John Allen Williams, and David R. Segal (2000), *The Post-modern Military: Armed Forces after the Cold War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Report of the Concil Intelligence Agency (CIA) (2006), *Como será o mundo em 2020*. Claudio Blanc and Marly Netto Peres (trs.). São Paulo: Ediouro.

Smith, R. (2005), *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*. New York: Vintage Books.

A version of this paper was previously presented at the Congress of the International Commission of Military History, Sofia, August 25–September 1, 2012.