

To cite text:

Stanar, Dragan, and Srđan Starčević. "The Place and Significance of Social Sciences and Humanities in Modern Military Education." *Philosophy and Society* 36 (2): 537–552.

Dragan Stanar
Srđan Starčević

THE PLACE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES IN MODERN MILITARY EDUCATION¹

ABSTRACT

In this paper authors aim to explore and explain the place and significance of social sciences and humanities education in today's military education. By analyzing the impact that rapid progress of technological sciences has made on entire societies, the authors assert that problems and challenges of the modern world are even more pronounced and dangerous in the military realm, despite the military being necessarily separated from society in virtually all aspects, including education. Authors recognize several important and perilous problems in the context of the military which are produced by technological breakthroughs, and conclude that the optimal approach to solving these problems is systematic and genuine education in social sciences and humanities at modern military schools. The authors conclude that members of the military are not just in need of education in social sciences and humanities, but that it is owed to them by their institutions and their societies, due to the highly specific mission of the military and demands that society has from them.

KEYWORDS

Social sciences and humanities, education, military, war, technology, military officers

Introduction

The position and role of the military in contemporary societies and modern democratic political systems is to a great extent, perhaps even entirely, defined by the Huntingtonian paradigm of civil-military relations which prescribes a clear line of demarcation between the military and the rest of society in all functional and ontological segments and aspects. Despite not being the only

¹ This paper is a result of research conducted in the research project of the Strategic Research Institute – "The Military Profession in Serbia in the Contemporary Security Environment" [Војна професија у Србији у савременом безбедносном окружењу] (ISI/DH/3/24-26)



one, this paradigm that presupposes functional isolation of the military from society is perceived as the “normal theory,” a framework within which all deliberations and considerations of the role and position of armed forces occur in democratic systems (Brooks 2021: 17), as “the proper and the ‘normal’ view of civil-military relations” (Atkins 2023: 966-967). Core functional attributes of the military system, institutional and organizational culture, the instruments the military uses, even the highly specific military ethos are essentially and necessarily different from all other social institutions and the mainstream social matrix. Accordingly, and quite naturally, the system of military education also significantly, in certain aspects even categorically, differs from its civilian counterpart. As Anglim (2018: 158) finds, significant differences between the military profession and other professions and social spheres condition and require different educational programs for the military and different ways of delivering of the said programs. However, despite these differences and peculiarity of the military education, the significance of high-quality and systematic education in the fields of social sciences and humanities (SSH) cannot be overstated in modern militaries in the current moment of civilization in which modern democratic societies reside. Including, of course, the Serbian society as well. Moreover, it seems that it is precisely SSH education that is more urgent and necessary than ever before in mankind’s history, primarily due to the effects that monumental progress in other scientific fields, namely the field of technological science, has had not only on the military, but the overall functioning of societies.

The past and the present of military education

History of military education, in the full sense of the notion, is intrinsically tied to emergence of professional military-educational institutions, i.e., to the genesis and rise of the military profession and creation of the officer corps. Despite the fact that some European armies, and partially the American army, had some rudimentary features of professional structures even before the 1800s (Anglim 2018: 154) we can only speak of full-fledged military education as a product of the 19th century. The previous aristocratic model of officers’ education was based on military academies which more resembled schools for developing aristocratic manners than proper military schools and schools intended for extensive education of military professionals. Young men of noble descent could always count on higher or lower positions in military hierarchy, solely by the virtue of their titles. Nonetheless, specificities of individual branches such as artillery or military engineering demanded that artillery and military engineering officers master certain skills in the realm of natural sciences and mathematics causing aristocratic military academies to open their doors for talented youngsters from common families. Thus, the practical demands for greater efficiency of military unites led to dissolution of the officers’ corps class structure even before the French Revolution. The French revolutionary and Napoleonic wars proved that social closure of the officers’ profession that entailed reserving high

positions for aristocracy grew unsustainable (Huntington 2004: 21-35). After the collapse of the aristocratic system of military leadership, and with the need for high competency of those who lead mass armies becoming univocally clear, it was only at the beginning of the 19th century that full awareness of the urgency of special and professional military education system was finally reached primarily in Prussian, French and British military; such an education system that would represent a militarily specific upgrade of the fundamental general education received outside military institution, (Ibid. 44-60).

Such education would be narrowly focused on military needs and would enable militaries to “produce their own personnel through a special system of education, necessarily separate and different from the educational system of the rest of society” (Stanar 2023: 37). Today, renowned military schools such as the French Saint Cyr or the British Sandhurst, as well as the military-education-wise avantgarde Prussian War Academy were all established in that period, at the beginning of the 19th century. It is worth noting that the Principality of Serbia too, following the initiative of Ilija Garašanin and by the decree of Prince Aleksandar Karadordević, established its Military Academy on March 18th 1850,² under the name of Artillery School (Zorić and Đukić 2010: 15).

Therefore, modern officers’ schools owe their beginnings to fundamental social transformation which took place in Europe at the turn of the 19th century. Given that this transformation was caused by the industrial revolution on the one hand and social and political civil revolutions on the other, officers’ schools continued to faithfully accommodate the developed nation states’ needs for projection of military power in their further development. *In concreto*, they adjusted their organization and curriculums to new conditions in which European nation states projected their power based on capitalist economy, industrial production, and national consciousness of their citizens (Gidens 2001: 46-53). As armies of nation states grew into massive national standing armies the need for a substantial number of active officers arose, but also officers in reserve. As military power was significantly founded on application of technological inventions, transformed into industrially manufactured and mass distributed war machines, it was implied that officers had to have considerable technical skills and knowledges. Rapid development of technical sciences and application of technical knowledge in growingly more specific and lethal means of war technology enabled the creation of specialized military units and their own tactics, followed by new military branches, arms and services. Specialization of military skills and knowledge, along with new military organization, inspired the formation of separate military academies for education of officers

2 There were some attempts and kernels of establishing military schools in the Principality of Serbia even before 1850 – the “Gard schools” was opened in Požarevac in 1830, but it operated for less than three years, until 1833; the same city was home of the newly opened “Military Academy of the Serbian Principality” in 1837, but the school first relocated to Belgrade, then Kragujevac, only to dissolve after only six months (Zorić and Đukić 2010, 11-14).

with particular skills – army academies, air force academies, naval academies, technical military academies, etc.

The dusk of the era of limited war, of “lace” and “cabinet” war, signified the dawn of total war in which generals leading feudal armies clashed no longer; rather, entire states clashed, mobilizing all social capacities. Military power has always depended on more than just material-technical power – the fighting spirit created by the human component of war has also always significantly contributed to it (Starčević and Blagojević 2017: 122); even though technology was always remarkably important, it “alone has never been the decisive factor in winning war: the victory has rather been an outcome of a proper understanding of how the will to fight relates to the quantity and quality of available military resources...” (Korać 2023: 378-379).

As a “clash of wills,” in these new circumstances war presupposed the readiness of the entire society to bear the costs of war efforts. Introduction of conscription and relatively long mandatory service in standing armies converted militaries into social institutions with the function of identity formation, institutions which continued the task of preparation of citizens for fulfilling their existential meaning (Bauman 2009: 139). New weapons and new tactics also contributed to a higher level of autonomy of smaller military units, and thus also individual soldiers on the battle field. In such conditions the knowledge of individual capabilities of each and every subordinate and the ability to propagate military solidarity in a unit became crucially important on all levels of command. Hence, the need for SSH education of officers remained undisputable; the bottom line is that war represents a form of social conflict, that the military is primarily a social institution, and that the job of an officer is to command military units comprised primarily of people.

A new shift in officer schools came with professionalization of militaries in modern developed societies. Modern (postindustrial, postmodern, consumer, fluid, information, etc.) society, quite suitable for small professional militaries, gave up on national standing armies (Starčević 2024: 13-14). High level of profesionalization of officers, in conjunction with new types of missions for modern militaries, still demanded that officers’ schools retain a considerable volume of SSH courses, especially due to the need for building and nourishing professional loyalty and due to the imperative of civil democratic control.

The fact that social and human sciences were an important part of the curricula and programs of officer education can be demonstrated by the example of the Military Academy in Belgrade. At the end of the 19th century, cadets of the Lower Course of the Military Academy had a total of 33 subjects, six of which belonged to social sciences and humanities (without specialized military subjects, physical education and foreign languages). At the Higher Course of the Military Academy, another 14 subjects were studied, three of which belonging to social sciences and humanities (Starčević 2025: 12-13). With regards to specific disciplines, legal and historical sciences dominated. In the first half of the 20th century, pedagogical and psychological subjects were included in the curricula, and after the Second World War, Marxist philosophy and political

economy followed. The curricula and programs of the Military Academy from 1998, after philosophy was erased from the education of officers, contained seven subjects from the field of social sciences and humanities, out of a total of 34 to 38 subjects (depending on the module for different branches). More recent research into the educational profile of officers also pointed to the fact that social sciences and humanities are necessary for officers (Marček, Životić-Vanović, Dikić 2014: 118-119). During the reform of military education in 2009, the study program intended for the education of officers of the Serbian Armed Forces had 45 subjects, eight of which belonging to the field of social sciences and humanities (Marček, Životić-Vanović, Dikić 2014: 173-174, 181).

The modern world and SSH

Having in mind the many different theoretical approaches to analytic consideration, description, and explanation of the modern world and the very logic of the complex social reality of today, it comes as no surprise that there are significant disagreements among scholars and thinkers who are invested in this topic. Pluralism of reference systems, approaches, and perspectives on the same phenomenon understandably and unavoidably results in a pluralism of theoretical explanations. Nevertheless, even in such an abundance of theoretical approaches to studying and explaining social reality one can clearly observe a minimal convergence of opinion on the decisive impact of rapid and galloping development of technology on virtually all aspects of modern humans and their societies.³ There is practically no scholar worth his salt today who is not pointing out the crucial role of technological progress in everyday life, while there are even some thinkers who tend to completely, in a very reductionist manner, reduce causality of all changes of social reality to technological innovations and discoveries to the point of creating “an ideology of technological determinism” (Edwards 1995: 268).

Despite the fact that technological determinism is as least as old as dialectic materialism, it seems as though we are today on the brink of a completely new era of humanity in which the implementation of artificial intelligence in all spheres of life will further alter and determine society as AI is likely “one of the most dramatic technological game changers of our time with the potential to transform life from daily social interactions to how we conduct warfare” (Hunter et al. 2023: 4). Chances are that the initial premise of every future analysis of humans and human society in general, not just of the military and the phenomenon of war, which aims to be serious will necessarily begin with the principal impact of new technologies. Acceptance of Castells’ (Kastels 2018: 71) remark that technology does not determine but rather embodies society, that is that “technology *is* society” and that social relations and practices change in accordance with the complex interaction of technology and social system,

3 Particularly interesting impact is the one produced in the political realm, including the realm of war, as discussed by many scholars (Korać 2023: 382-383)

leads us to a highly probable and balanced position that technology provides people (even more importantly, social groups) certain choices which would be impossible without technological breakthroughs. Essentially, technology enables certain practices, but it does not determine them (Kastels 2018: 366, 627). It of course goes without saying that every choice “offers some advantages which are paid for by acceptance of their detrimental consequences” (Levi-Stros 2018: 37).

In his brilliant short paper “Science and Reality,” Serbian philosopher Jovan Babić (2018: 57-62) offers a precise and highly convincing explanation of not just the way that natural and technical sciences⁴ shaped the world in previous centuries, but simultaneously of the genesis of social problems which occurred as products of sudden development of possibility of application of knowledge produced by these sciences. Namely, he indicates several major problems, among which the most important ones being the categorial difference in the very essence and “mission” between natural/technological and SSH and the phenomenon of the irresistibility of application of knowledge once produced. The image of today’s world, as well as the problems faced by our generation, can be excellently explained with the combination of these two problems – the essence and role of natural/technological sciences is to deal with causality of nature and produce means and know-how for realization of our desires and plans; when such a knowledge is produced, a powerful, seductive, and irresistible urge surfaces to immediately use this knowledge without patience (perhaps even without desire) to explore all the implications and consequence of using these new means, and especially without patience to produce knowledge of *why* and *if at all* should we use our new abilities and means.

It is precisely the knowledge that is created by SSH, by their definition, nature, and “mission.” Today’s world image and condition of our planet and societies are a result of immediate application of every new knowledge that has been created by natural/technological sciences in past centuries, before considering the implications of its use and before providing scientific answers to questions why use this knowledge and is this application even good. Therefore, it is only understandable that SSH have been marginalized and perceived as utterly irrelevant, redundant, or even unnecessary, even at the very moment of history in which they appear to be the most important and most vital ones for our desperate pursuit of answers to questions *why* and *for what (justified) purpose* are we doing all the things that are so effortlessly done today.

In a boundless ocean of consequences and implications of “raw” application of the entire corpus of technological knowledge produced in the modern age, a particularly ominous possibility stands out – the possibility of total manipulation of the most referential point imaginable, truth itself. In spite of seeming *prima facie* counterintuitive, the tremendous progress of information technology which occurred in previous decades and which “made dissemination of information and our access to knowledge and truth all but effortless,

4 The notion natural and technical sciences encompass all natural sciences, mathematics, technical and technological sciences and biotechnological sciences.

without a historical parallel” simultaneously enabled “an uncontrolled information explosion which ushered us the age of post-truth” (Stanar 2021a: 120). The notion of post-truth, whose relevance has been remarkably wreathed by “canonization” of this notion in various dictionaries of our era’s *lingua franca*, i.e. dictionaries of English language (Blackburn 2018: 5) portends an era of humanity in which explosion of different, confronted, and contradictory information and competing “truths” has led many to conclude that “there’s no such thing, unfortunately, anymore as facts” (McIntyre 2018: 2). Relying on a number of manipulation mechanisms⁵ which maximally exploit various innate biases, fallacies⁶ and our inclinations towards logical mistakes in judgment, the phenomenon of post-truth unambiguously reveals the new reality in which ignorance and delusions are not, as it was the case throughout mankind’s history, primarily products of inaccessibility or masterful covertness of information but rather of our inability to logical and critically think and analyze “an infinite amount of information which we all have literally at our fingertips,” that is of our inability to properly discern the truth in the flood of lies (Stanar 2021a: 119). Once again, we must call attention to the essential and pivotal role of SSH, or education in this field to be precise – to capacitate human beings for elementary use of logic, critical thinking and basic literacy. Because unlike previous eras, to be basically literate and educated today doesn’t mean to have access to information and ability to comprehend them but rather to be able to discern the truth among the infinite number of easily and effortlessly available lies and half-truths.

Truth, of course, is not the only object of relativization in the modern world – “truth, reason, morality, God, tradition, history, utopia, system, science, religion, all the *grand recits*, are meaningless” in postmodernism as Đuro Šušnjić (2015: 147) eloquently puts it. According to Baumann (2009: 61), contemporary society can be dubbed a fluid modern consumer society, while the transition of society from the phase of solid modernity into the phase of fluid modernity in the value plain is characterized by degradation of the ideals of “totality” and “long lasting” and their substitution with “the value of instant gratification and individual happiness”. However, society in fluid modernity fails in its attempts to realize ideals of happiness and content because it becomes atomized and transforms into a “factory of mutual suspicion and competition” (Bauman and Obirek 2016: 51). The first line of defense against alienation and dehumanization is exactly the reflection on the significance of society, public interest, solidarity, hierarchy of values and other human beings. Such a reflection would be impossible without thorough study of SSH and education in the fields of philosophy, sociology, psychology and political sciences.

5 Some of the most researched mechanism include “*fake news*, echo chambers, filter bubbles, AI bots, AI algorithms” (Stanar 2021a: 119)

6 Steven Pinker (2018: 403) warns of the fact that our innate cognitive biases and fallacies make us incredibly vulnerable and susceptible to manipulation. Recent studies only further confirm the magnitude and depth of these phenomena (Damjanović: 2024)

Significance of SSH education in modern militaries

The military is, as discussed, at least partially separated from the rest of society in virtually every aspect by the virtue of its nature and structure. Still, it does not exist nor function in a vacuum of exception from social changes and key drivers of social change. Therefore, the military certainly is no sphere of exception when it comes to the critical importance of SSH education in a world shaped and determined by technological breakthroughs and various contemporary social challenges that come along. Moreover, precisely due to its highly specific instruments, its mission and its quintessential essence, as well as the fact that almost every new scientific discovery and every technological innovation somehow find their first application in the defense sector,⁷ the military represents the primary location in which all the forementioned challenges of modern civilization manifest themselves, perhaps in the most obvious and most ominous way. These are the challenges to which only SSH can provide meaningful answers and solutions. Just like different technological innovations brought “unprecedented productivity to cities and factories,” which in itself caused a string of serious social challenges and problems, and so brought “unprecedented efficiency to killing in war” (Šar 2020: 54). To say that this newly discovered efficiency of killing in war also produces equally serious social challenges and problems would be an understatement and a euphemism *par excellence* to say the least. *Ergo*, the urgent significance of meaningful and quality education in SSH is even more emphasized and pressing in the military, i.e., in the system of military education of modern armed forces around the world.

If we were to search for a segment of society in which what Babić refers to as “irresistibility of application” of new knowledge and capabilities most openly and strikingly reveals and manifests itself, we would find no better and more brazen example than the military realm. History of technical and technological development of military weapons systems and various combat systems emphatically indicates an utter lack of desire to investigate long-term and broader social consequences and implications of application of a new military technology, in particular the perspective of moral desirability and moral justification of the said application.⁸ Instead, achieving mere technical *possibility*

7 Today’s media-political discourse regarding technology is dominated by the subject of artificial intelligence, i.e., its possibilities and limits. We should harbor no illusions that the logic of implementation of artificial intelligence in the military realm will be any different than implementation of any previous technological breakthroughs – gunpowder, tanks, aircrafts, etc. History teaches us that AI will be implemented in military weapons systems and in the defence system in its broadest meaning, as soon as it becomes possible, and that it will too “revolutionize warfare” and militaries around the world (King 2024: 2)

8 This lack of deliberation can be derived from numerous factors – military urgency of the situation, i.e., lack of time, lack of awareness of the need for such deliberation, overwhelming (at times justified) existential fear that extensive deliberation could allow the rival to catch up and even surpass technological achievement of a military, mistrust in rivals and competitors, etc.

to do something is simultaneously perceived as an automatic achievement of *desirability* and *justification*; every new capability is therefore immediately and automatically placed in use. Such a wicked and impermissible logic of development and implementation of military technology, which basically represents the ultimate hubris and man's appropriation of God's attributes and prerogatives, "gifted" virtually all militaries in the world with the ability for effortless, quick, and total destruction and desolation of Biblical proportions, without any meaningful historical parallel, while "blessing" members of the military with "unbearable easiness of killing" (Stanar 2021b: 238).

These "gifts" and "blessings" of means and modes of mass destruction, placed in the hands of militaries by natural/technological sciences which produced the knowledge of *how* to do something, must necessarily be supplemented and upgraded with the knowledge of *why*, *when* and *for what purpose* these means and modes should, must, or must not, be used. Knowledge that can exclusively be produced by SSH. That is why many scholars warn that in modern wars, when limits of significance and strategic impact of each and every individual action of each and every individual soldier are redrawn and drastically pushed (Krulak 1999: 14-17), there is an imperative duty of exceptional and broad education of military leaders and officers in the realms of "history, cultural anthropology, political theory, religion and philosophy... geopolitics, international relations, sociology, economy and diplomacy... politics and culture" (Cook 2015: 38; Beasley 2018: 125; Anglim 2018: 160).

Education in fields of history, sociology, political science, andragogy, law, philosophy and segments of military sciences⁹ in modern systems of higher military education of today's world has, at a minimum, as equal importance and relevance as education in fields of natural and technological sciences. This education, *inter alia*, must aim to develop and instill consciousness in future military officers, i.e., the governing structure of the military, about the role and function of the military within the political system, and thus about the meaning of their life calling, about the society they serve and from which they are recruited, about the culture and social values which are in fact protected by force and with arms, about the specific military ethos and moral and legal justification (or lack thereof) of certain actions and decision within the military, both in war and peace. Some key challenges and problems facing contemporary armed forces – recruitment and retention of talent (Bryant et al. 2021: 10-24; Shane 2022; Tresch 2018; Levy 2009: 136–139; Tresch 2008: 84; Korb, Duggan 2007), generational value gap between the military and society and the following alienation of the military institution (Stanar, 2024), various forms of dehumanization of the enemy which lead to mass war crimes (Livingstone Smith 2011; Grossman, 1996), etc. – can be, if not completely resolved then at least significantly mitigated, with optimal SSH education.

9 According to the latest classification in the Republic of Serbia, academic disciplines within military sciences include not only the "orthodox" military sciences of tactics, operational arts and strategy, but also military ethics and military history.

Additionally, for certain nations like Serbia, development of moral component of military power has been central for optimal development of defense capacities and successful defense – the glorious military history and war tradition of the Serbian people are comprised almost entirely out of great victories and achievements gained primarily due to the moral component of military power, based on understanding of important cultural and identity attributes and foundational social values as well as on understanding of the necessity of defending them at all costs – never due to any sort of technological or numerical superiority.¹⁰ Fulfilment of this task, the task of optimal development of the moral component of military power primarily depends on the education that members of the military profession receive in the fields of SSH, meaning that optimal education in these fields can and must be considered a normative *ante bellum* obligation of every military (Wertheimer 2015: 54-68)! Those who are expected to kill and risk their own lives and lives of others for freedom, protection of collective identity and fundamental social values must have a deep and intimate understanding of these phenomena, coupled with sublime intellectual knowledge and understanding of limits of force that can never, under any circumstances, be crossed; not even when it is seductively and irresistibly easy.

Members of the military represent a highly vulnerable and attractive target for disinformation and manipulation which permeate social reality in the age of post-truth, especially in turbulent periods of preparation for war and during armed conflict. Following upon the famous words of Hiram Johnson who wrote that “the first casualty, when war comes, is truth,” all modern armed forces engage in extensive propaganda activities during the metaphorical “artillery preparation” of war, aimed at enemy’s population, and in particular their military, in an effort to manipulate them into surrender, submission, or at least to weaken their defense capabilities by sowing doubt and confusion. It seems self-evident, clear and obvious that the task of discerning the truth in a sea of lies and half-truths is the hardest in the *Nebel des Krieges* in which the cognitive battle is fought; a battle that is no less brutal than the kinetic one (Brun and Roitman 2020: 11-12). Development of information technologies, proliferation of mass communication devices, and all-encompassing impact of human rights ideology which partially altered the dynamics of relations even in the military, all together in synergy rendered traditional means and instruments for countering enemy propaganda – deliberate epistemic limitation and active discouragement of discussion and disagreement among the troops, along with a systematic sabotage of accessing unwanted content (Wolfendale 2015: 91; McMahan 2009: 119) – basically useless.

Consequently, the most potent and reliable instrument that militaries have at their disposal in this fierce cognitive battle of “truths” and narratives is comprehensive construction and systematic strengthening of critical thinking

¹⁰ Colonel Dimitrije Đurić and Major Milan Milovanović wrote about this fact and the specific weight that the moral component of military power holds for Serbian army already at the end of the 19th century (Đukić 2019: 124, 116).

among military personnel so that war is not lost even before the kinetic battle begins – the same battle for which militaries, ultimately, construct and produce all the mighty and complex technologically advanced weapons systems. Construction of ability for critical thinking, that is of “weapons” for the battle in the cognitive theatre, again falls in the scope of SSH, primarily of philosophy. For over a millennium, philosophy has been aware of the crucial and decisive importance of *phronesis* (φρονησις) or *prudentia*, i.e., practical wisdom as the foundational virtue of pragmatic intellectual practice; by studying and mastering the philosophical disciplines of logic and ethics (axiology),¹¹ those who lead militaries are made capable of winning the cognitive battle. The victor of that battle is the “victor of spirit” which historically always triumphs, even against the sword (Đurić 1976: 373).

Important processes take place on a daily basis within military organization which require pristine knowledge in the realm of SSH, like for example civilian democratic control of the military, implementation (and partially creation) of defense policies, troops training, human resources management, composing and creating strategic and doctrines, upholding and nourishing military traditions, public relations, etc.¹² It is uncontroversial and clear that training in the military requires knowledges of andragogy, didactics, and methodology in order to be efficient; however, it is probably less known that efficiency of civilian democratic control of the military heavily depends on political culture of military personnel, that is of their education in ethics, political science and sociology. Familiarity with political processes, international relations, and public international law is indisputably necessary for those who participate in creation and implementation of defense policies. Proper command in the military rests upon fundamental study of human beings and social groups, it demands understanding of internal dynamics of collectives, humans, personality types, and human abilities and limitations in general; in short, it demands knowledge of psychological sciences.

Strategy has not been exclusively a military science for quite a while now: proper understanding of strategy requires perception of two levels of strategy – military level and state level. Officer competences must include understanding of both levels. Succinctly, SSH not only expand cognitive horizons and raise the level of general education of those who study them but also develop their

11 Slobodan Kanjevac (2023) writes that a nation is spiritually sterilized if deprived of “logic, axiology and language;” an entire military can be disarmed in the same manner today, even the one equipped with the most expensive, most advanced, and most complex weapons.

12 In addition to providing officers with appropriate expertise, education of officers in various disciplines of social studies and humanities also reflects expectations of political authorities from officers. For example, officers educated in Belgrade in the 19th century studied national history and Christian science, while after the Second World War they studied Marxist philosophy, and the contents of all other social subjects were adapted to Marxist ideology. For the past several decades, the political neutrality of the military has been the lowest common denominator of these subjects.

capabilities to properly understand and grasp social phenomena, contexts in which events unfold and in which military decisions are being made, as well as broader social consequences of military decisions. As a segment of military education, SSH enable officers to gain knowledge of the society they defend, of war as a form of social conflict, of the military as a social institution, of the social role of their profession, of collectives they command and of the human being – the only being on Earth that wages wars.

Conclusion

Specific knowledge produced by social sciences and humanities is crucial, essential and vital, not only for understanding the modern world shaped by leaps and bounds made by sophisticated advanced technology, but also for humanity's ability to rise to numerous current and future challenges of the world we live in. Military, as a critical social institution, is of course no exception with regards to the place and significance that social sciences and humanities hold in modern military education systems. Moreover, virtually all problems and challenges faced by modern societies, caused primarily by marginalization of social sciences and humanities and the lack of understanding of their nature and mission, are not only just as present in the military realm; indeed, they are even more pronounced, urgent, and with even potential to cause detrimental consequences if not addressed properly and optimally through extensive and systematic education in these fields.

The unprecedented power of destruction that practically all armed forces of the world wield must be guided, directed, and restricted by the knowledge of *why, for what purpose* and even *if at all* this power should or should not be used. Knowledge produced by social sciences and humanities. Reflections of countless issues of modern societies in the military sphere, can again only be properly and efficiently addressed with education in social sciences and humanities: recruitment and retention rates, awareness of the position of the military within society, awareness of pivotal social values and culture being defended, proper management of social groups, civilian democratic control of the military, alienation of the military profession, lack of critical thinking leading to vulnerability to subversive actions and propaganda, etc.

Finally, officers who spend their entire careers primarily working on and managing groups of people, members of an institution which in its essence loyally and obediently serves a country and its interests, people who are expected to kill and risk being killed for protection of key social values, culture and identity are the ones who are not only in dire need of broad and profound education in social sciences and humanities, but also the ones to whom such an education is owed the most and the ones who wholly deserve it, perhaps more than members of any other profession. Therefore, the responsibility and duty of every society and every military is to provide precisely such an education to its members.

References

- Anglin, Simon. 2018. "An Educated Military: Professional Education and the Profession of Arms." In Finney, Nathan K. and Tyrell O. Mayfield eds. *Redefining the Modern Military: The Intersection of Profession and Ethics*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press: pp.: 153–166.
- Atkins, Will. 2023. "Who lost Afghanistan? Samuel Huntington and the decline of strategic thinking." *Armed Forces & Society* 49 (4): 965–981.
- Babić, Jovan. 2018. "Nauka i stvarnost." In Mastilović, Draga ed. *Ideja filozofskog fakulteta i savremeni univerzitet*. Pale: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Istočnom Sarajevu: pp.: 57–62
- Bauman, Zigmunt, and Stanislav Obirek. 2016. *O bogu i čoveku, razgovori*. Novi Sad: Mediterran publishing.
- Bauman, Zigmunt. 2009. *Fluidni život*. Novi Sad: Mediterran publishing.
- Beasley, William M. 2018. "The Rise, Fall, and Early Reawakening of US Naval Professionalism." In Finney, Nathan K. and Tyrell O. Mayfield eds. *Redefining the Modern Military: The Intersection of Profession and Ethics*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press: pp.: 111–139.
- Blackburn, Simon. 2018. *On Truth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brooks, Risa. 2021. "The paradoxes of Huntingtonian professionalism." In Beehner, Lionel, Risa Brooks, and Daniel Mauer, eds. *Reconsidering American civil-military relations: The military, society, politics, and modern war*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: pp.: 17–40.
- Brun, Itai, and Michael Roitman. 2020. *National Security in the Era of Post-Truth and Fake News*. Tel Aviv: Institute for National Security Studies.
- Bryant, Susan, Brett Swaney, and Heidi Urben. 2021. "From citizen to secular saint: The societal implications of military exceptionalism." *Texas National Security Review* 4 (2): 10–24.
- Cook, Patricia. 2015. "A Profession Like No Other." In Lucas, George, ed. *Routledge Handbook of Military Ethics*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group: pp.: 32–43.
- Damjanović, Kaja ed. 2024. *Zbirka kognitivnih pristrasnosti i pogrešaka*. Smederevo: Heliks.
- Đurić, Miloš. 1976. *Istorija helenske etike*. Beograd: BIGZ.
- Edwards, Paul. 1995. "From 'Impact' to Social Process: Computers in Society and Culture." In Jasonoff, Sheila, Gerald Markle, James C. Peterson and Trevor Pinch, eds. *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage: pp.: 257–285.
- Gidens, Antoni. 2001. *Sociologija*. Podgorica: CID.
- Grossman, Dave. 1996. *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. New York/Boston: Back Bay Books/Little, Brown and Co.
- Hantington, Samjuel. 2004. *Vojnik i država*. Beograd: Centar za studije Jugoistočne Evrope, Fakultet političkih nauka i Diplomatska akademija.
- Hunter, Lance, Craig Alber, and Joshua Rutland. 2023. "The military application of artificial intelligence technology in the United States, China, and Russia and the implications for global security." *Defense & Security Analysis* 39 (2): 207–232.
- Kanjevac, Slobodan. 2023. "Nazad, ka čoveku." *Politika*, September 3rd. URL: <https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/569054/Pogledi/Nazad-ka-coveku> (last accessed: November 9th, 2024)
- Kastels, Manuel. 2018. *Uspom umreženog društva*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Korać, Srđan. 2023. "'Is drone becoming the new 'apparatus of domination?': Battlefield surveillance in the twenty-first century warfare." *Philosophy and Society* 34 (3): 377–398.

- Korb, Lawrence J., and Sean E. Duggan, 2007. "An All-volunteer Army? Recruitment and its Problems." *Political science and Politics* 40 (3): 467–471.
- Krulak, Charles. 1999. "The strategic corporal: Leadership in the three-block war." *Leatherneck* 82 (1): 14–17.
- Levi-Stros, Klod. 2018. *Svi smo mi kanibali*. Čačak – Beograd: Gradac K.
- Levy, Yagil. 2009. "Is there a Motivation Crisis in Military Recruitment in Israel?" *Israel Affairs* 15 (2): 135–158.
- Livingstone Smith, David. 2011. *Less Than Human: Why We Demean, Enslave, and Exterminate Others*. New York: St. Martin's Press
- Marček, Jan, Mirjana Životić Vanović, and Goran Dikić. 2014. *Savremeni tokovi reforme visokog vojnog obrazovanja*. Beograd: Medija centar "Obrana."
- McIntyre, Lee. 2018. *Post-Truth*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- McMahan, Jeff. 2009. *Killing in War*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pinker, Steven. 2018. *Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress*. New York: Viking.
- Šar, Pol. 2020. *Vojska bez vojnika*. Beograd: Laguna.
- Shane, Leo III. 2022. "Sluggish military recruiting worries Congress." *Military Times*, April 27th. URL: <https://www.militarytimes.com/news/pentagon-congress/2022/04/27/sluggish-military-recruiting-worries-congress/> (last accessed: November 9th, 2024).
- Stanar, Dragan. 2021a. "War and Post-Truth: Moral Equality of Combatants and Inculpable Ignorance in Just War Theory." *Theoria*, 64 (4): 111–122.
- _____. 2021b. "The Vital Significance of Military Ethics." *Journal of Military Ethics* 20 (3–4): 237–250.
- _____. 2023. "Moral Education in the Military: Optimal Approach to Teaching Military Ethics." *Theoria* 66 (1): 37–51.
- _____. 2024. "A Problem in the Huntingtonian Universe: The Military Side of the Gap." *Armed Forces and Society*, online first, May 21st 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X241254354>.
- Starčević, Srđan. 2024. "Povratak obaveznog služenja vojnog roka u Evropi – društveni determinizam i perspective." *Politika nacionalne bezbednosti* 26 (1): 11–26.
- _____. 2025. "Predgovor." In Todor Pavlović, ed. *Doktrine i razvitak taktike i drugi tekstovi*. Beograd: Dobrotoljublje; pp.: 7–42.
- Starčević, Srđan, and Srđan Blagojević. 2017. "Kreveldov spor sa Klauzevicem – da li je smisao rata politički?" *Srpska politička misao* 52 (2): 117–134.
- Šušnjić, Đuro. 2015. *Teorije kulture*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike.
- Tresch, Tibor S. 2018. "Challenges in recruitment and retention is there a solution?" *Contemporary Military Challenges* 20 (2): 19–21.
- Tresh, Tibor S. 2008. "Challenges in the Recruitment of Professional Soldier in Europe." *Strategic Impact* 28 (3): 76–86.
- Wertheimer, Roger. 2015. "Jus ante Bellum: Principles of Prewar Conduct." In Lucas, George, ed. *Routledge Handbook of Military Ethics*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group; pp.: 54–68.
- Wolfendale, Jessica. 2015. "Military Culture and War Crimes." In Lucas, George, ed. *Routledge Handbook of Military Ethics*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group; pp.: 82–97.
- Zorić, Mirjana, and Slobodan Đukić. 2010. *Srpsko vojno školstvo*. Beograd: MO RS.

Dragan Stanar i Srđan Starčević

Mesto i značaj društveno-humanističkih nauka u savremenom vojnom obrazovanju

Apstrakt:

U ovom radu autori nastoje da istraže i objasne mesto i značaj obrazovanja u sferi društveno-humanističkih nauka u današnjem vojnom obrazovanju. Analizom uticaja rapidnog napretka tehnoloških nauka na celokupno društvo, autori ukazuju na činjenicu da su problemi i izazovi savremenog sveta još izraženiji i opasniji u vojnom domenu, uprkos činjenici da je vojska nužno odvojena od ostatka društva u gotovo svim aspektima, uključujući i obrazovanje. Autori identifikuju nekoliko važnih i opasnih problema u kontekstu vojske koji su rezultat tehnoloških otkrića i inovacija, te zaključuju da je optimalan pristup rešavanju ovih problema sistematično i pravo obrazovanje u oblasti društveno-humanističkih nauka u savremenim vojnim školama. Na kraju, autori dolaze do zaključka da je pripadnicima vojske obrazovanje iz sfere društveno-humanističkih nauka ne samo neophodno, već da im njihove institucije i njihova društva duguju upravo takvo obrazovanje usled specifične misije vojske i zahteva koje društvo ispostavlja pred pripadnike ove institucije.

Ključne reči: društveno-humanističke nauke, obrazovanje, vojska, rat, tehnologija, vojni oficiri

