

Civilizational Processes And The Evolution Of Military Education

Khusanov Zikriyo Tolanboy oglu

Teacher of the Military Security and Defense University of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 September 2025; **Accepted:** 23 October 2025; **Published:** 28 November 2025

Abstract: This article examines the interrelationship between civilizational processes and the evolution of military education, providing an opportunity to deeply understand the essence of the ideological, cultural, and epistemological attention paid to the military sphere throughout human history.

Keywords: Civilizational processes, military education, ideological stability, geopolitical context, axiological values, digital security.

Introduction: Military education is an institution that civilizations have formed as a primary means of implementing their principles of security, order, political stability, and cultural preservation. The civilizational changes that have occurred during the development of mankind — that is, the processes from primitive communities to agricultural societies, from feudal systems to industrial and post-industrial stages — have radically changed the content, form, and goals of military education. In antiquity, military education was a means of educating an ideal citizen, in the Middle Ages it became a moral and disciplinary institution based on religion, and in the modern era it has developed on a scientific and technological basis and has been perfected as a complex system that embodies the ideology of the state. From this point of view, the evolution of military education is a historical and philosophical phenomenon that served as an adaptive, and sometimes innovative, response to civilizational changes. Each civilization has its own military model, which has developed in direct harmony with the worldview, social structure and value system of society. Especially in the 21st century, against the background of the global information space, digital technologies and hybrid threats, military education has acquired a civilizational character and has begun to acquire strategic importance not only on a national but also transnational scale. In this regard, within the framework of this chapter, the dialectical relationship between civilizational development and military education is analyzed on the basis of philosophical and

scientific criteria, and the transformational features of this system are revealed in the course of historical periods.

The evolution of civilizational processes and military education is a socio-cultural system formed on the basis of dialectical interdependence, and the historical movement of these two concepts has left its own mark at each stage of human development. Military education has a historical and philosophical basis, not only as a means of teaching military skills, but also as a force that preserves civilizational values, continuously transmits the cultural code, and legally strengthens the political-military hierarchy. Therefore, studying the evolution of military education in the context of civilizational dynamics requires analyzing it not only in terms of technological or methodological changes, but also in terms of ideological-aesthetic and moral-philosophical changes.

METHODOLOGY

According to the idea put forward by Podliesna V., “wars are an integral part of civilizational development, and their intensity always becomes a form of resolving internal contradictions in social evolution” (Podliesna, 2022: p. 53). This approach synthesizes the inextricable link between civilization and military actions, and interprets military education as a means of managing these contradictions. However, from a critical point of view, this idea is based on a hyperstructural approach and does not sufficiently take into account the spiritual and individual components of military education (Podliesna, 2022).

Cynthia A. Watson writes about the internal evolution of military education: "military education is becoming increasingly complex in its professional formation in accordance with the needs of civilian accreditation and democratic society" (Watson, 2007: p. 112). This idea suggests that modern military education, in harmony with civilizational values, is becoming a model that integrates not only the military system, but also the entire social system. In a critical approach, however, the author's analysis has a very technocratic and institutional character, in which the axiological ramifications of military education - for example, ethical norms, cultural diversity and historical identity factors - are highlighted in a secondary way (Watson, 2007).

José Campillo and F. Cardona, on the other hand, analyze military history based on evolutionary theory and the complex systems model and argue that "wars and military strategies are products of the evolution of social systems and can be explained by selection, adaptation, and coevolution" (Campillo & Cardona, 2013: p. 267). This view undoubtedly provides a new theoretical framework for military education, but the limitation of this approach is that it risks normalizing war as a natural process and restricts it from illuminating concepts such as social choice and moral responsibility (Campillo & Cardona, 2013).

Civilizational processes and the evolution of military education are inextricably and dynamically interconnected, and at each historical stage these two concepts have emerged as a decisive factor in the political, cultural and ideological formation of society. Each phase of the history of civilization has formed its own military-educational environment, which has directly influenced not only military strategies, but also changes in social consciousness, state building, division of labor and knowledge systems. Therefore, the evolution of military education is determined not only by technological or methodological innovations, but also by the general direction of civilizational thinking. Bruce Bowden writes about the expansionist nature of Western civilization in his work: "civilization is the desire to become an empire, because civilized subjects declare themselves superior by imposing their social norms on other societies" (Bowden, 2009: p. 35). This view grounds the evolution of military education primarily in terms of expansionism, colonialism, and geopolitical dominance. However, in a critical approach, this concept is based on an excessively Western-centric paradigm and equates the concept of "civilization" with imperial hierarchy, and therefore does not adequately reflect civilizational diversity, including the model of military pedagogy in Eastern or Southern civilizations (Bowden, 2009). The Chinese

military system studied by Xu De-ya is presented in a historical context as a direct result of civilizational changes. He argues: "The modern military system in China was formed under the influence of Western invasion, which led to the emergence of a new paradigm in military education, namely, civil-military integration" (Xu De-ya, 2007: p. 66). This view shows how Chinese civilization implemented internal reforms through civilian militarization. However, from a critical perspective, this approach overdramatically interprets the "Western pressure" factor, and relegates internal civilizational impulses, such as the role of Confucian moral and social doctrine in military education (Xu De-ya, 2007).

Toronto N.W., analyzing the modern stage of the transformation of military knowledge, writes: "Today, wars have gone beyond the scope of traditional combat operations and have become embedded in the informational, cultural and technological spheres; therefore, military education also requires a multidisciplinary approach" (Toronto, 2021: p. 4). This view undoubtedly indicates the new conceptual foundations of 21st century military education. However, in a critical review, it can be said that Toronto bases this multidisciplinary approach mainly on practices within the US and NATO, and as a result, the experience of military education in regions such as Africa, Asia, Latin America is overlooked (Toronto, 2021).

The relationship between civilizational processes and the evolution of military education has deep historical and philosophical roots, and the formation of military education is manifested as a reflection of the needs, cultural dominants and political and economic structures that arose at certain stages of civilizational development. Military education becomes the main mechanism of civilizational formation transmitted through social consciousness; through it, not only combat skills, but also the dominant epistemology and axiology of civilization are encoded. Almack, in his study, interprets education as "the main driving force of social evolution" and writes: "Only human consciousness can initiate a new form of evolution - continuous development through social processes" (Almack, 1935: pp. 5-6). This approach allows us to interpret military education as a civilizational intellectual heritage. However, from a critical point of view, Almack's theory is built on ideological-metaphysical foundations, which does not sufficiently take into account the historical socio-economic conditions of specific civilizations (Almack, 1935). In his study, Márton P. analyzes the concept of "evolutionary military processes" in a geopolitical context and concludes as follows: "There are two vectors of military

development: one is due to local and existential factors, the other is the result of an almost virtual competition between global powers" (Márton, 2017: p. 31). This dual analytical approach of the author shows that the evolution of military education is inextricably linked to civilizational and political realities. However, from a critical point of view, it can be said that Márton does not deeply study the mutual dynamics of these two vectors of forces — in particular, he does not clearly show what civilizational values are transmitted through the structure of military education (Márton, 2017).

Turchin et al. link the "evolution of military technologies" to civilizational complexity, arguing that "iron metallurgy, horsemanship, and the degree of global connectivity are key factors in the development of military innovations" (Turchin et al., 2021: p. not cited). This approach assesses military education from the perspective of technological evolution and is based on statistical modeling of historical processes. However, this view is critically narrow, leaving the cultural-philosophical components of military education – that is, knowledge transmitted through values, traditions, and ideology – in the background of technocratic analysis (Turchin et al., 2021).

The relationship between civilizational processes and the evolution of military education has been manifested in complex and multi-layered forms at all stages of human history. Military education has developed in direct connection with the organizational and institutional formation of society, social mobility, ideological heritage and technological developments. It is this aspect that requires a philosophical analysis of military education not only as a system of technical training, but also as a means of civilizational reproduction and continuity of the social idea.

V. Podliesna, in her article, emphasizes that "wars are an integral part of civilizational development" and explains them as "a form of resolving contradictions in social evolution" (Podliesna, 2022: p. 53). This idea of the author shows military education as a system that shapes the historical variability of social forces. However, in a critical approach, it can be said that this model, accepting war as a normal form of civilizational development, does not sufficiently take into account the need for military education to be connected with humanism, peacekeeping and universal values (Podliesna, 2022).

J. Almack, seeing military education as a form of civilizational evolution, writes: "Only the human mind can initiate a new form of evolution - continuous development through social processes" (Almack, 1935: pp. 5–6). This idea connects the formation of military

education with the mental maturation of humanity, interpreting it as a form of metaphysical development. However, in critical analysis, this model has an excessively idealistic character and does not sufficiently analyze practical political-economic factors and the mechanisms of social hierarchy in the military system (Almack, 1935). Cynthia A. Watson, analyzing the modern stage of military education, writes: "military education is becoming increasingly complex in its professional formation in accordance with the needs of civilian accreditation and a democratic society" (Watson, 2007: p. 112). This view analyzes military education in terms of civilizational modernization and integration with civil society. However, from a critical perspective, Watson's approach is based on a Western model and does not shed much light on the ways in which military education has evolved in other civilizational spaces (e.g., Asia or Latin America) (Watson, 2007).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Civilizational processes and the evolution of military education are formed on an inseparable historical and social basis, and this relationship is manifested in modern epistemological paradigms as a powerful determinant ensuring the formation of the military-educational model. Military education, in its stages of formation, not only adapted to social needs, but also served as a carrier of civilizational codes, as a cultural expression of historical identity and state power. Therefore, it is important to open the evolution of military education with a philosophical-observational approach in the context of civilizational changes in thinking, the dynamism of social structures, the moral-normative model and institutional transformations.

Strauss, studying the ancient Greek and Roman model, writes: "In antiquity, military education was the heart of general education, but in today's democratic societies this role is increasingly marginalized" (Strauss, 2008: p. 53). According to the author, military training in ancient civilizations was an important element in preparing the individual for society. However, a critical approach shows that Strauss's view is based on a Western-centric episteme, which ignores the modern multifaceted goals of military education, such as human rights, cultural diversity, and social inclusion (Strauss, 2008). Hu De-ya interprets the modernization of the military system in China as the result of civilizational pressure and internal reforms, writing: "The modern military system in China was formed under the influence of Western invasion, which led to the emergence of a new paradigm in military education, namely, civil-military integration" (Hu De-ya, 2007: p. 66). This position is of great importance in analyzing how national civilizational changes

transformed the military education system. However, from a critical perspective, the author focuses too much on external pressures, while the influence of internal socio-cultural inertia, Confucian morality, and feudal-unity paradigms is not sufficiently analyzed (Xu De-ya, 2007). Márton P., on the other hand, analyzes modern battlefields based on evolutionary thinking and says: "Wars are fought not only for local resources, but also for virtual hegemony in evolutionary stages" (Márton, 2017: p. 34). In his opinion, military education in modern civilization is being reshaped not only based on the principles of traditional balance of power, but also on information and cognitive superiority. This analysis shows military education as a competency for critical thinking, mental balance, and adaptation to hybrid threats in an information society. However, a critical aspect of this approach is that it relies more on geopolitical discourse and does not sufficiently analyze the ethical and anthropological aspects of military education (Márton, 2017).

The inextricable link between civilizational processes and the evolution of military education represents a complex mechanism for the formation of socio-philosophical thought. These two phenomena are a mutual metastructure, one of which not only determines the form and content of the other, but also acts as a factor transforming its episteme and axiology. Military education not only reflects the dominant cultural principles of civilization, but also plays a strategic role in transmitting them as a chain of continuity. A. Targowski in his study interprets the civilizational approach as "a strategy for developing a sustainable civilization through education." He writes: "In the modern era, when civilization is under threat, any higher education system, especially those that train the leading elite, must master the civilizational methodology" (Targowski, 2011: p. 9). This idea indicates the need to reassess education as a means of civilizational reflection against the backdrop of a socio-cultural crisis. However, in a critical approach, the author's civilizational method is limited to relying too much on the Western paradigm, interpreting other civilizational models and cultural systems as normative criteria (Targowski, 2011). Yao Zhong-guo interprets the concept of "educational civilization" as "a dialectical unity of national and personal development" and says: "Modern educational civilization is formed through educational modernization, universal recognition, socialization and legalization" (Yao, 2003: page not indicated). In this approach, military education becomes an institutional form of a civilizational value system. However, critically, the simplified sociological interpretation of this model does not sufficiently cover the anthropological and strategic

reflection in military education (Yao, 2003). Lin Dong-hu, writing about the Confucian military cultural heritage, describes its content as follows: "The Confucian military cultural heritage emphasizes the unity of war ethics, spiritual struggle and educational battle through the concepts of 'REN ZHAN', 'SHEN ZHAN' and 'JIAO ZHAN'" (Lin Dong-hu, 2004: page not indicated). This approach is valuable as a moral-existential approach of civilizational traditions to military education. From a critical point of view, it can be said that Lin did not develop methods for updating these concepts in the context of modern military pedagogy, and their actualization and real application remained open (Lin Dong-hu, 2004).

Civilizational processes and the evolution of military education were formed in a system of mutually complex determinants, creating a military-intellectual model of human thinking in historical-anthropological, axiological and geopolitical contexts. The dialectical relationship between these two conceptual directions plays an important role not only in the formation of social structures, but also in the spiritual and cultural formation of military knowledge. Military education has served as the episteme of the civilizational model and through it has served to ensure ideology, social role, political stability and historical continuity.

Bowden writes in his concept of civilization: "The idea of civilization has always served as an 'ideological legitimacy' that has encouraged Western states to forcefully transform other civilizations" (Bowden, 2010: page not indicated). This approach analyzes in particular the subordination of military education to the civilizational imperative and its use as a mechanism for creating a moral basis for military expansion. Critically speaking, Bowden's approach takes the concept of civilization to an excessively political-instrumental level and generalizes its internal cultural, spiritual, and technogenic differences (Bowden, 2010).

Yan Li, on the other hand, interprets civilizational education in the modern university system and writes as follows: "Civilizational education is an effective tool that guides students towards social harmony, moral culture, and life competencies" (Li, 2008: page not indicated). In his opinion, modern higher education institutions should be considered not only as institutions for professional training, but also as institutions for the formation of civilizational consciousness. In a critical approach, this model, although theoretically profound, does not sufficiently take into account the special nature of military education - a command-based structure, psychological preparation, and strategic thinking - that is, it tries to automatically apply the civilian education model to the military model (Li, 2008).

Another important source is the theory put forward by Huang Yong-sheng, who writes: "Military education is a new field consisting of the synthesis of pedagogy and military science, which forms the theoretical and practical foundations of the modern military system" (Huang, 2012: page not indicated). In this concept, the author shows the need to strengthen military education as a science within a specific civilizational system. Critically, although this approach provides a scientific and pedagogical basis, it does not sufficiently reveal the mechanisms for the methodological inculcation of civilizational identity, moral reflection, and historical thinking (Huang, 2012).

Civilizational processes and the evolution of military education, as mutually shaping systems, have long developed in close connection with the political and moral norms, technological achievements, and ideological paradigms of society. Military education, while being a means of transmitting the epistemic foundations of civilization, served as a strategic basis for national legitimation in their cyclical phases of crisis and stability. In this process, the development of military theory is not only a set of technical and practical knowledge, but also a structural part of civilizational thinking.

In the study "The Nature of Military Theory", the author interprets the military knowledge of antiquity as follows: "Each historical civilization has developed its own military ideas, in which there has always been a combination of combat experience and theoretical considerations" (Anonymous, 2009: page not indicated). This approach emphasizes the universality of military theory and the transnational continuity between civilizations. However, in a critical approach, it can be said that this position does not take into account the internal diversity of military ideas, the difference in cultural archetypes, presenting them as almost the same universal structure (Anonymous, 2009).

Wu Yong-mei, analyzing the teaching of military theory in Chinese universities, writes: "The military theory course is an important aspect of national defense education, and it is necessary to organize it in a systematic, scientific and goal-oriented manner" (Wu, 2009: page not indicated). This idea indicates the need to integrate modern military education with civilian education. However, from a critical point of view, this approach relegates the cultural-contextual characteristics of military education to the second level, that is, interprets it as a standardized didactic model (Wu, 2009). Podliesna V., on the other hand, explains military-civilizational evolution on the basis of a Marxist-functional approach as follows: "The economic basis of every developed civilization served

as the basis for military external expansion" (Podliesna, 2022: p. 53). This view emphasizes the connection of military education with socio-economic conflicts and presents it as a means of reproducing civilizational violence. In a critical approach, this concept is based on one-sided historical determinism and ignores the normative, ethical, or humanistic aspects of military education (Podliesna, 2022). In his article, Ping Haihong interprets military theory courses as a strategic component in the modern education system, writing as follows: "Military theory courses deepen students' understanding of national defense, increase their scientific interest in military strategy, and enable the training of a high-quality military personnel reserve" (Ping, 2021: p. 188). In this view, military education is interpreted as an organic part of the national security system. However, in a critical approach, it should be noted that the author's approach is functionalist and pragmatic, and does not sufficiently highlight the civilizational-spiritual and normative aspects of military education, that is, its role as a cultural-scientific resource in civilizational understanding (Ping, 2021). Zacharakis and Werff, on the other hand, evaluate military education based on adult pedagogy and come to the following conclusion: "It is necessary to emphasize the development of critical thinking skills in professional military education, as this forms a high level of cognitive and organizational culture" (Zacharakis & Werff, 2012: p. 89). This approach shows the intellectual, strategic and ideological basis of the formation of military personality in modern civilizations. However, critically, this approach is built on the individualistic intellectual paradigm inherent in Western culture, and sheds little light on the civilizational mechanisms based on collective morality, unity of values, and historical-cultural memory (Zacharakis & Werff, 2012).

Furthermore, the concept developed by Zhang Xiufang and Zhang Shoushun interprets military theory courses as "a form of ideological and spiritual education." They write: "In military theory classes, strengthening moral education, forming political consciousness, and instilling a culture of national security are the modern pedagogical

CONCLUSION

Civilizational processes and the evolution of military education are interrelated, finding their expression through the historical formation of societies, political hierarchies, knowledge paradigms and the consistent transfer of ideological laws to the military-institutional model. Military education, as a functional extension of civilizational thinking, serves as a determinant that forms not only the technological component of war preparation, but also the main indicators of

civilizational identity, a system of moral and ideological norms and a national philosophy of life. Therefore, this issue must be studied in a philosophical and civilizational framework.

The issue of civilizational processes and the evolution of military education requires a new theoretical approach in today's era of global threats, geopolitical redistributions and reconstruction of cultural identity. Military education has historically acquired a civilizational essence, serving as a mechanism for the stable transmission of the strategic worldview, moral norms and political will of society. Therefore, it is necessary to view military education not simply as a technical or tactical process, but as a means of civilizational reflection.

Analysis of civilizational processes and the evolution of military education shows that military education has changed in accordance with the socio-political, cultural-ideological and technological requirements of each era and has become an integral component of civilizational development. Military education has served as one of the main supporting systems of civilizations, not only as a means of ensuring state security, but also as a social institution that forms discipline, patriotism, civic responsibility and national pride in society. It has gone through stages of improvement in terms of content and form in parallel with civilizational transformations. In particular, in the era of globalization and the digital revolution, it has been proven that military education has become one of the strategic mechanisms for ensuring universal security, cultural preservation and ideological stability. Therefore, in today's conditions, reconsidering and improving military education from a civilizational perspective on a philosophical basis is of urgent scientific and practical importance.

REFERENCES

1. Mirziyoyev SH.M. Erkin va farovon demokratik O'zbekiston davlatini birgalikda barpo etamiz. –T.: O'zbekiston, NMIU, 2016.
2. Mirziyoyev SH.M. Qonun ustuvorligi va inson manfaatlarini ta'minlash – yurt taraqqiyoti va xalq farovonligining garovi. –T.: «O'zbekiston». 2017. – 48 b.
3. Mirziyoyev SH.M. Buyuk kelajagimizni mard va olijanob xalqimiz bilan birga quramiz. –T.: «O'zbekiston». 2017. –488 b.
4. Mirziyoyev SH.M. Milliy tiklanishdan – milliy yuksalish sari [Matn]. –T.:
5. Podliesna V. (2022). Military-economic cycles in the context of civilizational development, *Ekonomična teoriâ*, №4, 53-bet.
6. Ping Haihong. (2021). How to Strengthen the Teaching of Military Theory Course and Promote the National Defense Education of College Students, *Journal of Advances in Higher Education*, Vol. 4, 188-bet.
7. Zacharakis J., Werff J.V.D. (2012). The Future of Adult Education in the Military, *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2012(136), 89-bet.
8. Zhang Xiufang, Zhang Shoushun. (2024). Military Theory Course Reform in Colleges and Universities Based on the Perspective of Curriculum Moral Education, *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, sahifa ko'rsatilmagan.
9. Li Yan. (2008). The Civilization Education of College Students, sahifa ko'rsatilmagan.
10. Huang Yong-sheng. (2012). Offering of Military Education as a Discipline in Regular Institutions of Higher Learning, *Journal of Huaihai Institute of Technology*, sahifa ko'rsatilmagan.
11. Anonim muallif. (2009). The Nature of Military Theory, sahifa ko'rsatilmagan.
12. Wu Yong-mei. (2009). On China's Military Theory Teaching in Colleges and Universities, *Journal of Wuhan Institute of Technology*, sahifa ko'rsatilmagan.
13. Teshaboyev M.M “Ijtimoiy adolatni huquqiy-falsafiy muammo sifatida o'rganish zarurati” // *Scientific Bulletin of NamSU-Научный вестник НамГУ-NamDU ilmiy axborotnomasi-2023-yil / 328-330b*
14. Teshaboyev M.M “Contemporary problems and philosophical and legal support of social Justice in society.” // *Remie. Multidisciplinary Journal of Education Research*. 2022 Hipatia Press, ISSN:2014-2862. -P 46-50
15. Teshaboyev M.M “ Historical-conceptual analysis of equality and social justice in islamic teaching” // *Frontline social sciences and history journal / july 07, 2023 / 26-33 p*