



Journal Website:
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ijp>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

FROM THE HISTORY OF FOREIGN MILITARY PEDAGOGY

Submission Date: December 09, 2023, **Accepted Date:** December 14, 2023,

Published Date: December 19, 2023

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ijp/Volume03Issue12-30>

Umarov Farhad Umirovich

Senior Teacher Of The Armed Forces Academy Of The Republic Of Uzbekistan, Doctor Of Philosophy (Phd) In Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article considers the main stages of the development of military pedagogy abroad. Abroad, the officer training system is traditionally considered an important component of military development, and its main purpose is to meet the needs of all branches of the Armed Forces (AF) for personnel with high professional military training in peacetime and wartime.

KEYWORDS

Military pedagogy; military psychology; higher military educational institutions; stages of development of foreign military pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION

Analyzing the development of theoretical concepts of military pedagogy in foreign countries (Federal Republic of Germany, United States of America), we can state that the first stage of foreign military pedagogy covers the 19th century.

The characteristic features of this stage are that during this period the foundation of modern officer training was laid. In 1802, the US Congress founded the first national military school at West Point. American

pedagogical thought of this time was strongly influenced by the views of Western European teachers. The thoughts of the German teacher I. F. Herbart about the need to suppress the student's personality with the most stringent measures (strict control, restrictions, regulation of actions, moral and physical punishment) gave a powerful impetus to the development of the American Herbart movement, which arose in the USA in the second half of the century.

The teachings of I. F. Herbart were used in America to create a rigid, mechanical training system, which was widely used throughout the American education system, and especially in educational institutions that trained officers. A special place was given to religion, which covered the bulk of extracurricular activities and remained an important component of individual disciplines studied in military schools.

The program of military educational institutions of this period did not take into account the individual qualities of students and did not contribute to the development of creative thinking. The content and organization of the educational process in military schools in Germany and the United States diverged from the requirements that the Armed Forces must meet, which necessitated the need for military educators to review the existing order in the field of military professional education by the end of the 19th century.

The second stage of foreign military pedagogical thought covers the first half of the twentieth century. During this period, foreign military teachers in order to train officers

personnel widely use a variety of pedagogical theories, among which stand out: pedagogy of pragmatism, progressivism, social reconstructionist, adjustments, essentialism, perennials, industrial pedagogy and others.

Pluralism is emerging and developing in foreign military pedagogy, which contributes to a truly scientific approach to solving pedagogical problems and is one of the evidence of its progressive development.

Educational theorists such as Bernier, Williams, Wing, Krone, and Pulliam collectively list dozens of

pedagogical trends in the field of teaching and education [1]. During this period, the ideas of pragmatism, developed at the beginning of the twentieth century by the American philosopher and educator J. Dewey, became fundamental for the training of officers. He substantiated: free natural development, self-expression and initiative of students; encouraging interest as the main motive of any activity; organizing the accumulation of trainee experience by solving practical problem problems [2]. The practicality of J. Dewey's recommendations made pragmatism popular among foreign civilian and military educators. He was the first to openly oppose the rigid system of formal education. Dewey believed that freedom should be the main principle of teaching and education. The pragmatic philosophy that Dewey preached had a huge influence on military educators and attracted the attention of foreign officers training organizers. Among those who joined this pedagogical trend were V. Kilpatrick and E. Callings, whose ideas about activating students' activity by "doing" and completing educational "projects" formed part of the didactic recommendations used in the armies of the USA, Germany and other countries.

The progressiveness and scientific nature of the pedagogy of pragmatism are as follows:

- use of the education program to preserve national sovereignty, political freedoms and independence, together with its values, institutions and territorial integrity, that is, to improve and strengthen the existing state system;
- substantiation of the need for free natural development of personality in the learning process, approval of ideas about the ability of the majority of students for active intellectual activity;

- a scientific approach to the process of cognition, which is considered not only as the accumulation of personal experience, but also reveals the patterns of development of the surrounding reality;
- assessment of intellectual activity as a means of understanding the objective world in order to successfully act in solving social and professional problem situations;
- reliance on theoretical knowledge in the learning process and in a creative approach to the content of education.

The third stage, when foreign (USA, Germany) military pedagogy entered in the mid-50s of the twentieth century, was marked by the emergence of a number of critical trends that tried to substantiate new views on the training of professional military personnel. These trends included not only those who represented various philosophical movements, but also those who criticized the methods and results of educational institutions. The military leadership took active measures to target the military-professional education of military personnel for war.

Admiral Rickover stated that “the primary purpose of education is to produce experts capable of creating the technology and science on which victory in war depends.”[2]. These requirements are enshrined in the main legislative acts of the US Congress on the Armed Forces (Titles 10 “Armed Forces” of the US Code of Laws and 32 “National Defense” of the Code of Federal Regulations), as well as the Uniform Charter of the Armed Forces, branch manuals and regulations.

At the same time, special attention is paid to the development of scientific research, technical and applied sciences, mathematics, foreign languages and

the preservation of high elite standards of higher educational institutions. All this calls for a thorough analysis of the officer training system and proposals for its improvement. Military educators Masland and Radway [3] achieved certain results during their research, but their conclusions did not cause fundamental changes in the practice of officer training. In 1973, the US government suspended the forced conscription law, which necessitated a change in views on the training of officers for professional aircraft.

Summing up the results of our research, we can say with confidence that, at the present stage in the USA and Germany, the development of military pedagogy in theoretical and applied terms is aimed at training military personnel, first of all, loyal to their country, executive and ready to carry out combat missions.

REFERENCES

1. Bernier N.R., Williams I.B. Beyond belief. Ideological foundations of American education. Prentice – Hall, 1973; Wingo G.M. Philosophies of Education; an introduction. Lexington, 1974; The Dimension of American education. / Ed. By. Crane R. Reading (Nass.), 1974; Pulliam J.D. Hustory of Education in America. Columbus, 1976. 345 p.
2. Masland J.W., Radway L.J. Soldiers and Scholars. Military Education and National Policy. Prenceton, 1957. 215 p.
3. Pulliam J.D/ Hustary of Education in America. Columbus, Ohio, 1976. P. 135-136.