

Miloš Milenković*

*Institute for Strategic Research,
University of Defence, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia*

ARMY AND MILITARY PROFESSION IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY: A CONTRIBUTION TO DEFINING THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK**

(Translation in *Extenso*)

Abstract

The social transformations defining contemporary, postmodern, or post-Cold War society have inevitably shaped the military – its organization, functions, role, and societal position. Global shifts from a bipolar to a unipolar and now multipolar geopolitical order demand the continuous evolution of national armed forces. This paper provides an overview of the broader context in which the modern military and military profession operate. It seeks to establish an analytical framework for examining their role and position in contemporary society as a research subject. The objective of this paper is to contribute not only in a hermeneutic (cognitive) sense but also in a methodological sense by developing an analytical framework based on six key factors: (1) the political system and legislative framework, (2) national culture and social values, (3) historical experience, (4) the economy and the level of technical and technological development (5) the quality of military education and training, and

* E-mail address: milos.milenkovic@mod.gov.rs; ORCID: 0000-0003-1155-3797.

** The paper was written within the framework of the Institute for Strategic Research project "Military profession in Serbia in the modern security environment" (ИСИ/ДХ/3/24-26), financed by the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Serbia.

(6) international military cooperation. Each factor is briefly explained, emphasizing its significance and specific characteristics. Through the appropriate selection and application of scientific methods, the proposed analytical framework aims to enable future research on the role and position of the military and the military profession in contemporary society to achieve the most comprehensive scientific understanding of the research subject.

Keywords: military, military profession, post-modern society, post-modern army, analytical framework.

INTRODUCTION

To systematically examine the role and place of the army and the military profession in society, it is necessary to define the analytical framework first, which should serve as a starting point for further research on this topic. Bearing in mind that we are speaking of a complex issue impacted by a series of different factors, the analytical framework offers a structural approach to gathering and interpreting data, guiding researchers towards the correct choice of indicators and scientific methods, which should ensure that the research has a transparent and predictable course. On the other hand, this enables an easier operational definition of the research subject, which in this concrete research is the social determinants of the military profession and, in a broader sense, the internal characteristics of the military organization.

The term “analytical framework” should be understood as a basic model or concept guiding researchers towards the correct approach to the organization and conduct of research. In other words, the analytical framework serves to “identify, categorize and organize those factors that are seen as most relevant for understanding a phenomenon” (McGinnis 2011, 167). Therefore, it can be said that the key reason why we should think of the analytical framework at all is that it helps with defining the problem, identifying key factors related to the research subject, and contributes to the creation of a more complete insight into the subject itself and the research process. Moreover, the analytical framework defines and eases data management related to the research subject. Managing data in this sense would imply the entire process, based on relevant scientific methods, starting from data collection, classification,

processing, and finally, presentation. This process aims to ultimately obtain the most complete picture of the research subject – in this case, the military profession, its place, and role in contemporary society.

Speaking of research in social sciences, to which this research also belongs, if we define a firmer structure with specific relations between some variables or indicators, we could speak of an analytical model instead of an analytical framework. For researching political phenomena, methodologists Milosavljević and Radosavljević suggest one “typical mental model of research subject”, which consists of six key factors that could also, in some variety, be a valuable model for reaching scientific cognition regarding this issue (Milosavljević and Radosavljević 2006, 74–88). By applying knowledge from the field of operational research, it is also possible to quantify certain social phenomena, thus making concluding somewhat easier. For now, this is only a qualitative analysis, where specific segments appear that can be expressed with quantitative indicators, but whose purpose is only to additionally strengthen the components of the qualitative description of categories defined with this analytical framework.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE MODERN INTO POSTMODERN ARMY AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE CHANGE FROM MODERN TO POSTMODERN SOCIETY

Even though the postmodernism era in the philosophical and artistic sense starts way earlier, the second half of the 20th century, especially the period after the end of the Cold War, in a sociological sense, can be seen as the postmodern period, bearing in mind that social characteristics of this period are globalization, digitalization, individualization (fragmentation of identity) and skepticism towards “grand stories” (ideology, nationalism, etc.), which represent the negation or a difference from the modern period. The changes occurring in the post-Cold War period were reflected in all spheres of society in almost all countries. Due to numerous transformations that took place in the military sphere during that period, the term “postmodern”, hand-in-hand with the following nouns: military, army, war, etc., becomes quite appropriate and generally accepted, especially in Western terminology (Moskos et al. 2000; Bondy 2004; Kiszely 2009).

The globalization process became the main feature of this time, and liberal economy and technological advances, especially in information-communication systems, have led to different changes, not only in the internal structure of society but also in the global scene. Another significant characteristic of the postmodern society regarding this topic is the fact that it is the era during which the weakening of centralized forms of social organizations occurred. This carried along some consequences, reflecting the national security domain. Armed non-state actors often replaced regular armed forces of states or entered into conflict with them as one of the warring parties (Kaldor 2005; Kreveld 2010). Strong national states and markets retracted before the global and free market, dominated by multinational corporations, often with larger budgets than the states. Due to the ideal of an unhindered flow of goods, people, and capital, national borders do not hold the significance they once did, and their control, instead of the army, is usually taken up by specialized police units.

Quite helpful and interesting frameworks for viewing the overall social changes that occurred with the general reorganization of the industrial into a postindustrial or information society were provided by the Italian political scientist Giovanni Sartori, who contributed to researching democracy, as well as the Spanish sociologist Manuel Castells, through this theory of the network society. Sartori believed that the transformation of modern society into a postmodern one is reflected in the creation of “a society which holds rights”, that is, a society which seeks its rights and, at the same time, does not care that much for the duty and obligations. Such societies, in which the link between the law and duty does not exist anymore, create a special type of people, resembling “spoiled brats”, and thus, we cannot expect such people to be ready to give a sacrifice (Sartori 2001). As Srđan Starčević noticed, this negatively reflects on accepting military conscription and eventual participation in the state’s war efforts (Starčević 2024). This is in direct collision with the characteristics of modern society, based on a collectivist spirit and ideological and national values.

Similarly, Castells stresses that social structure based on networks, a characteristic of modern times, represents a highly dynamic and open system adjusted to social organization to “overcome space and waste time” (Kastels 2018, 644). Such changes resulted in a changed society that is not ready to make the sacrifice and drastically disturb its comfort. For such societies, only an “instant war” is acceptable, not including

regular citizens, but only professional soldiers, which is brief (and even instant) and which is “clean” in the sense that it is being carried on with highly-precise weapons, without grand destruction and civilian casualties (Kastels 2018, 627).

From a geopolitical perspective, in the beginning, the collapse of the bipolar international order led to a unipolar one, in which the only remaining superpower held global domination in the political, economic, and security spheres, the United States of America. The domination of the political West, led by the US, created a new reality in the international security arena, whose main feature was American interventionism (Ganzer 2018, 2021). Russia’s powerlessness and China’s restraint, as well as the developing countries following the political West, have led to the will and interest of Washington’s political and economic establishment, by force or will, being implemented in almost all meridians of the world.

Besides that, in the post-Cold War period, a change occurred in the perception of threats, which reflects the relations between the national armed forces and society. “After the Cold War, the security discourse became much wider, comprehensive, and elastic than before” (Ejduš 2024, 130). With the symbolic fall of the Berlin Wall, the fear that a major interstate conflict or a conflict of global proportions, such as World Wars One and Two, disappeared. This feeling especially reigned among the most developed countries of Europe and the EU Member States.¹ The fear of invasion by an enemy state, military bloc, or nuclear war replaced the fear of terrorist attacks, interstate tensions, and eventually conflicts, but relatively far from the countries of Europe (Tučić 2020, 48–49). This has led to a change in the vocabulary and terms previously used in military doctrines and the introduction of new terms which diminish the significance of an armed fight in war operations, such as “operations different from war”, “peace operations”, “maintaining stability and support operations”, etc. (Vuković 2024, 397). Because of that, in American military circles emerged a debate regarding which level of “operations that are not war” diminishes the “soldierly” abilities of national armed forces (Moskos 1998, 4–8).

The transition from modern to postmodern society did not necessarily condition the change from a modern to a postmodern army.

¹ Therefore, for example, in the European Security Strategy – “Secure Europe in a Better World” from 2003, the first sentence states as follows: “Europe was never so advanced, so secure, or so free. Violence from the first half of the 20th century gave way to a period of peace and stability, unprecedented in European history” (Janković 2006, 3).

Military and wars in the contemporary era were inextricably linked to the idea of the nation-state. The modern period is based on the state-centric approach to security, in which the only reference object of security is the state, which will transform in the period of postmodernism (Štrbac et al. 2013). This is the period from Napoleon's wars and then on, implying the existence of big national armies and the dominant role of rulers and holders of state power who make decisions on war and peace (see Klauzevic 1939; Žomini 1938). The format of the army from the times of modern was a combination of conscript and professional staff, in which the soldiers and a part of the lower ranks were conscripted into the general military service, referring to the male population of military age, while a segment of the non-commissioned officer and predominantly officer staff were from the professional staff. This army is "oriented towards war by its mission, of male composition and ethos, differentiated by structure and culture of the civil society" (Moskos et al. 1999, 1). It was precisely this separation of the military from civil society, of which even Carl von Clausewitz spoke, that represented one of the most significant features of the members of the military profession, thus making them a special segment of society.

Contrary to that, the postmodern army is going through a process of weakening the firm links with the nation-state, and thus, its fundamental form shifts towards "volunteer forces". Abandoning the concept of general conscription happened as a consequence of the rejection of war as an option and citizens resistance to the call of the state to a final sacrifice, which became clear after the inglorious outcomes the great powers bore in the wars waged in Algeria, Vietnam, Afghanistan (Kastels 2018, 625–627). The peak of the professionalization process and abandoning the principle of involuntary military service happened at the end of the nineties of the last century and at the beginning of the 2000s. Contrary to some earlier periods, when state security directly depended on the ability to fast and massively mobilize military servicemen and deploy large military formations, the postmodern army relies on smaller, well-trained and highly mobile units, equipped with contemporary and expensive war techniques, made up of professional staff. "The quantity is compensated by quality, not only in the personal army staff content but also the equipment of war techniques given to it" (Mirković 2007, 234). As the perception of security threats changed, the response to the state to them changed, leading to a change in structure and the size of the national armies.

What is characteristic of this new, postmodern army is the latest mission, which is multipurpose, implying that, besides the traditional role referring to the defense of the state from external threats, some new roles appear as well, in which the military force is used in almost “civilian purposes”. Therefore, it is not that unusual anymore to use the soldiers to help the civilian government in crises (which emerged as a consequence of natural disasters, technological accidents, terrorism, etc.), or to engage military personnel in different and numerous missions worldwide, whether under the UN umbrella or in some other format. The military ethos is not as belligerent as it was in modern warfare; men are not the only members of the military machine anymore, since women have joined them as well. Some see this as a breakdown of this warrior ethos, bringing the military in line with other professions accessible equally to men and women even earlier. Besides that, the military as an organization has become more open to civil society, and thus the military profession as well. The barracks fences are not the “impermeable walls” anymore, hiding the biggest “state secrets”, but various military objects have become accessible to civilians as well, and it became possible to organize the most diverse manifestations, often attracting media attention, in them (Moskos et al. 1999).

THE MOVE FROM UNIPOLARITY TO MULTIPOLARITY AND THE NEW NEED FOR TRANSFORMATION OF THE NATIONAL ARMY

The new shift of the international order, from unipolarity to multipolarity, conditions the latest changes in the national army’s role, organization, and size, and the tasks put before it. The first more serious indication of the end of unipolarity happened in 2008 with the military intervention of Russia in Georgia. The war in Ukraine, the conflict in the Middle East afterwards as well, and especially military interventions of Israel in the Gaza Strip, Yemen, and Lebanon, brought the topic of war conflicts back into the focus of interest of the world public. “It has become clear once again that, even though not the only one, the use of military force remains a significant tool in international politics” (Milenković i dr. 2025, 102). This also means that many countries, despite decades of neglect, will have to commit once again to the reaffirmation of the status of the army and military profession in society.

Moreover, other indicators, which are not directly linked with war events and those from the political and economic spheres, show that yesterday's sole superpower, the United States of America, has serious challengers. In the first line is China, which is succeeding in transforming its accelerated economic growth and increasing economic significance into political influence. At the same time, China is, in parallel, working on strengthening military capacities, thus becoming the most serious challenger to America in the Pacific region and globally (Pejić 2024). To China and Russia, which are still basing their rivalry with the states of the political West on military power and energy sources, we should add the rest of the BRICS member states and the Middle Eastern countries (Petrović 2010). Despite being an ally to the US on many issues, the European Union persistently attempts to position itself as an independent global economic and political actor. However, its deep dependence on the US military personnel does not permit it to fulfill the complete political autonomy towards which it strives (Štrbac i dr. 2015, 17–24).

With the conflicts in Ukraine and the Middle East, whose durations and scopes surpassed all initial expectations, the topic of war returned once again to the political agenda, and on a very high level. The fear of war on a larger scale, and not only conventional but nuclear, became a reality. Harsh and hyperrealistic images from the battlefield, as well as numerous analyses by various experts, impose on all countries of the world, and not only the ones that are direct or indirect actors in those conflicts, the need to question the force of their armies and the defense capacities of the state. The technological advance that occurred and which was never faster or bigger provides some new dynamics to the contemporary conflicts. The mass use of high-precision and unmanned weapons, in the first line, including drones of most different uses, brings dramatic changes to the method of waging wars, which necessarily reflects on the mere organization of the armed forces as well. The application of artificial intelligence in data collection and processing, as well as the target selection and decision-making processes, represents a novelty that will become the main feature of future wars.

Besides that, the current wars bring back once more to the scene the mass use of artillery and armor combat systems. This opens numerous questions for the states that have in the previous period, conducted transformations of national armed forces, which, as a rule, implied a reduction of the unit strength, both in terms of people and military equipment. First, are the numbers of contemporary arms, military

equipment, and munition reserves available to the armies sufficient for larger-scale wars? Second, given that most states shifted from conscription or combined personnel to a thoroughly professional army composition, whether the states have adequate trained citizens who, as a reserve force, can fill the war units if needed?

The responses to these two questions point that the new transformation of the national armed forces, in the organizational sense, will represent a “step back”, that is, the return to the old ways, which probably implies much more numerous armies than today which, besides professional members, contain conscribed persons, who can be counted in as a trained reserve. It is estimated that reinstating conscription will not be easy at all. Starčević also warns of the difficulties that will accompany the reintroduction of military conscription due to realistic expectations that the multipolar world will be a “world of military competition”, saying: “States that can convince their citizens that the threat to the country’s freedom is real will introduce this obligation, although it will be a lighter form of obligation than the one that was in force in the last century. The countries that have suspended involuntary military service and want to reinstate it without convincing their citizens of the reality of the threat will face clear resentment from their citizens” (Starčević 2024, 12). In parallel with this process, it can be expected that the military industry will have much more work in the following period.

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS AS ELEMENTS OF THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR CONSIDERING THE ARMY AND MILITARY PROFESSION IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

The previous lines presented the image of contemporary society in the security context and how its transformation from the modern into the postmodern era reflected on the army and its need for adjustment. However, understanding the global social context is still insufficient to properly understand the place and role of the army and the military profession in contemporary society. Therefore, among the main determinants of the army and the military profession recognized by the author of this paper, which we can deem to be the elements of the analytical framework, are as follows: (1) political system and legal framework, (2) national culture and social values, (3) historical experience, (4) economy and the level of technical-technological development, (5) quality of military education

and training and (6) international military cooperation. This is, by all means, a conditional division which is not final and depends on the temporal era and the region examined.

The political system and legal framework represent one of the fundamental factors in determining a society's army and military profession. The Constitution, as the highest legal act and the law, chooses the place and role of the military in the state system by clearly defining its purpose and tasks. The Constitution and laws prescribe who commands the army in times of war and peace, with what power, and conditions for performing military service is performed, and the rights and obligations of military personnel. Lower legal acts, various rules and instructions, starting with the Service Rules onwards, regulate in more detail the functioning of the army organization, the rules of using force, methods of engaging units, training, discipline, career advancement, and the like. However, considering different regulations by their hierarchy and fields is necessary, but not sufficient, to understand the proper place and role of the army and military profession in society.

A step further would be to consider the manner and extent of application of these regulations in practice, for which it is necessary to understand the political and social context reflected in the political system and political culture of the given society. The differences between states regarding political systems are recognized by "how the government, institutions, and relationships that govern and are created in political actions and processes are organized and regulated" (Pešić 2018, 24). The political system indicates the positions, significance, and relations among key political actors and institutions, as well as the power relations of the holders of political power in a state. Whether we are speaking of a country with a democratic or autocratic governing method, a republic or a monarchy, a presidential or parliamentary political system, whether the right wing or left wing oriented political parties are in power, etc., will indeed affect the position and significance of the army and members of the military profession.

Security and defense are significant functions of politics and the political system. Therefore, the state must possess adequate resources of power, knowledge, and ability to use these resources to fulfil national interests and goals (Blagojević 2018, 45–52). The function of defense must be institutionalized to be effective and efficient (Malinovski 1970, 137). In other words, the function of defense implies an organization in which the roles of the members of the community are clearly defined,

material means (equipment) are defined and secured, and in which tradition plays a significant role. The chief holders of the function of defense are the national armed forces.

Analyzing the political system shows the relationship between the army, political elites, and civil society, representing the backbone of civil-military relations (Todorć 2004, 7–15). Contemporary democratic standards imply professional actions of the army by its constitutional role and outside the influence of politicians and political parties (Hantington 2004). In this relationship, it is essential to consider whether and to which extent the army is “politicized”, bearing in mind that “a politicized army either appoints its leaders to the governing positions in the states or is being manipulated by the leaders of a certain political option” (Starčević 2011, 254). On the other hand, the interference of politics in military affairs disrupts the cohesion of the society and the army itself, one of whose main characteristics is monism.² Determining the nature of civil-military relations is especially visible through the influence of politics on expert military issues, such as army organization, doctrine, equipping, career advancement, etc.

National culture and social values are of essential importance for understanding different occurrences and processes, and for a proper understanding of the work of institutions and the behavior of prominent individuals and societies. When presenting his book *Theory of Culture*, Đuro Šušnjić said that culture is “a view of the world, not only as it was and is today, but as it could be and as it should be”, and that from culture “emerge calls for consents and uprisings” (Šušnjić 2015). According to his perception, understanding a society’s specific culture makes it impossible to comprehend its fate. Given that we cannot speak of a culture outside the community and the society, national culture is the core and the imprint of a demos/nation. According to Benedict Anderson, nationalism is a product of culture and emerges through identification with other nation members (Neš 2006, 86). Invoking the need to protect the (endangered)

² As a feature of the army, monism means that the army is one and unique. This implies that there is only one army, and not more, in the state, and it is unique because it is subordinate to a single authority and acts synchronously and in accordance with a unique idea to achieve a specific task/goal. “The society can be stable whether the supreme command is entrusted to a separate or collective body, but this stability will be called into question if there are several armed organizations subordinate to different, mutually independent commanders, or if, in addition to the constitutionally designated supreme command authority, someone else claims the supreme command. In such cases, there is a high possibility of civil wars and coups d’état breaking out” (Starčević 2022, 227).

people, their national identity, territory, etc., additionally strengthens the position and significance of the army and military profession in society.

Looking at the national culture and social values this community nurtures, the attitude of citizens towards freedom and the duty to defend it with arms, if needed, is also visible. This further influences the acceptance of community members to participate in training for military duties through different models of military service. In social communities within which there is a general military obligation for men of a certain age, being conscripted implies some form of initiation through which young men transit from “boyhood” to “manhood”, which is sometimes even accompanied by a sort of popular celebration (Kovačević 1986). This popular tradition and customs form confirms the place and significance of the army and the military profession.

In the analysis of national culture, it is useful to consider in more detail its two sub-types, political culture and strategic culture, which can be even more closely related to the topic. Political culture is closely linked with the notion of a political system and implies society's relation to political institutions and values. According to Dragan Simeunović, “political cultures are significantly shaped by social and historical circumstances, the geopolitical position of the society, the size of the state and nation, etc” (Simeunović 2022, 262). Political symbols through which, among other things, political culture manifests and which can be perceived and experienced emotionally, are closely linked with the dominant ideology in the society. Suppose political symbols emphasizing the libertarian tradition of the people are additionally supported by national myths and state ceremonies. In that case, the army and its members are more valued as guarantors of freedom and independence.

On the other hand, strategic culture, as part of national culture, is closely linked with political culture. “Created as an amalgam of history, geopolitics, possibilities, and the value system, strategic culture can be presented in the most general sense as a set of dominant attitudes and behavior patterns” (Blagojević 2019, 176). It explains the attitudes of the most significant social actors, primarily political and military elites, towards force and the use of force (Milenković 2019, 52). Through these relations, the status of the army factor in society can also be seen. Societies in which military interests, ideas, and customs prevail over all others are called militarized societies, and this practice is called militarism. Militarism can be understood as a value system in which the military

mentality, warrior virtues, and tradition are particularly emphasized and glorified, but also as “a military ideology which is the foundation of the subjective political activity of the military oligarchy” (Krstić 1993, 663). In such societies, the military as an institution and the military elites have a privileged, often even formally dominant position, compared to the civilian structures. Examples of such practice are Germany and Japan in the first half of the 20th century. On the value scale, this positions militarism as the opposite of democracy, due to which it is perceived as a negative social phenomenon (Dreze 2000).

Historical experience is an element without which it is difficult to perceive the proper role of the army and military profession in society, because we cannot understand the present without an appropriate understanding of the past. Thus, we cannot reliably predict the future. It should be acknowledged that most modern nations were created in conditions of war, conflict, and competition with other peoples and nations. This process dominantly took place in the 19th century, when the ideas of nationalism took root in the world. The historical experience in this context should be perceived through the role of the national armed forces in creating the state and through the fight for its preservation. If, throughout history, the army was the institution on which depended the destined survival of the state itself, and often even the biological and identity preservation of the people, then the position of the army in the given society would be more dominant in comparison to other actors.

Moreover, it has been observed that decisions in contemporary times are often made on the foundation of agreement with the actions from the past (Marsh and Stoker 2005, 76). This, by all means, also refers to the decision on the ab(use) of the army for fulfilling various political goals, whether it be the fight or maintaining the wished and acceptable peace, preservation or change of the internal social, economic, and political order. Based on the example of coup d'état, research shows that the possibility of its occurrence is significantly higher if it has previously occurred in the history of the given state (Simeunović 1991, 57). Such and similar “political engagements” can provide the military and its members, in one historical moment, with a special (privileged) social status, which can become a burden in the future.

Economy and the level of technical-technological development. What is completely evident is that the level of the economic power of a state influences the size and quality of the army. To examine the significance of the army and the military factor in a society, it is necessary

to monitor the level of financial allocations from the state budget for defense purposes.³ Besides the indicator reflected in absolute values, another significant indicator is the level of allocations concerning the total GDP expressed in percentages. By following this indicator for a more extended period, it is possible to notice the change of priorities of a government, which also implies the change in the position of the army and military profession in society. To make this analysis more complete, the budgetary allocations should be analyzed through the expenditure structure, based on which it would be clear what the operating, investment, and personnel costs are (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation [NATO] 2024; Stojković i dr. 2024).

Although personnel costs are not the only thing that counts, they reliably reflect the status of members of the military profession on the social ladder.⁴ In this sense, it is essential to consider the level and growth of personal income and the relationship between income and living standard during a specific period (market basket, inflation, etc.). Through the application of specific statistical methods, the relationship between the state's allocations for the personal income of the military personnel and the quality of life can be examined through the purchasing power parameter, which is a more realistic indicator than the amount of income itself. In addition, a comparative analysis of the current military budgets of relevant countries, neighboring countries, and countries with similar geopolitical positions and problems is also functional. Determining trends in these elements can also be a relatively reliable method of predicting significant occurrences and processes in the security field, which will determine the status of the army and the military profession shortly.

It is estimated that the new technical-technological advancement, primarily the information revolution, which is already reflected mainly on different means of military equipment, will impact the army organization

³ State allocations for military needs have a dual effect on economy and state development. Some empirical research stresses the conclusion that of the total military expenditure of the state, "one-third contributes to development, while two-thirds are unproductive investments, which only burden the economy and slow down its development" (Mirković 2007, 225).

⁴ To illustrate, the example of an army commander from the distant past shows the connection between the amount of received pay and the social status: "According to a salary list from the times of the rule of the Sargonid dynasty (2296–2105 BC), the highest income from the state treasury was received by the army commander, followed by the prime minister, the supreme judge, the deputy minister, the minister of the court and the palace usher" (Korać 2013, 28).

and method of unit engagement as well. The use of autonomous weapons is not a question of the future anymore. The new armament race is reflected precisely in the possession of armed autonomous systems and systems based on artificial intelligence (Šar 2020). What also represents a novelty when compared to the Cold War period are the units for conducting various types of operations in cyberspace, and for the most potent countries of the world, the cosmic warfare units. Such technical-technological advancement will reflect differently on the social position of the army and the military profession. It is natural to expect modern armies equipped with contemporary weapons and equipment to enjoy greater prestige.

Quality of military education and training should ensure that the army receives officers and soldiers capable and willing to defend and uphold the state, its citizens, and the values of the community. Only such members of the military professions can enjoy the respect of the community and colleagues from other armies, whether it be the allies or the adversaries. Investing in the education and training of military personnel is of first-class national significance. Knowledge and training for quick and proper reactions in crises create trust and a sense of security among the citizens. Constant changes in the security environment require continuous and lifelong learning and development. The fundamental characteristic is that today, more than before, the military profession asks for training and preparation for the “unpredictable”. By recognizing such trends, a group of American experts, even in the 1980s, developed proposals for improving modern military education, which they called the shift “from modern to postmodern (military) education” (Moskos 1998, 4–5).

Modern trends in globalization and the development of new technologies impose different demands on the process of military education and training. The main goal is to establish a training system that enables fast, simple, and efficient knowledge acquisition while reducing costs compared to traditional methods. To achieve this, modern armies use four chief training methods: distance learning, analysis of previous experience through the lessons-learned concepts, establishment of standard operational procedures, and learning through simulations (Vulić 2016). Quality education of an officer must integrate general academic knowledge, military skills, and strategic thinking, which will, during real combat operations, ensure success in achieving the set goals (Hornstra et al. 2024). The higher the quality of military education and training and the more in line with the standards of the most modern

armies in the world, the more respected the position of the army and the military profession in society will be.

International military cooperation is a segment that most definitely contributes to the reputation of the national army, not only among the partner armies and states but also on the internal level. The level of international military cooperation measures the trust and respect an army enjoys. Various alliances and partnerships can contribute to this. Due to the need for interoperability, membership in international military organizations, as well as bilateral defense agreements, influences the army's standards and procedures, thus making it better, more capable, and more ready to bear the contemporary challenges, risks, and threats to security. International cooperation is fulfilled through participation in peace operations and joint exercises with other armies. The army and its members, by participating in peace operations under the mandate of the United Nations or the European Union, acquire precious experience, build mutual trust with partners, and contribute to the reputation of the military and the state they represent (Vukadinović and Milenković 2024). A similar effect is achieved through participation in multinational exercises as well. Quality education, exquisite training, and high morale are prerequisites for a professional attitude towards military obligations and tasks, creating a positive image of the members of the army and the country they come from. Armies that exhibit the aforementioned virtues tend to be desirable partners and can expect a better position within their society.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Every significant social change, whether on geopolitical, economic, technical-technological, or internal political plan, reflects on the army and the military profession. No matter the different eras and changes that occurred during them, the fundamental purpose of the military always remains the same – to create or preserve “acceptable peace” (Stanar 2021). As it usually happens, in times of peace, its purpose is not always clear enough to the citizens, who allocate significant financial resources through the state budget. In times of crisis, especially in war, when the army and its members become the primary protectors of the citizens' lives, identity, property, and the fundamental values of a society, this understanding is quite different. The responsibility for a right and equally clear understanding of the purpose, but also the role and significance

of the army, not only in times of peace but in times of distress as well, lies on all social elites, both civilian and military ones, and especially holders of political power.

The post-Cold War period, perceived in this paper as the postmodern period, was marked by social changes that call for faster adjustment due to its dynamic nature. Even though the war between sovereign states was never completely ruled out as a possibility, it was believed that after the fall of the “Iron Curtain”, such a scenario was not so sure, especially not on European soil. Reality has refuted such expectations. Metaphorically speaking, Yoshihiro Francis Fukuyama’s bestseller *The End of History and the Last Man* from 1992 was replaced in 2008 by Robert Kagan’s *The Return of History and the End of Dreams* (Fukuyama 1992; Kagan 2008). Hardly predictable and constant changes in all spheres have become the reality and, in fact, the only predictable thing.

The analytical framework offered in this paper should enable a better understanding of the place and role of the army and military profession in contemporary society. As such, it can be a good starting point for future research. What is entirely sure is that the need will mark the future of the army and military profession for fast adjustment to dynamic technological, geopolitical, and other social changes. The development of artificial intelligence and autonomous combat systems has already begun to transform the way military operations are conducted. However, the need for military personnel to possess digital skills and constantly improve their technical knowledge in applying new technologies must not be allowed to diminish the importance of knowledge in social sciences. Without social sciences, it is impossible to understand the context and purpose and develop critical thinking, especially considering that contemporary and future security challenges surpass the traditional frameworks of warfare. The Military Academy of the University of Defense in Belgrade, which celebrates its 175th anniversary this year, has the mission of integrating knowledge from various scientific fields of importance for defense while following modern trends, which creates an assumption that the future officers will be able to fulfil even the most complex tasks set before them successfully.

REFERENCES

- Blagojević, Srđan. 2018. *Politički sistem*. Beograd: MC Odbrana.
- Blagojević, Veljko. 2019. „Strateška kultura i nacionalna bezbednost.” *Zbornik Matice srpske za društvene nauke* 70 (170): 163–178. DOI: 10.2298/ZMSDN1970163B.
- Bondy, Harry. 2004. “Postmodernism and the Source of Military Strength in the Anglo West.” *Armed Forces & Society* 31 (1): 31–61.
- Dreze, Jean. 2000. “Militarism, development and democracy.” *Economic and Political Weekly* 35 (14): 1171–1183.
- Ejdus, Filip. 2024. *Međunarodna bezbednost: teorije, sektori, nivoi*. Beograd: Fakultet političkih nauka i CLIO.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The end of history and the last man*. New York: Free Press.
- Ganzer, Danijele. 2018. *Protivzakoniti ratovi: Kako zemlje NATO podrivaju Ujedinjene nacije*. Beograd: Laguna.
- Ganzer, Danijele. 2021. *Imperija SAD: Beskrupolozna svetska sila*. Beograd: Laguna.
- Hantington, Semjuel P. 2004. *Vojnik i država: teorija i politika civilno-vojnih odnosa*. Beograd: CSES, FPN i Diplomatska akademija.
- Hornstra, Steven P. A., Steven J. Durning, Jaap A. Hoogenboezem, and Walther N. K. A. van Mook [Hornstra et al.]. 2024. “Closing the gap between skills training and academic education at a military academy: An integrated instructional design model.” *Ukrainian Journal of Educational Studies and Information Technology* 12 (1): 1–14. DOI: 10.32919/uesit.2024.01.01.
- Janković, Pavle. prir. 2006. *Evropska strategija bezbednosti: Bezbedna Evropa u boljem svetu*. Beograd: ISAC fond.
- Kagan, Robert. 2008. *The return of history and the end of dreams*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Kaldor, Meri. 2005. *Novi i stari ratovi – organizovano nasilje u globalizovanoj eri*. Beograd: Časopis Beogradski krug.
- Kastels, Manuel. 2018. *Uspon umreženog društva: Informaciono doba. Ekonomija, društvo, kultura*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Kiszely, John. 2009. “Postmodern challenges for modern warriors.” *Army History* 71: 19–33.
- Klauzevic, Karl fon. 1939. *O ratu*. Beograd: Geca Kon.
- Korać, Srđan. 2013. „Etička dimenzija javne uprave.” Doktorska disertacija. Univerzitet u Beograd: Fakultet političkih nauka.

- Kovačević, Ivan. 1986. „Odlazak u vojsku.” *Etnološke sveske* VII (1): 64–70.
- Kreveld, Martin Van. 2010. *Transformacija rata*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik i Fakultet bezbednosti.
- Krstić, Zoran. 1993. „Militarizam.” U *Enciklopedija političke kulture*, ur. Milan Matić, 663–668. Beograd: Savremena administracija.
- Marsh, David, i Gerry Stoker. 2005. *Teorije i metode u političkoj znanosti*. Zagreb: Fakultet političkih znanosti.
- McGinnis, Michael D. 2011. “An introduction to IAD and the language of the Ostrom Workshop: A simple guide to a complex framework.” *The Policy Studies Journal* 39 (1): 169–184.
- Milenković, Miloš, Dejan Vuletić, Anita Pešić, Dragan Bojanić, i Anđelija Đukić [Milenković i dr.]. 2025. *Fizionomija savremenih oružanih sukoba*. Beograd: Institut za strategijska istraživanja.
- Milenković, Miloš. R. 2019. „Prilog određenju političkih činilaca strateške kulture.” *Vojno delo* 71 (8): 52–72. DOI: 10.5937/vojdela1908052M.
- Malinovski, Bronislav. 1970. *Naučna teorija kulture*. Beograd: Savremena administracija.
- Milosavljević, Slavoljub, i Ivan Radosavljević. 2008. *Osnovi metodologije političkih nauka*, četvrto izdanje. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Mirković, Todor. 2007. *Naoružavanje i razvoj*. Beograd: Evropski centar za mir i razvoj (ECPD) Univerziteta za mir Ujedinjenih Nacija.
- Moskos, Charles. 1998. “The American Soldier after the Cold War: Towards a PostModern Military?” *U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*. Last accessed April 10, 2024. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA354194.pdf>.
- Moskos, Charles C., John Allen Williams, and David R. Segal. 1999. “Armed Forces after the Cold War.” In *The Postmodern Military – Armed Forces after the Cold War*, eds. by Charles C. Moskos, John Allen Williams and David R. Segal, 1–13. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moskos, Charles. C., John Allen Williams, and David R. Segal. 2000. *The postmodern military: Armed forces after the Cold War*. Oxford: University Press.
- Neš, Kejt, 2006. *Savremena politička sociologija: Globalizacija, politika i moć*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organisation [NATO]. 2024. “Defence Expenditure of NATO Countries (2014–2024).” *North Atlantic Treaty Organisation*. Poslednji pristup 10. April 2024. <https://www>.

- nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2024/6/pdf/240617-def-exp-2024-en.pdf.
- Pejić, Igor. 2024. „Strategija unutrašnjeg uravnotežavanja: razvoj kineskih oružanih snaga i promene u opažanju kineske pretnje od strane Sjedinjenih Američkih Država posle 2011. godine.” Doktorska disertacija. Univerzitet u Beogradu: Fakultet političkih nauka.
- Pešić, Zoran. 2011. *Politički sistem*. Niš: VŠSS za krimanilistiku i bezbednost.
- Petrović, Dragan. 2010. *Ka multipolarnom svetskom poretku*. Beograd: Pešić i sinovi i Centar za razvoj međunarodne saradnje.
- Sartori, Đovani. 2001. *Demokratija – šta je to?* Podgorica: CID.
- Simeunović, Dragan. 2022. *Politika kao umetnost iluzije*. Novi Sad: Prometej, Matica Srpska i Centar za kulturne integracije.
- Simeunović, Dragan. 1991. *Državni udar ili revolucija*. Beograd: Simtrade.
- Stanar, Dragan. 2021. „Mir kao svrha vojske.” *Vojno delo* 73 (3): 36–47. DOI: 10.5937/vojdello2103036S.
- Starčević, Srđan. 2011. „Samokontrola kao vid demokratske civilne kontrole vojske.” *Vojno delo* 63 (1): 242–255.
- Starčević, Srđan. 2022. *Sociologija*. Beograd: MC Odbrana.
- Starčević, Srđan. 2024. „Povratak obaveznog služenja vojnog roka u Evropi – društveni determinizam i perspektive.” *Politika nacionalne bezbednosti* 15 (26): 11–26. DOI: 10.5937/pnb26-50140.
- Stojković, Dejan, Dušan Mrdak, Boris Stojković, Brankica Potkonjak Lukić, Đorđe Petrović, i Marko Golubović, [Stojković i dr.], prir. 2024. *Bela knjiga odbrane Republike Srbije*. Beograd: MC Odbrana.
- Šar, Pol. 2020. *Vojska bez vojnika: Autonomno oružje i budućnost ratovanja*. Beograd: Laguna.
- Štrbac, Katarina, Miloš Milenković, i Milan Milutinović. 2013. “Transformation or Suppression of the State-centric Security Approach.” *Compendium from the Security Forum Cracow 2012*: 290–300.
- Štrbac, Katarina, Stanislav Stojanović, Milovan Subotić, Branislav Milosavljević, Veljko Blagojević, Miloš Milenković, i Jasminka Simić, [Štrbac i dr.]. 2015. *Strategijsko-bezbednosni trendovi u Jugoistočnoj Evropi do 2020. godine*. Beograd: MC Odbrana.
- Šušnjić, Đuro. 2015. *Teorija kulture*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike.
- Todorić, Slobodan. 2004. *Civilno-vojni odnosi*. Beograd: Vojnoizdavački zavod.

- Tučić, Boris. 2020. „Ključni institucionalni akteri evropske bezbjednosti – stanje i izazovi.” *Žurnal za bezb(j)ednost i kriminalistiku* 2 (2): 37–52. DOI: 10.5937/zurbezkrim2002037T.
- Vukadinović, Marija, i Miloš Milenković. 2024. „Vojna profesija u Srbiji kroz prizmu međunarodne vojne saradnje u savremenom geopolitičkom kontekstu.” U *Međunarodne integracije kao instrument geopolitike*, ur. Zoran Milošević i Dajana Lazarević, 105–126. Beograd: Institut za političke studije. DOI: 10.18485/ips_integr_geopol.2024.ch9.
- Vuković, Nebojša. 2024. *Sukob niskog intenziteta: Evolucija, karakter i kryptoživot jedne doktrine*. Beograd: MC Odbrana.
- Vulić, Ana. 2016. „Uticaj globalizacije na obrazovanje u vojsci.” *Vojno delo* 68 (6): 136–163. DOI: 10.5937/vojdelo1606136V.
- Žomini, Anri de. 1938. *Pregled ratne veštine*. Beograd: Geca Kon.

Милош Миленковић*

*Институт за стратегијска истраживања, Универзитет
одбране, Београд, Република Србија*

ВОЈСКА И ВОЈНА ПРОФЕСИЈА У САВРЕМЕНОМ ДРУШТВУ: ПРИЛОГ ДЕФИНИСАЊУ АНАЛИТИЧКОГ ОКВИРА**

Резиме

Друштвене промене карактеристичне за савремено, постмодерно или и постхладноратовско друштво нужно су се рефлектовале на војску, њену организацију, задатке, улогу и положај у друштву. Глобална кретања од биполарног, преко униполарног, ка мултиполарном геополитичком поретку намећу потребу за сталном трансформацијом националних оружаних снага. Поред давања прегледа једног општег контекста у коме се савремена војска и војна професија налазе, рад представља покушај дефинисања аналитичког оквира на основу кога се може сагледати место и улога војске и војне професије у савременом друштву, као предмету истраживања. Циљ рада је да се поред доприноса у херменеутичком (сазнајном) смислу, пружи допринос и у методолошком смислу, кроз развој аналитичког оквира за разматрање предмета истраживања кроз шест чинилаца: (1) политички систем и законодавни оквир, (2) национална култура и друштвене вредности, (3) историјско искуство, (4) економија и техничко-технолошки ниво развијености друштва, (5) квалитет војног образовања и обуке и (6) међународна војна сарадња. Сваки чинилац је укратко образложен уз указивање на његов значај и специфичности. Правилним одабиром и применом научних метода, овај понуђени аналитички оквир треба да обезбеди да се у неким будућим истраживањима места и улоге војске и војне професије у

* Имејл адреса: milos.milenkovic@mod.gov.rs; ORCID: 0000-0003-1155-3797.

** Рад је написан у оквиру пројекта Института за стратегијска истраживања „Војна професија у Србији у савременом безбедносном окружењу” (ИСИ/ДХ/3/24-26), који финансира Министарство одбране Р. Србије.

савременом друштву дође до што обухватнијег научног сазнања о предмету истраживања.

Кључне речи: војска, војна професија, постмодерно друштво, постмодерна армија, аналитички оквир.

· This paper was received on April 1st, 2025, and accepted for publication at the Editorial Board meeting on May 14, 2025.