TOP SECRET

4743

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

2 March 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Director of Central Intelligence

FROM : William W. Wells
Deputy Director for Operations

SUBJECT : MILITARY THOUGHT (USSR): Military Science Work in the Armed Forces at a New Stage

1. The enclosed Intelligence Information Special Report is part of a series now in preparation based on the SECRET USSR Ministry of Defense publication Collection of Articles of the Journal 'Military Thought''. This article sets forth a number of viewpoints expressed at a military science conference held in November 1965 on questions pertaining to directing military science work and its organization in the Armed Forces. Among the matters discussed was the need to centralize and strengthen coordination of military science work and scientific research, for which a single statute was proposed to regulate all scientific work. Other areas touched upon include special training of scientific personnel, the development of complex composite work on scientific themes, and the establishment of a center for publishing activity to direct all military scientific research work. Also the organization of military science organs throughout the branches of the Armed Forces was mentioned briefly. This article appeared in Issue No. 1 (77) for 1966.

2. Because the source of this report is extremely sensitive, this document should be handled on a strict need-to-know basis within recipient agencies. For ease of reference, reports from this publication have been assigned

William W. Wells

TOP SECRET

Distribution:

The Director of Central Intelligence

The Joint Chiefs of Staff

The Director, Defense Intelligence Agency

The Assistant to the Chief of Staff for Intelligence
Department of the Army

The Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence
U. S. Air Force

Director, National Security Agency

Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

Deputy to the Director of Central Intelligence
for National Intelligence Officers

Deputy Director for Intelligence

Director of Strategic Research

[redacted]

Intelligence Information Special Report

COUNTRY USSR

[redacted]

DATE OF INFO. Early 1966

DATE 2 March 1977

SUBJECT

MILITARY THOUGHT (USSR): Military Science Work in the Armed Forces at a New Stage

SOURCE Documentary

Summary:

The following report is a translation from Russian of an article which appeared in Issue No. 1 (77) for 1966 of the SECRET USSR Ministry of Defense publication Collection of Articles of the Journal "Military Thought". The authors of this article are Colonel M. Skoptsov and Colonel M. Vasilenkov. This article sets forth a number of viewpoints expressed at a military science conference held in November 1965 on questions pertaining to directing military science work and its organization in the Armed Forces. Among the matters discussed was the need to centralize and strengthen coordination of military science work and scientific research, for which a single statute was proposed to regulate all scientific work. Other areas touched upon include special training of scientific personnel, the development of complex composite work on scientific themes, and the establishment of a center for publishing activity to direct all military scientific research work. Also the organization of military science organs throughout the branches of the Armed Forces was mentioned briefly.

End of Summary

[redacted] Comment:

The authors also collaborated on "The Planning and Forms of Research of the Problems of Military Science" in Issue No. 3 (88) for 1969

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Military Science Work in the Armed Forces at a New Stage

by
Colonel M. Skoptsov
and
Colonel M. Vasilenkov

In November of last year the Minister of Defense of the USSR issued an order which summed up the results of military science work in the Armed Forces for the past three years, and laid down the basic tasks for the next three years (1966-1968). And at the end of November a scientific conference was held which was attended by: command personnel of the main staffs of the branches of the Armed Forces, of the staffs and directorates of the branch arms, of directorates of the central apparatus of the Ministry of Defense, and of military academies; operations and scientific personnel of staffs of military districts and of groups of forces, as well as representatives of certain scientific research institutions and of editorial staffs of military journals and newspapers.

These measures in the military science life of the Armed Forces were the first practical answer to putting the decisions of the September (1965) Plenum of the Central Committee of our party into the practice of military science work.

The Chief of the General Staff, Marshal of the Soviet Union M. V. Zakharov, gave a detailed report to the conference entitled "The Status and Tasks of Military Science at the Present Stage". The report summarized certain results of military science work that have been achieved in recent years in the area of working out problems of military theory and military history, and also contained individual critical comments.

The report particularly emphasized the point that under present-day conditions a scientific approach to problems of building the Armed Forces, to working out questions of military art, to the training of personnel and to raising the combat readiness of the Armed Forces as a whole, is a decisive factor in military affairs.*

---

*This lecture is published in the current issue of the Collection in somewhat abridged form [redacted].

Problems of the ideological education of Armed Forces personnel were discussed in great depth in the second report, given by the Deputy Chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, Colonel General M. Kh. Kalyashnik. Specifically, he expressed the idea that the high requirements in the morale and political qualities of soldiers must be based on a scientific approach, and on a thorough knowledge of modern weapons and methods of employing them. The second report gave an analysis of the condition of our military press, showed its role in interpreting the experience of the Great Patriotic War, and pointed out shortcomings in our military-memoirs literature and ways of eliminating them.

A total of 25 generals and officers addressed the conference, touching upon various aspects of military science work and making many extremely valuable proposals on how to further improve it.

In the concluding address, Marshal of the Soviet Union M. V. Zakharov, summing up the results of the conference and the specific tasks laid down for improving the quality of scientific research and the direction of military science work, expressed the hope that the command personnel of military science organs will, with even greater enthusiasm, carry out organizational activity in order to broaden the front of scientific research, and direct the efforts of a large number of generals of the army and the front toward further, more in-depth resolution of timely problems of modern military science.*

This article will set forth the viewpoints of the participants in the conference, as well as our own opinion on certain questions which were raised there, pertaining mainly to the area of directing military science work and its organization in the Armed Forces.

Addressing the conference, Colonel M. I. Kiryan (Military Academy i/n M. V. Frunze), General-Mayor M. G. Titov (North Caucasus Military District), General-Mayor S. N. Kozlov (editorial staff of the Journal "Military Thought"), Colonel General G. F. Odintsov (Military Engineering Academy i/n F. E. Dzerzhinskiy), Colonel G. V. Kuzmin (Military Political Academy i/n V. I. Lenin), and other comrades, documented the need to centralize and strengthen the coordination of military science work (in the area of military theory and military history) and scientific research (in the area of armament and combat equipment).

---

*A detailed account of the conference will be published in a special Information Collection of the General Staff in the near future.

Posing this problem at a military science conference is entirely proper. It stems from the nature of the fundamental revolutionary changes which are now occurring in military affairs. Military science work naturally cannot stand still. Old, set forms of scientific research and previous methods of practical leadership have become obsolete.

Now it is unthinkable to talk seriously about scientific research on theoretical military problems in isolation from research in the area of military technical problems. It is equally impossible to conduct fruitful research work in armament and combat equipment without considering the requirements of modern military theory and prospects for the development of forms and methods of combat action. The development of military affairs urgently requires a joining, a definite fusion of these two interdependent areas of military science. The existing disconnected methods of directing military science and military research work in the Armed Forces do not fully meet the new conditions.

We believe that a review of methods of directing military science and scientific research work should be begun, as was stated at the September Plenum of the CPSU and Central Committee, on a purely scientific basis, with a scientific definition of the very concept and content of this work.

We agree with the proposals of the participants in the conference to name scientific work in the Armed Forces military scientific research work. This designation most fully reflects its military content and scientific research method.

We know that military scientific research work in the Armed Forces must assume its two aspects: the first -- organizational, the second -- creative. On this basis we think it possible to give a definition of the concept of this work, for example; "military scientific research work in the Armed Forces is the organizational and creative activity of all personnel, and is directed toward the all-round development of military science."

This definition emphasizes that scientific work under modern conditions is the property of all personnel in the Armed Forces. And this is not accidental, for the level of theoretical and technical training of even the rank and file of the army and navy has risen so much that it enables them to make substantial improvements in existing and new models of armament and combat equipment and methods of their combat employment.

From this we may draw the conclusion that work on improved efficiency and new inventions must constitute part of military scientific research work in the Armed Forces.

The first step in the organizational incorporation of the suggested recommendations, we believe, may begin with the development of a single "Statute on Military Scientific Research Work in the Armed Forces."

This Statute, we believe, should define the general principles of the work, the organization and forms of direction for various levels of the Armed Forces (planning, control, and records keeping), basic methods of research and ways of introducing (realizing) scientific achievements into the practice of combat and operational training, and the guidelines for material rewards.

The directions in scientific work (scientific research work, invention, improved efficiency, and others), as well as scientific work in the branches of the Armed Forces, branch arms, training institutions, scientific research facilities, and among the troops, can be regulated by the appropriate statutes and instructions, which must be worked out on the basis of a single general statute for the Armed Forces as a whole.

The proposals of Colonel M. I. Kiryan, General-Mayor M. N. Kozhevnikov (Main Staff of the Air Forces), Colonel G. A. Mikhaylov (Moscow Air Defense District), and others, on broadening the front of scientific research and improving the quality of works being developed, merit attention. Toward these ends it was proposed to practice more widely the development of complex composite themes (works) through the combined efforts of the main staffs of the branches of the armed forces, staffs and directorates of the branch arms, military academies, and military districts (groups of forces).

Posing such a question is necessary because at present it is impossible to develop a theme in depth, and even more so to compose a scientific work, without the participation of numerous specialists. Only through the efforts of a large author's collective, with a free and creative discussion of the problems posed by practice, can the task be accomplished comprehensively.

Composite work on scientific works, and on the most important scientific problems, has been done in the Armed Forces for a long time, and has had positive results. It suffices to mention that the works "Field (Combat) Training of Troops and Staffs," "Fifty Years of the Armed Forces of the USSR," and others, are being written with the participation of the

main staffs of the branches of the armed forces, military academies, and military districts (groups of forces). The same kind of composite work on certain complex themes and scientific works is planned for 1966-1968.

As a result of the rapid development of armament and combat equipment, the organization of troops is changing and consequently many questions of military theory require scientific working out or refinement.

As was noted in the report by Marshal of the Soviet Union M. V. Zakharov, in recent years we have made definite progress in working out basic problems of military science. Theoretical works, regulations, instructions, guides and training manuals, in which timely questions are raised and ways of resolving them are indicated, have been prepared and published.

In works on strategy and operational art, the experience of major exercises has been generalized, the principles of conducting missile/nuclear war have been worked out, the principles of the strategic employment of branches of the armed forces in war have been set forth, and the problems of training and conducting operations with and without the use of nuclear weapons have been worked out.

At the same time we still have many unresolved problems. More in-depth research is required, for example, on the problems of waging nuclear war and training the armed forces for the delivery of the initial nuclear strike, questions of coalition wars, methods of preparing for and conducting meeting engagements, methods of troop control (especially during combat actions), questions of organizing and maintaining cooperation between formations and large units of various branches of the armed forces in a modern war, methods of improving field (combat) training of troops and staffs, questions of protecting troops and rear installations from weapons of mass destruction, and others.

To improve work on questions of military theory, and for more thorough study of available materials published in secret works of military academies and collections of military journals, we think it advisable to establish organic military science libraries in each staff of a military district (group of forces) and of an army. Such libraries could be set up not by increasing the size of the establishment, but by amalgamating small, isolated, secret sections of various departments and directorates. In these libraries it would be desirable to concentrate all secret military literature, which undoubtedly would have a positive effect on its study.

We are in agreement with the proposal of Colonel N. P. Suntsov (Far East Military District), Colonel M. I. Kiryan, and other comrades, on the need for special training of scientific personnel. This is entirely logical, since military academies, in our opinion, are giving students insufficient instruction in methods of scientific research, and in planning and directing military science work.

It would be advisable to put together and publish a textbook on methods of scientific research, and to organize special training of scientific personnel for the Armed Forces at the Military Academy of the General Staff or the Military Academy i/n M. V. Frunze. Military science can only benefit from this.

Certain participants in the conference -- General-Mayor D. M. Osadchiy (Main Staff of Rocket Forces), General-Mayor A. D. Listrovoy (Military Communications Academy), General-Mayor of Aviation D. I. Kopytin (Military Publishing House), and others, dealt with the subject of the state of publishing activity in the Armed Forces. We support their contention that all publishing activity in the Armed Forces must emanate from a single center. This controlling center must exercise overall direction of military scientific research work in the Armed Forces. As in scientific work, publishing activity at all levels of the armed forces must, in our opinion, be conducted on the basis of a single statute on publishing work.

We likewise share the view of those comrades who spoke of the need to revise the present policy on official periodical publications issued by staffs and directorates of the branch arms and military districts. The fact is that official publications, which began to appear as far back as the Great Patriotic War, were intended to give a broader interpretation to provisions of official regulations, and to promote the exchange of advanced experience in combat and operational training of troops and staffs. These publications were intended for command personnel of the postwar period, who had much combat experience but lacked sufficient theoretical and methodological training.

Since then conditions have changed radically. Every fourth officer has a higher military or special education. The army and navy have good regulations and manuals. But official periodical publications are written and published in the old way. It is no accident that staffs and directorates encounter serious difficulties in selecting authors and in writing material for these publications. As a result, works published in collections are often monotonous and uninteresting, and restate provisions of regulations which are already known. As experience shows, these

publications are read very little by the troops and they bring little of what is new to the development of military science.

We believe that military science, like any scientific field, can develop successfully only on the basis of creative initiative. In this regard a statement worthy of attention is the one put forth by certain comrades that scientific work done on initiative and creative inclination will always be superior to work which is done on order. We must take into consideration the fact that scientific work undertaken on one's own initiative is usually carried out without a special time frame, without release from official work, and without any kind of material incentive.

Considering all this, we should carefully study the recommendations of Colonel G. A. Mikhaylov (Moscow Air Defense District), Colonel L. G. Vinitskiy (Leningrad Military District), Colonel N. P. Suntsov (Far East Military District), General-Leytenant of Communications Troops P. I. Kinints, and Admiral N. D. Sergeyev, who have advocated revising the procedure for issuing official periodical publications, replacing them with secret periodical journal-type publications.

The great majority of those who addressed the conference touched to a certain degree on the organizational structure of military science organs, and broached the subject of T/O job categories of scientific workers. The great interest shown by the conference participants in this subject is not accidental. The success of military science in the final analysis depends on the people working in the given field. They must be concerned with this work both morally and materially. Undoubtedly, the greatest success in military scientific research work can be achieved only with a precise organizational system of military science organs from top to bottom.

Without going into the details of this problem, we believe that the overall direction, coordination, planning, and monitoring of all military scientific research work in the Armed Forces must be done within the framework of the General Staff, directly by a Deputy Chief of the General Staff for Military Scientific Research Work, having at his disposal a small working organization (department).

It would be advisable if those directorates of the General Staff which now provide direction of military science work (in the area of military theory and military history) and of scientific research (in the area of armament and combat equipment) were under the jurisdiction of a Deputy Chief of the General Staff for Military Scientific Research Work.

There is also good reason to have analogous departments of military scientific research work in the main staffs of the branches of the armed forces, in the staffs (directorates) of the branch arms, and in military academies.

We believe it necessary to also have departments (sections in interior military districts) of three to five men, for military scientific research work in the military districts (groups of forces) and in the fleets.

In order to improve the direction of scientific work directly among the troops, we think it advisable to introduce groups for supervising military scientific research work into the table of organization of army staffs, and to have a single officer in the staffs of individual corps and large units for this work.

This is the kind of model organizational plan of military science organs which, in our opinion, could provide direction of military scientific research work at the new stage of its development. Around these organs also must be concentrated all the creative activity of a wide circle of generals, officers, and all personnel of the Armed Forces, directed toward solving timely problems of military science.