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Some Questions on the Organization of
Military-Educational Institutions

by

Colonel V. Choporov

At all stages in the building of the Soviet Armed Forces, the Communist Party has attached considerable importance to improving the organization of military education and to the organization of officer personnel training.

In the Program of the CPSU, among the measures for the further strengthening of the Armed Forces and of the defensive capabilities of the country, serious attention has been given to the problem of officer personnel training.

"The Party," states the program, "will tirelessly look after the training of command and political personnel of the Army and Navy selected from among the best representatives of the Soviet people, and selflessly devoted to the cause of Communism. The Party deems it necessary that command personnel persist in mastering Marxist-Leninist theory, have the highest military-technical training, fulfill all the requirements of modern military theory and practice, and strengthen military discipline."

The reorganization of the system of training of specialists with higher and secondary education, the strengthening of ties between school and reality, and the further improvement in the quality of training for cadres of builders of Communism always were, and always will be, subjects of special concern to the Party.

1. This article discusses the military educational institutions of the Ground Troops, the Missile Troops and the FSO Troops of the Country, and military educational institutions not assigned to any particular type of Armed Forces. The term, "ground troops military educational institutions", is used in some cases for the sake of brevity.
The principal features provided for in the law, "On Strengthening of Ties between School and Reality and on the Further Development of a System of Public Education in the USSR", which was passed by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on the initiative of the Central Committee of the Party back in 1958, also affect the Ministry of Defense educational institutions engaged in training officer personnel, and have introduced radical changes in the training of specialists with higher and secondary special education.

The basic direction which should be followed in improving the quality of specialist training is to strive for a major improvement in theory and, especially, in practice, by combining theoretical and industrial training. It is recognized that, in order to achieve this, it is necessary to expand and strengthen the material-technical facilities of educational institutions, to equip laboratories with the latest machinery and equipment, and to increase the role of higher educational institutions in the field of scientific research. All this is necessary in order to improve theoretical training and to expand greatly night and correspondence school education, which is now considered one of the basic ways of training specialists.

Besides measures designed to improve the quality of theoretical and practical training of specialists, there are also plans for the further development and improvement of the system of higher and secondary special educational institutions. First of all, the number of educational institutions in new industrial areas is being increased. Also, educational institutions with similar training curricula are being consolidated, ministries and agencies are cooperating on a broad scale in the field of specialist training, and specialist training is being expanded to cover new technical fields.

Questions concerning involvement in the quality of officer personnel training, in the perfection of training methods, and in the improvement of the training process, have already been dealt with in the press. In particular, they have been presented in a rather detailed form in an article entitled, "Some Questions of Higher Military Education", written by General-Balin, Colonel Kornilov and Engineer-Colonel Shevyakov, and published in Collection of Articles of the Journal "Military Thought."1

1. Collection of Articles of the Journal "Military Thought", No. 4(48), 1959
In this article we shall only touch upon some of the problems dealing with improving the system and the organizational structure of military educational institutions, which, in our opinion, might be taken into consideration when carrying out future organizational measures concerning military educational institutions of the Ministry of Defense.

* * *

The system and the capacity of military educational institutions are directly proportionate to the needs of the armed forces for officer personnel, and are not permanently set at given levels. In the event of a reduction in the strength of the armed forces, whether as a whole or in some type (arm) of troops, naturally there will be a reduction in the needs for officer personnel and, consequently, a reduction in the system and capacity of corresponding military educational institutions.

Thus, for example, as a result of the reduction in strength of ground troops, in accordance with the decision of the Fourth Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, certain measures were also carried out for the reduction in the number of military educational institutions of these forces: the number of students in some of the military academies and schools was reduced; several schools were disbanded; and military institutes, in view of the decrease in size of their student bodies, were converted to military faculties in appropriate civilian higher educational institutions. At the same time, however, there was a substantial increase in the training of officers for the missile troops and, also, in training with new technical equipment used by other arms and types of troops, inasmuch as there has been considerable development along these lines in recent years. The number of military educational institutions of missile troops has been increased by transferring to them some higher educational institutions from other types of Armed Forces.

1. By capacity (yemkost) is meant the total number of temporary personnel (students). By system (sistem) is meant the number of military educational institutions.
Thus, the system and capacity of the educational institutions of the Ministry of Defense keep changing and improving, reflecting the evolution that is taking place in the organizational structure of the Armed Forces themselves, and in their technical equipment. Usually, sweeping organizational changes in the armed forces are followed by a revision of officer personnel requirements in the types and arms of troops and in the training and specialty curricula. There are also corresponding changes in the educational institutions which train officer personnel.

What, then, is the path to be followed for improving the system and organizational structure of our military educational institutions?

"The main attention at all levels of planning and management of the economy," states the CPSU Program, "must be focused on making the most efficient and effective use of material, labor, and financial resources. . . ."

It is our view that, in the planning and execution of organizational changes in the military educational institutions, we should strive to make them into large educational centers. Unquestionably, just as in the case of any industrial enterprise, a large educational institution has many advantages over a small one. First of all, it is more economical in comparison with a small one. In the training of personnel, it is likewise necessary to strive to carry out a given task with the minimum expenditure of manpower and materiel.

It is no secret that the training of officer personnel is expensive. Therefore, it behooves each person connected with this activity always to strive to reduce the maintenance costs of military educational institutions. In a large military educational institution, the ratio of administrative-management and support personnel to one student is lower. This can be clearly seen from the following examples.

Let us compare two existing secondary military schools with the same training curriculum but with a different numerical strength of temporary personnel. The T/Os of these schools were worked out at the same time.
The above figures show that, with a twofold increase of students in the second school over that of the first, there is only a 40 percent increase in the number of permanent personnel. If a large school has a ratio of slightly more than 0.5 of a permanent staff member to each student, a small school has an appreciably higher ratio of more than 0.75 of a permanent staff member to each student. This means that if, instead of two schools with 900 students each, there is one school with 1800 students, the numerical strength of permanent personnel is reduced by more than 400 persons.

Let us now compare three existing communications schools with 1000, 550, and 500 students respectively. The permanent staff at the school with 1000 students comprises 387 military personnel and 248 workers and civilian employees. The ratio of permanent personnel to temporary personnel at this school is 0.64 to 1. The other two schools have approximately the same number of students as the first one, but they have a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical strength of temporary personnel (students)</th>
<th>Numerical strength of permanent personnel (military, worker, and civilian employees)</th>
<th>Ratio of permanent personnel to one student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First School</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second School</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in the second school in comparison with the first school, in percentages</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
total of 214 more permanent personnel (493 military personnel and 356 workers and civilian employees). In this case, the ratio of permanent to temporary personnel is 0.85 to 1, i.e. almost one-third higher.

If there were one school with 1000 students, instead of two small ones with approximately 500 students each, it would be possible to reduce the number of permanent personnel by more than 200 persons.

Of course, because of differences in training curricula, technical complexities of existing armaments, housing conditions, and many other reasons, it is impossible to achieve complete equalization in the numbers of permanent personnel, even in higher educational institutions with the same number of students. Moreover, the organization of an educational institution, especially a higher educational institution, is influenced by such factors as established traditions, established methods of teaching, the experience of scientific-pedagogical personnel, etc. In spite of this, however, the concept that a large enterprise is more economical than a small one is also being fully applied to educational institutions.

In order to corroborate our thinking, let us examine the organization of three military academies which train command-engineer personnel for different arms of troops.

Since the exact names of the academies have no significance, we shall simply call them first, second, and third.

Here are the actual data on the numerical strength of these academies.
Numerical strength of temporary personnel, in percentage ratio*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Academy</th>
<th>Second Academy</th>
<th>Third Academy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total permanent personnel (military, workers and civilian employees)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers and civilian employees</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes only the main faculties which have the greatest influence on the organization and numerical strength of permanent personnel.

The above data show that the lower the numerical strength of students in a higher military educational institution, the higher the ratio of permanent personnel to temporary personnel. Whereas the first academy, which is the largest, has a ratio of slightly more than one member of permanent personnel to one student, the second academy, which has a student body less than half of that of the first academy, has a ratio of 2.3 to 1; and the third academy, which is even smaller than the second one, has a ratio of more than 2:1 members of permanent personnel to one student.

Judging by the cost of maintaining permanent personnel, the cost of military engineer training in the second and third academies is much higher than the cost of similar training in the first one. Moreover, the second and third academies do not differ from the first either in the complexity of arms or technical equipment, or in any special training processes. This increase in permanent personnel and in the cost of training is explained by the fact that they are educational institutions with small student bodies.
It is our view that the cost of training of specialists in these academies could be lowered by consolidating them. We are also certain that the quality of training of specialists will not suffer thereby but, on the contrary, will improve, and the saving, of course, will be considerable.

One of the arguments usually raised in opposition to proposals for the enlargement of military educational institutions is the lack of sufficient support and housing funds. This fact cannot be overlooked. It is true that housing facilities have a great deal to do with limiting the capacity of an educational institution. However, under our existing conditions this is still not the main reason. In this connection, we shall cite several examples.

Prior to 1959, one of the military posts in Saratov had two small schools, a tank school and a tank-technical school. Each one of them had its own organs of command and support and supply subunits. Naturally, this perplexed many people. Numerous proposals were advanced for their unification. But the armored troop command categorically opposed this, basing its refusal on the difference in the subordinations of the two academies. And apparently they would still be there, if a decision had not been made to create in their place a single artillery school. It should be mentioned that, at that time, this was not a unique case in the higher educational schools of the armored troops, for there were other cities with two tank schools.

For a long time, for example, there were two communications schools located in the city of Gorky. It seemed that they should be combined into one in order to reduce the cost of training communications officers. However, this was not done; instead, one of the schools was moved to another city.

We have only cited those cases in which two schools of the same arm were located in the same city. But if one cares to examine this problem on a broader scale, one will find even more possibilities for the consolidation of military educational institutions. Thus, for example, there are scores of cities which have two or more ground troops educational institutions. In our opinion, in the future, when planning measures for the development and improvement of the system of military educational institutions, the idea of consolidation of schools should be pursued more vigorously.
The most serious arguments against the consolidation of military educational institutions could be those based on military-strategic and mobilization considerations. When developing the organization and the entire system of military educational institutions, it is necessary, of course, to keep in mind their deployment in wartime, because the expansion of the armed forces in wartime and the increasing, irrevocable losses among officer personnel will require significant expansion in the system and capacity of military educational institutions. However, it would be inadvisable to maintain as many schools during peacetime as are needed during a war. After all, the capacity of military educational institutions in peacetime is determined on the basis of current requirements for officer personnel (replacement of natural losses; organizational measures, if carried out), and the number of military educational institutions must be as low as possible in order to minimize unnecessary expenditures for their maintenance. In the event of war, the deployment of educational institutions must be carefully planned in advance in complete accordance with the deployment of troops, and on the basis of expected losses among officer personnel under wartime conditions. We are convinced, therefore, that the existence of a large number of small military educational institutions cannot be justified at the present time even by these arguments.

In our opinion, the first military educational institutions which should be consolidated are those which have the same and related curricula and specialties.

At the present time, many of the higher military educational institutions of the Ministry of Defense are training officer personnel in the same or related specialties. For example, at the present time, officers with a higher education are being trained for the antiair defense troops in five higher military educational institutions, four of which are part of the FVO Troops of the Country and one of which is in the Ground Troops. Furthermore, two of these schools are located in the same city.

All these educational institutions are comparatively small organizations as far as their numerical strength is concerned, and the training of specialists in these schools, naturally, is a duplication of effort. In addition to the special command academy of the FVO, which
has the mission of training antiair defense command personnel for all types of armed forces. Kiev also has, for example, a higher artillery engineering school for the training of personnel for the Ground Troops PVO, and this same school also has a command training department. Also in Kiev, the Higher Engineering Radio-Technical School of the PVO Troops of the Country is training engineers in the same specialties as the Radio-Technical Academy 1/n Marshal of the Soviet Union L. A. Govcrov.

At the present time, military engineers with radio-technical specialties are being graduated from many higher military educational institutions. But is there any sense in training engineers in radio-technical specialties, for example, in the Military Academy of Communications when there is a well developed system of special radio-technical educational institutions and at the same time, when communications officers are being trained in higher military educational institutions of other arms of the armed forces? All these questions must be studied in detail, and resolved.

However, we are not talking solely about higher educational institutions. Undoubtedly, there are also possibilities for the consolidation of secondary military schools, especially those of the Ground Troops and of the PVO Troops of the Country, where the numerical strength of temporary personnel is much lower in comparison with schools of other arms of the armed forces.

We have analyzed and compared the T/Os of secondary schools of two arms of troops with similar training curricula. The total number of temporary personnel in each of these groups of schools was approximately the same during the past academic year. However, in view of the fact that one of these arms of troops has more schools than the other, the numerical strength of permanent personnel in its schools was 28 percent higher than in the schools of the other arm. Hidden here are internal reserves for a saving in manpower and resources.

In this connection, it is interesting to take a look at the process of development of higher and secondary special educational institutions in the country. In the academic year 1940-41 we had 817 higher educational institutions with a total of 812 thousand students. In the academic year 1959-60, the number of higher educational institutions decreased to 753, while the number of students in these schools increased to 2260 thousand.
The average number of students in a higher educational institution thus went up from 994 in the 1940-41 academic year to 3000 in 1959-60, i.e., it increased more than three times.

The number of secondary special schools also decreased during that same period (from 3773 in 1940-41 to 3329 in 1959-60), while the number of students increased almost twofold: from 975 thousand to 1907 thousand.

The second direction in which the improvement of the system of educational institutions, especially higher military educational institutions, should proceed is, in our opinion, to increase the role of the faculties in higher military educational institutions ( vvuz ).

According to a generally accepted understanding, a faculty is the academic-organizational part of a higher educational institution, combining the chairs that conduct the training of students and graduate students in several related specialties. A faculty is headed by a dean, chosen from among the body of professors of the leading disciplines, who directs the entire academic and scientific work of the faculty, its chairs, and its academic-auxiliary and academic-industrial establishments. A faculty is that part of a higher educational institution where the training of highly qualified specialists in established curricula is carried out, and, also, where the entire academic-methodological and scientific-research work conducted by the chairs is concentrated.

A number of military academies and higher engineering schools have truly full-fledged faculties. As an example we could cite the Military Air Engineering Academy in A. F. Mozhayskiy. The faculties of this academy are large in terms of numbers of students, and each faculty is training engineers in several specialties. Each faculty has 5 to 12 chairs, training laboratories, and polygons. For the purpose of conducting scientific research, the faculties have scientific-research laboratories which correspond to the curricula in the training of specialists. The faculties are headed by generals and officers who have academic degrees and ranks and who have extensive experience in the scientific and pedagogical field. Such faculties are the authentic organizers and leaders of all academic-methodological and scientific-research work.

But, unfortunately, this situation exists in far too few of the higher military educational institutions. In approximately half of the academies of the ground troops and in many higher engineering schools,
the faculties do not even have chairs. Naturally, such faculties cannot provide no direction of academic work, and even less of scientific work. Thus, they are simply line subunits whose principal task is the maintenance of military discipline and order among the students. In addition, such faculties, as a rule, are small in terms of numbers. Thus, for example, in almost half of the military academies the numerical strength of faculties does not exceed 200-250 students, and personnel training in such faculties in almost all cases is offered only in one specialty. Can such faculties really be considered full-fledged?

Evidently, this served as the reason for Comrades Sinitse, Konoplyanik, and Shevyakov to come forth with the proposal to abolish faculties in many higher military educational institutions in the interests of reducing the administrative apparatus. We cannot agree with this proposal. The abolition of faculty leadership would have insignificant economic results, but it would cause serious damage to the educational work with students and, at the same time, to the quality of officer personnel training. The desire to bring the academy leadership and students closer together is undoubtedly a proper one. We also are in favor of this. But it is difficult for one to see how the head of an academy could directly supervise each curriculum (specialty), each course, each chair, etc. It seems to us that a different line should be followed. If a serious approach is to be made to the question of economy in manpower and resources and to a reduction in the cost of officer personnel training, it is necessary to speak, not of abolishing faculties in a number of higher educational institutions but, on the contrary, of strengthening and consolidating faculties and, proceeding from this, perhaps of abolishing a number of independent higher military educational institutions and reorganizing them into the faculties of other higher educational institutions. When a faculty becomes a true organizer of the entire academic and scientific work of its curriculum, then it will be possible to create multi-curricular, reliable, and economical higher military educational institutions.

We do not wish, in this article, to make more specific proposals. Nevertheless, it can be said that the saving which would result from reorganizing one of the smallest academies into a faculty would be considerably greater than that which would result from cutting back the directorates of faculties even in all the higher military educational institutions of the ground troops.
In the Program of the CPSU, along with the tasks for further improvement in the training of scientific and engineer personnel, particular emphasis was given to the need "to develop scientific-research work in higher educational institutions". The carrying out of scientific-research work is now viewed as one of the most important missions of schools of higher education.

Such broad development of scientific research is dictated, first of all, by the fact that without scientific-research work there can be no training of specialists of scientific pedagogical personnel on the level required by present-day science and technology. Secondly, with their large body of highly qualified scientific workers in the persons of professors and teachers, and with their thousands and tens of thousands of students who are participating more and more in scientific-research work, the higher military educational institutions are capable of making a large contribution to the development of science.

Recently, important measures have been carried out for the purpose of improving the scientific-research work in the higher military educational institutions. One of the most important measures was a radical improvement in the organization of the work of professorial-pedagogical personnel. The Resolution of the Council of Ministers USSR No. 456, dated 12 April 1956, introduced a principle for determining the overall numerical strength of professorial-pedagogical personnel in higher educational institutions on the basis of the ratio of students to one teacher, instead of on the scheduled annual academic load, as has been done in the past. This permits a more effective distribution and utilization of scientific-pedagogical personnel; and it creates favorable conditions for the best possible improvement in the training process and, on this basis, a maximum saving of time for scientific-pedagogical workers to conduct scientific work. Unfortunately, this has not yet been introduced in all of the higher military educational institutions.

Important measures have also been carried out to expand the material and technical facilities of higher military educational institutions for scientific research and to provide them with new
models of combat equipment, instruments, and other equipment. Training-experimental plants have been set up in a number of military academies, while training-industrial shops have been expanded in the rest of the higher military educational institutions. Besides this, special scientific-research laboratories have been organized in almost all military academies and higher engineering schools.

It must be said, however, that so far only one method has been used to develop scientific research in higher educational institutions -- the creation of separate, uncoordinated scientific-research laboratories (ML) for each subject, which often lack their own material-technical facilities and use the equipment of the training laboratories of various chairs. Actually, this only results in an increase in support personnel and in a partial increase in the number of scientific workers being assigned to scientific-research laboratories. Yet, the law concerning the reorganization of higher schools provides not only for the creation of laboratories, but also for the organization of scientific-research institutes at higher educational institutions, as well as for the unification of some scientific-research installations with higher educational institutions.

In view of this presentation of the question, it seems to us that it is not only a matter of creating a good, firm foundation but also of combining the efforts of scientific workers of higher educational institutions and scientific-research installations, thus ensuring the solution of important complex tasks. In this way, maximum results will be achieved in scientific work with a minimum expenditure of effort and resources. Our country has already had some positive experience in unifying higher educational institutions with scientific-research installations.

Practical proposals for the unification of some scientific-research institutes with military academies have also been advanced by the Ministry of Defense, but so far they have not been reflected in any of the organizational measures being carried out in regard to higher military educational institutions or scientific-research installations.

There is no basis for the fear that such a unification would be detrimental either to scientific-research work or to the training of
personnel. On the contrary, in our opinion, the unification of scientific-research institutes with similar training curricula with higher military educational institutions should have a favorable influence upon the work of both. The large body of highly qualified scientific personnel in higher military educational institutions will be given the opportunity of conducting scientific work jointly with scientific workers of scientific-research institutes, using modern laboratory equipment of the institute. In this way, scientists of the higher military educational institutions will be placed in closer contact with important research activities.

The unification of efforts of the two scientific bodies will increase their capabilities and will permit the solution of important complex problems of major significance.

In turn, the workers of scientific-research institutes may be used to deliver lectures or carry out other work with students. Undoubtedly, this will improve the training-educational work and will free some of the basic professorial staff from teaching duties and enable them to carry out scientific work.

Thus, the unification of higher educational institutions with scientific-research installations will create favorable conditions for improvement in the training process and for further development of theoretical research and of all scientific-research work.

At the same time, unification will automatically resolve the problem of coordination of scientific-research work of the higher military educational institution and of the scientific-research institute. This will eliminate the parallelism which, unfortunately, still exists.

It seems to us that it would be advisable to effect such a unification between one or two scientific-research institutes and military academies. The experience gained therefrom could be studied, after which the practice could be used further.

* * *

The CPSU has presented enormous tasks in the field of public
education and, particularly, of higher and secondary special education. "With the progress of science and technology," states the Program of the CPSU, "there will be a further development in higher and secondary special education, which have been called upon to train highly qualified specialists possessing broad theoretical and political outlooks." This fully applies also to our military educational institutions.

At the present time, there is no single organ in the Ministry of Defense responsible for the development and improvement of the system of military educational institutions. Their direction is totally in the hands of commanders-in-chief of the types of armed forces.

The functions assigned to the Assistant to the Minister of Defense for Higher Military Educational Institutions are quite limited -- coordination of academic-methodological activities of the higher military educational institutions of the Ministry of Defense; and control over the training of scientific-pedagogical personnel of these institutions.

In order to put into practice the tasks which the Party put forth on further developing and improving higher and secondary special education, on raising the quality of specialist training, and on improving the overall activities of educational institutions, it is necessary for the Ministry of Defense to improve the leadership of the activity of the military educational institutions.

Without replacing the direct supervision which the commanders-in-chief of the types of armed forces have over the higher military educational institutions subordinate to them, and without relieving them of the responsibility for the training of officer personnel, it would be advisable to expand the functional duties of the Assistant to the Minister of Defense for Higher Military Educational Institutions. He should be assigned the task of directing the development and improvement of the system of higher and secondary military educational institutions of the Ministry of Defense in accordance with the long-term plans for the training of officer personnel.

Use should be made of the long experience acquired in the management of civilian educational institutions. Despite the fact that a number of higher and secondary special educational institutions are subordinate to various departments of the government, the overall direction of these
institutions in our country is in the hands of the Ministry of Higher
and Secondary Special Education of the Soviet Union. The validity
of this system has been proven in practice.

The proposed change in the functional duties of the Assistant to
the Minister of Defense for Higher Military Educational Institutions
will undoubtedly require organizational strengthening of his staff,
but, in our opinion, such a measure will prove itself.