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Abstract

The issues of theory and practice of qualitative foreign language training of the Armed Forces’ officers refer to the active military policy of Russia. The purpose of the study is to identify the trends in the development of special language education for strategic intelligence through the development of specialization and professionalization of foreign language communication, on the one hand, and the actualization of attention to the operational and instrumental equipment of foreign language communications, on the other. Methods. Authors compare the Soviet Army experience accumulated between the First and Second World Wars with the current theories of linguistics, general and professional pedagogy. The analysis of existing approaches permits to identify correct, justified and erroneous solutions. Research

Аннотация

Вопрос управления языковой подготовкой офицеров Вооруженных Сил связан с активной военной политикой России. Цель исследования – выявить тенденции развития специального языкового образования в интересах стратегической разведки посредством развития специализации и профессионализации иноязычной коммуникации, с одной стороны, и актуализации внимания к операционному и инструментальному оснащению иноязычных коммуникаций, с другой. Методология. Авторы сопоставляют опыт Советской Армии, накопленный между Первой и Второй Мировыми войнами с актуальной теорией и практикой иноязычных коммуникаций. Анализ подходов к языковой подготовке офицеров позволяет выявить
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material include historical documents (acts, laws and regulations, orders, instructions, and reviews), the works of historians, articles, memoirs and recollections. Results. Two different models of language training within professional military education of the Land Forces' officers in the post-war years remain in present day methodic. Conclusions and application. Under similar historical and organizational conditions, the military leadership of the countries engaged in active military construction can use the described positive experience and avoid the mistakes in solving problems of foreign language communication of officers.

**Keywords:** Internal motivation, senior military commanders, foreign language communication, professional military education, military specialists, military and technical cooperation.

### Resumen

La cuestión de la gestión de la formación lingüística de los oficiales de las Fuerzas Armadas se ve actualizada en relación con la política militar activa de Rusia. El propósito del estudio es identificar tendencias en el desarrollo de la educación especial en idiomas en interés de la inteligencia estratégica a través del desarrollo de la especialización y profesionalización de la comunicación en idiomas extranjeros; y la actualización de la atención al equipo operativo e instrumental, de comunicaciones en lenguas extranjeras. Los métodos. Al mismo tiempo, la tarea de educación de calidad de los ciudadanos para los idiomas extranjeros en la escuela aún no está resuelta. En estas condiciones, es aconsejable referirse a la experiencia del Ejército Soviético acumulada entre la Primera y la Segunda Guerras Mundiales y compararla con la teoría y práctica actual de las comunicaciones extranjeras. El análisis de los enfoques de la capacitación lingüística de los oficiales permite identificar soluciones correctas, justificadas y erróneas. El material de investigación incluye documentos históricos (actos, leyes y reglamentos, órdenes, instrucciones y reseñas), trabajos de historiadores, artículos, memorias y recuerdos. Los resultados. Dos modelos diferentes de capacitación en idiomas dentro de la educación militar profesional de los oficiales de las Fuerzas Terrestres en los años de la posguerra siguen siendo metódicos en la actualidad. Conclusions. Al estar en condiciones históricas y organizativas-pedagógicas similares, los líderes militares de los países que participan en la construcción militar activa pueden usar la experiencia positiva descrita y evitar cometer errores al resolver los problemas de comunicación en lenguas extranjeras de los oficiales.

**Palabras clave:** Gestión educativa, mandos, comunicación en lengua extranjera, capacitación militar, regulación estatal.

### Introduction

The period between the First and Second World Wars not only resembles modern realities, in terms of military construction, the military and political situation, and changes in the technologies of military and professional activity – they are quite comparable. Major changes concern all aspects of military affairs, including the training of officers. Among the requirements for an officer, which are actively being reviewed, is the ability to perform foreign language communications, both directly and indirectly, using various communication tools. This
requirement has to be met in the conditions of weak school preparation, limited time and the need to combine the training of an officer with other tasks of military service. Changing the model of an officer's language training is not yet a solved scientific problem, which determines many directions of scientific research. The contradictions that form this problem are multileveled, but they "act" as a single set.

At the highest level, the new military policy of the Russian Federation and the traditional approaches to an officer's language training contradict each other. Models of language training are oriented toward the defense Doctrine of the Cold War era and a large-scale positional confrontation. It is assumed that an officer's foreign language communications in such a war are quite limited; even without a school language base, he or she can master a set of patterns, a minimum vocabulary and several grammatical constructions. However, the geopolitical situation in the world is changing and the approaches to the use of the army and the navy are changing with it. The authors fully agree with McMaster (2017), stating that the events of recent decades have fundamentally devalued any defense doctrines. The new Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation suggests that the Armed Forces will actively protect state interests, including abroad, and, therefore, the conditions and nature of an officer's professional activities will change. The change of military doctrines is the most important feature of the examined historical period; it is especially important for the authors to find out how it influenced the model of an officer's language training. Actually, the problem of an officer's foreign language communication was manifested in the First World War and finally took shape during the Second World War, when new doctrines, military actions, and their provision required close cooperation not only with the armies, economic and political structures of the allied countries but also with the local population.

The second contradiction arises between the language training of an officer and the changing conditions of the military and professional activity; it is caused by a variety of factors: from technical to personal ones. The war, according to the study of Burmaoglu & Saritas (2017), is developing in parallel with the changes in society, technology, environment, politics, etc. The army adapts to these changes through revolutions in military affairs. The reference to the period between the two World Wars is the study of the previous revolution in military affairs and its influence on the forms, methods, and means of military communications. Exactly like it was in the previous revolution, there were superfluous hopes for the new means of communication: dictionaries, phrase books, and even the international language of Esperanto; today these hopes are placed on computer programs and automatic translators. In the process of retrospective analysis, on the historical material, the authors will try to prove that it is impossible to orient the model of language training exclusively on the means of communication. Evolutionary anthropologists – Glowacki, Wilson & Wrangham (2017), in particular, proved that the evolution of a war almost did not change the role of an individual, a person in it.

Finally, the model of language preparation, unchanged for a long time, contradicts the tendencies in the development of linguistics and pedagogy, where new concepts and theories have appeared. Supporters of the traditional model argue that between the First and Second World Wars, the best solutions to the problem of the language communication development of an officer were found and they uphold its relevance. The authors believe that this is not so. The solution is optimal for specific historical conditions and is caused by a lack of opportunities, and not by the actual needs of military affairs. This model should have been rethought a long time ago, starting with the objectives of language training. At the same time, this model, basically, has been used for almost a hundred years. The accumulated pedagogical experience is of certain interest for modern teachers and linguists.

Modern works in the field of foreign language communications do not give an exact idea of the necessary language training of the Armed Forces' officers. Today there is no definite answer even to the question "What does it mean to know the language?" (Ry dell, 2015), and various scientists state that there are misconceptions on this topic among the linguists themselves (Stollznow, 2018). The result of language training can be determined from the positions of the competence approach (Makulova, Alimzhanova, Bekturgenova, Umirzakova, Makulova & Kamirbaeva, 2015), by addressing a specialist – a user of communication tools and technologies in military affairs, by determining a language personality and its qualities (Davidovitch & Khyzhi niak, 2018; Rosiers & Eyckmans, 2017), by analyzing thematic sections and foreign texts that should be mastered by an officer (Kocote & Smirnova, 2016). In the authors' opinion, these approaches are important but one-dimensional.
The research goal is to reveal the tendencies of special language education development by means of specialization and professionalization, and the renovation of operational and instrumental equipment of foreign language communications.

Materials and Methods

The study presents an approach to solving the problem of language training, adopted in the Soviet Army in the period between the two World Wars. As the research method, a retrospective analysis was selected, which is not so much addressed to facts and events as to the factors and conditions for the formation of the model. Such knowledge will allow a reader to evaluate the approach as a topical one, or not. To collect empirical data for analysis, the analysis of scientific and documentary literature is applied. Periodization is used to synthesize basic generalizations and conclusions. The research is conducted in the conceptual field formed by the concept of "the foreign language communication of an officer". The following definition is used. Foreign language communication is an act of controlled (self-controlled) interaction of communicants with a purpose of their mutual enrichment with the knowledge, necessary to solve the tasks of joint activity, in which the verbal sign system based on the language, which is foreign for at least one of the communicants, is the basis of operational provision.

A quite productive idea arose in the examined historical period – to simulate an officer's language training through those foreign language communications, which he or she will face. When researching this idea, the authors addressed:

- The historical documents (acts, laws and regulations, orders, instructions, and reviews) illustrating the state policy in the field of military construction in general and an officer's language training, in particular;
- The works of historians forming an idea of the historical situation in which a model of language training was created (Isakov, 2014; Kavtaradze, 1988; Kamenev, 1991; Heyman, 1977);
- The monographs and articles on the educational policy and military education in the USSR (Maiofis & Kukulin, 2015; Mirolyubov, 2002);
- The memoirs and recollections, as well as the studies of the language training practice (Gavrilov, Kurapova & Torsukov, 2014; Dusin, 2010; Zagainov, 2016; Frolov, 2010);
- The monographs on the history of Esperanto in Russia (Vlasov, 2011; Zamenhof, 1922; Korolevich, 1989).

Results

In pre-revolutionary Russia, the linguistic education of fleet officers, artillery and engineer troops was at a high level, and the tasks of the Land Forces, which presupposed foreign language communication, were not predicted to the same extent as in the First World War and, accordingly, were not provided. Contrary to the stereotype, the officer corps of the Land Forces on the eve of the First World War did not consist exclusively of nobles with classical education, for which one or several foreign languages were, in fact, the second language of communication. Nevertheless, the general language training was a distinctive feature of the gymnasium, cadet and higher general education, where the teaching of foreign languages was organized by the method of "full immersion" in the linguistic space, up to the teaching of separate academic disciplines in foreign languages and the study of the so-called "dead languages". Latin and Greek, forming a universal linguistic base. Educating a native speaker from an early age is not a new idea, but early language education is still a feature of the aristocratic tradition (Jiménez-Alonso & Loredano-Narciani, 2016). This is certainly an effective solution, probably with small and class officer corps. By the way, today, even given the scale of the Russian army, a return to the idea of early language education is becoming quite real – due to the development of cadet education and specialized classes (Asriev, Mavrina & Mavrin, 2015). In Russian cadet education, in relation to foreign languages, ambitious tasks are set and solved, and pedagogical approaches are based on the natural development of a foreign language, which is characteristic of children. In this area, as Jackson and Hooper write (2017), a new interpretation of old ideas is considered possible. The First World War, having provoked a coup in many military affairs, sharply posed the problem of the foreign language communication of a Land Forces’ officer and the organization of special language training, providing it. At the same time, the problem at that time was not comprehended and was not developed as an independent one, but only in conjunction with other key problems of military construction. It should also be noted that during the First World War, there were no objective conditions for solving the problem, and the only way that the Armed Forces of the Russian Empire followed was the use of the
"rapidly melting" potential in the conditions of a large-scale and bloody war, which was laid by the pre-war system of general and professional military education.

The aggravation of the problem of foreign language communication, in the authors' opinion, can be related at least to the three leading factors manifested in a war of a new type:

- The tasks of direct interaction of subdivisions, units and formations, political, governing and providing structures of different nationalities;
- Extensive, multinational and multicultural theaters of military operations;
- The role of operational and tactical intelligence in providing combat operations. This list is surely not exhaustive, but it determined the need for solving a problem that had to be satisfied already by a new, Soviet state.

When creating a new, The Workers' and Peasants' Red Army (WPRA), a choice was made in favor of the class membership of the command staff at the expense of the educational level of the candidates. Class membership unites people in certain groups having similar goals, interests; such consolidation makes it easier to regulate and manage these groups (in our case – militaries), differentiating them from other groups by creating a unique identity that “contributes to overcoming the differentiation and strengthening social ties” (Sirazetdinova, 2015, p. 207). "The Workers' and Peasants' Red Army is created from the most conscious and organized elements of the working masses", as it is written in the Decree on its organization (Decree on the organization of the WPRA, 1957, p. 356). First of all, the class approach to recruiting the WPRA was due to its main task – to serve as “a means of support for the coming socialist revolution in Europe” (Decree on the organization of the WPRA, 1957, p. 356), but, in addition, the actual needs of the outbreak of the Civil War, where the value of foreign language communications were not so pronounced. It is noteworthy that the class approach to the formation of the officer corps, although in a slightly different concept, was present in those years in the Armed Forces of Germany and Italy (Crouthamel, 2017), and finally it was "worn out" only in the 1990s (Mincu, 2016).

At the same time, the leadership of the country and its Armed Forces was well aware of the dangers associated with the decline in the educational level of the command staff on the eve of the next world armed confrontation, the reality of which no one doubted. Recruitment of the WPRA's personnel, as Kamenev writes (1991), was provided by: attracting military specialists – former officers and generals of the Imperial Army; sending experienced revolutionaries to the Army; appointing revolutionary-minded soldiers to the command positions; accelerated courses of red commanders; and the formation of a new military school.

During the period of WPRA's reduction (1921-1923), which was very painful for its functioning (Protocols of the Eleventh Congress of the Workers' and Peasants' Party in 1936), most of the military specialists were demobilized (Kavtaradze, 1988), and the professional qualities of the new, revolutionary command staff did not fully correspond to the requirements of a future war. No one doubted that the solution of the problem of foreign language communications of commanders of the Land Forces, in particular, and their professional qualifications in general, is possible only in the process of forming their own, Soviet military school. Already in 1922, at the 11th Congress of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, the following was in the report of L.D. Trotsky, devoted to the further development of the WPRA: "We are not going to give up proletarian self-sacrifice, the precious qualities that were manifested in the revolution, especially in the civil war by the leading workers and peasants – but further - by the qualification of the army as a whole, especially its command staff, starting from the lower classes... we will make a real step forward" (Protocols of the 11th Congress of the WPRA, 1936, p. 308). Actually, in the formation of the WPRA, L.D. Trotsky played not only the role of an agitator and a propagandist, as it was erroneously believed, for example, by Heyman (1977). He contributed to creating the new command staff.

Attempts to solve the problem of foreign language communication in the Armed Forces of the RSFSR and the USSR between the First and Second World Wars can be conditionally divided into two paths: the restoration of special language education in the interests of strategic intelligence, international, political, military and technical and economic cooperation, propaganda and information warfare, the requirements of military construction (which remain outside the subject of the study), as well as the mass formation of simplified foreign language communications that permit the command staff of the Army and the Navy to accomplish promising combat missions.
and tasks of preparation for a future war. However, these paths were not implemented evenly.

If the training of the first-level specialists, as evidenced by the scientists studying this issue (Gavrilov, Kurapova & Torsukov, 2014; Maiofis & Kukulin 2015; Frolov, 2010), was quite effective, then the restoration of the military school’s ability to form foreign language communication of command staff was impossible without the required level of general education in the country.

The development of the theory and practice of teaching foreign languages in the USSR, according to A.A. Mirolyubov, were constrained for a long time by the following factors:

- "Political factors, related to the specifics of the current moment in the history of our country;"
- "Pedagogical factors, caused at that time by the influence of a number of theories in pedagogy;"
- "Pseudo-ideological factors, determining the position of a foreign language in the pre-revolutionary Russia as a privilege of the ruling class;"
- "Organizational factors" (Mirolyubov, 2002, p. 72).

In 1922, the “languages” (German, English, and French) were included in the training program for the command staff of the WPRA, but they were preserved only at the Academy of the General Staff (Kamenev, 1991). Already in 1923, the language disciplines were abolished in the programs of military schools of the first and second stages (the operational and tactical links of the administration). Foreign languages were subsequently introduced into the programs of military schools in 1926 exclusively for their voluntary and unscheduled study (Kuzmin, 1927).

This fact does not mean that the problem of foreign language communication in the forthcoming war is not realized and is not taken into account; it means a sufficiently sober and balanced assessment of the military school’s capabilities. Thus, the Head of the Department of Military Educational Institutions of the Main Department of the WPRA, N.N. Kuzmin (1927) wrote:

_The political situation urgently requires the presence of commanders who know foreign languages. Lessons at school even for two hours per week for each language give only about one hundred and fifty hours for the entire course, which is obviously not sufficient. Therefore, it is necessary to give a very limited task to the military schools: to read, write and pronounce, based on the main goal, to lay the foundation for future and already independent work. In addition, the school should maintain the knowledge of those people who have them. The school cannot do anything more._

And as it became clear at the beginning of the war, the school could not do even this. Right before the war, in 1940, with the replacement of the People’s Commissars of Defense, S.K. Timoshenko and K.E. Voroshilov, it was noted that a poor knowledge of foreign languages is one of the main shortcomings in the training of students in military academies and cadets of military schools (Order on the admission of the People’s Commissariat of Defense of the USSR, 1940).

The formation of foreign language communication of the command staff was constrained not only by the low educational level of cadets but also by the shortage of pedagogical staff, capable of teaching a foreign language in military schools and academies. Up to the beginning of the war, teaching foreign languages in their professional version to the senior command staff, the organization of studying foreign experience in military construction, the work with military and technical documentation at military education institutions were conducted with the involvement of military specialists – former officers of the Russian army (Kuzmin, 1927). Only in 1940, at the Maurice Thorez Institute of Foreign Languages in Moscow, as well as at the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies, military faculties were opened, which trained teachers of foreign languages and military specialists with knowledge of foreign languages for military schools (Gavrilov, Kurapova & Torsukov, 2014).

The desire to create an elementary language base for the formation of foreign language communication of experts is repeatedly found in government decisions of the interwar period. In 1929, for example, a number of decrees were issued by educational authorities on the introduction of foreign languages in secondary and higher professional education (Shelestyuk 2013). A little later, the Communist Party Central Committee decree dated August 25, 1932, which, in the authors’ opinion, was never fulfilled, set the task of providing each graduate with knowledge of at least one foreign language.
Attempts were made to eliminate the deficiencies in the general and professional education of the command staff of the WPRA, restraining the formation of foreign language communication, by mass self-education, including self-study of foreign languages. Frunze was one of its initiators in the Armed Forces (1940).

In the above-mentioned Kuzmin's reference (1927), the following is proposed:

The gravity center of the case must be transferred to a system of broad knowledge incentives and to the facilitation of the training of commanders after they graduate from military schools. These measures can be summarized as follows:

a) The title of a “military interpreter” for the command staff who are fluent in one or more foreign languages.

b) Additional pay to military translators, regardless of the place of service and the salary received, in the amount of – for the knowledge of one language – 25 rubles per month, for the knowledge of two or more languages – 40 rubles per month.

c) Open short-term courses for willing commanders who are sent on a business trip.

d) Encourage commanders by money grant (200-300 rubles) who have independently studied a language and passed the test.

e) Arrange business trips abroad for improving the knowledge of a language at the government expense.

f) Give an external distinctive badge.

g) Encourage commanders who know the local language in the border districts.

h) Give an opportunity to order foreign magazines, newspapers and books to those who know languages, if not for free, then with a large discount.

i) Keep track of those who know languages and give them instructions related to this knowledge (translations of articles, for example, reading newspapers, etc.), of course with payment.

j) The title of a military interpreter should be given for a period of not more than 3 years with the need to verify the knowledge after this period.

k) Firmly establish which languages should be studied and for what purpose.

Even with such stimulation, the solution of the problem of foreign language communications of an officer of the Land Forces requires inner motivation, independence, determination and perseverance that not all red commanders possessed. In the report of the head of the Department of Combat Training of the WPRA, V.N. Kurdyumov, at a meeting of the higher leadership of the WPRA on December 23-31, 1940 (the main issue on the agenda was the analysis of the outcome of the Finnish war), it was stressed that the command staff, especially the commanders of troops (batteries) and platoons, still put little efforts in improving their overall cultural level and development (Russian archive: The Great Patriotic War, 1993).

The attempt to once and for all eliminate language barriers and solve the problem of foreign language communications by creating a common language – “Esperanto”, the development and popularization of which was initiated by L.D. Trotsky (Vlasov, 2011; Korolevich, 1989), is considered interesting, although the authors could not find any mention of the study of Esperanto in the troops. The movement and language of Esperanto, the foundations of which were laid by Zamenhof's works (1922), was originally seen as a way of overcoming cultural differences and the world globalization, and in the Soviet state – as the language of the world social revolution. For a number of reasons, in the authors' opinion, the principal impossibility of uniting the cultural and historical identity of different peoples in a single means of expression is one of the main reasons why the popularization of Esperanto was inconclusive. Moreover, the Soviet works in the field of Esperanto relied on the administrative support of L.D. Trotsky and were stopped after his conviction in 1929. Repeated appeals to this idea already in the 1940s and 1950s did not have the scope or any scientific and practical effect.

During the Second World War, broad military and technical cooperation on bilateral treaties...
between the USSR, the United States, the Great Britain and other countries on the basis of the US state Lend-Lease program is added to the factors of actualization of the problem of foreign language communications of a Land Force officer, already listed by the authors. In addition to high-octane gasoline, explosives, uniforms and food, arms and military equipment were also supplied to the USSR, the mastering of which required work with the documentation in English, as well as training under the guidance of foreign instructors.

Contesting the critical importance of these supplies to achieve victory, V.I. Isakov and other historians, nevertheless, note the existence of a number of positions with which the Soviet industry did not fully cope in the war conditions. For example, according to the data provided by Butenina (2004), Isakov (2014) and Ryzhkov (2012), more than four hundred and seventy thousand cars (of which 80% of freight cars) arrived in the USSR and formed the basis of a military vehicle fleet, one thousand nine hundred steam locomotives, sixty-six diesel engine electric locomotives and more than eleven thousand wagons, about a thousand radar stations and sonars, more than five hundred warships and boats. In addition, about 12% of all aircraft (especially transport aviation), about 7% of tanks and self-propelled artillery units, and about 2% of artillery guns were received by Lend Lease.

In 1942-1943, along with the Soviet and Lend Lease weapons, the use of captured weapons, ammunition and military equipment sharply increased (Kolomiets & Moshchanskiy, 2000).

At this time, memos, instructions and manuals are issued on the use of the most widespread samples of captured weapons and military equipment. At the same time, their operation, armament and repair require personnel to understand and use technical documentation in German, Romanian, Czech, Polish and other languages. After 1943, judging by the numerous regulations for the collection, inventory and use of trophies, issued for the active army, captured property, armament and military equipment are considered as one of the components of its provision. During the war years and in the first years after it, the Land Forces actively used combat graphic documents, as well as instructions, manuals, summaries and bulletins published for Wehrmacht's personnel.

Military-technical and military-economic cooperation, the practice of widespread use of trophies is an independent and additional factor of the actualization of the problem of foreign language communications of the Land Forces' officers, while the three factors that were manifested during the First World War remained quite effective. In general, the investigated problem until the end of the Great Patriotic War did not have an effective solution. The class-educational principle of elitist manning of the officer corps of the Armed Forces (a priori providing for fluency in a foreign language) proved to be untenable in the conditions of a massive, large-scale war and a revolution in military affairs, which took the notion of "mastering a foreign language" further aside from the notion of "the ability to communicate in a foreign language" in terms of meaning and content.

The class principle of manning at the expense of the educational level, reliance solely on self-education in conditions of this trend's strengthening, in turn, did not provide the necessary linguistic basis for foreign language communications, which was not replenished with combat practice.

At the end of the First World War, during the interwar period and, especially, during the Second World War, the importance of foreign language communications of the Land Forces' officers was constantly growing, but the tasks of their language training, well understood in this connection, contradicted the general educational level of officers, pedagogical capabilities and resources of the military system education. This contradiction made it necessary to look for a low-cost model of language training, compensating the deficiencies in pedagogical resources, for the Land Forces' officers, and supporting the intensive formation of foreign language communications.

One of the solutions that meet these criteria is an increase in the operational and instrumental equipment of foreign language communication. New means of translation, introduced during the war, made it possible to carry out the simplest foreign language communications with minimal knowledge of a foreign language, or without it at all. These may include:

- Military dictionaries-phrasebooks (brief dictionaries-phrasebooks). They were elaborated and published in the 1930s-40s in connection with the urgent need for foreign language communications (for example, a short Russian-German phrasebook for a soldier and a younger commander of the Workers' and
Peasants’ Red Army by Biyazi published in two million copies (1941)). This means of communication had a threefold task: to provide access to foreign military sources (the input language is foreign), to solve the communicative tasks of military personnel (the input language is Russian) operating at the territory of the enemy, and to teach military personnel a professional foreign language (Zagainov, 2016);

- Phrasebooks and transliterated questionnaires, which differed from conventional military phrasebooks given that words and phrases were printed in Russian (Shebalin, 1944; Partizan’s Companion, 1942), and in addition – narrow specialization and thematic focus;
- Instructions and handbooks on handling foreign arms and equipment (the Main Automobile Department of the Red Army, 1945), including trophy ones (the Artillery Order of Lenin Academy of the Red Army named after F.E. Dzerzhinsky, 1942);
- Translated foreign military and technical documents, etc.

The material was prepared by the specialists of the Military Faculty of Western Foreign Languages of the Moscow State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages, the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Leningrad Institute of Language and Thought of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Foreign Languages Department of the Air Force Academy named after Zhukovsky, the Military Academy of Mechanization and Motorization named after I.V. Stalin, the Military Academy of Chemical Defense named after K.E. Voroshilov and the Artillery Academy named after F.E. Dzerzhinsky.

The problem of the formation of foreign language communication and the language training of the Armed Forces’ officers before the Second World War was never solved, despite all attempts made by the state and military leadership. In general, the examined problem, until the end of the Great Patriotic War, had no effective solution.

The model of language training created then was not optimal even at that time, since it was formed under extremely unfavorable conditions. It was not simple, but primitive, but with the compensation for experience and special means of translation, as well as with well-organized training of military translators, it allowed fulfilling combat missions in the Second World War, and therefore was entrenched for many years. Its long-term use, without significant modernization, was possible only in connection with the “stagnation” in the development of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation.

In the absence of general and mass language education, the degree of solving the problem of the foreign language communication of a Land Forces’ officer on the eve of the Second World War was not higher than at the end of the First World War.

The historical development of the problem of foreign language communications of a Land Forces’ officer in Russia and the USSR took place in a very contradictory situation, in which an active approach to language training, productive at the end of the war and during post-war time, fully developed in Soviet professional military education, was formed. The main idea of this approach completely fits into the paradigm of the formation of an industrial, technocratic and socialist society and the general tense situation in which the training of an officer is traditionally executed. It resides in the separation of meanings, and in this connection – in the content and methodology of language training, depending on the state and social needs, in which an individual participates. Shcherba (1929, p. 2) wrote:

> it is necessary to precisely clarify various goals that a knowledge seeker can set for himself or herself. This is important by itself, since not every person who wants to learn foreign languages is fully aware of what he or she actually needs; it is also important from the point of view of methods of studying a language, because different roads lead to different goals.

In the second half of the 20th century, undoubtedly, the main factor determining the entire system of professional training for the officers of the USSR Land Forces is the experience of the Great Patriotic War, scientifically comprehended in the postwar period, generalized and reflected in development strategies. The military education paradigm itself was defined by the military time doctrines, providing for a massive armed confrontation in classical theaters of military operations, serious changes in which were brought only by the proliferation of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction. The main unit of the armed confrontation was considered to be a
combined-arms battle, which did not impose more serious demands on a foreign commander’s competence than it was in the Great Patriotic War. The fallacy of this assumption has manifested itself in local wars and conflicts in which the Land Forces fought with irregular units of the enemy, mainly abroad, in an unconventional combat situation. In addition, the officers of the Land Forces often acted as advisers to foreign armies, where the problem of forming foreign language communications was often attempted to be solved either through additional professional education or using military interpreters as intermediaries. Nevertheless, these difficulties did not stimulate a new formulation of the problem of foreign communications of the Land Forces' officers, since the basic training of the officers was designed, all the same, for a global war as the most probable one.

At the same time, already in the Soviet times, special features emerged in the operational and strategic links of the administration, connected with the increasing complexity of requirements for foreign communication and the interaction of units and formations with their use in real time. The appearance of such features is connected:

- With the leading role of the Soviet troops' contingents deployed in the territory of Europe in the alleged hostilities;
- With the most likely European theater of military operations in the offensive war;
- With the bloc nature of the armed confrontation (NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries). The provision of new management functions was achieved not by changing the language training of combined arms officers, but by developing the institution of military translators.

In the system of professional military education of the Land Forces' officers in the post-war years, respectively, two different models of language training were formed and preserved to the present day, which differed radically and were mutually exclusive in meaning, goals, approaches and methodology.

The first model assumed the formation of mass simplified language communications allowing the use of a foreign language in practical activities. Due to the passive (receptive) assimilation of linguistic material, its subject was supposed to read and understand texts in a foreign language, to have specialized vocabulary and to be able to use a foreign language when performing typical military and professional tasks. The basis of an officer's language training is the instrumental grammatical and translational and comparative methods, in which a foreign language's constructs are formed in the mind (or on paper) through well-mastered language constructs of the native language, and all cogitative activity is carried out in the native language providing for foreign communication. The goals, based on which the language training is modeled, are expressed in the qualification requirements of a specialist and are stated, for example, as follows (Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation, 2006):

- to know: one of the foreign languages in the volume of 1800-2000 lexical units, of which there are approximately 800-1000 units of the all-military, military and scientific, as well as special military vocabulary; a grammatical minimum, including the grammatical structures necessary to conduct a conversation, the translation of combat documents and the reading of military literature on the specialty; be able to: conduct a two-way translation (interrogation of a prisoner of war); to read a text on the specialty without a dictionary with the extraction of basic information; read the text on the specialty with the dictionary with the extraction of complete information; read the tactical situation on the work card of the unit commander and transmit its contents in Russian.

The second model is intended for deep understanding and active operation of a language, mainly by those officers whose foreign language communications form the basis of a professional activity. It is based on linguistic and cultural immersion, providing an opportunity to form mixed and coordinating bilingualism.

**Discussion**

A retrospective analysis of the process of creating a model for the language training of officers, especially at the moment when the practice is divided into two strategies (deep linguistic training and teaching the patterns of a foreign language) reveals significant strategic mistakes that currently determine the difficulties of command staff in foreign language communications. This knowledge is of interest in connection with the reform of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation and the system of professional military education. At the same time, it is also useful for organizing language training for civilian specialists.
The authors give arguments about the need to change the model of the language training of officers of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, which was established in military pedagogy in the middle of the 20th century: first of all, it is necessary to combine the theoretical and professional-practical training of an officer by improving the quality of the educational process and professional and personal perfection of a personality.

The researchers' ideas about language training, based on the formation of foreign language communications (language + method + means of communication), formulated by the military linguists of the USSR in the period between the First and Second World Wars, are revealed.

Historical conditions are examined (the organization of general and military education, approaches to recruiting the army, positions of state and military leadership), in which the model of language training of officers of the Armed Forces of the USSR was formed. A great influence on the functioning of the language training system was provided by the prevailing geopolitical conditions of confrontation between the two world systems, as a result of which, due to the restriction of communication in a foreign language, an officer did not require language training at his professional level as part of his daily life.

The further aggravation of the problems of the development of foreign language communication among the officers of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation proved that the separation of the two strategies of language training was a mistake. It is the strategy of language learning, as Love proves (2017), that for a long time determines the character and, most importantly, the potential for language training, interaction and communication in a language. Already in the Soviet era, special features emerged in the operational and strategic links of the management, associated with the increasing complexity of requirements for foreign language communication and the interaction of units and formations with their use in real time. The appearance of such features is connected:

- With the leading role of the Soviet troops' contingents deployed in the territory of Europe in the alleged hostilities;
- With the most likely European theater of military operations in the offensive war;
- With the bloc nature of the armed confrontation (NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries).

The provision of new management functions was achieved not by changing the language training of combined arms officers, but by developing the institution of military translators.

Proceeding from the foregoing, language training at present should represent a kind of divergence of the theoretical and professional-practical training of a Land Forces' officer on the military service through the effective application of pedagogical conditions to improve the quality of the educational process, on the one hand, and professional and personal perfection, on the other hand.

Conclusion

It can be stated that the pre-war and war periods are characterized only by the formulation of the problem of the formation of foreign language communications by an officer of the Land Forces at the state level, but not by the development of an optimal solution. It should also be noted that two trends emerged in its development, which are currently relevant:

- Development of specialization and professionalization of foreign language communications of an officer of the Land Forces;
- Attention to the operational and instrumental equipment of foreign communications.

At the same time, based on the ideas developed during the examined historical period, during the Soviet period of scientific development of the problem of foreign language communications of Land Forces' officers, two approaches to its practical solution were finally formed.

The developed approaches in language training and foreign language communication are relevant at the present time. They are actively used both in the daily life of troops and in combat conditions, taking into account the positive and negative organizational and pedagogical experience. However, the model of simplified language training is obsolete and needs to be fully revised.
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