军事思维学前沿问题研究

毕文波 严高鸿 主编

The Frontier Problems in the Study of Military Thinking

军事思维学前沿问题研究

毕文波　严高鸿　主编

军事科学出版社

前　言

本书系全军军事科学研究工作"十五"计划课题"军事思维学前沿问题研究"的最终成果书名与课题名称相同，共三编九章及两个附录，由毕文波、严高鸿主编。

本课题研究和本书撰写历时将近 4 年。2000 年底，主编提出研究大纲。2000 年底至 2001 年，主编三次召集撰稿人讨论研究大纲及据此分别提出的各章研究提纲，统一认识；在此期间，同时进行其他先期学术准备。2001 年底至 2004 年 6 月完成初稿，主编完成初审，各章撰稿人按初审意见完成第二稿。2004 年 7 月至 11 月，主编完成全书统改和定稿。

本书第三、四、五、六、八章是在毕文波、严高鸿的博士生撰写的学位论文（或论文部分内容）的基础上改写的。原计划未设置两个附录标明的子课题；这两个附录都是在读博士生的学位论文详细提纲，参照以往有的著作一种灵活的编排体例，决定将其补入。

本书着眼于以军事思维学前沿问题为学术增长点，推动该学科基础理论研究、应用性理论研究和学科建设。

第一编是对我国 20 世纪 80 年代以来军事思维研究的首次长篇总结。其中第三部分依据已有的具有代表性的成果勾勒了军事思维科学这一新的学科体系及其内容的轮廓，可以看出现有的体系尚不完备，但已初具规模。第四部分从现状出发加以展望，提出了该学科研究有待进一步解决的问题以及解决的初步意见。

第二编和两个附录是对若干个国家军事战略思维的分析以

及对和平战略思维的探讨；其中国别的选择考虑到了当代军事战略思维系列研究的典型性。本编和两个附录有的问题尚属首次提出；有的问题学术界已有成果，此次研究重在更新、充实和系统化，或变换视角和思路。军事战略思维研究既可属于军事战略学的分支，亦可属于军事思维学的分支。本编和两个附录对于作为系统存在的军事战略思维概念的相对定型化以及军事战略思维研究的范式或方法作了一些探索。

第三编在学术界已有成果的基础上进一步研究了以信息化为特征的高技术战争和新军事变革中若干具有普适性的思维学问题。由于问题本身介于应用性理论和基础理论之间，研究成果或可视为从新的实践和理论中产生的军事思维学一般基础理论更新和充实所需要的"半成品"。

就应用层面来说，本书期望有助于厘清当代曲折发展的多极化世界的军事战略格局，理解和贯彻执行中国新时期军事战略方针，培养军事工作者新的思维素质，支持以军事思维科学为工具的中国特色军事变革和军队现代化建设的对策性思考。

研究和撰写过程中要求把握以下方法和原则：

一是以"前沿性"为逻辑线索设计框架结构。军事思维学前沿问题是一个弹性很大的"问题阈"，本书只是选择一些重要问题作为研究对象。因此框架结构不追求严格的完整性和体系性，而力求保持一定程度的完整性和体系性。

二是坚持军事理论科学党性和科学性的统一。一切军事思维现象都受制于有组织的武装暴力对抗的一般规律，一切军事思维研究都必须依据这样的一般规律体现其特殊的科学性。同时战争又是政治的继续，相当一部分军事思维现象具有这样或那样的政治倾向性，因此这一视阈内的军事思维研究又必须体现一定的党性。对于本书来说，就是必须旗帜鲜明地张扬基于实事求是认识路线的社会主义国家和共产党绝对领导下的人民

军队的军事理论科学的党性。

三是高度关注当代军事实践特别是以信息化为特征的高技术战争和新军事变革，从中寻求思维学问题，努力体现当代军事思维科学的当代性。

四是从军事思维与哲学思维、政治思维、国际战略思维、横断科学思维、科技思维以及文化学思维的结合上研究军事思维现象，避免孤立的、封闭的军事思维研究。

五是以现实军事思维问题为基点，从历史和逻辑的统一上，从既往纵深的回溯和未来趋势的前瞻上，动态地揭示军事思维规律或规律性现象。

六是努力达成研究集体军事思维学基本观点的共识，同时尊重并在保持必要的统一性的前提下允许在各章撰述中保留研究者个人独到的见解和学术个性。例如，对于什么是战略、什么是战略思维、二者有何区别和联系，大家都有一致的或基本一致的认识。但战略或战略思维往往都是一个系统（体系），战略系统的最高层面不仅对于战役、战术具有指导功能，而且对于其他层面的战略也具有指导功能。因此战略系统的最高层面或要点就可能与战略思维系统的某一层面或要点形成一个叠合的界面。有的学者倾向于将其纳入战略范畴，有的学者则倾向于将其纳入战略思维范畴。就是说，战略思维和战略的区别既具有确定性而不可随意混淆，又具有相对性而并非绝对分明。对于此类问题的处理，主编者应允许保留一个适度的弹性空间，但各章的撰述必须保持本章的逻辑自洽性。

本书撰稿人有（以各章及附录先后为序）：

毕文波（第一章、第二章），南京政治学院教授、博士生导师、中国军事科学学会高级研究员；

喻舒曼（第三章），中国国际战略学会副研究员、博士；

尚伟（第四章），南京政治学院副教授、硕士生导师、军

事伦理学教研室主任、博士；

　　吕川（第五章），南京政治学院博士生；

　　马德宝（第六章），南京政治学院副教授、博士、军事科学院战争理论和战略研究部博士后；

　　严高鸿、张学明（第七章），南京政治学院教授、博士生导师、学报主编、江苏省哲学学会副会长，广州军区政治部副教授、博士；

　　陈小明（第八章），南京政治学院讲师、博士；

　　牛宏伟、俞红（第九章），后勤指挥学院讲师、硕士，解放军理工大学讲师；

　　胡志东（附录一），二炮指挥学院讲师、南京政治学院博士生；

　　方玮（附录二），南京政治学院博士生。

　　尚伟、陈小明协助主编承担有关编务工作。

　　军事思维学前沿问题研究的后续任务将更加繁重。首先，需要扩大视阈，已经涉及的问题需要跟踪考察，更新内容，延伸深度，同时注意清理已有成果的失误。其次，需要努力架设军事思维学当代应用性理论成果与一般基础理论之间的桥梁。再次，需要进一步引进、消化和改造国外相关成果，为建设发轫于中国军事科学界的军事思维学服务。"前沿性"在更大的程度上意味着"尝试性"，因此这个项目的研究一定会在什么地方走了不该走的弯路，敬祈良师益友——拨正。

<div style="text-align:right">

毕文波　严高鸿

2004 年 11 月 30 日于南京政治学院

南京园区

</div>

Foreword to
The Frontier Problems
in the Study Of Military Thinking

This book is the final result of "the frontier problems in the study of military thinking", a Tenth Five – year – Plan project in academic research work of the Chinese Academy of Military Sciences (CAMS) . The book, with Prof. Bi Wenbo and Prof. Yan Gaohong as chief compilers, consists of nine chapters and two appendixes.

It took four years to complete this research project. The chief editors produced the outline of the book in December 2000. Over the next year, the chief editors assembled three meetings to discuss the outline and the gist of each chapter, so that the contributors could have a unified idea about how the book should be written. The preparatory work of the academic research was going on during the same period. By June 2004, the contributors had completed their second drafts in accordance with the advice and suggestions given by the chief editors after their reading of the first draft. The completion of the final reading by the chief editors for printing was done in November 2004.

The Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, and Eighth Chapters were developed from the doctorial dissertations (or part of those dissertations) . The original outline didn't contain the subproject listed in the appendixes; the two appendixes are actually detailed outline of doctorial dissertations by two doctorial candidates. Taken some of the previously published academic

works, these two appendixes were collected in the book as supplementaries.

This book takes the frontier problems in this study of military thinking as academic growth points, so as to propel the elementary theoretical research, applied theoretical research in this field and the establishment of this study as a subject.

Part 1 is a long summary of the study of military thinking since the 1980s in our country. The third section of this part outlines the study of military thinking as a new curriculum and the outline of its contents in accordance with the existing research results that have their representational nature. It points out that the present system is not yet complete, but has already gained its initial form. The fourth section looks into the future on the basis of the present status, and puts forward some problems that should be solved and some tentative suggestions as to how to solve these problems in this field.

Part 2 and the two appendixes analyze the nation's military strategic thinking and discuss peaceful strategic thinking. The selection of countries is typical of the serial research on contemporary military strategic thinking. Some of the problems contained in this part have been put forward for the first time, and some of which have got research results. This research now aims at updating, substantiating and systematizing or dealing with these problems from different angles and different approaches. The study of military strategic thinking could be considered as belonging to the branch of the study of military strategy, or belonging to the study of military thinking. This part probes into the relative finalization of military strategic thinking as an existing system and also probes into the models or approaches of the study of military strategic thinking.

Part 3 further studies some of the problems in the study of think-
ing, on the basis of the research results already achieved, in the high-
technology warfare and RMA characterized by the application of infor-
mation technology. Since these problems exist somewhere between ap-
plied theories and essentials theories, the research results may be re-
garded as "unfinished products" that are needed to update and substan-
tiate the general theory in the study of military thinking that arise from
new theories and practices.

As far as the application is concerned, this book may be helpful
in presenting a clear picture of the military strategic pattern of this mul-
ti – polar world that is developing unevenly, in understanding and im-
plementing China's military strategic principles in the new historical
period, in training the new thinking ability of military workers, and in
supporting the countermeasures in the RMA with Chinese characteris-
tics and the modernization of China's armed forces with the study of
military thinking as a tool.

The following approaches and principles are deemed necessary in
the studying and writing:

1. The framework design should be based on " frontier" charac-
teristics as the logical clue. The frontier problems in the study of mili-
tary thinking are very flexible "field of problems", only some of the
important problems are selected as the object of research in this book.
Therefore, completeness and systemization of the framework is not
strictly necessary, but they should be kept on a certain level.

2. The principle of the unification of Party nature and scientific
nature of military theory should be adhered to. All phenomena in mili-
tary thinking are bounded by the general law of organized armed con-
flict, so the study of military thinking should be based on this general

law so as to show its special scientific nature. Meanwhile, war is the continuation of politics, a considerable part of the phenomena of military thinking has its political tendency in this way or that, so their research in this field should symbolize the Party nature. As far as this book is concerned, it means to advocate with clear – cut stand the Party nature that is based on the military theory of the People's Army under the absolute leadership of the Communist Party in a socialist country in accordance with the cognition of "seeking truth from facts".

3. Great attention should be given to the military practices of the contemporary time, especially the high-technology warfare characterized by the application of information technology, trying to find problems in the study of thinking, and presenting the contemporary nature of contemporary study of military thinking.

4. The study of military phenomena should avoid isolated, closed study, and should be conducted by combining military thinking with philosophical thinking, political thinking, international strategic thinking, intersecting scientific thinking, science and technology thinking, and cultural thinking.

5. The law in military thinking or its phenomenon should be dynamically revealed with existing problems in military thinking as the basis, viewing them both historically and logically, looking back into the past and looking forward into the future.

6. A common cognition should be reached on the essential view of collective study of military thinking. Meanwhile, under the precondition of respecting and observing the unity of the book, each chapter could retain the unique understanding and academic characteristics of its individual contributor. A common or essential understanding should be reached, for example, on what is strategy, what is strategic think-

ing, and what are the differences and the connections between them. However, strategy or strategic thinking is usually a system, so the highest level of strategic system has the function not only in guiding campaign or tactics, but also in other phases of strategy. So the highest phase or focal point of strategy could form an overlapping interface with a certain phase or focal point in the system of strategic thinking. Some scholars tend to think that it belongs to the field of strategy, while others tend to put it in the field of strategic thinking. That is to say, the difference between strategic thinking and strategy should not be confused because of its certain definition, but the differences are also distinct because of their relativity. The chief editors should allow the contributors an appropriate and flexible space to deal with such problems, but the description in each chapter should be logically autonomous.

The chapters are contributed by:

Chapters 1　and 2 Bi Wenbo, professor of NIP, tutor of doctoral Candidates, senior researcher of CAMS

Chapter 3　　Yu Shuman, PhD, associate researcher of Chinese International Strategy Association

Chapter 4　　Shang Wei, PhD, associate professor of NIP, tutor of MA students, head of Military Ethics Teaching Office

Chapter 5　　Lu Chuan, PhD student

Chapter 6　　Ma Debao, PhD, associate professor, post – doctorial research fellow of Department of War Theory and Strategic Research, CAMS

Chapter 7　　Yan Gaohong, professor of NIP, tutor of doctoral Candidates, editor in chief of NIPJournal, deputy president of Jiangsu Philosophy Association; Zhang Xueming, associate professor, PhD, Political Department, Guangzhou Military Area Command

Chapter 8   Chen Xiaoming, PhD, lecturer of NIP

Chapter 9   Niu Hongwei, MA, lecturer of Logistics Command Academy; Yu Hang, lectures of PLA University of Science and Technology

Appendix 1   Hu Zhidong, lecturer of the Second Artillery Academy, NIP doctorial student

Appendix 2   Fang Wei, doctorial student, NIP

Shang Wei and chen xiaoming helped with the editorial work.

The research task that follows the study of frontier problems in the study of military thinking will be even heavier. First of all, the visual threshold should be expanded, the problems touched should be followed up, the contents should be updated, the depth extended, and mistakes in the existing research results corrected. Secondly, a bridge should be established between the present – day applicable theoretical results and the basic theory in the study of military thinking. Thirdly, the relevant research results in foreign countries should be introduced, digested, and reformed, in order to serve the establishment of the study of military thinking that originates in China's military science circle. The frontier nature of the study means, to a greater extent, the explorative nature of the study, so this research project is bound to have experienced some twists and turns, and it is our sincere hope that they are pointed out and corrected.

Bi Wenbo, Yan Gaohong
Nanjing Institute of Politics, Nanjing
Nov. 30, 2004

内容提要

第一章　军事思维研究述论

军事思维反思和研究的真知灼见不绝于史。20 世纪 80 年代以来，由于现代军事实践新发展的迫切要求和一般思维学研究新局面的推动，建立现代学科形态的军事思维学的任务提上了议事日程，这门新学科的学科建设正处于起步阶段。近 20 年间，理论军事思维学、军事决策思维学、军事谋略思维学、军事战略思维学等层面的研究都取得了代表性的成果，军事思维学作为学科群的内容体系已见端倪，但仍存在诸多薄弱环节乃至于缺项，不少问题尚未提炼为该学科所特有的概念、范畴和规律性认识，需要强化以军事思维学推动军事科学发展的学术使命意识，拓宽课题，提高研究质量，使这门新学科真正立定脚跟，充分发挥应有的作用。

第二章　中国新时期军事战略思维

中国新时期军事战略思维贯穿着中国特色的当代马克思主义认识论和社会主义政治原则，以及由此规定的一系列军事思维基本观念。前者突出地表现为：实事求是地反思和演绎历史经验，继承和发展积极防御的战略方针；以世界军事发展的制高点为参照系，客观地分析我军建设的主要矛盾，从全局上筹划和指导军事斗争准备和军队建设；立足于维护国家安全统一和维护世界和平的基本立场，思考和解决军事战略问题。后者包括：后发制人的攻势防御的观念；高技术条件下人民战争的观念；军事变革和跨越式发展的观念；军事系统观念。正是由

这些认识论和政治原则以及基本思维观念构成了新时期军事战略思维的整体框架。就是说，新时期军事战略思维正是按照上述原则进行"顶层设计"，并将有关基本观念作为它的支撑点。

第三章　冷战后美国军事战略思维

冷战后美国成为惟一的超级大国，它的一切国家行为都是指向"领导"全球，按照自己的意志重建世界秩序的"使命"，美国的军事战略思维则是这种新霸权主义国家意志的重要支柱。其基本观念是：美国至上的国家利益观、全球干涉的军事霸权观、世界领导的天定使命观和实用主义的哲学观。这种基本观念的实质在于：将基于超强实力的武力干涉和威胁作为实现美国全球利益的工具。上述基本观念通过以下思维模式得以体现，这就是：制造"全球性对手"，并通过新军事革命等途径大力加强军事实力，企图予以制服的冷战思维；从国家安全全局出发，筹划协调和综合运用军事手段与非军事手段的大战略思维；以控制欧亚大陆边缘地带为核心，以遏制欧亚大陆强国崛起为目的的地缘战略思维；建构以美国为核心，以北约和美日军事同盟为基轴的多层次全球联盟体系的联盟思维；力求保持军事信息技术、军事航天技术等领域的领先地位，执意建立和部署导弹防御系统，强调军事高技术绝对优势的高技术制胜思维。

第四章　冷战后俄罗斯军事战略思维

20世纪90年代初，苏联解体，冷战结束，新的俄罗斯联邦国家诞生。叶利钦执政时期，俄军事战略思维有以下主要内容：独立之初的"无敌国"思维闪念；以大国意识为源点的军事战略思维主线；将最根本的国家利益置于首位的军事战略思维基点；以美国及其为首的北约为主要潜在对手的军事战略思

维指向；以"体内联盟"为依托、东西兼顾的军事战略思维视角；以核遏制为安全盾牌、威慑与实战并重的军事战略思维模式；以军事改革为活性细胞的军事战略思维传统。普京上任后，俄军事战略思维的基本理念有：进一步摒弃冷战思维，适应新的安全环境，推进世界多极化进程；广泛参与国际军事合作，加重国际事务中的"俄罗斯因素"，谋求现有实力下战略利益最大化；继续推进军事改革，抢占未来军事制高点，重温军事强国之梦；适时调整"进"与"退"，谋求军事战略结构的"三个均衡"，确保大国地位和国家安全；秉承历史传统，强化爱国意识，坚决维护国家统一。总之，大国意识是贯穿俄罗斯军事战略思维的历史之轴，复兴梦想是冷战后俄罗斯军事战略思维的现实之索。

第五章　冷战后日本军事战略思维

明治维新之后，日本制定了"富国强兵"的政策，通过发动侵略亚洲的战争，走上了一条扩张主义的道路。第二次世界大战结束，日本沦为战败国。20世纪90年代以来，日本违背战后的和平建国原则，着力推行突破"专守防卫"界限和自卫队性质的军事战略。支配这种战略调整的思维理念在于通过军事途径，谋求"政治大国"地位，争夺地区及世界主导权。冷战后日本军事战略思维既是对国际政治格局变化、日本经济发展持续低靡和日本地缘环境等现实因素的畸形反应，又是日本武士道精神、皇国史观、耻感文化及相对主义哲学等传统文化因素的延伸。实际上，这是一条重返军国主义的思维路径。冷战后日本军事战略思维的基本原则包括：以"国际军事贡献"作为"走向世界"的重要途径；借助联盟力量拓展国家利益，同时积极寻求"自主"空间；对周边安全环境保持高度戒备，制造并对付所谓的"威胁"；强化军事变革在实现军事战略目

标过程中的作用；重视"攻防"兼备，而又侧重进攻。这种军事战略思维严重违背和平与发展的时代潮流，脱离国际战略形势的实际和日本国情，必然陷入难以自拔的思维误区。

第六章　和平战略思维

和平是战争的对立面，在这个意义上，和平战略与和平战略思维既可以成为军事战略与军事战略思维的前提，又可以成为军事战略与军事战略思维的延续和拓展。安全与和平是具有高度关联性、互动性和同一性的社会存在状态。一方面，安全的性质和水平决定着和平的性质和水平，惟有安全才有稳定的或较为稳定的和平。另一方面，和平是安全的最起码的条件，惟有和平才谈得上最低限度的安全。安全战略思维的变化，是和平战略思维变化的一个重要方面，从传统安全观向新安全观的历史性过渡，则是安全战略思维转折的重要标志，这就是确立以互信、互利、平等、合作为核心的国际战略新思维。确立以新安全观为核心的安全战略新思维，有利于维护和促进世界和平。和平战略思维的确立，不仅要集中关注安全问题，而且要有自身的总体性设计。适应时代发展需要的和平战略新构想，要求在战略基点上，从着眼既有利益转变到着眼全人类的长远利益；在战略目标上，从赢得战争转变到赢得和平；在战略手段上，推动强权的退缩与张扬基于综合力量的道义；在战略视野上，从突出战时军事力量的运用转变到同时注重平时国防力量的建设和适度发展；在战略方法上，从对抗走向合作。

第七章　高技术战争与军事思维方式的转换

由世界新军事变革孕育和生成的高技术战争，正在从根本上改变机械化的战争形态，动摇传统军事思维方式的实践基础，对传统军事思维方式的要素和结构产生强烈的冲击。我军

要赢得未来反侵略战争的主动权，必须实现军事思维方式的转换。这一转换的目标在于确立以制信息权为军事思维的重心，实现从封闭型军事思维方式向开放型军事思维方式、从"要素打击型"军事思维方式向"结构打击型"军事思维方式、从历史反思型军事思维方式向未来导向型军事思维方式的转换。

第八章 新军事革命与系统集成思维和精确思维

以信息化为本质和核心的新军事革命不仅从根本上改变着机械化战争和军事形态的面貌，而且从根本上改变着人们关于战争和军事的基本观念，改变着军事思维主体把握军事存在的军事思维方式。自觉按照打赢信息化战争的要求进行军事思维方式的变革，并通过军事思维方式的变革大力推进军事理论、军事制度、军事实践的创新，不仅是思维主体积极适应新军事革命的必然要求，而且是不断推进新军事革命的观念保证。实现军事思维方式的变革，关键在于根据新军事革命对军事系统和军事实践方式的深刻影响，确立新型军事思维方式。本章主要从两个方面分析新军事革命对军事思维方式的影响及应当确立的新型军事思维方式。一方面，随着信息化、智能化的军事变革不断向纵深发展，随着信息获取、处理、传输等技术的成熟及其在军事系统中的广泛应用，军事系统内部各个子系统之间的联系日益复杂与紧密，各子系统的要素之间的联系也日益复杂与紧密，整个军事系统由于信息的贯通、联结作用，越来越发展成为一体化的体系。与此相应，传统的系统思维逐渐发展出一种新的形式，即系统集成思维。所谓系统集成思维，就是以一体化的军事系统为目标，以信息为纽带，通过思维的谋划，整合与强化、优化军事系统各子系统间的联系，从而实现军事系统整体功能的大幅跃升。另一方面，随着各国数字化战场建设及数字化军队建设力度的加大，武器装备日益精确化、