



RUSSIAN MILITARY POLITICS AND RUSSIA'S 2010 DEFENSE DOCTRINE

Stephen J. Blank
Editor

Visit our website for other free publication
downloads
<http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/>

[To rate this publication click here.](#)



SSI Monograph

RUSSIAN MILITARY POLITICS AND RUSSIA'S 2010 DEFENSE DOCTRINE

Stephen J. Blank
Editor

March 2011

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. Authors of Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications enjoy full academic freedom, provided they do not disclose classified information, jeopardize operations security, or misrepresent official U.S. policy. Such academic freedom empowers them to offer new and sometimes controversial perspectives in the interest of furthering debate on key issues. This monograph is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

This publication is subject to Title 17, United States Code, Sections 101 and 105. It is in the public domain and may not be copyrighted.

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 632 Wright Ave, Carlisle, PA 17013-5046.

All Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications may be downloaded free of charge from the SSI website. Hard copies of this report may also be obtained free of charge while supplies last by placing an order on the SSI website. The SSI website address is: *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*.

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please subscribe on the SSI website at *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/newsletter/*.

ISBN 1-58487-482-1

CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Introduction	vii
1. Russia's Military Doctrine Development (2000-10)	1
<i>Marcel de Haas</i>	
2. Russian Military Doctrine: Past, Present, and Future	63
<i>Jacob W. Kipp</i>	
3. Russian Defense Doctrine	153
<i>Alexander G. Savelyev</i>	
About the Contributors	181

CHAPTER 1

RUSSIA'S MILITARY DOCTRINE DEVELOPMENT (2000-10)

Marcel de Haas

In assessing Russia's security policy, the analysis of military doctrine plays an important role. Military doctrine forms a part of the national security policy and is a reflection of past and possibly future political-military policy. Therefore, to gain a good insight into Russian security policy, a thorough analysis of the development of Russian military doctrine is essential. This chapter concentrates on Russian doctrinal thinking during the presidencies of Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev since 2000. Furthermore, this doctrinal review is generally limited to elements on external security, with the exception of the use of military force against internal threats, e.g., the conflicts in and around Chechnya. The introduction describes the theoretical setting of military doctrine within Russian security thinking and will also provide a brief overview of doctrinal developments in the 1990s. Next, Putin's first and only *Military Doctrine of 2000* will be explained. Subsequently, the paper of 2003, which I depict as a "defense white paper," was the following major security document on doctrinal thinking. After 2003, no documents related to military doctrine have been released. However, the security elite – politicians, military, and academics – regularly made statements on doctrinal thinking. As of December 2008, reports on a forthcoming new military doctrine – replacing the one of 2000 – became stronger, accompanied with

excerpts of this upcoming security document. Finally, on February 5, 2010, the new military doctrine was released. This chapter ends with conclusions on Russia's doctrinal development since 2000.

INTRODUCTION

Military Doctrine as a Major Element of National Security Policy.

The fact that a state lays down the safeguarding of its continuation in a national security policy is a broadly accepted principle. The objective of this policy is to ensure independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, welfare, and stability by taking political, economic, social-cultural, and military measures. Each state has specific interests. The use of armed forces is especially determined by the perception to which degree these interests are threatened. The conversion of interests into objectives takes place at the highest decisionmaking level, the political or grand strategy. Russia's political strategy—formerly National Security Concept and now National Security Strategy—explains that the Russian Federation (RF) has military, diplomatic, international-legal, information, economic, and other means at its disposal to meet its objectives. The political strategy enlightens Russia's interests and the measures to deal with threats that could prevent meeting its objectives. From the political strategy, as the principal security document, doctrines and concepts are drawn. The most important documents for clarifying Russia's security policy are the *Military Doctrine* and the *Foreign Policy Concept* (FPC). At the military strategic level, security policy is converted into the use of military power by guidelines laid down in a military

doctrine. Military doctrines can be divided into three categories. The most detailed are service doctrines, e.g., those of army, air force, and navy. On a national level we find the joint armed forces or military doctrine, which includes all services. Finally, we can establish multinational or alliance doctrines, e.g., that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This chapter describes only the military doctrine at the national, Russian-state level.

Russia's military doctrine is more abstract and has more politics in it than is the case with doctrines of Western states, which usually concentrate on guidelines for military action. As a result, the Russian doctrine is closely associated with the political-strategic level. Russian military doctrine usually defines itself as a set of officially approved state views concerning war and its prevention, force generation, preparation of the country and the armed forces for suppression of aggression, and methods of warfare to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity.¹ The doctrine provides guidelines in two directions. First, it deals with the needs of the armed forces in the field of organization, personnel, and equipment. Second, the doctrine provides guidelines for waging wars/armed conflicts. Russia's military doctrine provides political guidelines for the direction of all armed forces and troops, i.e., the armed forces of the Ministry of Defense (MoD), as well as the other troops of the so-called power ministries, such as the troops of the security service (FSB) and those of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD).

DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE 1990S

After the break up of the Soviet Union, the Russian military leadership was initially convinced that the

Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) would develop towards an organization similar to that of the former Soviet Union, naturally under Russian rule. This would allow the CIS to have combined armed forces at its disposal. However, it did not take long before a number of CIS states decided differently. They created their own armed forces, independent of Moscow's desires. Subsequently, Russia was forced to form separate RF Armed Forces. This also created the need for a RF military doctrine, which was published in May 1992. This draft *Military Doctrine* seemed to be the start of a movement towards a more assertive confrontational Russian security policy, different from the defensive and peaceful tone of the last Soviet doctrine. In the 1990s, doctrinal development brought forward this assertive policy direction in doctrinal entries on adopting a leading role for the RF in conflict solution and military cooperation within the CIS; granting itself the right to protect Russian minorities in other CIS states, if necessary by using force; lowering of the nuclear threshold by abandoning "no-first-use" statements; the return of terms such as "opponents/enemies"; (forward) deployment of RF Armed Forces and Other Troops outside Russian territory; and a fierce anti-Western threat perception. (See Table 1-1.)

Date	Policy Document
May 1992	Draft RF <i>Military Doctrine</i> published.
November 2, 1993	<i>Military Doctrine</i> ratified by Presidential decree.
September 29, 1999	Draft <i>Military Doctrine</i> endorsed by the Collegium of the RF MoD.
April 21, 2000	<i>Military Doctrine</i> ratified by Presidential decree.

Table 1-1. Chronology of doctrinal documents in the 1990s.

More specifically, doctrinal development in the 1990s included the following adjustments: A deteriorating relationship with the West was reflected in doctrinal entries on interference in internal Russian affairs, expansion of military blocs and alliances, attempts to ignore (or infringe on) RF interests in resolving international security problems, and language that reflects the feeling of being surrounded by enemies. Another illustration of the deteriorated relations was expressed in the development of the doctrinal views on international military cooperation. Cooperation with NATO has gradually disappeared from the doctrines. As a residue of Soviet thinking that threats only came from abroad, internal threats were not recognized at first. However, since 1993 experiences such as Boris Yeltsin's clash with the Duma, armed conflicts within CIS states and, later, the conflicts in Chechnya, have caused internal threats to be included in the doctrines. The growing importance of internal threats generated entries in other areas as well; for instance, regarding the type of conflicts. During the 1990s, the order of conflicts changed, with local and internal armed conflicts, rather than global and nuclear wars, being listed as the most important conflicts. The threat of a global war had diminished. The Russian military-political leadership realized that the security apparatus would be increasingly faced with domestic and regional armed conflicts. This shift from external to internal conflicts was also reflected in changes in the perception of the use of military force. The emphasis changed from external large-scale warfare to operations within the CIS and joint operations of RF Armed Forces and Other Troops in internal conflicts. Another consequence of this change of warfare was expressed

in doctrinal entries stating that the RF Armed Forces (of the MoD) could also be employed for internal operations, and that cooperation between them and the Other Troops (of the power ministries) was essential.

The leadership of the security apparatus, as laid down in the command and control chain of the doctrine, became gradually concentrated in the hands of the following institutions: the President, the Security Council of the Russian Federation (SCRF), the MoD, and the General Staff of the RF Armed Forces. Clearly, the consecutive doctrines gave evidence of a power play by the military. Since drafting the doctrines was mainly left to the General Staff, the military leadership was to a great extent responsible for the assertive tone of the doctrines, as reflected in entries on the desire of controlling former Soviet territory of the CIS and with regard to a fierce threat perception with a corresponding framework of tasks for the military. This forceful attitude was probably an attempt by the military to regain their strong and influential position, which had been diminished under Mikhail Gorbachev. Another example of their aspirations for power and influence was the fact that the SCRF, probably at the instigation of the military, was left out of the command and control chain in the doctrine of 2000.² Other entries aimed at diminishing the status and influence of the Other Troops. However, in doing so, the military found Putin in their way. Since the Constitution of 1993, the President had had a dominating position in doctrinal development and the Legislature no longer played a role in drafting or passing the doctrine. In the course of 2000, by removing the responsibility for military reforms from the General Staff to the SCRF, Putin made it clear that he intended to strengthen the position of the SCRF at the expense of the MoD and the General Staff.

The Military Doctrine of 2000.

In 2000 Putin started his first term in office as President by signing new editions of Russia's major security documents. Shortly after the publication of a new *National Security Concept* (NSC) in January 2000, the subordinate major security documents, i.e., the *Military Doctrine* and the FPC, were also revisited. The order of publication and the generally similar points of view of the different concepts gave proof of a well-coordinated and comprehensive approach to the foreign and security policies. The new military doctrine was signed by President Putin in April 2000.³ This paragraph proceeds with the contents of this doctrine (SCRF 2000). Since the NSC (as of 2009 renamed *National Security Strategy*) has been the principal document in Russian security thinking since the 1990s, for reasons of unity and clarity the main entries of the *Military Doctrine 2000* and of subsequent doctrinal documents and statements are offered in the format of the NSC, i.e., subsequently Russia in the world community, Russia's national interests, threats to Russia's security, and ensuring Russia's security.

RUSSIA IN THE WORLD COMMUNITY

The doctrine mentioned a number of destabilizing factors: Extremist national-ethnic and religious separatism and terrorism; weakening of existing mechanisms of international security; and unlawful application of military force under the pretext of "humanitarian intervention."

There was remarkably increased attention upon internal conflicts, irregular warfare, and joint op-

erations by MoD and other forces, which were the experiences of the Chechen conflicts (1994-96 and 1999-2010). These conflicts were examples of internal destabilizing factors listed as “extremist national-ethnic and religious separatism and terrorism.” A striking feature of external destabilizing factors was the prominence of negative tendencies with reference to Western security policy. NATO’s use of force in the former Yugoslavia (Bosnia and Kosovo) was seen as a particularly clear example of its policy of ignoring Russia, which claimed a decisive role in Europe, as well as of disregarding the United Nations (UN) and the standards of international law. Other concerns were NATO’s new *Strategic Concept of April 1999* and its enlargement with new member states in the East, adjacent to Russia’s borders. The doctrine rejected a leading role for other institutions in international politics other than the UN Security Council (UNSC). This provision was related to the objective of strengthening Russia’s international position. In the UNSC, the RF possessed the right of veto and was thus able to block undesirable resolutions. Therefore, the objective of reinforcing Russia’s international status could be promoted within the constellation of the UN. However, if NATO dominated international politics, the situation was different. In such an arrangement of the international system, the RF, without a veto right, would be more or less “dependent” on NATO’s policies. This explained the prominence of the UN and the UNSC in the doctrinal entries. The doctrine unmistakably expressed that both internal (the Chechens) and external (the West) “aggressors” had to realize that Russia was not be trifled with anymore.

Russia's National Interests.

The national interests stated in the doctrine reflect the military-political instrument that the state has at its disposal to achieve the objectives of its grand strategy: Military cooperation through the CIS Collective Security Treaty, creating a unified defense space and ensuring collective military security; and creating a common security and military policy with Belarus as an element of the union between both states.

The *Military Doctrine* dealt exclusively with the international military-diplomatic dimensions of national interests. Apparently, the military did not desire to mingle in or simply ignored the social-economic security interests of the state. This was a short-sighted approach. Russian forces participated in peacekeeping missions in Bosnia (SFOR) and Kosovo (KFOR) in which social-economic aspects were of great importance in reaching a long-lasting settlement of the conflict. Clearly, the Russian military leadership must have been well posted on the concept of "broad security," which nowadays is an accepted model in international (security) politics. Since the top level of the General Staff was raised in the ideological background of the Cold War, it might very well be possible that hawkish generals stubbornly stuck to the outdated and limited views of the military-diplomatic dimension of security. Furthermore, domestically, the first Chechen conflict should have made clear to the RF authorities that threats were not confined to the military dimension but also have their roots in political, social, and economic dimensions. However, if the RF authorities had taken this interdependence between internal and external national interests seriously, this should have brought them to the conclusion that the

Chechen type of conflicts could not be solved by military means. Consequently, in the interest of preserving and strengthening the RF's sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as of eliminating the causes of extremism and ethno-separatism, not only military and diplomatic means, but also social (human rights), economic (development projects, building and maintenance of houses, schools and medical facilities), and political (reform of the bureaucratic apparatus) activities are essential. However, these essential aspects were not identified in the doctrine as consequences of national interests. Furthermore, as a result of the Union Treaty of December 1999, Russia and Belarus had intensified their cooperation. The military aspects of the deepened relations were stated in the doctrine.

Threats to Russian Security.

The doctrine saw the fulfilment of the political-strategic objectives as well as Russian internal and external security threatened by a number of causes related to the aforementioned destabilizing factors. These included: interference in RF internal affairs; attempts to ignore RF interests in resolving international security problems; attempts to oppose the increase of influence of the RF on a global level; the expansion of military blocs and alliances; the introduction of foreign troops (without UNSC sanction) to the territory of contiguous states friendly with the RF; and the suppression of the rights of RF citizens abroad.

Protecting Russians abroad is a recurring theme in the doctrines. In the consecutive military doctrines of the 1990s, a provision on the protection of Russians abroad was included under the heading "External threats." In previous doctrines describing "abroad," the same expression was used as in the other two se-

curity documents: *za rubezhyom*. However, in the 2000 issue of the *Military Doctrine*, this term was changed into *inostrannyy*. *Inostrannyy* means out of the country in general, it has a neutral, dispassionate implication. Based upon the changed connotation of the term for abroad in the *Military Doctrine of 2000*, the assumption could be made that the General Staff/MoD had become less willing to use force if necessary for the protection of Russian minorities in a foreign country.

Ensuring Russia's Security.

This part of the doctrine portrayed standpoints on military deterrence, security, and the use of force, as well as the deployment of forces and troops abroad, for achieving objectives of foreign and security policies of Russia's grand strategy. As main policy elements for ensuring Russia's security, the doctrine listed: Suppression of aggression towards the RF and (or) its allies; Retaining nuclear power status for deterring aggression against the RF and (or) its allies; Maintaining the right to use nuclear weapons in response to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and in response to wide-scale aggression using conventional weapons in situations critical for the RF; and Possible deployment of limited contingents of RF Armed Forces and other troops in regions of strategic importance outside RF territory.

The *Military Doctrine of 2000* permitted the use of nuclear weapons to counter aggression. It allowed for the use of nuclear arms to repel a conventional attack as well, under certain, not specified, critical circumstances for national security. This attitude was not unexpected, since the on-going decline in conventional strength apparently had to be compensated with em-

phasis on the nuclear deterrent. Furthermore, stress on (the use of) nuclear weapons was also an instrument to counter attempts to decrease Russia's influence in the international arena. The doctrine allotted a special role to the Russian Navy in ensuring security. Since previous doctrines did not reveal a specific role for naval forces, this provision was possibly a new course in security policy. The increased contribution of the RF Navy to the implementation of the political strategy was possibly related to a purposive campaign of the top level of this service to strengthen its position. In 2000 President Putin had endorsed a document on naval policy until 2010, which was further elaborated into a maritime doctrine, published in 2001. In view of the fact that Putin gave his backing to both documents, he apparently was convinced of an essential role for sea power in achieving political-strategic objectives.⁴

HIERARCHY OF SECURITY ORGANS

The doctrine presented a hierarchy of the institutions responsible for national security. The President directs the agencies and forces that ensure RF national security, is the supreme commander of the RF Armed Forces, and, as the head of state, represents the RF in international relations. The Government coordinates the work of federal executive agencies and executive agencies of RF constituent entities concerning national security, provides the equipment of the RF Armed Forces and Other Troops, and directs the preparation of the RF for its defense. The MoD, the General Staff, and staffs of the services and the arms of the armed forces complete the hierarchy chain. According to the Constitution, only the President had the power to sanction the doctrine.⁵ Taking into account Putin's policy of centralization of power, it was not surprising

that the position of the RF President in the chain of command of security policy was strengthened in this doctrinal edition. However, the chain of command listed in the doctrine revealed a number of deficiencies in relation to the control of the Executive and the Legislative over military policy. Parliament and SCRF were missing in the doctrinal enumeration of security organs. Unmistakably, Parliament was set aside. This was probably because the SCRF, theoretically the primary security organ according to the chain of command list in the doctrine, was not involved in controlling the military apparatus and so leaving it out of the chain of command was most likely a purposive policy of the military to reinforce their own power and influence in this policy dimension. The military regarded the SCRF as a competitor, and it was probably for that reason that it was left out of the chain of command. However, in the course of 2000, Putin would make it clear that he intended to strengthen the position of the Security Council at the expense of the MoD and the General Staff (IISS 2000: 109).

THE DEFENSE WHITE PAPER OF 2003: *THE PRIORITY TASKS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RUSSIAN ARMED FORCES*

On October 2, 2003, Russian Minister of Defense Sergei Ivanov published *The priority tasks of the development of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation*, by its format not only a doctrine explaining military operations, but also describing military capabilities—and therefore here referred to as a defense white paper (DWP 2003) (Minoborony 2003).

Russia in the World Community.

With regard to the West, the DWP 2003 showed ambivalence. In dealing with the West in general and NATO especially, the 2003 DWP posed a vision of two minds. On the one hand, entries showed concern over the enlargement of the alliance and the possible deployment of NATO forces on the territory of new NATO members. But it also mentioned that the NATO-Russia partnership would be further deepened in spite of these major differences. Furthermore, it stated that nuclear and large-scale wars with NATO or other U.S.-led coalitions were no longer probable armed conflicts and that Russia expected cooperation with the United States and other industrialized countries to grow with consequent increased stability.

Analysis of the characteristics of current warfare from the 1970s until 2003 led the Russian MoD to a number of conclusions: a significant part of all conflict has an asymmetrical nature; the outcome of a conflict is more and more determined in its initial phase; the party that takes the initiative has the advantage; not only military forces but also political and military command and control systems (economic) infrastructure, as well as the population, have become primary targets; information and electronic warfare today have a great impact on conflicts; the use of airborne, air mobile, and special forces has increased; unified command and control, joint warfare, and a thorough cooperation between ground and air forces in particular, have become essential; a prominent role in modern warfare, as demonstrated in conflicts such as those in Kosovo (1999), Afghanistan (2002), and Iraq (2003), is taken by long-range precision-guided munitions in combination with airpower, after air superiority has been established; and massive use of tanks and

infantry has to a large extent been replaced by long-range guided weapon systems and massive air raids (Minoborony 2003: 34-38). With standpoints stressing the importance of information and electronic warfare, unified command and control and joint warfare, and asymmetric warfare, the 2003 DWP demonstrated a realistic view of modern warfare. Correctly, the DWP focused on asymmetric conflicts as being at the contemporary forefront, instead of large-scale conventional wars.

Russia's National Interests.

In addition to commonly used national interests — such as state sovereignty and territorial integrity — the DWP 2003 emphasized the following interests of Russia: weakening of the UNSC and unilateral use of force as a threat to RF political and military-political interests; legitimate interests of RF citizens abroad; growth of the role of military power in ensuring RF political and economic interests; and the possibility of preemptive use of military force if the interests of Russia or its allied obligations require it.

The document clearly listed national interests especially in relation to the military-political dimension. Entries mentioned under “Ensuring Russia’s security” demonstrate that the DWP 2003 attached great value to the armed forces in ensuring RF interests. This was regarding political issues such as on the UN and on protecting RF citizens, but also on economic issues, which could even demand the preemptive use of force. Since the DWP was a product of the MoD, it is not surprising that the military is given such an essential position to the exclusion of other instruments for ensuring national interests, such as those in the fields

of economics (sanctions or boycotts) and diplomacy (pressure or coalition).

Threats to Russia's Security.

The DWP 2003 identified these as major external threats: deployment of foreign troops in the territory of new NATO members and countries that aspire to join the bloc; armed force used by ad hoc coalitions; persistence of Cold War stereotypes that aggravate the international situation; reducing the role of the UNSC is a dangerous tendency; demonstration of military power close to the borders of Russia; expansion of military blocs; and Infringement on the rights and interests of Russian citizens in foreign states.

The document demonstrated ambivalence towards the West because, in addition to a positive attitude as mentioned under "Russia in the world community," the DWP 2003 also expressed an antagonistic approach, underlining that Russia expected the anti-Russian entries to be removed from NATO's military planning and political declarations. Even stronger, as listed under "Ensuring Russia's security," the document stated that if NATO was preserved as a military alliance with an offensive doctrine, cardinal changes would be undertaken in Russia's military planning and development of the Russian Armed Forces, including its nuclear strategy. At the time of publication of the 2003 DWP, these entries caused considerable concern in circles within NATO. The ambivalent character of the document clearly gave evidence that it was written by multiple authors.

Ensuring Russia's Security.

The DWP 2003 stressed the importance of modern and strong armed forces as an essential instrument for ensuring the security of the state: preservation of a strategic nuclear deterrent to prevent power politics or aggression against Russia and its allies; and strong RF Armed Forces with geopolitical significance for conducting operations in regions of vital economic and political interest of Russia.

Apparently, study of recent Western-led conflicts and of their own experiences in Chechnya convinced the Russian military-political leadership to concentrate on irregular warfare. Nonetheless, carrying out this realistic approach towards modern warfare was a concern. The observations that modern, specifically irregular, warfare could only be fought with sophisticated weapon systems, as well as by improving the training level of personnel, required financial means. The Russian Armed Forces, massive in form, were still aimed at conventional large-scale warfare and demanded a vast amount of money for upkeep. So far, military reform plans had not offered a solution for this dilemma. Unless the military-political leadership decided to radically change the structure of the armed forces towards one capable of conducting asymmetric warfare, the envisaged adaptation of the Russian army was expected to be hampered.

DOCTRINAL THINKING BETWEEN 2003 AND 2008

In the aftermath of the "Nord Ost" terror attack (hostage taking) in a theater in Moscow, Russia, in October 2002, President Putin ordered a revision of the

National Security Concept (NSC) and subsequently of the military doctrine and other security documents subordinated to the NSC. Likewise, after a school in Beslan, North Ossetia, RF, was taken hostage in September 2004, the Kremlin reiterated in its statements the necessity of new editions of the major security documents, which dated from the year 2000. However, in the following years no new developments in military doctrine could be discerned. Not earlier than 2005, Putin ordered a review of Russia's military doctrine (Solovyev 2007). In August 2006, reports appeared in the Russian press on the draft of a new doctrine to be completed in 2007 (Kirshin 2006). These reports, however, were immediately denied by Minister of Defense Ivanov ("And denies" 2006). In the course of 2007, with the announcement of the draft-in-process of a new doctrine, it seemed that the news reports were correct after all (Myasnikov 2006). On January 20, 2007, a conference of the Russian Academy of Military Sciences took place in Moscow. At the conference, the academy's president, Army General Makhmut Gareyev, and the Chief of the General Staff (CGS) of the Russian Armed Forces, Army General Yuri Baluyevsky, presented elements of a new military doctrine. The revised doctrine—to be published at the end of summer 2007—was to replace the one that was ratified by President Vladimir Putin in 2000. At the Moscow conference, it was stated that the doctrine then in force, of 2000—i.e., before the September 11, 2001 (9/11) terror attacks in the United States—needed revision because of the deterioration of the international security situation since then. Subsequently, in March 2007 the SCRF declared that in developing a new military doctrine, the growing role of force in the foreign policy of "leading states" would have to be taken into account ("Russia to revise" 2007).

After the terror attacks of 2002 and 2004, Putin had already ordered a revision of the NSC. However, after a report of Secretary SCRF Igor Ivanov in February 2005 on the draft contents of the revised NSC, nothing was heard on the subject of that draft document. At the conference of the Russian Academy of Military Sciences of January 20, 2007, Gareyev explained that the review of the NSC had been delayed and that the adjustment of the military doctrine would be accomplished first. The development of the new military doctrine, its sequence with the NSC, and the provisional contents of the doctrine clearly showed an attempt by the military to increase their influence among Russia's security elite and thus on decisionmaking in this field. Theoretically speaking, a country should first draft a political strategy before a military doctrine, which should be in line with and derived from this grand strategy. Traditionally, Russia's military had a fundamental influence on the state's security policy. To remain in the forefront of security policy, the military in 1999 managed to avoid the SCRF and to bring out a draft of the revised military doctrine before the draft of the modified NSC was made public. After taking over from President Boris Yeltsin, President Putin in 2000 returned order in the security documents by first ratifying the final edition of the NSC and then that of the military doctrine. In 2007 the development of security documents seemed like a repetition of 1999. For unknown reasons, the revised political strategy was delayed but instead of waiting for this, the military were well underway in releasing a new doctrine, which – according to the statements of Baluyevsky and Gareyev – was likely to include nonmilitary threats and measures as well, which actually belonged to the NSC. Obviously, just as in 1999, the military leadership was eager to strengthen its position.

On May 7, 2007, CGS Baluyevsky formally announced that a new military doctrine was being drafted. Coordination of the doctrinal drafting in general was in the hands of the SCRF and the technical structure was done by the MoD (“Minoborony razrabotalo” 2007). However, after Baluyevsky’s statement, further news on a forthcoming doctrine was not released until December 2008 (“Voyennaya doktrina ozhila” 2008). In spite of the statements of Gareyev and Baluyevsky in January and May 2007 respectively, neither a new issue of the military doctrine, nor of the other major security documents, was released before the end of Putin’s presidency in May 2008. During the remainder of Putin’s second term as President, no further significant terrorist attacks took place, which might explain the absence of revised security documents. Other reasons might have been division among the different actors – such as the SCRF and the Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs – in security policy decisionmaking or perhaps a lack of genuine interest on the part of Putin. As with the aforementioned doctrinal documents, the main entries of the doctrinal development from 2003 to 2008 are presented in the format of the NSC, i.e., subsequently, Russia in the world community, national interests, threats, and ensuring security.

Russia in the World Community.

In the editions of the military doctrine of 1993 and 2000, military threats and measures were separated from other dimensions, such as political, economic, diplomatic, and other nonviolent means to prevent wars and conflicts. These other spheres of security traditionally belonged in the domain of the NSC, Russia’s political strategy. The development of the international security situation demonstrated that this

division among threats and corresponding measures was disappearing. This led to the conclusion that either all related dimensions—i.e., all military and non-military security threats—were to be included in the military doctrine, or that the doctrine and the national security concept should be combined into one document, perhaps a so-called defense or security doctrine (Gareyev 2007; Solovyev 2007). The recognition that distinctions could no longer be made between internal and external security and between military and nonmilitary threats and corresponding responses was a noteworthy feature. As Western doctrinal experts had done previously, their Russian counterparts now also acknowledged that security is comprehensive and comprises all dimensions. In line with this was the call to strengthen the status of the SCRF, the organ to provide an all-inclusive and interdepartmental response to internal and external security challenges. These entries revealed that Russia's military had an open eye for international security developments and for recognizing the value of related analyses of others.

Russia's National Interests.

The statements on doctrinal changes focused mainly on (capabilities of) ensuring security. Only on the sideline were interests mentioned, such as guaranteeing the sovereignty of the state, protecting energy resources and infrastructure, and maintaining a balance of forces near the borders of Russia.

Threats to Russia's Security.

Russia's defense white paper (DWP) of October 2003 discussed characteristics of current wars and armed conflicts. Rightly, the DWP focused on asym-

metric conflicts as being at the forefront, instead of large-scale conventional wars. On January 25, 2006, CGS General Yuri Baluyevsky in the MoD's *Red Star* newspaper mentioned as modern day threats organized crime, drugs and arms trafficking, illegal immigration, extremism, separatism, and terrorism (Baluyevsky 2006). However, at the same time he repeated the traditional "Cold War vestiges" of threat perception such as: the expansion of military blocs; military presence in traditional regions of Russian interest; ignoring Russia in international security politics; and attempts against the strengthening of Russia as one of the influential centers in the world. Hence, although recognized as the primary warfare to prepare for, asymmetric threats were not emphasized as the most essential ones. This ambiguity in Russia's threat perception—emphasis on large-scale conventional and/or nuclear warfare and, conversely, on irregular conflicts—has been a constant factor in military thinking.

Russia's military observed that security cooperation with the West had not brought a diminished number of military threats. At the conference of the Russian Academy of Military Sciences of January 2007, Baluyevsky stated that the existing threats came from Washington: the course of America was toward global leadership and a desire to get a foothold in regions where Russia traditionally was present (Solovyev 2007). The next threat was the enlargement of the NATO "bloc" to the east and the fact that this alliance was involved in local conflicts near Russia's borders. Another threat was the increasing spread of hostile information on Russia's policies. Terrorism and separatism were only mentioned further down on his and Gareyev's list of threats. Gareyev's priority threats were those of specific international forces

and leading states aiming to affect the sovereignty of Russia, to damage Russia's economic and other interests, as well as to execute political and information pressure and undermining activities (Gareyev 2007). The threat to energy security was also considered a vital threat, since leading circles within NATO now considered price changes of energy resources as a form of aggression. The second threat on Gareyev's list was that of nuclear weapons—among others resulting from the construction of anti-missile defense systems—and the proliferation of WMD ("Russia to revise" 2007). According to Gareyev, in the end, nearly all holders of nuclear arms had them aimed at Russia. Third, he mentioned the start of armed conflicts and even large-scale wars as an existing threat. This threat derived from the motivations of great powers to reach military superiority and the presence of large military contingents near the borders of Russia, resulting in a change of the military balance. Finally, the fact that NATO had broadened its sphere of activities and was striving to act on a global level was also regarded as a threat by Russia. The entries on threats—mainly referring to the West in general, and the United States and NATO in particular—corresponded with the deteriorating relationship between Russia and the West. Yet, the anti-Western entries were not new and, therefore, not alarming. Similar phrases were used in the military doctrine of 2000.

HIERARCHY OF SECURITY ORGANS

According to Baluyevsky and Gareyev, in addition to advancing the strength of the armed forces, the position of the Minister of Defense was also to be reinforced (Gareyev 2007; Solovyev 2007). The draft doc-

trine suggested enhancing the status of the Minister of Defense by promoting him to deputy commander-in-chief of the armed forces. Considering that Russia's President is the commander-in-chief, this proposal included granting the Minister of Defense *de-facto* the position of Vice President. Furthermore, the draft stated that the SCRF should be the all-compassing security organ of the Russian state, which had not been the case in preceding years. To raise its standard to this level, the SCRF was to be under administrative command of the Vice President (Gareyev 2007; Solovyev 2007). The call to make the Minister of Defense deputy commander-in-chief of the armed forces, as well as (*de-facto*) Vice President looked like another effort to increase the leverage of the military in security-related decisionmaking. With supervision not only over the military, but also over the troops of the other so-called power ministries—such as the FSB and the Ministry of Internal Affairs—the extension of the position of the Minister of Defense with that of the newly to-be-established deputy commander-in-chief of the armed forces, and consequently that of Vice President, would mean a heavy concentration of power in the hands of one person, possibly giving preference to military power at the expense of other security organs.

Military Cooperation.

Gareyev called for a comparison with military doctrines of other key players in international security—such as China, the United States, and NATO—in order to include entries of their common threats, for instance on terrorism, into Russia's revised military doctrine. Moreover, to counter threats, Gareyev pleaded for a “division of labor” among East and West, by deter-

mining areas of responsibility between NATO and the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), the Russian-led CIS military alliance (Gareyev 2007). The demand for a comparison of threat perceptions with doctrines of other important actors—China, the United States, and NATO—demonstrated Russia's willingness to learn from others and not to consider itself in an isolated position. Related to this was the proposal to construct a division in areas of responsibility between NATO and the CSTO. Although this was to be unacceptable to the Western alliance, which, according to its 1999 Strategic Concept, regarded itself responsible for the unspecified Euro-Atlantic region, the fact that Russia encouraged cooperation between both military partnerships could possibly be valuable in the near future but, more importantly, also showed that Russia wished to continue security teamwork with the West in spite of the differences, as emphasized in entries on threats from the West.

Priority Dilemma between Conventional or Nuclear Forces.

Although President Putin, Minister of Defense Ivanov, parliamentarians, and academics regularly stated that radical modernization of the armed forces was necessary to cope with modern day warfare and contemporary threats, corresponding measures could hardly be traced. The status of material and personnel, as well as plans for the future, did not coincide with the perceived interest in acquiring capabilities for modern warfare. A large part of Russia's weaponry was becoming obsolete. However, the level of investments made for buying new hardware was too low. The number of arms and equipment becoming out-

dated grew faster than the number of arms and equipment meant to replace them. Around 2006 the share of modern military hardware was only some 20 percent of the total, whereas the weaponry of the armed forces of NATO countries was more than 70 percent modern ("Russian forces" 2006). To counter the threats, according to the excerpts of the draft doctrine of 2007, Russia's military organization was to be strengthened, both financially and politically. The size of the armed forces—more than one million—demanded a lot of money, not only for (low level) salaries, but also for other facilities to keep the forces going, thus preventing modernization of arms. Furthermore, a large share of the actual investment was not going to conventional but to nuclear forces, which became a vital reason for lack of investment in conventional forces. However, the provisional entries of the doctrine also emphasized the reinforcement of Russia's nuclear capabilities (Yasmann 2007). The political and military elite recognized the necessity of introducing modern arms to replace the majority of obsolete ones. However, the aforementioned ambiguity between nuclear and conventional arms was also visible in the State Programme of Armaments, *Gosudarstvennaya Programma razvitiya Vooruzheniy* (GPV). The GPV is a classified document covering domestic arms procurement, military related research and development (R&D), and the repair and modernization of arms and other military equipment, describing a 10-year period, of which the first 5 years are described in detail (IISS 2009: 214-215). A central point in the GPV-2015 was emphasis on the nuclear deterrent (FTsP 2008). Russia's strategic deterrent had shrunk from 1,398 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) in 1991 to 430 missiles in 2008 (IISS 2009: 214). According to the GPV-2015, by 2020 Russia

was to be equipped with a modern nuclear force by acquiring Topol-M land-based and Bulava submarine-launched ICBMs, as well as a number of new strategic bombers and (nuclear) submarines equipped with the Bulava. Conventional procurement would entail weapons such as tanks, armored personnel carriers, fighter aircraft, helicopters, and air defense missile systems. Apparently, the political leadership could or would not decide in which way military reforms were to go, either towards smaller, conventional, professional, high-tech, expeditionary forces—the direction Western armed forces moved to—or to continue with large but old-fashioned conventional forces together with modernized nuclear strategic-deterrent forces, to emphasize Russia's vital status in the international arena.

Large-Scale Static Conscript Forces versus Professional Expeditionary Forces.

In the DWP 2003, Russia rightly focused on modern high-tech warfare and on asymmetric conflicts instead of large-scale conventional wars. However, the traditional large-scale structure of the armed forces was not changed, which obstructed the adaptation of the armed forces to modern warfare. There were no indications that Russia was moving towards a model of Western-style modern forces. According to future plans, a large military force largely composed of conscripts was to be maintained. Russian military reforms were limited to reduction of manpower and an organizational change from a five-services (including strategic missile and air defense forces) into a three-services structure (air, ground, and naval forces). Military exercises—such as the (mainly) Russian-Sino

military manoeuvres of 2005 and 2007—demonstrated that Russia was capable of handling conventional warfare (Haas 2005; 2007). However, this applied to a large extent to deploying forces in a traditional way. Moreover, there were no indications that the armed forces were trained and equipped for wide-ranging, complex military operations abroad, as had become the core business of Western armed forces in that decade. During Putin's presidency, Russia refrained from radically changing the structure of the armed forces towards one that was capable of addressing the challenges of modern warfare and current threats. Russia's global ambitions, resulting from its endeavors to restore its superpower status, demanded the capability of power projection by highly skilled, modern equipped, expeditionary military forces that could be deployed at short notice anywhere in the world. However, instead of conventional modernization, the nuclear deterrent received priority. At the same time, protracted conflicts in the North Caucasus—Russia's Achilles heel—demanded armed forces capable of conducting asymmetric warfare against an irregular opponent. During Putin's presidency, neither the status of Russia's armed forces, nor future plans lived up to these two demands on the military.

Reorganization of the Military Administrative Structure.

Since the end of 2005, more and more details were made public on a change of thinking towards the organization of the armed forces. Traditionally, Russia's military had been administratively organized in military districts, for instance those of Moscow, North Caucasus, and the Far East. New Russian military

thinking, as stated in the DWP 2003, that a large-scale conflict was highly unlikely meant that centralized command and control should be changed. Aiming at decentralization, from 2006 until 2010, the organizational structure was to be changed from military districts into interdepartmental and interservice or joint regional operational groupings and strategic directions (Babakin 2006). In the 1990s, another attempt—though in vain—was already made to restructure the military districts system into operational-strategic commands. As a result of the Chechen conflict, a joint and interdepartmental command comprised of the different services of the RF Armed Forces, as well as the Other Troops, and military formations of the other power ministries, such as the FSB, existed in the North Caucasus for some years. Allegedly, Russia had planned to construct a second command of defense forces and internal and security troops in its Far East region. The reform of the administrative military organization would be aimed at changing all military districts into operational-strategic commands. Joint control and command of defense and other security forces was a justified initiative, considering that Russia had to cope with internal unrest and conflicts. However, the proposed reorganization from a structure of military districts to one of regional operational groupings or commands would not be realized during Putin's period in office.

Doctrinal Consequences of the Georgian Conflict of August 2008.

The Russian-Georgian conflict of August 2008 was part of a consistent assertive stance in Moscow's foreign and security policy, of which military power is

one of the major instruments. Around the military campaign in Georgia, President Medvedev launched new policy concepts, emphasizing Russia's return to a position of strength. However, this assertive stance in external security policy was not matched with a military apparatus capable of executing these political ambitions. Although a victory for the Kremlin, the Georgian conflict clearly demonstrated shortcomings in the capabilities of the Russian Armed Forces. A large part of Russia's weaponry was obsolete, and the operations were conducted in a traditional way of massive artillery barrages, counter to the high-tech warfare of the West. After the conflict, the Kremlin concluded that the military should be brought in line with Russia's (regained) status as an important power in the international arena. Thus, ambitious procurement and military reform plans were announced.

Enhancing Rearmament While Continuing Focus on Nuclear Deterrence.

Under Putin's presidency, the State Programme of Armaments GPV-2015 covering the period 2007-15 was developed. After the Georgia conflict, President Medvedev ordered an acceleration of the modernization plans for the armed forces. Although this was already well known, the conflict once again confirmed that a large part of the weaponry of the Russian Armed Forces was obsolete, which hampered successful conduct of operations. According to the GPV-2015, as of 2011-12 the military would receive new weapon systems on a large scale. The Georgia conflict revealed that the level of the existing arms was even worse than previously assumed. This convinced the political and military elite that the pace of modernization should

be enhanced, i.e., new weapon systems were soon to be introduced. As underlined in the statements on the GPV under Putin, after the Georgia conflict—in spite of its purely conventional warfare nature—remarkably, emphasis was again laid on the nuclear forces as the guarantee for Russia's national security. Prioritization of the nuclear deterrence was clarified by the assumption that no state would dare to attack a nuclear power. In October 2008, the Kremlin intended to allocate extra financial means for the enhanced modernization of the military (Denisov 2008). This line of policy was still formally valid in March 2009, stressing that the GPV-2015 would not be affected by the financial crisis. Again, priority for procurement of nuclear weapons—amounting to 25 percent of the expenditures on armament—was stressed.

Reorganization of Units and Structures.

Soon after the Georgian conflict, in September 2008 President Medvedev made a first statement on the necessity of modernizing the weapon systems of the armed forces, as well as their organizational structures and personnel. After this first announcement, a number of detailed military reform plans were to follow at a rapid pace, provided not only by President Medvedev, but also by First Vice-Premier Sergei Ivanov, Defense Minister Serdyukov, and Chief of the General Staff General Nikolai Makarov. The DWP 2003 had been the first Russian security document to express the need for restructuring the armed forces into Western-type expeditionary forces, comprising well-equipped and well-trained troops with strategic air and sea lift capacities, which could be deployed in irregular operations rapidly and far away from the

motherland. However, under Putin no structural modernization plans were undertaken, except for preparing for the large-scale introduction of modern weapons. The military reform plans of Medvedev provided a realistic attitude toward the present problems of the armed forces, sound measures to solve them, and ambitious plans to develop a modern military apparatus. The main objectives of the reorganization plans were the following. The combat readiness of the armed forces would be improved by deleting the unit levels of division and regiment and by creating permanent combat ready brigades. With regard to the structure of the military, in 2008 only 20 percent of the military units were in permanent readiness status. According to the reform plans, most largely unfilled framework units would be dissolved in favor of establishing permanent ready units. The restructuring measures dictated that in 2011 all (remaining) units should be permanently ready for deployment. Related to this was that the number of military units would be reduced from 1,890 in 2008 to 172 units in 2012. The total of 172 units would consist of 80 brigades, all permanently ready. These self-contained modular brigades would be capable of conducting operations independent of other units. The reorganization to a brigade-based structure was executed at a fast pace; in June 2009 50 brigades were already formed, and in December 2009 the establishment of the full number of some 80 brigades was to be accomplished ("Brigadnomu" 2009). Furthermore, if Moscow was to apply power projection more successfully than in the Georgian conflict, rapid reaction forces capable of conducting operations at short notice would be required. For this purpose, airborne brigades would be formed in each military district. Also, the number of available troops would be

raised by reducing the number of senior officers and increasing the number of junior officers and noncommissioned officers (NCOs). This was intended to end the discrepancy of the overload of officers compared to soldiers (until now officers filled between a third and half of the armed forces) and to organize a professional NCO corps. This would not only enhance the number of troops but also strengthen the combat readiness of the armed forces.

Assessment on Modernization and Reorganization Plans for the Military.

Fewer staff levels and reduced burden of command and control, more troops available for combat action, as well as the concentration on modern-equipped permanent ready and rapid reaction units would improve decisionmaking and usability of the military and provide the Kremlin with power projection capabilities in support of its foreign security policy. This must have been President Medvedev's objective for getting actively involved in modernizing Russia's military power. However, for a number of reasons, it is uncertain whether these plans will be fully carried out and successful in enhancing the capabilities of the military. For many years, the armed forces have been faced with military reforms that were not carried out because of obstruction by the military leadership and a lack of will on the part of the security elite. Furthermore, although Russia's defense budget had risen rapidly under Putin, there was no considerable improvement visible in the combat readiness of the forces. Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov, a former tax official, was appointed to this post by former President Putin especially to counter corruption

and obstruction by the military leadership. He faced a lot of opposition from the military leadership against his reform plans due to the intended deep cuts in the officer corps and central staff. Next, Russia was suffering heavily from the international financial crises to the extent that the financial reserves built up by oil and natural gas revenues were fading away rapidly, with consequences for rearmament.

Around December 2008, the reform plans still called for raising the number of modern weapons and equipment to 80-100 percent of the total by 2020. However, in March 2009, the modernization aim was lowered to 70 percent advanced weapons in 2020 ("Russia to downsize" 2008; Naumov 2008; "Russian military to be fully rearmed" 2008; Kremlin 2008a/b, 2009; "Russia announces" 2009). In addition, although aiming to reform its military into Western-style expeditionary forces, Russia's security elite continued to consider combat readiness and modernization of nuclear arms as its first priority, which was not consistent with the overall reform plans and could prove to be counter-productive to conventional arms reforms. Moreover, due to the inefficiency of the military industrial complex (MIC) and its contracts for arms export—meaning crucial revenues for the upkeep of the MIC—the output capability of the military industries was likely to be insufficient to deliver the requested amount of modern weapons for the RF Armed Forces. Hence, due to a number of developments, it was uncertain that Moscow was going to acquire fully modernized armed forces, skilled for power projection, to accomplish the political-strategic objectives of the foreign security policy of the Kremlin. However, what would be the use of a revised military doctrine without correspondingly updated armed forces?

Preparation of a New Military Doctrine.

After many years of discussion on a revised military doctrine and reiterated announcements on the publication of such a document, at the end of 2008 signals became stronger that this time the process of launching a new military doctrine had to be taken seriously. Probably the proceeding military reforms and the aftermath of the Georgian conflict had convinced Russia's security elite that an updated military doctrine was now inevitable. In December 2008, the Kremlin announced plans for a new military doctrine. At the SCRF, an interdepartmental working group was formed, consisting of delegates of federal state organs, the Duma, the Federation Council, the regional presidential representatives, the Russian Academy of Sciences, and the Academy of Military Sciences, as well of scientific and civil organizations (Borisov 2009). The working group drafting the new doctrine under the auspices of the SCRF was led by Deputy Secretary of the SCRF Baluyevsky. Deputy CGS General Anatoly Nogovitsyn was head of the working group on the development of military doctrine of the MoD ("Voyennaya doktrina ozhila" 2008; "Genshtab" 2009; Litovkin 2009). General Gareyev, president of the Academy of Military Sciences and member of the scientific council of the SCRF, was also involved in drafting the new doctrine (Nikolskiy 2009). On October 8, 2009, Nikolai Patrushev, Secretary of the SCRF and former Director of the Federal Security Service (FSB), announced that Russia would soon adopt a new military doctrine. The upcoming doctrine was expected to be presented to President Medvedev before the end of 2009 ("Russia may revise" 2009). In spite of the restated pro-

nouncements that a new military doctrine would be approved by President Medvedev before the end of 2009, this was not the case. Not until February 5, 2010, did Medvedev release the new doctrine in a session of the SCRF. The timing of publication was probably related to the publication of the U.S. *Quadrennial Defense Review* and the annual security conference in Munich, Germany (Giles 2010).

Statements on the Assumed Contents.

Chief of the General Staff (CGS) Makarov stated in December 2008 that in the new doctrine some provisions of the old one would be more precise. Former CGS and current Deputy Secretary of the SCRF Army General Yuri Baluyevsky pointed out that statements on the use of nuclear weapons would be adjusted (“V Rossii” 2009). However, also in December 2008, Deputy CGS Anatoly Nogovitsyn, declared that the part of the document regulating the use of nuclear weapons would not be released (Krainova 2009; “Doktrinal”naya” 2009). In August 2009, it was announced that the new doctrine would consist of two parts, a public part on military-political aspects, and a secret part on the application of the armed forces, including nuclear weapons (Litovkin 2009). Nonetheless, SCRF Secretary Nikolai Patrushev stated that the new doctrine would be a public document. In interviews for *Izvestiya* (October 14) and *Rossiyskaya Gazeta* (November 20), Patrushev further elaborated on the contents of the forthcoming military doctrine. In spite of the alleged secret part on the use of nuclear arms as stated by Nogovitsyn, Patrushev also revealed planned doctrinal changes on the use of nuclear weapons (Mamontov 2009; Borisov 2009). In

the *Izvestiya* interview of October 14, 2009, Patrushev, with regard to doctrinal entries on guaranteeing security, stressed that in the foreseeable future, nuclear weapons would remain the most important priority. The doctrine would list adjustments in the conditions of using nuclear weapons in repelling aggression with conventional arms, not only in large-scale, but also in regional and even in local wars. Furthermore, doctrinal entries were to provide a variance of options for using nuclear weapons, depending on the situation and the intentions of the adversary. Patrushev also remarked that in situations critical to national security, the use of nuclear arms, including preemptive (preventive) nuclear strikes against the aggressor, would be possible (Mamontov 2009).

Because of the uproar, especially in the West, due to Patrushev's statements on the use of nuclear arms, Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergei Lavrov was swift in underlining that these entries of the new doctrine were not meant as a threat, only to warn actors intending to attack Russia ("Russia moves to ease concerns over new doctrine" 2009). Regarding Russia's threat perception, in spite of the rapprochement of the United States and NATO towards Russia, in September 2009 Patrushev explained that traditional threats coming from NATO and America were still valid and thus to be mentioned in the doctrine.⁶ Newly listed as a doctrinal threat would be the escalating struggle for energy and other raw materials, increasing the potential for conflict at Russia's borders, including the Arctic region (Mamontov 2009; Borisov 2009). Another serious threat would be at stake when a more developed neighbor, not a member of a NATO-type military alliance, would use force against Russia to settle a territorial dispute. Theoretically, such a conflict would

be possible with Japan concerning the Kuril Islands (Kramnik 2009; Borisov 2009). According to Patrushev, the final chapter of the doctrine would discuss military-economic and military-technical conditions of defense, prioritizing improvement of the military-industrial complex. Sound functioning of enterprises and organizations of the defense industry and organizations would not only solve military challenges, but also entail an important social function by raising the living standards of the people (Mamontov 2009; Borisov 2009).

Assessment of the Drafting Process of the New Military Doctrine.

Formally, Patrushev's SCRF was in command of drafting the new doctrine. However, it seemed that the contents were also highly influenced by the military, considering the involvement of principal "doctrinal" generals, such as former CGS Baluyevsky, Deputy CGS Nogovitsyn, and president of the Academy of Military Sciences Gareyev. Nevertheless, the battle between the MoD and the SCRF on primacy over the major security documents seemed to have been won by the latter. After an earlier attempt in 1999-2000 by the MoD to overrule the SCRF, Putin restored order by considering the SCRF as the principal supervisor of security documents and by approving the National Security Concept to which the subsequent Military Doctrine of 2000 was subjected. Another effort by the military to bypass the SCRF occurred in 2007, when the delay of a new political strategy apparently was considered by the military as an opportunity to launch a new doctrine before the political strategy was published. In the end, neither of these security documents

was released. This time, in 2009, by revealing details of the forthcoming doctrine, Patrushev probably wanted to make it clear that the SCRF—and not the MoD—was responsible for supervision of the new military doctrine.

THE MILITARY DOCTRINE OF 2010

The text of the new doctrine, published on February 5, 2010, was divided into four chapters: general provisions; military dangers and military threats to the Russian Federation; military policy of the Russian Federation; and military-economic support for defense (SCRF 2010). The first chapter on general provisions merely unfolded the doctrine's relationship with other primary security documents and explained military-technical terms used in the text. The second chapter on military dangers and military threats also contained characteristics of modern warfare. The third chapter on military policy explained the objectives of Moscow's course of action and its instruments, the use of the RF Armed Forces in particular. The fourth and final chapter, on military-economic support for defense, elaborated on the importance of the economic situation and military industries as guarantors for adequate armed forces. Additionally, this chapter dealt with international military cooperation. The following analysis of the 2010 Military Doctrine will be conducted not according to the aforementioned chapters of this text, but—in light of the previously discussed security documents and statements—in line with the format of the National Security Concept/Strategy (see Table 1-2).

Military Doctrine April 2000	Defense White Paper October 2003	Statements on military doctrine 2003-2008	Military Doctrine February 2010
<p>RUSSIA IN THE WORLD COMMUNITY <i>Destabilizing factors for the military-political situation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremist national-ethnic, religious separatist, and terrorist movements, organisations and structures. • Attempts to weaken (ignore) existing mechanism for ensuring international security, above all the UN and OSCE. • Applying military force as a means of "humanitarian intervention" without UN Security Council sanction, in circumvention of international law. • Expansion of the scale of organized crime, terrorism, and illegal trade of arms and narcotics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current stage of global development is noted for acute socio-economic conflicts and political contradictions. • Security is shifting from questions of war and peace to complicated political, financial-economic, ethnic-national, demographic, and other problems. • The significance of military power in the post-bipolar world has not diminished, since a number of international security institutions are in grave crisis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of the international security situation has ended the distinction between military threats and measures from those of other dimensions, such as in the political, economic, and diplomatic fields. • Other spheres of security that traditionally belonged to the competence of the NSC, now are also applicable to the doctrine. • Distinction between internal and external security has also vanished: security is comprehensive and comprises all dimensions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The global development shows a weakening of ideological confrontation, a lowering of influence of certain states and alliances; and an increase in the influence of other states in domination, multipolarity, and globalization. • There is a continuing tendency towards a strong-arm resolution of conflicts, including in regions near RF. • The existing international security architecture (system) does not ensure equal security for all states. • Despite the decline in the likelihood of a large-scale war involving conventional arms and nuclear weapons against Russia, in some areas military dangers are intensifying.
<p>RUSSIA'S NATIONAL INTERESTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RF attaches priority importance to the development of military cooperation with parties to the CIS Collective Security Treaty because of the necessity to consolidate forces towards the creation of a unified defense space and ensure collective military security. • The RF executes a common defense policy with Belarus in the field of military organisation and the development of the armed forces of the member states of the Union. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic national interests: state sovereignty, territorial integrity, socio-political stability, constitutional regime, stability in the international arena, free access to vital economic- zones and communications. • Reducing the role of the UNSC and unilateral use of force is a threat to RF political and military-political interests. • Legitimate interests of RF citizens in foreign states. • Strong RF Armed Forces have a geopolitical significance. • The structure of the RF Nuclear Forces is guided by national security interests. • The possibility of pre-emptive use of military force if the interests of Russia or its allied obligations require it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sovereignty of the Russian Federation. • Energy security. • Maintaining the military balance near the borders of Russia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilization of political, diplomatic, legal, economic, environmental, informational, military, and other instruments to protect RF national interests and those of its allies. • Protection of the vitally important interests of the individual, society, and the state against external and internal military threats. • Expansion of the circle of partner states on the basis of common interests in strengthening international security. • To protect interests of Russia and its citizens and to maintain international peace and security, formations of the RF Armed Forces may be used operationally outside Russia. • Special formations of RF Armed Forces and Other Troops for use in the interests of Russia's economy.

Sources: SCRF (2000); Minoborony (2003); Baluyevsky (2006); Gareyev (2007); Solov'yev (2007); SCRF (2010).
Table 1-2. Main External Security Entries in Military Doctrine Documents (2000-10).⁷

Military Doctrine April 2000	Defense White Paper October 2003	Statements on military doctrine 2003-2008	Military Doctrine February 2010
<p>THREATS TO RUSSIA'S SECURITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interference in RF internal affairs. • Attempts to ignore (or infringe on) RF interests in resolving international security problems. • Attempts to oppose the increase of influence of the RF on a global level. • The expansion of military blocs and alliances. • The introduction of foreign troops (without UNSC sanction) to the territory of contiguous states friendly with the RF. • Suppression of the rights of RF citizens abroad. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the role of the UNSC is seen as a dangerous tendency. • Unilateral use of military power without UNSC mandate encourages greater demand for weapons of mass destruction (WMD). • Deployment of foreign troops in the territory of new NATO members and countries that aspire to join the bloc. • Cold war stereotypes continue to exist, aggravating the international situation. • Proliferation of mass destruction weapons. • Armed force is increasingly used for protecting economic interests, which enlarges foreign policy requirements for using violence. • Interference in internal RF affairs. • Demonstration of military power close to RF borders. • Expansion of military blocs. • Strengthening of Islamic extremism close to RF borders. • Infringement on the rights and interests of Russian citizens in foreign states. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of military blocs. • Military presence in traditional regions of Russian interest. • Ignoring Russia in international security politics. • Attempts against the strengthening of Russia as one of the influential centers in the world. • Course of the USA towards global leadership and a desire to get a foothold in Russia's sphere of influence. • NATO enlargement to the east and its involvement in conflicts near Russia's borders. • NATO's broadened actions strive to act on a global level • International forces and leading states aiming to affect the sovereignty of Russia and to damage Russia's economic and other interests. • The West considering price changes of energy resources as a form of aggression. • The construction of anti-missile defense systems. • Proliferation of WMD. • Desire of great powers to reach military superiority. 	<p>Main external military dangers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire to endow NATO's force potential with global functions and to move its military infrastructure closer to RF borders, expanding the bloc. • Attempts to destabilize the situation in individual states/regions and to undermine strategic stability. • Build-up of foreign troops on territories of states contiguous with Russia and its allies. • Deployment of strategic missile defense systems undermining global stability. • Territorial claims against Russia and its allies and interference in internal affairs. • Proliferation of WMD. • Non-compliance with previously concluded international treaties in arms limitation and reduction. • Use of military force on territories of states contiguous with Russia in violation of the UN Charter / international law. • Presence of armed conflict on territories of states contiguous with Russia and its allies.
<p>ENSURING RUSSIA'S SECURITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited contingents of RF Armed Forces and Other Troops may be deployed in regions of strategic importance outside RF territory as combined or national task forces and bases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring the security of RF citizens in armed conflicts and situations of instability. • Fight against international terrorism, political extremism, and separatism. • Preservation of a strategic deterrence force against power politics or aggression against Russia and its allies • The RF Armed Forces can conduct operations in regions of vital economic and political interest of Russia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambiguity on choice between conventional versus nuclear forces and a large conscript army versus professional expeditionary forces. • Reorganization of the military administrative structure from military districts to joint operational groupings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military-political cooperation has priority with Belarus, CSTO, CIS, SCO, and UN. • Ensure the protection of Russian citizens abroad. • An armed attack on a Union State member is regarded as an act of aggression and will cause retaliatory measures. • Russia regards an armed attack on a CSTO member state as aggression against all CSTO member states. • To ensure the technological independence of Russia in production of strategic and other armaments.

Table 1- 2. Main External Security Entries in Military Doctrine Documents (2000-10).⁷ (Cont.)

Russia in the World Community.

In this doctrine, Russian security thinking on global developments provided a mixed view; on the one hand, reduced political and military threats, but on the other, pointing at the use of military force to solve conflicts and the intensification of military dangers in some areas. The second chapter on dangers and threats started with the remark that the existing architecture of global security did not ensure the equal security of all nations. This seemed to correspond with President Medvedev's stance for a new European security architecture in which the "Cold War vestiges" of the Organization for Security Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), NATO, and the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty would be replaced by an all-European security treaty and conference, preventing the use of force by individual states or organizations.

Russia's National Interests.

With respect to national interests, three aspects in particular came to the fore. First, the desire to expand the circle of partner states on the basis of common interests in strengthening international security. This was probably especially related to Belarus and the member states of the CSTO and of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), cooperation with whom was explained later in the doctrine. Secondly, the provision that for the protection of the interests of Russia and its citizens and maintaining international peace and security, formations of the RF Armed Forces might be used operationally outside Russia. The protection of Russians abroad was mentioned three

times in the doctrine. Consequently, as laid down in the Law on Defense after the 2008 Georgian conflict, Moscow entitled itself to use military force abroad. The third aspect comprised the creation and training of special formations of armed forces and other troops for use in the interests of Russia's economy. This was probably related to protecting energy infrastructure and possibly also with an outlook on future resources, such as those in the Arctic region.

Threats to Russia's Security.

Previous doctrines only mentioned threats. This time the doctrine also referred to dangers. Actually, the threats seemed to be of less importance. They only appeared after the dangers. Furthermore, only the dangers were concrete, the (external) threats were of a very general nature: the drastic deterioration in the military-political situation (interstate relations); the impeding of the operation of systems of state and military command and control; the show of military force with provocative objectives on territories of states contiguous with Russia or its allies; and the stepping up of the activity of the armies of states involving partial or complete mobilization. The listed dangers were specific and referred to a great extent to the West. First of all, the doctrine stated the danger of NATO globalizing its endeavors, attempting to expand its military infrastructure closer to Russian borders, and expanding by adding new members. Clearly, this referred to the intended enlargement of NATO by including Georgia and – until the 2010 Presidential elections – Ukraine. The next doctrinal danger abroad was the deployment (or expansion) of foreign military contingents on territories neighboring Russia or its allies. This probably pointed at the American military contingents

deployed in Romania and Bulgaria. Another listed foreign danger was the development and deployment of missile defense systems. Although not specifically mentioned, this provision presumably meant the global U.S. missile defense network of which the annulled one in Poland and the Czech Republic was a part. Next, territorial claims against Russia and its allies were mentioned. In earlier public statements on the forthcoming doctrine, reference was made to Japan concerning the Kuril Islands. Finally, the doctrine pronounced the danger of the use of military force on territories neighboring Russia in violation of the UN Charter and other norms of international law. This entry possibly addressed NATO's attack on Serbia in the Kosovo conflict in 1999, but even more, Georgia's attack on South Ossetia in August 2008.

This chapter in the doctrine not only discussed dangers and threats but also characteristics of modern warfare, such as integrated use of military force and nonmilitary means; the use of highly effective conventional arms; increased military use of airspace and outer space; intensification of the role of information warfare; reduced preparation time to conduct military operations; increase in high-tech, networked command and control; and continuity of military operations. Moreover, the doctrine set forth the features of contemporary military conflicts: unpredictability of outbreak; a broad range of military-political, economic, strategic, and other objectives; increased role of modern highly effective weapons systems; speed; selectivity; a high level of target destruction; rapid maneuvering; firepower; mobility; initiative; the preservation of sustainable state and military command and control; supremacy on land, at sea, in the air, and in outer space; increasing significance of precision, electromagnetic, laser, and infrasound weap-

only; computer-controlled systems and drones; and nuclear weapons remaining an important factor for preventing the outbreak of military conflicts.

Ensuring Russia's Security.

In response to dangers and threats, the doctrine explained that Russia retained the right to use nuclear weapons in response to a WMD attack against itself or against its allies and also against an attack with conventional weapons when the very existence of the state was under threat. Furthermore, Moscow would ensure the protection of Russian citizens abroad. Other provisions to ensure RF security related to the strengthening of collective security within the framework of the CSTO, CIS, OSCE, and SCO; as well as to develop relations in this field with the European Union (EU) and NATO. Next, the main priorities of military-political cooperation were with Belarus, CSTO, CIS, SCO, and the UN. More specifically, on international security cooperation, an armed attack on a (Russia-Belarus) Union State member or a member state of the CSTO would be regarded as an act of aggression causing retaliatory measures. In addition to the aforementioned (CSTO Treaty) military assistance article, the doctrine also underlined Moscow's willingness to assign troop contingents to CSTO peacekeeping forces. Moreover, Russia would assign forces to the CSTO Collective Rapid-Response forces for the purpose of responding promptly to military threats.

Assessment.

The contents of the doctrine did not quite live up to the earlier statements related to it, nor to the realities of the RF Armed Forces. For instance, the expect-

ed emphasis on energy security was completely left out. The only reference to energy was in relation to the threat of disruption of the functioning of nuclear energy facilities. Furthermore, the repeatedly announced provision on preventive/preemptive nuclear strikes was also missing in the published text of the 2010 Military Doctrine. Moreover, the on-going deep reforms of the RF Armed Forces and the intended huge influx of modern weapons before 2020 were also absent from the doctrine.

Concerning Russia in the world community, the doctrine stated a plea for a new European security architecture, preventing the use of force by individual states or organizations. However, would the proposed European security treaty and conference also imply the type of force Russia used against Georgia in 2008? And if Russia prioritized international law and institutions, why did it veto the prolongation of the UN and OSCE missions in the Georgian separatist regions, and not allow EU observers to enter these regions? If Russia demanded a different security architecture, this would only come closer if Moscow itself would be the role model of adherence to international law. The facts showed a different picture.

Pertaining to Russia's national interests, the doctrine mentioned that the Kremlin could send troops abroad to protect its national interests or its citizens. The use of military force to protect Russian minorities – also by first creating such a minority as was the case in Abkhazia and South Ossetia by submitting Russian passports – was applied in the 2008 Georgian conflict. Countries with Russian minorities, such as the Baltic States, were worried, since they might be the next victim of this provision. This damaged international stability.

Regarding threats to Russian security, the 2010 Military Doctrine considered NATO as a danger. However, if international law was of crucial importance for Moscow as repeatedly stated in the doctrine, why did it not also recognize the right of self-determination of states to align themselves with international organizations as they like? Russia's frequently declared privileged interests in the former Soviet Union area did not entitle the Kremlin to decide what the countries in this region were allowed to do. With regard to foreign troops deployed close to Russian borders, U.S. military contingents deployed in Romania and Bulgaria were in other security documents mixed up with those of NATO. However, if U.S. and NATO policy were the same, Georgia and Ukraine would already have been NATO members. Considering the West as the primary adversary was a disappointing continuation of old thinking. However, by listing the West under "dangers" instead of "threats," damage to the relationship with NATO and the United States was less than otherwise. In that respect, the term "dangers" may have been introduced in order to not complicate the on-going negotiations with America for a new START Treaty on the reduction of strategic nuclear arms. Nevertheless, the thinking in terms of opponents was counterproductive to the course of rapprochement as initiated in autumn 2009 by U.S. President Barack Obama by annulling the European missile defense shield, and by NATO Secretary General Anders Rasmussen focusing his first major speech on improvement of relations with Russia. However, to a certain extent the West itself was also to blame for the prolongation of antagonistic views by the Kremlin, for example, by recognizing the independence of Kosovo—thus encouraging Russia to recognize the

Georgian separatist regions—and NATO extending air defense to the Baltic States, hence fulfilling Moscow's claim that NATO deploys its forces at Russia's borders.

With regard to ensuring Russia's security, in autumn 2009 it was mentioned that the new doctrine would entitle Russia to also use nuclear weapons in preventive (preemptive) strikes. At the time, this remark caused a lot of turmoil and criticism in the West. Perhaps because of that, this provision was absent in the doctrinal text of 2010. It is doubtful that this provision was totally deleted. On February 5, 2010, together with the Military Doctrine, President Medvedev announced his approval of the "Principles of State Nuclear Deterrence Policy to 2020" (Kremlin 2010). During the process of drafting the doctrine, Deputy Chief of the General Staff Anatoly Nogovitsyn had already remarked that the doctrinal part on the use of nuclear arms would not be made public. On February 5, only the doctrine was published on the websites of the Kremlin and of the SCRF. It is not unlikely that the not-publicly-released document, "Principles of State Nuclear Deterrence Policy to 2020," would contain this secret nuclear part of the doctrine, including provisions on preventive (preemptive) nuclear strikes. Another striking feature of ensuring security was the choice of "friends" for enhancing collective security and military-political cooperation. Considering the enumeration of the CSTO, the main actors to cooperate with were found to be Belarus and SCO. The mentioning of a military assistance entry—derived from the CSTO Treaty—together with doctrinal provisions on Russian troop assignments to CSTO peacekeeping as well as rapid reaction forces, unmistakably marked the CSTO as the primary security partner for Moscow.

The Union Treaty of Russia with Belarus was silenced for many years but now returned, just like the CSTO, in the format of a military assistance article. This was remarkable in light of the frequent problems between Russia and Belarus, i.e., on the further development of the CSTO. The SCO, the other international organization in which Moscow played a leading role, was also given a priority status of cooperation. However, different from other recent security documents, the special relationship with China and India was not listed in the doctrine. Perhaps by keeping silent about China, the Russian military thus avoided this taboo and made it clear that China could develop into a threat to Russia. Finally, the EU and NATO were mentioned in the sphere of collective security, as evidenced by RF military contingents participating in operations of both Western organizations. However, they were excluded from the list of military-political cooperation, underlining that these actors did not belong to the category of favored military partners.

CONCLUSIONS ON RUSSIA'S DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT SINCE 2000

A comparison of Moscow's documents dealing with military doctrine between 2000 and 2010 leads to the following conclusions (see Table 1-2).

Perception of Security.

During Putin's first term as President — one of economic weakness and subsequent more dependence on the West — the Kremlin in its DWP 2003 noticed a shift in security challenges from military to other socioeconomic problems. Gradually, in concurrence with

Western military thinking, Russia's security elite also recognized that broad security had become the general concept, i.e., considering all dimensions of security and accepting that internal and external security are connected. However, this attitude changed in Putin's second term when excerpts of the forthcoming new military doctrine underlined an alleged global tendency of solving political problems by military force. Incidentally, Russia itself had also become more active in the military field, e.g., by boosting its efforts in the Russian-led CSTO military alliance and the Russo-Chinese-led SCO by frequently conducting large-scale exercises with China and by resuming strategic bomber flights close to Western countries. The revenues from the increased prices of energy resources, strengthening Russia's economic and political power, and its decreasing dependence on the West allowed for an assertive stance that was also expressed in the doctrinal documents.

Energy: The New Vital Factor?

In Putin's second term, energy was introduced as a doctrinal factor in statements made in 2007 and 2008. In 2009, the alleged excerpts of the upcoming doctrine mentioned energy even more strongly. In his November 2009 interview, Patrushev mentioned energy (security) three times as an issue in the new military doctrine: the struggle for acquiring energy as a factor for armed conflict near Russia (e.g., the Arctic); the quest for energy as a military danger causing the use of armed forces; and energy as a grounds for escalation towards a large-scale conflict (Borisov 2009). In line with other security documents of recent years of Putin and Medvedev, e.g., Medvedev's National Se-

curity Strategy (NSS) of May 2009, energy security for the first time would now enter the military doctrine. Given the importance that the Kremlin attached to its energy resources as witnessed by the release of an Arctic Strategy in September 2008, and by openly admitting in the 2009 NSS the use of energy as an instrument of power, energy (security) was expected to be part of Moscow's doctrinal threat perception. However, in spite of strong expectations, energy security was missing completely in the 2010 Military Doctrine. The only indirect references to energy were the following:

- To ensure the security of the economic activities of the Russian Federation on the high seas;
- To create and train special formations intended for transfer to the RF Armed Forces and Other Troops . . . for use . . . in the interests of the economy of the Russian Federation.

The first entry could be related to the transport of oil and gas, the second one possibly for the protection of domestic energy facilities, perhaps also of future energy sites in the Arctic region. Nevertheless, the indirect mentioning, if at all, of energy meant a deviation from the tendency of growing attention for energy (instruments of power, security, and interests) in each security document since 2007. The question was if this breach had to be considered as an exception to the rule or as an indication that Russia's security elite had changed its mind on the importance of energy. The former would be more self-evident.

Constant Threats from the West.

In all the doctrinal documents since 2000, NATO and the United States have continuously been considered as threats to Russia's national security. The

Alliance was mainly condemned for its increasing range and breadth of activities and members, U.S. global dominance, nuclear deterrence, and missile defense plans and capabilities, all of which annoyed the Kremlin. This line of policy did not cease when these two Western actors started a policy of rapprochement towards Moscow in September 2009. A reset of the Western attitude would not automatically lead to a similar reply from the Kremlin. Possibly, Moscow needed such an adversary perception to justify aspects of its foreign and security policy. Therefore, this threat perception was to be prolonged.

Forceful Protection of Russians Abroad.

The interests and rights of Russian citizens abroad, or rather in the former Soviet Union area — Russia's so-called "near abroad" — has been another recurring factor in doctrinal thinking of this decade, as mentioned in the documents reviewed. In the Georgian conflict of August 2008, this doctrinal provision was brought into practice for the first time. After including this entry in the Law on Defense, it has become likely that military operations abroad allegedly aimed at protecting (the interests of) Russian minorities might be conducted more often. Related to this is the provision of using the Russian Armed Forces abroad in areas of strategic importance. Both doctrinal entries are probably connected to the common thinking of the Russian security elite that the region of the former Soviet Union is still Russia's legitimate sphere of influence. Conversely, and related to this thinking, NATO's expansion to the east and encouragement to former Soviet republics — Georgia and Ukraine — to join the Alliance, has been relentlessly rejected in the different doctrinal documents.

Nuclear Weapons.

By extending the types of conflict that could result in a nuclear response, including local wars, in interviews prior to the release of the 2010 Military Doctrine, Patrushev indicated a lowering of the nuclear threshold. Considering the nuclear paragraph of Russia's doctrinal documents since 1993, this would not be a watershed in security thinking but a continuation of thought. Gradually, new doctrines have moved away from a "no-first use" statement towards the possibility of using nuclear arms in smaller sized conflicts, including conventional ones. Most likely this development has occurred as a result of increasing weakness of Russia's conventional military power (Fenenko 2009). The 2000 Military Doctrine included the first-use of nuclear arms also in response to wide-scale aggression against Russia with conventional weapons ("Doktrinal" naya" 2009). In that respect, the alleged provisions on nuclear arms in the forthcoming military doctrine were – with the exception of the introduction of a provision on the preemptive use of nuclear weapons – not very different from the 2000 version, as was acknowledged by Gareyev (Nikolskiy 2009; Fenenko 2009).

Patrushev's statements in October 2009, during on-going military reforms, possibly reflected the feelings of the Kremlin that it needed to rely on nuclear deterrence even more in a time of military transition. Another reason for the expected emphasis on nuclear deterrence in the new doctrine was that only major powers possess such weapons. In other words, by demonstrating its nuclear force, the Kremlin demanded to be recognized as a great power. Such a status

was time after time claimed in recent major security documents and in public statements, even though this nuclear component carried the sound of Cold War during a time of endeavors of rapprochement by the United States and NATO towards Russia. The doctrinal emphasis on nuclear deterrence was also in line with statements of Medvedev and others of the security elite in autumn 2008 declaring the modernization of the nuclear force as a priority of the then started military reforms. However, in the actual text of the 2010 Military Doctrine, the stress on nuclear arms was much less than expected from Patrushev's statements. Probably because of the on-going U.S.-Russian negotiations on an agreement for a new bilateral pact cutting stocks of strategic nuclear weapons (START), as well as because of the strong condemnation of the West of the alleged provisions on preventive nuclear strikes, the latter statements were withdrawn and the overall emphasis on nuclear arms was strongly reduced in the published text of the doctrine. However, since the more harsh statements on the use of nuclear weapons could have been laid down in the nonreleased document, "Principles of State Nuclear Deterrence Policy to 2020," it is unlikely that the policy tendency of increasing attention for nuclear arms has been broken.

No Modern Doctrinal Concept of Warfare.

In none of the reviewed doctrinal documents and statements could a concept of modern warfare be discerned. No reference is made to a concept of security thought, nor of political-strategic objectives of using modernized forces in conflicts of contemporary warfare, such as the West is conducting in Iraq and Afghanistan. The 2010 Military Doctrine completely

ignored the on-going far-reaching restructuring of the RF Armed Forces. Furthermore, this new doctrine repeatedly referred to mobilization, whereas the current structural reforms envisaged a nonmobilization permanent-ready type of forces. Consequently, the 2010 doctrine also refrained from stating what use the new “Western-type” brigade-structured and modern equipped troops would have. And this is perhaps more than anything else the reason for which a military doctrine is written. The policy of acquiring (French) helicopter carriers in relation to the Russian-Georgian conflict of 2008 gave the impression that traditional warfare “around the corner” in Russia’s near abroad would continue to be the main stream of Russian military thinking (Kipp 2009). The 2010 Military Doctrine demonstrated ambiguity in military thinking. On the one hand, it stated characteristics of modern warfare, but on the other stressed mobilization capabilities, thus leaning on old-style large-scale warfare of the NATO-Warsaw Pact type. Similarly, it pointed at the necessity of acquiring modern conventional arms, but at the same time underlined the importance of an up-to-date nuclear deterrent force. Hence, the doctrinal development of the last decade demonstrated uncertainty in the direction of the security elite. The 2003 DWP gave the first recognition of modern warfare, of which the military reforms since 2008 have been the application. But the next step – establishing objectives for modernized armed forces – has apparently as yet not been reached: in the meantime Moscow is likely to stick to military adventures in its near abroad.

REFERENCES

“And denies reports of the new defense doctrine” (2006), *Radio Free Europe /Radio Liberty Newslines*, 10, 158, August 28.

Babakin, A. (2006) “Reorganizovat” možhno...Rukovodit” slozhno,” *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, July 14.

Baluyevsky, Yu. (2006) “Generalnyy shtab i zadachi voyennogo stroitelstva,” *Krasnaya Zvezda*, January 25.

Borisov, T. (2009) “Voyennaya doktrina v tretyem variante,” *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*, November 20.

“Brigadnomu poryadku krizis ne strashen” (2009), *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, July 17.

Denisov, V. (2008) “Novoye oruzhiye budet!,” *Krasnaya Zvezda*, October 2.

“Doktrinal”naya neopredelennost” (2009), *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, October 16.

Fenenko, A. (2009) “Vozvrashcheniye ‘gibkogo reagirovaniya’,” *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, November 13.

FTsP (Federal”nye Tselevye Programmy Rossii) (2008) “Gosudarstvennaya Programma Vooruzheniya: chetyre trilliony rubley do 2015 goda,” February 5, available from fcp.vpk.ru/cgi-bin/cis/fcp.cgi/Fcp/News/View/2010/2082.

Gareyev, M.A. (2007), “Novyye usloviya—novaya voyennaya doktrina,” *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, February 2.

“Genshtab: zakrytaya chast” novoy voyennoy doktriny RF opredelit proavoprimeneniye armii i flota” (2009), August 11, available from *Interfax.ru*.

Giles, K. (2010) “The Military Doctrine of the Russian Federation 2010,” *Research Review*, NATO Defense College, February.

Haas, M. de (2005) *Russian-Chinese military exercises and their wider perspective: Power play in Central Asia*, Russian Series 05/51, Swindon, UK: CSRC, UK Defence Academy, October.

Haas, M. de (2007) *The "Peace Mission 2007" exercises: The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation advances*, Central Asian Series 07/281, Swindon, UK: Advanced Research and Assessment Group, UK Defence Academy, September.

Haas, M. de (2009) "NATO-Russia Relations after the Georgian Conflict," *Atlantisch Perspectief*, Vol. 33, No. 7, November 2009, pp. 4-9.

IISS (2000) *Strategic Survey 2000-2001*, London, UK: Oxford University Press (International Institute of Strategic Studies).

IISS (2009) *Military Balance 2009*, London, UK: February.

Kipp, J. W. (2009) "The Shifting Strategic Priorities of the Russian Navy," *Eurasia Daily Monitor*, Vol. 6, Issue 195, October 23.

Kirshin, Yu. (2006) "Generalny verstayut novuyu voyennuyu doctrinu," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, August 25.

Krainova, N. (2009) "Patrushev Signals Change in Nuclear Policy," *The St. Petersburg Times*, October 13.

Kramnik, I. (2009) "Who should fear Russia's new military doctrine?" *RIA Novosti*, October 23.

Kremlin (2008a) "Opening address at a meeting with commanders of military districts," September 26, available from eng.kremlin.ru.

Kremlin (2008b) "Meeting on developing the Armed Forces," September 11, available from eng.kremlin.ru.

Kremlin (2009) "Opening address at an expanded session of the defense ministry board," March 17, available from eng.kremlin.ru.

Kremlin (2010) "Dmitry Medvedev signed the Military Doctrine and the Principles of State Nuclear Deterrence Policy to 2020," February 5, available from eng.kremlin.ru.

Litovkin, D. (2009) "Part of the military doctrine closed," *Izvestiya*, August 12.

"Minoborony razrabotalo novuyu voyennuyu doktrinu" (2007), *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, May 18.

Minoborony (2003) *Aktual'nyye zadachi razvitiya Vooruzhënnnykh Sil Rossiyskoy Federatsii* (The priority tasks of the development of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation), Moscow, Russia: Ministry of Defense Russian Federation, October 2.

Mamontov, V. (2009) "Menyaetsya Rossiya, menyaetsya i eë voyennaya doktrina," *Izvestiya*, October 14.

Myasnikov, V. (2006) "Predstoit seryeznyy razgovor o novoy doktrine," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, December 22.

Naumov, I. (2008) "Pushki vmesto masla," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, September 15.

Nikolskiy, A. (2009) "Rossiya ne udarit," *Vedomosti*, October 9.

"Rossiya nachala razrabotku novoy voyennoy doktriny" (2009), October 15, available from Lenta.ru.

"Russia announces rearmament plan" (2009), *BBC*, March 17.

"Russia may revise use of nuclear weapons in new military doctrine" (2009), *RIA Novosti*, October 8.

"Russia moves to ease concerns over new doctrine" (2009), *RIA Novosti*, October 23.

"Russia to downsize Armed Forces to 1 mln by 2012" (2008), *RIA Novosti*, October 14.

"Russia to revise its military stance over US missile plans" (2007), *Financial Times*, March 6.

"Russian forces reportedly lack modern weapons" (2006), *RFE/RL Newsline*, 10, 66, April 10.

SCRF (2000) *Voyennaya Doktrina Rossiyskoy Federatsii* (Military Doctrine of the RF), April 21, in Russian available from nvo.ng.ru/wars/2000-04-28/4_doctrine.html, in English available from www.armscontrol.org/act/2000_05/dc3ma00.

SCRF (2010) *Voyennaya Doktrina Rossiyskoy Federatsii* (Military Doctrine of the RF), February 5, in Russian available from www.scrf.gov.ru/documents/33.html.

Solovyev, V. (2007) "Voyennaya reforma obyavlena bessrochnoy," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, January 26.

"V Rossii izmenyatsya osnovaniya dlya primeneniya yadernogo oruzhiya" (2009), October 15, available from Lenta.ru.

"Voyennaya doktrina ozhila" (2008), *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, December 12.

Yasmann, V. (2007), "Russia: Reviving the army, revising military doctrine," *RFE/RL*, March 12.

ENDNOTES - CHAPTER 1

1. For definitions of the doctrine, see 'Osnovy voyennoy doktriny Rossii (Proyekt)', *Voyennaya Mysl'*, spetsial'nyy vypusk, May 19, 1992, p. 3; V. D. Zabolotin, *Slovar' voyennykh terminov* Moscow, Russia: Kosmo, 2000, p. 53.

2. The SCRF is the highest Russian state organ for internal and external security affairs. According to the 1992 Law on Security (*Zakon RF o Bezopasnosti*), the SCRF was charged with preparing presidential decisions on security affairs. Next, the SCRF analyzed aspects of internal and external security, as well as strategic problems concerning economic, social, military, information, ecological, and other forms of security. In June 1992, a presidential decree further defined the set of tasks for supporting the President in establishing domestic, foreign, and military policy and ensuring state sovereignty and social-economic stability. Thus, the set of tasks of the SCRF covered all aspects of Russia's grand strategy. Apart from the Law on Security, the foundations of the SCRF were also rooted in the Constitution of 1993. See M. Khodarenok, 'Vremya sobirat' kamni', *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, January 19, 2001, p. 1; 'Zakon Rossiyskoy Federatsii o Bezopasnosti', article 13; 'Konstitutsiya Rossiyskoy Federatsii', article 83, paragraph G.)

3. Presidential decree regarding the 2000 doctrine: 'Ukaz Prezidenta Rossiyskoy Federatsii ob utverzdenii Voyennoy doktriny Rossiyskoy Federatsii', *Krasnaya Zvezda*, April 25, 2000, p. 1.

4. "Principles of RF naval policy, as confirmed by Presidential decree, March 4, 2000," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, No. 11, March 31, 2000, pp. 1, 4; "Morskaya doktrina Rossiyskoy Federatsii na period do 2020 goda," *Nezavisimoye Voyennoye Obozreniye*, No. 28, August 3, 2001, p. 4.

5. *Konstitutsiya Rossiyskoy Federatsii*, *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*, December 25, 1993; article 83, paragraph H.

6. For the September 2009 Western endeavors on rapprochement with Russia, see M. de Haas, "NATO-Russia Relations after the Georgian Conflict," *Atlantisch Perspectief*, Vol. 33, No. 7, November 2009, p. 8.

7. The citations are mostly not literally derived from the different security documents, but are adapted by the author. The grouping of related entries as used here is for the purpose of clarity and does not necessarily correspond with the original documents. Since the National Security Concept (NSC) was the principal Russian security document until publication of the National Security Strategy in May 2009, for reasons of unity and clarity the main entries of the documents are offered in the format of the NSC, i.e., subsequently Russia in the world community, Russia's national interests, threats to Russia's security, and ensuring Russia's security.