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The rising trend in Russia’s military expenditure, which started in 1999, accelerated sharply in 2012, with a real-terms increase of 16 per cent compared with 2011. The draft budget for 2013–15 contains plans for a further rise in nominal terms of just over 40 per cent by 2015 (see table 3.5). This would amount to a real-terms increase of approximately 17 per cent between 2012 and 2015, based on current inflation projections, and military spending as a share of gross domestic product (GDP) would rise to 4.8 per cent. The increases come as Russia implements the ambitious 2011–20 State Armaments Programme (Gosudarstvennaya Programma Vooruzheniya, GPV), and undertakes a wide-ranging reform of its armed forces. This section summarizes the reforms and discusses widespread doubts as to how far they can be implemented.

The reform plans

The GPV aims to spend 20.7 trillion roubles ($705 billion) on military equipment by 2020. Of this total, 19 trillion roubles ($647 billion) is for the Ministry of Defence and the remainder is for other forces such as the Border Guards and troops of the Ministry of the Interior. The programme aims to replace 70 per cent of Russia’s armaments with modern weapons and is part of a broader effort to reform and modernize the Russian armed forces.

The reforms also include (a) changes in the structure of the armed forces to promote greater mobility and combat-readiness; (b) the replacement of a mass-mobilization strategy, which aimed to be able to mobilize up to 4 million troops over a long period in a major war situation, with a strategy based on a more readily deployable standing force of around 1 million troops and a much smaller reserve of around 700 000; (c) a major increase
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in the ratio of contract soldiers and non-commissioned officers to conscripts; (d) a reduction in the number of senior officers in the current top-heavy structure; and (e) the outsourcing of a range of non-core tasks to civilian contractors.5

The motivation for modernization was Russia’s intervention in the brief war in South Ossetia in 2008, which exposed severe weaknesses in Russian command, communication, mobility, readiness and equipment quality. The Russian armed forces had been in a state of decline since the collapse of the Soviet Union. It had procured almost no new major conventional armaments before 2008, leaving increasing proportions of its equipment obsolete or even non-functioning.6
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Challenges to implementation

The reform and modernization plans face several challenges. First, as has been well documented, the Russian arms industry remains in a weak state, with ageing machinery, two decades of low levels of research and development, a lack of new recruitment of skilled engineers and scientists, and inefficient organizational structures. The industry’s relationship with government has been increasingly strained by its inability to deliver advanced weapons in many areas, leading to Russia beginning to import certain weapons as a means of obtaining modern military technology. As part of the GPV, the government is investing 2.3 trillion roubles ($78 billion) in the industry to help it modernize. How quickly it will be able to overcome decades of atrophy is open to question.

Moreover, there is rampant corruption in the Russian arms industry. Dmitry Medvedev is reported to have said that it led to the loss of 20 per cent of procurement funds while he was president (in 2008–12). In November 2012 allegations of corruption led President Vladimir Putin to remove Anatoly Serdyukov, the architect of the military reform process, from the post of Minister of Defence. Whether the direction of the military reform will be affected by Serdyukov’s removal is as yet uncertain.

Second, the spending levels planned for the GPV, which was designed on the basis of economic conditions prevailing before the 2008 global financial crisis, may be unrealistic. A simulation by Professor Julian Cooper of the University of Birmingham suggests that, unless military spending as a share of GDP were to rise even higher than is planned, the defence budget would only be sufficient to fund around 80 per cent of the GPV by 2020. Moreover, some independent projections of Russian GDP growth are considerably lower than those of the Russian Government, which are the basis of this simulation. Concerns over the financial sustainability of Russia’s military and other spending plans led to clashes between the Minister of
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Finance, Alexei Kudrin, who opposed the plans, and President Medvedev, leading to the former’s sacking in October 2011.¹³

Third, structural reforms of the armed forces are threatened by deficiencies in personnel recruitment. Russia’s population is shrinking and ageing, leading to an ongoing fall in the available pool of recruits, as either conscripts or contract soldiers.¹⁴ Moreover, there are serious problems of poor education, health and nutrition among young Russian men. Current plans involve a considerable reduction in the number of conscripts, and an increase in the number of contract soldiers; but poor terms and conditions, including issues such as violent initiation of new recruits, make the armed forces an unattractive career for many.¹⁵

This combination of economic, industrial, demographic and institutional problems has produced a clear consensus among observers both within and outside Russia that the ambitious goals of the GPV will not be fulfilled in their entirety.¹⁶ Nonetheless, the major increases in military spending, involving increased investment in both new equipment and human capital, will lead to some increased capability of the Russian armed forces by 2020, whether or not the fundamental structural problems are successfully addressed.

¹⁵ Carlsson and Norberg (note 5), pp. 103–104.