



UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

Simulation on The Use of Force in Chechnya: An Exploration through Track-Two Diplomacy

This simulation focuses on the conflict in Chechnya and provides an opportunity to take part in a problem-solving workshop involving Russian and Chechen representatives of civil society.

Participants will play the roles of Russians and Chechens from various sectors of society: low to mid-level government officials, religious leaders, and representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Participants will explore possible future directions of this conflict, the needs and interests of the two peoples, and the conditions and situations under which violence and the use of force might possibly be justified.

The potential benefits of “track-two diplomacy” – that is, an effort to bring together influential members of the parties to a conflict in an unofficial capacity to explore joint problem solving – will be discussed and analyzed.



Simulation on the Use of Force in Chechnya: An Exploration through Track-Two Diplomacy

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
An Introduction to Track-Two Diplomacy	4
Basics of the Problem-Solving Workshop	4
Participant Tasks.....	5
Materials	7
Scenario	8
Background	9
Setting the Stage.....	9
Conflict Chronology	9
Impact of the War: Facts and Figures	17
Background on Russia	17
Background on Chechnya.....	20
The US on Chechnya.....	22
Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.....	22
Annotated Bibliography	24
Roles.....	28
Viktor Ozerov	29
Valery Manilov.....	30
Igor Fiodorov	31
Mikhail Rekalov	32
Alexei Arbatov	33



Boris Nemtsov	34
Abdul-Khakim Sultygov	35
Archimandrite Mark Golovkov	36
Oleg Orlov	37
Valentiana Malnikova	38
Sergei A. Kovalyov	39
Anna Politkovskaya	40
Hussein Iskhanov	41
Hamid Lashkarov	42
Salambek Maigov	43
Emin Orta	44
Hassan Khamil	45
Garan Sureyev	46
Shamsail Saraliyev	47
Umar Gregarov	48
Malik Saidullayev	49
Vakha Kasturiyev	50
Zarman Shakhmurzayev	51
Kazbek Arsenaev	52
Related Web Links.....	53
Related Institute Resources	53
Other Web Resources	53



Introduction

An Introduction to Track-Two Diplomacy

Since the end of the Cold War, the international community has been confronted by several persistent ethno-political conflicts, which frequently have deep historical roots and which require particular sensitivity to cultural and religious identities, political fears and aspirations, and security and well-being. Although these conflicts may involve official government action, they are frequently fueled by insecurity and discontent among the general population or segments of the population. The interactions of high-level policy makers in most cases deal expressly with state interests and questions of power, i.e., the kind of diplomatic interaction that brought former President Clinton, Yasser Arafat, and Ehud Barak together. This type of diplomacy, known as “track-one” diplomacy, involves negotiation among the official representatives to the parties to the conflict and is essential in producing and implementing policies that make and support peace.

In certain conflicts, track-one diplomacy has proven ineffective - in particular those conflicts dealing with issues of identity, survival, and ethnic fears of “the other.” In these cases traditional negotiation processes work best when supplemented by unofficial processes that address the perceptions of the “other” and fears that fuel the conflict. This unofficial process, known as “track-two” diplomacy, or “citizens” diplomacy, brings together influential members of the parties to a conflict in an unofficial capacity for joint analysis of the problem and joint problem solving. Participants may include lower-level government policy advisors, community and religious leaders, prominent businesspersons, and representatives of non-governmental organizations. Their unofficial position allows them the freedom to explore alternative solutions to the conflict at hand. The idea is to involve members of the community who will be able to replicate and advance the diplomatic process even after the facilitated sessions are complete. For some it is a way of imbedding a negotiated agreement or peace treaty into the communities that must live with the terms of that agreement.

The focus in track-two diplomacy is not on negotiating a specific outcome, but rather on opening up communication between conflicted groups, developing creative approaches to differences in identity, discussing the sources of violence and discontent, and encouraging understanding of the “other.” Sessions are typically facilitated by experts in dispute resolution who are also somewhat familiar with the cultures and conventions of both parties.

Ideally, sustained track-two diplomacy promotes reconciliation and builds public support and political will for the long-term developments that contribute to a lasting peace. It is important to note that track-two diplomacy is not meant to be a substitute for official negotiations. Ultimately, track-one diplomacy is necessary for structuring and institutionalizing the peacemaking process. However, track-two diplomacy is an excellent complement to the official process and can be quite helpful when government dialogues come to a standstill.

Basics of the Problem-Solving Workshop

This simulation takes place within the framework of a problem-solving workshop, one particular method of conducting track-two diplomacy. Such workshops often take place over two to four weeks and involve several hours of building trust and confidence among the participants, examining preconceptions and stereotypes, discussing group interests and positions, sharing personal motivations and feelings, brainstorming future solutions and goals, and practicing conflict transformation within the context of specific cultures. A problem-solving workshop also includes a variety of structured and unstructured social activities designed to give participants an opportunity to get to know one another in a low-risk environment. In some cases, participants live



in the same location for the duration of the workshop. The problem-solving workshop, then, is intended to provide community leaders with the opportunity to speak candidly, free from the pressure that high-level policy makers feel from their constituencies. The open-ended nature of the workshop sessions gives both parties the liberty to explore potential solutions without having to commit or make concessions that might indicate weakness.

In this simulation, students will assume roles of Russians and Chechens meeting at a problem-solving workshop to explore the needs and interests of each side in an effort to create alternative solutions to the conflict in Chechnya. The participants will include Russians and Chechens from various sectors of society: low-level government officials, religious leaders, and representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Positions will include hard line, moderate, and liberal viewpoints on the Russian side and moderate, separatist, and pro-Russian on the Chechen side.

The workshop is intended to acquaint participants with the concepts and processes involved in track-two diplomacy, the benefits of open-ended problem solving, the need for alternative approaches to ethno-political problems, and some of the complexities of the Chechen conflict.

Throughout the simulation, participants should consider how the facilitation and problem-solving workshop could apply to real-world situations. Because the simulation will be significantly shorter in duration than most real problem-solving workshops, it is very important for each participant to think in advance about the kinds of issues that are at stake for his or her individual role and group. Participants should examine their own views about the causes of conflict, options for resolution, and the situations in which war might be a justified response. As they prepare for the simulation, participants should consider as well in what ways these concepts apply to the dispute between Russia and Chechnya.

The problem-solving workshop is an attempt to move from a debate between opposing parties to a mutual problem-solving process.

- In Session 1 of the workshop, participants will have the opportunity to debate viewpoints within their group.
- In Session 2, participants will listen to the needs and interests of the opposing group to determine points of overlap.
- Participants will use this information in Session 3 as they develop recommendations for a future course of action with regard to the conflict, which they can bring back to their organizations and communities.

The workshop will be facilitated by participants playing representatives of the OSCE. They will guide the discussions. The workshop process is informal and relies heavily on respecting the thoughts and opinions of fellow workshop participants. There is no hierarchy in the workshop. All opinions are to be listened to and given the same weight, regardless of the title of the individual expressing the opinion.

Participants will not have access to organizational contacts during the workshop. Discussions and events that take place in the workshop setting are to remain in the room. Communicating opinions and beliefs shared in the workshop with individuals outside of the workshop can endanger participants' jobs and lives. If a crisis should arise outside of the workshop, facilitators will provide any necessary information to participants.

Participant Tasks

Participants' first task is to read the background documents and their role guides, and begin to understand the position and views of the role each will play. A list of questions designed to help



participants think about the simulation follows each section of the Background. Participants are not expected to develop detailed answers for each question; rather, they are included to guide preparations for the problem-solving workshop.

Throughout the problem-solving workshop, each participant should:

- Explore the reasons for the conflict (Session 1)
- Given these reasons, consider the justifications for and against the use of force, in light of the principles of just war theory. (Session 1)
- Listen to the needs and interests of the opposing party. (Session 2)
- Develop a series of recommendations for the future course of the conflict. (Session 3)

The simulation promises to be an enriching and fun experience. The importance of being prepared cannot be stressed enough. Participants should read all of the enclosed documents and take time to analyze the situation. It is important that participants remember which issues must be addressed, on which points flexibility is possible, and which issues are vital to a particular role's interests. With sufficient preparation, this simulation will provide participants with a firsthand experience of the rewards—and frustrations—that characterize track-two diplomacy.



Materials

Each participant should receive the following materials:

- The various Introduction, Scenario and Background documents (pages 1-27)
- A role guide

Teachers may wish to make available as well the following items for this simulation:

- A classroom or conference room and sufficient breakout rooms or additional space for any needed sub-group meetings or other teamwork exercises
- An overhead projector or multimedia data projector and an overhead screen.
- Flip charts and flip chart paper (or white boards) and markers
- 1 pad and pen per participant



Scenario

It is October 2003, and a group from the Russian Federation, and another from Chechnya are in Vienna, Austria to participate in a problem-solving workshop at the request of Rolf Ekeus, the High Commissioner on National Minorities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The participants have gathered to work toward a joint diagnosis of the Chechen conflict and to communicate their needs and concerns, hopefully to lead to common solutions that consider these needs and interests. The High Commissioner has reiterated the fact that the OSCE is not concerned with developing substantive solutions to the Chechen conflict, but rather with creating a process through which the disputants can find ways of meeting their needs and of securing their interests with the least possible physical violence.

This meeting has arisen in the wake of recent indications from both the Russian and Chechen sides that they are willing to explore alternatives to a military solution to end the Chechen conflict. President Putin's traditionally hard-nosed stance on the Chechen issue has softened due to increasing domestic opposition as well as international (European) appeals for negotiations on the part of both sides. Russian participants include members from the government, various political parties, human rights organizations, and the media.

On the Chechen side, this workshop reflects the wishes of moderates who have been consistently calling for negotiations without conditions. Previously, their voices have been submerged or ignored by more militant elements. However, the U.S declaration that it views the actions of Chechen separatists within the context of international terrorism has spurred some militant elements to pledge (at least publicly) their support for exploring alternative solutions with the Russians. The Chechen participants include members of the Russian-backed administration in Grozny, individuals supporting the various factions of the Chechen rebels, members of the Chechen underground separatist government, and religious and civil society leaders.

Given the reluctance of both parties to commit to a fully-fledged negotiation process, the large degree of mutual distrust and suspicion, and the lack of a positive track record with regard to talks, Mr. Ekeus has suggested a problem-solving workshop format. He sees this as a forum to air and exchange positions and ideas about the conflict and its possible resolution, and to deal with the ongoing violence on both sides, the victims of which are primarily civilians. He has made it very clear that participants have been invited in an *unofficial capacity* and with the explicit understanding that the workshop will offer an environment for the exploration of ideas without prejudice to any existing official positions. Participants will be able to express their own needs, interests, fears, and hopes and hear the same from others. Clearly, the fact that the participants will be able to explore options freely without the risk of any idea being interpreted as a concession or commitment has been significant in bringing both parties to the workshop. On the other hand, skeptics seem to think that this kind of meeting will produce very little in the form of tangible results, given that the participants do not have to commit to anything.



Background

Setting the Stage¹

The conflict between Russians and Chechens in Chechnya has taken a variety of forms. What began as an independence movement in 1991 was by 1999 transformed into a fractured movement with a significant faction of Chechens fighting for the creation of an Islamic state. This added religious component, coupled with the increased use of terrorist tactics, has resulted in a complicated, protracted conflict.

In August 1999, a group of guerrilla fighters led by Chechen warlord Shamil Basayev, invaded Dagestan, a neighboring Russian Republic of Chechnya, in an attempt to create a greater Islamic state. Shortly thereafter, a string of unexplained bombings rocked apartment buildings in Moscow and Volgograd. The Kremlin swiftly condemned the bombings as terrorist attacks, blaming the government of Chechen President Aslan Maskhadov for the death of nearly 300 civilians. As Russian Defense and Interior Ministry forces massed on the Chechnya's borders, both sides braced for the second conflict in less than two years.

Today, rebel fighters and Russian forces remain locked in a protracted guerrilla war where death and despair are the only clear victors. According to the Mothers of Russian Soldiers Committee, Russian military losses are nearly 11,000 dead and over 12,000 wounded. Experts estimate that the war costs Moscow upwards of \$100 million each month, and that as many as ten to twenty Russian conscripts and contract soldiers die every day.

For Chechens, the calamity is far worse. The Chechen Committee for National Salvation estimates that between 20,000 and 40,000 people have died since 1999. Total casualties, including those from the 1995-1997 war, could be as high as 100,000 people, or one person in ten. Another 400,000 Chechens have been displaced, with some 180,000 now living in refugee camps in nearby Ingushetia.

Support for the war is waning, however. Sixty-one percent of Russians surveyed in a recent poll indicated a desire to resume negotiations with rebel leaders. Recent articles by high-ranking former Russian government officials indicate growing concern over the course of the war. Private meetings between representatives of the pro-independence government of Chechen President Aslan Maskhadov and Chechen leaders loyal to Moscow have opened the way for formal talks in the future. (Excerpted from American Committee for Peace in Chechnya website).

It is within the context of these changing political and societal attitudes that the OSCE has convened a workshop aimed at setting the stage for future negotiations between the parties to the conflict.

Conflict Chronology

Deep History of Conflict with Russia

Russia and Chechnya have a long history of difficult encounters and entrenched conflict. Russian forces began moving into the Caucasus region as early as 1830 in order to secure the empire against the Ottomans. In 1858, Russia finally subdued the Chechen populace, which had

¹ This section excerpted from American Committee for Peace in Chechnya website, 27 May, 2003, <http://www.peaceinchechnya.org/background.htm>.



resisted under the leadership of their national hero, Imam Shamil. During World War II Joseph Stalin accused Chechens of collaborating with the Nazis and deported all ethnic Chechens to Siberia and Kazakhstan. They were permitted to return only in 1957 under Khrushchev.² The forced “Russification” program and the death of nearly one-fourth of the Chechen population in exile left deep rifts in an already conflicted relationship.

The 150-year history of Russian-Chechen engagement has solidified a number of negative stereotypes on both sides of the conflict, but the more recent conflict over the last decade has done much to reinvigorate old hatreds and fears. Russians see the Chechens as a lawless and corrupt people, frequently engaging in insidious, destructive acts against the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, and later the Russian Federation. Chechens have never regarded the invasion of Chechnya and incorporation into the empire to be a legitimate or legal act, and view the Russians as exploitative and tyrannical. The religious divide (Chechens are mostly Muslim and Russians are mostly Russian Orthodox) has been an ever-present issue throughout Chechnya’s history with Russia, but recent years have brought the conflict into sharp relief, particularly since the American invasion of Afghanistan in 2002.

1991 – Fall of the Soviet Union

In 1991 the Soviet Union disintegrated and the Russian Federation came under the leadership of Boris Yeltsin, a prominent advocate of reform. The former Union splintered into 15 independent states. While most of the former Soviet Republics would later voluntarily join the political association known as the Commonwealth of Independent States, Chechnya’s newly elected president, Dzhokhar Dudayev, declared unilateral independence for the small republic. In the following year, Chechnya adopted a constitution and announced the state to be independent and secular, to be governed by a president and parliament. In 1991, the movement for independence was clearly a nationalist one.

In 1991 the three Baltic republics to the west of the Russian Federation also declared independence, but unlike Chechnya, they were actually granted statehood. The Russian Federation’s refusal to grant Chechnya status as an independent republic remains subject to a great deal of speculation. Some experts claim that the region’s rich oil and natural resources make the republic especially valuable to a country that is dependent on petroleum exports. Others note that Chechnya is mostly surrounded by Russian territory and that allowing a small section of the country to secede could have triggered massive fragmentation and threatened large portions of the country. While much of the Russian Federation is ethnically and linguistically Russian, there are other republics with high percentages of different ethnic and religious groups that might have been particularly likely to push for independence or greater autonomy.

The First Chechen War: 1994-1996

Yeltsin invades Chechnya to quash rebellion

December 1994 – Yeltsin, in what he later described as his greatest mistake as president, sent troops into the Chechen Republic in December 1994 to end the independence movement. Experts estimate that as many as 100,000 Chechens, mostly civilians, died in the initial campaign. Russian troops were nonetheless unable to subdue the population, and beginning in 1995, Chechen tactics took on a distinctly terrorist-type approach. In June of 1995, Chechen

² Wikipedia



rebels took control of a hospital in Southern Russia, seizing hundreds of hostages and killing more than one hundred in the process. Russian forces fared worse in Chechnya than Yeltsin had expected, incurring heavy casualties in guerilla style warfare.

Peace talks and Chechen elections

April 1996 – It was not until Dudayev was killed in April of 1996 that Yeltsin began to broker a peace agreement with the Chechen successor, Zemlikhan Yanderbiyev. In August the Chechen rebels attacked once again, this time taking Grozny. The Chechen rebel Chief of Staff, Aslan Maskhadov, negotiated a ceasefire, known as the Khasavyurt Accords, with Russian General Alexander Lebed, laying the groundwork for an official peace treaty with Russia almost two years later.

1997 – Maskhadov was elected Chechen president in an election monitored by the OSCE. Russian President Yeltsin signed a peace treaty recognizing Maskhadov's authority as head of the republic, but the question of Chechen independence was never properly resolved.

Failure to establish lasting solution to the conflict

It is perhaps unfortunate that a more comprehensive solution to the problem was not reached when the conflict was still clearly a nationalist movement for independence. In the chaos that followed the first war, the changing international scene and the increasing discontent with the republic's welfare, complicated the issue of Chechen independence. Islamic fundamentalism and a new desire to establish a distinctly Islamic state developed throughout the second half of the 1990s.

Interwar Years: 1997-1999

Russia withdraws from Chechnya – increase in violence and lawlessness

1997 – Following the first Chechen War, Russia withdrew troops from the republic but continued to maintain a strong presence in the region. Russia did little to aid in reconstruction and rebuilding after what had been a devastating war. Crime statistics rose to new levels and terrorist activities and hostage-taking became the order of the day. After a number of prominent kidnappings, including foreign journalists and professionals, Maskhadov imposed a state of emergency. His authority as president became increasingly challenged by the strength of local warlords and rival rebel forces.

1998 May - Valentin Vlasov, Russia's presidential representative in Chechnya, was kidnapped and held for six months. Later in the year, four engineers from Britain and New Zealand were kidnapped and murdered.

Chechen political instability – rise of Islamic fundamentalism

1998 – Amid growing lawlessness, Maskhadov imposes a state of emergency.

1999 - Maskhadov announced that the imposition of Islamic Shari'a Law would be phased in over three years. A group of opposition forces, however, announced their immediate intention to govern the republic according to Shari'a Law and demanded Maskhadov's resignation. Although Maskhadov remained in power, the incident was indicative of the fragmented political scene in Chechnya and growing Islamization. The rise of fundamentalism is a key factor in the transformation of the conflict between the first and the second war.



Second Chechen War: 1999-Current

Moscow apartment bombings – Prime Minister Putin invades Chechnya

July/August 1999 – Shamil Basayev, a Chechen warlord, led rebel forces into the neighboring republic of Dagestan and announced his intention to create an Islamic state out of these two republics. Moscow responded with condemnation for Maskhadov and his inability to control the republic.

Following a series of apartment bombings in Moscow and other cities in Russia, the newly appointed Prime Minister, Vladimir Putin, and his Federal Security Services (FSS) rose to the forefront in the war against Chechen terrorism. Approximately 220 individuals died in the first two bombings in Moscow. Another eighty died in a second round of bombings a few days later. Putin and the FSS were quick to lay the blame on Chechen terrorists, although they provided little evidence regarding the specific case against Chechen groups. Observers were increasingly skeptical when a fifth bomb did not detonate, and the FSS called the entire operation to evacuate the apartment building a ‘test.’ Since then many in Moscow have come to believe that the Security Services were involved in some way in the bombings.

The incidents launched Putin’s political career. Russians came to associate him with his military campaign against Chechnya and with his tough stance against terrorism, factors that ultimately got him elected to the presidency. Chechens have claimed that he staged the bombings to start a war and achieve the political clout he needed as a relatively inexperienced politician. As Russian troops entered the Chechen republic, an estimated 200,000 Chechen refugees fled to neighboring Russian republics, the first in a series of human rights crises in the region. Chechnya has claimed that the conflict has continued primarily for Putin’s own political and personal agenda.

Establishment of Russian-backed government in Chechnya

2000 - The Russian Federation recaptured Grozny in early 2000, and declared that Chechnya would be governed directly from Moscow, establishing a pro-Russian Chechen administration with Chechen mufti Akhmad Kadyrov as President and Stanislav Ilyasov as Prime Minister. Maskhadov denounced Kadyrov as a traitor and took up leadership of the Chechen rebel forces. While Moscow considers the Kadyrov administration to be the official government of Chechnya, Maskhadov continues to be leader of the underground Chechen government, which appears to maintain the loyalty of the vast majority of the Chechen population.

Western journalists and human rights groups reported widespread abuses by Russian forces in so-called “filtration camps.”

Human rights violations and international response

2001 – International journalists’ fears of war crimes were confirmed by the discovery of a mass grave and hundreds of severely mutilated bodies. Journalists reported Russian “cleansing” operations targeting Chechen non-combatants. Europe was especially vocal about condemning the Russian Federation and specifically Putin’s security service for the violations. President Bush was far more reserved in his approach, seeking a new relationship with Russia and attempting to eliminate much of the tension that had developed between Putin and Clinton. Neither Europe nor the United States, however, took any concrete action to investigate or intervene in the Chechen conflict. Putin consistently claimed it was an internal Russian affair and while some of the international community might have been dissatisfied with the development of the conflict, it did in



fact remain a largely internal issue. At the same time, Putin transferred control of the Chechen war to the FSS.

U.S.-Russian relations under President Bush, international relations

After September 11, 2001 the conflict between Russia and Chechnya changed fundamentally. President Bush entered into an even closer security relationship with Putin and essentially promised to keep the Chechnya conflict off meeting agendas. Moreover, Putin was able to successfully claim that Chechen rebels were receiving significant funding and support from Islamic fundamentalist groups in the Middle East, specifically from Osama bin Laden and his Al-Qaeda forces. The result has been a decline in international criticism of Putin's conduct of the war and an increase in support from the United States for his tough stance against international terrorism.

A particularly striking difference between the first and second Chechen Wars has been the restriction of free press and media coverage. Accurate coverage of the situation in Chechnya has been difficult since Putin invaded in 1999, with journalists frequently reporting harassment and persecution when they have attempted to provide a realistic picture of anti-terrorist operations in Chechnya. Only recently has the policy of restricting media coverage been officially endorsed at the highest levels. In November 2002, Russia's upper house of parliament approved new amendments to the media law, giving the President broad authority to curb news coverage of anti-terrorist operations and promotion of rebel materials. The amendments were passed almost unanimously, drawing harsh criticism from free speech groups.³ The new restrictions are likely to make it even more difficult to monitor the events in the small republic.

New peace initiatives under President Putin

November 2001 – Greater guerilla resistance erupted than Putin had initially predicted and Moscow began to examine options for troop withdrawal. In November, during a brief lull in the fighting, Putin authorized peace talks between Akhmad Zakayev, Maskhadov's special envoy and Russian ambassador Viktor Kazantsev. They represented the first formal negotiations since Yeltsin's peace talks in 1999.

Rise of terrorist activities, public opinion, implications for peace

The pause in the hostilities, however, did not last long and relations crumbled again in the face of renewed terrorist activity and three highly publicized incidents. The combination of events between July-December 2002 significantly damaged any international support for Chechen independence.

July 2002 – The United Nations chose to suspend aid to Chechnya indefinitely after Chechen rebels kidnapped a Russian aid worker. While kidnappings were frequent throughout the 1990s, particularly as a financially lucrative practice, it was only at this point that aid workers became a targeted group. The United Nations chose to act in support of an affiliated agency, Druzhba, which also helps to provide critical supplies and support throughout the region.

October 2002 – Chechen rebels seized a crowded theater in Moscow, demanding independence for Chechnya in return for the nearly 800 individuals held hostage in the building. In a commando operation to disarm the terrorist group, Russian forces pumped a sleeping agent, Fentanyl gas,

³ "Russian Upper House Approves Amendments to Restrict Media," [Dow Jones International News](#), 13 Nov 2002: 3:38.



into the air duct system and charged the building. About 150 people died as a result of the gas. The incident dramatically increased Russian rhetoric against Chechen independence, prompted Putin to expand military power in Chechnya, and sparked both domestic and international anger. Approximately 85% of Russians polled after the siege said they supported Putin's actions. 32% of Muscovites thought that officials should increase security in Moscow, and nearly 25% believed that all Caucasians should be expelled from the city.

December 2002 – Chechen rebel forces attacked again, this time in a bombing of the pro-Russian Chechen government headquarters in Grozny, killing approximately 80 people. In both the Moscow theater siege and the attack on government headquarters, Chechen rebels claimed full responsibility for the acts.

Russia questions the reliability of Chechen leaders

The Russian Federation has struggled to determine precisely what involvement higher-level Chechen officials might have had in the Moscow theater siege and the government headquarters bombing. Putin has insisted that both Maskhadov and his special envoy Zakayev were instrumental in planning and carrying out the actions, although both officials have denied a connection to the Chechen terrorists. Following the Moscow theater siege in October 2002, Akhmed Zakayev, deputy and Foreign Minister to the Chechen underground government, was arrested and detained in Denmark while attending a conference. Despite a mutual extradition treaty with Russia, the Danish government ruled to block the extradition of Zakayev, claiming that Russia had provided too little evidence regarding Zakayev's participation in the incident. The decision seemed to be an indication of general European support for the Chechen cause and potential for peace. After his release, Zakayev traveled to the United Kingdom in December 2002 where he was once again arrested upon arrival in the country. Despite his arrest and subsequent release, repeated Russian requests for the extradition of Zakayev have thus far been met with negative replies in British courts.⁴ The British government has not ruled to extradite Zakayev to Russia where he would certainly face an uphill battle proving his innocence in the hostage taking and other acts of terrorism by Chechens. However, the courts began to waver in their views of the merits of Zakayev's case and have considered releasing him to Russian authorities. The two incidents were prominently covered in European and American press, further limiting sympathy for the Chechen cause, although a decision to extradite would almost certainly be a non-political, purely legal decision. Putin proclaimed himself justified in his appraisal of the Chechen rebels as a lawless and internationally connected terrorist group.

March 23 – Implications of the referendum and new constitution

In an unexpected move, Putin scheduled a new constitutional referendum to occur in Chechnya in mid-March. The Russian-backed constitution firmly establishes Chechnya as an integral part of Russia, although officials claim it offers broad political freedoms to the republic. The Kremlin announced that over 80% of the population turned out for the vote, affirming the new constitution by an overwhelming 95%. A host of countries and organizations, including the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, have reservedly praised the outcome as the most recent hope for a peaceful political solution. It is difficult to determine the accuracy of Russian figures as many of the monitoring groups that normally oversee such votes declined their invitations to avoid the appearance of supporting either side. Putin has indicated that he is willing to provide

⁴ Amnesty International http://www.amnesty.org/russia/zakayev_case.html



amnesty for Chechen rebels if they agree to a cease-fire and has also proposed a wide-ranging property compensation plan.

At this stage, the international community - Chechnya and Russia included – was “holding its breath” until it became clear that the referendum would in fact result in positive political solutions. Despite the respite in heavy military action, a broad range of criticisms concerning the vote has been voiced, and it was entirely possible that a significant backlash to a rigged referendum might spark a new round of hostilities. Separatist groups and human rights activists have called the referendum vote a scam, insisting that the announced turnout and outcome were far too favorable to be accurate. Moreover, they claim that a fair and democratic vote is impossible given the presence of nearly 80,000 Russian troops in the region. The polls were heavily fortified with Russian security and at 18 of the 418 booths, shots were actually fired to keep order. Additionally, approximately 30,000 Russian troops permanently stationed in Chechnya were eligible to vote, a fact that has concerned both Chechens and observers alike.

Aslan Maskhadov, still in hiding, was quoted on pro-guerilla websites as urging a negative vote in the referendum.⁵ He continued to maintain that the referendum did not reflect the vote of the people. He and other separatists claim that many Chechens who were opposed to the constitution actually boycotted the vote and refused to go to the polls. Meanwhile, Shamil Basayev continued to lead Chechen forces in terrorist activities.⁶

Russian public opinion and responses to the referendum

A factor in Putin's decision to hold the referendum may have been his own sense that the Russian public would not support continued military action for much longer. A poll taken in 2001 indicated the following:

- 30.6 % of respondents thought it necessary to continue military operations until all the Chechen guerrillas are destroyed.
- 20.0 % of respondents thought Russia should pull out its troops from Chechnya, recognizing its independence.
- 15.4 % of respondents thought it necessary to reduce Russian military presence in the rebel republic.
- 9.3 % thought it is necessary that more power be granted to local Chechen administration headed by Akhmad Kadyrov.
- 5.5 % of respondents suggest that a solution to the problem of Chechnya be developed by the international community.
- “Don't Knows” or those with other opinions accounted for 13.6 % of the respondents.⁷

The figures supporting continued military operations were slightly lower than the previous year, indicating a low level of willingness to make long term commitments to a region that has been problematic for so long. Russian casualties in Chechnya have typically been quite high, which has also contributed to the general wariness about long-term action there.

⁵ Michael Wines, “Rebel Leader Urges ‘No’ Vote,” New York Times, 19 Mar 2003: A6.

⁶ Sabrina Tavernise, “Possible Amnesty for Rebels,” New York Times, 20 Mar 2003: A8.

⁷ Russian Opinion and Market Research Webpage. <http://romir.ru/eng/default.htm>.



The above survey was conducted in mid-2001, before the 2002 wave of terrorist activities that included the Moscow Theater Siege. Polls taken immediately following the incident indicated a drastically different set of opinions. Although there is general discontent with Russian policy, there appears to be a fairly strong interest in tightening military operations within Chechnya. The Russian Public Opinion and Market Research Group reported the following data from November 2002⁸:

How much do you approve or disapprove of the policy of Russian authorities in the Chechen Republic?

	<i>% of total number of respondents</i>
Strongly approve	10.5
Somewhat approve	35.5
I don't care	9.9
Somewhat disapprove	25.8
Strongly disapprove	11.2
Don't know	7.1

What policy, in your opinion, should Russian authorities pursue in Chechnya, taking into account the October 23-26 tragic events in Moscow?

	<i>% of total number of respondents</i>
The policy should be toughened, with the stress made on the use of force.	64.0
The policy should be eased, allowing talks with the militants.	15.0
The policy should not change.	13.5
Don't know.	7.5

⁸ "Russian Citizens About Policy in Chechnya," Russian Public Opinion and Market Research Website, http://www.romir.ru/eng/research/11_2002/chechnya.htm.



It is possible that the strong negative opinion of potential peace in Chechnya was the result of heightened emotions after the terrorist attack and that public opinion will eventually return to the more balanced views of 2001. The next several months will be crucial in determining precisely how Russians will consider the prospects for peace. Currently, very few are optimistic about the potential for peaceful resolution following the referendum. When asked in advance whether authorities would be able to ensure fair voting, over half responded that they would not. Only 20% believed that officials could guarantee fair and equal voting practices. When asked, "Do you think that the adoption of the constitution and the election of president of Chechnya will lead to peace in the republic?" a full 67% responded that the constitution would not, or was unlikely to produce peace in the region. Only 23% believed the contrary.⁹

Impact of the War: Facts and Figures¹⁰

According to the Russian Ministry of Defense, Moscow's military losses total 4,750 killed and 13,040 wounded. Unofficial estimates are far greater, with an October 2002 report by the German intelligence service pegging Russian deaths at 10,000, or more than twice the official figure. All told, the Russian Federation lost more troops in Chechnya over the last three years than did the Soviet Union during its decade-long campaign in Afghanistan.

The U.S. Department of State conservatively estimates that 80,000 Chechen civilians and resistance fighters have died since 1999. Total deaths, including those from the first Russo-Chechen war (1994-1996), are believed to be around 180,000, though figures compiled by both Russian and Chechen non-governmental organizations suggest that this number may be closer to 250,000.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) reports that approximately 350,000 Chechens continue to be displaced by fighting, with 150,000 sheltering in the nearby Republic of Ingushetia, and another 30,000 seeking refuge in regions throughout the Russian Federation. Thousands more have joined the small yet growing diaspora in Central Asia, Europe and North America.

Background on Russia

Geography and History

The Russian Federation is the largest country in the world, with approximately twice the landmass of the United States. Its northerly location, however, makes much of the land unusable for agriculture or industry and provides few warm-water ports for access to world sea lanes. The current population of Russia is approximately 145 million, 81% of whom are ethnic Russians. There are small but numerous ethnic minorities throughout the nation, including Tatar, Ukrainian, Chuvash, Bashkir, Belarusian, Moldovan, and Chechen peoples. Russian Orthodox is the

⁹ "Referendum and Elections in Chechnya," Russian Public Opinion and Market Research Website, http://www.romir.ru/eng/research/03_2003/chechnya-referendum.htm

¹⁰ The Russo-Chechen War: Facts and Figures, The American Committee for Peace in Chechnya



majority religion within the Russian Federation, although Muslims make up the largest segment of the population in some of the 21 somewhat autonomous republics. Russian is the primary language with numerous other languages spoken in specific locales.¹¹

Government and Politics

The Russian Federation is a constitutional federation with a bicameral legislature (called the Federal Assembly) consisting of the Federation Council and the State Duma. The current President, Vladimir Putin, was elected from the position of prime minister in March 2000. There are nearly 150 officially registered political parties in Russia and seats in the Duma are awarded according to election percentages.¹²

The 1990s were a particularly tumultuous decade for the Russian Federation. In 1991 the Soviet Union, then under the presidency of Mikhail Gorbachev, splintered into fifteen separate, independent states. Boris Yeltsin, a prominent reform voice came to power following a power struggle within the communist party. The Russian Federation soon joined the former Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Belarus to form the Commonwealth of Independent States. Eventually, all but the Baltic States would join the Commonwealth.

President Yeltsin managed to maintain power throughout the 1990s despite continued unrest in the parliament, economic difficulties, strong elections for the communist party and his own declining health. In 1998 Yeltsin dismissed his Prime Minister, Viktor Chernomyrdin, beginning a struggle over the prime minister position that would last for the next eighteen months. In August 1999, Yeltsin appointed Vladimir Putin the fifth Prime Minister in a year-and-a-half. Putin, then head of security services, took a hard line stance against security concerns and rapidly launched a campaign into the Caucasus, claiming that Chechen rebels were responsible for a series of Moscow terrorist attacks. Putin's tough approach to security increased his popularity among Russians and ensured his accession to the presidency in the 2000 election.

Because of the political instability over the past decade and continued ethnic conflicts throughout parts of the former Soviet Union, Putin has made the claim that Chechnya represents a real security threat to the Russian Federation, not only as a refuge for terrorist cells, but also because granting Chechen independence could trigger a series of breakaway republics, as was the case in Yugoslavia in the early 1990s. Chechens claim that both Yeltsin and Putin were politically motivated in their invasions of Chechnya – that their presidential authority and reelection bid depended on a strong show of force to draw attention away from a lagging economy and government corruption.¹³

Today, Putin seems unlikely to take any chances in Chechnya, despite a current approval rating of 70%. The conflict seems to haunt Putin who was elected President in 2000 vowing to resolve the war swiftly. Facing hardliner demands to increase military action and liberal demands to pursue diplomacy, Putin seems determined to pave his own path. He has recently promised to

¹¹ "Russia," *The CIA World Factbook 2002*, 13 Feb. 2003
<<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/print/rs.html>>

¹² *CIA World Factbook 2002*

¹³ "Chechen Perspective," *BBC In-Depth*, 26 Dec. 1999 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/577525.stm>



“finish the job” of getting rid of the rebels while at the same time he has offered amnesty to those rebels who put down their arms by August 1.¹⁴

Economy

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the subsequent lifting of communist price controls, the Russian Federation experienced high levels of inflation, and the economy contracted for five years under slow government implementation of market reforms. High budget deficits, depreciation of the ruble, and international debt continued to be detrimental to the economy until 1999. Although the economy has rebounded in recent years, growing an average of 6% from 1999-2001,¹⁵ Russia continues to face serious economic difficulties even ten years after the end of communism.

The Russian economy is heavily dependent on its main export commodities, which include petroleum, natural gas, wood and wood products, and a number of manufactures. While rising world prices, particularly of oil, have contributed to the growth of the Russian economy, heavy reliance on the international market makes the country extremely vulnerable to market instability. Russia's involvement with oil in particular complicates its relationship with the Caucasus region. Many have claimed that control over the petroleum pipelines that run directly through Chechnya is largely responsible for the continued military occupation there.¹⁶

International Issues

As a nuclear power and permanent member of the Security Council, the Russian Federation has a long history of international engagement. Relationships with both Europe and the United States have frequently been strained during the last decade over a wide range of issues including arms reductions, nuclear trade with Iran, environmental policy, human rights abuses in the Caucasus, and limitations on the media. Despite the often conflicting policies, relationships with Europe and the US remain important to the Russian Federation as the country continues its transition from a totalitarian system. The US in particular provides large aid packages and technical assistance every year for arms reduction and nuclear security programs. The Russian Federation also has a number of crucial trading ties with both Europe and the United States. Germany and the US are Russia's main export and import partners, followed by Ukraine and Belarus.

Russia's borders have been unstable since the nineteenth-century and the country currently has a number of unresolved border and water rights conflicts with several former Soviet republics. Most significant to this simulation is a particular ongoing military and cultural conflict in the Caucasus, a mountainous region situated between the Black and Caspian Seas. Until recently, Russia's military policies in the region drew harsh criticism from both Europe and the United States. Non-governmental organizations have consistently provided information indicating that the Russian forces are engaging in human rights violations and war crimes. Putin claims that the matter is a purely internal one.

¹⁴ “Editorial: Chechen gambit,” Toronto Star, 23 May 2003
<http://thestar.com/NASAapp/cs/Contentserver?pagename>

¹⁵ CIA World Factbook 2002

¹⁶ “Chechen Perspective”



Questions to consider when examining the Russian position:

- What is at stake for Russia politically? Economically?
- Does the international community have any influence over Russian policy?
- How could the opinion of the international community affect peace negotiations?

Background on Chechnya

Geography and History

Chechnya is a small republic, only 19.3 thousand square km, within the Russian Federation. Its southern border is situated deep in the Caucasus Mountains along the northern border of the state of Georgia. The republic is home to approximately 1.3 million people, largely ethnic Chechens who are mostly Sunni Muslims.¹⁷

Government and Politics

Political and military authority in Chechnya has been fragmented over the past decade into essentially three camps: the official Russian-sanctioned government based in Grozny, the Chechen underground government, and militant separatists. Aslan Maskhadov is the current president of the underground government and leader of secular nationalist forces. He was elected in 1997 and was originally recognized by the Russian Federation until his association with the rebel factions, who have been waging guerilla and terrorist warfare in Chechnya and Moscow since the mid-90s. In 1999, the Russian Federation established a pro-Russian government in Grozny, with Akhmad Kadyrov acting as president and Rudnik Dudayev as the head of the Chechen Security Council. Although this is the official government according to Russians, most Chechens continue to recognize Maskhadov as the rightful leader of the republic. The militant separatists are comprised of different groups such as those resisting federal and other forms of governmental authority, externally funded foreign volunteers fighting for an Islamic state, and those fighting for revenge, financial gain or other personal reasons.

Legal and political relationship with Russia

The fractured nature of authority in Chechnya has had a number of implications for potential ceasefires and peace negotiations. President Putin has claimed that Maskhadov is a terrorist and therefore unacceptable as a negotiating partner. The problem, however, is finding a representative who is both acceptable to the Russians and a legitimate spokesperson for the Chechens. Some experts have pointed to Maskhadov's Deputy Special Envoy, Akhmad Zakayev as a potential broker for peace. However, Putin has implicated him in the recent Moscow theater siege and Moscow is attempting to have him extradited from the United Kingdom.

¹⁷ "Chechnya," Wikipedia Online Encyclopedia, 6 Mar. 2003
<<http://www.wikipedia.org/w/wiki.phtml?title=Chechnya>>



One possible broker might be Salambek Maigov who is the representative of Maskhadov's government to Russia. Putin's recognition of Maigov signals that he distinguishes between Maskhadov and extremist rebels and that he is interested in keeping a backdoor channel open for possible negotiations.

It is unclear precisely to what extent Islamic fundamentalism is a factor for Chechens in the most recent round of warfare. The war with Russia in 1994 was a more clearly defined nationalist independence movement. Chechen secular nationalists, who are fighting to establish an Islamic republic, claim that the religious connection is less crucial in the current fight than the Russian war crimes and human rights violations.

Economy

Although the republic was once rich in resources, especially in petroleum, persistent war has destroyed both the infrastructure and the quality of life in Chechnya. Much of Grozny remains in ruins, corpses go unburied, and attendance at universities and public schools has dropped to around 20%.¹⁸ Mafia action, arms smuggling, and financial scams have skyrocketed, as the lack of a central and strong authority throughout the 1990s made crime a prominent aspect of daily life. Part of the problem has stemmed from Russia's refusal after the first war in Chechnya to provide any help with rebuilding destroyed cities and industries. The deep poverty and constant threat to life are likely to be a major stumbling block in forging understanding and peace between Chechens and Russians.

International Issues

The international approach to the Chechen conflict has changed in light of a new anti-terrorism focus in the international community. The destruction of the world trade center and President Bush's prominent war on terrorism has not only removed U.S. support for the republic, but has encouraged Putin to increase his rhetoric linking the conflict in Chechnya with those in Iraq and Afghanistan. Non-governmental organizations and conscientious citizens have tried repeatedly to draw international attention to the human rights abuses and war crimes that are a daily part of the current war, but Putin has thus far managed to maintain the position that the conflict is purely internal.

Likewise, international recognition of and assistance for Chechnya's independence, which seemed to be a strong likelihood during the first Chechen War and throughout the 1990s, have largely quieted in the current anti-terrorism atmosphere. The prominent terrorist actions in the Moscow Theater Siege and bombing of the Chechen government headquarters in Grozny have done little to win the support of the international community. Moreover, the war with Iraq in mid-March drew much of the attention away from the small republic. It seems for now at least, that much of the outside world will leave the fate of Chechnya to Russia.

Questions to consider when examining the Chechen position:

- What are some of the economic factors contributing to the current conflict with Russia?
- To what extent is fundamentalism important to the conflict?

¹⁸ "In the Ruins of Grozny The Kremlin Says it is Winning Hearts and Minds in Chechnya." Time 2 April 2001.



- What is the responsibility of the international community in either monitoring or intervening in Chechnya?
- Is there a legitimate link between Bush's war on terrorism and the Chechen independence movement?
- How could the opinion of the international community affect peace negotiations?

The US on Chechnya

Former President Clinton took an active interest in the region, calling for changes in Russian policy and an end to the military involvement in Chechnya. President Bush has been less active, forging a closer relationship with Putin almost immediately after entering office. With the increasing focus on anti-terrorism, President Bush has backed away from the rhetoric of his predecessor and has been providing Putin with more diplomatic support for his war in Chechnya. This change is partially linked to Putin's claims that Chechen rebels are being funded by Osama bin Laden and other Islamic fundamentalist terrorist groups. Moreover, Bush has engaged in an active negotiation process with Moscow to gain support for military action against Iraq. In early February 2003, the US State Department announced its decision to include three Chechen rebel groups on its list of terrorist organizations. All of the groups are linked to prominent Chechen rebel Shamil Basayev. Analysts have pointed to the decision as one in a series of attempts to win Moscow's support for, or at least tacit agreement, with US action in the Middle East.

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

Background and Involvement in Russia and Chechnya

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) evolved out of a series of meetings and conferences that lasted from the early 1970s until the creation of the official organization in 1994. Today the OSCE comprises 55 countries from Central Asia, Europe, and North America, and is the largest regional security body in the world. The main responsibilities of the OSCE include "early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management, and post-conflict rehabilitation."¹⁹ Particularly crucial to these roles is the High Commissioner on National Minorities, based in The Hague, Netherlands.²⁰ Currently serving this post is Rolf Ekeus, who succeeded the first High Commissioner, Max Van Der Stoel in July of 2001.

The mandate for the High Commissioner includes two primary roles:

- providing early warning of potential national minority conflicts; and
- acting to prevent eruption of conflict in the OSCE area.

The mandate gives the High Commissioner a great deal of flexibility in terms of his activities within states, and Max Van Der Stoel in particular was heavily involved in the kind of work on which this simulation is based. It is important to note that the role of the High Commissioner is

¹⁹ "What is the OSCE?" OSCE Website, http://www.osce.org/publications/factsheets/osce_e.pdf

²⁰ "What is the OSCE?"



primarily security-based; he is unlikely to offer the kinds of public reporting and censure that a group such as the U.N. Human Rights Commission does. Instead, the High Commissioner operates in an atmosphere of privacy, confidentiality, and discretion that ensures parties in conflict will be open to exploring alternative solutions to disputes. This “quiet diplomacy,” as it came to be known under Max Van Der Stoel, has become a major tenet of the High Commissioner’s practice and has been adopted by Rolf Ekeus.²¹ His methods have the potential of being particularly effective in an area such as Chechnya where tensions are high and violence is widespread.

The OSCE also has a history of working in Chechnya over the past decade. An OSCE Assistance Group (AG) to Chechnya was established in April of 1995. OSCE staff there helped to broker cease-fire agreements, oversaw the Chechen presidential elections in 1997, and engaged in post-conflict rehabilitation until security concerns forced the group to relocate to Moscow. In 2001, the assistance group returned to northern Chechnya to promote stability, facilitate delivery of international aid, and provide support for the return of refugees and displaced persons. In early 2003, Russian President Putin refused to renew the OSCE mandate in Chechnya, and the office was scheduled to close in March.²² Regardless, the organization has a stake in the security of the Caucasus and is likely to push for continued involvement in the area. Moreover, the High Commissioner has a unique ability to engage any member state that he considers to be of strategic concern to Europe, and can request participation in lower-level diplomacy even if the organization is not officially acting in the area.

Questions to Consider when examining the OSCE Mediation Role:

In terms of the problem-solving workshop, it might be helpful to think ahead of time about the role the third-party mediator plays in establishing the right tone for conflict resolution:

- What is the benefit of private and confidential discussions regarding a conflict like the one in Chechnya? What are the consequences of breaking the trust established in resolution sessions?
- What sort of atmosphere would be conducive to open-ended discussion?
- What is at stake for the OSCE? What could make Rolf Ekeus a trustworthy mediator for both the Russian and Chechen camps?

²¹ Rolf Ekeus, “Preventative Diplomacy,” The Hague, 30 Jan 2003
<http://www.osce.org/hcnm/documents/speeches/2003/hcnmspeech2003-1.pdf>

²² “OSCE Assistance Group To Chechnya.” OSCE Website. <http://www.osce.org/chechnya>.



Annotated Bibliography

Background Sources

"Russia." Information Please Almanac Online. <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0107909.html>

"Russia." CIA World Factbook 2002. 13 Feb. 2003
<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factook/print/rs.html>

"Profile: Chechnya" BBC News Country Profiles.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/country_profiles/2565049.stm

"Chechnya." Wikipedia Online Encyclopedia. 6 Mar. 2003
<http://www.wikipedia.org/w/wiki.phtml?title=Chechnya>

All of the above are solid sources for background information on Russia and Chechnya. The sources on Russia are far more complete in terms of statistics, but BBC website on Chechnya is an especially well-condensed description of the background and chronology of the conflict.

Conflict Chronology

"The Chechen Conflict." BBC News In-Depth. 6 Jan, 2003
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in_depth/europe/2000/chechnya/default.stm

One of the best websites available for broad coverage of the conflict. Articles range from separate Russian and Chechen timelines, roots of the conflict, implications for the region, and analysis of the first and second Chechen Wars. There is an article entitled "Chechen Perspective" which is particularly helpful if you are having trouble gauging Chechen attitudes and opinions.

Russian Opinion and Market Research Webpage. <http://www.romir.ru/eng/default.htm>. An excellent website for a range of Russian public opinion polls on Chechnya.

OSCE Involvement

"High Commissioner on National Minorities Homepage." OSCE Website.
<http://www.osce.org/hcmn>.

This page has links to a number of articles and press releases on the OSCE website, including information about the official mandate of the High Commissioner, 'quiet diplomacy,' and a speech by Rolf Ekeus outlining his philosophy for his term as High Commissioner.

"OSCE Assistance Group To Chechnya." OSCE Website. <http://www.osce.org/chechnya>.

This website provides details about the OSCE Assistance Group in Chechnya, their mission there, dates of engagement, and a press release regarding Putin's decision to send the group out of the region.

Second-Track Diplomacy



Davies, John and Edward Kaufman. Second Track/Citizens' Diplomacy. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2002.

This book is an excellent source for information about the concept of track-two diplomacy, problem solving workshops, and their current application to ethno-political conflict.

Current Situation

Here are a number of the most recent articles (within the last two years) published on the Russia-Chechnya conflict. They are organized thematically to facilitate your research.

Life in Grozny/Human Rights Questions

Boustany, Nora. "A Russian's Passion for Mending Ethnic Fractures." Washington Post 18 May 2001, final ed.: A23.

"Chechnya's Refugees." Editorial. Washington Post 10 Jun. 2002, final ed.: A20.

Glasser, Susan B. "'Cleansing' Operation in Chechnya Blasted by Moscow-Installed Chief." Washington Post 10 Jul. 2001, final ed.: A12.

---. "Troops in Chechnya Rebuked; Russian General Acknowledges Abuses Against Civilians." Washington Post 12 Jul. 2001, final ed.: A24.

LaFraniere, Sharon. "Georgia Dispatches Troops Towards Separatist Region." Washington Post 12 Oct. 2001, final ed.: A29.

---. "Grozny Experiences Peace in Name Only." Washington Post 25 Jun. 2001, final ed.: A1+.

---. "Sifting a Human Dumping Ground in Chechnya." Washington Post 13 Apr. 2001, final ed.: A1+.

---. "Pressed by the U.S., Georgia Gets Tough with Outsiders." Washington Post 28 Apr. 2002, final ed.: A18.

"No Change in Chechnya." Editorial. Washington Post 26 May 2001, final ed.: A26.

Politkovskaya, Anna. "Remember Chechnya." Editorial. Washington Post, final ed.: A33

Russian Politics

Caryl, Christian. "Is Putin Looking to Expand the Chechnya War?" Newsweek 14 Oct. 2002: 6.

Lipman, Masha. "A Shifting Chechnya Policy?" Washington Post 5 Oct. 2002, final ed.: A21.

Glasser, Susan B. "Putin's War Persists as Sentiment Shifts." Washington Post 28 Jul. 2001, final ed.: A1+.

---. "Putin Now 'Ready' for Chechnya Talks." Washington Post 8 Sep. 2001, final ed.: A16.

Myers, Steven Lee. "Russia to Shut Monitoring by Europeans in Chechnya." New York Times 1 Jan 2003: A5.

Backlash Against Terrorism, US-Russian Security Relationship



- Baker, Peter. "Russians Announce Chechnya Crackdown." Washington Post 4 Nov. 2002, final ed.: A12.
- . "U.N. Work in Chechnya Halted after Abduction." Washington Post 30 Jul. 2002, final ed.: A12.
- Diehl, Jackson. "Chechnya Discounted." Editorial. Washington Post 11 Jun. 2001, final ed.: A19.
- Elliot, Michael. "Dining with the Devil; When Great Powers Have Work to Do, Moral Absolutes Can Get in the Way." Time 22 Apr. 2002: 80.
- Glasser, Susan B. "Russia Welcomes Chechnya Support." Washington Post 28 Sep. 2001, final ed.: A25.
- . "Russia May Seek U.S. Concessions; Support on Terrorism Promised." Washington Post 23 Sep. 2001, final ed.: A34.
- LaFraniere, Sharon. "Moscow Eager to Tie Rebels in Chechnya to Bin Laden." Washington Post 26 Sep. 2001, final ed.: A17.
- . "Setback Seen for Rebel Cause." Washington Post 28 Oct 2002, final ed.: A1+.
- Peterson, Scott. "Chance for Chechen Peace Wanes." Christian Science Monitor 1 Nov. 2002: 6.
- . "Defiance of Russia Only Deepens in Chechnya." Christian Science Monitor 22 May 2001: 1.
- . "'Lawless' Russian Actions Reflect Mounting Frustration." Christian Science Monitor 13 Jul. 2001: 7.
- Weir, Fred. "Hostage Crisis Refuels Chechnya Debate." Christian Science Monitor 25 Oct 2002:1.
- . "Russia Surfs Antiterrorist Wave." Christian Science Monitor 26 Sep. 2001: 6.
- . "Russian Backlash Against Chechens Begins." Christian Science Monitor 7 Nov. 2002: 9.
- "Why Chechnya is Different." Editorial. Washington Post 4 Oct. 2001, final ed.: A30. Wines, Michael. "Russia Links Arab Militants to Bombing in Chechnya." New York Times 29 Dec. 2002, sec. 1: 4.
- . "Suicide Bombers Kill at Least 46 at Chechen Government Offices." New York Times 28 Dec. 2002: A1+.

Controlling the Press, Misinformation

- "Chechnya's Non-Hostilities." Editorial. Washington Post 6 Sep. 2001, final ed.: A22
- Nivat, Anne. "The Muffled Sounds of War." Washington Post 29 Dec 2002, final ed.: B4.
- Quinn-Judge, Paul. "The Chechen Suicide Squad." Time 4 Nov. 2002: 54.
- . "In the Ruins of Grozny The Kremlin Says it is Winning Hearts and Minds in Chechnya." Time 2 Apr. 2001: 54+.
- Schorr, Daniel. "Snuffing out Russia's Free Press." Editorial. Christian Science Monitor 20 Apr. 2001: 11.

Referendum, New Constitution

- "A Sham Referendum in Chechnya." Editorial. New York Times 14 Jan 2003: A26.



Tavernise, Sabrina. "Russia Announces Chechen Vote on New Constitution in March." New York Times 11 Jan 2003: A6.

---. "World Briefing Europe: Russia: Possible Amnesty for Rebels." New York Times 20 Mar. 2003: A8.

Wines, Michael. "World Briefing Europe: Russia: Rebel Leader Urges 'No' Vote." New York Times 19 Mar. 2003: A6.



Roles

The simulation is planned for between 25-27 participants (i.e. 24 Russian and Chechen roles and 1-3 participants in the role of OSCE mediator).

Questions to Consider When Preparing to Play a Role:

The following questions may be helpful as participants try to become acquainted with their assigned roles:

- How does the individual view the conflict? What is the most important issue to the individual? What is the war really about?
- Is the survival or identity of the individual's group at stake?
- What does he or she believe about the violence to date? Is it a legitimate war? What would be a legitimate use of violence?
- What would the individual like to see in terms of potential solutions to the conflict? Does he or she believe the conflict can be resolved without violence?
- What sort of preconceived notions of the other side does he or she have? What does he or she believe about the other side's motivations?
- What sort of individual prejudices might this person have? Are there any personal issues that would make objective discussion of the conflict difficult? Does the individual have anything personal at stake in the outcome of the conflict?



Viktor Ozerov

Retired, Former Chair, Federation's Council's Committee for Security and Defense

Victor Ozerov has placed a high premium on fighting terrorism and insurrections against the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation. He sees the Chechen issue as an internal terrorist problem for the Russian Federation and believes that the rebels have to be defeated militarily before negotiations can succeed.

However, Ozerov also seems particularly aware of the need for international support and is conscious of Russia's role on the Security Council and as a partner of NATO. He believes that the international community should support Russia's stance, as it is an important part of the global war on terrorism. He is likely to be one of the most outspoken opponents to any peaceful discussions with Chechnya until a military solution to the problem has successfully disbanded the terrorist factions.



Valery Manilov

Retired, Former First Deputy Chief of the Russian General Staff

As one of the most important military figures in Russia's first war with Chechen rebels, Valery Manilov has been an outspoken proponent of a strong military response. Manilov considers the military failures to this point to be a result of mismanagement and bad planning at the highest levels. He has advocated that the government give greater freedom and control to the military to solve the Chechen problem. He has been urging for an increase in military engagement in the republic, advocating the deployment of six Russian soldiers to every one Chechen insurgent. Because operations within Chechnya are of a counter-terrorist nature, he firmly believes that peace talks can only be held after order has already been established.

Manilov's primary concern is with the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation and believes that total destruction of Chechen rebel troops by the end of the year is an attainable and desirable goal. Ultimately, he believes that the restoration of peace and democracy in the Chechen republic is possible, but not until Russia firmly establishes control over the insurrectionist republic.



Igor Fiodorov

Aide to Stanislav Ilyasov, Federal Minister for the Reconstruction in Chechnya

Igor Fiodorov is Stanislav Ilyasov's representative in unofficial meetings and negotiations. In November 2002, Stanislav Ilyasov resigned his post as the Russian-appointed Prime Minister to Chechnya and was replaced by Mikhail Babich, a young businessman and former vice-governor of a nearby province. As Prime Minister, Ilyasov was one of the most outspoken representatives of the Russian government, consistently backing the military campaign against the terrorists. Ilyasov frequently clashed with Russian-backed President Ahmed Kadyrov and pushed a more hard line stance against the terrorists. It is unclear precisely what Ilyasov's role will be as the new Federal Minister for the Reconstruction of Chechnya, although it was not a particularly powerful position for his predecessor.

Ilyasov expressed a great deal of support for the March 23 referendum, although he has taken a more balanced approach to the conflict in many of his recent public statements. He has also expressed sympathy for the Chechen position and is confident that with intensive work reconstruction can be complete within the next five years. Ilyasov's position is one that could be increasingly important if fighting in Chechnya is halted.



Mikhail Rekalov

Chair, The Development Group

Mikhail Rekalov, an influential and powerful businessman is Chair of the Board of the Development Group, one of Russia's largest and most powerful businesses, which incidentally is the largest supplier of food and rations for the Russian military. The Group, as it is popularly known started out in the transportation business and has earned a reputation among competitors for its aggressive business style. The Chair of The Development Group is believed to be closely connected to some of Russia's key political and military figures.

The Development Group is one among many business enterprises in Russia that have been ardent supporters of the government's efforts to eradicate the insurrection in Chechnya. They believe the Chechen uprising to be externally financed and aimed at destabilizing Russia. Eradicating extremism in their view, is an important first step towards ensuring political stability in Russia.



Alexei Arbatov

Deputy of the State Duma, Member of the Yabloko Faction and Member, State Duma Commission for Promoting a Political Settlement in Chechnya

Alexei Arbatov has been a member of the State Duma, the Russian Parliament, since 1994. He has been an outspoken proponent of a more moderate approach to Chechnya, particularly in regards to political negotiations. He believes that the military response to terrorism should not come at the expense of peace negotiations and that a negotiated solution is very much within reach. However, he believes that military success is a vital precondition for negotiations to succeed.

He has urged the government (and the military) to come up with an effective strategy to identify, marginalize, and eliminate Chechen extremists. He has argued for the complete cordoning off of the civilian border between Chechnya and Russia, which would permit civilians and businessmen to cross, and would give security officials the ability to control movement of guerillas and terrorists. He has also claimed that the current system of government in the republic is too decentralized and that a direct representative of Putin should be given presidential authority.



Boris Nemtsov

Co-Chair, Union of Right Forces

Boris Nemtsov is Co-Chair of the Union of Right Forces, a liberal political party in Russia. The Union of Right Forces is a minority party in the Russian Duma and represents 8.25% of the national vote. As a liberal in Russia, Nemtsov finds himself to the political right of the Communist-leaning Russian legislative body.

Nemtsov's approach towards Chechnya has been moderate. He was a supporter of the referendum, but insisted that it take place in an atmosphere free from political and military coercion. He has also advocated open negotiations with the Chechens and would allow the Chechens to choose their own negotiators.



Abdul-Khakim Sultygov

President's Representative for Human Rights in Chechnya

Abdul-Khakim Sultygov serves as Russian President Putin's Representative for Human Rights in Chechnya. Sultygov has held this position since July 2002, when President Putin appointed him at the recommendation of Chechen administration head Akhmed Kadyrov. Sultygov has promised broad progress in human rights protection in Chechnya, but some remain suspicious of his close connections with the Putin Administration. He has advocated broader amnesty plans in Chechnya, for both servicemen and members of illegal armed formations, in order to advance the process of peace and political rebuilding. Chechens with up to five-year sentences in jail would be freed. He even advocates amnesty for some who committed felonies, which is a departure from many in the Kremlin. At the same time, Sultygov has bristled at suggestions of unfairness in the recent referendum in Chechnya. When it was suggested that many Chechens may not have felt free to cast the vote that they would like, he retorted, "The Chechen people did what they were expected to do in a fair and open manner: they voted for the territorial integrity of Russia."



Archimandrite Mark Golovkov

Vice-Chairman of the Moscow Patriarchate's Department for External Church Relations

As the Vice-Chairman of the Moscow Patriarchate's Department for External Church Relations (DECR), Archimandrite Mark Golovkov is the second-ranking official most responsible for representing the needs and interests of the Russian Orthodox Church. Chechnya has become the latest issue of importance for the Church, as it has come under increasing criticism for ignoring the plight of the Chechens. Officials from the DECR and other branches of the Church have repeatedly indicated numerous efforts to aid the Chechen people, ranging from food, clothing and medicine collected from Russian parishioners and sent to the region, to its public statement on November 12, 1999 urging the Russian government to ensure that Chechen civilians are properly protected and not injured in the ensuing conflict. But critics maintain that these efforts do more harm than good, with the former donations going largely to Russian soldiers, and the latter statements empty given the Church's continued support of the Russian government's efforts.

As a representative of the Russian Orthodox Church, Archimandrite Mark Golovkov continues to combat these criticisms and properly represent the Church's interests. Golovkov represents the Church's view that the Russian government has taken all appropriate measures to prevent civilian deaths and damage and he stands resolute that the Russian government is justified in opposing the terrorism that thrives within its borders.



Oleg Orlov

Chair, Council of Human Rights Center, Memorial

Oleg Orlov is Chairman of the Council of Human Rights Center, “Memorial”, which is Russia’s predominant human rights group. The group gathers and disseminates factual information about human rights abuses within Russia in an effort to bring public attention, both national and international, and pressure to end those abuses. Memorial reports on human rights violations committed by both sides: the federal troops and separatist organizations within Russia. Memorial recognizes that neither side has clean hands in the Chechen conflict, and calls on an end to abuses of all kinds.

Memorial considers the Russian courts inadequate to deal with Chechen claims of human rights violations and is pushing for a greater role for the European Court for Human Rights in Strasbourg in dealing with human rights abuses in Chechnya.

Orlov has strongly condemned the referendum as not being an expression of the will of the people, saying the populace was scared of actions against civilians if turnout was low. Orlov and Memorial advocate political negotiations between Russian officials and the separatist government.



Valentiana Malnikova

Founding Member and Executive Secretary of the Union of Committees of Soldiers' Mothers of Russia (UCSMR)

Valentiana Malnikova is a founding member and Executive Secretary of the Union of Committees of Soldiers' Mothers of Russia (UCSMR), a non-governmental organization established in 1989 to draw attention to human rights violations within the Russian military. She is an advocate of the rights of soldiers and their families and as such does not support war that puts those men in danger. Although Chechnya is not its sole focus, the UCSMR has become heavily involved in the Chechen conflict and is an advocate against human rights violations in the conflict. The UCSMR urges an immediate end to obligatory military conscription by the Russian military and amnesty for Russian soldiers who have abandoned their units to distance themselves from the war crimes allegedly committed by those units.

Malnikova and the UCSMR believe that the Russian government has failed in its attempts to create a peaceful solution to the Chechen conflict and has entrenched itself in a position which is in opposition to the international community and its own population. In the conflict, the Russian government has violated UN treaties and international declarations as well as the very notions of human rights and equality. The UCSMR is skeptical about the Russian military leadership's commitment to finding a solution to the conflict.



Sergei A. Kovalyov

Russian Duma member, and Member of joint Duma-PACE working group; Human Rights Institute

The former head of a parliamentary human rights committee, Sergei A. Kovalyov made headlines at the end of 1994 for his outspoken criticism of the Russian invasion of Chechnya. Kovalyov reported on the effects of Russia's military operation in the secessionist Chechen territory shortly after it began. His condemnation of the widespread bombing of the capital, Grozny, and the deaths of innocent civilians during the first several weeks of the war helped bring international scrutiny, and ultimately censure, for the war. Kovalyov held a private meeting with President Boris Yeltsin in the first week of January 1994 and persuaded him to call the first of many largely unheeded cease-fires in the bombing raids against the Chechen republic. Kovalyov vowed to monitor the war until its end from an outpost in the neighboring republic of Ingushetia. In 1995 State Duma nationalists revoked Kovalyov's human rights commission. In January 1996 Kovalyov resigned as head of Yeltsin's human rights commission. Kovalyov remains one of the most influential critics of the Russian government's military operations in Chechnya.



Anna Politkovskaya

Journalist, Author of *A Dirty War*

An investigative journalist, Anna Politkovskaya has been one of the most outspoken reporters on human rights abuses in Chechnya. Called by many “Russia’s lost moral conscience” she has made enemies of the most powerful men in Moscow, not the least of which is President Vladimir Putin. Her dispatches for the Russian bi-weekly *Novaya Gazeta*, published in English under the title *A Dirty War: A Russian Reporter in Chechnya* have won her acclaim internationally and death threats at home.

Politkovskaya has been outraged about the toll the war has taken on civilians. Excesses perpetrated by the Russian army have been all but ignored and persist today. Since 1999 she has visited Chechnya roughly 40 times, reporting on conditions and increasing awareness of the human rights violations in the republic. When in October of 2002 Chechen rebels seized a theatre in Dubrovka and took hostages. Politkovskaya was called on to go in and attempt to negotiate the release of the hostages, Although she was ultimately unsuccessful, the incident was a testament to her credibility with separatists in Chechnya.



Hussein Iskhanov

Advisor to Aslan Maskhadov, President of the Chechen Underground Government

It has been increasingly hard for Maskhadov to articulate his views for Chechnya as both Russian military advances and internal conflict with senior military officials-turned-warlords have weakened his influence. Pro-military Russian officials have characterized Maskhadov's regime in Chechnya as "Wahhabite," or extremist, painting their military operation into the region as one aimed at quelling terrorism let loose by a madman. Maskhadov has responded by expelling extremist commanders such as Shamil Basayev from his government and has insisted that his government represents the legitimate aspirations of the majority of the Chechen people. He is a strong advocate of achieving independence through political means and has consistently been in favor of talks with Russia.

Iskhanov has served as Maskhadov's advisor since 1997 and is the architect of many of Maskhadov's policies implemented as President of the underground government.



Hamid Lashkarov

Aide to Ilias Akhmadov, Foreign Minister of underground Chechen Government

Since Akhmadov has not admitted to being in Chechnya since 1999, when the Russian authorities added him to their most wanted list, his aide, Lashkarov, is responsible for much of the Foreign Minister's legwork in Chechnya. As an aide, it is also his responsibility to brief the Foreign Minister and double-check security measures for both transportation and communications.

Although Akhmadov maintains a low public profile to escape being targeted by the Russian government, as a key member of the officially unrecognized Chechen government, it is generally understood that he believes in the independence of a Chechen state and staunchly opposes Russia's claim to sovereignty over the Chechen "domestic problem." He has also stated that the Russian Federation is exploiting the international war on terrorism to justify humanitarian crimes against Chechens.



Salambek Maigov

Representative of the Underground Chechen Government in Moscow

Appointed February 3, 2003 by Chechen President Aslan Maskhadov, Salambek Maigov serves as Maskhadov's representative in Moscow and is committed to a peaceful settlement between Chechnya and the Russian Federation. Having spent the greater part of his life in Moscow as well as serving as a top official in the Eurasian Party, Maigov has been seen as something of a moderate bridge between the two sides. He has repeatedly declared his hopes and efforts for peace negotiations and is eager to begin an active dialogue with his Russian counterparts. His appointment, however, has not been without repercussions. Upon confirmation of his new post, Maigov was voted out of the Eurasian Party. However, he continues to retain the majority of the connections he formed during his years in Moscow and within the party, a potential asset for future peace negotiations. In addition, Maigov has declared that only legitimately elected representatives can secure peace in Chechnya and believes that a cease-fire is essential if any progress is to be made. His skeptical outlook toward the more radical Chechen elements has earned him a degree of respect and legitimacy within Russian political circles.



Emin Ortsa

Commander of Rebel Forces and Rebel Negotiator

Emin Ortsa is an independent rebel commander and close associate of Shamil Basayev. He is fiercely loyal to the separatist cause and his convictions regarding the current conflict almost perfectly mirror those of Basayev. Ortsa has repeatedly criticized Russian military atrocities toward the Chechen civilian population and has consistently demanded the immediate withdrawal of any and all Russian troops. He has also suggested the Russian Federation pay reparations as partial compensation. His experience in the field is coupled with an intense sense of Chechen nationalism. He sees Chechnya as a fully sovereign and independent state, engaged in a life-or-death struggle to cast off the iron shackles of Russian oppression. For Ortsa, the Russian Federation is the last “colonial empire,” attempting to hold on to the last remnants of its former colonial grandeur.



Hassan Khamil

Chechen Field Forces (Khattab Faction)

As representative of one of the two main paramilitary factions on the Chechen side of the conflict in the Caucasus, Khamil plays an important part in making sure that the views and interests of the Chechen guerilla forces are made evident during negotiations with the Russians and other parties. The Chechen paramilitary forces are less concerned with economic, social, and major political issues than with the constant state of conflict with the Russians. The Khattab faction specifically focuses on two things: defeating the Russian military through whatever means necessary and establishing the Chechen republic as an independent Islamic state governed by Shari'a law. The Khattab faction believes wholeheartedly in fighting the Russian military as long as it is necessary in order to obtain Chechen independence.



Garan Sureyev

Aide to Ruslan Gelayev, Second most senior Chechen Field Commander

Ruslan Gelayev is a leader of rebel armed guerilla units fighting for Chechnya's independence. According to the Russian media, he fights independently from Aslan Maskhadov and Shamil Basayev, although Gelayev insists that he follows the command of President Aslan Maskhadov. Gelayev was formerly the defense minister and deputy prime minister in Maskhadov's government, but he was demoted in 2000 after he pulled rebel troops out of Grozny, leaving the capital to the Russian military, with no clear motive.

Gelayev views the Chechen fight for independence as an issue of nationalism, rather than religion. He does not support the increase of Wahhabists, followers of radical Islam, among the Chechen troops. Although he uses Islamic rhetoric in his speeches, he is viewed as a secular man, with no connections to the fundamentalist Wahhabi beliefs, such as those expressed by Al-Qaeda. He sees the Russian colonization of Chechnya as the source of conflict. He's also credited with playing a crucial role in liberating a Russian human rights activist in 2001.

Akhmed Kadyrov, the leader of the Moscow-backed Chechen administration, once expressed hope that Gelayev would be involved in negotiations with Moscow for Chechen peace. Gelayev has expressed an unrelentingly pessimistic view of the referendum and considers it to be merely another avenue for Russian colonization of the republic. Gelayev's aide, Garan Sureyev, represents his views to the public.



Shamsail Saraliyev

Press Secretary to Akhmed Kadyrov

Shamsail Sareliyev has been the press secretary for Akhmed Kadyrov since January 2002. Kadyrov is the leader of the Moscow-backed Chechen administration. When appointed in 2000, Kadyrov was the first Moscow-appointed Chechen to lead the region in four years. Kadyrov was formerly a Muslim leader who fought against Russia during the first Chechen War from 1994 to 1996, but he kept direct contact with the Moscow after the war and during the current campaign. His appointment in 2000 as leader of the Moscow-based Chechen government was very controversial. On one hand, Moscow hailed him as having the greatest authority and influence in Chechnya. On the other hand, Chechen leaders, including President Maskhadov, and Chechen rebel forces have branded Kadyrov as a traitor and many Chechens distrust him and regard him as a Kremlin “puppet.” Thus Kadyrov’s authority is not only undermined by the lack of power given to him by the Kremlin, but also by the lack of support from the Chechens.

Although Kadyrov supported Chechen aspirations for independence during the first war, he no longer does so. He has said that the majority of Chechens are opposed to the war as well as to secession from Moscow. While he wants Russian troops to leave Chechnya, they are his primary means of protection from secular nationalists as well as extremists. Saraliyev represents Kadyrov’s views to the public.



Umar Gregarov

Aide to Anatoly Popov, Prime Minister of Moscow-backed Chechen administration

Umar Gregarov is Popov's voice in informal meetings and negotiations. Anatoly Popov was appointed by Russian President Vladimir Putin as the Prime Minister of the Moscow-backed Chechen administration in mid-February 2003 replacing Mikhail Babich, who resigned following a financial scandal. However, Nikolai Aidinov had already been approved by Kadyrov as the Prime Minister elect, and Putin's decision to instead appoint Popov undermined Kadyrov's authority. Unlike Aidinov, a Grozny native who had considerable experience in Chechnya, Popov is a Russian with close ties to the federal military and security agencies.

After the March 23 constitutional referendum was passed, Popov stated that Chechnya's primary objectives were "to elect legitimate government bodies...after all government bodies have been elected, Chechnya's own parliament will pass the budget...We will be able to pass all the legislation required as a basis for using Chechnya's natural resources and the operation of its economy in general." Popov remains focused on and optimistic about the economic development of Chechnya, and has said that the constitutional referendum has stabilized the situation. His plans for economic recovery include commissioning industrial enterprises, creating jobs under a targeted federal program, restoring farms, and providing incentives for skilled specialists to return to Chechnya. He has also promised to implement a process of compensation for the many Chechens who have lost their homes.



Malik Saidullayev

Businessman, Former Chair, Chechen State Council

Malik Saidullayev has been quietly emerging as an important player in Russian circles. He is opposed to Kadyrov as he does not believe that Kadyrov has sufficient Chechen support to be president. Furthermore, he has also criticized Kadyrov as building his own private army. It is commonly believed that Saidullayev is positioning himself to be considered as Kadyrov's successor. Saidullayev is critical of both the Russian military's conduct of the war and of extremist separatists such as Basayev. He supports imposing direct presidential rule from Moscow for a temporary period to institute law and order in the republic. Once this is done, he believes that it will be possible for the Chechen people to elect a representative legislative body. He does not support the secession of Chechnya, and believes that the most important task right now is to establish security and order in the republic.



Vakha Kasturiyev

Executive Director, INTAR – Civil Humanitarian Organization

Kasturiyev founded INTAR in 1995 to respond to the humanitarian crisis that has resulted from the first and second Chechen wars. Between 20,000 and 40,000 people have died since 1999. Another 400,000 Chechens have been displaced, with some 180,000 now living in refugee camps in nearby Ingushetia. INTAR, along with other humanitarian organizations has called for an end to the violence so that pressing humanitarian concerns can be addressed. Kasturiyev has appealed for international humanitarian aid, but has been unsuccessful in securing this because of the continuation of the hostilities, the insecure environment, and Russian refusal to issue permits for international organizations. Kasturiyev is less concerned with independence than he is with the provision of food and shelter for all Chechens.



Zarman Shakhmurzayev

Chair, Coalition for the Defense of Human Rights

The Coalition for the Defense of Human Rights consists of seven NGO's from the Chechen human rights community. The Coalition demands that human rights violations against Chechen civilians be halted immediately. They opposed the holding of the referendum under conditions of war and human rights violations, believing it would further worsen the situation and result in more bloodshed, and have condemned it as not being free or fair. The Coalition has argued that demilitarization and the security of human rights should precede any political developments in the Chechen republic. Shakhmurzayev has supported prosecuting Russian military figures responsible for atrocities in the conflict and sees Russian disregard for human rights as a roadblock to any kind of ceasefire among the belligerents.

The Coalition for the Defense of Human Rights publicly condemns terrorism. Shakhmurzayev also insists that Russian actions meet the definition not of war, but of a small and systematic genocide. He has called the Russian actions state-sponsored terrorism. Shakhmurzayev maintains that the current atrocities will not end without the involvement of the international community, in particular pressure from President Bush.



Kazbek Arsenaev

Mufti of Grozny

Kazbek Arsenaev has been the Mufti of Grozny since 2000. As Mufti, he is the Muslim legal expert who is empowered to give rulings on religious law. Arsenaev believes strongly in the creation of an Islamic state and rule by Shari'a law. Moscow accuses Arsenaev of having close ties to Baseyev and of supporting Baseyev's incursion into Dagestan in 1999 to create a greater Islamic state. Arsenaev staunchly denies these accusations and states that while he supports independence for Chechnya, he does not believe violence is the means to achieve this end. Arsenaev has spoken out against the use of violence in this conflict.



Related Web Links

Related Institute Resources

Chechnya Web Links <http://www.usip.org/library/regions/chechnya.html>

Sovereignty after Empire:
Self-Determination
Movements in the Former
Soviet Union <http://www.usip.org/pubs/peaceworks/pwks19.pdf>

Other Web Resources

ReliefWeb documents and
articles on Chechnya [http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb.nsf/SR?OpenForm&Type=Cat&\[RWCcountry\]="Russian+Federation"+AND+\(chechnya\)&SortOrder=3&MaxResultsNum=50](http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb.nsf/SR?OpenForm&Type=Cat&[RWCcountry]=)

INCORE guide to Internet
sources on conflict and
ethnicity in Chechnya <http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/cds/countries/chechnya.html>

CRS Report for Congress:
Chechna Conflict – Recent
Developments <http://www.fas.org/man/crs/RL30389.pdf>

Guardian Unlimited: Special
Report - Chechnya <http://www.guardian.co.uk/chechnya/0,2759,180787,00.html>

Center for Defense
Information: Crisis in North
Caucasus <http://www.cdi.org/issues/Europe/ncaucasus.html>

BBC: The Chechen Conflict http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in_depth/europe/2000/chechnya/default.stm

U.S. State Department:
“Chechnya Conflict Threatens
Caucasus Region” <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/02050927.htm>