7

The use of Russia's security structures in the post-conflict environment

Ekaterina A. Stepanova

Before turning to Russia's recent experience of using its security structures[1] in post-conflict operations, it has to be noted that many of the problems faced by Russia in this field are, indeed, specific to the Russian model, as compared to those of most Western states. For that reason, more general problems of the use of the armed forces in a post-conflict environment should first be briefly addressed. That will serve as a general background, against which the performance of those of Russia's multiple security structures that seem to be best tailored for operations in a post-conflict environment – the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry for Civil Defence, Emergencies, and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters (EMERCOM) – will be assessed.

In the past decade, the level of military participation in post-conflict stabilization, reconstruction, and rehabilitation activities has been steadily growing.[2] The armed forces' increased involvement in these activities can be explained by several factors:

- the search by governments and armed forces for a new global role for the military with the passing of the Cold War (an imperative so strong that it was able to overcome the traditionally sceptical attitude of the professional armed forces towards ''non-military'' activities)
- the availability of significant military assets at the time when civilian organizations were overwhelmed with humanitarian relief and post-conflict reconstruction and development tasks
- the lack of alternatives for most Western states to deploying their

armed forces to perform essentially non-military tasks in post-conflict environments.

While in a post-conflict environment the division between security and non-security elements of peacebuilding and stabilization efforts is often relative, for the sake of clarity it makes sense to follow the basic division between security tasks, performed by the security or military component of an international peacebuilding effort or of a national "stabilization" campaign; and humanitarian, political, economic reconstruction and development, civil-society-related, and other peacebuilding tasks that have long-term implications for solidifying the achievements made by the military (security) component of the mission. The armed forces face a number of problems in dealing with these two main groups of tasks in post-conflict settings.

Addressing security issues in a post-conflict environment requires one to distinguish between various security needs. The regular troops have proved to be most effective in demilitarization (especially controlling the withdrawal of heavy arms) and provision of a basic security environment, with the emphasis still on force protection. At the same time, the functional division between traditional military and "normal" civil police duties has become increasingly blurred in the post-conflict environment, creating a "grey area" between cessation of hostilities and lasting peace. It is into this "grey area" of militarized police or other special duties that most of the security tasks in the post-conflict environments fall (patrolling refugees camps; escorting humanitarian convoys, refugees, and internally displaced persons (IDPs); providing protection to them upon their return, as well as to international civil personnel and local population; controlling riots and mob violence; dealing with war criminals; fighting terrorism, etc.).

The civilian sector has to rely on the "security component" of the mission to perform these tasks. As demonstrated by the extensive experience of the past decade, however, the armed forces normally lack special training and, fearing "mission creep" and its unforeseen implications, are often reluctant to perform "grey area" duties in post-conflict settings. At the same time, civil police (even if armed, as the UN police in Kosovo) cannot effectively carry out post-conflict police functions that, in contrast to "normal" police duties, are performed in an environment which could easily escalate into an armed conflict and thus requires more robust, militarized police capacities.[3]

The international community is thus in need of forces and mechanisms for maintaining order in the post-conflict environment – during the critical period after mission deployment, but before the rule of law is fully established or restored (so that control can be handed over to a local police force). Ideally, the forces to forge this "missing link" in conflict man-

agement should have the discipline, cohesion, and war-fighting skills of the military, plus the special equipment and training of the police, with an emphasis on anti-terrorist and special capacities and more robust policing efforts as opposed to ''normal'' police duties. Apparently, most functions required from the security component of the mission in a post-conflict environment are very close to those performed by internal security forces (or national police forces with military status) in countries that have such forces. With a few notable exceptions, such as the French gendarmerie and Italian carabinieri (law enforcement units responsive to their respective ministries of defence, financed from military budgets, and forming the core of NATO multinational specialized units in the Balkans), in most NATO states, including the USA, ''intermediate'' militarized police capacities are either lacking or insufficient. Thus, most of these states have no tenable alternative to deploying their regular troops in post-conflict environments and letting them drift towards police functions.

The growing involvement of the armed forces in post-conflict environments for non-security purposes can be even more controversial. While resort to the use of military assets and personnel is often inevitable, especially at the critical ''emergency'' stage of crisis, it also has the potential of weakening or undermining the comparative advantages of the civilian sector, such as technical expertise, knowledge of the region, ties to local communities, and especially longer-term commitment to reconstruction and development. As demonstrated by the experience of the past decade, the generic comparative advantages of the military (long-haul lift, logistics, communications, intelligence, and demining) tend to decrease gradually when the situation becomes less critical and moves from a state of conflict to a post-conflict stage, and as the military's tasks shift to activities more directly related to civilian (humanitarian, reconstruction, and development) work. The unprecedented level of militarization of non-security tasks, such as that seen in NATO operations in and around Kosovo, is, however, rather an exception than the rule: it usually results from direct international military involvement in the conflict on behalf of one of the parties, and is unlikely to be seen in most post-conflict environments that are less politically and strategically important to the West.[4]

In contrast to the West, Russia's post-Cold War involvement in post-conflict settings has been commonly related either to conflicts on its own soil (Chechnya) or to cross-border disturbances and conflicts in neighbouring or CIS states (Georgia/Abkhazia, Moldova/Transdniestria, Tajikistan). While some operations in more distant regions (for instance, in the Balkans) are possible, they are increasingly becoming exceptions rather than the rule. So for Russia the problems of countering sub-

conventional violence in a state between conflict and peace, restoring law and order, and recovery and reconstruction in post-conflict areas are a matter of more direct political, economic, and security concern. Also, in most cases in which Russia is involved, the boundary between the conflict and post-conflict environments, which is generally not always easy to define, is particularly blurred, as the situation in Chechnya has vividly demonstrated.

MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs): Coping with ''grey area'' security tasks

The emphasis on security structures' activities rather than just on the armed forces' performance in the post-conflict environment, as mentioned in the title of this chapter, reflects one of the most evident characteristics of the Russian model of post-conflict security building. While most Western states lack forces other than the military to perform ''grey area'' security tasks, for many countries that have not yet developed solid democratic traditions or face constant internal disturbances, most of these duties are very similar to ''internal security'' tasks. So are they for the Russian Federation, where the number of internal troops of the Ministry of Interior (up to 300,000 gendarmerie-type soldier-police) may soon be almost comparable to the country's land armed forces, which are subject to dramatic cuts. Internal troops are composed of formations that are in many respects similar to light infantry, and of special detachment units (*spetsnaz*), with the difference that they are trained to deal as much with civilians as with enemy troops. Internal troops are armed with light arms, light and heavy mortars, and armoured troop-carriers. However, unlike the armed forces, they cannot use heavy arms (artillery, tanks, and rocket-launchers) and ammunition, or assault aircraft, combat helicopters, and cassette rocket-launchers in public security operations.[5]

Internal troops have become the key force component to be deployed to post-conflict areas within the country, as they are made directly responsible by the Russian federal legislation for ''grey area'' security tasks at the transitional stage between the suspension of full-scale hostilities and the re-establishment of functioning state structures. According to the law, internal troops' tasks include, among others:

- sealing off areas declared under the state of emergency and zones of armed conflicts; prevention of hostilities and separation of the conflicting parties; confiscation of weapons from the population; disarmament of illegal armed groups or, in case of armed resistance, their elimination (in cooperation with other MVD structures)

- reinforcement of public order and security in areas adjacent to the "emergency" or conflict zones
- prevention of mass public disorders in settlements.[6]

Both regular internal troops and special units (special rapid reaction units – SOBR – and militia units of special detachment – OMON) are actively used in domestic operations other than war. These formations are better prepared to conduct specific "grey area" security tasks than regular armed forces. It should be noted, however, that this is only true for operations that do not involve combat: in combat-type missions on Russian territory (in conflict zones or at early stages of post-conflict stabilization) there is no alternative to the use of the armed forces, as demonstrated by the situation in and around Chechnya. While it was the internal troops and other MVD units who were the first to stand against the August 1999 invasion of armed Chechen groups into neighbouring Dagestan, they had to be replaced with regular armed forces as soon as that was possible. At the military stage of the second campaign in Chechnya, internal troops played support functions (rear and flank cover, cordon-off operations, etc.). Normally, after the army units neutralized the rebels' artillery in a certain area, internal troops and MVD special units arrived to conduct cordon-off (mopping-up) actions, population screening (passport regime control), and other operations.

By mid-2000 the focus of full-scale armed confrontation moved to the south of Chechnya. The rest of the republic's territory, especially the central region, remained subject to operations other than war, designed to prevent and counter occasional guerrilla attacks, skirmishes, ambushes, or terrorist acts. In these regions it was the internal troops, supported by regular police personnel (delegated by regional criminal police departments from all over Russia), who assumed the primary responsibility for restoring public order and security, in contrast to their military support functions at the military stage of the campaign. The internal troop units replaced the military at block-posts on the roads to settlements, took part in special operations, guarded objects of critical importance, and provided protection to humanitarian convoys. As compared to the first campaign in Chechnya (1994–1996), more attention was paid to building relations with the local population, especially in relatively "loyal" regions (while in Dagestan these relations were very cooperative, in many parts of Chechnya they remained highly problematic).

In addition to internal troops, in Chechnya's administrative districts the MVD formed interim departments of internal affairs, working in close cooperation with local military commandants' offices. A decision was taken to assign Russian regions (*oblast'*) and provinces to take responsibility for public security tasks in Chechnya's administrative districts by delegating part of the MVD's regular regional department personnel,

such as the criminal police. For instance, an interim internal affairs department from Volgograd *oblast'* was deployed to Chechnya's Shelkovskoi district; and public security tasks in Chechnya's Naurski and Nadterechnyi districts were assigned to Krasnodar and Rostov regional MVD structures, respectively. MVD interim departments, supported if necessary by internal troops, also checked the identity of IDPs leaving Chechnya and took over passport control in general. The neighbouring Republic of Ingushetia's MVD structures and the North Caucasus regional unit on combating organized crime (RUBOP) evacuated civilian populations from particularly insecure regions (for instance, they organized the evacuation of elderly people from Grozny). As the federal campaign's main focus gradually shifted towards non-military security tasks, the MVD structures had to take up additional responsibilities. In August 2000, for instance, the task of ensuring public security and order in view of the Federal State Duma's deputy election campaign assumed primary importance for the MVD in Chechnya.

   MVD structures also played a key role in providing security to humanitarian personnel in the North Caucasus. According to UN assessments, "the main threat to the humanitarian personnel is posed by organized criminal groups that have created a complex network of kidnapping (both foreign and Russian citizens) for financial gain".[7] Moreover, as the risk of hostilities in many regions of Chechnya decreased, the risk of hostage-taking activities and other forms of criminal violence increased. With the UN's growing humanitarian presence in the region, the problem of providing protection for international and local humanitarian personnel working in the field became more pressing. In practice, these security functions were mainly performed by the MVD's regional structures, particularly by North Caucasus RUBOP units. For instance, the UN office in Vladikavkaz was guarded by the North Ossetia RUBOP, while the Ingushetia RUBOP escorted UN humanitarian convoys to Chechnya.

   As the security situation in some of the regions slowly normalized, other problems started to emerge, such as the problem of avoiding duplication of functions between federal police deployed in the republic and local police units which were being formed, as well as the gradual, slow transfer of police functions from the former to the latter. One of the criteria of assessing the effectiveness of the MVD structures' performance in Chechnya is precisely the extent to which their functions are being transferred to local Chechen police, answering to the MVD of the Chechen Republic. By 2002 there were three Chechen MVD departments working in a relatively stable northern Chechnya (to the north of the River Terek), and 42,000 federal MVD personnel still deployed in the republic (the Internal Troops 46th Brigade is deployed in Chechnya on a permanent basis). Under a decree signed by President Putin in late June

2003,[8] it was the MVD that took over the regional operational staff for the North Caucasus, i.e. the overall control of all of Russia's security operations in the region, including those of the Federal Group of Forces (OGV) and the Federal Security Service, with the more remote goal of ultimately transferring law and order responsibilities to the Chechen republican MVD.

While the participation of MVD internal troops, special units, and regular police has been critical for the implementation of "grey area" tasks in post-conflict settings on Russian territory, it also raised a number of wider issues. One of them is how the involvement of MVD units in security tasks in the North Caucasus affects their regular performance throughout the country. While this problem is less relevant for internal troops in general (operations in conflict-type or post-conflict environments are part of their primary functions), it is more pressing for regular police units (such as criminal police), and especially for special units, such as OMONs. The latter are in strong demand throughout the country as a robust militarized rapid-reaction capacity to fight organized crime and be used in counterterrorist, counternarcotics, and other operations. An urgent need for these formations in non-conflict areas has been one of the reasons for their frequent rotation in Chechnya and in the North Caucasus in general. Yet it is widely recognized within the MVD itself that frequent rotation undermines MVD units' advantages in implementing post-conflict security tasks. In order to make MVD operations in Chechnya more effective, a decision was taken by the MVD's new head, Vladimir Gryzlov, to extend the period of their deployment in the region from an average of three months to an average of six months, and even up to one year.[9]

The first "administrative" MVD reform efforts (stronger centralization of the criminal police, coupled with greater decentralization of public security police structures) were reactivated during President Putin's first term in office by a group of his loyalists in the ministry's leadership, guided primarily by domestic law enforcement priorities rather than by post-conflict security-building requirements. Of particular relevance to security operations in the post-conflict environment was the preservation of the RUBOP structures, which proved to be effective in protecting humanitarian convoys and humanitarian personnel. At the same time, the special rapid-reaction units (SOBRs) were separated from RUBOPs and faced further reorganization to become MVD special forces. Developments in federal police training included the organization of regular special courses in international humanitarian law for internal troops officers – as a result of both the MVD's active interaction with the United Nations and other international humanitarian organizations in the North Caucasus, and increasing involvement in UN peace support missions

(although, as compared to the MVD's involvement in domestic operations, the latter remained very limited).[10]

During Putin's second term, general domestic political, economic, and security priorities, such as the need to improve general law and order conditions on the territory of the Russian Federation, have stimulated further attempts to streamline the huge and complex structure of the Ministry of the Interior and make it more efficient both operationally and financially. Apparently, this time Russia's experience in the North Caucasus has had a greater impact on the reform efforts. On 19 April 2004 Putin declared the launch of the "administrative" security sector reform and reorganization "in the spirit of the ongoing reform of the state administration" that had already affected most governmental "civilian" bodies.[11] Less radical than the reorganization of civil ministries, the "security sector reform" was aimed at reducing the number of top officials, as well as of intraministerial structural bodies, departments, services, and agencies in the ministries of the security bloc, and at delegating most specialized functions to federal agencies subordinate to, but structurally autonomous from, the "umbrella" ministries.

Unsurprisingly, the reform's central focus has been on the Ministry of Interior. According to the commander-in-chief of the internal troops, General Vyacheslav Tihomirov, the reform of the internal troops is both dictated by the overall economic reform agenda that calls for greater effectiveness of the entire MVD system, and based on practical experience in managing interethnic and other conflicts and post-conflict situations and countering political extremism and terrorism.[12] So far, the reform has involved measures aimed at greater mobility and gradual professionalization (by the end of 2004 the Internal Troops 46th Brigade, deployed in Chechnya on a permanent basis, was to be formed entirely on a professional contract basis); slow and selective downsizing (in 2004 alone, internal troops have been cut by 7,000 soldiers, and by 2005 this number should reach 33,900, or slightly more than 10 per cent of all personnel); modernization of arms and equipment, with a new emphasis on non-lethal weapons; and better financing (while at the start of the second federal campaign in Chechnya in 1999 only 29 per cent of the internal troops' financial needs were met by the government, in 2004 these forces have received 84 per cent of their requested financing).[13]

Proposals for a more radical structural reform of the MVD are also under discussion. Such a reform would be directed towards further specialization and division of the MVD's main functions – to the point of delegating them to several new bodies, such as the Federal Police (responsible for all regular law enforcement duties, except for criminal investigation), the Federal Service for Investigations, and the Municipal Militia (an entirely new body that would respond to local self-

government bodies and be financed from local municipal budgets). In this context, of critical importance to post-conflict peacebuilding and restoration of law and order would be the formation, on the basis of the current internal troops, of a separate security structure that may be renamed the ''National Guard'' – the ''state militarized organization tasked with the protection of the public order and security under extraordinary/ emergency conditions, guarding functions for the objects of high importance, and the fight against illegal armed groups''. This scenario would underscore the importance of the ex-internal troops and secure a higher profile for them by making the ''National Guard'' directly responding to the president.[14]

EMERCOM: Emergency aid, basic recovery, and reconstruction

The pattern described above does not only apply to security-related tasks, but extends to include humanitarian relief and some of the most urgent reconstruction functions performed by Russia's EMERCOM, a militarized civil defence and disaster relief agency.

While previously mainly limited to natural disaster mitigation, since the early 1990s the deployment of national civil defence or emergency relief agencies in man-made humanitarian crises and post-conflict environments has been growing steadily on a worldwide scale. However, no state or international organization has used the potential of civil defence and emergency agencies for humanitarian, recovery, and reconstruction purposes in post-conflict settings as widely as the Russian Federation. In the first 10 years after its creation in 1990, the Russian Civil Defence and Emergencies Agency conducted more than 150,000 rescue, humanitarian, and other operations in 47 countries, physically saved 57,000 people, and evacuated more than 1.5 million people from conflict zones.[15] This makes it one of the 10 most effective emergency services in the world. The agency was later elevated to a cabinet level and renamed the Ministry for Civil Defence, Emergencies, and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters, or EMERCOM for short.

EMERCOM is not a civilian agency, unlike most civil emergency/ emergency agencies in Western countries. Apart from EMERCOM's military-type organizational hierarchy, 40 per cent of its 70,000 employees are in fact arms-carrying service personnel. Forty per cent of those serve on a contract basis. EMERCOM has a countrywide structure of regional departments, working in cooperation with local governments. Local EMERCOM branches are especially active in remote regions (such as in some parts of Siberia, the far east, and the north), where they are

often the only well-maintained and conspicuous authority. Beyond that, EMERCOM has taken over some executive supervision and police functions to ensure that federal funds allocated for coping with crises and natural disasters are efficiently used and not stolen by local bureaucracies. EMERCOM enjoys high public respect, and its political neutrality and strong political profile guarantee a strong level of funding. This is helped along by the fact that natural and technological disaster mitigation is one of the most conspicuous ways for the central government to demonstrate its effectiveness, while failure to respond may lead to serious political consequences. Apart from regularly paid salaries to its employees, EMERCOM is known for its utilization of high-tech equipment. In fact, the agency seems to be one of the most technically advanced state security structures, equipped with speedboats, helicopters, and long-haul air-lift capacities. In sum, domestically, EMERCOM proves to be one of the very few successful experiments in post-Soviet state institution building.[16]

Apart from its disaster mitigation functions, throughout the 1990s EMERCOM became increasingly involved in conflict zones and post-conflict settings both inside and outside Russia. Since 1992, when EMERCOM was first tasked with helping and accommodating refugees from South Ossetia, its specialists have worked in Transdniestria, North Ossetia, Ingushetia, Abkhazia, Tajikistan, former Yugoslavia, and Chechnya.

Particularly in the North Caucasus, EMERCOM seemed to be the best-organized federal force, especially during and in the aftermath of the second Chechen campaign. EMERCOM's militarized organization allowed the agency to start working in Chechnya proper at the earliest stage of the military campaign. The first to be deployed were officers of EMERCOM's Centre for High-Risk Rescue Operations, whose specific responsibility was to provide security to the agency's personnel as they were deployed into the region. In February 2000 EMERCOM's Central Air-Mobile Rescue Unit was deployed; by the summer of 2000 a combined mobile unit, formed by several EMERCOM regional divisions, was fully operational; and in July 2000 an EMERCOM branch in the Chechen Republic was formed.

EMERCOM's activities in and around Chechnya were not limited to traditional search-and-rescue functions, such as evacuation of the population from highly insecure areas. Rather, they embraced a range of functions that could be described as complex humanitarian emergency operations. In 1999–2000 EMERCOM's priorities in the North Caucasus were as described below (in July 2000, many of these tasks were transferred to the republican EMERCOM).

- In the first days of the crisis EMERCOM started to construct temporary camps in Ingushetia for IDPs from Chechnya (whose number

reached 250,000 at the peak of the crisis). By the end of September 1999 four tent camps had been built by the EMERCOM of Ingushetia, with a capacity to host from 360 to 3,000 people; by June 2000, 12 camps were operational. EMERCOM's operational efficiency in camp construction and the quality of the camps were highly appraised by UN representatives, acknowledging that the professionalism of EMERCOM specialists sometimes even exceeded their own.[17]

- EMERCOM organized nutrition for IDPs both outside and inside Chechnya, as well as for the most needy (women, children, elderly people) throughout Chechnya. Overall, food aid was regularly provided to more than 240,000 individuals.
- Humanitarian aid, from food and living essentials to field kitchens, diesel power stations, and oil heaters, provided by the central government and particularly by Russia's regions, was collected and delivered to the region by air and trucks. Also, EMERCOM was responsible for ensuring customs clearance for and delivery of international humanitarian aid to the region and, at earlier stages of the campaign, its distribution among the beneficiaries. Later on, EMERCOM mostly escorted convoys into Chechnya, while local NGOs, under contract with the UNHCR, distributed the emergency supplies among needy families and individuals.
- EMERCOM medical teams provided medical aid to more than 60,000 people. Also, EMERCOM deployed two field hospitals to Chechnya, reconstructed 23 medical facilities, and served as an ambulance service by providing most urgent medical assistance on the spot and delivering the sick or injured to a nearby hospital.
- Water supply was organized by reconstructing or repairing water pumping stations, purification and distribution of potable water, and well cleaning.
- Along with the army's engineering force responsible for mine clearance and deactivation, EMERCOM actively participated in ''humanitarian demining''. Despite the high professionalism of EMERCOM demining teams and the impressive quantities of detected and removed unexploded ordnance, demining activities in Chechnya proved to be one of the least effective functions, as most of the demined areas were soon discovered to be mined again.[18]

Apart from these functions, EMERCOM has also performed a variety of other tasks, from burying bodies and setting up communications systems (first of all radio communication) to assistance for IDPs to register with the civilian Federal Migration Agency and reclaim their social status.

The humanitarian crisis in the North Caucasus has vividly demonstrated that EMERCOM has emerged as Russia's leading humanitarian agency. Compared to both civilian humanitarian organizations and the

armed forces, EMERCOM's advantages in the field of humanitarian emergency response are mobility, flexibility, intensive specialized professional training, and a militarized organization, the latter being critical for operating effectively in an insecure post-conflict environment. For instance, a typical mobile group of the EMERCOM Central Air-Mobile Rescue Unit, operating in every district of the city of Grozny and formed exclusively on a voluntary basis, included professional guards in addition to a driver, a physician, rescue workers, and other "functional specialists". In cases of minor attacks or hooligan acts, EMERCOM units had the right to use light arms. At the same time, in order not to stand out among the city's residents (should that be required for security reasons), the Central Air-Mobile Rescue Unit did not require its personnel to operate in official uniforms. EMERCOM tactics, to be "invisible for illegal armed groups, but open to the federal services, inaccessible to the media, but carefully explaining its activities to the local population",[19] proved to be effective in Chechnya.

In addition to emergency response skills, EMERCOM's high level of specialization and professional training allowed its personnel to accommodate specific humanitarian demands. For instance, EMERCOM units tried their best to observe the principle of humanitarian neutrality by not publicly siding with the federal authorities (!) when communicating with the local population, and by always stressing that their agency is "above politics". To facilitate interaction with the local population, a tactic of "local connections transfer" in the process of personnel rotation was particularly effective. In line with humanitarian standards, for security reasons EMERCOM insisted on IDP camp locations at some distance from an administrative border with Chechnya. At the same time, EMERCOM experts opposed camp construction outside of the North Caucasian region, as that would have made it very difficult for many IDPs to return to Chechnya.

In sum, EMERCOM proved to be effective and efficient in performing humanitarian emergency response tasks, especially as compared with the chronically underfinanced civilian agencies. As demonstrated by operations in the North Caucasus, in humanitarian emergencies in Russia there is no alternative to EMERCOM, which manages to reconcile a seemingly irreconcilable militarized organization with a high humanitarian profile.

Apart from EMERCOM's domestic functions, its advanced technical equipment (in line with most international standards), considerable airlift capacity, and operational flexibility, mobility, and efficiency, as well as its militarized personnel and organization, make the agency similar to a rapid-reaction force, ready to be deployed anywhere in the world. Unlike the MVD, as a humanitarian/disaster relief agency EMERCOM is

not bound by many legal restrictions for deployment outside Russia. EMERCOM involvement might be particularly welcome in cases when Russia's military or peacekeeping involvement is unwelcome, or politically undesirable for Russia itself, as already effectively demonstrated by EMERCOM operations in Afghanistan.

Among other things, EMERCOM's humanitarian mission to Afghanistan, labelled by its participants "a peaceful version of the Kosovo raid",[20] has vividly demonstrated the shift in Russia's foreign policy to more pragmatic and rational behaviour. EMERCOM activities in Afghanistan included:

- delivery of humanitarian supplies to the population of Afghanistan (food aid, non-food items, medicines, medical equipment, vehicles, and construction materials) by railroad to Dushanbe and then by trucks to Afghanistan, via the Osh-Faizabad route
- medical assistance to the local population in Kabul (in line with local customs, men and women were examined on different days in an EMERCOM-operated field hospital; Russian-speaking Afghan doctors were actively recruited and EMERCOM medical brigades were set up to work in towns and settlements outside Kabul)
- reconstruction works (at the Salang tunnel, which connects the north with the rest of the country, and elsewhere)
- additionally, EMERCOM has expressed its readiness to organize emergency relief training for Afghans and assist in the formation of a local professional rescue team etc.[21]

Security for EMERCOM personnel operating in Afghanistan was provided by Russian special services in cooperation with the new Afghan Ministry of Defence, as well as by EMERCOM's own guards (who were mistaken for the Russian military by the Western media).[22] In its humanitarian and reconstruction operations in Afghanistan, EMERCOM closely cooperated with individual states (Germany, France, and the UK) and international organizations (such as the World Food Programme), not to mention the local Afghan agencies, particularly the Ministry of Refugees and Repatriates.

Overall, as demonstrated by EMERCOM's experience in performing humanitarian and basic reconstruction tasks both inside and outside Russia, this militarized humanitarian agency is highly effective in the post-conflict environment. At the same time, it must be stressed that EMERCOM is ideally suited for operational emergency response only, and cannot provide humanitarian assistance on a long-term basis[23] nor deal with all of the consequences of a humanitarian disaster, nor with the entire post-conflict range of reconstruction and recovery tasks. These tasks have to be implemented by governmental, non-governmental, and international civilian organizations.

Implications for the military and for civil-military relations

The availability of several state-run militarized organizations, legally entitled to perform security and some non-security tasks in the post-conflict environment, means that there is no need for Russia to overburden its armed forces with non-combat post-conflict missions, most of which are likely to be domestic or have an important domestic aspect (such as cross-border missions). With EMERCOM effectively performing emergency humanitarian and basic relief, reconstruction, and recovery functions, there is no major need to involve the military in humanitarian assistance operations. While the military's occasional involvement in some humanitarian actions in the North Caucasus, especially at the earlier stage of the second campaign in Chechnya, was more active than in the 1994–1996 campaign (by delivering food, medicines, and fuel to residents of Dagestan and the northern and central regions of Chechnya), these activities were still limited, dictated primarily by political considerations, and only sometimes driven by technical necessity (such as the occasional use of military cargo planes for humanitarian aid delivery).

In the security field, the armed forces' involvement in non-combat activities, particularly in areas that could be described as post-conflict environments (most of the northern and some of the central regions of Chechnya), was mostly limited to:

- attempts to create "humanitarian corridors" from Grozny and some other cities and towns
- providing protection to two IDP camps near Znamenskaya in northern Chechnya (a task that was transferred to MVD forces as soon as that was possible)
- participation, alongside EMERCOM demining teams, in humanitarian demining (as well as in demining for military purposes).

In addition, there were also several bizarre cases of military involvement in apparently non-military activities, such as an attempt by the Joint Group of Federal Forces to impose restrictions on crossing the Chechen-Ingush border in both directions by all men aged from 10 to 60 – a decision so heavily criticized both inside and outside Russia that it had to be revoked three days after it was made.[24]

An important implication for civil-military relations is that several militarized security structures play a role of a buffer between the professional military and the civilian sector, reducing potential for civil-military tensions. The UN agencies operating in the North Caucasus, for instance, had few problems with the Russian armed forces for the simple reason that they had little interaction with these forces: most of their security problems were dealt with by the MVD or, in critical cases, by special services. Most transport, communication, and other logistical as well as

coordination problems were settled in cooperation with EMERCOM. Even keeping in mind the internal character of Russia's involvement in the North Caucasus, as opposed to NATO's out-of-area mission in the Balkans, the contrast between the two patterns is clear. For instance, if a NATO officer at the peak of the humanitarian emergency in the Balkans in the spring and early summer of 1999 happened to be unaware of the difference between the Office of the UN High Commissioner on Refugees (UNHCR) and the UN Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), it would have been problematic for the mission as he would have probably found himself in a position of dealing directly with these agencies. The same unawareness on the part of a Russian officer in the North Caucasus, however, was not a problem at all, as it was EMERCOM that was fully responsible for dealing with these UN agencies.

This does not mean that there have been no problems in the field between the civilian sector and Russia's security structures other than the armed forces. In the North Caucasus, the general record for these Russian-style paramilitary-civilian relations has been rather mixed. Of all force structures it was undoubtedly EMERCOM as a humanitarian, although militarized, agency that demonstrated the highest propensity to cooperate with international and domestic civilian personnel, as well as with the local population. For such a large, complex, and multilevel structure as the MVD, cooperation patterns varied from extremely negative to extremely positive. On the negative side, there have been serious tensions with the local population over so-called *zachistka* operations.[25] One of the reasons for the highly problematic nature of these operations was that, instead of being used only in critical situations as a selective measure of last resort, and only when based on solid operational intelligence, they have not just become a routine, but often served as a substitute for most other security-related activities, such as regular patrolling. On a positive side, in contrast to the humanitarian situation in and around Kosovo, there have been no major problems in arranging for protection of UNHCR convoys to Chechnya – this task was regularly and effectively performed by the regional MVD anti-organized-crime units from neighbouring Ingushetia.

If the record of paramilitary-civilian relations has been rather mixed, it is nevertheless much better compared to that of the military-paramilitary relations within the "security bloc". One of the most critical adverse effects of the Russian model, a lack of both "separation of tasks" and sufficient coordination, particularly between the armed forces and the MVD, was most evident during the first campaign in Chechnya. It has not been fully overcome in the course of the second campaign, although some lessons have been learnt. Interestingly, tensions between the armed forces and the MVD were at their highest during the military stage of

the second campaign. However, as soon as the focus shifted towards non-military tasks, where the advantages of the MVD were obvious, the tensions substantially decreased.

A further disadvantage of the Russian system is an apparent lack of multi-agency civilian presence in the field. It tends to be replaced by militarized security and emergency response structures, and can be only partly compensated by an international humanitarian presence. With the civilian (and particularly NGO) sector still underrepresented in Russian post-conflict operations, an excessive ''militarization'' of these activities is inevitable. As a result, civil-military relations in the field remain under-developed, and therefore paramilitary-military instead of civil-military relations have so far been more important. The option of demilitarizing many post-conflict tasks and increasing civilian participation in the field, which would theoretically be more suitable to long-term post-conflict requirements, is not workable for present-day Russia for a number of objective and subjective reasons. The main objective factors include financial constraints, ineffective state management (excessive bureaucratization and corruption), and general underdevelopment of civil society institutions and the non-governmental sector, which is unlikely to be overcome in the foreseeable future.

Throughout the first post-Cold War decade, the Russian government seemed to take little notice of the special character and structural advantages of militarized security forces, other than the military. However, several developments in the late 1990s to early 2000s indicate that the situation has begun to change. Among the most controversial of these developments has been the abolishment of the civilian Ministry for Federal Affairs, National and Migration Policy, which used to be responsible for registering and assisting IDPs in Ingushetia, Chechnya, and Dagestan – a move seen by some observers as the ultimate blow against a civilian presence in the field.[26] However, this chronically underfinanced and periodically reformed ministry was one of the most ineffective in the Russian government. As the leading state civilian agency involved in humanitarian operations in the North Caucasus in 1999–2000, the Federal Migration Service (FMS)[27] failed to perform even its direct task of registering IDPs, particularly at the peak of the crisis on the Chechen-Ingush border (September–October 1999). It was in fact the FMS's inability to set up IDP registration procedures effectively which contributed to the humanitarian crisis at the border crossing, when thousands of people were unable to cross the border. At the same time, the FMS was involved in humanitarian aid delivery to IDPs from Chechnya, a task that it was poorly prepared to implement and which, strictly speaking, was not a priority for this civilian agency. As a result of the FMS's poor performance in the North Caucasus, and because of political concerns over the potential

"floods" of refugees from Central Asian states, most of its functions related to refugees and IDPs were transferred from civilian structures (the Ministry for Federal Affairs, National and Migration Policy) to the MVD. While few migration experts have been enthusiastic about this move, there has been general recognition that it was dictated by pragmatic concerns.[28]

At the same time, the most hopeful sign in years has been the official assignment of the Ministry of Economic Development as one of the main state bodies responsible for post-conflict reconstruction – the first-ever attempt in Russia to link post-conflict stabilization institutionally with economic development. Several potential improvements for coordination have also long been under discussion, such as the creation of an interagency group on humanitarian and post-conflict reconstruction issues which could serve as a prototype for an interagency humanitarian agency.

Counterterrorism at the stage of post-conflict peacebuilding

Although counterterrorist tasks, operations, forces, and priorities are not the central subjects of this chapter, they cannot be ignored in an overview of the performance of the security structures at the stage of post-conflict peacebuilding. While this subject deserves a separate and detailed analysis,[29] some general observations are appropriate, particularly as, in the Russian case, by and large they confirm the pattern described in previous sections of the chapter, i.e. the need for and the primacy of skills, structures, and security forces other than the military (with selective support by the military) in performing counterterrorist tasks effectively at the stage of post-conflict peacebuilding.

The role of the armed forces in combating terrorism, particularly in low-intensity conflict areas and post-conflict environments, is a highly contentious issue. On the one hand, the approach conflating counterterrorism with the "war on terrorism", which relies primarily on the use of military force and tends to be event-driven, reactive, and short term in nature, is neither specifically tailored to counterterrorist needs nor particularly effective in meeting them, and has neither worked well for the US-led global war on terrorism nor helped curb the terrorist violence generated by local conflicts, such as those in Chechnya, Kashmir, or the Middle East. On the other hand, conflict-related terrorism[30] has become a standard mode of operation of militant resistance groups, and a military defeat can affect their performance in more ways than one (while, in some cases, it can provoke militant groups to resort increasingly to terrorist activities, in other cases an organization can suffer such a decisive military

blow that its ability to mount both guerrilla-type and terrorist attacks is drastically curtailed, forcing it to invest significant time to re-establish its operational capability). In sum, the armed forces, and special operations forces in particular, can certainly play a useful role in support of counter-terrorism, but military tools and structures are not best tailored for specific counterterrorist tasks and should not assume the primary role.

While the role of the military in counterterrorist operations is by definition limited (otherwise an operation would probably not even qualify as a counterterrorist one), the critical challenge is how to achieve an optimal division of functions and establish working cooperation between the two key sectors that bear primary operational responsibility for counterterrorist activities – the law enforcement and the intelligence/counterintelligence communities. It has been more or less recognized internationally that counterterrorism requires extensive collaboration between these two branches. In this context, however, it must be stressed once again that terrorism is always a form of political violence, which, while it can and should be "criminalized" to the greatest extent possible, can never be reduced to plain crime. Its political, religious, or ideological motivation, its psychological effects on society, and its diffuse financial, logistics, and operational links need to be countered by highly specialized capacities which need to develop solid intelligence on the perpetrators of violence and their networks on a permanent basis. Given the centrality of pre-emption, disruption, and prevention in counterterrorism, it becomes extremely important to obtain timely information about the planning and preparation of terrorist attacks by means of heightened use of human intelligence and undercover methods in order to penetrate groups involved in terrorist activities from within. In Russia, the law enforcement sector may have some of these capacities, but most of them are more directly associated with the intelligence community (the Federal Security Service and the Foreign Intelligence Service, as well as military intelligence).

In the end, however, the problem of performing counterterrorist tasks at the peacebuilding stage goes much deeper than just the need for better demarcation and coordination of security tasks and proper division of responsibilities. The key issue here is whether and to what extent counterterrorism in a post-conflict area can be viewed and undertaken as an enforcement-type activity. In fact, what distinguishes counterterrorism in the narrow sense from other security tasks is that its central goals are always the *prevention and pre-emptive disruption* of terrorist activities and networks, rather than post hoc *punishment, coercion, or retaliation*. While coercive measures can be used selectively in support of counterterrorism (for instance, to prevent a specific act of terrorism), they are not what counterterrorism is primarily about. The most proactive and effective

counterterrorist policy is never the one that is the most offensive and re-taliatory. In conflict or post-conflict areas in particular, operations whose impact goes far beyond the individual terrorist suspects themselves – such as "collective impact" or "collective punishment" measures, from curfews to large-scale mopping-up operations – can hardly serve counter-terrorist needs unless they are applied for a pre-defined period of time, cover a limited area, are based on very solid intelligence, and are selec-tively implemented for specific operational purposes. (Such a purpose would, for instance, be to detain a group of persons suspected of mount-ing a specific terrorist action while they are based in, operating from, or trespassing in a certain location.) When undertaken primarily for pu-nitive and essentially "counterinsurgency" purposes, collective impact measures, such as the Russian-style *zachistka* operations, tend to create greater problems than those they are meant to solve, because they cause serious tensions with and grievances among the local population. In sum, although collective impact measures have become almost standard coun-terinsurgency instruments for a number of states, including Russia, they have not been particularly effective as specific counterterrorist tools and are often counterproductive from the broader and longer-term peace-building perspective.

Conclusions and recommendations

The most pragmatic way to improve the effectiveness of Russia's opera-tions in the post-conflict environment would be to build on, and make better use of, the few structural advantages of the present system. For in-stance, while most Western countries lack forces other than the military (especially militarized police capacities) who could perform "grey area" security tasks in the post-conflict environment, in Russia these security components (especially the Ministry of Interior's troops and special units, and EMERCOM) are well-established, financed separately from the de-fence budget, readily available, and legally entitled to operate in post-conflict environments. This means that, structurally, there is no need for Russia to overburden its armed forces with non-combat post-conflict mis-sions, especially within the country. Given Russia's financial constraints, it makes sense to improve and develop further the existing organizational pattern by limiting the armed forces' responsibilities to tasks that might involve combat, while charging other security components with all "grey area" security tasks and selected non-security tasks, including humanitar-ian relief and basic reconstruction functions.

From the post-conflict stabilization and peacebuilding perspective, the emphasis of security sector reform on modernization, professionalization,

improved coordination, separation of tasks (specialization), downsizing, and greater civilian control over the militarized agencies and forces (such as the internal troops) is particularly important. In the future, further separation of tasks and improved coordination within the security bloc, especially between the armed forces and the Ministry of Interior, and further specialization of MVD troops and special units in ''grey area'' post-conflict security tasks, as opposed to military support or regular police functions, should be pursued. The modernization of equipment, arms, training, and logistics remains an absolute priority, while downsizing should not be viewed as a goal in itself (although important, this is less important for the MVD and other militarized force structures than for the armed forces).

As far as the tasks of combating terrorism are concerned, in addition to heavy reliance on the specialized capabilities of the intelligence/counter-intelligence sector, the specific conditions, constraints, and demands of an unstable post-conflict environment will still require the MVD to play a larger role in support of counterterrorist tasks. The effectiveness of counterterrorist operations will be more dependent on the ability of the law enforcement sector to provide basic law and order than it is in relatively stable or peaceful areas. More broadly, any further operational or structural reforms concerning Russia's ability to combat terrorism in a conflict or a post-conflict environment should stem from the highly specific nature of counterterrorism which distinguishes it from other types of security-related activities – in particular its essentially preventive, pre-emptive, disruptive, and highly selective character, and its complete dependence on solid, accurate, and constantly re-evaluated intelligence.

While MVD structures should bear primary responsibility for all ''grey area'' security tasks, except counterterrorism, in Russia's domestic post-conflict theatres, Russia's humanitarian relief agency EMERCOM, the best organized of all state forces (and, as such, the least affected by ''administrative reorganization'') could and should be used abroad more widely. This is the case especially when Russia's military or peacekeeping involvement is unwelcome, politically problematic, and undesirable for Russia itself. This approach has already worked well during the deployment of EMERCOM units in Afghanistan. While Russia's military involvement in post-conflict operations in regions outside of the CIS has become almost exceptional, EMERCOM's militarized organization, huge air-lifting capacity, modern technical equipment, and humanitarian relief focus make it the most appropriate rapid-reaction-type force to be deployed in post-conflict settings abroad.

This brief analysis suggests that Russian operations in the post-conflict environment are quite different from Western approaches. This does not mean that there is no place for external actors in the reform or modern-

ization of Russia's security sector in general. But as far as Russia's security structures' performance in domestic post-conflict situations is concerned, at the present stage the main priority should be given to practical cooperation in the field. The latter is politically less controversial, could be very instructive in logistical terms (through modernization of management, equipment, and communications capacities), and might have wider institutional implications. More generally, as compared to other international organizations (such as NATO and the OSCE) and individual Western states, UN structures could take up a more active role in encouraging security sector reform in general, and improved effectiveness of the Russian security structures in the post-conflict environment in particular. This proactive approach may well come as a logical progression of the UN's large-scale humanitarian involvement within Russia, particularly in the North Caucasus, its effective cooperation with Russian security/ emergency structures both within and outside the country, and the uncontroversial political status and high professional profile of UN agencies in the eyes of the Russian government and society.

Notes

1. Security structures – a synonym for the state security sector that includes armed forces, law enforcement agencies, intelligence services, and other militarized formations. In the Russian case, security structures, other than the armed forces, are Ministry of Interior troops, special units, and regular police structures, Ministry of Emergencies forces, border guards, railroad troops, Ministry of Justice forces, special services, etc. The focus of this chapter is on the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry for Civil Defence, Emergencies, and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters, as the ones most closely involved in post-conflict settings.

2. The changing role of the military and its increased involvement in non-military operations in crisis areas were reflected in national military doctrinal documents of that period. See, for instance, *Peace Operations*, FM 100–23, Draft 6, 30 December 1994. Washington, DC: US Department of the Army; National Defense Panel. 1997. *Transforming Defense, National Security in the 21st Century*, Report of the National Defense Panel. Washington, DC: Department of Defense; MoD. 1995. *Wider Peacekeeping, Army Field Manual*. London: Ministry of Defence; MoD. 1998. *Strategic Defence Review*, white paper presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Defence, CM 3999. London: Stationery Office; *Livre Blanc sur la Defense 1994*. Paris: Documentation Francaise; Etat-Majors des Armées. 1999. *Doctrine Interarmees d'Emploi des Forces en Operation*. Paris: Etat-Majors des Armées, Division Emploi. See also the documents of various international and regional organizations, such as UNDHA. 1994. *Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief*, Project Dpr 213/3 MCDA. Geneva: UN Department of Humanitarian Affairs; NATO. 1994. *NATO Doctrine for Peace Support Operations*, draft, 28 February. Mons: Peacekeeping Section, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE). See also Findlay, Trevor (ed.). 1996. *Challenges for the New Peacekeepers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Foster, E. 1995. *NATO's Military in the Age of Crisis Management*. London: RUSI; Mackinlay, J. and J. A. Chopra. 1993. *A Draft Concept of Second Generation Multina-*

tional Operations. Providence, RI: Thomas J. Watson Institute for International Studies; Minear, L. and P. Guillot. 1996. *Soldiers to the Rescue*. Paris: OECD; O'Hanlon, M. 1997. *Saving Lives With Force: Military Criteria for Humanitarian Intervention*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution; Record, J. 1998. *The Creeping Irrelevance of US Force Planning*. Carlisle Barracks: Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College; Leicht, R. C. 1992. *The New World Order and Army Doctrine. The Doctrinal Renaissance of Operations Short of War*. Santa Monica: Rand.

3. On the role of police forces in post-conflict situations, see for instance Chauveau, G. M. and G. Migone. 2000. *CIMIC and Police: Forging The ''Missing Links'' in Crisis Management*, Subcommittee on Civilian Security and Cooperation, Civilian Affairs Committee, 23 March. Brussels: NATO Parliamentary Assembly; Oakley, Robert B., Michael J. Dziedzic, and Eliot M. Goldberg (eds). 1998. *Policing the New World Disorder: Peace Operations and Public Security*. Washington, DC: NDU Press; Dwan, R. (ed.). 2002. *Executive Policing: Enforcing the Law in Peace Operations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

4. For more on this, see for instance Minear, L., T. Van Baarda, and M. Sommers. 2000. *NATO and Humanitarian Action in the Kosovo Crisis*. Providence, RI: Thomas J. Watson Institute; Suhrke, Astri, Michael Barutciski, Peta Sandison, and Rick Garlock. 2000. *The Kosovo Refugee Crisis: An Independent Evaluation of UNHCR's Emergency Preparedness and Response*, Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, EPAU/2000/001. Geneva: UNHCR, available at www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/research/opendoc.pdf?tbl=RESEARCH&id=3ba0bbeb4; Stepanova, E. 2001. *Voyenno-grazhdanskiye otnosheniya v operatsiyah nevoyennogo tipa (Civil-Military Relations in Operations Other Than War)*. Moscow: Human Rights Publications, pp. 110–134.

5. For general information and literature on the MVD, see for instance (in Russian) Kikot', V. (ed.). 2000. *Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' trudov o deiatel'nosti MVD Rossii (1802–2000 gg.): MVD 200 let*. Moscow: MVD Research Institute; Kozhevnikova, G. and P. Gazukin. 1999. *Silovye Struktury Rossii*. Moscow: Panorama.

6. Federal Law "On Internal Troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation", *Sobraniye Zakonodatel'stva Rossiiskoi Federatsii* (*Code of Laws of the Russian Federation*), No. 6, 27 February 1997, Art. 711.

7. UN Consolidated Inter-agency Humanitarian Appeal for the North Caucasus (Russian version), December 1999–December 2000, p. 14.

8. Ukaz No. 715 "O dopolnitel'nykh merakh po bor'be s terrorizmom na territorii Severo-okavkazskogo regiona Rossiiskoi Federatsii", 30 June 2003, in *Sobraniye zakonodatel'stva Rossiiskoi Federatsii*, No. 31, 4 August 2003, Part II, Art. 2889.

9. Minister of Interior Boris Gryzlov, cited by Rosbusinessconsulting News Agency, 25 December 2001.

10. The largest deployment in a UN mission has been that of more than 200 police officers as part of the UN mission in Kosovo. Roughly half of them served in CIVPOL, and others as special police units. Russian police personnel in Bosnia continued their work as part of the EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (EUPM) that replaced the UN International Police Task Force on 1 January 2003. There are also legal restrictions on the use of MVD forces outside Russia (similar to other countries), and every such deployment has to be decided on a case-by-case basis and approved by the parliament.

11. Press Service of the President of the Russian Federation, 19 April 2004.

12. Interview with the commander-in-chief of interior troops of the Russian Federation, General Vyacheslav Tihomirov, in *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 20 April 2004.

13. *Ibid*.

14. For more detail on this scenario, which has been under discussion for some time, see for instance *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 4 and 27 November 2002, 21 April 2004; *Kommersant*, 20 April 2004.

15. See Shoigu, Sergei. 2001. ''Vazhnyi etap stanovleniya MChS'' (An important stage of the EMERCOM formation), *Grazhdanskaya zaschita* (*Civil Defence*), January, pp. 6–7.

16. Of the very few references available on EMERCOM in English, see Thomas, T. L. 1995. ''EMERCOM: Russia's emergency response team'', *Low Intensity Conflict and Law Enforcement*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 227–236; on EMERCOM's humanitarian and emergency role in the North Caucasus, see Stepanova, note 4 above, pp. 210–216. Of EMERCOM's own publications, see for instance Legoshin, A. D. and M. I. Faleev. 2001. *Mezhdunarodnie spasatelnie operazii* (International Rescue Operations). Moscow: Ayaks Press; Vorobyov, Yuri L. (ed.). 2002. *Gumanitarnie operatsii mMChS Rossii* (*Humanitarian Operations of Russia's EMERCOM*). Moscow: Kruk Press.

17. Author's interviews with UN representatives in Moscow, July and August 2000.

18. See for instance *Ob okazanii kompleksnogo sodeistviya vnutrenne peremeschennym litsam i zhitelyam severo-kavkazskogo regiona po linii mchs rf* (*On complex humanitarian assistance to internally displaced persons and residents of the North Caucasian region by the EMERCOM of Russia*), EMERCOM Fact Sheet 24, June 2000; ''*O rabote territorial'nogo upravleniya mchs rossii v chechenskoi respublike*'' (On activities of EMERCOM's territorial department in Chechnya), *Grazhdanskaya zaschita (Civil Defence), May 2000.*

19. For more detail, see ''Gumanitarnaya missiya Tsentrospasa'' (The Central Rescue Unit's humanitarian mission), *Grazhdanskaya zaschita* (*Civil Defence*), February 2001, pp. 16–20.

20. Quoted in *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 5 December 2001. On 12 June 1999 Russian peacekeepers from Bosnia were transferred to Kosovo through Serbian territory and set up camp at the Prishtina airport before NATO troops entered the province.

21. See, for instance, ''On Russia's humanitarian projects to aid Afghanistan'', *Daily News Bulletin of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation*, 9 January 2003.

22. See, for instance, ''US OK with Russians in Kabul for now'', *Newsmax.com wires*, UPI, 29 November 2001; Franchetti, Mark. 2001. ''Russians in Kabul on spying mission'', *The Sunday Times*, 2 December.

23. For instance, citing financial debts, EMERCOM reportedly had to cut off hot meal and bread distribution in most camps in Ingushetia from June through to mid-August of 2000.

24. See, for instance, ''Conflicting reports about border ban on Chechen males'', *CNN*, 14 January 2000; ''Chairman slams Russian policy in Chechnya as 'Hippocratic Oath in reverse''', US Helsinki Committee press release, 13 January 2000.

25. *Zachistka* is an intense cordon and search/population screening operation by special police units in a certain populated area after it has been sealed off by the military or Ministry of Interior troops, or both.

26. See, for instance, interview with Ramazan Abdulativ, Radio Mayak, 18 November 2001; ''Changes in the government: Russia becoming more militarized?'', *SMI.ru*, 17 November 2001.

27. The FMS was later merged with the Ministry of Federation and Nationalities.

28. See, for instance, ''MVD's new role makes reform vital'', *The Moscow Times*, 6 November 2001, p. 10; *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, 16 November 2001.

29. On the problems of integrating anti-terrorism into the broader and more fundamental peacebuilding framework in a cross-regional context, see Stepanova, Ekaterina. 2003. *Anti-terrorism and Peace-building During and After Conflict*. Stockholm: SIPRI, available at http://editors.sipri.se/pubs/Stepanova.pdf.

30. The deliberate and politically motivated use of, or threat to use, violence against civilians or civilian targets by a weaker side in an asymmetrical armed conflict.