

Łukasz DONAJ

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań

## CONTEMPORARY CHECHNYA CONFLICT – NATION-LIBERATION FIGHT OR TERRORISM

The events of 11 September 2001, bloody terrorist attacks in Middle East, Bali Island, Dubrovka, Madrid or London, like thousands of other terror acts, depict how difficult, complicated and, at the same time, dangerous and unexpected phenomenon we deal with.

Terrorism can undoubtedly be labeled on of the most important global problem of the present world. Its indications occur with different frequency, force or dynamics in almost all parts of our globe causing significant loss both human and material. It happens so despite involvement of many organizations, countries, people or institutions to fight it<sup>1</sup>.

Problem of violence, terror and terrorism is an issue of deep historical roots. Its diverse forms have been present almost forever. Cause of terrorism is a composition of a number of different conditions, amongst which are not only political, ideological, religious, nationalistic or territorial aspects, but also cultural, historical or often neglected socio-economic ones<sup>2</sup>.

Definition of terrorism is a complicated question. Despite years of attempts and existence of hundreds (more than 300) very different definitions, international society was not able to elaborate one universal and commonly accepted one. In the beginning ideological as well as methodological aspects were an obstacle. Presently, we can observe a conflict of business, for example between countries voting for or against excluding from its regulations acts connected with national liberation fight or accepting or negating a concept of national terrorism. Another difficulty in thorough and detailed presentation of problem of terrorism is a constantly spreading research area of this notion. As time passes by, particular terrorist organizations start or cease to exist, a form or evaluation of its performance changes, but also new sorts of this phenomenon are created. To give an example: eco terrorism, bioterrorism, cyber terrorism or global terrorism<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Wojciechowski, *Słowo wstępne*, in: P. Ebbig, R. Fiedler, A. Wejkszner, S. Wojciechowski, *Leksykon współczesnych organizacji terrorystycznych*, Poznań 2007, p. 3. See also: N. Lubik, *Selected Aspects of Counteracting Modern International Terrorism*, "Political Science Review" 2008, No. 2.

<sup>2</sup> S. Wojciechowski, *Słowo wstępne...*, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Ibidem, p. 3–4. More: J. Połuszny, *Single Issue Terrorism*, "Political Science Review" 2005, No. 1; S. Wojciechowski, *The New – Global – Form of Terrorism*, "Political Science Review" 2006, No. 2; S. Wojciechowski, *Global Terrorism*, in: *The Faces of Terrorism*, ed. S. Wojciechowski, Poznań 2006; W. Stankiewicz, *The development of nation function in the context of legal aspects the*

Nevertheless, it is worth elaborating on notions such as: 'terror', 'terrorism', and 'nation liberation fight'. Initially terms 'terror' and 'terrorism' were used interchangeably. They were referred to forms of running governments by terrorizing society with mostly bloody repressions against political opponents. Currently both these terms have been given a different meaning, influenced in the last century by inflicting violence by individuals or groups of people against governments forcing various concessions. On the other hand, Bernanat claims that the notion of terror should be understood as a very specific type of regime or instrument applied by governments to keep the power<sup>4</sup>.

The notion of terrorism is often misinterpreted with nation liberation fight. Although most movements fighting for independence of their countries these days have applied terror act, for example Palestine Liberation Organization before founding of Palestinian Autonomy and their classification often depends on economic trend or political pressures, for example not condemning a national terrorism of Israel against Palestinians or acts of UCK in Kosovo and Macedonia under flag of international peace forces, yet the notion of terrorism and fight for independence will never be synonymous<sup>5</sup>.

Similar doubts connected with 'terrorism' or 'nation liberation fight' appear also in reference to actions led within Chechnya conflict. This conflict in its advanced form (not taking into consideration the historical background) started after the fall of USSR with a number of national communities aiming to improve their status within the republics which had gained independence. One such community are Chechens – about 1 million people. Their motherland lies on the northern slopes of the Caucasus mountains on the Terek river. The Republic of Chechnya has an area of 19,3 thousand square meters, which is 1% of overall Russia territory. Ethnic structure of this republic is: 56% of Chechens, 13% of Ingushs, 31% of Russians and peoples of Dagestan. In 18th century Chechnya was conquered by Russians, in 1859 it became a part of the Russian Empire. The Chechens did not want to reconcile with losing independence and led military actions with different intensity in 19th century. They did not cease their resistance in 20th century when they rebelled against collectivization of villages. In their military fight for independence they were even willing to accept it from Germans. Therefore, on Stalin's command on 23 Feb 1944 the Chechen nation was uprooted to Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. Only after 13 years of life in exile in 1957 Chechens were able to come back to their homeland. Yet, they suffered a terrible human loss. In the beginning of the 90's Chechens intensified their striving to gain a status of an independent country. They wanted to be free, which has always been their will. The authorities of the Russian Federation rejected these aspirations. Instead of looking for compromise in democratic ways, Russian army entered Chechnya to overcome any independence movements. Military actions brought huge destruction to the capital (Grozny) and other cities.

---

*fight of terrorism*, in: *Terrorism as a timeless actor on the international stage*, ed. S. Wojciechowski, Poznań 2005; J. Gryz, *The Phenomenon of Contemporary International Terrorism*, in: *The power of terrorism*, Poznań 2005.

<sup>4</sup> K. Bronowska, *Współczesny terroryzm – próba oceny zjawiska i prognozy*, in: *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe i regionalne w procesach globalizacji*, eds. J. Knopka, D. J. Mierzejewski, Piła 2006, p. 31.

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem.

Lots of Chechens and Russian soldiers died. Civil population suffered a great loss. Nowadays, a search for peace solutions to settle the range of autonomy within the Russian Federation is on. In 1996 war ended, Russian army retreated from Chechnya and Presidential election (27.01.1997) was won by Aslan Maskhadov<sup>6</sup>.

In the beginning period of this quasi-independence of Chechnya, Moscow was trying to find ways to influence and maintain control over the republic without army's interference. The strategy applied assumed delaying talks about Chechnya's status. The Kremlin aspired for economic bound of the Republic with the Russian Federation. Russian authorities were trying to convince that without Moscow's economic help, Chechnya's economy does not stand a chance for any development. Another idea aimed at controlling the republic was creating a free economic zone on the territory of Chechnya. As a result, the Caucasus Republic would be able to lead independent economic policy remaining at the same time within the structures of the Russian Federation. A substantial element of the policy was oil, which was supposed to be the basis for Chechnya's independence<sup>7</sup>.

Chechnya remained in an international isolation and Aslan Maskhadov was trying to bring it to the end. Apart from Afghanistan run by Talibs, it was not acknowledged by international community. Maskhadov tried to establish contacts with Muslim countries. Therefore, he met with Fahd, the King of Saudi Arabia. He also went to Turkey. He also visited non-Islamic countries, in October 1998 he came to Poland, too. He tried to win the US for the Chechnya's cause. However, the Russian Federation threatened that it will break off any diplomatic relations with the western countries if they acknowledge Chechnya as an independent country. For western countries Russia was far more important partner, that is why no country acknowledged Chechnya's independence<sup>8</sup>.

Kidnapping of journalists, Russian politics as well as citizens of other countries organized by some Chechen military organizations have become a serious problem for Chechnya. The criminal actions were mostly supposed to obtain ransom. The kidnapping was arranged by both internal and external forces to destabilize Aslan Maskhadov's regime. The Chechen authorities explained that kidnapping was organized by Russian secret service to discredit Chechnya in the eyes of Russian society. The Chechen authorities were also struggling with crime connected with drug dealing and oil theft. The situation in the country was deteriorating in even greater chaos, which had been additionally enforced by attempts to assassinate President Aslan Maskhadov. A state of emergency introduced in the middle of 1998 did not help at all<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Czeczeński konflikt*, in: Cz. Mojsiewicz, *Leksykon problemów międzynarodowych i konfliktów zbrojnych*, Wrocław 2001, p. 30–31. See also: A. Czajowski, *Problemy narodowościowe w Rosji*; J. Achmadow, *Krótki zarys historii Czechenii*, in: *Z badań nad współczesną problematyką państw Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej*, eds. J. Albin, J. M. Kupczak, Wrocław 2000; A. Woźniczak, *Wygrana wojna i przegrany pokój. Konflikt rosyjsko-czeczeński w latach 1994–1999*, in: *Współczesne spory i konflikty międzynarodowe. Studia przypadków*, ed. A. Potyrała, Poznań 2007.

<sup>7</sup> J. Lemm, *Okres quasi-niepodległości Czechenii w latach 1996–1999*, w: *Konflikty współczesnego świata*, eds. G. Ciechanowski, J. Sielski, Toruń 2006, p. 101–108.

<sup>8</sup> J. Modrzejewska-Leśniewska, *Konflikt rosyjsko-czeczeński 1994–2006*, in: *Konflikty kolonialne i postkolonialne w Afryce i Azji 1869–2006*, ed. P. Ostaszewski, Warszawa 2006, p. 785.

<sup>9</sup> J. Lemm, *Okres quasi-niepodległości Czechenii...*, op. cit., p. 103–104.

An answer to crisis and improvement of economic situation was supposed to be brought by Islam, to which a part of Chechen politicians turned. Maskhadov, as a new President needed ideological support, which religion guaranteed. Islam was also necessary to maintain coalition with Shamil Basayev Movladi Udugov. On 8 June 1997 the President of Chechnya proclaimed the republic an Islamic country. He justified his decision by the necessity to rebuild order in the country. He was in favor of introducing a soft version of Islam, that is Sharia was supposed to be supplemented by the rules of Chechen customary law. Against a total introduction of Sharia into Chechnya was Mufti Achmed Kadyrov who claimed that Chechen society is not mature enough to fully accept the rules of Islam. Nevertheless, religion did not help to fight the ever growing crime in Chechnya. What is more, any attempts to introduce Muslim regulations in the republic ended up in greater split among Chechen establishment<sup>10</sup>.

Islamic fundamentalism appeared in the republic, which claimed slogans about unity of Muslim countries of Northern Caucasus, especially Chechnya and Dagestan. The Chechen fundamentalism was represented by Udugov and Yandarbiyev. Maskhadov's failures to agree upon Chechnya's status with Russia gave more impetus to the extremists. A fundamentalist movement, Wahhabism was able to lead propaganda and military actions thanks to great financial potential. The extremists aimed at seize power in Chechnya to consequently introduce radical Islam rules in the country. Initially, Shamil Basayev and Salman Raduyev were opposing Wahhabists. Eventually, they also joined the Islamic fundamentalists<sup>11</sup>.

Crisis in Russian-Chechen relations was developing with growing problems of the government both in the Russian Federation and Chechnya. Aslan Maskhadov's real concern was a growing position of radical opposition as well as lack of power to overcome the situation in the country. On the other hand, situation in Russia, where struggling for power was going on, caused Moscow's policy look indecisive and inconsistent. Another tensions in Russian-Chechen relations were caused by military occurrences on the Chechen-Dagestan border. More and more frequent attacks on Russian posts led to Moscow's impatience towards the situation in this region. Terrorist attacks were aggravating the situation, military raids to neighboring republics were gradually deteriorating relations between Chechnya and the Russian Federation. Furthermore, any attempts to meet Maskhadov with Yeltsin ended in a fiasco, because of constant incidents on the Dagestan border. Republic's camp commanders also did not want the meeting of the presidents, as it would probably build up Maskhadov's position. Nevertheless, Sergei Stepashin, Russia's prime minister met with the Chechen president. The main issue was the situation in Chechnya and its economic problems. An important declaration on behalf of the Russian Federation's prime minister was the promise that federal forces would not be used against Chechnya. He reasoned his statement by the fact that Russia needs a strong Chechnya with strong Maskhadov's position. The promise however, had not been kept<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> S. Ciesielski, *Studia z dziejów Europy Wschodniej*, t. 2: *Rosja – Czeczenia. Dwa stulecia konfliktu*, Wrocław 2003, p. 298–303.

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem, p. 298–3003.

<sup>12</sup> J. Lemm, *Okres quasi-niepodległości Czeczenii...*, op. cit., p. 105–108.

Another Russia's military intervention was in a short run. The reasons for the outbreak of the second Caucasus War are to be found in frequent attacks on the Dagestan-Chechen border. On 7 August 1999 joined forces of Chechens led by Shamil Basayev and a Jordanian, el-Chattab entered Dagestan. Some powers in Russia and Chechnya were also aiming at the open conflict as well. The reason for another military intervention of the Russian Federation army were also bomb attacks in Moscow and Volgograd in August and September that year, which Chechen terrorists had been blamed for. Accusations aroused that it might have also been Russian secret service provocation<sup>13</sup>.

In the beginning of 2000 Russia declared the end of Chechen war. The Kremlin authorities declared introduction of normalization of life standards. However, this 'normalization' meant cruelty of Russian soldiers towards Chechen peoples<sup>14</sup>.

On 23 October 2002, right after the end of a break in 'Nord-Ost' ensemble, the theatre stage was seized by man wearing black clothes. They declared that the audience had become their hostages. Initially the audience thought it had been just another director's idea. Yet, when these men started shooting in the air it became clear that this situation is really serious. About 40 terrorists seized the theater with more than 800 people. They planted bombs on the walls, columns, and chairs. There were also women-terrorists wearing bombs on their bodies. All TV stations stopped their programs to broadcast news about seizing the Dubrovka theater. As a result of attack, all terrorists died. However, 129 hostages died as a result of gas used during the action and poor rescue operation. Another 40 people died 6 months after the attack<sup>15</sup>.

The tragedy in Dubrovka showed that Moscow has no concept for ultimate solution of Chechen conflict. Despite some successes in eliminating field commanders, it still tried to introduce conflict into the global antiterrorist campaign. On the other hand, a young radical Chechen generation of field commanders were motivated to destroy republic. Ahmad Kadirov's pro-Moscow administration occurred to be weak as well. His people did not possess resources to reconstruct Chechnya, especially to help the civilians. They were labeled corrupt collaborators by people living in the Republic. An attempt to 'Chechen' all aspects of life, occurred to be inefficient, as it led to larger inter-clan splits<sup>16</sup>.

On 1 September 2004 in school number 1 in Beslan, a small town in Northern Oseti another tragedy happened. Chechen terrorists seized the school taking hostages, also children who came to inauguration of the school year. On 3 September, that is on the third day of seizure, it had been agreed that catastrophe liquidation service and FSB officers will take corpses of men killed on the first day. The action was going well until suddenly two loud explosions were heard. From that moment, everything was happen-

<sup>13</sup> See more: A. Litwinienko, J. Felsztynski, *Wysadzić Rosję*, Poznań 2007.

<sup>14</sup> M. Lazar, *Czeczenii – naród wilejzej odwagi*, "Rocznik Wschodni" 2003, no. 9.

<sup>15</sup> B. Reitschuster, *Władimir Putin. Dokąd prowadzi Rosję*, Warszawa 2005, p. 100–113; J. Felsztynski, W. Pribyłowski, *Korporacja zabójców. Rosja, KGB i prezydent Putin*, Warszawa 2008, p. 119–123; J. B. Dunlop, *The 2002 Dubrovka and 2004 Beslan Hostage Crises. A Critique of Russian Counter-Terrorism. With a foreword by Donald N. Jensen*, Stuttgart 2006; *Moscow hostage crisis: timeline*, [www.news.bbc.co.uk](http://www.news.bbc.co.uk) (4.09.2009); *Chechen rebels' hostage history*, <http://www.news.bbc.co.uk> (4.09.2009).

<sup>16</sup> *Rocznik Strategiczny 2002/2003. Przegląd sytuacji politycznej, gospodarczej i wojskowej w środowisku międzynarodowym Polski*, ed. R. Kuźniar, Warszawa 2003, p. 237–239.

ing fast. Armed citizens, who had taken their positions before, started shooting of the school. The situation went totally out of control. Special units started attack. On the other hand, terrorists detonated bombs and started killing hostages. Consequent actions caused even greater chaos on the streets around the school. Many hours after the attack shootings and detonations could be heard. Broken flowers brought to the beginning of the school year were slowly drying in blood pools. Russian journalists reporting from Beslan were belying facts. They did not give the exact number of hostages, just like in case of Moscow theater<sup>17</sup>.

As a result of the operation of pro-Moscow military units subordinate to Ramsan Kadyrov in 2005 Aslan Amskhadov, the President of the Chechen Republic of Ichkeria who had not been acknowledged by the Russian authorities, died. He was a leader of a country fighting for self-determination. He also might have been an indispensable partner to solve the Chechen conflict. Maskhadov's death shattered possibilities to terminate a conflict more and more destabilizing the Northern Caucasus. It also buried any hopes for political dialog with moderate separatists<sup>18</sup>.

As Falkowski from Centre for Eastern Studies in Warsaw points out: A renewed outbreak of an open armed conflict in Chechnya appears to be unlikely in the nearest future. The militants are too weak to defeat the federal troops or even challenge their positions, and the people in Chechnya are too exhausted with over a decade of fighting to become actively involved on the militants' side. However, this does not mean that Chechnya will now experience lasting stabilization. In the coming years, skirmishes, attacks and other acts of violence will probably continue, albeit on a local scale. It is very probable, though, that the main theatre of the all-Caucasian armed conflict will be moved to Dagestan and Ingushetia. In the longer term, however, a new Chechen rising against Moscow appears to be inevitable, and this may take the form of a fight for national liberation or for the Islamic cause. Even though people in Chechnya today are not capable of another independence rising, it is possible that the question of separating Chechnya from the Russian Federation will be raised again within the next few decades. If such an outbreak indeed takes place, it will probably be led by the 'systemic' separatists who form the current pro-Russian government of Chechnya. This may be a peaceful movement or a new armed rebellion, depending in principle on the Kremlin's reaction to its emergence. If Moscow responds the way it did in 1994, with a military intervention, this may lead to another Chechen war for national liberation. If, however, the Russian government starts dialogue with Chechen leaders, Chechnya may gain de facto independence, or even separate peacefully from the Russian Federation<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> P. Baker, S. Glasser, *Cień Kremla. Rosja Putina*, Warszawa 2005, p. 23–26, in: K. Chojecka, *Polityka rosyjska wobec dążeń niepodległościowych Czeczeni*, MA under supervision of Ł. Donaj, WSSM Łódź, 2005, p. 78; B. Reitschuster, *Władimir Putin...*, op. cit., p. 278–284; J. Giduck, *Terror at Beslan: a Russian tragedy with lessons for America's schools*, 2005, <http://www.books.google.pl> (4.09.2009).

<sup>18</sup> *Rocznik Strategiczny 2002/2003. Przegląd sytuacji politycznej, gospodarczej i wojskowej w środowisku międzynarodowym Polski*, ed.: R. Kuźniar, Warszawa 2003, p. 237–239; *Chechen leader Maskhadov killed*, [www.news.bbc.co.uk](http://www.news.bbc.co.uk) (4.09.2009).

<sup>19</sup> M. Falkowski, *Chechnya: Between a Caucasian Jihad and 'hidden' separatism*, Warsaw, January 2007, <http://www.osw.waw.pl> (4.09.2009).



The ethos of national liberation, which is strongly rooted in the Chechen society, and the common hatred of Russia are among the factors that make the scenario outlined above appear probable. These sentiments are reflected not only in the political concepts and works of Chechen writers, poets, bards, etc, but also in the views of ordinary Chechens, both in Chechnya and abroad. The nationalist outlook of the current Chechen leaders and their demands for ever broader autonomy within the Russian Federation also suggest that the Chechen national liberation movement may be reborn. In this situation, it seems unlikely that the Chechens should refrain from trying to create an independent state of their own again. However, it seems even more probable that if a new rising against Russia breaks out in Chechnya, it will not be a fight for national liberation, but rather a battle for the ideas of Islam. In that case, the Chechens will not fight alone, but together with the other Muslim nations of the North Caucasus. The rebellion, initiated by the Islamists, will aim to 'liberate' the Caucasus from Russian rule and create an Islamic state or states in the region. It may spread to the entire North Caucasus, and will probably be directed not only against Moscow but also the local, secular governments. If such a rebellion takes place, Russia will risk losing the whole region. This scenario will be possible if the militants manage to strengthen their positions and win wider public support in all republics of the North Caucasus in the immediate future. It will also take the emergence of a charismatic spiritual leader capable of establishing himself in a position of authority among the militants and at least some sections of the society. The degree of support that the movement will have among the Muslim societies of the North Caucasus will in turn depend on the results of Russia's policy in the region, among other factors. If Russia proves capable of stabilizing the Caucasus by modernizing the region, improving the social and economic conditions and integrating the Caucasian societies with the Russian Federation, it is possible that this scenario will not materialize. Otherwise, frustration will probably rise in the region, leading to the outbreak of an armed conflict spanning the entire region, especially if the Kremlin continues its current policy of brutal repression, efforts at centralization, etc.<sup>20</sup>

The evolution of the conflict towards a Caucasian jihad and the emergence of Islamic armed groups, constantly growing in strength, are among the facts suggesting that the 'Islamic' scenario may indeed become reality. The exceptionally rapid growth of the number of young Muslim radicals in all the Caucasus republic, and especially in Dagestan, and the lack of prospects for any rapid improvement in the social and economic situation in the region, also indicate that the situation there may develop according to the above scenario. The outbreak of an Islamic revolution in the North Caucasus republics of the Russian Federation may also be catalyzed by the rise of the nationalistic, xenophobic and fascist sentiments currently observed in Russia<sup>21</sup>.

The realization of the above scenarios will depend to a large extent on internal developments in the Russian Federation. A rebellion of the Chechens against Russia, whether founded on the ideas of national liberation or the ideology of Islam, will be more probable if Russia experiences a serious political crisis. Such an uprising will also

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>21</sup> Ibidem.

be possible in the case of a serious economic crisis, which Russia may experience if the prices of energy resources in world markets decline<sup>22</sup>.

If Bialko's typology was taken into consideration, for whom terrorism means applying political influence with illegal use of force – enforcement or violence combined with breaking the elementary social norms and settled in a given country rules of political fight, based on intended intimidation and manipulating, achieving political objectives by creating with acts an atmosphere of violence, and obstructing functioning of a hostile social arrangement, and forcing decisions, and enemy's actions by drastic tactics of accomplished facts or forcible blackmail, as well as proposed by him subdivision of terrorism on: 1) Nation liberation (probably most controversial one), 2) religious, 3) subversive, 4) repressive (question whether a term 'terror' would be more justified in this case, which has been mentioned before<sup>23</sup>), in case of Chechnya it would be:

- repressive terror, that is applied by the State, in this case Russian;
- terrorist actions of Chechen fighters.

There are two mainstreams in this case. First of all, we can deal with nation liberation terror characterized by applying terrorist methods to achieve independence and sovereignty by people living on a given area. Secondly, there exists terrorism relying on manipulation of faith, making it an interpretation of actions, characterized by fundamentalism and fanaticism, operating with slogans of "war with infidels".

Nowadays, Chechnya is Russia's internal affair in the eyes of international public opinion. A question of breaking the elementary human rights by federal army is not dealt with, although there are more and more frequent gossips about Russia being a country taking a lead in trading with human organs. New York terrorist attacks of 11 September helped the West to perceive this war as an element of international fight with Islamic fundamentalism<sup>24</sup>.

## CONTEMPORARY CHECHNYA CONFLICT – NATION-LIBERATION FIGHT OR TERRORISM

### ABSTRACT

The events of 11 September 2001, bloody terrorist attacks in Middle East, Bali Island, Dubrovka, Madrid or London, like thousands of other terror acts, depict how difficult, complicated and, at the same time, dangerous and unexpected phenomenon we deal with. Terrorism can undoubtedly be labeled on of the most important global problem of the present world.

In this article the author tries to bring the problem of the Chechnya conflict, which is – in the eyes of international public opinion – today regarded as Russia's internal affair. New York terror-

<sup>22</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>23</sup> T. Białek, *Terroryzm – manipulacja strachem*, Warszawa 2005, p. 52–53, after: Ż. Nawrot, *Chechnya – a Case Study*, "Political Science Review" 2006, No. 3.

<sup>24</sup> Ż. Nawrot, *Chechnya – a Case...*, op. cit. See more: R. Fiedler, *The Sources and Faces of Islamic Fundamentalism*, "Political Science Review" 2002, No. 2; A. Potyrała, *The U.S. Global War on Terrorism and Supreme Court's Decisions of 2004, 2006 and 2007*, in: *Terrorist Pandora's Box. Analysis of chosen terrorist issue*, eds. J. Babiak, S. Wojciechowski, Poznań 2008.



ist attacks of 11 September helped the West to perceive this war as an element of international fight with Islamic fundamentalism.

## **WSPÓŁCZESNY KONFLIKT CZECZEŃSKI – WALKA NARODOWOWYZWOLEŃCZA CZY TERRORYZM**

### **STRESZCZENIE**

Wydarzenia z 11 września 2001 r., krwawe zamachy terrorystyczne na Bliskim Wschodzie, wyspie Bali, Dubrowce, w Madrycie czy Londynie, podobnie jak tysiące wcześniejszych aktów terroryzmu, obrazują z jak bardzo trudnym, złożonym, a zarazem niebezpiecznym i nieprzewidywalnym zjawiskiem mamy do czynienia. Terroryzm bez wątplenia uznać można za jeden z najistotniejszych problemów globalnych we współczesnym świecie.

W artykule tym autor stara się przybliżyć problem współczesnego konfliktu czecheńskiego, który dziś w oczach międzynarodowej opinii publicznej traktowany jest jako wewnętrzna sprawa Rosji. Kwestia łamania elementarnych praw człowieka przez wojska federalne nie jest podejmowana, gdyż zamachy terrorystyczne z 11 września pozwoliły Zachodowi postrzegać tę wojnę jako element światowej walki z fundamentalizmem islamskim.

