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ABSTRACT

This work focuses on the unique U.S.-Russian counterterrorism partnership. Following 9/11, the two states identified terrorism as a mutual enemy that posed utmost concerns to their national securities. Despite decades filled with antagonism, their teamwork reached unprecedented levels of cooperation on a multiplicity of matters; counterterrorism, counter-narcotics, and nuclear security are three concerns which this research centers on. Areas of such collaboration include multidimensional efforts in Afghanistan to eradicate drugs, to build infrastructure and to train Afghan police and military to fight the Taliban and to eliminate its sources of funding, which mostly come from the narcotics trade. The goal is to build the capacity of local Afghan forces that will be in charge, and responsible for protecting their country and people once the NATO troops withdraw in 2014. While efforts in Afghanistan have been significant in areas of education and training of Afghan military personnel, the larger issues of the Taliban and illicit drugs have not been solved. In fact, data show a significant increase of cultivation of opium since 2002. A severe amount of corruption together with the weak economy makes it nearly impossible for any progress to be made, because farmers cultivating opium have great economic incentives and weak alternatives. This thesis essentially concludes that the lingering mistrusts of the Cold War impede greater cooperation between Russia and the U.S., and that while the two powers have made notable progress in taking preventive measures to secure nuclear facilities, their counterterrorism efforts in Afghanistan have not been as successful.
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# LIST OF ABREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Afghan Local Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSF</td>
<td>Afghan National Security Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARICC</td>
<td>Central Asian Regional Information and Coordination Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Central Intelligence Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Country Programme for Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Shanghai Cooperation Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Enemy-Initiated Attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>Federally Administered Tribal Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSKN</td>
<td>Federal Drug Control Services of Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G20</td>
<td>Group of Twenty Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GICNT</td>
<td>Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNENP</td>
<td>Global Nuclear Energy Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEU</td>
<td>Highly Enriched Uranium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED</td>
<td>Improvised Explosive Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAEA</td>
<td>International Atomic Energy Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMU</td>
<td>Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Improvised Nuclear Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAF</td>
<td>International Security Assistance Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISI</td>
<td>Inter Service Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKK</td>
<td>Ku Klux Klan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSM</td>
<td>Khalid Sheikh Mohammed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOX</td>
<td>Mixed Oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>National Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPT</td>
<td>Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAL</td>
<td>Permissive Action Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDPA</td>
<td>People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKK</td>
<td>Kurdistan Worker’s Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMDA</td>
<td>Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>Russian Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td>Shanghai Cooperation Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START</td>
<td>Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPI</td>
<td>Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA</td>
<td>Transportation Security Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMA</td>
<td>United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>Weapon of Mass Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>September 11, 2011 Terrorist Attacks On the U.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The United States and Russia have historically had antagonistic relations and competed for global power, dominance and nuclear arms during the Cold War, but have since improved their bilateral relations because of the newly emerged, shared threat of international terrorism. Today, the two states have reached unprecedented levels of joint collaboration in a number of different dimensions including intelligence sharing and joint military operations, while co-chairing bilateral and multilateral international organizations aimed at preventing security, economic and world stability threats. This thesis examines the different ways in which the United States and Russia have cooperated in counterterrorism efforts. The multidimensional irony of the partnership should not go unnoticed: only twenty some years ago, the U.S –Soviet Cold War threatened the peace and stability of the entire world; today the two have reversed the cold relations, striking a warmer tone at the outset of the new century. Likewise, during their struggle for world dominance, the Soviet Union and the United States engaged in a proxy war in Afghanistan: the U.S. supported the mujahedeen fighting against Russian communist expansionary efforts, supplying funds and resources through Pakistan; such support at the end helped spawn what we today know as international terrorism. The irony is not only that the U.S. efforts against the Soviet Union ended up contributing to America’s (and Russia’s) foremost international security threat today, but also that Russia and the U.S. are now working together to stabilize the geographical locus of that threat, which is Afghanistan. Despite the increased collaborative efforts, the two nations still have a long way to go. The Cold War has left behind suspicion and mistrust between them despite complex bilateral ties, often slowing down progress in their evolving new relationship.
and in their continued joint operations. Nevertheless, there are many areas of cooperation, which this thesis explores in detail, and in order to understand this unique partnership one needs to understand the history and the perceptions of terrorism held by these two states, which are explored in the first two chapters. The former explores terrorism in the United States and Russia prior to the September 11 attacks, and then attempts to determine the extent to which 9/11 influenced domestic policies and international relations. The chapter also argues that there is a shade of difference in the way the United States and Russia define and perceive terrorism. Such a disparity can be witnessed clearly in the opposing U.S. and Russian views on Chechnya. The U.S. perceives the conflict as an ethnic uprising, whereas Russia believes it is a case of international terrorism. The following chapter, *Terrorism in Russia*, explores Russian terrorism concerns in detail and traces the roots of the issue to Afghanistan. As a mutual national security threat, terrorism has brought the two nations closer together. Such cooperation is detailed in the *U.S.-Russian Collaborative Counterterrorism Efforts* chapter, where Afghanistan is portrayed as the greatest area of cooperation in counterterrorism between the two states. Therefore, U.S.-Russian efforts in Afghanistan account for a large portion of this chapter, concentrating mostly on counternarcotic efforts, infrastructure development, and military training of local Afghan forces. The last chapter, *Diminishing the Threat of Nuclear Terrorism*, focuses on the U.S.-Russian efforts to secure nuclear facilities in Russia and in the former Soviet Union states. Furthermore, the chapter evaluates the nuclear threat in Pakistan and North Korea; Iran is discussed in the *addendum*. 
WHAT IS TERRORISM?

The term “terror” was first used in 1789, after the French Revolution, to describe the Jacobin ‘Reign of Terror.’\(^1\) The eighteenth century British philosopher Edmund Burke condemned "those hellhounds called terrorists."\(^2\) A surge of violence that welcomed the decades of the late 1900’s, urged the 20\(^{th}\) century thinkers to categorize the new threat in a class of its own. The attacks strived to achieve terror hand in hand with political change and the motivating factor seemed to be different from the more common acts of criminality. For decades, legal scholars, academics, lawyers, national and international bodies of governments have struggled to formalize the new concept of terrorism. Decades after, no single definition is recognized, supported and followed by the entire international community. Therefore, this chapter will not serve the purpose of defining terrorism. It will rather explore different approaches that nations take when coining the term, and how different perceptions of the concept affect the collaboration of the international community, more specifically the United States and Russia.

It is important to note that there is a difference between non-state terrorism and state terrorism. Non-state actors who do not represent the beliefs, values and the political agenda of any particular country inflict terrorism internationally, against nations which they usually don’t consider their homeland. Non-state actors don’t have a home per se; they are an international collaboration of like-minded and usually extremist-in-thought group of people who fight for the same cause. On the contrary, state terrorists inflict

---

terrorism from within the country to which they belong. Similar to non-state terrorists, they are also usually extremists in thought and opinion and use terrorism as a political tool.

There are two main methods used to define terrorism: the specific and the general. The specific approach attempts to comprise particular activities that would apply as terrorism, such as hijacking of an aircraft or a railway train, or hostage taking. The general approach is more wide-ranging. Instead of citing possible incidents, it focuses more on motivation, intention, purpose, and so forth. Different governments have adapted different approaches to formalizing law, most of which take shape of the specific, the general, or a combination of the two. Both methods carry capacity for logical fallacy. The specific model does not account for rapid innovation in our developing world; therefore, as technological improvements advance, new ways of conducting terrorism may emerge. The specific model then calls for frequent law modification.

According to one scholar, a law too unequivocal may also be unjust.

Referring to individual ‘acts of terrorism’ might not be capable of capturing what we mean by terrorism. A specific offence may not include the elements that distinguish a terrorist act from other criminal acts, and this can be a concern where additional penalties are imposed for terrorism.

In line with such reasoning, terrorists could moreover evade accountability for a terrorist act by being arraigned for only ordinary criminal charges. In nations where disorderly decision making persists, a specific approach may be favored as it “avoids political

---


4 Ibid.
conflict over basic definitional principles” and, also because it “[permits] textual agreement to be reached.”

The general approach therefore is preferred. Governments’ certainty that threats to which they are responding are actually of terrorist nature would allow for quicker responses.

In any event, the specific approach lacks the wider moral-political appeal of the general approach, which can lead to a stronger statement about the indiscriminate use of violence to attain political, religious or ideological ends.

Nevertheless, a general approach must strictly relate to terrorism and ensure that other acts of violence do not get swept under the same category. Too much ambiguity could essentially allow for negligent, unfair and contrivable decision-making by the government.

Now, does such an array of definitions impact the global collaboration in counterterrorism? This disparity in definition strategies among single countries reflects a divide in international organs, such as the United Nations. “Debates on terrorism often resemble a conversation in different languages: one camp speaks the language of methods, while the other side talks about causes.” Secretary-General Annan, in a meeting of the League of Arab States in 2005, noted that the United Nations’ efforts to impede terrorism have been weakened by the absence of a ‘clear and agreed definition.’

For one, the lack of a clear international definition poses a challenge when formulating and or implementing international counterterrorism agreements.

---

6 Ben Golder.
7 David Bosco,”An indefinable problem,” 1.
8 Secretary-General's Address to the Summit of the League of Arab States, March 23, 2005.
Once states agree on a common definition of terrorism, bilateral and regional extradition treaties could enable more effective prosecution of perpetrators. Efforts like the Proliferation Security Initiative, which aims to halt proliferation at sea, could expand to cover the transport of terrorists. Existing U.N. resolutions designed to prevent incitement to terrorism and to dry up terrorist funds could acquire some teeth.\(^9\)

The disagreement of nations on a formal list of terrorist organizations hinders not only the collaborative performance, but also individual efforts. Consider from the Turkish perspective the case of the Kurdistan Worker’s Party (PKK),\(^{10}\) a labeled terrorist organization in Turkey. The PKK’s international television station ‘Roj TV’ is broadcasted in Denmark, meanwhile Turkey deals with the terrorist issues at home.\(^{11}\)

Likewise, the U.S. and Russia use different approaches to define terrorism, which often impedes their joint counterterrorism efforts. A broader, clear definition, accepted by both nations, would better the efficiency and effectiveness of their collaboration against terrorism.

**The U.S. View on Terrorism**

“Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end, until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated. This is civilization’s fight; we ask every nation to join us. Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make: Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.”

George W. Bush

**Definition**

The United States does not have a unified definition of terrorism within its own borders. Agencies such as the Department of Defense and the Federal Bureau of

\(^{9}\) David Bosco.

\(^{10}\) Kurdish Translation: Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan.

\(^{11}\) "All Countries Should Agree on Definition of "Terrorism," Turkish Speaker," *BBC Monitoring European*, November 27, 2005, 1.

Investigation (FBI) use a different interpretation. The multiplicity of definitions brings a sense of ambiguity to how distinctive agencies respond differently under the same roof, and what they consider a terrorist threat. Nevertheless, every agency would only act within the scope of its mandate. The Code of Laws of the United States of America however, has defined terrorism under two different titles: Title 18, the Federal Criminal Code and Title 22, the Foreign Relations and Intercourse. The law distinguishes between international and domestic terrorism and gives both a broad description, following the general approach of defining terrorism, as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

The U.S. Federal Criminal Code. Title 18, Section 2331 of Chapter 113(B):

International Terrorism:

(A) Involve violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State, or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or of any State;

(B) Appear to be intended -(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and

(C) Occur primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or transcend national boundaries in terms of the means by which they are accomplished, the persons they appear intended to intimidate or coerce, or the locale in which their perpetrators operate or seek asylum.¹

The Central Intelligence Agency uses Title 22 of the US Code, Section 2656f(d):¹

(1) The term “international terrorism” means terrorism involving the territory or the citizens of more than one country;
(2) The term "terrorism" means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents; and
(3) The term “terrorist group” means any group that practices, or has
significant subgroups that practice, international terrorism.$^1$

Domestic Terrorism:

(5) The term "domestic terrorism" means activities that -

(A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State;
(B) appear to be intended -
(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and
(C) occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.$^1$

---

*John Brown and Osama bin Laden*

In recent U.S. history, violent attacks and mass casualties inflicted by non-state actors have signaled a surge of international terrorism. The Pentagon’s first serious concern with terrorism began as a result of the 1979-1981 hostage crisis in Tehran. Iranian nationalists held fifty-three Americans captive at the U.S. embassy in support of the Iranian Revolution.$^{12}$

In the 1970s and the 1980s, terrorism had been tied to regional conflicts, mainly in the Middle East. The majority of terrorist groups either were sponsored by governments or, like the Palestine Liberation Organization, were militants trying to create governments.$^{13}$

Prior to September 11, 2001 (9/11), terrorist suicide truck bombings on U.S. Marines and the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, Embassy bombings in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar el Salaam, Tanzania, and the bombing of the U.S. Navy guided-missile destroyer USS *Cole* claimed the lives of nearly 300 Americans. While taking the threats seriously, the U.S.

---


$^{13}$ Ibid., 92.
government did not take the threat as seriously as it would have if it were an attack by another country. Therefore, the government did not respond as forcefully as it would to challenge an enemy “of the first, second, or even third rank.”¹⁴ Hardly anyone knew of Osama bin Laden.

…Neither in 2000 nor in the first eight months of 2001 did any polling organization in the United States think the subject of terrorism sufficiently on the minds of the public to warrant asking a question in a major national survey. Bin Laden, al Qaeda, or even terrorism was not an important topic in the 2000 presidential campaign. Congress and the media called little attention to it.¹⁵

The first time bin Laden appeared on the U.S. radar was in 1992 when the State Department noticed his money trail leading to the Yemeni terrorists attempting to bomb the U.S. troops in Aden.¹⁶ The following year, Ramzi Yousef, an al Qaeda affiliate, masterminded the first bombing on the World Trade Center in 1993, killing a few and injuring over a thousand. The attack signaled not only a new challenge for America, but also inspired Khalid Sheikh Mohammed (KSM) to architect the 9/11 plane hijackings. His reasoning behind the attacks lay in thinking that he could best influence the U.S. policy by harming the country’s economy.¹⁷

President Clinton’s counterterrorism Presidential Decision Directives in 1995 (no.39) and May (no.62) reiterated that terrorism was a national security problem not just a law enforcement issue.¹⁸

As late as 1997, the Central Intelligence Agency’s (CIA) Osama bin Laden unit, believed him to be an “extremist financer,” but soon discovered his military actively planning

¹⁵ Ibid.,341.
¹⁶ Ibid.,109.
¹⁷ Ibid.,153.
¹⁸ Ibid.,108.
attacks against the U.S. worldwide.\textsuperscript{19} The hijacking of the four planes on September 11, 2001, by nineteen al Qaeda terrorists, impelled President George W. Bush to wage war on terrorism. Two planes crashed into the North and South towers of the World Trade Center Complex, one hit the Pentagon; and the fourth, which may have targeted the U.S. Capitol in Washington D.C., crashed in a field in Pennsylvania.

Nonetheless, the wave of international terrorism that swept the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century was not the only time the U.S. had dealt with terroristic figures and their organizations. Some scholars argue that the first signs of terrorism date back to the American Indian Wars, beginning with the Pequot War of 1637.\textsuperscript{20} However, American Indian conflicts more likely fit the categories of small wars, coups and raids. John Brown, an American abolitionist, on the other hand, has often been viewed as the first American terrorist. In the North he was regarded as a man of righteousness, but “for Southerners, he was the embodiment of all their fears—a white man willing to die to end slavery—and the most potent symbol yet of aggressive Northern antislavery sentiment.”\textsuperscript{21} In 1856, Brown led a spontaneous raid to Pottawatomie Creek where he and his men spared some, but interrogated, tortured and killed a number of proslavery settlers.\textsuperscript{22} Arguably, his raid on Harpers Ferry can also be viewed as an act of terror, where Brown and his companions seized the U.S. arsenal at Harpers Ferry in Virginia. The men inflicted terror on the

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
citizens as they captured slave-owners, killed a small number of men and seized a passenger train.\textsuperscript{23}

The Ku Klux Klan (KKK), a network of white, native-born, Protestant U.S. citizen supremacists, founded in 1866, is known to be the oldest U.S. terrorist organization.\textsuperscript{24,25} The KKK, notorious for its discriminatory views and persecuting actions against all viewed as not ‘racially-pure,’ especially those of African American dissent, has terrorized the American public for nearly 150 years.\textsuperscript{26}

Throughout its history, factions of the secret fraternal organization have used acts of terrorism—including murder, lynching, arson, rape, and bombing—to oppose the granting of civil rights to African Americans.\textsuperscript{27}

The KKK continues to be the major source of domestic terrorism today. Its presence in the U.S. remains very strong, particularly in the Southern and Midwestern states. Tens to hundreds of thousands of dollars in revenue are lost in communities around the country where Klan marches and rallies take place.\textsuperscript{28} While the U.S. knows how to, more or less, handle KKK matters, it was not ready nor organized enough to handle any international terrorism threats.

\textsuperscript{25} Keith J. Akins, "The Ku Klux Klan: America’s Forgotten Terrorists," \textit{Law Enforcement Executive Forum}.
\textsuperscript{26} West’s Encyclopedia of American Law.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
The Evolution of the U.S. Policy Concerning Terrorist Threats

Prior to September 11, the United States was not prepared for challenges posed by international terrorism because much of the Cold War mentality remained. The State Department led the counterterrorism policy throughout the 1960s and 1970s, as it was the primary means of communication between the U.S. and the governments affected by terrorists. The counterterrorist role of the State Department suited the time period because most terrorist incidences were resolved through negotiations led by embassy officials.29 After 9/11, the disparity between domestic and foreign threats was evident. “The domestic agencies did not know what to do,” and were left without direction. On the other hand, the agencies abroad, having had experience with such threats, had a “playbook” and needed no direction.30 Unprepared to deal with terrorism, the U.S. missed a number of opportunities to prevent 9/11.

Information was not shared, sometimes inadvertently or sometimes because of legal misunderstandings. Analysis was not pooled. Effective operations were not launched. Often the handoffs of information were lost across the divide separating the foreign and domestic agencies of the government.31


“…For example, the case of Mihdahr, Hazmi, and their January 2000 trip to Kuala Lumpur. The National Security Agency (NSA) analyzed communications associated with a man named Khalid, a man named Nawaf, and a man named Salem. Working-level officials in the intelligence community knew something more about this. They correctly concluded that Nawaf and Khalid might be a part of an operational cadre and that something notorious might be afoot. NSA did not think its job was to research these identities. If NSA has been asked to identify these people…NSA’s analysts would promptly have discovered who Nawaf was, and that his full name might be Nawaf al Hamziand. [With this information] managers could have more effectively tracked the
The FBI held the responsibility for domestic intelligence gathering on terrorism; however, its Director, during the Clinton Administration, had little communication with the President and shared little information with the National Security Council. Thus, the relationship was highly ineffective.\textsuperscript{32} Since 9/11, terrorism emerged as the foremost U.S. national security issue. The United States has greatly increased government spending on national security and defense. In 2001, Congress passed the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, which created the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), today a branch of the Homeland Security Department. TSA was created to ensure the security of the U.S. transportation systems by working closely with the law enforcement and intelligence communities.\textsuperscript{33} The following year, in 2002, the Homeland Security Act and the Maritime Transportation Security Act were also passed to strengthen homeland security.\textsuperscript{34,35}

Today, the CIA holds outmost responsibility for detecting terrorist threats and the FBI and the Justice Department are far more engaged domestically. The Defense

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 358.
\textsuperscript{33} The Department of Homeland Security; Transportation Security Administration. www.tsa.gov.
\textsuperscript{34} The Homeland Security Act: Sec. 101. Mission: (a) Establishment. - "There is established a Department of Homeland Security, as an executive department of the United States within the meaning of title 5, United States Code. (b) Mission (1) In General. - The primary mission of the Department is to (A) prevent terrorist attacks within the United States; (B) reduce the vulnerability of the United States to terrorism; and (C) minimize the damage, and assist in the recovery, from terrorist attacks that do occur within the United States."--U.S. Department of Homeland Security. www.dhs.gov.
Department has expanded to unprecedented measures, with counterterrorism as its primary concern on all levels. The State Department has focused on foreign policy tasks, while the National Security Council (NSC) and the Homeland Security Council are now joined by “a presidential advisory structure” at the White House, to ensure communication and flow of information across the board.\textsuperscript{36}

\textit{The Russian Perspective on Terrorism}

\textit{Definition}

Like the United States, Russia’s concern regarding terrorism has grown over the years. Currently, such a threat is considered a high priority on Russia’s security list. Nikolay Kovalev, the Director of the Federal Security Service in 1997, listed three types of terrorism that threaten Russia: “social, which aims at political and economic changes; nationalist and ethno-separatist; and religious.”\textsuperscript{37, 38} Counterterrorism measures that Russia has taken throughout history have followed “Russia's understanding of terrorism as an attack on the state rather than an assault on individual rights.”\textsuperscript{39} Chechnya is considered to be the foremost terrorist threat; one that is believed to have international characteristics and that encompasses all three types of terrorism defined by Russia. The law regarding terrorism was first introduced in 1994 after Russia responded to eighteen threats that year.\textsuperscript{40} In 1997, the law was refined, but remains a part of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, and uses the specific approach to define

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{39} Ibid.
\bibitem{40} Mark A Smith, “Russian Perspectives on Terrorism.”
\end{thebibliography}
terrorism. The text of the law refers and connects to different titles of the criminal code (Table 2). Unlike the United States, Russia does not differentiate the threat by domestic or international origin. Russian Procurator General, Vladimir Ustinov, “argued that the existing legislation was imperfect, as it failed to provide adequate definitions of what constituted terrorist crimes, and what constituted a terrorist organization. [He believed that the 1997 law] “defined terrorism too narrowly, which made it difficult to develop an effective national counter-terrorist policy.”41,42 Ustinov also criticized the clause regarding counterterrorism, arguing that many situations in Chechnya are not covered by the current law, thus the definition needs to be broadened.43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Terrorism, that is, the perpetration of an explosion, arson, or any other action endangering the lives of people, causing sizable property damage, or entailing other socially dangerous consequences, if these actions have been committed for the purpose of violating public security, frightening the population, or exerting influence on decision-making by governmental bodies, and also the threat of committing said actions for the same ends, shall be punishable by deprivation of liberty for a term of five to ten years.

2. The same deeds committed:
   a) by a group of persons in a preliminary conspiracy;
   b) repeatedly;
   c) with the use of firearms,
shall be punishable by deprivation of liberty for a term of eight to fifteen years.

41 Mark A Smith, “Russian Perspectives on Terrorism.”
43 Ibid.
3. Deeds stipulated in the first or second part of this Article, if they have been committed by an organized group or have involved by negligence the death of a person, or any other grave consequences, and also are associated with infringement on objects of the use of atomic energy or with the use of nuclear materials, radioactive substances or sources of radioactive radiation, shall be punishable by deprivation of liberty for a term of 10 to 20 years. Note: A person who has taken part in the preparation of an act of terrorism shall be released from criminal responsibility if he facilitated the prevention of the act of terrorism by timely warning governmental bodies, or by any other method, unless the actions of this person contain a different corpus delicti.

Article 205.1. Involvement of a Person in the Commission of Crimes of Terrorist Nature or Otherwise Assisting in Their Commission:

1. Involvement of a person in the commission of the crime stipulated by Articles 205, 206, 208, 211, 277 and 360 of this Code or persuading a person to participate in a terrorist organization, the arming or training of a person with the aim of perpetrating the said crimes as well as the financing of an act of terrorism or an terrorist organization shall be punishable by deprivation of freedom for a term of four to eight years.

2. The same deeds perpetrated by the person repeatedly or through the use of his official position shall be punishable by deprivation of freedom for a term of seven to fifteen years with confiscation of property, or without such confiscation.  

44 The Criminal Code of the Russian Federation. Section IX. Chapter 24: Crimes against Public Security; Article 205: Terrorism; Article 205.1 Involvement of a Person in the Commission of Crimes of Terrorist Nature or Otherwise Assisting in Their Commission.

Article 205.1.1 includes the following Articles: Article 205: Terrorism. Article 206: Hostage Taking; Article 208: Organization of an Illegal Armed Formation, or Participation in It; Article 211: Hijacking of an Aircraft, a Sea-going Ship, or a Railway Train; Article 277. Section X. Chapter 29: Encroachment on the Life of a Statesman or a Public Figure and Article 360. Section XII. Chapter 34: Assaults on Persons or Institutions Enjoying International Protection.
A Brief History

Russia’s sensitivity toward any offensive taken against its state can be traced back to the Mongol invasion. The Mongol-Tatar Yoke, occupying Russian lands from the 12th to 15th century, has largely influenced Russian political culture. As Prince Ivan III instigated собрание (sobranie), gathering of Russian lands, Russia rid itself of the Tatar control and emerged as a very militarized and a highly centralized autocracy.45 Although no longer a formal autocracy, present-day Russia has inherited much of the political culture that has been passed on by the tsars and communistic Bolsheviks of the 20th century. Likewise, the concept of terrorism is not a new phenomenon to the Russian regime. Narodnaya Volya, translated as ‘The People’s Will,’ emerged in Russia in 1879. It stands as the first ever known rebel, terror movement.46 The insurgents sought:

“A radical transformation of society, the group’s members understood terrorism as a temporary necessity to raise the consciousness of the masses and selected victims for symbolic reasons—that is, for the emotional and political responses their deaths would have.”47

Terroristic movements occurred at different times throughout Russian history. During the Bolshevik and Soviet regimes, terrorists were motivated by political discontent. Bolsheviks employed terror tactics to counter bourgeois terrorism and later, the Soviet government identified capitalist governments as a threat against the communistic

45 Dr. James W. Warhola, Professor at the University of Maine, “Politics of Russia,” Lecture.
47 Ibid.
Present day Russia, having preserved the centralization of power by giving its president great supremacy, has allowed for a more single-handed control over political issues, including terrorism. This unilateral access to power is partly the reason why Russia does not have a clear distinction between domestic and international definitions of terrorism. A vague categorization gives the regime more latitude when deciding which measures to take to counter violence and at whom to aim.

Today, most of Russia’s terrorist problems are domestic in nature, coming from the Russian region of Chechnya. Islamic extremists who made their way from Afghanistan during the 1990’s have, to some extent, played a hand in the radicalization of the Chechen Muslims. However, it is important to understand that Russia’s struggles in Chechnya predate the Russian invasion of Afghanistan and the recent emergence of extremists as a result of the conflict. The so-called Caucasian Imamate was a state established by the Chechen and Dagestani imams in 1824. Under the leadership of the imams, Chechnya and Dagestan have fought a number of wars against the Russian absorption. Nevertheless, in 1859 the Russian victory led to incorporation of the Imamate into the empire. Chechnya remained in opposition to Russian rule ever since the conquest, taking every opportunity to show its dissatisfaction through many rebellions. During the Second World War, Chechens were believed to be cooperating with the Germans and as a result, Stalin ordered their exile to Kazakhstan. An estimated quarter of
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the population died of cold, hunger and epidemics.\textsuperscript{52} But, in 1957, they were allowed back home. Along with the other former Soviet Union republics, at the collapse of the USSR in early 1990s, Chechnya declared its independence, but was not granted autonomy. The Russian leadership, then under Boris Yeltsin, decided to ‘solve’ the Chechnya problem instead, because the only oil pipeline extending to the Black Sea is the one running from Azerbaijan through Chechnya’s capital Grozny.\textsuperscript{53} The government feared losing its business opportunities and connection to the rich oil fields on the coast of the Caspian Sea. Thus, two Chechen-Russian wars followed throughout the 1990s. These struggles helped intensify the shade of difference that existed between Russia and the United States.

\textit{A Shade of Difference}

The United States and other Western states disagree with Russian violation of human rights in Chechnya, such as the mass killing of Chechen people. Because Chechnya is still considered a Russian republic, the U.S. perceives it more as an ethnic, national conflict rather than one of a terrorist nature. Some terrorist organizations are officially recognized by both nations, but there is also a shade of difference. National interests and beliefs guide both countries, which reflects in the difference in the recognized lists of terrorists (APPENDIX A, B). For instance, Russia recognizes “Congress of the Peoples of Ichkeria and Dagestan” as a terrorist network whereas the United States does not. Although Russia’s terrorist list is more specific in listing what type of actions would fall under the category, it also leaves room for ambiguity, allowing

\textsuperscript{53} Svante E. Cornell.
the government to stomp around the definition. This shade of difference has brought
some challenges to the collaboration table between the two nations, impeding progress at
times, but it has not prevented the two powers from working together, as explained in the
later chapters.

The difference between Russia and the United States is well explained by Dmitry Babich,
The Voice of Russia radio station’s political analyst. When asked to assess levels of
homegrown terrorism in the U.S. today, Babich replies:

It’s very hard for me to speak from Russia about the level of terrorism in the US,
but I think that for many years it was clear that the foreign policy was, at least,
strange. Although Russia never made any hostile moves towards the US since
1987, probably – since Gorbachev came to power – the US continues suspecting
Russia of having different values. And it always supported groups, sometimes-
militant Islamic groups, which challenged Russia. I mean, of course, president
Clinton didn’t support the Chechen separatists, but then if you read the American
press of the time and if you read even certain articles, which appeared on the
website of the New York Times today, you can see a lot of simplistic thinking
about the so-called Chechen Uprising and the Islamist groups in the North
Caucasus. The American newspapers say that Russia is to blame for all of these
terrorist activities. Well, I don’t agree with that. I think that Russia was actually
fighting a genuine international Islamism threat in the North Caucasus, at least,
during the second Chechen War (in 1999-2000). Obviously, this Islamist activity
in the North Caucasus is not only a threat to Russia. It’s also a threat to the US.
It’s also a threat to Europe, but somehow the Western countries just refuse to
recognize it.54

It is evident that the two powers are aware of their differences. But, the question is how
successful will their counterterrorism collaboration be if they cannot even agree on basic
matters? It is in Moscow’s economic interest to keep the North Caucasus region stable
and under control. Recognizing these opposing forces as terrorists, which Moscow
genuinely believes they are, actually allows Russia to exercise a special kind of power to

http://on.rt.com/ftkx3m.
defend its homeland. She has a wider-rang of options, because it could respond as it does against an international threat; such exercise of power has helped her keep political control over Chechnya. However, terrorism issues in Chechnya still persist and are explained more fully in the following chapter.

**TERRORISM IN RUSSIA**

Russia’s 21st century terror problem is a blend of political discontent, partially fueled by religious extremists pouring in from outside her borders. Much of the terrorism that Russia battles against currently dates from the era of the Cold War, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the disbandment of the USSR. Chechnya and the congregation of radical Islamists in the North Caucasus region represent a concern to Russia’s national security.

During the Cold War, geopolitical interests mostly motivated the Soviet Union’s invasion of Afghanistan. Moscow’s 40th Army invaded Afghanistan in December 1979, in order to support the communistic government of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA).

At the time, the United States had been making headway in the Middle East at Moscow’s expense, successfully courting Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and others. The Soviet Union feared the loss of its communist proxy in Afghanistan.

The war depleted the Soviet Union economically as billions of rubles were spent to fund the war. Meanwhile, the United States indirectly provided arms and funds to Afghani
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mujahedeen through the Pakistani Inter Service Intelligence (ISI), in order to help defeat the Soviet Union and consequently, to restrain the spread of communism.\textsuperscript{58} Islamic jihadists were given an opportunity like never before to hone their military capabilities and to build up their troops in CIA sponsored training camps.

With the active encouragement of the CIA, [Saudi Arabia], and Pakistan's ISI, who wanted to turn the Afghan jihad into a global war waged by all Muslim states against the Soviet Union, some 35,000 Muslim radicals from 40 Islamic countries joined Afghanistan fight between 1982-1992. Tens of thousands more came to study in Pakistani madrasahs. Eventually more than 100,000 foreign Muslim radicals were directly influenced by the Afghan jihad.\textsuperscript{59}

This surge of newly trained Islamic extremists led to a deterioration of Soviet influence in Afghanistan and it fueled the concerns of politically frustrated Chechens. Some jihadists which fought alongside Afghani mujahedeen made their way to the North Caucasus region, bringing with them Islamic extremism and using it to fight their new battle for independence in Chechnya. Shamil Basayev and Emir Khattab, two main rebel leaders in the Chechen wars against the Soviet Union, participated in CIA sponsored trainings in Afghanistan and Pakistan.\textsuperscript{60}

Khattab rushed to Chechnya in the first days of the Russian invasion and created the multiethinic guerrilla brigade that fought under explicitly Islamist colors, rather than the banner of Chechen nationalism.\textsuperscript{61}

Yossef Bodansky, director of the U.S. Congress Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare, noted that:

\begin{footnotesize}
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[The involvement of ISI in Chechnya] goes far beyond supplying the Chechens with weapons and expertise: the Inter Service Intelligence and its radical Islamic proxies are actually calling the shots in this war.\footnote{Levon Sevunts, "Who's Calling the Shots? Chechen Conflict Finds Islamic Roots in Afghanistan and Pakistan," \textit{The Gazette}, October 26, 1999.}

A 1999 BBC report indicated that Khattab departed from Afghanistan and moved to Chechnya with a group of Arab fighters in 1995, possibly sponsored by the Saudi-Arabian based Islamic Relief Organization.\footnote{"Khatab: Islamic Revolutionary," \textit{BBC News}, (1999).} Evidently, the Soviet attempt to promote and uphold the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan, and Washington’s funding of opposing forces in response, prompted the overwhelming assembly of jihadists. The Islamic extremists, given the proper training and funding, were able to further expand their numbers and extend their reach to Chechnya where Chechen Muslims, a Russian minority, struggled for liberation from Russian rule. Consequently, Russia’s leading terrorist insurgency has come from Chechnya. It is a hot bed of all Russian security concerns – separatism, ethnic conflict, and international terrorism – that provides an opportunity for domestic and foreign forces to cause instability in Russia. Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Anatoly Safonov, noted in an interview in 2004, with the Italian Newspaper \textit{L’Opinione delle Libertà} on Terrorism-Related Problems, that Chechen terrorists have an aim “to create a caliphate from the Black Sea to the Caspian Sea” and in doing so, to take away number of Russian republics and regions.\footnote{Anatoly Safonov, "Replies by the Russian Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Anatoly Safonov to Questions from an Italian Newspaper L’opinione Delle Liberta on Terrorism-Related Problems," \textit{Ed. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation: official site}, (2004).}
The Chechen Revolution began in 1991 right at the collapse of the USSR, as Gorbachev’s *perestroika* reform allowed great political freedom and expression.\(^{65}\)

Chechnya was ‘radicalized’ during 1993-1994 “in increasingly violent factional clashes.”\(^{66}\)

The Chechen revolution changed its ideology from the original predominantly secular anti-imperialism with strong undertones of socialism and developmentalism to an Islamic radicalism of anti-Western and loosely anarchist tone.\(^{67}\)

The dissatisfaction of some Chechens with the new peace agreement with Russia in the aftermath of the First Chechen War, initiated a number of violent terrorist acts, and the problems in Chechnya spilled over to other parts of Russia. Chechen rebels employed a number of different terroristic acts, including kidnapping tactics. In May 1998, Yeltsin’s personal representative in Chechnya was kidnapped and held for six months. Later in the
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year, four engineers from Britain and New Zealand were kidnapped and murdered. And in March 1999, General Gennadiy Shpigun, Moscow’s top envoy to Chechnya was kidnapped from the airport in Grozny and his corpse was later found in Chechnya. Suicide bomb attacks portrayed another technique of terror. Attacks on Russian military housing and on apartment buildings took place in Buinaksk, Moscow and Volgodonsk: A second Chechen War erupted.

The second Chechen War was led by two previously mentioned Islamists: Basayev and Khattab. In 1995, Basayev forced the Russian authorities to negotiate with the Chechen rebels when he attacked the city of Budionnovsk and occupied a hospital with nearly 1600 hostages. Khattab, on the other hand, together with his armed unit, humiliated Russia when he ambushed and massacred a Russian armored regiment in 1996. Going into the Second Chechen War, Putin said, “We will pursue the terrorists everywhere. You will forgive me, but if we catch them in the toilet, we will rub them out in the outhouse.” This has been a policy to which Putin has remained loyal to this day.
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Nevertheless, bomb attacks on Russia reached a halt as the Second Chechen War began, until when some 50 Chechen terrorists seized the Dubrovka Theater in 2002, holding about 800 innocent civilians hostage. The incident resulted in over 120 casualties. Since then, the bombing campaign has resumed and resulted in a number of deaths of Russian civilians.

[Later on, in December 2002] Russian government offices in Grozny were attacked by a suicide bomber [where] 80 people were killed. [The following year,] in 2003, another 50 people were killed in another suicide bombing of a Russian government building in the north of the republic. In August of 2004, two passenger airliners were brought down by Chechen women suicide bombers, [and in addition], there were a series of subway bombings.

The Beslan tragedy, also know as “Russia’s September 11,” was a siege of an elementary school in the Russian region of North Ossetia. Chechen rebels, who are believed to have ties with al Qaeda, seized 1,100 hostages. The siege lasted three days from September 1st to September 3rd in 2004. The end results were tragic as over 350 people died, most of whom where children; and nearly 800 people were severely injured. It is known that Shamil Basayev was the mastermind behind the attack. President Putin, in his address to the nation regarding the tragic upheaval, remarked that:

We are dealing here not just with separate actions aimed at frightening us, not just with separate terrorist sorties. We are dealing with direct intervention of international terrorism against Russia, with a total, cruel and full-scale war in which our compatriots die again and again.

Russian leaders have taken great measures to connect with the international community in counterterrorism operations; hence, Russia has improved its collaboration
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with the United States. Russia believes that terrorism is an international issue and the best way of handling such a problem is with the guidelines of international law. Andrey Denisov, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation, at the 11th Conference of Security and Defense, in Berlin, stated that:

Today we are witnessing increasing uncertainty in the field of security all over the world. In the face of turbulence and lack of predictability and stability, strict compliance with international law is the only safety net. Rule of law is of the same importance in international relations as it is in internal affairs.\footnote{Andrey Denisov, "Statement by Andrey Denisov, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation, at the Opening of the 11th European Conference on Security and Defense," Russian Foreign Ministry, November 27, 2012.}

Consequently, Russia has taken a number of initiatives at home and abroad toward developing a counterterrorism action plan. In 1999, Resolution 1269 was passed in the UN as a strategic basis for counterterrorism. First Deputy Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Trubnikov believes the resolution was mainly a result of Russia’s initiative.\footnote{Mark A. Smith, “A Russian Perspective on Terrorism,” Conflict Studies Research Center, January 2004.} Also, the United Nations Security Council has passed a number of resolutions since the September 11 attacks on the U.S., which Russia has fully supported. These resolutions include: “1368, 1373, 1377 (2001), 1438, 1440, 1450, 1452 (2002), 1455, 1465, 1516 (2003), which are all concerned with various aspects of the struggle against international terrorism.”\footnote{Ibid., 17.} Russia has also made an effort in counterterrorism through collaboration with the G8, NATO, EU, OSCE, SCO and the Council of Europe.\footnote{Mark A. Smith, “A Russian Perspective on Terrorism.”} The developments in Chechnya led the Russian government to adopt new domestic laws as well. The Federal
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Law “On Combating Terrorism” in 1998 has served as the primary foundation of Russian counterterrorism efforts.\textsuperscript{85}

“The law attempted to define terrorist activity omitting political motivation as one of the defining characteristics of the crime. It also sketched out the legal regime of the counterterrorist operation, and defined organizational basis of counterterrorism, placing Russia's Federal Security Service (FSB), and the Ministry of Interior (MVD) at the top of the list of agencies responsible for combating terrorism.” \textsuperscript{86}

As Russia plunged into the second Chechen struggle, which was followed by another wave of violence and terrorist attacks, President Putin’s primary goal was to restore Russia’s authority in the North Caucasus region and to stabilize the volatile Southern region.\textsuperscript{87} The first steps taken toward this goal included the re-assertion of “vertical-power” along with the Kremlin’s efforts to expand control over the mass media.\textsuperscript{88}

Subsequently, the Russian government revised the first Federal Law On Combating Terrorism and in 2006 replaced the 1998 version with a new Federal Law On Counteraction to Terrorism.\textsuperscript{89} “The law legalizes the application of armed forces for counterterrorism operations inside and outside of the country, but provides only scant description of prophylactic measures aimed at defending the Russian people and infrastructure against the threat of terrorism.” \textsuperscript{90} Similar to the 1998 act "On Combating Terrorism," the 2006 counterterrorism law:
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Allows for suspension of certain individual liberties and media freedoms in the zone of counterterrorist operations, and authorizes counterterrorism units to carry out searches and demolition of suspicious airplanes and ships.” 91

Bordering 14 other nations, with land and coastal boundaries totaling 35,974 miles, Russia’s national security poses a challenge. 92 Afghanistan’s proximity to the rest of the Central Asian countries that border Russia remains a large concern to the Russian authorities. Afghanistan’s northern border is directly connected to Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and China (Figure 2), all of which offer opportunities for Islamist extremists.

FIGURE 2

Source: http://mapsof.net/uploads/static-maps/Map_of_Central_Asia.png

While it was in power, the Taliban offered training camps to Chechen rebels and encouraged Islamic militants in Central Asia. Many militants left Central Asia to fight alongside the Taliban against NATO. Now, however, they are filtering back. According to Ahmed Rashid, a leading Pakistan based expert on Afghanistan and Central Asia, “They have done enough fighting for other
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people. They want to fight for their own country… They are trying to infiltrate weapons, ammunition and men back into Central Asia.”

Organizations like the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU), which is attempting to overthrow the Uzbek President, Islam Karimov, and Imomali Rakhmon, the Tajik leader who has supported and led pro-Russians against the Islamists in a 1990’s war, are a serious threat to Russia. Such movements have helped radical Islam to spread inside Russian borders, particularly in the Volga region. The first members of the Islamic radical movement Hizb ut-Tahrir made their way to Russia in 1996, most of which were of Uzbek and Tajik ethnicities. While most of Russia’s fights concentrate in the North Caucasus, Central Asia might be even of greater concern. The United States mission in Afghanistan is of great value to Russia; hence, the U.S.-Russian cooperation is central in impeding the radical movement across Central Asia.

U.S.–RUSSIAN COLLABORATIVE COUNTERTERORISM EFFORTS

Russian President Vladimir Putin was the first world leader to call and offer assistance to President George Bush after the September 11 attacks on the U.S. World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Even prior to 9/11, in 1999, the leaders of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS) agreed that an establishment of a joint working group would be of considerable interest to both nations,
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especially with the issue of national security threats. President Putin and the Clinton administration decided to take action against terrorism in Afghanistan by way of the “U.S.—Russian Working Group on Afghanistan.” At the very first meeting held on August 1st and 2nd in 2000, the two countries evaluated the threat posed to regional and international stability by Taliban’s backing for terrorism. “They explored bilateral, regional, and multilateral options for addressing that threat.”97 The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1267, adapted in 1999, calling for sanctions against all Taliban, Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda affiliates, was also reiterated.98 September 11 increased the counterterrorism bilateral relations between the two nations to unprecedented levels. Russia especially welcomed this opportunity as it portrayed itself victim of international terrorism long before the 9/11 events. Shortly after the attacks, the two countries took a further step toward building an unmatched post Cold War partnership. In the October 21, 2001 Joint U.S.-Russia Statement and the latter Joint Statement on a New Relationship Between the United States and Russia of November 13, 2001, the two made it clear that an effort would be made to join forces in agreement that terrorism represents a crime against all humanity.

Our countries are embarked on a new relationship for the 21st century, founded on a commitment to the values of democracy, the free market, and the rule of law. The United States and Russia have overcome the legacy of the Cold War. Neither country regards the other as an enemy or threat. Aware of our responsibility to contribute to international security, we are determined to work together, and with
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other nations and international organizations, including the United Nations, to promote security, economic well-being, and a peaceful, prosperous, free world.\textsuperscript{99}

Realizing that the bilateral efforts successfully helped pave the way for a new governmental installment led by Hamid Karzai, in Afghanistan, though the U.N. Bonn Agreement,\textsuperscript{100} the two sides decided to remodel the “U.S.—Russian Working Group on Afghanistan” to encompass issues broader than Afghanistan. In 2002, Putin and Bush advanced the working group to The U.S.-Russia Working Group on Counterterrorism. The new agenda embodied possibilities of combating terrorism on additional levels. For the first time, concepts of nuclear, biological and chemical terrorism found its place in the consensual plan.\textsuperscript{101}

The Russian Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the NAS, came up with six different work groups in counterterrorist efforts. These categories furthered the scope of terrorism threats and served as the groundwork for the bilateral effort in countering security risks for the years to come. But, intelligence sharing and yearly meetings defined the extent of collaborative efforts. Series of events from 2002-2008 interfered with the progress of bilateral ties: The 2002 U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile


\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Bonn Agreement}: “In December 2001, a group of prominent Afghans and world leaders met in Bonn, Germany under United Nation auspices to design an ambitious agenda that would guide Afghanistan towards “national reconciliation, a lasting peace, stability, and respect for human rights”, culminating in the establishment of a fully representative government. The Bonn Agreement has provided the basis for the foundation of many political and civil institutions in Afghanistan through commissions such as the Constitutional Commission – which was established to draft a new constitution in consultation with the public.”


Treaty\textsuperscript{102} signed by the two powers in 1972; the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, which was strongly opposed by Moscow; the U.S.-Russian disagreement over the independence of Kosovo; the American initiative to build an anti-ballistic missile defense system in Poland, which very much troubled Moscow; and finally the Russo-Georgian War in 2008, all put a strain on the U.S.-Russian and NATO-Russian relations, affecting collaboration in all dimensions. However at the 2009 G20 Summit, then newly elected U.S. President Obama and Dmitry Medvedev struck a friendly note when they announced the “reset” of the U.S.–Russian relations. This reset essentially led to a visit to Moscow, where the establishment of the U.S.–Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission under the initiative of President Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev was announced on July 6, 2009. The intent was to broaden the collective action on the world stage, and today the commission identifies eighteen different areas of mutual interest and cooperation, one of which is counterterrorism. Since the enactment, the bilateral partnership has once again surpassed its record of unprecedented reciprocation. On the very same day of the initial statement, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and Undersecretary of State William Burns concluded an agreement (U.S.–Russia Military Transit Agreement) that enables the United States to use Russian territory for transport of American military personnel and non-military equipment to its personnel in Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{103} The new routes decrease the amount of time it takes for the necessary support to reach the U.S. and its coalition bases in Afghanistan. Russia does not demand any air navigation charges for the agreement that

\textsuperscript{102} Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty: A treaty signed between the United States and the former Soviet Union on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems which are used to defend against nuclear threats.

permits 4,500 flights per year and that will save the United States government up to $133 million annually in fuel, maintenance and other transference costs.\textsuperscript{104}

By providing access to these transit routes, the Russian Federation is enabling a substantial increase in the efficiency of our common effort to defeat the forces of violent extremism in Afghanistan and to ensure Afghanistan’s and the broader region’s security.\textsuperscript{105}

With the ‘reset’ of relations, Russia has more and more involved herself in Afghanistan, surpassing the initial agreement to only provide support by alleviating transportation costs and difficulties. The Russians have not only provided intelligence and transportation routes but also their own personnel. For the first time ever, Russia and the United States conducted a joint military mission in Afghanistan. The reset relations between the two sides have proven to increase the amount of cooperation substantially, especially in Afghanistan.

\textit{Afghanistan}

The former Soviet Union’s experience in Afghanistan serves as a very valuable asset in U.S.-Russian efforts. A group of former Soviet Union diplomats, ambassadors and generals voiced their opinions at an American-Russian conference in 2009 and warned that ignoring a decade of experience there would be a mistake. The retired officials did not refer to Afghanistan as a real centralized state, but as an aggregation of various ethnic groups ruled by different tribal policies. “There is no such nation as Afghanistan,” said Ruslan Aushey, a former S.U. Lieutenant General.\textsuperscript{106} Hence, peace will not be brought with an escalation of troops, spoke the former Soviet ambassador to
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Afghanistan, Fikryat Tabeyev, from experience, as he witnessed a rise of over 100,000 Soviet troops in Afghanistan without any prospect of victory.

Many challenges that bedeviled the Soviets confront the American operation today. Among them are vicious tribal rivalries, a weak central government, radical Islamists, power-hungry warlords, incompetent or corrupt local military commanders, failing infrastructure and the complexity of fighting guerrilla groups...Trying to bring democracy to Afghanistan, or anything resembling it, will be as fruitless as [the Soviet] attempts to install communism.107

Instead, in their efforts to help the United States, the former officials advise the U.S. and Russia to invest in infrastructure, to bring doctors, educators, engineers and soldiers to guard irrigation systems and roads, rather than escalating the number of troops that are fighting village wars with no plausible victories. The core of the problem rests in the understanding that “[the economic sphere of Afghanistan] is now at a stage lower than the Middle Ages,” commented Pavel Grachev, a retired General. “Healthcare and education levels are among the worst in the world,” Grachev continues, “there are no jobs other than tending poppy fields.” After Kabul, which houses about 3.3 million people in its urban sphere, the second largest city, Kandahar, holds a population of only 498,000. This means that most of Afghanistan’s 31 million residents are dispersed across the rural outskirts of the country, living in small villages, alienated by the lack of transportation and road infrastructure.108,109

As a result, any occupation force will spend much of its time propping up a government that has little relevance outside Kabul and trying to corral disparate ethnic groups and tribes into a national army that's often unwilling to fight.110
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Consequently, much of the U.S.-Russian efforts in Afghanistan have concentrated on weakening the drug trade, building infrastructure and providing military training to Afghan forces.

**Drug Eradication**

Afghanistan today produces 90% of the world’s opium, most of which is sold as heroin in Europe and Russia. There are approximately 300-500 laboratories producing about 380-400 tons of heroin per year.\(^{111}\) Illegal drug trade profits uphold terrorism and its activities that threaten the security of both the U.S. and Russia. Also, Russia claims opium production and export of Afghanistan’s drugs a top national security threat as heroin smuggling across its borders accounts for the upsurge of drug related crimes and 130,000 annual deaths.\(^{112,113}\) Hence, diminishing drug production and its trade in Afghanistan is one of the top priorities on the U.S.-Russian joint to do list. “Terrorism and narcotics are two elements that cannot be separated from each other and Afghans lives’ have also been seriously affected by those two elements.”\(^{114}\) During the 1980s, mujahedeen operating out of Pakistan relied on the cultivation and sales of opium poppy—used in production of opium and heroin—to attain weapons used in fighting against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. After the Soviet troops withdrew in 1989, the U.S. no longer needed to fund the mujahedeen; hence opium became a vital channel to

---


\(^{114}\) Motlagh, “With U.S. Approval, Moscow Heads Back to Afghanistan.”
income and weapons against the communistic government. Juan Carlos, a former U.S. National Security Council adviser on terrorism argues that “narco dollars are a major, if not majority of [Taliban’s] funding sources” today, making up 85-90% ($80 to $100 millions of dollars) of the Taliban’s revenue, estimates John Solomon, a U.S. Military Academy's terrorism expert. This seems ironic considering the Taliban imposed ban on poppy cultivation (but not on its export) in 1999, arguing that it opposed Islamic beliefs. The Taliban charges the producers’ movement of drugs throughout its territory, and it has also been known to impose fraudulent tolls, taxes and even zakat, one of the five pillars of Islam requiring charity donation. Both terrorist organizations and organized crime groups have been known to use an informal money transfer system, hawala. After 9/11, bin Laden’s most gainful funding sources were terminated. However, al Qaeda has since reconstructed its money trail through the hawala system, often relying on Taliban’s illicit narco profits.

The major problems for the Afghani government include the fact that a large portion of its GDP comes from drug sales (15% in 2012), that most of its population lives in poverty and that it cannot financially compete with the Taliban. The average Taliban soldiers are paid $100 a month, which is about $20 more than the policemen receive. Considering the low price of local explosives, this money can go a long way. United
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Nations Office of Drug and Crime argues in *The Afghanistan Opium Survey 2008* that opium cultivation in Afghanistan is now closely linked with al Qaeda.

Indeed, 98% of all of Afghanistan’s opium is grown in just seven provinces in the south-west (Hilmand, Kandahar, Uruzgan, Farah, Nimroz, and to a lesser extent Daykundi and Zabul), where there are permanent Taliban settlements, and where organized crime groups profit from the instability. This geographical overlap between regions of opium and zones of insurgency shows the inextricable link between drugs and conflict. Since drugs and insurgency are caused by, and affect, each other, they need to be dealt with at the same time – and urgently.\(^{119}\)

Various efforts have been made to help eradicate the drug problem in Afghanistan, one of which is an effort to educate the population and opium poppy farmers through drug awareness campaigns.

*Drug Awareness Campaigns*

Since 1995, with an exception of the 2001 Taliban ban, the production of opium in Afghanistan has been on the rise (Figure 3), and with favorable weather conditions amounted to 93% of world’s production in 2007. Two factors have been identified as the causes for the 19% cultivation decrease in 2008: One, drought; and two, good leadership by province governors and religious leaders who campaigned against opium and encouraged farmers to grow alternative crops.\(^{120}\)


\(^{120}\) Ibid.
The leadership successes can be attributed to the western alliance’s installment of new government heads. The awareness campaigns, however, have a positive correlation with the reduction of poppy cultivation (Figure 4). According to the Afghanistan Opium Survey 2012: Opium Risk Assessment for All Regions:

Those villages, which had been covered by the campaign, were less likely to grow poppy than those which had not been reached by the campaign. This association was significant. Thus, the awareness campaign seems to have had a positive influence on the decision not to grow opium.\footnote{United Nations Office of Drug and Crime, “Afghanistan Opium Survey 2012: Opium Risk Assessment for All Regions,” Government of Afghanistan Ministry of Counter Narcotics (2012).}
Other efforts to reduce the production of opium target supply and demand. The U.S.-Russia Counternarcotics Working Group aims at diminishing both the request for and production of drugs.

_U.S. – Russia Counternarcotics Working Group:_

The group was chartered during the 2009 meeting between President Medvedev and President Obama, amidst the development of the U.S.-Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission. The creation of the Working Group established an operational cooperation between Federal Drug Control Services of Russia (FSKN)\(^{122}\) and the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) on measures directed at reducing narcotic laboratories in Afghanistan and quenching the illicit activities of Afghan narcotics trafficking networks.\(^{123}\) The group established a number of sub-groups, which aim at accomplishing three goals: supply reduction, demand reduction and establishing legal framework for counternarcotics efforts. For instance ‘sub-group “A”’ is to concentrate on illicit finances related to Afghan narcotics trafficking. ‘Sub-group “B” is delegated with the task of exchanging U.S.–Russian intelligence and experience, thus using the information to collaboratively enhance drug prevention and abuse while finding the best ways to provide assistance to those with drug dependency. Furthermore, ‘sub-group “C”’ strictly involved close cooperation between the U.S. DEA and FSKN on countering narcotics trafficking.\(^{124}\) In a press conference after the fourth Russia–U.S. Working

\(^{122}\) Russian Translation: Федеральная служба Российской Федерации по контролю за оборотом наркотиков, ФСКН России


\(^{124}\) Ibid.
Group meeting, the Director of National Drug Control Policy, Gil Kerlikowske, remarked:

Our joint efforts to reduce drug use and its consequences mark an era of unprecedented counterdrug cooperation and engagement with Russia. Already, our historic joint law enforcement actions have helped to strengthen public safety by disrupting illicit drug trafficking networks. Today’s work to share information and strategies to prevent drug use and expand treatment demonstrates our countries’ commitment to saving lives and protecting public health by reducing the demand for drugs among our citizens.125

Ivanov and Kerlikowske further note that the United States and Russia have taken numerous initiatives to increase collaboration since the enactment of the U.S.–Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission. The two powers have engaged in a number of different joint training activities, and in 2010 they jointly acted on two major enforcement operations. In July 2010, the prevention of a substantial cocaine shipment from the United States to Russia marked the very first major collaborative victory. The second triumph, possible due to combined efforts, resulted in liquidation of four drug laboratories in Afghanistan and the confiscation of 932 kg of heroin and 156 kg of opium in October of 2010, amounting to $250 million dollars and 200 million heroin doses. The Afghan National Security Forces, in collaboration with the U.S. and Russian experts, led the operation.126, 127

The Working Group also aspires to integrate regional support and legal cooperation in securing drug trafficking routes and stabilizing the region. An important partner is the Central Asian Regional Information and Coordination Center (CARICC) especially in regards to the Northern Drug Trafficking Route, which begins in Afghanistan and passes through Central Asia and Russia, reaching Western European Markets. The Central Asian countries are an important piece of the puzzle as their efforts to suppress the flow of narcotics all work toward a similar goal of stabilizing the region and preventing terrorism and narcotics from overflowing from Afghanistan into the neighboring regions.

The Counternarcotics Working Group has been on the right track in its mission to suppress the production, demand and smuggling of opium and heroin in Afghanistan. It’s important to understand that its mission goes hand in hand with counterterrorism efforts and other joint projects directed at improving the economy, infrastructure and the judicial system while diminishing corruption. Ivanov and other Russian officials have often criticized the United States for not doing enough to prevent the flow of heroin from Afghanistan to Russia. In 2010, Moscow remarked that the Russian intelligence services had identified and provided the U.S. officials with geographic coordinates for 175 different heroin-processing laboratories, but that the United States failed to act. The United States is very concerned with consequences of opium eradication. The U.S. officials have often argued that vast annihilation of poppy fields could drive farmers into the arms of the Taliban, consequently increasing the danger of radicalization and terrorist attacks that could ultimately result in further instability in Afghanistan and the surrounding regions.
Thus, it is important to bear in mind that while counternarcotic efforts help Russia and Europe suppress drug flow through their borders, it is equally, if not more, important that drug eradication liquidates funding necessary for terrorist organization to carry out operations.

*Country Programme for Afghanistan 2012-2014*

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) sponsors the Country Programme for Afghanistan (CPA). Both Russia and the United States contribute to UNODC financially and are considered top donor league members. The CPA aims to strengthen the capacity of the Afghan government and to, therefore, lessen the effects of drug and crime in the country.\(^{128}\) UNODC envisions stability and development in Afghanistan by enforcing the Criminal Justice system and Counter Narcotics and by handing responsibility for implementation to the head of the Kabul office, run by the local government. The Programme recognizes the complexity of Afghanistan’s illicit drug production, which closely intertwines with issues of weak governance, corruption and low standards of living, health and security.\(^{129}\) With such recognitions, the goal is to first identify all variables of the drug and crime problem, and second to use an integrated approach that entails four sub-programmes: \(^{130}\)

1. *Research, Policy and Advocacy:* This branch of the program strives to enhance the capacity of Afghanistan’s Ministry of Counter Narcotics by encouraging research, inter-agency cooperation, closer crop monitoring and further provincial outreach.


\(^{129}\) Ibid., 7.

\(^{130}\) Ibid., 8-10.
2. Law Enforcement: Aims to strengthen the capacity of Counter Narcotics Police and other national partners working toward the goal of diminishing drug influence. The strategy is to provide mentoring and training on specific curricula by using different methods of regulating, such as intelligence-led policing and the use of forensics for better drug control and crime prevention.

3. Criminal Justice: The focus of the branch it to establish a professional judicial culture; one that will redefine Afghanistan’s current judicial system to incorporate important lawful and just practices, taking into consideration integrity, impunity, prison reform, anti-corruption and inserting juvenile legal distinctions and justice. Such legal measures would provide the foundation for peace and stability in Afghanistan and will enable a fair and an effective way to address narcotics and trafficking. The legal system in Afghanistan lacks infrastructure, professional staffing, independence from the executive branch of the government and moreover, it’s infected with corruption. In a 2010 UNODC corruption survey, 25% of respondent “had to pay a bribe to a police officers [in 2010], 18% had to bribe a judge, and 13% a prosecutor.”

4. Health and Livelihood: Focuses on two groups of the population: One, those reliant on poppy cultivation for income and livelihood, and two, those affected by drug use and dependence. The goal is to reduce the amount of poppy farmers by offering alternative options for income and survival to people who make a living planting poppies by providing alternative crops and possibly different skillset trainings. The second objective is to diminish drug addition by providing assistance to addicts and or victims in need.

132 Ibid.,21.
Whether the CPA has had a significant impact is hard to tell. Figures 5 and 6, separated by regions, show the reasons why farmers did not cultivate poppies so far in 2013 compared to 2012. It is important to bear in mind that recent efforts in Afghanistan have concentrated in the southern, eastern, southwestern and central provinces. These regions are, to this day, under a heavy Taliban presence, and poppy cultivation, much of the time, results from the high Taliban demand. This could explain why “fear of eradication” has spiked by 44% in 2013 in these particular regions. Only 11% of farmers did not cultivate due to environmental or natural factors such as the lack of water, plant disease or not enough yield, because of the natural causes. The remainder of cultivators feared eradication more than the fact that there is a ban by the government, a 29% decrease from 2012. The fact that Islam and the decisions of elders and shura\textsuperscript{133} made a difference could mean that the awareness campaigns and the involvement of local religious leaders worked to an extent.

\textsuperscript{133}ШУРА (shu-ra) is an Arabic word for “consultation.” The Quran encourages decisions to be made in consultation with those whom it will affect.
On the other hand, when comparing the southern regions to those of the northern and northeastern Afghanistan, farmers’ attitudes change. The fear of eradication decreased by 27% from the prior year. A possible explanation could be, again, because governmental efforts have shifted to southern territories of Afghanistan, the northern regions have not been as affected by the CPA. However, more farmers are complying with the government, an 18% increase from 2012. Contrastingly, the northern regions are more affected by the environmental factors, 46% noted that there was either not enough yield or that there was a lack of water. This 46% of the farmers would most likely still cultivate poppies, had the environment permitted.

FIGURE 6

Considering that there are over 5 million heroin addicts in Russia, Moscow has promised support to the U.S. and NATO’s drug eradication effort in Afghanistan. In 2010, the Russian Interior Ministry has provided necessary training to over 200 Afghan
police officers. Nevertheless, higher prices of opium in 2012 encouraged a rise in cultivation of poppy crops, from 131,000 hectares in 2011 to 150,000 hectares in 2012, an 18% increase. However, due to bad weather and plant disease that damaged the crop, the overall production of opium fell by 36% from 5,800 to 3,700 tons. Cultivation figures are more important when measuring progress, since cultivation shows the initial intent of the farmers to produce opium. Therefore, it is clear that the U.S.–Russian and NATO efforts to eradicate the drug problem have not been very successful thus far. Figure 7 portrays reasons why farmers cultivated poppies in 2013.

It is evident that economic prospects from highly priced opium serve as the foremost motivating factors for poppy cultivation. The efforts to eradicate the cultivation and production of opium can only go to limited measures, because Afghans don’t have alternative work and income opportunities to provide for basic survival needs. Five percent or 191,000 households of Afghanistan’s population rely on the narcotic
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industry.\textsuperscript{136} However, it is not only the opium poppy farmers who drive the drug business, but among the permitting factors are also smugglers who encourage the farmers, poverty, corruption and lawlessness.

In an interview, U.S. Corporal Gregory Kilcommons, A Company, 1st Battalion, 25th Marines, deployed to FOB Alamo on the outskirts of Kabul Province, July 2011 to February 2012, served as an assistant team leader on Afghan National Army training team, as well as on the convoy personal security detachment. He does not believe the eradication campaign has worked thus far:

In my view, [the eradication campaign has] not been extremely successful, and that essentially is due to the consequences. With fertile land hard to come by, the ease of cultivating poppy, and the reward of cultivating poppy is high in terms of money, farmers in Afghanistan, whether affiliated with terrorism or not, have incredible incentive to grow poppy. Each growing season ISAF used to go around and burn the poppies harvests, either reimbursing the farmer or occasionally assisting the farmer with growing other crops. When this began to have a negative backlash in public opinion (…go figure…), the Afghan National Security Forces took up that roll, which then only helped ostracize the populace even further. Either way, whether they are ill spirited or not, Afghan’s will do whatever it takes to make a living. We must provide incentive to grow other crops, rather than simply burning or cutting down a farmer’s livelihood.\textsuperscript{137}

On a similar note, Lieutenant Sean Parnell who led his unit, the “Outlaw Platoon” against the Taliban along Pakistan border from 2006 to 2007, describes the constant struggle of the U.S. and NATO forces’ to help the Afghani people when the Taliban punishes them for accepting foreign aid. This dichotomy between the people’s need for help and their fear of consequences by the Taliban makes it very difficult to reach out to the public and fight the insurgency.\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{137} Colonal Gregory Kilcommons in interview with Maja Bedak, January 30, 2013.
Strengthening border control whilst diminishing corruption is as equally important as making an effort to influence farmers’ decisions to grow opium.

Landlocked, Afghanistan is reachable only by air and land, meaning that the very porous borders are difficult to patrol. Most of Afghanistan’s heroin passes through Pakistan (160 metric tons), Iran (115 metric tons) and Central Asia (90 metric tons) before reaching Russian, European, East and South Asian markets.\(^{139}\) On the other hand, an estimated 1,000 mt of chemicals, essential for conversion of opium into heroin, are illegally imported into Afghanistan every year. Thus far, Afghan forces organized the most successful operations, seizing 23 mt of such chemicals in 2011.\(^{140}\) Also in 2011, Counter Narcotics Police of Afghanistan conducted 1,807 operations, resulting in seizures of 53 mt of opium, 33 mt of heroin, 58 mt of hashish, 29 mt of morphine and 112 mt of precursor chemicals.

Despite the U.S. Russian Cooperation, some officials such as the Head of Russia’s Federal Drug Control Service, Viktor Ivanov, believe that the U.S. and NATO presence in Afghanistan has contributed to the drug problem. Ivanov proclaimed on *Ekho Moskvy*, a Russian radio station, that he “is convinced that the flow of (Afghan) drugs to Russia will decrease as soon as Americans withdraw from Afghanistan.” He argues that Afghanistan’s drug production skyrocketed with the U.S.-NATO invasion.\(^{141}\) Such outlook makes sense when considering the fact that the Taliban needed to increase its illicit profits to defend itself against the invading troops. On the other hand, Uzbekistan’s President Islam Karimov has a very different assessment of the situation:


\(^{140}\) Ibid., 21.

We have serious concerns that there will be an upsurge in terrorist and extremist activities, and the volume and scope of drug trafficking will grow following the forces' departure. In my opinion, one can hardly reject such a possibility. Secondly, these terrorist and extremist activities themselves will not be able to remain confined within the Afghan borders. They will spill over into other countries. A strong army should be formed in Afghanistan and other important problems facing this country should be resolved before the international forces leave it.¹⁴²

The strategy has been to build the capacity of the Afghan army, so when the U.S. and NATO troops begin their withdrawal, Afghanistan will be able to maintain its progress and secure its future.

*Securing the Future*

An important aspect of the U.S.–Russian vision in Afghanistan is to build the capacity of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), the Afghan Local Police (ALP), which is mostly village focused where ANSF numbers are limited, and of the supplementary counternarcotics regulators. Thus, all will be responsible for securing Afghanistan once international forces depart in 2014. The international community is concerned that once outside support disperses that Afghanistan will not be able to retain control and stability of the country on its own. Therefore, the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), established in 2001 by the United Nations Security Council; Russia; the U.S.; and United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA); have all lent a hand in trying to build a strong, self-sufficient national Afghan government and forces that will be able to maintain the socio-economic development and further improvements in national government necessary for a progressive and peaceful future of Afghanistan. The goal is to fully shift responsibility, currently led by ISAF, to

¹⁴² "Moscow, Tashkent Will Cooperate as NATO Forces Prepare to Leave Afghanistan Interfax: Russia & CIS General Newswire, June 05, 2012."
Afghan National Security Forces by 2014. NATO reports that transition is well underway, as ANSF currently maintains security of 87% of Afghan’s population.\textsuperscript{143} ISAF’s initial purpose was to lead and train Afghan National Security Forces and other policing governmental personnel, however, its duties over the years have expanded to combating the insurgency and protecting civilians throughout Afghanistan, whilst ensuring security necessary for infrastructure efforts.\textsuperscript{144} The transition of leadership to Afghan local forces has thus far been a four-step process, the first tranche beginning in March 2011, the second in November 2011, the third in May 2012 and the fourth, or the current one, was announced by President Karzai on December, 31 2012. The Russia-NATO council has also greatly contributed to developing visions, goals and actions taken in Afghanistan. At a press conference following a NATO-Russia Council meeting, NATO Secretary General, Andres Fogh Rasmussen, announced that Russia and NATO have been closely working together in counter-terrorism efforts and will be increasing their cooperation in 2013.

This year we will also take further steps in our counter-terrorism projects. In June, we will be testing for the first time a technology we developed jointly to detect explosives in crowded places. The test will be held in a metro station in a European capital. And in September, the NATO-Russia joint air traffic system will conduct a live exercise to defend against terrorist threats to civilian aircraft.\textsuperscript{145}

The latest ISAF figures indicate (as of April 22, 2013) that there are currently

\textsuperscript{143} North Atlantic Treaty Organization, “Inteqal: Transition to Afghan Lead.” April 15, 2013, \url{http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_87183.htm}.

\textsuperscript{144} International Security Assistance Force, “About ISAF: History,” \url{http://www.isaf.nato.int/history.html}.

99,590 ISAF forces contributed by fifty, NATO led nations and 187,000 ANSF trained troops in Afghanistan.\footnote{International Security Assistance Force, “Key Facts and Figures.” http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_2013_04/20130422_130422-isaf-placemat.pdf.} In 2002 ANSF was more of an infantry force, but today it has evolved to be a “fully-fledged army to comprise both fighting elements and enabling capabilities – such as military police, intelligence, route clearance, combat support, medical, aviation and logistics.”\footnote{ISAF, “Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF): Training and Development,” December 2012, http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_2012_12/20121205_121205-ansf-backgrounder-en.pdf.} While some reports and statistics, such as the ISAF Monthly Data Trends in 2012,\footnote{ISAF, “Monthly Data Trends Through August 2012,” September 24, 2012, pdf. http://www.isaf.nato.int/images/stories/File/20120924_NIU_ISAF_Monthly_Data-Release%20(Final).pdf.} show a reduction of Enemy-Initiated Attacks (EIA) to be 4% lower in 2012 in comparison to the prior year, one should not ignore the fact that the overall amount of EIAs has increased since 2009, but decreased since 2010. The increase can be explained by the Obama administration’s ‘surge’ of 30,000 soldiers to Afghanistan in November of 2009, possibly meaning that troops invoke more attacks and violence. The number of attacks on ANSF and ISAF usually increase during the poppy harvest and opium production season, which begins in April and lasts until August. Also of importance is the number of civilian casualties caused by the ISAF, which has decreased by 62% in 2012, in comparison to 2011 (Figure 8). This is significant because it shows that ISAF and ANSF collaboration and training is heading in a positive direction.\footnote{Ibid.} Nevertheless, it is evident that the number of attacks has overall increased.
over the years, and while ISAF has been successful in expanding the capacity of the ANSF and ALP, the coalition forces have not been successful in reducing the overall amount of violence (Figure 8).

U.S. Corporal Gregory Kilcommons believes that ISAF’s mission in Afghanistan has not been very successful:

ISAF, anchored by US forces, has been successful in routing terrorists from Afghanistan, bringing schools/medicine/infrastructure to the nation, and trained a force of over 300,000 Afghan security forces. However, I believe this stability is artificial and will not last. Sure, ISAF has pushed the area of operation of the Taliban to the southern perimeter of the country, but has only created a newer, possibly stronger Taliban in Pakistan’s FATA region. Sure ISAF has trained 300,000 Afghan security forces, but what is the quality of these troops and will the unstandardized training regimen provided by ISAF forces result in a effective combat force? In my experience, ISAF slowed down the operation. While in theory an international effort is appealing due to cooperation and the sharing of
ideas, resources, and diplomatic strength, the reality of an international effort runs the risk of being bogged down by bureaucracy, unequal efforts, and confusion; which I believe happened in Afghanistan. Essentially, ISAF has indirectly put Afghanistan in a position for a massive security/stability vacuum to occur, most likely to be filled by the Taliban as they flow through Pakistan’s porous border.\(^{150}\)

As important it is for ANSF and ALP to be self-sufficient and to protect its civilians from terrorism and narcotics it is also vital for Afghanistan to obtain a stable economy and to provide its population with alternatives to opium cultivation and production. One way to achieve this would be to invest in infrastructure.

**Building Infrastructure:**

While efforts to fight the cultivation and production of opium in Afghanistan remain a priority to Russia, Moscow has developed a concern that combating narcotics along with the opium producers and smugglers is not enough. Taking the advice from former Russian generals, ambassadors and diplomats, who experienced Afghanistan in the 1980s, the Russian and the U.S. governments decided to assist in infrastructure enhancements. Afghanistan’s northern regions are rich with natural gas and minerals, something Moscow knew even during its 1980s invasion. The plan to help, therefore, would not be only beneficial to Afghanistan, but also to Moscow as its companies would be actively involved in energy projects. The Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India Pipeline (TAPI) proposed in mid 1990s has undergone many debates and interruptions, especially during the war in Afghanistan, until 2011 when the talks on progress resumed. European and American interests in the pipeline have evoked a response from Moscow, which now wants to invest in the project and offer a possible contract with Gazprom.\(^{151}\)

\(^{150}\) Corporal Gregory Kilcommons interview with Maja Bedak.
TAPI would increase Afghanistan’s GDP, which would then hopefully be utilized to support the counternarcotic and counterterrorism forces.

Mounting Russian concerns that Islamist militancy and cheap drugs emanating from Afghanistan are a threat to its national security have made Moscow refocus on the region even as the U.S. and its NATO allies maneuver to draw down. Two decades after the Soviet army left Afghanistan in humiliating defeat, Russia is poised to spend billions in the war-wrecked country to develop infrastructure, mineral and energy reserves, with new plans taking shape to boost military capability. This time around, it has America's blessing. Large-scale investment may also enter Afghanistan to help shore up the embattled Karzai regime — and to make money.\(^\text{152}\)

Russia is also making an effort to upgrade a number of Soviet-era installations, one of which is a $500 million plan to rebuild a number of hydroelectric-power plants.\(^\text{153}\) Among the numerous projects in which Moscow plans to invest is the construction of wells and irrigation systems in Afghanistan’s countryside. Nevertheless, her ambitions extend to pursuing benefits from Afghanistan’s natural resources and minerals, such as natural gas, iron and aluminum, announced Motlagh, a Time Magazine reporter.\(^\text{154}\)

Russia has also been involved in a number of house-building projects and has built a cement factory at Jabal Seraj.\(^\text{155}\)

Likewise, the Obama administration has also reshaped its approach to counterterrorism in Afghanistan by shifting its focus from drug eradication to institution building and creating alternatives for opium poppy farmers. Both Moscow and Tashkent stand behind the new U.S. plan. Islam Karimov remarked that further militarization of Afghanistan will not solve long-term problems. Meanwhile Moscow agrees, it aims to
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\(^{152}\) Jason Motlagh, “With U.S. Approval, Moscow Heads Back to Afghanistan."

\(^{153}\) Simon Shuster, “Russia Returns to Afghanistan for a Drug Raid.”

\(^{154}\) Ibid.

find alternative means to eradicate both narcotics and terrorism, whose main sources it believes stem from Afghanistan and low standards of living in the country. President Obama’s strategy, very much relies on enhancement of Afghanistan’s regional support and reconstruction projects that strive to stabilize the country before the final withdrawal of U.S. forces in 2014. Providing the Afghan population with proper health care, education and access to basic resources, such as clean water and electricity, would encourage the support of Afghanistan’s central government and therefore, increase the probability of long-term peace and stability in the region.

Thus far, U.S.-Russian aspirations seem to have paid off in various sectors of populations’ livelihood. For one, education has reached unprecedented levels. Fifty percent of inhabitants are under eighteen-years-old, making Afghanistan have one of the largest populations of school children in the world. During the Taliban’s rule, zero percent of girls received an education; the percentage increased to 40% today. Furthermore, since 2002, more than 4,000 schools have been built and nearly 200,000 new educators have been trained. Also, only 900,000 children enrolled in school in 2002, whereas today, there are almost 8 million educated children. However, Afghanistan’s economy and job formation need to keep up with these statistics if real change is to be made, if opium farmers are to retire poppy cultivation and if terrorism funding is to be abated.

Counterterrorism Working Group

The U.S.–Russia Counterterrorism Working Group was created within the Bilateral Presidential Commission framework. It serves as a platform for the U.S.–Russian counterterrorism leaders to discuss important national and international security threats, to strengthen dialogue and cooperation on relevant law-enforcement matters, to find ways of securing and improving transportation security and to encourage information and intelligence sharing, among other missions.\textsuperscript{159} Russian Special Presidential Representative for International Cooperation in the Fight against Terrorism, Aleksandr Zmeyevskiy, and Coordinator for Counterterrorism in the U.S. Department of State, Daniel Benjamin, co-chair the Working Group and lead its efforts. Information exchange has been a very important aspect of this relationship. Russian intelligence supports the U.S. efforts to fight terrorism in Afghanistan and provides the U.S. forces with relevant classified data on a frequent basis. The joint effort in Afghanistan and the surrounding region has led to a number of successes, including disruption of money laundering operations, freezing terrorists’ financial assets and prevention of overall terrorist economic gains.\textsuperscript{160} National security has been one of the vital focuses, therefore, intelligence sharing has taken a step further by integrating the U.S. Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and the Russian Ministry of Transport, who have acknowledged the importance of exchange of techniques and information in order to best


secure civil aviation security. The two countries have also conducted joint operational trainings. For instance, active exercises on countering improvised-explosive devices (IED) was held in the United States, while TSA examined and observed heavily trafficked Russian airports, suggesting improvements and learning how to better improve aviation security in the United States. While the Working Groups proved that collaboration between the U.S. and Russia could bring successful outcomes, there is a lot of room for improvement. The U.S.–Russian relationship has without a doubt been a rocky one, which is often reflected in their counterterrorism efforts. Both countries accuse one another of civil right abuses. The Russian administration portrays the U.S. as hypocritical, because of its use of targeting drones and counterterrorist actions in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere. Also, at times, Russia has been critical of the United States for not making stronger opium eradication efforts in Afghanistan.

In the more recent example, the April 15, 2013 Boston Marathon bombings presumably perpetrated by two brothers of Chechen origin, Tamerlan and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, U.S.–Russian cooperation is publicized along with its flaws. Tamerlan, the older of the two brothers, has been on Russia’s terrorist watch list since 2011. In the case of the recent attacks, Moscow shared wiretaps with the United States of Zubeidat Tsarnaeva, their mother, presumably revealing conversations about jihad and connections to another person on Russia’s suspect list in Chechnya. The Russian authorities warned Washington of the possible threat. The question is why has not the United States taken the Russian warning seriously?

\[162\] Page 12.
Members of Congress have questioned the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s decision to close a 2011 inquiry into Tamerlan Tsarnaev, who later became a suspect in the bombings. Russian intelligence agencies had told the FBI that he had become radical and asked for information about him. The Central Intelligence Agency also was provided with the information and alerted other U.S. agencies.\textsuperscript{163}

The U.S. authorities followed up by searching its databases, but no evidence of terrorist activity or suspicion was found.

The FBI searched U.S. terrorism and crime databases, conducted interviews and found nothing incriminating, and the Russians didn’t respond to requests for more information, according to U.S. officials who asked not to be identified discussing intelligence matters.\textsuperscript{164}

Representative Adam Schiff, a member of the House Intelligence Committee, comments that Moscow is “careful about disclosing sources just as our own intelligence is, and there is a lot of mutual suspicion. So, we will take Russian help as much as they’re willing to give.”\textsuperscript{165}

It is evident that while there have been areas of cooperation, Russians and Americans have a lot more to discuss and to improve areas of intelligence sharing and further communication. This example of poor collaboration leading to the Boston Bombings, exemplifies the mistrust between the two nations. The fact that Russia warned the United States about terrorists with Chechen origins could have been a reason why the United States had not taken the threat seriously. However, as the authorities are still investigating the nature of the misconnect, it is difficult to conclude exactly why the Russian warning was not enough to prevent the Boston tragedy.

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid.
Nevertheless, while some aspects of the eradication campaign have shown to have some positive influence, the overall effort has not been very successful thus far. The figures prove that reliance of farmers on cultivation is on the rise. Until Afghanistan’s economy has the ability to provide its people with alternative, stable jobs, the cultivation and production of the opium poppy are not very likely to cease. The efforts should be directed more toward investing in infrastructure and educating the people, especially the younger generations who make up almost half of the population. Such initiatives have worked thus far, improving peoples’ livelihoods. On the other hand, while providing the Afghan security forces with proper training is a significant aspect in moving the country forward, U.S., Russia and their allies need to be wary of the newly created Taliban presence in Pakistan. Efforts to reform governmental institutions, especially judicial and legal branches have been an important focus of the international community and one that should be reiterated. However, vast corruption among governmental officials has proven to be a challenge, making it hard to successfully transform institutions vital for long term peace and stability in the region. Nevertheless, Afghanistan is not the only issue that the two powers need to worry about. The threat of nuclear terrorism is a grave concern that should not be ignored, and U.S. and Russia have already taken serious steps to eliminate such possibility.
DIMINISHING THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR TERRORISM

The United States and Russia collectively hold 95% of the worlds’ nuclear weapons, hence, cooperation between the two countries is vital to implementing preventive measures and reducing the risk of nuclear terrorism.\textsuperscript{166} A number of collaborative actions have been taken toward diminishing this threat that poses foremost concerns to their national securities. After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, thinking that a nuclear threat would create new dangers as former S.U. states inherited some of the Soviet nuclear arsenal, the United States and Russia took the initiative to create the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program under the leadership of Senator Richard Lugar and Senator Sam Nunn.\textsuperscript{167} The program aimed to secure and dismantle weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their infrastructure in the former USSR regions. Even with the turn of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, Russia’s stockpile of nuclear weapons posed a great concern. The hundreds of tons of highly enriched uranium (HEU) scattered across a vast amount of land, guarded by poorly paid soldiers, worried President George Bush as terrorist organizations like al Qaeda and even terrorists in Chechnya expressed their longing for weapons of mass destruction.\textsuperscript{168} Since the two-decade long effort to work together, the United States has offered funding and expertise in helping Russia to eliminate nuclear threats and succeeded in dismantling 7,600 nuclear weapons, destroying 2, 300 missiles and securing 24 storage sites, while eliminating all nuclear
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materials and weapons in Kazakhstan, Belarus and Ukraine.¹⁶⁹ In 2003, the Nunn-Lugar Expansion Act opened the opportunity for other states, not only Russia, to participate. Nevertheless, last year, Moscow announced that it would not be renewing the program. The United States has made efforts to persuade their Russian counterparts to continue working together on this issue, because Russia, to this day, lacks adequate nuclear security. However, Moscow has long perceived U.S. assistance to be too invasive and, today, no longer needs foreign funds to secure its nation.¹⁷⁰ Despite the recent disagreements, the two nations have collaborated closely and have taken special responsibility over the last couple of decades to ensure that WMDs do not make it to the hands of terrorist organizations. However, a number of barriers prevent a far-reaching joint collaboration, including the inability to share highly valuable information due to secrecy, political disagreements and differences, bureaucratic obstacles and “the sheer difficulty of preventing a potentially small, hard-to-detect team of terrorists from acquiring a small, hard-to-detect chunk of nuclear material with which to manufacture a crude bomb.”¹⁷¹ The United States, Russia and their international partners must not allow such barriers to impede collaborative processes, because nuclear terrorism poses a grave danger not only to the U.S. and Russia, but also to the rest of world. “If current

approaches toward eliminating the threat are not replaced with a sense of urgency and resolve, the question will become not if, but when, where, and on what scale the first act of nuclear terrorism occurs.”

**How Could Terrorists Acquire Nuclear Weapons?**

The first ever U.S.-Russian Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism was published in 2011, by the Elbe Group. The report aims to evaluate the severity of a nuclear threat in today’s globalized world, and it advises a comprehensive joint strategy. The assessment explains different ways in which terrorists might acquire a nuclear weapon. While theft is a viable tactic, it would be the least likely option pursued by the terrorists. The reason is that countries in possession of such warheads implement intensely high security measures. For instance, many modern nuclear weapons are safeguarded by sophisticated electronic locks, known as ‘permissive action links’ (PALs), which make it extremely difficult for terrorists to detonate a bomb without exclusive information. Likewise, many nuclear warheads are designed to work only with very particular, intricate programs that prevent detonation, unless the weapon has gone through the expected flight to reach its target. Another option is for terrorists to attempt to retrieve the nuclear material from a stolen weapon; however, modern nuclear warheads
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don’t contain enough material that would allow a high impact, crude bomb to be assembled. Nevertheless, while theft from a highly secured facility has low probability, acquiring a bomb from states outside the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) wouldn’t be as difficult in comparison. On the contrary, the most feasible way for terrorists to obtain a weapon of mass destruction is by constructing an improvised nuclear device (IND), with materials either stolen or purchased on the black market.

Total world stockpiles of highly enriched uranium (HEU) and plutonium separated from spent fuel amount to nearly 2000 metric tons. Such weapons usable nuclear materials exist in hundreds of buildings in over 30 countries, under security conditions that range from excellent to appalling. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has documented 20 cases of theft or loss of HEU or plutonium confirmed by the states concerned, and additional cases are known to have occurred. What is not known is how many cases may have gone undetected, or how much stolen material may still be outside of state control. Theft of weapons usable nuclear material, in short, is not a hypothetical concern but an ongoing reality.

Although obtaining the necessary materials, knowledge and technology essential for assembling an IND may be difficult, especially in secret, it is not impossible, which is the reason why the United States and Russia have taken the initiative to lead the nuclear world community toward more precautionary and preventive measures.

Sabotaging a nuclear facility represents the third way for terrorists to use nuclear materials for staging an attack. “Both al Qaeda and North Caucasus terrorist groups have considered sabotage of nuclear facilities and dispersal of radioactive material in a dirty bomb,” note the authors of the joint threat assessment. Lastly,

---

177 Ibid.
179 Ibid., 20.
spreading radioactive material harmful to life over a vast area is yet another option, though, undesirable to the terrorists as death tolls would not occur immediately.

Promoting Security

One way to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism is to reduce the superfluous weapons of mass destruction and the materials used to make them, in both the United States and Russia. The two countries have made a number of efforts to pursue this goal and a number of bilateral agreements were implemented in order to assure greater security. In the U.S.–Russia Strategic Framework Declaration in 2008, the two powers announced their willingness to cooperate in order to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism.

We recognize the profound importance of preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. We must prevent such weapons from falling into the hands of terrorists and those who support them. To this end, our two countries will provide global leadership on a wide range of cooperative efforts that will advance our common nonproliferation goals. These will include new approaches focused on environmentally friendly technologies that will support economic growth, promote the expansion of nuclear energy, and create a viable alternative to the spread of sensitive nuclear fuel cycle technologies.¹⁸⁰

For instance, the U.S.-Russian Highly Enriched Uranium Purchase Agreement has asserted transparency and monitoring measures. The agreement, upon its expiration in 2013 will have successfully eliminated 500 metric tons of HEU, which is equivalent to 20,000 permanently removed WMDs from the Russian stockpile.¹⁸¹ Likewise, disposition of plutonium highlights another area of cooperation. In September 2000, Russia and the United States signed the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement (PMDA).

www.nnsa.energy.gov.
Discarding plutonium poses a difficult challenge when compared to the simple technique of HEU dissolution. One way of accomplishing this goal is shifting the use of plutonium by converting it into mixed-oxide (MOX) fuel, which can be used as an energy source. This concept of reprocessing plutonium is the centerpiece of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP), which is a “joint government/industry cost-shared effort to identify sites for new nuclear power plants, to develop and to bring to the market advanced standardized nuclear power plant designs, and to demonstrate streamlined regulatory processes” that will reduce the risk of nuclear proliferation.182

The creation of the Bilateral Presidential Commission also brought to existence the U.S.-Russia Working Group on Nuclear Energy and Nuclear Security. The unit recognizes the unique responsibility of the two nations to secure nuclear weapons and nuclear materials, which include storage and production facilities around the world.183 A number of sub-groups that fall under the Working Group’s leadership include: Nuclear Material Consolidation and Conversion, Plutonium Disposition-Combat Illicit Trafficking, International Safeguards System-Export Controls, Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism (GICNT). The panel has been successful in combining techniques, information and ideas. A recent outcome of the teamwork was a newly opened Nuclear Protective Training Center in Gorelovo, Russia. The facility is designed to train special protective personnel who are to safeguard nuclear institutions in Russia. Furthermore, the U.S.–Russia Academies of Science have been working together within the framework of the Working Group in order to explore and investigate conversion of research reactors to low enriched uranium fuel.

The Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism has also proven to be a successful component of the partnership, designed by President Bush and President Putin in 2006, today consisting of 85 nations. The initiative is a “voluntary international partnership of nations and international organizations that are committed to strengthening global capacity to prevent, detect, and respond to nuclear terrorism.”


In addition, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has also worked closely with the United States–Russia Working Group on Nuclear Energy and Nuclear Security. Russia and the United States are two of the thirty-five board members that comprise the organization. The IAEA was created in 1957, and over the course of the last fifty years, it has conducted research and given advice on nuclear energy, safety and security techniques. It delegated responsibility to its Department of Safeguards by Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which aims at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and technology around the globe. IAEA exercises its safeguard measures through a number of inspection practices of member nuclear facilities and materials. “On an average approximately 600 samples of nuclear material and over
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400 environmental swipe samples are received and analyzed by the Safeguards Analytical Laboratories each year. Nevertheless, IAEA has also implemented an action plan to combat nuclear terrorism with the turn of the 21st century. The board of directors has stressed that protection of nuclear facilities to be of outmost importance, and thus far, billions of dollars have been invested in such precautionary measures.

President Obama and President Medvedev signed the New START treaty (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) on April 8, 2010. Under the treaty conditions, the United States and Russia should reduce their nuclear missile launchers by half. There will also be a reduction of deployed strategic nuclear warheads to a limit of 1,550, a two-thirds decrease since the original START treaty in 1991. Other reductions will limit deployed missiles and bombers down to 700 and deployed and non-deployed launchers to 800.

The U.S. and Russia, as the world’s largest holders of nuclear warheads, have taken the responsibility to decrease the amount of nuclear weapons in the world and reverse their arms race actions taken during the Cold War. Today, the two nations are assuring the security of their nations by eliminating the amount of nuclear material around the globe. Although immense progress has been made through various bilateral and multilateral treaties, agreements and the creation of institutions, much more can be done. Today’s threat of terrorism is unpredictable and unstable and the proximity of Russia’s vast amount of nuclear materials to unstable states such as Afghanistan and
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Pakistan, along with the rise of Islamic extremism in Chechnya and Uzbekistan concern Washington and Moscow.

The recent writings from top al-Qaeda leadership (2003 and 2008) offer a meticulously researched religious ruling, or *fatwa*, for the use of weapons of mass destruction in the mass slaughter of civilians. It is clear that the group desires high-end WMD, whether in the form of biological weapons or of nuclear weapons capable of killing millions of people and causing mass economic damage... There are chilling similarities between the warning and planning cycle associated with the 9/11 attack, and rituals associated with al-Qaeda’s WMD statements. The timing of al-Qaeda deputy leader Ayman al-Zawahiri’s 2008 *fatwa*—which meticulously justifies an unprecedented attack on an almost unimaginable scale of destruction—may have started the clock ticking for an attack capable of fulfilling al-Zawahiri’s promise to elevate the level of violence to a new scale.  

Thus, today, more then ever, the United States and Russia need to put aside their differences and concentrate on implementing preventive measures to contain the threat of nuclear terrorism, which could cost their nations hundreds of thousands of lives. Corporal Gregory Kilcommons remarks that the U.S.–Russian close collaboration is the foundation for a nuclear safe world.

I believe a strong Russian-US relationship is vital as we move forward due to the pursuit of nuclear arms by so many nations. Unfortunately, in terms of Iran, it does not seem like we are on the same page. Cooperation on this matter, as well as North Korea, would prove extremely valuable in acting as a deterrent towards both nations’ nuclear dreams.
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**Pakistan**

Corporal Gregory Kilcommons also argues that military ostracism of the Taliban only leads to a further buildup of the Taliban forces in Pakistan. Any further radicalization of the Pakistani population poses a great threat to Pakistan, as well the rest
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of the world. Pakistan currently has the fastest growing nuclear weapon program in the
world, possessing enough fissile material to produce over a 100 warheads.\footnote{192}

By 2021, however, Pakistan is expected to double the number of weapons in its
arsenal to at least 200, surpassing the United Kingdom. Soon thereafter, analysts
say there is a good chance that Pakistan will even surpass France to become the
world’s third largest nuclear-armed state.\footnote{193}

Security conflicts and disputes with India, over Kashmir, have led the regime to an arms
race. Pakistan’s handlings of its nuclear materials are not very transparent; therefore, it is
hard to assess how diligently the country handles management and transportation of its
nuclear materials. The world leaders are very concerned that Pakistan may have, what is
commonly referred to as ‘loose nukes,’ which implies a chance of nuclear warheads or
nuclear material used to build WMDs falling into the wrong hands.\footnote{194} Osama bin Laden’s
undetected presence near a Pakistani military base makes the issue of nuclear weapon
safeguarding more worrisome. Nevertheless, Pakistan argues that its nuclear sites are
heavily guarded and that great security measures have been assumed. Some scholars
agree that not even the United States knows exactly where Pakistan’s stocks are, as
Islamabad has implemented a number of decoy sites and uses a secret underground
transportation system to transport its materials.\footnote{195} Washington has appreciated Pakistan’s
cooperation in the fight against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan, and in return it
has been known to look the other way from Pakistan’s expanding nuclear program.
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Nevertheless, as Pakistan increases its nuclear stocks, the more of a challenge it will be to protect its sites. The authors of the U.S.–Russia Joint Threat Assessment on Nuclear Terrorism remark that Umma-Tameer-E-Nau (UTN), a militant network who has been suspected of supplying al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden with information about constructing nuclear weapons, is of current concern in Pakistan. Furthermore, there have been a number of reported attempted attacks on Pakistani nuclear holdings. These incidences include an attack on a storage facility in Sargodha in November 2007, an attack on a nuclear airbase at Kamara in December 2007 and an attack on a number of Wah facility entry points, known to be one of Pakistan’s focal nuclear holdings. The possibility of Pakistani ‘loose nukes’ poses a far greater threat to the United States than Iranian possession of WMD per se. Now that the U.S. presence in Afghanistan is winding down, Washington should concern itself more with Pakistan’s rapidly growing nuclear program and lead bilateral and international efforts to encourage Pakistan to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Russia is also concerned about Taliban’s increasing presence in Pakistan and the Pakistani nuclear program. At a press conference in 2009, Ivanov voiced that Russia is very concerned with Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal and that in order for lasting peace to be achieved in Afghanistan, Pakistan needs to be stabilized. Also, in an interview with
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Bloomberg Television in Moscow, Ivanov commented on the dangers of the Pakistani-
Afghan border.

It’s obvious to anybody that the Pakistani-Afghan border is a safe haven for
terrorists, for the Taliban. They hit and run back to Pakistan. So you have to deal
with both. Both are very unstable... We obviously see that the present system of
missile non-proliferation doesn’t work. More and more countries are laying their
hands on very dangerous missile technologies.199

Nevertheless, Russo-Pakistani ties have become closer over the years. In 2006, Pakistan
became an observing member of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), which is
a Eurasian security organization, founded by the leaders of China, Kazakhstan, Russia,
Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Russia wants to tighten relations with Pakistan for several
reasons, but mostly because it is concerned with security, instability and the presence of
foreign militants from Central Asia and Chechnya. Russia has a lot to think about when it
comes to securing the CIS (Commonwealth of Independent States) borders after the
withdrawal of the U.S. and NATO troops. Considering the proximity of Pakistan’s rising
instabilities to Russia, Moscow will want to have reliable relations with Islamabad. More
so, the presence of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) in Tajikistan, Uzbekistan
and northern Afghanistan is also very concerning to Russia, because the coalition wants
to form an Islamic Central Asian caliphate and it sympathizes with violent Chechen
organizations.

The United States and Russia, while acknowledging the problematic standing of
nuclear warheads in Pakistan, have not taken any strong joint initiatives to better the
situation. This may be for the best however, considering the very different relationship
that Pakistan has with Russia and the United States. This does not mean that the two
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could not still work together to find ways to solve the issue, if not jointly, then taking individual actions.

**North Korea: Threat of Generating Nuclear Terrorism**

North Korea’s strong dislike of the United States has been long acknowledged and has remained worrisome to the U.S. ever since the end of the Korean War in the 1950s. The North Korean leader, Kim Jong-un, took power after his father, Kim Jong-Il, passed away in 2011. Since, the new president has made a number of provocative acts against the United States and its allies, especially against South Korea. The threats are not news to the South Korean and American Presidents and their allies, as the former leader had often used hostile rhetoric and bravado intimidations to obtain Western aid. The top American commander in South Korea, General James D. Thurman, reports:

The North Koreans want the international community to feed their people, fuel their factories and fill their bank accounts. If North Korea were a self-sufficient enterprise, we would have a much bigger problem on our hands.\(^\text{200}\)

However, Kim Jong-Il seemed to know better than to actually execute any serious attacks and instead, used threats as bargaining chips. It is worrisome that little is known about the new president; his short time in office hasn’t allowed the world to familiarize itself with his personality and intentions. The issue at hand is not only that North Korea possesses weapons of mass destruction and that it has the ability to produce more, but that for the first time, it is implying nuclear threats. Recently, Kim Jong-un’s torrent of warnings to use nuclear warheads on American and South Korean cities has heightened tensions. The
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Obama administration, while perceiving the warnings to be acts of bravado, has responded with precautions. It has cancelled the intercontinental ballistic missile test with South Korea, a yearly joint field exercise, in order to avoid any misunderstandings. Also in response, the U.S. and its allies have tightened the preexisting sanctions against North Korea due to its production of nuclear weapon, whilst reinforcing missile defense systems to better counter a possible attack.

Nevertheless, most worrisome is North Korea’s recent announcement, in February 2013, that its nuclear weapons are for ‘sale.’ For production of nuclear weapons only two elements are needed: highly enriched uranium and plutonium. There is evidence that North Korea is capable of manufacturing a number of such weapons annually. Moreover, the fact that it is capable of producing uranium is equally bothersome, as the substance is easier to market than plutonium, less detectable, easier to export and building bombs with uranium is less complicated. It is concerning when considering who would be interested in buying these weapons of mass destruction and who North Korea would be willing to sell them to. As the former Secretary of Defense, Robert M. Gates, noted, “[North Koreans] will sell anything they have to, to anybody who has the cash to buy it.” The acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by a terrorist organization would lead to devastating outcomes and possibly claim thousands of innocent lives. The bomb
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dropped on Hiroshima in 1945 was a rudimentary, uranium-fueled model that killed about 100,000 people.\textsuperscript{204}

While Al Qaeda’s core is greatly diminished and its resources depleted, the man who succeeded Osama bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri has been seeking nuclear weapons for more than a decade. And then there are Israel’s enemies, including wealthy individuals in some Arab countries, who might buy a bomb for the militant groups Hezbollah or Hamas... If terrorists explode a single nuclear bomb in an American city in the near future, there is a serious possibility that the core of the weapon will have come from North Korea.\textsuperscript{205}

President Obama has previously stated that nuclear terrorism is “the single biggest threat to U.S. security.”\textsuperscript{206}

Moscow’s concerns are also heightened. President Putin has thus far supported President Obama’s approach, especially when the U.S. cancelled its military training with South Korea. “I think we should all thank the U.S. leadership for this step. I hope it will be noticed by our North Korean partners, that certain conclusions will be drawn; everyone will calm down and start joint work to ease the situation,” said Putin.\textsuperscript{207} Russia is very much in favor of conflict resolution and wants to revive the ‘Six-Party Talks’ with the American, North and South Korean, Chinese and Japanese leaders. While Russia and North Korea were close allies during the Cold War, today relations have weakened. Russia would only help North Korea as far as facilitating and partaking in friendly talks and negotiations. Nevertheless, it is important to mention the lingering mistrust in U.S.–Russian relations has the capacity to paralyze the bilateral partnership and lead to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{204} Graham Allison and Douglas Dillon, “North Korea’s Lesson: Nukes for Sale.”
\textsuperscript{205} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
consequences that otherwise, could be prevented. For instance, Dr. Stephen J. Blank writes in *Arms Control and Proliferation Challenges to the Reset Policy* that Russia fears the U.S. and its allies’ exploitation of this crisis to strengthen its regional military presence – if not more than the development of nuclear weapons in North Korea.²⁰⁸,²⁰⁹

Neither will Russia or China be able to exercise any decisive restraining leverage upon North Korea. Therefore, North Korea can behave provocatively at what it believes to be a minimum or at least manageable risk. While this behavior has allowed North Korea to get nuclear weapons without paying what it considers to be an unbearable price, it also exposes its supposed “backers” to the consequences of these great risks taken in disregard of their interests and without their knowledge or acceptance of the risks for them in that behavior. Yet until now, Russian and Chinese behavior has allowed North Korea to keep on behaving in this provocative manner. As a result, North Korea has repeatedly been able to outmaneuver the other five members of the process.²¹⁰

The standing threat of North Korea will only strengthen U.S. relations with South Korea and Japan, eventually isolating Russia and her self-delegated role of mediating conflicts and maintaining peace in the region. However, Russia has also shown interest in building an oil pipeline through the Korean Peninsula, supplying both North and South Korea with energy.²¹¹ Possible disruptions of oil flow by the North, for instance, could potentially escalate tensions on the peninsula. Kim Jong-un’s new vision to sell nuclear stock should be more worrisome to Russia considering her alleged international terrorism problems in Chechnya and Chechen association to Afghanistan. If the U.S. and Russia allow poor
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communication to progress due to distrust, then the threat of terrorists acquiring nuclear materials will only increase. Another concern is that further tightening of sanctions on North Korea will only provide its leadership with a greater incentive to sell its nuclear material and weapons to other countries and non-state actors, further threatening world stability.

**CONCLUSION**

Different ideologies and perspectives have led the U.S.–Russian relationship into the Cold War and have posed a barrier to closely-knit relations. Russia’s isolation under the Mongolian empire set it further apart from the developing Western world, while creating a sense of dominance the government held over the society. This is important even in today’s politics, as the Russian outlook on the world is different from that of the majority of Western nations. Russia believes that it has an important task to provide peace and security in the world, particularly in the regions surrounding it. However, the American aims to defend democracies from the Soviet communistic, Marxist ideals have often brought instability to regions like Afghanistan. When the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979, in support of the newly created socialist government, the United States supplied the mujahedeen with resources and funds in order to counter the Soviet presence and the socialist forces. This proxy war between the two powers essentially helped uphold, what is today known as international terrorism. The terrorists who prospered from American funds, not only supported the Chechen struggle against Russia, but also had an agenda against the West, particularly the United States. Terrorist networks like al Qaeda believed America to be a power-hungry colonizing force that created chaos in the Middle East, depleted countries of their valuable resources and
created instabilities, while not caring very much for the lives of Muslims. The issue of international terrorism bedevils the securities of both Russia and the United States and has created a common goal to eradicate its threats. Afghanistan is believed to be the breading ground for terrorists, which is why most U.S.–Russian efforts have concentrated on diminishing its sources of funding and influence in Afghanistan. Afghanistan’s vast production of opium and heroin impact the livelihood of Russia’s population and therefore, provide yet another incentive for Russia’s involvement in the region. The U.S. finds the drug issue to be equally as important to fight terrorism. Thus, U.S.–Russian interests very much overlap, which is why the two powers have decided to tackle the issue together. The American presence in Afghanistan, while not welcomed by Moscow, helps Russia reach its goal of diminishing the influence of narcotics and the further spread of extremism throughout the region that could find its way to Chechnya and to Russian borders through other terrorist networks in the region, like IMU.

Russia and the Unites States initiated cooperation mostly after the 9/11 attacks on the United States, when terrorism became America’s foremost security issue. Before that period, Russia often used the notion of international terrorism to justify its brutal actions in Chechnya during the 1990s, arguing that jihadists like Ibn-al Khattab made their way to Russia, radicalized Chechens and inflicted terrorist attacks on Russia. The West very much perceived Chechnya as an internal conflict initiated by a separatists group of people fighting for independence, rather than a concern of international terrorism, all the while criticizing Russia’s human rights violations in the region. Nevertheless, after 9/11, the U.S., while still disagreeing with Russia on Chechnya, made an effort to reduce the amount of criticism and aimed to increase cooperation. Putin and Clinton took the first
steps toward closer relations even before 9/11; however, the attacks expanded this cooperation and took a wider range of matters into consideration, such as the possibility of nuclear terrorism. Nonetheless, a number of events between 2002-2008 prevented progress toward warmer ties, until the reset of relations under President Obama and President Medvedev that led to the creation of the U.S.–Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission, which stabilized the relationship and allowed for a closer partnership. The Commission allowed the two countries to work together on a wide-range of matters, including counterterrorism and counternarcotics, two areas that became intertwined issues in Afghanistan. Under the Bilateral Presidential Commission, the U.S.–Russia collaboration reached unprecedented levels. The Center for Strategic and International Studies held a conference in 2010, where Russia's Special Presidential Counterterrorism Representative, Anatoly Safonov and the State Department's former Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Daniel Benjamin shared their opinions about the new cooperative efforts in countering terrorism. Stefano quotes a three-star American general:

I am sitting here and I am pinching myself on the ear, I cannot believe that I am present at this meeting. I am an expert on Russia and the Soviet Union and I know your aces and your resources, but never, I never even in the worst nightmares could imagine that I was going to be sitting in Moscow and that Russian generals would be reporting to me on military matters and Afghanistan and that they would be sharing this kind of information with me, each time I am asking myself if it is real or if it is not.  

For the first time, the two powers carried out a joint military operation in Afghanistan, shared intelligence on a frequent basis and worked together bilaterally and multilaterally to diminish a common threat. Their accomplishments in Afghanistan have mixed results.
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The country is still the largest producer of heroin in the world, the population is still living in poverty and issues of corruption are still widespread. That is not to say that things have not improved. The investments in infrastructure, security force training and education have had visible impacts. Corporal Gregory Kilcommons argues that American, NATO, and Russian efforts have not been very successful because poppy cultivation is a great incentive to earn money and since international forces like ISAF have put Afghanistan in a position for a great security vacuum to occur as the Taliban is likely make its way back from Pakistan into Afghanistan through their very porous borders. The economic hardships fuel corruption, and therefore, any reforms made to the governmental system, most importantly to the judicial branch, are not very likely to succeed. In conclusion the U.S. and Russia have not been very successful eradicating narcotics, nor have they made any lasting improvements in government reform. However, they have trained about 300,000 ANSF and ALP forces, whose capacities will be put to a real test once international personnel is no longer there to provide assistance. Corporal Kilcommons also points out that “another important aspect to note is the importance and popularity of drugs in Afghan culture. I sincerely wish I were joking when I said that 75% of the Afghan soldiers I met or worked with were high on one drug or another. With drugs so rampant within the force that is supposed to help eradicate them, how is any progress supposed to be made?” Kilcommons makes an excellent argument, which is the reason why it not very likely that Afghanistan will succeed in its efforts to eradicate drugs or to protect its nation from the Taliban’s influence within or outside its borders.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that the U.S. and Russia have made significant progress in installing precautionary measures and protecting nuclear stocks
from terrorists’ acquisition. The two powers have taken serious responsibility to eliminate 
the dangers of nuclear terrorism and that is an area of cooperation that has been 
successful. However, while the relationship after the “reset” improved, there are still 
barriers that stand in the way of full cooperation. The remains of the Cold War mistrust 
still linger and sometimes prevent full cooperation. While they need each other to better 
counter terrorism, and while sharing intelligence seems to have been a valuable aspect of 
the relationship, the U.S. and Russia are two powerful nations competing on the world 
stage. Russians have perceived the NATO enlargement as a security threat. Russia does 
not like having the United States in its backyard and would rather have the Collective 
Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) be the primary means of stabilizing the region. 
Though it is understandable that a simple reset button, symbolizing the ‘reset’ of U.S-
Russia relations, that former U.S. Secretary of State Hilary Clinton presented the Foreign 
Minister Sergey Lavrov with in Geneva, cannot erase decades of suspicion, the two 
powers need to continue building trust. With more certainty, the two could increase 
cooperation and would be more successful in preventing terrorism and providing security 
for their nations. However, closer cooperation is not very likely in the near future. The 
two nations are most likely to continue working together under the Bilateral Presidential 
Commission, maintaining diplomatic ties, but will likely continue to be wary of each 
other’s intentions and actions.
Addendum

Iran

In the aftermath of September 11, U.S.-Iranian relations seemed to have been warming up as Secretary of State, Colin Powell, shook hands with the Iranian foreign minister, Kamal Kharrazi, at the U.N. headquarters in New York City. This was the friendliest the two countries have been since the 1979-1981-hostage-crisis of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. However in 2002, in the State of the Union Address, President George Bush grouped Iran with "an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world."\textsuperscript{213} Later that month, Condoleezza Rice, the U.S. National Security Adviser, remarked that "Iran's direct support of regional and global terrorism and its aggressive efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction, belie any good intentions it displayed in the days after the world's worst terrorist attacks in history."\textsuperscript{214} It still remains unclear why the U.S.-Iranian relations took such a sharp turn, however, some would argue that President Bush’s announcement, that you are either with us or against us on the War on Terror, could explain the situation. Iran is believed to have supported the insurgency in Afghanistan by supplying food, clothing, funds and even personnel, in order to challenge the government installed through the Bonn agreements.\textsuperscript{215} It also has been known to support the terrorist organization, Hezbollah, in Lebanon, whose statements imply that its sole purpose is to annihilate Israel, and the U.S. also delegates responsibility to Hezbollah for attacks on the U.S. Embassy in 1983. Iranian supply of funds, weapons and even training to Hezbollah troops created tensions with the West. The U.S. Department of

\textsuperscript{213} BPS, “How Iran Entered the ‘Axis.’”
www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/tehran/axis/map.html
\textsuperscript{214} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{215} Ibid.
State estimated, in its 2010 report, that Iran provides Hezbollah with roughly $100 to $200 million dollars a year.\textsuperscript{216} Hamas is believed to be yet another group sponsored by Iran and al Qaeda member have also been known to flee to Iran, where they are believed to have found and established sanctuaries.

Iran has been seeking to develop weapons of mass destruction for decades and previously argued that its nuclear plants are to be used for peaceful nuclear-energy purposes. A former CIA Director, James Woolsey, notes in response: “there is no underlying [reason] for one of the greatest oil producers in the world to need to get into the nuclear [energy] business.”\textsuperscript{217} Also in 2001, Russia and Iran signed an $800 million dollar worth contract that would allow the partnership to build one of its largest plants at Bushehr, which would be monitored by the IAEA.

Nevertheless, Iran is believed to have other clandestine nuclear sites that are under strict military control. Recently, a number of these hidden reactors, used for producing HEU, have been discovered. The IAEA noted a number of times that it does not believe Iranian nuclear centrifuges are aimed for its energy program. In the recent 2013 report, the IAEA remarks that there are a number of different indicators that Iran might have WMD building intentions.

While the Agency continues to verify the non-diversion of declared nuclear material at the nuclear facilities and LOFs declared by Iran under its Safeguards Agreement, as Iran is not providing the necessary cooperation, including by not implementing its Additional Protocol, the Agency is unable to provide credible assurance about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran, and therefore to conclude that all nuclear material in Iran is in peaceful activities. [Furthermore,] It is a matter of concern that the extensive and significant activities which have taken place since February 2012


\textsuperscript{217} Ibid.
at the location within the Parchin site to which the Agency has repeatedly requested access will have seriously undermined the Agency’s ability to undertake effective verification. The Agency reiterates its request that Iran, without further delay, provide both access to that location and substantive answers to the Agency’s detailed questions regarding the Parchin site and the foreign expert.218

The international community has taken the threat of Iranian development of nuclear weapons seriously, for instance, the U.S. has held sanctions against Iran for many years. Recently the U.S. passed National Defense Authorization Acts of 2012 and 2013, “which placed sanctions on the Central Bank of Iran and foreign institutions doing business with the Central Bank of Iran. Those sanctions targeted major buyers of Iranian oil, forcing them to significantly reduce the amounts of oil they buy from Iran and to start paying for oil with goods instead of cash.”219

On the other hand, Russia believes that Iran has a right to develop a peaceful nuclear energy program and opposes any unilateral sanctions against the country, because it finds any such actions to be counterproductive, instead she is very much in favor of negotiations and talks with the Big Six on the issue.220 Russia has been less trustworthy of Iran, and despite her efforts to train thousands of scientists at the Bushehr plant, she has little to do with the recent Iranian development of HEU.

It is also important to bear in mind that the recent talks with North Korea could impact the situation in Iran. Valerie Lincy, executive director of the Wisconsin Project on

Nuclear Arms Control, a Washington-based research and advocacy group, noted in an interview, “I would imagine the lessons they’re drawing are not the ones the Western powers would like: That you can weather sanctions, and renege on previous agreements, and ultimately if you stand fast, you’ll get what you’re looking for.”\(^{221}\) Iran poses a major terrorist threat and every effort should be taken to contain the situation, especially by the United States and Russia, despite their opposing views on sanctions.
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### Designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Designated</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Abu Nidal Organization (ANO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Aum Shinrikyo (AUM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Gama’a al-Islamiyya (Islamic Group) (IG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>HAMAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Harakat ul-Mujahidin (HUM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Hizballah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Kahane Chai (Kach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) (Kongra-Gel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>National Liberation Army (ELN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Palestine Liberation Front (PLF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>PFLP-General Command (PFLP-GC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Revolutionary Organization 17 November (17N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Revolutionary People’s Liberation Party/Front (DHKP/C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1997</td>
<td>Shining Path (SL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/1999</td>
<td>al-Qa’ida (AQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2000</td>
<td>Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16/2001</td>
<td>Real Irish Republican Army (RIRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2001</td>
<td>United Self Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/26/2001</td>
<td>Jaish-e-Mohammed (JEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/26/2001</td>
<td>Lashkar-e Tayyiba (LeT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/2002</td>
<td>Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade (AAMB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/2002</td>
<td>Asbat al-Ansar (AAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/2002</td>
<td>al-Qa‘ida in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2002</td>
<td>Communist Party of the Philippines/New People's Army (CPP/NPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/2002</td>
<td>Jemaah Islamiya (JI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/2003</td>
<td>Lashkar i Jhangvi (LJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/2004</td>
<td>Ansar al-Islam (AAI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13/2004</td>
<td>Continuity Irish Republican Army (CIRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2004</td>
<td>Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2004</td>
<td>al-Qa‘ida in Iraq (AQI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2005</td>
<td>Islamic Jihad Union (IJU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2005</td>
<td>Moroccan Islamic Combatant Group (GICM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5/2008</td>
<td>Harakat ul-Jihad-i-Islami/Bangladesh (HUJI-B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/2008</td>
<td>al-Shabaab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18/2009</td>
<td>Revolutionary Struggle (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/2009</td>
<td>Kata'ib Hizballah (KH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19/2010</td>
<td>al-Qa‘ida in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/6/2010</td>
<td>Harakat ul-Jihad-i-Islami (HUJI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2010</td>
<td>Tehrik-e Taliban Pakistan (TTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/2010</td>
<td>Jundallah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23/2011</td>
<td>Army of Islam (AOI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2011</td>
<td>Indian Mujahedeen (IM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/2012</td>
<td>Jemaah Anshorut Tauhid (JAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30/2012</td>
<td>Abdallah Azzam Brigades (AAB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2012</td>
<td>Haqqani Network (HQN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/2013</td>
<td>Ansar al-Dine (AAD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Federation of Russia List of International Terrorist Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Supreme Military Majlis Shura of the United Forces of Caucasian Mujahideen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Congress of the Peoples of Ichkeria and Dagestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Base (&quot;Al-Qaeda&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Asbat al-Ansar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Holy War (&quot;Al-Jihad&quot; or &quot;Egyptian Islamic Jihad&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Islamic Group (&quot;Al-Gama'a al-Islamiya&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Muslim Brotherhood (&quot;Al-Ikhwan al-Muslimun&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Islamic Liberation Party (&quot;Hizb ut-Tahrir al-Islami&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Lashkar-e-Taiba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Islamic Group (&quot;Jamaat-e-Islami&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Taliban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Turkistan Islamic Party (formerly &quot;The Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>Social Reform Society (&quot;Jamiat al-Islah al-Ijtimai&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>RRevival of Islamic Heritage Society (&quot;Jamiat Ihyat al-Turaz al-Islami&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2003</td>
<td>House of the Two Holy (&quot;Al-Haramain&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/02/2006</td>
<td>Jund al-Sham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/02/2006</td>
<td>Islamic Jihad - Jamaat Mujahideen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2008</td>
<td>Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (former name - &quot;the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2008</td>
<td>Caucasus Emirate (&quot;Caucasus Emirate&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Решением Верховного Суда Российской Федерации от 14 февраля 2003 года признаны террористическими и запрещена деятельность на территории Российской Федерации следующих организаций:

1. «Высший военный Маджлисъуль Шура Объединенных сил моджахедов Кавказа»,
2. «Конгресс народов Ичкерии и Дагестана»,
3. «База» («Аль-Каида»),
4. «Асbat аль-Ансар»,
5. «Священная война» («Аль-Джихад» или «Египетский исламский джихад»),
6. «Исламская группа» («Аль-Гамаа аль-Исламиа»),
7. «Братья-мусульмане» («Аль-Ихван аль-Муслимун»),
8. «Партия исламского освобождения» («Хизб ут-Тахрир аль-Ислами»),
9. «Лашкар-И-Тайба»,
10. «Исламская группа» («Джамаат аль-Ислами»),
11. «Движение Талибан»,
12. «Исламская партия Туркестана» (бывшее «Исламское движение Узбекистана»),
13. «Общество социальных реформ» («Джамият аль-Ислах аль-Иджтимани»),
14. «Общество возрождения исламского наследия» («Джамият Ихья ат-Тураз аль-Ислами»),
15. «Дом двух святых» («Аль-Харамеин»)

Решением Верховного Суда Российской Федерации от 2 июня 2006 года признаны террористическими и запрещена деятельность на территории Российской Федерации следующих организаций:
16. «Джунд аш-Шам»
17. «Исламский джихад - Джамаат моджахедов»

Решением Верховного Суда Российской Федерации от 13 ноября 2008 года признаны террористическими и запрещена деятельность на территории Российской Федерации следующих организаций:
18. «Аль-Каида в странах исламского Магриба» (прежнее название - «Салафистская группа проповеди и джихада»)

Решением Верховного Суда Российской Федерации от 08 февраля 2010 года признана террористической и запрещена деятельность на территории Российской Федерации международной организации:
19. «Имарат Кавказ» («Кавказский Эмират»).

223 “Единый федеральный список организаций, признанных террористическими Верховным Судом Российской Федерации” (Single federal list of organizations recognized as terrorist by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation).
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