

Title: Political violence in the North Caucasus: a political sociology approach

Shortened version of the title: Political violence in North Caucasus

Aurélie Campana
Université Laval
Department of political science
Pavillon De Koninck
1030 avenue des sciences humaines - local 4423
Québec (Québec)
G1V 0A6
Canada
Tel: 418 656-2131, #3771
Email: aurelie.campana@pol.ulaval.ca

Jean-François Ratelle
School of political studies, University of Ottawa
Email: jrate066@uottawa.ca

Key words: Russia, North Caucasus, Chechnya, microdynamics of political violence, field of political violence.

Aurélie Campana is assistant professor in political science at Laval University, Québec, and the holder the Canada Research Chair on identity-based conflicts and terrorism.

Jean-François Ratelle is a PhD candidate in political science at the University of Ottawa, Canada. His PhD dissertation examines political violence and (in)security in the North Caucasus.

9,080 words, endnotes included

Title: Political violence in the North Caucasus: a political sociology approach

Abstract

This paper seeks to foster a better comprehension of the mounting violence in the North Caucasus region. Building on French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's concept of field, the article presents a theoretical framework that focuses primarily on the social actors and their interactions. After discussing the micropolitical turn in the study of social violence, it offers a definition of the concept of "field of political violence" and demonstrates its analytical utility for the study the interactions between social actors' practices and preferences. The proposed framework deconstructs reified actors and focuses on their dynamic relationships, including their social, cultural, economic and political aspects.

Draft—Comments Welcome
Do not quote or circulate without permission

Political violence in North Caucasus: a political sociology approach

On March 29, 2010 two suicide-attacks carried out by the so-called Black Widows hit Moscow subway, reawakening the fear of a new cycle of terrorism in the Russian capital. These acts also drew a new attention to the North Caucasus¹ region that has been engulfed by several violent conflicts since the break-up of the Soviet Union. Indeed, experts concluded that violence escalated in the region throughout 2009 and during spring 2010 compared to 2008 levels.² Moreover, the violence that has been for the most part confined to Chechnya has spilled over into the neighbouring Republics, especially in Dagestan and Ingushetia.

This paper seeks to foster a better understanding of this upsurge of violence on the regional scale. We argue that the violence in the region is a product of multiple microdynamics involving various state and non-state actors. For the purpose of this study, we broadly define political violence as “the commission of violent acts motivated by a desire, conscious or unconscious, to obtain or maintain political power”.³ The themes of the two Russo-Chechen wars (1994-1996 and 1999-) is the predominant focus of the literature on the region.⁴ Several studies approach the subject matter of violence in the neighbouring Republics with authors exposing the impacts of the two Russo-Chechen wars at the regional level.⁵ Nonetheless, most scholars examine the increasing violence in the republics on a case by case basis. They interpret the bloodshed as a manifestation of the endemic political and socio-economic crisis. Indiscriminate acts of violence against civilians⁶ and the exportation of military tactics heavily used in Chechnya (death squads, forced disappearances, torture and extrajudicial killings) are seen as one of the major causes of violence in the region.⁷ Meanwhile, the widespread corruption of the local authorities and their authoritarianism are interpreted as situational factors. This political context explains the growing

disconnection between the elites loyal to Moscow and the population, as well as the reasons why some groups turn to alternative sources of power, including insurgent and/or Islamist groups.⁸

This scholarship offers insights into the escalation of violence in the context of one or two Republics of the region. It also draws attention to specific evolutions, such as the growing Islamization. However, none formulates a theoretical articulation of the roles of various actors involved in the diverse manifestations of violence observed in the region. This paper aims to fill this gap in the literature by proposing an interpretive framework focused on the actors and their interactions. As such, this work does not seek to present the results of an empirical research, although we have both conducted empirical research on the region. The purpose of this article is primarily conceptual. Moreover, we place our analytical focus on political violence and not on the causes of the multiple conflicts, which have set the region ablaze. Our main objective is to contribute to the theoretical debates on the microdynamics of violence, by crossing-referencing the literature on political violence, contention and international political sociology. In addition, in basing our reflections on the North Caucasus case study, we also intend to advance the comprehension of the mounting violence in this region.

The paper is divided into four sections. In the first one, we discuss the two main approaches that form the starting points of our theoretical argument: the literature on the microdynamics of war and critical security studies in international political sociology. We then introduce the concept of 'field of political violence'. Building on Bourdieu's theory, we define the concept and demonstrate its analytical utility in the analysis of social actors' practices and preferences. In the third section, we engage in a discussion of the strategic aspects of the use of violence and its influence on the evolving field's structure. Finally, we revisit the main explanations proposed by the literature on the escalation of violence in North Caucasus and illustrate how the concept of

'field of political violence' may be used to better comprehend to upsurge of violence in the region and what are its theoretical implications.

Political violence and micro-dynamics in internal armed conflicts⁹

Stathis Kalyvas, in a chapter of the book entitled *Order, Conflict and Violence*, proposes a research program that puts the emphasis on the microdynamics of civil war.¹⁰ The proponents of this approach insist that “[internal] wars are not binary conflicts but complex and ambiguous processes that foster an apparently massive, though variable, mix of identities and actions.” Kalyvas also notes that “actions ‘on the ground’ seem more related to local or private issues than to the war’s driving (“master”) cleavage. Individual and local actors take advantage of the war to settle local or private conflicts often bearing little or no relation to the causes of the war.”¹¹ In a similar perspective, several authors argue about the privatization of violence and explain that violent actions are influenced by individual motivations or local factors.¹² Instead of focusing on high politics, top-down analysis and fixed identities, the studies of microdynamics of conflict propose to disaggregate reified labels and actors in internal wars and to look deeper into the structural causes of violence. This leads us to address questions such as: “how victims are selected, why atrocities occur, and how personal revenge intersects with group goals,”¹³ and to concentrate on the roles of local traditions, specific leaders, social, historical or political contexts to explain the episodes of political violence. These dimensions intersect with the master conflict, especially when violence exacerbates the existing fragmentation and creates new dividing lines.¹⁴

Recently, scholars have demonstrated a growing interest in the micro level of analysis. As a result, the scholarship on microdynamics of political violence has grown significantly in the last

few years with studies being published on genocide,¹⁵ insurgency and counter-insurgency,¹⁶ civil war,¹⁷ ethnic violence,¹⁸ contentious politics and violence¹⁹ etc. These analyses cover various issues such as collective action problem,²⁰ violence against civilians,²¹ the use of indiscriminate violence,²² demobilization,²³ individual motivations and emotions, which drive violent behaviour.²⁴ Charles King has coined this approach the “micropolitical turn” in the study of social violence.²⁵ He delineates four characteristics that emerge from this new research program: “a stress on engaging violence at analytical levels far below the nation-state; an attentiveness to how discrete episodes of violence are defined; a scepticism about the utility of labels applied to conflicts from the outside; and a commitment to finding ways of incorporating the voices of participants into the analysis.”²⁶

One can identify two major problems in the literature about microdynamics of political violence. First, many authors examine only one actor (incumbents or insurgents) and do not study their interactions.²⁷ The second problem is related to one postulate most authors seem to share: they tend to disaggregate the insurgent category. In so doing, they keep reifying the incumbents –i.e. the state actors. We argue that the incumbents do not in any way represent a homogenous actor. As in the case of the insurgents, the incumbents’ category is composed of collective and individual actors representing the state. International political sociology and the Paris school offer conceptual tools to deal with these problems. First, the Paris school invites us to deconstruct the category of incumbents; secondly it introduces the concept of field to better map out the interactions between the collective and individual state actors that form this category.

Critical security studies in international political sociology, particularly those conducted by the Paris school scholars²⁸, have analyzed the various competitive interactions and struggles

between state security agencies throughout the implementation process of political decisions from governmental structures. They have primarily focused on what Didier Bigo calls the “field of (in)security professionals or more generally of the management of the unease.”²⁹ “Th[is] “field” is determined by the struggles between police, intermediaries and military agencies about the boundaries and definition of the term “security” and the prioritization of the different threats³⁰.” These security agencies have different interests that are often heterogeneous, leading to a competition for state resources and capital. We posit that it is necessary to analyse the state as a configuration of agencies that possess knowledge—in the Foucauldian sense of the term—as well as repertoire of practices and various interests and capacities. Consequently, each of the security agencies in question should be analysed as an autonomous actor. This study in particular centers its analysis on the strategic interactions between each group, thereby diverging from Bigo who focuses on the effects resulting from competition between agencies and their conflicting interests.

Drawing on the ‘microdynamics of civil war’ approach and the findings of the Paris school scholars, we emphasize the need to consider both collective and individual actors; to disaggregate both the insurgent and incumbent categories in an internal war; to develop a relational approach to better comprehend the microdynamics of internal war and the perpetuation of violence. In order to further analyze the strategic interactions in the North Caucasus, we build on the theory of “field of political violence”, a conceptual construction based on Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of field.

The concept of « field of political violence »

The concept of field is central to Pierre Bourdieu's sociology.³¹ As Bourdieu put it, "in analytical terms, a field can be defined as a network or configuration of objective relations between different positions."³² Each actor's positioning in the field is determined by his/her *habitus* and ability to develop his/her capital. The *habitus* is a set of dispositions and functions like a "matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions".³³ It is both a "structuring and a structured structure"³⁴ that evolved over times. Actor's behaviour and practices are therefore structurally adapted. The notion of capital refers to "the real as well as potential resources linked to a durable network of relationships".³⁵ Social actor's continuous socialisation and dispositions have an influence on the evolution of its capital. In Bourdieu's perspective, a field is both a "configuration of forces and as a site of struggle."³⁶ As such, this concept opens the black box of the mechanisms of domination and competition and allows us to theorize the dynamic positioning of actors based on the micro-logics of dependence or distinction and distribution of resources, as well as material and symbolic capital.

Although widely used, the concept of field has never been, to our knowledge, applied to research in political violence. It has to be emphasized that Bourdieu considers violence to be primarily symbolic. While it is not the purpose of this section to discuss this notion at length,³⁷ we are obliged to briefly define the concept for the sake of clarity. The notion of symbolic violence refers to the interiorisation of patterns of domination by social actors. According to Bourdieu, symbolic violence determines social interactions for it unconsciously influences the choices made by the actors in a society. Although we establish a clear distinction between symbolic and physical violence, we argue that the field of political violence often witnesses

interplay between both. While physical violence is, by definition, more coercive than the symbolic kind, the latter could also influence the preferences of an individual.

In the “field of political violence” both the different collective actors who interact in internal wars and the individual actors that composed those groups have been included. These collective actors are but not limited to the government forces (security agencies, local militias and paramilitary groups), insurgent groups, and among them, those who resort to terrorism and/or engage in criminal activities (trafficking of all kinds, kidnapping ...). In the field, violence structures interactions and defines the rules of the game, which codify and regulate social agents’ practices. Considering the structuring role of violence shifts the angle of analysis from the causes of violence to how it constrains actor practices. As a result, an analysis of the formal as well as informal rules of the game that exist within the field is necessary to better understand the actors’ positioning and preferences.

We distinguish four main ideal-typical categories of violence that although drawn from the North Caucasus case can be applied to other internal war contexts. The first one is related to insurgency strategies and tactics, including terrorism regardless the nature of the group (revolutionary, separatist, Islamist etc.). Although the authors consider terrorism to be a specific type of violence, for the purpose of this study the broad definition given by Todd Sander of terrorism as “the premeditated use, or threat of use, of extra-normal violence or force to gain a political objective through intimidation or fear”³⁸ is used. Terrorism could be a discriminate or indiscriminate strategy, and is often coupled with guerrilla warfare.³⁹ The second category of violence refers to state violence. It is defined both as violence produced by state security agencies in their fight against insurgents and violence in which security agencies’ personnel are involved. Violence linked to criminal activities (economically motivated assassinations; extortion;

kidnappings, looting etc.), which can be the product of state and non-state actors makes up the third category. Finally, the fourth category treats violence associated with social norms, like vendetta. This practice is still widespread in many fragmented societies, like the ones in North Caucasus, Central Asia, and Africa.

The field of political violence is a configuration of collective and individual actors engaged in these four spheres of violence. As Bourdieu put it, there is ‘no a priori answer’ when it comes to delimiting the field.⁴⁰ Each field exists when the game in which the various actors are engaged has impacts on the actors themselves and on the field.⁴¹ The use of violence embodies a constant ‘innovation’⁴² that entails a parallel evolution of the repertoire of actions and properties of the field. As Nick Crossley explained it, innovations can bring changes in field structures and create new ones.⁴³ The concept of repertoire of actions, borrowed from Charles Tilly, can be tied to Bourdieu’s sociology as Tilly and Sidney Tarrow identify two factors that force the repertoires to evolve: turning points in the conflict and gradual changes that affect the structure of the field.⁴⁴ Likewise, the evolution of the repertoires of action may result from improvised adjustment and struggles between social actors.⁴⁵ The above attribute of the field concept raises the question of the strategic use of violence.

Group boundaries, interests and structuring the ‘field of political violence’

Collective and individual actors involved in the game bear competing interests and ideas. Bourdieu assumes that interests, a notion that he terms ‘illusio’, are first and foremost historical constructions. Each field is characterized by one specific interest that makes the stakes of the

game valuable for the competing actors.⁴⁶ Since the field of political violence can be described as a “fragmented field”⁴⁷ due to the absence of real dominant groups or factions, violence constantly redefines patterns of domination and exacerbates the struggle between actors. At the same time, physical and symbolic struggles stimulate interests to evolve from those centred on strict survival to the ones aimed at acquiring a better position in the field and/or to accumulating additional symbolic and material resources.

Political entrepreneurs and collective actors put forward different strategies to achieve their goals inside the field. We identify three ideal-types of strategic interactions: contention, competition/outbidding and brokerage. Contention includes a wide range of contests, from institutionalized political struggle to violent conflicts.⁴⁸ As we analyse strategic interactions within the ‘field of political violence,’ we only consider violent forms of contention. Groups may, nonetheless, use both non-violent and violent repertoires of actions simultaneously. Violent forms of contention are more often than not politically motivated. Disenchanted groups of actors mostly oppose the central and local regimes in place. While some develop separatist claims, like during the Chechen wars, others put forward territorial demands: the Ingush claim for the return of the Prigorodny District given in 1944 to the North Ossetia, a conflict that transformed into a violent war in 1992.⁴⁹ Ethnic contention may also occur within a subnational unit, as exemplified by the longstanding conflict between two ethnic groups in Dagestan, the Laks and the Chechen-Akkins.⁵⁰ Another form of power struggle has been taking place in the North Caucasus since the early 1990: conflicts that have brought the proponents of an ‘official’ Islam backed by local authorities face to face with adherents of a more radical vision of Islam (mainly Salafism).

Competition and outbidding between groups belonging to the same faction are strong factors explaining the resort to violence.⁵¹ The principal objective of this strategy is to acquire a

dominant position amongst the actors belonging to a same faction. Chechen President Ramzan Kadyrov progressively eliminated his closest political rivals, the Yamadayev brothers who began collaborating with the Kremlin before the Kadyrov clan. They were supported by the Ministry of Defence that permitted the brothers to act as strong counter-power to Kadyrov in Chechnya. The latter eventually decided to use violence (assassinations in Moscow and in Dubai) to silence them.⁵² Assassinations are not limited to members of other pro-Russian militias but also target various political opponents such as (former) insurgents or Kadyrov's close collaborators (Umar Israilov). The insurgent groups are also torn apart by many divisions which fuel the conflict. Furthermore, competition could be economically or criminally-driven. At the ground level, violence and criminal endeavours could be the result of the general breakdown in army discipline, common thuggery,⁵³ or economic incentives driving such behaviour.⁵⁴ Many authors have demonstrated that internal wars are used by thugs and criminals as a cover-up for criminal activities, which are often instrumentalized by opportunist politicians and political entrepreneurs.⁵⁵ Indeed, the difference between politically-motivated insurgents and economically-driven thugs is increasingly difficult to discern as both groups often intersect.

The pursuit of intermediary interests may result in contracting punctual alliances with other groups —brokerage. The more these groups share common properties and interests the more they are inclined to work together. This collaboration may span from sharing information and resources to organizing joint military operations. But we also observe *a priori* non-natural alliances between usually opposing groups. In order to nurture strategies of contention or concurrence, some groups or individuals representing a security agency may strike a very temporary deal with an insurgent group to achieve limited immediate goals. This behaviour would signify that expected short-run gains outweighed the long-run costs, in a context where

private interests supersede public ones. The North Caucasus case provides a wide range of examples of such strategies of brokerage. For instance, in August 2004, two high-ranking officers of the Chechen police were accused of selling weapons as well as explosives to Chechen insurgents. One member of the *Kadyrovtsy* has been accused of participating in a terrorist attack, and of facilitating the access of militant organizations to weapons, explosives and information.⁵⁶ Mark Kramer adds that more than 20 members from the local Chechen police were accused of having supported or encouraged the insurgent attacks against the MVD and the army in June of 2004.⁵⁷ Events such as the terrorist attacks that took place against Akhmad Kadyrov and in Beslan school hostage crisis in 2004 have exposed corruption problems within North Caucasian pro-Russian forces as well as among Russian security agencies such as OMON.⁵⁸

By putting forward a variety of strategies to achieve their goals within the field, collective actors also restructure and perform their group identity and its boundaries. It can be viewed as the result of the extreme fragmentation of the field and the nature of interactions, based on violence. Relationships between actors are non linear, varying in scope and in intensity. Rogers Brubaker, who relies on Bourdieu's sociology to analyse the performative nature of group building, attests that interests have to be disaggregated to better isolate the objectives pursued by actors.⁵⁹ Leaders and their followers may therefore have divergent interests and not share the same rationale for participating in a given conflict.⁶⁰ Although Brubaker analyses primarily the role of political entrepreneurs in crystallising group boundaries, while we consider both collective and individual actors, his argument elucidates the ways in which actors transform categories to suit their short-term and long-term strategies.

Once again, the conflicts ravaging the North Caucasus region offer a good example of shifting group boundaries in a context where individual interests and identities prevail. The initial years of the Second Chechen war highlighted the porosity of group boundaries when the Russian government offered amnesty for Chechen warlords in return for collaboration with the Russian forces against the insurgents. The process of Chechenization of the conflict provides another example of how groups' boundaries evolve as a result of strategic interactions between groups. The case of Akhmad Kadyrov, who had declared jihad against Russian forces in 1995 during the First Chechen war, illustrates well the effectiveness of Kremlin's policy of defection. When Kadyrov and his clan agreed to join Russian forces after fighting Salafist groups during the interwar period and Putin appointed him as the head of the Chechen administration in July 2000, the principle of granting an amnesty to those people who had not committed serious crimes has become extremely blurred. It has been widely acknowledged that among the *Kadyrovtsy* a significant number of *boyeviki* took part in activities with the infamous Chechen rebel Shamil Basayev such as the raid of Budennovsk hospital in June 1995.⁶¹ The former president of the Chechen Republic, Alu Alkhanov, was quoted as saying that "7,000 former *boyeviki* made up almost half of the forces of law and order in Chechnya".⁶² As a result, we argue that violent interactions play a critical role in activating and deactivating group boundaries and connections between actors.⁶³ Political entrepreneurs often use violent interactions strategically to engage with other groups and take advantage of the fragility of group boundaries. As such, these strategies deepen the fragmentation within the field. Returning to North Caucasus case-study, we hope to showcase another perspective on the upsurge of violence in this region based on the concept of field of political violence.

Violence in North Caucasus: the Chechen spill-over thesis revisited

The North Caucasus is a region characterized by ethnic, linguistic, religious diversity and strong politico-economic disparities. We contend that the upsurge of violence in the last few years follows similar patterns despite the variations in the political dynamics among the Republics. The following argument also holds regardless of the high level of fragmentation that characterizes the ‘field of political violence.’ It is made up of three different sub-fields: the first one is made up of state actors including the Russian armed forces and the local militias affiliated with the state; the second sub-field encompasses insurgent groups be they founded on nationalist, territorial, or religious grievances; the third one is composed of actors involved in criminal activities. The boundaries between each sub-field are highly permeable and, depending on their capital, actors can easily move from one sub-field to another. This multi-positioning might induce tensions in actors’ *habitus* by the need to establish themselves in two sub-fields simultaneously. We identify three main ideal-typical dynamics that structure the field of political violence in the North Caucasus: strategic positioning, routine and conversion of capital. Before exploring each of these dynamics any further, we need to explain how political games have evolved in the North Caucasus after Vladimir Putin’s ascent to power.

The field of political violence in the North Caucasus: a multidimensional game

During the 1990s, the federal government acted as hub for regional negotiations and not as a center of power.⁶⁴ Violent clashes were controlled or defused through negotiations without ever addressing the causes of the conflicts. The local authorities managed to maintain stability within each Republic. However, Putin’s reforms that aimed to recentralize federal power, altered both

directly and indirectly the rules of the game tipping the regional situation off-balance. The 2004 reform that abolished regional elections for Oblast governors and Republic presidents enabled Moscow to further advance its policy of replacement of the key regional leaders by elites loyal to Moscow. Some members of the new North Caucasian ruling class like Murat Zyazikov, President of Ingushetia from 2002 to 2008, have a *siloviki* background. Others, like Mukhu Aliyev, President of Dagestan from 2006 to 2010, belong to the former Soviet cadres who pledged allegiance to Putin's regime. Aliyev's nomination is also associated with a major constitutional change in the Republic. Until 2007, Dagestan was officially led by a State Council, constituted by the representatives of the 14 titular nationalities. Aliyev's predecessor, Magomedali Magomedov, assumed *de facto* the role of president only following a consensus within the State Council.

Vladimir Putin's decision to impose a solution from above to ensure the loyalty of regional leaders contributed to the destabilization of the Republics' already volatile internal balance.⁶⁵ Moreover, the significant federal capital transfers have not boosted the regional economies. Instead, money coming from Moscow bolstered the patronage networks, corruption amongst pro-Russian elites and strengthened authoritarianism in most of the North Caucasus Republics. The growing social discontent that appeared among the local population was met by regional governments touting a harder line. Many local administrations imported Chechen practices to regulate political opposition (violent repression, arbitrary detention etc).⁶⁶ For example, the 'counter-terrorist' operations in Ingushetia since 2003 reached the same level of brutality as those in Chechnya under Ramzan Kadyrov's regime.⁶⁷ While these reforms are not by any means the primary causes of the escalation of violence, they have had a significant impact on the established rules of the game in the field by destroying the existing balance of power and

integrating new actors and practices. As a result, competition within each sub-field increased, opening new structure of opportunities. Multidimensional games between actors led to the restructuring of the field and violence became a tool for local authorities to manage discontent and to bolster the contested regimes. As such, violence has come to represent simply another pattern of interactions among the various actors in the field.

INSERT FIGURE 1 (document in .tiff format)

Violence as routine

The evolution of the political context and the use of violence as a political tool have contributed to a routinization of violence, and eventually to its deinstitutionalisation. The Russo-Chechen wars have played a crucial role in the transformation of the meaning and use of violence. In particular, they have altered the rules of revenge and given a new meaning to feud, a social practice rooted in centuries of tradition.⁶⁸ Mairbek Vatchagaev, a Chechen historian, believes that ‘patriotism and vengeance’ have been the main motivations for Chechen struggle against the Russian occupiers since 1999.⁶⁹ Revenge has also been said to be one of the strongest motivations that drove men and women who committed suicide attacks.⁷⁰

As Valery Tishkov remarkably demonstrated, the two Russo-Chechen wars have destroyed the social links among Chechen society and led to ‘demodernisation.’⁷¹ This social deregulation has brought about an expansion of vendetta practices previously controlled by the Council of Elders. In this context, vendetta integrates the repertoire of actions available to social actors without any regulatory mechanisms. Similar patterns are observed in Ingushetia and Dagestan, where vendetta became a substitute for an inefficient justice system, as well as an *a posteriori* justification for violent practices. The family of Ingush journalist and political opposition figure,

Magomed Yevloyev, declared a vendetta against Zyazikov's relatives after Yevloyev was murdered in custody in September 2008.⁷² Some sources insist that the attack a month later against Zyazikov's cousin was committed by Yevloyev's relatives.⁷³

The call for revenge, used in a variety of contexts, has indirectly contributed to prolonging the conflict and banalizing violence. Political figures like Ramzan Kadyrov exploited the practice by publicly endorsing honour killings in Chechnya that has been largely regarded by scholars as an attempt to cover up the civilian casualties of police operations.⁷⁴ The legitimization of violent practices is not solely confined to North Caucasian societies. Violence is also rooted in the daily practices of other actors —the Russian armed forces. Similar to hazing, *Dedovshchina* is an unofficial practice commonly applied to first-year recruits in the army that includes the use of symbolic (repeated humiliation) and physical (torture, rape, even death) violence.⁷⁵ Such use of violence represents a rite of passage, but also a means to reaffirm the hierarchy of the armed forces. Consequently, violence becomes a common practice, which is in its turn inflicted upon the civilians and captured insurgents. Violence transforms social actors' and structures internal relations within the field of political violence as a whole as well as within each sub-field.

Violence as a strategy

As demonstrated above, violence has strong socio-cultural components but also results from changes in the rule of game in the field. But violence has been often used as a strategy for different groups to achieve their primary goals such as their survival, the support of local populations or control over other factions. Although all actors develop strategic views of violence, the logics behind the use of violence vary from subversion, to competition and

punishment. Two examples of the uses of violence for strategic purposes are discussed below. The first one analyses the strategy of diffusion of the conflict taken up by several Chechen groups since the beginning of the second Russo-Chechen war; the second examines the different logics at work within the state-actor sub-field.

Since the beginning of the second Russ-Chechen war, some Chechen warlords, whether moderate or radical, have developed a strategy of conflict diffusion. This tactic was first and foremost based on interpersonal connections.⁷⁶ Although the moderate Aslan Maskhadov claimed in 2004 to command battalions outside the Chechen Republics, the radical Shamil' Basayev and Salman Raduyev certainly have had the most vibrant and expansive network connections. Both, Basayev and Raduyev, formed alliances with rebel groups in Dagestan and Ingushetia, either before, during or after the first war.⁷⁷ As a result, since 1996, several Dagestani leaders have established their bases in Chechnya, fleeing repression in their Republic, and taking advantages of the presence of mercenaries and foreign backers in Chechnya to enlarge their own networks and attract financing.⁷⁸

Indeed, during the second Chechen conflict, Basayev and his ally Ibn al-Khattab were the cornerstones of this strategy. They found growing support among Jamaats, both new and old, active in neighbouring Republics. Jamaats are network-based communities that have proliferated since early 1990's.⁷⁹ The great majority of them advocates radical Islamism, predominantly Salafist, ideology and includes violence in their repertoire of actions⁸⁰ despite often professing a moderate, non-violent stance at their inception like the Jamaat led by Musa Mukozhev in Kadarbino-Balakaria. The Jamaats are not united and rarely share any common religious or political agenda for they harbour first and foremost local preoccupations. Basayev's strategy certainly led some of them to forge temporary alliances with his group, based mostly on common

interests, religious affiliation and tactical links. Nonetheless, the degree of coordination between the groups has never led to a long-term integrated strategy. After Maskhadov's and Basayev's death, respectively in 2005 and in 2006, their successors pursued a similar scheme of diffusion of the conflict with no real success. Two years after its creation in 2007, the North Caucasus Emirate, with Dokka Umarov, who heads the organization and is also said to lead the Chechen insurgents, began to unite various groups under the Emirate's umbrella.

Three main factors explain the resurgence of what remains a yet-elusive regional project. First, the deterioration of the political climate of the North Caucasus Republics and the frequent resort to violence to regulate social interactions create a favourable context for the unification of various local militant groups. Second, the deep socio-economic crisis and the crisis of legitimacy⁸¹ faced by the local political and religious authorities combined with progressively repressive policies have created a fertile ground for the insurgent groups to recruit young people in search of new social referents. Finally, even if the Caucasian Emirate remains an uncertain project lacking any formal structure, the prospects of joining the group include the possibility of access to new resources. The geographical proximity of the upcoming 2014 Olympic Games in Sochi to the region could become an opportunity for insurgent groups to broker new alliances. There is a danger that several organizations in the Western part of North Caucasus may radicalize and get closer to the Caucasian Front in order to make their voice heard in Moscow. A growing dissatisfaction among Circassian population against Moscow has been observed. A certain number of groups plan to use the Sochi Olympics as a platform to voice their grievances against the state with the launch of the public campaign to demand an official apology for the Circassian genocide, whose 150th anniversary will coincide with the year of the Sochi Games, from the Federal government.⁸² In the meantime, several insurgent groups have already sworn

loyalty to Dokka Umarov. In October 2009, the Adygeya Jamaat announced its intention to join the Emirate.⁸³ The Olympics in Sochi may therefore become the unifying factor amongst different insurgent groups and other informal organizations in the 'stable' republics in North Caucasus (Adyghea, Krasnodarsky Krai, Karachevo-Cherkessia, Stavropolsky Krai) who have already begun to articulate heterogeneous grievances (nationalist, socio-economic, religious etc.) towards the central and local administrations.

Other patterns of strategic violence could be identified within the sub-field of state actors. Russian armed forces enounced a military strategy of counter-insurgency based on indiscriminate violence against civilians and insurgents in hopes of achieving their ultimate objective —curbing the upsurge of militancy. The first part of the military intervention of the second Russo-Chechen war aimed to halt, deter and punish the civilians who have granted support to the insurgents by randomly bombing villages and other non-military targets. The Russian forces, along with pro-Russian militias, also engaged in mop-up operations (*Zachitski*) all over the region. The primary objective of these manoeuvres is to arrest active militants who could go into hiding within the population. The second goal is to create an atmosphere of fear among the population to discourage people from assisting insurgents.⁸⁴

Given discipline problems within the Russian armed forces and the strong competition on the ground within this sub-field, the strategy of indiscriminate violence has not evolved into a coherent initiative to eliminate the various resistance movements. Instead, the policy metamorphosed into a multitude of forms of violence that were not always in line with the official goal of the fight against terrorism and the insurgency. Competition over capital and resources between security agencies involved into the campaign against insurgents and has proved to be one of the main incentives for the resort to indiscriminate violence. This dynamic is

further illustrated by a lack information-sharing between the different institutional actors on the ground.⁸⁵ The FSB as well as the command of the Joint Troops Group (OGV) often refused to disclose any crucial intelligence to pro-Russian Chechen militias and the Chechen police force due to the complete absence of trust.⁸⁶

The strategic use of violence intervenes at different level within the field. As more than often short-term interests supplant long-term ones (defeating the insurgency and deterring terrorist groups), personal interests may lead to the use of violence, interfering with the very objectives of the mission. For the local security forces in the various republics, the *zachitski* provided the opportunity to violently suppress political opponents and to take control of lucrative local businesses like reconstruction, shadow economy, and kidnapping industry.⁸⁷ Although the strategic bombing campaign has been effective in reducing the strength of guerrilla opposition and the terrorist attempts⁸⁸, brutality and abuses against civilian populations might have provoked a spiral of violence between incumbents and insurgent groups.

Violence and conversion of capital

The porosity of the borders between each sub-field is partly explained by the multi-positioning of the actors, who reinvest capital acquired in one sub-field in another. The interweaving of subfield 'criminal groups' best illustrates these strategies of conversion of capital. The involvement of various actors, including state ones, in criminal practices has been a widespread during the Soviet time: since the 1970s, extensive patronage networks, all with ties to Moscow, were taking part in trafficking of all sorts.⁸⁹ This shadow economy exploded after the break-up of the Soviet Union. The uncontrolled process of privatization led to an expansion of the patronage networks and the diversification of their activities. New goods like the weapons

and equipment sold by the ex-Soviet battalions stationed in the North Caucasus were introduced to the black market.⁹⁰

The criminalization of the Chechen state and its transformation into an operational base for the Russian criminal organizations⁹¹ resulted in a struggle over illegal resources (mainly arms, drugs and oil). The outbreak of the first Chechen war in 1994 created new business opportunities for a wider set of actors. Enjoying a complete impunity, Russian soldiers became major economic actors in these informal deals. The dismal conditions of the army and the breakdown in discipline have prompted Russian soldiers to sell any goods to the highest bidder whether they were insurgents or civilians. The second Chechen war led to an increase in this type of criminal activities. Russian soldiers and pro-Russian militias started to gain substantial amounts of money by accepting bribes for the release insurgents and the sale of dead bodies to their families.

Various types of informal economic transactions have transpired between Russian soldiers and insurgents such as weapons trafficking and all form of bribes at checkpoints and detention centers.⁹² As a result of which, Russian soldiers have contributed to the expansion of criminal networks throughout North Caucasus. The phenomenon of ‘interpenetration’⁹³ between security forces and organized crime sometimes controlled by insurgents dramatically increased since the outbreak of the second Chechen war. The porous border between criminal activities and security forces is not limited to Eastern “unstable” republics. One can observe similar patterns of interactions among security forces in Karbardino-Balkaria and Karachaevo-Cherkessia.⁹⁴ Nonetheless, the extension of patronage networks and the increasing amount of actors have certainly been one of the most salient factors explaining the reproduction of violence within the field of political violence.

Conclusion

Building on Bourdieu's concept of field, this article proposes a theoretical framework that focuses primarily on the social actors, their practices, their representations, and their interactions. It offers new avenues for the recent "micropolitical turn" in the study of social violence and fills some of the gaps of the literature on the microdynamics of war. Namely, the premises that drive this theoretical framework lead us to deconstruct all actors involved in the field of political violence and to consider them as autonomous ones. We then reject the simple analytical dichotomy (insurgents vs. incumbents) and integrate smaller groups and individuals into the analysis. Additionally, this theoretical framework conducts us to deconstruct reified labels often used to analyse internal wars, like ethnicity, religion or military affiliation. Instead, we put the focus on actors' relationships and their dynamics without limiting our analysis to a single feature (economic, social, political and cultural aspects).

From a methodological perspective, unlike formal models which look at actors' choices and the factors which influence them, we seek to isolate actors' preferences and practices and focus on their interactions. As Kalyvas puts it, the studies of microdynamics in internal wars bring about new possibilities, such as "improving data quality, testing microfoundations and causal mechanisms, maximizing the fit between concepts and data, and controlling for many variables that can be held constant."⁹⁵ The recent shift from macro-econometric and cross-national large-N studies toward micro-level analysis opens up a new trend of research linking ethnographic fieldwork and quantitative analysis.⁹⁶ Though we think our analytical framework offers interesting research possibilities for scholars studying political violence, we acknowledge the need to engage in a more rigorous data-collecting collection on the ground in order for the

framework to be tested empirically. This paper should therefore be considered as the first step in a larger research program that includes empirical work.

Although we do not claim, at this stage, any external validity for our model and acknowledge the fact that our framework was built based on our empirical observations on the North Caucasus, we plan to empirically test its validity. We first suggest putting forward a comparative empirical analysis that would look at the North Caucasus as a region and study the various actors, practices and strategic interactions addressed in this article. The *Center for the Strategic and International Studies* has already tracked all violent acts in the region. We now need to identify the regular patterns of behaviour and strategic interactions based on quantitative analysis and ethnographical research. Then, we should compare the findings with our assumptions and possibly identify regularities between strategic interactions inside the field. In so doing, we intend both to contribute to the debates on the microdynamics of internal war and to offer a better comprehension of the dynamics that are taking place in the long second Russo-Chechen war and in the neighbouring North Caucasus Republics.

¹ North Caucasus Federal District includes the Republics of Dagestan, Chechnya, Ingushetia, North Ossetia, Kabardino-Balkaria, Karachay-Cherkessia, Adyghea and Stavropolsky Krai

² Sarah Mendelson, *Violence in North Caucasus. 2009: A Bloody Year* (Center for the Strategic and International Studies, 14 January 2010), <http://csis.org/publication/violence-north-caucasus-5>, last time consulted 4 February 2010 and Sarah Mendelson, Matthew Malarkey and Lucy Moore, *Violence in the North Caucasus. Spring 2010: On the rise, again?* (Center for the Strategic and International Studies, 13 May 2010), http://csis.org/files/publication/100513_Violence_in_the_North_Caucasus_Spring_2010.pdf, last time consulted 3 June 2010.

³ Caroline Moser and Elizabeth Shrader, "A Conceptual Framework for Violence Reduction," *Sustainable Development Working Paper 2* (Washington D.C: World Bank, 1999), 4.

⁴ Publications on Chechnya are numerous. We could distinguish three main categories of studies. The first ones offer an historical perspective and analyse the two contemporary wars (1994-1996 and 1999-present) as new episodes of violence in the Russo-Chechen history. See for example John Dunlop, *Russia Confronts Chechnya. Roots of a separatist conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Moshe Gammer, *The Lone Wolf and the Bear. Three Centuries of Chechen Defiance of Russian Rule* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006). The second ones focus on the Islamization of parts of the Chechen rebel groups and leaders. See for instance Paul Murphy, *The Wolves of Islam. Russia and the Faces of the Chechen Terrorism* (Washington: Brassey's, 2004); Yossef Bodansky, *Chechen Jihad. Al-Qaeda's Training Ground and the Next Wave of Terror* (New York: Harpers Collins, 2007). The

third ones question the political, social and societal consequences of the conflict on the Russian and Chechen societies. See for example: Anatol Lieven, *Chechnya: Tombstone of Russian Power?* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Dmitri V., Trenin, Alexei V. Malashenko with Anatol Lieven, *Russia's restless frontier: The Chechnya factor in post-Soviet Russia*, (Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2004); Valery Tishkov, *Chechnya: Life in a War-Torn Society* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press: 2004).

⁵ Gordon M. Hahn, "The Rise of Islamist Extremism in Kabardino-Balkariya," *Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization* 13, no.4 (2005): 557; John O'Loughlin, "The geography of violence in the North Caucasus, 1999-2007," Kennan Institute, Washington DC, 10 March 2008, http://www.colorado.edu/ibs/waroutcomes/docs/Kennan_Institute_03102008.pdf, last time consulted 27 April 2009.

⁶ Domitilla Sagramoso, "Violence and conflict in the Russian North Caucasus," *International Affairs* 83, no. 4 (July 2007): 681-705; Jason Lyall, "Does Indiscriminate Violence Incite Insurgent Attacks?: Evidence from Chechnya," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53, no. 3 (June 2009): 331-362.

⁷ See for the exportation of methods in Chechnya: Matthew Evangelista, "Ingushetia as a Microcosm of Putin's Reforms," *PONARS Policy Memo* 346 (November 2004), http://csis.org/files/media/isis/pubs/pm_0346.pdf, last time consulted 27 April 2009.

⁸ Georgi Derluguian, "The Coming Revolutions in the North Caucasus," *PONARS Policy Memo* 378 (December 2005), http://csis.org/files/media/isis/pubs/pm_0378.pdf, last time consulted 27 April 2009; Georgi Derluguian, *Bourdieu's Secret Admirer in the Caucasus. A World-System Biography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005); Hahn (see note 5 above); Miriam Lansky, "Daghestan and Chechnya: the Wahhabi Challenge to the State," *SAIS Review* XXII, no.2, (Summer-Fall 2002): 167-191.

⁹ This category of internal war includes all categories of asymmetrical conflicts, from guerrillas and insurrections to separatist conflicts.

¹⁰ Stathis Kalyvas "Promises and Pitfalls of an emerging research program: the microdynamics of civil war," in Stathis Kalyvas, Ian Shapiro and Tarek Masoud (eds.), *Order, Conflict and Violence*, (Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 2008): 397-421.

¹¹ Stathis Kalyvas, "The Ontology of Political Violence: Action and Identity in Civil Wars," *Perspectives on Politics* 1, no.3 (2003): 475-476.

¹² Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler, "Greed and Grievance in Civil War," *Oxford Economic Papers* 56, no.4, (2004): 563-595.

¹³ Charles King, "The Micropolitics of Social Violence," *World Politics* 56, no.3 (April 2004): 448.

¹⁴ Charles Tilly, *The Politics of Collective Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003): 78.

¹⁵ Scott Straus, *The Order of Genocide: Race, Power and War in Rwanda* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

¹⁶ Lyall (see note 6 above); Jeremy Weinstein, *The Politics of Insurgent Violence*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Macartan Humphreys and Jeremy M. Weinstein, "Demobilization and Reintegration" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 51, no.4 (2007): 531-567.

¹⁷ Stathis Kalyvas, *The Logic of Violence in Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Elizabeth Wood, *Insurgent collective action and civil war in El Salvador* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

¹⁸ Steven I. Wilkinson, *Votes and Violence. Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Ashutosh Varshney, *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); Paul R. Brass, *Theft of an Idol: Text and Context in the Representation of Collective Violence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

¹⁹ Mark Beissinger, *Nationalist Mobilization and the Collapse of the Soviet State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

²⁰ Stathis Kalyvas and Matthew Kocher, "How 'free' is free-riding in civil war? Violence, insurgency, and the collective action problem," *World Politics* 59, no.2 (January 2007): 177-216.; Wood (see note 17 above).

²¹ Weinstein (see note 16 above).

²² Kalyvas (see note 17 above); Lyall (see note 6 above).

²³ Humphreys and Weinstein (See note 16 above)

²⁴ Roger D. Petersen, *Understanding Ethnic Violence: Fear, Hatred and Resentment in the Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Mark Howard Ross, *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

²⁵ King (see note 13 above): 431-455.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 447.

²⁷ Kalyvas (see note 17 above): 6.

- ²⁸ Didier Bigo, "Globalized (in)Security: the Field and the Ban-opticon," in Didier Bigo and Anna Tsoukala (eds.), *Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2006): 5-49; Paris school is not limited to Bigo's work, for more details see: C.A.S.E. COLLECTIVE, "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto," *Security Dialogue*, 37, no.4 (2007): 443-487.
- ²⁹ Bigo (see note 28 above): 23.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, 24.
- ³¹ The notion of field has been widely discussed and many authors have offered competing conceptualisations. Cf. For instance, Bert Klandermans, *The Social Psychology of Protest* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997); Jack Goldstone, "More social movements or fewer? Beyond political opportunity structures to relational fields," *Theory and Society* 33, no.3-4, (2004): 333-365. In this paper, Bourdieu's definition forms the starting point of our theoretical discussions.
- ³² Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant, *Réponses. Pour une anthropologie réflexive* (Paris : Seuil, 1992), 72-73.
- ³³ Pierre Bourdieu, *Questions de sociologie* (Paris : Minuit, 1981),134.
- ³⁴ Hans-Peter Müller, "Action et structure. La praxéologie de Pierre Bourdieu," in Peter-Hans Müller and Yves Sintomer (eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu, théorie et pratique* (Paris : La Découverte, 2006), 55.
- ³⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, "Le capital social. Notes provisoires," *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, no.31 (January 1980) : 2.
- ³⁶ Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 101.
- ³⁷ See for example, Lahouari Addi, "Violence symbolique et statut du politique dans l'œuvre de Pierre Bourdieu," *Revue Française de Science Politique* 51, no.6 (December 2001) : 949-963.
- ³⁸ Todd Sandler, "On terrorism, guerrilla warfare, and insurrections," *Defence and Peace Economics* 3, 4 (1992): 260.
- ³⁹ On the relationship between terrorism and insurgency, see for instance Ariel Merari, "Terrorism as a strategy of insurgency," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 5, no.4 (Winter 1993): 213 – 251; Bard E O'Neill, *Insurgency & Terrorism: Inside Modern Revolutionary Warfare* (Herndon : Brassey's, 2001) ; Stathis N. Kalyvas, "The Paradox of Terrorism in Civil War," *The Journal of Ethics* 8, no.1 (March 2004): 97-138; Weinstein, (see note 16 above).
- ⁴⁰ Bourdieu and Wacquant (see note 32 above): 100.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴² The term of « innovation » is borrowed from Doug McAdam, "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency," *American Sociological Review* 48, no.6 (1983): 737-754.
- ⁴³ Nick Crossley, "Habitus, Agency and Change: Engaging with Bourdieu," *Gendai Shakai-Riron Kenku (Journal of Studies in Contemporary Social Theory)* 12, (2002): 329-57, quoted in Nick Crossley, "From Reproduction to Transformation: Social Movement Fields and the Radical Habitus," *Theory Culture Society* 20, no.6 (2003): 44.
- ⁴⁴ Charles Tilly and Sidney Tarrow, *Politique(s) du conflit. De la grève à la révolution* (Paris : Presses de Science Po, 2008), 49.
- ⁴⁵ Doug McAdam, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly, *Dynamics of Contention* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001): 49.
- ⁴⁶ Bourdieu and Wacquant (see note 32 above): 117-118.
- ⁴⁷ The distinction between 'fragmented field' and 'hegemonic field' is taken from Raka Ray, "Women's Movements and Political Fields: A Comparison of Two Indian Cities," *Social Problems* 45, no.1 (February 1998): 23.
- ⁴⁸ See McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly (see note 45 above) and Tilly and Tarrow (see note 44 above).
- ⁴⁹ On the North-Ossetian-Ingush conflict, see Julian Birch, "Ossetiya—land of uncertain frontiers and manipulative elites," *Central Asian Survey* 18, no.4 (1999): 512-524.
- ⁵⁰ Aurélie Campana, "Les Tchétchènes et Ingouches, entre résilience et résistances passives, 1956-1991," dans Aurélie Campana, Grégory Dufaud et Sophie Tournon (eds.), *Les déportations en héritage. Les peuples réprimés du Caucase et de Crimée soixante ans après* (Rennes : Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2010) : 97-116.
- ⁵¹ Neil Devotta, "From ethnic outbidding to ethnic conflict: the institutional bases for Sri Lanka's separatist war," *Nations and Nationalism* 11, no.1 (2005): 141-159; Mia Bloom, *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).
- ⁵² The Jamestown Foundation, *North Caucasus Weekly* 9, no.36 (26 September 2008); The Jamestown Foundation, *North Caucasus Weekly* 10, no.13 (3 April 2009).
- ⁵³ John Mueller, "The Banality of Ethnic War," *International Security* 25, no.1 (Summer 2000): 42-70.
- ⁵⁴ Jeremy Weinstein (see note 16 above)

⁵⁵ Paul Brass (see note 18 above); V.P. Gagnon Jr., *The Myth of Ethnic War: Serbia and Croatia in the 1990s*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).

⁵⁶ Mark Kramer, "Guerrilla Warfare, Counterinsurgency and Terrorism in the North Caucasus: The Military Dimension of the Russian-Chechen Conflict," *Europe-Asia Studies* 57, no.2 (2005): 214-215.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid, p.243. This trend is by not far limited to Chechnya. In Dagestan, in October 2009, the Minister of Interior, Adilgirei Magomedtagirov, was assassinated while he was attending a wedding ceremony. Although the identity of the perpetrators remains unclear, some Dagestani politicians, including the President, have stated that this assassination would have been impossible without the information given by corrupted law enforcement officials to the killers, supposedly insurgents. On the attack, see Nabi Abdullaev, "Sniper Kills Dagestan's Top Policeman at Wedding", *St-Petersburg Times*, 9 October 2009, http://www.sptimes.ru/index.php?action_id=2&story_id=29199, last time consulted 2 February 2010.

⁵⁹ Rogers Brubaker, "Ethnicity without groups," *European Journal of Sociology* 43, no.2 (2002): 170-171.

⁶⁰ Ibid.,176

⁶¹ C.W. Blandy "Chechnya: The Search for a Strong Successor," *Conflict Studies Research Centre*, no.3. <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?ots591=0C54E3B3-1E9C-BE1E-2C24-A6A8C7060233&lng=en&id=87536>. Last time consulted 27 March 2010.

⁶² John Russell. *Chechnya-Russia's War on Terror* (New York : Routledge, 2007), 204-205.

⁶³ Tilly and Tarrow (see note 44 above), 78.

⁶⁴ Trenin and Malashenko with Lieven (see note 4 above), 2.

⁶⁵ Charles W. Blandy, *North Caucasus: On the Brink of Far-Reaching Destabilisation* (Conflict Studies Research Center, Caucasus Series 05/36, 2005): 6-7.

⁶⁶ Matthew Evangelista, "Ingushetia as a Microcosm of Putin's Reforms," *PONARS Policy Memo* 346 (2004) : 4.

⁶⁷ Human Rights Watch, *Spreading Despair: Russian Abuses in Ingushetia* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2003).

⁶⁸ Anne Speckhard and Khapta Ahkmedova, "The Making of a Martyr: Chechen Suicide Terrorism," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 29, no. 5 (2006): 467.

⁶⁹ Mairbek Vatchagaev, "Vers une radicalisation du conflit tchétchène" *Cahiers d'études sur la Méditerranée orientale et le monde turco-iranien* 38 (July-December 2004) : 118.

⁷⁰ Speckhard and Ahkmedova (see note 68 above): 466-467.

⁷¹ Tishkov (see note 4 above): 14.

⁷² Magomed Yevloyev ran the website *Ingushetiya.org* and was considered as the main opponent to the then Ingush President Zyazikov. He was shot dead after being arrested by local police officers for unknown reasons. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, "Ingushetia Prosecutor Reverses Decision To Investigate Journalist's Death", *RFE/RL News* (20 March 2009).

http://www.rferl.org/content/Ingushetia_Prosecutor_Reverses_Decision_To_Investigate_Journalists_Death/1513766.html, last time consulted 1 May 2010.

⁷³ « Ingush president's cousin shot dead in possible vendetta killing", *Ria-Novoti* (Nazran, 10 September 2008), <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20080910/116692838.html>, last time consulted 26 March 2010.

⁷⁴ The Jamestown Foundation, *North Caucasus Analysis* 10, no.9 (6 March 2009).

⁷⁵ On the dedovshina and its impact on the Russian Society, see the special issue of the *Journal of Power Institutions in Post-Soviet Societies* 1, no.1 (2004), online : <http://pipss.revues.org/index190.html>, last time consulted 26 March 2010.

⁷⁶ Charles W. Blandy, *North Caucasus: Escalation of Terrorism into Ingushetia* (Conflict Studies Research Center, Caucasus Series 04/17, 2004): 2.

⁷⁷ Anna Matveeva, "The Islamic challenge in post-soviet Eurasia," *Central Asia and the Caucasus* (1999) <http://www.cac.org/cgi-bin/search/show.pl?url=http://www.cac.org/dataeng/04.matveeva.shtml&words=lawlessness>, last time consulted 24 April 2009.

⁷⁸ Jean Radvanyi, "Le Daghestan, par delà les idées reçues," *Cahiers d'études sur la Méditerranée orientale et le monde turco-iranien* 38, (juillet-décembre, 2004): 50.

⁷⁹ Aleksei Malashenko and Akhmed Yarlykapov, "Radicalisation of Russia's Muslim Community", *MICROCON Policy Working Paper* 9 May 2009, p. 11, http://www.microconflict.eu/publications/PWP9_AM_AY.pdf

⁸⁰ For instance, the Jamaat Ingushetiya, the Jamaat Yarmuk (Kabardino-Balkaria), the Jamaat Karachai, also known under the name « Islamist association n°3 (Karachay-Cherkessia) - Andrew Mcgregor, *Military Jama'ats in the*

North Caucasus: A Continuing Threat (The Jamestown Foundation, 2006): 17.

⁸¹ On the crisis of legitimacy, see Lansky (see note 8 above): 172; Derluguian (see note 8 above).

⁸² The Jamestown Foundation, *Eurasia Daily Monitor* 7, no.58 (25 March 2010).

⁸³ The Jamestown Foundation, *Eurasia Daily Monitor* 6, no.182 (5 October 2009).

⁸⁴ On the impacts of the mop-up operations on the civilian population and the war crimes committed by the Russians armed forces, see Emma Gilligan, *Terror in Chechnya: Russia and the Tragedy of Civilians in War* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2009) and Jason Lyall, "Are Coethnics More Effective Counterinsurgents? Evidence from the Second Chechen War," *American Political Science Review*, 104, no. 01 (February 2010): 1-20.

⁸⁵ Kramer (see note 56 above): 249-250.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ On the kidnapping business, see Tishkov, 2004 (see note 4 above): 107-124 and Anne Nivat, *La guerre qui n'aura pas eu lieu* (Paris: Fayard, 2004), 118.

⁸⁸ Lyall (See note 6 above)

⁸⁹ On the extension of black market in the Republic of Chechnya-Ingushetiya and on the implication of local elites, see Campana (see note 50 above), 104-106.

⁹⁰ Robert Seely, *Russo-Chechen Conflict, 1800-2000. A Deadly Embrace* (London : Frank Cass, 2001): 120.

⁹¹ Valery Tishkov, *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Conflict in and after the Soviet Union, The Mind Aflame* (London: Sage Publications, Oslo, International Peace Research Institute, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, 1997):, 212.

⁹² Kramer (see note 56 above): 221-222; Trenin and Malashenko with Lieven (see note 4 above): 144.

⁹³ Pavel Baev, « Contre-terrorisme et islamisation du Caucase du Nord », *Politique étrangère* 1, (Printemps 2006): 81.

⁹⁴ The Jamestown Foundation, *North Caucasus Analysis* 7, 46 (29 November 2007).

⁹⁵ Kalyvas (see note 11 above): 397.

⁹⁶ Lyall (see note 6 above).