The Russian Federation
Bureau of Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration
Taryn Painter
12 May 2020

Should IDPs be included in the existing framework of refugees, and if so, how will national sovereignty be reconciled with intervention on their behalf? How should the international community respond to large-scale refugee situations that spill over into neighboring countries?

In situations where conflict is ongoing or terrorist organizations are using IDP populations as recruiting grounds, what should be the role of the international community regarding IDPs?

I. Introduction

Over the course of the past thirty years, the Russian Federation's rates of migration have been on the rise. Immigrants from all over the world have passed through Russian borders for a multitude of reasons. International exchange students enter the state in search of an enriching educational experience; others enter the Federation in search of permanent or temporary work and labor. More frequently, people enter the Russian Federation in the hopes of seeking temporary or permanent refuge from natural disasters, war, and persecution. Though the plight of refugees is an important matter for the international community to discuss, the growing issue of migration rests not with foreign migrants, but in internally displaced people who have been neglected and underserved.

Internally displaced persons (IDPs) are those who have been "...forced or obliged to flee or leave their homes ... as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights, or natural or human-made disasters and who have not crossed an internationally defined border" (UNHCR "Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement" 1998). The state of origin is required by the Guiding Principles on Internal

Displacement to provide shelter, food, and other basic necessities to these populations. This responsibility falls to the state due to the fact that the internally displaced have not passed an internationally recognized border into another jurisdiction. Therefore, IDPs are classified differently from other migrants, such as refugees, and are provided separate protections. Refugees are defined as migrants who "...have crossed an internationally recognized border and have thus lost the protection of their home countries" and require assistance from other states or organizations (Inter-Parliamentary Union 2013, p. 19). Also unlike refugees, the term 'internally displaced persons' does not hold a special legal status as that of 'refugees,' and applies to both citizens and non-citizens that are within a state's borders (Inter-Parliamentary Union 2013, p. 19-20). Therefore, the responsibility of protecting and guaranteeing the rights of the internally displaced remains with an individual's home state.

The Russian Federation has previous experience with the issue of IDPs. The dismantling of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in 1991 introduced unprecedented regional instability as people struggled to determine the independent state to which they now belonged. Extremists in the Chechen region took advantage of this instability, inciting violent rebellions against the government. There was mass displacement as a result of this violence as homes and villages were destroyed. The Russian Federation was tasked with aiding the displaced and providing adequate resources and aid to those escaping the violent conflict. At the end of the year 2000, there were 491,000 estimated IDPs within the Russian Federation (The Brookings Institution and Institute of State and Law of the Russian Academy of Science 2002). This number has decreased exponentially since 2000, as there were a reported 2,300 IDPs in 2018 (Internal Displacement Monitoring System 2018). The Russian Federation has worked tirelessly

to reduce the number of IDPs within its own borders and seeks to stimulate further international discussion that addresses how to better attend to the needs of this vulnerable population.

A new, growing concern for the Russian Federation and the international community as a whole connects to this topic of IDPs: the continuous and disturbing acts of global terrorism. Terrorism in the twenty-first century knows no limitations and spans all borders. More frequently, transnational terrorism that targets vulnerable groups, such as immigrants and IDPs as potential recruits has increased globally. Displacement provides "...fertile ground for human rights abuses including torture, rape, killings, the forced recruitment of child soldiers, forced evictio and property loss" (Inter-Parliamentary Union 2013, p. 3). Human rights violations have acted as a "...significant and substantive mediator between IDPs and terror attacks," meaning consistent breaches of rights actively encourage the displaced to join the ranks of terror organizations (Choi and Piazza 2016). Therefore, it is imperative to affirm and protect the rights that displaced populations inherently retain in order to decrease terror recruitment.

Pursuing the topic of internally displaced persons and how it intertwines with possible concerns for terror recruitment not only addresses the interests and well-being of the Russian Federation overall, but the international community. The Russian Federation firmly believes that action is required in order to safeguard humanitarian law and seeks to address migration and terrorism through close observance of international, regional, and domestic policies that have attempted to solve these issues separately, but not as an interconnected issue. After a close examination of these policies, the Russian Federation will recommend a long-term and short-term course of action that effectively addresses the threat that terror recruitment poses in

areas with populations that have experienced repeated, long-term displacement in the Middle East.

II. Background

A solution to the Russian Federation's questions of IDPs and global terrorism can be found in the treaties and organizations that the Federation is party to at the international, regional, and domestic level. At each level, the Russian Federation cooperates with multiple entities to establish functional migration policies and counter terrorism tactics.

International Organizations

The Russian Federation is an active member of the international community. As an established global power, the Russan Federation seeks to lead states throughout the world in humanitarian and peacekeeping efforts. These goals can be attained through the international organizations and associations that the Russian Federation takes part in, such as the United Nations. Through the United Nations, the Russian Federation is party to multiple agreements, such as the Global Compact for Migration (GCM) and the 1951 and 1967 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. The Russian Federation also interacts with multiple United Nations bodies, offices, and councils, such as the High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Security Council's Counter Terrorism Committee, and the Human Rights Council (UNHRC). Multi-state organizations, such as BRICS, also play a large role in emphasizing humanitarian efforts.

United Nations

Following the conclusion of World War II, the Russian Federation, (then the USSR), ratified the United Nations (UN) Charter in 1945. The USSR was appointed as a permanent member of the UN Security Council and held the power to execute peacekeeping strategies

across the globe (United Nations Security Council 2020). Following the dissolution of the USSR in 1991, President Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation alerted the Secretary-General of the UN that the membership and responsibilities of the Soviet Union were to be transferred to the Russian Federation. The eleven member countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States supported this transfer of power (United Nations, "Member States" 2020).

The goals of the United Nations are to promote world peace after the violence of two World Wars. The goals and aspirations for all member states of the UN were solidified in the establishment of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UNDHR) in 1948. The UNDHR stipulated in Article 3 that "...everyone has the right to life, liberty, and the security of a person" (United Nations 1948). This hints at the role that the Security Council is to play in the maintenance of peace across the globe. Inherently, the UNDHR rejects the activities of terror organizations that seek to threaten international peace and individual safety.

Article 13 discusses migration within and out of a state, stipulating that "...everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within borders of each state" and that "...everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country" (United Nations 1948). Articles 14 and 15 of this document relate specifically to the topic of migration. Respectively, the two articles state that "...everyone has the right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution," and that "... everyone has the right to a nationality [that] "...cannot be arbitrarily deprived" (United Nations 1948). The UNDHR set the basic foundations for the methods by which international migration policy must be made and followed.

Similar to the UNDHR, the UN General Assembly (UNGA) adopted the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in 1966 (United Nations Office of the High

Commissioner for Human Rights 1966). Similar to Articles 14 and 15 in the Universal Declaration, the International Covenant states that "...everyone lawfully within the territory of a State shall, within that territory have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence" and that "... everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own" (United Nations Office of the Higher Commissioner for Human Rights 1966). This covenant, to which the Russian Federation is a party, reaffirms the UNDHR and acts as a binding international document that holds the Russian Federation accountable to the statutes described (Manley 1985).

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

Articles 14 and 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights established the foundation for the Higher Commission for Refugees (UNHCR). The UNHCR was established in 1950 to assist the millions of Europeans who fled their homes throughout the war and called upon governments around the world to cooperate with the Commission in providing protection and admittance, assimilation services, and the 'voluntary repatriation' of refugees (Statute of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 1951). In addition to the Statute, the United Nations drafted the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. The purpose of this convention was to codify the rights of migrants that signatory states must recognize and to determine the meaning of the word 'refugee,' which was decidedly defined as, "...a person who is unwilling or unable to return to their country of origin owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted due to race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership of a social group" (United Nations 1951).

The 1967 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees extended the implications set forth in the 1951 Convention. The 1967 Protocol made the scope for refugee status universal and

expanded upon the definition of refugee, stating that refugees should be defined as stated in Article I of the 1951 Convention, but "...as if the words 'As a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951' and 'a result of such events' were omitted" (United Nations High Commission for Refugees 1967). Though the USSR was a member state of the UN during these Conventions, it was not party to the 1951 Convention or its 1967 Protocol. The Russian Federation did not sign on to these documents until after the dissolution of the USSR in 1991 (Chudinovskikh and Denisenko 2017).

The UNHCR has played a role in increasing international awareness of IDPs. The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were published through the UNHCR following a 1992 mandate to the UN Secretary-General's Representative on internally displaced persons. The representative charged with this mandate was tasked with observing the precipitating factors of internal displacement, the current status of IDPs in international law, and suggestions on how the international community can further protect IDPs (UNHCR Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement 2020). Though the Guiding Principles are non-binding, the document acts as a guide on how to address issues with regards to displaced persons within Russian borders, as the Guiding Principles are in compliance with international refugee and humanitarian law (Internal Displacement Monitoring Center 2020).

United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC)

The United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) was created in 2001 in response to the terror attacks of 11 September 2001 in the United States. The CTC was tasked with overseeing the outlined goals in Security Council Resolution 1373, which called upon member states to criminalize the financing, planning, or aiding of terror organizations.

Additionally, Resolution 1373 called for multilateral cooperation between member states, specifically with regards to informing neighboring governments on active terror groups that are or have been planning attacks (United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee 2020). In order to track the implementation progress of each member state, the CTC's Executive Directorate (CTED) issues a Global Survey that reviews the policies each member state has initiated with regards to counter terror measures. The latest Global Survey was issued in 2016, and lists regional recommendations to combat terrorism and the various global trends in terrorism. These trends include the increase of women in the promotion and prevention of terrorism, the rise of foreign terrorist fighters, the growing role of information technology, and the role of children and young adults in terror attacks (United Nations Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate 2016).

According to the Global Survey, eastern Europe has been deemed relatively stable since 2011. However, the Russian Federation individually has a high threat level as it has faced numerous successful and unsuccessful terror attempts both within and outside of its borders (Counter Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate 2016). In order to address these threats, the Russian Federation has introduced many counter terrorism measures, particularly in preventing the financing of known terror organizations such as al-Qaeda and ISIL as directed in UN Resolution 2199. The Russian Federation has also developed a strategy for combating the spread of online terror propaganda (Statement by Vladimir Voronkov, Moscow Conference on International Security 2018).

In addition to the Global Surveys, the CTC has identified multiple focus areas to ensure that Resolution 1373 is properly implemented. These focus areas include border management

and terrorist fighters. The Russian Federation has an interest in foreign terrorist fighters and border management because of the increase in extremists that reside within the Russian Federation. Such extremists include Muslim fundamentalists who are sympathetic to the known terrorist organization, the Islamic State of the Levant (ISIL) (Sinai 2015). Many of these extremists and sympathizers are found in the Russian Federation's North Caucasus region in Chechnya, where rebellions previously have been extinguished during the late 1990s and early 2000s (Sinai 2015) (explained further in Domestic section). The renewed activity in these areas in 2018 is a cause for concern, as it could be beginning of the global spread of ISIL terrorism (Al Jazeera 2018). With the open possibility for the presence of Islamic extremists in the Chechen area, fundamentalists can attempt yet another extreme act of terrorism against the Russian Federation, similar to that which occurred during the 1990s during the Chechen rebellions (see Domestic: Addressing Chechen Terrorism and Foreign Terrorist Fighters) (Sinai 2015).

In addition to border management and foreign terrorist fighters, the CTC has pursued research to identify trends within terror attacks. The Security Council has acknowledged that "...counter terror tactics cannot be prevented through repressive measures alone," and that states should "...take account of grievances that may be exploited" by extremists (CTC, "Countering Violent Extremism" 2020). Therefore, it is imperative that states do not suppress initial grievances as this will further inflame conflict. As scholar Harmeet Sandhu notes,

> "Terrorists fear that their calmer voice will not be heard nor their objectives met through conventional means. They, therefore, employ unconventional and extreme means of getting their point across and attracting the attention of society. They go about recruiting people who are on the fringes of society, directionless, without hope and looking for a purpose in life or a way of belonging to some group, inculcating in them the belief that they are rallying for a good cause " (Sandhu 2012).

This observance by Sandhu establishes the connection between terrorism and IDPs. Displaced populations are placed into a unique position of vulnerability where they are without a permanent home or shelter, an income, reliable sources for safe food and drinking water, and occasionally, without the companionship of close family and relatives. Many of the places that IDPs may travel to, including refugee camps or in the ruins of air bombed cities, have a greater risk for human rights violations to occur. As IDPs are placed into environments of high stress and danger, they may begin to turn to terror organizations in order to ensure that their individual and family needs are being met. To a displaced individual, the acts that they commit under a terror organization may not appear to be 'bad,' for these terror organizations promise to fulfill the needs that IDPs so desperately require. This line of reasoning introduced by Sandhu forms the argument that counter-terrorism measures must be based in a human rights based approach that guaranteees a safe standard of living for the displaced.

Such vulnerable populations include the dependents and families of foreign terrorist fighters. Spouses and children often travel to areas of conflict, such as Syria and Iraq, with the individual terror fighter as a family unit. The role of these dependents varies on an individual basis, as some actively participate in terror training and fighting while others do not (CTC Key Principles 2019). As stipulated by the UNCTC's Key Principles for the Protection, Repatriation, Prosecution, Rehabilitation, and Reintegration of Women and Children with Links to United Nations Listed Terrorist Groups, women and children should be provided with humanitarian aid as needed and without discrimination. Children that are linked to terror groups are to be given the utmost consideration, as some are "critically vulnerable and subject to violence at multiple levels" after being under the control of, or linked to, terrorist groups (CTC Key Principles 2019).

The aim of treating women and children with dignity, as directed in the UNDHR, is to reduce the risk of radicalization and increase the likelihood of repatriation into their respective state of origin (CTC Key Principles 2019).

United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC)

Created in 2006 by UN General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution 60/251, the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) is the division of the United Nations that advocates for the protection of human rights worldwide. The UNGA annually elects UN member states to fill the forty-seven positions that comprise the Council based on a geographical distribution. Upon its creation, the UNHRC replaced the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (United Nations Human Rights Council 2020a). The Russian Federation served as a former member of the HRC for three previous terms, (2006-2009, 2009-2012, and 2013-2016), and submitted a candidacy paper for the election of the Russian Federation to the HRC Council for the 2017-2019 term (UNGA 2016). Despite its candidacy paper, citing multiple instances where the Russian Federation committed itself to the advancement of human rights, the Russian Federation was not elected to a Council position.

According to the UN, human rights are defined as "...rights inherent to all human beings regardless of race, sex, nationality, ethnicity, language, religion, or any other status" (United Nations, "Human Rights," 2020). Examples of endowed human rights include "...the right to life and liberty, freedom from slavery and torture, freedom of opinion and expression, and the right to work and education" (United Nations, "Human Rights," 2020). The UNHRC is responsible for promoting and protecting human rights globally through various Human Rights Conventions and Covenants, such as the UNDHR and the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial

Discrimination (United Nations 2020?). The UNHRC may launch independent investigations, fact-finding missions, and inquiries based on formally filed complaints by individuals or third-party organizations and issue recommendations to the UNGA on how to resolve human rights issues (United Nations Human Rights Council 2020b).

The Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights (OHCHR) acts as the Secretariat for the UNHRC. The OHCHR has released multiple management plans on the maintenance of human rights across the globe that the UNHRC endeavors to fulfill. According to the OHCHR, rights-based approaches to peace and security have "inherent preventative power" that can make sustainable peace achievable (UN Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights 2020). Without a human rights based approach, global counter-terrorism and counter-extremism efforts frequently fail. The current plan established by the UNCHR from 2018-2021 seeks to address this issue by partnering directly with state actors enmeshed in conflict. Particularly, the UNCHR aims to: implement human rights information into early warning systems in order to prevent crises before they occur; deepen the understanding of new and developing technologies to ensure consistency with international law; and monitor human rights abuses throughout a variety of regions experiencing conflict (UNOHCHR 2020).

The UNHRC has been implementing multiple procedures to align with the goals established by the UNOHCHR, particularly with its active monitoring systems. Current areas of interest that are actively being monitored include Venezuela, Myanmar, Yemen, South Sudan, Burundi, and the Syrian Arab Republic. The investigation on Syria was established via Human Rights Council Resolution S-17/1 in August 2011 with a formal mandate to "investigate all alleged violations of international human rights law since March 2011" (UNHRC 2011). Since

the initial resolution, the UNHRC has published twenty reports on the human rights situation in Syria based on information gathered from witness testimonies of displaced persons. To date, Syria has not granted its permission to the UNHRC to initiate investigations within its borders (explained further in Domestic: Situation in the Syrian Arab Republic) (UNHRC 2020d).

In addition to independent investigations, the UNHRC monitors human rights improvements across all 193 UN member states through the Universal Periodic Review (UPR). The goal of the UPR is to "prompt, support, and expand the promotion and protection of human rights on the ground" by assessing the progress within individual states in subduing human rights challenges (UNHRC 2020c). Reviews are based upon a national review, provided by the state in question; information compiled by human rights experts, additional UN groups, and other treaty bodies; and information from non-governmental organizations (UNHRC 2020c). The Russian Federation completed its most recent UPR in May 2018. Out of 317 recommendations issued by the UNHRC, 191 received the support from Russian Federation, while 34 required additional clarification and 92 would require further consideration from President Putin (UNHRC 2018). Throughout the UPR, the Russian delegate reassured all that the Russian Federation would continue to pursue policies at the federal level to ensure the protection of all persons within Russian borders (UNHRC 2018).

Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons

Under the supervision of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons is a mandated position that investigates and enhances protection programs for IDPs. The post of Special Rapporteur is currently occupied by Cecila Jimenez-Damary. The duties of the Special Rapporteur include

making visits to countries across the globe to report on the status of IDPs (UNHRC 2020e). The Special Rapporteur, to date, has visited the Russian Federation twice: once in 1992, and again in 2003 following the International Conference on Internal Displacement in the Russian Federation, which urged the Russian Federation to coordinate a Representative visit to the Chechen Republic following cases of insurrection (United Nations Commission on Human Rights 2004).

The 2003 visitation from former Rapporteur Francis M. Deng was intended to observe and understand the situation of internal displacement and the status of formally displaced peoples following the 1994 separatist conflict in Chechnya. Rapporteur Deng was "pleased to note the consistent policy statements" made by the Russian Federation in terms of its commitment to humanitarian law, but discussed further concerns with Russian officials on the increasing needs for the internally displaced (UN Commission on Human Rights 2004). The Special Rapporteur recommended providing IDPs with information on the safety status of areas of conflict; proper compensation by the federal government to IDPs that have damaged or a complete loss of property due to displacement; and the continued support and cooperation with non-governmental organizations (UN Commission on Human Rights 2004).

The New York Declaration and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration

In 2016, the United Nations hosted the Summit for Refugees and Migrants, where the 193 member states of the UN developed the New York Declaration. The New York Declaration sought to address the global concern regarding migrants and refugees, and how member states can better prepare and care for such populations together (United Nations 2016). The New York Declaration stated that the global number of migrants surpassed 244 million people, outpacing the growth of the world's population itself (UNGA, The New York Declaration for Refugees and

Migrants 2016). The UNGA recognized that migrants and refugees alike relocate for numerous reasons, including food insecurity, human rights abuses, and terrorism, but further acknowledges the paramount role that migrant populations have on the economy and sustainable development within the states that they enter (UNGA, The New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants 2016). In order to promote the well-being of migrants, the UNGA reaffirmed the United Nations' commitment to respect the dignity of all migrants and refugees, improve humanitarian aid and resources to countries most in need, and develop a more "...comprehensive refugee response system" based on international cooperation (UNGA, The New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants 2016). The New York Declaration was further extended in 2018, when the United Nations developed the intergovernmental, non-legally binding treaty Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration.

The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration (GCM) solidified international commitment to establishing a cooperative system of global migration. Based on the comments and recommendations of the UN Secretary-General, the GCM established a cooperative framework with twenty-three guiding objectives and proposals for action, which included the plan to address the root causes that lead people to leave their country of origin and the "timely dissemination" of migrant data to all member states (United Nations 2018). With the proposal of increased information and organizational tactics, the GCM introduces methods by which the international community can best prepare for incoming populations.

The Russian Federation issued a statement supporting the adoption of the GCM, as it established "channels for legal migration and mechanisms for effective control over migration processes, elaborate instruments over illegal migration, including readmission, as well as the

fight against migration-related crimes" (Statement of the Russian Federation on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration 2018). Included in its declaration of support for the Global Compact was the Russian Federation's reiterated stance on shared responsibility. Shared responsibility is the premise that member states with direct connection to a given circumstance of mass emigration should "primarily bear the greatest responsibility" for migrant populations (Statement of the Russian Federation on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration 2018). The Russian Federation furthermore acknowledges the need for international cooperation in obtaining 'political settlement' in the states that have a notable number of migrants that seek refuge in an outside state. Although Russia is supportive of the mission of the GCM, there are concerns with regards to the additional monetary funds and obligations that could potentially be requested on behalf of international agencies in order to aid migrants (Statement of the Russian Federation on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration 2018).

A majority of the world's refugees come from states in which there is societal instability or violence. Many of these states are located in the Middle East and Africa, where nearly 1.1 million refugees in 2018 were fleeing armed conflict situations in locations such as Syria, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and South Sudan (Amnesty International 2020). Many of these refugees are fleeing to neighboring states in the region and beyond. To date, Turkey currently hosts the most refugees of any country in the world at approximately 3.7 million people (Amnesty International 2020). The Russian Federation is projecting 9,000 refugees to enter the state's limits over the course of 2020 (UNHCR 2020b).

Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa (BRICS)

BRICS is the acronym for the independent states of Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa. BRICS formed in 2008 after the meetings of Russian Federation President Vladimir Putin at the G8 Summit with then-leaders Hu Jintao of the People's Republic of China and Manmohan Singh of India (Ayres 2017). The intended goal for BRICS is the collaboration between states that have large, fast-growing economies that deserve greater responsibility and recognition in the global sphere (BRICS Brazil 2019).

The tenth annual BRICS Summit was held in 2018 in Johannesburg, South Africa. The Summit operated under the theme of Collaboration for Inclusive Growth and Shared Prosperity. Part of the vision for growth and prosperity stemmed from the 2018 Summit and the subsequent publishing of the Johannesburg Declaration, which outlined the aspirations for BRICS members in the coming years. From the Johannesburg Declaration, BRICS reaffirms its commitment to multilateral cooperation in fostering security and peace and recognizes the vital role that the United Nations plays in the promotion of these goals. With these goals in mind, BRICS called for an increase in representation of African States in UN peace and security concerns and an increase in diversity within the UN Security Council to make it inclusive to developing states (Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India 2020). As permanent members of the Security Council, the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China aim to further the goals of the Johannesburg Declaration and further integrate developing countries that show an interest in addressing the terrorism and migration.

The Johannesburg Declaration also called for an increase in global multilateralism and cooperation on counter-terrorist matters. Regarded as a "deplored" act, the BRICS states call upon the UN to establish a "firm international legal basis" to better support its member states in

the fight against terrorism (Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India 2020). BRICS recognized that since 1996 the UN General Assembly has been in the process of drafting the Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism. The Johannesburg Declaration promoted the continued discussion and eventual resolution of this Convention, including the various protocols that have been approved and signed by the Russian Federation in its stead over the years: the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, and the International Convention for the Suppresson of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India 2020; United Nations General Assembly Sixth Committee 2014).

Regional Organizations

As the largest geographical state in the world, the Russian Federation holds territory in both Europe and Asia. Consequently, the Russian Federation maintains membership in a variety of regional organizations in both regions that seek to improve, protect, and enhance the values and quality of life for Russians and other neighboring entities. The Russian Federation is a member state of the Commonwealth of Independent States, BRICS, the Council of the Baltic Sea States, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. Although it is not a member state of the European Union, the Russian Federation works collaboratively with the organization as needed.

Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

The Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) was created in a series of successive agreements. The first agreement, known as the Belavezha Accords, was signed on 8 December 1991 between Belarus, Ukraine, and the Russian Federation. These Accords established the CIS

as the successor to the USSR, effectively dissolving the Union, but made a statement for all former Soviet states to remain in cooperative agreements (Boris Yeltsin Presidential Library 2017). The protocols of the CIS were established through the Alma Ata Protocol three weeks later and added the Republics of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan as members of the Commonwealth (Commonwealth of Independent States 1991). The CIS Charter was ratified two years later in 1993 by all current acknowledged member states, with the exception of the Republic of Ukraine and the Republic of Turkmenistan (Ministry of Foreign Affairs "Commonwealth of Independent States" 2020). The CIS Charter reaffirmed the Commonwealth's commitment to the goals proposed in the UN Charter and outlined the goals and various departments of the CIS.

Similar to Russia, the CIS recognizes regional security as a priority. An emerging area of cooperation between member states has been the Anti-terrorist Center of the CIS Member State (ATC-CIS). The ATC-CIS was established in 2000 by the Decision of the Council of CIS States as a permanent branch tasked with coordinating cooperation between CIS states in the fight against international terrorism and escalating instances of violent extremism (Antiterrorist Center of the CIS Member States 2020). The ATC-CIS is partularly interested in preventing global terrorism related to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) that operates out of Syria and Iraq. ISIL has been recognized by the Russian Federation as a terrorist organization since 2014 (Antiterrorist Center of the CIS Member States 2020).

The ATC-CIS is determined to eliminate terrorist and extremist acts and has several areas of focus: coordination, information and analysis, regulation, research and guidelines, and training and professional development (The Commonwealth of Independent States Anti-Terrorism Center

2020). These areas of focus are the basis for multiple agreements and concepts, such as the Treaty of the CIS Member States on the Interstate Search of Persons. The Russian Federation became party to this Treaty in 2014 in order to better promote cooperation between CIS Member States in searches for people of interest. Such people include those that are, "...hiding from the sides' relevant authorities and evading criminal sanctions or execution of court decisions." (The Kremlin 2014). The Treaty also extends to those, "...who are missing or not in contact with their families [and] on matters of establishing the identities of persons who are unable to provide background information, as well as in cases of discovering unidentified bodies" (The Kremlin 2014). The Russian Federation remains actively engaged with the ATC-CIS on establishing resolutions related to the issue of terrorism. Recently, the ATC-CIS has released The Program of Cooperation of the CIS Member States in the Fight Against Terrorism and Other Violent Manifestations of Extremism for 2020-2022 (Anti-Terrorism Center of the CIS Member States 2020). In his speech at the CIS Heads of State Council, President Vladimir Putin stated his goals for the program, which included increasing the role of the CIS Anti-Terrorism Centre in order to predict the movements of foreign terrorist fighters from Syria into CIS member states (The Kremlin 2019). The success of this program has yet to be fully determined, but the CIS remains committed to the continued prevention of terrorist movement into Member States.

European Union (EU)

The European Union (EU) was initially formed in 1958 by the independent states of Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands in the hopes of establishing peace, security, and inclusivity throughout Europe (European Union "The History of the European Union" 2020). The EU seeks to attain these goals through economic and political

cooperation of all member states and through collaborative interaction with non-member border entities. Membership over the years has increased incrementally, and has currently reached twenty-seven member states (European Union, "The History of the European Union," 2020).

The Russian Federation is part of both Europe and Asia. Though it is not a member state of the European Union due to "fundamental incompatibility," the Russian Federation acknowledges the overlap of concerns that involve both parties and chooses to remain a close and connected partner (Wegren 2019, 379). Following the disintegration of the USSR, many former Soviet states applied for EU membership, including the Baltic States of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, all of which successfully joined the EU in 2004 (Oldberg 2012; European Union "Countries" 2020). The positioning of Kaliningrad oblast, which shares a border with Lithuania, and the large Russophone populations within surrounding states necessitates a positive relationship with the Baltic States (see *Council of Baltic Sea States*). Currently, the Russian Federation and the Baltic States do not have a close political relationship but the Russian Federation remains committed to further developing a positive relationship (Trenin 2020).

Much of the Russian-EU partnerships are based on the St. Petersburg Summit held in 2003 that established the four EU/Russia Common Spaces, which include research, education, and culture, economic space, freedom, security, and justice, and external security (European Commission 2020). The St. Petersburg Summit of 2003 established the basis for future EU/Russia policies.

Much of the dialogue that is held between the Russian Federation and the EU on topics of migration and security occur between the Delegation of the European Union to Russia; however, dialogue has been suspended since 2014 due to EU concerns regarding the reintegration of the

Crimean Peninsula into the Russian Federation (Makarova 2019). Many EU member states have initiated sanctions against the Russian Federation with the intention of reversing actions in the Crimean Peninsula (European Union Delegation to the Russian Federation 2019). To date, the Russian Federation continues to fund socioeconomic projects within the Crimea to improve the lives of all who reside in the region (The Kremlin 2020).

Despite the suspension dialogue, the EU and the Russian Federation remain committed to bilateral cooperation on matters such as border security. Through the EU's Neighborhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations, the Russian Federation is collaborating in the Cross Border Cooperation, which seeks to promote joint action between EU member states and non-member states that share a land or sea border (European Neighborhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations 2020). Through the Cross Border Cooperation, multiple programs have been developed to promote better collaboration between bordering EU states and the Russian Federation. These programs in the past have included Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland (European Neighborhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations 2020).

The Council of the Baltic Sea States

The Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) was founded in 1992 as an intergovernmental organization for regional cooperation between the states of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and the Russian Federation. Additionally, the European Union holds a special seat within the CBSS (Council of Baltic Sea States, "About the CBSS" 2020). Historically, the CBSS has acted as a platform for communication between the Russian Federation and the EU. The former USSR states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are both CBSS and EU member states. Travel between the border regions

of EU member states and CBSS members are the catalyst for many of the issues that strain EU-Russian relations today, specifically with Kaliningrad. The exclave is geographically separated from the Russian Federation by Poland and Lithuania, two EU states, and causes complications for Russian citizens within Kaliningrad who wish to travel to other locations within the Russian Federation (Huisman 2002; Oldberg 2012). Despite these complications in travel, Kaliningrad remains the western-most part of the Russian Federation and holds numerous opportunities for further collaboration with its surrounding border entities.

The CBSS also acts as a platform for the Russian Federation to promote regional and international concerns such as terrorism. In 2002, the Russian Federation sought to add international terrorism to the CBSS list of priorities, following the struggle in the Chechen Republic against extremist separatists. However, the western CBSS member states "...did not accept the Russian definition of terrorism... as... one of the greatest threats to modern civilized societies" and was thus forgotten as a long-term priority for the CBSS (Oldberg 2012). The Russian Federation remains open to discussing the advancement of counter-terrorism and other security-related issues with the CBSS.

Currently, the CBSS is approaching critical issues such as sustainability, safety, and security (Council of the Baltic Sea States 2020). The Safety and Security initiative encompasses multiple vulnerable populations including children, intergrating migrants, and victims of human trafficking and exploitation. The Soft Security and Migration in the Baltic Sea Region Conference in 2017 identified migration as one of the "most pressing issues," and sought to increase conversation surrounding irregular and forced migration (Council of the Baltic Sea States "Soft Security and Migration" 2020). Since 2015, the Baltic Sea Region has experienced

an increase in the amount of applications requesting asylum and has sought to introduce new policies on matters such as immigration authorities, border patrols, and non-governmental authorities (Lisborg et al 2017).

The Final Report on Soft Security and Migration in the Baltic Sea Region is an example of such new policies. The Final Report acknowledges the duty of states to "...protect and accommodate forced migrants and asylum seekers" (Lisborg et al 2017). However, the report fails to explain the varying classifications between migrants, as refugees, displaced persons, and asylum seekers are protected under different international treatises. The Report on Soft Security and Migration stated that the Russian Federation "...recognizes one million persons from Ukraine as refugees," but that upwards of ten million could qualify as refugees in accordance with the Geneva Accords (Lisborg et al 2017). The report charges that the Russian Federation's disregard for those who may be qualified as refugees as a lack of political will, but the Russian Federation holds that this potential underreporting is due to the ongoing administrative updates on how *Rosstat*, the Russian Federation's prime administrative division for the collection of national statistics, gathers and analyzes data. Currently, *Rosstat* is seeking to add additional questions to surveys to better gauge the demographics of the individual (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe 2018). Until methods for data collecting are updated entirely, the Russian Federation is unable to provide resources to those that cannot prove that they fit the criteria of a refugee.

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)

The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) is an outlook on regional security. Officially formed in 1975 by the USSR following the signing of the Helsinki

Accords, the OSCE historically acted as a dialogue platform for the Western and Eastern blocs to connect and negotiate during the Cold War period (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe "What is the OSCE" 2020). The Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States within the Helsinki Accords provided the framework for which member states could interact with one another and defined the scope of power that each member state maintained. Such framework included the "peaceful settlement of disputes, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms [and the observance of] the equal rights and self-determinations of peoples," all of which the Russian Federation works to actively uphold and pursue (Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe 1975).

Currently, the OSCE acts as an authority providing groundwork services on behalf of requesting member states. Such groundwork intends to relieve political and ethnic tensions in high-risk areas and rebuild communities following conflicts (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe "What is the OSCE" 2020). Currently within the Russian Federation, two OSCE Observer Checkpoints at Gukovo and Donetsk are located at the Ukranian-Russian border. The Observer Checkpoints were established upon the explicit request of the Russian Federation and consequent approval by all fifty-seven participating OSCE member states under the 1130 Decision of the Permanent Council (Organization for the Security and Co-operation of Europe 2014). The presence of such observers is intended to moderate and report entries into the Russian Federation, as well as resolve tensions that have occurred in the area following the reintegration of Crimea (Organization for the Security and Cooperation of Europe 2020) (explained further in Domestic section). As mentioned in a statement submitted by the

Permanent Russian Federation Representative at the 1194th Meeting of the OSCE Council on 30 August 2018:

> "...we share the desire for a swift settlement of the internal Ukrainian conflict... We are convinced that all that is lacking for a successful settlement of the conflict, which has been going on for more than four years now, is the political will of the Ukrainian Government to solve peacefully with its fellow citizens in the east of the country the problems that have developed. This needs to be done through direct dialogue with Donetsk and Luhansk" (Organization for the Security and Co-operation of Europe 2018).

As required by the Helsinki Accords, the Russian Federation remains committed to the deliberate cooperation of all involved member states in the resolution of all conflicts within Ukraine and remains open to peaceful and constructive dialogue with the Ukrainian government in reaching a negotiation. Until such dialogue between member states improves, observers will remain at the aforementioned border points and deliver weekly observer reports (Organization for the Security and Co-operation of Europe 2020). Multiple measures have been implemented to encourage a path to a settlement, but the Russian Federation stipulates that the Ukrainian government must also resolve the matter with its own citizens through peaceful and civil discourse.

Domestic Organizations and Policies

The domestic institutions of the Russian Federation are the local entities and procedures that guide the Russian government. The Russian Federation utilizes multiple entities, such as the Ministry of Defense, the Federal Migration Service, and *Rosstat,* to address issues regarding migration and terrorism. Particular events, such as the reintegration of the Crimean Peninsula and the instances of Chechen insurrection in the late 1990s, have further guided the Russian Federation in determining policy, such as the Federal Law on Combating Terrorism. Many of

domestic policies of the Russian Federation are influenced by its expansionist years under Tsarist rule and its experience under the USSR.

Russian Expansion under Tsarist Rule

The Russian Federation traces its roots back to 862 CE in what is present day Kiev, Ukraine, which acted as the homeland for the first Russian peoples. Beginning in 1237, the first Slavic state of Kyivan Rus experienced multiple invasions from outside groups, such as the Muscovite Princes and the Mongol Golden Horde (Coleman and Holliway 2020). Moscow and other northeastern cities grew stronger and overthrew these outside powers in 1480 under the rule of Ivan III (r. 1462-1505) (Donaldson, Nogee, and Nadkarni 2014, 19). Russia began to unify and expand further east during the first tsarist reign of Ivan IV (r. 1547-1584) towards the Tatar-controlled regions of Kazan, Astrakhan, and Siberia (Coleman and Holliway 2020). During the reign of Boris Gudenov, Russia was occupied by Poland until Michael Romanov (r. 1613 - 1635) and his son, Alexis (r. 1645 - 1676) expelled the Polish forces and once more reclaimed Kiev (Donaldson, Nogee, and Nadkarni, 2014, 20).

Further integration of cultures came under the rule of Peter I (r. 1682 - 1725). Upon his ascension to the role of Tsar, Peter I spent portions of his reign abroad in western European states. The return of Peter I to Russia stimulated the beginnings of modernization, as well as new goals for expansion. As a military leader, Peter I led the Great Northern War against Sweden, and secured the territories of Livonia, Ingria, and portions of Finland. Near these regions, St. Petersburg was established and named as the Russian capital, and Russia gained access to ports in the Baltic Sea (Donaldson, Nogee, and Nadkarni 2014, 21-22).

Catherine the Great (r. 1762 - 1796) continued Russian expansion through a series of wars. Under Catherine the Great, Russia obtained a Turkish coast on the Black Sea through the Treaty of Belgrade and obtained the Finnish city of Vyborg through the Peace of Abo (Donaldson, Nogee, and Nadkarni 2014, 21-22). Additional conflicts with Turkey from 1768 to 1774 and 1787 to 1792 resulted in Russian control over northern portions near the Black Sea, such as the Crimean Peninsula. The three partitionings of Poland in 1772, 1793, and 1795 yielded the territories of Belarus, Lithuania, and western Ukraine to the growing Russian Empire (Donaldson, Nogee, and Nadkarni 2014, 21-22).

By the time Alexander I (r. 1801-1825) seized the role of Tsar, multiple ethnicities had been incorporated into the Russian Empire. Alexander I faced the first issues of growing nationalism, which intensified during the reign of his brother, Nicholas I (r. 1825-1855). Nicholas I ruled Russia under the guiding ideals of "Autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism," and in 1849 he sent 200,000 troops to Hungary to suppress a revolution against the Russian Empire (Donaldson, Nogee, and Nadkarni 2014, 22). The successor of Nicholas I, Alexander II (r. 1855-1881), relinquished a majority of the acquired Russian territories through the Treaty of Paris of 1856, which ended the Crimean War against Turkey and its allies. Russia sought to regain territory by focusing expansion efforts into Asia. In 1860, the Russian Empire renegotiated the border between China and Russia with the Treaty of Peking, and established the city of Vladivostok near present-day North Korea (Donaldson, Nogee, and Nadkarni 2014, 25). Turkestan was also incorporated into the Russian Empire over the course of twenty years, from approximately 1865 to 1883 (Donaldson, Nogee, and Nadkarni 2014, 25).

Further territory was added to the USSR in the twentieth century. The Kaliningrad oblast was previously a part of Germany in a region known as East Prussia. This territory had been under the control of the Russian Empire between the years of 1758 and 1762, following the Seven Years' War. However, after Russian Tsar Peter III negotiated a peace with Prussian ruler Frederick III, the city of Koenigsburg was returned to the German crown. The Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of 1945 returned the territory to Russia, where the region was renamed Kaliningrad in 1946 ("Kaliningrad History," 2020). As the western most part of Russia, Kaliningrad has played a large role in the 'Russian World' and 'compatriots abroad' concepts and in warding off anti-Russian sentiments in an area surrounded by European Union and NATO-allied states (Sukhankin 2017). The "compatriots abroad"and "Russian World" concept urged ethnic Russians to migrate from the former Soviet state of Lithuania to the Kaliningrad oblast, but the measure has largely been unsuccessful in obtaining this goal (Zevelev 2016).

The institutions and policies that the Russian Federation employs today are built upon centuries of Russian expansionist history which occurred under Tsarist rule until its overthrow in 1917. The creation of the USSR in 1922 placed the territories of Ukraine, Belarus, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Armenia under the direct control of Russians, who largely led the new Soviet Union (Coleman and Holliway 2020). The establishment of the USSR further promoted the spread of varying languages, religious practices, and ethnicities into Russia. The intermix of these components establish context and introduce many of the migration and displacement problems that the Russian Federation inherited following the dissolution of the USSR.

Federal Migration Service of Russia and Rosstat (FMS)

The migration services currently utilized by the Russian Federation is greatly impacted by the migration policy that was used during the time of the USSR. During the time of the USSR, a comprehensive passport system allowed ethnic Russians to move from central Russia to the periphery territories of the Union for labor purposes and population redistribution across less densely populated regions (Chudinovskikh and Denisenko 2017). As a result, millions of ethnic Russians emigrated outwards and into territories that now compose states such as Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. When the USSR disbanded, many of these ethnic Russians were left with the question to which state they legally belonged (Heleniak 2002). In states like Ukraine, ethnic Russians constitute a majority of the population at around fifty-eight percent (Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization 2017).

Following the dissolution of the USSR, the Russian Federation faced the challenge of developing and updating its migration system to fit the post-USSR world. The initial challenges faced by the Russian Federation in the early 1990s included issues such as legal migration, a lack of legislation mandating the legal status of foreigners, and individual issues of 'unresolved citizenship' due to the Soviet passports (Chudinovskikh and Denisenko 2017). The dissolution of the USSR reignited conflicts between ethnic groups. With the creation of fourteen newly independent states, 25 million ethnic Russians became internally displaced as they "...suddenly [became] members of minority groups ... hostile to their existence" (Heleniak 2002). This hostility towards ethnic Russians prompted the widespread migration back into the Russian Federation from the border states, which the Russian Federation could not address quickly in such large volumes. From 1991 to 2000, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Georgia, Ukraine, and Tajikistan contributed the most immigrants to the Russian Federation's growing populace. More

specifically, about twenty-six percent of Russia's incoming migrant population hailed from Ukraine; twenty-two percent hailed from Kazakhstan; ten percent from Uzbekistan; and six percent from Belarus and Azerbaijan (Chudinovskikh and Denisenko 2017)

Multiple steps were taken to address the pressing issue of migration. The first step included the establishment of the Federal Migration Service of Russia (FMS) in 1992, which was tasked with drafting and enforcing national migration law (Romodanovsky 2020). In 1992, the Russian Federation also signed onto the United Nations 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its subsequent 1967 Protocol. The adoption of the Convention and Protocol is crucial to the development of the Russian Federation's migration policy as it is the internationally recognized document that provides guidance on the rights of migrants and refugees (Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951). The 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol provide the Russian Federation with the widely recognized laws on foreign immgration and include various anti-discriminatory, non-refoulement, and non-retaliation policies for illegal entry during the quest for asylum (Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951).

Additionally, the Russian Federation adapted institutional changes to better assist citizens in former Soviet states in obtaining residence permits, work permits, and visas in the early 1990s, and simplified the process to obtain such documents in 2002. The naturalization process to obtain Russian citizenship has been revised to match the fluctuation of immigration rates throughout the years (Chudinovskikh and Denisenko 2017). Changes in immigration policy resulted in an estimated eleven million immigrants entering the Russian Federation from between

1992 to 2017, a majority of whom identified as former residents of Soviet republics (Chudinovskikh 2018).

Currently, the Russian Federation utilizes the Federal State Statistics Service, also known as *Rosstat,* and the National Statistical Office to collect migration data. Both of these offices are subdivisions of the Ministry of the Interior, which gained the previous responsibilities of the Federal Migration Service after its dissolution in 2016 (Chudinovskikh 2018). The National Statistical Office gathers migration data through censuses, surveys, and statistics compiled from other administrative organizations, such as the Ministry of Justice, and the Ministry of Health (Chudinovskikh 2018).

Rosstat is used to measure and track multiple aspects of the Russian Federation's migrant population, such as the amount of foreign students within the state and the rates of crime amongst migrants compared to Russian citizens (Chudinovskikh 2018). Currently, *Rosstat* is seeking to improve upon the collection of migrant data by including survey questions relating to migrants' entrepreneurship, labor skills, and involvement in the economy (Chudinovskikh 2018). With such collected information, the Ministry of the Interior will be able to better monitor the growth of the foreign population and provide additional services in order to help migrants assimilate.

Since 2011, *Rosstat* has undergone numerous developmental changes to improve the accuracy of immigration data reporting (Chudinovskikh 2018). *Rosstat* has been attempting to make the switch from paper-based data collection to an electronic-based system of statistical analysis and has acknowledged the time-consuming task of manually inputting information into data processing platforms. The Russian Federation's updated policy on the Concept of State

Migration includes provisions that seek to address the inclusion of digital technology to "...eliminate conditions conducive to corruption, decrease the probability of technical errors and reduce time-related, organizational, and financial costs" (Statement of the Russian Federation on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration 2018). With the aid of digital technology, the Russian Federation will be better equipped to provide for its various migrant populations.

Concept of the State Migration Policy

The Russian Federation's policy on the Concept of State Migration Policy includes many provisions that coincide with the proposed goals of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration under the UN. The Concept of State Migration Policy was implemented in 2012 by President Vladimir Putin in accordance with the constitutional laws and the principles of international law (The Kremlin 2012). The initial goals of the Concept of State Migration Policy include, "...helping Russian compatriots living abroad resettle in Russia; promoting the immigration of qualified specialists and other foreign workers needed on the Russian labor market; and simplifying entry and residence in the Russian Federation for foreign citizens doing business in Russia" (The Kremlin 2012). Additionally, the document specifies measures for promoting the development of internal migration by Russian citizens. The Concept of State Migration Policy was divided into three stages, each of which lasted four years: Stage One, from 2012 to 2015; Stage Two, from 2016 to 2020; and Stage Three, from 2021 to 2025. The end goal for the third stage of the Concept of State Migration Policy is to increase the "migration inflow" to the Far Eastern and Siberian regions of the state (The Kremlin 2012).

The Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation

The Ministry of Defense (MOD) is an executive body overseen by the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin. The MOD coordinates with other international bodies, such as the UN and the OSCE, in a variety of peacekeeping missions. As a member of the UN Security Council, the Russian Federation is bound by duty to ensure security across the globe and utilizes its forces when deemed necessary (MOD Mission 2020).

The Ministry of Defense recognizes the growing nuances of international terrorism and that it is an amalgamation of "complementary aspects," such as politics, religion, and nationalism. The MOD generally defines terrorism as "a response to the continuous foot dragging in resolving burning social issues," meaning that those participating in terror activities act due to unsatisfactory situations that do not address their needs (MOD Mission 2020). As a result, terrorism necessitates the need for a comprehensive plan that not only mitigates the effects of terror attacks, but addresses the societal concerns that may precipitate or promote them. The MOD was deployed in the Chechen Rebellions of the 1990s and early 2000s that utilized terror tactics and foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs) (see Addressing Chechen Terrorism and Foreign Terrorist Fighters).

Currently, the Ministry of Defense is concentrating on counter-terrorism tactics in both former Soviet Republic and far abroad states (MOD Mission 2020). The Ministry of Defense is active in the crisis in the Syrian Arab Republic after a 2015 Kremlin decision to intervene in the conflict in 2015. The Ministry of Defense also operates the Russian Center for Reconciliation of Opposing Sides and Refugee Migration Monitoring that assesses the humanitarian situation in Syria and administers necessary supplies to affected civilian populations ("Reconciliation Process" 2017).

The Situation in the Syrian Arab Republic

The Syrian Arab Republic is located in the Middle East, bordering Israel, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey. In its modern history, Syria has experienced multiple shifts in government, ruling power. Following World War I, Syria was placed under French rule via the League of Nations mandate system until 1946. The end of French occupation in Syria left a political vacuum, where multiple parties struggled for power until 1958 when Syria and Egypt convened to form the United Arab Republic. After the United Arab Republic separated in 1961, Syria became embroiled in the 1967 Arab-Israeli War and lost the Golan Heights, a territory under Israeli control to this day. In 1970, Hafiz al-Assad gained control of the Syrian government, bringing the state towards a period of stability. Hafiz al-Assad's son, Bashar al-Assad, assumed the role of president following the former's death in 2000. Al-Assad remains in power to this day as a result of popular referendums (CIA, "Syria," 2020). Syria is a member of the United Nations, and is currently suspended from participating in regional organizations such as the Arab Leagues.

There are two major events currently occupying the government of Syria with regards to migrants and internally displaced persons. The first event relates to the decades old conflict between Israel and Syria over the Golan. The Golan is an area of land in southwest Syria that Israeli troops began to occupy in June 1967 Israel annexed the Golan in its entirety in 1981. Prior to Israel's occupation of the Golan, this area was home to over 140,000 Syrians that were forced to flee their homes in order to avoid the conflict (Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations 2020). While some Syrian chose to flee their homes, others remained stationed in their villages. It is estimated that around 20,000 Syrians continue to live within the

Israeli Occupied Golan, alongside a growing Israeli population that has built over forty illegal settlements (Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations 2020. As Israel still claims sovereignty over the Golan, an estimated 500,000 Syrians are unable to return to their homes (Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations 2020). The Syrian government has attempted negotiations with Israel in the hopes of establishing a durable and lasting peace at the Madrid Conference of 1991, but no agreement came to fruition due to Israel's insistence on remaining within the Golan (Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations 2020). To date, Israel continues to control the Golan and move Israeli settlers into this occupied territory.

In addition to the ongoing Golan dispute, Syria has been embroiled within a civil war since 2011 as a result of the larger scale Arab Spring movement. The conflict began in 2011 after a series of anti-government protests began, calling for the resignation of President Bashar al-Assad. The protests became more violent, and began to devolve into three different campaigns: opposition to President al-Assad from anti-government groups, military operations by Turkey against the Kurdish population in Northeast Syria, and the fight against terror organizations such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and the al-Nusrah front, led by the United States (Council on Foreign Relations, "Civil War in Syria," 2020).

The Russian Federation became actively involved in Syria in September 2015. The Russian Ministry of Defense began deploying air strikes within portions of Syria held by terror groups (Chappell 2015). With the aid of the Russian Ministry of Defense, Assad has retained the territories that have been under the control of terror organizations. The last area that the Syrian government has yet to reclaim is in the northwest Idlib province (Ali 2020). In addition to

deploying military aid to Syria, the Russian Federation has negotiated peace talks within the region to address the growing humanitarian emergency. Russia, Iran, and Turkey have negotiated the Astana Process in 2017 in an attempt to determine ceasefire areas and demilitarized zones throughout rebel-held, non-ISIL territories. However, continued attacks from pro-government forces halted any further progress of the Astana Process (Council on Foreign Relations, "Civil War in Syria," 2020).

Additionally, the Syrian Civil War has caused worldwide human rights and migration concerns. The situation in Syria has caused mass migration problems for European states. 2015 marked the beginning of the Syrian refugee crisis, as states across the region were unable to handle the five million registered refugees (Council on Foreign Relations, "Civil War in Syria," 2020). The Republic of Turkey currently hosts the most Syrian refugees at around 3 million people (European Union 2019). Since the start of the Syrian War, the Syrian government and its allies have been charged by multiple sources of flagrantly breaching international human rights laws. Such accusations included arbitrary detention, the deliberate targeting of schools, hospitals, and other civilian locations, and utilizing chemical weapons against citizens and non-combattants (Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic 2019). In response to these charges, the UNHRC established an independent inquiry on Syria in 2011, which to date continues to actively monitor the human rights situation in Syria. After nearly a decade of ongoing conflict, the UNHCR reports that there are an estimated 6.2 million internally displaced Syrians seeking refuge from violence (UNHCR, "Syria Regional Refugee Response" 2020).

There have been multiple UNSC Resolutions passed with the goal of mitigating the Syrian conflict. Most recently, the UNSC voted in Resolution 2504 to renew, for a six month period, two of the four authorized border crossings established in Resolution 2165. The two renewed border crossings included the Bab al-Salam and Bab al-Hawa border crossings between Syria and Turkey. The reduction from four to two border crossings was met with some resistance within the Security Council, as multiple states— namely Germany, the United Kingdom, and France— requested that all four border crossings authorized in Resolution 2165 remain open for cross border assistance. However, the Russian Federation maintained that the border crossings to Jordan and Iraq (Al-Ramtha and Al Yarubiyah) had not been utilized often over the course of a year (United Nations, "Cross Border Aid Delivery to Syria," 2020).

Furthermore, the Russian Federation maintained that all cross border deliveries needed to be approved by the Syrian government. The Syrian representative in December 2019 explained their reasoning for rejecting the proposal for the renewal of all four border crossings, stating that "the circumstances in which it [cross border mechanism of Resolution 2165] was established no longer exist" (United Nations, "Cross Border Aid Delivery to Syria," 2020). Additionally, there had been no method developed by the UNSC in order to protect humanitarian aid from terrorist groups. Terrorist groups have been stealing supplies delivered at border crossings in Idlib province, stated the Syrian representative (United Nations, "Cross Border Aid Delivery to Syria," 2020). Though delegates of the UNSC meeting disagreed on portions of Resolution 2504, the measure passed with eleven favorable votes, zero votes against, and four abstensions from the Russian Federation, China, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Addressing Chechen Terrorism and Foreign Terrorist Fighters

Chechnya, located in the North Caucasus regions, has been under the control of the Russian Federation for centuries. Within the Russian Federation, Chechens are an ethnic and religious minority, as a majority of the people practice Islam (Bhattacharji 2010). There have been multiple attempts in the past, particularly during Joseph Stalin's reign, when the Chechens have attempted to revolt against the Soviet Union and establish themselves as a separate sovereign entity (Bhattacharji 2010). The insurrectionist movement was reignited following the dissolution of the USSR in 1991, at which time Chechen extremists attempted to organize a movement for total independence from the Russian Federation. The movement for independence escalated in violence and in frequency and nearly resulted in war (United Nations Commission on Human Rights 2004).

In the process of these rebellions, a substantial amount of the Chechen and Russian population was displaced. By May 2004, it was estimated that over 200,000 people were displaced within Chechnya (Holland 2004). This displacement was the result of terror attacks. In 1999, a group of Chechen and foreign Islamic fighters bombed a total of three apartment complexes in Moscow and Volgodonsk (Myers 2003). These attacks killed 242 people and injured hundreds more (Eckers 2019). The terror attacks resulted in President Putin issuing a mass air campaign in 1999 to the Northern Caucasus, during which the foreign fighters were suspected to be hiding amongst Chechen extremists (Eckers 2019).

Despite the efforts of President Putin, violence still reigned throughout the Caucasus and into the early 2000s. The most infamous act of extremism is remembered through the Beslan hostage crisis of 1-3 September, 2004, where Chechen militants took 1200 citizens hostage in a Beslan elementary school. The Chechen perpetrators forced all hostages into the gym, where

they performed a series of executions of teachers and parents who had accompanied their children to school. By the third day of the crisis, the Russian security forces stormed the building after two blasts were heard from within the school. The end of the crisis resulted in over 350 people dead, half of whom were young children (Radio Free Europe 2019a).

The repugnant violence in Chechnya was the result of extremists led by a misguided ideology pushed forward by foreign terrorist fighters. This misguided ideology embedded in Islamic extremism is resurfacing in Chechnya and may once more require the force of the Russian military to effectively defend against such threats. The presence of foreign terrorist fighters from the Middle East and the return of Russians that have travelled abroad to states with known extremist entities threaten the security and safety of the Russian Federation. A 2017 report issued by The Soufan Center listed the top ten nationalities of foreign terrorist fighters. The Russian Federation was at the top of this respective list with over 3400 people who have travelled to Syria or Iraq with the intent of engaging with terror organizations. Of those that travelled abroad to Iraq or Syria, only a portion (four hundred) returned to the Russian Federation. The next state, Saudi Arabia, had 173 less fighters that travelled abroad, but yielded a greater number of returned fighters (Barrett 2017).

Country of Origin	Number of Fighters Who Traveled to Iraq or Syria	Estimated Number of Returned Fighters	Share Returned (%)
Russia	3,417	400	12
Saudi Arabia	3,244	760	23
Jordan	3,000	250	8
Tunisia	2,926	800	27
France	1,910	302	16
Morocco	1,660	236	14
Turkey	1,500	n/a	n/a
Uzbekistan	1,500	n/a	n/a
Tajikistan	1,300	147	11
Germany	915	300	33

Source: Benton and Banulescu-Bogdan 2019

This chart demonstrates the need for the Russian Federation to defend against foreign terrorist fighters and prevent the return of those who have been exposed to radical ideology. With one of the largest nationalities of foreign terrorist fighters, the Russian Federation must prevent the radicalization of vulnerable populations, such as the dependents of foreign terrorist fighters who are exposed to violence and extremism and may choose to follow in the steps of their parental guardian (Benton and Banulescu-Bogdan 2019).

The Russian Federation has established various documents with the explicit intent to address the growing concern of terrorism. The Federal Law On Combating Terrorism was initially created in 2006, but has since enacted multiple amendments. The Federal Law established the basic principles of combating terrorism, the framework for eliminating the consequences of terrorism, and the means by which the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation may intervene during instances of terrorist attacks. Articles 18 through 21 discuss the methods by which the Russian Federation will compensate those who participate in the fight against terrorism (Federal Law "On Combating Terrorism" 2006). Furthermore, the Russian Federation

continually updates its list of banned terror organizations, which presently includes the Chechen based groups of the Congress of the Peoples of Ichkeria and Dagestan and the Supreme Military Majlisul Shura of the United Mojahedin of the Caucus (ATC-CTC, "Russian Federation" 2019).

The Russian Federation maintains its strong convictions on the Chechen Republic remaining as a de facto entity under Russian governance. In his address to the first session of the Chechen Parliament in 2005, President Putin stated that, "Russia has always been the most loyal, reliable, and consistent defender of the Moslem world's interests. In trying to destroy Russia, terrorists are undermining one of the Moslem world's main sources of support in the fight for the legitimate rights of the Islamic countries" (The Kremlin 2005). The Russian Federation will continue to protect all of its various identifying populations and uphold humanitarian law, but will suppress any uprisings that threaten the stability of the legitimate government.

Reintegration of the Crimean Peninsula and the Support of the Donbas Separatists

The Crimean Peninsula, as stated by Russian President Vladimir Putin, "has always been an inseparable part of Russia" (The Kremlin 2014a). The territory was gained by the Russian Federation under Catherine the Great's reign and ceded to Ukraine in the 1950s under Soviet leader, Nikita Khrushchev, out of personal initiatives allowed by the Communist Party (CIA, "Ukraine," 2020; The Kremlin 2014a). During its time under Soviet governance, the Crimean Peninsula was a strategic point for the Russian Navy, as the city of Sevastopol served as the headquarters for the Black Sea Fleet. After the Crimean Peninsula was ceded to Ukraine in 1954, the Russian Federation continued to utilize the Sevastopol port under the Russia-Ukraine Friendship Treaty and the Budapest Memorandum until Crimea's reintegration in 2014 (Toucas 2017). The Crimean Peninsula also became heavily populated with ethnic Russians that migrated

to the area in search of labor and new opportunities (Coleman, "Ukraine," 2020). The population of ethnic Russians in the Crimean Peninsula increased during the years of the USSR due to the comprehensive passport system between member states.

Upon the fall of the USSR, Ukraine attempted to pursue democratic practices of government. However, many of the policies pursued by the Ukrainian government were viewed negatively by the local populations, particularly the decision to refute further negotiations on strengthening Ukranian relations with the European Union (Pifer 2019a). This decision led to riots against the state government of Ukraine, calling for "an end to corruption, inefficient state management, and poverty" that has plagued the state since the fall of the USSR (The Kremlin 2014a). These riots resulted in the ousting of the Ukrainian President and the infiltration of the Ukrainian government by a coup composed of "nationalists, neo-Nazis, Russophobes, and anti-Semites" (The Kremlin 2014a). The people of the Crimea, a majority of whom are ethnic Russians, called upon the Russian Federation for their protection, fearing the infringement of their rights as an ethnic minority (The Kremlin 2014a).

The Crimean Peninsula was reintegrated into the Russian Federation on 16 March 2014 after a referendum was held on the question of whether or not the Crimean Peninsula would remain under the jurisdiction of Ukraine (The Kremlin 2014b). The results of the referendum yielded largely positive results, with over ninety-six percent of the recorded vote favoring joining the Russian Federation (O'Loughlin 2019). The international community, including the United Nations General Assembly, does not recognize the legitimacy of this referendum, claiming that the Russan government interfered with the voting results (Pifer 2019). The Russian Federation,

however, maintains that the referendum was a, "...direct exercise of the people of Crimea's right to self-determination," and should therefore be recognized (O'Loughlin 2019).

Ukraine's lack of recognition of the right of the people living in the Crimean Peninsula to determine their fate led to conflict within the Peninsula. The eastern regions of Ukraine, Donetsk and Luhansk, have also proclaimed their desire to separate and rejoin the Russian Federation (Yuhas 2019). Ukraine has utilized its military in an attempt to control the regions despite the calls of self-determination from varying locations. The Russian Federation continues to support these regions that seek to separate or leave Ukraine and has provided support to Donetsk and Luhansk. The conflict between Dunbas separatists and Ukrainian soldiers has escalated in violence, leading the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Germany, and France to secure the Minsk Protocols in order to de-escalate tensions and negotiate a ceasefire ("Protocol on the results of consultations of the Trilateral Contact Group" 2014). The OSCE has also played a role in alleviating tensions by establishing a border crossing between the Donbas region and the Russian Federation (Organization for the Security and Co-operation of Europe 2014).

According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring System (IDMC), currently 800,000 people within the Crimean Peninsula have been displaced as of 2018 (IDMC, "Ukraine," 2018). This is a sharp reduction from the estimated number of 1.6 million in 2014 (UNHCR 2020). The displaced have fled their homes as a result of violence, human rights abuses, and food insecurity. Some populations within the Crimea and the areas of Donetsk and Luhansk are repeatedly displaced as access to resources becomes even more restricted and calls for independence from Ukraine further push them from their place of permanent residence (IDMC 2020). Settlements and camps have been established within Ukraine to address IDPs, and the UNHCR continues to

provide humanitarian relief to the affected populations (UNHCR 2020). The Russian Federation remains open to dialogue with Ukraine and observer parties, such as Germany, France, and the OSCE, in order to resolve the humanitarian conflict.

III. Policy Recommendation

Given the past experiences and current interests of the Russian Federation, it is recommended that the state provides humanitarian aid in both short-term and long term capacities. In the long-term, it is recommended that the Guiding Principles on Internally Displaced Persons and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration (GCM) be discussed at a global Summit to redress the challenges that IDPs may face across the globe. In the short-term, it is recommended that the Russian Federation continue to provide humanitarian aid to Syrians seeking refuge from the ongoing conflict. In order to do so, the Russian Federation will petition for a staging area to be established at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing between Syria and Turkey.

The combined approach of groundwork and the reworking of international policy will not only benefit the Russian Federation, but the international community as well. Through the Chechen rebellions of the 1990s and early 2000s, the Russian Federation has seen the negative influences that extremists can bring to a region embroiled in turmoil. Many of the extremists that have utilized terror tactics within the Chechen rebellions were inspired by extremists abroad in the Middle East (Myers 2003). By working to mitigate tensions within the Middle East, particularly in Northwest Syria, the Russian Federation is taking steps to prevent further extremism that could once more infiltrate the state.

Furthermore, the Russian Federation will be honoring its deep relationship with Syrian leader, Bashar al-Assad. Russia has had a long and beneficial relationship with the Russian Federation that initially began in 1971 with Bashar al-Assad's father, Hafez al-Assad. The bond between Syria and the Soviet Union was mutually beneficial, as Syria could obtain weapons from the USSR in exchange for a guaranteed military base. Currently, the Russian Federation holds multiple military bases within Syria, including an air base in Latakia and a naval base in Tartus. The naval base within Tartus is of extreme importance to the Russian Federation, as it not only allows visits into Syria's territorial waters and ports, but also provides Russian ships access to the Mediterranean Sea, as stipulated in a 2017 agreement (Radio Free Europe 2019b). The agreement with Syria to house Russian air and naval fleets places the Russian Federation into a position of power within the Middle East region, further countering Western Europe's opposition to Russia (Gaub and Popescu 2013; Roberts 2019). Therefore, supporting Syria and alleviating its humanitarian crisis is in the interest of the Russian Federation as it guarantees permission for the continued use of overseas military bases.

By introducing a Summit on the GCM, the Russian Federation is enhancing opportunities for global cooperation on the issue of migrants. Internally displaced persons (IDPs) are currently subject to the protection of their state of origin. Thus, IDPs are addressed in a different manner than other migrants, such as refugees, whose rights and protections are outlined in a separate protocol and calls upon international states to provide for them (Phuong 2000). However, some states are unable to provide the necessary resources needed to address the plight that IDPs face. This leads IDPs to seek aid from third-party, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or seek refuge in states outside of their home state (United Nations 2020). In situations where the state of

origin is unable to provide assistance to IDPs, NGOs and other entities may cross into state territory to provide necessary aid, contingent upon state approval. This discretion on the acceptance of international aid rests with a state's government, which may decide to decline or withdraw third party assistance at any time.

The Russian Federation respects the sovereignty of all independent states and understands that the acceptance of international aid must be the ultimate decision of the state government. Hosting a Summit will respect the boundaries of state sovereignty and cultivate an atmosphere that promotes the spirit of international cooperation. The resulting amendments, if any, will be non-binding, as per the introductory statement to the Guiding Principles on Internally Displaced People and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration. The non-binding nature of these documents will safeguard sovereignty and ensure that no state, including the Russian Federation, is pressured by another actor to initiate policy.

IV. Policy

The Russian policy, Drought Insurance Approaches and Discussion with Efforts for Migration Supplies (DIADEMS) attempts to resolve the issue of internally displaced persons and terrorism through international policy and groundwork. Part I provides a long-term solution to the issue of internally displaced persons through means of discussion, while Part II allows for immediate short-term relief to IDPs in areas of armed conflict to deter recruitment into terror operations.

Part I: Summit on Migration and the Internally Displaced (SMID)

Introduction

Internally displaced persons (IDPs) as defined by the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees in the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement are, "persons...who have been forced...to flee or to leave their homes... in particular as a result of or

in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized border" (United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees 1998). However, the Guiding Principles have not been reviewed since their publication in 1998 and no further United Nations protocols have since been introduced in order to further the discussion of IDPs. Furthermore, this definition of IDPs is "...purely descriptive" and does not act as a legal definition of IDPs or outline the specific protections afforded to IDPs. As a result, these migrants are in a perpetual state of insecurity and exposed to multiple human rights abuses. It is necessary to encourage further international discussion on how to prevent displacement and protect the rights of the displaced.

Body

The Republic of Indonesia agrees to host a Summit in Jakarta on September 17-19th, 2021 to review and update the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, with a focus on adding new propositions in regard to IDPs. Indonesia has shown an increasing concern over the humanitarian crisis in Syria and the international threat of terrorism ("Statement at The United Nations Security Council Briefing on Middle East" 2019; "Agenda Item 107 Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism" 2020). Holding the Summit at a location that recognizes the intersectional importance of the two issues will greatly facilitate conversation on how to rectify circumstances for IDPs.

Opening of dialogue on how to prevent internal displacement and better assist those who have been displaced is a starting point for states to decrease terror recruitment. At the Summit, participating states will discuss an amendment to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and

Regular Migration (GCM), where the newly refined Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement may be reaffirmed as a part of the internationally recognized GCM. Acknowledging the Guiding Principles within the GCM will reaffirm signatory states' commitment to *all* migrants, including the internally displaced, as declared in the Preamble of the GCM (United Nations General Assembly 2018). Both the GCM and the Guiding Principles are non-binding documents and thus respect the sovereignty of signatory states.

Funding

The Summit will be funded by all participating states. States that choose to participate in the Summit will cover the individual costs of transportation, hotel lodging, personal costs, and compensation for delegates. Delegates, at the expense of their respective states, may also travel with one translator and one support staff member. A total of two delegates from each state will be required to attend. These representatives will be selected at the discretion of each participating state. Additionally, a thirteen-member Steering Committee will be established in order to organize the Summit agenda, make venue reservations, and ensure the presence of adequate security. The Steering Committee will be co-chaired by the Republic of Indonesia and the Russian Federation. The next eleven states which agree to the Summit and post the required dues in a timely manner will also be invited as members of the Steering Committee.

The World Bank divides states into three categories based on income: high-income, middle-income, and low-income. It is based on these categories that fees and payments for each attending state are determined. High income states such as Croatia and Germany will pay USD 2000, per delegate and staff member, to attend. Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) that are interested in attending the Summit, such as the UNHCR, the UNSC, and the International

Organization for Migration will also pay USD 2000. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) may also attend the Summit, contingent upon the approval of the Steering Committee. Middle income states per World Bank criteria, such as China, Turkey, South Africa, Indonesia, and the Russian Federation will pay USD 1500 to attend. Low income states such as Rwanda will pay USD 1000 to attend. All funds submitted by participating states will be handled by the Steering Committee.

Conclusion

By initiating conversation on an international document, the global community may become more aware and inclusive to the concerns of IDPs. By hosting a Summit on the Guiding Principles, the issues of internally displaced persons may be readdressed on a global scale and reaffirm the intergovernmental cooperation on the topic of migration. Discussion of amending the GCM will further reflect the international concerns of the internally displaced, and provide an additional platform for states to consider how to prevent and protect victims of internal displacement.

Part II: Staging Area for Relief Efforts towards Syrians (SARES)

Introduction

Though there is no internationally recognized definition for terrorism, it is generally acknowledged to be, "the ideology of violence and the practice of influencing decision-making by state authorities, local authorities or international organizations related to intimidation of the population and/or other forms of unlawful violent actions" (Russian Federal Law, "On Combating Terrorism," 2006). Terrorism can incite cases of mass internal displacement as a means to obtain political goals and new recruits. Studies have shown that states with large

internally displaced population are more likely to experience suicide terrorist attacks due to a lack of provisions, aid, and human rights protectons that then enables an environment in which IDPs will turn to suicide terrorism to resolve conflicts (Choi and Piazza 2014).

Body

To reduce the number of recruits to terror organizations, it is necessary to improve the environment in which IDPs live. In order to pursue this goal, Signatory States agree to petition the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to establish a staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing near Reyhanli, on Turkey's Southern border. By establishing a staging area, the United Nations and other non-governmental aid agencies may more easily disperse medical supplies, food, blankets, and tents to the populations that have demonstrated the highest need and are projected as high-risk areas. This staging area will house aid workers and store materials, such as blankets, tents, and medical supplies, that will be transported to IDPs located at the Qah refugee camp, a village north of Idlib, Syria. IDPs are fleeing to the overcrowded Qah camps from Idlib, which is currently under the control of the Hayat Tahrir al-Sham, an al-Qaeda linked regime. The continued operation of the Bab al-Hawa border crossing will be determined by the UNSC based on the current policy approved in January 2020 (United Nations Security Council 2020). Humanitarian needs will be provided until the state receiving aid no longer demonstrates need for assistance.

Funding

Funding for the staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing will be funded through the United Nations Security Council and will not require funding from consenting states.

Conclusion

Multiple organizations have created multilateral agreements to address some of these issues, but have previously disregarded the crucial role that IDPs may play in recruitment for terror organizations. Northwestern Syria is a location that encompasses both of the aforementioned issues and presents an opportunity for resolution in areas where the international community has previously fallen short. The current conflict in Syria is nearing its tenth year. While much military progress has been made on behalf of the Assad regime against terror organizations and rebellion groups, the humanitarian situation has only grown more dire. The urgency for humanitarian aid in Syria has increased as the displaced suffer the effects of fluctuating temperature changes and are exposed to novel diseases. The introduction of a staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing will aid the United Nations and relief agencies in providing the necessary resources for those displaced, and lower the likelihood for violent extremism and recruitment into terror organizations to be viewed as an alternate solution for survival.

V. Justification

This proposal by the Russian Federation is the most reasonable option that will greatly benefit all states that approve. The implementation of a Summit on the Global Compact for Migration and the Guiding Principles for Internally Displaced Persons will provide an international platform for discussion on how to better protect and provide for internally displaced persons, an issue that both developing and developed states have and will face in the coming years. Any amendments that are made to the Guiding Principles or the Global Compact will be non-binding. By maintaining the non-binding status of these documents, the sovereignty of signatory states will be respected. The hosting of an international Summit on internally displaced

persons will promote global cooperation in solving an issue that both developed and developing states have and will experience as global conflict and disaster continues.

As global terrorism increases, it is important for the international community to recognize the role that all states play in preventing the escalation of such extremism. By having the international community commit resources to IDPs in temporary camps, the likelihood of successful terror recruitment will decrease. With a decrease in terror recruitment in IDP populations, there is less of a chance for foreign terrorist fighters to grow in strength and spread extremist ideology across the globe.

The implementation of these two policies will also seek to address the overarching conflict in the Middle East. Syria has been embroiled in its civil war for nearly ten years. According to a UN special envoy for Syria, approximately 400,000 people have perished, though it is likely this number far exceeds the estimated count (Al Jazeera 2016). Within that time frame, multiple states have intervened within the conflict, such as Turkey, Iran, and the Russian Federation. The war in Syria has required the support of multiple actors who have committed their own soldiers and resources in the attempt to mitigate the situation and prevent further escalation. The provision of a staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing will call upon the greater international community to make similar contributions as the states that have already intervened in the conflict.

III. Negotiation Strategies

The Russian Federation will approach negotiations with all states by using a non-zero-sum strategy, in which all sides in an agreement "win." In situations where a non-zero sum strategy is utilized, it becomes possible for all parties to achieve a mutual gain (Starkey

2015, 50). By utilizing this negotiation strategy, the Russian Federation will be able to better persuade states to ratify the proposed policy, since all will be shown the mutual victory that will be achieved for their respective interests in battling terrorism and in ensuring the human rights of migrants.

China

The People's Republic of China (PRC) is a geographical neighbor to the Russian Federation. China is recognized as the most populous country in the world at 1.3 billion people, and the fifth largest country by land size (CIA, "China," 2020). The population of China is relatively homogenous, with over ninety percent of the population identifying as ethnically Han. Despite this large majority, the Chinese government formally recognizes over fifty-six ethnic identities (CIA, "China," 2020).

Many of China's advancements have occurred within the past century and a half. The People's Republic of China was officially established in 1949 after Mao Zedong's Communist party ousted Chaing Kai-Shek's Nationalist Party. Under Mao's government, China began to work closely with the USSR. This close connection led to a beneficial partnership between the two states, which resulted in large Soviet influences on the development of the Chinese legal and government system (CIA, "China," 2020). Soviet influences on the Chinese can still be seen today as China, like the former Soviet Union, remains a highly centralized state.

Like the Russian Federation, The People's Republic of China holds a permanent position on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and the power to cast vetoes (United Nations Security Council 2020). China has signed on to a variety of international treaties that address the issue of migration, including the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the

1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. The PRC has released a statement issuing its support for the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration, but has stressed that states should utilize the Global Compact within the framework of current international law based on "principles of voluntariness" (Statement of Ambassador Li Li 2018). China has voted on a number of policies that actively align with the goals and votes of the Russian Federation. Most recently, China voiced its support for the stance of the Russian Federation in regards to cross border aid into Syria through Resolution 2504 and agreed that Syria had to approve of all incoming humanitarian aid As a result, China aligned itself with the Russian Federation in the final vote and chose to abstain (UNSC 2020a).

With regard to internal migration in states aboard, China holds a firm non-interference stance and refuses to become entangled in other sovereign states' affairs. However, China supports the concept of global cooperation through "extensive consultations and joint contributions" between states (Statement by Ma Zhauxo at Security Council Meeting on Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict 2018). China is a strong proponent of internal political settlement with regards to the political issue within Syria and supports the Syrian government in its efforts to rebuild cities and infrastructure for its citizens. China maintains that Syria should maintain "openness and transparency" and report to the Security Council "in a timely matter" on the progress of rebuilding efforts ("Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN" 2020c). Regarding the role that the international community should play in aiding the humanitarian crisis, China urges member states to continue to contribute funds to the United Nations so that resources can be provided for Syrians in need and to continue discussion

surrounding cross-border humanitarian relief ("Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN" 2020b).

Furthermore, China believes that Syria's humanitarian crisis is inextricably connected to the issue of terrorist organizations. In a statement from UN Ambassador Zhang Hun at the Security Council Open Meeting on the Humanitarian Situation in Syria on 29 January, 2020, China determined that "the elimination of terrorist forces is a necessary condition for Syria to restore peace" ("Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN" 2020a). Similar to the Chechen insurrection that the Russian Federation endured throughout the 1990s and 2000s, China's Xinjiang province has experienced many issues with regard to terrorist attacks from the Uighurs, a group of Muslim separatists that reside within the area. The Chinese government has assured the UN that the situation has been contained, but the international community holds concerns on the methods that China has used to suppress these attacks, as expressed by the United Kingdom's ambassador ("Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China" 2020d).

It is expected that non-zero sum negotiations with China will go smoothly. Of the several resolutions passed by the UNSC thus far into 2020, China has either voted or abstained from voting in a manner similar to the Russian Federation, such as in Resolutions 2504 and 2505 (United Nations Security Council 2020a; United Nations Security Council 2020b). To negotiate with China, the Russian Federation will negotiate over the shared interest of preventing extremism, particularly within foreign bodies. In recent years, China has had issues with the Uighurs, a Muslim minority population in the Xinjiang province that has insurrectionist tendencies towards the Chinese state government. It has been reported that the Uighurs

established a presence within Syria in the early years of the conflict (Ali 2020). The presence of the Uighurs in the Idlib territory raises the stakes for non-interventionist China as they face the risk of the return of terrorist fighters as seen in the Russian Federation. Thus, the Chinese government will be compelled to act in order to guarantee China's security.

Post-Summit Analysis: China at the Summit

China's interaction with the Russian Federation's Bureau of Humanitarian Emergencies was limited throughout the duration of the Summit. China's humanitarian proposal, 21.2 Development of Universal Modern Produce (DUMP) was a joint proposal with its Global Environment bureau that aimed to provide genetically enhanced crops that could withstand the effects of climate change, and therefore reduce the amount of migrants that emerge as a result of food insecurity. Due to this joint proposal and its focus on environmental agriculture, the Russian Global Environment Bureau handled most negotiations with China. Few messages were exchanged between the two delegations' Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration Bureau, many of which the Russian Federation sent. The Russian Federation sent twenty-two, while China sent only six.

Though most negotiations occurred between the Global Environment bureaus, China did propose questions with regards to DIADEMS, most of which related to its funding section. In conference message 357, the Chinese delegation inquired about the funding method that the Russian Federation established. If the Russian delegation could provide the rationale for the required fee of each state, China stated that they would be "willing to work on supporting this proposal." The Russian Federation replied, stating that the requested funding amount was reached through World Bank statistics. Our delegation asked for any further suggestions or edits

that China's delegation required before committing to DIADEMS as a co-sponsor, yet no response was delivered.

The Chinese delegation proved to be a strong supporter and ally of the Russian delegation during the second humanitarian emergencies and migration conference. Within conference message 20, the Chinese delegation stated how DIADEMS resolved many of their concerns with regards to the scarcity of water resources in Southern Africa— an ally of both China and the Russian Federation through BRICS. Similarly, the Russian Federation supported China's proposal in conference message 23, as it provides a solution to food insecurity in a time of changing climates. This is especially within the interest of the Russian Federation, as only a small percentage of Russian land is arable; maintaining the healthy production of crops is of the utmost importance for both the environment and Russian economy. As a result of the mutual benefits that both policies would enact within China and Russia in stemming mass migration, the Russian Humanitarian bureau, after deliberation with the Russian Global Environment burau, chose to co-sponsor and vote in favor of DUMP. Likewise, China also co-sponsored and voted in favor of DIADEMS.

The Russian Federation is pleased with most decisions that the Chinese delegation made with regards to the different policy proposals. China's explanation to vote against Rwanda's proposal closely mirrored the Russian Federation's reasoning, as the Chinese delegation also found fault in the inclusion of a trade deal. Similarly, the Russian Federation was pleased that China chose to vote in favor of the policy proposed by Turkey. Though China held reservations about the Turkish policy, 25.1 ICEIR, and the way in which it may alienate Eastern European

states, China was in concurrence with the Russian Federation's view that the refugee crisis must be resolved, particularly by neighboring states in the European Union.

The Russian Federation was surprised at the decision to support the Indonesian policy, LDPO, as it had numerous flaws and no visible benefits to the international community (see Post-Summit Analysis: Indonesia in the Summit). As Indonesia voted in favor of China's policy, it is suspected that the Chinese delegation may have compromised with the Indonesian delegation in order to secure this vote. The Russian Federation also took issue with China's decision to support the German policy, DEUTSCH. Many aspects of DEUTSCH were undefined by the German delegation and were written in ambiguous, unspecified manners (see Post-Summit Analysis: Germany in the Summit). It is especially surprising that China voted in favor for the German proposal after the Russian delegation received a message from China inquiring about our delegation's stance on DEUTSCH (summit message 1137). The Russian delegation was curious as to whether or not this signified an ambivalence on the Chinese delegation's behalf, and what promises the German delegation may have proposed in order to secure China's favorable vote.

Overall, the Russian Federation was satisfied with the interactions of the Chinese delegation. China proved easy to negotiate with, but our delegation is troubled at the lack of correspondence on behalf of the Chinese delegation. While an explanation on why each delegation chose to cast the vote that they did was not required, it would have been appreciated by our delegation if China expanded upon the benefits that they saw within DIADEMS and its

implementation. It is the Russian delegation's hope that the Chinese delegation provides an explanation to its decisions and communicates more frequently in the future.

Croatia

Croatia is a state located in southeastern Europe that was a part of the former Austro-Hungarian empire prior to World War I. The fall of the Austro-Hungarian empire after World War I prompted Croatians to merge with other ethnic Balkan minorities to form Yugoslavia, a communist state that operated in the areas of Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Slovenia (U.S. Department of State, "Croatia," 2020). Croatia declared independence from Yugoslavia in 1991, but dealt with opposition from other Yugoslavian ethnicities such as ethnic Serbians. Following independence from Yugoslavia, Croatia has made efforts to become globally and regionally integrated. Croatia has been a member of the United Nations and the OSCE since 1992, the EU since 2013, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) since 2009 (CIA, "Croatia", 2020).

The dissolution of Yugoslavia was not accomplished without violence. The Yugoslav Wars throughout the early 1990s led to cases of ethnic cleansing. Those seeking refuge from the violence became simultaneously displaced *and* stateless as Yugoslavia dissolved. The first major wave of displacement stemmed from the war in Croatia in 1991. Around 200,000 Croats, Hungarians, and others were displaced from one-third of Croatian territory by Serbians. This number of internally displaced persons increased to 605,000 by the end of 1992 (Weiss and Pasic 1997). The issue of repatriation of those who were internally displaced became increasingly complicated as many IDPs' former homes were destroyed or occupied as a result of the war (Weiss and Pasic 1997). In order to ease tensions within Yugoslavia, the UNHCR extended aid

to those displaced, including to those classified as IDPs, and assisted with repatriation and resettlement (Weiss and Pasic 1997). Currently, the Internal Displacement Monitoring Center (IDMC) reports that since 2018, Croatia has experienced 140 new displacements due to disaster (Internal Displacement Monitoring System 2020).

Although a member of the EU, Croatia is not a member of the Schengen Area that allows free movement of EU citizens between EU states. However, Croatia, as of 2019, Croatia is in the process of ensuring that the "necessary conditions for Schengen ascension" are being met (European Union, "Schengen ascension" 2019). The migration policy for EU member states closely resembles that which is stipulated for immigrants of non-EU states. Croatia offers international and temporary protection to third-country migrants. Temporary protection is granted to foreign nationals "in the event of a mass influx or imminent mass influx of displaced persons" unable to return to their country of origin (Ministry of Interior 2020a). This temporary protection may be provided up to a maximum of three years, but the Council of the EU has the ability to extend this protection if deemed necessary (Ministry of the Interior 2020).

Croatia's largest concern within the issue of migration is irregular and illegal migration. In his statement at the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration, Croatia's Minister of the Interior stressed the need for "a clear distinction" between regular and irregular migration, and called upon the international community to "combat against the irregular ones" by enhancing border security and by providing migrants with proper identification ("Speech of the Minister of the Interior of the Republic of Croatia" 2018). Croatia further called upon the international community to fulfill its role in burden sharing, particularly the states in which migrants originate. Repatriation of those who have been displaced or forced to flee is an

obligation that Croatia views as a part of international law ("Speech of the Minister of the Interior of the Republic of Croatia" 2018).

Croatia has experienced few terror attacks. However, in the height of the Yugoslav Wars, a police station in Rijeka was the target of an Islamist extremist group that aimed to recover its spokesperson that was held by Croatian police (Reuters 1995). In a letter to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Republic of Croatia stated its "strong condemnation" of terrorism, and reaffirmed its recognition for "strong and intensive cooperation" among regional and international organizations (Ombudsperson of the Republic of Croatia 2019). Croatia additionally recognizes the importance of human rights in order to combat terrorism and promotes counter terrorism tactics that emphasize the rights and freedoms that are guaranteed under international protocol (Ombudsperson of the Republic of Croatia 2019).

Negotiations with Croatia on the establishment of a Summit are expected to go well. Croatia has consistently commented on the importance of dialogue as a means to promote global cooperation on broad issues. Introducing the topic of IDPs will offer Croatia the opportunity to discuss the distinction between refugees and migrants and to determine under which categories IDPs should constitute.

Negotiations with Croatia on the establishment of a staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing may be a bit more difficult. In 2013, it was reported that Croatia had sold arms to Saudi Arabia, which then transferred these same arms to Syrian rebels (Chivers and Schmitt 2013). This support for Syrian rebels may cause tensions on the side of the Russian Federation when negotiations begin. This is due to the fact that the Russian Federation supports and supplies military aid to the Assad government and its supporters.

Post-Summit Analysis: Croatia at the Summit

Croatia's contact with the Russian Federation was very limited. In total, Croatia's Humanitarian Bureau sent only five messages, as opposed to Russia, which sent sixteen to Croatia. The Russian Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration Bureau sent multiple conference follow up messages, communiques, and inquiries to Croatia, yet the delegation refused to engage further with Russia. As Croatia did not post a humanitarian policy, there was little that would provoke further discussion with Croatia, apart from any concerns that the delegation may have held in regards to DIADEMS. The Russian Federation's Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration sent a total of sixteen summit messages, while in turn, Croatia sent only five.

Croatia held only one concern with DIADEMS. In regards to Part C, SARES, Croatia questioned if the Russian Federation had been in contact with the Turkish delegation with regards to the border crossing. It was implied that Croatia was asking if Turkey would accept or agree to the terms listed under SARES. To reassure Croatia that the Russian Federation was in the process of communicating with Turkey, Russia wrote in summit message 281:

> "In regard to your query on SARES, we have attempted to consult the Turkish delegation, but to no avail, which resulted in sending a message earlier (280) asking for increased dialogue between states. On 11 January 2020, the UNSC voted to extend cross-border aid delivery through two border crossings on the Syrian-Turkish border. By outfitting one border crossing with a UN staging area, it can be used as a model for future staging areas and UNSC Resolutions regarding cross-border aid delivery. It is agreed that the Turkish stance is necessary in regard to current negotiations- however, Turkey has been silent in communication so far. Despite this, President Putin and Turkish President Erdogan's summit on 5 March 2020 reaffirmed the commitment of both states on the safety of displaced Syrian refugees, giving our delegation the confidence that Turkey would support the creation of an aid staging area in order to help refugees."

Through this response, the Russian Federation reassured the Croatian delegation of two concerns: first, that the Russian Federation was attempting to communicate with Turkey; and second, that the staging area would be accepted by the Turkish delegation. The Russian Federation introduced the Putin-Erdogan Summit and various Security Council resolutions as necessary background information that pertained to the humanitarian issue in Syria and demonstrated the relevance that the issue holds within the international community today. As the UNSC only recently renewed cross-border aid at Bab al-Hawa, the implementation of a staging area would only increase the efforts that relief agencies are executing in an area of dire need. This would align with Croatia's stated desire for further international aid for humanitarian issues, as stated in conference message 81. The invocation of the Summit between Presidents Putin and Erdogan further solidifies the point that the Turkish delegation would be willing to vote in favor of DIADEMS, so as to further the goals of Erdogan's commitment with Russia in aiding displaced Syrians.

Croatia was more active with the Russian Federation throughout the two humanitarian conferences and communicated its goals clearly. In the first conference, Croatia asked multiple questions with regards to the rate of climate refugees entering Russia (conference message 53) and how our delegation envisions how states may be held accountable (conference message 44). The Russian Federation responded swiftly to both messages, reiterating the importance of respect for national sovereignty (conference message 48) and the inability to provide an accurate refugee number due to migration policy reviews (conference message 64). The Russian Federation was appreciative of these questions, as it demonstrated Croatia's interest in participating and collaborating with the other states attending the Summit. It is disappointing that this interest from

the Croatian delegation waned after the conclusion of the first conference and resulted in little correspondence.

However, the Croatian delegation made it clear throughout its interactions within the conferences that it was seeking a proposal that would improve coordination between states and international organizations. Through conference messages 34 and 71, the Croatian delegation expressed its interest in continuing efforts in working with already established organizations. After Indonesia announced in message 67 that it established a new organization to increase partnership between states, Croatia said in message 81:

> "Croatia wants to affirm the importance of collaboration of global and regional organizations than developing a new organization as that takes much more time in swiftly responding to the disaster."

This response from Croatia signaled to the Russian Federation that DIADEMS would align very well with the ideals of the Croatian delegation. All parts of DIADEMS worked in close coordination with either an international or regional body. Part A, SAPADD, was to be implemented by signatories to the Kampala Convention of the African Union, a regional organization focused solely on issues within the African continent. Part B, SMID, would be hosted in coordination with representatives from the UNHCR and other UN member states, while Part C, SARES, would act as additional aid to a UN regulated border crossing.

In the second Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration conference, Croatia commended the efforts of the Russian proposal and stated its intent to further consider DIADEMS prior to the final vote. In message 22, Croatia stated its satisfaction with the funding for SMID, as it was adjusted for the GDP of each state and sought to increase dialogue between states. The follow-up

conference message from the Russian Federation reiterated this message, and stressed the benefits that DIADEMS would provide for the Republic of Croatia. As a result of this message, Croatia chose to sponsor DIADEMS shortly after.

Overall, the Russian delegation was pleased with Croatia's decision to co-sponsor and vote in favor of DIADEMS. Our only wish was for more private conversations with the Croatian delegation outside of conferences so that we could better ascertain Croatia's goals. Croatia's decision to refrain from posting a policy greatly hindered opportunities for communication and collaboration as well. It is our hope that in the future, the Croatian delegation takes the initiative to begin conversations with other participating states and provides their own insight into how global humanitarian crises may be solved.

Germany

Located in central Europe, the Federal Republic of Germany's economy is ranked as number one in Europe, and it is the second most populous state in Europe after Russia. In the aftermath of World War II, the USSR temporarily had control over Eastern Germany, known as the German Democratic Republic (GDR). Western Germany remained under the control of Britain, France, and the United States under the name of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). The two halves of Germany diverged from one another, as they pursued different policy goals. The FRG joined NATO and the EU, while the GDR joined the Warsaw Treaty Organization. During this time of German separation, Russian President Vladimir Putin served as a K.G.B. officer in Dresden (Smale and Higgins 2017). The GDR and FRG were not reunited as one state until 1990, following the fall of the Berlin Wall. In addition to NATO and the EU,

Germany is a member of the UN and various UN councils, the OSCE, NATO, and the G7 and G20 groups (CIA, "Germany," 2020).

Since its unification in 1989, Germany has been actively engaged in both regional and international organizations. Germany is the fourth largest contributor to the regular and peacekeeping budgets of the United Nations and one of the largest Western states to contribute troops to the peacekeeping mission ("Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations" 2020a). Germany is an additional member of the Security Council in what has become known as "P5 + 1." It is currently serving its sixth term as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and assumed the presidency of the Council in April 2020 ("Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations" 2020a). Throughout its tenure in the Security Council, Germany aims to: improve conflict resolution and prevention; commit to the advancement of women, peace, and security; and strengthen the humanitarian system.

The relationship between German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Russian President Vladimir Putin is one that is defined by "...wariness, mutual suspicion, if also mutual respect" (Smale and Higgins 2017). Chancellor Merkel views President Putin with suspicion, due to her upbringing during the Cold War years in East Germany. The large Statsi and KGB presence within East Germany, and Putin's experience as a former KGB officer, is a source of much of Merkel's scepticism towards Russia (Smale and Higgins 2017). Recent meetings between Merkel and Putin have revealed that the leaders are seeking resolutions towards the same issues, particularly in regard to Syria. President Putin expressed his interest to Merkel on obtaining German aid in rebuilding infrastructure in Syria so that refugees could return to their home state

and save Merkel from the large protests that have erupted after her decision to allow over one million refugees into Germany (Eddy 2018). However, Merkel remains wary of President Putin and the Russian Federation's actions in the Crimean Peninsula (Eddy 2018).

Immigration to Germany is multifaceted, as there are different regulations for those belonging to an EU member state and those from a third country (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees 2020). From the end of World War II and through the 1990s, Germany hosted more asylum seekers than any other member state of the EU (Bösche 2006). In the 1980s, German immigration policy shifted towards humanitarian migrants, particularly from Yugoslavia, Romania, and Bulgaria. This triggered the start of Germany's "asylum compromises" in 1992, which rolled back its previously generous migration policy (Rietig and Muller 2016). Germany then experienced a time of policy reversal attempting to limit the flow of migration into the state, restricting migration for EU member states and states that were designated as "safe countries" (Rietig and Muller 2016).

Since 2000, Germany has been reversing course on its migration policies. Policies on migration since 2000 have been becoming more and more liberal, beginning with the expansion of citizenship. The rollbacks on strict migration policy began with legislation such as the Residence Act of 2001, which reduced administrative dealings and propelled federally funded integration programs (Rietig and Muller 2016). The Freedom of Movement Act under the EU further reshaped Germany's migration policy. It stipulates that an individual from an EU state seeking to migrate to Germany may do so at any given time, and stay within Germany for a maximum of three months, provided that the required documentation is available. Visits to Germany may be extended for these individuals if they are employed, studying, or undergoing

vocational training (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees 2020). In respect to states with migrants outside of the EU, Germany adopted the EU Blue Card into federal law in 2012, which promoted the specialized labor of migrants from third-states (Rietag and Muller 2016). Germany's heavy integration with the EU further rolled back stipulations introduced with the 1992 asylum compromises, particularly with the EU Asylum Procedures Directive (Rietag and Muller 2016).

Presently, Germany remains as one of the top destinations for asylum seekers and refugees across the globe (Rietag and Muller 2016). Much of Germany's current migrant population originates from Iraq and Syria as a result of the 2015 refugee crisis (Al Jazeera, "Germany's Refugee Crisis," 2016). However, with the entrance of so many other Middle Easterners, anti-immigration groups have gained increased support amongst Germans. Within the past decade, Germany has experienced multiple terror attacks. Many of these attacks target Germany's immigrant and Muslim populations. Most recently, on 19 February 2020, Germany witnessed a shooting in Hanau, where nine immigrants were killed by an alt-right extremist (Eddy 2020). Alternatively, Germany has experienced a rise in terror attacks led by Muslim extremists, such as the attack on Berlin in 2016 where an ISIL inspired truck attack killed a dozen people and injured forty-eight ("Berlin Terror" 2016; Pleitgan et. al 2016).

Negotiations with Germany are expected to go well despite Germany's disagreement on the Russian Federation's stance within the Syrian conflict. As a current non-permanent member of the Security Council, Germany has been closely following the humanitarian crisis in Syria. At the 28 February Security Council Meeting, Germany condemned the Syrian attacks on Turkish soldiers and demanded that Russia halts its support for the Syrian government. Additionally,

Germany urged the Russian Federation to continue negotiations with Turkey in order to establish a demilitarized zone within Idlib province ("Permanent Mission of the Federation of Germany to the United Nations" 2020d). During Security Council deliberations concerning the renewal of cross border aid to Syria, Germany expressed its disappointment in the lack of agreement to maintain the Al Yarubiya crossing. Germany stressed the importance of maintaining the Al Yarubiya crossing, as it "has allowed medical aid to reach 1.4 million people," a statement which countered the Russian Federation's point of the crossing not being utilized often over the course of the year (United Nations, "Cross Border Aid Delivery to Syria," 2020).

Simultaneously, Germany recognizes the importance of international humanitarian assistance and the need for unhindered access to regions in crisis. Germany believes in the neutrality of humanitarian assistance and aims to deliver humanitarian assistance exclusively to populations that are in need ("Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations" 2020c). Despite Germany's opinion on the actions of Syria and the Russian Federation's support of the Syrian government, it is likely that Germany will be receptive to the establishment of a staging area, as it will provide necessary resources to displaced populations and promote further intergovernmental cooperation.

With regard to the Summit on the Global Compact for Migration, Germany will most likely agree to support and attend. Though Germany has generously accepted over one million migrants as a result of the 2015 refugee crisis, an unexpected consequence of the incoming migrants was a rise in far-right extremists that plan terror attacks against predominantly minority areas. By hosting a Summit on IDPs, states may determine a method by which the international

community can mitigate conflict so that displaced persons do not have to relocate outside of state borders, as observed in the 2015 crisis.

Post-Summit Analysis: Germany in the Summit

The German delegation was in contact with the Russian delegation much more frequently than the other participating states. The total exchange of messages between the two delegations resulted in forty-three messages, twenty of which the German delegation sent. However, many of these messages were not replies back to the Russian Federation's concerns, questions, or comments; rather, these messages were promotions of the German policy, 19.2 DEUTSCH, or late, nonessential messages of gratitude for participating in conferences.

Germany chaired the first Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration conference, established the agenda, and mediated discussion between states. The Russian Federation was pleased with the promptness of Germany in posting the agenda, as our delegation was then able to properly prepare for the ensuing discussion. However, the Russian delegation wished that there was time specifically allotted for the discussion of counter-terrorism tactics, as a large portion of our policy was devoted to this topic. Though the Russian Federation inquired about terror recruitment amongst IDPs during the apportioned time for Open Discussion, there was no response from any states, which was deeply troubling to the Russian delegation.

Outside of the conferences, the German delegation proved less easy to remain in contact with throughout negotiations. Though DIADEMS was posted on the second day of the Summit, the German delegation did not offer their feedback until several days later. The German delegation acknowledged the posting of DIADEMS in message 264, yet did not provide their feedback until message 704. Even more angering, the German delegation issued a reminder to

the Russian Federation in message 609 to review DEUTSCH after comments from our delegation were already sent. This seemed inconsiderate to our delegation, as the German delegation had expectations for the Russian delegation to review its policy immediately, despite the fact that the German delegation did not act reciprocally. From these initial messages, the Russian delegation was frustrated with the composure and lack of regard displayed by the German representatives.

Nevertheless, the Russian delegation continued to endeavor in its attempts to cordially work with the German delegation. Upon initial review of DEUTSCH, the most pressing concerns to the Russian Federation related to Part A, IDPIC, particularly Germany's inclusion of "publicity-centered arrangements" and the decision to host IDPIC in Berlin. The Russian Federation provided its explanation of these concerns in message 355:

> "In the first portion of the main text, it is stated that the first day of the week-long conference (IDPIC) will include "an opening press conference, reception, and address with more publicity-centered arrangements, such as photoshoots." The Russian Federation would like to inquire as to why Germany believes such events are necessary to the conduct of this proposed conference. Hosting such publicity-focused events do not contribute to the overall discussion on the internally displaced, and appears to only be an opportunity for Germany and other Western States to promote themselves internationally at the cost of other states. The Russian Federation would like to receive more information on events such as these to avoid unnecessary events that do not explicitly address the issue of IDPs.
>
> The Russian Federation also asks that Germany reconsider the location of IDPIC. Conferences bring publicity and revenue to the site, which Berlin has an exorbitant amount of, given its location in a developed state. The Russian Federation asks the German delegation to reconsider the location in lieu of one in a developing state, such as Rwanda. While Germany has demonstrated its commitment to refugees and the internally displaced, the Russian Federation believes that states that have historically been outside of the international, Western-focused spotlight should be afforded the opportunity to host a conference of this magnitude. Jakarta, Indonesia was chosen for this reason, per the Russian policy, DIADEMS, in Section B."

Within summit message 355, the Russian delegation upheld its status as the representative of small and developing states. As the Russian Federation does not identify entirely with Europe and the Western states, such as Germany, that dominate its political scene, the Russian Federation is more easily able to see when portions of policy disproportionately favor the occidental states. Though Germany may have been unaware of how its decisions may have been perceived by small and developing states, the Russian Federation strives to act in a manner that is more inclusive to these states that may otherwise be disregarded from opportunities that could further advance their development.

Though Germany resolved these matters by removing publicity-centered events and by relocating IDPIC to Kigali, Rwanda, a third concern arose within the Russian delegation in regards to Part B, REACH. The Russian delegation was satisfied that the German delegation sought to add on to an already established body (the UNHRC), but required more detail as to how the proposed task force within REACH would be selected. The Russian Federation proposed this question to the German delegation in multiple messages, but received no meaningful response to our inquiries.

With regards to DIADEMS, the German delegation did not find much fault in it. Germany was partial towards Part B, SMID, and suggested that the conference would work well after as a follow-up conference at the conclusion of the German-proposed conference, IDPIC. Throughout negotiations, Germany only asked for one clarification on DIADEMS, particularly on how supplies and medical personnel at the staging area proposed in Part C, SARES, would be protected from terror attacks. The Russian Federation responded to this query, stating that protection of supplies would be a joint effort between the Russian Federation, Turkey, and the

UNSC, as the Bab al-Hawa crossing was authorized under the Security Council's jurisdiction. As the German delegation did not provide the Russian Federation with any further concerns, the Russian delegation urged the German delegation to sponsor DIADEMS, which it promptly did following the Second Conference.

Germany's voting decisions at the conclusion of the Summit were questionable. The Russian Federation is confused as to why Germany would decide to vote in favor of Turkey's proposal, 25.1 ICEIR, when it would only increase the amount of migrants and refugees entering EU member states. As Germany already is hosting the largest number of refugees in all of the European Union and is facing a rise in far-right, anti-immigration sentiment (see Negotiation Strategies: *Germany*), it raises the question as to how Germany will adequately care for and protect these incoming populations. The Russian Federation and other participating states were unable to discuss Turkey's proposal in depth throughout the second conference, as Indonesia chose not to add it, and therefore was unable to ascertain Germany's thoughts on ICEIR.

Similarly, the Russian Federation is confused as to how Germany could vote in favor of the Rwandan proposal, 8.5 IPPA. Though Germany permits the distribution and usage of contraceptives within its own state, it is questionable that Germany would support a measure that forces other states against contraceptive usage to provide them freely to its populations. This is a clear violation of the basic principle of state sovereignty. The Russian Federation has suspicions that Germany may have casted its vote in favor of IPPA in order to secure the new location for IDPIC in Kigali.

Overall, the interaction with the German delegation was tolerable. Though the German delegation was slow to respond to Russia's messages, Germany responded in a much more

timely manner than other delegations, such as Croatia and Turkey. The German delegation proved easy to negotiate with, as they voted in favor of the Russian policy and amended two of the three concerns that the Russian Federation held on DEUTSCH. The Russian Federation only hopes that in the future the German delegation may be more communicative and responsive to the concerns of other states. Had the delegation resolved the last issue broached by Russia multiple times, the German policy may have passed unanimously.

Indonesia

Until 1945, Indonesia was under the control of the Netherlands, which had colonized the territory in the 17th century. Indonesian independence was not recognized until 1949, when, after a series of constant battles, the UN intervened and finally agreed to give Indonesians self-rule. Following its newly established republic, Indonesia implemented a relatively unstable democracy until 1957 when a military government was established by President Soekarno. This form of government lasted in Indonesia for nearly half a century until free elections were implemented in 1999. Indonesia is one of the world's largest Muslim-majority states and the largest chain island entity (CIA, "Indonesia," 2020). Indonesia was admitted to the United Nations in 1950, becoming the sixtieth member state of the organization (Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia 2020a).

Indonesia maintains a strong connection with the United Nations. Since its approval for membership in 1950, Indonesia has served as a non-permanent member of the Security Council three times in the years 1975-1976, 1995-1996, and 2007-2008. In November 2007, Indonesia served as the Security Council's president (Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia 2020a). Currently, Indonesia remains active within the UN on issues of climate change and

colonization, serving as the Chair of the Committee on Decolonization and as a serving member of the Troika Leaders on Climate Change (Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia 2020a). In connection with the UN, Indonesia signed on to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration and the Global Compact for Refugees and has held multiple workshops on the GCM previously (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia 2019).

Indonesia remains committed to resolving the issue of migration worldwide. In a statement at The Arria-Formula Meeting on "Responding Effectively to the Needs of Refugees, Displaced Persons, and Returnees" on 24 June 2019, Indonesia stated the important role of the Security Council in resolving the outflow of populations due to conflicts and the need for states at the origins of such conflicts to determine the root causes of such migration outflows (Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia 2019). In order to address the large dispersal of migrants, Indonesia called for an expansion of "third-country resettlement, as advised in the Global Compact on Refugees" as a starting point for long-term peace (Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia 2019). Additionally, Indonesia advocates United Nations assistance to states that need help in relocating their displaced populations and places high importance upon burden and responsibility sharing of transit states. As of 2019, Indonesia hosted more than 14,000 refugees and asylum seekers from more than forty-seven states (Permanent Mission to the United Nations 2019).

With regard to the humanitarian crisis in Syria, Indonesia maintains high concerns on the well-being of those displaced from the conflict. In a Security Council briefing held on 27 February 2020, the Indonesia Ambassador to the UN urged all actors investe in Syria to construct

a ceasefire and to halt military strikes within highly populated regions (Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia 2020b). Within this same statement, Indonesia's Ambassador stressed the importance of cross-border cooperation in providing UN assistance to those in need (Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia 2020b). The Ambassador of Indonesia to the United Nations issued similar sentiments the week prior on 19 February, stating that "the establishment of a positive environment on the ground is key to advance the political process" (Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia 2020c). Indonesia believes that once a more stable climate is created within Syria, serious peace talks may commence between the Assad government and its rebelling regimes.

Negotiations with Indonesia are expected to go smoothly. Indonesia has shown great cooperation with the United Nations and the Security Council in furthering international peace, and it is expected that the negotiations with regard to the staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing will go with little opposition. It is presumed that Indonesia will also agree to host the Summit in September of 2021. Indonesia has shown an increasing concern over the humanitarian crisis in Syria and the international threat of terrorism ("Statement at The United Nations Security Council Briefing on Middle East" 2019; "Agenda Item 107 Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism" 2020). Holding the Summit at a location that recognizes the intersectional importance of the two issues will greatly facilitate conversation on how to rectify circumstances for IDPs. Furthermore, multiple benefits await the state of Indonesia, should it agree to host the Summit. Tourism and other economic stimulators will spur the Indonesian economy towards growth. Furthermore, Indonesia's commitment to the topic of immigration is

evident in the large number of refugees that it supports. At the Summit, Indonesia will be able to further expound upon the importance of international cooperation in assisting migrants.

Post-Summit Analysis: Indonesia in the Simulation

Indonesia was actively engaged with the Russian Federation throughout the duration of the simulation. Indonesia extended some of the first welcome messages to the Russian Federation at the beginning of the Summit on March 23rd. From its initial communique, Indonesia has made its intent of increasing international cooperation clear. In message 11 of the first conference, Indonesia stated that a resolution to the issue of climate refugees must be addressed "...through a new platform or organization to promote multi-party communication channels and mutual trust." Indonesia also expressed its desire to have the Russian Federation collaborate with the Indonesian delegation. Within the first ten messages of the first conference, Indonesia issued a private message to Russia, stating that they were, "...honored to receive the attention of the Russian Federation. The delegation of Indonesia would like to hope we can exchange more in the future." The actions of Indonesia within the first conference inspired much confidence that negotiations would go well.

The Indonesian plan, 10.2 Long-Term Deepening Partnership Organization (LDPO), appeared well-put together at the start; the introduction that explained the purpose behind the organization seemed promising. However, as the Russian Federation reviewed the stipulations for LDPO, there were multiple concerns that arose. The three main components that the Russian Federation took issue with included: the proposed ten percent membership fee; the composition of the Secretariat; and the inclusion of local governments within the structure.

The Russian Federation sent Indonesia multiple messages with regards to these concerns. While Indonesia amended part of its policy to include an explanation of the makeup of LDPO's Secretariat, it failed to address Russia's other concerns regarding funding and the inclusion of local governments. Excerpts from message 693 on Russia's worries for LDPO are below:

> "The funding section seems infeasible to many states, even those that are well-developed economically such as Germany. Requesting a ten percent from each state's defense budget drains much of a state's funds that are necessary for other resources and programs. Furthermore, small and developing states will be discouraged from joining LDPO, as their economies simply cannot handle the heavy fee attached to the organization.
>
> The Russian Federation still hosts concerns on the inclusion of local governments within LDPO. In Section III, Sub-section A, sub-sub-section A, sub-sub-sub section d, Indonesia has stated that the obligations of sovereign states in LDPO is to "share part of sovereignty and fully support the presence and effort of LDPO in order to manage and prevent emergencies." According to the Oxford English Dictionary, sovereignty is defined as "the power of a country to control its own government." The inclusion of local governments within LDPO is a direct contradiction to this definition and is in violation of the concept of sovereign equality as enshrined in Article 2, Section 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. The Russian Federation views the participation of local governments as an invitation for interference in domestic affairs from outside parties and urges Indonesia to reconsider the inclusion of local governments in LDPO."

Within this section of message 693, the Russian Federation seeks to underline the faults of the Indonesian proposal. The Russian Federation urged Indonesia to see the rationality behind lowering the membership fees and by eliminating the inclusion of local governments, but Indonesia failed to understand Russia's critiques and make concessions. Though Indonesia acknowledged in message 731 that the membership fee was "quite high," it maintained that this initial fee could be renegotiated by members *after* each state had pledged to the organization. Indonesia further defended the inclusion of local governments, stating in message 731 that "local governments with partial decision-making power have demonstrated their flexibility and

enforcement" when "sovereign states are inconvenient to act because of political considerations." This argument disregarded the entirety of the Russian Federation's points in message 693, which included a citation from the UN Charter on state sovereignty. The Russian Federation saw no rationality within either line of thinking, and attempted once more to urge Indonesia to alter these conditions, yet to no avail. As Indonesia was unwilling to compromise and negotiate with the Russian Federation on its policy, despite multiple messages, Russia chose to not sponsor LDPO.

The many reasons that led Russia to not sponsor LDPO were the same reasons that resulted in Russia voting against LDPO. Additionally, LDPO did not align with the goals or interests of the Russian Federation. There is no clear benefit in creating yet another international organization to "deepen mutual trust and understanding" when there are already such existing entities— namely, the United Nations. The Russian Federation believes that the United Nations already holds the capacity to achieve much of what LDPO endeavored to accomplish, all while following the internationally recognized norms and principles. It is surprising that Indonesia did not attempt to coordinate with a branch of the United Nations, as Indonesia is a state that continuously engages with UN bodies, such as the Security Council and the Troika Leaders on Climate Change (Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations 2020).

Similar to the Russian Federation's surprise at the passage of the Rwandan proposal, it is a shock that so many states would sign on to a policy that disregards the federal government and its jurisdiction. LDPO clearly ignores the UN Charter, the principle of sovereignty, and the role of the state as the mediating body between the international and local spheres. While Indonesia implemented minor changes to its plan, such as a more detailed explanation as to the makeup of

the Secretariat, these changes were simply not enough to meet the standards of the Russian Federation.

In regards to Indonesia's response to DIADEMS, Indonesia held some initial concerns. Indonesia was pleased with Part B, SMID, as it proposed to hold the conference in Jakarta, but claimed in message 663 that Part A, SAPADD, to "not be fully applicable to Southeast Asia" and that it "ignores the efforts of Southeast Asian governments and NGOs." To this, the Russian Federation replied back in message 693:

> "The Russian Delegation would like to remind the delegation that Indonesia is currently experiencing a prolonged drought. The International Federation of the Red Cross reports that more than forty-eight million people lack access to potable water for sanitation, consumption, and agricultural purposes. Additionally, the Russian Federation would like to reiterate to the Indonesian Delegation, as mentioned in previous correspondence and the framework of DIADEMS Section A, that the South African Program to Address Drought and Desertification (SAPADD) is merely to serve as a model for the development of other regional response organizations. Noting that Indonesia is victim to the adverse processes of drought, there is a high potential for a regional response organization similar to SAPADD to be established in Southeastern Asia- specifically Indonesia."

Not only did the Russian Federation have to point out to the Indonesian delegation that its state was in the midst of a national crisis, but also had to reiterate the basic principle of SAPADD: that it is a *model* for how regions may respond to climate crises. While SAPADD would first be implemented within the South African region, there are clear benefits that a replication of SAPADD could bring to other areas of the world suffering adverse conditions. Should a government within the Southeast Asian region refute implementing SAPADD within its own state after trials in South Africa, that is the sovereign state's decision which no state can oppose. Of course, the idea of sovereignty may be an aspect of international governance that Indonesia may be unfamiliar with, based on its policy proposal.

Overall, the Russian Federation had a neutral experience with the Indonesian delegation. While Indonesia's sponsorship was obtained with relative ease after reminding the Indonesian delegation of its prolonged drought, they proved to be unwilling to listen to the concerns of the Russian Federation and to compromise on the multiple faults that rested within their policy. It is our delegation's hope that the Indonesian delegation will be more open to compromises in the future.

Rwanda

The Republic of Rwanda is located in central Africa, resting north of Burundi and to the east of the Democratic Republic of Congo. Currently, Rwanda is a member of the United Nations and the African Union (CIA, "Rwanda," 2018). Following independence from Belgium in 1962, tensions between two ethnic groups began to rise. The Hutus, who were the majority group, began orchestrating attacks on the minority Tutsis, who historically under Belgium control were the dominant, ruling group (CIA, "Rwanda," 2020). The Tutsis responded to these attacks by migrating into neighboring states and assembling the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). The 1990s began with a civil war led by the RPF against the Hutus, straining ethnic pressures. Tensions reached their peak in 1994 when a Hutu-led genocide was initialized, eliminating nearly three-fourths of Rwanda's Tutsi population. The conflict ended later the same year after the RPF defeated the Hutu-led armies and established a nationally unified military government. Attempts at democratization were made with the establishment of local elections in 1999 and legislative elections in 2003 (CIA, "Rwanda," 2018).

The 1994 genocide spurred mass internal displacement within Rwanda as people began to flee their villages and homes in search of safety. The UNHCR estimates that by the end of 1994,

Rwanda had approximately 1.5 million internally displaced persons (United Nations 2000b). The search for safety led people to move across state borders and into the surrounding states of Zaire (Democratic Republic of the Congo), Tanzania, and Burundi. These states sought to absorb the swells of incoming refugees and provide protection from the conflict, but were met with the issue of far-right Hutu fighters (the Interhamwe) continuing the escalation of violence within refugee camps such as Goma (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2000b). The presence of Interhamwe supporters in refugee camps led to intense suspicion and paranoia, as international aid groups were tasked with distinguishing fighters from refugees (Adelman 2001).

Those Rwandans who did not move outside of the state's borders remained in areas of high risk, vulnerable to further violence. The UNHCR acknowledged the 'protection gap' that existed between IDPs and international bodies. Without a "coherent international response," Rwandan IDPs suffered "tragic consequences" at the hands of Rwandan armed forces perpetrating the genocide (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2000a). The continued killings of the internally displaced led to a drastic decrease in the number of repatriations in ensuing months (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2000a).

In order to mitigate some of the issues that Rwandan IDPs experienced throughout the 1990s, the African Union held a special Summit of the Union in Kampala, Uganda on 23 October, 2009. The result of this special Summit produced the Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa, otherwise known as the Kampala Convention. The adoption of the Kampala Convention was a regional effort that sought to provide additional legal framework to prevent internal displacement and provide further assistance to those displaced within their respective state (United Nations 2020). Article 3 of the

Kampala Convention stipulates that, "...states shall refrain from and prohibit arbitrary displacement of populations" and "...prevent political, social, cultural, and economic exclusion and marginalization that are likely to cause displacement or populations or persons" (African Union 2009).

Though Rwanda has not experienced any terror attacks, it remains committed to the promotion of counter-terrorism tactics withn the United Nations. In response to resolution 31/30 of the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC), Rwanda submitted a document providing the UNHRC with its recommended best practices for combating terrorism while simultaneously protecting human rights (Rwanda National Commission for Human Rights 2020). This report from Rwanda in response to UNHRC Resolution 31/30 states Rwanda's support for international counter terrorism documents, such as the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, as well as regional counter-terrorism agreements such as the African Union Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism (Rwanda National Committee for Human Rights 2020).

Negotiations with Rwanda are expected to move along smoothly. Rwanda's adoption of the Kampala Convention demonstrates the state's concern regarding IDPs, and their commitment towards furthering the prevention and protection of these vulnerable populations. It is likely that Rwanda is interested in promoting the issue of IDPs globally and would be in favor of attending a Summit on the Global Compact for Migration in order to address the issue of IDPs on a global scale.

Rwanda may be more reluctant to approve the establishment of a staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing. It is likely that Rwanda will acknowledge the humanitarian benefits

that the staging area will provide to IDPs most in need. However, based on its experience with fighters hiding in the ranks of refugee camps, Rwanda may have reservations and concerns of resources inadvertently being supplied to terror organizations that could continue to precipitate conflict in areas of supposed safety.

Post-Summit Analysis: Rwanda in the Summit

Rwanda actively engaged and conversed with the Russian Federation throughout the duration of the simulation. The Rwandan bureau was one of the first to extend a welcoming message to the Russian Federation following the opening of the summit on March 23rd. Rwanda's initial communique indicated its intentions for the simulation and its policy, which sought to address the overarching issue of overpopulation. The Rwandan Proposal 8.5, International Population Aid Agreement (IPAA), asked for signatory states to commit funds towards the dissemination of family planning resources— namely, physical contraceptives and family planning workshops.

While overpopulation is a pressing issue that demands attention, the focus of the summit rested on climate refugees and internally displaced persons. Overpopulation may be a contributing factor that triggers mass migration, but the Rwandan delegation did not provide any instances where overpopulation was a main cause in migration in either its initial greeting (message 10) or in the introduction of Rwanda's final proposal. IPAA appeared to be a Rwandan domestic policy under the guise of an international agreement, and did not align with Russian goals. As the Russian Federation is experiencing a decline in population, increasing the birth rate

has been one of President Putin's top priorities (BBC 2020). Agreeing to IPPA would work against the interests of the Russian president.

The Russian Federation voiced its original concerns on Rwanda's policy in message 139:

> "How does the provision of accessible physical contraceptives and sexual education workshops care for populations that are currently displaced? The Russian Federation would like further clarity on this point, as this aspect of the IPAA policy seems to be a purely preventative measure that does address the hardships of those currently affected by humanitarian crises such as terrorism or climate change.
>
> It is stated within the policy that IPAC will also coordinate trade deals between participating states. Similar to the previous question, Russia is curious as to how these trade deals directly impact those experiencing the negative effects of displacement. Are trade deals intended to coordinate relief efforts between states?
>
> Further, the Russian Federation would like to renegotiate the proposed percentage of GDP that states committing to the IPPA must pledge. 0.1 percent of every state's GDP seems unreasonable, particularly to states that have developing economies. The Russian Federation recommends that this percentage is altered and based upon the income level of each participating state, per the World Bank index. High-income states would commit a higher percentage of its GDP towards IPPA than middle or low-income states. Overall, the Russian Federation recommends that the percentage of GDP committed to IPPA is lowered considerably."

Within this message, the Russian Federation conveyed its skepticism on Rwanda's proposal to help the internally displaced and climate refugees in ways that benefit signatory states through practical means. Requiring all states to provide communities with contraceptives may violate the sovereignty of a state that has implemented anti-contraceptive legislation, such as in Turkey (BBC 2016). Furthermore, IPPA does not provide immediate aid to migrants suffering the brutal effects of humanitarian crises. The initial inclusion of Catholic ministries as the main party to conduct door-to-door education workshops raised concerns on both the effectiveness and impartiality of such methods, as many participating states have a variety of religious communities.

Though a trade deal may further the economic ties between states and act as an incentive for states to sign on and remain with IPAA, Rwanda provided no further clarification on the humanitarian benefits of a trade deal. The trade deal proposed by Rwanda was useless to the Russian Federation, as there are multiple other organizations and treaties that provide Russia with outlets for trade. Additionally, as this was a proposal for the Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration bureaus, the inclusion of a trade deal was misplaced; this portion of the policy may have been more fitting if included within Rwanda's Economic and Trade Development policy, as stated in message 563.

Similarly, the initial funding of IPAA was poorly conceived, and demanded too great of a state's budget. Rwanda provided no guidance as to how the amount of .01 percent was reached and made it clear that this was a number that was decided upon arbitrarily. The lack of research into how much a state was required to commit to IPAA shows a disregard for small and developing states, as they would be unable to accrue and put forth the desired amount. The Russian Federation is surprised that a developing economy such as Rwanda would propose such a large commitment fee and expect other small states to commit the same.

Throughout the remainder of negotiations, Rwanda addressed the issues surrounding its funding section, the proposed usage of Catholic ministries, and the issue of where state fees committed to IPAA would specifically fund. However, Rwanda retained the trade deal, despite repeated messages from the Russian Federation to remove or alter this clause, as stated by Russia in messages 139, 186, 563. This unwillingness to remove this trade deal, along with the inherent principle that signatory states to IPAA provide contraceptives to populations, resulted in the Russian Federation's decision to neither sponsor or vote in favor of the Rwandan policy.

In regards to DIADEMS, Rwanda was very receptive to all aspects of the proposal—particularly, Part A, SAPADD, which sought to resolve issues of prolonged drought within South Africa. Rwanda was one of the first states to co-sponsor DIADEMS, and only inquired on a few parts of DIADEMS. The few queries on DIADEMS were related to SAPADD, as this was a facet of the Russian proposal situated within the same geographical region as Rwanda. In message 118, Rwanda's concerns focused on Russia's willingness to put forth funds into the project and the ability of SAPADD to be implemented within other African states. Once the Russian Federation stated that it would commit its own funds towards the production of desalination and waste-water plants and that if successful, the model may be reimplemented elsewhere, Rwanda decided to pledge its support.

While the Rwandan delegation was cordial in its correspondence with the Russian delegation, it is surprising that a policy with such egregious phrasings and stipulations managed to pass. There were little benefits within IPAA for Russia to even consider signing on to, and even fewer for other states such as Turkey, who voted in favor of the proposal, or China, who is also experiencing a major population decline. Russia is curious as to how many of the states that casted a vote in favor of IPAA only did so to obtain the Rwandan delegation's vote on their own respective policies, which is a clear disregard for the purpose of the Summit overall. It would be in the Rwandan delegation's best interest to bear in mind the wide range of opinions that emerge when a sensitive topic such as contraceptives is introduced in a global policy.

Turkey

Located in the Middle East, modern Turkey has its roots in the Ottoman Empire. After the fall of the Ottoman Empire in World War I, Turkey underwent many social, legal, and

political changes. Turkey became a state with democratic institutions, but throughout the years it has experienced multiple disruptions in its relative peace due to instability and military coups. Turkey has remained engaged with the local European community, as it joined the UN in 1945 and NATO in 1952 (CIA, "Turkey," 2018). In 1974, Turkey's military prevented a Greek takeover of the island of Cyprus. To this day, Northern Cyprus remains under the control of Turkey. Similar to the Russian Federation, Turkey has had an increase in terror attacks, specifically in 2015 and 2016. In addition to the UN and NATO, Turkey holds an observer status on the CBSS and is a member of the OSCE (CIA, "Turkey," 2018). From 2009 to 2010, Turkey held a position as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council ("The United Nations Organization and Turkey" 2020).

Relations between Turkey and Russia under the respective leadership of Presidents Erdogan and Putin have increased. Like Russia, Turkey is not a member of the European Union, and therefore functions outside of the framework established by European organizations. Though a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Erdogan has been increasingly alienated by NATO allies. This was most apparent after European leaders lagged to offer support to Erdogan after deposition attempts in 2015 (Higgins 2020). This makes Turkey more accessible to negotiate with in comparison to European states (Rahimov 2018). However, relations between Putin and Erdogan are often strained in regards to Syria, as Erdogan supports the anti-Assad rebels. The frequent deaths of Turkish soldiers by pro-Assad fighters, that are often trained and supplied by Russian forces, places greater strain between Putin and Erdogan. Nevertheless, the two presidents are able to reach agreements, such as the ceasefire negotiated on March 5, 2020, in order to maintain the humanitarian crisis in Syria (Higgins 2020).

Turkey has been a candidate for ascension to the European Union since the late 1980s. However, ascension negotiations between Turkey and the EU have been "effectively frozen" since 2016, as a result of Turkey's inability to apply additional protocols requested by the EU (European Union 2019). Such protocols included the fulfillment of various human rights tasks petitioned by the European Commission that included "the return of internally displaced persons to their original settlements" (Human Rights Watch 2004).

Despite Turkey's non-membership status, Turkey remains closely connected with the EU. Together, the EU and Turkey collaborate on issues such as migration and counter-terrorism. The EU is focusing much of its efforts on mitigating Turkey's growing influx of Syrian migrants. Recent data reveals that Turkey hosts the most refugees in the world at a staggering 3 million people (European Union 2019). The EU and Turkey established a Joint Action Plan in 2015, which aimed to bring order to the flow of migration, and end the work of traffickers and smugglers into Turkey (European Union 2019). In addition to the Joint Action Plan, the EU opened the EU Facility for Refugees, which provided additional resources and aid to the Turkish government (European Union 2019).

In addition to accepting Syrian refugees, Turkey is currently invested in the Syrian crisis. Turkey, Iran, and the Russian Federation are the guarantors of the Astana Process, which was developed as a method by which Syria could obtain lasting peace in accordance with the UNSC's Resolution 2254 (United Nations Security Council 2015). However, the Astana Process in and of itself is complicated between the three parties, as Turkey supports Syrian rebel groups while the Russian Federation and Iran support the Assad government (BBC 2020). The measures established at the 2017 Astana meeting have come to a halt as a result of continued air strikes

(Council on Foreign Relations, "Civil War in Syria," 2020). The 2018 deal between Turkey and the Russian Federation established a ceasefire and a demilitarized zone (DMZ) within Idlib but has also failed, as both parties continue to accuse the other of violations (Russia Today 2020).

In order to assist refugees and migrants, Turkey had agreed to open its borders to Syrians seeking safety from the conflict. Turkey also has previous arrangements with the EU to allow these refugees a safe passage into Europe. However, Turkey is currently unsatisfied with the response from European states, as Turkey currently hosts 3.6 million refugees and projects an additional 4 million in ensuing months (Russia Today 2020b). A report from the UNHCR from 7 May 2020 reports that Hatay, Gaziantep, Istanbul, and Sanliurfa provinces hold over 300,000 Syrian refugees each (UNHCR, "Regional Refugee Response Turkey," 2020). Turkey can not reduce or move these refugees further north into Europe, as Greece recently refused the admittance of 10,000 refugees at the border it shares with Turkey (Russia Today 2020).

Negotiations with Turkey with regards to the calling of a Summit on the Global Compact for Migration and the Guiding Principles for Internally Displaced Persons are expected to go well. Turkey's current frustration with the lack of EU support concerning how to handle migration may be resolved if there is a peaceful opening of dialogue for states to address their concerns and needs.

Negotiations with Turkey with regards to the Bab al-Hawa border crossing are expected to be tense. Despite the Astana and Sochi Processes, violence within Syria has still persisted. Recently, the government of Turkey has accused the Russian Federation of supporting airstrikes carried out by the Syrian government against Turkish soldiers. As a result of the airstrikes, twenty-two Turkish soldiers died. The Russian Federation, however, remains firm in its stance

that these airstrikes were perpetrated to oust jihadist extremsists that collaborate with the Syrian rebels. The Russian Federation also insists that the Syrian government is within its rights to defend against terror attacks, as stipulated by the Security Council (Russia Today 2020c). In order to prevent further strife between Turkey and the Russian Federation, President Putin hosted negotiation talks with President Erdogan on 5 March 2020 about the escalating tensions within Idlib. The two world leaders agreed to establish a ceasefire within Idlib and a six-kilometer wide security corridor in the area. The document further agreed to "facilitate efforts to prevent the humanitarian crisis in Idlib and create conditions for the refugees to return to their homes" (Russia Today 2020a).

With the establishment of de-escalation documents, the Russian Federation is prepared to introduce the establishment of a staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border crossing in order to enhance humanitarian efforts. Turkey's government reaffirmed their commitment to delivering humanitarian aid within Syria and has stressed the need for continued humanitarian support in order to prevent the outpour of refugees. As Turkey already hosts a majority of Syrian refugees, the state may see its best interest to commit further resources towards resolving the issue that caused the large flow of migrants. Furthermore, Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs has expressed its determination in wanting to "support the UN in every possible way" and "enhance its contributions to international peace, security, and stability" (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2020). With this statement in mind, Turkey may be more receptive to the construction of a staging area that is created with UN sponsorship.

Post-Summit Analysis: Turkey in the Simulation

Turkey was relatively quiet with regards to correspondence with the Russian Federation. The Turkish delegation failed to reply back to Russia's initial welcome messages and first communiques that detailed Russia's goals for the upcoming conferences. However, halfway through the simulation, the Turkish delegation apologized for its lack of communication and stated that it would endeavor to connect with delegates in a more active manner.

The Turkish Humanitarian Emergencies bureau posted its policy late into the simulation as well, which left little time for negotiations on its policy, 25.1 International Coalition for European Integration of Refugees (ICEIR). Upon initial review, Russia held many qualms about Turkey's proposal as it was very vague. However, the Russian delegation viewed the sponsorship and subsequent Turkish vote in favor of DIADEMS as a necessity, as Part C of DIADEMS related to the border between Turkey and Syria. Consequently, the Russian delegation did not press too hard on the specifics of ICEIR in order to maintain the good favor of the Turkish delegation which already was initiating limited conversation.

On April 2, Turkey provided its feedback on SARES in message 442:

> "Turkey is pleased with the SARES section of DIADEMS as well. We are curious as to what the establishment of a staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border might imply for the Republic of Turkey. How would Turkey be included or implicated in the implementation of the staging area?"

In message 554, Russia replied to message 442, addressing Turkey's concerns and asking for its sponsorship:

> "In response to Turkey's concerns on Part C of DIADEMS in message 442, Turkey itself will play a minimal role in the establishment of a staging area at the border crossing, but of course is more than welcome to oversee the operations as they unfold. As Bab al-Hawa is already a UN border crossing between Syria and Turkey, much of the work will be facilitated by the United Nations. The Bab al-Hawa border crossing is one of two Syrian border crossings that was renewed by the UNSC on 11 January 2020 in Resolution 2504. By outfitting one border crossing with a UN staging area, it can be used as a model for future staging areas and UNSC

> Resolutions regarding cross-border aid delivery to populations that are in dire need of resources.
>
> Bearing this information, the Russian Federation would like to ask Turkey for its sponsorship of Proposal 2.0, DIADEMS. Sponsoring DIADEMS would be of great interest to Turkey, as it would bolster the commitments that President Putin and President Erdogan pledged at a 5 March 2020 Summit on the current situation in Syria."

Turkey replied to message 554 in message 760, reiterating its thanks and appreciation for President Putin as a Turkish ally. The Russian Federation replied in message 968:

> "The Russian Federation sees the Turkish proposal as very beneficial to today's Europe. Points were brought up during the conference, and the Russian Federation is willing to exchange sponsorships of Proposal 25.0 ICEIR Proposal 2.1 DIADEMS. Please let us know if this is possible. After further discussion within the Bureau, it has become apparent that the EU requires more help than they currently are receiving, as the issue of refugees is massive.
>
> The Russian Federation would like to reiterate the benefits that Proposal 2.0, DIADEMS, would bring to the Turkish delegation. In particular, Part C of DIADEMS, SARES, would greatly align with the goals proposed by President Erdogan to alleviate the strain that Turkey is currently experiencing from hosting over 3 million Syrian refugees and help them resettle.
>
> In March 2020, President Erdogan proposed the idea to construct new cities along the Syria-Turkey border in order to resettle Syrian refugees currently in Turkey. SARES will also be operational at the Syria-Turkey border and may accelerate this resettlement process. Syrian refugees that are resettled into these newly built cities will be immediately provided with incoming humanitarian aid that is prepared and distributed through the staging area. The Russian Federation requests Turkey to consider this portion of Proposal 2.1 as it directly relates to the interests of President Erdogan regarding refugees."

Within this message, the Russian Federation utilized a different method of negotiating. Rather than aiming for zero-sum, Russia opted for a non-zero sum tactic in order to gain Turkey's sponsorship for DIADEMS and to reaffirm the alliance that has been solidified between Erdogan and Putin. Russia rationalized ICEIR as it aligned with Russian interests towards the European Union. Though the EU has partnered with Turkey in order to stem and care for the mass influx of migrants (see Negotiation Strategies: Turkey), the Turkish delegation has argued that European states have not been as generous in accepting migrants. The Russian

delegation concurred with this observation upon second review of the policy. As the Russian Federation is unable to receive additional incoming migrant populations, the EU remains the next viable option for the burgeoning Syrian refugee population in Turkey, which has exerted much of its resources in the interest of migrants.

Additional information on how DIADEMS, particularly SARES, would positively align with the proposed goals of President Erdogan was also provided as additional incentive to sponsor and vote in favor of DIADEMS. While the Turkish government focuses the administrative processes of resettling Syrian refugees into their home state, worries over how these populations will provide for themselves will be alleviated as the staging area will aid in the dispersal of necessary aid to vulnerable populations.

IV. Conclusion

The plight of the internally displaced is a concern for all states across the world. As people globally are forced to leave their homes due to conflict, war, and natural disasters, they are placed into increasingly dangerous environments that pose great threats to their well-being. The threats that face displaced populations throughout their journey to find refuge often leave them feeling hopeless, which leads them down the dark path of extremism. While solutions to conflicts may not be immediately resolved, the global community can convene together to mitigate the circumstances that migrant populations may endure.

The long-term and short-term plans of action proposed by the Russian Federation's Bureau of Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration are well equipped to accomplish this feat and provide for displaced communities. The combination of a Summit on Migration and the Internally Displaced (SMID) and the Staging Area for the Relief Efforts towards Syrians

(SARES) through DIADEMS introduces the best possible methods in order to recognize the sanctity of human life and honor the principles enshrined in international documents and within Russian national policies.

These policies depart from previously enacted policies at the international levels of governance. DIADEMS seeks to resolve issues of terror recruitment amongst IDPs and displacement by reaffirming the humanity of all migrants and providing the necessary resources that will drastically improve their quality of life. Stimulating further discussion of internally displaced populations and their current standing through SMID is of the utmost importance. With a focus primarily on established documents and agreements, such as the Global Compact for Migration and the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, the international community may convene and build upon the existing structures of international law and amend as necessary. The convening of a Summit on IDPs will not only reaffirm the global community's dedication to the migrant community, but will serve as a platform for states to assert the rights of migrants and discuss human rights based approaches to counter-terrorism.

Similarly, the introduction of a staging area at the Bab al-Hawa border will provide much needed relief to Syrian IDPs in areas of conflict. Though much progress has been made on behalf of Russian ally Bashar al-Assad in the reclamation of territory from anti-government regimes, Idlib province remains the last stronghold of the Syrian Democratic Forces and the terror organizations that they coordinate with. The provision of supplies to vulnerable populations will drastically improve the standard of living for the displaced in the Qah refugee camps and deter individuals from joining the ranks of terror organizations in order to receive such support. As the conflict in Syria moves into its tenth year, it is imperative that the international community

responds to the millions of Syrians in need that have been deprived of their homes, property, and livelihoods. Easing the plight of the displaced is a call that the Russian Federation must respond to out of solidarity for our Syrian ally.

The Russian Federation firmly believes the actions established through the Bureau of Humanitarian Emergencies and Migration is required in order to safeguard humanitarian law, address issues of migration and displacement, and promote more successful counter-terrorism operations. The achievements of DIADEMS will reiterate to the world that Russia is a global power, utilizing its strength and expertise for the betterment of the international community at large.

Works Cited

Adelman, Howard. 2001. "The Use and Abuse of Refugees in Zaire." *web.stanford.edu* http://web.stanford.edu/~sstedman/2001.readings/Zaire.htm (March 4, 2020).

African Union. 2009. Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons (Kampala Convention). *African Union.* https://au.int/en/treaties/african-union-convention-protection-and-assistance-internally-displaced-persons-africa (May 11, 2020).

"Agenda Item 107 Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism." *Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations*. https://kemlu.go.id/newyork-un/en/pages/agenda-item-107-measures-to-eliminate-international-terrorism/2504/etc-menu (February 25, 2020).

Ali, Zulfiqar. 2020. "Syria: Who's in Control of Idlib?" *BBC News*. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-45401474 (February 27, 2020).

Al Jazerra. August 20, 2018. "ISIL claims attacks on security forces in Russia's Chechnya." *Aljazeera.* https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/08/isil-claims-attacks-security-forces-russia-chechnya-180820141627043.html (February 20, 2020).

Aljazeera. April 2016. "Syria death toll: UN envoy estimates 400,000 killed." *Aljazeera.* https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/04/staffan-de-mistura-400000-killed-syria-civil-war-160423055735629.html (March 5, 2020).

Al Jazeera. "Germany's refugee crisis." 2016. *Aljazeera.* https://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/peopleandpower/2016/03/germany-refugee-crisis-160302135618356.html (March 3, 2020).

Amnesty International. 2020. "The World's Refugees in Numbers." *Amnesty International.* https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/refugees-asylum-seekers-and-migrants/global-refugee-crisis-statistics-and-facts/ (March 10, 2020).

Anti-terrorism Center of the CIS Member States. 2019. "Russian Federation." *Anti-terrorism Center of the Member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States.* https://www.cisatc.org/1289/134/160/1269 (March 10, 2020).

Anti-terrorism Center of the CIS Member States. 2020. "ATC CIS Documentary on Recruitment Technologies in the IG." *CIS Integraton Center.* https://e-cis.info/cooperation/2917/78882/ (February 10, 2020).

Anti-terrorism Center of the CIS Member States. 2020. "The Program Cooperation of the CIS Member States in the Fight Against Terrorism and Other Manifestations of Extremism for 2020-2022." https://www.cisatc.org/1289/135/1333 (February 16, 2020).

Ayres, Alyssa. 2017. "How the BRICS Got Here." *Council on Foreign Relations*. https://www.cfr.org/expert-brief/how-brics-got-here (February 12, 2020).

Barrett, Richard. 2017. *Beyond the Caliphate: Foreign Fighters and the Threat of Returnees.* New York: The Soufan Center. https://thesoufancenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Beyond-the-Caliphate-Foreign-Fighters-and-the-Threat-of-Returnees-TSC-Report-October-2017-v3.pdf (March 10, 2020).

BBC. 2020. "Russia's Putin seeks to stimulate birth rate." https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-51120165 (May 5, 2020).

BBC. 2016. "Turkey's Erdogan warns Muslims against birth control." https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36413097 (May 5, 2020).

Benton, Meghan and Banulescu-Bogdan, Natalia. 2019. "Foreign Fighters: Will Revoking Citizenship Mitigate the Threat?" *Migration Policy Institute.* https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/foreign-fighters-will-revoking-citizenship-mitigate-threat (March 10, 2020).

"Berlin terror: Reconstruction of the breitscheidplatz attack." 2016. *Der Spiegel.* https://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/berlin-terror-reconstruction-of-the-breitscheidplatz-attack-a-1127251.html (March 3, 2020).

Bhattacharji, Preeti. 2010. "Chechen Terrorism (Russia, Chechnya, Separatist)" *Council on Foreign Relations.* https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/chechen-terrorism-russia-chechnya-separatist (February 10, 2020).

Boris Yeltsin Presidential Library. "The Belavezha Accords Signed." 2017. *Presidential Library*. https://www.prlib.ru/en/history/619792 (February 11, 2020).

Bösche, Monika. 2006. "Trapped inside the European fortress? Germany and European Union Asylum and Refugee Policy." *Germany's EU Policy on Asylum and Defence. New Perspectives in German Studies.* Palgrave Macmillan, London: 29-90.

BRICS BRAZIL 2019. "What is BRICS?" 2019. http://brics2019.itamaraty.gov.br/en/about-brics/what-is-brics (February 11, 2020)

Brookings Institution Project on Internal Displacement and Institute of State and Law of the Russian Academy of Science. 2002. *International Conference on Internal Displacement in the Russian Federation.* https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/20020425.pdf (February 15, 2020).

Central Intelligence Agency. "The World Factbook: China." 2018. *Central Intelligence Agency*. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ch.html (February 20, 2020).

Central Intelligence Agency. "The World Factbook: Croatia." 2018. *Central Intelligence Agency*. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/hr.html (February 20, 2020).

Central Intelligence Agency. "The World Factbook: Germany." 2018. *Central Intelligence Agency*. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/gm.html (February 20, 2020).

Central Intelligence Agency. "The World Factbook: Rwanda." 2018. *Central Intelligence Agency*. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/rw.html (February 20, 2020).

Central Intelligence Agency. "The World Factbook: Indonesia." 2018. *Central Intelligence Agency*. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/id.html (February 20, 2020).

Central Intelligence Agency. "The World Factbook: Syria." 2020. *Central Intelligence Agency*. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/sy.html (April 10, 2020).

Central Intelligence Agency. "The World Factbook: Turkey." 2018. *Central Intelligence Agency*. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tu.html (February 20, 2020).

Chappell, Bill. 2015. "Russia begins airstrikes in Syria after Assad's request." *National Public Radio.* https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/09/30/444679327/russia-begins-conducting-airstrikes-in-syria-at-assads-request (May 8, 2020).

Chivers, C. J., and Schmitt, Erik. 2013. "In shift, Saudis are said to arm rebels in Syria with Croatian Arms." *The New York Times*

https://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/26/world/middleeast/in-shift-saudis-are-said-to-arm-rebels-in-syria.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 (March 5, 2020).

Choi, Seung-Whan and Piazza, James A. 2014. "Internally Displaced Populations and Suicide Terrorism." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60(6), October: 1008-1040.

Chudinovskikh, Olga, and Mikhail Denisenko. 2017. "Russia: A Migration System with Soviet Roots." *Migration Policy Institute.* https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/russia-migration-system-soviet-roots (February 10, 2020).

Chudinovskikh, Olga. 2018. "Statistics on international migration in Russia: the current situation." Conference of European Statisticians. https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.10/2018/mtg1/RUS_Chudinovskikh_ENG.pdf (March 9, 2020).

Coleman, Denise Youngblood, and Ryan Holliway. "Russia Country Review." *Russia Country Review*, Jan. 2020, pp. 1–774. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=141495274&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Coleman, Denise Youngblood. 2020. "Ukraine Country Review." *Ukraine Country Review - EBSCOhost*: 1-527. search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=141507601&site=ehost-live&scope=site. (March 11, 2020).

Commonwealth of Independent States. "Council of Foreign Ministers." *Commonwealth of Independent States*. http://cis.minsk.by/category/body?id=5 (February 11, 2020).

Commonwealth of Independent States. "Unified Register of Legal Acts and Other Documents of the Commonwealth of Independent States." *Unified Register of Legal Acts and Other Documents of the Commonwealth of Independent States*. http://cis.minsk.by/reestr/ru/index.html#reestr/view/text?doc=4 (February 10, 2020).

Commonwealth of Independent States. 1991. *The Alma Ata Declaration.* http://www.operationspaix.net/DATA/DOCUMENT/3825~v~Declaration_d_Alma-Ata.pdf (March 10, 2020).

Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. 1975. *Final Act Helsinki 1975.* https://www.osce.org/helsinki-final-act?download=true (February 18, 2020)

Council of the Baltic Sea States. “About the CBSS.” cbss.org. https://www.cbss.org/council/ (February 11, 2020).

Council of the Baltic Sea States. “Soft Security and Migration.” *cbss.org*. https://www.cbss.org/latest-news/soft-security-migration/ (February 11, 2020).

Council of Commonwealth of Independent States Heads of State. 1993. *Unified Register of Legal Acts and Other Documents of the Commonwealth of Independent States*. http://cis.minsk.by/reestr/ru/index.html#reestr/view/text?doc=187 (February 11, 2020).

Council on Foreign Relations. “Conflict in Ukraine.” *Global Conflict Tracker*. https://www.cfr.org/interactive/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/conflict-ukraine (February 15, 2020).

Council on Foreign Relations. “Civil War in Syria.” *Global Conflict Tracker*. https://www.cfr.org/interactive/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/civil-war-syria (April 24, 2020).

Donaldson, Robert H., Nogee, Joseph L., and Nadkarni, Vidya. 2014. *The Foreign Policy of Russia: Changing Systems, Enduring Interests.* Fifth ed. M.E. Sharpe: Armonk, NY.

Eckers, Mike. 2019. “Two Decades On, Smoldering Questions About the Russian President’s Vault to Power.” *Radio Free Europe.* https://www.rferl.org/a/putin-russia-president-1999-chechnya-apartment-bombings/30097551.html (March 10, 2020).

Eddy, Melissa. 2018. “Merkel and Putin sound pragmatic notes after years of tension.” *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/18/world/europe/merkel-putin-russia-germany.html (May 12, 2020).

Eddy, Melissa. 2020. “Far-right terrorism is no. 1 threat, Germany is told after attack.” *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/21/world/europe/germany-shooting-terrorism.html (March 3, 2020).

European Commission. “Press Corner.” *European Commission - European Commission*. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/MEMO_05_103 (February 16, 2020).

European Union. “Countries.” *European Union*. https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries_en#others (February 16, 2020).

European Union. Delegation to the Russian Federation. 2019. *EU restrictive measures in response to the crisis in Ukraine.* https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/eu_restrictive_measures_in_response_to_crisis_in_ukraine_en_0.pdf (February 16, 2020).

European Union. "The History of the European Union." *European Union.* https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history_en (February 16, 2020).

European Union. 2019. "Turkey." *European Neighbourhood Policy And Enlargement Negotiations - European Commission*. https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/countries/detailed-country-information/turkey_en (March 5, 2020).

European Neighborhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations. "Cross Border Cooperation." https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/neighbourhood/cross-border-cooperation_en (February 16, 2020).

Gaub, Florence and Popescu, Nicu. 2013. "Russia and Syria — the odd couple." *European Union Institute for Security Studies,* September 2013. https://www.iss.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EUISSFiles/Alert_Russia-Syria.pdf (May 11, 2020).

"Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement." *Internal Displacement Monitoring Center*. https://www.internal-displacement.org/internal-displacement/guiding-principles-on-internal-displacement (February 17, 2020).

Heleniak, Timothy. 2019. "Migration Dilemmas Haunt Post-Soviet Russia." *Migration Policy Institute*. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/migration-dilemmas-haunt-post-soviet-russia (February 10, 2020).

Higgins, Andrew. 2020. "Putin and Erdogan reach accord to halt fighting in Syria." *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/05/world/europe/putin-erdogan-syria.html (May 12, 2020).

Holland, Mary. 2004. "Chechnya's Internally Displaced and the Role of Russia's Non-governmental Organizations." *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 17, no. 3 (Oxford University Press): 334-346.

Huisman, Sander. 2002. “European Union Institute for Security Studies.” *A new European Union policy for Kaliningrad | European Union Institute for Security Studies*. https://www.iss.europa.eu/content/new-european-union-policy-kaliningrad (February 12, 2020).

Human Rights Watch. 2004. “Turkey.” https://www.hrw.org/legacy/backgrounder/eca/turkey/2004/10/1.htm (March 5, 2020).

Internal Displacement Monitoring Center. 2020. “Croatia.” *Internal Displacement Monitoring Center.* https://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/croatia (March 5, 2020).

Internal Displacement Monitoring System. 2018. “Russia | Conflict Figure Analysis.” https://www.internal-displacement.org/sites/default/files/2019-05/GRID%202019%20-%20Conflict%20Figure%20Analysis%20-%20RUSSIA.pdf (February 15, 2020).

Internal Displacement Monitoring System. 2018. “Ukraine.” *Internal Displacement Monitoring System.* https://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/ukraine (March 11, 2020).

Inter-Parliamentary Union and United Nations, Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. 2013. “Internal Displacement: Responsibility and Action.” *Inter-Parliamentary Union.* https://www.ipu.org/resources/publications/handbooks/2016-07/handbook-internal-displacement-responsibility-and-action (May 11, 2020).

Official Guide to Kaliningrad. 2020. “Kaliningrad History.” *Kaliningrad.* https://visit-kaliningrad.ru/en/charm/history.php (May 11, 2020).

Lisbourg, Anders, Friðriksdóttir, Bjarney, Lesinska, Magdalena, and Lisborg, Morten. “Report on Soft Security and Migration in the Baltic Sea Region.” 2017. Council of Baltic Sea States. https://www.cbss.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/REPORT.pdf (February 11, 2020).

Makarova, Tatyana. 2019. “The European Union and the Russian Federation.” *European Union External Action.* https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/russia/35939/european-union-and-russian-federation_en (February 11, 2020).

Manley, Robert. *The New York Times.* February 22, 1985. “Opinion | What Russia Signed.” https://www.nytimes.com/1985/02/22/opinion/l-what-russia-signed-044370.html (February 15, 2020).

Ministry of External Affairs of the Government of India. “MEA: Statements : Bilateral/Multilateral Documents.” *Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India*.

https://www.mea.gov.in/bilateral-documents.htm?dtl/30190/10th_BRICS_Summit_Johannesburg_Declaration (February 17, 2020).

Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation. "MOD Mission." *Peacekeeping operations : Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation*. https://eng.mil.ru/en/mission/peacekeeping_operations.htm (February 14, 2020).

Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation "MOD Mission." *Counterterrorism : Ministry of Defence of the Russian Federation*. https://eng.mil.ru/en/mission/fight_against_terrorism.htm (February 14, 2020).

Ministry of the Interior. "Temporary Protection." *Croatia.* https://mup.gov.hr/aliens-281621/international-protection/temporary-protection/281627 (March 5, 2020).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia. "Commonwealth of Independent States." *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia*. https://www.mfa.am/en/international-organisations/2 (February 11, 2020).

Myers, Steven Lee. 2003. "Russia Closes File on 1999 Bombings." *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2003/05/01/world/russia-closes-file-on-three-1999-bombings.html (March 10, 2020).

O'Laughlin, John. 2019. "The Crimea conundrum: legitimacy and public opinion after annexation." *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 60, no. 1: 6-27. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15387216.2019.1593873 (March 11, 2020).

Oldberg, Ingmar. 2012. "Soft Security in the Baltic Sea Region: Russian Interests in the Council of Baltic Sea States." *Swedish Institute of International Affairs.* https://www.ui.se/globalassets/ui.se-eng/publications/ui-publications/soft-security-in-the-baltic-sea-region-russian-interests-in-the-council-of-baltic-sea-states-min.pdf (February 11, 2020)

Ombudsperson of the Republic of Croatia. 2019. "Submission for SRCT report on soft law." *Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights* https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Terrorism/SR/Submissions/Ombudsperson_Croatia_GA74CT.pdf (March 5, 2020).

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. "What Is the OSCE." *What is the OSCE?* https://www.osce.org/whatistheosce/factsheet?download=true (February 11, 2020).

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. "OSCE Observer Mission at the Russian Checkpoints Gukovo and Donetsk." *Where We Are.*

https://www.osce.org/observer-mission-at-russian-checkpoints-gukovo-and-donetsk (February 11, 2020)

Organization for the Security and Co-operation of Europe. Permanent Council. 2014. 1012 Plenary Meeting, Agenda Item No. 3. PC.DEC/1130. https://www.osce.org/pc/121826?download=true (February 11, 2020).

Organization for the Security and Co-operation of Europe. Delegation of the Russian Federation. "Statement by Mr. Alexander Lukashevich, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation, at the 1194th meetings of the OSCE Permanent Council." 2018. *PC.DEL/1036/18*. https://www.osce.org/permanent-council/392513?download=true (February 11, 2020).

Organization for the Security and Cooperation of Europe. Weekly Reports. 2020. https://www.osce.org/om/reports (February 11, 2020).

"Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN." 2020a. *Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN*. http://www.china-un.org/eng/chinaandun/securitycouncil/regionalhotspots/mideast/t1737260.htm (February 25, 2020).

"Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN." 2020b. *Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN*. http://www.china-un.org/eng/chinaandun/securitycouncil/regionalhotspots/mideast/t1731166.htm (February 25, 2020).

"Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN." 2020c. *Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN*. http://www.china-un.org/eng/chinaandun/securitycouncil/regionalhotspots/mideast/t1741743.htm (February 25, 2020).

"Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN." 2020d. *Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the UN*. http://www.china-un.org/eng/chinaandun/securitycouncil/thematicissues/counterterrorism/t1742216.htm (February 25, 2020).

Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations. "Germany: Member of the United Nations Security Council 2019-2020." https://new-york-un.diplo.de/un-en/service/02-Germany-and-UN (March 2, 2020a).

Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations. "Humans Rights and International Law." https://new-york-un.diplo.de/un-en/themen/human-rights-and-intl-law/949388 (March 2, 2020b).

Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations. “Humanitarian Aid.” https://new-york-un.diplo.de/un-en/themen/humanitarian-aid/906238 (March 2, 2020c).

Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations. “Remarks by Ambassador Christoph Heusgen during Security Council Meeting on Syria - February 28, 2020.” https://new-york-un.diplo.de/un-en/news-corner/200228-heusgen-syr/2312528 (March 2, 2020d).

Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia. “Indonesia & The United Nations.” https://kemlu.go.id/newyork-un/en/pages/indonesia___the_united_nations_/1002/etc-menu (March 2, 2020a).

Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia. “Indonesia: The issue of humanitarian assistance should not be politicized by anyone.” February 27, 2020b. https://kemlu.go.id/newyork-un/en/news/5122/indonesia-the-issue-of-humanitarian-assistance-should-not-be-politicized-by-anybody (March 2, 2020).

Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia. “Indonesia Urges for an Immediate De-Escalation in Idlib Syria.” February 19, 2020c. https://kemlu.go.id/newyork-un/en/news/4967/indonesia-urges-for-an-immediate-de-escalation-in-idlib-syria (March 2, 2020).

Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia. “Statement at the Arria-Formula Meeting on ‘Responding Effectively to the Needs of Refugees, Displaced Persons, and Returnees.” June 19, 2019a. https://kemlu.go.id/newyork-un/en/pages/statement-at-the-arria-formula-meeting-on-responding-effectively-to-the-needs-of-refugees-displaced-persons-and-returnees/2946/etc-menu (March 2, 2020).

Permanent Mission to the United Nations Indonesia. “Indonesian Calls for Global Agreement on Migration.” August 28, 2019b. https://kemlu.go.id/portal/en/read/548/berita/indonesian-calls-for-global-agreement-on-migration (March 2, 2020).

Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations. “The Syrian Golan.” https://www.un.int/syria/syria/syrian-golan (April 24, 2020).

Pifer, Steven. 2019a. “Ukraine: Looking forward, five years after the Maiden Revolution.” *The Brookings Institution.* https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2019/02/22/ukraine-looking-forward-five-years-after-the-maidan-revolution/ (March 11, 2020).

Pifer, Steven. 2019b. “Five years after Crimea’s illegal annexation, the issue is no closer to resolution.” *The Brookings Institution.*

https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2019/03/18/five-years-after-crimeas-illegal-annexation-the-issue-is-no-closer-to-resolution/ (March 11, 2020).

Phuong, Catherine. "Internally Displaced Persons and Refugees: Conceptual Differences and Similarities." *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights* 18, no. 2: 215-229.

Pleitgan, Frederick, Dewan, Angela, Griffiths, James, and Shoichet, Catherine E. 2016. "Berlin attack: ISIS claims it inspired truck assault at market." *CNN News.* https://www.cnn.com/2016/12/20/europe/berlin-christmas-market-truck/index.html (May 12, 2020).

"Protocol on the results of consultations of the Trilateral Contact Group (Minsk Agreement)." *United Nations Peacekeeper.* https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/UA_140905_MinskCeasfire_en.pdf (March 11, 2020).

Radio Free Europe. 2019a. "Fifteen years after Beslan tragedy, emotions still run high." *Radio Free Europe.* https://www.rferl.org/a/emotions-high-beslan-school-attack-masscre-russia/30139763.html (May 11, 2020).

Radio Free Europe. 2019b. "Moscow close to finalizing deal to lease Syria's Tartus port for 49 years." *Radio Free Europe.* https://www.rferl.org/a/moscow-damascus-near-deal-on-lease-syrian-port-tartus/29894114.html (May 11, 2020).

Rahimov, Rahim. 2018. "Putin-Erdogan relationship grows into Russian-Turkish partnership." *The Wilson Center.* https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/putin-erdogan-relations-grow-russian-turkish-partnership (May 12, 2020).

"Reconciliation Process in Syria Supported by 1,475 Settlements." 2017. *TASS.* https://tass.com/world/944035 (March 11, 2020).

Reuters. 1995. "Islamic groups hits Croatia." *The New York Times* https://archive.nytimes.com/query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage-9402E7DE1E39F931A15753C1A963958260.html (March 5, 2020).

Rietig, Victoria and Muller, Andreas. 2016. "The new reality: Germany adapts to its major role as a major migrant magnant." *Migration Policy Institute*.

https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/new-reality-germany-adapts-its-role-major-migrant-magnet (March 2, 2020).

Roberts, Alexandra. 2020. "Understanding the relationship between Russia and Syria." *The Aspen Institute.* https://www.aspeninstitute.org/blog-posts/understanding-the-relationship-between-russia-and-syria/ (May 11, 2020).

Romodanovsky, Konstanin. "Federal Migration Service." *Official Website of the Government of the Russian Federation / The Executive Branch*. http://archive.government.ru/eng/power/247/ (February 13, 2020).

Russian Federal Law "On Combating Terrorism." https://www.cisatc.org/1289/135/155/284/7921 (February 16, 2020).

Russia Today. "Russia & Turkey agree on de-escalation in Idlb, Syria after Putin-Erdogan talks in Moscow." March 5, 2020a. https://www.rt.com/news/482432-putin-erdogan-moscow-meeting-idlib/ (March 5, 2020).

Russia Today. "'Get out of the Way, let us deal with the Assad regime,' Erdogan says he told Putin regarding Idlib, Syria." February 29, 2020b. https://www.rt.com/news/482006-erdogan-russia-syria-fighting/ (March 1, 2020).

Russia Today. "Syria has every right to fight terrorists in Idlib and Russia can't interfere - Moscow." February 28, 2020c. https://www.rt.com/news/481904-syria-has-full-right-to-fight-terrorism/ (March 1, 2020).

Russia Today. "Almost 10,000 migrants 'stopped at Greek border', but some have managed to slip through (VIDEO)." March 1, 2020d. https://www.rt.com/news/482045-turkey-migrants-border-fence/ (March 1, 2020).

Rwanda National Commission for Human Rights. "Best practices and major challenges in addressing negative effect of terrorism on the enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, particularly the right to life, liberty and security of person." https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/RuleOfLaw/NegativeEffectsTerrorism/NHRI-Rwanda.pdf (March 4, 2020).

Sandhu, Harmeet Singh. 2012. "Terrorism and Human Rights: An Appraisal." *Pakistan Institute of International Affairs* vol. 65, no. 1 https://www-jstor-org.proxy-tu.researchport.umd.edu/stable/24711210 (May 11, 2020).

"Schengen Accession: Croatia on the Way to Join the Schengen Area." 2019. *mup.gov.hr*. https://mup.gov.hr/news/schengen-accession-croatia-on-the-way-to-join-the-schengen-area/285814 (March 5, 2020).

Sinai, Joshua. 2015. "The Terrorist Threats Against Russia and its Counterterrorism Response Measures." *Connections* vol 14, no. 4. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26326421 (February 10, 2020).

Smale, Alison, and Higgins, Andrew. "Putin and Merkel: A Rivalry of History, Distrust, and Power." *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/12/world/europe/vladimir-putin-angela-merkel-russia-germany.html (March 10, 2020).

"Speech of the Minister of the Interior of the Republic of Croatia." 2018. *Intergovernmental Conference on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration.* https://www.un.org/en/conf/migration/assets/pdf/GCM-Statements/croatia.pdf (March 5, 2020).

Starkey, Bridgid, Boyer, Mark A., and Wilkenfeld, Jonathon. 2015. *International Negotiations in a Complex World.* London, UK: 2015.

"Statement of Ambassador Li Li, Leader of the Chinese Delegation and Chinese Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, At the Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt the Global Compact For Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration." 2018. *Plenary Statements.* https://www.un.org/en/conf/migration/statements.shtml (February 27, 2020).

"Statement at The United Nations Security Council Briefing on Middle East." *Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations*. https://kemlu.go.id/newyork-un/en/pages/statement-at-the-united-nations-security-council-briefing-on-middle-east-syria/2949/etc-menu (February 25, 2020).

"Statement of the Russian Federation on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration." 2018. *United Nations*. https://www.un.org/en/conf/migration/assets/pdf/GCM-Statements/russia.pdf (March 10, 2020).

"Statement by Vladimir Voronkov, Under-Secretary-General for Counter Terrorism - VII Moscow Conference on International Security." 2018. *United Nations Office of Counter Terrorism*. https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/ctitf/sites/www.un.org.counterterrorism.ctitf/files/20180404_USGVoronkov_statementENG_MODInternationalSecurityConferenceMoscow_April%202018_FINAL.pdf (March 10, 2020).

Sukhankin, Sergey. 2017. “Kaliningrad Oblast and Challenges to the Baltic Sea Region.” *EuropeNow.* https://www.europenowjournal.org/2017/12/05/kaliningrad-oblast-and-challenges-to-the-baltic-sea-region/ (May 11, 2020).

The Commonwealth of Independent States. “Activities.” *Anti-Terrorism Center of the Member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States.* https://www.cisatc.org/1289 (February 16, 2020).

The Kremlin. January 24, 2014. *Agreement of CIS Member states on interstate search for people submitted to State Duma for ratification.* http://en.kremlin.ru/acts/news/20066 (February 15, 2020).

The Kremlin. 2005. “The Election of the Parliament of the Republic of Chechnya is an important and symbolic event for the life of Chechnya and of the whole country.” *The Kremlin*. http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/34651 (February 12, 2020).

The Kremlin. 2012. “Concept of the State Migration Policy of the Russian Federation through to 2025.” *The Kremlin*. http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/15635 (February 12, 2020).

The Kremlin. 2014a. “Address by the President of the Russian Federation.” *The Kremlin.* http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20603 (March 11, 2020).

The Kremlin. 2014b. “Agreement on the accession of the Republic of Crimea to the Russian Federation signed.” *The Kremlin.* http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20604 (March 11, 2020).

The Kremlin. 2019. “Meetting of the CIS Heads of State.” *The Kremlin.* http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/6178 (March 10, 2020).

The Kremlin. 2020. “Meeting on socioeconomic development of Crimea and Sevastopol.” *The Kremlin*. http://en.kremlin.ru/catalog/regions/CR/events/62559 (February 13, 2020).

Toucas, Boria. 2017. “The Geostrategic Importance of the Black Sea Region: A Brief History.” *Center for Strategic and International Studies.* https://www.csis.org/analysis/geostrategic-importance-black-sea-region-brief-history (May 11, 2020).

Trenin, Dmitri. 2011. "Russian Policies toward the Nordic-Baltic Region." *Nordic Baltic-Security in the 21st Century: The Regional Agenda and the Global Role,* Sept. 2011: 47-51. https://carnegieendowment.org/files/Nordic-Baltic_Security_Trenin.pdf (March 9, 2020).

"The United Nations Organization and Turkey." *Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs.* http://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-united-nations-organization-and-turkey.en.mfa (March 1, 2020).

United Nations. 2020. "Avoiding Midnight Deadline, Security Council Extends Authorization of Cross-Border Aid Delivery to Syria, Adopting Resolution 2504 (2020) by Recorded Vote | Meetings Coverage and Press Releases." https://www.un.org/press/en/2020/sc14074.doc.htm (May 11, 2020).

United Nations. Commission on Human Rights. Economic and Social Council. 2004. *Report of the Representative of the Secretary-General on internally displaced persons.* E/CN.4/2004/77/Add.2.

United Nations. General Assembly. Sixth Committee. "Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism - Sixty-Ninth Session - Sixth Committee (Legal) - UN General Assembly." *United Nations*. https://www.un.org/en/ga/sixth/69/int_terrorism.shtml (February 17, 2020).

United Nations. General Assembly. 1948. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

United Nations. General Assembly. 1951. *Statute of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.*

United Nations. General Assembly. 1951. *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.*

United Nations. General Assembly. 2016. *New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants.* 71st sess., A/Res/71/1.

United Nations. General Assembly. 2016. *Letter dated 19 April 2016 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.* A/71/81*.

United Nations. General Assembly. 2018. *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.* A/CONF.231/3.

United Nations. 2020. "Human Rights." https://www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/human-rights/ (May 7, 2020).

United Nations. Human Rights Council. 2020a. “Welcome to the Human Rights Council.” *United Nations Human Rights Council.* https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/AboutCouncil.aspx (April 29, 2020).

United Nations. Human Rights Council. 2020b. “OHCHR | Human Rights Council Complaint Procedure.” https://www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/human-rights/ (May 7, 2020).

United Nations. Human Rights Council. 2020c. “OHCHR | UPR Basic Facts about the UPR.” *United Nations Human Rights Council.* https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/BasicFacts.aspx (May 7, 2020).

United Nations. Human Rights Council. 2020d. “OHCHR | Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic.” *United Nations Human Rights Council.* https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/IICISyria/Pages/AboutCoI.aspx (May 7, 2020).

United Nations. Human Rights Council. 2020e. “Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons.” *United Nations Human Rights Council.* https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/idpersons/pages/idpersonsindex.aspx (May 11, 2020).

United Nations. Human Rights Council. 2018. *Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirty-ninth session.* A/HRC/39/2.

United Nations. Human Rights Council. 2011. *Resolution adopted by the Human Rights Council at its seventeenth special session: Situation of human rights in Syria.* S-17/1.

United Nations. “Internally Displaced People.” *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*. https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/internally-displaced-people.html (March 3, 2020).

United Nations. “Member States.” *United Nations*. https://www.un.org/en/member-states/index.html#gotoR (February 10, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights. *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.* https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx (February 15, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. 2020. “Preventing violations and strengthening protection of human rights, including in situations of conflict

and insecurity." *Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.* https://www.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/ManagementPlan/Pages/preventing-violations.aspx (May 11, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner of Refugees. 1967. *Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees.* https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/3b66c2aa10 (February 12, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner of Refugees. 1951. *Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees.* https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/3b66c2aa10 (February 12, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner of Refugees. 1998. *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.* https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/protection/idps/43ce1cff2/guiding-principles-internal-displacement.html (February 12, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. 2000a. "Lessons Learned from the Rwanda and Burundi Emergencies." *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees* https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/research/evalreports/3ae6bcfc4/lessons-learned-rwanda-burundi-emergencies.html (March 5, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. 2000b. "The State of the World's Refugees 2000: Fifty Years of Humanitarian Action." *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.* https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/publications/sowr/4a4c754a9/state-worlds-refugees-2000-fifty-years-humanitarian-action.html (March 4, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. 2009. "African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention)." *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*. https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/about-us/background/4ae9bede9/african-union-convention-protection-assistance-internally-displaced-persons.html (March 5, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. "Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) - UNHCR Ukraine." *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Ukraine*. https://www.unhcr.org/ua/en/internally-displaced-persons (March 11, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. "Situation Syria Regional Refugee Response." *Operations Portal Refugee Situations.* https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria#_ga=2.245654852.176437928.1523643313-212092299.1523478943 (May 8, 2020a).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. “Russian Federation.” *United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees | Global Focus.* http://reporting.unhcr.org/node/2551 (May 8, 2020b).

United Nations. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. “Situation Syria Regional Refugee Response Turkey” *Operations Portal Refugee Situations.* https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/113 (May 8, 2020).

United Nations Security Council. “Current Members.” https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/current-members (February 15, 2020).

United Nations Security Council. Counter-Terrorism Committee. “About the Counter-Terrorism Committee.” https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/about-us/ (February 20, 2020).

United Nations Security Council. Counter Terrorism Committee. “Countering violent extremism.” https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/focus-areas/countering-violent-extremism/ (February 20, 2020).

United Nations Security Council. Counter Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate. 2016. “Global Survey of the implementation of the Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) by Member States.” *Counter Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate.* https://www.un.org/sc/ctc/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Global-Implementation-Survey-1373_EN.pdf (March 10, 2020).

United Nations Security Council. Counter Terrorism Committee. 2019. “Key Principles for the Protection, Repatriation, Prosecution, Rehabilitation, and Repatriation of Women and Children with Links to United Nations Listed Terrorist Groups.” *United Nations.* https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/sites/www.un.org.counterterrorism/files/key_principles-april_2019.pdf (March 10, 2020).

United Nations. Security Council. 2015. *Resolution 2254.* S/RES/2254.

United Nations. Security Council. 2020a. *Resolution 2504.* S/RES/2504 (2020).

United Nations. Security Council. 2020b. *Resolution 2505.* S/RES/2505 (2020).

Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization. 2017. “Crimean Tatars.” *Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization.* https://unpo.org/members/7871 (March 10, 2020).

U.S. Department of State. Office of the Historian, Foreign Service Institute. “The Breakup of Yugoslavia, 1990-1992.” https://history.state.gov/milestones/1989-1992/breakup-yugoslavia (February 20, 2020).

Wegren, Stephen. 2019. *Putin’s Russia: Past Imperfect, Future Uncertain.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Yuhas, Alan. 2019. “A Kremlin Offer of Expedited Citizenship Challenges Ukraine.” *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/24/world/europe/russia-ukraine-citizenship.html (March 11, 2020).

Zevelev, Igor. 2016. “The Russian World in Moscow’s Strategy.” *Center for Strategic and International Studies.* https://www.csis.org/analysis/russian-world-moscows-strategy (May 11, 2020).