

Uzbekistan¹

by Chris Maggard

The Central Asian republics have largely remained hidden from the world attention since they gained independence a decade ago. However, immediately following September 11th the region was brought into focus as a part of the US-led “War on Terror”. Uzbekistan became a full partner in this initiative when the government decided to allow the U.S. military full use of its territory in the invasion against Afghanistan . As Uzbek President Karimov has become willing to work with the West than neighboring countries, the debate in recent years has been how and to what extent, rather than whether or not the United States should commit resources to Uzbekistan and the rest of Central Asia.

The West’s previous hesitance to work with these countries was based on their record of widespread human rights abuses and their refusal to bring about reform. No one denies that these abuses are still occurring. There is considerable difference of opinion about what should be done to bring about human rights reform and if this should be a requirement for continued U.S. and international involvement. Many fear that a partnership based solely on security needs without attention to human rights, equality and justice will legitimate the authoritarian governments of the region and ultimately lead to elevated levels of instability and repression there.

Since 1999 , international observers and policymakers have often viewed Central Asia as swept up in a tide of Islamic fundamentalism. In his speech to Congress in September 2001, President George W. Bush singled out the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) as a terrorist group demanding immediate attention. Instability in Central Asia has often been blamed on radical Islamic groups such as the IMU who aspire to establish a state based on Islamic Law, and provide assistance to worldwide terrorist networks. However, President Karimov’s efforts to control radical Muslims have gotten out of hand and persecution of many ordinary Muslims has come about as a result. With Muslims making up 90 percent of Uzbekistan ‘s population, many believe the United States is purposefully strengthening the repressive regime against them. Further repression, of course, could lead to increased support for Islamic extremists and radicalization of a larger portion of the population.

Background

General Information

Svante E. Cornell; Roy Allison. 2003. “Strategic Security Dilemmas in the Caucasus and Central Asia”. NBR Analysis. 14(3): <http://www.nbr.org>.

ABSTRACT: A two-part inquiry dealing first with the “Military and Economic Security Perspectives” of the Central Asian states. The creation of American bases within this region has, in a

¹ This section has a supplement that begins on page S-62.

way, redrawn the political map, complicating the states' abilities to address the endemic problems of the region. The second part, "The Limits of Multilateralism", asserts that it will be difficult to implement multilateral strategies to solve regional problems.

Simon Churchyard. 2002. "Supporting Tyranny in the Name of Freedom". *Utne Reader*. (112): 25.

Focuses on the U.S. -Uzbekistan partnership to fight terrorism and how ironic it is to be teaming up with a tyrant in the name of freedom. Discusses the terms agreed to for assistance to be extended by Uzbekistan President Islam Karimov to the U.S. forces during the terrorism campaign in Afghanistan.

Economist. July 26, 2003. "Your Move". *Economist*. 368(8334): 15.

Central Asia has come a long way since independence but is still facing serious security problems, which America, Russia and China are keen on alleviating. The Shanghai Co-operation Organisation was set up to deal with border issues, but has recently concentrated on anti-terrorist measures. It provides non-lethal military assistance and training to most Central Asian countries.

Bakhtiyar Babajanov and Martha Brill Olcott. 2003. "The Terrorist Notebooks". *Foreign Policy*. 31(March/April).

Notebooks of radical Islamic students learning to become terrorists in Uzbekistan. Students are taught mostly in military subjects and once that is mastered they turn to jihad, how, when and who to kill for the faith.

Farkhad Tolipov and Roger N. Mcdermott. 2003. "Uzbekistan and the Us: Partners against Terrorism". *The Review of International Affairs*. 2(4): 1-18.

Focuses on the threat of terrorism in the Central Asia region and the newly-emerged US-Uzbek strategic partnership that has emerged. This relationship is a key factor in shaping the region's geopolitical status quo. Analysis deals with military aspects of the partnership in conjunction with Uzbekistan's military reform dynamics and state policy towards counter-terrorism.

Norwegian Refugee Council; Global IDP Project. July 1, 2003. "Profile of Internal Displacement: Uzbekistan". <http://www.idpproject.org>.

In 2000 the Uzbekistan government forced many villages along the Tajikistan border to relocate to hastily-built, destitute settlements in order to decrease the flow of armed Islamic forces into the country. Though this threat has considerably lessened since then, there government shows no inclination to repatriate the roughly 3000 villagers, who are now suffering in extreme poverty.

Svante E. Cornell and Regine A. Spector. Winter 2002. "Central Asia: More Than Islamic Extremists". *The Washington Quarterly*. 25(1): 193-206.

Rather than viewing the incursions in Central Asia by Islamic extremists as the cause of the current instability, they should be understood as indicators of the region's complex dynamic. This involves the role of Islam in Central Asia, the challenges of regional poverty and drug trafficking, and the ideological spillover effects of the war in Afghanistan.

Human Rights Watch. September 26, 2001. "Press Backgrounder: Human Rights Abuse in Uzbekistan". <http://www.hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/uzbek092501-bck.htm>.

After 9/11, President Bush announced that the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) was linked to Osama bin Laden. The IMU is a militant group that seeks the establishment of Islamic Law in Uzbekistan. In the Uzbek governments efforts to stop this group, many innocent Muslims have been branded “extremist” and had their rights violated.

Human Rights Watch. 2001. “Sacrificing Women to Save the Family? Domestic Violence in Uzbekistan”. <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/uzbekistan/>.

Women in Uzbekistan have their rights doubly violated, first by suffering physical and other abuse from their husbands and then by the government, who accomplish the goal of “save the family” through coercing women victims to remain in abusive situations, ignoring violence against women, and perpetuating impunity for violent husbands. Many recommendations are given to Uzbekistan and international actors for increasing women’s rights.

Human Rights Watch. 2001. “U. S. Policy in Central Asia”. <http://www.hrw.org/background/eca/uzbekistan0605-bck.htm>.

A good overview of U.S. policy towards Central Asia before September 11th. Argues that the U.S. has failed to effectively address human rights problems, and that allowing these abuses undermines economic reform, deters honest investment and stunts the development of strong civil societies.

Human Rights Watch. 2003. “Uzbekistan: From House to House: Abuses by Mahalla Committees”. <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/uzbekistan0903/>

The mahalla is a centuries-old autonomous institution organized around Islamic rituals and social events. Under President Karimov, the Uzbek government has converted the mahalla committees from an autonomous expression of self-government to a national system for surveillance and control. The people find themselves under increasing pressure from government and law enforcement authorities to enforce government policies that violate human rights norms.

Central Asia

Svante E. Cornell and Roy Allison. 2003. “Strategic Security Dilemmas in the Caucasus and Central Asia”. NBR Analysis. 14(3): <http://www.nbr.org>.

ABSTRACT: A two-part inquiry dealing first with the “Military and Economic Security Perspectives” of the Central Asian states. The creation of American bases within this region has, in a way, redrawn the political map, complicating the states’ abilities to address the endemic problems of the region. The second part, “The Limits of Multilateralism”, asserts that it will be difficult to implement multilateral strategies to solve regional problems.

Svante E. Cornell. 2002. “Central Asia: More Than Islamic Extremists”. *Washington Quarterly*. 25(1): 193.

Reports on the integral participation of Central Asian republics in the U.S. campaign against terrorism, the launch of insurgencies by the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan in the republic, and consequences brought by the rise of the Taliban government for Central Asia. Economic conditions in Central Asia are also discussed.

Svante E. Cornell. 2004. "The United States and Central Asia: In the Steppes to Stay?" Cambridge Review of International Affairs. 17(2): 239.

September eleventh elevated the importance of Central Asia in U.S. global strategy and the Central Asian republics proved crucial bases for military and intelligence operations. As its Central Asian footprint grows, Washington must consider the interests of key Eurasian powers and demonstrate a sustained economic and political commitment to the region.

"Your Move". 2003. *Economist*. 368(8334): 15.

Central Asia has come a long way since independence but is still facing serious security problems, which America, Russia and China are keen on alleviating. The Shanghai Co-operation Organisation was set up to deal with border issues, but has recently concentrated on anti-terrorist measures. It provides non-lethal military assistance and training to most Central Asian countries.

Pauline Jones Luong. 2002. "After Afghanistan Implications of the "War on Terrorism" for Central Asia". PONARS Policy Memo No 212.

To prevent political and economic instability in Central Asia, the article recommends long term, pro-active U.S. policy that will give a comprehensive economic aid package to help dealing with the impending refugee crisis, continue pressure for human rights and democratization and prevent a unilateral military buildup in Uzbekistan.

Alec Rasizade. 2002. "The Specter of a New "Great Game" in Central Asia". Foreign Service Journal. 48.

Since the US-led intervention in Afghanistan, Central Asia has been transformed into a crucible of international diplomacy. The three fundamental challenges confronting any model of American involvement in Central Asia are to uphold human rights, promote meaningful economic development and stay engaged in the region for the long haul.

United States Senate Subcommittee on Central Asia and South Caucasus of the Committee on Foreign Relations, One Hundred Seventh Congress. Second Session, June 27, 2002. "Balancing Military Assistance and Support for Human Rights in Central Asia". <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>.

This hearing explores American policy in Central Asia focusing simultaneously on human rights and the U.S. security agenda. Many opinions are shared, and it is generally believed that rooting out terrorism, promoting democracy and human rights are not mutually exclusive and may even be mutually enforcing. Emphasis is put on "enhanced engagement" to ensure justice, equality and human rights are actively promoted in Central Asia.

Elizabeth Wishnick. 2004. "Strategic Consequences of the Iraq War: U.S. Security Interests in Central Asia Reassessed". <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pdffiles/PUB383.pdf>.

By focusing on antiterrorism in Central Asia the United States is addressing a symptom, rather than a causes of regional security. This is a counterproductive strategy that is contributing to the radicalization of opposition movements and discrediting the U.S. and democracy. Instead,

underlying human security problems in the region should be addressed because weakness in that area creates opportunities for terrorist movements.

Turkmenistan

107th Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Second Session, 2002.

“Democracy and Human Rights Trends in Eurasia and East Europe”. <http://www.csce.gov>.

Focuses on leadership in Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Turkmenistan has not liberalized at all since 1992, and President Niyazov rules over all aspects of the country with an iron hand. No basic freedoms are allowed and elections are nothing but a fraud. Uzbekistan under President Islam Karimov has become an oppressive police state, banning opposition and basic freedoms.

Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. One Hundred Sixth Congress, Second session, March 21, 2001. “The State of Democratization and Human Rights in Turkmenistan “. <http://www.eurasianet.org/turkmenistan.project/files2/00-03-21Hearing.pdf>

Congress. March 2000. “Human Rights and Democratization in Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan”. <http://files.csce.gov/centralasia.pdf>.

Chemen Durdiyeva. 2003. “Turkmenistan: Historic Pact Signed with Russia”. Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst. <http://www.cacianalyst.org/>.

ABSTRACT: Turkmen president Saparmurad Niyazov paid an official two days visit to Moscow from the 10th to 11th of April 2003. During the visit, he signed agreements on security cooperation, exporting Turkmen gas to Russia, and canceled a dual citizenship deal between Russia and Turkmenistan.

The Lancet. 2003. “Health and Dictatorship: Effects of Repression in Turkmenistan”. 361. www.thelancet.com

A short article listing the many human rights abuses taking place in Turkmenistan. The government seems immune to international pressure and it still seems unclear whether the international community will take President Niyazov to task for his abuses against the Turkmen people.

United Nations. 2004. “Situation of Human Rights in Turkmenistan”. Commission on Human Rights: Report on the Sixtieth Session. E/CN.4/2004/127 (Part I).

A resolution outlining the general human rights abuses being committed in Turkmenistan and the actions that the government there is being called upon to do to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Viktoriya Panfilova. 2003. “Cold Genocide”. *Digest of the Post Soviet Press*. 55(6): 16.

Reports on the launch of an effort to evict people from their apartments as part of Turkmenistan’s campaign to combat terrorism, displacement of potentially disloyal residents of Ashgabat by military, law-enforcement and security personnel and confiscation of apartments by the Turkmen authorities.

Anna Sunder-Plassmann. 2002. "The Human Rights and Security Situation in Turkmenistan". International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights. <http://www.ihf-hr.org>.

The largest meeting yet of human rights organizations and exiles came together to discuss the human rights situation in Turkmenistan. It was agreed upon that Turkmenistan has one of the worst human rights records in the world and that it is the most authoritarian of all former Soviet Union countries. A joint press statement was released calling on the international community to push for implementation of the recommendations in this report.

Human Rights

General Human Rights

Elizabeth Andersen. 2003. "Letter to EBRD Executive Directors from HRW and CEE Bankwatch Network". Europe and Central Asia Division, Human Rights Watch. Available from http://www.hrw.org/doc?t=europe&c=uzbeki&document_limit=80,20.

Letter encouraging the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) to use a recent meeting to communicate to the Uzbek government clear demands for progress, including an end to torture, decriminalization of legitimate religious activity and an end to harassment of human rights defenders and civil society groups.

Charles Buxton. September 28, 2004. "Central Asia: Intrigue, Neutrality and Inter-Dependent Development". <http://www.intrac.org>

While Central Asia was beginning to see reform and the development of a civil society in certain places, the war on terrorism has begun to threaten democratization in the region. The regime took the chance to crack down on human rights activists, religious groups, NGOs and international organisations, arguing that the measures against terrorism require unpopular moves.

Nick Cohen. 2003. "The Mystery of Our Man in Tashkent". *New Statesman*. (13 October): 25-27.

Craig Murray, UK ambassador to Uzbekistan, loudly spoke out against the Uzbek regime, causing an investigation into his conduct and disciplinary charges against him. He is now in the hospital and allegations are being made that this is because various threats and actions have been made against him for inconveniencing the war against terrorism.

Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. 107th Congress, 2nd session, March 7, 2002. "U. S. Policy in Central Asia and Human Rights Concerns". http://www.csce.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.Download&FileStore_id=70.

Gregory Feifer. 2002. "Uzbekistan's Eternal Realities: A Report from Tashkent". *World Policy Journal* (Spring): 81-90.

Focuses on human rights abuses and corruption in Uzbekistan. Uzbek President Karimov has absolute power, and the U.S. will not be able to change him by threatening force. The most effective way to make him reform is through incentives. In its drive to combat terrorism, the U.S. must not ignore Uzbekistan's appalling state of affairs.

Ed McWilliams. 2003. "Putting Human Rights Back on the Agenda". *Foreign Service Journal*. (April): 25-32.

Across Central Asia, human rights problems are abundant and conditions are not improving. The Bush administration is pursuing "enhanced engagement" with the region because the War on Terror requires their cooperation on security matters, but is providing only rhetoric in promoting human rights and reform. The U.S. must set strict benchmarks for progress or the region will become more insecure and anti-US.

Craig Murray. April 2003. "Diplomatic License". *Index on Censorship*. 32(2): 171-3.

Presents excerpts from the British ambassador to Uzbekistan about politics and government in the country. Includes its prospects for democracy, its role in the fight against terrorism and drug trafficking, and its record in the human rights field.

United Nations. April 24, 2004. "Situation of Human Rights in Turkmenistan". Commission on Human Rights: Report on the Sixtieth Session. E/CN. 4/2004/127 (Part I).

A resolution outlining the general human rights abuses being committed in Turkmenistan and the actions that the government there is being called upon to do to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Anna Sunder-Plassmann. June 8-10, 2002. "The Human Rights and Security Situation in Turkmenistan". International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights. <http://www.ihf-hr.org>.

The largest meeting yet of human rights organizations and exiles came together to discuss the human rights situation in Turkmenistan. It was agreed upon that Turkmenistan has one of the worst human rights records in the world and that it is the most authoritarian of all former Soviet Union countries. A joint press statement was released calling on the international community to push for implementation of the recommendations in this report.

Human Rights Watch. "In the Name of Counter-Terrorism: Human Rights Abuses Worldwide". <http://www.hrw.org/un/chr59/counter-terrorism-bck.htm>.

Since September 11, the government of Uzbekistan has used the global campaign against terrorism to justify its own abusive five-year campaign to eliminate independent Islam. Western governments, particularly the United States, have been less critical of the Uzbek government's human rights record in view of the country's strategic importance to international counter-terrorist efforts.

Human Rights Watch. 2003. "Persecution of Human Rights Defenders in Uzbekistan". <http://hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/uzbek050103-bck.htm>.

The Uzbek government persecutes human rights defenders and obstructs human rights work, and in the past twelve months alone has imprisoned six human rights defenders and harassed numerous others. Human Rights Watch urges the Uzbek government to cease the illegal arrest, physical mistreatment, and harassment of human rights defenders that impedes the work of human rights activists.

Human Rights Watch. 2001. "Press Backgrounder: Human Rights Abuse in Uzbekistan". <http://www.hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/uzbek092501-bck.htm>.

After 9/11, President Bush announced that the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) was linked to Osama bin Laden. The IMU is a militant group that seeks the establishment of Islamic Law in Uzbekistan. In the Uzbek governments efforts to stop this group, many innocent Muslims have been branded “extremist” and had their rights violated.

Human Rights Watch. 2004. “Uzbekistan and the EBRD: Progress Report on the Human Rights Benchmarks”. http://hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/ebird_benchmark.pdf

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) gave Uzbekistan one year to make improvements on human rights in order to continue receiving aid money. Specific measures include greater freedom of speech, better functioning of civil society and implementing the U.N. recommendations on torture. These reforms have not taken place and the EBRD must act on this or lose credibility.

Human Rights Watch. 2004. “Uzbekistan: Free Speech Stifled as Summit Opens”. <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2004/06/17/uzbeki8854.htm>.

Uzbek authorities have stepped up the use of harsh methods to block peaceful demonstrations and silence political activists prior to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization’s six-nation summit. Argues that ensuring protection for basic human rights, including freedom of speech and assembly, should be a key element toward promoting security in the region. The government should protect people’s right to speak out peacefully.

Human Rights Watch. 2003. “Uzbekistan: Progress on Paper Only”. <http://hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/uzbek060303-bck.htm>

The U.S. State Department certified that Uzbekistan made “substantial and continuing progress” in meeting its human rights and democracy commitments. This certification is required to release U.S. assistance to the Uzbek government. In many areas outlined here, progress was outweighed by significant setbacks for reform.

Religious Persecution

Elizabeth Andersen. 2002. “Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and the International Religious Freedom Act”. <http://hrw.org/press/2002/08/religious-freedom-ltr.htm>

Letter urging U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell to designate Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan as countries of particular concern under the U.S. International Religious Freedom Act (IRFA) because of their imprisonment and persecution of law-abiding Muslims. This action would strengthen the US’s ability to reform the region and reverse the perception that the it puts the war on terror above human rights concerns.

Zeyno Baran. 2004. “Uzbekistan: The Key to Success in Central Asia?” House Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia. <http://www.nixoncenter.org/publications/ZeynoTestimony.pdf>.

Explains the dangers of allowing radical Islamists to take power and describes the terrorist groups within Uzbekistan. Suggests that U.S. follow Turkey’s model of religious freedom, where

Islam is controlled politically but not banned. The U.S. should not certify Uzbekistan because it has not reformed, but should continue engagement or it will lose the country to Russia and China's pull.

Acacia Shields. 2004. "Creating Enemies of the State: Religious Persecution in Uzbekistan". <http://hrw.org/reports/2004/uzbekistan0304/>

ABSTRACT: In-depth and detailed report documenting all forms of religious persecution in Uzbekistan from 1996 to 2003. Extensive recommendations are given to the US, EU, U.N. and OSCE on how to remedy all aspects attributing to persecution.

Svante E. Cornell and Regine A. Spector. 2002. "Central Asia: More Than Islamic Extremists". *The Washington Quarterly*. 25(1): 193-206.

ABSTRACT: Rather than viewing the incursions in Central Asia by Islamic extremists as the cause of the current instability, they should be understood as indicators of the region's complex dynamic. This involves the role of Islam in Central Asia, the challenges of regional poverty and drug trafficking, and the ideological spillover effects of the war in Afghanistan.

Human Rights Watch. 2004. "Hear No Evil, See No Evil: The U.N. Security Council's Approach to Human Rights; Violations in the Global Counter-Terrorism Effort". <http://hrw.org/backgrounder/un/2004/un0804/>.

Uzbekistan has criminalized legitimate religious practice and belief in a way that casts individual's exercise of their rights to freedom of conscience, expression, and association as attempts to overthrow the government. Uzbek leaders use the war on terrorism to legitimize their actions and increase their power.

Human Rights Watch. 2001. "Memorandum to the U.S. Government Regarding Religious Persecution in Uzbekistan". <http://www.hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/uzbek-aug/>.

Detailed account of the systematic religious persecution of independent Muslims in Uzbekistan, where unlawful arrest, incommunicado detention, torture, unfair trials, and incarceration of non-violent believers are being carried out. Uzbekistan should be designated a "country of particular concern" under the International Religious Freedom Act.

Human Rights Watch. 2002. "Religious Persecution of Independent Muslims in Uzbekistan from September 2001 to July 2002". <http://hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/uzbek-aug/uzbek-brief0820.pdf>

For years the government of Uzbekistan has violated the right to freedom of conscience by imprisoning and persecuting independent Muslims whose peaceful practice of their faith falls beyond government controls. This briefing paper describes arrests, trials, torture, and other persecution of independent Muslims during the past year, as well as cumulative effects of Uzbekistan's five-year campaign against them.

Human Rights Watch. 2004. "Uzbekistan: Crackdown Targets Dissident Muslim Women". <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2004/04/13/uzbeki8425.htm>

Gives specific details of Muslim women being detained incommunicado, which puts them at serious risk for torture. The arrests indicate a broadening of the government's crackdown on nonviolent independent Muslims, who practice their faith outside state religious institutions.

Russell Zanca. 2004. "Explaining' Islam in Central Asia: An Anthropological Approach for Uzbekistan". *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*. 24(1).

In the debate about religion in Uzbekistan the rise and practice of Islam remain unexamined. Ethnography shows that Islam reaches beyond state-level politics to the social fabric of daily life. The article argues that people are not merely prey for extremists and that culture and history must be also taken into account.

Torture

Human Rights Watch; Aire Center. 2004. "Mamatkulov and Askarov V. Turkey". Application Nos. 46827/99 and 46951/99.

ABSTRACT: Details relevant general information collected by Human Rights Watch about the human rights situation in Uzbekistan, including specific information about the applicants' experiences on their return to Uzbekistan, and sets out more general information about reliance on diplomatic assurances as a safeguard against torture in extradition and expulsion cases.

Julia Hall. April 2004. "Empty Promises: Diplomatic Assurances No Safeguard against Torture". 16(4): 26-65.

Despite a request of the European Court of Human Rights, the Turkish government extradited two Uzbek nationals at a request from the Uzbekistan government, which charged that they had been involved in terrorist activities in Uzbekistan. The extradition was done after the Uzbek government gave assurances that torture would not be used, but the government's record hardly deems this assurance trustworthy.

Human Rights Watch. 2003. "Deaths in Custody in Uzbekistan". <http://hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/uzbek040403-bck.htm>

Despite hope that the Uzbek government was beginning to seriously address the problem of torture, Human Rights Watch documents 21 suspicious deaths that the Uzbek authorities refused to investigate and calls on the international community to make rigorous implementation of anti-torture measures a key element in their relations with the country.

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Elizabeth Andersen. 2003. "Letter to EBRD Executive Directors from HRW and CEE Bankwatch Network". *Europe and Central Asia Division, Human Rights Watch*. <http://hrw.org/press/2003/03/uzbekistan030603ltr.htm>

Letter encouraging the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) to use a recent meeting to communicate to the Uzbek government clear demands for progress, including

an end to torture, decriminalization of legitimate religious activity and an end to harassment of human rights defenders and civil society groups.

Steve Crawshaw. 2003. "Clare Short Helps out a Tyrant". *New Statesman*. (February 24): 17.

Though Uzbekistan's human rights record is very bad, Clare Short, England's Secretary of State for International Development, is due to chair the annual meeting of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) in Uzbekistan without asking for any concessions towards democracy or human rights. This is a big reward for bad behavior, which can only make matters worse there.

US Policy

US Should Change

Zeyno Baran. 2004. "Uzbekistan: The Key to Success in Central Asia?" House Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia. http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/intlrel/hfa94278.000/hfa94278_0.htm.

Explains the dangers of allowing radical Islamists to take power and describes the terrorist groups within Uzbekistan. Suggests that U.S. follow Turkey's model of religious freedom, where Islam is controlled politically but not banned. The U.S. should not certify Uzbekistan because it has not reformed, but should continue engagement or it will lose the country to Russia and China's pull.

Matthew Brzezinski. 2001. "Whatever It Takes". *New York Times Magazine*. 151(51969): 72.

Accessible discussion on the leaders of Uzbekistan, particularly Communist Party leader Islam Karimov, and their tyrannical efforts to control Islamic militants. Though the U.S. is cooperating with and supporting these leaders, they continue to silence all opposition and allow human rights abuses without meaningful efforts toward reform.

The Carter Center. May 2004. "Human Rights Defenders on the Frontlines of Freedom: Protecting Human Rights in the Context of the War on Terror". <http://www.cartercenter.org/documents/1682.pdf>.

Contains several good accounts on the reality of the streets in Uzbekistan, where the people have become increasingly angry at the Uzbek government's abusive and exclusive policies. The people are gaining courage in standing up to the government and attacks are often targeted at policemen. The international community should not justify oppression, but should push for reforms and human rights.

Belinda; Traugott Cooper, Isabel. 2003. "Women's Rights and Security in Central Asia". *World Policy Journal*. 20(1): 59.

The U.S. is making allies out of countries with bad human rights records. Rather than focusing on straight military strategies to win the region, Washington needs to recognize that promoting

rights, particularly women's rights, can further U.S. security interests and lay the groundwork for long-term resistance to terrorism.

Svante E. Cornell. July 2004. "The United States and Central Asia: In the Steppes to Stay?" Cambridge Review of International Affairs. 17(2): 239.

ABSTRACT: September 11 elevated the importance of Central Asia in U.S. global strategy and the Central Asian republics proved crucial bases for military and intelligence operations. As its Central Asian footprint grows, Washington must consider the interests of key Eurasian powers and demonstrate a sustained economic and political commitment to the region.

Gregory Feifer. 2002. "Uzbekistan's Eternal Realities: A Report from Tashkent". World Policy Journal. (Spring) 81.

Focuses on human rights abuses and corruption in Uzbekistan. Uzbek President Karimov has absolute power, and the U.S. will not be able to change him by threatening force. The most effective way to make him reform is through incentives. In its drive to combat terrorism, the U.S. must not ignore Uzbekistan's appalling state of affairs.

Veronika Leila Szente Goldston. 2004. "U. S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe Hearing "Uzbekistan: Stifled Democracy, Human Rights in Decline"". <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2004/06/24/uzbeki8959.htm>.

US legislation giving assistance to the Uzbek government is conditional on that government's efforts to improve its human rights record and institute political and institutional reform. Because the Uzbek government has unquestionably failed to make credible progress toward meeting these goals, the U.S. administration should do anything but decertify their support.

International Crisis Group. 2004. "The Failure of Reform in Uzbekistan: Ways Forward for the International Community". ICG Asia Report Number 76. www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=2537&l=1

The international community has long urged political and economic reform in Uzbekistan. There are no grounds for the State Department to certify that Uzbekistan has made "continuing and substantive progress" on political liberalisation, human rights, and economic reforms. The U.S. and others must force change in the region.

Pauline Jones Luong. 002. "After Afghanistan Implications of the "War on Terrorism" for Central Asia". PONARS Policy Memo No 212.

To prevent political and economic instability in Central Asia, the article recommends long term, pro-active U.S. policy that will give a comprehensive economic aid package to help dealing with the impending refugee crisis, continue pressure for human rights and democratization and prevent a unilateral military buildup in Uzbekistan.

Ed McWilliams. 2003. "Putting Human Rights Back on the Agenda". Foreign Service Journal. (April): 25-32.

Across Central Asia, human rights problems are abundant and conditions are not improving. The Bush administration is pursuing "enhanced engagement" with the region because the War on Terror requires their cooperation on security matters, but is providing only rhetoric in

promoting human rights and reform. The U.S. must set strict benchmarks for progress or the region will become more insecure and anti-US.

Martha Brill Olcott. 2003. "The War on Terrorism in Central Asia and the Cause of Democratic Reform". *Demokratizatsiya*. 11(1): 86-105.

Leaders in Washington may be reluctant to hold the Central Asian states to democratic norms, for fear of the political uncertainty it could cause when their help is needed. This legitimizes tyrannical leaders and stops reform. The U.S. should immediately increase pressure on this region to democratize and respect human rights.

Transitions Online. 2004. "The Uzbek Tinderbox". *Transitions Online*. April 12.

Compares Uzbekistan under President Karimov as a tinderbox that could go up in any flames at any minute. The U.S. should pull out of Uzbekistan immediately, because their presence is making Karimov's tyranny stronger and making more terrorists target the US. The U.S. needs to put political pressure on Karimov to allow opposition parties.

Charles V. Peña. 2001. "The Anti-Terrorism Coalition: Don't Pay an Excessive Price". http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=1592.

The United States needs to avoid longer-term entanglements, open-ended commitments, and the potential for an extreme anti-American backlash in waging the anti-terrorist campaign. If the U.S. is not careful, there is a good chance that its war or terrorism could end up breeding more terrorists than there are now in countries such as Uzbekistan, which is cited throughout the text.

Alec Rasizade. 2002. "The Specter of a New "Great Game" in Central Asia". *Foreign Service Journal*. <http://www.afsa.org/fsj/nov02/greatgame.pdf>.

Since the US-led intervention in Afghanistan, Central Asia has been transformed into a crucible of international diplomacy. The three fundamental challenges confronting any model of American involvement in Central Asia are to uphold human rights, promote meaningful economic development and stay engaged in the region for the long haul.

Center for Strategic and International Studies. 2004. "Assessing the "War on Terror" in Central Asia". *Islam in Eurasia and the "War on Terror" Series*. <http://www.csis.org/ruseura/wot/040503.pdf>.

Seminar on Central Asia featuring two panels that explore questions surrounding the sources of instability and extremism in the region and the role of the United States given its strategic and long-term interests in Central Asia. Large emphasis is put on economic reform and on the underlying economic, political and social causes of extremism.

United States Senate Subcommittee on Central Asia and South Caucasus of the Committee on Foreign Relations, One Hundred Seventh Congress. Second Session, June 27, 2002. "Balancing Military Assistance and Support for Human Rights in Central Asia". <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>.

This hearing explores American policy in Central Asia focusing simultaneously on human rights and the U.S. security agenda. Many opinions are shared, and it is generally believed that rooting out terrorism, promoting democracy and human rights are not mutually exclusive and may even

be mutually enforcing. Emphasis is put on “enhanced engagement” to ensure justice, equality and human rights are actively promoted in Central Asia.

United States Senate Subcommittee on Central Asia and South Caucasus of the Committee on Foreign Relations, One Hundred Seventh Congress. First Session, December 13, 2001. “Contributions of Central Asian Nations to the Campaign against Terrorism”. <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate>.

US policy in Central Asia must include a commitment to deeper, more sustained, and better-coordinated engagement on the full range of issues upon which we agree and disagree. These include security cooperation, energy, and internal strengthening of these countries through political and economic reform.

Human Rights Watch. 2001. “Memorandum to the U.S. Government Regarding Religious Persecution in Uzbekistan”. <http://www.hrw.org/background/eca/uzbek-aug/>.

Detailed account of the systematic religious persecution of independent Muslims in Uzbekistan, where unlawful arrest, incommunicado detention, torture, unfair trials, and incarceration of non-violent believers are being carried out. Uzbekistan should be designated a “country of particular concern” under the International Religious Freedom Act.

Elizabeth Wishnick. 2004. “Strategic Consequences of the Iraq War: U.S. Security Interests in Central Asia Reassessed”. <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pdf/PUB383.pdf>.

By focusing on antiterrorism in Central Asia the United States is addressing a symptom, rather than a causes of regional security. This is a counterproductive strategy that is contributing to the radicalization of opposition movements and discrediting the U.S. and democracy. Instead, underlying human security problems in the region should be addressed because weakness in that area creates opportunities for terrorist movements.

Official U.S. Standpoint

George Bush. 2004. “Extension of Waiver for Turkmenistan”. *108th Congress, 2nd Session*.

Turkmenistan President Niyazov has restricted movement and emigration in the country, violating the Jackson-Vanik freedom of emigration provisions. In June 2003 a waiver was given to Turkmenistan allowing it time to fix matters, which it hasn’t done. A 12 month extension is now necessary to fully liberalize its policies and Bush has granted this.

Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. One Hundred Sixth Congress, Second session, March 21, 2001. “The State of Democratization and Human Rights in Turkmenistan “.

Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. 107th Congress, 2nd session, March 7, 2002. “U. S. Policy in Central Asia and Human Rights Concerns “.

House of Representatives Committee on International Relations, One Hundred Eighth Congress. First Session

2003. "Central Asia: Terrorism, Religious Extremism, and Regional Stability". October 29. http://www.house.gov/international_relations.

Congressional hearing featuring a wide range of testimonies and written statements about the impacts of the U.S. strategic shift to the region and what must further be done. Highlights the need for the U.S. to continue to focus on the region, deterring religious extremism and terrorism while at the same time promoting democratic institutions and human rights so that this isolated region may become integrated into the larger international community.

Lutz Kleveman. October 13, 2003. "How America Makes Terrorists of Its Allies". *New Statesman*. <http://www.kleveman.com/middleeast/statesman131003.htm>.

Argues that since the current Bush administration turned the 11 September terror attacks into an excuse to pursue policies seen by many as arrogant, aggressive and imperialist, the change in perception could not be more drastic. The U.S. has lost most of its cultural attractiveness in the ex-Soviet countries of central Asia and their neighbours, and is widely hated for its politics.

Human Rights Watch. July 14, 2004. "Uzbekistan: U.S. Cuts Aid over Rights Concerns". 3p. <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2004/07/14/uzbeki9062.htm>.

Human Rights Watch applauds the U.S. State Department's decision to cut aid to the Uzbek government over its lack of progress on human rights. This action will show that the United States takes human rights records seriously and means what it says. Now the United States needs to continue its engagement with the Uzbek government and press for human rights improvements.

Conservative

Zeyno Baran. 2004. "Uzbekistan: The Key to Success in Central Asia?" *House Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia*. http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/intlrel/hfa94278.000/hfa94278_0.htm.

Explains the dangers of allowing radical Islamists to take power and describes the terrorist groups within Uzbekistan. Suggests that U.S. follow Turkey's model of religious freedom, where Islam is controlled politically but not banned. The U.S. should not certify Uzbekistan because it has not reformed, but should continue engagement or it will lose the country to Russia and China's pull.

Svante E. Cornell. 2002. "Central Asia: More Than Islamic Extremists". *Washington Quarterly*. 25(1): 193-207.

ABSTRACT: Reports on the integral participation of Central Asian republics in the U.S. campaign against terrorism, the launch of insurgencies by the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan in the republic, and consequences brought by the rise of the Taliban government for Central Asia. Economic conditions in Central Asia are also discussed.

Organization for Security and Co-Operation in Europe. 2002. "Striking a Fair Balance: Protecting Human Rights in the Fight against Terrorism". *OSCE Newsletter*. 9(4): 13. www.osce.org.

Spells out areas in which the Uzbekistan government has cooperated and began human rights reform. The Independent Human Rights Organization was legally registered, prison personnel began undergoing more training and alternative prison sentencing was promoted in an open seminar.

Roger McDermott Farkhad Tolipov. 2003. "Uzbekistan and the U. S." *The Review of International Affairs*. 2(4): 19.

Discusses the threat of terrorism in Central Asia and the new strategic partnership between the U.S. and Uzbekistan. Focus is on military aspects of eliminating terrorism and religious extremism. Concludes that security is more important than human rights at this time.

Arch Puddington and Adrian Karatnycky. 2002. "The Human-Rights Lobby Meets Terrorism". *Commentary*. (January): 28-31.

An attack against major human rights groups, particularly Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, claiming that their overemphasis on human rights skews their ability to recognize more important security concerns to the U.S. and the international community. Claims that criticizing the U.S. is reprehensible and shows a lack of judgment.

Erkin Nazarov. April 12, 2004. "Uzbekistan: A Terrorist Target Again". *Transitions Online*.

ABSTRACT: Focuses on the outbreak of violence due to terrorism in March 2004 in Tashkent, Uzbekistan and the number of suspected terrorists that have been arrested, according to Uzbek Prosecutor-General Rashid Kadyrov. Actions taken by the country to implement security measures and reactions of the Uzbek media on the limited information on the bombings are also covered.

Paul Starobin. August 15, 2001. "The 'Stans' Seize the Day". *Business Week*. (3753): 58-61.

Increased U.S. relations with Central Asian countries are welcomed by the leaders of those countries, who hope for economic growth. The citizens of those countries are largely anti-American, but may be swayed over with the prosperity brought on by becoming an economic partner with the US.

Angela Stephens. June 12, 2004. "Uzbekistan Faces Human-Rights Test". *National Journal*. 36(24): 1874-6.

Though the human rights record of Uzbekistan remains bad and many say that President Islam Karimov is using the new alliance as a smokescreen for oppressing political opponents and devout Muslims, the article points out that the country is increasingly cooperating with the U.S. and that continued engagement is necessary.