

民族分離運動的比較研究

- 以俄羅斯聯邦之韃靼共和國與車臣共和國為例

指導教授：吳玉山 博士

研 究 生：曾靖芳

論文摘要

本論文以隸屬於俄羅斯聯邦架構中的韃靼共和國和車臣共和國作為分離運動比較研究的兩個案例，進行民族分離運動相關問題的探討，包括民族分離意識興起的原因以及影響分離運動往不同路徑發展的因素。由於俄羅斯屬於前社會主義國家，國家體制曾經歷轉型的過程，因此除了具有一般民族問題的特質外，還必須將多重轉型的特殊性列入考量。

除了原生差異與政經利益考量的工具性訴求外，社會主義國家特有的聯邦制與本土化政策也促使民族意識興起，創造了潛在的民族分離團體。當中央的控制力有了鬆懈的跡象，分離意識便有了發揮的空間，分離運動隨之爆發。

韃靼共和國與車臣共和國分離運動的比較研究證明，作為動員基礎的原生性條件以及工具性訴求僅是影響分離運動發展的次要因素，由於領導人的動員可以決定分離運動發展的方向，因此領導人的策略抉擇才是影響分離運動發展的關鍵因素。而在蘇聯末期政治不穩定的局勢中，由誰來主導分離運動的發展相當程度受到莫斯科、原共和國執政者與民族主義力量三角關係的影響。

韃靼共和國的分離運動由立場溫和的夏米耶夫主導，在不斷的妥協談判後，最終以雙邊條約的方式界定與俄羅斯聯邦的關係，創造了「韃靼模式」，分離運動得到平息。相較之下，車臣共和國的分離運動在杜達耶夫激進的領導風格下一步步朝向完全獨立與脫離俄羅斯聯邦的方向發展。如此極端的立場當然不容於莫斯科。為了維護俄羅斯聯邦領土的完整性，莫斯科最後發動戰爭來解決車臣問題。在整個分離運動的發展過程中，領導者的策略決定了分離運動的發展，可見領導者的路線抉擇才是影響分離運動發展最關鍵的因素。

關鍵字：民族分離運動、韃靼、車臣、俄羅斯聯邦、三角（邊）關係

A Comparative Analysis of National Separatism in Russian Federation - the Cases of Tatarstan and Chechnya

Abstract

This thesis focuses on national separatism in former socialist countries and takes Tatarstan and Chechnya for a case study. My research seeks to answer several questions, such as where did the separatist group originate from? Why did nationalist movements explode? How to explain different attitudes towards secession?

I argue that primordial attachment and instrumental consideration about interests are the important causes shaping separatist groups. In the cases of former socialist countries, however, it is necessary to take the institutional factor into consideration, that is - ethnic federalism and *korenizatsiya*. All these elements combined to create the potential secessionist groups. Once the coercive controls formerly imposed by the central authority were removed, the previously repressed national groups inevitably reemerged and led the secessionist movement.

The comparative analysis of the secessionist movements in Tatarstan and Chechnya proves that primordial and instrumental factors can only explain the emergence of secessionist movements, however they are of little significance when it comes to explaining the divergent paths of the movements. What matters more is the leadership's strategy. The crucial problem is who will lead the secessionist movements? In the chaotic years leading up to the collapse of the Soviet Union, it was the triangular relations among Moscow, republican leadership and secessionist movement that determined the exact leader of the secessionist movement.

In our cases, the moderate Shamiev led Tatarstan's separatism by negotiation and was able to reach agreement with Moscow on a new Sovereignty Treaty. This pattern later came to be called the "Tatarstan Model". After that, the secession in Tatarstan quieted down. In sharp contrast, Dudaev pursued a radical strategy and sought Chechnya's complete independence from the Russian Federation. To defend his integrity of territory, Moscow dispatched Russian troops to quell this separatist republic. Leadership strategy thus determined the outcome of secessionist movements, and the choice of leaders proved crucial in the whole process.

Keywords: secession, national separatism, Tatarstan, Chechnya, Russian Federation,
triangular interactions