Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH)

Mission Statement

Staff members at IFSH research the conditions for peace. They analyze, review and develop strategies for the prevention and reduction of collective violence. The particular approach of the IFSH lies in the analytical connection of fundamentals of peace research with current questions of security policy. The IFSH combines excellent research with interdisciplinary teaching, the promotion of young researchers and practice-relevant consultancy to political and societal actors. The IFSH, as an independent scientific institute, cooperates with the University of Hamburg, institutions of the Hamburg metropolitan region as well as national and international partners.

Intermediate-term Work Program 2013-2018

"Contemporary Peace Strategies – Peace and Security Policy at the Fault Lines of Globalization"

Summary

With its work program, the IFSH pursues three goals: it aims to scrutinize the sustainability of liberal peace strategies under the conditions of globalization, analyze the suitability of the peace and security policy of German and European political actors and develop approaches for a coherent peace policy under the conditions of globalization. For this purpose, selected problem areas in which violence threatens to break out or an outbreak of violence has already occurred will be studied.

Liberal peace strategies, which aim at preventing the collective use of force worldwide through democratization, economic integration, rule of law and distributive justice, are increasingly being challenged. This happens at various levels. First, there is criticism of a fundamental nature: According to this argument, with globalization, the conditions that are necessary to prevent, limit or end collective use of violence change. Liberal peace strategies are seen as not (or no longer) compatible with these changed realities. Second, the criticism is directed at the political practice: Liberal peace strategies do frequently still serve as a theoretical framework, in practical policies, however, security policy considerations increasingly trump peace policy. This applies both to Germany and to the European Union. Have liberal peace strategies been proven to be ineffective or are changed political goals being reflected here? How must liberal peace strategies be changed or adapted to remain guiding principles for German and European policy?

These questions will be worked on in three research clusters:
1. Changes in the forms of collective use of force
2. Changes in the global power architecture and
3. Losses of autonomy and legitimacy within societies due to globalization

These areas of research were chosen because of their special relevance for the future of German and European peace policy.

Content

1. Introduction

The point of departure for the work program is the observation that "peace" and "peace policy" have lost significance in the recent past compared to other concepts such as "security" and "security policy". This applies both to the international academic discussion in which, over the last ten years, much more thought has been given to security than to peace, as well as for policy discourses. Security policy dominates in official documents as well as in the current political discourses.

The loss in significance of "peace" as an analytical term and "peace policy" as a guiding concept is, according to a basic assumption of this work program, primarily the consequence of changed global conditions, which can be summarized in the term globalization. Globalization can be defined as an unprecedented acceleration of processes of integration and interdependencies in areas such as the economy, security, culture/communication and the environment. Since the end of the East-West conflict, in the course of diverse globalization processes, societies have, on the one hand, grown together and conflicts have been defused but, on the other hand, new fissures and fault lines have arisen. This has already been widely researched with the emphasis, however, on economic and political consequences of globalization. Still relatively few – and often also contradictory – contributions deal with the effects on peace and security.

With the work program, the IFSH wants to consciously move the terms peace, peace strategies and peace policy in a globalizing world back into focus. Thereby, it is not primarily the assumed "sunny sides" of globalization, but rather their potential "shadowy sides" that will be researched, that is, not their pacifying effects but their fissures and fault lines which, in turn, can entail dangers for peace and security. Typically, these challenges are seen, above all, as security policy problems which, as such, must be confronted by defense, containment or combat. Within the framework of the work program, the degree to which traditional, liberal peace strategy approaches are appropriate or the degree to which alternatives would be more suitable for confronting these problems will be studied. The subject matters of the analytical study are both liberal peace theory concepts as well as the peace policy instruments and measures developed from them. The assumptions of the peace theories will be examined to analyze whether they capture the reality of a globalizing world and its fissures. The strategies derived from them will be studied to determine whether, with their help, the rise and use of collective violence at the fissures of globalization can actually be prevented. The analytical work will take place with a research strategy in three steps:

- First, there is the task of studying the degree to which a "positive" determination of peace under changed and dynamically shifting conditions of collective use of force is possible. For this purpose, a differentiated look at global and local changes since the end of the Cold War is needed: at societal integrative as well as fragmenting processes, at winners as well as losers of globalization, at harmonization as well as fissures in the world.

- In a second step, it is a question of evaluating selected strategies, instruments and measures geared to establishing and stabilizing peace, to see whether, under the given conditions, they are still appropriate to meet the objectives set for them. Thereby, we aim to expand discussions on security and security policy that are frequently limited both thematically and temporally through a peace-policy view.

- From this analysis, the staff at IFSH will ultimately try to develop criteria for the modification or reformulation of elements of a peace strategy under the conditions of globalization. Then these can, in turn, serve as foundations for European and German political action. They should allow assessments of whether and to what degree policies are sufficient to meet the requirements of a consistent peace policy under globalization.

Considering the abundance of potential research topics on the consequences of globalization for the use of collective violence, a focus is necessary. Within the framework of this work program, three areas of particular relevance for peace and security actors in Germany and Europe are paramount:

1. Changes in the forms of collective use of force. Peace theories and strategies have to come to terms with this change and its consequences today.

2. The change in the global power architecture and, above all, the growing consequences in the future for norm setting, norm enforcement and the regulation of problems that endanger peace.

3. Globalization-determined losses of autonomy and legitimation, which could result in the use of collective force within societies – also in highly developed industrialized societies.

With this new direction of the work program, the IFSH connects its research activities up until now to questions of German and European peace and security policy and aligns them with the current world political developments and dynamics as well as the peace policy consequences resulting from them. Thereby, this new program continues the practice of expounding and concretizing peace strategies and security policy in light of the changing world political conditions, which has been the guiding principle for the work of the IFSH since 1971.

On this basis, the IFSH is well-suited to study the conditions and consequences of peace strategies under the conditions of globalization. Through the focus on the analytical connection of fundamental approaches of peace research with the challenges of current security policy, the IFSH differentiates itself both from other peace research institutes, as well as from the security and regional research. In this combination they are a unique characteristic of the IFSH

2. Conditions for Peace in the Understanding of Liberal Peace Theories

Liberal peace strategies on the borderline between a "Westphalian" and a "post-Westphalian" understanding of the international are of particular significance and, to a great degree, determine the rhetoric for political and societal actors in Germany and Europe but also in the United Nations. This is shown, for instance, in the action plan "Civilian Crisis Prevention, Conflict Resolution and Post-Conflict Peace-Building" of the German Federal government or in the "General Provisions on the Union's External Action" in the Treaty of Lisbon (Art. 21).

The fundamental bases of liberal peace strategies are, first, theoretical considerations of liberal thinkers beginning with Immanuel Kant and, second, the historical experiences in Europe after the end of the Second World War. Altogether, liberal peace theories are the envisioning of peace as a societal process in the course of which collective use of force becomes ever less likely. Liberal peace theories lay considerable weight on the democratization of systems of governance and the creation of rule of law, since they connect the decision on war and peace to the will of the society. Because autocratic systems of governance serve the interests of their elites first and foremost and scarcely have to consider societal demands, they are seen as less peaceful than democracies.

These intra-societal processes are seen by the representatives of liberal peace theories as being in a complementary relationship to an increasingly interstate integration on various functional and international levels as expressed in catchphrases such as "peace through law", "peace through trade" and "peace through the League of Nations". Such ideas are found, for instance, in the concept of a "security community" developed as early as the 1950s by Karl Deutsch and his colleagues, which holds that the creation of peace zones is the result of a collective learning process or of the idea of a "society of nations" supported by the so-called "English School". The vision, stemming from the 19th century, that economic integration between societies, above all, leads to peace, mostly recently had a revival in the theory of a "capitalistic peace", but also survives in cosmopolitan peace strategies. Finally, institutional and functional elements were brought together in security-governance approaches that aim at the inclusion of all stakeholders in the creation of regulations for sustainable conflict resolution.

A further central element of many (but not all) liberal peace theories is the reference to the peace-creating significance of increasing distributive justice, both at the intrastate and at the international level. While equal opportunity is in the foreground of classic liberal thinking, authors such as Ernst-Otto Czempiel and Dieter Senghaas point out the necessity of material equity.

The societal models derived from the peace theories are, at the same time, regulatory and governance models. Thus the dominant liberal peace model in Europe rests on a combination of three elements: democracy, a free-trade oriented market furnished with social compensation mechanisms, as well as distributive justice. From a peace strategy point of view, the proponents of this model prefer the world-wide promotion of these conditions through institutionalization and legal regulation, also at an international lev-

el. In the liberal peace theories, the "universal" validity of these conditions and a normative influence of the "West" are assumed. Because the concept of "peace" primarily follows liberal-universalistic principles and ideas, this is always an expression of a certain epoch and historical constellation.

3. The World in Transition: Changes in the Forms of Violence and Fault Lines of Globalization

The historical constellation in which the peace theories and strategies described were developed has, for some time already, found itself in upheaval. A constitutive characteristic of this change is globalization.

However, different from the assumptions of early globalization theorists and also from a range of peace researchers, the acceleration of societal integration observed in the course of globalization has not led everywhere or linearly to the increase in peace predicted by liberal peace theory. Neither is a general convergence of societies towards intrastate democracy and a well-regulated market economy detectable nor has effective universal regulation and global institutionalization followed.

Instead, globalization has created countertendencies: local resistance, regionalization, fragmentation and exclusion tendencies, traditionalization and special pathways have been identified, in the sense of James Rosenaus, as "turbulences" and the "other side" of globalization. On the one hand, globalization produces losers, who (cannot) participate in the stabilizing and prosperity-enhancing effects of globalization. On the other hand, new possibilities have arisen for influential actors who seek to use the advantages of globalization for themselves.

Characteristic is the increase in "hybrid" mixed forms of modern societies, heterogenic, different forms and characteristics of societal identity and organization occurring simultaneously. Through "the simultaneity of the non-simultaneous", the continuous divergence of tradition and the modern, a complex situation has developed which requires that it be observed and analyzed in a differentiated way.

We concentrate on three developments which put the dominant peace strategies in Europe and Germany to the test in a particular way: first, currently, a shift in the forms of violent conflicts has already been observed. It forces us to think about what can still be characterized as "war" and as "peace", who can be categorized as a combatant and how these developments and phenomena can be taken into account through legal regulation and monitoring mechanisms. Second, there are shifts in international power structures, which are impelled particularly by economically successful states, which do not belong to the OECD world and are, to some extent, ruled autocratically. These shifts are connected with an aggravation of global conflicts of interest and, on the western side, a loss of agenda-setting power. Third, due to globalization-determined developments, the western democracies are also coming under intrastate pressure. "Informal" globalization powers, such as globally operating transnational actors, threaten to un-

dermine the foundation on which democracies rest. These developments are not yet sufficiently reflected in peace strategies, particularly the dominant liberal ones, and their proponents have not yet developed appropriate ideas or instruments to deal with them.

3.1 Changes in Forms of Violence

Data from empirical conflict research show that the frequency and intensity of interstate and intrastate violent conflicts has declined over the past two decades.

However, the analysis cannot stop here, for security problems are perceived differently today. Indicative of this, in particular, is the rise of the concept of risk in the academic and political debate. Even in Europe and Germany, many people feel ever more uncertain despite objectively verifiable security gains. An increasing "securitization" or "riskification" of globalized living conditions has contributed to ever more alleged risks being discovered. Security policy, in turn, has reacted to this shift with an expanded array of measures. The buildup of missile defense systems, international interventions, under the leadership of western states, or the use of drones in the context of networked warfare, are examples of this.

This is further aggravated by the fact that, in the course of globalization, ever more actors have relevant technologies at their disposal. The proliferation of nuclear technology and the possibility of misuse through state and non-state actors is the most obvious example for this development. However, similar problems also occur in other areas such as, bio- or information technology, with the risk of cyber-attacks or cyber-wars being taken ever more seriously.

In the recent past, in various regions, particularly in the global south, new forms of collective violence have been observed on the outskirts of and also, especially, outside of the sphere of state influence. At present, more and more varied methods of violence combine – the regular battle with irregular forms, such as terror, guerilla tactics, sabotage or organized crime – not least as a consequence of external interventions. New combinations, comingling and interactions of various dimensions and kinds of violent conflict are also emerging, which have the effect that even the central questions about who is friend and who is foe or the actual existence of an attack often is not clear. For the IFSH, this is a reason to ask how local forms of violence and use of violence develop through third parties *in dependency on each other* and, more concretely: how local conflict motives, constellations and armed forces disposition with high-tech support are interrelated and which future developments are looming. What springs to mind here is, for example, the use of modern weapons and communications technology and the "selective strikes" through drones, which can scarcely be considered conventional warfare as they have been practiced, primarily by the United States, in the last few years.

3.2 Changes in Global Power Structures and Norms

With the economic and political ascent of the BRICS states (Brazil, Russia India, China, South Africa) and a further dozen emerging nations (i.e. Indonesia, Mexico, Thailand, Vietnam) a rapid change of global power and influence structures is occurring. This implies not only the end of the two decades-long duration of USA dominance, but also the end of the centuries-long western, i.e. European-American global hegemony.

This global process of change is complex and encompasses many different dimensions: economy, wealth distribution, ecology, military power, political systems of rule, the exercising of power at global and regional levels, but also ideas, value systems and symbolic order. A segment of the aspiring states features autocratic ruling systems or involves democracies with serious defects. Since these states have long since achieved significant positions of power, there must be cooperation with them in order to make possible global and regional conflict resolution. Here, the question is how these states can be reliably integrated into international systems which deal with conflict and problem resolution. But also those aspiring states, such as India or Brazil, which have democratic systems, do not automatically follow western positions. The peace and security action and thinking of regional powers and "new policy shapers" must, therefore, be integrated into the analysis of the changing conditions for the use of peace strategies. Thereby, it is in no way a foregone conclusion how these states will behave towards the existing political institutional and cultural order, that is, whether they will take these over, adapt them or reject them

Still open is the extent to which the loss of the economic and politically dominant position of the west will be accompanied by a loss or at least a relativization of the western normative-symbolic *monopoly of interpretation*. The consequences of the looming competition of ideas of the west with autocratic-capitalistic and patrimonial states should, therefore, also be studied. This applies particularly for the possibility of spreading western norms – simultaneously deemed by the liberal peace theories as a significant condition for peace and a practice that is often pursued by western politics with missionary zeal while practicing double standards.

3.3   New Intrastate Potentials for Violence

With respect to *intrastate* violence dynamics – also that which is associated with globalization processes – the focus of the research up until now has, in the main, been directed at the weak and transformation states. Taking a look at "failed states" and transformation states does remain necessary since, in the past, collective violence has occurred most frequently here and recurs in new forms and intensity. However, attention should also be given to globalization-induced exclusion and fragmentation processes *within consolidated democracies*. For in the western consolidated democracies as well, the limits of the economically and politically feasible could be felt in the course of the financial crisis after 2008. The financial crisis shows that expansion and integration not only af-

fect stability and peace beneficially, but also involve new challenges and possibly even risks and dangers for security and peace. The question of how peace can be maintained *within* democratic states is, therefore, just as relevant and its future conditions just as worthy of research as the maintenance and creation of peace *between* states.

Here, two concurrent processes can be identified through which the foundations of democratic policy could be drastically changed: first the political ability of democratic governments to act is increasingly limited when, for instance, globally operating transnational actors make important decisions without the participation of these governments, but the societies represented by them are badly affected by these decisions. Second, the congruence between the ruling and the ruled is limited by the transfer of decisions to democratic, but only weakly legitimated, international organizations due to the need for interstate cooperation.

When there are serious disruptions of social cohesion in connection with globalization processes, even in democracies which, up to now, have been seen as consolidated, then it is certainly conceivable that conflicts of interest here can also no longer be reliably contained by rules and procedures accepted by all sides. The *London "riots"* of 2011 may still be classifiable as unique outbreaks of violence and the protest movements in Spain and other European countries (may be) seen as primarily "peaceful" in a physical sense. However, it is obvious that broader counter-movements against such actors and processes will be created, which can be regarded as "non-formalized" globalization powers.

4. Consequences for German and European Peace and Security Strategies

The developments described affect the bases of European and German foreign policy action and, thereby, the peace and security policy of Germany and Europe as well.

Thus, with respect to the changes described in the forms of violence, a first step is the task of asking how the agendas and decision-calculus will change European and German policy related to the use of force. The consequences of the increasing ability to conduct selective military action shall be studied. The relevance of this question becomes clear with the example of the acquisition and use of armed drones. In a second step, the ethical and strategic implications of these developments for the European and German policy shall be analyzed. European and German actors have, in the past, played a pioneering role in advocating international control of many types of weapons and technologies. One research question is whether they can and also want to take on such a role-model function in regulating entirely new militarily relevant technologies. The basis and, thereby, also the instruments for preventing proliferation, are undergoing a dynamic change in which we need to find new peace and security answers.

The changes in global power and influence structures will fundamentally shape political action, also within the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian space and in relationship to Europe's neighboring regions. The chances of implementing liberal peace strategies in pol-

icy must be reevaluated in light of these changes. On the one hand, the chances for European state actors to advance their ideas with traditional instruments of power, but also with "soft power", are tending to decline. On the other hand, the influence of non-state actors, who are critical of the often-inconsistent implementation of liberal peace strategies, is growing. Thus, the self-concept as "peacemakers", which is widespread in the EU and Germany, is coming under pressure from two sides: The contestation by the rising powers of the western democracy and development model and the criticism of liberal peace strategies within the west are coming together. Beyond the relevant questions for peace strategies in the global space, there is a range of additional specific aspects of significance for European and German action such as, for instance, the kind of European and German participation in efforts to expand "global governance." This is primarily geared to the regulation of relationships of a multitude of actors and should, through cooperation at international levels, improve the chances for peaceful settlement of disputes, greater distributive justice and development for the countries of the South. It is this specific structure of cooperation that should be reviewed for its peace policy suitability in light of the power shifts described.

The questions mentioned shall be studied primarily for a large region for which IFSH competence is available or can be created, the "Eurasian-Atlantic" space. At heart, this comprises the participating states of the OSCE, but must be expanded analytically and, from a peace policy perspective, as a "regional security complex", depending on the thematic area, by adjacent states (for instance, China, North African States)

Also, new questions are arising with an eye to new intrastate violence dynamics within the EU and the OECD world. On the one hand, they focus on the forms and the intensity of intrastate violence, as well as on the rationale used by the actors. Furthermore, they focus on how European institutions and national governments can react to outbreaks of violence in a de-escalating way and a manner that is in conformity with peace. Third, they direct attention towards new forms of civil society engagement (including protests) that can promote the necessary societal transformation.

5. Key Questions and Research Clusters

We place the above considerations in three research clusters. In these three clusters, the effects of globalization on liberal peace theories and the peace strategies derived from them shall be examined for their suitability. These three clusters are:

- Changes in the forms of violence

- Changes in global power structures and norms

- New potentials for intrastate violence

The three clusters will be linked by the following key questions:

1. To what extent do the peace conditions postulated in liberal peace theories still correspond to the current conditions of global change? Where and how do they deviate from them?
   a. What peace-relevant fissures have arisen in the course of the global shifts and what conditions were decisive for their emergence?
   b. How have the interests and the possibilities for influence of the actors changed? Which new actors have been added? What normative ideas and perceptions currently guide their action?

2. To what degree must the established peace theories and strategies, as well as agendas and instruments, particularly those of German and European peace and security policy, be changed or adapted in light of the changed conditions?
   a. In what way can peace strategies still tie in with the knowledge of the "established" peace theories despite changed conditions? To what degree do traditional German and European agendas on the establishment and securing of peace – with their constitutive principles, juridification and transnationalization, democratization and promotion of human rights, market economy and free trade – still have a prospect of success? Where should peace strategies, their instruments and their agendas, be decoupled from such liberal models?
   b. What new assumptions arise for peace conditions and how should peace theories be appropriately reformulated? How could new strategies on prevention of violence look from a peace policy perspective?

In light of the considerations and key questions mentioned above, concrete areas of research and relevant questions arise. The latter guide the treatment of the research objects but are not comprehensive research questions on their own. Dealing with them is only envisioned in connection with the research areas.

5.1. Research Cluster 1: Changes in Forms of Violence

5.1.1 Research Area: "Use of Force and Warfare"

- Which changed or new forms of handling conflicts are observable in the global context?

- How do local forms of violence and high-tech supported use of violence develop in dependency on each other? How are local conflict motives and constellations and modern, globally operational, selectivity-based disposition of armed forces (in the future), related to each other?

- How is the change in form embedded in the historically specific logic of the exercise of power and processes of social change?

- How do perceptions and conceptions of risk and security change and how do these affect decisions to use force?
- Which peace theories and ethical implications do the new forms of violence have?

5.1.2 Research Area: „Weapons Technology and Proliferation"

- How do arms and risk technologies change the decision calculus of political and military decision-makers?
- In what way do arms and risk technologies spread beyond national borders?
- What requirements of control instruments arise through new types of arms technologies? In which areas are traditional models and approaches of arms control still appropriate?
- How can new, i.e., civil society, actors be integrated into the control regimes?

5.2. Research Cluster 2: Changes in Global Power Structures and Norms

5.2.1 Research Area: "Europe as Peacemaker"

- Which normative ideas guide the actors who are integrated into the EU?
- To what extent is the idea of a common normative peace order within the EU space still sustainable? To what extent can it still be projected beyond the borders of Europe?
- To what extent are "western-liberal" actors turning away from their own norms or reinterpreting them? Where and how do these norms still influence the change and adaptation processes in non-established democracies?
- What new possibilities for influence do German and European actors have under the conditions of the global shift?

5.2.2 Research Area: "Perspectives for the Euro-Atlantic Peace Order"

- Which alternatives to the western-liberal model of state and peace building can be perceived and how are they to be evaluated?
- How can we deal constructively, from a peace perspective, with the "new" global powers, which are developing an international, increasingly transformative, potential?
- How can non-formalized actors, such as globally operational concerns, be responsibly integrated into institutional contexts?
- How must global cooperative structures in the Eurasian-Atlantic space be designed so that they can contribute to peace?

5.3. Research Cluster 3: New Intrastate Potentials for Violence

- Which conflict-laden turbulences are to be expected in Europe through globalization-induced processes, such as rising inequitable distribution of wealth?

- Which new intrastate requirements will be formulated for state peace and security policy? To what extent can the state meet these requirements?

- To what extent do democratic principles, such as intrastate regulation, representation and participation still have a conflict-dampening impact?

- Which processes of politicization and radicalization can be observed in the Eurasian space? How are these connected with the effects of globalization?

- To what degree can politicization and radicalization lead to conflicts and violence? Where could they lead to a peace gain through, for instance, attention to political grievances and the initiation of relevant political debates?

- How do security institutions and powers react to the new intrastate challenges?

6.   Departments – Working Groups

The research work in this work program takes place both within the existing departments of the IFSH (ZEUS, CORE, IFAR) as well as across these groups (see table)

The previous priorities in the ZEUS department have been refocused on work in the research areas of "Use of Force and Warfare", "Europe as Peacemaker?" and "New Intrastate Potential for Violence (focal point EU-Europe)". In the area of the potential for intrastate violence, the study of radicalization is also a focal point. For CORE, the new work program places particular emphasis first on the peace strategy assessment of concepts and approaches for the security order in a wider Europe, bearing in mind the position of this community in the world. Secondly, the work on Central Asia/North Caucuses as an exemplary region, with the focus on intrastate violence and containment of violence, will be continued. For IFAR, the new program includes a concentration on work on new military capabilities and their significance for the use of force, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, possibilities for monitoring the control of weapons systems, arms and risk technologies in a changing international system.

For the three research clusters, cross-sectional working groups shall be introduced in which, on the one hand, research work in the individual departments shall be networked but, on the other hand, interdepartmental projects shall also be initiated. Among these are projects on the relationships between use of force and arms technology in military interventions, on proliferation and its consequences for the use of force, on assessments by the EU of concepts for security order in a larger Europe, on arrangements of intergovernmental security organizations in Europe and on theories of radicalization.

Research Cluster	ZEUS	CORE	IFAR
Changes in forms of violence	Use of force by states/ federations of states and non-state actors		Arms technology and proliferation
Changes in global power structures and norms	Europe as Peacemaker?	Perspectives for a Eurasian-Atlantic Peace Order	Perspectives for Arms Control in the Eurasian-Atlantic Space
Intrastate potentials for violence	New intrastate potentials for violence (focal point EU-Europe)	New intrastate potentials for violence (focal point Central Asia/North Caucasus	

7. Networking

Within the framework of the work program, work contacts, both locally in Hamburg as well as internationally, shall be strengthened. We are pursuing closer cooperation with the GIGA in Hamburg in the area of research on global power shifts as well as changes in forms of violence. GIGA and IFSH have agreed to link their respective regional competencies (GIGA: Africa, Asia, Latin America; IFSH; Europe, Central Asia) more strongly in these common research areas through joint projects. The close cooperation with institutes of the University of Hamburg on natural science aspects of peace research (Centre for Science and Peace Research) and climate impact research (Integrated **Cli**mate **S**ystem **A**nalysis and **P**rediction (**CliSAP**)) shall be continued, which, with the social science departments (Center for Globalization and Governance), will be intensified. Hereby, the IFSH will contribute its competencies for analysis of conflicts and the development of peace policy strategies and policies. Further cooperation partners locally, with whom the scientific cooperation in the areas of this work program are to be strengthened, are, for instance, the Helmut-Schmidt University, the Institute for Theology and Peace and the Federal Armed Forces Command and Staff College.

At a national level, the scientific exchange with institutes in the area of peace research and security policy will be further intensified. First and foremost here, the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF) should be mentioned. The current program of the HSFK with the title "Just Peace Governance" promises valuable insights into peace theory bases, which, from the particular perspective of the IFSH work program – appropriateness of liberal peace strategies under the conditions of globalization – are to be evaluated. At the same time, the knowledge in the three research areas of the IFSH work program nicely complements the research results of PRIF on topics of the relationship of justice and peace.

Internationally, the IFSH is well-networked especially with institutions in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia as well as in the area of disarmament and arms control with such institutions in the USA. For the research in the work program, the existing contacts will be strengthened and expanded in the context of joint research projects.

8. Teaching and Promotion of Young Researchers

Intensive promotion of young scientists remains a focus of IFSH's activity. The Master's Program "Peace and Security Studies" (M.P.S), conducted jointly with the University of Hamburg, a doctoral program of our own, the mentoring of interns at the institute and the promotion of post-docs are all part of this promotion of young scientists.

In addition to the M.P.S program, the IFSH also participates in other University of Hamburg courses of study, such as the "European Master's Program of Human Rights and Democratization" (EMA), as well as the "Eastern Europe" study program. In addition, as much as the core responsibilities allow, staff members of the IFSH are involved in teaching at the faculties of economics and social sciences, as well as mathematics, informatics and natural sciences at the University of Hamburg, and at other universities.

8.1. Master's Program "Peace and Security Studies"

In the current work program, improvement in the curriculum of the M.P.S will continue. This course of study offers the possibility for students from various countries and different educational backgrounds to receive a degree with very good career opportunities. In addition, further expansion of its international network is being pursued. The international course of studies, through its graduates, contributes to the transfer of scientific knowledge, methods and research approaches for working on peace-related problems in policy and societal practice. It is also an important recruiting area for the young scientific staff at IFSH.

8.2 Promotion of Doctoral Candidates

The IFSH will continue its promotion of doctoral candidates in cooperation with various graduate schools of the University of Hamburg and GIGA. Existing partnerships for the financing of fellowships, especially with the DAAD, will be expanded and developed and new ones will be sought.

8.3 Post-doc Promotion

The IFSH is pursuing increased promotion of post-docs. The primary goal is enhancing their competency to submit qualified applications to institutions which fund research. In

this, post-docs are supported by experienced scientists and further qualified and third-party funding in the form of fellowships is acquired.

9. Transfers and Public Relations

The IFSH makes research-related service and transfers available, including through standard publications appearing regularly.

It offers, to a considerable extent, advice for a broad spectrum of societal and political actors on the basis of their own scientific work. Of particular importance in the focal areas of the IFSH are the close working contacts with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the Federal Foreign Office and members of Parliament from various parties. There is also close cooperation with the Ministry of Defense through the "military component" of the IFSH. The consulting activity shall be continued at the level already achieved, with a stronger focus on the core topics and the improvement of the international impact of the work of the IFSH.

IFSH staff members are sought-after interview partners, in particular in cases of current crises. In the future, (opportunities for) public expert functions shall also be seized, insofar as they are covered by relevant scientific work at IFSH. With its public relations work, the IFSH makes an important contribution to informing the society and promotes democratic debate.

The newsletter, *IFSH News*, provides information on the work of the Institute. In the *Hamburger Contributions* the authors address themselves to a professional public and in the *Hamburger Information* to a broad readership. The *OSCE Yearbook* and *Peace Report* remain, as serial publications, which particularly address political decision-makers, to increase the level of awareness of the IFSH in the political environment. With the start of the implementation of this work program, a new design for the IFSH Website is foreseen. In the future, the English-language offerings, in particular, will be expanded to strengthen international visibility.