



The German OSCE-Chairmanship 2016 Ministerial Council Meeting in Hamburg on 8/9 December



Presentation of the Project Report "European Security – Challenges at the Societal level". From left to right: Philip Remler, Oleksiy Semenyi, Barbara Kunz, Fred Tanner, Wolfgang Zellner, Gernot Erler (Photo: NMD)

With the Ministerial Council Meeting on 8/9 December, the 2016 German OSCE Chairmanship came to an end. It would be an oversimplification to measure the success of the Chairmanship solely on the basis of the ten decisions of the Ministerial Council Meeting. Rather, it is more about what the Chairmanship achieved over the entire year with crisis management, setting new topics, strengthening the OSCE and the initiation of dialogues in a continually deteriorating political environment.

Managing crises from Ukraine to Nagorno-Karabakh

Despite four summits and 13 Foreign Ministers' meetings in the Normandy format (Ukraine, Russian, Germany and France), implementing the provisions of the Minsk Agreement, a ceasefire and political steps have not been successful to date. But the greatest concern, that the separatists, supported by Russia, could capture the large city of Mariupol and push through towards Transdniestria, is no longer a problem. The OSCE Special Observer Mission – which, in addition, represents the only source of reliable information - contributed considerably to the relative stabilization of the situation

In Moldavia, the official negotiations in the 5+2 format (Moldova, Transdniestria, Ukraine, Russia, the OSCE

plus the EU and the USA) were resumed after a longer interruption. At the same time, integrating Transdniestria into the free trade agreement between the EU and Moldova was achieved. The Ministerial Council adopted a declaration on Transdniestria.

In the Geneva International Discussions, in which representatives from Tbilisi, Sukhumi, Zkhinvali, Moscow and Washington participate, under the Chairmanship of the UN and the OSCE, a solution to the conflicts is scarcely discussed, but rather individual security-relevant topics. At the local level, the *Incidents Prevention and Response Mechanisms* (IPRM) resolve concrete problems, such as access to fields. In 2016, it was possible, thereby, to re-activate the IPRM for Abkhazia, which had been blocked for years.

In the case of Nagorno-Karabakh, where heavy fighting broke out in April, the OSCE was, in any event, able to have a curbing effect. The suggestions made by the German OSCE Chairmanship on strengthening the ability to respond to crises have not yet been accepted.

Putting new topics on the agenda

The German Chairmanship was successful in presenting or positioning two topics a little higher. Economic connectivity as a condition for political stability had already been introduced by the Swiss Chairmanship in

Contents

The German OSCE-Chairmanship 2016.....	1
Promotion of young academics in the field of nuclear disarmament and arms control.....	2
Division of power in post-war and post-crisis societies	3
Improved migration policy and border control.....	3
Peace Report in Brussels	3
Publications	4
Peace Report 2016.....	4
S+F Security and Peace	4
Staff News	
Purevdagva Lkhagvabaatar	5
Lina-Marieke Hilgert	5
Imprint.....	5

2014. With a large conference – 1,000 participants and a Chinese delegation – the German Chairmanship was able to upgrade the topic. This was reflected in a decision of the Hamburg Ministerial Meeting.

The other topic dealt with a traditional German focus, namely, conventional arms control, placed prominently on the agenda by Foreign Minister Steinmeier in September 2016. All the more gratifying was that the Hamburg OSCE Ministerial Meeting was able to agree on the decision “From Lisbon to Hamburg. Declaration on the 20th Anniversary of the OSCE Framework for Arms Control”.

Strengthening the Organisation, Developing new Levels of Dialogue

Even at the end of 2016, the German Chairmanship succeeded in something which is not a matter of course in the OSCE, namely adopting a budget punctually. Furthermore, this budget included some additional positions for conflict management. Unfortunately, there was no consensus on a draft resolution that went further. On the one hand, though, dialogue was conducted on almost all OSCE questions from military doctrine to anti-Semitism. And on the other hand, the German Chairmanship tried to better promote dialogue among the “bosses”. The informal Foreign Ministers meeting on September 1 in Potsdam and the dinner of the Foreign Ministers in Hamburg on December 8 served this purpose.

Conclusion and Outlook

Although the difficult times are not over, the OSCE is in better shape at the end of the year 2016 than it was at the beginning. Having achieved this, even under the very difficult circumstances, represents a success. Important was that Germany, by taking on the Chairmanship, demonstrated that it attaches importance to the OSCE and is prepared to invest political capital in it. This encouraged a range of other states. In 2017, Austria will have the OSCE Chairmanship, followed by Italy in 2018 and Slovakia in 2019.



Participants of the OSCE-Network (Photo: NMD)

Thanks to the support of the German Foreign Ministry, the OSCE Network had the opportunity to invite to Hamburg around 20 members, who had cooperated on the two Network projects on *European Security* and *Protracted Conflicts*.

The project report, “European Security – Challenges at the Societal Level”, was presented by Wolfgang Zellner (IFSH), Oleksiy Semenyi (Institute for Global Transformations, Kiev), Barbara Kunz (Institut Français des Relations Internationales) and Philip Remler (Carnegie Endowment) in the so-called “Mixed Zone” of the Ministerial Meeting, moderated by Ambassador Fred Tanner, Senior Adviser to the OSCE Secretary General. Gernot Erler, the Special Representative of the German government for the German OSCE Chairmanship, emphasized in his commentary, that the report is based on around 15 national narratives. The project was supported by the Foreign Ministries of Austria, Finland and Switzerland as well as the German Foreign Office.

The report on the project “Protracted Conflicts in the OSCE Area. Innovative Approaches for Co-operation in the Conflict Zones”, supported by the German Foreign Ministry, was presented by the primary author, Philip Remler with Nino Kemoklidze (University of Birmingham), Tanja Tamminen (Institute for East- and South-east European Studies, Regensburg) and Hajo Schmidt (Peace Research Institute, Frankfurt) at the premises of IFSH. Wolfgang Zellner moderated it.

CONTACT: WOLFGANG ZELLNER

ZELLNER@IFSH.DE

Promotion of young academics in the field of nuclear disarmament and arms control

First Meeting of the N.EX.T. Fellows in Berlin

From November 20-22, the N.EX.T. (Nuclear Expert Talks) Fellows met in Berlin, for the first time, for a two-day workshop on the future of nuclear arms control and disarmament. The N.EX.T. project, which is jointly conducted by the IFSH and the Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung (hbs), is led by Ulrich Kühn. The aim and purpose of the project is to bring together young, mostly female, researchers and experts from Russia, Central and Western Europe, and the United States and to present their novel approaches on nuclear weapons' policies to a broader audience. The focus of discussion at the workshop was on the nuclear ban treaty movement, the re-nuclearization of Europe, how to better approach civil society, the normative and economic aspects of nuclear disarmament argumentation, and the future of the bilateral U.S.-Russian deterrence relationship.

In the run-up to the Berlin meeting, the 15 N.EX.T. Fellows (among them eleven female scholars) had been asked to jointly elaborate five working papers, which were to form the basis of discussions in Berlin. Even though sometimes intricate, this process proved to be very beneficial in strengthening understanding among the Fellows about the divergent political views. It also contributed to a much more constructive working atmosphere. At the end of each day, Fellows met for informal dinners involving external experts from the Berlin policy community, thus broadening the basis for debate.



Participants at the first meeting of N.EX.T.-Fellows in Berlin

Right now, the Fellows are in the process of re-drafting their papers. Publication of an edited volume by the hbs is scheduled for February 2017. One of the future tasks of the project is, then, to raise public

awareness about the imperative and implications of novel approaches to the issues of nuclear disarmament and arms control in a multi-polar world. Therefore, the hbs plans to conduct a couple of outreach activities, such as events in Berlin, Moscow, and Washington. Further public events are envisioned to take place in 2017 in Brussels and Vienna. Having then achieved all these goals, the N.EX.T. project will close its first project cycle. In the coming years, IFSH and the hbs hope to continue the project by involving more young experts from different regions of the world in order to strengthen the cause of nuclear disarmament and arms control.

CONTACT: ULRICH KÜHN

KUEHN@IFSH.DE

Division of power in post-war and post-crisis societies

GIGA and IFSH participate in the PeaceLab 2016



At the GIGA-IFSH Peacelab Workshop, from left to right: Christian von Soest, Christian Jetzelsperger, Naida Mehmedbegović Dreilich, Michael Brzoska, Esther Somfalvy, Julia Strasheim, Sabine Kurtenbach

(Photo: GIGA)

Under the auspices of the Foreign Ministry, the German Federal Government is working on new guidelines for civil crisis prevention and peace promotion. Within this framework, a series of events with associations, non-governmental organisations and scientific institutions was also conducted as "PeaceLab 2016". On 16.11, GIGA and IFSH contributed to the guidelines process with a workshop on "Crisis prevention – thinking ahead". Theme of the event was "Power-sharing in post-war and post-crisis societies". Experts from the two centres introduced new research findings, analyses and experiences with shaping the political processes and institutions so as to achieve and ensure an enduring peace. Often of central importance for the future of peace, particularly in societies divided ethnically or in other ways, is how the national constitutions, elections and parliaments, as well as the division

of competencies between different state levels or rules for creating the political will, are organized. The international community makes an effort, therefore, to regularly create sustainable peace-promoting political institutions. The bases for this are frequently variations of European models of building democratic political will as well as European experiences with functional and territorial power-sharing. However, the experience with these mechanisms is mixed. The event served to clarify the conditions under which different institutional arrangements offer the best prospects for enduring peace. Reporting on this from IFSH were Naida Mehmedbegović-Dreilich on Bosnia-Herzegovina and Esther Somfalvy on Kyrgyzstan and, from GIGA, Sabine Kurtenbach on Columbia und Julia Strasheim on Nepal. Christian Jetzelsperger, who is responsible for the guidelines process in the Foreign Ministry, introduced the event. Sabine Kurtenbach spoke on the basic findings of the recent research on the topic. The workshop was organised by Christian von Soest from GIGA and Michael Brzoska from IFSH. Publication of the new guidelines is anticipated to be in spring 2017.

CONTACT: MICHAEL BRZOSKA	BRZOSKA@IFSH.DE
NAIDA MEHMEDBEGOVIĆ DREILICH	NAIDA.M@IFSH.DE
ESTHER SOMFALVY	SOMFALVY@IFSH.DE

Improved migration policy and border control

Conference in the European Parliament

On 15 November, the European Conservatives and Reformists (EKR), together with the Members of Parliament from Bulgaria, Finland, Denmark, Poland and Germany, issued an invitation to a conference in the European Parliament (EP) in Brussels. Numerous government representatives and experts came together to exchange views on the topic of improved migration policy and border controls.

In her lecture on the topic, "Australian maritime border protection", Patricia Schneider (IFSH) emphasized that the Australian method would not be a suitable model for the European Union, even though it is rated by the Australian government as a success. She argued, *inter alia*, that not only does the geographical position of Australia differ greatly from that of the EU but also considerably fewer migrants come into Australia via the sea route. This would also be inappropriate in Europe for financial reasons, as the expenses in Australia for these migrants are disproportionately high. Furthermore, Australia is only able to pursue its "Pacific solution" – which is based, above all, on a deterrence strategy - because, by contrast to the EU,

there is no appeal body and additional institutionalised regulations guaranteeing protective measures for migrants. The "Pacific Solution" aims at denying asylum to all migrants who reach Australia by sea and bringing them to the island of Nauru or to Papua New Guinea (PNG) instead. However, in April 2016, the Supreme Court in PNG ruled that the detention centre for asylum seekers on the island of Manus limited the right to personal freedom and violated the constitution and, for this reason, a new solution for those affected would have to be found. The practice of externalisation and the situation in the camps are, on the whole, strongly criticized

Furthermore, Schneider emphasized that the public discourse in the EU is completely different from that in Australia, so that it cannot be assumed that a similarly strong societal support for such approaches would be generated. In Australia, the perception is that migrants who want to enter by sea are trying in an unfair way to obtain a humanitarian visa. However, Australia only takes in a predetermined number of refugees every year anyway, irrespective of how many migrants try to reach Australia by sea.

CONTACT: PATRICIA SCHNEIDER	SCHNEIDER@IFSH.DE
-----------------------------	-------------------

Peace Report 2016 in Brussels

On October 11, the *Peace Report 2016* made its appearance in Brussels, as it has every year since 2008. In cooperation with the editors from IFSH, PRIF, BICC, FEST and INEF, the Brussels Office of the Protes-



Presentation of the Peace Report 2016 in Brussels
From left to right: Christiane Höhn, Rebecca Harms, Katrin Hatzinger, Renke Brahm, Stephan Hensell

tant Church in Germany (EKD) and the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Brussels hosted the event on the EKD premises vis-à-vis the building of the European

Commission in Rue Belliard. The programme tackled the question “Can Europe make peace without weapons?” In her introductory speech, Margret Johannsen (IFSH, coordinating editor of the *Peace Report 2016*) shed some light on the yearbook’s rationale and its target groups in general, as well as on the conclusions and recommendations of this year’s edition. One of the recommendations of the previous edition – Remove the Palestinian Hamas as a political organization from the EU’s terror list because exerting influence is scarcely possible without contact – led to the subject of the first panel. Chaired by Katrin Hatzinger (Head of the EKD’s “Brussels Office”), Stephan Hensell (Hamburg University, co-author with Martin Kahl of the chapter “Lack of foresight: The war against ‘Islamic State’”), Christiane Höhn (Advisor to the EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator), MEP Rebecca Harms (Co-Chair of the Greens-European Free Alliance in the European Parliament), and Renke Brahm (Commissioner for Peace of the EKD Council) discussed the question “The war on terror – can Jihadism be beaten militarily?”

On the second panel, dedicated to “Operation Peace – civil conflict prevention in the EU’s new foreign and security policy” and chaired by Uwe Optenhögel (Director FES Brussels), Corinna Hauswedell (FEST, co-editor of the *Peace Report 2016*), Rene van Nes (European External Action Service), MEP Ana Gomes (Group of the Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament) and Steven Blockmans (Centre for European Policy Studies, CEPS) scrutinized the new “Global Strategy” of the EU.

A miniature edition, with selected texts in English, has been prepared for the audience in the EU’s capital. This was made possible through the continued generous sponsorship by the German Foundation for Peace Research (DSF). The translations are also available on www.friedensgutachten.de.

CONTACT: MARGRET JOHANNSEN JOHANNSEN@IFSH.DE

Publications

Margret Johannsen/ Bruno Schoch/ Max M. Mutschler/ Corinna Hauswedell/ Jochen Hippler (Eds.), *Peace Report 2016. A Selection of Texts*, Wien 2016. ISBN978-3-643-90794-3.

On October 10, the English edition of the German *Friedensgutachten 2016* (see IFSH News 115) was presented in Brussels. In 106 pages, it contains a selection

of texts from the German edition: The preface, the complete Editor’s Statement, five chapters and the



Peace Report 2016

A Selection of Texts

Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg
Peace Research Institute Frankfurt
Bonn International Center for Conversion
Protestant Institute for Interdisciplinary Research Heidelberg
Institute for Development and Peace Duisburg

LIT

summaries of all 17 chapters of the German yearbook. The selected articles are taken from both sections of the book: “Causes of flight in focus: Assuming responsibility” and “Towards new power politics”. Where necessary, the English versions, which appeared three months later than the German versions, were updated. The chapter on Turkey, authored by Tannas Michel and Günter Seufert, has been substantially revised – due to the failed Putsch of July 15 having happened between the appearance of the German edition and the English edition. The degree to which the two versions differ can be assessed when looking at the titles of the two chapters: “Turkey’s pursuit of hegemony in the Middle East” and “Turkey’s failed pursuit of hegemony in the Middle East: Three periods of Turkey’s ‘independent’ foreign policy” respectively. This is what can happen to yearbooks. Each year, the editors aim at presenting a report to be completed the way they want it to be: informative, critical, up-to-date. This year, an English edition was published for the fifth time. It addresses, first of all, readers in the European capital who are professionally involved in matters of peace and security. It also targets potentially new English-speaking audiences, also with the purpose of initiating or developing new institutional co-operation beyond the German speaking area.

CONTACT: MARGRET JOHANNSEN JOHANNSEN@IFSH.DE

S+F Sicherheit und Frieden Security and Peace

S+F. Security and Peace, Issue 3/2016: Comparing Threat Perceptions and Security Policy Concepts

Security policy concepts and doctrines form the basis for actions in the field of security and military policy, military strategy of states or security organisations. One significant element of these policy documents is the assessment of risks, dangers, and threats. This special issue was edited by *Walter Feichtinger*.

Sybille Reinke de Buitrago demonstrates in her article on the US, the interaction of perceptions and structures and the essentiality of a security policy discourse in combination with the importance of identity.

Jānis Bērziņš analyses the role of Russia in the context of the threat that arises from the West, above all NATO and the US, which are supporting anti-Russian political powers in the region, while rejecting Russia's global power position.

In his article, *Peter Buchas* illustrates how China's conversion from "harmonic co-existence" to the "Chinese dream" affects the activities and perceptions related to its security and defence policy.

Erico Duarte outlines the current security and safety efforts of Brazil and assumes that two factors might cause regional instability and rivalry: the exploitation of energy resources in the Southern Atlantic and the US re-orientation from being a stabilising power in South America towards interest in the Western Pacific. *Abel Esterhuysen* deals with South Africa and refers to its significant change in the security mindset, which has shifted from a traditional one to a human security approach, focussing on individual daily threats and dangers.

Simon Koschut discovers in his paper on Germany that the end of the East-West conflict has caused a dominant comprehensive and preventive understanding of security in Germany. This new framework involves a diffuse threat perception, a norm-orientated multilateralism, as well as a restrictive stance towards the use of military force.

Gunther Hauser examines the EU Security Strategy from 2003 as well as the "European Global Strategy", which was announced in June 2016. This strategy shows how the security situation inside and surrounding Europe has worsened.

Outside the special section: *Gerhard Beestermöller* deals with reasons for and limits of a co-operation with states of dubious legitimacy, from an ethical per-

spective. Moreover, we publish an analysis of *Anne-gret Bendiek* on the need for a new German strategy for cybersecurity.

CONTACT: PATRICIA SCHNEIDER

SCHNEIDER@IFSH.DE

Staff News



Purevdagva Lkhagvabaatar is participating from October 2017 until February 2017 in the "International Fellowship-Programme Graf Baudissin" of the IFSH. He is member of the Mongolian armed forces. He studied social sciences at the Universität der Bundeswehr München from 2006 until 2012. After several assignments at all levels he is now a member of the general staff of the Mongolian armed forces, focused on EU and Russian issues.

CONTACT: PUREVDAGVA LKHAGVABAATAR
DEEL6931@GMAIL.COM



Since November 2016, **Lina-Marieke Hilgert** has been working as the project co-ordinator for the "Challenges to Deep Cuts" project and as a researcher at IFAR². Her research interests cover arms control, disarmament, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as well as regional and

strategic stability. Before her current position, she successfully completed a Master's degree in "Peace and Security Studies" with a thesis on armament dy-

namics and strategic stability in East Asia. Prior to her postgraduate Master's program, she studied Cultural and Social Anthropology, Psychology, International Studies as well as Japanese Studies in Hamburg and Thessaloniki, Greece. In addition, she successfully completed training as a mediator and also worked as an independent project manager in Northern Germany and Brussels and, in this context, developed, inter alia, a prospective risk analysis and evaluation for the EMEA region.

CONTACT: LINA-MARIEKE HILGERT

HILGERT@IFSH.DE

Imprint

Responsible for this issue:
Anna Kreikemeyer/Susanne Bund