



A worthy farewell for retiring Director Prof. Michael Brzoska

Such an experience can only be imagined in a limited way in advance. For you have sat together in countless director and expert meetings, organized events, written research proposals and debated publications and, all of a sudden, the one who has been at the centre, who was the head, will no longer be there. On September 27, 2016, that day came. With a ceremonial event, the IFSH sent the outgoing Director, Prof. Michael Brzoska, into retirement which, however, - so we have heard - will serve to open up new scientific horizons once again.



Michael Brzoska

The Deputy Director, Dr. Wolfgang Zellner, welcomed the numerous members of the illustrious public who attended. Many professors from Hamburg universities came. Deans, former State Councillors, a university president (ret.), representatives of the Ministry for Science, Research and Gender Equality (BWFG), long-time companions of Michael Brzoska and, of course, the IFSH staff.

The round of speeches started off with a welcoming address by the Senate Director, Dr. Rolf Greve from the BWFG. Greve praised the contribution of Michael Brzoska to the consolidation and scientific of the Institute, which was underscored

by the results of the 2016 evaluation. At the same time, he stressed the consultation capacity of the IFSH, which was recently highlighted at a Federal States meeting by the head of the planning team of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Thomas Bagger.



From left to right. Prof. Götz Neuneck, Dr. Rolf Greve, Prof. Michael Brzoska, Prof. Lothar Brock, Dr. Wolfgang Zellner

Prof. Dr. Lothar Brock, long-time leading member of the Hessen Foundation for Peace and Conflict Research gave the laudation. He knew very well that in such an appraisal “the desire for enthusiasm must be balanced with the objectivity required in an academic enterprise.” Lothar Brock showed us Michael Brzoska both as a scientist and as a hu-

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| A worthy farewell for retiring Director Prof. Michael Brzoska | 1 |
| IFSH Evaluation | 2 |
| Report on the visit of Prof. Gary LaFree | 4 |
| Peace Research in Europe and Eurasia | 4 |
| IFSH Summer school in Osh, Kyrgyzstan..... | 4 |
| White Paper and Conception Civil Defense on trial..... | 5 |
| Staff News | 6 |
| EU-Nonproliferation Internship | 6 |
| Publications | 6 |
| S+F. Security and Peace, Issue 2/2016: Hybrid Wars and Threats | 6 |
| Imprint | 8 |

man being. One can easily imagine Michael as a wanderer: as a wanderer who cannot be diverted from the path by anything in the complex research landscape” but also as one “who holds the entire orchestra’s attention” – in this case the IFSH.

Brock traced Michael Brzoska’s career, which began in 1978 with civilian service at the IFSH, and led, via the University of Hamburg, to the *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute*, where he worked as project leader in the area of arms trade. This was followed by a position as an assistant professor in the research centre for Wars, Arms and Development at the University of Hamburg. Then Michael worked for twelve years as the Deputy Director and Research Leader at the *Bonn International Conversion Center* and, finally, took over the leadership of the IFSH. An “impressive career”, said Brock, “which was not planned in this way but, however, unfolded with very comprehensible logic and hard work.”

This logic has a great deal to do with Michael Brzoska’s professional profile. “Michael is one of the few peace researchers” said Brock, “who not only studied economics as a minor subject, but is also a political scientist and an economist.” Michael Brzoska earned his doctorate in 1985 with a thesis on the arms export policy of the social-liberal (SPD-FDP) coalition. Lothar Brock vividly described how, in the 1990s, Michael brought this expertise into a dialogue project of the two large churches on arms export policies and his “no less impressive ability to bring to the fore his expertise with the help of a quiet but in-depth way of reasoning – also with politicians and the all-too-eager people of the churches”. A well-observed characteristic of Michael Brzoska from which we at the IFSH have profited for ten years. Further working areas of Michael’s, related to economics, were the militarization of the Third World, arms dealing, armament conversion, non-military sanctions, security reform and, recently, as *principal investigator* in the Excellence Cluster *Climate System Analysis and Prediction* on the possible connection between climate change and violent conflicts which, in Michael’s view, cannot be seen as empirically certain”. Lothar Brock’s summarizing assessment was: “To express it in the language of certain possibilities in our elections: Differentiate, don’t split the ticket; debate, don’t simply accumulate!”



Guests at the farewell event

Deputy Director Prof Dr. Götz Neuneck expressed the thanks of the IFSH. In the ten years that Michael Brzoska was in office, “the Institute was [...] reorganized. During this time, Michael Brzoska was remarkably modest and supportive, diligent and team-oriented.” A great deal to which little attention had been paid previously – director and expert circles, the employees’ council and gender equality – were revived. New topics and structures – prominently “Climate and Security” and the interdisciplinary working groups – were introduced. Götz Neuneck noted that with the progressive “social scientist academization”, Michael Brzoska had never forgotten the “complementarity of scientific research and political consulting”. “The staff thanks Michael Brzoska for ten years of untiring service for and in the IFSH, his loyalty and his peace research and organizational stimuli. The IFSH has achieved a scientific respectability on which a successor can easily build.”

Musically, the event was framed by two guitar pieces by Francisco Tarrega and Fernando Sor, played by Naida Mehmedbegović Dreilich, the latter piece, with the evocative title of “*Introduction et Variations sur l’Air: Marlborough s’en va-t-en guerre*”. The evening came to a close with a delicious buffet and a glass of wine.

CONTACT: WOLFGANG ZELLNER

ZELLNER@IFSH.DE

IFSH Evaluation

In July 2015, the FHH Hamburg’s Ministry for Science, Research and Gender (BWFG) together with the IFSH’s Board of Trustees decided on an evaluation of the institute. Entrusted with this task were professors Lothar Brock (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt), Heinz Gärtner (Austrian Institute for International Affairs), Kathryn Nixdorff (Technische Universität Darmstadt), Robert Kappel (German Institute for Global and Area Studies), Conrad Schetter (Bonn International Center

for Conversion), as well as Heiko Nitschke (Federal Foreign Office). Taking over the task, the evaluators acted in their personal capacity.

The IFSH provided the evaluators with extensive information about the institute in form of a report with numerous appendices. In January 2016 the commission visited the IFSH for the purpose of a site inspection. In March 2016 Chairman Lothar Brock sent the commission's report to the BWFG and the IFSH bodies. The IFSH was given the opportunity to issue a statement.

In the meantime the IFSH's Scientific Advisory Board and Board of Trustees, as well as the BWFG have considered the report. They expressly thanked the evaluators for their throughout and precise analysis of the strengths and weaknesses, risks and challenges of the prospects of scientific work at the IFSH.

The commission's overall judgement is that the IFSH has "established itself very well in the relevant research landscape and the political and social environment". This was received with gratification and pride by the IFSH. The commission's recommendations provide important ideas for the institute's further development. Partly these have already been taken into consideration by the BWFG and the IFSH itself.

The commission sees the "interdisciplinary work concerning peace *and* security" as an unique characteristic of the IFSH, as it "brings together the research fields of peace and security and approaches these interdisciplinary in their work, in this case from the perspectives of natural and social sciences". The unique features of the IFSH include "connecting interdisciplinary research with strong advisory services".

The commission concludes that the IFSH is well connected on a local, national and international level. The institute can be characterized by its impressive scientific and advisory services. In this context several flagship projects are mentioned: the organization of training courses and summer schools, the management of the OSCE Network of Think Tanks and research institutes in the field of OSCE Research, the organization of the "Deep Cuts Commission" (in which Germany, the US and Russia are represented), as well as the expertise provided to governments within the fields of arms control and disarmament.

The development and administration of the Master's Program in Peace and Security Studies

(MPS) is regarded as "special achievement of the IFSH". Further the transfer of counseling and research activities to the public is considered to be "very good".

The evaluators noted two relative weaknesses of which the IFSH was already aware and which have repeatedly been discussed in the institutes' advisory boards before. This concerns obtaining external funding for research in basic issues, as well as being published in high-level scientific journals. The commission acknowledges that the IFSH leadership has "successfully aimed at extending the scientific research, to strengthen the institute's contribution to scientific debates and to improve the position of basic research in relation to practice oriented research". However, the desired balance has currently still not been achieved. Consequently several recommendations are aimed at improving this. The advisory boards and leadership of the IFSH are especially considering these, but simultaneously intend not to weaken other areas by doing so. Therefore, additional human resources are required and the BWFG has already included the necessary financial resources in the budget plan for the coming year.

Managing the change of personnel the following years is regarded as the greatest challenge to be faced by the IFSH in near future. The evaluators thus urgently recommend that "all future work should be planned considering the transition management". The advisory boards want to aim at an agenda that maintains the institute's strengths combined with addressing its deficiencies. The challenge of a change of personnel also bears great potential. The advisory boards of the IFSH agree with the commission's view that the current flexibility in addressing agendas in peace and security policies, in which the institute has distinguished itself, should be maintained.

The commission regards the intensified cooperation of scientific institutions and those close to science which work in the fields of peace and security in Hamburg as a special opportunity for the IFSH. They observe that the potentials of joint research and presentation to the public are not fully realized. The IFSH is encouraged to further pursue its efforts in making Hamburg a central location in Germany. The BWFG has announced its support for this plan.

The IFSH report, the report of the evaluation commission and the IFSH statement are available

in German on the website of the IFSH:
www.ifsh.de/forschung/evaluation2016

CONTACT: WOLFGANG ZELLNER
 GÖTZ NEUNECK

ZELLNER@IFSH.DE
 NEUNECK@IFSH.DE

Counting terrorism: No simple solutions

Prof. Gary LaFree, Maryland visits IFSH



Patricia Schneider and Prof. Gary LaFree

On Monday, September 19, Prof. Dr. Gary LaFree, director of the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START) of the University of Maryland, gave a speech at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH), Germany, on the topic *Counting Terrorism: No Simple Solutions*. The presentation was moderated by Dr. Patricia Schneider of the IFSH. The American Consulate and the IFSH invited a broad audience to the talk and reception. It was well-attended and the discussion was lively. In addition to the presentation, the IFSH invited to a successful expert workshop for a more in-depth insight into the topic. It took place on Tuesday the 20th and was attended by IFSH researchers, as well as PhD and master students.

Gary LaFree is a professor of criminology and criminal justice at the University of Maryland. He has written over 80 articles and book chapters and six books, mostly on criminal and political violence. His most recent book is *Putting Terrorism in Context* (with Laura Dugan and Erin Miller;

published in 2015 by Routledge). He received his Ph.D in sociology from Indiana University in 1979.

The topic of the event were the technical and measurement issues of open sourced data on and the empirical studies dealing with (counter-) terrorism and its implications for policy recommendations. The Global Terrorism Database (GTD) is based on open-source and unclassified information. He explained how the data on terrorism is collected for the event-database and what we can learn about the characteristics of terrorism from the database that provides detailed information on domestic and international terrorism attacks from all over the world. However, there is still more research to be done to explain the trends we can observe better, putting into context more detailed and continuously up-to date information.

In addition to the presentation on Monday, the event was concluded by a workshop held by Dr. LaFree on Tuesday. The workshop elucidated the topic of counter-terrorism more clearly and provided time for follow-up questions. In the second part he concentrated on the Profiles of Individual Radicalization in the United States (PIRUS) which was followed by a stimulating discussion.

CONTACT: PATRICIA SCHNEIDER SCHNEIDER@IFSH.DE

Peace Research in Europe and Eurasia. IFSH Summer school in Osh, Kyrgyzstan



The participants of the summer school at the entrance of Osh State University

Peace and conflict studies that have gradually developed in Northern Europe and in the U.S. since the 1960s have merely been an import product of external actors that bear fruits only partially. Literature on peace research issues is still written mostly in English by foreign experts and hardly reaches local discourses. An academic dialogue on new perspectives of common peace studies requires common learning in Europe and Eurasia (post-Soviet space and bordering/ neighboring states) along the key question: Is it possible to jointly work on the basis/fundamentals of a common peace research and how could this look like both conceptually and practically?

Funded by the German Academic Exchange service Anna Kreikemeyer managed a three staged project for a cooperative development of a peace research concept with academic teachers and students from four post-Soviet states (Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan). First, she organized a preparatory teacher's workshop at Erevan State University. In a second step the teachers held a summer school with 15 PhD students and graduates from the participating states at Osh State University in South Kyrgyzstan. In a third stage in autumn 2016, four visiting fellows from the partner universities will stay at IFSH to jointly conceptualize articles on a new approach to peace research in Europe and Eurasia and apply it to concrete case studies. The participants of this project join the network „Peace Research in Europe and Eurasia“ that was founded in 2013 together with the *Centre for Peace Studies* at the University Tromsø, Norway, and ten partner institutions in Kyrgyzstan. Some members of this network will also take part in the 3rd Central Asia Day at IFSH on „Prospects for Peace Research in Central Asia. Between Discourses of Danger, Normative Divides and Global Challenges“ (17/18 November 2016). The different strands of these peace research projects contribute to innovative research and teaching, put the threatening divides between Europe and Eurasia on the agenda, build bridges and keep the civil societies dialogue on conflict prevention and peacebuilding alive.

CONTACT**ANNA KREIKEMEYER****KREIKEMEYER@IFSH.DE**

White Paper and Conception Civil Defense on trial



Protection Congress „State crisis and emergency response“ from right to left: Götz Neuneck (IFSH); major general, Jürgen Knappe, Christoph Unger, head of bureau of disaster management; Raed Arafat, interior ministry Romania; Christoph Flury, bureau of disaster management Switzerland; Michael Rogge, head of Securitymanagement Amprion GmbH

On July 13, 2016 the Federal Government Cabinet approved the new White Paper on the Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr. It is the most important basic document on security policy in Germany and establishes a strategic determination for German security policy. Hans-Georg Ehrhart and Michael Brzoska published a statement with the title "2016 White Paper: A lot of security policy and armed forces, but no comprehensive strategy" on July 13. On August 24, the federal cabinet also adopted the conception "Civil Defence". It describes the interagency coordinated performance of tasks in the field of civil defense and civil emergency preparedness and found a great resonance in the media. In early 2015, ZEUS and IFAR had elaborated, on behalf of the Federal Office of Civil Protection and Disaster Assistance (BBK), the study "Analysis of security policy threats and risks with regard to aspects of civil defense" (Published by Nomos Verlag 2015, Editors: Hans-Georg Ehrhart and Götz Neuneck, 218 pages). In this comprehensive study, military and terrorist threats, as well as technological hazards and different types of war are discussed. Later on, the results were not only published in professional journals such as the *Civil Protection* (No.3 / 2016 p.2-6) or in the journal *Humanitarian Law*, but also discussed with the civil protection department of the Federal Ministry of the Interior in Zeuthen. At the invitation of the President of the Federal Office for civil protection and disaster assistance Christoph Unger, Götz Neuneck presented an introductory lecture at the 12th European Congress on Disaster Protection in Berlin. The subsequent panel was attended by representatives from Romania, Switzerland, the energy industry and the

armed forces. Swiss and German experts confirmed the results of the IFSH. Inter alia, the study argues for the strengthening of civil protection, a greater awareness of the population regarding potential hazards and improved risk and crisis communication. A functioning civil defense has fundamental significance for effective conflict prevention, a robust crisis management and conflict resolution and, in the end, has a damage minimizing effect.

CONTACT: GÖTZ NEUNECK

NEUNECK@IFSH.DE

Staff news

From July to September Wolfgang Bretschneider has been visiting scholar at the IFSH. He worked on the issue of migration, especially in consideration of the collective goods problem. Mr. Bretschneider studied economics and music in



Leipzig. This year he received his doctorate at the Leipzig University in the field of economics with a thesis

on the subject of drinking water allocation. This thesis provides a concept for a specification of a 'human right to water' from an institutional economics perspective. In more than 30 publications Mr. Bretschneider has been dealing mainly with the institutional link of social and ecological concerns, along with economic implementation requirements. The major part of the publications has been produced during his time at the Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ), Leipzig, Germany. Since October 2016 Wolfgang Bretschneider is senior research fellow at the Friedrich Schiller University Jena (Chair for Economic Policy), Germany, working on the BMBF project "Organization and Regulation of the Civil Security Market in Germany".

**KONTAKT: WOLFGANG BRETSCHNEIDER,
WOLFGANG.BRETSCHNEIDER@UNI-JENA.DE**



Ulrich Kühn has joined the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace for one year. At Carnegie's Washington Office, Ulrich joins the Nuclear Policy Program as an Associate and Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow. During his one year stint, he will work on potential nuclear, conventional or 'hybrid' escalation dynamics between NATO and the Russian Federation with a special focus on the Baltic region.

CONTACT: ULRICH KÜHN

UKUEHN@CEIP.ORG

EU-Nonproliferation Internship

Since September Marinke Gindullis works as an intern at the IFSH, supported by the EU Non-



Proliferation Consortium. She examines the potential agency of the 'International Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities', an initiative of the European Union, which aims at enhancing safety, security and sustainability in space, and its perception by the

international community. Marinke specializes in the field of space and security. Her diploma thesis already dealt with the European satellite navigation system Galileo and its relevance for the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP). A dissertation project on the relevance of global satellite navigations systems (GNSS) for military security and related geostrategic issues is underway.

Publications

S+F. Security and Peace, Issue 2/2016: Hybrid Wars and Threats

War is a specific form of collective violence. In lieu of regular conventional war between states we increasingly observe irregular wars between states and non-state actors, as well as between state ac-

tors. The same is true for hybrid wars which are a mixture of both.

At first, *Hans-Georg Ehrhart* discusses the phenomenon of postmodern warfare. According to him, this is a form of irregular warfare applied by the states of the global north, characterized by the special role of information operations, comprehensive approaches, the mixture of direct



Herausgeber:

Prof. Dr. Michael Brzoska
Dr. Walter E. Feichtinger
Dr. Volker Franke
Prof. Dr. Hans J. Giessmann
Prof. Dr. Heiner Hänggl
Dr. Sabine Jaberg
Dr. Axel Krohn
Dr. Patricia Schneider

Gastherausgeber:

Dr. Hans-Georg Ehrhart

Themenschwerpunkt:

Hybride Kriege und Bedrohungen
Hybrid Wars and Threats

Postmoderne Kriegführung: In der Grauzone von
Begrenzung und Entgrenzung kollektiver Gewalt
Hans-Georg Ehrhart

Chimäre statt Chamäleon: Probleme der begrifflichen
Zählung des hybriden Krieges
Felix Wassermann

Tertium datur: Neue politische Konfliktformen
wie sogenannte „hybride Kriege“ bringen alte
Legitimationmuster unter Druck
Bernhard Koch

Hybride Kriegführung und das „Center of Gravity“
der Entscheidung
Johann Schmid

Die NATO und hybride Kriegführung
Johannes Varwick und Aylin Matlé

Clausewitz und der Kampf um Anerkennung in hybriden
Kriegen: Zur Motivation von IS Kämpfern
Andreas Herberg-Rothe und Miriam Förstle

Beyond Mere Terrorism: The Islamic State's Authority
as a Social Movement and as a Quasi-State
Christoph Günther und Tom Kaden

Hybride Bedrohung und Bevölkerungsschutz
Dirk Freudenberg

Forum:

„Wie wird Frieden?“ Zur Friedensethik von Dietrich
Bonhoeffer
Detlef Bald

Der Konflikt um die Ukraine: Was wir von Egon
Bahr lernen können
Ulrich Kühn

2016
34. Jahrgang
ISSN 0175-274X

Nomos

and indirect activities, and the use of high-tech means.

Felix Wassermann uses Clausewitz' metaphor of war as a chameleon and emphasizes the multitudes of forms that war can assume, concluding that hybrid war eludes a clear-cut definition.

Bernhard Koch deals with the ethical challenges posed by hybrid warfare. He states that ethics itself is being used as a weapon in conflict while the traditional differentiation between war and peace is becoming increasingly opaque. Hybrid warfare is an indicator of both processes.

Using the example of Russia's intervention in Ukraine, *Johann Schmid* discusses the question of what hybrid warfare really is. He emphasizes the strategic nature of hybrid warfare.

Johannes Varwick and *Aylin Matlé* analyze NATO's debates on hybrid warfare. They contextualize them with regard to the development of the NATO alliance, and seek to evaluate the arguments surrounding this topic.

Andreas Herberg-Rothe and *Miriam Förstle* state that Clausewitz's concept of the „wondrous trinity“ understands war essentially as a hybrid phenomenon. Referring to the example of the Islamic State they analyze the crisis of the Islamic-Arab world and the struggle for interpretation of the own existence.

Christoph Günther and *Tom Kaden* analyze the sources of authority that the Islamic State employs locally and globally in order to further the establishment of a worldwide caliphate. They argue that the Islamic State can be regarded as a social movement and a quasi-state.

Dirk Freudenberg asks which relevance hybrid threats have for civil defense, stating that modern societies which depend on the functions of critical infrastructures are easily threatened by hybrid phenomena.

Outside the special section: *Detlef Bald* deals with the peace ethics of Dietrich Bonhoeffer in resistance to Nazi ideology. Moreover, we publish an analysis of *Ulrich Kühn* on possible courses of action in the Ukrainian crisis, taking into account Egon Bahr's "Change through Rapprochement" approach.

CONTACT: HANS-GEORG EHRHART:

EHRHART@IFSH.DE

PATRICIA SCHNEIDER

SCHNEIDER@IFSH.DE

The new **Handbook of Peace Ethics**, edited by **Jacqueline Werkner** und **Klaus Ebeling** (**Springer VS: Wiesbaden 2017**, ISBN 978-3-658-14686-3, Price € 77,75, ebook 62,00€)



has been published. Numerous contributions i. a. of the IFSH were included in the 979 pages, such as "Peace in different Scientific Disciplines"

(i.a. Patricia Schneider, Michael Brzoska, Götz Neuneck), “Arms Production and Export: Bids, Bans and Paradoxes” (Michael Brzoska) and “War in the Internet? Cyberwar in ethic Reflection”.

CONTACT: GÖTZ NEUNECK

NEUNECK@IFSH.DE

Boas, Ingrid, Delf Rothe. 2016. From conflict to resilience? Explaining recent changes in climate security discourse and practice. Environmental Politics 25 (4): 613-632.

DOI: 10.1080/09644016.2016.1160479.



Ingrid Boas and Delf Rothe examine and explain the recent rise of resilience thinking in climate security discourse. Using the case of the United Kingdom they study practitioners’ understandings of resilience to show how these actors use a resilience lens to rearticulate earlier story-

lines of climate conflict in terms of complexity, decentralisation, and empowerment. On the basis of 52 qualitative expert interviews the article shows that practitioners in the climate security field tend to reinterpret resilience in line with their own established routines, rationales and habits. Climate resilience storylines and practices turn out to be much more diverse and messy than is suggested in the conceptual literature. Building on these findings, Boas and Rothe set out to explain the recent success of resilience thinking in climate security discourse. They show that climate resilience – not despite but due to its messiness – is able to bring together a wide range of actors, traditionally standing at opposite ends of the climate security debate. Through resilience storylines, climate security discourse becomes something to which a wide range of actors, ranging from security to the development field, can relate.

CONTACT: DELF ROTHE

ROTHE@IFSH.DE

Imprint

Responsible for this issue:
Susanne Bund, Anna Kreikemeyer