

## **IFSH Workshop: ‘Trans-nationalization of risks of violence as a challenge to European peace and security policy’**

On 26 and 27 February 2009 the IFSH held a workshop at which a group of leading experts discussed aspects of the institute’s current working programme: ‘Trans-nationalization of risks of violence as a challenge to European peace and security policy. The IFSH is pursuing a theory-led engagement with contemporary problems in the field of security policy, as well as their prevention, containment and management.

Risks of violence no longer necessarily emanate from nation states and their policies, but are increasingly transnational in nature. Transnational risks of violence are cross-borders threats to peace and security, which are characterized by participation of a minimum of one non-state actor. They can have their origins in problematic policies by European actors or have their source in other world regions. They can threaten peace in Europe directly, but also work indirectly by impairing global European interests, for example, energy and commercial-political interests. Risks of violence attain particularly large security-political weight when they are accompanied by the menace or use of asymmetrical force against complex highly technologically advanced societies, vulnerable to the limited use of force.

The overarching problem addressed in the IFSH’s current medium-term working programme is the question of how the transnationalization of risks of violence can be addressed via the internationalization of measures aimed at preventing violence and of peace and security policy in general. The programme assumes that the transnationalization of risks of violence is changing the demands placed upon peace and security policy. The individual nation state increasingly appears incapable of mastering all these challenges using its own means and under its own leadership. Instead, managing transnational risks of violence requires cross-border cooperation and coordination, i.e. the development of effective forms of multidimensional security governance. This raises the significance of institutionalised international actors, although these must also regularly interact with national and transnational actors.

A key concept in the debate over transnational violence is that of risk: an open situation that could develop into a violent conflict but where interventions are also possible that could prevent any such transformation. Prevention can thus be applied at a juncture where there is neither already manifest violence nor the inevitability of a future violent conflict, but where signs of both – or at least a tendency towards them – are present.

The key theme of the working programme is the prevention, containment and management of transnational risks of violence by international actors. Central to this is the analysis of the effectiveness of the concepts, strategies and instruments used by international organizations in the area of security and peace policy, as well as these organizations’ institutional structures. The geographical focus generally falls on Europe and adjacent regions. At the centre are the two major European security organizations, the EU and the OSCE, as well as the United Nations, their overarching cooperation partner. Consideration also needs to be given to the way these organisations interact with their member states and other international and transnational actors (third states, IGOs, INGOs). Finally, from time to time the analysis needs

to take into account political changes at the global level, especially the relationships between European actors and the US and China.

The IFSH plans only a marginal expansion of its regional expertise. Instead, it will strengthen its cooperation with other institutions in Hamburg and beyond that possess complementary regional competencies.

The IFSH invited leading experts to the workshop to comment on and discuss its working programme. In the first panel, Professor Christopher Daase, holder of the Chair of International Relations at Munich's Ludwig-Maximilian University dealt with the theoretical aspects of transnational risks of violence in the post-national world. Elke Krahmman, Senior Lecturer in Politics at the University of Bristol and Humboldt Fellow at the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, spoke on dimensions of government and governance in the post-national world; and Hans-Georg Erhart, the head of the Centre for European Peace and Security Studies at the IFSH (ZEUS) addressed problems of security governance.

The second panel was concerned with the various forms of transnational risks of violence and their complex interconnections. Edwin Bakker, the head of the Security and Conflict Programme at the Netherlands Institute of International Relations, Clingendael, considered the example of international terrorism; Professor Götz Neuneck, Deputy Director of the IFSH and head of IFAR<sup>2</sup>, took as his topic the cross-border proliferation of substances for manufacturing weapons of mass destruction; while Marietta König, a doctoral candidate at the IFSH/CORE, discussed the role of transnational actors in the perpetuation of structures of violence in South Ossetia.

Finally, the third panel was devoted to the management of transnational risks of violence by international organisations. Monika Heupel from the Center for Transnational Relations, Foreign and Security Policy at the Otto-Suhr-Institute for Political Science, Freie Universität Berlin, described the work of the United Nations; Professor Jörg Monar, the Director of Studies of the European Political and Administrative Studies Department at the College of Europe, Bruges, that of the EU; and Wolfgang Zellner, Deputy Director of the IFSH and head of the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE), the contribution of the OSCE.

Contact

Prof Michael Brzoska  
brzoska@ifsh.de

### **CORE Participates in the Security Dialogue of the OSCE Forum for Security Co-operation**

On 25 February 2009 the Head of the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE), Wolfgang Zellner, participated with a presentation on 'European Arms Control: Old Problems – New Chances' in a round table discussion dedicated to 'Initial Thoughts on European Security'. The meeting was organized - for the first time in this format - by the OSCE Forum for Security Co-operation, the body in which the 56 OSCE participating States discuss, negotiate and take decisions on European security issues. Further presentations were given by Zdzislaw Lachowski from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute and by the Director of the Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique, Camille Grand.

The fact that more than 20 delegations contributed to the two-hour debate clearly shows that disarmament – a concept that some have not been keen to use until recently – is back on the

agenda. The discussion focused, among other things, on the fate of the adapted Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (ACFE) Treaty, confidence-building measures and conceptual questions concerning European arms control beyond the ACFE.

Contact

Dr Wolfgang Zellner

[zellner@ifsh.de](mailto:zellner@ifsh.de)

### **Visit of a Leadership Seminar of the Friedrich Naumann Foundation**

On February 2009 the participants of an international seminar on ‘Conflict Prevention and Conflict Management’ organised by the Leadership Academy of the Friedrich Naumann Foundation visited the IFSH. After an introduction into the importance and the different instruments of conflict prevention and the simulation of corresponding role games, the attendees coming from 22 different countries visited several institutions in Hamburg.

After lectures at the Helmut Schmidt University, the German Armed Forces Command and Staff College and the German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA), the group also visited the IFSH together with Rolf Freier, Yasemin Pamuk and Thomas Hellmich. Here Dr Wolfgang Zellner presented the activities of the IFSH and CORE, Patricia Schneider introduced the Master of Peace and Security Studies, Anna Kreikemeyer gave an overview on CORE Capacity Building activities and former IFSH PhD fellows of the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Elena Kropatcheva and Marietta Koenig, spoke on their PhD topics, the Russian policy towards Ukraine and conflict management by the UN in the Georgian conflicts respectively.

Contact

Dr Anna Kreikemeyer

[Annakreikemeyer@gmx.de](mailto:Annakreikemeyer@gmx.de)

### **Discussion on Russia-Ukraine gas dispute**

‘When two quarrel, the third is compelled to stay in the cold’. The last gas dispute between Russia and Ukraine, its consequences and lessons learned for both countries and the EU were the focus of a discussion organised on 19 February by Manuel Sarrazin, member of the EU Committee of the Bundestag. Contributions were made by Elena Kropatcheva (IFSH), Dr Norbert Verweyen (RWE Supply & Trading, Market Design & Regulatory Affairs) and Dr Peter Danylow, Director of the East and Central European Association. It was stressed inter alia that energy issues do not have only an economic significance, but also strongly involve security aspects. Moreover, gas relations between Russia and Ukraine also reflect the domestic political situation in these two countries.

Contact

Dr. des. Elena Kropatcheva

[kropatcheva@list.ru](mailto:kropatcheva@list.ru)

## **CORE advises on establishment of Diplomatic Academy of Armenia**

Between 9 and 12 February 2009, CORE Deputy Head Frank Evers and CORE researcher Diana Digol conducted a second consultancy visit to Yerevan to discuss issues related to the establishment of the Diplomatic Academy of Armenia (DAA). The visit was undertaken at the invitation of the OSCE Office in Yerevan.

The key event of the visit was a meeting with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia, H.E. Mr. Edward Nalbandyan, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Arman Kirakossian, the Head of the OSCE Office in Yerevan, Ambassador Sergey Kapinos, and the Head of the Delegation of the European Commission to Armenia, Ambassador Raul de Luzenberger, at the Armenian MFA on 10 February 2009. This meeting gave the opportunity to exchange views on the project approach and the steps to be undertaken in the immediate future. The meeting included the presentation of a needs assessment report entitled "Establishing a Diplomatic Academy of Armenia" which had been produced by CORE at the request of the OSCE Office in Yerevan in 2008.

The programme also included extensive consultations with Deputy Minister Kirakossian and other MFA officials in charge of the Academy project, as well as a number of talks with the heads and other key representatives of the OSCE Office in Yerevan and the Delegation of the European Commission in Armenia.

Contact:

Dr Frank Evers  
eversfrank@lycos.com  
Dr Diana Digol  
digol@ifsh.de

## **Lectures and conferences in the field of disarmament, security in space and nuclear non-proliferation**

On February 10 Oliver Meier spoke on "NATO's 60th anniversary: possibilities for disarmament" during a caucus meeting of the members of the Green Party parliamentary group in Berlin. The panel, in which Germany's Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control Ambassador Klaus-Peter Gottwald also participated, focussed on German and European arms control options against the background of the upcoming NATO summit.

On February 4, Oliver Meier participated in a seminar on "Cyber security: What role for the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy?" organized by the EU Council and Estonia in Brussels. The event addressed the growing risk of cyber attacks. The issue had been added to the catalogue of strategic threats to Europe's security in the amended EU Security Strategy adopted during the French Presidency in December 2008.

On January 27, Oliver Meier was invited to speak on "The future of efforts to control nuclear weapons" at the research colloquium of the Political Science Department at the University of Heidelberg. His presentation focused on German and European efforts to secure a successful review conference of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 2010.

Contact

Dr Oliver Meier  
[oliver@armscontrol.org](mailto:oliver@armscontrol.org)

## **Germany's Deputy Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control visits the IFSH**

On February 3 Germany's Deputy Commissioner for Disarmament and Arms Control visited the IFSH upon invitation by Götz Neuneck. Following postings to Geneva, New York and Washington, Ambassador Wunderlich's work currently focuses on conventional arms control and the role of NATO in arms control. Following an initial discussion on possible progress on arms control and disarmament after Obama's election, IFAR, IFSH and ZNF staff presented their work. In the framework of the seminar series on "Scientific Contributions to Arms Control", Ambassador Wunderlich then gave a presentation to more than 50 students on "Perspectives and Reality of Future Arms Control", focussing in particular on the December 2008 agreement on cluster munitions. Ambassador Gottwald's presentation can be downloaded at [http://www.ifsh.de/pdf/aktuelles/2009-02-4\\_Streumunition\\_Stand\\_nach\\_Zeichnung\\_Oslo.pdf](http://www.ifsh.de/pdf/aktuelles/2009-02-4_Streumunition_Stand_nach_Zeichnung_Oslo.pdf)

Contact

Prof Dr Götz Neuneck  
[neuneck@ifsh.de](mailto:neuneck@ifsh.de)

## **New research project funded by the German Research Foundation to start: Justification with the Same Arguments? A Research Towards the Arguments for Restricting Human and Civil Rights in the Fight against Terrorism in the USA, the EU and Russia**

The project "Justification with the Same Arguments? A Research Towards the Arguments for Restricting Human and Civil Rights in the Fight against Terrorism in the USA, the EU and Russia" analyses the argumentation of different governmental actors in the USA, the EU and Russia to restrict human and civil rights in the fight against terrorism. The aim is to identify potential convergence in rhetoric with regard to the legitimisation of "exceptional measures" in the fight against terrorism.

The project starts from the assumption that such convergence is an evidence for the rise of a coalition of governmental 'norm challengers'. The persons in charge of carrying out the project are Martin Kahl and Regina Heller.

Contact:

Dr Regina Heller  
[heller@ifsh.de](mailto:heller@ifsh.de)  
Dr Martin Kahl  
[kahl@ifsh.de](mailto:kahl@ifsh.de)

## **IFAR participation in the Middle Power Initiative Forum**

On January 28/29, the Middle Power Initiative (MPI) held one of its regular Article VI forums. The MPI - [www.middlepowers.org](http://www.middlepowers.org) - is a joint initiative of eight international non-governmental organizations with the goal of promoting nuclear disarmament – an obligation contained in Article VI of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Gernot Erler, Minister of State at the Federal Foreign Office, made introductory remarks (available at <http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/de/Infoservice/Presse/Reden/2009/090129-Erler-NVV.html>), Oliver Meier gave a presentation on Panel II, dedicated to "Resolving Challenges to the Non-Proliferation Regime", while Götz Neuneck moderated Panel I on the "US-Russian

Security Relationship". About 100 participants attended the forum, including high-level diplomats from Berlin, Geneva and New York as well as arms control experts and representatives of non-governmental organizations.

### **Global Zero Conferences discuss nuclear disarmament**

Götz Neuneck held a presentation titled "What about Missile Defenses?" at the International School on Disarmament and Research on Conflicts, which took place in Andalo near Trento/Italy from 11 to 18 January 2009. This year's Isodarco Wintercourse, which has been organised by the Italian Pugwash Group since 1966, focussed on "Nuclear Futures: What Would Nuclear Disarmament Look Like?", a debate which has acquired new impetus since Obama's election. Among the participants were Catherine Kelleher, Alexej Arbatow and David Holloway. Hans Christian Gils (IFSH) also participated in the one-week course as junior researcher.

On 9/10 January 2009, Götz Neuneck attended the "Dialogue of Americans, Russians and Europeans" Workshop in Milan. The DARE workshop, supported by the Watson Institute for International Studies of the Brown University and the Carnegie Corporation, was dedicated to the topic "Committing to Zero: American, Russian, and European Perspectives".

Contact

Prof Dr Götz Neuneck

[neuneck@ifsh.de](mailto:neuneck@ifsh.de)

### **2009 Annual Convention of the International Studies Association**

On 15 and 18 February, Michael Brzoska, Jens Narten and Isabelle Maras presented their working papers on "International Partnerships in Security Sector Reform and Post-Conflict Reconstruction" at the 2009 Annual Convention of the International Studies Association in New York.

The papers are available online at:

Paper Prof Dr Michael Brzoska: <http://www.ifsh.de/pdf/aktuelles/ISAPaper2009Brzoska.pdf>

Paper Jens Narten: <http://www.ifsh.de/pdf/aktuelles/ISAPaper2009Narten.pdf>

Paper Isabelle Maras: <http://www.ifsh.de/pdf/aktuelles/ISAPaper2009Maras.pdf>

Contact

Prof Dr Michael Brzoska

[brzoska@ifsh.de](mailto:brzoska@ifsh.de)

### **Publications**

#### **New Publication: OSCE Yearbook 2008**

In a year that saw two OSCE participating States go to war and a territory within a third declare its independence, the OSCE Yearbook documents the dramatic events in detail. It also covers a wide range of OSCE-relevant topics with contributions by leading academics, diplomats, and practitioners.

S. Neil MacFarlane, Elena Kropatcheva, Hansjörg Eiff, and David Aprasidze provide analysis and background on the Georgia-South Ossetia conflict, while Bernhard Knoll takes a detailed look at the legal ramifications of the Kosovo status process.

European security and the role of the OSCE are explored by P. Terrence Hopmann and the authorial team of Michael Merlingen, Manuel Mireanu, and Elena B. Stavrevska.

The OSCE Yearbook 2008 explores the work of the Organization's field presences in Croatia, Macedonia and Tajikistan, and includes a comparative analysis of the OSCE's democratization strategies. Knut Vollebæk reviews fifteen years of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, and Arnaud Amouroux considers the record of the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media a decade on. Other matters in the spotlight include the work of the Special Representative on Trafficking in Human Beings, the Forum for Security Co-operation, and the OSCE's relations with China and Afghanistan.

The OSCE Yearbook addresses students and academics, politicians and journalists, and the interested general public.

*Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg/IFSH (ed.), OSCE Yearbook 2008. Yearbook on the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), vol. 14, Baden-Baden 2009, 434 pages, €59.00, ISBN 978-3-8329-4242-7.*

The OSCE Yearbook can be purchased from:

Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft  
Postfach 10 03 10  
D-76484 Baden-Baden

Vertrieb@nomos.de  
<http://www.nomos.de>

### **S+F Security and Peace / Sicherheit und Frieden/1-2009 NATO at 60 – (still) on the right course?**

The 60th anniversary of NATO is seen as a good occasion by many to assess the past and discuss the future of the alliance. Security and Peace is joining this assessment with a specific contribution of its own. Corresponding to its character as a forum of discussion among academics and practitioners of security policy and peace research, we are not supplying a broad survey but rather focus on particularly controversial issues.

In the centre is the issue of the reorientation of NATO from a Cold War defence alliance to a military institution spanning the world in times of global uncertainty. How far has reorientation gone? How is it implemented? Is the reorientation appropriate? Prime case to discuss these questions is the NATO mission in Afghanistan. Is NATO, can NATO be successful in Afghanistan? Are strategies working, do they need to be changed or is the mission doomed? And what does the NATO mission in Afghanistan tell us about the future of NATO? Is the alliance (still) on the right course?

*Michael Rühle* defends the NATO mission in Afghanistan in his contribution. He argues that the mission is necessary because of the changed security environment and has no alternative. He laments that the discussion about NATO's reorientation in general and the mission in

Afghanistan in particular does not focus on contemporary security needs but is dominated by domestic policy considerations. This is particularly true for Germany.

In their refereed contribution, *Hans Georg Ehrhart* and *Roland Kaestner* come to the conclusion that the current NATO strategy in Afghanistan is not appropriate. They criticize, among other things, an overoptimistic view of the situation in the country, an underrating of the resistance in the Afghan population and an overemphasis of military over civilian measures for the stabilization of the country. They plead for a radical reorientation of the NATO mission in Afghanistan.

An even less positive assessment is provided by *Lara Olson* and *Anja de Beer* who argue from the point of view of humanitarian and aid organisations working in Afghanistan. Civilian goals and interests, foundations of the NATO mission in Afghanistan, are outweighed by military goals and interests, to the detriment of the Afghan population.

The relation between civilian and military instruments also is at the core of the text by *Jochen Hippler*. In US military doctrine these are increasingly mixed and subsumed under military goals. This is counterproductive for reaching development objectives. Hippler sees dangers here for NATO, too, where discussions are often strongly influenced by ideas coming from the US.

*Bernd Lemke* takes a historical look at the thesis that there has been a radical reorientation of NATO after the end of the Cold War. He partially rejects it. Debates about the geographical reach of NATO are not new to the alliance and already occurred in its early years. These continue into the present even though they now take different forms and partially have different outcomes.

The message that NATO has not found a clear course for the future also permeates the text by *Christos Katsioulis* and *Christoph Pilger*. They see an urgent need for a more intensive discussion about the future of nuclear weapons in NATO's strategy. After careful considerations of arguments they come to the conclusion that NATO should dispense with nuclear weapons.

The selective stocktaking of NATO at 60 concludes with an article by *Elena Kropatcheva*. She asks whether NATO has an appropriate concept to react to Russia's re-emergence as a power. Not least the war in Georgia in August 2008 demonstrated, in her view, that NATO is also not on the right course in its relations with Russia.

Outside of the special focus, *Hans J. Gießmann* and *Frank Werner* call for a ban of warfare in urban spaces. *Volker Rittberger* discusses the tasks for peace research at the beginning of the 21st century and *Tim J. Aristid Müller-Wolf* and *Patricia Schneider* examine the concept of the United Nations regarding the "responsibility to protect".

See also <http://www.security-and-peace.de/informationen.htm>

**Hans-Georg Ehrhart, EUFOR Tschad/RCA: Zwischenbilanz und Empfehlungen für eine effektivere Konfliktlösung [EUFOR Chad/CAR: A mid-term review and recommendations for a more effective conflict resolution], in: Integration 1/09, pp. 75-80.**

The author examines the course and difficulties of the EU EUFOR Chad/CAR Mission, and provides recommendations for a comprehensive conflict resolution strategy.

**Hans-Georg Ehrhart, Die EU und die NATO [The EU and NATO], in: Werner Weidenfeld/Wolfgang Wessels (Hrsg.), Jahrbuch der Europäischen Integration 2008, Baden-Baden 2008, pp. 477-484.**

The author analyses the relations between the EU and NATO in four steps: 1) the institutional challenges, 2) the operative activities, 3) from St. Malo I to St. Malo II and 4) conceptual orientations.



**Oliver Meier, BWC States Address Safety, Security Measures, in: Arms Control Today, Vol. 39, No. 1, January/February 2009, pp. 29-30.**

The article summarizes the 2008 meeting of states parties of the Biological Weapons Convention and analyses discussions on strengthened biosafety and biosecurity measures.

**Oliver Meier, States Approve OPCW Budget, Not Report, in: Arms Control Today, Vol. 39, No. 1, January/February 2009, p. 28.**

The article outlines the outcome of the 2008 Conference of States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Conventions, and describes the failure to agree on a consensus report.

**Sybille Reinke de Buitrago, Expertenrunde: Heilsbringer Obama – unerfüllbare Erwartungen? Cuadriga Deutsche Welle TV, 16. January 2009.**

The discussion focussed on Obama's election and the challenges of the new US Administration in the inner and foreign policies, with regard to - among other things - the future of transatlantic relations.

## **Staff**

On 1 March 2009 Dr Regina Heller started to work as a senior researcher at the IFSH. Until then she had been working as a researcher at the institute.

Regina Heller studied Political Science and East Slavic Studies at the University of Mainz, at the Middlebury College, VT/USA and the University of Hamburg. After her graduation in Hamburg, Regina Heller worked as project manager at the Conflict Prevention Network (CPN) at the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik in Ebenhausen and Berlin, then as coordinator of the research project "International Risk Policy" at the Center for Transatlantic Foreign und Security Policy at the Free University Berlin, and later as project manager of the "German-American-Russian Dialogue" at the Aspen Institute Berlin. In 2007 Regina Heller finished her PhD with a thesis on "Norm socialisation in Russia. Chances and limits for European human rights policy vis-à-vis the Russian Federation".

Her current research focuses on Russia, EU-Russia relations, the EU neighbourhood policy as well as European security economics. In her new position, Regina Heller will work on the FP7 research project EUSECON and on parts of the research project "Convergence in justification?", funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). She will also co-design a research project on Russian foreign policy and take over some cross-cutting institutional tasks within the IFSH.

### Contact

Dr Regina Heller  
heller@ifsh.de

## **Imprint**

Responsible for this issue:

Michael Brzoska, Annelisa Cotone, Susanne Bund, Anna Kreikemeyer