On the 17th and 18th of September 2015, the IFSH and the Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) organized a conference in Berlin on the topic “Learning from Clausewitz? Strategies against hybrid warfare”. More than 40 participants from various fields, such as political science, NGOs, NATO, journalism and politics, discussed in four panels an issue that has been on the top of the political security agenda since the start of the war in Ukraine.

After welcome addresses of Michael Bröning (FES) and Hans-Georg Ehrhart (IFSH), Felix Wassermann (Humboldt University Berlin) set the stage of the topic by elaborating on political-strategic questions, conceptual and theoretical considerations as well as historical references. The first panel, chaired by Martin Kahl (IFSH), dealt with strategies and practices of hybrid warfare. Hans-Georg Ehrhart gave a brief lecture on the American and Russian concepts of unconventional warfare. While he concentrated on state actors Anja Wehler-Schöck from the FES Jordan office examined the role and the practice of the so-called Islamic State in the Middle East. Andreas Herberg-Rothe from the University of Fulda gave comments on both inputs.

The second panel chaired by Bernhard Koch from the Institute for Theology and Peace dealt with technological aspects of hybrid warfare. First, Niklas Schörnig from the Peace Research Institute of Frankfurt covered the topic of the role of drones and of robots in the wars of the 21st century. Then, Götz Neueck (IFSH) analyzed the challenge of cyber warfare as a future weapon. Detlef Puhl from the Emerging Threat Division of NATO commented on both inputs.

The next day started with the third panel and the topic of “hybrid truths”. Christoph Günther from the University of Leipzig gave a brief lecture on how the IS uses modern media for its way of warfare and Claudia Major (SWP) gave a presentation on the western way of coping with the challenge of hybrid war. Johann Schmid from the German Ministry of Defence...
and Senior Fellow at the IFSH acted as commentator. The session was chaired by Johannes Varwick from the University of Halle-Wittenberg. Andreas Zumach, journalist with the TAZ, chaired and commented on the last panel which stood under the heading “From understanding to counter-strategies”. The first input was given by Rainer Meyer zum Felde from the Standing Representation of the Federal Republic of Germany with NATO. Niels Annen, foreign political speaker of the SPD-Faction in the German Bundestag, gave an overview on the German approaches to the problem. Michael Brzoska (IFSH) wrapped up the conference. As the conference took place under “Chatham House Rules” the following paragraph merely sketches some basic ideas without naming the authors.

The Russian course of action in the Ukraine has similarities with the US concept of unconventional warfare, which can be describes in a nutshell as support of insurgents. Russian concepts of future warfare recur to a stronger use of civilian means and a mix of military and non-military instruments. Also the IS uses a mixture of military tactics and methods of warfare. Network organization, agility and the use of new technologies are striking aspects of hybrid warfare offering weak new options and opportunities. However, drones are used mainly by industrialized states enabling a more personalized way of warfare. Up until now, cyber space is open for and used by all actors for non-lethal purposes only. Nevertheless, both technologies are potential and actual means of hybrid warfare. The Islamic State (IS) can be described as a political actor who is a quasi-state and whose legitimacy and rule rests primarily on violence. It is supported by its own media apparatus that produces and disseminates its propaganda under strict control of contents. As hybrid wars are always different and as they cannot be converted into traditional scenarios the question how to adequately respond to this kind of challenge comes up. Possible answers could consist of hardening resilience and more agile responsiveness, but also of a better common understanding and appreciation of shared basic values. The challenge of hybrid warfare is to be assessed against major overall trends such as global power shifts, problems coming more closely to Europe, the effects of new technologies, and a new dialectic of limitation and delimitation of conflicts. On an abstract level, three options can be offered: strengthening the symmetric way of dealing with conflicts via rule setting, acceptance of and adapting to the asymmetric way of warfare, or a combination of both.

IFSH takes part in “Nacht des Wissens” (Night of Science)
November 7th, 2015, 5pm - midnight at IFSH (Beim Schlump 83).

There will be presentations and discussions on the topics of: “Wars in the 21st century”, “Boat people – a challenge for Germany and Europe”, “Wars in the middle of Europe – the next steps in Ukraine?”, “The Islamic State (IS): Hopes of salvation and horrors”, “External Peacebuilding?”, “Drones and killer robots – unmanned warfare”. At 8pm there will be the annual quiz “War and Peace”. The winner will receive a free copy of the “Peace Report 2015”.

Bundeswehr goes Cyber – IFAR’s contributions to the debate

Considering the expected growing threat within cyberspace, many leading industrial nations have started setting up cyber-command-centers, published cyber doctrines and are discussing potential defensive and offensive strategies. As early as 2013, IFAR – together with UNIDIR – has pointed to this trend. International organizations such as the UN, EU, NATO or regional organizations such as the OSCE have also been working on creating trust building measures.

On the 17th of September 2015, a workshop took place - as part of the new white paper process - in Berlin with the Federal Ministry of Internal Affairs, the University of the German Federal Armed Forces, and Bitkom with the title “Perspektiven der Cyber-sicherheit (Perspectives of cyber security)”. Götz Neuneck, Dr Hans-Georg Maassen (President of the domestic intelligence service of Germany) and Claudia Nemat (Executive Board Member of Telecom Germany) made a statement together at the opening panel concerning the strategic threat of cyber attacks to Germany. Götz Neuneck emphasized the importance of keeping the internet “open, safe and peaceful” in or-
order to prevent a digital arms race. This event can be viewed online.

Additionally, Götz Neuneck organized a workshop together with Professor Hannes Federrath from the Department of Computer Sciences at the University of Hamburg on October 1st, for the 45th annual meeting of the German Society of Informatics. Neuneck and Thomas Reinhold – who held a presentation on what cyber weapons are – had already stressed in a previous publication that computer science must address the technical, but also the security and peace research implications that are interlinked with this issue. The mentioned essay was published as the opener in the 79th dossier of the magazine “Wissenschaft und Frieden” (W&F) under the title “Die Militarisierung des Cyberspace – die Informatik ist gefordert (The militarization of cyberspace – computer science must deliver)”. The panel presentations and concluding discussions demonstrated that many concepts, such as deterrence in cyberspace, or even the definitions of terms such as offensive or defensive, are not yet understood in their entirety when compared to the reach of the digital revolution. Much work is still needed.
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"Investigating the social contexts of emotions"
Panel at the ECPR General Conference 2015 in Montreal

Regina Heller from IFSH, together with Simon Koschut from the University of Erlangen-Nuernberg organized a panel at this year’s General Conference of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) in Montreal on the social contexts of emotions. The panel was designed as a contribution to current academic debates on the question of how emotions influence and interact with perceptions, identity, as well as practical politics. Emotions, many IR researchers claim, play an important role in the construction of social relationships. However, we still do not know very much about this social ‘character’ of emotions in international relations, let alone that we could predict when and how they unfold their social dynamic. How do, for instance, emotions contribute to the transformation of inter-state relationships, e.g. from distrustful to trustful relationships and vice-versa? What role do particular emotions such as empathy, honor or respect/anger, disappointment, grief, shame or hate play in this regard? How are emotions as social phenomena related to norms, identity, culture and other social group phenomena and dynamics? Why are some inter-state relationships emotionally more burdened than others?

The papers presented at the conference not only provided a variety of different theoretical and methodological approaches to these questions, but also a very broad and interesting empirical picture: The papers looked at emotions in the status-power figurations between Russia and the West, analyzed narratives on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the role of emotions therein, identity-culture-based politics of China, honor as a tool in international negotiation processes, as well as emotions in European identity constructions and their measurement. While the theoretical and empirical picture was multifaceted, the presentations and following discussion the papers were all tied together by a couple of key questions fundamental to the study of emotions in world politics: Are emotions reflexive or reflective; Are emotions a motivation for or an instrument to political behavior?; and What is the relationship between emotion and "rationality"?
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Preparing for the 2016 German OSCE Chairmanship
CORE trains officials from the German Federal Foreign Office in Berlin and Vienna

In preparation of Germany’s OSCE Chairmanship in 2016, CORE has conducted a two-part series of training courses for about 40 officials from the German Federal Foreign Office. The courses took place at Berlin City Hall (Rotes Rathaus) between the 3rd and 4th of September 2015 and at Vienna Hofburg between the 7th and 8th of September 2015. The idea of conducting these courses goes back to experiences gathered since the provision of the first training course of this kind conducted by CORE for Kazakh diplomats in 2007. Since then, CORE has trained the teams of the Kazakh, Lithuanian, and Irish, Ukrainian, Swiss and Serbian OSCE Chairmanships as well as the team of Mongolia’s Chairmanship in the OSCE Forum for Security Cooperation in 2015.

The two courses for the German diplomats in Berlin and Vienna were now the tenth and eleventh training measures along this line. Their general intention was to contribute to broadening the personnel pools of the German OSCE Task Force and the Permanent Mission of Germany to the OSCE. They were oriented towards communicating practice- and policy-relevant know-how and gave an overview of the OSCE acquis and the history, procedures, structures and operations of the organisation. Particular emphasis was put on understanding the logics and formats of the OSCE’s conflict management. The courses were also aiming to impart insider knowledge of previous chairmanships. CORE was - as always - supported by a number of partner institutions in implementing these courses. CORE wishes namely to thank colleagues from the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC), the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) and the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs for their valuable contributions as well as the Berlin Senate Chancellery and the OSCE Conference Services for their kind support.
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DAAD summer school on political ethnography in Tbilisi

Some questions in political science require going beyond the study of documents and existing literature. Especially when we study objects or regions, which are yet ‘understudied’, mainstream approaches are not always helpful. What is needed in such cases is not so much the testing of theories, but rather to understand the logic and the meaning of the object being studied. Especially during the last two decades, political ethnography became known as a method to study research objects more directly. The method has, amongst others, two salient features: First, researchers study the research object several times and during a longer period and in an interactive mode. Second, it is not the formal institutions or the self-descriptions of organizations or societies, which are of primary interest for ethnographers, but rather their practices and daily routines.

Political Ethnography is a promising approach for peace and conflict research in the post-Soviet space. An informal group of Central Asian researchers and IFSH staff member, Sebastian Schiek, came up with the idea to organize method training for colleagues from Central Asia and the Caucasus. The workshop took place in Tbilisi, Georgia, in August 2015, with a generous funding from the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the support of the Ilia State University in Tbilisi. Twenty university lecturers – post-docs and doctoral candidates – from nine countries participated.

Two renowned experts Dr Edward Schatz (Toronto) and Dr Julian Eckl (Hamburg) gave lectures, seminars
and exercises. Schatz is an expert on Central Asia and the editor of a book on ethnography in political science (2009). Eckl has extensive experiences in ethnographic field research and in lecturing the methods to students. The first three days of the workshop were devoted to in-class inputs and exercises on the method of political ethnography. On day four, the participants were supposed to apply their new methodological knowledge by conducting field research for a fictional research project on the presentation and self-representation of external actors in Tbilisi. The IFSH prearranged appointments with staff members of external actors, among them the EU Monitoring Mission, the NATO, the U.S. and German embassies. Groups of two visited one of the ten embassies and international organizations, which cooperated with the summer school. The last day of the school was devoted to the presentation and discussion of the results of the exercise. As a follow up of the summer school, some participants are planning to integrate elements of political ethnography in their lectures. Moreover, a group plans to use ethnographic methods for the study of the legitimacy of external actors in Central Asia.
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Publications and Conference papers

S+F. Sicherheit und Frieden, Issue 3/2015
The Arctic: regional cooperation or conflict?

The editor of the issue, Axel Krohn, states that geopolitical competition was the overriding feature of the Arctic region during the Cold War era. With the end of the Cold War a military pull back took place. Current military activities do not pose a threat. But competing sovereignty claims over navigation routes and competition for resources could develop into a more destabilized conflicting environment. In addition, primarily due to the effects of the climate change the High North is undergoing significant changes.

Sebastian Knecht examines the persistence of geopolitical paradigms in international relations and the Arctic. Looking at the European Union, Tobias Etzold and Stefan Steinicke outline the EU’s interests and political goals in the region, and its application to become a permanent observer in the Arctic Council (AC). Katrin Keil points out that ongoing transformations occurring in the Arctic are deeply intertwined with regional and global processes including the dispute on oil and gas resources. Looking at recent developments, Golo M. Bartsch elaborates on the military situation in the High North. He asks the question: Is the “Arctic arms race” on again? In this context Christoph Humrich elaborates on regional security governance and the Arctic Council. Finally, Marc Lanteigne examines China’s role in the emerging Arctic security discourses.

Outside of this issue’s special section, Viljar Veebel and Raul Markus analyze the prospects for success of the economic sanctions imposed against Russia.
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For over a decade, Europe’s most important security players have ignored too often the skulking decay of the institutions of cooperative security. With the ongoing Ukraine conflict, Europe’s security acquis is now back in the lime light. Three self-reinforcing crises – political, military, and structural – are at the heart of the current conflict. The intertwined character of the three crises in conjunction with hardened political positions will make it extremely challenging to reengage on Eu-
rope’s security acquis. At the same time, the current conflict in Ukraine underscores the need for stabilizing and confidence-building measures. Possible technical solutions from the realm of arms control are conceivable. What is needed is a serious restart at the political level. For the time being, such a restart is not in sight. Moscow has embarked on a dangerous mix of belligerent language, military muscle-flexing and nationalistic propaganda. The West pursues a no less dangerous strategy of pressuring Moscow to change course through the employment of sanctions. What both need now is an open and serious dialogue about the principle structures underlying European security.
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IFSH at the European International Studies Association conference (EISA), Sep. 23-26, 2015

The IFSH was represented at the EISA 9th Pan-European conference in Giardini Naxos, Sicily by three colleagues. Sybille Reinke de Buitrago presented the paper "National Identities and the Logic of Appropriateness in Military Interventions" (co-authored with Henrike Viehrig, University of Bonn, and Andrea Schneiker, University of Siegen). She also participated in the Young Researcher Workshop "IR's Feelings - Exploring Avenues for Theorizing the Processes that Render Emotions Political" at the University of Catania, where she presented her work on the role of emotions in U.S.-Iranian relations.

Delf Rothe co-convened a section on "Violence, Agency and Critique in an Age of Complexity" together with David Chandler from the University of Westminster. The section consisted of four panels and a roundtable, and discussed the tension among global complexity, violence and international security policy. He also acted as chair and discussant and presented the paper "Seeing like a Satellite: Remote sensing and the ontological politics of environmental security".

Sebastian Schiek presented a paper on "Political Legitimacy and Political Scandals in Central Asia" as part of the section "Resilience → Legitimacy ← Resistance".
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